



Strategy And Tactics Of Scientific Dispute

Turabova Sevara Kattaqulovna

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Associate Professor, Termez University of Economics and Service

E-mail: turobova.sevara@mail.ru

ORCID - 0000-0001-9028-6943

Tel.: +998996762269

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes the need to implement a special strategy and tactics of the speech concept to achieve the goal in a scientific dispute, as well as the requirement for a clear planning of step-by-step actions to achieve the goal set in a scientific discussion. The rationale for the use of certain strategies and tactics depending on the type of dispute is described. Also, on the basis of scientific sources, the classification features of the strategy and tactics of conducting discussions, practical discussions, in particular aspects of setting and solving problems, were analyzed.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 14th July 2023

Revised: 14th August 2023

Accepted: 20th September 2023

KEYWORDS: dispute, strategy, tactics, eristic method, dialectical method, sophistic method, opponent, proof, problem, contradiction, criticism, logic, argument, proof

Introduction

To date, the emergence of a significant level of interest in the issue of debate culture, which is a manifestation of argumentation in Uzbekistan, is caused by the processes of democratization of social life, which have created favorable conditions for the exchange of ideas between representatives of various social movements. , it is appropriate to emphasize that. In the end, "... educating the new generation of educated and qualified personnel who will be proactive reformers, think strategically"[1] was included among the strategic tasks of the education policy. Therefore, the increasingly rapid development of new areas in the life of society, besides, the professional related to influencing people's beliefs in such areas as education, politics, mass media, jurisprudence, philosophy, religion and psychology. the need for more training of specialists has also made the need for special research on the methods of influencing trust-belief urgent

Materials And Methods

Since the argument is a communicative process consisting of a clash of ideas and a struggle, it requires a strategy and a tactic, based on a specific plan of communication, which consists of an orderly, systematic implementation using appropriate tools. The dictionary meaning of the term "Strategy" is "(Greek. stratos - army, agia - I lead) the art of waging war; means the general plan of conducting war and military operations" [8:573]. "The essence of strategy is to define tactical tasks" [2]. Today, "strategy" has become a universal concept and is used in the sense of the art of management based on long-term, accurate forecasts.

Tactics" is also a military term in origin, from "Greek. taktike means "(the skill of forming an army, spending) a component of military art that includes the theory and practice of preparing for battle and

conducting battle" [8:646]. Today, this concept is used in the sense of a set of tools and methods used to achieve a defined goal.

D. Fayzikhojayeva stated that "argument strategy is the goal of an argument, which is manifested in persuasion, winning, agreement, finding a solution, strengthening self-confidence, and so on".[7:162]

According to O. S. Issers, "strategy is not only a set of tactics, but also determines their general direction" [5:45]. However, a concrete practical result cannot be achieved through strategy alone. An effective result is achieved only in the cooperation of tactics and strategy. Because argumentative tactics are a means of realizing an idea. In particular, O. L. Goykhman defines tactics as "a means of implementing a strategy through techniques that allow achieving a goal in certain situations" [3:208]. That is, each tactic is aimed at expressing a specific communicative goal of one or another party. Tactics deals with direct implementation of resources

Discussion

Therefore, we will consider the main aspects of the strategy and tactics of the debate in a related situation:

- argument strategy is an idea of goal realization, and argument tactics is a means of realization of this idea;
- the dispute strategy determines the use and use of resources in the plan, and the dispute tactics deal with the direct implementation of resources;
- argument strategy determines the correct course of the sequence of activities, and argument tactics implements this sequence.

Depending on the type of dispute, certain strategies and tactics are used. Given that strategy is a general plan for the structure of a debate, let's consider the strategy used in a debate led by one person as an example. An example of this can be a manager justifying the correctness of his decision to his subordinates or a politician justifying the correctness of the position put forward by his party on a certain issue.

The following strategic steps should be taken:

- the first is logically perfect formulation of the thesis (theses must be consistent, clear, without contradictions);
- the second is to create arguments to defend the thesis, to criticize the opposing concept;
- the third is a logical assessment of the thesis, taking into account the presented evidence.

This strategy seems very simple, even obvious, but following it requires certain skills on the part of the proponent, the opponent, and the audience. It may also be the case that, for example, a thesis is formed, evidence is presented, but no conclusion is made about how much the presented evidence can confirm the thesis.

Modern researchers distinguish the following types of strategies used in the field of jurisprudence: defense strategy, attack strategy and psychological influence strategy.

The defense strategy is implemented through the tactics of partial admission of guilt, the tactics of proving acts of passion, and the tactics of positive characterization.

At the trial, the lawyer seeks to take the initiative in the trial and, accordingly, resorts to an attack strategy when trying to accuse the accuser of wrongdoing or injustice. Discrediting, criticizing the accuser, and sarcasm are among the tactics that implement this strategy.

In addition, the lawyer must have an appropriate influence on the court, because after his speech and the last word of the defendant, the court goes into session. Among the tactics that implement the strategy of psychological influence, researchers distinguish appeal to the principle of justice, logical focus, counter analysis and offering a certain point of view.

Now let's turn our attention to the tactics of debate. As it is known, the tactic deals with the direct implementation of resources. Argument tactics are a set of tools and methods used to achieve a goal in a debate. That is, it includes the analysis of a specific disputed situation and the tactical decisions made on the basis of this analysis. This content also includes:

- first, choosing an opponent or determining a position in relation to an existing opponent;
- secondly, to conduct the debate correctly;
- thirdly, the choice of methods of argumentation;

- fourthly, to constantly analyze and control the method used by the opponent, to maintain a balance similar to the ongoing debate;
- fifth, to finish the debate properly.

The tactics of choosing an opponent take into account the following situations (when it is possible to choose):

Don't argue with fools. "The more ignorant or stupid a person is," writes S. I. Povarnin, "the less he understands and accepts a complex idea or a complex argument." [6:32]

Do not argue with someone who is rude and intemperate. Sometimes the "Chapanic" style of communication, which is acceptable among "acquaintances", is not acceptable in an official debate.

Do not argue with sophists. If you are not sure that you can defeat cunning people who are inclined to use all kinds of lies and tricks, who consider the truth to be relative, "within their territory", it is better not to argue.

Don't argue with "argumentative" people who don't know how to listen to objections. S. I. Povarnin describes this category of debaters as follows: "He constantly forgets the topic of the debate, clings to one word, quickly changes his mind, interrupts the opponent and does not allow him to speak, until he finds an opportunity, o He shouts and accuses his opponent of not allowing him to speak" [14:51].

The following general rules should be followed during the discussion:

if it is possible to reach an agreement without conflict, it should be used, if there is no special need, one should not argue.

However, there are also fundamental issues that need to be discussed. You should not be afraid of such discussions and try to avoid them in different ways. Scientific debates are especially important. The spirit of science demands a detailed objective analysis of any reality and rejects false analyses. The analogy of the presumption of innocence does not apply to science - the scientist must be ready to critically analyze his results.

Argument tactics. The procedure or style of conducting the debate is determined according to the personal characteristics of the opponent and the goals of the debate. Therefore, according to the main types of debate, we distinguish three methods of it: a) dialectical, b) eristic, c) surbetcha methods.

The dialectical method is a rule-based, valid argument. This method is, first of all, characteristic of high-level debates, that is, debates aimed at finding an optimal solution to the truth and problem. Sophisms and forbidden tricks are not allowed in such a debate. A "dialecticist" treats his opponent with respect, does not allow personal attacks, insults, inappropriate comments.

The eristic method - this "combatant" method is typical for disputes where the goal is usually to win. But battles also have their own rules. In such a dispute, if the opponent uses tricks and violates the rules, then it is permissible to respond to him in the same way. In order to prevent the tricks of the opponent, usually the sophist uses tricks that are forbidden to him.

The "surbetcha" method is characterized by several obscene aspects. In this case, the public is addressed mainly in order to condemn the opponent. Arrogant sarcastic tone, rude laughter, mockery of the arguments presented by the opponent, and the fact that the goal is to disrupt the debate are considered the main signs of "surbet-style debate". It is known that it is not necessary to do business with such opponents, because he will pursue goals that are far from truth, conscience and honor. If someone argues with you in this way, you should leave the argument as soon as possible without responding to the attacks.

Tactic to end the dispute. When one of the disputing parties gives up his point of view and removes his objections to the opponent's point of view, it means that the dispute is over. This is the ideal situation. In practice, arguments do not always end with such a logical conclusion. Therefore, we will also consider the actual cases of the conclusion of the dispute.

A "compromise" situation. In this case, consensus is reached. The theses of the parties were found to be practically or theoretically equivalent; misunderstandings in terms are clarified; this friendly meeting of opponents is also known as "tengu-teng battle".

A "net win" situation. One of the parties will be forced to throw out their theses as a rejected, defeated thesis.

The situation of "suspension of diplomatic relations". In this case, there is a violation of the necessary conventions of proof, namely:

- the use of incorrect methods and false evidence;
- violation of the dispute regulation;
- that one of the parties deliberately tried to "disrupt the dispute". Sometimes such a violation is done deliberately in order to avoid defeat.

Conclusions

Disputes are a process that always takes place in a specific context, affecting people's beliefs, principles, honor and pride, and personal dignity. This situation requires choosing a certain method of debate, taking into account all the conditions, knowing the nature and essence of the opponents' methods of withdrawal. It is especially important to rely on the principle of tolerance when arguing. According to this principle, it is necessary to have such qualities as accepting the opinions of others objectively, showing respect to the opponent, recognizing the correctness of the opponent's point of view, and being ready to change one's idea after reasonable criticism. . It may also be that you win the argument but lose another aspect of it. you can All this requires careful selection of strategy and tactics.

References:

1. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Shavkat Mirziyoyevning Oliy Majlisga Murojaatnomasi. 24.01.2020-yil.
2. Alimardonov T. Harakatlar strategiyasi — O'zbekiston milliy taraqqiyotining yangi bosqichi./Halq so'zi. 29 Yanvar 2019 yil.
3. Гойхман О. Я., Надеина Т. М. Основы речевой коммуникации: Учебник для вузов / Под ред. проф. О. Я. Гойхмана. — М.: ИНФРА-М, 1997. — С. 208.
4. Демина Л. А. Теория аргументации. — М.: "МГОУ", 2009. — С. 123.
5. Иссерс О. С. Речевое воздействие : учеб. по-соб./ О. С. Иссерс. - 2-е изд. - М. : Языки славянской культуры, 2002. - 167 с.
6. Поварнин С. И. Искусство спора: О теории и практике спора. — М., 1993. (Воспроизведено по 2-му изд. Петроград., 1923). Гл. X.
7. Fayzixo'jayeva D., Negmatova Sh. Mantiq tarixi va nazariyasi. O'quv qo'llanma. —Samarqand. 2021. — B. 162.
8. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati. — T.: "O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi", 2006. — B. 646.
9. Турабова, С. (2023). Ilmiy bahs fenomenining mantiqiy–gnoseologik maqomini o'rganishda konseptual-metodologik yondoshuv. Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари/Актуальные проблемы социально-гуманитарных наук/Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences., 3(8).
10. Turabova, S. (2023). SOCIO-HISTORICAL AND LOGICAL-GNOSEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ART OF DISPUTE IN THE HISTORY OF KNOWLEDGE. Educational Research in Universal Sciences, 2(6), 73-87.
11. Turabova, S. K. (2021). Socio-Historical and Logical-Epistemological foundations of the development of the art of dispute. *ASIAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL RESEARCH*, 10(5), 58-61.
12. Turabova, S. K. (2019). Socio-historical basis for the development of euristics in the history of knowledge. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 3(71), 485-488.
13. Kattaqulovna, T. S. (2023). Historical Genesis of the Formation and Development of the Culture of the Dispute. *Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture*, 4(8), 17-28.
14. Kattakulovna, T. S. (2023). Conceptual and methodological approach in the study of the logical and gnoseological status of the phenomenon of a scientific dispute. *MODELS AND METHODS FOR INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH*, 3(26), 48-54.
15. Туробова, С. (2020). Талабаларнинг аргументатив компетентлигини ривожлантиришда бахс-мунозара методининг ахамияти. *Общество и инновации*, 1(1/s), 496-500.