

# CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH IN THE STUDY OF THE LOGICAL AND GNOSEOLOGICAL STATUS OF THE PHENOMENON OF A SCIENTIFIC DISPUTE

**Turabova Sevara Kattakulovna**

*Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)*

*Associate Professor, Termez University of Economics and Service*

*E-mail:* [turobova.sevara@mail.ru](mailto:turobova.sevara@mail.ru)

*ORCID - 0000-0001-9028-6943*

*Tel.:* +998996762269

**Abstract.** *This article analyzes the functional aspects of the dispute phenomenon as a developing intellectual phenomenon passing through the stages of its emergence, formation and development. Based on the analysis of the formulation of a scientific discussion in modern logic and epistemology, the article substantiates the cognitive, practical and debatable aspects of the dispute. In particular, the importance of a scientific dispute in the formulation and solution of scientific problems is revealed. So, on the basis of scientific sources are analyzed the classification features of the dispute.*

**Key words:** *scientific dispute, logic, argument, proof, culture of dispute, controversy, debate, dispute, dialectical dispute, eristic dispute, sophistical dispute, apodectic dispute, proof, argument.*

## INTRODUCTION


The phenomenon of scientific debate is a process with a multifaceted appearance, and it is appropriate to consider separately the components, priorities and factors influencing its development. In other words, "what is a dispute?", "what are its characteristics?", "what aspects are related to it?" it is necessary to find answers to such questions.

## Materials and Methods

First of all, based on the debate and its peculiarities, it is desirable to clarify the conceptual interpretation of the concept of "dispute" and its components. In the "Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language" and "Pedagogy: Encyclopedia" the following definitions are given to the concept of "debate": a method aimed at finding a solution to a problem by promoting mutually exclusive opinions in some cases" [4. 129] is.

Logical scientist A.A. According to Ivin, "A debate is a clash of ideas or views,





in which opponents present arguments to support the correctness of their views, and criticize ideas that do not agree with their own. "[6. 216].

Professor K. Nazarov, doctor of philosophy, explains the essence of this concept as follows: "The debate is a vivid example of practical logic in the development of the culture of discussion, the use of techniques necessary to understand the interlocutor.

According to the description of V. Alimasov, "argument is a way of approaching and clarifying conclusions, reacting to existing views" [1. 52].


Methodological research of the science of debate was first started by logicians. For example, to cases related to disputes abroad [10. 1-29]. Notably, there are many publications that consist of purely practical developments in implementing the skills of winning an argument with the help of argumentation strategies and tactics. In particular, S. Toulmin in his "The Uses of Argument" [12. 247] criticized the formal approach to the analysis of debate and argumentation and raised the issue of the need to develop a new approach to the theory of argumentation. S. Toulmin put forward the idea that it is necessary to bring logic closer to epistemology, and thus to expand the research scope of logic by covering controversial processes that occur in various situations of human activity.

Belgian researchers Haim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Titek [9. 216] together studied the methods and rules of argumentation and debate, which are often used in the activities of lawyers, politicians, sociologists and humanitarians. In their work entitled "New Rhetoric", they were able to create a unique set of argumentative rules used in group debate and persuasion of the audience.

Famous representatives of formal dialectics are YE. M. Barth and Ye. V. Krabbe in 1982 in his book "From Axiom to Dialogue" [9.] developed a system of "formal dialectics" designed to accept one or another point of view based on general rules. It reflected a certain set of rules for conducting critical dialogues between the defender and the opponent.

Today, European scientists have developed a modern theory of argumentation under the name pragmadialectic. In particular, representatives of the Amsterdam school, consisting of F. Yeyemeren, R. Grootendorst, E. Feteris, P. Houtlosse, A. F. Henkemas and others, proposed a theory of argumentation called pragmadialectic. Pragmadialectic is an interpretation that occupies an intermediate position between logical and rhetorical approaches to argumentation. Representatives of the Dutch school, who worked within the framework of the development of this concept, developed the concept of pragmadialectics in a way that combined the advantages of both directions. In this approach, the argument meets the requirements of





pragmatics and the argument dialectical character. The most important aspect of pragmadialectics is the formation of a set of rules aimed at rationalizing the actions of the discussion participants. Pragmadialectic models of debate are mostly used in cases where compliance with regulations is required, for example, in legal systems.

### **Discussion.**

It is known from the above that proof and refutation occupy a central place in the process of scientific debate. Based on the opinions expressed, we comment on the scientific debate according to the initial working definition: the scientific debate, according to its epistemological character, is a dialogue aimed at searching for the truth by discussing scientific problems in the process of research. is the most organized and systematic form. In a scientific debate, unlike other simple forms of debate, the phenomenon of constantly searching for evidence for both sides, confirming or denying them, and choosing acceptable ones plays an important role.

If we approach the issue of scientific debate from a logical-epistemic point of view, real scientific debates always rely on a rational basis, that is, its effectiveness is determined by the logical connection and validity of the arguments put forward in it. The arguments and proofs used in this regard allow the participants of the discussion to arrive at the truth based on a rational basis.

### **Results**


The eristic view of the argument is an argument to win, "in which the main goal is to convince the opponent" [5. 45]. The founders of the eristic style were the sophists, among whom Protagoras of Abder occupies an important place. According to G. Gauthier [4.], Protagoras is the first deontological logician who introduced the term "eristics" and described the famous trial with his student Evatl.

In eristic debates, the polemicist almost always tries to transfer the topic of the debate to a circle known to him and unknown to his opponent. However, the manipulative aspect of this method is that the scope of the argument, which is not well known to the opponent, can be very relevant and interesting for the listening audience, and familiar to the erist himself.

The eristic approach to debate has not lost its importance in the form of an art that arose in Ancient Greece as a way of convincing one's point of view and denying the opponent's opinion. In this case, a person needs to have certain skills to defend his point of view and, first of all, to find logical errors in the opponent's reasoning, to be able to uncover sophisticated, psychological traps and illegal methods in polemics.

"The methods of using various psychological traps and sophistry to defend one's position and reject the opponent's ideas can be studied in the history of






eristics as the art of persuasion" [13. 27]. It is from this point of view that Arthur Schopenhauer, the author of the book "Eristics or the Art of Argument", approaches the theory of eristics: "eristic dialectic is the art of always being right in an argument" [14. 618]. i.e. "per fas et nefas" [15. 12], explains. A. Schopenhauer looks for the cause of eristic behavior in the psycho-emotional nature of the disputing person. According to Schopenhauer [16. 52], "truth as a dialectical (dialogical) mechanism can be born only in debate. However, the subjective reasons hidden in human nature not only make it permissible to reach the truth in the debate, but also make it impossible in practice.

A. Schopenhauer did not clearly distinguish the difference between eristics, sophistry and dialectics. At first, he even wanted to name his work "Dialectics". Schopenhauer, like Kant, considers dialectic to be "the art of argumentation or conversation." In his opinion, the research topic of dialectics "must be the activity of thinking in cooperation between two intelligent beings, and if they cannot come to an agreement with each other, a dispute will undoubtedly arise [17. 2]". According to him, the purpose of the dispute is not only Convince and defend the opponent that z's opinion is correct, but most importantly, win. Of course, without complete and deep knowledge of the issue, it is impossible to achieve such a goal, but in his work, the analysis of the mistakes that should not be made in the debate and thus the prevention of the opponent's chances of an easy victory is important. is enough. In particular, in order to help people to be right in arguments in complex and difficult situations, Schopenhauer studied and developed special tricks in arguments, and described the appropriate methods and rules for them in his doctrine called "Eristic Dialectic". did

The sophistic view of the debate is characterized by an egocentric and destructive approach, negative rhetoric. A sophistic argument, unlike an apodectic argument, mainly aims to defeat the opponent. The sophistic dispute was deprived of any axiological significance, and the main goal was to achieve victory at any cost. Behind the desire to win, the sophist is not at all interested in the search for truth and does not seek to convince his partner of anything.

In modern literature, sophistic and eristic debates are mostly indistinguishable. For example, D. Walton characterizes the eristic type of communication among the types of communication listed above as a high level of competitiveness and struggle, because "each participant tries to make an impression about himself in the eyes of fans as the smartest and most talented" [18. ] This situation also determines the nature of communication. According to the scientist, "the out-of-bounds appearance of such communication causes a quarrel."





D. Walton[19.] distinguishes six main types of dialogue based on the initial situation of a dialogue and the individual aims and collective goals of the participants. These are: "persuasion dialogue, negotiation dialogue, eristic dialogue, inquiry dialogue, deliberation dialogue and information-seeking dialogue are dialogues" [20. 183]. At the same time, D. Walton often in his works "looks at the eristic dialogue as a sophistic dialogue" [21. 195].

Walton D. characterizes the eristic type of communication as a high level of struggle and competitiveness, because each participant tries to create the impression that he is "the smartest and most talented" in the eyes of fans. As a result, such a situation also determines the nature of communication. According to D. Walton, the appearance of such a communication that goes beyond the limits causes a scandal.

To summarize the results:

First, eristics deals with the argumentative type of communication. Any discussion implies an active and critical exchange of ideas between the participants of the dialogue.

Secondly, the characteristic feature of eristic communication is that it always implies a struggle for victory. It is observed that various tricks and traps can be used in such disputes.

### **Conclusions**

It is known that in life, more attention is paid to the aspects related to the essence of the debate, therefore, one of its important requirements is to choose the type of debate (for example, discussion, debate or polemic) based on the circumstances determined by concrete conditions. First of all, it should be said that the interpretation of discussion, debate, polemic and dispute do not mean the same thing. However, it is observed that in the majority of scientific literature in the fields of pedagogy, philology, and even logic in our country, special forms of debate and their differences are not analyzed. Actually, in practice, "discussion, debate, polemic and disputes should be characterized as synonyms, i.e. special forms of debate".

### **REFERENCES:**

1. Алемасов В., Мамадалиев Ш.О. Илмий тадқиқот: методология, методика, ижодиёт. Катта илмий ходимлар-изланувчилар ва мустақил изланувчилар учун қўлланма. II қисм. – Т.: Ўзбекистон Республикаси ИИВ Академияси, 2016. – 52 б.



2. Блажевич, Н.В. Судебная эристика: монография / Н. В. Блажевич. Тюменский юридический ин-т. – Тюмень : Тюменский юридический ин-т МВД РФ, 2005. – 111 с.
3. Gauthier, G. Le cadre éristique du débat argumentatif / G. Gauthier// Communication. Vol. 30/2 , 2012. – URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/communication/3570>
4. Педагогика: энциклопедия. – Т.: “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси”, 2015. –Б.129.
5. Коренная О. Б. Спор. К вопросу о логико-психологических аспектах спора //Вестник Амурского государственного университета. Серия: Гуманитарные науки. – 2013. – №. 60. – С. 43.
6. Павлова, Л.Г. Спор, дискуссия, полемика / Л.Г. Павлова. – М.: Просвещение, 1991. – 124 с.
7. Пири, М. Железные аргументы. Победа, даже если ты не прав / М. Пири. – Москва: Питер, 2013. – 191 с.
8. Поварнин, С.И. Спор: О теории и практике спора (1918) / С.И. Поварнин. – СПб.: Лань, 1996. – 149 с.
9. Perelman Ch, L., Olbrechts-Tyteca. The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. - London: Notre Dame, 1969
10. Perelman, Ch. Traité de l'argumentation. La nouvelle rhétorique / Ch. Perelman, L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. – Bruxelles: Ed. De l'Université de Bruxelles, 1983. – 734 p.
11. Рузавин Г.И.-Логика и аргументация.-М:Юнити,1997.-С.122
12. Stephen E. Toulmin. The Uses of Argument. Cambridge University Press, 2003 P. 247
13. Тамразова И. Г. Функционально-прагматические характеристики эристического дискурса. Автореферат дис. .... кандидата философских наук. – Пятигорск, 1999. – С. 27.
14. Шопенгауэр А. Эристическая диалектика // Логика и риторика. Хрестоматия / сост. В.Ф. Берков, Я.С. Яскевич. Мн., 1997. – С. 618
15. Шопенгауэр А. Искусство побеждать в спорах (сборник) / А. Шопенгауэр — «Эксмо», 1900
16. Schopenhauer, A. L'art d'avoir toujours raison ou Dialectique éristique (1864) / A. Schopenhauer. – Strasbourg: Circé. 1999. – P.52
17. Шопенгауэр А. Эристика или искусство спорить. - Санкт-Петербург: 1900,



18. Walton, D. A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy / D. Walton. – The University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, 1995. – 324 p.
19. Walton D.N., Krabbe E.C.W. Commitment in dialogue. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995
20. Walton, D. Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation. – NY, 2006. – P. 183.
21. Walton, D. The new dialectic: Conversational contexts of argument. – Toronto, 1998 – P.195.
22. Турабова, С. (2023). ILMIY MUAMMOLARNI HAL ETISHDA BAHS-MUNOZARALARNING TUTGAN O'RNI. *Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари/Актуальные проблемы социально-гуманитарных наук/Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences.*, 3(S/5).
23. 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.
24. Turabova, S. K. (2023). ISLOM MANBALARIDAGI BAHS VA DALILLASH USULI ZAMONAVIY ARGUMENTLASH NAZARIYASI TALQINIDA. *RESEARCH AND EDUCATION*, 2(7), 26-31.

