

THE ROLE OF POLEMIC IN THE HISTORY OF MASS COMMUNICATIONS

E'tiqodkhon Atakulova

University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan
Senior lecturer of the "Human rights and media" department, Tashkent
etaqulova@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the appearance and role of polemics in the history of mass communication. It is known that the most powerful discovery in history - the emergence of the word - formed the need for communication in human society. Communication is a process unique to humans. It includes information exchange. With the help of communication, people work together to satisfy their needs towards a specific goal. In the process of dialogue, the goals and interests of the parties are not always shared. This causes mutual contradictions, disputes, conflict of opinions or various disputes. As a form of argumentation, it is polemic that has been exalted to the level of art. At this point, if we transfer it to the pages of the press, in addition to the press's awareness function, the polemic also serves the function of raising opinions, forming public opinion on a specific issue, and pluralism. Polemical articles usually appear in the press when debates, arguments, and different opinions arise in some area of society, around a specific problem.

Key words: *debate, mass media, content, orator, polemic, pluralism, discussion, press.*

В ИСТОРИИ МАССОВЫХ КОММУНИКАЦИЙ РОЛЬ ПОЛЕМИКИ

Эътикодхан Атакулова,

Узбекский Университет журналистики и массовых коммуникаций
Старший преподаватель кафедры "права человека и медиа", Ташкент.
etaqulova@gmail.com

АННОТАЦИЯ

В данной статье речь пойдет о проявлениях, месте полемики в истории массовой коммуникации. Известно, что самое мощное в истории открытие - появление слова-сформировало в человеческом обществе потребность во взаимодействии. Общение-это процесс, присущий только людям. Он предполагает обмен информацией. С помощью общения люди работают вместе, чтобы удовлетворить свои потребности, направленные на достижение определенной цели. В процессе общения не всегда цели, интересы сторон являются общими. Это приводит к возникновению взаимных противоречий, споров, конфликтов мнений или различных споров. Как форма аргументации, прославляемая на уровне искусства, является полемикой. В этот момент, когда мы переносим его на страницы прессы, полемика, помимо информативной функции прессы, также выполняет функцию пробуждения мнения, формирования общественного мнения по конкретному вопросу, плюрализма. Полемические статьи обычно попадают в прессу в той или иной сфере жизни общества, когда вокруг той или иной проблемы возникают споры, споры, различные мнения.

Ключевые слова: *дебаты, СМИ, контент, оратор, полемика, плюрализм, обсуждение, пресса.*

We often use the concept that truth is born in arguments in our conscious activities. This concept, which has been passing from language to language for several centuries, shows that the theory of debate has gone through a long historical development. The concept of debate, which is present in our values, history, and literature, appeared in ancient Greece in oral communication before the appearance of writing, and was glorified at the level of art as a manifestation of the talent and skill of the orator. The art of debate goes back to the art of oratory, which served to form the culture of public communication and is considered the oldest form of art.

In ancient Greece, orators paid special attention to meaningfulness and coherence in their speeches, to explanation with arguments and proofs [1]. Speeches and polemics of orators were important in finding a solution to one or another controversial situation in society. Polemic is one of the most ancient, traditional, and therefore the most concrete forms of communication, and this phenomenon entered our worldview, our way of life long before the emergence of journalism and the formation of editorial teams: "Production of human history, mythology, religion, atheism, could not have developed without the achievements of science, without the struggle of social contradictions and political views" [2].

The ancient art of polemics occupies a great place in the development of the theory of debate. In the science of the world, new ideas, discoveries, scientific theoretical foundations, development of various fields, conflicting opinions and disputes play an important role. Debate clarifies thoughts, increases worldview. Especially if it is within the framework of spiritual and moral standards, it becomes a sign of enlightenment [3]. Before we dwell on these concepts, we will pay attention to the term polemic.

It is worth noting that the concept of polemics, its essence and characteristics are given different definitions in the scientific literature:

Polemika is a Greek word, which means written, scientific debate, dispute[4]. The word "dispute" is derived from French, where the word "polémique" comes from the Greek "polemikos" ("combatant"). "Polemos" is derived from the word "war" [5].

In the explanatory dictionary of the Russian language, polemic is derived from the Greek word (polemikos) and has the meaning "combatant, enemy, attack".

Also, polemic is an argument during a discussion to clarify any problem, questions[6], a written or verbal attack against a certain opinion, defense of an opinion[7], the correctness of one's point of view and argument aimed at proving the wrongness of the opponent[8], a type of communication that takes place in the form of an intellectual duel, in which each of the participants criticizes and refutes the opponent's statements, as well as justifying and arguing his position[9]. Researcher A.

M. Shesterina defines polemic as "a debate aimed at proving the correctness of one's point of view and the wrongness of the opponent".

Arguing about a literary, artistic, scientific, political issue or event, a social issue, quarrels in the press about some common interest, is a type of debate in which everyone tries to prove that his position is correct [10].

Russian logician L.G. Pavlova defines polemic as follows. "Polemics is the science of persuasion. It teaches to strengthen an opinion with reliable and indisputable evidence, especially scientific evidence" [11], another researcher A.A. Ivin complements the scientist's thoughts and says that interest in such phenomena is "compulsion in society, it appears not through violence, threats, etc., but through the need to convince through speech" [12].

It can be seen from the above definitions that there are three different approaches to the concept of polemic itself. That is:

First, polemic is a concept that expresses an action, activity, such as a quarrel, conflict, war, attack.

The second is a type of communication that expresses meanings such as argument, defense of opinion.

The third is the method of persuasion and interest. The general aspect of the three different approaches is the presence of parties in each of the types we have classified. If there are no parties, there will be no conflict, no communication, no trust between them.

Polemics, as a rhetorical tool that determines the truth or falsity of the positions of the parties in a debate on any issue, was first used in the form of the art of discussion and scientific debate as an object of study of dialectics, philosophy and logic since ancient times. has started.

Protagoras, an ancient Greek philosopher and a skilled orator, who lived and worked in 480-410 BC, also taught his students the art of philosophy, oratory and debate, and created a work called "The Science of Debate". However, his works have

not reached us. The debate between Protagoras and his student Evatl is preserved in the pages of world history under the name "Evatl's fallacy" [13].

In 1281-1349, the English philosopher William Ockham introduced new methodological rules called "Ockam's razor", he preferred to observe the principles of simplicity and simplicity in scientific debates. Scientific debates and debates were often held at Oxford University, where William worked. The main condition of the polemic was that the student should firmly defend his opinion and answer them appropriately. Such disputes are usually violent, often ending in a fight, sometimes with execution[13]. A vivid example of this is the Italian philosopher Filippo Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), who always won polemics. The court of the Catholic Church uses all tortures to force Bruno to give up his views. But Bruno remains faithful to his faith. "To burn in the grass is not to deny!" These words were the last exclamation of Bruno who was burning in the fire[13]. René Descartes (1596-1650), who put forward the view that "I think, therefore I exist!", although he was curious by nature, he was able to behave decently during debates and arguments.

Since the foundation of statehood, there have been constant conflicts between social strata and power, society and religion, and this continues to this day. Also, in the teachings of the holy book of Zoroastrian religion "Avesta", it is recognized that the constant debate between lies and truth continues, and the celebration of good deeds, good words and good behavior has won [14]. In Yusuf Khos Hajib's work "Kutadgu Bilig", which is considered a rare example of Turkish literature in the 11th century, the manifestation of four images (state, justice, minister, mind) is revealed through question-and-answer, debate and advice. The author thinks about polemical issues within the framework of morality, science, humanity and justice.

Polemics at the level of art was formed in the ancient world under certain socio-historical conditions, and it served as the basis for a special teaching called "eristics" [15]. In the Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary, eristics is derived from the Greek word (eristikos), which means "to argue."

In the textbook "Osnovy polemicheskogo masterstva" by the researcher L.N. Sedova, eristics is defined as the art of arguing and polemics. Many scientific sources mention that this word is also used as a synonym of sophistry and dialectic.

Ancient Greek scholars noted dialectical conversations and sophistic debates as types of conflict. Another Russian researcher A.A. Gardariki's "Philosophy: Encyclopedic Dictionary" contains information that eristics as a kind of practical art later turned into dialectic and sophistry. Eristics was common in Greece and was understood as a means of finding truth through conflict. Researcher Sevara Torabova mentioned that eristics is considered as a study aimed at studying various descriptions (logical, pedagogical, semiotic, psychological) of the debate, which is one of the complex methods of the communication process[15]. The 19th century German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer, writing about eristics in his book "The Art of Winning Arguments", develops specific recommendations on how to win arguments. Aristotle also put forward the definition that eristics is the art of disputing in unfair ways.

Dialectic is derived from the Middle Greek (dialectikḗ) which means the art of arguing, reasoning. In a number of sources related to the history of philosophy, it is said that Zeno of Elea and Protagoras of Abder were the first to apply the dialectical argument. According to Zeno, the task of dialectics is to analyze thoughts and identify contradictions in them[15]. Initially, dialectics is a field of knowledge, the purpose of which is to teach the art of conversation and debate. However, later this term was formed as a science that studies the most general laws of the development of nature, society and thinking[16].

The history of philosophy, as defined by thinkers, includes Heraclitus's doctrine of eternal formation and the changeability of being, Socrates' art of dialogue, which is perceived as understanding the truth, Plato's method of separating and connecting the supersensible (ideal) essence of things, Aristotle the general rules of the doctrine of Nikolai Kuzansky, Giordano Bruno's doctrine of the unification of opposites, Kant's method of cleaning the human mind from illusions, (which strives for complete and

absolute knowledge and inevitably involves contradictions) Hegel's existence of opposites, spirit and it is possible to cite as an example the universal method of knowing the internal factors of the development of the body, the doctrines and methods accepted as the basis for knowing the reality and its revolutionary change[17]. In this regard, Plato's views on dialectics have a special place. According to his definition, dialectic is "a means of gaining a deeper understanding of the world of ideas through verbal conversation, questioning, proving, getting rid of emotional cognition, thinking. He defines dialectic as knowing how to question and answer. " "He who knows how to ask a question and can answer it, we call a dialectician," he says.

Dialectic was also a leader in medieval Eastern philosophy. According to Abu Nasr ibn Muhammad Farabi, the term dialectic was used by the ancient Greek philosophers Socrates and Plutarch, which means to expose the contradictions in the disputant's mind and to reach the truth through debate. According to him, a person can reach the truth only through dialectics[17].

According to Farabi, in order for dialectics to win in the debate, it is necessary to know the "art of training" in order to prepare a person to engage in theoretical science based on concrete knowledge and to make correct decisions in everyday life. He emphasizes that dialectical debates have two main purposes. The first goal is to deny, and the second is to prove. The second goal is not only to answer questions, but also to determine the strategy and tactics of the debate and to win over the opponent[18].

Sophism is an intellectual fraud, an activity aimed at justifying a preconceived notion of absurdity[13]. The goal of supporters of this view is to use the art of speech not to reach the truth through argument, but to achieve official and legal victory and to convince others that it is possible to win any dispute, regardless of the topic. . According to them, any argument can be fought because it has its counter-evidence. However, in the sophists, the argument began to serve not for truth, but for victory. They have developed a tactic to make even weak arguments appear strong in the course of an argument. However, it was the supporters of the sophists who were the first to

use proofs in debates, forcing the ancient Greek thinkers to develop the theory of proof[13].

A moral change in the basis of debates is associated with the name of Socrates, who opposed polemics, which serve to determine the truth, to eristics. Socrates gave dialectics a philosophical and intellectual form as a means of comparing opposing views of reality. He believes that the most correct way to the truth through polemics is to identify the contradictions in the opinions of the opponents. In addition to Socrates, Plato and the sophists, Aristotle also paid special attention to the study of debates in Ancient Greece. His works "Topika" and "On Sophistic Refutation" included in the collection "Organon" are among the first theoretical sources for systematic analysis of the principles of debate theory and practice.

The eighth chapter of Aristotle's treatise "Subject" is entirely devoted to dialectical discussions, in which he criticizes the eristic and sophistic debate. According to him, there are general methods of researching any issue in a dispute, general rules, topics on which the disputing parties should rely[14].

In conclusion, it can be said that the concept of dispute has not entered our life today. Argument theory has its own historical development path. First of all, there are opinions about the emergence of a dispute where there are generally two opposing opinions in the art of public speaking, in court cases, and in various discussions to solve social problems. Disputes cause the increase of different opinion circles in the society. It sharpens the mind, increases the worldview, and serves the birth of new ideas. As Karl Popper quoted, "the goal of debate should be progress, not victory." At this point, if we transfer it to the pages of the press, polemics, in addition to the press's awareness function, also performs the function of generating opinions, forming public opinion on a specific issue, developing pluralism, and finding a solution to a controversial issue.

REFERENCES

1. M.I. Ismailov., L.I. Tashmohammedova. The art of oratory. Study guide - T.: Publisher, 2019.
2. Абдеев Р.Ф. Философия информационной цивилизации / Р.Ф. Абдеев. – М.: ВЛАДОС, 1994. – 336 с.
3. Nazira Qurban. Analytical journalism: textbook.-T.: Bayoz, 2019. B.110.
4. Даль В.И. Толковый словарь живого великорусского языка: избр. ст. / В.И. Даль; совмещ. ред. изд. В.И. Даля и И.А. Бодуэна де Куртенэ. – Москва: Олма-Пресс: Крас. пролетарий, 2004. – 700 с.
5. Крылов Г.А. Этимологический словарь русского языка. – СПб.: ООО “Полиграфуслуги”, 2005. – 432 с.
6. http://ozhegov.info/slovar/?q=%D0%9F*&pg=149&ind=N
(Murojaat sanasi: 24.04.2023).
7. http://Users/yodgorov044gmail.com/Desktop/polemika/Polemik%20ta'rifi%20va%20ma'nosi%20_%20Col lins%20inglizcha%20lug'at.html
(Murojaat sanasi: 23.04.2023).
8. Шестирина А.М. Полемический текст в современной прессе: автореферат дисс ... док. филол. наук. – Воронеж, 2004. – 44 с.
9. Родос В.Б. Теория и практика полемики. – Томск: Томский государственный университет им. В.В. Куйбышева, 1989. – С. 10.
10. Энциклопедический словарь. М.: Гардарики. Под редакцией А.А. Ивина. 2004.
11. Павлова Л.Г. Спор, дискуссия, полемика. --М.: "Просвещение", 1991. С.6
12. Абрамов С. Война и журнал: О страницах «Нового мира» сорокалетней давности / С. Абрамов // Новый мир. – 1985. – № 1. – С. 225
13. Scenes of reality. 100 classic philosophers / Sayings, sayings, aphorisms. -T.: New age generation, 2013. - B.226.
14. Hamidov, Hamidjon. "Avesto" interest. — T.: Public heritage in the name of A. Kodiriy, 2001. — p.5.

15. Turabova S. Logical-epistemic analysis of scientific debate (debate, discussion, polemic, dispute). --Т: "Surkhan Nash", 2020.

16. Mikhailov, F. T. // New philosophical encyclopedia: in 4 volumes / ago. scientific.V. Edited by S. Stepin Council. 2nd edition., - М.: Fikr, 2010.

17. Аль-Фараби. Диалектика Историко-философские трактаты. Алма-Ата: "Наука", 1985, --С.405

18. Fayzikhojayeva D. Abu Nasr al-Farabi and Abu Ali Ibn Sina about logical proof. -- Т.: "Nishon-Nashir", 2013. - В.104.

19. Поварнин С.И. Спор. О теории и практике спора /С.И.Поварнин. - М.: Технологическая школа бизнеса, 2008. - с 72.