



**TRAPS AND MANIPULATIVE (SPECULATIVE) METHODS USED IN
DISPUTES**

Turabova Sevara Kattaqulovna
Associate Professor, PhD in Philosophy,
Termez university of Economics and Service Uzbekistan.
Email: turobova.sevara@mail.ru

ABSTRACT

This article provides a logical epistemological analysis of traps and manipulative (speculative) methods used as a tactical method in debates. Although it is not possible to classify the traps according to one specific feature, according to the mutual ratio of manipulation and proof method in the tactical structure of the art of argumentation, the article highlights the most common typical traps in order to have a means of protection when facing the erist in the future.

KEYWORDS

Argument, trap, manipulation, communication, logical trap, psychological trap, information.

Introduction

It is known that the culture of interpersonal communication as a complex phenomenon of social life has its own logic of development. Today's modern civilization has reached a completely new stage of its development, where information has become one of the main values in human life. Mass use of new technical tools and information technologies, which form the basis of the rapidly developing process of informatization, has changed the way of life of a modern person, the requirements for his thinking and culture.

It is no secret that in modern society conditions are emerging for the rapid development of communication with the help of technical means. has acquired the properties of a powerful tool that can have a positive or negative effect on health. This is the second side of information governance, which makes the problems of communication culture more urgent.

Manipulation and logical fallacies are communication phenomena that have been around for a long time. At certain stages, science began to develop in the direction of condemning a person who uses illegal methods and traps that create barriers to communication in speech communication. These aspects are still relevant today as there are acute questions in the form of the causes of manipulation, signs of manipulators and methods of influencing them. However, modern rhetoric science, based on complex realities, not only allows the use of manipulative methods and tools, but also makes suggestions and recommendations, in this regard the following opinion of Bredemeyer, one of the famous researchers of modern rhetoric, is noteworthy: "All communicative technical methods and the means are essentially neutral in themselves, their halal or dubious method only happens when they are used, turning into black or white rhetoric" [Bredemayyer K., 2005 — P. 8]

It is known that there is a general opinion among researchers that "the history of the origin of

manipulative influence on a person should be sought in European culture." However, we do not consider this view to be correct. The phenomenon of manipulation first appeared and began to take shape in the East, and as a basis for this, examples of strategic thinking in the form of works of art, which are an integral part of the individual, national and social psychology of the Orientals, are, for example, in ancient China "Treatise on 36 Strategies" [Zenger X. fon. M., 1995] . Sun-Shi's "Treatise on the Art of War " [Sun Szi, - Moskva : AST, 2019. - 223], Guygu-szi's treatises of manipulative communication expressed in metaphorical schemes can be cited as an example.

Only a few centuries later, the manipulative approach to interpersonal communication, already common in Eastern cultures, began to spread in the West. In the last two millennia, it entered the culture and practice of communication in many European civilizations.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

In this paragraph, we will focus on traps and manipulative (speculative) methods used as a tactical method in debates. Sometimes, skilled erists deliberately use methods that go against all the rules of the argument if their goal is to win the argument. These are called "sophism" and "sophistic tricks". As a result, incompetent polemicists, especially those without a logical culture, unwittingly engage in paralogism they can make a mistake in the form.

During the dispute, there are methods used to make the dispute easier for him and harder for his opponent" [Sidelnikova T. T.– 2021. – №. 68-1. – S. 20], These methods, which lead to violation of the rules of discussion, are called pitfalls. And when it comes to manipulation, V.P. In the words of Moskvin [fr. manipulation manipulus - handful < manus - hand] "to covertly influence the addressee in order to ensure one-sided advantage in the dispute"[Moskvin V. — Rostov n/D, 2008.–P.355] understood.

Brennan, M.D "manipulation is the act of using others for one's own benefit, of influencing them by controlling them" [Brennan, MD. 2020] says. Excessive manipulation is a trick of tricksters, fraudsters and liars who do not respect moral principles, deceive and take advantage of the weakness and gullibility of others. At the very least, manipulation is the use of influence to gain control, gain, or advantage at the expense of others [Brennan, MD. 2020].

Today, in the theory of argumentation, "fallacies" called "fallacies" are studied as special types of false (broken) arguments [Aberdein, A 2014; Amossy, R 2010; 2013; Walton, D. 1995]. ". If these arguments are "false" (corrupted), on the one hand, they are determined by the subjective factor of "virtue argumentation theory" [Karimov, A.R. 2018; Aberdeen, A. 2010; 2014; Gascón, J.Á. 2017], on the other hand, it is determined by the skill of forming such an argument, that is, how skillful it is [Aberdein, A. 2014]. In addition, it is important to check that the opponent, who is responsible for finding and rejecting logical errors and deviations according to the terms of the debate, does not avoid this responsibility. For this purpose, the theory of logical errors (Theory of Fallacy) [Eemeren, van F.H.], which is widely used in didactic practice today, is aimed at the formation of argumentative debate skills [Conti, de M 2013]. 1992; Eemeren, van 2009; Tindale, Ch. W. 2007; Walton, D. A 1995] in development.

DISCUSSION

Manipulative (speculative) methods, signs of logical and psychological traps traditionally studied in the West, but unfortunately still unknown to most specialists in our country Given its apparent

weakness (perhaps due to certain historical reasons), we have set ourselves the task of exploring the manipulations and logical pitfalls found in debates. After all, it is precisely these types of traps that define the rhetorical dimension of argumentation. Unfortunately, the lack of knowledge of this conceptual system weakens the study of the science of logic in our country, and accordingly, it indicates the weakness of the current level of development of the theory and practice of argumentation in our country (this is obvious to anyone who is relatively familiar with the Western and especially the Anglo-American logical-rhetorical tradition obvious for).

Evidence culture [visual. the argument culture] consists not only of following Grays postulates (in particular, the maxims of politeness) and the ability to identify "subtleties and inconsistencies in the opponent's argument", but also, unfortunately, almost unknown to us logical, psychological, informational and it also means being aware of ways to identify and neutralize linguistic traps and manipulative schemes. The purpose of this paragraph is to fill this gap in our national culture. I.A. Gerasimova, one of the scientists of the CIS countries [Gerasimova IA. –M. 2010. –P..122] "Trap" refers to any direct violation of the requirements of evidence (in case of intentional violation, this is called an error), or the use of evidence techniques for malicious purposes, or violation of moral, psychological, cognitive norms and requirements of rational communication.

Nguyen Thi Thu describes pitfalls in debate as "one of the first steps in mastering the art of debating, which is a method of manipulating and arguing with the opponent." In S. Povarnin's work entitled "The Art of Argument", we can observe that various traps and tricks are used to improve one's own position and complicate the position of the enemy in a debate.

In the tactical structure of the art of argumentation, it is impossible to classify the traps according to their specific characteristics, but to have a means of defense against the erist in the future. can be distinguished for the purpose. S. Povarnin divided such traps into "permissible", "impermissible" and "psychological" types.

It can be seen that A. Ivin also divided the tactical traps that help to win the argument into "permissible and unacceptable traps". The first method is mostly technical, with elements of trickery, but no outright lies. In traps of the second method, various deceptive actions are directly observed .

According to the classification used by U. Vinokur, traps are divided into logical and psychological types. This author's description of pitfalls in debate is based on A. Schopenhauer's work "Eristics, or the art of winning arguments". The author deliberately does not divide traps into permissible and impermissible methods. He emphasizes that "a person should not limit himself in polemics and use any method that seems effective to him."

Therefore, "allowable pitfalls" are used to ease the argument for the erist himself, they are mainly of a technical nature. For example: sometimes the arguments of the opponent cannot be answered right away. It's just that "thoughts just don't come to my head." In such cases, the response is delayed as much as possible without noticing the opponent. For example: the opponent is asked to provide information about the grounds that he deliberately brought. Or, in order to save time, the answer comes from afar. In this case, time is used, and the thought is concentrated and the answer sought is formed.

CONCLUSIONS

From the mentioned points, it is clear that knowing the basic methods of protection against manipulative people is the most important for today. Indeed, as the number of attempts to control the

masses of people in the direction of their goals increases, it is desirable to know the methods of protection against them.

Today's world realities are a clear manifestation of manipulation, but this is not an influence on the minds of individuals, but an influence on the minds of entire nations and societies. People are easily indoctrinated with false goals that are fundamentally at odds with their values and beliefs. The problem is that the majority of the audience does not want to analyze the stream of information they receive, at least to check whether that information is correct or not. Because it is much easier to just accept information than to evaluate it and look critically.

The danger of manipulative influence lies in the fact that a person who falls under the influence not only performs the action directed at him, but also sincerely believes that he is performing this action according to his own will. In order for manipulation to be considered to have achieved its goals, a person's actions must be completely programmed, and even concepts that contradict his previous views must be accepted as values by him. It can be seen that manipulation means having a double influence. The manipulator begins to influence the object, and the object, in turn, becomes a partner in the process of manipulation.

REFERENCES:

1. Bredemayyer K. Chernaya ritorika: Vlast i magiya slova / Karsten Bredemayyer; Per. s nem. — 2-ye izd. — M.: Alpina Biznes Buks, 2005 — S. 8
2. Zenger X. fon. Stratagemy: O kitayskom iskusstve jit i vijivat: Znamenitiye 36 stratagem za tri tisyacheletiya: Per. s nem. M., 1995 [Elektron, resurs]. Rejim dostupa: <http://galactic.org.ua>
3. Sun Szi, (VI-V vv. do n. e.). Iskustvo voyni [Tekst] : [s kommentariyami i poyasneniyami : 12+] / Sun-Szi ; [per. s kitayskogo V. V. Bashkeyeva]. - Moskva : AST, cop. 2019. - 223
4. Sidelnikova T. T. Ulovki kak razreshenniye i zapreshenniye priyemi delovoy i neformalnoy kommunikatsii // Natsionalnaya assotsiatsiya uchenix. – 2021. – №. 68-1. – S. 20
5. Moskvina V. P. Argumentativnaya ritorika : teoreticheskiy kurs dlya filologov / V. P. Moskvina. — Izd. 2-ye, pererab. i dop. — Rostov n/D : Feniks, 2008. — S.355
6. Turabova, S. (2023). O 'rta asrlar sharq falsafasi tarixida ilmiy bahs muammosi va uning zamonaviy tafakkur rivojiga ta'siri. Namangan davlat universiteti Ilmiy axborotnomasi, (8), 294-298.
7. Kattakulovna, T. S. (2023). The problem of scientific dispute in the philosophy of medieval muslim peoples and its influence on the development of modern thinking. scientific approach to the modern education system, 2(18), 1-5.
8. Turabova, S. (2023). Talabalarning eristik kompetentligini rivojlantirishda ilg 'or xorij tajribalarni implementatsiya qilish imkoniyatlari. TISU ilmiy tadqiqotlari xabarnomasi, 1(2), 89-93.
9. Brennan, MD. „Signs of Emotional Manipulation“. www.webmd.com. WebMD. Qaraldi: 23-noyabr 2020-yil
10. Encyclopedia of Rhetoric / Ed. Th. O. Sloane. Oxford Univ. Press, 2001. P. 455.
11. Gerasimova IA. Vvedeniye v teoriyu i praktiku argumentatsii: ucheb, posobiye / I.A. Gerasimova. — 2-ye izd. — M.: Logos, 2010. — S.122
12. Турабова, С. К. (2023). Влияние современных технологий и социальных сетей на формирование молодёжи. International scientific journal of Biruni, 2(3), 132-137.

13. Kattakulovna, T. S. (2020). The creative interrelation of scientific debate with social life, the political situation and the dialectical way of thinking that reflects them. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 10(5), 1093-1098.
14. Kattakulovna, T. S. (2020). The importance of the discussion method in the development of argumentative competence in students. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 2(09), 442-446.