

**КИЇВСЬКИЙ СТОЛИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**  
**ІМЕНІ БОРИСА ГРІНЧЕНКА**

**Факультет суспільно-гуманітарних наук**

**Кафедра філософії та релігієзнавства**

**Галузь знань: 03 Гуманітарні науки**

**Спеціальність: 033 Філософія**

**Рівень вищої освіти: перший (бакалаврський)**

**ДИПЛОМНА РОБОТА**

**ІЗ СОЦІАЛЬНОЇ ФІЛОСОФІЇ НА ТЕМУ:**

**Satirical-pamphleteering competition as a cultural phenomenon**

**Студента 4 курсу ФІЛб-1-22-4.0д групи**

**Половинка Данііла Миколайовича**

**Науковий керівник - Горбань Олександр Володимирович**

**Роботу захищено « \_\_\_\_ » \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_ р.**

**Оцінка \_\_\_\_\_**

**Київ – 2026 р.**

## Зміст

INTRODUCTION .....	3
I. Ridicule in European and Ukrainian Cultural Tradition .....	5
1.1. The Philosophical Foundations of Pamphlet and Satire Culture .....	5
1.2. Satirical-Pamphlet Tradition as a Space of Social and Cultural Dialogue .....	12
1.3. Irony, Parody, and Exposure as Forms of Cultural Competition.....	17
II. Hip-Hop and Battle Culture as a Contemporary Form of Satirical- Pamphlet Competition .....	26
2.1. Hip-Hop as a Culture of Resistance and Identity.....	26
2.2. Rap Battles and Diss Tracks as Modern Pamphlet Dialogue.....	31
2.3. Internet Culture as a Contemporary Arena for Satirical Pamphleteering and Hip-Hop Agonistics.....	37
Summary .....	44
REFERENCES .....	47

## INTRODUCTION

Satire and pamphleteering occupy an important place in cultural history because they transform criticism into a public act. Before modern journalism, hip-hop or any semblance of today's internet culture, these literary devices allowed writers and marginalized communities to challenge authority and expose hypocrisy inside the same hierarchical systems that burdened them, meanwhile they invited their respective audiences to participate in symbolic struggles over legitimacy and identity. Their force lies not only in direct argument, but also in parodying and exaggerating the authorities through various grotesque imagery and rhetorical confrontation.

The importance of satirical-pamphlet competition extends beyond literature – it shaped religious debates and revolutionary movements, as well as anti-imperial critique and later forms of popular culture. From Aristophanes, Martin Luther, Jonathan Swift, Voltaire, Taras Shevchenko, and Ivan Franko to hip-hop battles, diss tracks, memes, and online commentary, societies repeatedly use mockery intertwined with public exposure to negotiate power and meaning.

The relevance of this research is determined by the fact that contemporary culture is increasingly shaped by rapid symbolic conflicts. Often times today's internet debates and viral memes function in ways similar to older pamphlet wars: they circulate quickly and invite public judgment, all the while turning disagreement into cultural performance. Therefore, studying satirical-pamphleteering competition makes it possible to understand both forms of intellectual resistance and their transformation within hip-hop and digital media.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze satirical-pamphleteering competition as a cultural phenomenon and to reveal its philosophical, culturological, communicative, and agonistic functions through the comparison of satire

and pamphlets, hip-hop battles and diss tracks, and how these forms shaped internet culture.

Main tasks of this paper:

- Analysis of satire and pamphleteering as historical forms of cultural criticism and public dialogue;
- Analysis of Ukrainian polemical literature as a form of cultural self-defense and moral critique;
- Examination of ridicule, irony, parody, grotesque imagery, exposure, and polemical confrontation as mechanisms of cultural struggle;
- Comparison between historical satirical-pamphlet competition with hip-hop battles and diss tracks as contemporary forms of verbal agonistics;
- Lastly, it's important to determine how internet culture, memes, reaction videos, livestreams, and algorithmic media transform older forms of satirical conflict.

Object: satirical-pamphleteering competition as a cultural and communicative phenomenon.

Subject: the philosophical, cultural, rhetorical, and media mechanisms through which satire, pamphlets, hip-hop battles, diss tracks, and internet culture function as forms of public confrontation, symbolic competition, and cultural resistance.

The theoretical and methodological basis of the study consists of philosophical, literary, cultural, historical, and media-theoretical approaches. The research relies on concepts of carnival and grotesque laughter, public sphere theory, agonistic democracy, cultural representation, subculture, spectacle, imagined communities, postcolonial critique, and hip-hop studies.

The methodological foundation includes analysis and synthesis, historical and comparative methods, cultural interpretation, discourse analysis, and content analysis.

The practical significance of the study lies in connecting historical literary and philosophical traditions with contemporary cultural practices. By analyzing satire, pamphlets, hip-hop, and internet culture within one framework, the research demonstrates that modern digital conflicts are not isolated phenomena, but part of a longer history of public symbolic struggle through which societies question authority, defend identity, and negotiate truth, legitimacy, and moral order.

**KEY WORDS:** Satire, pamphlet, social media, hip-hop, diss tracks, battles

## **I. Ridicule in European and Ukrainian Cultural Tradition**

### **1.1. The Philosophical Foundations of Pamphlet and Satire Culture**

Before modern journalism or social media rose to dominate the press, satire and pamphleteering provided ways for marginalized voices to criticize the elites or dominant ideologies in their given culture. The genres emerged as two of the most powerful assets to writers and any thinkers to challenge authority in forms that were accessible and difficult to suppress completely. Together, satire and pamphlets formed an alternative public sphere, where a

space where ideas could circulate outside official institutions and where resistance could become collective rather than isolated.

Satire is a literary mode that uses different types of humor, predominantly irony, exaggeration and parody to criticize human vice, and any kind of institutional failure. It is not simply “making fun” of something; whether directly or indirectly it aims to reveal flaws by making them visible through ridicule. A key theoretical formulation comes from Dustin Griffin, who emphasizes that satire is a “critical act of communication” rather than a fixed genre.

The roots of satire can be traced back to the ancient world; in ancient Greece, comic playwrights such as Aristophanes mocked war and corruption in their plays, as well as the failures of democracy itself. Satire in this early form functioned as a social weapon disguised as entertainment which became a way to expose contradictions in power structures without directly presenting a formal political argument. *The Clouds*, admittedly one of his less famous comedic plays, acted as a lampoon of intellectual fashions in classical Athens and served as a great example of the ways Aristophanes would depict well-known political and philosophical figures, and in this example, someone like Socrates would be described as an aloof false prophet who taught how to make the weaker argument defeat the stronger.

The Romans expanded satire into a literary genre. Writers such as Juvenal and Horace transformed satire into a sustained mode of intellectual commentary. Juvenal’s writings, which represented the Silver Age Latin satire, attacked greed and corruption within the Roman Empire, as well as its’ moral decay during the early Common Era (Juvenal, 100-127 AD (published in 1467)), while Horace employed a more ironic approach to ridiculing foolishness through humor (Horace, 35 BC). Either way, the given moral systems often emerge not from virtue itself but from resentment, through which the weak transform their impotence into moral judgment against the powerful (Nietzsche, 1887).

This tension between official narratives and satirical critique remained important throughout the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Although medieval Europe was dominated by monarchies and religious institutions with immense power over intellectualism, satire survived through folk traditions such as carnivals and oral storytelling. Festivals often “inverted” social hierarchies where peasants mocked nobles, fools mocked priests, and any ordinary person had the chance to participate in “flipping the script”. This carnival culture represented a temporary suspension of hierarchical order in which “all were considered equal during carnival,” allowing common people to parody authority through grotesque and collective laughter; the latter having "a deep philosophical meaning" and serving as a force of cultural renewal.

The invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg in the fifteenth century transformed both satire and pamphleteering permanently. Before print technology, manuscripts were expensive, slow to reproduce, and controlled largely by religious or aristocratic elites. Print made the rapid circulation of ideas possible on an unprecedented scale. This technological shift was revolutionary because resistance no longer depended solely on local speech or performance. Ideas could now travel across cities, kingdoms, and eventually continents. The pamphlet became one of the most important forms enabled by print culture because it was cheap, portable, and relatively easy to produce.

Pamphleteering likewise transformed in the digital age. Blogs, manifestos, social media threads, zines, and independent digital publications function similarly to historical pamphlets. They are relatively inexpensive to produce, circulate rapidly, and often emerge outside institutional gatekeeping. The modern internet in many ways revived the chaotic energy of early print culture. Information spreads quickly, authority fragments, and ideological battles occur in public view. Guy Debord’s "The Society of the Spectacle" anticipated modern performative media culture and symbolic competition.

Pamphlets were short printed texts usually focused on a specific argument, controversy, or political issue. Unlike large scholarly books intended for educated elites, pamphlets addressed broader publics. They were designed to provoke and spread quickly. Their affordability meant they could reach merchants, artisans, urban workers, and literate commoners rather than only aristocrats or clergy; pamphlets therefore democratized intellectual conflict.

One of the earliest and most influential uses of pamphleteering as intellectual resistance occurred during the Protestant Reformation. Martin Luther used pamphlets extensively to criticize the Catholic Church, particularly its sale of indulgences and concentration of authority (Luther, *Ninety-five Theses*, 1517). His ideas spread across Europe with astonishing speed because printing presses reproduced his writings in massive numbers. Luther's success demonstrated how pamphlets could undermine centralized institutions by creating decentralized ideological movements.

Religious conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries intensified the importance of pamphlets. Catholics, Protestants, monarchists, republicans, and radicals all used print to attack enemies and defend their visions of society. During the English Civil War, pamphlets flooded the public sphere. Competing factions used them to debate sovereignty, religion, law, and the rights of ordinary people. Radical groups such as the Levellers argued for expanded political participation and civil liberties through pamphlet literature. In this context, pamphlets became weapons in ideological warfare.

Satire also flourished during these centuries because direct criticism of rulers remained dangerous. Writers used allegory, irony, and fictional narratives to disguise attacks on authority. The ambiguity of satire was part of its power. A satirist could deny literal intent while audiences recognized the target. This duality made satire resilient under censorship. It could survive because meaning often depended on interpretation.

The Enlightenment further expanded satire and pamphleteering as forms of intellectual resistance. Thinkers increasingly challenged absolutism, religious dogma, and inherited hierarchy. Satirical writers exposed irrationality within supposedly rational institutions. Voltaire used irony and satire to criticize religious intolerance, authoritarianism, and philosophical optimism. His work illustrated how satire could function philosophically as well as politically. Rather than merely mocking individuals, Enlightenment satire attacked entire systems of thought.

Pamphlets became central to revolutionary movements in both France and United States (Darnton, 2023). During the American Revolution, Thomas Paine published the pamphlet *Common Sense*, which argued for independence from Britain in language ordinary readers could understand, thus exemplifying the political power of accessible language (Paine, 1776). Intellectual resistance succeeded not only through sophisticated theory but through emotional clarity and rhetorical force.

Similarly, the French Revolution depended heavily on pamphlets, political cartoons, and satirical publications. Revolutionary writers attacked monarchy, aristocracy, and clerical privilege through print culture. Satire became more aggressive and populist, often portraying rulers as grotesque, corrupt, or absurd. The visual dimension of satire grew increasingly important because caricatures and illustrations could communicate criticism even to semi-literate audiences.

By the nineteenth century, satire and pamphleteering evolved alongside industrialization and mass politics. Expanding literacy rates and cheaper printing technologies created larger reading publics. Socialist, anarchist, feminist, and anti-colonial movements all adopted pamphlets as tools of organization and resistance. Pamphlets were practical because they condensed complex ideological positions into portable forms suitable for workers' meetings, protests, underground networks, and activist circles.

Satire during this period frequently targeted capitalism, imperialism, and bourgeois morality. Writers such as Jonathan Swift earlier had already demonstrated the horrifying effectiveness of extreme irony in works like *A Modest Proposal*, where he sarcastically suggested impoverished Irish families sell their children as food for the rich. The shock of the satire forced readers to confront the cruelty of British colonial policy toward Ireland. This illustrates a key mechanism of satire as resistance: exaggeration reveals moral truths hidden by normalized violence.

In the twentieth century, authoritarian regimes demonstrated how threatening satire and independent pamphleteering could be. Fascist and totalitarian governments often censored humor, underground publications, and dissident literature because these forms weakened ideological control. Satire punctures political mythology. Dictatorships rely heavily on spectacle, seriousness, and the image of invincibility. Ridicule can therefore become politically dangerous. Underground newspapers, samizdat publications in the Soviet Union, anti-fascist cartoons, and dissident essays circulated despite censorship because people continued seeking alternative interpretations of reality.

Anti-colonial movements also relied heavily on pamphlets and satirical journalism. Intellectuals resisting European empires used print culture to develop national consciousness and criticize colonial domination. Writers in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East employed satire to expose the hypocrisy of imperial “civilizing missions.” Colonial powers claimed moral superiority while practicing exploitation and violence, and satirical critique highlighted this contradiction.

Satire evolved further through new media technologies such as radio, film, television, and eventually the internet. Yet its essential structure remained consistent: using humor, irony, exaggeration, or parody to reveal hidden truths about power. Modern political cartoons, television comedy, internet memes, and diss tracks all descend from older satirical traditions. They

simplify complex grievances into emotionally powerful symbolic forms. This is why satire often thrives during moments of political frustration. When formal institutions seem unresponsive, satire becomes a way for people to reclaim interpretive power.

Pamphleteering likewise transformed in the digital age. Blogs, manifestos, social media threads, zines, and independent digital publications function similarly to historical pamphlets. They are relatively inexpensive to produce, circulate rapidly, and often emerge outside institutional gatekeeping. The modern internet in many ways revived the chaotic energy of early print culture. Information spreads quickly, authority fragments, and ideological battles occur in public view.

The relationship between satire and resistance is deeply connected to language itself. Power often depends on controlling narratives, defining legitimacy, and naturalizing inequality. Satire interrupts this process by reframing reality. It reveals absurdity within systems presented as inevitable or sacred. Pamphlets complement this function by offering direct arguments capable of mobilizing collective action. Satire destabilizes belief; pamphlets organize alternatives. Together, they historically formed a dual structure of intellectual resistance: emotional disruption paired with ideological persuasion.

Importantly, satire and pamphleteering were not always progressive. They could also spread propaganda, prejudice, conspiracy theories, and reactionary politics. Throughout history, different groups used these forms for competing purposes. Their democratic potential came from accessibility, not inherent morality. Because they bypassed elite mediation, they could empower liberation movements or inflame hatred. This ambiguity remains visible today in digital political culture.

## **1.2. Satirical-Pamphlet Tradition as a Space of Social and Cultural Dialogue**

By the seventeenth/eighteenth centuries, Europe witnessed the rapid growth of literacy, urban communication networks, newspapers, salons, coffeehouses, and public discussion. This transformation created what many historians describe as the emergence of the modern public sphere. Political and philosophical questions were no longer confined exclusively to royal courts, churches, or universities. Instead, ideas circulated among broader social groups through accessible printed forms, especially pamphlets.

The pamphlet possessed several characteristics that made it uniquely suited for intellectual polemics. It was relatively inexpensive to produce, short enough to circulate quickly, and flexible in tone and style. A pamphlet could be philosophical, satirical, religious, journalistic, or openly propagandistic. Unlike lengthy academic treatises intended for elite scholars, pamphlets addressed broader audiences directly.

This accessibility transformed pamphlets into instruments of cultural dialogue. Competing authors answered one another publicly, attacked opposing ideologies, defended social reforms, and mobilized readers around political causes. Pamphlet culture therefore created an interactive intellectual environment. Writers did not speak into silence; they participated in ongoing argumentative exchanges that crossed national, religious, and class boundaries.

Satire became especially important within this pamphlet tradition because direct criticism of power remained dangerous in many European societies. Monarchies, churches, and state authorities frequently censored dissent. Satirical forms allowed writers to criticize institutions indirectly through irony, fictional narratives, parody, and exaggeration. Humor became both

protection and weapon. Readers learned to interpret hidden meanings beneath comic surfaces.

One of the most influential figures in the satirical-pamphlet tradition was Jonathan Swift. Swift's works exemplify how pamphlets could function simultaneously as literary art, political intervention, and moral critique. His famous pamphlet-like essay *A Modest Proposal* remains one of the most devastating examples of satirical moral judgment in European literature. By ironically suggesting that impoverished Irish families should sell their children as food to wealthy elites, Swift forced readers to confront the brutality of British economic policies toward Ireland. (Placeholder2) The shocking exaggeration revealed a deeper truth: society had already reduced the poor to economic objects. Swift's satire worked because it mirrored the cold rationality of political discourse itself.

Importantly, Swift's work illustrates how pamphlets created dialogue through provocation. Readers were not passive consumers but active interpreters. Satirical pamphlets demanded intellectual participation because meaning often depended upon recognizing irony and contradiction. The pamphlet therefore became a space where public reasoning and moral reflection occurred collectively.

The Enlightenment public sphere increasingly resembled a transnational conversation conducted through print culture. Pamphlets crossed borders, were translated into multiple languages, and circulated through salons, cafés, and underground networks. Intellectual conflicts became European rather than merely local. Within this environment, Jean-Jacques Rousseau emerged as another transformative figure in pamphlet culture, though his relationship to Enlightenment rationalism was more ambivalent than Voltaire's. Rousseau used polemical writing to challenge assumptions about civilization, progress, inequality, and human nature. His works frequently

provoked fierce public controversy because they questioned the moral foundations of modern society itself.

Rousseau's pamphlet-like interventions often responded directly to contemporary debates. In his *Discourse on the Arts and Sciences* and *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*, he argued paradoxically that civilization and cultural refinement had corrupted humanity rather than improved it. These texts functioned as provocations against Enlightenment self-confidence. Rousseau attacked vanity, artificiality, and social competition, claiming modern society alienated individuals from authentic freedom and moral integrity.

Unlike formal academic philosophy, pamphlet polemics were emotionally charged and rhetorically vivid. Writers appealed not only to reason but also to indignation, sympathy, fear, humor, and outrage. This emotional dimension made pamphlets politically powerful. They could mobilize collective sentiment and shape public opinion rapidly. The satirical-pamphlet tradition also blurred boundaries between literature, journalism, philosophy,

Ukrainian polemical literature occupies a special place in the cultural and intellectual history of Ukraine because it emerged not merely as a literary phenomenon, but as a form of spiritual, political, and national self-defense. Throughout centuries of foreign domination, religious pressure, censorship, imperial assimilation, and social inequality, Ukrainian writers used polemical texts to defend cultural identity, criticize injustice, challenge systems of oppression, and articulate visions of national and moral renewal. Polemical literature in Ukraine developed at the intersection of religion, philosophy, political thought, satire, and public discourse. It became a space in which intellectual resistance and cultural dialogue were inseparable.

From the early religious controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to the socially charged literary modernism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Ukrainian polemical tradition consistently reflected periods of historical crisis and transformation. Writers such as Ivan

Vyshenskyi, Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, and Volodymyr Vynnychenko transformed literature into an instrument of moral judgment and social critique. Their works illustrate how Ukrainian polemical writing evolved from religious defense into broader philosophical and political reflection on society, freedom, identity, and justice.

The origins of Ukrainian polemical literature are closely connected to the religious and political struggles of the late sixteenth century, especially after the Union of Brest in 1596. This church union sought to place part of the Orthodox population of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the authority of the Roman Catholic Church while preserving Eastern rites. The event produced intense ideological conflict and stimulated the development of Orthodox polemical writing in Ukrainian lands.

Vyshenskyi's writings reveal many defining features of Ukrainian polemical literature. First, they combine theological argument with moral indignation. For Vyshenskyi, religious conflict was inseparable from ethical questions concerning justice, humility, greed, and spiritual authenticity. He attacked bishops and clergy who, in his view, betrayed Christian values through attachment to wealth, privilege, and political power.

Second, Vyshenskyi used emotionally charged language designed not only to persuade intellectually but to awaken readers spiritually. His style was confrontational, prophetic, and often deeply satirical. He mocked hypocrisy and denounced social inequality with a severity that reflected both religious conviction and social protest. His polemics therefore transcended narrow theological disputes and became critiques of broader systems of domination.

This ethical and national dimension reached extraordinary artistic force in the work of Taras Shevchenko during the nineteenth century. Shevchenko transformed Ukrainian literature by combining poetry, satire, historical memory, and political protest into a unified vision of national and human liberation. Although best known as a poet, Shevchenko's works possess a

strongly polemical character. His poetry frequently functions as direct moral accusation against empire, serfdom, social injustice, and national oppression. Through irony, biblical imagery, emotional intensity, and satirical contrast, he exposed the hypocrisy of imperial civilization.

In poems such as *Kobzar* and satirical works like *The Dream*, Shevchenko attacked autocracy, bureaucracy, and the moral emptiness of imperial elites. He portrayed rulers and officials not as sacred authorities but as grotesque figures sustained by violence and exploitation. Shevchenko's polemics also carried profound ethical significance. He consistently defended the dignity of oppressed people: peasants, workers, women, and colonized Ukrainians. His vision of national liberation was inseparable from broader humanistic concerns. Unlike purely nationalist rhetoric, Shevchenko's critique extended to all forms of dehumanization and moral corruption.

Another major stage in the development of Ukrainian polemical literature is represented by Ivan Franko, whose intellectual range and ideological complexity made him one of the central figures of modern Ukrainian thought. Franko lived during a period of rapid modernization, industrialization, and ideological transformation. Socialist movements, nationalism, liberalism, positivism, and European modernity all influenced the intellectual climate in which he worked. Unlike earlier polemicists focused primarily on religion or national oppression, Franko believed literature should engage actively with social reality rather than retreat into aesthetic isolation; polemics became for him a means of awakening social consciousness and encouraging intellectual responsibility.

Franko's satirical and critical writings often targeted conservatism, dogmatism, clericalism, and political opportunism. At the same time, he remained critical of simplistic ideological solutions. His thought evolved throughout his life, reflecting tensions between socialism, nationalism, and liberal humanism.

The transition into the twentieth century brought new forms of political crisis, psychological complexity, and revolutionary transformation, all of which profoundly shaped the work of Volodymyr Vynnychenko. As writer, dramatist, political thinker, and statesman, Vynnychenko introduced modernist psychological analysis and existential tensions into Ukrainian polemical discourse.

Vynnychenko's literature reflects the instability of an era marked by revolution, social upheaval, ideological conflict, and the collapse of old moral systems. His works frequently explore contradictions between personal freedom and political commitment, morality and desire, sincerity and social performance.

Unlike earlier polemicists who often wrote from relatively clear ethical positions, Vynnychenko emphasized ambiguity, internal conflict, and psychological fragmentation. His characters struggle with hypocrisy not only in society but within themselves. Polemics thus become internalized. Moral critique turns inward toward questions of authenticity and self-deception.

At the same time, Vynnychenko remained deeply engaged with political realities, criticizing authoritarianism and social injustice while searching for forms of human liberation compatible with individual integrity.

### **1.3. Irony, Parody, and Exposure as Forms of Cultural Competition**

Debunking power structures is one of the central functions of satire in any given culture. Any political systems or empires which push ideological regimes onto the less powerful often depend not only on physical intimidation but on symbolism. The grotesque plays an important role in this process – it emphasizes excess and instability; by virtue of its representation, any idealized image of authority is immediately shattered by peeling back the curtain on the abstract, thus the abstraction of power into material, vulnerable, and often ridiculous reality.

The roots of this tradition stretch back to antiquity. In ancient Greek comedy, playwrights such as Aristophanes mocked politicians, military leaders, intellectual trends, and democratic institutions themselves. Even within societies that valued hierarchy and civic order, laughter created temporary spaces in which authority could be challenged symbolically.

The Roman satirical tradition expanded this function further. Writers such as Juvenal used exaggeration and moral outrage to expose corruption, decadence, and hypocrisy within Roman society. Satire became a means of revealing the gap between imperial ideals and lived reality. Official Rome projected discipline, virtue, and civilization, while satirists portrayed greed, cruelty, and moral decay beneath the surface.

During the Middle Ages and Renaissance, grotesque and carnival culture developed as collective forms of symbolic resistance. The work of Mikhail Bakhtin provides one of the most influential interpretations of this phenomenon. In his analysis of carnival and the writings of François Rabelais, Bakhtin argued that grotesque realism and popular laughter temporarily overturned official hierarchies and ideological seriousness.

Carnival culture inverted social order symbolically. Kings were mocked, fools became wise, clergy were parodied, and sacred authority lost its distance from ordinary bodily existence. The grotesque body — exaggerated, excessive, consuming, aging, and material — became a weapon against official ideals of perfection and transcendence. Authoritarian systems often rely upon ritual seriousness and symbolic grandeur to maintain legitimacy. Grotesque satire interrupts this process by transforming fear into laughter. A ruler who becomes ridiculous loses part of the symbolic power sustaining obedience.

Importantly, grotesque satire does not merely negate authority; it also creates cultural competition over meaning. Official ideologies attempt to define reality through fixed narratives and symbolic order. Satire introduces alternative interpretations that challenge these narratives publicly. Cultural authority becomes contested rather than absolute.

The Enlightenment intensified this process by using irony and parody against monarchy, religious dogma, and inherited hierarchy. Writers such as Voltaire employed satirical narratives to expose fanaticism, irrationality, and institutional hypocrisy. Through irony, Enlightenment satire undermined the sacred legitimacy of traditional authority and promoted critical reason as an alternative foundation for society. The French Revolution, for example, generated enormous quantities of political caricatures, pamphlets, and satirical prints that portrayed monarchy and aristocracy as grotesque, parasitic, or absurd. Royal authority, once presented as divinely sanctioned, was symbolically dismantled through ridicule.

This mechanism is clearly visible in the satirical work of Jonathan Swift. In *A Modest Proposal*, Swift uses grotesque irony by suggesting impoverished Irish children be sold as food to wealthy elites. The horrifying absurdity of the proposal exposes the inhuman logic already embedded within colonial economic policy. Swift demythologizes the supposed rationality of imperial governance by revealing its moral monstrosity.

Similarly, modern dystopian satire often demythologizes political systems by exaggerating their underlying tendencies. Writers such as George Orwell and Franz Kafka portray bureaucratic and ideological power as grotesque systems detached from human reality. In these works, authority appears irrational, dehumanizing, and absurd despite its claims to order and necessity.

The twentieth century demonstrated particularly clearly why authoritarian regimes fear satire and grotesque representation. Fascist, totalitarian, and dictatorial systems frequently censored comedians, caricaturists, satirists, and dissident artists because symbolic authority is vulnerable to ridicule. In Soviet dissident culture, underground jokes and satirical anecdotes became forms of everyday resistance. Citizens used humor to expose contradictions between official propaganda and lived reality. Even when political opposition was impossible openly, satire preserved alternative interpretations of reality. Laughter became a form of intellectual autonomy.

Grotesque demythologization also operates strongly within anti-colonial and postcolonial literature. Colonial empires often portrayed themselves as civilized, rational, and morally superior while depicting colonized peoples as primitive or inferior. Satirical writers reversed these representations by exposing the violence, hypocrisy, and absurdity of imperial ideology. Colonial authority lost its moral legitimacy when subjected to parody and inversion.

Modern media culture continues these traditions through political cartoons, television satire, stand-up comedy, internet memes, parody accounts, and digital remix culture. Contemporary satire frequently targets political spectacle itself, revealing how modern authority depends increasingly on image management, branding, and media performance.

Internet memes, for example, often function as compressed forms of grotesque demythologization. Politicians and public figures become exaggerated visual symbols stripped of official dignity and reinserted into absurd or ironic contexts. The meme transforms authority into participatory cultural material subject to collective reinterpretation.

At the same time, modern digital culture complicates the relationship between satire and power. In earlier periods, satire often emerged from relatively marginal positions against centralized authority. Today, irony and parody are deeply integrated into mainstream media and political communication itself. Institutions sometimes absorb satire rather than being destabilized by it. Politicians may embrace ironic self-awareness as a strategy of image management, blurring distinctions between critique and spectacle.

The duel-like character of pamphleteering distinguishes the pamphlet from many other literary forms. The pamphlet is immediate, polemical, and addressed toward a living opponent — whether a political institution, church, ruling ideology, social injustice, or cultural orthodoxy. It assumes conflict as the natural condition of public life and seeks not passive

contemplation but active response. The pamphlet therefore becomes a dynamic arena in which cultural power itself is contested.

Historically, the emergence of pamphlet culture was closely connected to the development of print technology and the expansion of the public sphere after the invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg. Print enabled ideas to circulate rapidly beyond the control of courts, churches, and universities. Intellectual disputes that once occurred primarily among elites became increasingly public. Pamphlets transformed ideological conflicts into visible social phenomena, and one of the earliest major examples of the pamphlet as cultural duel appeared during the Protestant Reformation. Martin Luther used pamphlets to challenge the authority of the Catholic Church, particularly concerning indulgences, corruption, and centralized religious power (Luther, *On the Freedom of a Christian*, 1520).

The pamphlet duel during this period was not only doctrinal but symbolic. The Church represented continuity, sacred order, and institutional legitimacy, while reformers portrayed themselves as defenders of authentic spiritual truth against corruption and dogma.

This relationship between pamphlet culture and ideological conflict intensified during the Enlightenment. Writers such as Voltaire transformed pamphleteering into a weapon against absolutism, censorship, clerical power, and inherited hierarchy. Enlightenment pamphlets frequently used irony, satire, and parody to undermine institutions claiming unquestionable authority. The duel between artist and authority is especially visible in satirical pamphlets because satire destabilizes seriousness itself. Political and religious systems often rely upon ritual dignity, symbolic grandeur, and emotional reverence. Satire interrupts these mechanisms by transforming fear into laughter and authority into absurdity. A ruler or institution that becomes ridiculous loses part of its symbolic power.

In *A Modest Proposal*, Swift adopts the voice of rational economic discourse only to push its logic toward grotesque absurdity. By suggesting

impoverished Irish children be sold as food, he exposes the inhumanity hidden within colonial policy and elite indifference.

This strategy transforms the pamphlet into an intellectual duel fought through irony. Swift does not argue directly against British imperial ideology in simple moral language. Instead, he forces authority's own logic to reveal its monstrosity. Satirical pamphlets often operate precisely through this inversion: ideology defeats itself when exposed fully.

The pamphlet as cultural duel also played a major role in revolutionary politics. During the American and French Revolutions, pamphlets became weapons in struggles over sovereignty, citizenship, liberty, and political legitimacy. In these contexts, pamphleteering transformed readers into participants within ideological conflict. Citizens no longer appeared merely as subjects receiving decrees from above but as audiences evaluating arguments and choosing sides.

The nineteenth century expanded the pamphlet duel into conflicts surrounding industrialization, capitalism, nationalism, socialism, and modernity itself. Socialist manifestos, anarchist essays, feminist pamphlets, nationalist tracts, and anti-colonial publications all participated in struggles against dominant ideological systems. Importantly, pamphlets often emerged where official channels of expression were restricted or censored. Under authoritarian systems, the pamphlet acquired special significance because it allowed dissident voices to bypass institutional control.

In Ukrainian cultural history, pamphleteering and polemical literature played a particularly important role under conditions of imperial domination and cultural suppression. Writers such as Taras Shevchenko used satirical and polemical forms to challenge imperial ideology, expose social injustice, and defend national dignity. Literature became a space where cultural identity confronted systems seeking assimilation and erasure.

Similarly, Ivan Franko used essays, criticism, journalism, and public polemics to engage with ideological conflicts surrounding socialism,

nationalism, modernization, and social inequality. For Franko, literature was inseparable from intellectual struggle and civic responsibility.

Modern media environments continue many aspects of the pamphlet duel. Blogs, manifestos, opinion journalism, political satire, online essays, activist publications, and social media commentary all function as contemporary forms of pamphleteering. Digital platforms have intensified ideological confrontation by accelerating the speed and visibility of public polemics.

At its core, satirical competition refers to the struggle between competing interpretations of reality carried out through irony, parody, ridicule, caricature, exaggeration, and exposure. Satire is never neutral because it positions itself against someone or something: rulers, institutions, ideologies, social norms, cultural hypocrisy, or political narratives. Through this oppositional structure, satire became an important form of symbolic competition in which cultural actors struggle to define legitimacy and truth within society.

The origins of satirical competition can be traced back to ancient literary traditions. In ancient Greece, satire and comic performance already functioned as forms of public political commentary. Playwrights such as Aristophanes used theatrical comedy to mock military leaders, politicians, philosophers, and democratic institutions themselves. These performances were not merely entertainment but public interventions into civic life. Greek comedy demonstrated that ridicule could undermine authority by exposing contradictions between political rhetoric and social reality.

In ancient Rome, satire developed into a more explicitly literary genre through writers such as Juvenal and Horace. Roman satirists attacked corruption, decadence, greed, and moral hypocrisy within imperial society. Satirical writing became a cultural arena in which intellectuals competed symbolically with official values and elite behavior. The literary character of satire during this period reflected the limited accessibility of literacy and public participation, but even then satire already possessed political implications because it destabilized symbolic authority.

Throughout the Middle Ages and Renaissance, satirical competition expanded through carnival culture, folk humor, and theatrical traditions. Theories later developed by Mikhail Bakhtin emphasize how carnival and grotesque laughter temporarily inverted social hierarchies and challenged official seriousness. Satirical competition during this period often took collective rather than individual literary forms. Public festivals, theatrical performances, and popular humor created symbolic spaces where ordinary people mocked aristocrats, clergy, and institutions.

The Renaissance intensified the role of satire through humanism and the revival of classical rhetorical traditions. Writers such as François Rabelais and Erasmus used parody and irony to criticize religious dogmatism, scholastic rigidity, and social corruption (Bakhtin, 1965). Satirical competition increasingly reflected broader ideological struggles emerging within European society.

However, the decisive transformation occurred with the rise of print culture and the expansion of the public sphere during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the printing press enabled satire to move beyond elite literary circles into broader political communication.

At the same time, satirical journalism began emerging as a distinct public force. Newspapers and journals created regularized spaces for political commentary and public criticism. Satire became serialized, immediate, and responsive to current events rather than confined primarily to literary works. Public discourse itself became more agonistic as competing newspapers and pamphleteers fought symbolic battles over public opinion (Habermas, 1962).

The rise of modern journalism changed the temporal structure of satire. Literary satire often reflected broader philosophical or moral concerns, whereas journalistic satire responded rapidly to daily political developments. Satirical competition became continuous and immediate. Politicians, governments, and public scandals were subjected to ongoing scrutiny through humor and caricature.

Theater played an equally important role in the politicization of satire. Modern political theater transformed the stage into a site of ideological struggle and public reflection. Satirical plays challenged social norms, exposed class contradictions, and critiqued institutional power. The theatrical dimension of satire allowed audiences to experience political criticism collectively rather than individually.

Writers such as Bertolt Brecht revolutionized political satire in theater by rejecting purely emotional identification and encouraging critical distance instead. Brecht's epic theater used irony, fragmentation, and alienation techniques to force audiences to analyze social structures critically rather than passively consume narratives. Satirical competition became pedagogical, aimed at awakening political consciousness.

The twentieth century expanded satirical competition dramatically through radio, cinema, and television. Mass media transformed satire into a central component of modern political culture. Satirical films, radio programs, late-night television shows, and televised parody reached audiences far larger than traditional literary forms ever could.

Cinema became especially powerful as a medium of satirical demythologization. Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* mocked fascist spectacle and authoritarian leadership during a period when direct criticism remained politically dangerous. By parodying totalitarian imagery, Chaplin demonstrated how satire could confront mass political mythologies through popular media (Chaplin, 1940).

Television later intensified the integration of satire into political discourse. News parody, sketch comedy, and satirical commentary programs blurred distinctions between journalism and entertainment. Political satire became a major source through which many audiences interpreted current events. In some societies, satirical television gained greater public trust than official news institutions because satire appeared less constrained by political or corporate interests.

The relationship between satire and journalism became increasingly complex. Traditional journalism emphasized objectivity and factual reporting, whereas satirical journalism used exaggeration and irony to reveal deeper truths about political systems. Programs blending comedy with investigative critique often exposed contradictions ignored by conventional media formats.

The digital age transformed satirical competition again by decentralizing media production and accelerating communication. Internet culture, memes, social media parody accounts, YouTube satire, and digital remix practices created participatory forms of satirical expression accessible to millions of users.

The meme represents one of the clearest contemporary forms of satirical competition. Memes compress political critique into highly shareable visual and textual fragments. Politicians, ideologies, and public events become subjects of rapid symbolic reinterpretation. Satirical competition now unfolds at extraordinary speed across digital networks.

Importantly, the internet democratized satirical production. Individuals no longer require institutional media access to participate in political satire. Anyone can create parody, circulate ridicule, and challenge official narratives publicly. This resembles earlier pamphlet culture but on a vastly accelerated global scale.

## **II. Hip-Hop and Battle Culture as a Contemporary Form of Satirical-Pamphlet Competition**

### **2.1. Hip-Hop as a Culture of Resistance and Identity**

From its earliest stages, hip-hop functioned as a culture of resistance through which marginalized communities transformed social exclusion into creative expression. The origins of hip-hop are inseparable from the conditions of

African American and Latino communities in the United States during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Although hip-hop eventually became a global phenomenon, its formation was rooted in the urban environment of the South Bronx in New York City. During this period, the Bronx experienced an aggressive mix of racial injustice and urban planning policies that displaced working-class communities, much of which ballooned into gang violence and institutional neglect (Rose, 1994).

One of the major causes of this crisis was deindustrialization – factories and industrial jobs that had once provided reliable opportunities for urban working-class populations to make a decent living gradually disappeared. In result of this transformation, many if not all African-American and Puerto Rican communities were disproportionately affected due to them being in particularly vulnerable positions within the American economic system.

Urban renewal policies and highway construction projects further destabilized neighborhoods in the Bronx – for instance, the Cross Bronx Expressway project, one of Robert Moses’ largest scale developments, displaced thousands of residents and contributed to the destruction of local social networks. Projects such as this caused wealthier populations to mass-migrate to suburban areas, while poor minority communities remained concentrated in the now neglected urban districts. It’s no such surprise as to why the South Bronx became symbolically associated with decay and arson, whether it was connected to any kind of insurance fraud, or broader social collapse. Mainstream media often portrayed the Bronx as a space of criminality, hence why hip-hop emerged as a cultural response to exclusion and invisibility (Chang, 2005).

When push comes to shove, any community that’s been degraded by the “powers that be” will resort to combatting their repressor, and in this concept no weapon is more dangerous than a common person’s voice. Throughout history, the ability to speak publicly and participate in collective discourse has been deeply connected to social authority. To possess a voice means more than simply producing sound; it means being recognized as a subject

whose experiences matter within society. For marginalized communities especially, claiming voice becomes an act of cultural empowerment through which silence is challenged not only symbolically, but politically.

Historically, many marginalized populations were denied all kinds of institutions; in our context, impoverished communities, especially racial minorities and previously enslaved peoples, frequently appeared in public discourse not as speaking subjects but as objects described and interpreted by others. By claiming voice under such conditions, a true, powerful resistance against the oppressors is born due to its' disruptive quality over dominant narratives (Hebdige, 1979).

By this logic, the common man's voice in African American communities in the United States is deeply important; by diving deep into the community's history which spans multiple centuries and involves the struggle with enslavement, oppression, segregation et cetera, we can notice how important, even fundamental the strive for survival and identity was. Hip-hop was, perhaps the rawest example the voice being an asset for unity against these common enemies (George, 2002).

The influence of the Civil Rights Movement and Black Power movement also shaped hip-hop indirectly. Although early hip-hop was not always overtly political in its' lyrical content, it emerged within communities deeply affected by struggles against racism, police brutality, segregation, and systemic economic inequality that continued long after the formal victories of the civil rights era.

Moreover, hip-hop developed during this period of growing disillusionment with American institutions. The assassinations of Malcolm X in 1965 and Martin Luther King Jr. in 1968, alongside state repression directed toward organizations such as the Black Panther Party, contributed to this particular distrust. The killing of Fred Hampton during a 1969 police raid further intensified perceptions that Black political movements were being systematically suppressed. Couple that with the aftermath of the Vietnam War and ongoing racial inequality, many marginalized youths experienced

skepticism toward how democracy and justice was discussed in the confines of a seemingly “maturing” America.

Musically and philosophically hip-hop inherited elements from earlier Black musical and oral traditions including blues, jazz, gospel, funk, soul, spoken word poetry, and the politically charged aesthetics of the Black Arts Movement, such as the Black Panther movement. In terms of hip-hop’s foundation, the elements of which are commonly identified as DJ-ing, MC-ing (rapping), breakdancing, graffiti art, and later knowledge of self (Gosa, 2015) or consciousness. DJ culture played a central role in the birth of hip-hop.

One of the key figures associated with hip-hop’s origins is DJ Kool Herc, a Jamaican immigrant who organized block parties in the Bronx during the early 1970s. Herc developed techniques involving the extension of instrumental “breaks” in funk and soul records, allowing dancers greater opportunities for performance and rhythmic experimentation.

Hip-hop’s competitive structure within this culture reflects broader traditions found throughout the African-American cultural history. Rather than eliminating all conflict, hip-hop redirected it into symbolic forms – rivalries between DJ’s, MC’s and dancers became creative struggles for recognition, more notably respect. This transformation of social conflict into artistic competition parallels earlier traditions of satire, such as the rhetorical duels of before.

Rap, more commonly referred as MCing at that time, gradually evolved from party-oriented crowd engagement into a sophisticated form of verbal expression. MCs initially functioned as hosts energizing audiences, but over time lyrical complexity, storytelling, wordplay, boasting, social commentary, and verbal competition became central features of hip-hop performance.

This oppositional dimension connects hip-hop directly to older traditions of satirical and pamphlet culture. Just like Juvenal or Aristophanes’ satirical

works, rappers address audiences directly, they critique systems of power, as well as expose hypocrisy within their opponents, be it the lyricists they're engaging in or the aforementioned systems, as well as engage in public ideological conflict. Rap battles especially resemble forms of rhetorical and satirical competition, almost as plays, in which verbal skill becomes a weapon of symbolic confrontation (Huizinga, 1938) say.

As hip-hop expanded during the 1980s and 1990s, it increasingly entered mainstream commercial culture. Artists such as Grandmaster Flash, Public Enemy, N.W.A, and many others transformed rap into a national and eventually global phenomenon.

Importantly, different strands of hip-hop emphasized different aspects of resistance and identity. Conscious rap focused on political critique, racial injustice, and historical awareness. The so-called subgenre, today known as "Gangsta rap", reflected experiences of violence within the community or with the police, as well as survival within marginalized urban environments that were plagued by poverty. Battle rap emphasized lyrical competition, often insulting and verbally dominating the crowd, yet despite these differences, all retained elements of hip-hop's oppositional cultural origins.

The commercialization of hip-hop created tensions between resistance and commodification. As corporations recognized hip-hop's profitability, elements of the culture were absorbed into mainstream entertainment industries. Critics argued that commercialization sometimes diluted hip-hop's political and community-oriented dimensions. Nevertheless, even commercialized hip-hop frequently retained traces of social critique and cultural resistance (Anderson, 1983).

In post-Soviet societies, Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe, hip-hop often became associated with youth activism, anti-authoritarian critique, and cultural self-definition. The global spread of hip-hop illustrates how its core structures — verbal competition, satirical exposure, identity

formation, and oppositional expression — resonate across diverse social conditions.

From a broader cultural perspective, hip-hop can therefore be understood as a contemporary continuation of historical traditions of satirical-pamphlet competition. Like pamphlets and polemical literature, hip-hop creates spaces where marginalized voices challenge dominant narratives publicly. Rap battles resemble rhetorical duels in which symbolic power is contested through language and performance. Satire, parody, insult, and exposure remain central mechanisms within this competition.

## **2.2. Rap Battles and Diss Tracks as Modern Pamphlet Dialogue**

Within hip-hop culture, battles function not merely as entertainment or competitive spectacle, but as structured forms of public dialogue in which cultural legitimacy is contested through verbal performance. In this sense, rap battles and diss tracks may be understood as modern continuations of the satirical-pamphlet tradition, where language becomes a weapon of symbolic domination.

Rap battles modernize this structure. Battle rap is inherently agonistic because it centers on confrontation through language. In this context, the battle consists of two or more performers competing publicly by demonstrating verbal superiority, whether it linked to an individual's lyrical creativity, improvisational ability, their wit or psychological dominance, as well as how well they're able to control the audience.

The battle format transforms verbal expression into ritualized combat. These competitors seek to weaken opponents symbolically through insult, sometimes parodying or humiliating them, perhaps exposing their vulnerabilities. This structure closely parallels earlier traditions of satirical polemics and pamphlet dialogue, where writers attacked ideological adversaries publicly through language designed to persuade audiences and undermine authority.

Importantly, rap battles do not merely involve random insult exchange. They operate according to highly developed rhetorical conventions and cultural expectations. Only the most successful battle rappers have the ability to display true originality, in principle they aim to incorporate skillful timing as if they're crafting a masterful punchline to their set-ups, not to mention how crucial it is for them to master linguistic dexterity, metaphorical complexity, and how to control the audience. (Placeholder1) In a way, any battle for the rapper should resemble both poetic performance and public trial.

The term “diss” derives from “disrespect,” emphasizing the confrontational foundation of this form (Placeholder3), yet diss culture is not reducible to aggression alone. Effective diss tracks rarely succeed through insult by itself; as mentioned, they depend upon rhetorical strategy and precision. This logic connects it directly to the historical tradition of satire. Jonathan Swift and Voltaire used ridicule and exaggeration to uncover truths concealed beneath political rhetoric; likewise, diss tracks operate similarly by destabilizing carefully constructed public personas and forcing audiences to critically reconsider appearances.

For some, literary pamphlets and rap battles may appear fundamentally different. Eighteenth–nineteenth century polemics belonged primarily to print culture and intellectual circles, while hip-hop battles emerged within musical and performative traditions associated with marginalized urban communities. Yet beneath these differences lies a shared cultural logic based on public confrontation verbal skill, audience's judgment is just as crucial in both art forms, so is the symbolic struggle over meaning.

One of the strongest parallels lies in the importance of rhetoric and verbal mastery. Eighteenth–nineteenth century polemical writers relied heavily on irony, satire, exaggeration, wit, metaphor, parody, and rhetorical persuasion. The social functions of both traditions are also remarkably similar. Literary polemics and hip-hop battles both emerge strongly during periods of social transformation, instability, or ideological fragmentation. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries also experienced revolutions and class conflict, that time period, too, was plagued with class conflict and crises of religious authority.

A chronological overview of hip-hop diss culture demonstrates how rap battles inherited the same agonistic logic that once shaped pamphlet wars and literary polemics. One of the earliest foundational examples was the so-called “Bridge Wars” of the mid-1980s between KRS-One’s Boogie Down Productions and MC Shan of the Juice Crew.

The conflict emerged after MC Shan’s “The Bridge” (1985) appeared to claim Queensbridge as the birthplace of hip-hop: *“You love to hear the story again and again/Of how it all got started way back when/The monument is right in your face/Sit and listen for a while to the name of the place”*, and *“This is the place where stars are born/And we are the only ones that can’t be worn out”* (Shan, 1985). KRS-One responded with “South Bronx” (1986) and later “The Bridge Is Over” (1987), transforming regional rivalry into symbolic lyrical combat. In “The Bridge Is Over,” KRS-One mockingly declares: *“The bridge is over, the bridge is over / Biddy-bye-bye,”* using repetition and ridicule to delegitimize MC Shan’s authority while simultaneously asserting South Bronx authenticity.

*“You can’t sound like Shan or the one Marley/Because Shan and Marley Marl, dem a rhyming like they gay/Picking up the mic, man, dem don’t know what to say/Saying hip-hop started out in Queensbridge/Saying lies like that, man, you know dem can’t live”* (KRS-One, 1987)

During the 1990s, diss culture expanded into larger conflicts connected to commercial success and media visibility. The feud between Tupac Shakur and Christopher Wallace, professionally known as The Notorious B.I.G. or Biggie, became one of the most influential and tragic examples in hip-hop history. After Tupac was shot in 1994 and believed associates of Bad Boy Records had prior knowledge, distrust intensified between the West Coast and East Coast scenes. Tupac's diss track "Hit 'Em Up" (1996) transformed personal hostility into aggressive public spectacle. Tupac opens the song with the infamous line: "*First off, fuck your bitch and the clique you claim,*" immediately attacking both Biggie and Bad Boy collectively.

The track accused Biggie of disloyalty and inauthenticity while framing the conflict as a struggle over power within rap culture itself, not to mention Tupac's idea that the opposing enemy was the one who set up the shooting, though to this day no strong evidence suggests that he intended to escalate the situation in such drastic measures (Placeholder4): "*Biggie, remember when I used to let you sleep on the couch/And begged a bitch to let you sleep in the house?/Now it's all about Versace, you copied my style/Five shots couldn't drop me, I took it and smiled*" (Shakur, 1996). Although deeply tragic in its escalation beyond symbolic boundaries, the conflict demonstrated how hip-hop battles function as public struggles over narrative power.

By the late 1990s and early 2000s, diss tracks increasingly resembled serialized rhetorical wars. The feud between Shawn Carter, better known as Jay-Z, and Nasir Jones, known as Nas, represented one of the clearest examples of lyrical competition functioning as public intellectual combat. Just like Aristophanes portrayed Socrates as absurd, arrogant, detached from reality, and morally corrupting to Athenian youth in "The Clouds," Jay-Z's "Takeover" (2001) criticized Nas's artistic decline and relevance. Socrates was depicted literally suspended in the air within a "Thinkery," symbolizing intellectual pretension disconnected from ordinary life. This resembles the logic of Jay-Z's takedown of his opponent, exposing his "fall of grace": "*Had a spark when you started, but now, you're just garbage/Fell from top*

*ten to not mentioned at all” and “Switch up your flow, your shit is garbage/What, you tryna kick knowledge?” (Carter, 2001)*

Nas, on the other hand, responded with “Ether” (2001), a track so culturally influential that the word “ether” became synonymous with symbolic destruction in hip-hop discourse. Nas attacked Jay-Z’s authenticity and accused him of “loving his style” so much as to stealing it with lines such as: “*What’s sad is I love you ‘cause you’re my brother, you traded your soul for riches/My child, I’ve watched you grow up to be famous*” and “*You a fan, a phony, a fake, a pussy, a Stan*” (Jones, 2001) ridiculing Jay-Z’s public image through satire and humiliation.

Digital media later transformed these feuds into globally participatory events. Aubrey Graham, better known as Drake’s “Back to Back” (2015), released during his public feud with Meek Mill, further demonstrated how diss tracks had evolved within the age of digital media. Unlike earlier diss records that relied primarily on direct threats, “Back to Back” weaponized ridicule and meme-like repetition as strategies designed to weaken an opponent’s legitimacy or credibility. The conflict initially emerged after Meek Mill accused Drake of employing ghostwriters, thereby challenging the authenticity of Drake’s artistic identity within hip-hop culture, where lyrical authorship remains deeply connected to credibility and status. Rather than responding defensively, Drake transformed the accusation into performative spectacle through a track that framed Meek Mill as emotionally unstable, commercially inferior, and incapable of sustaining competitive pressure.

One of the defining characteristics of “Back to Back” was its ability to blur the boundaries between diss track, commercial hit, and internet phenomenon. Drake’s repeated line, “*Is that a world tour or your girl’s tour?*”, mocking Meek Mill’s relationship with Nicki Minaj, became instantly quotable across social media platforms and public discourse. The feud therefore illustrates how digital-era rap battles continue the agonistic and satirical structures of historical polemics, while adapting them to algorithmic media environments in which humiliation, visibility, and audience participation become central mechanisms of rhetorical power.

Using the same strategy of “weaponizing memes” against the other opponent, Terrence Thornton, known as Pusha T, published “The Story of Adidon” (2018) amidst his own rivalry with Drake; this track spread rapidly online through social media circulation, reaction videos, and meme culture more than any other. It became infamous for exposing Drake for allegedly intending to reveal Adonis through an Adidas advertising campaign. Pusha-T used this opportunity to frame Drake as inauthentic by portraying him as a celebrity figure more concerned with branding and commercial image than personal responsibility, thus tying back to the roots of battle culture – authenticity, control over the audience and poetic performance by publicly trialing the opponent: *“You are hiding a child, let that boy come home/Deadbeat mothafucka playin' border patrol, ooh/Adonis is your son/And he deserves more than an Adidas press run, that's real”* (Thornton, 2018)

Finally, the 2024 Kendrick Lamar–Drake conflict demonstrated the contemporary fusion of diss tracks, viral media, and public moral judgment. Kendrick Lamar’s “Not Like Us” and Drake’s “The Heart Part 6” circulated instantly across streaming platforms and social networks, functioning as neo-modern pamphlet wars shaped by algorithmic visibility and collective digital commentary. Importantly, both literary polemics and hip-hop battles contribute to cultural innovation through competition itself. Rivalry encourages stylistic experimentation, rhetorical creativity, and intellectual intensity. Conflict becomes productive artistically and culturally.

From a philosophical perspective, rap battles and diss tracks reveal how modern societies continue relying upon symbolic conflict to negotiate identity and legitimacy. Even within highly mediated digital environments, public discourse remains deeply agonistic. Competing voices struggle for recognition, authority, and narrative control through rhetoric and performance.

This continuity with historical pamphlet traditions demonstrates that the need for confrontational public dialogue persists despite technological change. Pamphlets once circulated ideological battles through print; today rap battles circulate them through music, video, and digital platforms. Yet the underlying structure remains remarkably similar: public symbolic conflict mediated through language and judged collectively.

Most important, verbal agonistics in hip-hop often preserve forms of intellectual engagement absent from conventional political discourse. Battle rap rewards memory, improvisation, metaphorical thinking, rhetorical precision, and critical responsiveness. Despite its aggressive surface, battle culture frequently demonstrates high levels of linguistic sophistication and interpretive complexity.

### **2.3. Internet Culture as a Contemporary Arena for Satirical Pamphleteering and Hip-Hop Agonistics**

Although the forms of public communication have changed from printed pamphlets to rap battles and diss tracks, and with the arrival of the internet, memes, livestreams, reaction videos and online commentary took over, the underlying mechanisms of satirical confrontation remain consistent. While internet culture did not invent agonistic communication, it, more accurately, accelerated older structures of polemics such as public ridicule/accusation and the audience's judgement. In this sense, contemporary digital culture can be understood as one of the latest arenas in which the satirical-pamphlet tradition and hip-hop combat converge.

Pamphleteers addressed the public directly, their work circulated quickly and attacked opponents by name or implication, all the while the readers were invited to interpret ideological struggle as a social event. Satirical pamphlets were especially powerful because they did not merely present

arguments; they dramatized contradiction through irony and exaggeration, and the opponents the writers tackled ranged from key political or religious figures (the likes of which we mentioned before), to broader groups of people who pose as a threat to cultural integrity or the philosophical values the authors sought to defend. Jonathan Swift, for instance, used satire to expose the brutality of British colonial policy toward Ireland and the moral indifference of political elites. In works such as *A Modest Proposal* and *The Drapier's Letters*, Swift transformed irony into moral accusation, defending Irish dignity by revealing how colonial systems reduced human life to economic calculation.

Voltaire positioned satire as a weapon against censorship and authoritarianism. Martin Luther transformed pamphleteering into a form of spiritual resistance against corruption during the Protestant Reformation in texts such as *Ninety-five Theses* and *On the Freedom of a Christian*, same with Jean-Jacques Rousseau who defended the idea of authentic humanity against social systems driven by vanity in “*Discourse on the Origin of Inequality*”.

Taras Shevchenko used poetry and satire to defend Ukrainian cultural memory against imperial domination and historical erasure through works such as *Kobzar* and *The Dream*, where the empire was portrayed as morally grotesque while affirming the dignity of oppressed people and national identity (Said, 1993). Ivan Franko, borrowing from his aforementioned influence, viewed literature as a form of social and intellectual responsibility rather than detached artistic expression.

Hip-hop inherited this agonistic logic under different historical conditions. Whereas many earlier pamphleteers and satirists belonged to literate or educated circles, hip-hop emerged primarily from African-American and Latino youth communities that had been excluded from institutional cultural power. On this topic, agonistic culture treats conflict not as a failure of communication but as one of its defining energies; feuds driven by rap battling or other means clarify positions, expose contradictions, test

legitimacy, and force audiences to make judgments. Chantal Mouffe's theory of agonistic democracy is helpful here because it emphasizes that public life is shaped by contestation rather than artificial consensus, shaping a culture that is willing to participate in verbal discord for the means of negotiating power and competing visions of social reality (Mouffe, 2013).

Hip-hop battles perform a similar function as the satirists within culture: they turn disagreement into visible symbolic struggle. The Bridge Wars between Boogie Down Productions and the Juice Crew demonstrate how early hip-hop conflict was already connected to questions of origin, legitimacy, and cultural ownership. KRS-One's *The Bridge Is Over* was not simply an attack on rival artists; it was an argument about where hip-hop came from and who had the right to narrate its history. Brooklyn, or The Bronx, became more than a geographical location – it became a site of cultural memory and authenticity. In this respect, the diss track operated like a polemical pamphlet, which intervened in a public dispute and attempted to reorganize collective understanding.

The rivalry between Tupac Shakur and The Notorious B.I.G. expanded the scale of hip-hop agonistics during the 1990s, especially through the theatrical aggression of *Hit 'Em Up*. Jay-Z's *Takeover* and Nas's *Ether* transformed commercial rivalry into a debate over artistic credibility, street authenticity, longevity, and cultural respect. These conflicts were not reducible to personal insult, instead they became public arguments over who properly represented the culture, who had betrayed it, and whose image could survive collective scrutiny.

Revisiting our previous example, Aristophanes caricatured Socrates in *The Clouds* as ridiculous detached from ordinary life, using comic exaggeration to turn a philosopher into a public object of suspicion. Dante placed political rivals into Hell in *The Divine Comedy*, converting poetry into symbolic punishment and moral exposure (Alighieri, 1321) – not too dissimilar to how Tupac humiliated Bad Boy Records through accusation and insults within public consciousness.

Internet culture further transforms this tradition by accelerating this revolution. Social networking and video sharing platforms such as Tik-Tok, YouTube, X (formerly known as Twitter) and the likes allow controversy to move instantly across audiences through recommendation systems fueled by the algorithm; digital culture therefore absorbs older structures inherited from pamphlet wars and hip-hop battles while emphasizing on their visibility and fragmentation.

Mememes are especially important as satirical forms – any meme has the power to condense criticism into a symbol that fuses image or text with irony and the culture’s perception of today. Like pamphlets, mememes spread rapidly during moments of political conflict or social anxiety; and just like rap battles, they depend on proper timing, wit and control of audience’s expectation.

Mememes also democratize satire because they allow almost anyone with internet access to take part in symbolic production. The difference between author and audience becomes unstable: users consume and constantly redistribute content, which recalls Mikhail Bakhtin's idea of carnival, where social hierarchies have their ideals “flipped on their head” through mockery; same goes for any celebrities or politicians, which get thrust into the space of ridicule.

At the same time, digital agonistics introduces new dangers – pamphleteers often used pseudonyms, but internet culture enables anonymity on a scale that was unachievable, the likes of which was beyond reach for the earlier print culture. This newfound anonymity allows marginalized people to criticize power without punishment, though it usually encourages harassment and mob mentality, not to mention that misinformation isn’t regulated the same way as it was before. Barthes argues that modern ideology disguises itself as common sense through the mundane. Coming back to hip-hop, it, too, attacks this exact process, exposing the constructed nature of celebrity and luxury, nationalism and racial performance. Internet users then go forth through commentary content, turning criticism into a collective practice.

This logic becomes especially visible in the Drake-Kendrick Lamar conflict of 2024, which functioned as one of the clearest examples of diss tracks operating as pamphlet warfare and cultural criticism within public philosophy. Although tensions have been brewing for a better part of a decade, the feud truly escalated from Kendrick Lamar's verse on *Like That*, in which he calls out Drake for being a much inferior musician and performer: *“Motherfuck the big three, it's just big me”*, and *“And your best work is a light pack/Prince outlived Mike Jack”*, in the latter lyric comparing himself to Prince who, to him, is a superior artist to Michael Jackson, someone who Drake's compared to often due to his influence on the music industry while being one of the most commercially successful artists of all time.

Both exchanged many diss tracks over the course of a couple months, including Drake's *Push Ups* and *The Heart Part 6*, alongside Kendrick's *Euphoria*, *6:16 in LA*, *Meet the Grahams*, and *Not Like Us*. The conflict spread like wildfire across streaming and social media platforms, such as TikTok, YouTube, Twitter, Twitch and the likes, spawning countless lyric breakdowns and memes, creating a massive ecosystem around the music.

Unlike many rap conflicts, which centered mainly on commercial rivalry or personal insults, this battle revolved around cultural authenticity, specifically around gentrification and appropriation of African-American artistry and culture, as well as fatherhood and moral responsibility toward hip-hop culture itself. Kendrick Lamar repeatedly framed hip-hop as an ethical inheritance rather than pure mainstream entertainment. This position had already appeared in *The Heart Part 5*, a record from 2022, where Kendrick used deepfake imagery to embody figures such as Nipsey Hussle and Kanye West while reflecting on violence and trauma, calling out to his community to love oneself, even amidst political and socioeconomical turmoil, while advocating for preserving historical memory of his kind.

In Euphoria, Kendrick's central accusation was that Drake treated African-American culture as aesthetic performance rather than lived communal experience. He criticized Drake's shifting accents and personas as signs of cultural simulation: *"You know I got language barriers, huh/It's no accent you can sell me, huh"*, and *"It's not just me, I'm what the culture feelin'"*.

Not Like Us intensified this accusation by turning its title into a collective verdict. The track not only functioned as dance anthem and a celebration of West Coast culture, but as a public, moral denunciation of Drake's allegedly strange behavior around women who are much younger than him, all wrapped up in the package of a viral slogan: *"Say, Drake, I hear you like 'em young/You better not ever go to cell block one"*, and *"Tryna strike a chord and it's probably A minor"* (Lamar, 2024).

Drake's The Heart Part 6 attempted to reverse the accusations by portraying Kendrick as manipulative, highly hypocritical when it comes to his "superiority complex", and psychologically unstable. Yet the title itself carried symbolic significance because it appropriated Kendrick's own Heart series, demonstrating how diss tracks contest cultural territory intertextually (Graham, 2024). Though, in an attempt to ridicule his opponent by "reclaiming" one of modern hip-hop's most celebrated batches of songs, the record itself became notorious for misinterpreting Kendrick's art: *"My mom came over today, and I was like, "Mother, I—" ah, wait a second/That's that one record where you say you got molested"*, in reference to the song "Mother I Sober", a deep psychological dive into Lamar's trauma while encountering his own family being sexually abused, despite receiving no harm himself: *"Family ties, they accused my cousin, "Did he touch you, Kendrick?"/Never lied, but no one believed me when I said "He didn't"*

The 2024 feud also demonstrates how contemporary diss tracks are no longer isolated songs. They are multimedia cultural events; their meanings are produced not only by the artists but also by audiences and journalists, streamers and meme creators could join in and create new satirical content

either in support or against the artists they watch. In this sense, modern diss culture resembles a digitized pamphlet war, where each track becomes a new controversy, each meme becomes a miniature satirical response, and each reaction video becomes part of the public sphere (Debord, 1967)agoni.

Guy Debord's "The Society of the Spectacle" helps explain this transformation because contemporary conflict is often mediated through images. Marshall McLuhan's "Understanding Media" is equally relevant because media technologies reshape the form of social consciousness itself. The internet does not simply distribute hip-hop conflicts; it changes their structure by making interpretation instantaneous, mixing memetics with visuals.

Dick Hebdige's "Subculture: The Meaning of Style" further clarifies why hip-hop agonistics is inseparable from culture. Hebdige argues that subcultures resist dominant society through reappropriation, and hip-hop operates in precisely this way: all of the cultural elements of the movement, including clothing and slang, regional musical sounds, graffiti and dance culture become signs of identity. When Kendrick frames himself as defending hip-hop culture, he is defending music and the art surrounding it, as well as defending a symbolic system of style and creativity.

This is why internet culture is a necessary arena for the modern form of the satirical-pamphlet tradition – the internet shapes the conflicts by rewarding speed and compression. A diss track becomes more powerful when its lines can be quoted as captions, perhaps even remixed into memes or turned into short videos. The same process can be seen outside hip-hop in political satire and viral public criticism, where online users routinely use parody and editing to challenge politicians and celebrities, thus challenging media narratives. These practices continue the older ways of using satire by exposing hypocrisy between official image and perceived reality. However, digital satire often operates faster and with less institutional mediation, which makes it more democratic, yet more unstable.

Even in a decentralized digital environment, audiences still debate who carries historical responsibility. Kendrick Lamar's critique of Drake gained power because it almost “activated” older anxieties in terms of appropriation of Black cultural forms by the entertainment industry. The conflict therefore operated as cultural philosophy: it asked what authenticity means when identity itself can be branded, performed, streamed, and monetized.

Internet culture should therefore be understood as a contemporary arena for satirical pamphleteering and hip-hop agonistics because it combines pamphlet’s blunt confrontational qualities, rap battle’s flashy performances and the speed of digital media. It is a space where societies negotiate truth and power, hence why modern culture lives through irony and ridicule, much of which comes from remixes of other media. Technologies change, but the underlying struggle over meaning remains persistent. What changes is the medium through which that struggle becomes visible, memorable, and collectively judged.

## **Summary**

This text explores the historical development of satire, pamphleteering, hip-hop culture, and internet media as interconnected forms of cultural resistance and public confrontation. It argues that despite technological and historical changes, societies continue to rely on symbolic conflict, irony, parody, and public dialogue to challenge authority and negotiate cultural legitimacy.

The first chapter examines the origins of satire and pamphleteering as tools used by marginalized voices to criticize political, religious, and social power. Satire emerged in ancient Greece and Rome through writers such as Aristophanes, Juvenal, and Horace, who used humor, exaggeration, and irony to expose corruption and hypocrisy. During the Middle Ages and

Renaissance, carnival traditions and grotesque humor temporarily inverted social hierarchies, allowing ordinary people to symbolically challenge authority. The invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg transformed pamphleteering by making ideas easier to distribute, creating a new public sphere where political and ideological debates could spread beyond elite institutions.

The text highlights the importance of pamphlets during the Protestant Reformation, the Enlightenment, and major revolutions in Europe and America. Writers such as Martin Luther, Voltaire, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Jonathan Swift used pamphlets and satire to criticize religious corruption, authoritarianism, colonialism, and social inequality. Swift's *A Modest Proposal* is presented as a key example of satire exposing the brutality hidden within political systems. The chapter also emphasizes that satire and pamphleteering were not always progressive; they could also spread propaganda, conspiracy theories, and reactionary ideas.

A major section of the work focuses on Ukrainian polemical literature as a form of cultural and national resistance. Writers such as Ivan Vyshenskyi, Taras Shevchenko, Ivan Franko, and Volodymyr Vynnychenko used literature to defend Ukrainian identity against imperial domination, criticize social injustice, and encourage intellectual responsibility. Their works combined satire, political criticism, and moral reflection, showing how literature became both a cultural weapon and a form of public dialogue.

The text then explains how irony, parody, and grotesque representation function as methods of “demythologizing” power. Satire exposes the gap between official ideology and lived reality by turning rulers, institutions, and systems into objects of ridicule. Thinkers such as Mikhail Bakhtin are referenced to explain how carnival and grotesque realism challenge authority by disrupting seriousness and symbolic grandeur. Over time, satire evolved

through newspapers, theater, film, television, and eventually the internet, becoming increasingly immediate and participatory.

The second chapter connects these historical traditions to hip-hop culture. Hip-hop is presented as a culture of resistance that emerged in the South Bronx during the 1970s in response to racial inequality, poverty, deindustrialization, and social neglect. Influenced by African American oral traditions, the Civil Rights Movement, and the Black Power movement, hip-hop gave marginalized communities a public voice. DJs, MCs, graffiti artists, and dancers transformed social frustration into creative expression and symbolic competition.

Rap battles and diss tracks are analyzed as modern versions of pamphlet wars and satirical polemics. Like historical pamphleteers, rappers publicly challenge opponents through rhetoric, insult, parody, and performance. Conflicts such as the “Bridge Wars” between KRS-One and MC Shan, the feud between Tupac Shakur and The Notorious B.I.G., and the rivalry between Jay-Z and Nas are presented as examples of symbolic struggles over authenticity, authority, and cultural legitimacy. Diss tracks rely not only on aggression but also on rhetorical skill, audience participation, and public interpretation.

The final section focuses on internet culture as the newest arena for satirical pamphleteering and hip-hop agonistics. Social media platforms, memes, livestreams, and reaction videos accelerate public conflict and transform it into a collective, participatory process. Memes are described as compressed forms of satire that rapidly spread political criticism and reshape public perception. The internet democratizes symbolic production because users can both consume and create satirical content, though it also encourages misinformation, anonymity, and online harassment.

The text concludes with an analysis of the 2024 feud between Kendrick Lamar and Drake as a modern example of digital pamphlet warfare. Tracks such as “Not Like Us,” “Euphoria,” and “The Heart Part 6” became multimedia cultural events shaped by streaming platforms, memes, reaction videos, and online commentary. The conflict addressed issues of authenticity, cultural appropriation, morality, and identity within hip-hop culture (Baudrillard, 1981). Ultimately, the work argues that from ancient satire to modern internet culture, societies continue to use symbolic conflict and public criticism to negotiate truth, power, and cultural legitimacy.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Alighieri, D. (1321). *The Divine Comedy*.
2. Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*.
3. Aristophanes. (423 BCE). *The Clouds*.
4. Bakhtin, M. (1965). *Rabelais and His World*.
5. Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacra and Simulation*.
6. Chang, J. (2005). *Can't Stop Won't Stop: A History of the Hip-Hop Generation*.

7. Chaplin, C. (Director). (1940). *The Great Dictator* [Motion picture]. United Artists.
8. Darnton, R. (2023). *The Revolutionary Temper: Paris, 1748–1789*.
9. Debord, G. (1967). *The Society of the Spectacle*.
10. George, N. (2002). *Hip Hop America*.
11. Gosa, T. L. (2015). The fifth element: Knowledge. In J. A. Williams (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Hip-Hop*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Graham, A. (2024). *The Heart Part 6* [Song]. OVO Sound/Republic Records.
13. Habermas, J. (1962). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*.
14. Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*.
15. Horace. (35 BCE). *Satires*.
16. Huizinga, J. (1938). *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture*.
17. Juvenal. (100–127 CE). *Satires*.
18. Lamar, K. (2024). *Not Like Us* [Song]. pgLang/Interscope Records.
19. Luther, M. (1517). *Ninety-five Theses*.
20. Luther, M. (1520). *On the Freedom of a Christian*.
21. Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically*.
22. Nietzsche, F. (1887). *On the Genealogy of Morality*.
23. Paine, T. (1776). *Common Sense*.
24. Rose, T. (1994). *Black Noise: Rap Music and Black Culture in Contemporary America*.

25. Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*.
26. Baldick, C. (2015). *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
27. Griffin, D. H. (1994). *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. University Press of Kentucky.
28. Hutcheon, L. (1985). *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*. Methuen.
29. Eisenstein, E. L. (1979). *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. Cambridge University Press.
30. McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill.
31. Barthes, R. (1957). *Mythologies*.
32. Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Sage/Open University.
33. Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The Souls of Black Folk*.
34. hooks, b. (1992). *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. South End Press.
35. Gates, H. L., Jr. (1988). *The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism*. Oxford University Press.
36. Perry, I. (2004). *Prophets of the Hood: Politics and Poetics in Hip Hop*. Duke University Press.
37. Forman, M. (2002). *The 'Hood Comes First: Race, Space, and Place in Rap and Hip-Hop*. Wesleyan University Press.
38. Keyes, C. L. (2002). *Rap Music and Street Consciousness*. University of Illinois Press.
39. Shifman, L. (2013). *Memes in Digital Culture*. MIT Press.

40. Goffman, E. (1956). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.
41. Swift, J. (1729). *A Modest Proposal*.
42. Swift, J. (1724–1725). *The Drapier's Letters*.
43. Voltaire. (1759). *Candide*.
44. Rousseau, J.-J. (1755). *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men*.
45. Shan, M. C. (1985). *The Bridge* [Song]. Cold Chillin'/Bridge Records.
46. Boogie Down Productions. (1987). *The Bridge Is Over* [Song]. B-Boy Records.
47. Shakur, T. (1996). *Hit 'Em Up* [Song]. Death Row/Interscope Records.
48. Carter, S. (2001). *Takeover* [Song]. Roc-A-Fella/Def Jam Recordings.
49. Jones, N. (2001). *Ether* [Song]. Ill Will/Columbia Records.
50. Graham, A. (2015). *Back to Back* [Song]. OVO Sound/Young Money/Cash Money/Republic Records.
51. Thornton, T. (2018). *The Story of Adidon* [Song]. GOOD Music/Def Jam Recordings.
52. Future, Metro Boomin, & Lamar, K. (2024). *Like That* [Song]. Freebandz/Boominati/Epic/Republic Records.
53. Lamar, K. (2022). *The Heart Part 5* [Song]. pgLang/Interscope Records.
54. Lamar, K. (2024). *Euphoria* [Song]. pgLang/Interscope Records.

