POLITICAL DISCOURSE AS A MEANS OF PUBLIC SPEECH

Boltayeva Nargiza Raxmatovna
Researcher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages,
Teacher of ZARMED UNIVERSITY
nargizamagistr214@gmail.com
+998994710589

Abstract: Modern society is characterized by the increasing importance of political communication, which, in turn, is caused by the increasing democratization of the social and political structure of the state. Many state problems are currently subject to open discussion, moreover, the solution of some of them largely depends on how these problems will be interpreted in language and communicated to the addressee - the citizen of the state. In recent years, certain problems within the framework of political discourse have been actively discussed by both the media and the scientific community, however, the specifics of political communication aimed at the struggle for political power or its retention in different countries still remains insufficiently studied to draw up a complete picture of this phenomenon. I will analyze the political discourse and its features in this article.

Keywords: Political discourse, political speech, public speech, discourse analysis,

Introduction

In world linguistics, the peculiarities of the communicative interaction of representatives of various fields are being widely studied. In recent years, related problems have attracted the attention of researchers. In recent decades, many prominent linguistic theorists have turned their attention to political language. In world linguistics, the question of how a speaker uses the effective means of language to convey his or her thoughts to a listener or reader clearly, concisely and intelligibly is attracting more and more attention. It is especially important for political activists who work with a team and often communicate with the people, including candidates, deputies, and political speakers in election campaigns, to know what linguistic means are effective for public communication, what are the decisive basic units that lead to the intended goal from speech. Political discourse encompasses the language, rhetoric, messages, and communication adopted by politicians, leaders, and governments. The analysis of political discourse has become a vital part of linguistics. As politics and society around the world become increasingly polarized, understanding political psychology through discourse has become a pressing need. Linguistics offers tools to explore how rhetoric divides public opinion, shapes political debates, and inspires collective action that affects millions of people. Educational initiatives and international collaborations in Uzbek linguistics focused on the analysis of political discourse are essential to sharing best practices among linguistic communities. Political discourse is at the heart of applied linguistics, advancing progress and human understanding. The analysis of political discourse provides insights into how leaders maintain power and exercise social control through language. Linguistic theories such as critical discourse analysis explore these dynamics in various systems of governance.

Main part

In the modern world, political linguistics has developed rapidly and is considered today to be a very promising linguistic direction. The name of the direction indicates the subject of the study, which is

considered to be the study of political communication aimed at emotional impact on citizens of the country, at motivating them to political action, at developing public opinion. At the same time, the goal of political linguistics is "the study of the diverse relationships between language, thinking, communication, subjects of political activity and the political state of society" [Chudinov, 2006; 6].

Systematizing approaches to defining discourse by E. I. Sheigal, A. P. Chudinov and E. V. Budaev, researcher B. M. Shakova identifies several approaches to studying political discourse:

1. narrow (analysis of texts by political figures) and broad (analysis of texts on political topics) approaches;

2. field (the object of research here is transcripts, public speeches and interviews of political leaders, as well as texts created by journalists and distributed through the media);

3. comparative (reveals national characteristics in the perception of the language of political reality);

4. cognitive (political concepts, frames, speech acts and tactics of speech behavior are studied);

5. descriptive (identification of linguistic means and methods of manipulation);

6. critical (analysis of ways of implementing social inequality, which is expressed in language or discourse);

7. rhetorical (units of language are considered as means of conveying thoughts).

As the author notes, "the approaches do not contradict each other and are often used in a comprehensive manner, creating conditions for a multi-aspect study of political discourse" [Shakova, 2013; 95-97]. This paper will analyze speech tactics and linguistic means used by Russian opposition politicians, which reflect the connection between political discourse and social practice. Therefore, we will use cognitive, descriptive and critical approaches to the study of political discourse.

As for political discourse, its popularity is due to the fact that its main goal is to consider one of the most important spheres of human activity - politics, which involves various aspects that form a complex structure of relationships and interdependencies. Together, these aspects are an integral part of the life of society and complicate research within the framework of political linguistics. It is believed that political communication is carried out in a special version of the language, which can be identified as a separate, political language. Other researchers, on the contrary, are of the opinion that political communication does not go beyond the norms of language as such and is carried out through the native language. Consequently, the allocation of political language as a separate subsystem has no basis. On this issue, A.P. Chudinov rightly notes that "the term "political language" has the right to exist, since the terms "colloquial language", "scientific language" have no more features than political language, nevertheless, they exist. Therefore, "political language is a variant of the national language oriented towards the sphere of politics" [Chudinov, 2006; 32].

Political discourse is, to a certain extent, characterized by the predominance of manipulativeness: each act of political communication is considered as a process of managing the interlocutor's activity by forming certain attitudes in his consciousness, instilling the need for "politically correct" actions and/or assessments" [Demyankov, 2002; 37]. According to G. N. Parastayev, due to low political culture and the inability to analyze their own choice and its consequences, the overwhelming majority of society is unable to make a political choice based only on personal interests. That is why "skillfully using language, the authorities easily "juggle" concepts, categories, ideas, transforming existing concepts to their advantage. The simplest method of linguistic influence is the use of the right expressions and words" [Parastayev, 2011; 97]. Indeed, for the constantly changing political situation in the world, there is a need for constant argumentation and updating in the mass consciousness.

In order to influence the audience and control its perception, political discourse resorts to special techniques and speech means that are characterized by purposefulness, implicitness and mass character.

Of particular interest to researchers at this stage of studying political discourse is the representation of emotiveness in a political text, which is determined by the goals of political speech - influencing the addressee, creating a certain attitude of the audience to various political events.

The idiolects of politicians inevitably influence the emotional response and moral attitudes of the addressee, but such speeches may lack clear argumentation and logic of the text. The goal of political discourse is persuasion, which is why the politician's speech is saturated with symbols that affect the consciousness of the listener, touching on his irrational sides. Emotional impact, in this regard, is most

effective. Sociologist D. V. Tchaikovsky suggests dividing the symbols used by an experienced politician into two groups: presentational symbolism of power (symbols that do not have a linguistic form) and discursive symbols (linguistic symbols). The first group includes, for example, insignia, clothing, manner of speech, gait, gestures and postures of a person, as well as ranks and positions, academic degrees and special titles; and the second group includes language and speech techniques [Tchaikovsky, 2011; 185]. Conducting research describing the speech behavior of politicians, manifested in the process of political communication, researchers determine the linguistic means by which perception is managed and identify linguistic possibilities for managing consciousness. In this case, language is of particular interest for scientific research, because, as N. E. Gronskaya, "language can disguise its functions, can pass one thing off as another, can inspire, influence, bear false witness" [Gronskaya, 2000; 221]. For example, L.M. Bosova emphasizes that the language of politicians is more aimed not at stating facts, but at conveying an assessment. In addition to non-evaluative vocabulary, which acquires an evaluative connotation in a political text, politicians often use evaluative vocabulary to express a personal attitude to a certain problem in order to convince the audience of the correctness of their views. This can be especially clearly seen in election speeches, in which candidates try to attract their electorate by all possible means, including linguistic ones.

Thus, the idea is confirmed that political communication is a complex process of interaction between communication subjects, including various emotional components that resonate in the audience's perception of certain socio-political events.

By the concept of "strategy" we will, following O. N. Parshina, understand "a certain direction of speech behavior in a given situation in the interests of achieving the goal of communication" [Parshina, 2005;19]. However, approaches to identifying certain strategies into groups have forced researchers to consider this concept in different ways. Thus, O. N. Parshina identifies the following strategies of political discourse:

• self-presentation;
• discrediting;
• attack;
• self-defense;
• forming the emotional mood of the addressee;
• informational and interpretative;
• argumentative;
• agitational;
• manipulative.

According to J. Searle, it makes sense to highlight special types of statements that politicians often resort to in various public speeches:

1. representative statements - statements aimed at securing the speaker's responsibility for his judgments;

2. directives - express the speaker's desire to encourage listeners to perform certain actions (or inactions);

3. commissives - secure the speaker's promise to adhere to a certain line of behavior;

4. expressives - serve to express the speaker's emotions and assessments;

5. declarations - state the current state of affairs [J. Searle 1986; 170-194].

Using such speech structures, a politician effectively influences the intellectual, volitional and emotional sphere of the addressee, clearly conveying to him his own point of view as correct.

Conclusion

Political speech is a fundamental rhetoric to the audience. That's why every politician uses speech elements in his rhetoric correctly. Speech messages are becoming more "sophisticated": the semantic load of each situational sign and the association generated by it require increased attention. Politicians choose ideal words in their nation. "Playing" with the word, the author of the text not only pays attention to the sound form and semantics of the word, its etymology, the presence of synonymous words, but also enhances the emotional impact on the recipient. Interest in how the use of linguistic means influences the emergence of the desired attitudes in an individual or collective addressee is shown today by those for whom speech

communication is part of the sphere of professional competence. This category includes, for example, lecturers, lawyers, politicians, businessmen - all those who often have to convince the addressee of the correctness of a point of view, and, accordingly, think through their actions in advance during speeches, negotiations, debates. Accordingly, the need for understandable and practically applicable communication models determines the relevance of the study of communicative strategies of persuasion.

References:

1. Чудинов А. П. Политическая лингвистика: учеб. пособие – М.: Флинта : Наука, 2006. – 256 с.
2. Шакова Б. М. Различные подходы к исследованию политического дискурса // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. № 9 (27). 2013. Ч. 1. С. 195-197.
3. Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса. Монография – Волгоград: Перемена, 2000 – 368 с.
4. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политической филологии//Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. М., 2002. № 3. С. 32-43.
5. Гронская Н. Э. Языковые механизмы манипулирования массовым политическим сознанием (Электронный ресурс) // Вестник Нижегородского лингвистического университета. 2000. С. 220-231.
6. Паршина О. Н. Стратегии и тактики речевого поведения современной политической элиты России: дис. ... д-ра филол. наук: 10.02.01. – Саратов, 2005. – 325 с.
7. Чайковский Д. В. Манипулятивный дискурс как способ воспроизводства власти // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2011. № 6 (12): в 3-х ч. Ч. II. С. 185-188.83
8. Raxmatovna, B. N. (2022). Specific Features of Political Speech. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 3(12), 80-87. https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/93U2T
9. Boltayeva N.R (2023) "Political linguistics as a basis of Political speech" International Journal on Integrated Education 6 (5).270-273, **https://journals.researchparks.org/index.php/IJIE** of Public Diplomacy and International Studies, https://grnjournal.us/index.php/AJPDIS/article/view/550
10. Парастаев Г. Н. Проблема манипуляции в американском политическом дискурсе (на примере публичных выступлений политических деятелей США) // Вестник Московского государственного гуманитарного университета им. М. А. Шолохова. Филологические науки. Вып. 3, 2011. С. 97-103.