THE CONCEPT OF "POLITICAL DISCOURSE"

Scientific supervisor: Petrosyan Nelya Valerevna
Samarkand state institute of foreign language
Khamrakulova Farangiz Rakhmatovna
Master of the 2nd course

Article history:		Abstract:
		This article is determined by the key role of political discourse in the formation of public consciousness. It becomes an instrument of mass manipulation, an expression of dominance or discrimination. Identification and characterization of methods of such influence are becoming increasingly important in the framework of modern linguistics. "Political discourse and its specifics" highlights the features of the concepts of "political discourse" in modern linguistics and approaches to their analysis, provides genre and also defines the phenomenon of interdiscursivity.

In the second half of the XX century, the promotion of new areas of scientific interests in linguistics began, which led to the emergence of terms and concepts, many of which went beyond one scientific field and were reinterpreted in other areas. An illustration of such a process can be the fate of the term "discourse". Discourse is the object of study of many sciences. Its research is carried out by scientists from the fields of linguistics, psychology, philosophy, sociology, theology, pedagogy, law, political science, etc. At the moment, there is no clear and generally accepted definition of discourse covering all cases of its use. Every science that studies this phenomenon offers its own definitions.

Political discourse deserves special consideration in a number of types of discourse. At the moment, considerable attention is paid to political discourse in linguistics. Political discourse is an interdisciplinary concept that is of interest to linguists and political scientists, as well as sociologists, cultural scientists and psychologists. This allows us to better understand the nature of this phenomenon and consider it from different angles, thus creating a complete picture of it.

Political discourse is the central object of political linguistics research. There are dozens of definitions of it, but most often they turn to the definition of A.N. Baranov: political discourse is "the totality of all speech acts used in political discussions, as well as rules of public policy, sanctified by tradition and proven by experience" [1].

Creating her own definition of political discourse, E.R. Levenkova also includes in it a reference to the mental sphere of human existence, without the analysis of which modern studies of discourse would be incomplete. According to the researcher, political discourse is "a linguistic expression of public practice in the sphere of political culture, which is the professional use of language, which is based on the nationally and socio-historically conditioned mentality of its speakers" [2].

The authors of these definitions, along with foreign (T.A.van Dyck and R.Vodak) and domestic (E.G.Kazakevich) scientists, in the study of political discourse, concentrate only on the forms of public communication of professional politicians with the aim of winning and retaining power. Thus, T.A. van Dyck asks in his book "The Discourse of Power" whether the media can be considered a "power group", and, consequently, whether the results of the activities of journalists, reporters and other representatives of this group can be attributed to political discourse. According to the author, the media only contribute to the dissemination of political discourse, facilitate access to it by citizens of the whole world, but they themselves cannot be considered political discourse. [3].

Unlike linguists who support the so-called "narrow" approach to understanding political discourse, E.I. Sheigal, A.G. Altunyan, A.P. Chudinov and others are among those who advocate a broad commemoration of political discourse, which includes all forms of linguistic activity in which something connects it with the world of politics (be it the subject, addressee or the content of a sample of discourse) [4]. Consequently, the political discourse also includes media products.

According to E.I. Sheigal, the media are "an intermediary between politicians and the people" [5]. This means that the perception of these same events by ordinary citizens depends on how political events are presented in news feeds, on radio and television. Therefore, it is indisputable that in different countries the same conflict on the world stage can be covered in different ways.

A.P. Chudinov puts political communication carried out by journalists and aimed at a mass audience on a par with its other three varieties: hardware, accessible only to initiates and focused on state institutions; public, addressed to the people; and political speech activity of a wide range of people not related to politics, but taking an active social position and participating in rallies, etc. [6].

A broad approach to political discourse can also be attributed to V.V. Zelensky, who distinguishes two levels of politics: official and personal. The first is based on all kinds of manifestations of politics in the social life of people in any country. It also includes the mass media. The second level of politics is actualized when there is a relationship of the individual with other people or the surrounding world [7].

The differences in the level of policy determine the characteristics of the two types of discourse, which are directly correlated with the above classification.

In the first case, the speaker has a specific role clearly assigned to him: he is the bearer of a certain social status and represents a specific social institution. In the second case, the speaker acts as himself: he is a person with a unique set of traits [6].

For modern political linguistics, it is extremely important to include in political discourse a number of components related to speech activity: these are the political views of the author; and other discourses that can be implicitly or explicitly represented in a particular sample of discourse; and the political situation that determines the content of the discourse; etc.

Thus, the study of political discourse presupposes "the study of the degree of influence on this text and on its perception by the addressee of various linguistic, cultural, social, economic, political, national and other factors" [6].

Functions of political discourse

As for the functions of political discourse, here it is necessary to refer to the functions of language derived by academician V.V. Vinogradov: communication, communication and impact [8]. All these functions are represented in the political discourse. The central role is assigned to the influence function, since the speech of the politician is aimed not so much at transmitting any information, but precisely at influencing the audience. The function of communication also fades into the background, since often there is no communication as such between the author and the addressee.

It seems expedient to look at another classification of language functions developed by R. Jacobson [9] on the basis of the orientation of each function to some component of communication. Thus, he distinguishes communicative, emotive, motivational, phatic, metalanguage and aesthetic functions.

The main function of political communication seems to be the incentive function, which consists in influencing the addressee in order to gain and retain power. E.I. Sheigal even brings this feature into his definition of political discourse: this is "communication, the main intention of which is the struggle for power" [5]. Indeed, behind the political discourse there is a desire to gain power, so it is often used as a way of manipulating people. The struggle for power implies the need to encourage the audience to act (for example, before elections), to convince them of the purity of intentions, the correctness of the speaker's judgments, etc. That is why political language is so rich in various stylistic means by which the speaker makes his speech more convincing and impressive.

The motivational function can be expressed in different ways in the discourse: explicitly, that is, in the form of slogans, direct appeals to the people with appeals, etc., and implicitly, when the author conveys through his discourse a certain emotion, be it fear, anger or a sense of unity, thereby pushing the audience to some action.

Despite the dominance of the motivational function, the other functions of language also play an important role in political discourse. The communicative function is responsible for the transmission of information: political discourse often contains information about important political events, political trends and everything that may be important for a given communicative situation. The emotive function is responsible for expressing the feelings and emotions of the speaker, as well as for awakening the same emotions in the addressee. Thanks to the persuasiveness of speech and the success of the choice of stylistic means, the speaker is able to evoke a whole range of diverse emotions to the listener. In political discourse, it is very important that the addressee shares the feelings of the addressee: only then will they be able to strive together to achieve common goals.

The phatic function is associated with the establishment and maintenance of communicative contact. It is closely intertwined with the previous one, because only if there is interest and commonality of tasks and views, contact between the parties will be established and communication will be successful.

The metalanguage function helps to correctly convey the meaning of a word or phrase. Thus, politicians often resort to explaining certain terms, concepts and ideas of the world of politics, since their meaning may not be completely clear to the audience.

The last function in this series – aesthetic - is aimed at creating expressiveness of speech. As in a literary text, it plays an important role in political speech, since the use of stylistic means makes speech vivid and memorable [6].

The functional features of political discourse leave an imprint on its substantive and formal components. One of the features of political discourse is that it combines standardization and expression. The first component is necessary in order for the discourse to be accessible to a wide range of recipients. It consists in observing certain sequences of construction and reproduction of discourse, as well as the rules for choosing vocabulary. Expressiveness also allows you to convey in the discourse the emotional state of the author and his attitude to the topic.

Being expressed with the help of stylistic figures of speech, expressiveness also makes the text interesting for perception, which is extremely important for the world of politics, since the more thoughtful the discourse is, the more influence it can have on the audience.

The nature of the audience also leaves an imprint on the political discourse, which is characterized by the predominance of the mass addressee. This peculiarity lies in the fact that when creating and reproducing any sample of discourse, the author expects that it will be heard by a significant number of people at once. For example, debates in parliament take place in the presence of its members, and the inaugural speech of the new president is broadcast by television and radio not only in the relevant country, but also abroad.

Political language is also an integral part of political discourse. It is characterized by uncertainty, often expressed by words with abstract meanings and polysemy. It reveals itself due to the fact that politicians often have to speak veiled about unpleasant things that cast a shadow on them. This includes the anonymity of some statements in order to hide the person responsible for a particular decision. This can also include the use of uncertainty by the speakers, so as not to show their ignorance in any matters. In addition, uncertainty helps to avoid possible conflicts, because if the speaker does not specify his message, but speaks blurrily, then he will not have to answer for what he said or it will be much easier to repel the attacks of rivals and detractors [5]. Consequently, political discourse adapts to external conditions. G. Lasswell classifies the types of political discourse according to the degree of transparency of the language, depending on the tension of the situation in the country or the world. So, if political decisions play a key role in deciding the fate of a country or a particular person, as, for example, in the case of the promulgation of laws or sentencing in court, the discourse will be based on established standards and will be transparent and concise.

Other situations, such as calls to take sides in elections or referendums, when the people must choose for themselves the path of future development, are still largely tense because the audience is faced with a choice, and, therefore, is responsible for it. Nevertheless, the authors of the discourse have much more freedom to express their emotions about what is happening, to use stylistic means of expression, etc.

The latter, in this scale of the situation, are least associated with the tension of their participants. These include celebrating the victory of one of the presidential candidates in the elections or the inauguration ceremony of the new president. The discourse corresponding to them is the most colorful, replete with stylistic means, bringing to the fore the values of society and the idea of the unity of the nation [10].

At the present stage of the development of political discourse, many researchers are studying the linguistic features of political discourse, called "political language", which means a special style, manner of communication with the addressee. Political language is in a bilateral relationship with extralinguistic reality. On the one hand, it is significantly influenced by the political situation on the world stage, because it reflects the life of the country with its values, traditions and priorities. For example, political reality often forces speakers to differentiate people in their discourse into "their own" and "strangers", and it is often necessary to carefully draw this boundary in order not to cause new conflicts.

On the other hand, the choice of language means is of great importance for political discourse. It allows you to influence the consciousness of the addressee, on how he will perceive this or that information, how he will behave after comprehending it. The role of political language in creating the image of a politician or an entire party, as well as in making important decisions, should not be underestimated. There are many examples when a successful performance in public changed the course of historical, and especially military, events.

Speaking about the creation and perception of political discourse, T.A. van Dyck also touches on the idea of two types of knowledge. He contrasts "general cultural knowledge shared by participants of various social groups" and "knowledge shared by participants of a separate social group" [11]. The first type forms the basis of communication, is objective and indisputable. The second type of knowledge meets the criteria of the first with only one limitation – the similarity is true only for a particular society. For everyone else, this knowledge seems to be just a belief or an opinion.

This classification of political knowledge is extremely relevant for the analysis of African-American political discourse. The tasks of this dissertation do not include identifying differences in the knowledge of certain social groups, but it can be assumed with some confidence that if the discourse of the civil rights movement period is replete with references to the second type of knowledge, characteristic only of African Americans in the United States, then the modern discourse of Barack Obama is understandable to all citizens of this country due to the special status of its author.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Baranov, A. N. Parliamentary debates: traditions and innovations / A. N. Baranov, E. G. Kazakevich. - M.: Znanie, 1991. - 64 p.
2. Levenkova, E.R. British and American Political discourse: a contrastive analysis. diss. ... doc. philol.Sciences: 10.02.04 / Elena Romanovna Levenkova. - Samara, 2011. - 423 p.
3. Dyck, T.A. van. Discourse and power: representation of dominance in language and communication: trans. from English / T.A. van Dyck. - M.: Book House "LIBROCOM", 2013. - 344 p.
4. Maslova, V.A. Political discourse: Language games or word games? / V.A. Maslova // Political linguistics.- Yekaterinburg, 2008. - Issue 1 (24). - pp. 43-48.

5. Sheigal, E.I. Semiotics of political discourse dis...doc.philol.Sciences: 10.02.01, 10.02.19 / Elena Iosifovna Sheigal. - Volgograd, 2000– - 440 p.

6. Chudinov, A.P. Political linguistics: a textbook / A.P. Chudinov. - M.: Flint: Nauka, 2006. - 256 p.

7. Zelensky, V.V. Afterword / V.V. Zelensky // Psychology of Politics. Psychological and social ideas of Carl Gustav Jung / V. Odainik. - St. Petersburg: Juventa, 1996. - pp. 368-380.

8. Vinogradov V.V. History of Russian linguistic teachings: a textbook for philology. specialties of the University / V.V., Vinogradov; comp. Yu.A. Belchikov; [preface by Yu.V. Rozhdestvensky]. - M.: Higher School, 1978. - 360 p.

9. Jakobson, R. Linguistics and Poetics / R. Jakobson // The Discourse Reader / ed. by A.Jaworski and N.Coupland. - 2nd edition. – N.Y.: Routledge, 2006. - pp.48-55.

10. Lasswell, G. Style in the language of politics / G. Lasswell // Political Linguistics. –- Yekaterinburg, 2007. -- Issue 2(22). - pp. 165-177.

11. Dyck, T.A. van. Language. Cognition. Communication: trans. from English / T.A. van Dyck. - Blagoveshchensk: I.A.Baudouin de Courtenay BGC, 2000. - 308 p.