



CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

eISSN: 2660-6828 | Volume: 03 Issue: 12 Dec 2022
<https://cajlp.centralasianstudies.org>

Specific Features of Political Speech

Boltayeva Nargiza Raxmatovna

English teacher of Turon Zarmed University, nargizarakhmatova@gmail.com

Received 12th Oct 2022, Accepted 11th Nov 2022, Online 15th Dec 2022

ABSTRACT

In the given article the definitions of political linguistics, political language, political interrelation are studied in examples. The study of politics allows students to feel the relationship between political, economic, cultural and social events. The study of politics expands students' knowledge of various political concepts and terms, such as sovereignty, state, political obligation, and the relationship between the individual and the political system. The emergence of new research in the field of political linguistics, the appeal of researchers to new aspects of the study of political language - all this requires a comprehensive understanding of the history of this scientific direction, its current state, its laws.

KEYWORDS: Political linguistics, political language, political speech, political discourse, political communication, public speech, metaphors.

INTRODUCTION

Political linguistics is the study of the relations between language and politics. Language is used as a means to form a state and is enacted in various ways that help achieve political objectives. Language allows for people in a very large number to communicate with each other in a large scope to the effect that a state is formed. As language forms the basis of communication, politics is thus affected by language. There are strong relationships between political linguistics, social linguistics, and media linguistics.

Political linguistics is the study of language as a tool of persuasion in politics, especially speeches and campaigns. It examines the effects of slogans, mass media, debates, and propaganda. The study of political linguistics is important for undergraduates and postgraduates, as it will contribute to a better understanding, analysis and production (including in the process of translation into other languages) of relevant texts. At the same time, the study of political linguistics will help to better understand the political processes taking place in the modern world; learn to see the true meaning of the speeches of political leaders and the ways they use to manipulate public consciousness. Today, the problems of the relationship between language and power, language and ideology, the role of myth in political communication and linguistic manipulation proper are attracting the attention of an increasing number of linguists. The rhetoric of political discourse correlates with overcoming of its negative features such as ideological pretentiousness and monopoly, aggressiveness, dictatorship, pragmatism, and propensity towards conflict. The intensive development of political technologies, the increasing role of the mass media, and the increasing theatricalization of political activity

contribute to increasing public attention to the theory and practice of political communication. Politicians have a language of their own too. Studying politics will enhance students' understanding of various political concepts and terms such as sovereignty, state, political obligation, and the relationship between the individual and the political system.

This is possible because a good understanding of politics among students will empower them, thereby enhancing their political consciousness and participation. The key to the success of the speech manipulator lies in the ability to play with words – look for neologisms, metaphors, metonymies, allusions, logos and pathos. The study of politics involves the study of a system that is interconnected with social, economic, and cultural structures.

The main part. The study of political linguistics is particularly useful when analyzing international negotiations. International negotiations are complex events with many factors where language and culture barriers often occur. Translators run into difficulties ensuring that nuances and details are not lost in the translation process. At the moment, political linguistics, which emerged at the intersection of political science and linguistics, belongs to the actively developing areas of linguistics. Nominations for new research areas traditionally appear late. Before a certain name can be assigned to the established direction, the field of research must formulate its subject and try out new methodological approaches. The phrase "political linguistics" appeared in the late 80s of the last century, but the actual origins of this trend should be seen earlier, when a steady methodological interest in the study of political communication, rhetoric, and semiotics began to form a separate area of scientific research.

Understanding political language in accordance with rhetorical and cognitive approaches will help to understand political ideology better and how structures work to contribute improving a political system. The study enhances an awareness of values in politics by communicating to students ideologies of various political systems such as democratic system. The information gained will be useful in making value judgments about a particular political system to either accept or reject it. Thus, political studies enable students to comprehend various forms of government and hence make informed choices with knowledge of the purpose and functioning of each.

The interest in political linguistics has already begun, but has not been fully studied. For that, we intended to study the linguistic features of political language in a broad sphere and to find unexplored peculiarities of political language, to search political terms in accordance with cognitive and rhetorical approaches, to investigate contemporary political neologisms.

Political interaction as a communicative sphere, the main topic and the driving motive of which is the struggle for power, became the focus of Russian scientific interest mainly in the mid-1980s, when the coexistence of political elites ceased to be purely ritualistic and acquired the shape of one of the ways of functioning of society. Today, the problems of the relationship between language and power, language and ideology, the role of myth in political communication and linguistic manipulation proper are attracting the attention of an increasing number of linguists. This is largely due to the fact that politics (as opposed to other areas of human activity) is inherently discursive and political actions are, as a rule, speech actions. Attempts of scientists to give a correct definition of the concept of "political discourse" have led to the emergence of many definitions:

this is "the totality of all speech acts used in political discussions, as well as the rules of public politicians illuminated by tradition and proven experience"¹

Research of political communication within the framework of traditional rhetoric and stylistics. Initially (that is, even before the emergence of political linguistics as a special scientific field), publications on the problems of political communication were perceived as a kind of stylistic or rhetorical research. The corresponding publications were mostly "prescription", praising or critical (discrediting) in nature.

In publications of the first type, the authors they tried to show their readers how to achieve success in public speaking or other public speech activities, including in the political sphere. Among the most striking examples of publications of a prescription nature are the works of Dale Carnegie and Paul Soper, which reviewed a variety of specific presentations and publications, as well as offered fairly effective recommendations. In such publications, the metaphor was presented as a very useful "decoration" of speech, the skillful use of which can bring a significant pragmatic effect.

The second type of publication focused on a detailed description of the advantages and, to a lesser extent, disadvantages in the speech activities of specific political figures. Have been extensively studied on a variety of aspects the rhetorical skill of political leaders. The reasons for the persuasiveness of presidential speeches were sought in phonetic and rhythmic features, wit, sincerity, openness, simplicity, imagery, and other qualities of speech. In the works of critical orientation, the main focus has traditionally been on "exposing" the unscrupulous tricks of political opponents, as well as their tongue-tied, lack of education and speech negligence. A significant number of critical publications were devoted to the "spoilage" of the native language, among the reasons for which some political reasons were usually mentioned events, as well as the General decline in morals, loss of spiritual foundations and respect for national traditions².

The Emergence and formation of political linguistics (the twenties and fifties of the twentieth century). The history of the origin and formation of any scientific discipline is inextricably linked with the history of society, and political linguistics is no exception. In a series of events of the XX century, the starting point for the formation of political linguistics was the First world war, which led to unprecedented human losses and a radical change in the worldview of mankind. In new conditions the need to study political communication and its relationship with socio-political processes became more and more obvious.

After the experience of unprecedented propaganda confrontation between warring countries, knowledge about the mechanisms of manipulating public opinion becomes highly scientific and humanitarian value. Therefore, it is not surprising that after the war, the attention of researchers of the language of politics was directed to the study of ways to form public opinion, the effectiveness of political agitation and military propaganda. The most significant works of this period are related to activities of Walter Lippmann, Paul Lazarsfeld, Harold.

During the First world war, Lasswell, W. Lippmann wrote propaganda leaflets for the allied army in France, after the war he studied propaganda and agitation issues, and served as an adviser to twelve US presidents. Modern political linguistics uses the concept of "agenda setting process" proposed by W. Lippmann, i.e. highlighting some issues in political communication and silencing others. Thus, the scientist he distinguished the real relevance of a particular problem and its "importance" in the perception of society. In addition, W. Lippmann holds the primacy in the use of content analysis as a method for studying public perceptions of the political picture of the world. In particular, in 1920 W. Lippmann published a study of the corpus of texts of

the newspaper "The New York Times", which were dedicated to the October revolution 1917. As W. Lippmann showed, it was impossible for the average American to form any objective opinion about what was happening in the world of events due to the anti-Bolshevik bias of the analyzed texts.

Another significant precursor to political linguistics was Paul Lazarsfeld, who was active in the study of propaganda at Columbia University. In 1937, he led a research project on the impact of broadcasting information on American audiences. Subsequently, this project resulted in the creation of the "Bureau of applied social research" – the only University-based research Institute at that time that dealt with political issues and mass communication.

Therefore, in the 40s of the XX century, G. Lasswell, N. Leites, P. Jacobson and other researchers identified various interdependencies between the semantics of language units and political processes based on the analysis of Soviet slogans, language of the international, texts of fascist propaganda. During this period, there is an additional impulse to understand the role of language in politics, associated with the practice of totalitarianism and a new, even more destructive world war. Considering this stage of development of political linguistics, historians of science name, in addition to communication specialists, the English writer George Orwell and the German literary critic Victor Klemperer, who turned to a critical study of totalitarian discourse. The first of them wrote in 1948 a dystopian novel "1984", which described the principle of "doublethink" (doublethink) and Newspeak dictionary, that is, specific examples were used to describe ways of speech manipulation of human consciousness in order to gain and retain political power in a totalitarian state.

On the other hand, metaphorical images played an important role in the development of the political situation, emphasizing the danger of the consequences of an atomic disaster ("nuclear winter", "atomic Apocalypse", "warmongers", etc.). It is not surprising that the awareness of the urgency of the tasks facing by researchers of political communication, it becomes a significant factor in the development of political linguistics.

An important place in the political linguistics of the period under review is occupied by the French school of discourse analysis (J. Dubois, J.-J. Curtin, M. Pesche, M. Foucault, etc.). As P. Serio shows, this school arose "as an attempt to eliminate the shortcomings of content analysis used at that time in the Humanities, especially in the field of United States". According to French scientists, American content analysis "involves ordering the surface variety of texts, thereby opening up the possibility of their comparison and calculation".

Accordingly, the task of the researcher is to generalize various ways of expressing similar content and statistical analysis of the results obtained. French experts perceive this analysis as "a set of secondary techniques". The theoretical basis for the French school of discourse analysis was the ideas of psychoanalysis, Marxism, and structural linguistics.

So, in the sixties and eighties of the last century, the research of political vocabulary, theory and practice of political argumentation, political communication in historical perspective, political metaphors and symbols became widespread. The researchers' attention was drawn to the issues of the functioning of political language in the situation of election campaigns, parliamentary and presidential debates, in party discourse, etc. The scientific apparatus is becoming more and more subtle the study of political communication is increasingly taken into account when studying the discursive significance of certain statements, texts, or text bodies. Already in this period, the study of political communication develops into a relatively independent direction of linguistic research. In the 70s and 80s, textbooks on political communication and methods of its analysis were regularly published abroad.

Thus, A. N. Baranov and E. G. Kazakevich do not question the independence of the role of political language in the communication system: "Political language is a special sign system designed specifically for political communication: to develop public consensus, to make and justify political and socio-political decisions"³.

After studying 56 political speeches of the 19th and 20th centuries, he found that technological progress can reduce the prevalence of archetypal metaphors. For example, in the XX century, the number of metaphorical images associated with water sharply decreased, while in the XIX century river and ocean metaphors were very common. The archetypal nature of political metaphor has received a formalized character in the theory of conceptual metaphor, according to these mechanisms of metaphORIZATION are unconscious and are determined by the physical experience of human interaction with the surrounding world. Thus, an important basis for metaphorical universalism was the anatomical and physiological community of representatives of homo sapiens, which to some extent determines the patterns of thinking.

At the same time, critics of the theory of conceptual metaphor often forget that, according to the theory of J. Lakoff and M. Johnson's conceptual metaphors are consistent with the main concepts of a particular culture, which in principle not only overcomes the shortcomings of the cultural universalism, but also does not exclude diachronic variability of political metaphor.

Indeed, many metaphors are recorded by researchers in different cultures and at different times. For example, metaphors of diseases have long been used in different countries to represent someone Else's health-threatening social organism. For example, in the age of the Queen Elizabeth I and king James I were very common metaphors of the disease of England, and the causes of these diseases society saw in "foreign bodies": Jews, witches, Catholics. Similar metaphors they are also found hundreds of years later in the rhetoric of Adolf Hitler, and in modern political discourse, in which metaphors of illness

are a significant means of understanding reality and discrediting political opponents in many countries. Of course, the scope of the target for mob of metaphors varies in different epochs.

If in the era of Queen Elizabeth, Catholics could be metaphorically represented as the causes of diseases, then before the reform of Henry IV or during the reign of Mary the Bloody, it is unlikely, but the argumentative potential of the source sphere is actively used in different countries.

Political linguistics as modern science of language is characterized by multidiscipline (different science methodologies usage), anthropocentrism (a person, lingual identity is a base point for research of lingual conditions) and interrelation with political science, philosophy (axiology), sociology, culturology, psychology, knowledge engineering. Formation of political linguistics as independent department of science of language has begun in the 20th century but its impetuous development in the end of last century.

Political linguistics is an independent scientific discipline possessed object and subject of research, interdisciplinary connections, directions of research.

The dominant purpose of political linguistics is a study of various connections between language, thinking, communication, entities of political activities and political condition of society and also strategies and tactics of political activities.

Research of works was highlight close links with linguistics directions such as axiological linguistics, pragmalinguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, sociological linguistics, functional linguistics, rhetoric, text linguistics in a political linguistics direction.

The most important directions of political linguistics are researches of shared problems of political communication, study of political media-discourse and categories of political discourse, separate political concepts, research of communicative strategies, tactics, procedures of political discourse, political discourse's role structure study.

The complement of comprehensive study has been political discourse by the way of: 1) primary needs of linguistic theory adverted to real facts of language system functioning; 2) designation of political discourse's analysis methods necessity for showing up different tendencies in socio-political consciousness sphere; 3) the problems of political science in a political thinking study, its connection with political behavior⁴.

Famous linguist A.N.Baranov calls the subject of political linguistics as a political discourse, which is a commonality of discourse practices identified participants of political discourse or formed concrete theme of political communication.

Another magisterial researcher in a political communication field A.P.Chudinov calls more extensional term as a subject of political linguistics – political communication representing speech, focused on propaganda of some or other ideas, emotional impact on citizens of the country and motivate them to definite policy decisions.

Political communication in its turn has own research subjects: political language, political discourse and political narrative.

Political language is defined as the special semiotic system being used in a political communication with the aim-formulation of social consensus, political decisions making and foundation in society amid of various points of view.

There are two approaches of political discourse research: narrow and extended. A.N.Baranov and E.G.Kazakevich under political discourse term mean "totality of all speech acts in political discussions use and rules of public politics were lightened by traditions and proved by time." The extended approach was conceived by E.I.Sheygal including "not only institutional but also non-intrusive forms of communications in which one of three constituents belongs to: subject, addressee or content of message".

Political narrative is whole of political texts by A.P.Chudinov, concentrating around definite political event.

A lot of research works about suggestiveness and complexity of the "discourse" term were written. Developing of discourse concepts does not alone in linguistics but in political science, philosophy, psychology, history, literary studies and etc.

Since research paradigm in study of language has been changed to the anthro- centralism the term "text" has been inadequate for imaging of all variety constituent of event's communicative practice.

Generally speaking, the first chapter of this work reflects to the investigation of the formation of political linguistics as a science and views of political scientists. Summing up the review, it should be emphasized that the variety of aspects of the study of political communication reflects the interest that is shown in political

speech, and the variety of material, areas of analysis and positions that are characteristic of modern political linguistics. According to A. N. Baranov, political discourse includes all speech acts of political discussions and the rules of public politics, having specific conventions. The importance of political discourse lies in the fact that well-maintained political communication provides for reaching consensus in the society. This implies that a politician should aspire making decisions from which the society would benefit greatly. The main aim of political discourse is to make the recipients believe in the necessity of politically correct actions or evaluations. So, it is not to describe but to persuade, so that the recipient would have some intentions, beliefs and need for certain actions. When it comes to discussing the effectiveness of political discourse, the researchers would analyse it in accordance with the main aim of political discourse. It is obvious that talking about the effectiveness of political discourse it is impossible to avoid one of the most important elements of political speech, i.e. persuasiveness. A politician should be capable of finding the best way to address his audience taking into consideration their opinions, beliefs and so on. In accordance with E. V. Budaev and A. P. Chudinov, we suggest that there are several sources through which we can comprehend political discourse and language. The main source of political language that the audience touches upon is mass media, including newspapers, radio, television and the Internet. There is also a source of political institutional discourse comprising leaflets, parliamentary debates, public speech, published documents, etc. Political discourse is considered specific since it possesses a number of peculiar features or characteristics. In their speech, politicians use particular terms and notions, which means that their vocabulary is professional, at the same time common words and phrases when used in political context might possess a different meaning opposed to their usual one.

Conclusion

The structure of political discourse is also specific, as it is comprised of particular speech strategies typical of political discourse. The researchers also note that discourse possesses an outstanding spoken and written form, i.e. pauses and intonation. They say that politician's speech contains twice as many meaningful pauses as other people's, and these pauses tend to be longer which makes it possible to compare this type of speech with theatrical performances. As it was mentioned in the introduction to this paper, discourse as a whole and political discourse in particular is subject to multidisciplinary research and there is a variety of approaches towards it. In this paper, we suggest that there are at least three perspectives worth discussing. First, political discourse can be viewed from the point of view of physiology as any other text; however, in this case an academic would also regard the context and ideologies. In addition, the last perspective is one concerning the analysis of personal rationales or intentions and/or the addressee's as well within certain context.

All these features make political speech sound theatrical and aggressive. The intention of politicians in this case would be to discard their opponents and impose their ideas and beliefs upon the audience. The abovementioned suggests that studying political discourse is indeed interconnected with a number of fields of study and aims at analyzing forms, intentions and content of the discourse used in certain context. In addition, another peculiarity of political discourse is its oratory character including declamations, propaganda, triumphant style, ideologies, abstract notions, references to science and logic, criticisms, bumper-sticker rhetoric, and claims of undeniable truth.

References:

1. Баранов, А. Н. Политическая метафорика публицистического текста: возможности лингвистического мониторинга / А. Н. Баранов // Язык массовой информации как объект междисциплинарного исследования. — М., 2001. — С. 134—140.

2. Баранов, А. Н. Словарь русских политических метафор / А. Н. Баранов, Ю. Н. Караулов. — М. : Помовский и партнеры, 1994. — 351 с.
3. Баранов, А. Н. Русская политическая метафора. Материалы к словарю / А. Н. Баранов, Ю. Н. Караулов. — М. : Ин-т русского языка АН СССР, 1991. — 193 с.
4. Баранова, А. А. Политические субъекты в программах радиостанции «Эхо Москвы» и «Радио России» / А. А. Баранова // Политическая лингвистика. — 2012. — № 1 (39). — С. 92—98.
5. Белова, В. Ф. Сопоставительное исследование метафор в парламентском и публицистическом дискурсах на немецком языке / В. Ф. Белова // Политическая лингвистика. — 2015. — Вып. 2 (52). — С. 122—129.
6. Белова, В. Ф. Универсальный характер коммуникативных стратегий в парламентских дебатах / В. Ф. Белова, И. А. Зюбина, М. В. Лесняк, Г. Г. Матвеева // Политическая лингвистика. — 2016. — № 3 (57). — С. 53—60.
7. Белоусов, К. И. Образ мира политика (по данным частотного анализа лексики) / К. И. Белоусов, Н. Л. Зелянская // Политическая лингвистика. — 2012. — № 2. — С. 60—66.
8. Будаев, Э. В. Зарубежная политическая лингвистика: учеб. Пособие / Э. В. Будаев, А. П. Чудинов. — М. Флинта, 2006б. — 252 с.
9. Будаев, Э. В. Сопоставительная политическая метафорология: дис. ... д-ра филол. наук / Э. В. Будаев ; Урал. гос. Пед. ун-т. — Екатеринбург, 2010в. — 474 с.
10. Берк, К. Риторика гитлеровской «Борьбы» / К. Берк // Политическая лингвистика. — 2008. — № 25. — С. 149—160.
11. Зелянская, Н. Л. Медиаобраз политика: интернет-сообщество как агент политической реальности — Москва 2014. — № 4 (50). — С. 120 126.
12. Chudinov, A.P. Linguistic political prognostics: models and scenarios of future- Moscow. P-129
13. Chudinov A.P. Politicheskaya lingvistika: uchebnoe posobie [Political linguistics] training manual / A.P.Chudinov. — 2-e izd. ispr. — M: Flinta: Nauka — Science, 2007. — p.256
14. Lakoff, G. Metaphors We Live by / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. — Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1980. — 242 p.
15. Lakoff, George (2008). "Metonymic models". Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. University of Chicago Press. p. 77. ISBN 978-0-226-47101-3. Retrieved 7 January 2017.
16. Nargiza Raxmatovna Boltaeva & Dr. Leyla Eshkuvatovna Holmuradova. (2021). THE ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENT'S SPEECH. *Academicia Globe: Inderscience Research*, 2(6), 111–114. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DP4FR>
17. Boltaeva Nargiza Raxmatovna, Kholmuradova Leyla Eshkuvatovna. PUBLIC SPEAKING AS THE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECT OF ORAL COMMUNICATION. Multidiscipline Proceedings of DIGITAL FASHION CONFERENCE. January 2022. ISSN 2466-0744, Seoul, Republic of Korea.