SECTION 7.
LAW AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mokhira Eshanova
Senior Lecturer, Specialized Branch
Tashkent State University of Law, Republic of Uzbekistan

SOCIO-CULTURAL CHRARCTERISTICS
OF THE POLITICAL LANGUAGE

Summary. Politics and its institutions cannot accomplish their goals without language opportunities in the society. At the same time, the language itself is also influenced by politics in this or that way. It is known that language becomes an object of individual policy and planning by the state. In the literature, such phrases as "special political language", "functional style of politics", "special lexical composition of politics", "special political lexics" are identified. In our view, the concepts of "political language" and "political term", first of all, are synonymous combinations, and secondly, have a somewhat general meaning in relation to the combinations of "special political language" and "functional style of politics". Consequently, they will cover as fully as possible the issue we are studying in this article.
Keywords: political language, political text, society, natural language, literal language, political terms.

What is the specifics of the language of politics? The linguistic scholar V.Schmidt explains it as follows: "A common sign of political lexicon is its ideology". However it is controversial, because first of all there are political, legal, religious and other types of ideology. Of course, it is clear that V.Schmidt refers to exactly political ideology, and not to a different ideology. Secondly, does political consciousness refer to political ideology? It is debatable issue either. Thirdly, ideology is such a spiritual product, in which reality is reflected through the prism of private interests. Such expression of social reality in consciousness is political consciousness. But this is not an exhaustive conclusion, because in it social psychology is set into[1]. But this is not an exhaustive conclusion, because it is based on social psychology. Now we will return to the language of politics again. To do this, we need to determine the general specificity. Language is a system that constantly changes, performs tasks such as expressing the opinion of society, expressing, studying, rendering information, communication. It is also a specific socio-cultural tool for the storage, aggregation and delivery of information, human activity, and management of behaviour.

As a rule, in the functioning and development of the language, researchers distinguish its "two interrelated sides: the structure of the language and the language, which makes it possible to consciously intervene in the processes of development of social functions". In our opinion, such independence is not an absolute independent phenomenon, although it occurs in the conditions of various historical epochs and political order. Because language is represented as a social and socio-historical phenomenon. By the way, the language obtained in terms of its structure or construction will be more independent than the language chosen according to its social functions. However, since this is perceived as a feature of all languages, it is difficult to distinguish the

---

[1] Shmidt V. Sootnoshenie yazika i politiki kak predmet issledovaniya sosial'noy effektivnosti yazika s pozisiy marksizma-leninizma // Aktual'nie problemi yazikoznaniya GDR. Yazik - ideologiya - obshestvo. M., 1979.

specificity of the language of politics, its reforms in the life of society, the policy pursued by the head of the country and its implementation by the political elite from the interpretation of the language and its devices, processes. From now on, language should be looked at in the context of society and culture. In this place it is possible to distinguish a number of languages. Such a changing situation arises from the fact that society and culture are complex structures. And also different spheres of culture (science, religion, art, politics, law, etc.) are available. Each of such spheres forms its own language. In addition to these specialized areas in society, there is also an unfixed sphere of everyday life. In it, the so-called "natural language " is a language, that is, which has been formed for many centuries and is manifested in the daily life activities of people and as a means of interaction. In a developed culture, this language will exist in two main forms: 1) ordinary folk language; 2) in the form of literary language. Since natural language is not specialized, it is considered non-functional language.

Languages that serve relatively independent spheres of society are created within these spheres and are therefore called specialized languages. It's obvious, such a language can not exist without a natural language (first of all, without a literary language). But the natural language is also subordinated to the language sphere in which it is used. Specialized language is used within the framework of a special sphere and activity (by profession, by type of training, etc.), so it is a functional language. In this regard, it should be noted that any language - both functional language and non-functional language-has its own functional function. Consequently, in this case, it is not about the functional system of the language, but about the functionality of the whole language. The peculiarity of the language of policy or political language is that it is considered a mean of political implementation, achievement of political goals. In this aspect, it differs from legal, scientific, philosophical, medicine and any other functional language. But the language of policy is closely related to all the rest of the language, the composition of the general language lexicon. At present, the language of policy is not as clearly distinguished as the language of medicine, technology or jurisprudence.

The language of politics is a diverse and holistic thing. It has a certain structure. This structure can be considered as 1) the core and a number of concentrated circles around it; 2) in the form of a series of stages subordinated to each other. In our view, these two models complement each other, and when taken separately, they do not reflect the whole structure of the policy language. In the first model, special political terms serve as the basis. It carries an important task in the field of politics. M.M. Bakhtin writes about the originality of the term: "In the term, although it does not come from a foreign language, there is little stabilization of meanings, weakening of the power of metaphors, much meaningfulness is lost. The fact that the term has one meaning distinguishes it from other concepts." In our opinion, political terms do not always have a strict meaning. In different political systems, exactly the same meaningful words can express completely opposite views. Such a situation is also difficult to meet in such areas as law, medicine and technology. It is known that policy is divided into foreign and domestic policy, and domestic policy is divided into a number of sectors (economic policy, cultural policy, policy in the field of education, etc.). Therefore, the basis of the policy language lies in its terminology: a) terms that are common to all types of policies (that is, both domestic and foreign policy); b) terms that are relevant to foreign and domestic policy are distinguished. But domestic policy, in turn, is divided into sectors. Consequently, even here, terms that are common to the whole domestic policy and are inherent only in one of its branches are distinguished. The political language is assimilated from the language of different spheres of culture and different strata of the population, with the aim of propaganda, interpretation of the essence of political events, recognition to the masses, that is, strengthening public relations where the lexicon reflects its expression.

Conclusion

The upper stage of the political language is considered the official language. This is the language of various declarations, statements, memoranda, notes in foreign political activity, and

in domestic political activity-political programs, decisions, decrees, etc. This language consists of strictly selected, tested terms. They are emotionally neutral and are mainly intended for the intellectual level of the audience. And on the bottom of it there is a language that expresses communication, relationships. Its task is to reach an agreement between the parties involved in the dialogue (it can be representatives of other states, parties or organizations) or to ensure that the interests at the language level are common. The language of diplomatic communication belongs to this level. It's a little flexible. Below it there is the language of political education. Its task is to achieve normative structures and formulate political approaches of citizens. Such a language is characterized by emotionality, expressiveness, flexibility and relying on evidence-proof. The language of political education is widely used in the field of education, mass communication. The lowest level of political language structure is the language of political propaganda and is used in the process of propaganda to change the structure of political speeches, party values and opinions or, conversely, to strengthen them. It is in many respects similar to the language of political education, but not as flexible and full of evidence as it is. In this language, special political terms are almost not used, but they are used in the case of avoidance and exaggeration in the evaluation, etc.

Language at the level of political propaganda is quite abstract. The reason is that it is intended for as wide an audience as possible. In it, the slogans occupy a special place. They are extremely functional words, are an integral part of popular speech in the field of thought formation and transformation.

In conclusion, the political language is manifested as an expression of the processes associated with the life of a society with a complex structure, the internal and foreign policy of the state. It is the combination of social, political, cultural life and the possibility of realization of political goals and tasks on the basis of certain interpretations, national interests and, it is important in the life of the state and society, in the political decision-making related to human interests.

References:
1. A.G. Altunyan, Analysis of political texts. – M.: University Book, Logos, 2006. – p. 7.
2. M.M. Bakhtin, Aesthetics in Written Works. – M., 1979. R. Barthes, Selected works: Semiotics. Poetry. –M.,1989. L. Wittgenstein, Philosophical works. – M., 1994.
3. H. Gadamer, Truth and Method. – M., 1988. D.Davidson, Truth and Meaning // News in foreign linguistics. – M.,1986. J.Dales, Logics of meaning. – M., 1995.
4. W.Quine, Word and Object // News in foreign linguistics. – M., 1986.
5. J. Lacan, The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis. – M., 1995.
6. Y.M. Lotman, Lectures on structural poetics // Y.M. Lotman and Tartu-*Moscow Semiotic School*. – M., 1994. P.Ricoeur, The Conflict of Interpretations. – M., 1995.
7. E. Sapir, Selected publications on language studies and culture studies. – M., 1993.
8. M.Heidegger, Language. – SP., 1991. G.Frager, Thought // Logics. Philosophy. Language. – M., 1987.
9. M.Foucault, What is an author? Discourse order // Will to knowledge. – M., 1997.
10. I.F. Oukhvanova-Shmygova, Cause based analysis of a political text / Methodology of researching a political discourse: Actual problems of content based analysis of socio-political texts: collection of research worsks / Belorussian State University, under the review of I.F. Oukhvanova-Shmygova, 1st issue. – Minsk, 1998. – p.p. 45-52.
11. A.P.Chudinov, Metaphorical Mosaics in the Modern Political Communication – Yekaterinburg, 2003. – p. 248.
12. N.G. Yuzefovich, Political discourse and cross-cultural communication / N.G. Yuzefovich // Interpretation. Understanding. Translation., collection of scientific articles / St. Petersburg State University of Economics and Finance;