

## **Peculiarities of Modern Political Texts**

**Boltayeva Nargiza Raxmatovna**

*Researcher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Teacher of the Department of  
Languages of Zarmed University,  
nargizaboltayeva02@gmail.com*

**Abstract:** In this article, showing that, it is possible to analyze texts and break through the deliberate clouding of meaning, based on text analysis and is give reliable conclusions. The main goal of this article is to explain how political texts are structured, to show how they can be analyzed and what information can be extracted from them. In the last few decades, the study of political communication has expanded greatly, and this growth has been evident around the world. This article will be basic information about some characteristic features of political texts.

**Keywords:** Political texts, political linguistics, political science, political problems.

### **Introduction**

More than half a century ago, George Orwell wrote in “Politics and the English Language”: “In our time, political speeches and texts are mainly a defense of what cannot be defended”, indicated like this. The continuation of British rule in India, the purges and deportations in Russia, the atomic bomb dropped on Japan can of course be defended, but only by arguments that will seem too crude for most people and that do not coincide with the declared goals of political parties. Therefore, political language should consist mostly of euphemisms, questions and vague statements.

As before, the goal of many, although not all, political texts are to manipulate, obscure, hide reality behind pretty words and pretty promises. And as before, in a society, at least partly democratic, it is necessary to be interested in politics, try to make a choice, comprehend your preferences, even if you have to choose from two, almost identical, evils.

So, we will understand by “political text” such a text that deals with current political problems and which is addressed to the May audience, while by the word “mass” we mean a potentially mass audience.

### **Main part:**

Why write political texts? Ultimately, to influence the political situation, the alignment of forces, the opinion of society regarding political problems, phenomena, events, figures.

We will call political problems directly related to:

- a) the distribution and redistribution of power, the conquest of political power;
- b) the political structure of society, the structure of power;
- c) Political management of society.

It is very important for a political analyst to learn to understand and feel what is important, what is not important from a political point of view in current news, in published texts; what will become political news and a political event, and what will not. One must not only understand events from the point of view of political relevance, but also be able to assess the possible reaction of society: how the political audience, its individual parts, will perceive this event, how it can be used in political propaganda, counter-propaganda. A few more considerations about which texts are political. The text becomes political if the main subject of the political process begins to consider it as such: in democratic countries - the political audience, in authoritarian countries - the government itself or its institutions.

In different political systems, texts that are identical in structure and relevance for these systems will be evaluated differently. One of the explanations is that they are not considered political by the speakers themselves, and the audience does not believe that they can somehow affect the authority of the leader, the distribution of political power. The subjects of the political process are: authorities, politicians, parties, and the author of the text, the audience, certain groups or strata of society. Any political text is potentially, strategically, aimed at changing or maintaining the current political situation, at redistributing or maintaining the existing balance of power. But in their pure form, texts aimed at the implementation of these strategic objectives are usually associated with election and other political campaigns: marches, protests, strikes.

The ideological function of a political text includes several components. Firstly, it consists in the fact that the author of the text selects and formulates those problems that he considers necessary to highlight and the solution of which he proposes. This includes a description of the general context of the situation, and a program of action, and polemics with a political opponent. We call this function ideological, because the representation of reality in political speech or text is given in the way the author sees and understands it. And what are the main problems, and what are the best ways to solve these problems, and the situation in which the political struggle unfolds - all this depends on how the author of the text sees the surrounding reality. As has long been noted, a politician in his speeches and texts, even if he tries to be absolutely objective and reliable, depicts not so much objective reality, the existence of which is still controversial, but a picture of reality that he saw. Political parties in their programs, individual politicians in their speeches, political publicists in their texts offer their vision of the world and ways to solve pressing problems. But the task of a politician, a political publicist, is wider than simply depicting a situation within a certain point of view. He needs, firstly, to convince the audience that it is his point of view that is true, that it is his vision of problems and society that is adequate to reality, and that within the framework of reality understood in this way, it is possible to solve these problems, and to solve them in the best way for the audience. He needs to identify the problems that he puts forward with the problems of the audience, or to ensure that the audience perceives the problems put forward as their own, it is necessary to prove to the audience the relevance of these problems. Secondly, he must offer such a picture of the current moment and portray it in such a way that there are common points of contact between the audience's vision of the situation and its presentation. The context of the situation in the presentation of the politician should be at least understandable, or better, close and adequate to the context as understood by the audience. Thirdly, he needs to prove that the solution he proposed to the problems relevant to the audience is the best of all possible. That this particular solution is most acceptable to the audience, so that the audience perceives the proposed solution as their own solution. To do this, the author uses various argumentation systems: from logical arguments to recourse to authoritative symbols, from emotional images to rhetorical repetitions, from intonational play to graphic highlights. The correct choice of emphasis (on logical arguments or on authoritative symbols, and on which ones) depends on the skill of the author, on how much he imagines the audience, is convinced that he is right, etc.

Traditionally, following Aristotle, there are three main ways, three sources of argumentation: appeal to reason, to morality, morality (these are appeals “based on the qualities, reputation, prestige of the speaker”) and emotional and psychological calls .

The well-known American political rhetorician Theodore Wind explains: “By logs, Aristotle meant arguments of a rational order in relation to a proposed course of action or a position taken. No one can convince others without offering some kind of reason, whether they are real or imaginary reasonable. People want to have an argument for what they believe, what they do, or what they are called to do. The idea of logos should not be confused with formal logic in its philosophical or academic form, and also with a rigid system of premises tested for truth. Rhetorical reasoning comes from personal opinions, from public opinions, values, laws, customs, deviations from evidence, and from a variety of other sources. Developing his thoughts, reasoning, a political orator who seeks to convince the public has two goals:

1. to present the best possible arguments and arguments in favor of his position;
2. Choose from these arguments those that will be most understandable for that part of the audience that the speaker seeks to influence and convince.

Aristotle meant the character, prestige, authority of the speaker, and the level of audience confidence that the speaker has. "... The way you are speaks so loudly that it's hard to hear what you're actually talking about." Listening, reading a speech, the audience always takes into account who is speaking. People remember the opinions of those they consider to be authorities. They respect those who have character, even if they don't agree with them. They trust those who are trusted."

However, convincing the audience that the politician is right is not all. A politician does not need a sympathetic but passive audience. If in ancient Athens, at the Roman Forum, persuasion was the main goal of the orator, since the decision was made right there, at the Forum, then it is not enough for a modern politician to convince. He needs the listener or reader to leave not only convinced, but also ready for action in the future; for example would vote as it is necessary for a politician. He needs to mobilize the audience in his support, in support of his position. It is necessary to ensure that the reader, listener - a member of a potential political audience - not only understands that the author of a political text is right, but also supports his position, his party in a conversation with friends, at a polling station, at a demonstration or in a picket. The need for mobilization was often forgotten by Russian politicians at the beginning of the economic and political reforms of the 1990s. Focusing on a rational educational paradigm and on the politically engaged part of society, many democratic politicians professed the thesis: to convince is what it means to mobilize. And this, of course, is far from the case. And so far in the speeches and texts of many politicians there is no bright mobilization principle. An illustrative exception is Vladimir Zhirinovskiy. In a certain sense, the weakened mobilization function of modern political texts testifies to the deformity of our democracy: it exists outside and without active interaction and mutual interest between the audience and politicians. Politicians, at best, conscientiously inform the population about their plans and intentions, leaving mobilization at the mercy of political technologists, and sometimes simply relying on direct administrative pressure.

A political career can be measured in terms of how effectively a politician uses this political capital, or, conversely, how much he abuses it. By rhyme, Aristotle meant two things: personal emotions that influence people's actions and their ideas, and the psychological characteristics of the various groups that make up the target audience (meaning the characteristics of age, gender, occupation, etc.).

From the fact that the main functions of a political text are persuasion and mobilization, for example, the following conclusion follows: a political text must be completely understandable, transparent for the potential audience for which it is intended. Rather, it should not contain

incomprehensible, difficult to understand and decipher elements. All decorative elements related to the direct word, to the obviously expressed one, such as metaphors or other rhetorical figures, should be easily readable. Additional meanings, accents can be arbitrarily sophisticated (for example, propagandizing the “fight for peace, threatening war to those who “do not care about peace”), but they should also be clear to a potential political audience. Possible exceptions - for example, the vagueness of the text - must be compensated by something (for example, increased emotionality), otherwise they significantly reduce the potential of the text as a mobilizing and persuasive factor.

In order for a political text to fulfill its functions, the authors use a variety of techniques: rhetorical, stylistic, and argumentation techniques that we still have to work with.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion we may say that, political text has strategic and tactical functions. Any political text is potential, strategic, aimed at changing or maintaining the existing political situation, redistributing or maintaining the existing balance of power. And in cases, some political texts perform tasks of a tactical nature: the tasks of current political life, the struggle: filling in information, drawing a certain line within the party, trying to help certain decisions to be taken or not, specific individuals, affecting certain structures. In developed democratic systems, many printed political texts perform specific tactical tasks, while the role of the press in the political life of countries is also large. But the task of a politician and a political publicist is broader than simply describing the situation within a certain point of view. He must first of all convince the audience that his point of view is true, that his vision of problems and society is adequate to reality, and that it is possible to do so within the framework of reality understood in this way.

### **ADABIYOTLAR RO'YXATI:**

1. А.П. Чудинов. Современная политическая коммуникация: Учебное пособие / Отв. Ред. / Урал. гос. пед. ун-т. – Екатеринбург, 2009. – 292 с.
2. Э. В. Будаев, М. Б. Ворошилова, Е. В. Дзюба, Н. А. Красильникова. Современная политическая лингвистика: учебное пособие; отв. Ред. А. П. Чудинов; Урал. гос. Пед. Ун-т. – Екатеринбург, 2011. – 252 с.
3. Чудинов А. П. *Политическая лингвистика: учеб. пособие/М.: Флинта: Наука, 2006. — 256 с.*
4. Алтунян А. Г. “Анализ политических текстов”: Учебное пособие. — М.: Университетская книга; Логос, 2006. — 384 с.
5. Аристотель. “Риторика” пер. с древне-греч. Н.Н. Платоновой. – Москва: Издательство АСТ, 2017. – 352 с
6. 6.В. Гофман “ Слово оратора” : Учебное пособие. Ленинград 1932, -267 с
7. 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.
8. 8.Баранов, А. Н. Словарь русских политических метафор / А. Н. Баранов, Ю. Н. Караулов. — М: Помовский и партнеры, 1994. — 351 с.
9. 9.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.
10. Будаев, Э. В. Зарубежная политическая лингвистика: учеб. Пособие / Э. В. Будаев, А. П. Чудинов. — М. : Флинта, 2006б. — 252 с.
11. Водак Р. Язык. Дискурс. Политика. Волгоград, 1997.

12. Dale Carnegie (AKA Dale Carnegie) and J. Berg Esenwein “The Art of Public Speaking”, 2005.
13. Шейгал Е. И. “Семиотика политического дискурса” Диссертация, Волгоград – 2000, 440 с
14. Rahmatovna, 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>
15. Гаврилова М. В. Политический дискурс как объект лингвистического анализа. – Полис. Политические исследования. 2004. № 3. С. **127-139**  
с <https://doi.org/10.17976/jpps/2004.03.13>