



THE EMERGENCE OF MODERN POLITICAL LINGUISTICS

Esanov Azizbek Shermamat o'g'li

Master's student at Termez State University

azizbekesanov97@gmail.com

Abstract

In this article, the genesis of modern political linguistics is taken into consideration from position of the formation of modern political linguistics, characterizing the main directions of the study of political communication with a number of examples in practical study of political metaphor. Furthermore, the field of political linguistics, which is one of the branches of modern linguistics, as well as the concepts of political speech and political discourse in linguistics, and studies the ideas expressed in Russian and world linguistics, is analysed.

Key words: *modern political linguistics, political communication, political metaphor, discourse analysis, "newspeak", "double think".*

I. Introduction

In the modern science, political linguistics, which arose at the intersection of political science and linguistics, is one of the actively developing areas of linguistics. In 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 outlook of humankind. In these conditions, the need to study political communication and its relationship with socio-political processes became obvious. Traditionally, nominations for new research areas appear late. Before a definite name is assigned to an established direction, the field of research must formulate its subject and test new methodological approaches. The emergence and formation of any scientific discipline is inextricably linked with the history of society, and political linguistics is no exception. The phrase "political linguistics" appeared in the late 1980s last century, but the actual origins of this direction should be seen earlier, when a steady methodological interest in the study of political communication, rhetoric, semiotics began to form a separate area of scientific research.

II. Literature review

The most significant works of the period of the formation of the discipline are associated with the activities of Walter Lippmann, Paul Lazarsfeld, Harold Lasswell, Nathan Leites. [1; 377]After the experience of unprecedented propaganda confrontation between the belligerent countries, knowledge about the mechanisms of manipulating public opinion acquired a high 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 studying the methods of forming public opinion, the effectiveness of political agitation and military propaganda.

During the First World War, W.Lippmann wrote propaganda leaflets for the Allied army in France, after the war he took up the study of propaganda and agitation issues, served as an adviser to twelve US presidents. In modern political linguistics, the concept of "agenda-setting process" proposed by W.Lippmann is used, that is, pedaling some issues in political communication and silencing others. Thus, the scientist distinguished between the real urgency of a particular problem and its "importance" in the perception of society.

W.Lippmann has developed an effective methodology for the application of content analysis in the study of public perceptions of politics. In 1920, W.Lippmann, together with C.Merz, published a study of The New York Times' corpus of texts dedicated to the October Revolution in Russia. The

analysis showed that it was impossible for the average American to form any objective opinion about the events taking place due to the anti-Bolshevik orientation of the published texts. The study showed that in most of the texts, the desired was passed off as real (the articles convinced readers of the imminent collapse of the Bolshevik state), the readers were deprived of the opportunity to draw their own conclusions and predictions.

Another significant predecessor of political linguistics was Paul Lazarsfeld, who was actively involved in the study of propaganda at Columbia University. In 1937, he led a project to study the impact of broadcast 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 the time that dealt with issues of political and mass communication. Together with his colleague R.Merton, P.Lazarsfeld developed a focus group survey method used to collect data on the attitude of ordinary Americans to government calls for the radio to plant "victory gardens" or purchase war bonds. It is noteworthy that the same government programs were developed and analyzed not only by P.Lazarsfeld, but also by other researchers (including Harold Lasswell). [2; 20]

P.Lazarsfeld is the leader in the use of content analysis to study the dependence of electoral behavior on election campaigning in the media. The most famous is his research conducted in Erie County (Ohio). During the six months prior to the 1940 presidential election, P.Lazarsfeld and his colleagues conducted a focus group survey of 600 people in order to determine the effectiveness of the campaigning influence of political media texts on American citizens. To the surprise of the researchers, only 54 participants in the experiment changed their preferences in six months in favor of another presidential candidate, and even fewer respondents did so under the direct influence of newspapers, magazines and radio broadcasts. This experiment made us doubt the taken before as self-evident provision about the total nature of the influence of the media on the voter.

Subsequently, P.Lazarsfeld and other researchers developed a model of two-level communication, according to which in any society there are "opinion leaders" who are susceptible to the influence of political propaganda and disseminate political information through interpersonal channels. P.Lazarsfeld's technique has become widespread and is used up to the present time. Despite the underestimation of the propaganda role of the media, the developments of P.Lazarsfeld initiated interest in the study of additional factors of communication impact on the voter.

One of the innovations of political linguistics of that time was the expansion of research tools through the methods of quantitative semantics. The founder of this direction can be considered G.Lasswell, who demonstrated the heuristics of the method in a series of studies, among which the most famous monograph "Language in Politics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics" [3]. G.Lasswell and his colleagues identified various interdependencies between the semantics of linguistic units, their frequency and political processes .

The work of G.Lasswell is widely known, in which he demonstrated the close connection between the style of political language and the political regime [3; 42] . The researcher showed that the discourse of democratic politicians is very close to the discourse of voters to whom they are addressing, while non-democratic elites strive for superiority and distance from ordinary members of society, which is inevitably reflected in the stylistic features of the political language of power. Linguistic innovations precede social transformations, therefore, changes in the style of political language serve as an indicator of an impending democratization of society or a crisis of democracy.

III. Results and discussion

An example of the synthesis of quantitative semantics and traditional methods is Erwin W. Fellows' study "Propaganda: The History of the Word" [4]. The use of content analysis techniques

allowed E. Fellowes to trace the changes in the history of the word propaganda according to two criteria: connotation and scope. The author showed that originally the word propaganda was used in Catholic discourse in the phrase *de propaganda fide* (a holy brotherhood called to spread the faith through missionary activity) and had ameliorative connotations. In the first half of the XX century, propaganda is associated with world wars and acquires pejorative connotations. In the post-war period, the main sphere of use of the term is politics, which is accompanied by the change of sharply judgmental connotations by others with more ameliorative shades. [4; 182]

Considering the described stage in the development of political linguistics, historians of science name, in addition to communication specialists, the English writer George Orwell and the German literary critic Viktor Klemperer, who turned to a critical study of totalitarian discourse.

The first of them wrote in 1948 a dystopian novel "1984", which characterized the principle of "doublethink" (doublethink) and the vocabulary of "newspeak", that is, the methods of verbal manipulation of human consciousness were demonstrated with specific examples, the conquest and retention of political power in a totalitarian state. George Orwell clearly showed how language can be used to make a person believe a lie and consider it true, how exactly the oxymoric slogans "War is peace", "Freedom is slavery" and "Ignorance is power" can be put into the basis of state ideology. Modern experts in political propaganda have repeatedly noted George Orwell's prophetic gift: sometimes it seems that exactly according to the recipes of "Newspeak" American leaders called the military aggression against Yugoslavia and Iraq "a struggle to establish democracy."

In 1946, G.Orwell published the famous article "Politics and the English Language" [5], which can be attributed to the first experiments in political linguistics. G.Orwell drew attention to the fact that in political speech such words as democracy, socialism, freedom, patriotic, realistic, justice do not have a definite meaning (meaningless words), and attempts to give them an unambiguous definition are met with resistance among politicians. For example, in the word democracy, only an evaluative characteristic is universal. When we call a country democratic, we praise it, so the defenders of any political regime (including fascist or communist ones) tend to call this regime a democracy. Totalitarian leaders are reluctant to give the term "democracy" a precise definition, since then they will no longer be able to freely use it. As G.Orwell notes, such words are deliberately used to manipulate public consciousness (for example, class, totalitarian, progressive, reactionary, bourgeois, and equality). G.Orwell pointed to the widespread occurrence of such words (now they would be called ideologemes) in the political communication of various states.[5; 252]

The "newspeak" described by George Orwell was the product of his fantasy, an assumption about what the development of totalitarian ideas in Great Britain could lead to. German philologist Viktor Klemperer described in detail the fascist "newspeak" he had the misfortune of observing for 12 years [Klemperer 1947]. The practice of Nazi "Newspeak" turned out to be much more varied and more sophisticated than the theoretical model created by George Orwell.

During the period under review, a special direction of political linguistics - linguistic Sovietology - was finally formed [6]. After World War II, the relations of the Soviet Union with the countries of Western Europe and the United States changed dramatically. The military alliance of the united nations was replaced by an era characterized by the dominant political metaphors of the Cold War, the Iron Curtain, the balance of fear and the witch hunt. Linguistic Sovietology at this time began to be perceived as the study of the political language of a hostile country and the methods of enemy propaganda. A detailed analysis of this scientific area is presented in the monograph "Linguistic Sovietology" [6; 291].

Closely connected with the research of Soviet political discourse is the introduction into the methodological toolkit of political linguistics of the linguo-psychoanalytic approach associated with

the ideas of Z. Freud, A. Adler, K. Jung, E. Fromm. The main initiator of the use of psychoanalytic techniques was Nathan Leites, a renowned expert on the Soviet Union. N. Leites was supposed to provide information about the Soviet political elite to the US government. Such tasks were set before him as an employee of the RAND Corporation, a well-known research center in California that studies the problems of international relations and national security. The subject of research by N. Leites (the discourse of specific politicians) determined the methodological direction of his research. Fulfilling the order of the government, N. Leites turned to psychoanalysis, which was quite appropriate in the study of idiolects. This allows us to distinguish quantitative semantics according to G. Lasswell, used in the research of N. Fellowes, from psychoanalytic analysis according to N. Leites. [7; 317]

As an American researcher, N. Leites set himself pragmatic goals: he was interested in the analysis of the Soviet language primarily as a way to unravel the mechanisms of the mysterious Bolshevik (Russian) thinking, as a step towards predicting the political reactions of communist leaders. In his book *A Study in Bolshevism* [8; 147] N. Leites explored the images, fantasies, characteristic metaphors used by the Bolshevik leaders (mainly on the example of the works of Lenin and Stalin), as well as the “literary models” with which the Bolsheviks identified themselves or who were rejected. According to N. Leites, few cultures were able to capture the types of national character in their literature as vividly as the Russian one. In particular, the author highlights the behavioral models associated with the images of Karamazov, Raskolnikov, Myshkin, Verkhovensky, Rudin, Chichikov, Oblomov, Chekhov's heroes. Analyzing the attitude to these behavioral models in the Bolshevik discourse, the author determined which “psychological masks” are accepted and which are rejected by the Bolshevik leaders and, accordingly, with which model of thinking and behavior they identify themselves. Using these models, N. Leites turned to the methods of Freudianism in an attempt to highlight the “latent meanings” of Bolshevik images. The researcher came to the conclusion that the model of Bolshevik behavior was formed as a negative reaction to the Oblomovs, who slept through their lives; on the Rudins, high-flying talkers who do nothing, on the philosophy of Tolstoy's Karataev. The Bolshevik discourse permeates the new principle “Who will kill whom”, which N. Leites unfolds into the radical formula “Who will kill whom first”. Comparison of the discourse of the Bolshevik elite with the worldview of the Russian intelligentsia of the 19th century led N. Leites to the conclusion that the founder of this principle was V.I. Lenin, the “father” of the Bolshevik discourse and the Bolshevik image, which was followed by the “Leninist children”. If the elite of the XIX century. She easily succumbed to mood swings and was characterized by “thoughtfulness”, “introspectiveness”, “soul-searching”, then the representatives of the Bolshevik elite are characterized by the researcher as tough, suspicious, stubborn, aggressive. Their attitude to reality and actions, according to the scientist, are in many ways reminiscent of the worldview and activities of religious fanatics.

Nathan Leites notes that before the invasion of the USSR, fascist scientists also studied the Russian character from the works of Russian classical literature, but they did not compare this data with the Bolshevik discourse (obviously, the fascist elite did not need “discoveries” in the field of totalitarian discourses). As a result, the fascist army expected to see apathetic Chekhov's heroes and Oblomovs on the battlefields, but met the Maresyevs, Matrosov and Panfilovs. This, according to the scientist, serves as an argument in favor of the importance of studying the historical dynamics of the development of the Russian national character.

Despite theoretical innovations, researchers continued to use traditional rhetorical and stylistic techniques. After the Second World War, various aspects of the rhetorical skill of presidents were especially actively studied. The reasons for the convincingness of presidential speeches were sought in phonetic and rhythmic characteristics, wit, sincerity, openness, simplicity, imagery and other qualities

of speech.

During the period described, the foundations of rhetorical criticism - an important component of American political linguistics were laid. Kenneth Burke was at the origin of this trend. K. Burke taught at ten US universities, including Harvard and Princeton, and published 18 books. In the United States, K. Burke is "one of the most influential researchers of rhetoric since Aristotle" [9; 145]. K. Burke considered political rhetoric from the standpoint of its ability to construct reality. Rhetoric, according to K. Burke, is a study of how language and other symbolic systems give rise to rhetorical worlds in which we live. K. Burke is responsible for the creation of theories and the development of methods that are still popular among specialists in political communication in the United States, including the theory of rhetorical drama, the theory of symbolic action, the method of analyzing the "dramatic pentagma" and the method of framing symbolic experience.

It is quite natural that during the Cold War era, militaristic discourse attracted special attention of linguists. Against the background of "balancing war and peace," the understanding of how politicians convince ordinary citizens of the need to use a nuclear bomb acquires a humanistic meaning. By analogy with G. Orwell's "newspeak" (newspeak), the concept of "nukespeak" is consolidated in the conceptual arsenal of linguists [10; 94-112], that is, the "nuclear language" used by politicians to justify the possible use of a nuclear bomb, to disguise and obscure the catastrophic consequences of such a scenario. Along with this, metaphorical images played an important role in the development of the political situation, emphasizing the entire danger of the consequences of an atomic catastrophe ("nuclear winter", "atomic apocalypse", "warmongers", etc.). Awareness of the relevance of the tasks facing researchers of political communication becomes a significant factor for the formation of political linguistics.

Another direction of political linguistics can be considered research in the field of political symbolism associated with the names of M. Edelman, R. Cobb and C. Elder. Working in the mainstream of political semiotics, the researchers chose political symbols as the subject of analysis, which were primarily viewed as a way to legitimize power [11; 305-334]. According to the theory of political symbolism, the basis for the legitimization of power is its effectiveness, which causes satisfaction with power, reinforced and reinforced by symbols. In the future, symbols become independent phenomena that can replace this satisfaction. The high status attributed by the theory to symbols determines the detailed attention of scientists to their semantics, syntactics and pragmatics.

During the described period, the study of political vocabulary, theory and practice of political argumentation, political communication in a historical perspective became widespread. The attention of researchers was drawn to the issues of the functioning of the political language during the election campaign, at parliamentary and presidential debates, in party discourse and so on. [12].

Already during this period, the study of political communication develops into a relatively independent direction of linguistic research. In the 70s and 80s., monographs and textbooks on political communication and methods of its analysis regularly appear abroad.

Conclusion

It is noteworthy that many researchers of the period under review indicated the works of G. Lasswell as the theoretical basis of their work. Some completely borrowed his methods, others made a bias towards Z. Freud, and still others supplemented the analysis with the theory of M. Edelman. This unity and diversity characterizes well the development of political linguistics in the middle of the 20th century. On the one hand, political linguistics was still in its infancy, and researchers exploited what little had been done in this area, and on the other, significant methodological differentiation was already observed.

At the next stage in the development of political linguistics (60-80s of the XX century), linguists focused their attention on the study of communicative practice in modern Western democracies. These works have shown that even in conditions of "freedom" linguistic manipulation of consciousness has constantly been used so far.

References:

1. Discourse Studies : in 5 vol. / ed. by T. van Dijk. – Vol. 1. – L.: Sage, 2007. – 377 p.
2. Lasswell, H.D. Style in the Language of Politics / H.D.Lasswell // Language of Politics. – N. Y., George W. Stewart, 1949. – pp. 20-39.
3. Language in Poltics: Studies in Quantitative Semantics / H. D. Lasswell [et al.]. – N.Y.: George W. Stewart, 1949. – 402 p.
4. Fellows, E.W. Propaganda: History of a Word / E. W. Fellows // American Speech. – 1959. – Vol. 34 (3). – pp. 182-189.
5. Orwell, G. Politics and the English Language // Horizon. – 1946. – Vol. 13, № 76. – pp. 252-265.
6. Budayev, E.V. Lingvisticheskaya sovetologiya / E.V.Budayev, A.P.Chudinov; UrGPU. – Ekaterinburg, 2009. –p. 291.
7. Leites, N., Politburo Images of Stalin / N.Leites, E.Bernaut, R.Garthoff // World Affairs. – 1951. – Vol. 3. – pp. 317-339.
8. Leites, N. Stalin glazami Politbyuro / N. Leytes, E. Bernaut, R. Gartxoff // Politicheskaya lingvistika. – 2009. – № 29. – pp. 146-154.
9. Borchers, T. A. Rhetorical Theory. An Introduction / T. A. Borchers. — Belmont: Wadsworth, 2006. – p. 145
10. Chilton, P.A. Nukespeak: Nuclear Language, Culture and Propaganda / P.A. Chilton // Nukespeak: The Media and the Bomb / ed. by C. Aubrey. – L.: Comedia Publishing Group, 1982. - pp. 94-112.
11. Cobb, R. The Political Uses of Symbolism / R. Cobb, Ch.Elder // American Politics Quarterly. – 1973. – Vol. 1, № 3. – pp. 305-338.
12. Budayev, E.V. Zarubejnaya politicheskaya lingvistika / E. V. Budayev, A.P.Chudinov. – M.: Flinta; Nauka, 2008. – p. 352.