LINGUISTIC-PARADIGMATIC FEATURES OF POLITICAL IDEOLOGY

Mokhira Eshanova Yuldashbaevna*

*Senior Lecturer,
Specialized Branch of Tashkent State University of Law,
UZBEKISTAN
Email id: mohiraladybird@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article studies and analyses political reality, which is of great importance, showing not only the basis of political ideology, but also the aspects of its formation. This requires, on the one hand, the study of the ideological processes taking place in the world, their content, and, on the other hand, the study of the linguistic paradigmatic features of political ideology. The role and importance of ideology in the life of society is important, it performs many functions in socio-political life. Indeed, ideology is important from an epistemological point of view in knowing society, human life, the essence of reality.

KEYWORDS: *Political Ideology, Political Language, Political Text, Discourse, Socio-Political Events*

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of ideology from a historical point of view, through different perspectives, serves to shed light on the problem in all its aspects. Naturally, ideologies and political ideology have played an important role in the history of mankind. In the history of all the peoples of the world, there has been a struggle for religious or political beliefs to be replaced by knowledge derived from human life experiences. We know that geniuses such as Beruni, Khorezmi, Ibn Sina lived in Central Asia during the Renaissance or Enlightenment. But in our country, the Renaissance was limited to science, culture, and ethics, and this process, which began later in Western Europe, applied to all spheres of society. In the political sphere, it was manifested in such ideas as the emancipation of man, the equality of all men before the law. Each social group had the opportunity to propose their own philosophy and practice of building a social life based on their perceptions of the world, man, society. This was also largely due to the fact that politics came out of the shell of religion and acquired a secular meaning. As a result, various ideologies began

to struggle for the high position of religion in society and to determine the fate of people, communities, countries. While religions, by their very nature, sought truth and formed beliefs about it, ideologies sought ways to protect the interests of the classes or groups on which they relied.

There have been cases of separation of ideology and science, skepticism of the cognitive functions of ideology, their denial. In the early 20[th]century, Weber, M. (1916) introduced ideology and other ideological, religious structures into the realm of blind faith. In so doing, he denies the question of the scientificity of ideology.Mannheim, K. (1929) sees any ideology as a false, one-sided reflection of reality, a collection of ideas that consciously conceal the true state of events. Leaving aside the socio-historical sources of ideology, it is also common to interpret it as a weapon that unites the community (Lemberg, O., Parsons. T.). There are also cases when political ideology is represented by the psychology of individual groups and individuals (Paynes, R., Brown, D.).

The various approaches mentioned above suggest that ideology is a complex mental phenomenon. Political ideology is a peculiar form of political consciousness. It differs from political psychology in terms of its reflection on political existence. In political psychology, spontaneously formed, incomplete, unstructured feelings, passions, and in political ideology, theoretical elements, ideas, concepts of political consciousness predominate. In political ideology, the political entity is theoretically processed, specific programs are developed. Political ideology, by its very nature, is a rounded, systematized, logically coherent form of political consciousness that theoretically reflects political existence. In this sense, ideology seeks to recognize a particular model of society and political system, to theoretically justify certain types of ways and means of forming this model. In other words, along with wars and revolutions, ideas and ideologies also determine the development of humanity and culture. The fact that the twentieth century, which witnessed the most horrific wars and the bloodiest revolutions, is called the "age of ideologies" is a recognition that these wars were founded by ideological struggles that divided the world into two opposing poles.

In general, political ideology is a set of structured, logically coherent ideological views that represent and protect the interests of a particular social group, requiring the submission of people's thoughts and actions to specific goals and objectives of the use of power. In short, political ideology is a holistic ideological system that justifies the aspiration or use of power by a particular social group and envisages a specific strategy of political action.[1]

Process and Development

Ideology not only reflects a new political reality through language, but also diagnoses it. Such an approach is an integral part of the ideological process, helping to express or understand reality through language, which is relevant to all spheres of socio-political life. This is the theoretical basis of political philosophy. The process of complex reflexes belonging to the theoretical field of political philosophy, and the construction of the meaning of individual words and phrases, is manifested in a peculiar way in the political linguistic paradigm. Today, the content of political philosophy is considered in the framework of the political-linguistic paradigm not only on the basis of a methodological device, but also with special attention to its paradigmatic aspects. In this regard, Bart, R. (1989)explains that in the expression of today's political reality, the paradigmatic object is seen in a similar and different relationship with another object within its

group.[2] I believe, reality as a human subject becomes an object of several spaces. That is why Bart, R. calls them "unit" because they are important in revealing the complex aspects of political life. This does not happen without a construction process that represents the meaning of the object. Because language plays a big role in political speech. Ferdinand De Saussure (1998), who developed the philosophy of language, describes this process as the "res-verba" based modeling. The model structure also emphasizes that the meaning of an object is comprehensive (ambiguous and plural).[3] In my view, such an approach does not fully reflect the political reality. Because the political reality is fully manifested where the meaning arises, according to the "law of reproduction" inherent in the philosophy of language. Such a situation is revealed through a dialectical approach, such as the classifiers of political reality. Therefore, in the political linguistic paradigm, several objects can be divided into groups. For example, there are the following classifications of socio-political life:

- Political objects (president, government, party, specific political system);

- Social objects (social group, society, and situation);

- Cultural objects (theater, opera, ballet, literature, folklore);

- Economic objects (money, goods, price, demand, supply, capital, oligarch, small business, cooperative).

In the modern humanities, especially in political philosophy, it is accepted to divide principled ideas into two major general scientific paradigms. These are called modern (modernity) and postmodern (study of the past). In turn, their structure also differs chronologically. The modern period corresponds to the historical framework, and the concept of understanding the methodological apparatus is accepted as "ideology". Its chronological date dates back to the 19th century, when it entered the political arena with the concept of "adult" ideology, socialism, liberalism, communism, conservatism and similar conceptual ideas. Their work was based on an approach such as not mixing semantic sources with respect to the subject. Such an approach is expressed in the works of Tocqueville, Burke E., Millon the example of changes in socio-political reality.

The language of political ideology was strictly followed at that time, which is why T. Marcuse (2003) called it "open language".[4] Its openness depends on the development of lexemes in the noun phrase in different ways and is explained by the fact that "the cut expresses a meaning contrary to its meaning". Here, it is about the classic word - ideology, used by the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which was the dominant language in the XIX century. For the bourgeois conceptual conservatives and liberals, their sociality (the bourgeoisie explains "the subject of the technical process, the naming of nature, the creation of social wealth"), but for the socialists it led to the disruption of the social structure and general achievement tools.

Such openness is manifested in the ideological field in relation to the nature of language. Therefore, it can be understood only in terms of "other and others", unchanged. According to M. Bakhtin (1996), "in the theory of dialogue, those who have spoken before expect the right response."[5] In this process, the character participates as an important component of the speech text. Because they regulate, modify, and transform social rhythm and value in the context of non-constant movement. Social value and their adequate connotation will change. Therefore, the linguistic field remains a source of interest in conflicts with heterogeneous education. Such

controversial points reflect the field of ideological struggles. Characters, on the other hand, are direct mediators of ideology, and without values and ideals, they remain a dead structure without a "guide to life".

All of Voloshinov's (1995) research on the philosophy of language leads to the conclusion that the word is an ideological phenomenon ("par exellence").[6]In everyday life, the word is combined with thought, forms a speech, but this is a socius language, not an individual language. According to V.Voloshinov (1995), the socio-political reality appears to be "common, accurate ideological phenomenon". A speaker's worldview, emotions and evaluation is determined, on the one hand by language structure, and on the other hand by the subject of speech. That is why M.Bakhtin (1996) and V.Voloshinov (1995) explained the language and opinion as the basis of "abstract subjectivism", the basis of the object of research, as ideological problem. In this case, they effectively use sociological laws. In particular, V.Voloshinov develops language theory in the sociological perspectives, M.Bakhtinputs the word on the first plan.

So today, it is of great importance to claim hegemony, to bring many realities to the scale of a polycentric political world, and to express political language in a multifaceted way. This not only encourages the development of diverse views, but also provides ample opportunity to fully express the political object defined from a modern perspective. This situation is recognized in science as a product of views within postmodern philosophy. That is why it is important to use the achievements of postnoclassical science in illuminating the linguistic paradigmatic features of political ideology.

Politics, language and time: future challenges and tasks

People communicate through a system of languages that helps to build a world of dominant social structures and interacting concepts. Personal thought is an action, a historical event. Determining the importance of the text, understanding what the author means, allows us to determine the discourse at the time the text is created. Any discourse involves the structure of linguistic conventions within constrains (a set of suspending cases) in which policy can be institutionalized and constitutionalized. Comparing the number of languages known to researchers in earlier and later times, J. Pocock describes himself as a discourse historian. At the heart of this word is not Foucault's method, but speech, literature (political), public appearance (mass method of self-expression). J. Pocock's early works are devoted to the ancient British constitution.

Pocock's major work was The Machiavellian Moment, which influenced modern political theory for many years, as it taught a different type of original language, the language of civic humanism or the language of classical Republicanism. The language originated in Florence in the 17th century and entered England through Harrington Oceania. During the eighteenth century, civic humanism became the most acceptable language for opposition groups. Such language defined freedom as a factor of participation in civic life. A prosperous life is conceived in terms of general well-being. In this way, the language demanded the establishment of a republic with the help of honest people as a barrier against chaos and corruption.

J. Pocock identified several languages formed on the basis of modern political theory. Machiavelli pointed out that the language of civic individualism clashed with the languages that were being formed in the future. The language of civic humanism is manifested in the context of

modern democratic ideology. In this case, the democratic system becomes the main model, the political mentality of the peoples living in a democratic society is formed through the media, as most international legal documents (for example, the UN Declaration, the EU Declaration and the Charter) are written in the language of civic humanism (back to Pokok). In the logic of political science and the analysis of political processes, perceptions, all procedures are compared to democracy. In the 1920s, democratic figures were criticized, but this did not lead to a decline in the democratic goal. J. Pocock proved thatthe language of civic humanism, freedom in civil life, responsibility for the fate of self-sufficient citizens is determined on the basis of civil independence.

In conclusion, political text and discourse is a combination of perceiving the life from the viewpoint of conceptual-discourse methods, standards of scientific researches and activities. The primary form of analyzing a text identifies hidden factors of its political and ideological objectives as they reflect socio-political changes turning to setting the target for investigating, evaluating and selecting.

Currently, the prosperity of Uzbekistan has its reflection on the development of the Uzbek language and its application in people's lives. Language is the basis of political life, hence, political thinking remains unchanged unless national language develops. In this view, it's essential to investigate argumentative issues of the essence of political linguistics, the interrelation, the main idea that determines the notion of political discourse in terms of political-philosophical aspects. For this reason, the article mainly focuses on political language and its peculiar features. It clearly defines epistemic-linguistic problems and the frame of the tasks in developing national idea.

Political language constitutes different spheres of a culture, interpretation of the lexis delivered during propaganda and political events within various strata of population, as well as timeliness to strengthen the link with population.

REFERENCES

1. Yusupova G.H., Jabborov H.J., Kosimova H.H. Siyosatnazariyasi. UzMU, 2002

2. Bart R. Strukturalizm kek deyatelnost, Bart R., Izbranniyeraboti: Semiotika. Poetika. Progress, 1989

3. Saussure de F. Kurs obsheylingvistiki. Logos, 1998

4. Marcuse G. Odnomerniychelovek. ACT, Ermak, 2003

5. Bakhtin M.M. Problemarechevogojanra, Sobr. soch. 7 t. Russkiyeslovari, 1996

6. Altunyan A.G., Analysis of political texts. University Book, Logos, 2006

7. Bakhtin M.M., Aesthetics in Written Works. 1979

8. Barthes R., Selected works: Semiotics. Poetry. 1989

9. Wittgenstein L., Philosophical works. 1994.

10. Gadamer H., Truth and Method. 1988; Davidson D., Truth and Meaning // News in foreign linguistics.1986; Dales J., Logics of meaning. 1995

11. Quine W., Word and Object // News in foreign linguistics.1986

12. Lacan J., The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis. 1995

13. Lotman Y.M., Lectures on structural poetics // Lotman Y.M. and Tartu-*Moscow Semiotic School*. 1994; Ricoeur P., The Conflict of Interpretations. 1995

14. Sapir E., Selected publications on language studies and culture studies. 1993

15. Heidegger M., Language. – SP., 1991; G.Frager, Thought // Logics. Philosophy. Language. 1987