HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THE NATURE OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Muminova Adolat Safarovna

Adviser of city school No. 26 Termez

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23369189

Annotation: This article provides an in-depth investigation into the nature of political discourse within modern linguistics, focusing specifically on the tripartite nexus of power, ideology, and communicative impact. Grounded in critical discourse analysis, cognitive semantics, and pragmalinguistics, the study explores how political language operates not merely as an informational vehicle, but as an operative mechanism for legitimizing authority, enacting ideological dominance, and shaping public consciousness. The paper analyzes conceptual metaphors, framing, euphemization, syntactic agency masking, and polarization strategies across institutional and digital communication.

Keywords: political discourse, power relations, ideology, communicative impact, critical discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, pragmalinguistics, manipulation, persuasion, conceptual metaphor.

ZAMONAVIY TILSHUNOSLIKDA SIYOSIY DISKURS TABIATI

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada zamonaviy tilshunoslikda siyosiy diskursning ontologik tabiati hamda hokimiyat, mafkura va kommunikativ ta’sir o‘rtasidagi murakkab munosabatlar majmui tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda tanqidiy diskurs tahlili (CDA), kognitiv semantika hamda pragmalingvistika yondashuvlari asosida siyosiy tilning nafaqat axborot almashish, balki hokimiyatni legitimlashtirish, mafkuraviy gegemoniyani o‘rnatish va jamoatchilik ongini boshqarishdagi yetakchi roli yoritiladi. Konseptual metaforalar, ramkalash (framing), evfemizatsiya, sintaktik agentlikni yashirish hamda qutblanish strategiyalari kabi lisoniy mexanizmlarning amaliy ifodasi ochib beriladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: siyosiy diskurs, hokimiyat munosabatlari, mafkura, kommunikativ ta’sir, tanqidiy diskurs tahlili, kognitiv tilshunoslik, pragmalingvistika, manipulyatsiya, persuaziya, konseptual metafora.

ПРИРОДА ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

Аннотация: В данной статье исследуется природа политического дискурса в парадигме современного языкознания, с акцентом на триаду власти, идеологии и коммуникативного воздействия. На основе критического дискурс-анализа, когнитивной семантики и прагмалингвистики раскрывается роль политического языка как фундаментального механизма легитимации власти, трансляции идеологии и моделирования общественного сознания. Анализируются концептуальные метафоры, фрейминг, эвфемизация, синтаксическая вуализация агентивности и стратегии идеологической поляризации в традиционной и цифровой среде.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, властные отношения, идеология, коммуникативное воздействие, критический дискурс-анализ, когнитивная лингвистика, прагмалингвистика, манипуляция, персуазивность, концептуальная метафора.

In contemporary linguistics, political discourse is recognized as one of the most dynamic and multidimensional fields of interdisciplinary research. Rather than functioning merely as an instrument for information exchange, language in the political arena serves as a primary mechanism for constituting, exercising, and reproducing social reality. The shift toward anthropocentric and communicative-cognitive paradigms has fundamentally transformed the scholarly understanding of political verbal interaction. Political discourse encompasses not only institutional political speeches, governmental decrees, and parliamentary debates, but also all communicative events where power relations and ideological convictions are negotiated. In this broad sense, any utterance that seeks to influence the allocation of societal resources, rights, and duties falls within the functional boundary of political communication[1].

The systematic inquiry into political language reveals that every political text is intrinsically intentional, pragmatic, and goal-oriented. Language does not neutrally mirror the external world; instead, it actively constructs political realities through selective categorization and interpretive perspectives. Within modern sociolinguistics and discourse analysis, political communication is conceptualized as an ongoing dialogue between institutions of governance and society[2]. This communicative exchange operates under specific institutional rules, normative conventions, and contextual constraints. Consequently, deciphering the latent mechanisms of political discourse requires integrating insights from cognitive science, sociolinguistics, semiotics, and political philosophy.

The central purpose of political verbal interaction is to secure legitimacy, elicit public consent, and guide societal behavior toward predetermined goals. Traditional linguistic frameworks that focused solely on formal syntactic structures proved inadequate for explaining how language mobilizes collective action. Modern linguistic inquiry therefore emphasizes the dialectical relationship between language and society, showing that discursive practices both shape and are shaped by socio-political structures[3]. This interrelation underscores the necessity of investigating political discourse not as a static linguistic artifact, but as a dynamic communicative process. Against this theoretical background, examining the interplay of power, ideology, and communicative impact emerges as an imperative objective of modern linguistic science.

The relationship between language and power constitutes the foundational cornerstone of contemporary political discourse analysis. Following the philosophical insights of Michel Foucault, power is no longer understood as merely a centralized, repressive force imposed from above, but as a pervasive network of relations instantiated through discourse. Foucault demonstrated that discursive formations establish regimes of truth that determine what can be meaningfully stated, thought, and practiced within a given historical era[4]. Language functions as the primary medium through which power becomes visible, naturalized, and socially operational. In close connection with power,

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

ideology serves as the cognitive and conceptual framework that organizes the values, beliefs, and worldviews of social groups.

As Teun A. van Dijk convincingly argues, ideologies are social cognitions shared by members of a collective, providing the axiomatic basis for their discursive practices. Ideological systems find their most concrete and effective realization through verbal structures, wherein social hierarchies and norms are linguistically codified. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), pioneered by Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, and Teun van Dijk, emerged specifically to uncover the covert ways in which discourse sustains unequal power relations[5]. CDA operates on the premise that power asymmetries are frequently disguised as common-sense assumptions and universal truths. Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model conceptualizes any communicative event simultaneously as a linguistic text, a discursive practice, and a broader social practice.

Through this tripartite framework, linguists can systematically analyze how micro-level textual choices reflect and reinforce macro-level power configurations. Pierre Bourdieu's sociological concept of linguistic capital further illuminates how political actors leverage verbal competence as a form of symbolic power. In political struggles, actors compete to impose their own definitions of the social world as legitimate and authoritative. Hegemonic discourse succeeds when the worldview of the dominant group is internalized by society as natural, objective, and unquestionable. The reproduction of political power therefore relies heavily on the continuous maintenance of discursive dominance across public communication channels[6].

Ruth Wodak's discourse-historical approach demonstrates that political texts cannot be divorced from their historical trajectories and socio-political contexts. Ideological representations within political texts constantly adapt to historical ruptures, institutional crises, and cultural transformations. Consequently, power in political discourse is never permanent; it must be continuously negotiated, defended, and linguistically re-legitimized against rival narratives. The linguistic manifestation of ideology thus operates as an epistemic filter that highlights certain aspects of reality while systematically effacing others[7]. The intersection of power and ideology ultimately dictates the parameters of legitimate political discourse, defining the boundaries of what is socially acceptable and politically feasible.

At the operational level, political discourse achieves its communicative impact through a sophisticated repertoire of cognitive and semantic mechanisms. Foremost among these cognitive instruments is the conceptual metaphor, which functions not as mere stylistic ornament, but as a fundamental mode of thought. According to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, metaphorical projections allow human cognition to map abstract political concepts onto concrete, experiential domains. In political communication, metaphors such as "politics as warfare", "the nation as a family" and "the economy as a living organism" shape how citizens perceive complex socio-economic realities. By activating specific metaphorical frames, political communicators subtly constrain the interpretative options available to the public[8].

Conceptual framing, closely linked to metaphorization, functions by selecting and highlighting certain facets of an issue while relegating competing interpretations to the background. A successfully entrenched frame directs the audience toward specific moral evaluations, causal attributions, and

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

policy solutions. Lexical selection represents another decisive semantic strategy through which political actors inject ideological value judgments into seemingly neutral descriptions. The deliberate choice between terms such as “freedom fighter” and “terrorist” or “economic reform” and “austerity measure” immediately positions the speaker within a defined axiological hierarchy. In this context, euphemization plays a strategic role by mitigating unpleasant facts, sanitizing harsh realities, and neutralizing moral outrage.

Political euphemisms disguise controversial actions such as renaming military invasions “peacekeeping operations” or structural job losses “downsizing” thereby dulling critical public scrutiny. Conversely, dysphemism is systematically deployed against political adversaries to evoke disgust, moral condemnation, and societal rejection. Another subtle semantic device is presupposition, which allows speakers to introduce contested claims into discourse as if they were already accepted, unchallengeable facts[9]. Because presupposition remains linguistically backgrounded, audiences tend to accept them unconsciously without subjecting them to explicit verification. Syntactic structures also play a profound role in regulating communicative impact and distributing institutional responsibility.

The use of passive voice constructions and nominalization frequently serves to conceal the agent of controversial political actions. By eliminating the grammatical subject, political actors can describe adverse outcomes such as “mistakes were made” or “taxes were raised” without attributing direct blame to identifiable decision-makers. Furthermore, nominalization transforms dynamic, human-driven actions into abstract, static entities that appear natural and inevitable[10]. Modality, expressed through modal verbs and epistemic markers, enables politicians to calibrate their commitment to truth, duty, and authority. These cognitive-semantic devices operate collaboratively to configure a linguistic architecture designed to maximize communicative persuasion and behavioral compliance.

From a pragmalinguistic perspective, political discourse is inherently performative and strategically organized around speech acts. Applying John Austin and John Searle’s speech act theory illuminates how political utterances execute actions rather than merely stating facts. Directives and commissives occupy a prominent place in political rhetoric, through which leaders issue instructions, make legislative promises, and pledge future obligations. The illocutionary force of a political speech act is aimed directly at producing a specific perlocutionary effect within the target audience, such as electoral mobilization, patriotic solidarity, or legislative compliance[11]. A central theoretical problem in political pragmatics lies in delineating the boundary between persuasion and manipulation.

Persuasion is grounded in transparent argumentation, communicative rationality, and the voluntary consent of an autonomous interlocutor. Manipulation, on the other hand, involves the covert exploitation of cognitive biases, semantic ambiguity, and informational asymmetries to control public consciousness against the audience’s genuine interests. Manipulative political discourse intentionally restricts the recipient’s critical reflection while manufacturing an illusion of free choice[12]. One of the most pervasive manipulative strategies in political communication is ideological polarization, systematically formulated around the “Us versus them” dichotomy. As Teun van Dijk’s “ideological square” demonstrates, political discourse routinely emphasizes our positive attributes and their negative attributes, while de-emphasizing our negative attributes and their positive attributes.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

This discursive polarization constructs a moralized boundary between the virtuous ingroup and the corrupt or threatening outgroup. Ingroup solidarity is reinforced through the strategic deployment of inclusive first-person plural pronouns, such as “we”, “us” and “our” which simulate collective unity and shared responsibility. Concurrently, the pronoun “they” is loaded with pejorative connotations to foster suspicion, externalize guilt, and consolidate political allegiance. Argumentation schemes in political rhetoric frequently rely on fallacious reasoning, including arguments from authority, ad hominem attacks, and false dilemmas. Presenting political scenarios as binary choices such as “stability versus chaos” leaves no discursive space for nuanced deliberation or alternative viewpoints.

Rhetorical devices such as parallelisms, antitheses, and tricolons further enhance the memorability and rhythmic appeal of political messaging. Emotional appeal (pathos) is often prioritized over logical argumentation (logos) to elicit immediate affective responses, such as fear, pride, anger, or hope. Fear-inducing discourse is particularly potent during periods of socio-political crisis, as it induces populations to surrender liberties in exchange for perceived security. The pragmatic efficacy of a political message depends fundamentally on the speaker’s perceived ethos, or moral authority and institutional credibility. Through the synergistic combination of ethos, pathos, and strategic speech acts, political actors achieve profound communicative impact across diverse social strata.

In the contemporary era, the digitalization of media has profoundly transformed the nature, speed, and reach of political discourse. Political communication is no longer confined to traditional unidirectional broadcasts, but has transformed into a highly interactive, fragmented, and networked discursive ecosystem. Social media platforms have democratized public expression while simultaneously creating echo chambers and polarized filter bubbles. The brevity of digital communication formats encourages aggressive linguistic compression, sensationalist framing, and emotionalized rhetoric. Algorithmic mediation amplifies polarizing content, thereby reshaping the structural conditions under which political consensus can be forged.

Furthermore, contemporary political discourse is intrinsically multimodal, combining verbal language with visual imagery, typography, gestures, and digital audio. Visual symbols, political memes, and curated photographs frequently communicate ideological messages with greater immediate affective power than extensive textual arguments. Non-verbal semiotic resources, including bodily posture, facial expression, and proxemics, reinforce the verbal messages delivered during televised political performances. As digital technologies continue to evolve, the boundaries between authentic human discourse and automated political communication are becoming increasingly blurred. The deployment of generative artificial intelligence and computational bot networks introduces unprecedented challenges for identifying manipulation in public deliberation.

Modern linguistics must therefore expand its theoretical paradigms to integrate computational analytics and multimodal semiotics into political discourse analysis. Deconstructing these complex discursive architectures is essential not only for theoretical scholarship, but also for fostering critical media literacy among citizens. An informed public capable of deciphering linguistic manipulation constitutes the vital safeguard of democratic governance and civic freedom. In conclusion, political discourse in modern linguistics embodies the inseparable unity of language, power, and ideology,

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

functioning as an active site of social struggle and consensus building. Future research in this domain will continue to reveal the profound ways in which verbal structures shape human political consciousness, institutional authority, and the evolutionary trajectory of global society.

References:

1. Fairclough, N. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. London: Longman. – 1995.
2. Van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and Power. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. – 2008.
3. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. Methods of Critical Discourse Studies. London: SAGE Publications. – 2015.
4. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. – 1980.
5. Chilton, P. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge. – 2004.
6. Foucault, M. The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language. New York: Pantheon Books. – 1972.
7. Bourdieu, P. Language and Symbolic Power. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. – 1991.
8. Austin, J. L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford: Oxford University Press. – 1962.
9. Searle, J. R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – 1969.
10. Charteris-Black, J. Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor. London: Palgrave Macmillan. – 2005.
11. Van Dijk, T. A. Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach. London: SAGE Publications. – 1998.
12. Fairclough, N. Language and Power. London: Longman. – 1989.