



*Dildor ESHMURATOVA,*  
*Teacher of English language and Literature кафедра*  
*Mahliyo ESHBOYEVA,*  
*Termiz State of University, Faculty of Foreign filology*

*Termiz davlat universiteti katta o'qituvchisi, filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori, (PhD) Sh.Kayumova taqrizi asosida.*

### POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN THE MEDIA AND TRANSLATION

Annotation

This article is dedicated to an analysing political discourse in journalism as well as translation, among which a special attending is given to the theory of media and translation of political discourse. Publication and media are developing drastically through translation. The internet users should take essential data on usual human lifestyle, careers and so on. Media and translation have confusion in terms of translation process. The article analyzes some aspects of political discourse as well as provides solution to various problems encountered in translation and media.

**Key words:** political discourse, theoretical, discursive, critical reading source language, delimitation, framework, pragmatists, plea.

### OMMAVIY AXBOROT VOSITALARIDA SIYOSIY MUHOKAMA VA TARJIMA

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqola jurnalistikadagi siyosiy nutqni, shuningdek tarjimoni tahlil qilishga bag'ishlangan bo'lib, ular orasida ommaviy axborot vositalari nazariyasi va siyosiy nutq tarjimasiga alohida e'tibor qaratilgan. Nashr va ommaviy axborot vositalari tarjima orqali keskin rivojlanmoqda. Internet foydalanuvchilari insonning odatiy turmush tarzi, martaba va boshqalar haqida muhim ma'lumotlarni olishlari kerak. Ommaviy axborot vositalari va tarjimada tarjima jarayonlari nuqtai nazaridan chalkashliklar mavjud. Maqolada siyosiy nutqning ayrim jihatlari tahlil qilingan, shuningdek, tarjima va ommaviy axborot vositalarida uchragan turli muammolarga yechimlar berilgan.

**Kalit so'zlar:** siyosiy nutq, nazariy, diskursiv, tanqidiy o'qish manba tili, chegaralash, ramka, pragmatistlar, iltimos.

### ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЙ ДИСКУРС В СМИ И ПЕРЕВОД

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена анализу политического дискурса в журналистике, а также переводу, среди которого особое внимание уделяется теории медиа и переводу политического дискурса. Публикация и средства массовой информации стремительно развиваются благодаря переводу. Пользователям Интернета необходимо собрать необходимые данные об обычном образе жизни человека, карьере и так далее. СМИ и перевод путают процессы перевода. В статье анализируются некоторые аспекты политического дискурса, а также предлагаются решения различных проблем, возникающих в сфере перевода и СМИ.

**Ключевые слова:** политический дискурс, теоретический, дискурсивный, критическое чтение исходного языка, разграничение, рамки, прагматики, призыв.

**Introduction.** In this article authors explore some to the seemingly naive question "What is the political discourse analysis?". Analysing political discourse is interesting for everyone in the way language is used in the world of politics. According to Aristotle's idea that we are all political animals, able to use language to pursue our own ends, the book uses the theoretical framework of linguistics to explore the ways in which we think and behave politically.

Written in a lively and engaging style, Analysing Political Discourse offers a new theoretical perspective on the study of language and politics, and provides an essential introduction to political discourse analysis. Vilayanur S. Ramchandran feel that, remember that politics, colonialism, imperialism and war also originate in the human brain. Obviously, the notion of Political Discourse Analysis (henceforth PDA), is ambiguous. Its most common interpretation is that PDA focuses on the analysis of 'political discourse', although we then still need to determine which discourse is political and which is not. On the other hand, there is also a more critical reading of the label, viz., as a political approach to discourse and discourse analysis, e.g., in the way understood in contemporary Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This respect at the same time formulates a

plea (a legal suit or action) that advocates a broader use of discourse analysis in political science. Of course such a plea can make an impression only if we have something to sell that political scientists want to buy. To present the argument that most phenomena in politics are forms of text and talk may be obvious, especially to a discourse analyst, but it is as such not a good reason for political scientists to change their current approach to a more discourse analytical one: Few scholars are prepared to 'reduce' their field, or their methods, to those of another field. Hence, we must show that problems in political science can in principle be studied more completely and sometimes more adequately when it is realized that the issues have an important discursive feature.

**Literature review.** Political discourse specified by Paul Chilton's theory, only in and through language can one issue commands and threats, ask questions, make offers and promises – provided one has convinced one's interlocutors that one has the requisite resources to make the speech act credible. And only through language tied into social and political institutions can one declare war, declare guilty or not guilty, prorogue parliaments, or raise or lower taxes. Speech acts have been treated by 'ordinary language' philosophers and some pragmatists within linguistics as a largely

technical problem. It is clear, however, that the non-logical parts of meaning-making cannot be easily separated from social and political interaction, its conventions and institutions. Mey (2001: 115–16) captures this point nicely in pointing out that language is always reflects 'the conditions of the community at large': Among these conditions are institutions that society, that is, the social humans, have created for themselves: the legislative, the executive, the judiciary, and other organs of the state; the various religious bodies such as faiths and churches; human social institutions such as marriage, the family, the market and so on. In all such institutions and bodies, certain human agreements and customs have become legalized, and this legalization has found its symbolic representation in language.

Frankly, the identical is true for the definition of the field of media discourse, which also needs to focus on its audiences. And also in medical, legal or educational discourse, we not only think of participants such as doctors, lawyers or teachers, but also of patients, defendants and students. Hence, the delimitation of political discourse by its principal authors' is insufficient and needs to be extended to a more complex picture of all its relevant participants, whether or not these are actively involved in political discourse, or merely as recipients in one-way modes of communication.

The co-evolution of language and politics? If it is granted that language is an innate organ of the human mind/brain, we can ask how it evolved, and whether this casts any light on how we might think about possible links between language, society and politics. There are two views as to how this 'language organ' has arisen techniques and procedures used to identify and analyze information regarding a specific research connected with political discourse. It contains all the important aspects of social, cultural, communicational including research design, data collection methods which the research is conducted. While these points can help you understand what is research methodology, you also need to know why it is important to pick the right methodology. In this point of our article some views have consequences for thinking about the relationship between language and politics. We have discussed speculation about the origins of language was banned by the Paris Linguistics Society in 1866, so wild and ill-founded had it become, just six years after the publication of *The Origin of Species*. However, the present re-emergence of Darwinian evolutionary theory, and new computational, archaeological, neurological and philosophical methods of investigation, have given rise to renewed and more rigorous enquiry into how language evolved in homo sapiens (see for example, Bickerton 1990; Hurford et al. 1998; Jackendoff 2002: 231–64). While the debate remains very much open, two clear lines of thought have been established, and both have implications for thinking about the relationship between language and politics. According to the first line of thought, language evolved from an arbitrary genetic mutation

that was beneficial to evolving humans. It does not build on prior properties of emerging human brains, but is an entirely novel and species specific ability. This is the position apparently taken by Chomsky (e.g. Chomsky 1975, 2000). What are the implications of such a view for question of the relationship between language and political behavior? It is possible to sketch possible conceptual links between this view of the evolution of language and important ideas that are familiar in the tradition of political thought. If this version of the emergence of a language Lability in the human brain were correct, language would have no direct genetic or neurological link with social grouping or social manipulation.

**Analyses and results.** The ideal of free communication there is a further domain of thinking about language, in this case specifically about language and society, that involves a similarly idealised 'in principle' kind of argumentation. It comes not from linguistics but from the social theorist Jürgen Habermas (1971, 1973, 1979, 1981). It is valuable to consider this kind of thinking here by way of conclusion to this chapter, since it has been often mentioned by analysts with a commitment to the politically oriented analysis of discourse (e.g. Fairclough 1989; Wodak 1996)

Political discourse involves metaphorical reasoning. Cross-domain metaphorical mappings make it possible to draw inferences that could not be drawn on the basis of direct evidence or the basis of direct experience. In political discourse metaphors are often not just embellishments of literal propositions, but modes of reasoning about, for example, the future and about policies.

Politics and language: 1 This account leaves out relations between states – the international arena. It is often argued that beyond the state the international sphere lacks differentiated institutional functions and is anarchic in the technical sense. Such a model does indeed characterise the foreign policy of most states. Opponents of this view of international relations point to the development of international law, the increasing porosity of state boundaries, and global economic and communication networks, all of which increasingly lead to world politics. This dimension, though arguably continuous with domestic politics, does require separate treatment and is not dealt with directly in the present volume.

**Conclusion.** To sum up centres of the brain this hypothesis emerged during our investigation of texts in Chapter 7, but is relevant to others as well. Whether there are indeed specific emotions that could be called 'political' remains arguable. However, some politically relevant feelings, such as territorial belonging and identity ('home'), love of family, fear of intruders and unknown people have certainly shown up in our analyses. Such emotions might have an innate basis and be stimulated automatically in the political use of language.

## REFERENCES

12. Teun A. Van Dijk, "What is political discourse analysing", University of Amsterdam (2006).
13. Paul Chilton's "Analysing political discourse theory and practice " (2004).
14. Aristotle (1932) *Politics*. With an English Translation by H. Rackham, London, Heinemann.
15. "What is the political discourse?" by Teun A. Van Dijk/Universitet Van Amsterdam(2007).
16. Abadi, A. The Speech Act of Apology in Political Life. *Journal of Pragmatics*. Article 1990.14(3):467-471.
17. Chilton, P. Words, Discourse and Metaphors: The Meanings of Deter, Deterrent and Deterrence. In P. Chilton ed, *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak Today*:(1985)103-127. London: Pinter.
18. Chilton, P., & Ilyin, M. 1993. Metaphor in political discourse: The case of the common European house. *Discourse & Society* 4(1): 7-32.