EXPRESSION FORMS OF INTERESTS AND INTENTIONS IN POLITICAL DIALOGUE

Mokhira Eshanova Yuldashbaevna
Senior lecturer at Specialized Branch of Tashkent
State University of Law
mohiraladybird@gmail.com

Abstract. Political dialogue 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 dialogue 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.

Key words: double communication, political dialogue and discourse, interests and intentions, hidden factors, socio-political events, political communication

Annotatsiya. Siyosiy muloqot va nutq hayotni kontseptual-diskurs metodlari, ilmiy tadqiqotlar va faoliyat standartlari nuqtai nazaridan idrok etish uyg'unligidir. Muloqotni tahlil qilishning asosiy shakli uning siyosiy va mafkuraviy maqsadlarining yashirin omillarini aniqlaydi, chunki ular ijtimoiy-siyosiy o'zgarishlarni aks ettiradi va tadqiqot, baholash, tanlash maqsadini belgilashga yordam beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: juft muloqot, siyosiy dialog va diskurs, manfaat va intensiyalar, yashirin omillar, ijtimoiy-siyosiy voqealar, siyosiy muloqot

In contrast to normative (thought-provoking) communication, in paired communication, the reciprocity of competition and action is preserved, but the difference in meaning disappears, and the boundaries of the subject are completely confused. So here, interaction and competition lose their positive meaning and become a factor of self-mockery. It is no coincidence that we have chosen the word "para-dialogue" (Greek prefix παρά -) to describe this type of communication. παρά is a prefix, which means "near", "next to", "directed to something" and "deviation from purpose or reality". In fact, it is meant not just to deviate, but to turn it into a completely different meaning.

The meaning of the Greek word "διάλογος" is similar to the meaning of the Latin word "disputatio" (calculation, consideration; scientific research, scientific work, scientific reasoning, research; discussion), but has a different meaning than the Latin "discursus". This term, which has become one of the main terms in naming communicative processes today, later appeared and meant "conversation, talk" in Latin. Its original meaning was "to run in all directions (to throw oneself)"; "maneuver"; "attack"; "continuous movement", "continuous blinking", and "meaningless run."

In double communication, neither "views", nor "concepts", nor "ideologies" move, but simply (as in collages, clips) the two streams of thought and speech merge together in space and time. This contradicts the principle of success of conversation in standard communication. According to N.Luhmann, the idea of effective (productive) communication between people always means that one of the communicators speaks. If several people start talking at once, and continue their speech stubbornly, the answers will be incomprehensible and the harmony will disappear. Multiple topics can only be considered in turn.

Communication participants should limit their answers to a topic that is relevant for the moment or change the topic.

A person observing a pair of conversations can evaluate certain parts of the discourse: the response of this or that participant, this or that part of the conversation. The observer can conclude that one of the participants of the communication process is more successful than the other (confident, pleasant, masterful, all of these assessments are almost the same in content). However, communicative success is understood here in a false aesthetic sense, and the observer cannot join in such "communication" (because there is no clear meaning), nor can he say exactly which side of the "debate" he is on. The dialogue observer introduces the "third" person to the discourse, to the role of the interlocutor; and double communication stops and limits it.

Language is man's most powerful communication tool. The armed forces are able to keep the people, even generations, in a state of subjugation for many years. But it is only through language that the human mind can be subconsciously manipulated and co-operated in the work of self-oppression. Understanding language in this way means the beginning of political independence.

In conclusion, political linguistics is more or less related to the study of the relationship between language and society. The study of political language in modern political science is effective for the study of the political process in general, this or that political path, as well as individual political organizations and politicians. Political linguistics is a new, actively evolving humanitarian science that studies the use of language resources as a means of struggle for the unconscious management of political power and social consciousness.

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 dialogue 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. Deleuze G. Marsel, Prust i znaki, Seriya:Metafizicheskie issledovaniya, Prilojenie k almanahah Aleteya 2014.. –S. 190.
2. Bazilev V. N., Interpretativnoe perevodovedenie: propedevticheskiy kurs: Uchebnoe posobie/V. N. Bazilev, Yu. A. Sorokin - Ulyanovsk: UlGU, 2000. – S.134.
3. Luhmann N., Vlast / Per. s nem. A. Yu. Antonovskogo. — M.: Praksis, 2001. — S.256
4. Luhmann N., Sotsialniye sistemi, Ocherk obshey teorii/Per. s nem. I. D. Gaziyeva, pod red. N. A. Golovina. — SPb.: Nauka, 2007. — S.648
5. Poskonina O. V., Niklas Luhmann o politicheskoy i yuridicheskoy podsistemax obshestva: Monografiya. — Ijevsk: Izd-vo Udmurtskogo un-ta, 1997. — S.124
6. Ter-Minasova S.G., Slovosochetaniye v nauchno-lingvisticheskom i didakticheskom aspektax. Izd.3 LKI 2007. –S.152.
7. Amanova Nodirabegim Furkatovna. (2022). effective method of teaching. conference zone, 53–55. Retrieved from http://www.conferencezone.org/index.php/cz/article/view/124

8. Amanova   N.F   Amanova   F.F (2022) Malum bir maqsadga qaratilgan va maxsuslashgan til.

9. https://conf.iscience.uz/index.php/yumti/article/view/118/110