

## Studying the Relationship between Diplomatic and Political Discourses

NILUFAR MAXAMADALIYEVA

*National University of Uzbekistan, Tashkent, Uzbekistan*

### ABSTRACT

*Nowadays, conducting research on different types of discourses occupies a special place in the linguistics of our country and the world. This is explained by the process of expanding the relationship between countries and of each language as a result of the rapid development of science and technology, the increase in the amount of socio-economic, scientific and technical information. This process creates the need for scientific research of the political language used in many states cooperation areas.*

**Keywords:** Communication, political discourse, diplomatic discourse, international policy, diplomatic corps, institutional communication.

### INTRODUCTION

The study of diplomatic discourse and political discourse involve identifying the main features of these types of institutional communication and their differences from other types of communication similar to diplomatic communication in certain parameters. According to the views of several researchers, diplomatic discourse is about who speaks, to whom, and what goals the speaker sets for himself.

### METHODS AND MATERIALS

In this article we consider the relationship between political and diplomatic discourses. Diplomatic discourse has a public character

and represents a specific form of political activity. On the other hand, the goal of the action agent is to reach an agreement between the various participants of the communication on international policy issues, to establish relations between countries based on mutual interests, to coordinate their interests, to expand cooperation, to limit conflicts, etc..In this case, diplomatic discourse is a closed process of negotiations prepared and conducted on the basis of specific theoretical rules and practical developments in communication theory, conflictology, communication psychology, etc., and therefore can be considered a specific scientific activity of members of the diplomatic corps.

#### RESULT AND DISCUSSION

First, let's look at the dictionary meaning of the word "diplomacy" in the *Uzbek Explanatory Dictionary*: "Diplomacy (fr.diplomatie/jun.diploma - a sheet of paper folded in two) 1. The state's activities in the field of implementing foreign international policy and communicating with foreign countries. 2. Skillful dealings aimed at achieving a goal" [1, 624]. Similar definitions of diplomacy are given in other dictionaries published abroad. The Macmillan Essential Dictionary defines diplomacy as: "1. the profession or skill of establishing friendly relations between countries. 2. the ability to deal well with people so as not to offend them" [2, 191].

According to experts in the diplomatic corps, "diplomacy is the science of international relations and the heads of state and special bodies of foreign relations: the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, diplomatic functions, diplomats' participation in determining the direction of the country's foreign policy and its peaceful implementation. The main goal and task is to protect the interests of the state and citizens" [3, 4]

The nature of the agent and the client determines the third characteristic of diplomatic discourse – its goals. On the one hand, the agent's task is to inform the general public, both at home and abroad, about the views of the government of the state he represents on certain international issues.

The purpose and situation of diplomatic communication determine the communicative aspect of speech, individual speech acts and the genre as a whole. However, the communicative component is only one aspect of any speech expression. In parallel with the communicative aspect, that is, with the specific situation of oral communication, with all its individual circumstances. The transition of thought into speech is expressed in the translation of cognitive formations determined by the subject of discussion into language systems. Thus, the full speech activity combines communicative, cognitive and linguistic aspects. Together, these aspects reflect the internal program of speech, which exists in the consciousness of the individual speaker and represents the "hierarchy of propositions underlying it" [4, 114]

As the Russian linguist and psychologist A. A. Leontiev noted, "A hierarchy is formed by the speaker on the basis of a certain directional strategy in the situation described, depending on the "cognitive weight" of one or another component of the situation" [5, 114]. In other words, the presence of a single topic of communication, as well as the presence of a goal, does not mean that the psychological structure of the topic-situation will be the same in the mind of the speaker and listeners, who differ from each other in terms of their psychological characteristics. This situation allows us to highlight another parameter in the general structure of diplomatic speech - the diplomat's linguistic personality, his communicative, cognitive and linguistic abilities ultimately determine the success of all communication.

Thus, diplomatic speech can be considered as a specific form of communicative activity, the main difference between which and other types of communication is its multifaceted nature, which is associated with various goals and objectives, which are carried out in different contexts – public and private. The specificity of the context – a wide public audience or an equal, educated and informed partner – determines the social model of interaction and the direction of interaction, the possibility of achieving goals, the choice of speech strategy and the specific features of the use of linguistic means, directly related to the individual level of development of communication.

The public form of diplomatic discourse belongs to this type of institutional communication, which by its characteristics corresponds to political communication. The connection between politics and diplomacy shows that, unlike some other spheres of activity, political diplomatic actions are mainly speech actions, and in both cases "language is not only a means of reflecting political reality and a component of the political sphere" [6]. Its main function is that language serves as "a hidden source of power" [7, 2] allowing those who use it to directly influence the course of events. In other words, language, both in political and diplomatic communication, does not simply influence the state of relations between states. With its help, a separate worldview of these relations is created, demanded by the state and certain political forces, both in the minds of the negotiating partners and in the public mind.

The second important factor that determines the similarity of these types of speech practices is the certain specificity of the goals of diplomatic and political discourses, although this affinity is not obvious, it can be determined only through comparative analysis.

At first glance, the goals of these types of discursive practices are quite different. If the goal of political discourse is the struggle for power, it follows from the general definition of diplomacy that, in addition to the tasks of informing and coordinating interests, the functions of diplomatic communication include the protection of the interests of the country and its citizens. However, an analysis of international documents shows that in practice, the concept of "protecting interests" is often replaced by the desire to establish control over one's partners, to take a leading position in the world using various forms of pressure on the international community and various international organizations, without taking into account the positions of other participants in the initial contact.

From the similarity of goals follows the third point that unites diplomatic and political discourses – the coincidence of their orientation towards the fulfillment of a certain linguistic task.

First, these considerations relate to the general linguistic function that determines the nature of all language. As the Russian linguist E. I. Sheigal noted: "Political discourse, along with religious and advertising, is part of the group of discourses in which the regulatory function is dominant" [8, 86-88]. The function of regulating the addressee's activity, encouraging him to take necessary actions by creating favorable conditions for activity is also manifested in the public form of diplomatic discourse.

As part of its instrumental function, the language of diplomacy is intended to perform several tasks as a language of politics. First, it forms a certain perception of reality between communication partners, that is, it acts as a guide. Secondly, these languages are understood as the tasks of general integration and social differentiation, as well as the tasks of movement, that is, the task of mobilizing activities that are manifested in various genres of diplomatic discourse reflected in the mass media. Meanwhile, the mass form of diplomatic discourse is primarily aimed at shaping public opinion on a number of international issues, that is, its main social goal is the same as the goal of political discourse, namely, to instill in the recipients the need for "politically correct" actions or assessments, because this is beneficial for those striving for power. The diplomatic discourse agent creates a "ground for convincing" society of the correctness of its course, while at the same time defining the circle of its supporters. The final stage is the stage of developing a line of struggle against the enemy. As in political discourse, in diplomatic discourse all of these tasks are carried out with the help of special signs, that is, through the ideological meanings of political terms, which are reflected explicitly, as well as indirectly, through a special choice of vocabulary that assesses the tone of the entire speech.

The increasingly frequent publication in the media of the contents of diplomatic negotiations and some other diplomatic documents leads us to another, fourth, intersection point of diplomatic and political discussions – the "blending" and "transparency" of their boundaries at a certain point.

On the one hand, such types of discourse remain institutional forms of communication. However, the changes taking place in modern society cannot but leave a certain mark on them, which brings these types of discursive practices closer to other types of communication.

Also, researcher E. I. Sheigal, in his monograph, devotes a comprehensive analysis of political discourse, showing that in its peripheral genres, political discourse can be interconnected with the functions of other types of discourse – mass media, pedagogical, legal, religious, and others.

It can be said that this peculiarity is also characteristic of the public form of diplomatic communication, which has changed significantly in recent decades.

The new features that diplomatic discourse has acquired at the current stage of development are directly related to the global changes that have been taking place in the world over the past decades. The situation has changed dramatically over the past decades. The growth of trade, the increase in international financial transactions associated with the establishment of various types of ties between states – the emergence of international corporations, joint ventures, international tourism, and others – led to the redirection of diplomacy towards economic expansion. In recent decades, trade, foreign investment, and everything that "improves prosperity, the standard of living, and the quality of life" have taken first place in diplomacy, after the security and territorial integrity of the country. This is precisely why a new branch of diplomacy has emerged, it was directly involved in coordinating relations within and between various economic unions and blocs, as well as economic relations in the area of intersection of interests of various countries outside of unions and blocs.

This situation also cannot but affect the content of diplomatic discourse. In general, negotiations in the field of international trade are undoubtedly diplomatic in nature, but they pursue not only political, but also economic interests of the states participating in them. Such negotiations should include not only negotiations between any two states, but also negotiations on the creation of concepts for the development of economic relations

within the framework of projects to create a multilateral mechanism of free trade zones, customs and payment unions, uniform foreign trade systems, customs and tax legislation.

In this case, a unique process of "mixing" of different types of discourse – diplomatic, political, commercial features – takes place in one text. In this sense, diplomatic discourse appears in the mass media to a lesser degree than political discourse. However, speeches by diplomats at meetings of the Security Council, the UN General Assembly, and its many organizations, public radio and television appearances by ambassadors outlining the local and foreign policies of the state they represent, and interviews with representatives of the diplomatic corps published in the media, Information-analytical articles based on confidential materials of embassies and others directly relate to the field of diplomatic discourse, in this case showing its close connection with political communication.

It can be said that the unity of the information channel about the political and diplomatic activities of the state led to the formation of another kind of system of discursive practices - theatricality.

The specificity of the theatricality of political discourse has been studied a lot, and as researchers have pointed out, this feature of political communication is based on several interrelated factors:

1. The perception of politics as a type of social game;
2. The form of describing fragments of political events;
3. The ritual of political actions, which leads to the perception of any political event as a theatrical action taking place on the "stage of life";
4. The widespread use of theatrical metaphors in the interpretation of political dialogue; [9, 48]

In general, the theatricality of the mass form of diplomatic discourse, like its counterpart, the theatricality of political discourse, is determined primarily by the specific characteristics of the addressee, that is, the mass audience. Communication with them is carried out only at the level of the institution or its

representative – the "citizens". This feature is manifested in its plot-role layer, as well as in the tendency of the public mind to understand diplomacy through the theatrical stage.

All of the above features of the public form of diplomatic discourse also determine its specific speech genres: press conferences, speeches, interviews, statements, conversations with representatives of the press, and many of them correspond almost entirely to genres that belong to political discourse.

On the other hand, there are several factors that make it impossible to distinguish between diplomatic and political communications.

The difference between diplomatic communication and political communication is, first of all, the specific characteristics of the social institution and its representatives. First of all, these are specially trained personnel, that is, members of the diplomatic corps. The "upper echelon" consists of high-ranking state officials with the most complete knowledge and authority, who are given the opportunity to carry out both political and diplomatic actions at the same time. The addressee of this component of diplomatic discourse is also unique. Diplomacy's modern demand for transparency provides an opportunity to expand the boundaries of the client sphere of diplomatic communication. On the one hand, this type of communication is aimed at a mass addressee, in this case, the tasks of diplomatic discourse, like political discourse, are to "see and understand reality" using linguistic means (translation and orientation), to manage (control) the consciousness of the mass addressee, to integrate and differentiate, to agonistic and harmonizing, as well as to disseminate information, create an agenda, and analyze future and past events. On the other hand, this communication is aimed at partners with equal status, and in the next step it becomes information and motivation to action as the main task. So, the task of providing information in diplomatic discourse has its own characteristics.

According to many experts, the main criterion for information content is the novelty, relevance, and adequacy of the content in presenting information [10, 118-135].

As researchers of political discourse have noted, political communication is a ritual, and therefore the lack of novelty is often compensated for by affectation. As a rule, therefore, affectation and evaluation prevail over evidence.

The requirements for the professional skills of a diplomat include, in particular, the requirement for perfect knowledge of the professional language, the main characteristic of which is the character of restraint and caution. Therefore, the elements of false candidacy in the political component of diplomatic discourse represent a kind of "Aesopian" language that is easily read by professionals and are intended to perform almost the same tasks in the mind of the public addressee as in political communication: to create an atmosphere of calm in society, to provoke the desired reaction of the recipient, to hide unnecessary information, etc. Semantic ambiguity is also important to allow the participants of the communication to "save their reputation" and not aggravate the situation.

In general, in our opinion, the political form of diplomatic discourse primarily reflects the various connections between diplomatic communication and society. Its analysis allows us to understand how the goals and objectives of state foreign policy, which stem from the social norms of people's cultural values, are transmitted to the public consciousness through this type of communication and forms, along with political language and the "global worldview." The success of this form of diplomatic discourse is determined by the ability of the communication participants to use the most effective and appropriate communicative (verbal and nonverbal) means of communication in this type of dialogue. In other words, the level of development of a person's communicative competence plays a special role in the functioning of this aspect of diplomatic discourse, as the main indicators of which are:

1. His level of knowledge of different speech genres;
2. Dominant communicative attitude based on the compatibility of speech and moral norms;
3. Belonging to a certain type of speech culture;

However, the political form of diplomatic discourse is only a visible and smaller part of this type of institutional communication. Most diplomatic communications are closed in nature, not intended for public discussion. The uniqueness of this form of diplomatic discourse comes from the understanding of diplomacy as a science of negotiation. In our opinion, this makes it possible to separate diplomatic discourse as a form of scientific communication in the general field of diplomatic communication, in addition to the public aspect.

In this study, we adopt a broad understanding of E.I. Sheigal's term "political discourse" and consider diplomatic discourse to be an institutional type of discourse, which is a type of political discourse. Orientation of diplomatic discourse to the foreign policy of the state, as well as stylistic and institutional-role differences in the characteristics of political and diplomatic discourses do not exclude diplomatic discourse from the sphere of political communication, because foreign and local policy are different aspects of the concept of "state policy".

Meanwhile, diplomatic discourse is an institutional type of discourse with a number of specific features (high culture of communication, specific characteristics of the social institution and its representatives, adherence to diplomatic protocol). On the other hand, the presence of common features with political discourse allows us to consider diplomatic discourse as its foreign policy-oriented variety.

#### REFERENCES

1. *Uzbek Explanatory Dictionary*. <https://www.ziyouz.com/kutubxonasi>.
2. *Macmillan Essential Dictionary for learners of English*. 2003.
3. Sayamov, Yu. N. 2022. Diplomacy and diplomatic service in the global world: Theory and practice of diplomatic service. *Uchebno-metodicheskoe posobie*. Moscow.
4. Leontev, A. A. 2003. *Basic Psycholinguistics*. Moscow.
5. Leontev, A. A. 2003. *Basic Psycholinguistics*. Moscow.
6. ссылка на статью.киберленинка.(Ealy1981)

7. Zyablova, O. A. 2024. Osobennosti politicheskogo i diplomaticheskogo discursa: obshchie zamechaniya. *Mejdunarodnyi nauchnyi journal "Flagman nauki"*, 6/17.
8. Sheygal, E. I. 2000. Semiotics of political discourse. diss..filol. science.
9. Sheygal E.I."Semiotics of political discourse".diss..filol. science - V., 2000. 48p.
10. Klyuev, R. V. 2002. Rechevaya kommunikatsiya.uchebnoe posobie dlya universitetov i institute.

**NILUFAR MAXAMADALIYEVA**  
DOCTORAL STUDENT,  
TRANSLATION THEORY AND  
COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS,  
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF UZBEKISTAN,  
TASHKENT, 100178, UZBEKISTAN.  
E-MAIL: <ASATOVA.N@GMAIL.COM>