

UN DISCOURSE AND ITS FEATURES

Nilufar Turanbaevna KUCHIMOVA

Teacher of the English Language, PhD
Samarkand State University
Samarkand, Uzbekistan

BMT DISKURSI VA UNING XUSUSIYATLARI

Nilufar Turanbaevna KUCHIMOVA

O'qituvchi, PhD
Ingliz tili kafedrası
Samarqand davlat universiteti
Samarqand, O'zbekiston

ДИСКУРС ООН И ЕГО ОСОБЕННОСТИ

Нилюфар Туранбаевна КУЧИМОВА

Преподаватель, PhD
Кафедра английского языка
Самаркандский государственный университет
Самарканд, Узбекистан Kuchimovanilufar7@gmail.com

UDC (UO'K, УДК): 811.512.133'366.596

**For citation (iqtibos keltirish uchun,
для цитирования):**

Kuchimova N.T. *Un Discourse and its Features*//
O'zbekistonda xorijiy tillar. — 2023. — № 5
(52). — B. 63-71,

<https://doi.org/10.36078/1696581696>

Received: August 29, 2023

Accepted: October 03, 2023

Published: October 05, 2023

Copyright © 2023 by author(s).

This work is licensed under the Creative
Commons Attribution International License
(CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

Abstract. At the current stage of the development of linguistics, the focus of attention of scientists working in various fields is language identity in all its styles and forms. The need for communicative practice to focus on its optimization and identification of the factors that represent the success of communication has predetermined the growing interest in discourse and its components. This article focuses on identifying the distinctive features of the official UN discourse. The theoretical framework of discourse analysis includes various fields of social sciences such as sociology, psychology, linguistics, media and political science. Each of these fields uses discourse analysis based on its own perspective and scientific methods and creates its rules for discourse analysis. The need for communicative practice to focus on its optimization and identification of the factors that represent the success of communication has predetermined the growing interest in discourse and its components.. This article, respectively, focuses on identifying the distinctive features of the official UN discourse.

Keywords: discourse; language; text; official speech; UN.

Annotatsiya. Tilshunoslik taraqqiyotining hozirgi bosqichida tilning uslub va shakllari turli sohalarda faoliyat yuritayotgan olimlarning diqqat markazida bo'lmoqda. Kommunikativ amaliyotni optimallashtirish va muloqot muvaffaqiyatini ifodalovchi omillarni aniqlashga e'tibor qaratish zarurati nutq va uning tarkibiy qismlariga bo'lgan qiziqish ortib borayotganini oldindan belgilab bermoqda. Ushbu maqola rasmiy diskursning, xususan, BMT rasmiy diskurs orqali uning o'ziga xos xususiyatlari, farqlari va boshqa janrlar bilan o'xshashliklarini aniqlashga qaratilgan. Diskurs tahlilining nazariy asosi sosiologiya, psixologiya, tilshunoslik, media va siyosat fanlari kabi ijtimoiy fanlarning turli sohalarini o'z ichiga oladi. Kommunikativ amaliyotni optimallashtirish va muloqot muvaffaqiyatini ifodalovchi omillarni aniqlashga e'tibor qaratish

zarurati nutq va uning tarkibiy qismlariga bo'lgan qiziqish ortib borayotganini oldindan belgilab bermoqda. Ushbu maqola rasmiy diskursning, xususan, BMT rasmiy diskurs orqali uning o'ziga xos xususiyatlari, farqlari va boshqa janrlar bilan o'xshashliklarini aniqlashga qaratilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: diskurs; til; matn; rasmiy nutq; BMT.

Аннотация. На современном этапе развития языкознания в центре внимания ученых находится языковая личность во всех ее стилях и формах. Необходимость коммуникативной практики сосредоточить внимание на ее оптимизации и выявлении факторов, обуславливающих успешность общения, предопределила растущий интерес к дискурсу и его компонентам. В статье основное внимание уделяется выявлению отличительных черт официального дискурса ООН. Теоретическая основа дискурс-анализа включает в себя различные области социальных наук, таких как социология, психология, лингвистика, медиа и политология. Каждая из этих областей использует анализ дискурса, основанный на своей собственной точке зрения и научных методах, и создает свои собственные правила анализа дискурса. Необходимость коммуникативной практики сосредоточить внимание на ее оптимизации и выявлении факторов, обуславливающих успешность общения, предопределила растущий интерес к дискурсу и его компонентам. Данная статья, соответственно, посвящена выявлению отличительных особенностей официального дискурса ООН.

Ключевые слова: дискурс; язык; текст; официальная речь; ООН.

Introduction. The discourse is the idea that “ideology is the power of ideas and hegemony is the ability to dominate by adopting ideas”. Discourse creates a reality in which identities are formed. This way, discourse becomes part of the culture, shaping and reiterating accepted assumptions (8, 50). Jorgensen and Phillips explain speech as a social action that creates a social world or “.. a particular way of speaking and understanding the world (or some aspect of it” (5, 2). Therefore, discourse is a matter of language that examines and analyses power relations to create normative perspectives through which it is possible to criticize these relations and implement social changes. Although some discourse analyses exist, they can agree on some points raised by Jorgensen and Phillips: 1) Language is not a simple reflection of a pre-existing reality. 2) Language is not a single general system organized into discursive forms but rather a set of systems in which meanings change. 3) These forms of discourse are fixed and change in discursive practices, and 4) therefore, the maintenance and modification of these forms must be studied by analyzing the specific contexts of language in action (5, 3). For example, groups do not exist as groups until they are socially predetermined until they are given form in discourse (5, 2). Michel Foucault's work on discourse and power suggests that power does not belong to a specific agent and can be oppressive and influential. According to Foucault, power is fluid, and discourse is not static but variable.

These are historically and politically constructed systems of meaning, symbolic systems and arrangements in which social configurations compete for meaning (6, 46).

The pragmalinguistic model of discourse is based on the concept of communicative activity carried out by particular people in specific situations and circumstances. Each person exists in a certain culture; therefore his life consists in this culture; therefore, programs of linguistic behavior arise from programs of social behavior consisting of examples, rules, knowledge, skills, ideals, values and norms of activities valid in the interior of this culture. For this reason, many linguists underline that the national-cultural dimension must be considered when writing a business letter (4, 51).

Formal communication refers to a complex network of intersections of the main and additional meanings of individual words and groups of words. Words, word combinations and fixed combinations appear as units of meaning and additional meanings in such communication texts (4, 52).

The term “official discourse” has been used sociopolitically for a long time, but a clear definition is still lacking (2, 45). A feature of official discourse is that, in general, the communicative resources used by participants to carry out communicative tasks constitute the essence of the process (7, 42). The basis of official speech is real speeches and calls for negotiation and is generally understood as an exchange of ideas for various socio-political purposes.

Official speech is a means of communication and constitutes a component of the concept of political-social relations between countries at the level of linguistic units. The focus of the official discourse is the study of the official language of communication relating to real international socio-political activities (2, 51). It is known that all types of communication are carried out with a certain style and scale. The formal style is used in the field of administrative and legal activities. It is used in various texts: state documents, laws, international documents and correspondence between natural and legal persons (8, 57).

Linguistic analysis of official speech means the creation of discursive signs at the level of linguistic units (in this case, the analysis of lexical, semantic and formal features of diplomatic work) and the study of internal features of speech.

It is known that during formal communication, partners engage in conversation. Like any social behavior, these activities are carried out according to certain rules, which are formed and realized as a result of the communicative-social interaction of the interlocutors. Interactions occur based on various personal, social, formal and informal social relationships. Accordingly, the effect of the word can be realized according to certain standards. The basis of official communication is norms and rules that are quite fixed and always used in practice (14).

Functional styles of linguistics that study the vocal system, including selection criteria and compatibility of linguistic tools. It

can be said that the formal linguistic style is the type of language used in administrative-legal social activity and is characterized by a set of linguistic means specific to linguistic activity in this social sphere (12, 163).

The main objective of official texts is to manage relationships between individuals, institutions and countries and convey information about an issue's status. In this case, the text content must have the same meaning. Therefore, it is possible to draw a conclusion about the purpose of official speech and evaluate the level of value of official (socio-political) action from a linguistic point of view. The job of a diplomatic representative, for example, is to inform the public, both at home and abroad, about the government's perspective on certain international issues. In such a situation, official discourse represents a particular political and social activity (2, 52). On the other hand, the goal of the official speech of the United Nations is to reach an agreement between various general participants in the communicative action by issues of international politics, establish rules of mutual interest between regions, harmonize their interests, expand cooperation, limit conflicts, etc.

The style of official correspondence and documents is a means of communication in economic, legal and diplomatic relations, government institutions and commerce (2, 51). Accordingly, legal articles, diplomatic requests: notes, decisions of state institutions, orders, contracts, official announcements and messages, correspondence and similar documents are written in this style. The essence of formal speech, as of general speech, is the communication of the main pair of communicators: the message recipient produces and sends a spoken or written message, and the message recipient listens / reads and decodes the message. Fedorovskaya defines the official style as follows: "It is a style that expresses official relations in social, political and economic life in the form of official documents, during communication of states, organizations and members of society in official situations" (1, 38).

The specialized agencies of the United Nations are autonomous international organizations collaborating with the UN. All were established based on negotiations with the United Nations. Some of them existed before World War I. Some were associated with the League of Nations, created around the same time as the United Nations. The United Nations has created other organizations to meet emerging needs.

Teun van Dijk developed the general framework of CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis). Following Van Dijk's approach, formal discourse analysis can be divided into the features of the text (such as theme, genre, local meanings, style and rhetoric) and the characteristics of the context in which the discourse is constructed.

The main difference between the official UN speech and other speeches (especially political and diplomatic) is that this speech consists of normative texts and speeches published by an authoritative source, which refer to non-legally binding measures.

What official UN discourse has in common with other types of discourse is that the language used in drafting and distributing texts is one of the most important issues. In the past, there have been periods when language played a dominant role in international relations due to its political, strategic, economic and cultural superiority (7, 40). Today, most international negotiations are conducted *in English, the modern global language or lingua franca*. Treaties and other important documents are usually written in English, and international organizations conduct most of their activities in English. Using an international language such as English is essential for the effective conduct of international business, but it can also lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings (4, 60).

Despite the existence of a universal model of basic procedures in the official discourse of the United Nations, misunderstandings arise in negotiations due to the different meanings attributed to certain words, which are strongly influenced by cultural factors. Cohen states the following regarding diplomatic language, which is part of the official discourse (4, 63).

“Diplomatic language is the further development of language as a means of communication [...] Language is often the cause of misunderstandings and conflicts [...] The question of the meaning of language and culture is based on a vision that reflects semantics differences such as different interpretations of reality and normative patterns of behavior [...] Ambiguity in a diplomatic text helps to avoid a situation of war or hostility and can be wise and appropriate”.

In particular, in the analysis of official discourse, considering the communicative interaction between two or more parties, the different pragmatic purposes of normative text types are examined, as well as the role of the verbal system and archaic expressions in relation to English.

As Williams states: "Interpreting the intentions of the legislators and drafters of a particular bill inevitably requires careful examination of the language used [...] the absence of a particular clause in a declaration can give rise to heated and prolonged debates interpretative" (14, 11). Linguistic analysis refers to the use of imperative and pragmatic verbs to express obligations at different levels in UN documents. A starting point is the description of the legal texts published by international organizations, and in particular by the United Nations, and the linguistic and pragmatic functions of these texts.

In Van Dijk's approach, themes refer to semantic macrostructures, that is, the most important textual elements that “characterize the overall coherence that gives the text the desired unity” (12, 165). Schemas represent general argument structures or linguistic formations (9, 100). Local meanings refer to the microanalysis of individual words, sentences, and paragraphs. As Van Dijk points out, style is about the choice and variety of words used to present ideas (10, 207). Rhetoric aims to increase the

recipient's understanding and acceptance of the speech through such means as alliteration, metaphor, metonymy, exaggeration, rhetorical questions, parallelism, comparison, contrast, and irony (11, 249). According to Van Dijk, context is generally determined by the social, political and historical structures in which discursive practices take place (13, 106).

The relationship between the speaker and the listener occurs in the context of verbal communication. The linguistic act requires a communicative text and acquires meaning in the context of this communication. For communication to occur, an environment must exist. It is known that language arises in the form of text in the process of communication, that linguistic actions do not occur one by one but occur in groups, and each of them has a place in the linguistic text. The place of each linguistic structure in the text is important both for this structure itself and for the formation of the entire communicative text in terms of form and content. It is, therefore, necessary to separate the textual functions from the linguistic sign (2, 48). The texts of the official speech of the United Nations can be classified as rhetorical hyperstyle. It differs from the traditional method of journalism by its "traditional connection with the scientific method and the preservation of some characteristics of this method". Above all, it is possible to use words and phrases arising from the speaker's desire to impact his audience emotionally. Communication is the main function of formal style. The following can be considered important characteristics of the discourse: the form of the associated text, its dependence on non-linguistic factors, the direction of the event and the intended social impact (12, 170). The official speech of the United Nations Organization is an institutional speech or text, that is, the speech of a particular state institution, which is a complex cultural phenomenon in spiritual and material terms and which embodies diplomatic, political and cultural characteristics. Formal communication is a type of communication between people in which people set the goal of achieving a work-related goal. This objective is of two types: objective and informative. The objective is a material thing; objective information means new information and knowledge.

Considering the importance of discourse in terms of the text concept, it is possible to observe that official departmental texts are characterized as a form of discourse. Since discourse is used to analyze texts and examine intercultural relations, we believe it is legitimate to clarify its nature, main classifications and differences with respect to the text (12, 175). This refers to the interdiscursive structure of texts, that is, to their discursive capacity. The first is to reveal its main structural features in an atypical situation (belonging to another type of speech), and expand one's borders, "enter" another discourse. That is, such texts contain terminological words related to various fields of human knowledge, incomplete expressions, new words of the author, etc. Such characteristics of UN discourse,

particularly its political component, impose limitations on the translator, especially regarding accuracy.

The research uses “formal discourse”, the conceptual tool developed by Burton and Carlen, to analyze formal discursive practice. Burton and Carlen conceptualize and define official discourse as follows (2, 44). “Official discourse is the systematization of forms of argumentation that declare the legal and administrative rationality of the State. Discourse is a necessary requirement of political and ideological hegemony. This hegemonic discourse is not only the request for the inclusion of the dominant classes in politics, but its pedagogy also serves to maintain the trust and knowledge of the hegemonic segments... The creation of a discourse of unity and solidarity between parties through production periodically manifests itself in manifestos and in the dominant consciousness of the State” (2, 52).

The functions of formal discourse include integration, legitimacy, and trust. Inclusion means providing information to the public in a way that supports state control strategies (Van Dijk, 1994). Based on the principles mentioned above, it can be said that the official practice of the president's speech aims to ensure the legitimacy and justification of state practice through the systematization of evidence (Burton and Carlen, 1979). Furthermore, it was established that the speakers' official speeches to the public aim to “politically locate” them in the current political order.

List of used literature

1. Федоровская О.А. О жанровой классификации научно-технических документов и их науч. трудов под ред. М.Я. Цивиллинг. — М.: 1989. — С. 37–51.
2. Burton F., Carlen P. Official Discourse. — London: Routledge, 1979. — pp. 43-52.
3. Cohen R. Language and Negotiations: A middle East Lexicon. In Jovan Kurbalija, Hannah Slavik. Language and Diplomacy Malta: Diploprojects. 2001. — P. 67-91.
4. Cohen R. Language and Conflict Resolution: The Limits of English. — NY.: International Studies Review. 2001. — P. 51–67.
5. Jørgensen M., Louise, P. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. – 2002. — P. 1–5.
6. Larsson B. Ett Delat Rum: Agonistisk Feminism och Folklig Mobilisering – Exemplet Kvinnofolkhögskolan. — Halmstad: Tryck Bulls Graphics. 2010. — P. 34-49.
7. Nick S. Use of language in diplomacy. In Jovan Kurbalija, Hannah Slavik (eds). Language and Diplomacy Malta: Diploprojects. McAlevy, The Arab-Israeli Conflict. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1998. — P. 39-47
8. Thompson, N. Power and Empowerment. — Oxford: Russell House Publishing, 2007. — P. 49-57.

9. Van D. T. *Prejudice in Discourse*. — Amsterdam: JBPC. 1984. 105 p.
10. Van D. T. *Racism and the Press*. — London: Routledge. 1991. 209 p.
11. Van D. T. *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis*. *Discourse and Society*. 1993. — P. 249-283.
12. Van D.T. *Discourse and Cognition in Society*. In Crowley, D. and Mitchell, D. (eds.), *Communication Theory Today*. Stanford: Stanford Un. 1994. — P. 163-177.
13. Van D.T. *Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity*. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. — London: Sage Publications, 2001. — 108 p.
14. Williams, C. *Tradition and Change in Legal English: A Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse*. — Berlin: Peter Lang. 2005. — P. 11–22.

References

1. Fedorovskaya O. A., Tsvilling M. *O zhanrovoy klassifikatsii nauchno-tekhnicheskikh dokumentov i ikh nauch* (On the genre classification of scientific and technical documents and their scientific content), Moscow, 1989, pp. 37–48.
2. Burton F., Carlen P. *Official discourse*. London. 1979, 48 p.
3. Cohen, R. *Language and Negotiations: A Middle East Lexicon*. In Jovan Kurbalija, Hannah Slavik (eds). *Language and Diplomacy Malta: Diploprojects*, 2001, pp. 67-91.
4. Cohen. R. *Language and Conflict Resolution: The Limits of English*. *International Studies Review* 3 (1) 200,67 p.
5. Jørgensen, M., Louise P. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. 2002. 1-5 pp.
6. Larsson, B. Ett D. R. *Agonistisk feminism och folklig mobilisering – examplelet kvinnofolkhögskolan*. Halmstad: Tryck bulls graphics. 2010, pp. 38-34.
7. Nick, S. *Use of language in diplomacy*. In Jovan Kurbalija, Hannah Slavik. *Language and Diplomacy Malta: Diploprojects*. McAlevy, T. *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1998. pp. 39-47.
8. Thompson, N. *Power and Empowerment*. Oxford: Russell House Publishing Ltd. 2007. 5 p.
9. Van D. T. *Prejudice in Discourse*. Amsterdam: JBPC, 1984, 105 p.
- 10 Van D. T. *Racism and the Press*. London, 1991, 209 p.
11. Van D. T. *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis*. *Discourse and Society*, 4, 1993, pp. 249-283.
12. Van D. T. *Discourse and Cognition in Society*. *Communication Theory Today*. Stanford: Stanford Un. 1994,177 p.
13. Van D. T. *Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity*. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications. 2001, 108 p.

14. Williams C. *Tradition and Change in Legal English: A Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang. 2005, 11 p.