MODERN TENDENCIES IN DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE: A LINGUISTIC AND COMMUNICATIVE STUDY

Umirov Bahodir
Head of the HR department
Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute
Xidirov Olmosbek Abdurazak o‘g‘li
Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute
Doctoral student
Email: olmosbekxidirov@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. This article investigates contemporary developments in diplomatic language, focusing on the linguistic and communicative analysis of diplomatic terminology within the sphere of international relations. It highlights the defining features of diplomatic discourse and its vocabulary - such as neutrality of tone, formality, and precision -illustrated through lexical examples. The study emphasizes that a diplomat’s professionalism, grounded in comprehensive knowledge of their field, plays a crucial role in shaping intercultural communication and influencing the global geopolitical landscape. Overall, the research offers both a descriptive and theoretical perspective on diplomatic language.

KEYWORDS: diplomatic language, international relations, intercultural communication, linguistic analysis, political discourse, negotiation strategies

INTRODUCTION. Interest in the language of diplomacy has historically arisen from examining the parallels between the complexity of diplomatic activity - such as negotiations - and its representation in media discourse. Central issues in diplomatic practice include establishing relationships, reaching agreements, adhering to norms of diplomatic propriety, and understanding the roles of ambiguity, manipulation, and implicit communication [1]. Studying the effectiveness of a nation’s diplomatic language is essential, as it reflects its political, international, and cultural significance while influencing national stability and social cohesion. In the sphere of foreign policy, the intellectual capacity of diplomatic language must be substantial, encompassing scientific, technical, political, social, economic, and cultural domains. It is also worth emphasizing that the values of tolerance, cooperation, friendship, partnership, and consensus in international relations are realized primarily through the medium of language [2].

METHODOLOGY. This study adopts a qualitative approach, applying linguistic, communicative, and discourse analysis to examine contemporary trends in diplomatic language. The research draws on political speeches, diplomatic documents, and negotiation transcripts, focusing on lexical, semantic, and stylistic features such as neutrality, precision, and metaphorization. A comparative perspective is used to highlight differences across languages and cultures, while a linguacognitive framework helps reveal how diplomatic discourse reflects worldviews and strategies of persuasion. Both primary sources, including official documents and speeches, and secondary academic literature inform the analysis, with the aim of identifying the communicative mechanisms that shape effective diplomacy and intercultural understanding.

RESLUTS AND DISCUSSION. An analysis of political and diplomatic language in the discourse between representatives or ambassadors of different nations reveals the cognitive background of each side - their knowledge, strategies of psychological influence, communicative culture, intellect, and personal interests - expressed through language. Political and diplomatic communication, therefore, follows specific rules, norms, cultural pragmatics, and stylistic conventions. For this reason, contemporary linguistics places great importance on applying linguacognitive approaches that explore how language shapes worldviews and facilitates the understanding of political processes [3].

This research focuses on identifying the linguistic, theoretical, and practical foundations of contemporary political and diplomatic language - encompassing diplomatic vocabulary, official documents, political discourse, and the metaphorization of political thought. It employs innovative linguistic and communicative approaches with the aim of enhancing the country’s intellectual potential from a political standpoint.

Diplomatic language functions as an international medium of politics, distinct from the expressive style of journalism or literature. It is concise, precise, and marked by classical simplicity, avoiding unnecessary embellishments. Beyond providing accurate evidence, diplomatic language also embodies deeper analysis and generalizations of governmental policies and actions. Indeed, a diplomat’s most powerful tool is language itself [4].

Diplomacy represents the implementation of a state’s foreign policy objectives by government institutions, their representatives, or authorized envoys abroad. It is commonly regarded as a distinct form of state activity carried out through official communication aimed at promoting national interests and achieving foreign policy goals.

Diplomacy also serves as a vital instrument of foreign policy - a collection of practical means, tools, and methods through which a state pursues its international objectives and establishes relations with other nations. Today, diplomacy holds primary importance, with most other foreign policy instruments functioning in a subordinate role to it.

In many countries, diplomacy is regarded as both a scientific discipline and a methodology for ensuring the peaceful coexistence of states. It is often defined as the study of political strategies and methods aimed at fostering interstate friendship, building partnerships, and resolving conflicts peacefully. The history of diplomacy, along with diplomatic law, service, and protocol, are considered integral areas of this field. In certain contexts, diplomacy is equated with negotiation itself, understood as the practice of managing international relations through dialogue and bargaining [5].

It's important to note that confidentiality and secrecy have been integral parts of diplomacy since its inception. In the modern world, numerous researchers on this topic have noted the gradual disappearance of a type of diplomacy that deemphasizes political tactics such as confidentiality.

One of the typical characteristics of diplomatic language is a somewhat subdued tone, a certain understatement. It's fair to say that the actual weight of words and terms in diplomatic jargon is much greater than that of the same words in "normal" everyday speech [6].

An examination of commonly used terms in diplomatic negotiations - such as the word “concern” - reveals that, when translated into plain language, it may imply: *“we believe your government is exerting unfriendly, even hostile, pressure on our country.”* This illustrates that diplomatic language carries multiple layers - linguistic, semantic, and metaphorical. Such features are employed to maximize the effectiveness of spoken or written communication, enhance message delivery, and achieve greater persuasive impact - whether to convince, influence, or dissuade an interlocutor. Ultimately, the outcome of negotiations often depends on the diplomat’s chosen communicative strategy: one guided by restraint, neutrality, tact, and courtesy, or one marked by ultimatums, categorical assertions, emotional displays, and a departure from objective representation of current events.

In contemporary international negotiations, representatives of states, corporations, and organizations often come from diverse linguistic backgrounds. To overcome these differences, they rely either on interpreters or, increasingly, on a common third language - a bridge language—for direct communication. More often than not, this language is English. Its prevalence in diplomatic and business negotiations fosters the perception among native speakers that English is neutral, unbiased, and capable of conveying the negotiation process with complete accuracy and objectivity. Consequently, the adoption of English as a bridge language by non-native speakers is often seen as creating a more balanced linguistic environment [7].

This claim can only be supported within the closed framework of discussions between monolingual English speakers, relying exclusively on English-language materials.

It should be added that the semantic analysis of the language of negotiations is conditional, therefore not defined and in any case open to various interpretations.

Reconstructing and interpreting the language of negotiations is crucial for grasping what native speakers intend through particular descriptions and expressions used in their own language. Linguo-communicative analysis helps uncover the meanings of words and texts, thereby revealing key tendencies and patterns. Distinct semantic fields, unfamiliar terminology, and implicit cultural assumptions often become visible only when the vocabularies of different languages are compared. In fact, linguistic diversity remains one of the most prominent characteristics of the international arena. [8]

However, in the field of international relations, the fact of linguistic and, consequently, semantic diversity is given little attention and the dominance of English is assumed.

International negotiations clearly illustrate this point, as they involve participants who speak different native languages and interpret reality in diverse ways. Yet, discussions of negotiation practices often treat language and linguistic differences as secondary concerns, leaving crucial issues of understanding and interpretation largely overlooked [9].

Another reason for overlooking linguistic diversity is the assumption that English has achieved status as the dominant global language and serves a variety of purposes, capturing the original meanings of negotiators even if their native language is not English. Quite often, the superficial form of English conceals important nuances of the native language, the semantic nuances of the original. This view is supported by a comparative study of negotiating vocabulary.

Because many words, even the simplest at first glance, are polysemic, meaning they have multiple meanings, it's common to find that a word and its equivalent in another language encompass overlapping but distinct semantic fields. Translation problems can arise in this

case for two reasons. First, a word may be deliberately chosen to convey more than one of its distinct meanings. More complex are cases where words combine categories of experience or behavior that are then unconsciously perceived by native speakers as naturally paired.

As noted earlier, understanding key negotiating terms plays an important role in the subsequent formulation of negotiating positions, the content of arguments, drafting options, post-agreement rhetoric, and future implementation.

Diplomacy research typically focuses on the general meaning rather than the means of language. However, studying the use of language in diplomacy can lead to a better understanding of how diplomacy functions and why some diplomatic processes are more successful than others. By critically examining various aspects of diplomatic language, one can improve one's understanding of both the explicit and implicit messages sent by world leaders and other political actors, thereby enhancing one's own ability to communicate in the most effective and appropriate ways.

References:

1. Логунова, К. А. (2014). Эвфемизмы в дипломатическом языке. *Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики*, (12, ч. 2), 109–112. Тамбов: Грамота.
2. Аветисян Ашот Альбертович (2023). РОЛЬ ЯЗЫКА В РЕАЛИЗАЦИИ КУЛЬТУРНОЙ ДИПЛОМАТИИ И МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ. Социально-гуманитарные знания, (8), 46-48.
3. Керимов, Р. Д., & Федянина, Л. И. (2015). Лингвокогнитивные подходы к изучению социальной коммуникации: методический и методологический аспекты. СибСкрипт, (2-3 (62)), 165-169.
4. Решетняк, И. А. (2012). Использование эвфемизмов в интервью политиков и дипломатов в англоязычной прессе. Язык и культура (Новосибирск), (3), 72-76.
5. Barston, R. P. (2014). Modern diplomacy (4th ed.). Routledge.
6. Логунова, К. А. (2015). Язык дипломатии как язык для специальных целей. Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики, (6-2), 124–126. Тамбов: Грамота.
7. Юрченко Наталья Юрьевна (2017). АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК И ЯЗЫКОВАЯ ПОЛИТИКА. Вестник Университета мировых цивилизаций, (15-2), 166-171.