METALANGUAGE MODELS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Mokhira Eshanova,
a Senior Lecturer, Specialized Branch of Tashkent State University of Law
mohiraladybird@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
The axiom of letter and symbol is based on two fundamental meta-models of political science. The letter structure dominated the science until the early 1920s, defining the boundaries of "science" in the name of consciousness. Despite the contradictions between the principles of learning the letter and the symbol, in the political discourse these principles are complementary, that is, principles that complement each other's constructive, methodological shortcomings. This article scrutinizes the principles on which the theoretical metalanguage models that determine the structure of political science discourse are based and derived from the specificity of the letter and symbol.

Keywords: metalanguage, letter, symbol, meta-style, discourse, interpretation

Introduction

There is an opportunity to create methodological models of political science meta-style on the basis of language as a transcendental object that prevents the definition of political knowledge: literal and symbolic models. In this process, the following should be distinguished: a) symbolic metalanguage as a method of political research and metaparadigm (literal metalanguage) - a set of epistemological axioms that translate the original policy and help to turn it into a theoretical form; b) political knowledge - a symbol (letter) in the form of a direct structure, which is realized and transmitted in the form of theories, schemes, concepts.

The letter reveals the hidden aspect, subjugates it to the invisible - experience, logic, reason, common sense, the symbol hides the open side, reveals that political reality is not discrete, it has different layers, in addition to the aspects represented by the letter principle. In other words, the letter is a scientific metalanguage, a principle that creates a micro-model of "science", and real conclusions are created and legitimized by this principle. Such a creative principle is determined by the analysis of research metalanguage, i.e., text-context interdependence, where paradigms, methods, and context of value goals justify the validity and scientificity of political knowledge (text). Consideration of the historical set of political theories and approaches through the structure of political metalanguage, in turn, is associated with the origin of language in the initial form and any intelligible meaning, the differentiation of meanings in political communication and their exchange. The absolute first pattern (matrix) that we cannot create at all in our imagination is the condition of thinking, language, which distinguishes letters and symbols in a stylistic sense. Therefore, the policy mold, i.e.

the rules of the game, the forms of imagination, and the principles of methodology in the field of politics can be constructed as a metalanguage model. Language is divided into spontaneous literal (formed) and symbolic (hermeneutic) models. These models have historical dynamics that can be easily determined in the reduction of political theory to language. In addition, an approach to politics (authority) from the point of view of language theory frees the researcher from distinguishing the historical form of science, in particular, rationality in the Enlightenment and the Modern Ages.

Language uses politics as a tool for the theoretical subject, so political action can be thought of as a letter, a symbol, or a link to speech or text. The debate over the "end of ideology" leads to the emergence of a "different" model of the meta-style of political science, organized according to the possibilities and logic of the symbol, which stems from a move from structuralism to poststructuralism. With scientific metalanguage change, the forms of thinking, their context, and, as a result, perceptions of power also change.

DEVELOPMENT

Opinions about letters and symbols are highly conflicting. Often letters and symbols are likened to each other and recognized as synonyms. French linguist Tsvetan Todorov writes: "On the one hand, in practice, letters always become symbols, and each letter grows with the number of symbols. On the other hand, statements of a theoretical nature state that everything is a letter, that there are no symbols or that they do not exist." It is important not only to distinguish the letter and the symbol, but also to contrast them.

The contrast of letters and symbols in Greek philosophy stems from two forms of language, and therefore from two forms of speech comprehension: prescriptive interpretation (positivism) and denotative interpretation (modern hermeneutic practice), such as the antagonism of logos and myth as interpretations or reprimands. This is the origin of two conceptual forms of cognition: satirical rhetoric and logic based on analysis. The principle of logos in modern understanding (given to the language of modern science by Descartes and Bacon) is compared to the model of rationalism, which considers the human mind as basic, but replaces it with any transcendental basis and places objectivity in the immanent realm. There are contradictions between the interpretations that knowledge is private, subjective, and non-transparent, that it cannot always be passed on to someone else, and that scientific interpretation implies that it can only be passed on to another person without harm. While the potential for interpretation is not always comprehensible, it is precisely its structures that have been declared dominant and universal.

Scientific thinking seeks to resolve the contradictions described above, that is, the division of language into letters and symbols, by turning language into a means of knowing. Here, in the opinion of M. Foucault "one can observe the struggle between the methods of interpretation and formation. The first method seeks to speak within

its means, to approach it, to speak in its language without its participation (according to Freud, unconsciousness, according to Heidegger, poetic thinking), while others (Russell, Wittgenstein) try to control language through the law that determines what is said ."

Historically, the content and structure of politics, its goals and values, in other words, "meta-stories" (J.F. Liotar's phrase), which are paradigms of immanent political thinking, have changed. In ancient times, philosophical systems emerged as the normative discourse in the political space. Management systems, political ethics, forms of political participation, values and dreams depended on the macrocosm and microcosm in the dominant philosophical system. With the advent of Christianity, politics also began to take shape in the form of religious doctrine. Getting rid of the influence of religion and the emergence of nation-states requires the connection of metalanguage with politics and the rational sciences.

Immanent political theories and schemes seek to present policy unchanging and independent of the "other" order. They implement the political technologies of power. The introduction of the symbol into political theory is associated with the privileges of the letter structure and the "crisis" or post-modernist "elimination" of the political ideology based on it, which is legitimized. We are primarily interested in the share of the traditions of thought - hermeneutic, phenomenological, dialectical, structuralist, the factors that have a significant impact on the metalanguage models of political discourse.

According to Gegel, "A letter is different from a symbol": a symbol is an observation that represents more or less the meaning; and the letter is the content of the observation. " Here the meaning of the symbol is transparent and the meaning of the letter is hidden, vague. That is, what is understood by the letter does not appear. The nature of the letter is closely related to its agreement, the conventional link as a result of the contract.

A.F. Losev, working on dialectical traditions, formed the symbolic axiom: "Any letter can have infinite meanings, that is, it can be a symbol." Here the symbol is marked on the opposite side, derived from the letter. A. Losev describes the letter as "a movement of human thinking that reflects this or that system of semantic relations that exist in thought, independent of people." But on the other hand, Losev writes, "The meaning of a letter is a sign made out of its own context," which leads to its variability. However, interactions that do not fit into all patterns are eliminated by establishing a single, normally accepted context. The sign is always thought out, and all thought signs are the result of meanings. Thus, the meaning of a letter is a reflection of what is being understood. The symbol, on the other hand, emerges as a generalized and ideological or expressive structure for what it reflects. If the letter relies on the logic of referential similarity, the logic of the symbol emphasizes, first and foremost, a particular way of meaning formation and thought articulation. Thus, the symbol of an object is the meaning that created and constructed it. The symbol appears as a product model. The

symbol is not an abstract generalization of objects of the same type, but rather indicates their similarity.

Relying on the hermeneutic approach, P. Riker writes: "I consider any structure of meaning a symbol, in which the primary, original, and direct meaning also has an indirect, secondary, different meaning, which can be understood only through this meaning."[1] According to Ricker's definition, it is not possible to understand a symbol in one sense, that is, to always determine its meaning, it can only be interpreted. When the problem is posed in this way, the interpretation emerges as a factor of thinking aimed at revealing the hidden meaning. The hermeneutic practice of interpreting texts is based on the perception of meaning.

K.G.Yung relies on the above definition of the symbol. It stems from the need to distinguish letters and symbols in language. Letters are not strictly descriptive means. They make no sense, they only represent the objects to which they belong. Yung refers to symbols as "a term, name, or image that is known in everyday life but has an additional meaning along with its own meaning." Of course, Yung is referring to an "unconscious" aspect that is not clear. Yung's perspective takes us to areas beyond the realm of common sense and where it can be identified from the outside. Man usually refers to symbolic terms when it is necessary to interpret concepts and events that have been decided beyond his original understanding and common sense. Therefore, any religion, science, or art uses symbolic language[2].

Symbols are always more or less unconscious, and the unconscious is always symbolic because it fits into any form of previous logic and rationality. Rationality is a predominant feature of individual thinking, while collective consciousness is a thin veil of consciousness, while unconscious thinking is symbolic and divine, beyond the realm of reason.

Considering unconscious thinking as a symbolic discourse of something else shaped as language, J. Lacan interprets symbolism as a substitute for something that does not exist.

The symbolic aspect enters political science after everything at the theoretical level. Any "non-exclusive third" policy letter models will need to be translated into the dominant meta-style. Thus, politics is analyzed at the level of common sense, free from symbolic pathology, the inability of science to place it in the imaginary space that forms the "classical episteme" hindered its universality in the field of knowledge.

Symbols have always existed in politics. But in the rationalized situation, the symbols have been singled out as something "alien," transcendental, and even "superfluous". Symbols are considered to belong to the "irrational environment" of politics. Therefore, the introduction of metalanguage symbolic theories and models into political science took place in the intermediate fields of the sciences, which were

[1] Rikyor P. Germenevtika. Etika. Politika (Moskovskiye lektsii i intervyu). // Per. s fr. - M., 1995. –S.160.
[2] Yung K. G. Izbranniye raboti. Per. i sost. A. M. Rutkevicha. – SPb.:. RXGA, 2014. –S.288.

initially less defined by the object under study. Symbolism entered political science through the "back door": political psychology, mass and leadership psychology, language theory, political philosophy, manipulation theory, and political hermeneutics as text analysis. However, after confirming the effectiveness and relevance of symbolic metalanguages to the political sphere, the question of the possible coherence and interdependence of symbolic and political objects arose.

The decline of "big ideologies" plays an important role in the formation of a new situation in politics. "The end of politics" means the end of policy as an ideological and general phenomenon, at least the dominance of meta-language models and concepts that claim the status of universal structures that interpret politics.

Power is searching for new ways of legitimization in the new symbolic discourse on politics, which, firstly, leads to a change in the normative nature of power, which represents the system, and secondly, to the emergence of new ideologies of methods and laws of influence. This is the source of both the "end of politics" and the "postmodern state" after the end of the "great ideological method" in politics.

Until the twentieth century, symbolism was compared to imperfection and a departure from the scientific method of thinking. There are distinctions between flawless scientific knowledge that deals with systematic letters and mythology that is subject to symbolism. The symbol, therefore, is usually based on analysis, which is the basis for the creation of true scientific knowledge. With the formation of statements about poststructuralism, psychoanalysis, hermeneutics, the ideology of political knowledge, and therefore the large number of probable norms, the letter became an axiom became a problem. Eventually, science becomes more focused on a symbol that makes world life more complete and rich. The policy, represented by symbolic metalangauge, is once again finding its "lost" transcendental criterion.

The letter is at the same time a structure that expresses a valuable principle and policy. It is based on the classical meta-methodology of political science as a comprehensible and expressive, similarity of life and thought. Here the political imagination operates only in the context of the completeness and similarity of existence, words and things. As a principle of letter recognition, it is intended to define universal structures, general concepts, and schemes that encompass all existing things. The letter indicates the predominance of intellectually accessible ideas over the emotional diversity of experience, normative objects over empirical objects, and nomotic objects over ideographic objects (M.Ilin).

Other creatures that "conscious" human beings think symbolically of — animals, children, savages, and lunatics — are devoid of the defects of symbolic thinking. Various forms of culturological and ideological prohibitions have precluded the notion of scientific meta-symbolism, which is comparable to flawless universal knowledge based on "analytical features".

Until recently, "the wild symbols of others, the depiction of their symbols, in essence, turned our symbols into mere wild images. However, our thinking actually uses the

methods used by "primitive people". The difficult part of distinguishing personal thinking from fraud is that it interferes with the personal habits and foundations of thinking. In his time, he exposed a number of centrisms: ethnocentrism (K. Levi-Strauss), anthropocentrism (M. Foucault), logocentrism (J. Derrida).

Thus, knowledge - the appearance of power as a resemblance to power - is replaced by a symbol of tolerance for "other things", which leads to a change in attitudes to the study of the universe, as well as changes in the universe itself. Authorities cannot form a hidden ideological discourse of politics using the literal meta-methodology of political study. Political knowledge goes beyond the "classical epistemology" of the letter (M. Foucault) and inevitably reveals its symbolism, which is reflected in the dissatisfaction with the literal metalanguage and "universal", "out-of-date" political theories and models. The need for more effective legitimization of power is compounded by the search for new methodological principles of knowledge. Political ideologues are given such an opportunity by the symbolic structure that makes up the political space of the imagination.

As a principle of learning, the symbol focuses on the original and the individual. The symbol is based on metaphorical - similarity and metonomicity - harmonization according to similarity. The heuristicity of the symbol is determined by the fact that the literal metatylism of politics allows it to go beyond the existing and dominant self-similarity. The symbol focuses on imperfection and difference, it focuses on what is happening. The symbol connects scientific thinking with imagination. If the letter rejects time, the symbol focuses on something related to time.

Symbols allow access to the space of transition and recovery, and the structure of the letters allows us to identify the factors that led to the creation of such a ratio of knowledge-power, which seeks to subdue time, to instill confidence in its immutability and naturalness. The symbol is internally contradictory, its meaning is variable, and the letter is a metaphysical principle by which metaphysical considerations are created. Therefore, the letter is a metaphysics in the true sense of the word, outside the realm of "political physics." The point is, first and foremost, that universal ideas take precedence over what they mean, political practice. Because of this, the metaphysics of the letter is equated with the idea of how ideas are realized, of something beyond time, of something connected with time, of unity as a whole, of ideology as the resultant superiority of infinity. That is, the normative, conventional subjective laws of policy as the subject of a convention are falsely compared to the objective laws of nature.

The symbol is associated with ambiguity. This is the interpretation of the political imagination and its dissimilarity in space. A letter is a meaning, and a symbol is a symbol that has many meanings. The meaning of symbols is often determined by the context, the situation, the form in the symbol takes precedence over the content. It can be said that the letter treats the symbol as if the original meaning of the word had reacted to its portable meaning. Therefore, symbolic meaning is associated with

various means of artistic representation - metaphor, figurative word (words and phrases in the figurative sense, figurative meaning, analogy, avoidance, change of the original meaning. Such means do not express the original meaning, they express the meaning using analogy, gesture, irony. For example, A.Losev directly distinguishes schemas, symbols, and allegories according to their perceived and expressive proportions. If the scheme (plan) in practice reflects the illogicality of the original meaning and the resulting specific content, the allegory shows the complete superiority of the plan of expression over the content plan, and the symbol is a criterion for complementing and enriching each other.

Another important difference is that the symbol is legendary in origin. Here we rely on A.Losev's description of the legend in "Dialectics of Myth" and "Mythical Dialectics". In this case, the myth is defined as a "strange personal history", a way of being free from the scientific model of reality, which has imperatives such as personalized life or, more simply, generality, objectivity, systemicity.

According to the Platonic idea, meaning is formed along with thought. Content usually makes sense even in a strictly defined context. Its relativity, which is determined by a conditionally fixed coordinate system, also follows from this. The meaning of "on the other side" and "before" is to affirm truth / falsehood. Only a fictional statement can be true / false. Contradictory content opposes meaningless content. In other words, it is only possible to load this or that meaning into a thought-provoking sentence. The semiological aspect of the content is always based on this or that model of interpretation, finding it depends on the method used.

The scope of meanings is related to specific political practices and value systems. In this sense, the letter is related to the category that defines rational consciousness and meaning. The symbol is related to the consciousness behind the meaning, and this consciousness is not fully controlled by external instances because it is contradictory. "The main difference between the mind and the consciousness is to overcome the contradictions in the realm of the mind and to allow for the contradictions in the realm of the mind." I.Kant connects the scientific mind with talent, the mind with genius.

The symbol relies on marginal meanings, enlivens the negative side of things, and the letter is associated with a two-sided code of truth / falsehood, norm / pathology. The M.Foucault norm is a method of legitimizing the ruling discourse of power, through which both scientific study and the practice of punishment can be disseminated throughout society. In Europe, for example, Protestantism, imbued with a new notion of labor and a new work ethic, such as "labor as a prayer," formed by looking at the poor as pious, extracurricular people who should be separated from the working class, showed a completely new pattern (matrix) of meanings. This pattern is the classical epistem of enlightenment, which, within the framework of the new historical epistem, defined the ways of studying the corpus of social sciences, their problematic and methodological compatibility. With the help of similar methodological aspirations, modern concepts of mind, truth, power, health, etc. were formed.

The historical situation in which truth and norm are likened to each other, when truth is squeezed out by norm, and falls into the background, is interesting because the letter structure is always viewed as a normative structure. In this way, the struggle for power emerges in the form of a struggle to establish the norm, to include its own interests in it, while adhering to the structure of the dual code of truth. This struggle is intensifying in all spheres of society - science, politics, economics, law.

The intensity and popularity of the political movement is further enhanced during the implementation of Enlightenment ideas. Historically, any complex action that takes a person beyond his or her life experience and daily goals, bringing him or her into the social world, has been effectively accomplished using symbolic structures of meaning transfer. The symbol interprets political power, which, in turn, seeks to "perpetuate" the symbol, prolonging its political eternity by interpreting the actual immanent political situation in its own way with the immutable meaning of the symbol. The symbol will become a topical symbol in politics as a result of this move.[3] Since the existing subjects of political power are not eternal, they are reinterpreted by another subject. The derailment of the formed political frame allows for a struggle of alternative views. The search for differences is more important than the search for universal similarities, formalism gives way to interpretation, positivism to hermeneutics, ideology to utopia, power to opposition. Ideological symbols have lost their absolute meaning and become a "false consciousness" outside the closed political context.

The contradiction between the literal and symbolic metalanguage of politics continues in a transparent and sharp way through the "acratic" and "encratic" debates of metalangauge in political science: hermeneutics and positivism. The literal meta-style of political science is encratic, opposed to it by an acratic, i.e., non-doxical (paradoxical) and non-authoritative language that is critical of the dominant discourse of the meta-style of power. The dominant discourse of political science is always "encratic," that is, it is concerned with the self-interpretation of power: in which the apology of power dominates the code of independent scientific truth.

CONCLUSION

The encratic metalanguage seems to be a natural language, and it is the language of public culture (press, radio, television), and in a sense, the language of life, of different opinions (doxes); the power of the encratic language stems from its contradictions - it is both hidden (difficult to grasp) and attractive (impossible to avoid) at the same time ". In other words, the accuracy of the language structure is artificially created. Clear language, dox language, is the language of authority, in which precision is an effective

---

[3] Delbryuk B. Vvedeniye v izucheniye yazika: Iz istorii i metodologii sravnitelnogo yazikoznaniya. Per. s nem. Seriya:Lingvisticheskoye naslediye XIX veka Izd.3 2010. –S.152.

way of defining credibility and naturalness is an effective way of defining norms of authority.

Incratic metalanguage regulates political decisions and actions. Such discourse serves to legitimize the elite who promote the idea of efficiency in order to maintain and justify the status quo in politics. The basic concept of the paradoxical metatyl belonging to Demos is to address the issue of political justice. Justice is a condition of legitimizing a political movement focused on the practice of struggle for freedom, the establishment of a new form of justice in class relations. In other words, the political ethics of the elite is based on the idea of efficiency, while the ethics of the masses is based on the idea of justice.

The goal of the encratic metalanguage is to attempt to restore the Tower of Babel in the imagination of the authorities. The myth of the Tower of Babel in Derrida's interpretation is that its construction is transcendent, the creation of a divine language in which language and the universe, power and society, elites and masses, etc., intervene within the framework of common objective reality. Consequently, its derailment leads to an increase in the incompatibility of the universe and language, class antagonisms, insurmountable boundaries and differences, and a decline in humanity's desire to create a common, i.e., divine language.

References

1. Rikyor P. Germenevtika. Etika. Politika (Moskovskiye lektsii i intervyu). // Per. s fr. - M., 1995. –S.160.
2. Yung K. G. Izbranniye raboti. Per. i sost. A. M. Rutkevicha. – SPb.:. RXGA, 2014. – S.288.
3. Delbryuk B. Vvedeniye v izucheniye yazika: Iz istorii i metodologii sravnitelnogo yazikoznaniya. Per. s nem. Seriya:Lingvisticheskoye naslediye XIX veka Izd.3 2010. –S.152.
4. Yuldashbaevna, M. E. (2020). Theoretical-Practical And Epistemological Review Of Political Linguistics. The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 2(09), 470-483. ttps://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume02I ssue09-72
5. Yuldashbaevna, M. E. (2021). LINGUISTIC-PARADIGMATIC FEATURES OF POLITICAL IDEOLOGY. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, Vol. 11, Issue 10, October 2021, 850-855, DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2021.02175.3.
6. Schmidt, Der Diskurs des Radikalen Konstrukti-vismus, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main (1996), 7. Aufl.
7. Yuzefovich N.G., Political discourse and cross-cultural communication / N.G. Yuzefovich // Interpretation. Understanding. Translation., collection of scientific articles / St. Petersburg State University of Economics and Finance;

8. Honazarov K., Globalisation and language philosophy. – T., Institute of Philosophy and Law, 2009. –136p.

9. Mamashukurov D.A., Socio-political and spiritual bases of developing the Uzbek language as a state one, Dissertation for Candidacy of Philosophical Sciences. – T., 1999. –136 p.

10. Oukhvanova-Shmygova I.F., Cause based analysis of a political text / Methodology of researching a political discourse: Actual problems of content based analysis of socio-political texts: collection of research worsks / Belorussian State University, under the review of I.F. Oukhvanova-Shmygova, 1st issue. – Minsk, 1998. – p.p. 45-52.

11. Lotman Y.M., Lectures on structural poetics // Y.M. Lotman and Tartu-*Moscow Semiotic School*. – M., 1994. P.Ricoeur, The Conflict of Interpretations. – M., 1995.

12. Sapir E., Selected publications on language studies and culture studies. – M., 1993.

13. Heidegger M., Language. – SP., 1991. G.Frager, Thought // Logics. Philosophy. Language. – M., 1987.

14. Foucault M., What is an author? Discourse order // Will to knowledge. – M., 1997.

15. Amanova Nodirabegim Furkatovna. (2022). effective method of teaching. conference zone, 53–55. Retrieved from http://www.conferencezone.org/index.php/cz/article/view/124

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

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