

## EUPHEMISMS AS A REFLECTION OF NATIONAL MENTALITY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK POLITICAL SPEECH

Scientific advisor **Ruziyeva Nafisa Zarifovna**

*PhD teacher of English Linguistics*

*Department Bukhara State University*

*n.z.ruziyeva@buxdu.uz*

**Qudratova Kamola Jamol qizi**

*Master student at Bukhara State University qudratovakamola2@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** *This research provides a comparative analysis of how euphemisms function within English and Uzbek political discourse. It explores how these linguistic tools serve as mirrors for national mentality, examining their role in softening political realities, managing public perception, and maintaining social norms. By investigating the linguistic features and cultural contexts of both languages, the study highlights how these nations use language to shape communicative strategies and express their unique worldviews.*

**Keywords:** *Comparative Linguistics, political discourse, political linguistics, national mentality, cultural linguistics, political communication, cross-cultural analysis.*

**Introduction.** At its core, a euphemism is a linguistic device used to take a blunt, harsh, or uncomfortable concept and frame it in a softer, more palatable way. In the high-stakes arena of political discourse, euphemisms are not just decorative; they are strategic tools. Political actors utilize them to manage communication, influence public opinion, and obscure difficult truths. Comparing English and Uzbek political rhetoric allows us to see how each culture’s distinct history, psychology, and social structure shapes the way their leaders communicate. **The English Political Perspective: Pragmatism and Diplomacy** In the political contexts of the United Kingdom and the United States, euphemisms are predominantly used to avoid direct confrontation, maintain diplomatic appeal, and soften criticism. The English political mentality is deeply rooted in pragmatism and a tradition of understatement.

Common examples include: **“Collateral damage”**: Used to mask the gravity of civilian casualties. **“Downsizing”**: A gentler way to describe mass layoffs. **“Enhanced interrogation techniques”**: An euphemistic label for acts of torture. Linguistically, these expressions often rely on Latin or French-derived formal vocabulary and metaphors to create distance between the speaker and the raw reality of the action.

**The Uzbek Political Perspective: Harmony and Respect** Conversely, in Uzbek political discourse, the use of euphemisms is primarily driven by the desire to maintain social harmony, show respect, and uphold traditional values. The concept of **“face-saving”**—avoiding public bluntness or criticism—plays a significant role in communication. Key characteristics include: **Social Focus**: Terms like **“social protection”** (*ijtimoiy himoya*) are used to describe support for vulnerable groups, though they can also be used to soften the scale of social issues.

Reframing Challenges: Words like *“reconstruction”* (*qayta qurish*) or *“improvement”* (*takomillashtirish*) are often employed to describe complex changes or societal difficulties. Linguistic Roots: These expressions typically draw from Turkic roots or attractive terms borrowed from Persian-Tajik, emphasizing positive concepts such as *“progress”* (*taraqqiyot*) or *“stability”* (*barqarorlik*). The historical context is also vital; while English euphemisms are often tied to histories of war and international relations, Uzbek euphemisms are shaped by both the Soviet linguistic legacy and the post-independence state-building process.

Modern English political rhetoric often reframes economic difficulties using softer terminology. Examples include: *“Revenue enhancement”* instead of “tax increase”; *“Negative growth”* instead of “economic decline”; *“Correctional facility”* instead of “prison”; *“Undocumented immigrants”* instead of “illegal immigrants”. These expressions frequently appear in newspapers such as The New York Times and The Guardian during discussions of immigration, crime, and economic reform.

Political speeches in Uzbekistan often frame reforms using highly positive vocabulary. Examples: *“Yangi taraqqiyot bosqichi”* (“a new stage of development”); *“Modernizatsiya jarayoni”* (“modernization process”); *“Obodonlashtirish ishlari”* (“beautification and improvement works”). These expressions are commonly found in state media and official speeches discussing urban development or policy reforms. Unlike English political euphemisms, which often conceal responsibility, Uzbek euphemisms tend to emphasize unity, national progress, and respect for authority.

Both English and Uzbek political discourse are strongly influenced by media institutions. In English-speaking countries, media outlets sometimes challenge political euphemisms by exposing their hidden meanings. For example, journalists criticized the phrase *“enhanced interrogation techniques”* because it concealed acts internationally recognized as torture. In Uzbekistan, official discourse more commonly reinforces euphemistic language to preserve social stability and public confidence.

The analysis of English and Uzbek political speech reveals that euphemisms are far more than mere linguistic substitutions; they are profound reflections of national character. While English political language utilizes euphemisms to prioritize pragmatism and diplomatic maneuvering, Uzbek political language uses them to prioritize social cohesion and traditional respect. Ultimately, studying these differences offers significant insight into how each society constructs, perceives, and manages its political reality.

## REFERENCES:

1. Allan, K. & Burrige, K. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
2. Crespo-Fernández, E. *Sex in Language: Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Metaphors in Internet Forums*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2018.

3. Lutz, W. *Doublespeak: From Revenue Enhancement to Terminal Living*. HarperCollins, 1989.
4. Mahmudov, N. *O‘zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug‘ati*. O‘qituvchi, 2003.  
Qodirov, M. *Til va madaniyat*. Fan, 2008.
5. Soliyev, A. *Siyosiy lingvistika asoslari*. O‘zbekiston faylasuflari milliy jamiyati, 2015.
6. Warren, B. "What Euphemisms Tell Us About the Interpretation of Words". *Studia Linguistica*, 1992.
7. *Ideology and Discourse* van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Politics, Ideology and Discourse*. Elsevier.
8. *Political Language and Metaphor* Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don’t Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.