

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

STATE AND THE SOCIETY, THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POLITICAL PROCESS OF CONTROLLED COMMUNICATION

Salieva Muhabbat Kushanovna

Doctor Of Philosophy, Associate Professor Of Tashkent State University Of
Oriental Studies, Uzbekistan

Abstract

in this article, the current state of communication in public administration consists mainly in the use of propaganda and manipulation methods and technologies for influencing society when transmitting information, in the fact that in practice feedback mechanisms, indicators, channels are used, and this is practically ignored in activities government agencies. that in the context of the globalization of the information space, the number of participants in political communication processes can increase significantly, which will lead to the definition of more competitive communication relations in the field of politics.

Keywords State, politics, management, technology, problem, global information, communication, information space, mechanism, indicator.

INTRODUCTION

Different goals and methods, structures and political processes in the sphere of state power determine complex, multifaceted communication forms of information and communication exchange between people. This popular political event has a wide interpretation. Russian scientist, Professor N. Baranov hypothesizes that "this phenomenon is a political activity based on manipulation of popular values and expectations among the people, which is used to express various socio-political movements and ideologies"[1]. Any information process is based on systematic networks of communication, the analysis specific to the process of information exchange allows us to distinguish its most important fundamental aspects. According to the American political scientist Gerald Lasswell, the main components of such a structure are necessary to answer the

following questions: "Who is speaking? About what? On which channel? To whom? How does it affect?"[2]

Another complex structure of political communication processes involves taking into account their different levels. Canadian scientist Joseph John Thomson suggests distinguishing the nature of information communication and the levels of technical influence. "These levels make it possible to distinguish the most important and qualitatively different components of the information-communication process. On the other hand, effective interaction of political subjects with the public defines opportunities" [3, 559].

Means, symbols, representational ability that preserve or prevent the preservation of the meaning of the messages transmitted by people and

ensure their realistic interpretation by the recipients should be taken into account here. In this sense, various political subjects need to be in moderation of verbal speech or gestures, facial expressions, body movements, range of speech, laughter, etc. when communicating and communicating.

Technical tools at the disposal of organizations also play an important role in the implementation of information relations in politics, from this point of view, the information activity of political entities is considered as the activity of special organizational structures, personnel centers, data banks, information storage and transmission networks, and technologies. The importance and role of all such technical means of communication is determined by the extent to which they can convey the message without any change, in time and the correct form. According to N. Baranov, "the information selected from various information flows to prepare and make necessary decisions in the field of state power or in the performance of functions, as well as to carry out actions related to them, is called political information"[1, 233].

From the point of view of research, the exchange of information is a necessary condition for the actions of any political entity and performs an important task that allows effective cooperation in the political sphere to achieve the planned goals.

"Whoever engages in politics," writes Alfred Weber, "seeks to enjoy the sense of prestige it gives or seeks power, or acts as a means to other (ideal or selfish) goals"[4, 646]. The author substantiates this opinion with examples, such examples correspond to all processes in life.

According to the Russian scientist P. Schwarzenberg, "communication is a constant exchange of political meaning between individuals and the political forces of society to reach an agreement" [5, 174], to increase the effectiveness of activities in this direction, political subjects

should consider the purposefulness of providing information, the interests of certain message audiences, considers that it should be compatible with the characteristics. According to S. Lennart, "The mass media acts together with interpersonal communication, not monopolies, in information flows. Information reaches its object directly or indirectly through interpersonal communication, which can have the opposite effect on the formation of the attitude of citizens or be a new source of information in itself" [6, 15]. In any case, the transmission of messages involves the use of certain technical means, so information processes must inevitably be provided with appropriate technical components. That is, it includes technical channels through which information is distributed (broadcast), as well as structures that allow not only transmission and processing but also information collection, control, storage and protection.

R. Schwarzenberg defines political communication as "political communication is transferring political information, through which it moves from one part of the political system to another, between the political system and the social system. There is a process of continuous information exchange between individuals and groups at all levels" [7, 42].

Purposeful relationships between people who exchange and consume different information, knowledge and messages connect different levels of the political system. It allows political institutions to perform specific functions of state and society management.

According to A. Deutsch, "the government, as a subject of state management, mobilizes the political system by regulating information flows and communication interactions between the system and the environment, as well as individual blocks within the system itself, three main types of communications in the political system: 1)

personal, informal communications, for example, personal communication of a candidate for deputy with a voter in a free environment; 2) through organizations, when communication with the government is carried out through parties, organizations, etc. 3) communication through mass media, printed or electronic means, whose role in post-industrial society is constantly increasing" [8, 42].

Modern political communication is not only related to election campaigns, but also covers a wide range of issues related to political governance and public policy. Broadly speaking, politics includes all the processes by which society reaches a consensus on issues of power.

Herbert Schiller writes: "Political communication plays a key role in ensuring the stability of modern society, it allows the formation of political myths, with the help of which it is possible to maintain the rule of the political elite in the modern state"[9, 97]. There we see that political communication is much more developed than the first manifestations.

In his research, Y. Habermas showed that politics is reflected in the system of communicative actions acting as a chain of mediation, for example, in the relationship between capitalism and democracy. Habermas divides power into two main types: "firstly, it arises in the process of political communication within society and is free from any repression and violence, and secondly, administrative, within which political communications are managed to ensure legitimacy"[10], through this idea, Habermas says that in a modern democratic state, the political emphasized that the field exists as an effective and stable element.

When talking about political communication, as Harold Adams Innis, a Canadian researcher representing the Toronto School of Communication Studies, said, "the means of

communication determine the type of social structure and create certain socio-political effects. At the same time, whoever is in power also controls the mass media. Therefore, depending on the type of mass media, it is possible to evaluate the state policy" [11, 226]. In the transmission of any political communication delivered to society in mass media, there is an information effect developed by the main author of that medium.

In turn, Richard Perloff writes that "modern political communication is understood as the process by which national leaders, mass media, and citizens express their opinion and discuss the content of messages related to the conduct of public policy" [12]. In the management of information processes between the state and society, the development of political communication affects the spread of democracy and civic values and provides an opportunity to improve the working model of political communication.

David Swanson, studying the role of the communication process in political management, defined the concept of the political-media system as "the constantly changing relationship between media institutions and state and political institutions in the field of their interaction with society" [13]. Since people perceive information differently, interpret its content based on certain rules, habits, and methods of perception, the subject's ability to understand meaningful messages is of primary importance in the process of information exchange. This aspect of subjective perception, analysis and assimilation of information is called communication or the process of establishing meaningful relations between senders of political information, that is, communicators and recipients.

When talking about the role and importance of communication in the aspect of political management, it is necessary to note the scientific position of M. Kastels, who in his work, "The

exercise of power takes place primarily on the basis of production, and cultural codes and the interests and values of information dissemination, management of communication networks are human behavior. "It will become the leading principles of the movement" [14, 11], he writes. In the era of today's information globalization, in the era of digitalization of innovative technologies, the transmission of various information through code has become the most alternative option or leading principle for people. In turn, another supporter of mass media theory, well-known expert R. In his book *Parchment, Print Media, and Hypermedia: Connections in Transforming the World Order*, Deyberet writes:

It is concluded that "any changes in the methods of communication have important consequences for the distribution of power within society, the change of personal and social consciousness, as well as the revision of social values, so that the main goals of political management can be achieved by changing the methods and forms of communication"[15].

M.N. According to Grachev, "political communication is the process of information exchange, transfer of political information, structuring of political activity and giving it a new meaning" [16], that is, in the creation of information, especially in the conditions of modern communication and telecommunication systems, information security problems and information systems, the field of creation and application of information technologies and their support tools develops in connection with the needs of all sectors through the political communication system.

In turn, A.I. Solovyov writes that "mass communication is an integral part of politics". Mass communication is an integral part of the modern world, through which the production and exchange of information of social importance, the

interaction of different groups and the inclusion of individuals in the social system are carried out.

It can be seen that the technologies of political advertising, campaigning and public relations are based on the implementation of communication, although sometimes one-way, through direct communication of political subjects through campaign networks. Campaigns with a target audience and their representatives strive to have technical channels for organizing informational communications through indirect mass media and outdoor advertising. As the most important institution of state power, it should have the necessary number of channels for disseminating official information, in particular verbal (briefings, interviews with leaders, etc.) or paper (publications in newspapers and magazines, government bulletins), as well as those that allow continuous communication with citizens. must have a visual and electronic (state television channels and regional communication systems, etc.) system.

In 1963, the American scientist Jerome Bernard Cohen formulated the classic definition of such an influence of mass communication in the sense of the procedure of "setting issues on the agenda". This effect has become the object of modern research. Its essence, says the author, is that "the press cannot persuade people to a certain opinion, but it can tell its readers what to think about, setting the agenda is a metaphor describing the cognitive process by which society thinks about the topics of the day covered in the media" [18, 9], explained in an understandable way.

J. Zeller, one of the proponents of reviving the concept of the significant impact of the mass media on political processes, described it as follows: "the mass media have a significant impact on the individual and public consciousness, on political relations", in which the author stated that the value of the media in political communication is not in strengthening its rights, but in clearly shaping

them. emphasizes.

Also, determining the multifaceted structure of political processes, analyzing it in the communication system, which is the basis of information processes, makes it possible to distinguish the most important fundamental aspects of any information exchange process.

According to the definition of the French historian Jules Sylvain Zeller, "the mass media have a significant influence on the individual and public consciousness, on the political attitude and the behavior of voters"[19, 94], and this influence is definitely manifested in the forms of political communication. The existence of different goals and methods, structures and participants of political processes, as well as other parameters for solving specific problems in the sphere of state power, determines the complex, multifaceted structure of information and communication exchange between people, and makes it possible to distinguish its most important fundamental aspects. According to German political scientist Arendt Hanna, "human freedom and politics are compatible and complement each other as two sides of the same subject" [20, 149]. Since people perceive information differently, interpret its content based on certain rules, customs, and methods of perception, the subject's ability to meaningfully perceive messages in the process of information exchange is of fundamental importance.

According to the views of a group of scientists R. Jacobson, P. Lazarsfeld, G. Laswell, it is said that the interpersonal aspect of communication has its own characteristics: "the source of information is related to the existence of an interpretive event; commented information is already a message; the context of the message is particularly important; there are interactions between information sources and the communicator, on the one hand, between the message and the audience, and on the

other hand, between the commentator and the listener" [21, 108].

This aspect of subjective perception, analysis and assimilation of information is called communication or establishing meaningful relationships between senders (communicators) and receivers of political information. Such an explanation shows that no amount of information can create an appropriate connection between political subjects.

The communicative aspects of information relations show that the exchange of messages is not a faceless technical process that ignores the characteristics of the receivers as real participants in political relations. In practice, many decisions, even at the pinnacle of state power, can be made in any form, regardless of the information received under the influence of the emotions of political leaders.

It should be noted that in terms of the level of people's consumption and the exchange of various information in the sphere of state power, all institutions and mechanisms of power are nothing more than tools for processing information flows and relatively independent structures in the information market. In addition, the effectiveness of their activities directly depends on the ability to organize information and establish meaningful relationships with other subjects. At the same time, the political subjects themselves change their image, appearing as different information carriers.

Thus, when we consider politics from the point of view of information-communication relations, we understand its structures and institutions as such a social unity designed for the development, reception and processing of information that determines the implementation of various actions by political subjects.

The scientist who introduced the political system as an information-communication system for the first

time was Karl Deutsch, who stated that "from the point of view of the role of technical components in the exchange of information, politics can be shown as a socio-technological structure, its institutions are oriented to the purposeful transmission, exchange and protection of information[22]", he says. He considered political messages a determinant of political behavior and called them the "nervous system of government." Karl Deutsch's approach was later developed theoretically. German sociologist Jürgen Habermas focused on the relevant elements of communicative actions and politics (values, norms, actions)[23, 195] and presented them as the basis of social and political order. In contrast, the German sociologist Helmut Shelsky in 1965 distinguished the technical rather than the social aspects of the political organization of power and formulated the idea of a "technical state" [24, 747]. According to this approach, the state should respect the wishes and interests of individual citizens and groups only to a small extent. At the same time, the logic of modern technology, its imperative requirements, should be considered both as a guide and as a means of action. "The power of the apparatus", increasing the efficiency of the use of technology makes the state and the whole politics in general a means of rational and unquestionable regulation of all social relations. Later, in the development of these views and to justify the emergence of the "information society", a number of scientists (D. Michn, R. Johnson) proposed hyperrationalist interpretations of political communications [25, 142], in which computer technologies were given a decisive role.

The modern experience of the development of political systems has indeed shown certain tendencies to increase the role of technical and information media in the organization of political life, primarily in industrialized countries. This applies especially to the emergence of additional technical opportunities for voting (in particular,

electronic interactive communication systems), increasing the role and importance of mass media in the political process, eliminating many former hierarchical relationships in public administration, and strengthening autonomy. However, these are only conditions that increase the possibilities of maneuvering by the institutions and subjects of power, because they do not eliminate the leading role of groups, political interests, conflicts and contradictions between them.

The mass information-communication process is important for politics. At this level of organizing information relations, first, special training is required to interact with public opinion. These components include: official institutions of the state (their heads, as well as representatives of public relations information departments); state (national) mass media; corporate structures (party bodies, public associations, professional political advertising agencies, etc.); foreign mass media.

Their interaction mainly forms an information market, in which each of them implements their own political strategies, subordinated to the achievement of their interests in the sphere of power. All these various techniques and methods used by political agents to obtain information and communicate with their counterparts can basically represent two types of actions in the information space: mobilization, including marketing represented by propaganda and public relations methods, as well as political advertising and PR..

These methods of influence through information describe the behavior of subjects in the information space from different perspectives. In this sense, propaganda and propaganda are methods of information control over people and giving a strict social direction to their political actions. According to the Belgian scientist G. Toveron, propaganda does not offer people a choice, it makes certain changes in their thoughts, beliefs and behavior [26, 74]. According to Goebbels, the influence of

propaganda is a means of "social control", which does not mean persuading people, but attracting supporters and ensuring that their actions are obeyed. The scheme of such information interaction is as follows: "the communicator sends - the receiver receives". Classic examples of one-sided use of such methods of informing the public refer to the way of personalization and manipulation of consciousness. However, the use of these forms of behavior in the information market always creates the risk of changing the quality of information and communication processes. The desire to systematically control the mind and behavior of citizens is inextricably linked with the constant manipulation of public consciousness, biased tricks and direct deception of the population, which inevitably leads to the replacement of information with disinformation.

Similar qualitative changes are taking place in establishing relations between the authorities and the public. Propaganda and propaganda often cross the boundaries of free competition for the human mind, replacing its ideological conquest methods with methods of psychological pressure designed to forcefully instill pre-programmed values and attitudes into it, unconsciously perceive and master it.

In contrast to such methods of conquering the human mind, marketing strategies are formed according to the relationship of demand and supply of information and are focused on ensuring that the information necessary for the subject is at his disposal at the right time and in the right place. These communication marketing strategies focus on persuasion rather than mind control, they suggest rather than directly prescribe specific ideas and behavior patterns. These strategies, where reliability of information and respect for partners are increasingly becoming an indispensable condition for maintaining warm, cordial relations and communication, are

primarily aimed at informing political actors based on feedback, dialogue, honesty and mutual respect.

"Today, many countries of the world are living in the information society or in the period of transition to it. In our country, the process of full transition to the information society and institutionalization and its structural structures are shown to be working with low efficiency, which in turn is an obstacle to innovative development. The complicated nature of reforms and changes in the process of institutionalization stems from the fact that the harmony of interests in the reforms has not been fully ensured and they have not been implemented in response to the requirements of the time" [10, 8]. This direction of behavior in the information market is inextricably linked with a prior understanding of a person's needs for information and his confidential information, which is ultimately aimed at consciously choosing the direction of his political behavior. Such methods were mainly used in countries with well-developed democratic traditions or, for example, in countries where opposition forces had just come to power, and at first had to rely more on the moral incentives of the social behavior of the population and conduct a more open policy.

Means of political communication are defined as certain organizations and institutions that traditionally operate within the framework of social and political systems, through which the process of information exchange is carried out. Some researchers also refer to means as communicative actions or situations, groups or individuals (directly or indirectly, mediated or immediate or extended over time) that contribute to the exchange of information.

Among the means of political communication, informal means of information transmission occupy a special place. Recently, many researchers have noted a decrease in trust in official sources of information, which has led to an increase in the

importance of messages that appear at the level of interpersonal communication.

As the Russian scientist Yuri Irkhinn said, "Political communication is a semantic aspect of the interaction of subjects through the exchange of information during the struggle for power or its implementation. It is related to targeted transmission and selection of information, without which the political process cannot move" [27, 511], it is said.

Political communication is a continuous exchange of political communication between individuals and the political forces of society in order to reach an agreement. According to the results of the research, political communication is a continuous process of transferring political information, forms of information and methods that circulate between various elements of the political system, as well as between political and social systems. and forms are considered. It is appropriate to define political communication as a process of information exchange, which has a completely different effect on politics in society, and is carried out in the process of formal and informal interaction of political subjects.

The political communication that is formed in the life of the society is focused on the regulation of existing political relations and ongoing political processes. The importance of communication in the political process develops under the influence of the generality of social, ideological, moral, religious, etc. relations and, in turn, has a very important effect on them.

Informal means of political communication include rumours, gossip, anecdotes and graffiti. These sources, first of all, affect the formation of a negative assessment of the activities of political leaders and political institutions.

Famous American political scientist M. Edelman believes that "all political life is a unique

construction created with the help of language" [16, 244]. It includes analysis of every important political fact, description of every political event or attitude to a political figure based on specific sources, based on the ideological and psychological characteristics of the participants and observers of political activity. That is, a political fact can be perceived differently by different people, but this cannot be the basis for practical models of communication in the political sphere.

Political communication is done in various ways, particularly by sending political messages to specific people and communities. Messages can appear as a statement of facts or an explanation of the content of events that arouse public interest in them. Political communication is mainly carried out as vertical downward communication. The initiator (communicator) of messages is, as a rule, a leader or a political organization. The subject of communication has a mechanism for forming and distributing information.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is necessary to say that in the conditions of globalization of the information space, the number of participants in political communication processes can increase significantly, which determines more competitive communication relations in the field of politics.

In the current state of communication in the state administration, propaganda and manipulation methods and technologies of influence on society are mainly used in information transmission. Feedback mechanisms, indicators, and channels are not used in practice and are almost ignored in the activities of state bodies.

REFERENCES

1. Баранов Н. Политическая коммуникация. – М.: 2020. – С. 233.
2. Вебер А. Избранные произведения. – М.: 1990. – С. 646.

3. Шварценберг П.Ж. Политическая социология. – М.: 1992. – С. 174.
4. Lenart S. Shaping political attitudes. The impact of interpersonal communication and mass media. – Oxford: Thousand Oaks et al. 1994. – P. 15.
5. Шварценберг Р.Ж. Политическая социология. 3 ч. – М.: 1992. – С. 81.
6. Дойч А.А. Основы политической теории. – М.: Высшая школа. 1998. – С. 42.
7. Шиллер Г. Манипуляторы сознанием. – М.: 1980. – С. 97.
8. Хабермас Ю. Философский спор вокруг идеи демократии // Демократия. Разум. Нравственность. – М.: 1995.
9. Innis Harold Adams. The Bias of Communication. – University of Toronto Press. 2008. – P. 226.
10. Perloff R.M. Political communication: politics, press, and public in America. – Mahwah: NJ. 1998.
11. Swanson D. The Political – Media Complex at 50: Putting the 1996 Presidential Campaign in Context // American Behavioural Scientist. 1997. N 40 (8). – P. 126.
12. Кастельс М. Галактика Интернет. Размышления об Интернете, бизнесе и обществе. – Екатеринбург. 2004. – С. 11.
13. Deibert R.J. Parchment, Printing, and Hypermedia: Communications in World Order Transformation. N.Y.: 1997.
14. Грачев М.Н. Политическая коммуникация // Вестн.Российск. ун-та дружбы народов. Сер.: Политология. 1999. № 1.
15. Соловьев А.И., Пугачев В.П. Введение в политологию. – М.: 2000. – С. 41
16. Bernard Cohen. The Triumph of Numbers: How Counting Shaped Modern Life. Norton. 2005. – P. 224. – P. 9.
17. Баранов Н. Политические коммуникации. <https://nicbar.ru/politology/study/kurs-teoriya-politiki/lektsii-po-kursu-teoriya-politiki-2002-2007-gg/95-lektsiya-26-politicheskie-kommunikatsii>.
18. Zeller J.S. Pie IX et Victor Emmanuel. 1979. – P. 94.
19. Arendt H. What is Freedom? // Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought. – N.Y.: 1993. – P. 149.
20. Кретов Б.И. Современная российская политическая система. – М.: 1998. – С. 108.
21. Электрон ресурс: <https://studbooks.net/politologiya/>.
22. Habermas J. Konzeptionen der Moderne. Ein Rtickblick auf zwei Traditionen // Politische Essays. Frankfurt: Die Postnationale Konstellation. 1998. – P. 195.
23. Wolfgang Lipp, Schelsky, Helmut, in: Wilhelm Bernsdorf / Horst Knospe, Internation. Vol. 2, Enke, Stuttgart. 1984. – P. 747.
24. Хубецова З. Ф. Политическая коммуникация Теория, образование, опыт В 2 частях Часть 1. Исследование и преподавание политической коммуникации Учебное пособие. – М.: Санкт – Петербург, 2017. – С. 142.
25. Соловьев А.И. Политология: Политическая теория, политические технологии. – М.: Аспект Пресс. 2001. – С. 74.
26. Ясин Е.Т. Модернизация и общество // Вопросы Экономики. – 2007. – № 35. – С. 8.
27. Ирхин, Ю. В. Политология: учебник / Ю. В. Ирхин, В. Д. Зотов, Л. В. Зотова. – М.: Юрист. 2002. – С. 511.