



FEATURES OF MILITARY TERMINOLOGY IN MODERN CONDITIONS

Namozova Dilnoza Berdimurotovna

Senior Teacher, Department of Foreign Languages,
Military-Technical Institute of the National guard of the Republic of Uzbekistan,
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Currently, the terminology is being evaluated and improved. Sometimes it is very difficult to understand it, since most of the new terms are often used for other purposes and require scientific justification. Therefore, in modern conditions, with the further improvement of the fundamental statutory documents, there is an urgent need to solve the problem of military terminology in order to clarify the basic concepts and categories of the system of knowledge about war and military security through the appropriate terms in the form of definitions.

KEYWORDS: *military terminology, military security, terms, basic concepts and categories.*

DISCUSSION

The categories of military science are historical in nature. They reflect the development of military affairs, methods and forms of armed struggle. With the appearance of new objects, phenomena, and connections, new concepts and categories can be formed in the business. At the same time, the formation of concepts and categories can proceed on the basis of scientific foresight, before the real appearance of new objects and phenomena, which is especially characteristic of military science. There is a constant need to clarify the existing categories, both at the level of definitions, as well as their content and scope. The historical nature of the categories of military affairs determines the objective process of dying out of some of them and excluding them from the number of existing concepts.

Military science, like any science, has its own system of concepts and categories, its own conceptual apparatus. The development of the conceptual apparatus of any sphere of subject activity is due to the expansion of the range of knowledge about the subject itself. In this regard, it is necessary to consider some categories and concepts that are used by military specialists when conducting research on military terminology in modern conditions.

The encyclopedic definition of the concept is "a form of thinking that reflects the essential properties, connections and relationships of objects and phenomena" [1]. The concept allows us to distinguish the general, which is achieved by

abstracting from all the particular features of individual objects and phenomena of this class.

Each concept is characterized by its content and volume. The content of the concept is determined by the totality of the features of objects and phenomena reflected in it. The scope of the concept is determined by the number of generalized homogeneous objects or phenomena that have features that belong to the content of the concept.

The system of concepts is characterized by a hierarchical structure, determined by the degree of generalization of objects and phenomena. The limit of generalization is the concepts with the maximum volume, which become categories.

The category is "the most general and fundamental concept that reflects the essential, universal properties and relations of the phenomena of reality and cognition" [2]. The interpretation of the category as the most general concept does not have clear criteria. The degree of generalization of any concept does not always lend itself to an objective assessment. Therefore, in order to distinguish a concept into a category, it is necessary, in addition to determining the degree of generality, content and scope, to assess the place and importance of this concept in the relevant science. Categories form the basis of the structure and content of military science. They are a form of concentration of knowledge about the subjects and phenomena of military theory and practice. In fact, the content of the categories determines the level of development of military science.



A term is "a word or a combination of words denoting a special concept used in science, technology, and art" [2]. In relation to knowledge about war and military security, it is an external, verbal expression of the content of concepts and categories.

Definition (definition) is "clarification of the subject of consideration, its unambiguous characteristic" [2].

Thus, the article offers formulations of concepts and categories of the system of knowledge about war and military security through the corresponding terms in the form of definitions.

The concepts and categories of military science are the most important tool of military-scientific knowledge, one of the forms of transfer and dissemination of military knowledge. Without a clear definition of concepts and categories, it is impossible to communicate with military specialists in all areas of their activities, especially in a combat situation.

The hierarchical nature of the system of concepts and categories determines its several levels [3].

The first level is the most general categories related to such phenomena as preparing a country for war, maintaining the military security of the state, military construction, the activities of the armed forces, their types and branches of the armed forces, and military operations. The first-level categories relate to almost all tasks of national defense and military operations. The system-forming category is the category of "war". With this fundamental category, all others of any level should be correlated and subordinated.

The second level is the category of components of military science. For example, within the framework of military art, they include the categories of strategy, operational art, and tactics. The theory of the construction of the armed forces has its own categories.

The third level consists of categories of individual theories or sections of private military sciences.

Relatively independent subsystems are a set of categories of types of armed forces, which, while occupying a subordinate position in relation to higher-level categories, reflect the specifics of the land forces, air forces and air defense forces.

The branches of social, natural and technical sciences related to defense issues also have their own categorical apparatus.

The complex multi-level scheme of relations between the categories of military knowledge makes it necessary to carefully justify their content and scope in accordance with their place and subordination in the general system.

Currently, the military specialists in their activities use more than twenty official encyclopedic publications, military dictionaries published in

different countries, which summarize and synthesize the existing military and scientific achievements of the world. These publications mainly objectively reflect the current content and understanding of the main military-theoretical problems, but they do not reflect the features of the development of military-scientific achievements.

The analysis and generalization of the existing special terminology used in the implementation of various types of activities in the selected areas of the life of the state and society, allow us to draw some conclusions.

First, it does not fully take into account the ever-changing nature of threats that affect the provision of military security, carried out by politics-diplomatic, economic, information and other subversive non-military means.

Secondly, it should be noted that in modern conditions, the nature of armed struggle is also changing. The importance of indirect actions is increasing, the nature and methods of using military force are significantly changing, which requires a new approach to determining the main forms of use of the Armed Forces, other troops and military formations both in local wars and armed conflicts, and in large-scale wars.

Third, in the published encyclopedias and dictionaries, some of the definitions given are not quite accurate, and in some cases incorrectly reveal the essence of the concepts, do not fully reflect objective phenomena and processes, so they turn out to be "non-working" and do not meet their purpose.

So, for example, at one time, for insufficiently clear political reasons in the field of state security and in connection with the defensive nature of the military doctrine, the concept of "strategic offensive operations" was abandoned, replacing them with a "counteroffensive" undertaken after a defensive operation. But the defensive nature of a military doctrine only means that the party adhering to such a doctrine does not intend to be the first to launch military operations. With the outbreak of war, the policy of the state changes and is entirely subordinate to the interests of protecting the Fatherland. And in these conditions, with the outbreak of war, any state will use various methods of defense without restrictions, all the necessary actions, both defensive and offensive, which will be required by the situation. Therefore, the whole system of concepts of strategic operations is restored in the system of categories and terms. At the same time, it needs to make a number of significant changes, taking into account the experience of modern wars and military conflicts.

Fourth, in a number of issues, the American, NATO terminology is blindly copied, which turned out to be not entirely justified and vital. So "war" is defined as a kind of conflict [4]. But war and conflict



differ not only in scale, they are different phenomena in nature and in essence.

Fifth, in the published encyclopedias, dictionaries, and service reference books, serious methodological errors are made in the development of the conceptual apparatus, and the elementary rules of formal logic are not observed. According to the laws of logic, in order to define a particular concept, it is necessary to first bring this concept under another, broader concept, and then show its specifics, how it differs from other related objects and phenomena. For example: a birch is a tree that differs from other trees by its corresponding crown, leaves, and other properties; war is not a kind of universal human conflict, but a complex social phenomenon associated with the continuation of politics by violent means, etc. [5].

It should be noted that at present there are a number of problems both in the construction of the Armed Forces and in the development of forms and methods of their use. This is due to the fact that modern military science is largely lagging behind the development of socio-political and economic processes in the world, improving the means of armed struggle, untimely use of modern practical experience of headquarters and troops in military conflicts in order to develop military theory.

When developing and justifying new terms and concepts, special attention should be paid to the methods of conducting operations and combat operations in modern local wars and armed conflicts. This area of activity is still poorly understood. No common views have been developed on the joint use of various forces and means in the course of preventing, localizing and eliminating the conflict. This problem of course can be solved by joint efforts of various government bodies. [6].

Therefore, in today's conditions, due to changes in the forces and means of the Armed Forces, it is necessary to change the approaches to the development of terms.

Improving the terminology is one of the main tasks of military science in modern conditions. When improving the terminology, it is necessary to take into account the main thing that, in general, the formation and implementation of the national security policy of the state is led, within the limits of the constitutional powers.

REFERENCES

1. *Military encyclopedia / Russian Federation, Institute of History; ed.: A. P. Gorkin. - M.: Bolshaya Rus. encyclopedia.: RI POL klassik, 2002.*
2. *The New Philosophical Encyclopedia. Security of Eurasia: An encyclopedic dictionary-yearbook. - M., 2000. - Vol. 1. - p. 425.*
3. *Collection of military and special terms. - Moscow.: MO RB, 2004. - p. 105.*
4. *Clausewitz K. About the war. - M.: Logos, Nauka, 1997. - p. 76.*
5. *Maltsev L. S. The essence of war and armed struggle, a look into the future//The army. - 2003. - No. 5. - p. 5-6.*
6. *Maltsev L. S. Armed Forces, history and modernity//The army. - 2003. - No. 6. - p. 4.*