

РОЗДІЛ 3

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНО-ІСТОРИЧНЕ І ТИПОЛОГІЧНЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81'27[32:316.46](477+73)(045)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2019.10-2.14>

POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL “OTHERNESS” THROUGH LINGUISTIC CHOICES

ПОЛІТИЧНА ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЧНА «ІНАКШІСТЬ» ЗАСОБАМИ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНОГО ВЧЕННЯ

Halasa I.S.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-9186-6357

*PhD, Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Economic Relations
Ternopil National Economic University*

This study presents a sociolinguistic analysis of political discourse with a focus on different linguistic means that are used by political leaders in order to express their political ideology. The author demonstrates the choice of linguistic forms used by political leaders. Furthermore, in this article the peculiarities of creating allies and enemies among social actors are shown. Finally, this sociolinguistic analysis generates a typology of discourse strategies manifested in political discourse of “otherness”.

Linguistic generalizations, implications and discursive “approaches” form significant insights to understand the nature of political discourse and show ways in which language is manipulated in order to obtain definite political goals. Most of recent studies have neglected the analysis of the linguistic form to correlate language and ideology and to account for the particular ways in which ideology, power and sociocultural nuances are constructed linguistically. Similarly, some studies in different fields demonstrate the fact that politicians manipulate language to convey their goals, to establish their points of view, to set alliances, but very few of them articulate explicitly how this is done linguistically.

In order to project the enemy most politicians bring another voice into the discourse, a voice with whom the politician will align himself and which will allow him support his own political arguments versus the enemy’s political arguments. The voice of interlocutor sets an alliance with the recipients forming rapport with it by means of specific linguistic means such as questions, vocatives, modality markers etc. By building “we-team”, the politician indirectly distances “them” instigating the process of “otherness”.

Key words: political discourse, “otherness”, discourse strategies, sociolinguistic analysis, social actors.

Це дослідження є соціолінгвістичним аналізом політичного дискурсу з акцентом на виборі лінгвістичних засобів, які використовуються політичними лідерами для демонстрування своєї політичної ідеології. Авторка пропонує добірку мовленнєвих форм, які використовуються політичними лідерами. Окрім цього, в статті окреслено особливості створення образів союзників та ворогів серед соціальних суб’єктів. Наостанок, це соціолінгвістичне дослідження є типологічним аналізом дискурсивних стратегій, що виражаються в політичному дискурсі «інакшості».

Лінгвістичні узагальнення, наслідкові зв’язки та дискурсивні «підходи» є важливими для розуміння цілі політичного дискурсу, а також способів, завдяки яким мовою маніпулюють, щоб досягти конкретних політичних цілей. Більшість вчених у своїх нещодавніх дослідженнях знехтували аналізом мовленнєвої форми, яка поєднує мову та ідеологію, а також не врахували особливостей спільного формування лінгвістичної ідеології, влади та інших соціокультурних нюансів. Натомість інші дослідники в різних сферах демонструють маніпулювання мовленням політиками з метою досягнення своїх цілей, презентації своїх точок зору, будування альянсів, але мало хто з них чітко показує, як ця ціль досягається лінгвістично.

Для того щоб продемонструвати ворожість, більшість політиків змінює тембр голосу, який дає їм змогу протиставити власні політичні аргументи політичним аргументам недруга. Голос соціального суб’єкта формує своєрідний альянс із реципієнтами, який встановлює зв’язок з аудиторією за допомогою таких лінгвістичних засобів, як запитання, вигуки, маркери модальності тощо. Створюючи «ми-команду», політик дистанціює від себе «їх», ще більше продукуючи процес «інакшості».

Ключові слова: політичний дискурс, «інакшість», дискурсивні стратегії, соціолінгвістичний аналіз, соціальні суб’єкти.

Chilton states that political actors have discovered the significance of linguistic effects. The author states that politics is “very largely the use of language” [1, p. 14]. Furthermore, only “when language is tied to social and political institutions can a war be

declared, or a person guilty or not guilty” [1, p. 30]. Joseph is convinced that language is always political, and every verbalization demonstrates a political alignment. The researcher sends a message that “language is political from top to bottom” [2, p. 17].

It's interesting that linguistic analysis of political speeches has been associated with the notion of critical linguistics [3]. Style and manner of speaking may correlate with other variables such as Socio-Economic Status. The explanation of this fact is that it contains specific linguistic features associated with low or high class. Dealing with style, one may present several possible linguistic variables to distinguish formal or informal style in political speeches: Lexical choices, vocabulary, full explicit syntax vs. deleted elements, morphological features, complex vs. simple syntactic constructions: (coordination vs. subordination), pragmatics variables (politeness strategies, address forms), metaphors, modality and evaluative markers, Key (e.g. joking vs. serious), repetition (lexical or structural), the use of questions (full and tag questions).

The **problem** under analysis is important for the development of linguistic study, since it presents a comparative analysis of speeches of politicians from different cultures, languages and ideologies which may contribute to a better understanding of the use of language by political actors to pursue different goals. The study fills the gap in the text analysis linguistic sphere. It also contributes to the literature of analysis of political discourses in a language other than English.

Recent studies addressing the analysis of political discourse have attempted to present the relationship between language and power, language and inequality, language and racism. Many scholars have tried to draw a line between linguistic means and language of deception, or cognitive structures such as metaphors, etc. However, in their last studies the researchers tried to observe how a social group or a definite elite can control, misrepresent or exploit language to preserve their status in society, and how political actors in political situations legitimate their actions or proposals through language use [1]. Blommaert states that people should understand what language use means to its users and what people do with language [4, p. 14]. The author makes a statement: "It is within this intellectual tradition that I propose to analyze language use in political discourse to demonstrate the manner in which language is used by politicians to convey their desires, beliefs, political goals and even to persuade the audience to accept his/her viewpoint" [4, p. 14].

The studies of language within the critical linguistics framework are mainly motivated by an understanding of the importance of language as a vehicle able to shape, transform or misrepresent the reality.

Those linguistic analyses of political discourse that do exist have been mainly guided by Critical

Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Billig, Chilton, Fairclough, Kress, van Dijk, van Leeuwen, Wetherel, Wodak) in the last twenty years. Another guiding source for political text analyses has been provided by Functional Grammarians (Halliday, Thompson). CDA and Functional Grammar are far from being the only possible methodologies for critical analysis of text. Works by Foucault, Blommaert, Bolinger and Bourdieu are examples of sharp analytical works in the use of language. However, most of the literature mentioned so far focuses on political speech in English, and a great part of them is based on North American politics because of its preeminent military and economic position in the world.

Famous politicians usually use language to manipulate their audiences. "The prototypes are also great orators, such as Churchill, or Roosevelt or Hitler. For the inspiring orator can also lead a people, or rather mislead them, into believing that the narrow self-interests of the governing party are actually the interest of the people as a whole" [2, p. 13].

It is important to understand that political discourse is usually planned [5], and it presents an example of a very persuasive speech. Politicians understand and exploit the power of linguistic means to explain or justify acts in order to encourage people to support them. Silverstein is convinced that in order to analyze political speech it is significant to understand the indexical readings embedded in political messages [6]. It is possible only through careful and critical discourse analysis of politicians' speeches, that researchers are able to discover the linguistic realizations of political rhetoric that enable politicians to disguise their intentions efficiently.

The **purpose** of this article is to analyze recent political speeches in English and Ukrainian and to demonstrate the relationship between discourse shifts enacted by specific semiotic resources to achieve political objectives. Furthermore, the study is aimed at presenting the way politicians achieve distancing of other social actors. The author makes an attempt to observe the rhetorical methods used to create the enemy, and develop a typology of discourse strategies employed by politicians to construct "otherness". The way the political enemy is rhetorically and linguistically constructed and defined in political contexts is also presented.

The fact that politicians demonize their enemies and picture them in the worst possible light is not new. Both American and Ukrainian political leaders tend to label some of their ideas with adjectives such as "new". This adjective seems appealing to the audience. It gives an idea of modernity, innovation and progress and also avoids possible con-

nections with the negative attributional properties of the adjective “old”. But it is important to clarify what is really “new” and what part of the phenomenon has happened at some other time in the past but is now being labeled “new” to impress the audience with a sense of novelty, actuality and modernity. The way politicians demonize enemies in a particular context and within specific periods of history changes and can be “new”. As Chomsky elaborates: “For each of the superpowers, it is very useful to have a ‘Great Satan’ that can be invoked to terrorize the domestic population into consent and obedience, when it chooses to carry out one or another form of violence: subversion, aggression, destabilization, a war of terror” [3, p. 349]. Chomsky’s quote emphasizes what is common of any superpower state or nation, since it is a well-known and predictable attitude of governments in power. The threat, the fear, the danger, the terror are not new but recognizable elements of political superpower machineries. Ukrainian politicians also try to use adjective “new” in their discourse in order to distance themselves from the politicians who were at power some time ago, are not liked by the electorate anymore, who are considered to be “old” ones. Here are a few examples of positively colored Ukrainian political speeches with adjective “new”/ “новий” (“А жити по-новому – це і означає жити вільно в умовах такої політичної системи, яка гарантує права та свободи людини і нації”, “Ми вміємо і хочемо жити власною працею, здатні бути творчими та інноваційними”, “Тому що на відміну від нас країни європейської спільноти побудували економіку вільної конкуренції, нових ідей, ділової ініціативи, наполегливої праці, постійного самовдосконалення”, “Настав час будувати нову велику країну. Сучасну, високотехнологічну, обороноздатну, конкурентоспроможну”) [7].

On terrorism Chomsky affirms: “Terrorism is now being used and has been used pretty much the same way communism was used. If you want to press some agenda, you play the terrorism card. If you do not follow me on this, you are supporting terrorism” [3, p. 737]. Chomsky shows in *The Culture of Terrorism* that the use of fear by governments to terrorize people is not a new strategy in political discourse; however the mode of terrorism has changed [8]. For example, using possible attacks of Islamic terrorists as strategies to promote fear in people is new in the context of the U.S.A. In short, the notion of terrorism is not new. However, the previous U.S. administration has seen the possibility to materialize, to concretize, this fear of terrorism in the falling of the “Twin Towers” in New York, whose fresh images remain in our memories so that

the government need not construct ideas of terrorism or fear based on an abstraction. Rather, terrorism and the Twin Towers become synonymous, shaping a reality that places the notion of terrorism within a very specific, spatial, temporal frame.

The attacks of September 11 shook the world and allowed the U.S. to actively exercise, now with apparent “justification”, its role as defender of the world. Thus began a fight against a new enemy: Terror and its allies. Soon the Bush administration specifically defined and demonized the enemy as “the axis of evil”, a phrase that allows a simplistic but effective dichotomy between “us good” and “them evil” [6; 9] and places the U.S. on the “good side”. In Bush’s words: “Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists” [10].

The September 11th attacks presented the administration with the opportunity to use the umbrella term “The War on Terror” as justification to activate the “war machine. “The War on Terror” encompasses any nation that was suspected of harboring terrorists and therefore made some countries easy and viable targets. Fighting terror was transformed into a global campaign that actually accommodated the administration’s agenda under the questionable claims that it was protecting the U.S. and the world by combating terrorists. In reality, the administration was able to take any action by placing all international interaction under “the War on Terror” frame. In modern world, where globalization is considered key to understanding human relations and to spreading information quickly, the government saw an opportunity to globalize fear in respect to terror. This was achieved, as shown later, by George W. Bush’s words. The “War on Terror” soon became a “world war on terror”. This globalization has been shown with the attacks on Madrid, Spain (March 11, 2003) and England with the bomb blasts of London’s public transport system (July 7, 2005).

Regardless whether the world changed drastically or just found an argument to justify the change, the Russian-Ukrainian War in Donbass and Annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation were particular events that have been used as the turning point to lead the public opinion through political discourse to support political actions or to set alignments with specific ideological positioning’s in Ukraine. A historical analysis puts facts that strike society in a particular moment into perspective. In the case of the Russian-Ukrainian War in Donbass and Annexation of Crimea, there was a tendency to double the scope of the tragedy to more fully demonize the opposition. And in the central core of this is the portrayal of Ukraine (its language problem, values,

church and so on) as the universal symbol. This terrifying time-period is crucial not only for Ukraine, but equally for the rest of Europe. Situation in Ukraine also changed European perspectives on foreign policy, security, alienation, etc. Other consequences may not be so visible at first glance, but they are a result of the effects of the Russian-Ukrainian War in Donbass and Annexation of Crimea, which changed and are changing many aspects of Ukrainians' lives. These have partially been possible due to the processes of globalizations that were already taking place in the world. The concept of "otherness" is vividly observed in Petro Poroshenko's 2014 inauguration speech: "Зрозуміло, що не зі «стрелками», «абверами», «бесами» чи іншою нечистю. Йдеться про діалог із мирними громадянами України. Навіть з тими, хто дотримується інших, ніж я, поглядів на майбутнє країни", "Сьогодні окремо хочу звернутися до співвітчизників із Донеччини та Луганщини", "Будь-який агресор на кордоні України має згадати Євангельську мудрість: хто з мечем прийде, той від меча і загине!", "Країна зробилася інакшою. Іншими стали люди" [7]. He proceeds in his other speeches: "Війна взагалі не наша ініціатива. Вона нав'язана нам ззовні. Наш вибір – мир", "Ще раз наголошую, що такі утворення, як так звані ДНР та ЛНР, у документі не згадуються взагалі!", "Ми скинули тиранію. Ствердили європейський вибір. Встояли в суровій боротьбі із зовнішнім ворогом", "Їхня мета – знищити нашу державу, не давши нам впевнено звестися на ноги й стати успішним

проектом, гідним наслідування", "Це перша в новітній історії континенту спроба не просто переглянути кордони, а стерти з карти цілу країну. Знищити окрему велику європейську націю. Свідому своєї історії, традицій, спільної долі, славного минулого і величного майбутнього", "Та ворог грубо прорахувався. Він зробив нас ще сильнішими. Українська політична нація остаточно ствердилася на всіх теренах" [7].

So, in this study, the researcher made an attempt to collect political leaders' linguistic ways of constructing the notion of enemy after definite particular moments in the histories of two countries – USA and Ukraine, trying to observe differences and similarities among politicians in different ideological positioning's.

Conclusions. This article is work building the bridge between linguistic choices and ideological alignments. This study complements and innovates different theoretical approaches to present analysis of alignment and distancing in political discourse. It also presents another interdisciplinary approach to account for the linguistic realizations of a typology of discursive strategies to construct the notion of "otherness", as well as to examine the phenomena of alignments and "otherness" in the political discourse, showing what specific aims can be achieved with each of them. The future focus will be on understanding of how politicians portray themselves in the international global arena and how they construct ideological paths with or against specific social actors.

REFERENCES:

1. Chilton P. *Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London : Routledge, 2004.
2. Joseph, J.E. *Language and Politics*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press, 2006.
3. Chomsky N. *Language and Politics*. Edited by C.P. Otero. (Expanded 2nd ed). Oakland, CA: AK Press, 2004.
4. Blommaert J. *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. NY : Cambridge University Press, 2005.
5. Ochs E. "Planned and Unplanned Discourse". *T. Givón, (ed.), Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*. New York : Academic Press, 1979.
6. Said E. *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. NY : Columbia University Press, 2004.
7. Збірник промов Президента України Петра Порошенка. URL: https://gartua.io.ua/s867035/zbirnik_promov_prezidenta_ukraeni_petra_poroshenka (дата звернення: 27.06.2019).
8. Chomsky N. *The Culture of Terrorism*. NY : Black Rose Books, 1988.
9. Said E. *Peace and Its Discontents: Essays on Palestine in the Middle East Peace Process*. Preface by Christopher Hitchens. New York : Vintage, 1995. Published in Britain as *Peace audits Discontents: Gaza-Jericho, 1993–1995*. London : Vintage, 1995. Bush G.W. Address to Congress, Sept. 20, 2001. URL: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?166196-1/president-bush-addresses-nation-911-attacks> (retrieved: 01.07.2019).