RU

Структурно-содержательные особенности военно-политического дискурса: теоретические аспекты (на материале английского языка)

Мошкина Ю. В., Крамаренко О. Л., Богданова О. Ю.

Аннотация. Цель исследования - выявить интегративный характер английского военно-политического дискурса, определить его структурно-содержательные характеристики. В статье рассматривается основная цель данного типа дискурса, обусловливающая его жанровые особенности, а также его составляющие компоненты. Научная новизна исследования заключается в попытке рассмотреть военно-политический дискурс через призму его гибридной природы, имеющей черты как военного, так и политического дискурса, и выявить таким образом его уникальные черты. Результаты исследования показали, что наряду с такими жанровыми формами военно-политического дискурса, как доклад, выступление на пресс-конференциях, интервью, газетная статья и другие, в последнее время особое значение стали приобретать устные выступления, заявления и доклады первых лиц и высших чинов военных ведомств.

EN

Structural and Content Features of Military-Political Discourse: Theoretical Aspects (Based on the English Language)

Moshkina Y. V., Kramarenko O. L., Bogdanova O. Y.

Abstract. The study aims at identifying the integrative nature of the military-political discourse in English and determining its structural and content characteristics. The article considers the components of this discourse type, as well as its main goal, which determines its genre features. The research scientific novelty lies in an attempt to examine the military-political discourse through its hybrid nature which has features of both military and political discourse, and thus identify its unique features. The attained results have shown that along with such genre forms of military-political discourse as a report, speech at press conferences, interviews, newspaper articles and others, oral speeches, statements and reports of top officials and senior officials of military departments have recently become of particular importance.

Introduction

The attention to the problem of studying the military-political discourse has tremendously increased among the scientific community in the last decade. Such interest appeared primarily due to the modern extralinguistic situation, which is characterized by saturation with military and political conflicts.

J. Shy and T. W. Collier in their work "Revolutionary War" in the book "Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age" note the importance of language in "revolutionary war", where the words are a weapon and language is used to isolate and confuse enemies, rally and motivate friends, and gain the support of hesitant witnesses. Instead of being just an instrument of war, language can form war. That very language directs or misdirects military efforts [13]. The study relevance is due to the fact that the military-political discourse got into the focus of researchers' attention not so long ago being less studied than the political discourse taken on its own.

According to the main objective of the article, the authors have set up the following tasks:
- to consider the integrative character of English military-political discourse;
- to single out the military-political discourse structural components and their characteristics;
- to reveal the military-political discourse genre features in English.

The practical value of the work is due to the possibility of using the research results by different specialists in the field of text linguistic expertise, for example for public figures, military leaders and politicians. For this reason, the authors of this article consider it important and necessary to present the research materials in English based

on the translation of some theoretical statements taken from the research work by Yu. V. Moshkina [4] including some additions.

To solve the set tasks, the article uses the following research methods: the method of continuous sampling; the statistical method; the method of componential, conceptual and comparative analysis; the method of linguistic description. The study material is the English-language American presidents' State of the Union Addresses. The theoretical background of this work is the military-political discourse theory by N. D. Arutyunova [1], V. I. Karasik [2], R. R. Mavleev [3], E. V. Pilgun [5], M. A. Syomkin [6], O. A. Solopova [7], K. A. Naumova [7; 8] and E. I. Sheigal [9].

Integrative character of military-political discourse

Some authors distinguish military-political discourse as a special type of discourse, securing a special place for it in discourse research (R. R. Mavleev [3], K. A. Naumova [7; 8], O. A. Solopova [7], T. N. Khomutova [8], etc.). At the same time, along with the extensive literature devoted to the study of political discourse, little attention is paid to military-political discourse. On the one hand, one of the main reasons for this situation is that most linguists give priority to research in the field of political communication. On the other hand, this is due to the difficulty of studying "hybrid" formats of discourse, which include the military-political one. Researchers often ignore it, preferring a separate consideration of issues of political or military discourse. However, it is precisely the integrative character of the military-political discourse that gives it special features distinguishing it from both political and military types of discourses.

In the United States, a special interest in the study of military-political discourse is associated with the events of September 11, 2011, after which the fight against terrorism came to the fore in the speeches of politicians and the American media. The US Government and the US Department of Defense began to view the "global war on terrorism" as a national policy priority and to conceptualize their role in this war.

J. Michaels in his work "The Discourse Trap and the US Military: From the War on Terror to the Surge" points out that the importance that political and military systems attach to the creation, distribution, and control of language in war goes beyond the war itself and becomes a key feature of the conflict as a whole. Once introduced into political-military discourse, words can shape the battlefield and fight for themselves. This phenomenon, according to J. Michaels, has not yet received sufficient academic attention and represents a gap in the existing literature on war study [11].

J. Michaels deconstructs the official discourse of the period 2001-2012, starting with the discourse on the fight against terrorism that emerged after September 11. The author examines the reality of events and how this reality has been distorted by the so-called "*discourse trap*". J. Michaels uses the term "*discourse trap*" to show how discourse with its terminology, developed for political or military reasons, entraps the politicians, motivating or limiting their actions. As an example of a "*discourse trap*", the author cites the term "shock and awe", which was widely used to describe American strategy during the early stages of the 2003 Iraq war (more than 600 news reports around the world spoke of shock and awe during the first week of the war). According to J. Michaels, the term, which appeared as a buzzword in 2003, was originally developed as a concept in a 1996 publication and played its role in planning the war in Iraq. Thus, the author emphasizes the importance of language in developing a strategy, as well as the consequences arising from a lack of understanding among officials of the meaning of the words they use.

J. Michaels describes several types of "discourse traps":
• "boomerang effect": when the terminology used by a politician is borrowed by his opponents in order to compromise the intended course;
• exploitation of popular ideas: when a politician wishes to benefit from popular discourses, often giving them new meaning and using them in a new context;
• marginalization of alternative ideas: when a discourse becomes dominant and sustained through the oppressive influence on alternative discourses [Ibidem].

The types of discourse strategies identified by J. Michaels give us a general idea of the conditions for the formation of military-political discourse.

Structural components of military-political discourse and their characteristics

Let us further consider the structural components characteristic of military-political discourse as a special type of discourse, relying on the typology proposed by V. I. Karasik [2] for any type of institutional discourse. The researcher identifies the following components of the institutional discourse: *participants*; *goals*; *values*; *subject*; *varieties of genres*; *discursive formulas* [Ibidem, c. 6-7]. The main *participants* in political discourse are agents of political institutions, in military discourse, these are the employees of the military departments, while in military-political discourse, they are the top officials of the state, representatives of the military departments at the highest level, heads of international organizations, as well as the state media. The main *goal* of the participants in political discourse is the struggle for power, its retention and redistribution; the goal of the participants in the military discourse is to carry out military operations, to defeat the enemy; in military-political discourse, the main goal is to initiate hostilities and substantiate their necessity, inform the population about the course of the war and form public opinion. Among the *values* of political discourse, V. I. Karasik singles out, first of all, an appeal to the traditional values adopted in a particular society; it is an appeal to the qualities required for the conduct of war in military discourse; it is whipping up a sense of threat

and the need to intervene in a situation, an appeal to a sense of patriotism, national unity to solve a common problem in military-political discourse. The scientist attributes ideology, political systems, political activities and processes, political subjects to the *subject* of political discourse; military conflicts, principles and tactics of warfare, subordination are the *subject* of military discourse; international relations, international law, issues of war and peace are the *subject* of military-political discourse. The main *genres* of political discourse include a Party Program, political report, speech at a rally or in parliament, newspaper article, slogan; different orders and decrees, instructions, directives are the main *genres* of military discourse; a report, a speech at a press conference or at international organizations' bodies meeting, an interview, a newspaper article are the main *genres* in military-political discourse. To achieve the desired effect, both political and military-political discourse are characterized by the use of numerous techniques at the stylistic level (*discursive formulas*), namely, the use of metaphors and comparisons, while military discourse is characterized by the use of "unemotional language" in which clichés prevail as well as statutory wording, common commands, etc. Thus, we can summarize the main connections of military-political discourse with other types of discourse: military discourse rather sets the conceptual components of military-political discourse (goals, participants, values), while the political type of discourse determines their content (strategies, subject, discursive formulas).

Genre features of military-political discourse

Further, in order to establish the whole variety of specific situations of communication in which the military-political discourse is implemented, its genre features should be considered. Understanding the genre in the broadest sense of the word implies any, often repeated (which has become conventional) speech model of interaction with a predictable set of linguistic means, actions, participants, topics, as well as with a certain environment [6].

In case of institutional discourse, the speaker acts as a representative of a certain social institution within the established status-role and situational-communicative norms. As V. I. Karasik notes, the signs of institutionalization fix the role characteristics of agents and participants of institutions, their actions and speech clichés. Institutional discourse is a status-oriented form of communication: communicants appear not so much as individuals, but as carriers of a certain social status [2].

In the study of discursive speech formulas used in military-political discourse, methods of studying political discourse are applicable, in particular, analysis of speech acts. According to N. D. Arutyunova, the sequence of speech acts creates a discourse as far as the main features of a speech act are intention (intentionality), purposefulness and conventionality [1, c. 59].

E. I. Sheigal considers political performatives to be the main speech acts of political discourse (political performatives are statements, the very utterance of which is a political action, the implementation of which in the appropriate institutional context is a form of political participation, which can lead to quite real political consequences) [9, c. 285-303]. The most significant political performatives include those of trust and distrust, support, choice, demand, promise. In addition, the researcher proposes to consider speech acts through the prism of the basic semiotic triad of political discourse "integration – orientation – agonality".

Integration speech acts are used to express unity, solidarity and rallying of "Us". An example of such speech act as a call for unity or a statement of unity, as well as performatives and quasi-performatives of support, can be demonstrated on the *text of the 2004 State of the Union Address, which President Bush delivered to a nationally televised joint session of Congress:*

"We have faced serious challenges together, and now we face a choice: we can go forward with confidence and resolve, or we can turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us. We can press on with economic growth and reforms in education and medicare, or we can turn back to old policies and old divisions. We've not come all this way, through tragedy and trial and war, only to falter and leave our work unfinished. Americans are rising to the tasks of history, and they expect the same from us. In their efforts, their enterprise and their character, the American people are showing that the state of our union is confident and strong..." [12].

Using 'we', George Bush positions himself as an inseparable part of the American nation. The performative nature of the speech is strongly expressed in the contrast between 'go forward' and 'turn back', 'confidence and resolve' and 'dangerous illusion'. The President also appeals to the American history and national character to make his speech sound more convincing.

Orientation speech acts are slogan assertions and declaratives, denoting a programmatic position or statement, as well as such speech acts as reflexives that help to relieve cognitive tension, exposure of lies and exposure of euphemisms, forecast. The speech act of forecasting, according to E. V. Pilgun, is, along with an assumption, a specific means of orientation associated with the analysis of the future, and not the present or the past in the world of politics. The main features of the forecast are:

a) intention: an assumption about the likely course of events;

b) specific linguistic markers: future tense or subjunctive mood, indicators of the modality of probability;

c) optional components: a link to a source of information, an indication of the motives for possible actions of the politician [5, c. 13].

The speech of President Trump, delivered on February 28, 2017 can serve as a vivid and striking example of such orientation speech act. This speech was not officially deemed a "State of the Union Address"; like the freshman's

addresses of President George H. W. Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush and Barack Obama, President Trump treated this speech as simply an "Address to a Joint Session of Congress":

"Dying industries will come roaring back to life. Heroic veterans will get the care they so desperately need. Our military will be given the resources its brave warriors so richly deserve. Crumbling infrastructure will be replaced with new roads, bridges, tunnels, airports and railways gleaming across our very, very beautiful land. Our terrible drug epidemic will slow down and, ultimately, stop. And our neglected inner cities will see a rebirth of hope, safety and opportunity. Above all else, we will keep our promises to the American people..." [10].

In this speech Donald Trump uses a lot of epithets: 'heroic', 'brave', 'desperately', 'crumbling', 'beautiful', 'terrible', 'neglected' which, taken together, form a deep contrast between the situation in the USA before Trump's presidency and the future perspectives of the country. Future Simple is typical of such speeches for describing things which are likely to happen soon.

Speech acts of agonality include, first of all, behavioral regulations (calls and demands) that stimulate political agents to commit political actions [5, с. 19].

"Inside the United States, where the war began, we must continue to give homeland security and law enforcement personnel every tool they need to defend us.

And one of those essential tools is the Patriot Act, which allows federal law enforcement to better share information, to track terrorists, to disrupt their cells and to seize their assets. For years, we have used similar provisions to catch embezzlers and drug traffickers. If these methods are good for hunting criminals, they are even more important for hunting terrorists.

Key provisions of the Patriot Act are set to expire next year.

The terrorist threat will not expire on that schedule.

Our law enforcement needs this vital legislation to protect our citizens. You need to renew the Patriot Act..." [12].

In this case, the speech is saturated with verbs 'to give every tool they need', 'to share information', 'to track terrorists', 'to disrupt cells', 'to seize assets', 'to catch', 'to expire' thus giving vivid character to the situation described and persuading the authorities of the necessity of rapid actions.

This category also includes argumentative acts, which are a civilized way of waging political struggle through polemics, as well as acts of verbal aggression.

Conclusion

Having considered the military-political discourse as a special type of institutional discourse, we come to the following findings:

1) the integrative character of the military-political discourse gives it special features distinguishing it from both political and military types of discourse. During interdiscursive interaction, there is an interpenetration and integration of the characteristics of certain types of discourse. Military-political discourse most clearly manifests its political component, and unlike military discourse, its language is not so strictly regulated and tends to use different literary devices;

2) the main *participants* in military-political discourse are the top officials of the state, representatives of the military departments at the highest level, heads of international organizations, as well as the state media. The main *goal of the participants* in military-political discourse is to initiate hostilities and substantiate their necessity, inform the population about the course of the war and form public opinion. The *values* of military-political discourse are whipping up a sense of threat and the need to intervene in a situation, an appeal to a sense of patriotism and national unity to solve a common problem. The *subject* of military-political discourse is international relations, international law, issues of war and peace. Military discourse rather sets the conceptual components of military-political discourse (goals, participants, values), while the political type of discourse determines their content (strategies, subject, discursive formulas);

3) political performatives are the main speech acts of political discourse. Integration speech acts are used to express unity, solidarity and rallying of "Us". Military-political discourse is characterized by orientation speech acts such as slogan assertions and declaratives; speech acts of forecasting presented by future tense or subjunctive mood, indicators of the modality of probability; speech acts of agonality which include calls and demands, etc.

Thus, we can conclude that the specificity of military-political discourse as a special type of institutional discourse is primarily determined by its purpose. Unlike political discourse, the goal of which is in the struggle for power, or different from military discourse, the goals of which relate to the direct conduct of a war, the goal of military-political discourse is to gain the support of the population to initiate hostilities, continue and/or justify them. This goal determines a certain specificity of genres, precedent texts and discursive formulas. And in this aspect, the military-political discourse most clearly manifests its political component, which brings it closer to political discourse. But, unlike political discourse, in which the media, agents of political institutions are participants, the military-political discourse is more "elitist", since its participants are the first persons of the state, representatives of the military departments at the highest level, and the heads of international organizations. Also, the fundamental difference between the military-political discourse and the political one is that the former gravitates towards verbal speeches (statements, addresses of top officials of the state and/or senior officials of the military departments); written genres, including the mass media, are usually created on the basis of these verbal sources. Further research perspectives in this scientific field are presented in determining the degree of the authoritatives' addresses and speeches influence on public consciousness.

Источники | References

1. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс [Электронный ресурс] // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь / отв. ред. В. Н. Ярцева. М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1999. URL: https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=21282370 (дата обращения: 06.05.2021).
2. Карасик В. И. О типах дискурса // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. науч. тр. Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. С. 5-20.
3. Мавлеев Р. Р. Роль военно-политического дискурса в информационно-психологической войне (на материале русского, английского и китайского языков) // Речевое воздействие в политическом дискурсе: материалы Международной научной конференции / гл. ред. А. П. Чудинов. Екатеринбург: Уральский государственный педагогический университет, 2016. С. 91-94.
4. Мошкина Ю. В. Структурно-содержательные особенности военно-политического дискурса: теоретические аспекты // Антропоцентрическая направленность лингвистических исследований поликультурного военного и политического дискурса / под науч. ред. В. Н. Бабаяна. Ярославль: ООО «Цифровая типография», 2020. С. 121-131.
5. Пильгун Е. В. Лингвистические и социокультурные особенности политического дискурса американского варианта английского языка: монография. Мн.: Изд-во РИВШ, 2016. 75 с.
6. Сёмкин М. А. Жанровые особенности политического комментария в аспекте дискурс-анализа // Вестник Рязанского государственного университета имени Е. А. Есенина. 2010. № 4 (29). С. 86-90.
7. Солопова О. А., Наумова К. А. Гибридные форматы дискурса: проблемы классификации // Филологический класс. 2018. № 4 (54). С. 15-21.
8. Хомутова Т. Н., Наумова К. А. Военно-политический дискурс как особый дискурс // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Лингвистика. 2017. Т. 14. № 3. С. 49-53.
9. Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса: монография / Ин-т языкознания РАН; Волгогр. гос. пед. ун-т. Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. 368 с.
10. Donald Trump's First State of the Union Address [Электронный ресурс]. URL: https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Donald_Trump's_First_State_of_the_Union_Address (дата обращения: 10.03.2021).
11. Michaels J. The Discourse Trap and the US Military: From the War on Terror to the Surge. N. Y.: Palgrave Macmillan (US) - a division of St. Martin's Press, LLC, 2013. 267 p.
12. President Bush's 2004 State of the Union Address [Электронный ресурс] // The Washington Post. 2004. January 20. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/transcripts/bushtext_012004.html (дата обращения: 11.03.2021).
13. Shy J., Collier T. W. "Revolutionary War" // Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age / ed. P. Paret et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991. 940 p.

Информация об авторах | Author information

RU   **Мошкина Юлия Валерьевна**[1], к. пед. н.
Крамаренко Ольга Леонидовна[2], к. филол. н.
Богданова Оксана Юрьевна[3], к. филол. н.
[1, 2, 3] Ярославское высшее военное училище противовоздушной обороны

EN   **Moshkina Yulia Valerievna**[1], PhD
Kramarenko Olga Leonidovna[2], PhD
Bogdanova Oksana Yurievna[3], PhD
[1, 2, 3] Yaroslavl Higher Military Institute of the Air Defense

[1] *julia73dom@yandex.ru,* [2] *petruper@mail.ru,* [3] *dictema@mail.ru*