

Communicative aspect of political discourse

Aspecto comunicativo del discurso político

Aigul Airatovna Karamova
Bashkir State University - RUSSIA
kar_aa@mail.ru

Alla Ralifovna Boduleva*
Ruslan Rashitovich Khamidullin*
Yury Nikolaevich Sergeev*
Andrey Vladimirovich Stovba*

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to identify the specifics of political communication, following it at the level of all communicative components, and determine the features of its analysis. The leading method for the study of this problem is discursive analysis, which involves the study of speech tools in the wide non-linguistic context. In addition, the results of the analysis of speech units are obtained by means of contextual, stylistic analysis, in some cases - elements of lexical, international, derivational, grammatical, syntactic analysis. The article revealed the specifics of political communication, which is confirmed by the results of the analysis of speech means. The addresser of political communication is predominantly institutional. The addressee is characterized by a two-component (direct addressee and addressee-listener). The goal of political communication - being a means of struggle for power, is to induce active assessments and actions. Ways to achieve this goal, that is, the impact on the addressee, are primarily emotional-psychological and hidden psychological ones. The materials of the article are of practical value for the subsequent study of political discourse as a special type of communication, determining its place in the general typology of discourse, studying its features.

Keywords: political discourse, communication, political communication, addressee, addresser, emotional-psychological conviction, hidden psychological manipulation.

RESUMEN

El propósito de este artículo es identificar los aspectos específicos de la comunicación política, seguirla a nivel de todos los componentes comunicativos, y determinar las características de su análisis. El método principal para el estudio de este problema es el análisis discursivo, que implica el estudio de las herramientas del habla en un contexto amplio no lingüístico. Además, los resultados del análisis de las unidades del habla se obtienen mediante el análisis contextual y estilístico, en algunos casos, elementos del análisis léxico, internacional, derivativo, gramatical, sintáctico. El artículo reveló los aspectos específicos de la comunicación política, lo que se confirma con los resultados del análisis de los medios del habla. El que dirige la comunicación política es predominantemente institucional. El destinatario se caracteriza por un componente doble (destinatario directo y destinatario-oyente). El objetivo de la comunicación política, al ser un medio de lucha por el poder, es inducir evaluaciones y acciones activas. Las formas de lograr este objetivo, es decir, el impacto en el destinatario, son principalmente emocionales, psicológicos y psicológicos ocultos. Los materiales del artículo son de valor práctico para el estudio posterior del discurso político como un tipo especial de comunicación, determinando su lugar en la tipología general del discurso, estudiando sus características.

Palabras clave: discurso político, comunicación, comunicación política, destinatario, direccionador, convicción emocional-psicológica, manipulación psicológica oculta.

*Bashkir State University, Birk branch, Russia

Recibido: 07/01/2019 Aceptado: 15/05/2019

Introduction

Despite the rather long, very active use of the term “discourse”, it still has not received an unambiguous interpretation. Political discourse is a very multidimensional, multi-faceted phenomenon, it is a subject for interdisciplinary study. And even considering it only from the standpoint of linguistics, researchers focus on its different sides, studying its communicative and pragmatic (Dake, 2000; Forestal, 2017; Khazagerov, 2018; Larson, 1995), semiotic (Sheigal, 2000; Weinmann, 2017), sociolinguistic (Dijk, 1998; Wodak, Weiss, 2003), linguistic and culturological (Kolosov et al., 2018a, 2018b), cognitive (Johnson, 2015) characteristics.

Based on the most successful interpretation of the discourse as a “complex communicative phenomenon” (Dake, 2000: 112), more specifically - as a “communicative event” (Dake, 2000: 122), and also taking into account the nature of the relationship between the concepts of discourse and the text (Alekseev, 2017), discourse can be defined as “a text, represented by special speech means, that correlates with a certain communicative situation (with a historical, socio-cultural, political, ideological, psychological context); with the system of communicative and pragmatic installations; with cognitive processes of generation and perception” (Kolosov et al., 2018a: 128). Hence, political discourse is a text represented by special speech means, correlated with those situations of communication that are connected with the political sphere of people’s life activity.

The most important aspect of discourse, including the political one, is its communicative and pragmatic side (Dake, 2000; Forestal, 2017; Ruiz de Mendoza, 2012). Communication assumes the presence of an addresser (sender of information); addressee (recipient of information); their interaction; the information itself, expressed by certain means (verbal and non-verbal) and presented in certain ways, which is caused by the target setting (intention) of the addresser.

It seems that political discourse is a special type of communication, the specificity of which is manifested at the level of all the above communicative components and the analysis of which requires a special approach.

The purpose of this article is to identify the specifics of political communication, tracing it at the level of all communicative components.

Methods

As a material for the study, texts of political genres are used: public speech, politicians election programs (V. Putin, D. Medvedev, V. V. Zhirinovskiy, G. A. Zyuganov, S. M. Mironova, etc.), party programs (United Russia, Fair Russia, Communists of Russia, Communist Party of the Russian Federation, LDPR, etc.); genres of political discourse of the media: interviews with politicians, election televised debates, press debates, presented in print media (“Arguments and Facts”, “Komsomolskaya Pravda”, “Rossiyskaya Gazeta”), on TV channels (Vesti, Rustavi 2), on official sites of the President of Russia, the Chairman of the Government, the State Duma.

Selection of factual material is based on the principles of discursive analysis, which involves the study of speech means, taking into account the broad non-linguistic context. After all, the identification of the communicative features of political discourse is impossible without referring to the most communicative event. The description is made taking into account the critical approach (critical discourse analysis), which is due to the specificity of the analyzed type of communication.

In the description, methods of contextual, stylistic analysis were used, in some cases - elements of lexical, intonational, word-formation, grammatical, syntactic analysis were used.

Results

The addresser of political communication

The addresser of political communication is a politician, more often a political institution. Therefore, political discourse is primarily institutional. Institutionalization is communication between people the representatives of a certain group of society. The institutionalization of political discourse is manifested to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the genre of communication (for example, the candidate’s election program and the candidate’s commercial). The institutional (predominantly) nature of political discourse is determined by the fact that even a single politician (“I”) is a representative of the institute (“we”): The health and education of the Russian people should be free. We want to warn those who want to make money on this: we will not let you do this !!! (V.V. Zhirinovskiy), etc.

In such examples, one of the values “we” is realized: “we” = “me + party, comrades-in-arms”; “We are the party”: We want to build a fair society in Russia based on the strong social policy of the state (the program of the United Russia party), etc. (Khazagerov, 2018).

At the same time, the ratio of “I” / “we” in the discourse of different politicians is not the same, depending on the psychological leadership qualities of the politician, but it is always, at least, significant.

But the institutionalism of communication does not completely depersonalize the subject of political communication — politician. After all, it is known that the communicative component is an important characteristic of idiostyle (in

another terminology - speech portrait, individual discourse) of politician. In this regard, it is also important what is the attitude of the subject-politician to the addressee, how he identifies himself ("I" in relation to the addressee ("I" of others).

Addressee of political communication

The addressee of political communication is also specific. According to a number of researchers, a complicated model of speech communication is characteristic of political discourse. As its participants, there are two addressees: a rival (opponent) and a people. So, O.L. Mikhalev, in addition to the Addressee (Sb of political action-1), speaks of two more communicants: Sb of political action-2 — the direct recipient (listener) that is a rival who may or may not actually participate in the conversation: The Communists will be afraid, because ink has not been dried yet on the presidential decree banning all communist organizations in Russia (V.V. Zhirinovskiy); Sb of political action-3 — The addressee-observer ("people"), whose attention is sought by the politician, to whose interests he refers: Our compatriots have learned to compare words and deeds (S. Yastrzhemskiy) (Mikhalev, 2009: 36-37).

In some cases, the addressee-observer (people) becomes the direct addressee (listener) (for example, in the pre-election appeal to citizens): Dear fellow citizens! Compatriots! Friends! .. Do an important and correct thing - come to the elections of deputies of the State Duma, decide who will represent you in the highest legislative body of Russia (D.A. Medvedev). Quite often (especially in the pre-election discourse), the addressee-observer (people, society) plays the role of the speaker with the politician (through one of the meanings of "we" -inclusive: "we" = "we are the party" + "people"): We as a nation became not just one of the free nations, we became a responsible and price-knowing society (D.A. Medvedev).

The specificity of the addressee of political communication (both direct and observer) is its mass character, manifested to one degree or another. The addressee is the entire country, region, party, any civil society. An individual person can also act as a direct addressee: a politician (for example: in the genre of a conversation between the President and a representative of a ministry; also individual statements like: I explain what they are doing, Vladimir Vladimirovich, maybe they report to you, but not everything! (V.V. Zhirinovskiy), a simple citizen (for example, in the genre of elaboration - in the Soviet discourse.) The addressee-observer is always massive - the people.

The prevailing mass character of the addressee of political communication predetermines his "collectiveness, indivisibility, unpredictability" of reaction to the message (Lebon, 1995: 83), that is, the difficulty of achieving the goals of communication. In light of this, the addressee has a most important task - to choose an approach to everyone, "to find some kind of common interest for everyone, and of a higher order than the interests of individual groups" (Vinnik, 2018: 126), combine them with this. In this regard, the importance of such concepts as "the psychology of the masses (the crowd)", "the soul of the masses (the crowd)" increases (Wodak, Weiss, 2003: 30).

It is the presence in the communicative structure of the addressee-observer, according to Sheigal (2000) which predetermines such a feature as the theatricality of political discourse. Theatricality is considered as a system-forming feature of political discourse, as well as one of its main communicative strategies. The addressee-observer in political communication acts as a spectator, for whose sake political actions are played, political roles are distributed. The main means of expressing the theatrical essence of political discourse are metaphors with the source sphere "Theater": development according to its own scenario (Russia) (D.A. Medvedev); turning democratic elections into a farce (S.M. Mironov), etc.

According to the conducted research, the language means of nominating participants of political communication are scaled from specific reference names (in a few cases, which is due to the predominant institutional discourse of the political discourse) to deictic words (especially personal pronouns, we, you, they, in what we see the basic semiotic opposition "our own" - "alien", which is expressed by the opposition we - they).

Goals of political communication

The main goal of political communication is by acting on the addressee, thereby contributing to the formation of a certain ("correct", from the addresser's point of view) linguistic picture of the political world, to induce him to certain ("correct") assessments and actions. This goal is aimed at achieving the global goal of politics - the struggle for power.

Types of influence on the addressee

Political communication uses different types of influence: emotional-psychological persuasion, hidden psychological manipulation.

1. Researchers agree that the most effective type of influence in political discourse, as compared to other types, is emotional-psychological persuasion, when the subject appeals to the addressee's emotional sphere (Charteris-Black, 2011; Holbert et al., 2014; Lakoff, 2014; Weinmann, 2017). After all, it is known that the voter is more susceptible to emotional rather than rational arguments.

The means of emotional and psychological influence in the political discourse are units of different levels.

Phonetic tools:

- non-neutral intonation constructions: A step-by-step plan should be made in all directions! (V.V. Putin) (IK-5); Can't trust this man anymore! (S. Mironov) (IK-3); ... only in Russia, the state takes away from the poor and gives it to the rich! (V.V. Zhirinovskiy) (IK-6), etc. ;
- copyright punctuation marks: The price of housing is very heavy for an ordinary family (G. A. Zyuganov); It is necessary to clearly understand: if we want to become a civilized state, we must first become a legal state (D.A. Medvedev);
- pauses: Before, the authorities warned the voter with threats of revenge - communist, oligarchic ... called for a vote in order to "not lose", say "no" to terrorism, decide the fate of the country ... And now? Elections without intrigue and the image of the enemy are fraught with a loss of appearance (Arguments and facts);
- chanting pronunciation: And now I propose to show how the congress of "United Russia" refers to Russia. Russia, hooray! (Chanting along with the audience) Russia, Russia, Russia, Russia! (V.V. Putin);
- the syllable utterance: We do not violate anything. Do not (V.V. Putin. News. Morning); rhyme: Zyuganov takes the right course: Russia, Motherland, People! (G.A. Zyuganov).

Lexical and phraseological tools:

- expressive with unmotivated meaning: We ... for the fact that any official rudeness and bureaucratic conceit is punished to the fullest extent of the law and social morality (Soviet Russia);
- metaphors: the paralysis of the global financial system (V.V. Putin); dirty electoral technologies (S.M. Mironov);
- metonymy: the race for the presidency (Moskovskiy Komsomolts), the Orange Revolution;
- phraseological units: the country of legal nihilism, the policy of double standards; We wanted the best, but it turned out as always (V.S. Chernomyrdin);
- derivational expressive expressions: Stalinism, the national communist;
- lexical and stylistic techniques: lexical irony: Immediately begin paying deposits, which Yeltsin's "reforms" took away from the people (G.A. Zyuganov); lexical methods of language game: Instead of the past, we will build a present Russia ... (D.A. Medvedev); rich country of poor people (Komsomolskaya Pravda), etc.

Grammar tools:

- stylistic figures: a rhetorical question: Is this not a national disgrace? (G.A. Zyuganov); rhetorical exclamation: We have to admit with bitterness that only in Russia the state takes away from the poor and gives it to the rich! (S. Mironov); parceling: To give the entrepreneur the opportunity to work on his own and create jobs for others. But not to pull and not to "press" with checks (V. Putin); epiphrase: Little money is allocated (less than 10% of budget expenditures), moreover, they are unevenly allocated during the year (V.V. Zhirinovskiy); parallelism: 20 years of struggle, 20 years of victories, 20 years of party formation (V.V. Zhirinovskiy); antithesis: the birth rate fell, the death rate grew (V.V. Putin); ellipse: All corrupt officials - for life! (V.V. Zhirinovskiy); inversion: But given the ... how successfully the 21st century has started for us, we have very good chances (D.A. Medvedev); Asidenton: Do you know how to resist the administrative resource, dirty election technologies, black PR (S.M. Mironov);
- means of expressive syntax: homogeneous members of the sentence: We should not especially praise foreign armies, because before our eyes they were defeated in Korea, in Vietnam, in Cuba, and in Africa (V.V. Zhirinovskiy), lexical repetitions: We live in an unreal world with an unreal policy and an unreal economy (M. Prokhorov), comparisons: In other words, Russia has lost its economy, which has flowed abroad like sand through fingers (S.M. Mironov), quotes: Russia should be united centralized country in which there would be no room for extremists and terrorists who tried to take "as much sovereignty as they could swallow" (V.V. Zhirinovskiy), etc.

Text tools:

- composition - intentional concentration of emotionally saturated units at the beginning or at end of the

text - the most communicatively significant parts of it. For example, the solemn nature of the beginning of the program of a political party: Russia is entering a new frontier of its development. Thanks to the work and courage of all Russians, the will of the responsible political forces, the crisis of recent years has been steadily overcome. The consolidation of the nation around the policy of strengthening the rule of law and order in the country, economic and political stability, and improving the welfare of citizens has become the mainstay of the country's development. In the new conditions, it becomes vital to unite all forces capable of taking responsibility for the fate of Russia, united around noble ideas and goals that are close and understandable to the overwhelming majority of the country's citizens (the United Russia party program); and even more solemn, slogan nature of the ending of the program: We are the party of those who, by their own work, talent and personal initiative, create material and spiritual values, protect the civil and social rights of people! We are for Fair Russia! We are for Socialist Russia! We urge all those who cherish the future of Russia to go with us! (The program of the party "Fair Russia"). The ending of such texts, as a rule, contains mottos, slogans, appeals, and programmatic statements: By our joint efforts, the 21st century should be the century of Russia's greatness and prosperity (the program of the United Russia party); The motto of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation is "Russia, work, democracy, socialism!" (Program of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation); Communist society - the historical choice of mankind (the program of the party "Communists of Russia"), etc.

It should be noted a pronounced socio-political expressiveness, which is caused by the main feature of the policy - agonism caused by the struggle for power. In political communication, expressiveness sometimes reaches extreme limits, turning into speech aggression. Speech aggression is associated with the expression of a negative assessment and is aimed at belittling the enemy in order to discredit him in a political struggle. Means of expression of speech aggression are a wide range of expressiveness: metaphors, mainly militarized: we must give a real fight to falsifiers and fraudsters who turn democratic elections into a farce (S.M. Mironov), zoomorphic: The priority will be the well-being of the broad masses of the people, not a handful oligarchs, the interests of the common man, and not the "fat cats" blubber (P. Grudinin), the criminal ones: If, as a result of economic growth, the rich are rich and the poor are poor, then this is not economic growth, but plundering of the country! (S.M. Mironov); Injunctives: All Moscow government is a scam! (V.V. Zhirinovsky), labels: The Russian Empire is the gendarme of Europe; nicknames; Zhirik, Zu, etc.

In addition, a pronounced expressiveness due to the relationship "leader and crowd." According to Lebon (1995), the crowd, by its very nature having an exaggerated feeling, is able to respond only to the same exaggerated feelings. And so the leader, who wants to captivate her, "must abuse strong expressions".

2. Psychological manipulation. Psychological manipulation - the hidden effect on the recipient, aimed at the subconscious perception. With regard to political discourse, it is advisable to speak of manipulation as a fairly common form of ideological influence (Vinnik, 2018; Chikileva, 2018; Billig, Marinho, 2014; Dijk, 2006). It, unlike emotional-psychological persuasion through evaluative and expressive means, has a hidden effect on the subconscious sphere of the recipient, by building complex strategies. By instilling ideas that are profitable for themselves, the manipulator sometimes achieves more effective results than the aggressor.

The main method of psychological manipulation is speech manipulation, that is, implicit speech influence on the addressee's subconscious mind in order to correct his picture of the world, to form motives favorable for the addressee.

The study of speech manipulation is not limited to a simple analysis of the means of their expression. The linguistic researchers are interested in the more communicative and pragmatic aspect of manipulation: the subjects of communication, the illocutionary goals of the addresser, the perlocutionary response of the addressee, the interaction between the addresser and addressee, communicative strategies used to achieve manipulative goals.

Any impact, according to a fair comment by Dotsenko (1997) is an interaction, because "one person decides what he intends to do with another person (as with an object), but how to do something is found (recognized) in the process of their interaction (at an operational level) with the addressee" (p. 62). The same remark applies to manipulative effects. "Every manipulation of consciousness is an interaction," states Kara-Murza (2000), because "a person can become a victim of manipulation only if he acts as its author, accomplice" (p. 12). Thus, from the communicative point of view, manipulation is a type of speech interaction between the addresser and the addressee. In the manipulative process, the subjects of communication acquire a specific coloring, as compared with other types of communication.

The manipulator is guided by unseemly goals to achieve one-sided benefits; refers to the addressee "from the top to bottom" only as an object of influence, not recognizing in him the existence of his own stable opinion, his position. In a political discourse, a manipulator can be either a direct subject of political communication (a politician, a political institution), or the media, conveying information to the addressee in a revised, or interpreted, or distorted form, in any form advantageous to itself. In this connection, of course, one must distinguish between direct (from the subject of political communication) and indirect (from the media) manipulation.

As for the object of manipulation, its features are due to the unconscious nature of the manipulative effect. The object of manipulation is most often people who are susceptible to suggestion, allowing themselves to be manipulated without noticing the very fact of the introduction of motives of behavior advantageous to the manipulator in their consciousness. They are not able or unwilling to be critical of the information provided to them. In relation to political discourse, these are people with a passive civic stance, unstated political views, unformed political worldview.

At the same time, it should be recognized that it is extremely difficult to resist manipulation. After all, the “target” of manipulation, that is, “those mental structures that are influenced by the initiator of influence” (Dake, 2000: 115), are the most vulnerable areas of human nature.

The target for manipulation, according to Kara-Murza, becomes primarily a region of feelings. Therefore, “a general principle in the manipulation of mass consciousness is the preliminary “swinging” of the emotional sphere, in particular, appeals to fear, envy, hatred, complacency, etc. (Kara-Murza, 2000: 81), that is, mainly to the base inclinations and aggressive aspirations (Kara-Murza, 2000: 115). A safe target are also the imagination of man, as well as memory and attention (Kara-Murza, 2000: 100, 109).

And the very nature of political communication predetermines the possibility of manipulation. The collective, mass addressee (or the crowd, in the sense of Lebon (1995)) is extremely suggestible. This is because the consciousness is individual, and the unconscious - collectively. Individuals dissolve in the mass under the influence of suggestion, since suggestion in a crowd is infectious. Therefore, the manipulative capabilities of a political, mass in nature, communication is particularly significant.

Manipulations are carried out through carefully thought-out speech behaviors or strategies. The main manipulative strategies in political discourse are appropriate to consider the strategy of implication and reduction, since, firstly, these are the most presented manipulative strategies in political communication, secondly, the strategies most closely corresponding to the very nature of manipulation as a hidden psychological impact.

The implication strategy is a hidden presentation of information, concealment of true meanings, carried out, for example, by:

- euphemetic metaphor: neutralization instead of military operation; zero growth instead of stagnation;
- passive constructions and constructions with nominalization, in which information is implied on the subject's belonging to the area of one's own / alien (since an ideologically diverse subject can take an agent's position in such constructions), but which can be easily deciphered in the addressee's mind, based on the positive / negative context: what is the army brought to? (V.V. Zhirinovsky) - the actions attributed to the “alien”; One of the indisputable achievements of the last decades is the direct and free participation of citizens in elections (D.A. Medvedev) - actions attributed to “their own”, etc;
- constructions with conventional implicatures (presuppositions), in which assertion (that which needs to be proved, in our case, to instill) is served under the guise of presupposition (what is obvious, true, does not require proof): The state must regulate prices (G.A. Zyuganov) - estimated presupposition “the state does not regulate prices”; Russia must become a country capable of defending itself, where security is guaranteed for every person, where law enforcement agencies work reliably, a fair judicial system operates - the estimated presupposition “is not that: not capable, does not guarantee, does not work” (The United Russia party program);
- constructions with communicative implications, in which implicit information is presented under the guise of a violation of the Principles of Cooperation (according to G. P. Greis), for example, one of the principles - the quantity postulate - reads: “Your statement should contain no less information than is required”; and if this principle is intentionally violated, this is an implicit meaning, for example: But they made statements that the doors of NATO are open for Georgia, so ... (Rustavi 2).

Reduction strategy - speech actions of the subject of communication, aimed at simplifying the actual problems. This, for example:

- evaluative vocabulary and phraseology, which is actively used to create reduced (positive / negative, bright / dark, white / black) temporal images: poverty and robbery of a “market economy”; anti-people laws, etc. (G.A. Zyuganov); screaming poverty of Russians; depreciation of fixed assets, etc. (V.V. Zhirinovsky) - a negative image of the present;
- words with the meaning of quantity, the use of which for manipulative purposes becomes possible due to their prestige, scientific imagery (and therefore - confidence in them from the addressee), positive/negative statistics are used to reduce temporal images: With the advent of the Liberal Democratic Party to power, Russia will be revived in 3-5 years, the welfare of all Russians will increase 2-3 times ...

Otherwise, the country will have to live another 50 years in such a difficult condition as it is now (LDPR Party Program);

- vaguely personal constructions with common semantics of alienation, reducing the area of “alien”, painting it in negative tones, shifting responsibility for harmful actions and words to “alien”: Plunged our country into a pit (Russia 1), etc.

The interaction of communicants.

Any communication, including political, is not only an impact, but also an interaction. This interaction manifests itself first, at the level of information processing (coding it by the addresser and decoding by the addressee), that is, in how the addressee perceives information, as far as is influenced.

Secondly, interaction manifests itself at the level of change of communicative roles: the addressee (direct or observer) becomes the addresser of communication, reacting to information (in a word, silence or action; instantaneously or slowly). Therefore, the most important characteristic of communication is dialogue (both narrowly and broadly understood). Dialogue of political discourse is manifested not only in the vivid representation of dialogic genres in its structure, such as: televised debates, the presidential telethon, a meeting with voters, an interview with a politician, etc. (a narrow approach to dialogue as an interactive interaction, exchange of replicas). It seems that the dialogue in the understanding of M.M. Bakhtin (according to which any statement - from a short replica to a multi-volume work – is dialogically - is a broad approach) is most applicable to PD, which is due to its main purpose. The specificity of political discourse here is manifested in the fact that this is mainly a dialogue-controversy - “a dialogical opposition of “one’s own” (that is, correct) and alien” (that is, erroneous) points of view (Forestal, 2017). According to the remarks of researchers, the political (ideological) text is polemical in nature. A political text that does not contain “polemical tension” will not be able to fulfill its main purpose - to convince.

Despite the interaction of the subjects of political communication, the initiating role in it belongs to the policy subject. The change of the roles of the addresser and the addressee-observer is manifested in such, for example, rather small genres, such as the reader’s address to the editorial office, citizens’ questions in the Presidential Telethon, the citizen’s letter to the politician by Internet. This is the so-called discourse of reaction, which becomes possible only in a democratic society.

Discussion

Thus, consideration of the features of political communication convinces in its specifics. The specificity of political communication is manifested at all levels.

The addresser of political communication is primarily institutional, he is a representative of the institute - like-minded groups, parties, public organizations, etc. Speech means of expression of the indicated specificity of the political communication sender is the activity of the pronoun we with the general meaning “we are the party”.

The addressee of political communication is characterized by two-component (direct addressee and addressee-listener) and, mainly, by mass character. Interaction in the field of “subject-direct addressee” is “theatrical”, calculated for another addressee - “spectator”, which is proved by the activity of the metaphor with the source sphere “Theater”.

The main, ultimate goal of political communication is the struggle for power. This substantiates the activity of the militaristic, animalistic metaphor, nicknames, non-literary words and expressions, other speech manifestations of aggression. The way to achieve this global goal is to form a picture of the world at the addressee-observer that is beneficial for the addresser, encouraging him to take active assessments and actions. Therefore, the main, main addressee of political communication is the addressee-listener, the people, the electorate, the “spectator”, to whom the communication is directed, on the decision of which, by and large, depends on the outcome of the political struggle.

This goal determines the specificity of the impact on the addressee-observer. The main methods of influence are primarily emotional-psychological, which is connected with the mass character of the addressee-observer (after all, “the crowd thinks in images” (Lebon, 1995)); hidden psychological, which is also associated with the mass nature of the addressee-observer (after all, consciousness is individual, and the unconscious - collectively; individuals dissolve in the mass under the influence of suggestion, because suggestion in a crowd is infectious (Lebon, 1995)). The advantage of these types of influence in political discourse is evidenced by the activity of the corresponding speech means presented at all language levels.

The specificity of the interaction of communicants is also manifested in the polemics, that is, the opposition of “their” and “alien” ideological positions, as evidenced by the activity of expressive, evaluative speech means.

The revealed specificity of political communication justifies the need for its critical analysis. Critical discourse analysis took shape in the middle of 1990s in foreign linguistics and is actively developing at present (Dijk, 2006;

Dijk, 1998; Wodak, Weiss, 2003). In the course of the analysis of linguistic elements, the implicit attitudes of political discourse are revealed, the hidden effects on the addressee are demonstrated.

It seems that the methods of critical discourse analysis can be used even when it comes to open emotional and psychological impact through expressive means. Indeed, beautiful words and expressions often do not have a solid foundation based on a strong ideological political foundation. The relevance of critical discourse analysis increases even more when political communication turns into manipulative communication. Through a hidden psychological impact, you can inspire the addressee with the necessary, advantageous to the addresser ideas and achieve the desired, favorable for the addressee's reaction.

Such a critical approach to the analysis of political texts has significant practical value - by informing the public, it teaches critical perception and understanding of political tests, and the development of mechanisms for protection against adverse effects.

Conclusion

Thus, the article considers the communicative aspect of political discourse, attempts to justify the specifics of political communication. Consideration of the subjects of political communication, the features of their interaction, methods of influence allows to conclude that political discourse is a special, specific type of communication that has a powerful influence on the addressee-listener, the people. Pursuing the conquest of power as the ultimate goal, the addresser of political communication uses a rich arsenal of means of explicit and hidden psychological influence, often unfavorable. All this requires a special, critical approach to its analysis and description.

The results of the study will further solve some important problems of studying political discourse, in particular, in determining the place of political discourse in the general typology of discourse, in organizing and describing manipulative strategies and tactics of political discourse, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Alekseev, A.B. (2017). On the question of the distinction between the concepts of "text" and "discourse". *Modern problems of the ecology of language*, 73-78.
- Billig & Marinho (2014). Manipulating information and manipulating people. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(2), 158-174.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chikileva, L.S. (2018). Presidential political discourse as a means of manipulation: a pragmalinguistic aspect. *Russian Humanities Journal*, 7(1), 20-29.
- Dake, T.A. van (2000). *Language. Cognition. Communication*. Moscow: Lenand.
- Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology. A multidisciplinary study*. London.
- Dijk, T. A. van. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse and Society*, 17(2), 359-383.
- Dotsenko, E.L. (1997). *Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and protection*. Moscow: CheRo, Moscow State University Publishing House.
- Forestal, J. (2017). Trolls, Digital Media, and Deweyan Democracy. *American Political Science Review*, 111(1), 149-161.
- Holbert, Hill & Lee. (2014). The political relevance of entertainment media. In Reinemann, C. (Eds.). *Political communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Johnson, M. (2015). Embodied understanding. *Front. Psychol.*, 6, 875.
- Kara-Murza, S.G. (2000). Manipulation of consciousness. Retrieved from <http://www.twirpx.com/file/624713/>.
- Khazagerov, G. (2018). Rhetoric, grammar, discourse and homeostasis. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov, Seriya Lingvistika*, 22(2), 357-372.
- Kolosov, Zotova, Popov, Gritsenko & Sebentsov. (2018). Russia's Post-Soviet Border Zone in between East and West (Analysis of Political Discourse): Part I. *Looking West. Polis*, (5), 57-69
- Kolosov, Zotova, Popov, Gritsenko & Sebentsov. (2018). Russia's post-soviet border zone in an analysis of political

- discourse. Part II: Looking east. *Polis*, (5), 57-69.
- Lakoff, G. (2014). Mapping the brain's metaphor circuitry: metaphorical thought in everyday reason. *Frontiers in Human Neuro-Science*, 8 Art. 958. Retrieved from <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00958>.
- Larson, C.U. (1995). *Persuasion: reception and responsibility*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publ. Company.
- Lebon, G. (1995). *Psychology of peoples and masses*. Moscow: Layout.
- Mikhalev, O.L. (2009). *Political Discourse: Specificity of the Manipulative Impact*. Moscow: Book House LIBROCOM.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F.J. (2012). Galera -Masegosa A. Metaphoric and metonymic groups in phrasal verb interpretation: metaphoric chains. In Eizaga Rebollar B. (Eds.). *Studies in Cognition and Linguistics*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 161-190.
- Sheigal, E.I. (2000). *Semiotics of political discourse: dissertation of Dr.Sc. in Philosophy*. Volgograd.
- Vinnik, Y.V. (2018). *Political Discourse: General Characteristics and Manipulative Potential*. *Language and Speech in Synchrony and Diachrony*, 162-163.
- Weinmann, C. (2017). Feeling political interest while being? *Psychology of Psychology. Popular Psychology*, 6, 123-141.
- Wodak, R., Weiss, G. (2003). *Critical discourse Analysis theory and disciplinarity*. New York.
- Zolyan, T. (2018). 'Doublethink' and semiotics of political discourse. "Double Thinking" and the Semiotics of Political Discourse. *Polis*, 3, 93-109.