

Pragmatics of communication strategies in political discourse

Iskakova O.G., Tleuzhanova G.K

Academician Ye.A. Buketov Karaganda University

The article examines the linguistic tactics of accusation in the American political discourse. The accusation is understood as one of the speech methods of implementing the communicative strategy of the "game for the fall", the purpose of which is to discredit the opponent. Negative metaphors, epithets, and nominations, as well as pejoratives, dysphemisms, deictic constructions, and rhetorical appeals are distinguished as language techniques of accusation. The author comes to the conclusion that the choice of certain speech techniques in general depends on the goals that the communicant sets for himself, as well as his moral and ethical attitudes.

Today, the political situation in the United States has a negative dynamic in terms of resolving domestic and international conflicts. The confrontation between the establishment and the White House Administration 64 Philological Sciences. Questions of theory and practice. 2019. Volume 12. Issue 1 of the House, the lack of public consensus on the issue of political migration, the increase in the number of victims of incidents involving firearms, problems in relations between the police and the African-American community, the increase in nuclear tensions on the Korean Peninsula, the lack of progress in cooperation with Cuba and Iran, the continued fight against international terrorism – all these events are reflected in the characteristic functional features of the English-language political discourse and its transformational trends. Thus, in the communicative and strategic models of speech behavior of American politicians at all levels, conflict rhetoric has increased, which is often saturated with negative pragma-semantic components of evaluating (including offensive) the opposition and ideological rivals [1]. The result of these changes is a shift in the communicative norms characteristic of political discourse, and the emergence of increasingly atypical speech situations. Accusation becomes one of the leading communication tactics implemented in a conflict situation. This tactic is increasingly considered by scientists in the framework of research on confrontational and manipulative communication strategies, which allows us to characterize its research as relevant. However, the linguistic ways of implementing the accusation in the context of American political discourse have not yet been analyzed in detail, which determines the novelty of this article.

Speech tactics are a set of techniques that determine the use of certain language tools in certain situations [2]. So, in situations where the goal of the producer is to destroy the reputation of the opponent, a number of techniques are used to discredit the opponent, including accusing him of some crimes or moral and ethical violations. Accordingly, under the accusation, we will understand "attributing to someone any guilt, finding guilty of something, as

well as revealing, detecting someone's unseemly actions, intentions, qualities." The tactics of the accusation

refer to the speech methods of implementing the communicative strategy of the "game for a reduction", i.e., the deliberate expression of a negative attitude towards the opponent, belittling his image and debunking his political positions. The accusation can be personal and impersonal. In the first case, it is directed at a specific person or group of people. In the second case, the culprit of the condemned action is not indicated by the person or group of persons. In the second case, the culprit of the condemned action is not specified.

It is possible to distinguish a number of problematic issues of an extralinguistic nature that are raised in the American political discourse when implementing the tactics of prosecution. This is the presence or absence of patriotism in the opponent, the humiliation of his way of life, the presence of contacts among questionable socio-political groups, working for an ideological enemy, respect for human rights and freedoms, adherence to certain views and values. As an example, consider the statement of former US President Barack Obama about his predecessor George W. Bush: The problem is, is that the way Bush has done it over the last eight years is to take out a credit card from the Bank of China in the name of our children, driving up our national debt from \$5 trillion for the first 42 presidents – #43 added \$4 trillion by his lonesome, so that we now have over \$9 trillion of debt that we are going to have to pay back – \$30,000 for every man, woman and child. That's irresponsible. It's unpatriotic. /

It is unpatriotic (here and further translation of the author of the article. - Ya. Kh.).

In this speech act, the subject directly and indirectly accuses his predecessor as president of several state problems at once. First of all, Bush Jr., according to Obama, is responsible for the huge increase in US debt. This act is characterized by the subject of speech as unpatriotic(unpatriotic), irresponsible (irrepressible) and hypocritical (in the name of our children). The direct reference to China as the country that provided the loan allows us to hint at the overly active cooperation of the Obama predecessor with the ideological opponent of the United States. The by his lonesome idiom points to the selfishness of Bush's actions, the consequences of which are forced to be decided by the successor administration and the American population (we are going to have to pay back). The addressee deliberately uses deictic elements expressed by plural pronouns (we, our) and phrases with the generalizing pronoun every (for every man, woman and child) to emphasize Obama's commitment to democratic values and loyalty to his people. Thus, he implements in his speech not only the tactics of accusation to discredit the opponent, but also the tactics of positive self-presentation, highlighting himself as the complete opposite of Bush Jr. as president.

T. Cruz uses the noun garbage as a nomination for Trump's actions, thereby

emphasizing a derogatory attitude towards the opponent. The senator accuses him of unfair competition, abuse of his influence on the media and spreading gossip. Cruz characterizes Trump supporters by using the pejorative name henchmen, which is most often used in modern English in relation to gang members or officials of dictatorial regimes. The speech constructions do his bidding and there is no low Donald won't go allow us to emphasize Trump's dubious past in the economic sphere, accuse him of dishonest business conduct and non-compliance with the laws.

The second paragraph is characterized by the use of syntactic parallelism, which increases the persuasive effect on voters and allows the communicant to represent himself as a victim of unfair political game. Thus, Ted Cruz uses the tactics of accusation to create a negative image of the opponent, negatively characterizing his actions and behavior and avoiding direct insults. These speech actions also allow the politician to set himself against the opponent and emphasize his own honesty and ethics.

In order to fix a negative image of the accused politician in the minds of the recipients, communicants often use verbal labels to nominate their actions, expressed by metaphors with a negative evaluative component of meaning (1), pejoratives (2) and dysphemisms (3):

(1) Senator Obama suspended those requests for pork-barrel projects after he was running for president of the United States. He didn't happen to see that light during the first three years as a member of the United States Senate, \$932 million in requests.

ечал сомнительность подобных проектов, запросив в общей сложности на них 932 миллиона долларов. (2) President Obama is acting like the playground bully who, when he can't have everything he wants, decides to take his ball and go home. I ask President Obama not to divide us further by acting like an imperial president.

как лидер империалистического государства, чтобы не способствовать разладу в обществе. (3) The blood on George W Bush's hands will never dry. Don't glorify this man. For liberals across the spectrum, the temptation is real to lionize George W Bush now. Donald Trump is our child-king, slobbering over the country and embarrassing us all. He is parody made real, a lackey for rightwing billionaires everywhere.

In fragment (1), the communicant uses the pork-barrel projects metaphor to describe the corruption laws passed during Barack Obama's time in the Senate. The speech construction of see that light highlights the short-sightedness and hypocrisy of the future US president, since he drew attention to the fraudulent schemes of the Senate only during his election campaign.

In fragment (2), Obama's behavior as president is compared first to the behavior of a bully in a playground (the playground bully), and then to the behavior of the leader of an imperialist state (an imperial president). With the help of these pejoratives, the US president is accused of a lack of democratic views, incorrect behavior and increasing discord within the country. Performative construction

I ask allows the communicant to also implement the tactics of reproach, aimed at correcting this situation and subordinating the object of the accusation to the intentions of the speaker.

Fragment (3) is devoted to the criticism of former US President George W. Bush and the comparison of his personality with the current head of state Donald Trump. The modified idiom the blood on George W Bush's hands replaces the neutral construction to be guilty of and, taking into account the macro context of the situation, points to the guilt of Bush Jr. in allowing the terrorist attacks of September 11 and the war in Iraq, which resulted in the death of many American servicemen and civilians. The verb of the exalted vocabulary to lionize is used by the communicant in a negative sense and deliberately substitutes the verb to respect to emphasize the overestimation of the former US president among liberals. In turn, such nominations of Trump as child-king, parody made real and a lackey for rightwing billionaires, allow to represent him as an incapable, biased and frivolous leader, to doubt his ability to govern the state.

References

1. Иссерс О. С. Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. Омск: Изд-во Омского гос. ун-та, 1999. 284 с.
2. Казабеева В. А. Формы реализации взаимодействия участников общения в политическом дискурсе // Успехи современного естествознания. 2013. № 7. С. 146-148.
3. Михалева О. Л. Политический дискурс: специфика манипулятивного воздействия. М.: ЛИБРОКОМ, 2004. 256 с.
4. Сорокина А. А. Роль фразеологизмов в реализации тактик скрытого воздействия в американском предвыборном дискурсе // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2. Языкознание. 2013. № 2 (18). С. 168-172.
5. Хлопотунов Я. Ю. Речевая тактика дискредитации в американском предвыборном дискурсе // Вопросы прикладной лингвистики. 2017. № 27. С. 77-86.