

Elya Davtyan

Lecturer of Foreign Language

Department at Eurasia International University

Email: davtyanelya@gmail.com

DOI: 10.53614/18294952-2022.2-78

HATE SPEECH IN AMERICAN AND ARMENIAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Hate speech is one of the basic concepts of linguistics and political rhetoric. In political speech, language expressions of hate speech are often decisive for the acceptance or rejection of the ideology and main theses of a politician's. Since politics is mainly implemented through language: speeches, debates, addresses, etc., the linguistic manifestations of hate speech have a great deal of content and influence in them. The purpose of this study is to identify the main linguistic means of hate speech in American and Armenian political speech.

Keywords: hate speech, communication, political discourse, tolerance, linguistic expressions, conflict.

Introduction

There are many examples of manifestations of hate speech in American and Armenian political discourse. The examples discussed in the article will be subjected to content analysis, as a result of which a general picture will be formed about the peculiarities of the linguistic manifestations of hate speech in the case of the languages in question. The relevance of such an analysis lies in the fact that in modern conditions, politics and politicians, especially political leaders, face many urgent problems (fight against terrorism, regional military conflicts, increase in the volume of migration, increase in international crime, epidemic, etc.), which require quick and effective solutions. Based on this relevance, politicians and especially country leaders often prefer to use intolerant but effective means of

influencing mass consciousness and opposing their political rivals, including hate speech. It includes expressing and instilling hostility and disrespect toward the target, ridiculing, taunting, insulting, slandering, accusing a political opponent, etc.

Methods, Theoretical Basis

The method of functional–linguistic analysis of discourse has been used in this paper. The study has been conducted on the basis of the content analysis method. The object of the study is American and Armenian political speech, and the object of the study is the linguistic manifestations of hate speech in this speech. The theoretical basis of the study is the work of a number of linguists and researchers devoted to the manifestations of hate speech in political speech.

Results

The study found that all three types of hate speech are present in political speeches: hard, medium and soft. One of the important results is that the analyzed examples point to a direct connection between the significance of hate speech and political processes in political discourse, that is, the more important a political event concerns a politician’s speech (eg. elections), the larger and harsher the verbal manifestations of hate speech in his speech.

The results obtained are important for understanding the linguistic image of a politician and his behavior, which depends not only on the degree of tolerance of a given person, but also on the political processes in which he is directly involved. (eg: elections). This means that hate speech is as specific to political speech as tolerance, and is not an exceptional phenomenon, but is always present in political speech to one degree or another.

Hate speech is generally perceived as speech containing disrespectful, rude remarks and expressions directed at ethnic or religious groups or their representatives. Hate speech is shaped by discussions and speeches on racism, nationalism, sexism, xenophobia and homosexuality. However, accepting only religion or ethnicity as the basis for hate speech somewhat narrows the scope of hate speech. For this reason, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2016) has broadened the traditional definition of “hate speech” to include all acts aimed at spreading or inciting racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism and other forms of hostility based on intolerance. This framework includes manifestations of intolerance such as nationalism, ethnocentrism, violation of the rights of minorities, migrants and immigrants (Верховский, 2002).

There are different classifications of hate speech. The most detailed types of hate speech are presented in A. M. Verkhovsky’s classification (Верховский, 2002, p. 20–49), which consists of three categories. The first of these is “hard hate speech,” which includes:

1. Literal and open engagement in the conflict,

2. Propaganda and promotion of violence through slogans and appeals;
3. Verbal and open calls for accountability and discrimination,
4. Promoting discrimination through common slogans,
5. Hidden calls for violence and discrimination.

The second category is “average hate speech”, which includes:

1. Public protection of historical precedents of violence and discrimination,
2. Publications and statements questioning known and recognised instances of violence and discrimination in history,
3. Validation of historical crimes committed by members of any ethnic group,
4. The association of a social group with foreign political and state structures in order to discredit it,
5. Confirmation of the criminality of a particular ethnic group,
6. A statement about the superiority of an ethnic group in terms of material wealth or income, as well as in public institutions,
7. A reprimand for the negative influence of a social group on society,
8. A call for the eradication of any social group from society.

The third group includes “soft hate” phenomena.

1. Creating a negative image of any ethnic group,
2. A disparaging description of any ethnic group;
3. Emphasising the inferiority of an ethnic group,
4. highlighting the imperfect moral perceptions of any ethnic group,
5. Mentioning a social group in an offensive context,
6. Reproduction of xenophobic statements or similar publications without appropriate commentary distinguishing the views of the speaker from those of the author of the text.

Two levels of hate speech are distinguished: linguistic and extralinguistic (Melnikov, p. 117).

At the extra-linguistic level of hate speech, we are dealing with socio-political, psychological, cultural, legal and ethical phenomena.

Meanwhile, the linguistic means of implementing hate speech are all conscious or unconscious statements aimed at creating irrational delusions in the recipient’s perception of reality by using innuendo, falsification of facts and various stylistic devices.

The prevalence of this type of speech in the modern period is greatly influenced by linguistic and extra-linguistic factors of hate speech, where more covert forms of the phenomenon prevail, as opposed to the more open and expressive forms used in the past.

Hate speech thus manifests itself in the case of problems related to racism, nationalism, sexism, xenophobia, homosexuality, as well as in the form of overt, rude language directed at ethnic, religious and political groups or their individual representatives.

Discussion

Types of hate speech

The need to study the phenomenon of ‘hate speech’ stems from the fact that many 21st century political conflicts take place directly in the information space. This shift from open confrontation to an informative stance is fraught with the risk of presenting biased material and thus increasing the psychological manipulation of the masses.

Hate speech can be rough, medium and soft. Rough language is characterized by a strict separation of “we” and “them”, as a result of which hate speech or text may contain hostile expressions towards “them”, and in some cases call for decisive action.

The main subject of this part of the thesis is verbal aggression, which is the most typical and widespread manifestation of hate speech in adult communication and, in particular, in political speech.

The danger of verbal aggression lies in its destructive effect on the perception of the participants in the communication, in preventing the full exchange of information and in blocking the channels of communication. This is a good reason to study the phenomenon of verbal aggression not only from the point of view of communicative security of the individual, but also of society as a whole. Examples of manipulative verbal aggression include lying about events during a conflict, distorting world history, actively promoting a country’s policies, etc. Verbal aggression can be used to instil the perception that a country is an unqualified aggressor or a victim on the international stage, for example (Zhilavskaya, 2001, p. 115).

Types of verbal aggression can be classified in different ways.

Table 1. Classification of types of verbal aggression according to the form of manifestation

Active	Passive
Direct	Direct
a. verbal abuse b. humiliation of someone’s dignity c. threats against someone d. call to war e. conflict incitement f. violence	a. refusal to participate in negotiations, b. avoiding conversation with another person
Indirect	Indirect
a. promoting false information about someone by spreading gossip	a. refusal of any oral explanation, b. ignoring the opponent, c. abusive attitude towards the opponent (Bykova, 1999)

Table 2. Classification of types of verbal aggression according to the form of manifestation

Explicit	Implicit
Explicit, overt, there is a pronounced influence on consciousness	Hidden, disguised; there is an indirect influence on the mind
Ways of creating verbal aggression	
1. Use of offensive and obscene language (slang, offensive words, obscene expressions).	The use of extracts from texts, making analogies (often used as allusions).
2. The use of slang and jargon (by slang we mean the language of a particular social group, by slang we mean the coded language of the criminal community).	The use of words and expressions that are not devoid of ambiguity, which is non-trivial, derogatory and obscene.
3. The use of negative metaphors and paraphrases is another way of creating verbal aggression. Metaphors are usually used to express a word, but they can often show its negative connotations.	Creating hostile irony using slang and argonisms.

Types of verbal aggression are also divided into two groups according to their intensity.

Table 4: Classification of types of verbal aggression according to intensity.

Strong verbal aggression.	Mild verbal aggression.
Expressed hostility without attempting to conceal the intent to create conflict.	A weakly expressed conflict of the opposite party, in which etiquette and rules of politeness are observed.

In addition to the above-mentioned manifestations of verbal aggression, there are two other types of means.

The first order of means of verbal aggression usually includes words and expressions expressing unfavourable assessment; offensive and stylistically abbreviated, random words, aggressive metaphors, profanity, etc. Open verbal aggression is usually formed by these means. The following article headline is an example of this type: “How Putin managed to form a pro-Russian coalition in Europe” (Как Путину удалось сколотить пророссийскую коалицию в Европе, 2014). In the original, the Russian expression <сколотить коалицию> is used, which is closer to the word <to forge>. Thus, a headline with seemingly positive content actually indicates the author’s intention to reduce the authority and competence of the President of the Russian Federation, as the headline leads to a negative perception of the information read by the addressee.

The second type of means of expressing speech aggression includes the means

of speech aggression, which are carried out in any speech. Such techniques include the use of contrast, language demagoguery and the biased use of negative information (Месропян, 2011).

It should be noted that the use of contrast is also an indirect means of verbal aggression. This method is likely to go unnoticed by the recipient in the perception of the information. By remaining unrecognized, such information increases the risk of influence and manipulation. In examining the discursive techniques of verbal aggression used in English-language political discourse, we conclude that demagoguery is a common type of covert verbal aggression. The term “demagoguery” translates from Ancient Greek as “to lead the people”, “to please the people”. The scientific definition of demagoguery is “a set of rhetorical and argumentation techniques and means to mislead the listener and to persuade him or her to take his or her side”. Most often, demagoguery is used to achieve political goals, in advertising and propaganda. Notably, the first demagogues, including Themistocles and Pericles, were politicians, suggesting that the original meaning of the word was <politician>. Later Aristotle revealed a slightly different content of the term, from which it follows that a demagogue is a defender of the interests of the people.

Researchers point to several techniques of linguistic demagoguery, but the most common is the use of an implicator. This technique allows the main purpose of the statement to be disguised by voicing the non-letter part of the text’s content. In this case, the information is presented as a hidden message rather than the main message. Acceptance of context is most often used in the interpretation of historical facts, when a certain opinion or distorted reality is imposed. This tends to make the recipient of information lose his alertness or lead to a so-called “silence” of the mind, whereby he accepts those incorrect arguments as valid and trustworthy. A special place in manipulation of consciousness is occupied by a false diversity of opinion, on the basis of which the recipient forms a persistent belief in the credibility of the information. False pluralism is based on the idea that if the same information comes from a large number of different sources, it is perceived as objective and true. The contrasting technique is also used to generate verbal aggression. This principle is based on a covert juxtaposition of positive and negative phenomena in the text, with the negative side being emphasised most strongly.

One effective means of verbal aggression is irony, which is used in indirect methods of influence such as innuendo, jokes and cynical expressions (Кузьмин, 2005, p. 156).

Hate speech as a strategy to discredit an opponent in political discourse

As the research above shows, verbal aggression is capable of disarming a political opponent because one of its main functions is to discredit and slander. “Defamation is the dissemination of knowingly false, inaccurate or distorted in-

formation in a printed or otherwise reproduced text or mass media with the intent to damage the reputation of a subject.” (Большой Юридический словарь, 2001, p. 144). The notion of aggression has passed into linguistics from psychology, where it is understood as a verbal or physical action aimed at inflicting harm on a political opponent. The author of many studies, T. A. Vorontsova, distinguishes two approaches to verbal aggression. The first is linguopsychological, since the expression of aggression in language is intended to leave a certain psychological impact on other subjects of communication. At the same time, verbal aggression is directly expressed in speech dynamics, voice, intonation and even gestures. In this sense, verbal aggression should be seen not only as a psychological phenomenon, but also as a type of political strategy.

The second approach embodies the interaction of sociolinguistic, stylistic, and legal-linguistic aspects of the analysis of verbal aggression. The evaluation of some aggressive language units is possible only in terms of their role and function in a particular discursive action, since their status is formed depending on the context. Therefore, it is impossible to consider the studied phenomenon as a means of communication without taking into account its functions in the framework of a specific discursive action.

The goal of verbal aggression in political speech is to defeat the opponent and lower his political status. Speech aggression in terms of political conflict is understood as a speech act that creates psychological or social inequality between speech participants, contributing to the dominance of some over others. Verbal aggression is an individualistic and egocentric form of human behavior that denies the norms of morality and is aimed at reducing or partially destroying the social status of the recipient with a tendency to further oppress or exploit the victims of aggression. Verbal aggression is a strategy to discredit a political opponent socially and morally.

Linguistic Expressions of Hate Language in American Political Speech

The reference	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>They're going to put him into a home, and other people are going to be running the country, and they're going to be super-left, radical crazies. And Joe's going to be in a home and he'll be watching television</i> (Trump: They'll put Joe Biden in 'a home' if elected president, 2020).</p>	<p>Here Trump uses the negative terms super-left and radical crazies in reference to his rival Joe Biden. Super and radical adjective emphasizes the sharp difference between the political views of the two rivals, and the description of crazies, which can even be considered a medical assessment, is intended to indicate the insanity of Joe Biden's supporters.</p> <p>Joe's going to be in a home and he'll be watching television – this hyperbole is essentially a blatant mockery of Trump's opponent's age and health. The goal is to create an image of Joe Biden as a pensioner, instead of whom the country is run by his team.</p>	<p>With this statement, Donald Trump uses hate speech to show voters that his opponent is helpless and out of touch, and to characterize Joe Biden's team as radical (extremist).</p>

<p><i>She said she was Indian. And I said that I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none. I'm sorry, and we drove her crazy and that's a good thing, not a bad thing (Trump swipes at Warren: 'I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none', 2019).</i></p>	<p>Notable in this segment are Donald Trump's attacks on Senator Elizabeth Warren, which are based on ethnic minorities to mock the senator's statement.</p> <p>I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none – this sneering formulation allows us to indirectly accuse Elizabeth Warren primarily of hypocrisy, but also of trying to build a political career on the manipulation of the issue of ethnic identity, which has great political resonance for the United States.</p> <p><i>Through this phrase we drove her crazy and that's a good thing, not a bad thing, Trump is actually encouraging massive criticism of his opponent and attempts to destabilize him.</i></p>	<p>With this statement, Donald Trump uses hate speech to mock his opponent's attempts to gain political weight on ethnic identity, and publicly records that his opponent can be easily thrown off-balance.</p>
<p><i>Looks to me like it's going to be Sleepy Creepy Joe over Crazy Bernie. Everyone else is fading fast!</i> (Hart, 2020, p. 142).</p>	<p>Here, Trump uses verbal labels built on comical name combinations and exaggerated descriptions of his opponents – SleepyCreepy Joe over Crazy Bernie:</p> <p>The scornful and hateful expression represents Donald's frivolous attitude</p> <p>the lack of concern about rivals in the political struggle and the possibility of losing the main public office of the country. The fading fast metaphor, in turn, emphasizes the lack of a serious political struggle and worthy opponents for the president among the Democrats.</p>	<p>Such language creates in the minds of voters an image of Donald Trump as the undisputed and unconditional favorite in the election.</p>
<p>Disgraced and discredited Bob Mueller and his whole group of Angry Democrat</p> <p><i>Thugs spent over 30 hours with the White House Council, only with my approval, for purposes of transparency</i> (Trump rages on Mueller following Times report, 2018).</p>	<p>In this statement, one can see the negative epithets disgraced and discredited towards the lawyer Robert Mueller, who was investigating the case of Russian interference in the 2016 US presidential elections. This story had a negative impact on the image of Donald Trump, as he was suspected of collaborating with the Russian special services.</p> <p><i>The negative prefix dis- allows us to emphasize Trump's victory over R. Mueller's unsuccessful performance, and his group of Angry Democrat Thugs</i> phrase shows the baselessness of that investigation.</p>	<p>Donald Trump is presenting himself as the victim of a meaningless political pursuit, which is taking up a lot of his time (spent over 30 hours with the White House Council, only with my approval, for purposes of transparency).</p>

<p>So interesting to see “Progressive” Democrat Congresswomen, who originally came from countries whose governments are a complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world (if they even have a functioning government at all), now loudly and viciously telling the people of the United States, the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth, how our government is to be run (Trump says congresswomen of color should ‘go back’ and fix the places they ‘originally came from’, 2019).</p>	<p>Here, Donald Trump uses indirect insult tactics against Democratic congresswomen. The purposeful use of quotation marks and capital letters when writing the epithet «Progressive» clearly shows the president’s mocking tone toward his opponents, while the discursive element «originally came» emphasizes their immigrant status and implicitly allows them to classify their opponents as «foreigners.</p> <p>D. Trump also uses hate speech against the countries these politicians come from.</p> <p>Complete and total catastrophe, the worst, most corrupt and inept anywhere in the world – phrases built on metaphors and the biggest and the greatest and most powerful Nation on earth – the antithesis characterizes these nations as falling behind the United States, and the attitude of immigrants and their homeland indirectly underscores the president’s opponents’ belonging to an alien culture, as well as their hypocrisy and disrespect for the American people –</p> <p>now loudly and viciously telling the people of the United States how our government is to be run:</p>	<p>Այստեղ Դոնալդ Թրամփը շեշտում է իր հակառակորդների էթնիկ ծագումը և դրա հիման վրա նրանց ներկայացնում որպես ամերիկյան մշակույթին օտար մարդկանց: Այնուհետև ծայրահեղացնում է ատելության խոսքը և ԱՄՆ-ի կառավարման մասնակցելու նրանց հավակնությունը ներկայացնում որպես անհարգալից վերաբերմունք ամերիկացիներին նկատմամբ:</p>
--	--	--

Table 2: Speaker of the US House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p>I think this president is a coward when it comes to helping our kids who are afraid of gun violence. I think that he is cruel when he doesn’t deal with helping our Dreamers, of which we are very proud of. I think he is in denial about the climate crisis. However, that’s about the election.</p>	<p>In this section N. Pelosi voiced several negative characteristics of President D. To Trump</p> <p>(a coward, cruel) and through the negative wordings “doesn’t deal” and “denial about” emphasizes his retrograde views on the issues of migration policy and global warming. The multiple use of pronouns: our (our kids, our Dreamers), this (this president), I (I think) and we (we are very proud), emphasizes the <own-foreign> division, through which the speaker creates a contrast with the head of the country. And the American society, showing that the president’s activities contradict the interests of the citizens and the US state.</p> <p>That’s about the election – this reference is used by Pelosi to remind and focus everyone’s attention on the fact that the president is elected and changes.</p>	<p>In this passage, the word hate is applied to the person of Donald Trump, not the institution of the presidency.</p>

Table 3: White House press secretary Stepiani Grisham

Reference	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>I think the president is making clear that the Democrats have been parroting Iranian talking points and almost taking the side of terrorists and those who were out to kill the Americans. I think the president was making the point that the Democrats seem to hate him so much that they're willing to be on the side of countries and leadership of countries who want to kill Americans</i> (Trump criticized for retweeting image of Pelosi, Schumer in Muslim attire, 2020).</p>	<p>In this quote, S. Grisham speaks out against the Democratic Party of the United States, which has criticized Donald Trump's anti-Iranian policies. Here, the trick of converting concepts into foreign languages (Iranian - terrorists, those who were out to kill the Americans, countries who want to kill Americans) was used, through which a negative image of the people of Iran was created, in which they act as criminals and enemies of the USA. Accordingly, it turns out that D. Trump's opponents become defenders of terrorists. At the same time, using language that implies probability rather than reality (I think, almost to the point, it seems) avoids the direct charge of protecting criminals from the Democratic Party. C. Grisham also emphasizes the Democrats' hatred of Trump: hate him so much that they're willing to be on the side of countries and leadership of countries who want to kill Americans.</p>	<p>This passage uses hate speech against Donald Trump's opponents to show that their criticism of the country's leader is not motivated by America's interests, but by personal interests and motives.</p>

Table 4: Senator Elizabeth Warren

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>So I'd like to talk about who we're running against, a billionaire who calls women "fat broads" and "horse-faced lesbians." And, no, I'm not talking about Donal Trump. I'm talking about Mayor Bloomberg</i> (Elizabeth Warren skewers Michael Bloomberg, calling him 'a billionaire who calls women fat broads and horse-faced lesbians', 2020).</p>	<p>With this statement, the senator criticizes his opponent in the elections, Michael Bloomberg, for chauvinism and homophobia. The purposeful comparison between M. Bloomberg and D. Trump highlights the similarities between the two figures (a billionaire who calls women). who we're running against - this wording is used to create a <own-foreigner> contrast, which suggests that M. Bloomberg belongs to the ranks of foreigners against whom E. Warren himself is running.</p>	<p>Thus, Senator E. Warren uses hate speech to portray his opponent in the election as a person of different views and preferences, with more characteristics of an outsider than his own.</p>

Table 5: Former Mayor of New York, 2020 US presidential candidate Michael Bloomberg, who withdrew his candidacy in favor of Joe Biden

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>I'm a New Yorker. I know how to take on an arrogant conman like Donald Trump,</i></p> <p><i>that comes from New York. I'm a mayor or was a mayor. I know how to run a complicated city, the biggest, most diverse city in this country (I was a mayor..., 2020).</i></p>	<p>M. Bloomberg tries to present himself in a positive, profitable way and emphasizes that the only thing he and D. Trump have in common is origin (<i>I'm a New Yorker — Donald Trump, that comes from New York</i>).</p> <p><i>an arrogant conman</i>– this phrase, used in the above context, is intended to express his dislike for the head of the country (D. Trump) and contains an indirect hint that, unlike him, D. Trump became the owner of huge wealth through fraud, and this is the essential difference between the two billionaires. Parallelism and repetition are used in the last two sentences (<i>I'm a mayor or was a mayor</i>). <i>I know how to run a complicated city, the biggest, most diverse city in this country</i>) emphasize his managerial and political experience, and the superlative epithets (<i>the biggest, most diverse</i>) should create parallels in the audience with New York (whose head was M. Bloomberg) and among the entire USA, because this city best expresses the state of the whole country with its ethnic composition.</p>	<p>Thus, M. Bloomberg's successful experience as head of the country's largest city is presented as making him the best candidate for president of the United States.</p>

Table 6: Former New York City mayor and 2020 U.S. presidential candidate Michael Bloomberg talks about socialist Bernie Sanders, the Democratic candidate in the 2020 U.S. presidential election.

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>What a wonderful country we have. The best known socialist in the country happens to be a millionaire with three houses. What did I miss here?</i> (Sanders vs. Bloomberg..., 2020).</p>	<p>In this phrase Bloomberg uses the device of criticizing Sanders, accusing him of having a negative attitude toward millionaires. He uses <i>what a wonderful country we have</i> and <i>what did I miss here?</i> the techniques of rhetorical exclamation and rhetorical question with ironic content. In turn, the expressions «<i>the best known socialist</i>» and «<i>a millionaire with three houses</i>» are used as contextual antonyms that emphasize the views and real lifestyle of his political opponent.</p>	<p>Thus, M. Bloomberg is trying to create a negative image of his political rival in order to neutralize his agenda, to devalue his image as a fighter for social justice.</p>

Table 7: From the Democratic Party in 2020 Candidate for participation in the US presidential elections, socialist Bernie Sanders

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>You know, when we talk about a corrupt political system, bought by billionaires</i></p> <p><i>like Mr. Bloomberg, it manifests itself in a tax code in which not only is Amazon</i></p> <p><i>and many other major corporations, some owned by the wealthiest people in this</i></p> <p><i>country not paying a nickel in taxes, we have the insane situation that billionaires</i></p> <p><i>today, if you can believe it, have an effective tax rate lower than the middle class.</i></p>	<p>B. Sarder characterizes the American political system with a corrupt negative adjective and adds bought by billionaires like Mr. Bloomberg's description, indirectly accusing the latter of bribing other politicians and taking state institutions under shadow leadership. He uses hyperbole – the wealthiest people in this country not paying a nickel in Taxes, epithet: the insane situation, conditional judgment: if you can believe it, which together emphasize the absurd nature of tax reforms in the United States. Also added is a comparison– (that billionaires today have an effective tax rate lower than the middle class), which is used as evidence that the country's leadership is corrupt.</p>	<p>Thus, a negative image of American billionaires is created, in which they appear as greedy people who use the tax system to increase their personal wealth.</p>

In addition to the desire to accuse the opponent and belittle his authority, hate speech can be used for the following purposes: to bring the opponent out of emotional equilibrium, to push him to a certain action, to openly show his ignorance in the dialogue, to despise him and not to accept him.

The following examples present just such a tactic.

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p><i>Let's dumb this down for me, because I don't know what a class 1 is, and I don't</i></p> <p><i>have the Book of Mormon over there like you've got to read from...</i> (State Sen, 2017).</p>	<p>In this segment, Matt McCoy mocks Republican Jack Chapman, who tried to explain the differences between different classes of pyrotechnic products while pushing legislation through the Senate to allow the sale of pyrotechnics in the state.</p> <p>The imperative wording «Let's dumb this down for me» shows M. McCoy's disrespectful, contemptuous attitude towards the opponent, and the next wording containing parcellation: I don't have the Book of Mormon over there like you've got to read from... I tried... – allows to implement the tactic of mocking D. Chapman's professed religion.</p>	<p>Thus, in this example, the author resorted to the technique of constructing a hate speech according to the «own – foreigner» scheme in order to show his negative attitude towards Mormonism and indirectly emphasize the madness of his opponent, thereby devaluing the project he put forward.</p>

Manifestations of hate speech in Armenian political speech

In general, hate speech in political speech is most evident before and after elections, especially if they are accompanied by a sharp political struggle, accompanied by rallies and mass actions and end in a change of power. In this sense, the most recent period of Armenia’s political history, which began in 2018 with the change of power in the country, is characteristic. During the mass assemblies and preceding acts of defiance, hate speech by opposition leaders repeatedly featured in their speeches, causing deep divisions in society.

Hayk Marutyan, “Civil Contract” party, former mayor of Yerevan.

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p>The situation in Armenia today is very simple: there are white forces and there are black forces, that’s all.</p> <p>I want to make it official, although you know I have to say, yes, we are white forces, and all those who don’t want us to succeed, I can say black forces. I can even say there is no game against our team (Կան սև և սպիտակ ուժեր. ովքեր չեն ուզում, որ մենք հաջողություն ունենանք սև ուժերն են, 2018).</p>	<p>During the campaign for mayor of Yerevan, Hayk Marutyan used hate speech based on the division into “ours” and “foreigner,” this time calling people black and white. This device involves manipulation because the supporters are associated with white people, foreigners with black people, white people with good people, and black people with bad people.</p>	<p>Thus, a ploy is used to introduce an artificial division of people through hate speech, which also has a manipulative purpose, that is, to present whites as positive and blacks as negative, with the result that people subconsciously place themselves among whites, which is primarily speech in the interest of the holder.</p>
<p>I put this division into blacks and whites before the election, and I did it very right, because before the election there were forces that wanted to cancel the election. You can call them “black” or “anti-state,” it doesn’t matter (Ես ընտրություններից առաջ սև ու սպիտակի բաժանումը դրել եմ և շատ ճիշտ եմ արել, 2019).</p>	<p>Already after the election as mayor, Hayk Marutyan said that he did not regret the artificial division of people into blacks and whites during the pre-election period, and even added that blacks could also be called anti-state.</p> <p>The hate speech used here takes the form of an accusation.</p>	<p>Thus, it follows from Hayk Marutyan’s speech that he not only does not regret spreading hate speech through the <ours-foreigner> scheme, but also takes this speech to an extreme, characterizing foreigners as anti-state.</p>

The 2021 parliamentary elections in Armenia, held after a 44-day war and in a fierce political struggle, were marked by many manifestations of hate speech, as all the major actors in Armenia’s political regime, two former presidents and the current prime minister participated in the elections.

There were many manifestations of hate speech in the pre-election speeches, to which even the human rights defender of the Republic of Armenia had to respond.

N. Pashinyan, RA Prime Minister

Quote	Explanation	Conclusion
<p>Before the 2018 revolution, I said there would be no cadre pogroms. Now I want to say that there will be personnel massacres and those officials who, taking advantage of the opportunities provided by the revolution after 2018, played in the corridors of the people's power and during that time played the role of a Trojan horse, will be massacred. Give the mandate to do that personnel massacre and we will throw all those Trojan horses out of the Armenian state administration system (Pashinyan wants personnel massacre and vendettas, 2021).</p>	<p>Here Pashinyan breaks his own promise that he will not fire people appointed by the previous government to various positions after his election as prime minister, and uses the term «personnel slaughter,» which implies an intolerant attitude toward certain categories of citizens.</p> <p>N. Pashinian also uses the term «Trojan horse,» using a metaphor with which he actually accuses these people of being spies and invaders.</p> <p>Not limiting himself to this, he continues to incite hatred: «We will throw all these Trojan horses out of the state administration system of Armenia,» where the wording «throw» is a gross violation of the rights and dignity of a citizen and public servant and, in fact, a threat to commit violence.</p>	<p>Thus, N. Pashinyan's speech contains a number of manifestations of hate speech in the form of metaphors, accusations and threats of violence.</p>
<p>I said there would be no vendettas. Today they send me photos from various election gatherings, people stand at these gatherings with bent necks, as if they were taken with a leash around their necks. It is obvious that leaders of some institutions, leaders of some communities, using their administrative levers, lead people to gatherings. I tell the law enforcement officers that we have introduced a provision in the law that forcibly taking people to gatherings is criminally punishable, but there are procedures, people must go and testify, say yes, we were forced. But I say now very directly and clearly: after the elections, there will be vendettas against the leaders of the communities who are trying to subject the people to coercion. I don't care if it's a private or public institution, the heads of those institutions who subjected their employees to any kind of coercion will be subject to the harshest but political retaliation (Pashinyan wants personnel massacre and vendettas, 2021).</p>	<p>First, N. Pashinyan uses the term “vendetta” – revenge, which in itself implies illegal actions and arbitrary use of force against another person.</p> <p>Secondly, the phrase «there will be vendettas after the elections» contains an overt threat.</p> <p>Third, he directs this threat not only at government employees, but also at private individuals: «I don't care if this institution is private or public, they have subjected their employees to every kind of coercion, they will be subject to the harshest but political retaliation.»</p> <p>Although the end of the speech indicates that he is referring to political vendettas, not physical ones, this does not diminish the level of hostile language, which is quite high, given the fact that he is expressing an open threat.</p>	

<p>In a word, the leaders of these communities will be get out and new elections will be held there. I don't care about the heads of these institutions, even if they are owners, if the owners try to resist, we will deal with the owners as well, we will subject them to the cruelest political vendetta, I warn you. Do not try to shake (Pashinyan wants personnel massacre and vendettas, 2021).</p>	<p>Here N. Pashinyan continues to threaten, using the offensive wording “they will be get out”. Second, he also takes the threat to an extreme by introducing the phrase “the cruelest vendetta”: I don't care about the heads of these institutions, even if they are owners, if the owners try to resist, we will deal with the owners as well, we will subject them to the cruelest political vendetta, I warn you.</p> <p>The last phrase of this part “Don't try to shake suddenly” again contains a threat and an insult (the word to shake associates a person with an animal), which are forms of harsh hate speech.</p>	<p>In this case also N. Pashinyan's speech contains a number of manifestations of hate speech in the form of metaphors, accusations and threats of violence.</p>
<p>And you will see political vendettas, and you will see civil vendettas, you will see a staff disintegration, all the crooks who, taking advantage of the people's forgiveness, acted against the people will be expelled from the system of government. I will personally throw everyone out of the state administration system, one by one, by the neck.</p> <p>And so prepare for civil revenge, prepare for civil vendettas, prepare for staff massacres (Pashinyan wants personnel massacre and vendettas, 2021).</p>	<p>In the last part of the speech, the hate speech is exacerbated by hyperbole and insults: “You will see political vendettas, you will see civil vendettas, you will see staff fragmentation, all the crooks will be kicked out of the state administration system”.</p> <p>The hate speech here is also reinforced by the repetition: “you will see... you will see... you will see”.</p> <p>A new concept of hate speech, the staff breakdown, has been applied, which shows N. Pashinian's essentially arbitrary, subjective, and deconstructive attitude toward civil servants and their rights.</p>	<p>Therefore, the hate speech here is enhanced by hyperbole, because until then he was only talking about political vendettas, and in this section he added to them also “civil vendetta”, which is a broader concept than the political.</p> <p>A new term containing overt hate speech – civil revenge – is used, which increases the level of hatred and aggression in Pashinyan's speech.</p>
<p>And, yes, we have already talked about this, that this mandate fixes that in the Republic of Armenia by the will of the people a dictatorship of law and right is established. From this very moment, from this very second, and we will fully implement this mandate. Yes, in this mandate there is a hammer, there is a sword, there is also a spade, in this mandate there is everything that is necessary to build a free, happy, powerful Armenia (Nikol Pashinyan's Speech at Rally Summarizing Early Parliamentary Election Results, 2021).</p>	<p>During the rally there was a solemn ceremony, a representative of the people (who was actually one of their supporters, i.e. there was a mass manipulation) handed the newly elected prime minister a steel mandate. A steel mandate was given to the newly elected Prime Minister. The mandate was symbolic and had the appearance of the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia. Through this manipulation N. Pashinyan wanted to legitimize many expressions containing hate speech uttered at the rally, as if they were accepted by the people. “This mandate records that a dictatorship of right and law is established in the Republic of Armenia by the will of the people. From this very moment, from this very second, and we will fulfill this mandate fully”.”</p>	<p>Thus, the language of hatred in this passage is expressed through manipulations and enumerations.</p>

	<p>Then there is the reinforcement of hate speech by enumeration: “Yes, this mandate has a hammer, has a sword, and has a shovel,” which actually shows the tools that Pashinyan intends to use on behalf of the people against that very people.</p>	<p>In addition, instead of the phrase <rule of law and right>, the wording <dictatorship of law and rights> is used, which also makes the speech intolerant and aggressive.</p>
<p>I hope that today we will indeed record that the internal political crisis that began in Armenia on November 9 has been overcome, and tomorrow we will return to full-fledged work. But we have to admit that conditions and the environment have changed considerably today. Because the Republic of Armenia has given our government, this political team, a mandate to establish a dictatorship of law and order in the country. The people made a steel revolution (Nikol Pashinyan’s Speech at Rally Summarizing Early Parliamentary Election Results, 2021).</p>	<p>Once again the term “dictatorship” is used, which is the subject of manipulation as it is said that during the elections Pashinian’s team was allegedly mandated to “establish a dictatorship of law and order in the country.</p> <p>This manipulation is essentially an experiment, a way to justify the planned post-election massacre of staff.</p> <p>The hate speech is reinforced here by the phrase “steel revolution”, which needs further explanation. The fact is that the change of power in Armenia in 2018, as a result of which N. Pashinyan became prime minister under the slogan of the “velvet revolution. In this speech N. Pashinyan uses the epithet and creates a contrast between the velvet revolution and the steel revolution.</p>	<p>Thus, at the end of his speech N. Pashinyan does not try to soften the aggressive speeches and manifestations of hatred, but rather increases their level even more, “justifying” his intention to establish a dictatorship by saying that people allegedly made a steely revolution and thus gave him a mandate to establish a dictatorship.</p>

CONCLUSION:

The article analyzes the linguistic manifestations of hate speech in American and Armenian political speech, which aim to devalue the opponent, to show the unreasonableness and even frivolity of his point of view, as well as to convince the audience that the opponent belongs to a different, foreign or hostile camp. Linguistic manifestations of hate speech can be divided into three groups: rough, medium and weak. In all cases, language devices are used, such as hyperbole, repetition, irony, threat, accusation, <own and foreign> division, etc.

The analysis of the examples proves that there are rough manifestations of hate speech in both American and Armenian political speech, and the more relevant and important the topic the politicians talk about, the more rough manifestations of hate speech are in the speech.

It can also be concluded that politicians or leaders of countries most often resort to hate speech during the pre-election period, when the main task of political speech is to take or keep power.

References

Bykova, O.N. (1999). Rechevaya (yazykovaya, verbalnaya) agressiya: materialy k entsiklopedicheskomu slovaryu «Kultura russkoy rechi» [Speech (linguistic, verbal)

- aggression: materials for the encyclopedic dictionary “Culture of Russian speech”] // *Teoreticheskie i prikladnye aspekty rechevogo obshcheniya*. Vyp. 1 (8). Krasnoyarsk. (In Rus.)
- Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2016). *European Commission against Racism and Intolerance*. ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 15 on Combating Hate Speech. <https://rm.coe.int/ecri-general-policy-recommendation-no-15-on-combating-hate-speech-russ/16808b5b07> (In Eng.)
- Diskreditatsiya*. [Discredit] // Bolshoy Yuridicheskiy slovar. 2001. <http://library.khpg.org/files/docs/1331896563.pdf> (accessed: 18.05.2022) (In Rus.)
- Elizabeth Warren skewers Michael Bloomberg, calling him ‘a billionaire who calls women fat broads and horse-faced lesbians’*. (2020, February 20). Retrieved from Business Insider India: <https://www.businessinsider.in/politics/news/elizabeth-warren-skewers-michael-bloomberg-calling-him-a-billionaire-who-calls-women-fat-broads-and-horse-faced-lesbians/articleshow/74218414.cms> (In Eng.)
- Hart, Roderick P. (2020). *Trump and Us What He Says and Why People Listen*. New York. Cambridge University Press. (In Eng.)
- I was a mayor...* (2020, February 20). Retrieved from Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/mikebloomberg/videos/2578145105794189/> (In Eng.)
- Kak Putinu udalos’ skolotit’ prorossiyskuyu koalitsiyu v Yevrope* [How Putin managed to put together a pro-Russian coalition in Europe]. (2014, dekabr’ 8). Retrieved from Polit Informatsiya: <https://politinform.su/10111-kak-putinu-udalos-skolotit-prorossiyskuyu-koalitsiyu-v-evrope.html> (accessed: 18.05.2022) (In Rus.)
- Kan sev yev spitak uzher. ovk’er ch’en uzum, vor menk’ hajoghut’yun unenank’’ sev uzhern yen* [There are black and white forces. those who do not want us to succeed are the black forces]. (2018, September 3). Retrieved from ArmDay.am: <https://www.armday.am/post/61761/kan-s-spitak-o-zher-ovqer-chen-o-zo-m-or-menq-hajogho-tjo-n-onenanq-s-o-zhern-en-hajk-marotjan>; (In Arm.)
- Kuzmin, I.V. (2005) *Yazyk periodicheskoy pechati: kulturnye traditsii i sovremennaya sotsiokulturnaya i ekonomicheskaya situatsiya* [Language of periodicals: cultural traditions and modern socio-cultural and economic situation]. Nizhniy Novgorod. (In Rus.)
- Melnikov, M. (2006) *Prikladnaya konfliktologiya dlya zhurnalistov* [Applied Conflictology for Journalists]. M.: Prava cheloveka. (In Rus.)
- Mesropyan, L.M. (2011) *Implitsitnaya (verbalnaya) rechevaya agressiya kak sredstvo vozdeystviya v informatsionnoy voyne* [Implicit (verbal) speech aggression as a means of influence in information warfare] // Rossiyskiy akademicheskij zhurnal. *Yazykoznanie*. 2011, № 3 (17) <https://ur.booksc.eu/book/33423141/9e59ab> (accessed: 18.05.2022) (In Rus.)
- Nikol Pashinyan’s Speech at Rally Summarizing Early Parliamentary Election Results*. (2021, June 21). Retrieved from The Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia: <https://www.primeminister.am/en/statements-and-messages/item/2021/06/21/Nikol-Pashinyan-Speech/> (In Eng.)
- P’ashinyany kdrayin jard e uzum u vendetaner* [Pashinyan wants personnel massacre and vendettas]. (2021, Hunis 8). Retrieved from Arravot: <https://www.aravot.>

- am/2021/06/08/1196579/ (In Arm.)
- Sanders vs. Bloomberg: "The Best Known Socialist in the Country is a Millionaire Who Owns Three Houses"*. (2020, February 19). Retrieved from RealClearPolitics: https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2020/02/19/sanders_vs_bloomberg_the_best_known_socialist_in_the_country_owns_three_houses.html (In Eng.)
- State Sen. Matt McCoy under fire over comments*. (2017, March 23). Retrieved from KCCI 8 News: <https://www.kcci.com/article/state-sen-matt-mccoy-under-fire-over-comments/9172396#> (In Eng.)
- Trump criticized for retweeting image of Pelosi, Schumer in Muslim attire*. (2020, January 13). Retrieved from The HILL: <https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/478017-trump-criticized-for-retweeting-image-of-pelosi-schumer-in-muslim/> (In Eng.)
- Trump rages on Mueller following Times report*. (2018, August 20). Retrieved from Saanich News: <https://www.saanichnews.com/news/trump-rages-on-mueller-following-times-report/> (In Eng.)
- Trump says congresswomen of color should 'go back' and fix the places they 'originally came from'*. (2019, July 14/ Updated 2019, July 15). Retrieved from News: <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/donald-trump/trump-says-progressive-congresswomen-should-go-back-where-they-came-n1029676> (In Eng.)
- Trump swipes at Warren: 'I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none'*. (2019, August 8). Retrieved from The HILL: <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/455875-trump-swipes-at-warren-i-have-more-indian-blood-than-she-does-and-i-have/> (In Eng.)
- Trump: They'll put Joe Biden in 'a home' if elected president*. (2020, March 2). Retrieved from New York Post: <https://nypost.com/2020/03/02/trump-theyll-put-joe-biden-in-a-home-if-elected-president/> (In Eng.)
- Verkhovskiy, A. M. (2002). Obshchiy analiz rezultatov monitoringa [General analysis of monitoring results] // *Yazyk moy... Problema etnicheskoy i religioznoy neterpimosti v rossiyskikh SMI*. (str. 20–49) M., ROO «Tsentr Panorama». <https://www.sova-center.ru/files/books/ya02-text.pdf> (In Rus.)
- Yes yntrut'yunnerits' arraj sev u spitaki bazhanumy drel yem yev shat chisht yem arel* [I made the division between black and white before the elections and I did it very correctly]. (2019, June 17). Retrieved from IRAVABAN.NET: <https://iravaban.net/229635.html> (In Arm.)
- Zhilavskaya, I.V. (2011) Problemy informatsionnoy bezopasnosti cherez prizmu novogo zakona [Problems of information security through the prism of the new law]. *Informatizatsiya obshchestva: sotsialno-ekonomicheskie, sotsiokulturnye i mezhdunarodnye aspekty: materialy mezhdunarodnoy nauchno-prakticheskoy konferentsii 15–16 yanvarya 2011 goda*. Penza – Praga. (In Rus.)

Թգտագործված գրականության ցանկ

- Быкова, О.Н. (1999). Речевая (языковая, вербальная) агрессия: материалы к энциклопедическому словарю «Культура русской речи». // *Теоретические и*

- прикладные аспекты речевого общения*. Вып. 1 (8). Красноярск.
- Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe (2016). *European Commission against Racism and Intolerance*. ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 15 on Combating Hate Speech. <https://rm.coe.int/ecri-general-policy-recommendation-no-15-on-combating-hate-speech-russ/16808b5b07>
- Дискредитация* // Большой Юридический словарь. 2001. <http://library.khpg.org/files/docs/1331896563.pdf> (մուտք՝ 18.05.2022)
- Elizabeth Warren skewers Michael Bloomberg, calling him ‘a billionaire who calls women fat broads and horse-faced lesbians’*. (2020, February 20). Վերցված է Business Insider India՝ <https://www.businessinsider.in/politics/news/elizabeth-warren-skewers-michael-bloomberg-calling-him-a-billionaire-who-calls-women-fat-broads-and-horse-faced-lesbians/articleshow/74218414.cms>
- Hart, Roderick P. (2020). *Trump and Us What He Says and Why People Listen*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- I was a mayor...* (2020, February 20). Վերցված է Facebook՝ <https://www.facebook.com/mikebloomberg/videos/2578145105794189/>
- Как Путину удалось сколотить пророссийскую коалицию в Европе*. (2014, декабрь 8). Վերցված է Полит Информация՝ <https://politinform.su/10111-kak-putinu-udalos-skolotit-prorossiyskuyu-koaliciyu-v-evrope.html> (մուտք՝ 18.05.2022)
- Շան սև և սպիտակ ստեր. ուրեր չեն ուզում, որ մենք հաջողությամբ ունենանք՝ սև ստերն են* (2018, Մեպտեմբերի 3). Վերցված է ArmDay.am՝ <https://www.armday.am/post/61761/kan-s-spitak-o-zher-ovqer-chen-o-zo-m-or-menq-hajogho-tjo-n-onenanq-s-o-zhern-en-hajk-marotjan;>
- Кузьмин, И.В. (2005). *Язык периодической печати: культурные традиции и современная социокультурная и экономическая ситуация*. Нижний Новгород.
- Мельников, М. (2006). *Прикладная конфликтология для журналистов*. М.: Права человека.
- Месропян Л.М. (2011) ИмPLICITная (вербальная) речевая агрессия как средство воздействия в информационной войне //Российский академический журнал. Языкознание. 2011, № 3 (17). С.83. URL: <https://ur.booksc.eu/book/33423141/9e59ab> (մուտք՝ 18.05.2022)
- Nikol Pashinyan’s Speech at Rally Summarizing Early Parliamentary Election Results*. (2021, June 21). Վերցված է The Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia՝ <https://www.primeminister.am/en/statements-and-messages/item/2021/06/21/Nikol-Pashinyan-Speech/>
- Փաշինյանը կադրային ջարդ է ուզում ու վենդեթաններ* (2021, Հունիս 8). Վերցված է Առավոտ՝ <https://www.aravot.am/2021/06/08/1196579/>
- Sanders vs. Bloomberg: “The Best Known Socialist in the Country is a Millionaire Who Owns Three Houses”*. (2020, February 19). Վերցված է RealClearPolitics՝ https://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2020/02/19/sanders_vs_bloomberg_the_best_known_socialist_in_the_country_owns_three_houses.html
- State Sen. Matt McCoy under fire over comments*. (2017, March 23). Վերցված է KCCI 8 News՝ <https://www.kcci.com/article/state-sen-matt-mccoy-under-fire-over-comments/9172396#>

- Trump criticized for retweeting image of Pelosi, Schumer in Muslim attire.* (2020, January 13). Վերցված է The HILL՝ <https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/478017-trump-criticized-for-retweeting-image-of-pelosi-schumer-in-muslim/>
- Trump rages on Mueller following Times report.* (2018, August 20). Վերցված է Saanich News՝ <https://www.saanichnews.com/news/trump-rages-on-mueller-following-times-report/>
- Trump says congresswomen of color should 'go back' and fix the places they 'originally came from'.* (2019, July 14/Updated 2019, July 15). Վերցված է News՝ <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/donald-trump/trump-says-progressive-congresswomen-should-go-back-where-they-came-n1029676>
- Trump swipes at Warren: 'I have more Indian blood than she does, and I have none'.* (2019, August 8). Վերցված է The HILL՝ <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/455875-trump-swipes-at-warren-i-have-more-indian-blood-than-she-does-and-i-have/>
- Trump: They'll put Joe Biden in 'a home' if elected president.* (2020, March 2). Վերցված է New York Post՝ <https://nypost.com/2020/03/02/trump-theyll-put-joe-biden-in-a-home-if-elected-president/>
- Верховский, А. (2002). Общий анализ результатов мониторинга // *Язык мой... Проблема этнической и религиозной нетерпимости в российских СМИ.* (стр. 20–49) М., РОО «Центр Панорама», 2002. <https://www.sova-center.ru/files/books/ya02-text.pdf>
- Ես ընտրություններից առաջ ևս ու սպիտակի բաժանումը դրել եմ և շատ ձիշտ եմ արել:* (2019, հունիսի 17). Վերցված է IRAVABAN.NET՝ <https://iravaban.net/229635.html>
- Жилавская, И.В. (2011). Проблемы информационной безопасности через призму нового закона. *Информатизация общества: социально-экономические, социокультурные и международные аспекты: материалы международной научно-практической конференции 15-16 января 2011 года.* Пенза – Прага.

Էլյա Դավթյան

Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի
Օրսար լեզուների ամբիոնի դասախոս,
Էլ. huaugte@davtyanelya@gmail.com

ԱՏԵԼՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԽՈՍՔԸ ԱՄԵՐԻԿԱՆ ԵՎ ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆՅԱՆ ՔԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ԽՈՍՈՒՅԹՈՒՄ

Ատելության խոսքը լեզվաբանության և քաղաքական հոետորաբանության հիմնական հասկացություններից է: Քաղաքական խոսույթում ատելության խոսքի լեզվական արտահայտությունները հաճախ որոշիչ են լինում քաղաքական գործչի գաղափարախոսության և նրա ելույթի հիմնական թեզերի ընդունման կամ մերժման համար: Հաշվի առնելով այն հանգամանքը, որ քաղաքականությունն իրացվում է առավելապես լեզվի միջոցով՝ ելույթներ, բանավեճեր, կոչեր և այլն, ուստի դրանցում ատելության խոսքի լեզվական դրսևորումները բովանդակային մեծ ծանրաբեռնվածություն և ազդեցություն ունեն: Սույն հետազոտության նպատակն է պարզել ամերիկյան և հայկական քաղաքական խոսույթում ատելության խոսքի դրսևորման լեզվական

հիմնական միջոցները:

Հիմնաբառեր. աստելության խոսք, հաղորդակցություն, քաղաքական խոսույթ, հանդուրժողականություն, լեզվական արտահայտություն, կոնֆլիկտ:

Эля Давтян

Преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков и литературы

Международного университета Евразия

Эл. адрес: davtyanelya@gmail.com

ЯЗЫК ВРАЖДЫ В АМЕРИКАНСКОМ И АРМЯНСКОМ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Язык вражды является одним из основных понятий языкознания и политической риторики. В политической речи вербальные выражения языка вражды часто являются решающими для принятия или неприятия идеологии политика и основных тезисов его речи. Поскольку политика в основном реализуется через язык – выступления, дебаты, обращения и т. д., – вербальные проявления языка вражды имеют большую содержательную нагрузку и воздействие. Целью данного исследования является выявление основных вербальных средств проявления языка ненависти в американской и армянской политической речи.

Ключевые слова: язык вражды, коммуникация, политический дискурс, толерантность, вербальные проявления /linguistic expressions/, конфликт.

Հոդվածը խմբագրություն է ներկայացվել՝ 2022թ. հոկտեմբերի 26-ին:

Հոդվածը հանձնվել է գրախոսման՝ 2022թ. նոյեմբերի 3-ին:

Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության՝ 2022թ. նոյեմբերի 12-ին: