



Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Journal.
Philological Sciences. Vol. 1 (99)

Вісник Житомирського державного
університету імені Івана Франка.
Філологічні науки. Вип. 1 (99)

ISSN (Print): 2663-7642
ISSN (Online): 2707-4463

УДК 811.111'42

DOI 10.35433/philology.1(99).2023.105-113

VERBAL WAYS AND MEANS OF MANIPULATIVE EFFECT IN THE DISCOURSE OF THE REPUBLICANS ABOUT THE RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN WAR

O. I. Nazarenko*, O. Ye. Nesterenko**

The article deals with investigating the speech ways of the realization of a manipulative effect in the discourse of the Republicans about the Russian-Ukrainian war.

The intensive development of political technologies, ever-increasing role of mass media, the acuteness of the problem of language manipulative potential encourage the increase in attention of society to the theory and practice of usage of special ways which favour the realization of the political discourse main functions. The defining feature of political discourse is struggle for power, which provides for bringing the greatest possible number of supporters to their side, that is why the subjects of politics should create such a discursive reality which would meet the needs, interests and expectations of their audience. Description is not an aim of political discourse, its aim is to persuade a recipient, arouse certain intentions and induce to act.

Political activity has a lot of manifestations, and one of them is war. So, war is part of politics and, respectively, accepts all its features and characteristics. We consider that war discourse is an integral component of political discourse. Discourse of the militaries about war, discourse of politicians about war, discourse of mass media which highlights military operations are classified as war. It's a well-known fact that war is a continuation of politics with the help of violent means and is connected with the shift of relationships between the subjects of politics. So, it is obvious that the war discourse of the aggressor state politicians as well as the discourse of the states which are the allies of the aggressor state and of those who are interested in waging this war are unduly manipulative.

Any manipulation is realized by using the certain speech means in particular by speech effect.

Speech effect is the use of the peculiarities of the language system and functioning which have an increased capability of the effect on the consciousness and conduct of the recipient or recipients of a message.

American politicians, the representatives of the Republican party, use the following lingual ways and means to realize the manipulative effect on the audience in their discourse about the Russian-Ukrainian war: "labelling", stereotypes, comparisons, repeats, coinages, suppression of information which appears in concealing the certain topics or in their partial presentation.

* Senior Lecturer

(Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University)

olganazarenko1@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-628-910

** Lecturer

(Kyiv National Taras Shevchenko University)

oksanaenglishteacher@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-5924-6174

Keywords: manipulative effect, political discourse, war discourse, discourse of politicians about war, "labelling", stereotypes, comparisons, repeats, coinages.

ВЕРБАЛЬНІ ШЛЯХИ ТА ЗАСОБИ МАНІПУЛЯТИВНОГО ВПЛИВУ В ДИСКУРСІ АМЕРИКАНСЬКИХ ПОЛІТИКІВ-РЕСПУБЛІКАНЦІВ ПРО РОСІЙСЬКО-УКРАЇНСЬКУ ВІЙНУ.

Назаренко О. І., Нестеренко О. Є.

У статті досліджено мовленнєві шляхи та засоби реалізації маніпулятивного впливу в дискурсі американських політиків-республіканців про російсько-українську війну.

Інтенсивний розвиток політичних технологій, важлива роль ЗМІ, гострота проблеми маніпулятивного потенціалу мови сприяють зростанню уваги суспільства до теорії та практики використання спеціальних засобів, які сприяють реалізації основних функцій політичного дискурсу. Визначальною характеристикою політичного дискурсу є змагання за владу, яке передбачає залучення якомога більшої кількості прихильників на свій бік, саме тому суб'єкти політики мають створювати таку дискурсивну реальність, яка б задовольняла потреби, інтереси та очікування аудиторії. Метою політичного дискурсу є не опис, а переконання адресата, викликання певних намірів та спонукання до дії.

Політична діяльність має багато форм та проявів, одним із яких є війна, тобто війна є частиною політики і, відповідно, приймає всі її властивості та характеристики. Ми вважаємо, що військовий дискурс є невід'ємною складовою політичного дискурсу. До категорії воєнного дискурсу належать дискурс військових про війну, політиків про війну, дискурс засобів масової інформації, які висвітлюють військові дії. Як відомо, війна є продовженням політики насильницькими засобами й пов'язана зі зміною відносин між суб'єктами політики. Очевидним є той факт, що військовий дискурс політиків держави-агресора, а також дискурс політиків держав-союзників країни-агресора та тих, хто зацікавлений у веденні цієї війни, є край маніпулятивним.

Будь-яка маніпуляція здійснюється лише шляхом використання певних мовних засобів, тобто шляхом мовного впливу. Мовний вплив – це використання особливостей системи та функціонування мови для створення повідомлень, які мають підвищену здатність впливу на свідомість та поведінку реципієнта або реципієнтів повідомлення.

Американські політики-республіканці застосовують такі лінгвальні шляхи та засоби для реалізації маніпулятивного впливу на аудиторію у своєму дискурсі про російсько-українську війну: "навішування ярликів", стереотипи, повтори, порівняння, неологізми, замовчування інформації, що виявляється в приховуванні певних тем або лише в їхньому частковому висвітленні.

Ключові слова: маніпулятивний вплив, політичний дискурс, військовий дискурс, дискурс політиків про війну, "навішування ярликів", стереотипи, порівняння, повтори, неологізми.

Introduction. The image of war is always constituted discursively, that is why it is appropriate to study war by studying military discourse. Politicians' discourse about war is an important component of war discourse, as politicians shape their audience's attitudes toward war through their speeches, comments, and statements. That is why politicians resort to various ways of managing mass consciousness, namely, communicative tactics of manipulation and linguistic influence. This influence, as a rule, is aimed at changing the thoughts, motives and

goals of people so that they correspond to the vector of interests of the manipulators. The successful application of manipulative strategies and tactics will determine the attitude of the people to this war, which will lead to the success or failure of certain political forces.

The relevance of the study of the manipulateness of the politicians' discourse about the war is determined by the increased attention of the world to the Russian-Ukrainian war and to the ways and methods of its coverage by politicians all over the world, as well as

the insufficiency of the research of the above-mentioned ways and methods in the war discourse, and especially in the politicians' discourse about the war.

Analysis of previous research. A number of works by such prominent scientists as T. van Dijk, R. Wodak, N. Fairkloof, A. Vezhbytska, and N. Chomsky are devoted to the problem of studying and analyzing verbal means used to obtain a manipulative influence on the consciousness of recipients.

Ukrainian philologists, namely O. V. Dmytruk, V. V. Zirka, O. G. Ruda, also pay considerable attention to the study of this problem. A. Hodges, V. Pogonets in their works investigate the peculiarities of military discourse and the discourse of politicians about war as its integral component.

The aim of the article. The aim of this work is the analysis and research of verbal ways and means used to exert manipulative influence on the audience in the discourse of American Republican politicians about the Russian-Ukrainian war.

Results and Discussion. Modern scientific research is characterized by the growth of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the problem, and political linguistics is no exception. Since political activity is reflected in the mass media, political discourse should be studied by taking into account a variety of political phenomena. Currently, in the information space, considerable attention of the audience is focused not only on individual political leaders, but also on the coverage of their actions and deeds in the mass media.

As a result, politics has become one of the most important elements of the functioning of modern society, designed to regulate the relations of people within this society, as well as to guarantee the stability of social processes. The characteristic features of political communication are its openness, orientation in one direction (from the one who transmits information to the recipient), heterogeneous and unstable composition of the audience. The intensive development of political

technologies, the ever-growing role of the mass media, the acuteness of the problem of the manipulative potential of language contribute to the growing attention of society to the theory and practice of using special means that contribute to the realization of the main functions of political discourse.

T. A. van Dijk characterizes political discourse as a unity of genres of the political domain and insists that the main category for distinguishing political discourse should be the context, and notes that certain social categories constitute the context for the functioning of a certain text as a political discourse [4: 127].

In addition, one of the main criteria for distinguishing political discourse from other types of discourse is its focus on the performance of some specific functions in the political process or action.

R. Wodak sees political discourse as a polysemantic phenomenon, in the formation of which various cultural spheres are integrated, namely the mass media, group professional environment, multilingual communities, systems of individual assessment [9: xvi]. Thus, she expands the concept of political discourse, emphasizing that participants in political discourse are not only politicians, but also other recipients involved in communication, such as political communities and ordinary citizens.

The main features of political discourse are its institutionality (political subjects are representatives of various institutions), conventionality (clichés, idioms, a number of political terms) and intertextuality (the property of creating political texts within the scope of expressing a certain ideology, socio-cultural norms and values). And it is these features that determine its basic functions.

G. Seidel singles out the following functions of political discourse: persuasive, argumentative, persuasive-functional, and the function of group association [7: 51].

The main function of political discourse can be considered its use as a tool of political power (struggle for power, seizure of power, its preservation, protection and support, stabilization or redistribution).

The defining characteristic of political discourse is the competition for power, which involves attracting as many supporters as possible to their side, which is why political actors should create such a discursive reality that would satisfy the needs, interests and expectations of the audience. In addition, political discourse should be characterized by simplicity of understanding in order to be accessible to everyone.

The effectiveness of political discourse consists in convincing the addressees - citizens of a certain society - of the need for politically correct actions and conclusions. In other words, the purpose of political discourse is not description, but persuasion of the addressee, evoking certain intentions and prompting to action.

But political activity has many forms and manifestations, one of which is war. According to the famous Prussian commander, military reformer, theorist and historian, whose work "On War" became decisive for the development of the foundations of military science, Carl von Clausewitz, "war is not something else, but the continuation of politics by other ways and means" [3: 361]. That is, war is a part of politics and, accordingly, takes on all its properties and characteristics.

Therefore, taking into account the above, we believe that the discourse of war is an integral part of the political discourse.

No war is possible without broad public support, and politicians win this support by finding the right approaches to their audiences.

Military discourse characterizes the use of language and social interaction as a mediating element in the initiation, conduct and discussion of a political armed conflict. War, as an organized and purposeful form of group action, depends

in some way on the organizational capacity of discourse to create integrity and strengthen support in one's own community and to clearly define the enemy group and direct the struggle against it, to legitimize the use of lethal weapons (actual or potential) in the eyes of its citizens and international community.

According to Adam Hodges, the key elements of military discourse are the rhetoric of a call to arms, a clear discursive delineation of social identities, and the creation of linguistic means to legitimize and heroize military actions and the use of arms [6: 1].

As Pogonets V. V. notes. "by military discourse we understand the text as a communicative subsystem of speech in combination with non-speech - pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological and other factors" [2: 68]. Military discourse examines war in both its historical and contemporary forms.

The category of military discourse includes the discourse of the military about the war, politicians about the war, and the discourse of mass media covering military operations. The content of the discourse is centered around the basic concept, which is the topic of the discourse (for example, the discourse of the Second World War, and now we can talk about the discourse of Russia's war with Ukraine). Analyzing its linguistic and extra-linguistic components together enables us to systematically investigate and describe the various structures and strategies that are typical and characteristic of military discourse.

"War is a socio-political phenomenon, which is one of the forms of resolution of socio-political, economic, ideological, national, territorial, religious and other contradictions between states, peoples, nations, classes, social groups by means of armed violence. War is a continuation of politics by violent means and is associated with a change in relations between political subjects." [1: 4: 57]. Thus, it is obvious that the war discourse of the politicians of the aggressor state, as well as the discourse of the politicians of the allies of the

aggressor state and those who are interested in waging this war, is extremely manipulative.

Any manipulation is carried out only through the use of certain language means, that is, through linguistic influence.

Linguistic influence is the use of features of the language system and functioning in order to create messages that have an increased ability to influence the consciousness and behavior of the recipient or recipients of the message.

T. A. van Dijk considers manipulation as a versatile phenomenon. The scientist believes that manipulation is a communicative and interactive practice, which suggests that the manipulator, acting in his own interests, should establish control over other people, usually against their will. The main property of manipulation is abuse of power. A manipulator who pursues his own goals and interests forces people to commit certain actions that are in the sphere of the interests of the manipulator and contradict the interests of those who are being manipulated [5: 364].

From the point of view of R. Wodak "Manipulation is a peculiar form of persuasion. The difference is that persuasion implies the fact that interlocutors have the opportunity to think and act according to their own views and opinions, based on which they accept or not the arguments of the person who is persuading them. Manipulation, in turn, makes victims of those who are manipulated, who are deprived of the opportunity to understand the true intentions and designs of the manipulator, and who are not aware of the real consequences that will entail the actions and views that the manipulator imposes on them" [8: 393].

T. A. van Dijk notes the presence of legitimate and illegitimate social practices. Legitimate ones involves informing, and illegitimate ones consist of all forms of interaction that are in the addressee's interests and against the recipients' interests. Manipulation,

according to T. A. van Dijk, is an illegitimate social practice that creates inequality in any democratic society [5: 379].

The basic features of the military discourse of politicians are aggressiveness, pressure, persuasiveness, audacity, emotionality, persistence, advocacy of one's own point of view, which entails the use of the whole range of linguistic manipulative strategies and tactics.

American Republican politicians are notorious for their negative attitude towards Ukraine and support for putin's russia in the war against Ukraine, and it is their war discourse on this topic that is characterized by a high level of manipulateness.

One of the most common manipulative techniques is "labeling". This technique consists in choosing unmotivated, biased, offensive, emotionally colored characteristics to denote a person, an idea or any social phenomenon. Such "labels" cause a negative attitude of the audience to the subject being discussed.

Madison Cawthorn a former member of the US House of Representatives from the Republican Party, had the following to say about our country and its President shortly after russia's full-scale invasion of our territory: "*Remember that Zelenskyy is a thug. Remember that **the Ukrainian government is incredibly corrupt and it is incredibly evil and has been pushing WOKE ideologies***" [1]. The use of powerful negative axioms, such as "thug" to characterize the Ukrainian president, "incredibly corrupt and incredibly evil", "WOKE ideology" (ideology of racial hatred) to characterize the government of Ukraine, is aimed at forming a negative attitude towards our country in the mass American audience at a time when we desperately need support of our partners in the fight against the enemy.

Lauren Witzke, a former candidate for the Senate from the Republican Party, notorious for her extreme right-wing views, also resorts to "labeling": "*I'm kind of confused why they're telling us to*

*stand with Ukraine when it seems that everybody affiliated or standing with Ukraine is either **transgender, a Satanist, or a straight up Nazi*** [2]. In this statement, the role of "labels" is played by negatively colored nominative units such as "transgender", "Satanist", "a straight up Nazi", which are used to discredit in the eyes of the average American the rival party, namely the Democrats, who support Ukraine.

The manipulative technique of "labeling" is quite common among radical Republicans, this is how the American political blogger and activist, a member of the right wing of the Republican Party Candace Owens defines the activities of our President: "**President Zelensky is a very bad character who is working with globalists like Soros and Clinton against the interests of his own people**" [3]. Calling President Zelensky a "bad hero", the blogger accuses him of cooperating with globalists, knowing that the American everymen see globalism as the destruction of their economy. Thus, the use of these negative language units is aimed at deepening distrust both in the leaders of our state and in discriminating against world leaders who support us.

Steven Bannon, a businessman and investment banker, the chief manager of Donald Trump's election company, does not shy away from the manipulative technique of "labeling": "**Every member of Conservative Inc. that backs this Ukraine war is a simp**" [4]. This politician calls every member of the British ruling party, where everyone is known to support Ukraine, ungrateful and not sufficiently appreciative of the long-standing support of Britain by the United States.

Another manipulative technique that can often be found in the speeches and statements of Republicans are stereotypes. A stereotype is a simplified idea accepted in society about anything that is not based on a person's own experience. These ideas have such characteristics as emotionality, stability, axiomaticity, evaluability and, accordingly, can influence the behavior

and judgment of people under certain circumstances, and thus have a sufficiently high potential for manipulateness.

This is what Roger Stone, an American political consultant, lobbyist, member of the right wing of the Republican Party, says about the United States' aid to Ukraine: "**There are in fact bio labs in Ukraine funded by our tax dollars...Putin is acting defensively. Why are we funding this?**" [5]. Since the collapse of the USSR, Putin's Russia has consistently accused the United States of funding biological weapons laboratories, which, as they say, are located on the territory of the former republics of the Soviet Union. Americans have refuted this information many times, presenting convincing evidence, but a Republican politician uses this stale stereotype to negatively influence American society regarding aid to Ukraine.

The odious Tucker Carlson, a Republican, a conservative political propagandist and a TV host, a justifier of Russian fascism and Putinism, declared in one of his programs: "**While members of both parties in Washington rail against Russian President Vladimir Putin, it is China that is on its way to controlling the world**" [6]. Exploiting the fears of ordinary American voters that the US will lose its superpower status to China, its perennial economic, military and scientific rival, he uses the old stereotype of China's aspirations for world leadership to distract his audience from the threat of aggression and tyranny from Putin's Russia, which hung over all of Europe.

This politician also uses repetition in his statements. Repetition of the same maxims draws the audience's attention to them, and thereby fixes this information in the minds and memories of the recipients. Thus, the audience is under both linguistic and psychological pressure. "**Here's the weird thing. By any actual reality-based measure, Vladimir Putin is not losing the war in Ukraine. He is not losing the war in Ukraine and Joe Biden looks at that and**

says we won't stop until you offer an unconditional surrender" [7].

Marjorie Taylor Greene, an American far-right politician, a Republican candidate for the US House of Representatives in the 2020 elections, also resorts to repetition in her comments. "You see Ukraine just kept **poking the bear, poking the bear**, which is **Russia**, and **Russia** invaded. And the hard truth is that **Russia** is being very successful in their invasion" [8]. Repeating the phrase "poking the bear" (playing with fire) and **russia**, the author shifts the blame for the start of the war to Ukraine, manipulating the consciousness of her readers, she distorts reality, painting a completely opposite picture.

Right-wing Republicans also use comparisons in their speeches and comments. Comparison allows the author to establish similarities between two objects, even if they are completely different. Comparison is additional emotional information that expresses the author's subjective assessment and evokes in the mind of the addressee a number of associations that are beneficial for the manipulator.

Here is one of the statements of Stu Peters, a far-right media person, a Republican, in one of his radio shows: "**The ethnic Russians in Ukraine are like our Jan. 6 protesters** and the deep state wants to crush them for the same reason they want to crush the Jan. 6 protesters" [9]. Comparing ethnic russians living in Ukraine to the illegal mobs of Donald Trump supporters who stormed the White House after his 2020 presidential defeat, the host casts reality in a distorted light, noting that ethnic russians in Ukraine are subjected to such the same oppression and punishments as criminals in the USA.

Speaking about linguistic techniques and means of manipulation, it is worth mentioning neologisms. Neologisms are new words or phrases that are coined to denote some new, previously unknown object or phenomenon, which is why all participants in communication feel the unusualness of such a word or phrase.

Neologisms are emotionally-colored units, with high expressive potential, which always attract the attention of the audience, and that is why they are quite a popular tool for manipulators.

Here is one of the statements of the above-mentioned Marjorie Taylor Greene: "NATO has been supplying the neo-Nazis in Ukraine with powerful weapons and extensive training on how to use them. What the hell is going on with these **#NATONazis?**" [10]. The neologism "NatoNazis" is used by a politician, who is a member of the Republican Party, to discredit the NATO member states for their support of Ukraine in its fair fight against the aggressor for its independence.

A common manipulative tool is also the silencing of information, which is manifested in the concealment of certain topics or only in their partial coverage. Such silencing is used for the purpose of actual deception by deliberately ignoring some facts and their consequences.

It is worth considering one of the statements of Donald Trump, the leader of the Republican Party and an ardent supporter of good relations with russia: "**putin is taking over a country for two dollars worth of sanctions. I'd say that's pretty smart**" [11]. In this case, there is a purposeful silencing the fact that Western sanctions have dealt a devastating blow to the russian economy, the consequences of which will intensify over the next decades and may very well cause the complete economic collapse of the russian federation.

Conclusions and Perspectives.

Politicians' discourse about war, as a type of political discourse, is highly manipulative because politicians are interested in winning over as large an audience as possible. This is exactly the discourse of American Republican politicians about the Russian-Ukrainian war, which is aimed at convincing their voters of the need to support Russia in this war by tarnishing Ukraine and devaluing its role in protecting the whole of Europe from an arbitrary aggressor. This manipulation is implemented through linguistic influence when using

certain verbal techniques and tools, which are described in this article. We can see the prospects of researching the problem in the further analysis of

various types of discourse concerning the implementation of manipulative influence in them by using all possible linguistic methods and means.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1. Енциклопедія Сучасної України. Т. 4.: "В" – "Вог" / Головна редколегія: І. М. Дзюба, А. І. Жуковський, М. Г. Железняк та інші. НАН України. НТШ. Київ: Інститут енциклопедичних досліджень НАН України. 2005. 700 с.
2. Погонєць В. В. Особливості англomовного військового дискурсу. Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія Філологія. № 39. Том 2. Одеса: Міжнародний гуманітарний університет. 2019. С. 67–70.
3. Carl von Clausewitz. On War. Princenton University Press. Edited and Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. 1989. 752 p.
4. Dijk T. A. van. Context Models in Discourse Processing. New York. 1999. P. 123–148.
5. Dijk T. A. van. Discourse and Manipulation. Discourse and Society. № 17 (2). 2005. P. 359–383.
6. Hodges A. War Discourse. Carnegie Mellow University. New York. 2015. 6 p.
7. Siedel J. Political Discourse Analysis. Handbook of Discourse Analysis. London: Academic Press, № 4. 1985. P. 43–60.
8. Wodak R. And Where is the Lebanon? A Socio-Psycholinguistic Investigation of Comprehension and Intelligibility of News. Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse. Vol. 7. Issue 4. 1987. P. 377–410.
9. Wodak R. The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan. 2011. 252 p.

СПИСОК ДЖЕРЕЛ ІЛЮСТРАТИВНОГО МАТЕРІАЛУ

1. <https://www.wral.com/us-rep-madison-cawthorn-calls-zelensky-thug/20180199/> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
2. <https://twitter.com/AccountableGOP/status/1509943406067388424?s=20&t=8iA2d5C3ibntV0aKPXkdHQ> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
3. <https://twitter.com/RealCandaceO/status/1504529380873318403?s=20&t=9jfRjHmOfoHlfrAMigeow> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
4. <https://twitter.com/AccountableGOP/status/1547612015920746499?s=20&t=fUXb3XRDmT3t3zvIkiui9Q> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
5. <https://twitter.com/AccountableGOP/status/1505941719040331782?s=20&t=bybzgowEYjsSSYAUWT7iAQ> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
6. <https://cubasi.cu/en/news/tucker-carlson-slams-corrupt-ukraine> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
7. <https://theguardian.com/media/2022/oct/02/tucker-carlson-ukraine-vladimir-putin-propaganda> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
8. <https://twitter.com/HeartlandSignal/status/1506328524986241> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
9. <https://mobile.twitter.com/RightWingWatch/status/1497240190208913408> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
10. <https://twitter.com/RepMTG/status/1503858436504698883> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)
11. <https://rumble.com/vvrbcp-president-trump-on-putin-hes-taking-over-a-country-for-two-dollars-worth-of.html> (дата звернення: 23.01.2023)

REFERENCES (TRANSLATED & TRANSLITERATED)

1. Entsyklopediya Suchasnoyi Ukrainy (2005). [Encyclopedia of Modern Ukraine]. Vol.4.: "V" – "Vog"/Golovna Redkolegiia [Main Editorial Board]: I. M. Dzyuba, A. I. Zhukovskii, M. G. Zelezhnyak and others. NAN Ukrainy [Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences]. NTSh. Kyiv: Instytut entsyklopedychnyh doslidzhen' NAN Ukrainy. 700 p. [in Ukrainian].
2. Pogonets, V. V. (2019). Osoblyvosti angломовного viyskovogo dyskursu [Peculiarities of English War Discourse]. *Naukovyi visnyk Mizhnarodnogo Humanitarnogo universytetu. Seriya Filologiya. №39. V/ol. 2.* Odesa: Mizhnarodnyi Humanitarnyi Universytet. P. 67–70. [in Ukrainian].
3. Carl von Clausewitz. (1989). On War. Princenton University Press. Edited and Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret. 752 p. [in English].
4. Dijk, T. A. van. (1999). Context Models in Discourse Processing. New York. P. 123–148. [in English].
5. Dijk, T. A. van. (2005). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse and Society. № 17 (2).* P. 359–383. [in English].
6. Hodges, A. (2015). War Discourse. Carnegie Mellow University. New York. 6 p. [in English].
7. Siedel, J. (1985). Political Discourse Analysis. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* London: Academic Press, № 4. P. 43–60. [in English].
8. Wodak, R. (1987). And Where is the Lebanon? A Socio-Psycholinguistic Investigation of Comprehension and Intelligibility of News. *Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse. Vol. 7. Issue 4.* P. 377–410. [in English].
9. Wodak, R. (2011). The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan. 252 p. [in English].

SOURCES OF SUPPORTING MATERIAL

1. <https://www.wral.com/us-rep-madison-cawthorn-calls-zelensky-thug/20180199/> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
2. <https://twitter.com/AccountableGOP/status/1509943406067388424?s=20&t=8iA2d5C3ibntV0aKPXkdHQ> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
3. <https://twitter.com/RealCandaceO/status/1504529380873318403?s=20&t=9jfRjHmOf0HlfrAMigeow> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
4. <https://twitter.com/AccountableGOP/status/1547612015920746499?s=20&t=fUXb3XRDmT3t3zvIkiui9Q> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
5. <https://twitter.com/AccountableGOP/status/1505941719040331782?s=20&t=bybzgowEYjsSSYAUWT7iAQ> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
6. <https://cubasi.cu/en/news/tucker-carlson-slams-corrupt-ukraine> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
7. <https://theguardian.com/media/2022/oct/02/tucker-carlson-ukraine-vladimir-putin-propaganda> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
8. <https://twitter.com/HeartlandSignal/status/1506328524986241> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
9. <https://mobile.twitter.com/RightWingWatch/status/1497240190208913408> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
10. <https://twitter.com/RepMTG/status/1503858436504698883> (reference date: 23.01.2023)
11. <https://rumble.com/vvrbcp-president-trump-on-putin-hes-taking-over-a-country-for-two-dollars-worth-of.html> (reference date: 23.01.2023)

Стаття надійшла до редколегії: 25.01.2023
Схвалено до друку: 28.02.2023