

МОВОЗНАВСТВО. ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81'42:316.46.058.5:32

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/40-3-10>**Tetiana PALIEI,***orcid.org/0000-0003-1615-8251**PhD in Philology,**Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations**Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts**(Kyiv, Ukraine) pltatiana@ukr.net***LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF “NAME-CALLING” MANIPULATIVE TACTICS
IMPLEMENTATION IN AMERICAN POLITICAL DISCOURSE**

One of the most effective means of seizure, holding, exercise and legitimation of power is manipulation of human consciousness. The concept “manipulation” is an interesting field for Political studies, Social Studies, Linguistics, Psychology. Manipulators use various manipulative strategies and tactics to achieve their aims. Manipulation in general, and political manipulation in particular, is implemented by linguistic (verbal) and paralinguistic means – phonic (tone, timbre, loudness, melody), kinetic (gestures, posture, mimics), graphic. But the use of such means and their variations is conditioned by extra-linguistic factors. Both groups of factors – linguistic and extra-linguistic – form pragmatic aspect of an utterance. So we can state, that pragmatic aspect of manipulation (of any kind, including political) is the key one. The choice of communicative strategy and appropriate (corresponding) tactics depend upon both the genre of political discourse (TV debates, propaganda address (speech), political advertising, interview in mass media and others) and combination of intentions which every definite person (subject) of discourse possesses in definite situation. Politicians who are in power and opposition members use different tactics and strategy repertoire. Scholars single out such strategies of political discourse: self-representation, propaganda, emotional disposition creation, information and interpretation, reasoning, manipulation, discrediting, attack, self-defence and others. “Name-calling” is one of the most widely used tactics and it has proved to make necessary, intended results.

From the linguistic point of view this tactics is implemented through a selection of metaphors, epithets, sometimes disphemisms, that is a selection of so-called “labels”, pinned to people for giving characteristics to a person, organization or any social phenomenon. As a rule such “names” or “pinned labels” possess negative emotional coloring and are aimed at evoking certain associations and assigning them to a given object in order to weigh this object down. Having analyzed the types of metaphors used by candidates for President office in the USA during the election campaign in 2008, we can state that they mainly use imaginative metaphors – the most expressive kind of metaphors. These ones are occasional and individual. They are created by the speaker in a definite situation to characterize a definite person. That is why they are bright, image-bearing and picturesque. According to S. Kara-Murza, metaphors are finished clichés of thought, but the clichés which are esthetically attractive. He thinks that they are stereotypes expressed in the artistic way. Having neither enough time nor mental possibilities for constant re-examining of the received information we adjust all the messages to long-ago-formed clichés, which can function as a peculiar filter for manipulators. These clichés, or metaphors, according to scientists, are the stereotypes, or fixed ideas about reality facts, which lead to simplified and exaggerated estimations and affirmations on behalf of an individual (Kara-Murza, 2009:192).

Key words: *political manipulation, “name-calling” tactics, linguistic means.*

Тетяна ПАЛЄЙ,*orcid.org/0000-0003-1615-8251**кандидат філологічних наук,**доцент кафедри міжнародних відносин**Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв**(Київ, Україна) pltatiana@ukr.net***ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ РЕАЛІЗАЦІЇ
МАНІПУЛЯТИВНОЇ ТАКТИКИ «НАВІШУВАННЯ ЯРЛИКІВ»
В АМЕРИКАНСЬКОМУ ПОЛІТИЧНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ**

Одним із найбільш ефективних засобів захвату, втримання, використання і легітимації влади є маніпулювання громадською думкою. Концепт «Маніпуляція» – цікава проблема, яка вивчається Політичними науками, соціологією, лінгвістикою, психологією. Маніпулятори користуються різними стратегіями і тактиками

для досягнення своїх цілей. Маніпулювання взагалі, і політичне маніпулювання в особливості, відбувається, здійснюється за допомогою лінгвістичних (вербальних) і паралінгвістичних засобів – фонетичних (тон, мелодія, тембр, гучність), кінетичних (постава, міміка, жестикуляція), графічних. Але вживання цих засобів і їх варіації обумовлено екстралінгвістичними факторами. Обидві групи факторів – лінгвістичні та екстралінгвістичні – формують прагматичний аспект висловлювання. Тому можна стверджувати, що прагматичний аспект будь-якого виду маніпулювання (включаючи політичне) є ключовим. Вибір комунікативної стратегії і відповідної тактики залежить від жанру (теледебати, пропагандистські промови, політична реклама, інтерв'ю в засобах масової інформації та інші види) і комбінації інтенцій, притаманних кожному суб'єкту дискурсу в певній ситуації. У політиків при владі і членів опозиції різний набір стратегій і тактик. Вчені виділяють такі стратегії в політичному дискурсі: самопрезентація, пропаганда, створення емоційного настрою, інформація (інформування) та інтерпретація, обґрунтування, маніпуляція, дискредитація, атака, самозахист та інші. «Навішування ярликів» – одна із найпоширеніших тактик, яка довела досягнення потрібних результатів.

Із лінгвістичної точки зору ця тактика втілюється за допомогою вживання метафор, епітетів, дисфемізмів, тобто набору так званих «ярликів» (лейблів), які навішуються на людей, щоб дати характеристику особі, організації або соціальному феномену. Як правило, такі «назви», або «навішані ярлики», мають негативне емоційне значення і спрямовані на створення певних асоціацій і приписування їм певному об'єкту з метою зниження його цінності, тобто знецінення. Проаналізувавши типи метафор, які вживали кандидати на пост президента США у 2008 році, можна стверджувати, що вони вживали здебільшого образні метафори – найбільш експресивний вид метафор. Вони оказіональні й індивідуальні. Їх створює сам мовець для характеристики певної особи і в певній ситуації. Тому вони дуже яскраві, образні, колоритні й дотепні. Згідно з Кара-Мурзою, метафори – це закінчені кліше думки, але естетично привабливі кліше. Він вважає, що це стереотипи, виражені художніми засобами. Не маючи ні часу, на ментальних можливостей для постійної переоцінки отриманої інформації, ми пристосовуємо все повідомлення (меседжі) до давно сформованих кліше, які можуть функціонувати як певний фільтр для маніпулятора. Такі кліше, або метафори, на думку вчених, є стереотипами, або фіксованими ідеями про факти реальності, які ведуть до спрощених або перебільшених оцінок та афірмацій з боку індивідуума (Kara-Murza, 2009: 192).

Ключові слова: політичні маніпуляції, тактика «навішування ярликів», лінгвістичні засоби.

Manipulating of human consciousness is one of the most effective means of seizure, holding, exercise and legitimation of power. The concept “manipulation” is an interesting field for Political studies, Social Studies, Linguistics, Psychology. In Ukraine and Russia scholars studied different aspects of manipulation, depending upon the branch of science. **The formulation of the problem.** We propose to consider linguistic representation as one of the pragmatic aspects of manipulation. Pragmatics is understood as “inter-scientific field of knowledge, which studies situational and behavioral, status, psychological, cognitive and linguistic factors of communicative interaction of subjects and their attitude to the means of this interaction and certain sign system, used by interlocutors in their communication” (Селіванова, 2011: 582).

The problem analysis. Political manipulation is paid great attention to and its different aspects are being studied by many scientists, representing numerous fields of science. In Ukraine aspects of manipulative tactics and their representation were studied by G. Pocheptsov, O. Boiko, O. Selivanova and others.

But there always remain the questions which need more detailed research. So, **the goal of our study** is to analyze linguistic aspects of “name-calling” manipulative tactics in American political discourse on the materials of election campaigns.

The term “manipulation comes from the Latin “manipulus” meaning “handful”, and means skillful treatment of an object with hidden intentions and

goals. This meaning gives rise to modern metaphorical meaning, given in Oxford dictionary, as the act of influence on people or efficient management of them, especially with contemptuous covered sense (implication); as hidden but intended management. Russian psychologist Ye. Dotsenko suggests the following definition. “Manipulation is a kind of psychological influence, mastery execution of intentions with another person, which contradict to this person’s existing wishes” (Доценко, 1997: 58). So we can state that manipulation is the result of communicative actions.

It is worth mentioning the risks, intrinsic to manipulation, which are discussed by S. Kara-Murza:

1) a kind of intellectual and psychological influence (but not physical coercion). The target of a manipulator is intelligence, psychic structures of a personality;

2) hidden influence, which should not be noticed by the object of manipulation... for manipulation false reality is needed, where a person will not feel he is being influenced;

3) it is a component of authority’s technology, but not the influence on friend’s or partner’s behavior (Kara-Murza, 2009: 154).

The scholar states that manipulation as the tool of authorities springs up only in civic society when the political order, based on representative democracy is established. According to F. La Rochefoucauld, “people could not live in society, if they made a fool of one another” (Ларошфуко, 1990: 42).

Ye. Shostrom expresses the opinion that both an object of manipulation becomes a victim and manipulator himself suffers too as “manipulation is pseudo philosophy of life, aimed at exploiting and controlling of both manipulation” (Шостром, 2004: 28). So, mutual aspiration to adjust surroundings to personal criteria causes changes in both – subjects and objects of manipulation.

If interpersonal communication is aimed at a recipient and a manipulator psychologically adjusts to an addressee, political manipulation refers to a crowd. In this case the will, power of the minority, in a hidden way, is imposed on the majority. O. Boiko defines political manipulation as a set of psychological, ideological and managerial actions, directed at hidden correction of mass consciousness with the aim of stimulating social activity in the way, necessary for a manipulator, in his struggle for political power, its grasping, exercising and holding (Бойко, 2010: 9).

We can quote some more definitions of the term “political manipulation” depending upon which science deals with it.

So, political manipulation is viewed as:

- a system of ideological, intelligent and psychological influence on mass consciousness with the aim of imposing definite ideas and values; goal-seeking influence on civic opinion and political behavior for turning them in the needed direction (V. Voronkova);

- a component of the authorities technology, the essence of which is in programming of thoughts and strivings of people, their dispositions and even psychological state with the aim of forming such manner of behavior, which conforms with those, possessing the means of manipulation (S. Kara-Murza);

- a system of psychological actions, aimed at the implementation of illusionary ideas; machination (gerrymander) (A. Derkach, V. Zhurov);

- agent's actions, which, in a covert manner, create conditions for planned action on behalf of the object of manipulation (O. Saveliiev) common to mankind experience of forming, holding and implementing shadow power, goal-seeking play on people's superstitions and prejudice (Yu. Yermakov).

The key aspects of political manipulation are its direction at mass peculiarities and attention to the method of power exercise. To my mind this is the key difference of political manipulation which influences the arsenal of methods and technologies of influence on mass consciousness at the level of state formation.

The aims of political manipulation are the following (V. Amelina):

- to enroot the content though obscure but wanted by definite groups and present it as objective information in the consciousness of masses;

- to affect painful problems of civic consciousness, causing fears, anxiety, etc.;

- to implement some ideas and hidden goals (intentions) (Цуладзе, 1999: 15).

Manipulation in general, and political manipulation in particular, is implemented by linguistic (verbal means) and paralinguistic means – phonic (tone, timbre, loudness, melody), kinetic (gestures, posture, mimics), graphic. But the use of such means and their variations is conditioned by extra linguistic factors. Both groups of factors – linguistic and extra linguistic – form pragmatic aspect of an utterance. So we can state, that pragmatic aspect of manipulation (of any kind, including political) is the key one.

No politician addresses the public spontaneously, without having in mind the aim of his address, hidden intentions he wants to embed, enroot into the consciousness of people and without a complex of definite strategies and tactics. This set of strategies and tactics can be well developed (if he is experienced in political struggle for example P. Poroshenko) or not well developed.

Strategic plan foresees (presupposes) the creation of traps for an opponent (Бойко, 2010: 100). Such strategic plan is usually worked out in advance and, as a rule, well approved during communication with people. Usually it includes several strategies. Strategy is described as “the process of development and implementation of communicative task, put forward with the aim of affective influence on an addressee” (Славова, 2006: 116). Within one strategy one can single out several speech tactics, “working” for this strategy. Under tactic scholars understand a totality of methods and modes, which guarantee strategic success, that is the achievement of the set goal (Бойко, 2010: 162) or, in other words, the way of strategy implementation. In case of consciousness manipulation verbal and nonverbal means are the modes of communication.

Strategies and tactics, appropriate for the successful implementation of strategies, need to be brought into system. There exist some classifications of speech strategies and corresponding tactics. One of them belongs to O. Dmytruk, who singles out:

- evasion (avoidance of) from the truth (tactics of “name calling”, “glittering generality”, “transfer”);

- misrepresentation of information (tactics of repetition (hyperbolization), exaggeration, depreciation, simplification of notions, ignoring trick shuffling, forging / fabrication of facts, dividing the integral picture into smaller parts);

- immunization of utterances (tactics of referring to authorities / testimonial tactics, tactics of using universal utterances);

- modification of illocutionary force of utterance (tactics of categoric / non-categoric nomination);
- strategy of group identification (tactics of inclusiveness, spacing);
- strategy of structuring according to the principle of relativity (tactics of giving important information at the beginning and at the end of the message / utterance, using structures with implicative potential).

Pioneers in creating and working out technologies of political manipulation of mass consciousness is the USA. At the end of 1930s the USA Institute of propaganda analysis worked out and classified 7 key tactics of tactics of information and psychological influence, the so-called “Propaganda ABC”. Those 7 tactics were:

- “name calling”;
- “glittering generality”;
- “transfer”;
- “testimonial” (reference to authorities);
- “plain folks”;
- “card stacking”;
- “band wagon” (Грачев, Мельник, 2003: 216).

Taking this classification as the basis, we will try to study the tactics “name calling” (label pinning) and its candidates for the Presidential Office during election campaigns served the material of the research.

Every video-clip demonstrated one of the tactics depending upon the needs of the communicative process and electoral goals. Consequently every tactic was designed with the help of several linguistic, mainly stylistic, devices. So, every tactic is a totality of definite linguistic devices.

Bearing in mind, that text analysis of video-clips, taken without visual and soundtracks, will be incomplete and not reliable, the necessity of including pragmatic aspect seemed urgent and well-proved. To pragmatic aspect we ascribe such video-clip characteristics as its short-term duration (length up to 4 min.); they present a finished story; information is subdivided into explicit (utterances) and implicit (not verbally expressed, but understood from comparison, references to other people and actions, allusions and so on); a video-clip should arise corresponding associative and stereotyped images; its emotionality; combination of visual and sound irritants; sphere of application – Internet and TV. So I have proved that video-clip text analysis should be done in close interconnection with audio and visual tracks.

“Name calling” tactics and its linguistic representation.

This is one of the most widely used tactics and it has proved to make necessary, intended results.

From the linguistic point of view this tactics is implemented through a selection of metaphors, epi-

thets, sometimes disphemisms, that is a selection of so-called “labels”, pinned to people for giving characteristics to a person, organization or any social phenomenon. As a rule such “names” or “pinned labels” possess negative emotional coloring and are aimed at evoking certain associations and assigning them to a given object in order to weigh this object down.

G. Shiller calls such pinning of false labels (or false name calling) and misrepresentation of struggle targets of ideological opponents as a typical mode of propaganda machine.

To implement such intentions speakers use different stylistic devices, metaphors being most potential among them.

Metaphor is the term which denotes “expressive renaming on the basis of similarity of two objects: the real object of speech and the one whose name is actually used. But there is only affinity, no real connection between the two” (Скребнев, 2003).

Scholars give almost the same definition of metaphors, stressing that it is the result of transference of the name of one object to another object “it is based upon similarity of the objects (not contiguity)” (Yefimov, 2011: 54).

Summing up the existing definitions we can conclude that metaphor is a stylistic trope, based on breaking well-established logic connections and on forming new ones. Scholars also treat it as a way of creating picture of the world. The main function of a metaphor in political discourse is to add more expressivity while forming a needed attitude to the object.

Having analyzed the types of metaphors used by candidates for President office in the USA during the election campaign in 2008, we can state that they mainly use imaginative metaphors – the most expressive kind of metaphors. These ones are occasional and individual. They are created by the speaker in a definite situation to characterize a definite person. That is why they are bright, image-bearing and picturesque.

As an example one can mention a poster, widely distributed in the Internet. This poster referred to one of the candidates B. Obama and had an inscription on it: “46 – Years Old Political Virgin”. In this context the word “virgin” acquires negative connotation. Except this pinned label “Political Virgin”, there existed an advertisement video-clip “Not ready ... yet”, which was executed by Mc Cane’s team. In this clip Mr. Mc Cane dwells upon B. Obama’s inability to conduct state politics, and in one of the shells there appears the caption: “Obama lacks the experience the America needs”. An one more TV clip “Sweet Equity” (Mc Cane, 2008) the following phrase is not only pronounced by the news reader, but it gradually appears on the screen, in parts: “Barak Obama. Higher taxes.

More spending. Not ready”. Here one more stylistic device is used – gradation (or climax), where each subsequent component increases significance, importance and emotional tension of the utterance – the atmosphere of critics is becoming more intense. The thesis about un sufficient experience forms the image of Obama as a weak leader, who can't cope with the challenges the President may face. On the other hand, B. Obama's opponent Mr. Mc Cane gets a label. “The oldest / biggest celebrity”. It would sound great, and absolutely positive, if not the person who uttered it: public celebrity P. Hilton, having scandalous reputation. Negative publicity of P. Hilton overlaps the positive image of a serious politician (Mc Cane) and this conflict forms the context where the word “celebrity” acquires negative coloring.

Another example of using metaphors in political discourse is the slogan of Democrats with Bill Clinton in 1996, which sounds: “Building a Bridge to the 21st Century. Metaphorical usage of the word “bridge” emotionally strengthens the idea of building up, constructing new future.

Metaphorical comparison of a person with an animal or natural phenomenon is picturesque and adds more expressivity to video-clips of candidates for Presidential Office.

In video-clip “From the Heart”, intended support B. Dole (Dole. 1996) metaphorical comparison is used to make candidates characteristics more vivid and impressive: “This is Bob Dole. He is a workhorse ...” The noun “workhorse” is used in figurative sense, characterizing a person, who fulfils the most part of the work.

Superb is the video-clip “Wolves” (Bush, 2004), where, with the help of visual metaphoric methods, terrorists are presented as wolves and this aggravates the feeling of fear in the following message.

Let us analyze one more video-clip – “Storm” (Mc Cane, 2008). The video lasts for only 30 seconds. It is based on description of storm, which is becoming stronger and stronger (the effect of audio-visual creating of emotional pressure, unrest). First the following words are heard: “We choose president to guide us ... If that storm does get worse with someone who is untested at the home?”, then against the black background, for the first time the only one caption appears: “Barack Obama. Untested”. To my mind (but it is completely subjective point of view) the words “We choose president to guide us...” echoes the Bible's legend about Moses and Jews, their Exodus from Egypt: President will guide them (the nation) as Moses guided the Jews ...

In video-critics “Dome” (Mc Cane. 2008) to define tax policy, offered by B. Obama, the follow-

ing metaphors were used: “painful taxes ... skyrocket taxes”, which intensify negative emotional tension. In the 2 last mentioned video-clips one can observe the formation of the associative row of unrest and diffidence, a kind of threat in case B. Obama were elected.

According to S. Kara-Murza, metaphors are finished clichés of thought, but the clichés which are esthetically attractive. He thinks that they are stereotypes expressed in the artistic way.

He explains that we have neither enough time nor mental possibilities but enough abolitions to constantly re-examine information which we receive. That is why we adjust all the messages to long-ago-formed clichés, which can function as a peculiar filter for manipulators. According to scientists, stereotype is fixed ideas about reality facts, which lead to simplified and exaggerated estimations and affirmations on behalf of an individual. These ideas are widely disseminated in certain social groups with the help of language or image (Kara-Murza, 2009: 192).

This conclusion is also proved by Nietzsche's words that due to speeding of life our spirit (mind) and sight are getting used to deficient or untruthful judgment (opinion) or conception of the world (cit. Kara-Murza, 2009: 192). G. Lebon stresses, that “having a stock of formulas learned in childhood, we have everything we need not to get exhausted with contemplations” (Лебон, 2011: 168).

Ye. Gursel introduced the term “sedimentation” meaning sedimentation of experience as stereotypes (cit. Kara-Murza, 2009: 194). Sociologist V. Lipman in his book “Public thought” (1922) offered a concept of propaganda, as such quality of person's consciousness saves a lot of manipulator's efforts. S. Kara – Murza, in his turn, considers that for “successful manipulation one should have a reliable” “list of stereotypes” of different groups and layers of society – the whole cultural context of the targeted population” (cit. Kara-Murza, 2009: 194).

On the basis of these judgments scholars analyze the ways how the speaker can introduce his message: a) by using the existing stereotypes, but intensifying them; b) by using the existing stereotypes, but partly correcting them by changing accents in the message; c) by substitution of existing stereotypes for new ones. And these are the metaphors, that help the speaker change the meaning and content of his message, to adjust it better for its manipulative function.

Political discourse serves political parties and factions in their desperate struggle with one another for supporters and, as a result, for voters. This struggle can be more loyal or more intensive depending upon social and political situation. During election campaigns it becomes more desperate and dirty. But polit-

ical discourse can change dramatically if the country faces challenges especially terroristic attacks. In such cases parties can forget about their disagreements to rebuff the threat to the whole nation. As an example we can mention political discourse after September, 11, 2001. The political discourse changed dramatically. Everybody realized, that there are external threats and political discourse must also serve the struggle against terrorism. It was a new function. Polish lawyer and researcher P. Brzozovski offers to call political discourse in this new function as *novomovus geopoliticus* (cit. Kara-Murza, 2009: 198). In his opinion this term defines a new wave of struggle against terrorism, which restrains political and social rights. In political discourse there appear new phrases which are considered to be stable expressions nowadays: *international* terroristic groups, terroristic attack, terroristic organization, war on terror and others. So it is clear, that terrorism and war in Iraq become mainstream topics in the 2004 election campaign. 2001 terroristic attacks still being remembered, people reject any mentioning of any action which can lead to reduction of country's forces and opportunities in the struggle on terrorism. This situation was successfully used by G. Bush in his video-clip “Weapons” (Florida), where he reproaches Kerry for his striving for weapons reduction. Bush's phrase sounds like that: “John Kerry opposed weapons vital to the war on terror”. The pragmatics of this message is: the war on terrorism remains the mainstream task of all people and those, who are for reduction of weapons, are domestic enemies. So Kerry automatically becomes one of such enemies. Against the background of war on terrorism the best candidate is the one who is able to win a victory and to defeat the enemy. In the video-clip “First choice” (rather catching title, isn't it) senator Mc Cane makes accent on G. Bush's ability to fight the enemy: “This war will be a fight for our survival ... America is under attack ... He (Bush) has determined to make this world better, safer, freer place ...”. In another video-clip “Finish it” (Bush, 2004) there is such a phrase: “These people want to kill us. They killed hundreds of innocent children... President Bush didn't start this war, but he will finish it”. So we see that the statement about Bush's capability of finishing the war is repeated again and again, in different words but the same message. Due to such repetitions the stereotype of the country's rescuer, liberator – G. Bush, is formed.

Manipulation of public consciousness, the tactics of creation the common enemy has some functions: a) this idea has to unite people of the whole country, as everybody can be jeopardized and the feeling of safety is one of the basic needs of any person

(A. Maslow) and a kind of “a tool” for a manipulator (Броуди, 2007: 114); b) the problem of danger, threat becomes a burning one, turning away the attention of population and mass media (as a mediator between politicians and society) from unwanted political actions.

During election campaign in 2000 there were no serious military threats, only domestic / internal problems with economics, education, medical care provision. In this social and political situation the most important problems for discussion were the problems of environmental pollution and global warming. So A. Gore deals with these things in the video-clip “Matter” (Gore. 2000): “In this election the environment itself is on the ballot. ... I work for 24 years to protect our air and water. I believe we can reverse the global warning. I heard some people say that this election doesn't really matter. It does matter. Our air and water are in stake and I need your help to protect them”. The candidate points, that the condition of environment itself is the price of this ballot: “environment itself is on the ballot”, and only he can help and improve the situation with the help of voters, of course. In 2007 Albert Gore was awarded the Nobel Prize of Peace “For studies of global climate changes results, caused by people's activity, and for working out measures for their (these results) possible prevention”.

In 1968 everybody's attention was focused on Vietnam war. As an example of using this topic in political advertising the video-clip “Vietnam” (Nixon, 1968) can serve. The dreadful shots from military actions scenes change rapidly, that generates the feeling of tension and perpetual anxiety, text accompaniment makes it only worse: “Never has so much military, diplomatic and economic power been used so ineffectively as in Vietnam ... I say the time has come for the American people to turn for the new leadership ... We shall have a honorable end to the war in Vietnam”. After that on the screen there appears the first inscription “love” on a helmet of an American soldier. The function of this – to tune in the viewer to positive appreciation of the information which follows, that is Nixon's profile on the screen with the inscription: “This time Vote Like Your Whole World Depended on It”. This example proves the interaction and mutual influence of textual and visual information and the importance of its presentation order.

The phrase “Vote Like Your Whole World Depended on It” was the key slogan of the Republican Party in this election campaign. Nixon's image seems to be treated and accepted with love and sympathy in contrast to general semantics of struggle in the first part of the video-clip. The stereotype of a leader who can rescue population from the war.

During election campaign in 1964 between Johnson and Goldwater the problem of nuclear war arose. In video-clip of the Democratic Party “Merely another weapon” (Johnson, 1964) Johnson creates Goldwater’s image as a supporter of nuclear weapons development, saying: “On October 24, 1963, Barry Goldwater said of nuclear bomb: “Merely another weapon”. Another video-clip “Daisy” (Johnson, 1964) was banned after its first showing on the screen. The nuclear explosion was heard and a little girl was seen. The video-clip “Ice Cream” to some extent resembles “Daisy”, but is not so drastic: a girl is eating ice-cream and woman’s voice tells about nuclear weapons, but one of the last phrases refers to Goldwater: “he wants to go on testing more bombs...” All the videos mentioned form an associative succession “Goldwater – nuclear weapons”. In such a way the image of an enemy in home affairs of the country is cre-

ated and this image, due to a number of repetitions in different situations, is made a stereotype.

Conclusions. The choice of communicative strategy and appropriate (corresponding) tactics depend upon both the genre of political discourse (TV debates, propaganda address (speech), political advertising, interview in mass media and others) and combination of intentions which every definite person (subject) of discourse possesses in definite situation. Politicians who are in power and opposition members use different tactics and strategy repertoire. Scholars single out such strategies of political discourse: self-representation, propaganda, emotional disposition creation, information and interpretation, reasoning, manipulation, discrediting, attack, self-defence and others. The most widely used tactics is “name-calling”. For its implementation the speakers use a lot of different stylistic means – metaphors, euphemisms and disphemisms, comparisons and others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бойко О. Д. Політичне маніпулювання: навч. посіб. Київ : Академвидав, 2010. 432 с.
2. Броуди Р. Психические вирусы. Как программируют ваше сознание. Москва : Поколение, 2007. 304 с.
3. Грачев Г., Мельник И. Манипулирование личностью. Москва : Эксмо, 2003. 384 с.
4. Доценко Е. Л. Психология манипуляции: феномены, механизмы и защита. Москва : ЧеРо, Издательство МГУ, 1997. 344 с.
5. Кара-Мурза С. Г. Власть манипуляции. Изд. 2-е. Москва : Академический проект, 2009. 380 с.
6. Ларошфуко Ф. Д. Максимумы и моральные размышления . Суждения и афоризмы. Москва, 1990. С. 42.
7. Лебон Г. Психология народов и масс. Москва : Академический проект, 2011. 238 с.
8. Селіванова О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Полтава : Довкілля – К., 2011. 843 с. С. 582.
9. Скребнев Ю. М. Основы стилистики английского языка. Москва : Астрель, 2003.
10. Славова Л. Л. Комунікативні стратегії та тактики у сучасному мас-медійному політичному дискурсі: зіставний аспект (на матеріалі українських та американських Інтернет-джерел). Вісник Житомирського державного університету ім. І. Франка. 2006. № 27. С. 116–117.
11. Цуладзе А. М. Политические манипуляции, или Покорение толпы. Москва : Книжный дом «Университет», 1999. 144 с.
12. Шостром Э. Анти-Карнеги. Минск : Попурри, 2004. 54 с.
13. Yefimov L., Yasinetskaya E. Practical Stylistics of English. Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha Publishers. 2011. 228 p.

REFERENCES

1. Boiko, O. Politychne manipuliuvannia. [Political manipulation]. Kyiv, Akademvydav, 2010. [In Ukrainian].
2. Brody R. Psikhicheskie virusy. Kak programmirovuiut nashi soznanie. [Psychic Viruses. How our consciousness is programmed]. Moskva, Pokolieniiie, 2007. [In Russian].
3. Grachev G., Melnik I. Manipulirovanie lichnost'iu. [Manipulating of a personality]. Moskva, Eksmo, 2003. [In Russian].
4. Dotsenko Ye. Psikhologiya manipuliatsii: fenomeny, mekhanizmy I zashchita. [Psychology of manipulation: phenomena, mechanisms and defence]. Moskva, Izdatelstvo MGU, 1997. [In Russian].
5. Kara-Murza S. Vlast' manipuliatsii. [The power of manipulation]. Moskva, Akademicheskii proiekt, 2009. [In Russian].
6. La Rochefoucauld, F. Maksimy I moralnyie razmyshleniia. [Maxims and moral reflections]. In: Syzhdeniia i aforizmy [Judgments and aphorisms]. Moskva, 1990. [In Russian].
7. Lebon G. Psikhologiya narodov i mass. [Psychology of peoples and masses]. Moskva, Akademicheskii proiekt, 2011. [In Russian].
8. Selivanova O. Lingvistychna entsyclopediia. [Linguistic encyclopedia]. Poltava, Dovkillia-K, 2011. [In Ukrainian].
9. Skrebnev Y. Osnovy stilistiki angliiskogo iazyka. [Fundamentals of English Stylistics]. Moskva, Astrel-AST, 2003. [In English].
10. Slavova L. Komunikatyvni strategii i taktyky u suchasnomu masmediinomu polituchnomu discoursi: zistavnyi aspect (na materialy ukrainskykh ta amerykanskykh Internet-dzherel). [Communicative strategies and tactics in modern mass media political discourse (on the materials of Ukrainian and American Internet resources)]. In: Visnyk Zhytomyrskogo Universytetu. 2006, №27. [In Ukrainian].
11. Tsuladze A. Politicheskie manipuliatsii, ili pokorenie tolpy. [Political manipulations, or conquering the crowd]. Moskva, Knizhnyi dom “Universitet”, 1999. [In Russian].
12. Shostrom A. Anti-Karnegi. [Anti – Carnegie]. Minsk, Popurri, 2004. [In Russian].
13. Yefimov L. Practical Stylistics of English. – Vinnytsia: Nova Knyha Publishers. – 2011. [In English]