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LINGUISTIC DIMENSION OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

For international non-degree students
Linguistic Dimension of International Relations

For international non-degree students

This book contains an analysis of the current issues regarding the relationship of language and society in the context of global politics. In the academic sense, the linguistic dimension of global politics is a new line of research that focuses on a range of international relations, which form a unique lingua-political, lingua-economic and lingua-cultural infrastructure of the modern world in the era of globalization. In the author’s opinion, the experience of Hispanophone in this context provides the most relevant example.

For various specialists in international politics and international relations, students, undergraduates and graduate students of universities and other academic institutions, as well as for anyone who is interested in the contemporary development of the global community.

Annotation

Linguistic dimension of world politics is currently becoming one of the most vital elements of practice and theory in world politics.

This course explores the theoretical and applied aspects of linguistic factor of world politics. It encompasses both negative and positive features of the spread of languages, providing an introduction to the field of language policy. It draws on naturally occurring language influence in the world and highlights language data from a wide variety of political, cultural, economical and social contexts.

The lecture focuses primarily on wider political issues concerning culture through language, that is viewed as constitutive of, as well as reflective of, state foreign policy.
COURSE METHODOLOGY

1. **Course Aim:** explore the theoretical and applied aspects of linguistic factor of world politics penetrating into the role of Russian language

2. **Course Objectives:**
   - To present the linguistic map of the world and the international oligarchy of languages and the place of Russian
   - To encompass both negative and positive features of the spread languages providing an introduction to the field of language policy
   - To highlight language data from a wide variety of political, cultural, economical and social contexts
   - To stress upon the role of Lingvophonian organizations and Russophobia and movements in international relations in globalization

3. **Course Place in Graduate’s Professional Training:** optional

4. **Course Prerequisites:** Students in the course should have an undergraduate university degree, good knowledge of English, and have the basics of political and economic analysis

---

**CLASSES VOLUME AND ASSIGNMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main topics</th>
<th>Total number of hours</th>
<th>Classes including Lectures</th>
<th>Seminars (in hours)</th>
<th>Home Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Introduction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Linguistic dimension of Foreign Affairs “world oligarchy of languages” and Russian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Russian Language as the vehicle of Globalization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 International Russian Political Terminology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Language Policy and Linguistic Culture in Russia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lessons and Methods in Language Policy of Russian Federation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Language Policy and Linguistic Human Rights in Russian Federation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Lingvopolitical Movements and organizations, Russophobia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROCESS, INTERIM AND FINAL CONTROL OF THE STUDENTS**

The process control of the students is based on their participation in the class discussions and preparations for the seminar sections. Lectures’ attendance is optional whereas seminars must be attended by all the students.

There is no mid-term exam for this class.

Final exam will consist in 2 parts:

1. Students will need to write a test answering up to 20 questions
2. Students will need to introduce the model of any Lingvophonian movement or organization
1. INTRODUCTION
Languages and Mentality. Interdependence?
Language is the architect of nationality
Languages – macro-mediators
The ability to communicate in several languages as a great benefit for individuals, organizations and companies alike.
Languages breaking cultural stereotypes, encouraging thinking “outside the box”
National languages and the formation of the nation.
Political Linguistics
Discussion

2. LINGUISTIC DIMENSION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
“WORLD OLIGARCHY OF LANGUAGES” AND RUSSIAN
Different Powers of Languages
Demographic power, Publishing power, Status, Role in WWW, Economic power
“Gross Language Product” – the turnover of multinational companies using this language (Concept by A. Watson)
The Role of Russian Language in the world, the powers of Russian language
Forecasts: In Globalization English will overgrow itself and will have many faces
New languages or pidgins
The “club” of “world oligarchy of languages” in the global village
The process of language extinction
Discussion

3. RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AS THE VEHICLE OF GLOBALIZATION
Historical Background, Challenges and Forecast
The future of the linguistic map of the world in its connection with Russian
Challenges connected with Language vitality, pidgin and creolized languages, autochthon or endangered languages
The past of the Russian-Speaking people and the values they have learned
The concept of “Positive thinking”
The Diary of Political Correctness
Political Negotiations in Russian: Working towards agreement
Presentation in English about Russians: master class by A. Watson
(professional training, CTN Communications, London)
Discussion

4. INTERNATIONAL RUSSIAN POLITICAL TERMINOLOGY
Introduction to world politics through terminology used in political Negotiations in Russian
Survey on the widespread political terminology
The notion of “Public Discourse” and “Political Discourse”
The Discursive construction of national Identity (pointing out through speeches, interviews, focus groups, media reports)
Political texts as materially durable products of linguistic actions
Analyzing political texts from newspapers through terminology of IR
• Statehood, Political Ideologies
• International and regional organizations
• Politico-economic development of the countries
• International finance system
5. LANGUAGE POLICY AND LINGUISTIC CULTURE IN RUSSIA

Foreign policy concepts as a declaration of interests and goals of foreign policy. The evolution of the conceptual thinking.
The notion and evolution of Linguistic culture. Sociology of Language, Anthropological Linguistics
Diglossia. Language policy in Russia, EU members, Latin America, Africa, USA Language planning in multilingual context
Language issues in the census
A view of relationship between national languages in Russia with Russian, and connection between English and Russian, Russian and Spanish, Russian and Japanese and other languages stressing upon their mutual influence in the lingvopolitical map of the world
Discussion

6. LESSONS AND METHODS IN LANGUAGE POLICY OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The overview of Methodological Perspectives in Language Policy
Ethnographic Methods in Language Policy Planning
Frequent constructs used in psycho-sociological Research in Language Policy
micro-ethnography analyzes
ethnography of speaking, sociolinguistic ethnography
Ethnolinguistic vitality
Geolinguistically Peripheral and Fragmented Communities
Discussion

7. LANGUAGE POLICY AND LINGUISTIC HUMAN RIGHTS IN RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Language policy and national identity
Practical language regimes
Operational conception of Language inherited from colonial predecessors.
Language and colonial power
Nationalism, Politics and the Minorization of Languages: legitimation and institutionalization
Linguistic Human Rights. Linguistic Imperialism. Linguistic genocide
Educational Linguistic Human Rights and the lack of them
MTM (mother-tongue-medium)
The role of International Organizations. OSCE, EU.
Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights
Discussion

8. LINGVOPOLITICAL MOVEMENTS AND ORGANIZATIONS, RUSSOPHONIA

Lingvophonical movements (diverse complex of national strategies on promotion of the international image of language)
Lingvopolitical Organizations: Structure, Types, Geography
Evolution of the goals of Lingvopolitical Organizations
Discussion

Seminar: introduce the model of any Lingvophonian movement or organization
The “language consciousness” phenomenon has drawn increasing attention of the representatives of various academic schools\(^1\). A.A. Leontyev introduced the concept of the world image into psycholinguistics. It is one of the most fundamental concepts to describe existential peculiarities and the interaction of individuals as representatives of various cultures with their environment. Leontyev writes that “to have consciousness means to know the language; to know the language means to possess values”\(^12\). The system of these values is different for each language consciousness. For example, the linguistic comparison of French and Russian mindsets is conducted by analyzing the lingua-cultural concepts of destiny, soul, mind, conscience, thought, idea, fear, etc. The concepts of verity, truth and good are the moral dominants of the Russian consciousness. The French consciousness is focused on activity, purposefulness, responsibility and the ambition for prosperity and welfare. This set of values originates in antiquity. In other words, the mutual understanding between the representatives of different nations is only possible when they share a common knowledge base of language and stereotypes, which exist in their native culture. Mutual understanding between native speakers of different languages representing different cultures is limited to the intersections of their consciousness. Discrepancy of these areas leads to misunderstanding in the cross-cultural dialogue.

Language is an existential state of national consciousness. It is the means to understand both native and foreign cultures in their subjective, physical and mental forms. The understanding of foreign national consciousness often occurs through its comparison with the native consciousness or by means of searching for intersection points. There are no identical national cultures and therefore no identical conscious stereotypes. All of the sensory and mental images are nation-specific in different cultures. Many researchers raise the question about the existence of a uniform world image in various ethnocultural communities, which is common for everyone, independent of their nationality\(^13\). Many scholars, in particular Ch. Osgood\(^4\), consider that the underlying basic structure of the world image is identical in all languages. It is based on the uniformity of human existence and therefore provides an opportunity for mutual understanding on the international level. According to a number of researchers, language will only stop causing international conflicts and mutual misunderstanding in the case of total language unification and the creation of one universal language. Presumably, such theoretical concepts underlie the search for a universal “constructed” language, such as Esperanto.
However, in spite of the fact that every national language consciousness possesses certain universal characteristics, I consider the creation of an effective universal language impossible. A more detailed prospective on this problem will follow in the second paragraph of the current chapter.

In any cultural community, unique national world images are passed from generation to generation explicitly through native language. Some examples come from advertising. Any hidden meaning in a commercial that can be perceived by the native culture will be incomprehensible to other ethnic and cultural communities, should they become the target audience for this commercial in their own country. Several years ago Sony advertised camcorders in Spain using an image of a jellyfish as a typical symbol of grace. However, the jellyfish did not at all attract the Spanish market. In another case, the French carmaker “Renault” launched its new car “NOVÁ”, which means “new” in French. However, the car did not have any success in the Spanish market because Spaniards were not interested in buying a car with a name that meant “doesn’t go” in Spanish (Spanish “no va”). Another example originates in the field of international negotiations. In 1998, after two “no tie” meetings between Russian and Japanese leaders, the Japanese side was shocked by the unusual and “clearly national” way that the Russian side approached these events. As a result, the Japanese insisted that all future meetings of such level be conducted in the form of “official visits”\textsuperscript{15}. These simple examples clearly demonstrate the diversity of the peoples’ worldview and the fact that language can become a key factor of international misunderstanding and respectively rejection of other cultures. Various forms of international tensions are in many ways connected to the area of language relations. Language acts as an organ of national self-consciousness, self-reflection and the worldview of a particular ethnic group. W. Humboldt; the representative of the “linguistic relativity” theory wrote in the introduction to his last study “Of the Kawi Language” on Java that each language embeds a distinctive worldview and ideology\textsuperscript{20}.

The author of the given monograph considers the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis as a key linguistic teaching. At this point it will be analyzed in detail. Its first postulate indicates that different languages condition the world according to the national perspective. The next step to the hypothesis is the statement that any language directs the native speakers’ thought into a channel, which is predetermined by the worldview within their language. One of Edward Sapir’s main conclusions is that the way people see, hear and experience the world is predetermined by the language habits of their society\textsuperscript{17}. The second formulation of the hypothesis belongs to Benjamin Lee Whorf. “We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way—an agreement that holds throughout our speech community and is codified in the patterns of our language”\textsuperscript{18}. In scientific terms, we dissect the nature of civilization and the language itself as it is dictated by our native language. Every natural language represents a codified world, a belief system and a kind of national philosophy. Sapir and Whorf refer to the “tyranny” of the native language in a number of their writings each in a different way. It is the tyranny that no one is able to escape. It is the source of social and cultural development of the nation. In one of his works Sapir writes that meanings are not clarified through experience, but are imposed upon it due to the tyrannical supremacy of the language form over human orientation in the world\textsuperscript{19}. This extract supports the understanding of the hypothesis and helps apply it to the given study. Sapir and Whorf turn language into a kettle for intellectual food. Language becomes a tool of human cognitive activity, a tool that is hidden on the subconscious level of the native speakers’ minds. Sapir and Whorf emphasize the fact that every language reveals its own system of categories and concepts. It is impossible to find two different languages that reflect reality the same way. Language is a “guide to social reality”\textsuperscript{20} that forms the national character.

However, there exists a polar opposite perspective in linguistic research, a so-called “universalistic” approach. It is presented in the works of Kolshansky, Albrecht, Koseri and others. According to this concept, language does not define national mindset (as it would mean that there are as many philosophies as languages or language families). Language simply reflects it\textsuperscript{21}. The author criticizes this concept and presumes that by removing language from the human consciousness and turning it into a mere “reflector” of national mindset and values, the role of language in the creation of a new and unique cultural worldview will be reduced. At the same time the author agrees with the notion that the question of the primacy and secondariness of language and national mindset resembles the dispute regarding the primacy of the chicken or the egg. According to O.A. Kornilov’s study, the external environment of a language-forming community, the cultural traditions, the physiological and anthropological features form certain qualities, which then form the root of the national character, national temperament and mindset\textsuperscript{22}. Next, specific
mindset features enter the national language, get embodied and recorded in it. Subsequently these features are passed on from generation to generation via language, which later starts forming the national mindset. Kornilov’s arguments lead to the conclusion that no matter how strong the external changes in the historical ethnic environment, the national characteristics and the national mindset features will be reproduced in every coming generation. This happens because the language has absorbed the peculiarities of the national worldview and evaluation and therefore begins to impose stereotypes of national thought. According to the study results, the author of this thesis has become an adherent of the first reviewed concept that implies the dependence of national thought on the language. Language is the “house of peoples’ spirit”, which is destined to pass the national “language world image” to the following generations. Every ethnic language is the “house of peoples’ spirit”, which is destined to pass the national mindset of a particular ethnic group on its native language.

Another goal of this research is to analyze language in the context of cross-cultural communication. When we communicate with representatives of other countries and cultural “habitats”, we often ask ourselves what culture they belong to. It is not a coincidence that A. Baumgart and B. Jänecke’s popular German book on the specific nature of Russian culture begins with this question. Most people perceive their native cultural standard as the only possible and correct alternative in the light of their national language, which is a conductor of national culture. This phenomenon is called ethnocentrism. According to G. Maletzke, ethnocentrism has two characteristics: 1) native language and culture are seen as a matter of course, 2) native culture and language are perceived to be superior to other cultures. Ethnocentrism is only “one step away” from nationalism in its negative connotation. In this regard, nationalism can be defined as the recognition of one’s national superiority, an irrational explanation of superiority over other nations, non-recognition of human equality and the intolerance of other nations. Such nationalism will be rejected by the international community considering its documented negative reaction against nationalism. However, the community has to consider the fact that language, according to I. Chernov, “appears as a factor in global politics and serves as the basis (or at least as an inevitable companion) for the majority of serious conflicts of our time.”

One supporting example is the recent conflict in Macedonia regarding the Albanian language. Local Albanian population insisted on the equality of Albanian and Macedonian (national language) with weapons in their hands. The other example is the resistance of the Turkish Kurds against the prohibition of the Kurdish language. Pressured by the EU, the Turkish government had to yield. Kurdish was widely spread in the Kurdish areas, on the radio and television. Since ethnocentrism contradicts the main thesis of human equality, which remains the central tenet of modern social and political ethics, a new counter concept, “cultural relativism”, has appeared within the intercultural communication theory. According to this concept, there are no highly developed or underdeveloped cultures and languages. They cannot be compared on any level. This concept provides the necessary grounds for mutual understanding and perhaps even for the intertwining of different languages and associated cultures. The complex, multi-component and multifaceted structure of different cultural and linguistic codes should be studied in the aforementioned context. According to O.A. Leontovich, “the matching of these codes opens communication channels, while their mismatching blocks them.” This leads to the inevitable communication failures and contradictions, called “frame conflicts” in linguistics. However, this approach contains a contradictory opinion that communication skills develop best in the context of a multicultural society, that is, a society in which representatives of different languages and cultures live in close contact. Australia; a country of emigration, can be used as a good example. Australian language policy is based on the recognition of multilingualism and multiculturalism as the definition of the socio-cultural situation (despite the absolute dominance of the English language). In such circumstances, in 1993 a number of educational institutions and government organizations in charge of the internal language policy were given the task of establishing an intercultural understanding within the country. The core of this understanding is the knowledge of each other’s cultural and linguistic identity and the willingness for dialogue on the basis of mutual recognition of cultural differences. Such measures should prevent any possible misunderstandings, discrimination and cultural stereotypes.

Undoubtedly, each of the considered viewpoints fit into a certain culture. In the context of increasing globalization, two different cultures have developed: individualistic (e.g. European and North American) and collectivistic (Asian, Arab, African and Native American). These cultures are characterized by the obvious structural difference of the native languages and values, which can lead to contradictions.
It is important to point out the multifaceted components of linguistic doctrines that contribute to the acquisition of knowledge in the field of the linguistic dimension of global politics. Modern scholars proposed the term “ecolinguistics” to define the discipline that studies the interaction of languages on a global level. The ecolinguistic approach to language interprets the latter as an integral part of the relationship chain that exists between people, society and nature. Einar Haugen, a Norwegian linguist who developed the relationship theory between languages and their natural environment, was the first to introduce the term “ecolinguistics”. We should not treat language in isolation of the human external environment. The study of language diversity and its causes, the study of endangered languages, the relation between biological and linguistic diversity, the relationship between language and society and the relationship between the languages are the prospective ecolinguistic trends. Ecolinguistics studies the place of language in its environmental surroundings on a global level. Followers of this discipline support the preservation of multilingualism because it supports plurality of world images. According to ecolinguists, monolingualism is extremely dangerous and can cause a disruption of the whole linguistic ecosystem. At this point, linguistic diversity, which is studied by political scientists and academics in the field of international relations, also becomes the subject of linguistic research. Ecolinguistics offers a unique academic base for the analysis of the linguistic situation in the world, the status of regional and minority languages on a global scale, the problem of biological diversity and the preservation of indigenous languages threatened with extinction.

The analysis of geographical language space is of interest for this study. It is the subject of language geography or geolinguistics, a transdisciplinary science that studies territorial language distribution and language phenomena. Language geography is associated with the names of R. Austerlitz, J. Nichols, E.A. Makaev, D.I. Eldman and others. Geographical factors can explain the nature and rate of language changes. Thus, the similarity between Spanish and Portuguese is often explained not only in terms of common language history (which is primarily associated with Latin) but also in terms of geographical proximity. The basic concept of geolinguistics is the language “habitat”, which is related to the phenomenon of genetic density. Genetic density is the number of languages spoken within a certain area of this habitat. The higher the density, the more languages are spoken. That is, geographical factor determines linguistic diversity and any language community in general.

The term “language unions” that cover certain areas of language distribution has also been proposed by geolinguists. According to a number of prominent researchers, e.g. U. Weinreich and K. Masika, these unions are formed between the unrelated languages within one “habitat” that become more similar to one another rather than to the related languages in other habitats. The Portuguese language in Brazil is a good example. Many linguists note that Brazilian Portuguese is becoming more similar to Latin American Spanish, than to the language spoken in Portugal, its “civilizational” home country. According to some predictions, this trend will continue developing. It will be directly connected to the distribution area of the Spanish language and its neighboring countries of Ibero-America, which will be affecting the nature of the Portuguese language in Brazil. However, the influence of one language on the other does not always follow such geographical patterns. For example, Russian was influenced by German and French, although their “habitats” had no direct contact points with the “habitat” of the Russian language. In present day global politics, English actively affects most world languages. This happens not because of, but in spite of geographical settings. In this case, the social, ethnic and historical proximity of language speakers becomes more powerful than the geographical factor. Thus, proximity is just one factor that causes changes in languages. Therefore, all these factors should be considered as a whole.

The academic method of sociolinguistics was used in the given research. Sociolinguistics is a transdisciplinary science studying the social conditions of languages. Critical ideas in sociolinguistics belong to such eminent researchers as J. Baudouin de Courtenay, B.A. Larin, M. Cohen, Ch. Bally, J. Vendryes and others. According to J. Fishman; an American sociolinguist, studying language in social perspective makes it possible to see the way representatives of different cultures use their language. The sociolinguistic language study takes into account a variety of factors that may influence the use of language, which ranges from various characteristics of the speakers to the peculiarities of a particular language.

In the context of the research topic, sociolinguistics offers a number of important concepts and terms, among which “language community” and “language situation” have most significance. “Language community” may
be defined as: a) a group of people within a common social, economic, political and cultural framework that use one or more common languages to communicate with each other, or; b) a whole country.

“Language situation” reflects the principles of various communication systems that serve a particular language community. These terms are helpful in the multifaceted analysis of a situation, when geographical language boundaries do not coincide with political boundaries. Modern Africa is an obvious example, where one and the same language can be spoken in different countries (Swahili is common in Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda and certain parts of Zaire and Mozambique), and several languages co-exist within the same state (Nigeria has more than 200). Two other concepts introduced by sociolinguistics are “linguistic code” as the means of communication and “linguistic subcode” that has a narrower scope of use. These terms were applied to the current study in order to understand the origin of pidgins and their impact on the future of world languages.

Linguistic economics as a new transdisciplinary science was proposed by both foreign and Russian academics over the recent years. It will provide a certain theoretical basis for this research. This discipline develops in two directions: from language to reality and from reality to language. If this development moves from language to reality, it comes to singling out the language archetypes, which will fit into the linguistic image of a specific person as a part of the global economic community. All global, regional and national social economic development models have to consider the conceptual sphere of the national native language as well as being transparent, natural and understandable within the linguistic world image of different ethnic groups.

Should this development move from reality to language, then it comes to the matter of language creation, the construction of a new universal language of global economic terms. Here, the language is seen as a conductor of economic globalization. The outcome of the research will be used to identify the economic component of Hispanophone and to study the influence of language on the interdependence of capital goods in the Ibero-American region. Linguistic economics is often linked to the concepts of “language engineering” and “language marketing”. In the author’s opinion, these terms can become useful tools for practical language policy and its research. According to various academics, e.g. L. Muhryamova, language is a component of market relations. It can be replicated through newspaper advertisements, magazines, television, video and computers.

According to Ch. Baker and S. Jones, “language marketing can be a challenge to the existing order. It can instigate political and social anxiety.” The language marketing application areas of major significance are the protection of the Russian language and its historical “habitat” in the neighboring countries, the protection of the rights of the Russian-speaking population and the combat against the discrimination of the Russian language. This is already an act of Russian foreign policy.

The political, economic and culturological role of language has always been obvious not only to linguists, philosophers and economists, but also to other specialists, including politicians. The Russian word “политика” (pronounced: po-´li-ti-ka) has two different meanings despite its apparent simplicity. On the one hand it means “policy”, which implies certain government actions to fulfill one or the other political course, the technology of adopting political decisions; on the other hand it stands for “politics”, which is a more complex term. There are many definitions of “politics”. Political science textbooks offer absolutely different definitions of this phenomenon: economic, stratificational, ethical, institutional, anthropological, conflict-consensus based, etc. While some define politics as activity directed to achieve public welfare, others understand it as actions that are directed to gain, retain and use authority. Another definition is a form of law-based civilizational dialogue between the people and a means of collective human existence. In the context of conflictology, it is a violent or peaceful conflict resolution activity, the intensity factor for interhuman unification or separation. According to I. V. Chernova, politics can be defined as “the planning, approval and implementation of obligatory resolutions for the society. This process includes the following stages: 1) goal setting; 2) decision making; 3) organization of the masses and resource-raising; 4) control over political activity; 5) outcome analysis; 6) new goal setting.” Politics represents public relations inseparably linked with authority in all contexts. Politics cannot exist outside the language sphere. Politics is in a way a system of human relations that in many respects occur through language. The term “political linguistics” has appeared in various publications in recent years. Political linguistics studies political language or the language of certain politicians. Political phenomena cannot be understood outside the dialogue and the mechanisms of political communication. In the world of politics, language turns into an environment
in which humans act. Language becomes a link within the political society, a tool to maintain the required information level. Language, according to K.S. Gadzhiev, has to be considered as the first and the most important stage of socialization. At the same time language becomes a tool to influence society, a phenomenon of social authority. That is, in many cases language plays the role of a control device. Kress and Hodge rightfully remark that “the language form allows for the transfer and distortion of information. A word possesses in itself a powerful informational and emotional charge.” We cannot deny the plurality of contradictory language forms. A. Toynbee made a fair statement that “language history is an abstract of social history.” The political dictionary develops according to historical realities and is very closely connected to the epoch dictionary; e.g. the concepts of “policy” and “politics” originated in the antiquity while “sovereignty” and “radicalism” appeared during the New Age. Today, the term “European language” or “Eurolanguage” is mentioned more often in the context of European integration. It represents a set of language terms and metaphors which are used in connection with the new European institutes. The word “Europe” has acquired a new meaning in this language and has become synonymous to the concepts of “United Europe” and “integration.” A range of its derivatives have appeared: Europeanization, proeuropean, antieuropean, eurostandard, eurodeputy, European space, etc. The modern political discourse has become a powerful tool to influence society. G. Lakoff describes in his research of how the US government and the pro government mass media have used certain linguistic concepts in order to implant the idea into the minds of American people (and the global community) that the US military operations against Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq (First Gulf War) were ethically faultless. The main argument was the struggle against a ruthless tyrant who has appeared to be convincing for the majority of Americans and Europeans. Mutual misunderstanding between Arabs and Americans during the First Gulf War can to a large extent be caused by language dissimilarities that are responsible for image-building in people’s national consciousness. The political language used by the American government to justify its actions has appeared to be convincing for the majority of Americans and Europeans. The people in the Near East were more impressed by Saddam Hussein’s arguments.

One of the most vivid examples of language use as means of political influence is the presentation of the Balkan events in the Russian and American political discourse. “Villain” and “victim” often swapped roles both in the USA and in Russia. The linguistic role of the “valorous savior” in Europe and the USA was given to NATO troops whereas Russian politicians gave this role to the Russians. Both Russian and American viewpoints were strongly influenced by the linguistic stereotypes of the native languages. The phrase “Russian and Serbs are brothers” was very common in Russian political debate at that time. That was the reason why Russia used the interfamily model of relations with the former Yugoslavia instead of common principles in international relations. Relationship phenomenon plays no role for Americans. Therefore, Russian arguments expressed through language, do not have the desired effect in the USA. American political language operates with metaphors regarding health care, economic profit and fair police, which find no feedback in Russia. The same situation occurred around the recent invasion of Iraq. The language used to cover this topic contained corresponding political metaphors. Iraq in the eyes of Americans is a large organism that has to be treated by American-NATO doctors and called to order by valorous policeman Uncle Sam. The Spanish government led by Prime Minister H.M. Aznar supported the American invasion of Iraq. The Spanish government used American political metaphors translated into Spanish in order to find support among the population. However, Americans and Spaniards have a different national mindset. That is why Aznar’s politics in Iraq was not supported by public opinion. Aznar’s party failed in the following elections in Spain and the office was taken by the socialist leader José Luis Rodriguez Zapatero and his cabinet. Apparently, the Spanish political will was strongly affected by Zapatero’s election promise to withdraw troops from Iraq, which
contradicted Aznar’s course in foreign affairs. It is quite obvious that Aznar’s attempt to adopt the American worldview to Spanish foreign policy left his party with no chances to win in the elections.

Thus, there is not only an inextricable connection between politics and language, but also “a certain political language, which is one of the most important manifestations of politics itself, a language as an authoritative tool”52.

The given part of the research introduces a complex approach to language as social phenomenon. Linguistic, lingua-cultural, lingua-economic, lingua-ecological, sociolinguistic and lingua-political approaches form an integral part of complex language studies, which become the conceptual base for the creation of the theoretical lingua-political component of the international relations study.53

Main Sources and Literature
29. Skutnabb-Kangas T. Language Policies and Education: the role of education in destroying or supporting the world’s linguistic diversity. Keynote Address at the World Congress on Language Policies, 16-20 April2002,
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25 ibid, p. 59.
29 This phenomenon is analyzed in Paragraph 3, Chapter 1.
31 ibid, P. 21.

45 ibid, p. 547.
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