



Complex Analysis of Political Speech

Andrej Tushev¹, Liya Bushkanets² and Valerij Letyaev³

Kazan Federal University, Department of History, Kazan, Russia

E-mail: ¹<andpsy@yandex.ru>, ²<bushkanetsl34z@gmail.com>, ³<letyaevv547@gmail.com>

KEYWORDS Political Linguistics. Text analysis. Socio-Political Text. Stolypin

ABSTRACT Political linguistics is one of the most current and rapidly developing areas of linguistics. Previous studies indicated that the task of a holistic, comprehensive analysis of the socio-political text has not yet been set. For this reason, this study deals with a fundamentally new task; that is, a comprehensive and holistic analysis of the socio-political text as a source of information about the value orientations of society. Most of the existing methodologies in various humanitarian disciplines are focused on the analysis of only one or several aspects of the text, which narrows, limits, and distorts the analyzed situation. Therefore, the study gives the concept of a holistic structure of a politician's speech. Thus, it focuses on the analysis technique and shows implications of this approach.

INTRODUCTION

Political linguistics is one of the most current and rapidly developing areas of linguistics. It is at the junction of linguistics, political science, sociology, cognitive science, psychology, and other sciences. It should be noted that each research paradigm deals with certain features of socio-political discourse, so that "choosing" from socio-political texts requires the subject and topic of the research (Grimmer and Stewart 2013; Lakoff 2015; Li et al. 2019; Proksch et al. 2019).

Researchers pointed out, "At this time, researchers of text have accumulated quite a lot of methodological paradigms." One of them was born together with the information theory which treats the text as an information trail, and the information as the elimination of uncertainty. Cultural studies direction includes the subjective situation of communication in the research paradigm (Gilbert 2018; Biryukov and Sergeyev 2018). However, cultural studies did not pay attention to the subjects of communication, but to the text itself, taken in its statics. Structural approaches dominate in that field (semiology and semiotics have a great influence), and the analysis of the content is aimed at revealing the text versatility and its potential (text polysemy). Nonetheless, the influence of the literary criticism research paradigm is also visible (attention to the functioning of the texts from the standpoint of their form – genre analysis, narrative analysis). Cultural research is carried out using linguistic categories, in particular, the category of modality is used in it (study of texts from the

standpoint of reality/irreality) (Khisamova and Moullagaliev 2016; Thompson 2018). The semi-otic-structural direction explores the vast cultural and linguistic context of correlations (frame of reference), while the texts are considered as the processes of signifying and decoding (by mutual "reflection" of culture and sign system) (Parfentieva 2018). In addition, the performative research paradigm equals sign activity with practical one, and the text (as a sign of reality) is examined from the standpoint of how it "behaves in society", how much it complies with the generally accepted standards, and to what extent does the objective position reflect the state of affairs (a truth/false scale). Moreover, critical research paradigm considers typical "content" (text content) in the context of inequality, the reasons for which are rooted in various forms of discrimination (social, ethnic, political, religious, gender, etc.). It should be mentioned that the main task of text analysis is to show the role of language in the emergence and consolidation of asymmetric relations between people (Diamond 2015; Biryukov and Sergeyev 2018; Proksch et al. 2019). Here, the possibility of using the methods of discourse analysis, content analysis of functional activity linguistics, psycholinguistics, ethnomethodology, pragmatolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and so forth is noted.

Objectives

This study deals with a fundamentally new task; that is, a comprehensive and holistic analysis of the socio-political text as a source of

information about the value orientations of society. It should be noted that the current study is based on the analysis of the speech given by famous Russian politician and reformer of the early twentieth century Pyotr Stolypin “The Speech on the Organization of the Peasants’ Life and on the Right of Ownership” (Jurkowski 2017). The speech was delivered in the State Duma on May 10, 1907. The material was chosen based on the fact that Stolypin was an excellent speaker, with subtle understanding of the laws of construction of official political speech.

METHODOLOGY

Studies showed that the task of a holistic, comprehensive analysis of the socio-political text has not yet been set. The text is the “unit” that modern man faces as a participant in socio-political life, as a reader of modern media, and as a creator of texts (social network posts, letters to government structures, articles in the media, etc.).

The analysis complexity assumes that the analysis results of a particular text by various linguistic (and not only linguistic) methodologies are correlated with each other and give a common mutually overlapping and mutually complementary understanding of the meanings of the text.

Of course, it requires building a universal model (not only one within the framework of the approach) of the socio-political text and determination of the scope and possibilities of a particular methodological paradigm.

For example, consider the organization of a socio-political text. This is an “ideal” structure that takes into account all possible levels, but not all of them may be represented in a particular text. However, it must be remembered that the text, even a very small one, reflects the worldview of its creator as a whole. Therefore, for example, the spatial component of the author’s worldview (the presence of friendly and hostile spaces, permeability or impermeability of borders, understanding of a certain space as mystical (for example, Russia), and rationally primitive (West), etc.) may not be verbalized in the specific text, but it determines its position in the subtext. It may be reconstructed through other texts or elements of the given text.

In fact, the speech of a politician creates a special world that is difficult to relate to reality. The inner world of the text is created in the image and likeness of the real world, but in accordance with the intentions of the author.

First of all, the world is inhabited by people. Therefore, it creates an image of a politician. It is created by the features of appearance (for example, emphasized absurdity) and biography (e.g., its correspondence to the cultural archetype of a hero).

However, the spatio-temporal organization of the inner world of a socio-political text has its own laws and is built on oppositions. This is a contrast between a good past and a bad present; a bad present and a beautiful future; a good present, despite the problems and a wonderful future, and so forth during the election campaign, the choice of one of the opposition depends on the situation in which the candidate is: whether he was a successful politician in the past, whether he is a representative of the opposition or he is in power and wants to keep it. A rare politician creates his own individual spatio-temporal organization of the world, basically all the texts reproduce in one way or another the “ideal model”.

Of course, the third level of the world structure, which is created by the politician in his speech, is the image of the listeners to whom the speech is addressed. These are not real people, but an image of them.

And finally, the fourth level refers to the actual features of speech, such as metaphor.

On the one hand, the role of language is very important, all these levels are implemented at the lexical level, primarily through vocabulary available for analysis by computer programs (Cook and Stefanski 1994; Chudinov 2001; Benoit et al. 2009; Young and Soroka 2012; Lauderdale and Herzog 2016). On the other hand, language is only the realization of the worldview that is created in the speech of a politician.

The whole text was created for affirming its meaning in the process of communication. It is the system of ratings and meanings that determines the choice of the topic of utterance, construction of the composition, imagery system, spatial structure of the inner world, and so forth. In addition, the system of meanings and ratings correlates with the philosophical and political picture of the world of the text’s creator.

Here, it should be noted that a comprehensive holistic analysis of a political text is important primarily as a way to verify the analysis of its specific levels. As noted earlier, the main direction of the modern analysis of a sociopolitical text is to analyze its individual levels out of connection with others. Moreover, we can trust the data only if it correlates with the analysis of all levels of text. Therefore, Tushev and Bushkanets (2016) conducted a comparative analysis of certain discursive techniques (using the SHEV You/I, lexical repetitions, rhetorical questions, modal verbs must, can, should, transfers, graphological deviation, and non-standard started suggestions) in campaign speeches of Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton and concluded that “Trump speech has a higher degree of addressing to the audience, which is reflected in more frequent use of the pronoun you; it also uses lexical repetition, which helps the audience to involuntarily remember his ideas. Trump’s speech is more characterized by the variability of modal verbs, which indicates his desire for indirect psychological impact on the audience. However, Clinton’s success is based on the use of rhetorical questions to strengthen contact with the audience and two vivid series of recitations that clearly criticize Trump (for example, he called women pigs, slobs, and dogs.) and increase the emotionality of her speech. In her speech, graphological deviations are also important, which in oral discourse express a greater degree of emotionality”. Nonetheless, these observations did not help predict success in the election of one of the candidates. This is precisely because part is torn out of the whole.

Again, the structure of a socio-political text that we have already presented allows us to understand the place of the level analyzed by a particular method in the text as a whole, what is the significance of this level, and what exactly the analysis of this level the researcher can reveal in the text.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

However, the Speech is based on the unfolding of time. Unlike time, Space is set initially – the whole Russia (“all Russian people”).

However, introduction gives the image of the present: “I think that all Russian people, eager

for the tranquility of their country, want a speedy resolution of that issue, which undoubtedly, at least partially, feeds the troubles, stop gentlemen, on the consideration that the state is one whole organism, and that if a struggle starts between parts of an organism, parts of a state, the state will inevitably die” (Benoit et al. 2009). At present, the state is ill. The sickest, the weakest part, which is growing weak, which is withering is the peasantry. It needs help.” The affirmation of the present as “bad” and problematic is a necessary element of the structure of time in the political image of the world.

In addition, the speech is constructed as the unfolding of three possible variants of “the future”. Within the three parts, the same structure is used; that is, the proposal of one of the Duma parties, its analysis, and the proof that this is a future disaster for the country. And most importantly – the assertion that each of the options contradicts the highest values that the narrator advocates and which unite him not with the Duma, but with Russia: “I openly declare this, since the Russian minister cannot speak otherwise in the Russian State Duma, one can foresee the presence of new attempts to acquire land by force and violence. I must say that at present this danger is still far away, but it is necessary to determine the line, behind which this danger, danger of successful impact on the population, is becoming really alarming. Of course, the state does not allow to cross this line and this limit; otherwise, it will cease to be a state and will become an accomplice of its own destruction. All that I said, gentlemen, is an analysis of those aspirations that, in the opinion of the government, do not give the answer to the requests, the resolution of the case that Russia expects.”

The first option was proposed by the left party. They want state power to “rise above the law” and declare that “the whole task of the present moment is precisely to destroy statehood with its landowner bureaucratic foundation and on the ruins of statehood to create modern statehood on new cultural principles (Lauderdale and Herzog 2016). To sum up, the recognition of the nationalization of land, with or without compensation for the alienated land, will lead to such a social upheaval, such a shift in all values, such a change in all social, legal and civil relations that history has not seen.” In

addition, the future that awaits the country in this turn of events – “will lead to a complete revolution in all existing civil relations, it leads to the fact that subordinates the interests of one, although numerous, class interests of all other segments of the population. Finally, it leads, gentlemen, to a social revolution.”

The second sentence is the project of the Constitutional Democratic Party. The author of the speech accuses its creators of illogicality and deliberately contradictory renders their position. And this option leads to the fact that the peasants will stop working.

And another dead-end option – “... I will allow myself to dwell on another way to resolve the land issue, which has settled in many heads. This way is the way of violence. You all know, ladies and gentlemen, how easily our peasant listens to all kinds of explanations, how easy he is to give a push, especially in the direction of resolving his lusts of land by an explicit way, by way of, so to speak, violence. Our gray peasant has already paid several times for this. I cannot but say that at present the danger of new violence, new ills in the countryside is increasing.”

Stolypin creates three options for the future for implementing the ideas of his opponents. In all cases, the triumph of “violence”, “excitement”, “unrest”, “turmoil”, “a social revolution”, “destruction of the existing state” (“we are offered, among other strong and strong peoples, to turn Russia into ruins so that on these ruins to build a new, unknown homeland.” Everything that opponents do leads to destruction either as a result of unreasonableness (lack of logical thinking) or as a result of conscious actions.

On what basis does the author of the speech propose to act? He clearly indicates: “But, in addition to these tangible results, which would be given to a country from the moral perspective?” What is the basis of his understanding of the moral foundations?

Firstly, the right of ownership, which will allow people to relate to what they have as its masters. Secondly, the need to make the state healthy, which should be based on the freedom and education. Thirdly, justice.

This is what allows us to create the image of future Russia, which will certainly be accomplished by the author of the speech and the forc-

es that stay with him on a moral basis: “I think that Russia will not fall apart in the second millennium of its life. I think that it will be renewed, improve its way, and go forward, but it will not go through decay, because where is decay – there is death”, “Violence will not be tolerated” (Benoit et al. 2009). The nationalization of land appears to the government to be disastrous for the country, and the project of the Constitutional Democratic Party; that is, semi-expropriation and semi-nationalization, in the final conclusion and in our opinion, will lead to the same results as the proposals of the left parties.”

The option that Stolypin offers is based on the moral principle of justice and a common cause. At the same time, “Now it is necessary to immediately take on the inconspicuous hard work”, “The started business must be improved”, “After spending about 10 years in the land organization, I came to the deep conviction that hard work is needed in this, long-term hard work is needed. This question cannot be resolved; it must be resolved. In Western countries, it took decades. We offer you a modest but sure path.”

Speech is explicitly devoted to the agrarian question, so acute for Russia at the time of utterance. However, its implicit meaning is much more important (“I, gentlemen, do not think to present you the complete agrarian program of the government”), which becomes apparent only in the final: “Opponents of statehood would like to choose the path of radicalism, the path of liberation from the historical past of Russia, liberation from cultural traditions. They need great upheavals; we need a Great Russia! (Applause on the right).”

CONCLUSION

Thus, Stolypin, being a brilliant speaker, built his speech according to the ideal structure.

1. Opposition “opponent (carrier of negative origin) – author of speech (carrier of positive origin)”.
2. Opposition “past (in which mistakes were made) – present (problematic, potentially containing a threat), a possible bad future – a good future (to which the author’s actions will lead)”.

3. Opposition “immoral – moral”, and the actions and ideas of the author of speech are based on the highest moral values.
4. The inner plot, the development of thought is based on the movement from “bad” to “good”.

This is the structure that underlies most of the speeches of politicians, with possible options for this invariant structure.

Understanding the worldview structure in the speech of a politician allows us to build its analysis as complex, on the basis of the system of values that underlie it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Previous studies indicated that the task of a holistic, comprehensive analysis of the socio-political text has not yet been set. For this reason, this study deals with a fundamentally new task; that is, a comprehensive and holistic analysis of the socio-political text as a source of information about the value orientations of society. It was recommended to analyze the political history text in the future studies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

REFERENCES

- Benoit K, Laver M, Mikhaylov S 2009. Treating words as data with error: Uncertainty in text statements of policy positions. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2): 495–513.
- Biryukov N, Sergeyev V 2018. *Russian Politics in Transition*. UK: Routledge.
- Chudinov AP 2001. *Russia in the Metaphorical Mirror: A Cognitive Study of Political Metaphor (1991–2000)*. Ekaterinburg: Ural State Pedagogical University (In Russian).
- Cook JR, Stefanski LA 1994. Simulation-Extrapolation-Estimation in parametric measurement error models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89(428): 1314–1328.
- Diamond E 2015. *Performance and Cultural Politics*. UK: Routledge.
- Gilbert P 2018. National obligations: Political, cultural or societal? In: Simon Caney, David George and Peter Jones (Eds.): *National Rights, International Obligations*. UK: Routledge, pp. 102–118.
- Grimmer J, Stewart BM 2013. Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. *Political Analysis*, 21(3): 267–297.
- Jurkowski R 2017. Cultural, educational and charitable activities of Pyotr Stolypin as Governor of Grodno in 1902–1903. *Modern History of Russia*, IX: 51–83.
- Khisamova VN, Moulalagiev NK 2016. Stylistic peculiarities of expressing modality in the fiction (On the basis of writings by HB Stowe). *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies (IJHCS)*, 1(1): 670–675.
- Lakoff G 2015. Linguistics and politics. In: Keith Allan (Ed.): *The Routledge Handbook of Linguistics*. UK: Routledge, pp. 562–576.
- Lauderdale BE, Herzog A 2016. Measuring political positions from legislative speech. *Political Analysis*, 24(3): 374–394.
- Li E, Lui P, Fung A 2019. *Systemic Functional Political Discourse Analysis: A Text-based Study*. UK: Routledge.
- Parfentieva NN 2018. To the study of reflection of cultural identity processes in the Russian Art of the 16th–17th centuries. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences*, 11(7): 1127–1136.
- Proksch SO, Lowe W, Wäckerle J, Soroka S 2019. Multilingual sentiment analysis: A new approach to measuring conflict in legislative speeches. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 44(1): 97–131.
- Thompson M 2018. *Cultural Theory*. UK: Routledge.
- Tushev AN, and Bushkanets LE 2016. Literary criticism of humor magazines in establishing of the literary hierarchy. *Turkish Online Journal of Design Art and Communication*, 6: 2898–2903.
- Young L, Soroka S 2012. Affective news: The automated coding of sentiment in political texts. *Political Communication*, 29(2): 205–231.

**Paper received for publication in October, 2019
Paper accepted for publication in December, 2019**