

Decoding the Language of Politics: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Ukrainian President Zelensky's Speeches during the Ukrainian-Russian Conflict

فكُّ شفرة لغة السياسة: تحليل نصِّي نقدي لخطابات الرئيس الأوكرانيِّ زيلينسكي
خلال الصِّراع الأوكرانيِّ الرُّوسِيِّ

Dr. Yasser A. Gomaa

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Arts, Assiut University, Egypt

gomaa@aun.edu.eg

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1503-4337>

Abstract

Political discourse is one of the most powerful tools for influencing and shaping reality. It is commonly acknowledged that discourse plays a critical part in forming our perspective of the world. Political discourse persuades and manipulates the recipient to adopt particular actions or decisions in line with the aims of the speech produced by political actors or the group to which they belong through the use of strategic tools and processes, such as biases and ideologies. In this context, discourse is particularly notable for its ability to shape public opinion and influence political and cultural outcomes. The focus of this study is on the political discourse of Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky, specifically in the context of the Ukrainian-Russian war. The analysis examines his speeches to identify the rhetorical devices and linguistic units he employs to shape public opinion, persuade his audience, and advance his political objectives. By examining the political and ethical lexicon used by Zelensky, the study seeks to enhance the comprehension of how conflicts are viewed and how political discourse affects political decision-making. The ultimate goal is to contribute to a deeper comprehension of the complex relationships between politics, power, and language in the contemporary world.

Keywords: Political discourse, critical discourse analysis, power and politics, Ukrainian-Russian war, Volodymyr Zelensky.

الدور الحاسم الذي يلعبه الخطاب في تشكيل فهمنا للعالم مُعترف به على نطاق واسع، حيث يُعتبر الخطاب السياسي إحدى أقوى الأدوات للتأثير والتغيير في الواقع. من خلال استخدام أدوات وآليات إستراتيجية، مثل التحيزات والأيديولوجيات، يُفنع الخطاب السياسي المتلقي ويتلاعب به لإتخاذ إجراءات أو قرارات مُعينة تتوافق مع نوايا مُنتج الخطاب أو المجموعة التي ينتمون إليها. في هذا السياق، يُميَّز خطاب وسائل الإعلام بشكل خاص بقدرته على تشكيل الرأي العام والتأثير على النتائج السياسية والثقافية. يَتمحور تركيز هذه الدراسة حول الخطاب السياسي للرئيس الأوكراني فولوديمير زيلينسكي، وتحديدًا في سياق الحرب الأوكرانية الروسية. يقوم التحليل بفحص خطاباته لتحديد الأجهزة البلاغية والوحدات اللغوية التي يستخدمها لتشكيل الرأي العام، وإفناع جمهوره، وتحقيق أهدافه السياسية. من خلال فحص المفردات السياسية والأخلاقية المستخدمة من قبل زيلينسكي، تسعى هذه الدراسة إلى تعميق فهمنا لدور الخطاب السياسي في تشكيل فهمنا للصراعات وتأثيره في صنع القرارات السياسية. الهدف النهائي هو المساهمة في فهم أكثر دقة للتفاعل المعقد بين اللغة والسلطة والسياسة في العالم المعاصر.

الكلمات الدالة: الخطاب السياسي، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، السلطة والسياسة، الحرب الأوكرانية-الروسية، فولوديمير زيلينسكي.

0. Introduction

The Russian-Ukrainian conflict is rooted in and caused by several factors. The war began on February 24, 2022, after a speech by Russian President Vladimir Putin, in which he announced the launch of "a military operation aimed at disarming Ukraine and rooting out Nazism from it." Despite Ukraine's international recognition of its independence in 1991, the Russian leadership still regards it as part of its vital sphere of influence and historical extension. As a result, politico-security-military tensions have developed between the two nations. Since the arrival of Russian forces into the Crimean Peninsula and its annexation to the Russian Federation in 2014, along with the subsequent start of conflict in the Donbass area later that year,

there have been continuous tensions. The first significant attempt at Donetsk and Luhansk's independence was made in the Donbass area, which was supported by Russia and had a large Russian-speaking population.

In this heated environment, Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky signed a new national security plan in September 2020 that outlined Ukraine's plans for developing a special partnership with NATO with the goal of obtaining membership in the alliance. He then signed a decree in March 2021 outlining a strategy to end the Russian occupation and reintegrate the temporarily occupied territories of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol. Russia views Ukraine's potential membership in NATO and the expansion of the alliance as a whole as a threat to its national security. Ukraine and some other European countries neighboring Russia have accused President Putin of attempting to restore the Russian Empire and pursuing aggressive military policies.

In March 2021, Russia began a military buildup on its border with Ukraine, which continued to escalate until February 2022. During this period, Russia made demands of the United States and NATO through two proposed treaties, which included requests for what it called security guarantees. These guarantees consisted of a legally binding commitment to prevent Ukraine's accession to NATO and the reduction of NATO forces and military equipment stationed in Eastern Europe. Russia threatened

military action if these demands were not fully met. Then, Russian discourse began with President Putin speaking about discrimination against Russian speakers on the Ukrainian side and the fear that such practices could lead to genocide. This discourse escalated into a political escalation between Russia, on one hand, and the United States on the other, with the latter considering these allegations as a pretext by Russia to justify its invasion of Ukraine.

In February 2022, following Russia's recognition of the "people's republics of Donetsk and Luhansk," Putin ordered Russian forces, along with heavy equipment, to be sent to the Donbass region under the guise of a peacekeeping mission. The next day, US President Joe Biden declared that the Russian invasion of Ukraine had started, and NATO Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg predicted that the invasion would expand in the coming days. Putin received unanimous approval from the Russian Federation Council to use military force outside of Russia, while Ukrainian President Zelensky declared a state of emergency in the country and mobilized Ukrainian reservists. In the early hours of February 24, Zelensky gave his first speech after the start of the Russian military operation, in an emotional televised address, in which he spoke directly to Russian citizens in their native language and appealed to them to prevent the war. Throughout the conflict, he delivered several speeches addressed

to the citizens of Ukraine and Russia, as well as to various international bodies and organizations.

This study aims to analyze four speeches delivered by Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky on the international level through social media. The purpose of this analysis is fivefold. Firstly, it aims to enhance our comprehension of Zelensky's perspective on the Russo-Ukrainian conflict. Secondly, it seeks to scrutinize the strategies he employed to communicate with diverse audiences. Thirdly, it aims to obtain insights into his communication strategies. Fourthly, it endeavors to evaluate the degree to which he was successful in mobilizing support for Ukraine's stance in the ongoing conflict. Lastly, it aims to explicate the most notable mechanisms and tools used by Zelensky to impact international public opinion and urge the countries and entities he addressed to take the decisions he considers suitable. The speeches examined are sourced from two platforms. His speeches to the US Congress on March 16, 2022, the Israeli Knesset on March 20, 2022, and the UN Security Council on April 5, 2022, are sourced directly from the Ukraine government website. The speech given to the European Parliament on March 1, 2022, has been downloaded via YouTube since it is not available on the Ukrainian official website.

1. The concept of discourse

Discourse is a platform through which academic disciplines introduce their subjects, outline their methodologies, and

articulate their theories and interpretations. It receives significant scholarly attention across a range of fields, particularly in the humanities and specifically within the realm of linguistics. In ancient times, discourse closely intertwined with the democratic system prevalent in numerous cities of Greece. It embodied the belief that every individual possessed the right to freely express their opinions without strict adherence to predefined rules or principles. However, the varying levels of persuasive abilities among individuals and resulting discrepancies necessitated the establishment of rules and principles governing the practice and instruction of discourse. Plato notably drew connections between discourse, sincerity, and psychology, delving into how genuine discourse engaged the audience through truthful arguments. He contended that authentic discourse was embodied by a knowledgeable teacher who imparted wisdom or a wise ruler who cultivated virtues within individuals' minds by reminding them of their core values (Law, 2003). The term discourse, in its contemporary sense, has gained considerable prominence since the 1980s. It encompasses a broad range of verbal activities, events, and speech presentations. Scholars are engaged in studying discourses as distinct and analyzable entities, and any endeavor to define discourse inherently involves delineating a network of connections between discourse, language, the individual, and society (Angermuller et al., 2014). Furthermore,

it necessitates exploring the intricate interplay between language and its societal practice.

Discourse is a complex and multifaceted concept that scholars from various fields, including linguistics, sociology, psychology, and anthropology, extensively study. According to Wodak (2022), discourse is a coherent set of linguistic expressions, such as sentences, utterances, and texts, produced within specific social, cultural, and historical contexts. She argues that discourse is not only a means of expressing reality but also an avenue for constructing it. In this regard, discourse functions as a social practice and a form of social action. This idea is supported by Gee (2014), who emphasizes that discourse includes not only the linguistic characteristics of a certain language but also the social, cultural, and historical facets of a particular civilization.

Fairclough (2015, p. 16) makes a similar argument, stating that speech is a “social practice which constitutes and is constituted by social structures and relations.” He contends that speech is a dynamic and constantly shifting phenomena that reflects the power structures, beliefs, and values that exist within a particular group or civilization. Furthermore, he places a strong emphasis on how discourse shapes social and political realities, especially those that have to do with power, identity, and social justice. van Dijk (2015) adds that discourse is a tool for creating and sharing information, ideas, and attitudes, which in turn shapes how people see the world and behave. Since it has this effect, it

affects social and political results (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2022).

Recent studies have increasingly focused on the power dynamics that discourse entails. For example, van Dijk (2017) argues that language shapes and depicts the social power relations that it both reflects and reproduces. In light of this, discourse may be viewed as a sort of social control that affects how people think, feel, and behave. It has broad ramifications for comprehending the complexity of social life and the ways in which language is employed to create and replicate social realities. Discourse is also highly relevant in today's globalized and Interlinked world because of the tremendous improvements in media and communication technology. Couldry and Hepp (2018) discuss how social media networks and digital platforms have changed the means by which discourses are produced, shared, and experienced in many contexts. They investigate the effects of these technologies on social connections, the formation of meaning in a linked and globalized world, and power dynamics. They claim that modern technologies have made it possible for discourses to cross cultural and geographic boundaries, impacting people and communities on the worldwide level. Consequently, discourse is a nuanced and comprehensive concept that plays a crucial role in comprehending how language both influences and reflects social reality. Its importance is broad-based, including social and political transformation as well as other areas,

illuminating the complex interactions between language, power, and societal structures.

From the standpoint of Critical Discourse Analysis (hereafter referred to as CDA), political discourse can be viewed as a dynamic force that aims to shape and affect reality. It uses a variety of tactical techniques, including biases and ideologies that are hidden beneath words and images. CDA seeks to recognize and expose these components in order to increase awareness and enlighten people. According to Wodak (2011), persuasive tactics, a favorable self-image, a negative portrayal of others, and the use of populist language are all crucial components of political discourse.

The Nexus of discourse and context

Discourse analysis theory aims to produce an accurate and structured representation of the linguistic units being studied, taking into account two crucial dimensions: text and context. The internal organization of discourse, including the words, sentence patterns, and other elements that contribute to the discourse's overall structure, is referred to as the text dimension. The context dimension, on the other hand, is divided into two categories: linguistic context, which deals with the internal organization of the text itself, and non-linguistic context, which analyzes the speech in light of external factors and direct effects. The participants in the communicative event, the production

conditions, cognitive and social aspects, cultural traits, and the discourse's relationship to its particular time and place are all included in this list of external factors. A thorough comprehension of the text and its context permits a deeper examination of discourse and all of its facets. This highlights the thoroughness of discourse analysis, which goes beyond analyzing the surface structure of language to look at the underlying external factors that affect how it is produced and why it is used. It is especially pertinent in the context of political discourse, which endeavors to convince, direct, and put pressure on its listeners. Political discourse makes use of straightforward, realistic language as well as basic structural elements that influence other people's behavior and evoke strong emotions. While maintaining a strong link with external reality, it offers powerful instruments for persuasion.

The significance of examining these external variables and how they affect discourse has been underscored by recent scholars. For instance, Smith and Kabele (2020) contend that examining political speech necessitates a focus on the ideas and content communicated since they are essential in determining its persuasive influence. Ponton (2020) adds that the choice of language and rhetorical devices employed in political discourse significantly influence its effectiveness in achieving its intended goals. Additionally, Richards et al. (2021) suggest that political discourse should be examined in relation to the broader socio-

cultural and historical context in which it emerges. By considering both the internal aspects of discourse, such as its structure and content, and its interaction with external factors, discourse analysis provides a comprehensive understanding of the persuasive strategies employed and their intricate relationship with the surrounding context. Therefore, discourse, in terms of its intertwined and interactive function, refers to the discursive unity between the occurrence and the meaning in the sentence. That is, the meaning is formed in discourse through the interaction between context and the uttered words in the sentence. Accordingly, discourse can be seen as a specific product, associated with a specific speaker and specific production conditions. This also implies the discourse is a spoken communicative stance that interacts with its specific surrounding conditions.

In this particular context, international communication emerges as a prominent aspect of political discourse worldwide. It goes beyond being merely a cultural stance, as it involves communication at the national level, reaching out to a large audience that typically comprises nations rather than small groups or individuals. Both the communicators and their audience in international communication are politically conscious, driven by their country's interests, and employ heightened expressions to shape their nation's image (Kenski & Jamieson, 2017). Consequently, international communication is a complex and

challenging form of discourse that transcends the boundaries of homelands and nations, engaging diverse audiences with varying ethnicities, nationalities, cultures, and civilizations. Examples include speeches directed to global populations in forums like UN Security Council, during times of conflict or peace treaties, aiming to influence international public opinion in favor of the speaker's position. Such discourse involves participants with diverse languages, religions, nationalities, political affiliations, and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, effective engagement in this form of communication necessitates the speaker's comprehensive awareness, knowledge, and skillfulness in addressing and connecting with such a diverse audience.

Zelensky's political speeches, delivered to the world since the onset of the Russo-Ukrainian conflict, exemplify international political discourse. His political speeches are classified within the realm of discourse that engages a wide-ranging international audience and addresses the intricate dynamics of geopolitical affairs. These speeches transcend national boundaries, targeting diverse audiences across nations, cultures, and civilizations. He aims to shape international public opinion, foster support, and convey Ukraine's perspective on the ongoing conflict.

1.1. The Role of Rhetoric in Political Discourse

Political discourse employs various persuasive techniques to influence the recipient and persuade them to undertake a specific action or make a particular decision in accordance with the

agenda of the speech producer or their affiliated entity (Mohammd, 2022). Consequently, political discourse possesses significant rhetorical power that can manipulate minds to achieve specific political or cultural objectives (Sahmeni & Afifah, 2019). Rhetoric - the art and practice of persuasive communication - represents a fundamental pillar in political discourse, functioning as both a linguistic tool and a cognitive pathway capable of altering the positions of a human group within a defined timeframe. However, the impact of this influence extends beyond the immediate moment and can potentially alter the course of entire nations' histories. Referring to the significance of rhetoric as a crucial component in political discourse, Charteris-Black (2018) argues that rhetoric serves as a strategic means of influencing public opinion and shaping political narratives. It enables speakers to employ persuasive techniques such as argumentation, emotional appeal, and rhetorical devices to sway the audience and achieve their desired objectives. Similarly, Williams et al. (2022) emphasize that rhetoric is instrumental in constructing and disseminating persuasive messages that can shape public attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. In other words, rhetoric has the power to alter the historical trajectory of entire nations. Effective rhetoricians may change societal beliefs and mold the collective memory of a population. Rhetoric has the power to organize large crowds, spark movements, and even bring about important social and political reforms by using

persuasive techniques and appealing to common ideals and ambitions.

CDA is essential for exposing the linguistic and cognitive mechanisms that discourse producers use to persuade listeners to accept their arguments. It is based on the interplay between the speaker, discourse, and the recipient's interpretation within the contextual framework, as well as the explicit and implicit dimensions of the text. By studying these connections, CDA provides insightful information on the difficulties of communication and the significance of language. It highlights the significance of understanding the interplay between language, context, and intention in order to reveal the nuanced layers of meaning embedded in discourse. This analytical framework enables scholars to discern the strategies employed by discourse producers and gain a deeper understanding of the power dynamics and rhetorical devices employed. Ultimately, CDA serves as a valuable tool for comprehending the intricate nature of communication and its profound impact on individuals and societies.

1.2. The Rhetorical Strategies and Techniques Employed in Zelensky's Speeches

The discussion above suggests that political discourse performs a purpose that goes beyond simple communication. Rather than solely conveying specific information or experiences to the recipient, it possesses an influential purpose aimed at

guiding and shaping the audience's perspectives. Its primary objectives lie in persuasion, influence, and often involve the utilization of manipulation and deception. By exercising a certain degree of power and dominance, political discourse manipulates events and facts to serve its pragmatic agendas and strategic goals. Consequently, the relationship between discourse and context becomes intricately functional, a notion that is applicable to Zelensky's speeches as a case study. For a thorough comprehension of this relationship, undertaking a CDA is essential. Such analysis exposes the underlying manipulation, tactics, and ingrained ideologies present in Zelensky's political discourse. Moreover, it delves into the dynamics of power and domination within his speeches, scrutinizing the role of linguistic choices in reflecting his political orientations and ideologies.

The present study aims to comprehensively examine the speeches delivered by Zelensky, focusing on the extraction and scrutiny of various linguistic elements employed within these speeches. It encompasses two key aspects: the political lexicon and the ethical lexicon. The political lexicon pertains to the specialized vocabulary and terminology used in his political discourse. Through the analysis of this aspect, the study aims to highlight the specific language choices and rhetorical strategies employed by Zelensky to convey political messages and shape public opinion. This examination provides valuable insights into the persuasive techniques and

argumentative strategies utilized within Zelensky's speeches, enabling a deeper understanding of the methods employed to sway opinions and advance arguments. On the other hand, the language connected to moral principles and ethical issues is included in the ethical lexicon. The present study aims to shed light on the moral dimensions and persuasive strategies used in Zelensky's speeches by conducting a thorough investigation of this aspect. By doing so, the study aims to demonstrate how Zelensky strategically employs ethical language and appeals to moral principles to strengthen his arguments and rally support for his viewpoints. The examination takes Zelensky's allusions to international organizations and institutions into account in addition to the linguistic analysis. Additionally, his claims against Russia and its president, Putin, are given special consideration. These include casting Putin and Russia in the role of the "other," setting them apart from Ukraine and raising the possibility of hostility. This construction of an enemy figure adds a crucial dimension to the analysis of Zelensky's rhetoric and sheds light on the dynamics of his political discourse. Furthermore, the study delves into an analysis of Zelensky's and Ukraine's self-presentation. By examining how Zelensky presents himself and his country, the aim is to understand the strategic choices made to shape their public image and establish credibility. Additionally, the shared characteristics between Zelensky's speeches and

the intended audience are explored, examining how he tailors his message to resonate with and persuade the addressees.

This study utilizes CDA to uncover the intricate linguistic strategies, persuasive methodologies, and deeply ingrained ideological dimensions apparent in Zelensky's speeches. By doing so, it contributes to the ongoing advancement of understanding the complex dynamics that govern political communication and discourse in contemporary sociopolitical environments. The subsequent sections provide a detailed exposition of the findings derived from this investigation.

1.2.1. Biased words and phrases

Linguistic bias, which operates within diverse social contexts encompassing various domains such as politics, media, education, and everyday communication, has been extensively examined and elucidated by scholars across disciplines including linguistics, sociolinguistics, CDA, and media studies. Their collective efforts aim to shed light on the intricate mechanisms through which linguistic bias becomes entrenched and propagated. They also investigate how language use can reinforce stereotypes, discrimination, and exclusionary practices, contributing to the maintenance of social inequalities. These scholars not only illuminate the ways in which language can perpetuate biases and inequalities but also advocate for more inclusive and equitable language practices.

Highlighting its multifaceted manifestations and its potential impact on societal attitudes and structures, Tannen (2010) and van Dijk (2010), for example, argue that linguistic bias encompasses the intricate ways in which language, encompassing lexical choices, expressions, and discourse patterns, can communicate and reinforce societal biases. This notion emphasizes the role of language as a vehicle for transmitting and perpetuating prevailing social norms, beliefs, and power imbalances. Beukeboom and Burgers (2017) explore how linguistic bias intersects with social factors such as gender, race, and ethnicity. They draw attention to the ways in which language may promote social injustices, reflect them, and have an impact on how people perceive the world. Focus is placed on the function of linguistic bias in political discourse by Fairclough (2013) and van Dijk (2015). They examine how word choice, framing, and metaphor usage in media portrayals might reinforce biases and influence public opinion. They place emphasis on how skewed narratives are created and spread by the media. The broader social effects of language bias are studied by Wodak (2011) and Fairclough (2015). They look at how language is used to reflect and support ideologies, social norms, and power disparities in politics, advertising, and other domains.

Beukeboom (2014) and Beukeboom & Burgers (2017) are two examples of scholars who study linguistic bias. They critically evaluate this language phenomena at various levels, from specific

individual utterances to more general society discourse. They contend that a particular word or phrase choice might highlight implicit biases and strengthen preexisting social structures. These language decisions frequently entail the use of loaded words or descriptions that have implicit meanings and shape views of particular social groups or situations. They also stress the fact that language patterns, such as the way arguments are presented or stories are put together, subtly encode and maintain biases by favoring some viewpoints while marginalizing others.

The phenomena of lexical bias, which involves the purposeful use of particular words or terms with implicit meanings to reflect social biases and shape views of persons or groups, is one way that linguistic bias is expressed. Words can carry strong positive or negative connotations, reinforcing stereotypes or giving some social groups more prominence while excluding others. For instance, the choice between synonyms such as ‘said,’ ‘claimed,’ or ‘alleged’ can significantly influence the interpretation of a statement, highlighting the nuanced effects of lexical bias. By examining the vocabulary employed in political discourse, it becomes apparent that certain words are loaded with positive or negative associations, reinforcing stereotypes or privileging particular social categories while marginalizing others. This manipulation of language can serve to advance certain agendas, consolidate power structures, or perpetuate inequalities within society.

An essential aspect of lexical bias is the utilization of specific terms and descriptors that can shape public opinion and influence perceptions of events. Political discourse often employs words such as ‘suicide bomber/martyr,’ ‘militants/terrorists/Muslims,’ or resistance fighters/rebels’ to frame and influence narratives in alignment with their own perspectives. These carefully chosen expressions carry inherent biases that can convey particular ideological stances and generate desired emotional responses. Conversely, emotionally charged terms may also be used to defend a specific position, even when contrasting viewpoints exist, as seen in the contrasting labels of ‘terrorist’ versus ‘freedom fighter’ (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2013). It is crucial to recognize that lexical bias operates not only through explicit language choices but also through subtle connotations and associations embedded in the semantic realm. Through a critical examination of the vocabulary and terminology used in political discourse, a clearer understanding emerges regarding the perpetuation of linguistic biases. These biases contribute to unequal power dynamics and significantly influence public perceptions of individuals and events.

As President Zelensky confronts an ongoing conflict with Russia and openly expresses animosity towards both Russia and President Vladimir Putin, it is expected that his political speeches would prominently feature language and expressions that exhibit bias. This is evident in the manner in which he characterizes

Russia, employing terms such as ‘terrorists’, ‘war criminals,’ ‘bloodthirsty’, ‘perpetrators of massacres’, ‘killers of children and innocent individuals,’ ‘purveyors of falsehoods and deception,’ and ‘agents of destruction for Ukraine and Europe.’ In the following excerpt from President Zelensky's address to the UN Security Council on April 5, 2022, a compelling introduction emerges, wherein a series of descriptive terms are employed to distort the perception of the adversary.

It is difficult to find a war crime that the occupiers have not committed there. The Russian military searched for and purposefully killed anyone who served our state. They executed women outside the houses when approaching and simply calling someone alive. They killed whole families - adults and children. And they tried to burn their bodies. I am addressing you on behalf of the people who honor the memory of the deceased everyday. Everyday, in the morning. The memory of the killed civilians. Who were shot in the back of the head or in the eye after being tortured. Who were shot just on the streets. Who were thrown into the well, so that they die there in suffering. Who were killed in apartments, houses, blown up by grenades. Who were crushed by tanks in civilian cars in the middle of the road. For fun. Whose limbs were cut off, whose throat was cut. Who were raped and killed in front of their own children. Their tongues were torn out only because they did not hear from them what they wanted to hear. How is this different from what the ISIS terrorists were doing in the occupied territory?

This excerpt from Zelensky's speech is distinguished by a collection of accusatory statements and emotionally charged language, culminating in an open-ended question that draws a comparison between the actions of Russia and those of the terrorist organization ISIS. That is, it is replete with descriptive attributes that serve to tarnish the image of the opponent and the enemy, forming a comprehensive indictment that reaches its peak with an open question regarding the disparity between Russia's actions and those of the terrorist organization ISIS. Zelensky's utilization of the words and expressions in this excerpt is geared towards shaping public opinion and crafting a negative portrayal

of the opposing party, thereby eliciting a profound emotional response from the audience.

Zelensky, on the other hand, seeks to present an image of the Ukrainian people as ‘citizens,’ ‘lovers of freedom,’ ‘defending each other,’ ‘paying the price,’ ‘living through tragedy,’ and ‘sacrificing their best men and women.’ He has also made sure to identify himself as “the leader of the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian nation,” emphasizing this during his speech to the U.S. Congress on March 16, 2022:

Now, I’m almost 45 years old. Today my age stopped when the heart of more than 100 children stopped beating. I see no sense in life if it cannot stop the deaths. And this is my main mission as the leader of my people, brave Ukrainians, and as the leader of my nation, I’m addressing the President Biden. You are the leader of the nation, of your great nation. I wish you to be the leader of the world. Being the leader of the world means to be the leader of peace.

1.2.2. Vague linguistic expressions and terminologies

The complex and multifaceted concept of vagueness has garnered significant attention from academics across multiple fields. Scholars specializing in anthropology (Duranti, 1993), communication (e.g., Benoit, 2022), linguistics (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2017; Hodges, 2013), and political science (e.g., Katz & Mair, 2018) have examined the intentional utilization of vagueness by politicians, considering various motivations and consequences. Benoit (2022) defines vagueness as the use of imprecise or ambiguous language in political discourse to avoid committing to specific positions or actions. Charteris-Black (2017) views vagueness as a deliberate strategy of ambiguity in

political discourse, where speakers use language that is open to multiple interpretations, allowing for flexibility and evasion. Hodges (2013) characterizes vagueness as a strategic rhetorical choice employed by politicians to create a sense of inclusivity, allowing for multiple interpretations and avoiding the risk of alienating specific audiences. Katz and Mair (2018) describe vagueness as a deliberate strategy used by political actors to maximize their electoral appeal by remaining deliberately imprecise about their intentions and policy positions. In addition, they all discuss the reasons, tactics, and effects of exploiting vagueness in political speech. Collectively, these scholars enhance our understanding of the complexities of vagueness, across languages and cultures, by unraveling its intricacies and enriching our comprehension of language use and interpretation in diverse domains.

Vague linguistic expressions and terminologies imply a specific meaning and clear significance, presenting themselves as agreed-upon terms, such as 'terrorism.' However, in fact, they are undefined and unrestricted terms, and the recipient doesn't derive any practical outcome from them. The purpose behind using these terms is to lend seriousness to texts and convey intent, as well as to create specific goals, which gives these texts value and importance. In reality, these terms are merely relying on concepts with vague meanings and phrases, such as 'world peace,' 'war on terrorism,' and the like. These are constructive phrases that can

be interpreted in unlimited ways, granting the interlocutor the authority to include what suits them and exclude what doesn't fit their context. Politicians often use vague linguistic expressions and terminologies to communicate ideas or sway public opinion without committing to concrete specifics or actions. The use of these expressions and terms enables politicians to remain adaptable, escape responsibility, and serve a variety of audiences or interests. They may also help politicians to reach a wider audience and prevent the enmity of certain groups. Politicians may make enticing-sounding declarations or promises, but they often don't follow through. The use of vague language offers room for interpretation, allowing other individuals or groups to assimilate the message to fit their own objectives and expectations.

The Ukrainian President, Volodymyr Zelensky, employed vagueness in all four of his speeches, using ambiguous expressions and terms. Without specifying specific required steps ,he appeals to the European Parliament (1) to adopt a “European option for Ukraine,” which implies the consideration of a specific path for Ukraine that aligns with European principles, values, or integration, and suggests the possibility of Ukraine aligning itself more closely with Europe in terms of political, economic, or cultural aspects, and (2) to implement “a stronger European Union,” which implies undertaking measures to improve the European's functionality, effectiveness, and

influence. He also expresses the need for “new alliances” and emphasizes the importance of “establishing an anti-war alliance,” “defending the world,” and “to support humanity.” These ambiguous expressions have vague definitions and undefined goals. The UN Security Council is also urged by him to “impose peace,” “reform the UN system,” and “achieve fair representation in the UN Security Council.” These phrases exhibit a lack of clarity and precision and primarily serve as rhetorical and symbolic devices in his speech rather than offering precise instructions.

1.2.3. Exaggeration

Exaggeration is a rhetorical device that involves stressing or overstating a point in proportion to its literal or actual importance. It is used in political speeches to draw attention to a certain topic, elicit powerful emotions, or convince the audience to support a specific viewpoint. Politicians may utilize exaggeration to make their ideas more impactful, create a sense of urgency, and sway public opinion. That is, exaggeration may be used in political communication for a variety of reasons, such as emphasis, persuasion, emotional appeal, and memorability. Politicians may engage the audience and identify their perspective by emphasizing a problem's effects. They can affect public opinion in their favor by exaggerating the advantages of a suggested course of action or the disadvantages of an opposing viewpoint. By portraying severe situations or consequences, they might

arouse fear, rage, or empathy, which can affect public opinion and spur action. They can also use colorful and exaggerated language to make a lasting effect on the audience, guaranteeing that their message is maintained and remembered afterwards.

Exaggeration in political discourse has been the subject of several scholarly discussions. Politicians' use of exaggeration and other rhetorical techniques, as well as their effects on public perception, are highlighted by Mercieca (2020). Jamieson (2013) examines the use of exaggeration as a persuasive technique as well as the significance of rhetoric in political campaigns. Hariman (2010) investigates the function of exaggeration in political discourse. Claridge (2014) looks at the purposeful use of hyperbole by politicians to influence public opinion and win support. Exaggeration's use in political speeches as a persuasive technique is examined by Kiewe (2020). In addition, the knowledge of exaggeration's use in political discourse, its influence on public opinion, and its part in influencing political campaigns and communication have been advanced by these scholars.

Politicians often resort to the use of exaggeration to emphasize the seriousness of a situation and amplify its impact. One example is the United States's manipulation of the phrase "war on terror" during its military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq. This manipulation aims to instill fear in the audience and convince them that the war is being fought to safeguard their well-being.

This is an illustration of how politicians frequently exaggerate the threat and repercussions of an issue in order to sway public opinion and defend their actions in the name of national security.

Another strategy politicians employ is the use of exaggerated epithets and descriptions to justify the killing, eradication, or provocation of the opposition. This raises a crucial question: What happens when the audience is subjected to military warfare or invasion, as is the case with Ukraine? It is natural, then, for the Ukrainian president to resort to using exaggerated expressions in his speeches to demonstrate the extent of the danger that Russia poses to Ukraine. He excels at employing this strategy in his speeches, depending on a wide range of vocabulary and terms that might inspire the audience to act in favor of Ukraine against the “brutal attack” perpetrated by Russia.

Zelensky attempts in his four speeches to focus on the fact that the Russian military operation not only targets Ukraine but also aims to destroy the entirety of Europe and poses a threat to international security worldwide. He goes as far as linking it to the survival of planet Earth. In his passionate speech to the UN Security Council on April 5, 2022, he states, “Today the Ukrainian people are defending not only Ukraine, we are fighting for the values of Europe and the world, sacrificing our lives in the name of the Future. That’s why today the American people are helping not just Ukraine, but Europe and the world to keep the planet alive, to keep justice in history.” In his speech, he

cleverly manipulates exaggerated language to persuade the UN Security Council members. His main goals are to raise awareness of the dire situation and mobilize support for taking prompt action. He attempts to portray a sense of urgency and highlight the detrimental impact of the Russian President's acts by using strong and elevated vocabulary. He paints a vivid picture of the consequences, the erosion of internal unity, the contempt for clearly defined borders, and the denial of many peoples' right to self-determination.

In addition, he also draws attention to the systematic eradication of ethnic and religious diversity, the targeted killing of civilians, and the ensuing devastation of cities and loss of innocent lives. Besides, he underlines the possible worldwide effects, such as the escalation of food crises and the political unrest brought on by fluctuating food prices. Through his persuasive use of exaggeration, he seeks to mobilize the support of the UN Security Council members and urge them to take decisive measures in response to the perceived aggression of the Russian President. Similarly, he accuses Russia of wanting to “turn Ukrainians into silent slaves” and openly stealing everything, starting with food and ending with gold earrings that are pulled out and covered with blood. Therefore, by using exaggeration, the Ukrainian president emphasizes the importance of putting an end to Russia's war against Ukraine, asserting that it goes beyond being a conflict between two countries. In his view,

it is a threat to global peace, impacting all nations and crucial elements such as food security.

1.2.4. Connotations and Inferences

Connotation, as defined by van Dijk (2010), refers to the socio-cultural and contextual implications and associations that extend beyond the explicit or dictionary definition of a word or phrase. These connotations are shaped by societal and ideological factors and contribute to the broader discourse and communication dynamics within a specific cultural and linguistic context. Inference, on the other hand, is the process of drawing conclusions or making assumptions based on implicit or indirect information in communication (Tannen, 2010). It involves filling in gaps and making meaning beyond the literal content of the message, relying on contextual cues, shared knowledge, and pragmatic understanding. De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2019) describe inference as the cognitive process by which individuals go beyond explicit meanings and make interpretations about underlying intentions, attitudes, or beliefs in discourse. They also argue that inferences are constructed through the integration of linguistic cues, shared knowledge, and socio-cultural context. Accordingly, inferences and connotations are critically important to comprehend the complex meanings, social implications, and interpretative techniques present in political speech. As such, they are crucial in forming perceptions, creating ideologies, and affecting the persuasive impact of political communication.

Connotations and inferences play significant roles in political discourse. They are powerful linguistic tools that may be strategically used by politicians to support their policies and guide the audience's understanding of complex issues. They comprise a vital component in analyzing and evaluating political speeches and messages. The vital part played by these rhetorical devices in political discourse has been extensively studied by many scholars. Highlighting the power of connotations in influencing perceptions of political ideologies and framing debates, Wodak (2022) examines how political actors tactically use connotations to shape public opinion and construct social identities.

Howarth et. al (2016) explore the importance of inferences in political discourse. They emphasize how politicians systematically employ inferences to communicate implicit meanings and create spaces for plausible deniability. They also argue that inferences allow politicians to advance their agendas while sustaining flexibility and avoiding direct responsibility. Besides, Fairclough (2015) delves into the relationship between language and power in political discourse. He underscores how connotations and inferences are used to legitimize and maintain power structures, framing certain issues and marginalizing alternative viewpoints.

Similarly, van Dijk (2010) thoroughly investigates the part played by connotations and inferences in political

communication, focusing on how ideologies are constructed and reinforced through these linguistic devices. Exploring the role of connotations and inferences in political conversations and debates, Tannen (2010) emphasizes the role of implicit meanings and connotative language in influencing interpretations and shaping political narratives. Also, Charteris-Black (2016) underscores the significance of metaphor and connotations in political discourse, highlighting the role of metaphorical expressions and connotative language in shaping public perception and frame political issues. In the same vein, De Fina and Georgakopoulou (2019) investigate the contribution of connotative meanings and inferential processes to the negotiation and representation of political identities. Taking together, all these scholars underscore the nuanced ways in which connotations and inferences operate in political discourse to elucidate the persuasive strategies, power dynamics, and social implications inherent in the language used by political actors.

In light of the aforementioned discourse, connotations and inferences refer to the added semantic value that goes beyond the stated content of the speaker's discourse, representing numerous secondary meanings that can sometimes take precedence and become the primary meaning behind their usage. Consequently, they do not differ from the explicit and stated in terms of purpose and content, except that they create a sense of intimacy with the audience, who feels they are sharing a secret with the speaker.

Politicians frequently employ expressions such as “we all know what this means,” intentionally seeking to gain trust and evoke a sense of intimacy.

During his speech at the Israeli Knesset on March 20, 2022, Zelensky declares, “I want to remind you of the words of a great woman from Kyiv, whom you know very well Golda Meir... We intend to remain alive.” He then continues to state, “I don't need to convince you how intertwined our stories are,” implying the presence of an existential threat that jeopardizes both Ukraine and Israel. This inference aims to bridge the distance between Ukraine and Israel, establishing a shared and essential common ground through the discourse of “struggle for survival.” It cultivates a sense of unity and resemblance, forging a collective front and engendering feelings of integration and similarity in their joint confrontation against a common adversary endeavoring to eradicate their existence.

In addition, during his address to the US Congress on March 16, 2022, Zelensky uses the powerful phrase 'I have a dream,' which is first uttered by Martin Luther King Jr during the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in 1963, to evoke its profound historical and humanitarian significance in the American collective consciousness. This deliberate choice of language insinuates the parallel aspirations for freedom shared by the American and Ukrainian people. Furthermore, it hints at a personal resonance between Zelensky, as the leader of Ukraine,

and the American civil rights activist Martin Luther King Jr., fostering a sense of intimacy and connection between the speaker and the audience on emotional, ethical, and political levels. As a result, this inference lays the groundwork for a moral and political commitment to the demands advocated by the Ukrainian president.

1.2.5. Expressions of Condemnation

Expressions of condemnation are often used in political discourse to effectively influence political narratives and shape public opinion. Scholars have offered insightful analysis of this language phenomena from a variety of angles. Smith and Kabele maintain that these expressions serve as a persuasive tool to delegitimize other ideas and rally support for politicians' own goals. When used wisely, they may enable politicians to portray their opponents or policies negatively, eliciting strong emotional responses from the public. Similarly, Jamieson (2013) argues that Politicians use them to convey a sense of moral wrath and justice, presenting themselves as champions of moral principles and depicting their opponents as unethical or irresponsible. He also emphasizes the influence these expressions have on people's perception and memory. He contends that certain pejorative terms or labels may be ingrained in the communal memory, affecting how people recall and understand historical occurrences or political leaders. It should be noted that using these expressions in political discourse

excessively may escalate social division, hinder constructive dialogue, and make it more difficult to find common ground. Therefore, understanding the dynamics of condemnation expressions is essential for critically examining political communication and its impacts on society.

When aiming to rally support or mobilize their followers, politicians utilize words or phrases of condemnation, such as 'This action is unacceptable,' 'We strongly condemn these actions,' 'This behavior is disgraceful,' 'We denounce these acts of violence,' 'It is reprehensible that...,' 'We condemn these discriminatory practices,' 'This is an outrageous violation of human rights,' 'Such actions are abhorrent and unacceptable,' 'We express our strong disapproval of...,' 'This conduct is morally reprehensible,' 'We deplore these acts of corruption,' and 'These actions warrant our unequivocal condemnation.' These words and phrases imply a strong moral judgment, criticism, or disapproval of specific actions, behaviors, or circumstances. By employing these phrases, politicians aim to create a sense of urgency and assertiveness in their messaging. This approach urges the addressees to recognize their moral duties and highlights the importance of taking firm and meaningful actions. It also cautions the addressees that their deeds will undergo careful scrutiny from both a political and an ethical perspective. Additionally, this tactic may be successful in compelling the recipients to act decisively in accordance with the politician's

agenda, as they may be motivated to comply due to the fear of public criticism and potential repercussions of inaction. Politicians hope to rally support and foster a sense of shared responsibility by portraying themselves as advocates for the interests of the addressees. This strategy can inspire a sense of collective action and energize public sentiment towards specific subjects. However, it is crucial to take into account any potential drawbacks of such an approach, as it can also lead to polarization, hinder productive discourse, and limit the exploration of diverse perspectives. The Ukrainian president uses this approach in his four speeches, which serve as the basis for the current study, to implore the audience to defend Ukraine against what he considered to be aggression against Ukraine and the Ukrainian people.

The Ukrainian president also employs condemnatory language by utilizing phrases such as "I demand" or "We demand" instead of more neutral alternatives like "I ask" or "We suggest." This rhetorical approach positioned the audience in a position of condemnation, compelling them to take action and assume political and ethical responsibility for their decisions. This linguistic strategy was prominently featured in the president's speech delivered before the Israeli Knesset on March 20, 2022, evoking a distinctly negative response within Israeli circles. He says, "I am sure that every word of my address echoes with pain in your hearts. Because you feel what I'm talking about.

But can you explain why we still turn to the whole world, to many countries for help? We ask you for help... Even for basic visas.” He further states: “What is it? Indifference? Premeditation? Or mediation without choosing a party? I will leave you a choice of answer to this question. And I will note only one thing - indifference kills. Premeditation is often erroneous. And mediation can be between states, not between good and evil.”

The same approach is employed by Zelensky in his address to the US Congress on March 16, 2022, when he states, “This is a terror Europe has not seen for 80 years!, And we ask for a response. For the response from the world. For the response to terror. Is this too much of a request? To establish a no-fly zone over Ukraine is to save people.” He proceeds to say “If that's too much, we offer an alternative. You know what defense systems we need ... You know how much depends on the battlefield on the ability to use aircraft ... To protect your people. Your freedom. Your land. Aircraft that can help Ukraine. That can help Europe.”

In like manner, in his address to the UN Security Council on April 5, 2022, he admonishes the so-called international community for failing to make appropriate decisions to halt the war, stating, “Are you prepared to dissolve the United Nations? Do you believe that the era of international law has passed? If your answer is no, then it is incumbent upon you to act now and take immediate action... If your current efforts are unalterable, and if there is simply no viable solution, then the only remaining

option is for you to fully resolve the situation.” He also admonishes the international community for failing to make appropriate decisions to halt the war, stating, “Are you ready for the dissolving of the UN? Do you think that the time of international law has passed? If your answer is no, you need to act now, act immediately. ... if your current format is unalterable and there is simply no way out, then the only option would be to dissolve yourself altogether.”

Conclusion

This study attempts to offer a deeper understanding of the concept of political discourse. Its main objective is to critically analyze political discourse, highlighting its role as a potent authority that seeks to shape and transform reality through using a range of strategic tools and mechanisms. By delving into the underlying biases and ideologies that often remain concealed within language, this study aims to identify and reveal these elements through the lens of CDA. The ultimate aim is to raise awareness and enhance the understanding of recipients, specifically in relation to the political speeches of President Volodymyr Zelensky of Ukraine.

The four speeches delivered by Zelensky during the initial phase of the Russo-Ukrainian war are examined, addressing the European Union, the US Congress, the Israeli Knesset, and the Security Council. The general context of these speeches is provided through a brief explanation of the roots and causes of

the Russo-Ukrainian war and its escalating intensity since Ukraine's independence until the present day. In addition, the study analyzes the prominent tools and mechanisms employed by the Ukrainian President in these speeches, including biased words and phrases, vague linguistic expressions and terminologies, exaggeration, connotations and inferences, as well as expressions of condemnation.

The statements made by the Ukrainian President in his four speeches represent a deliberate adoption of argumentation techniques within the realm of political discourse, a practice that has been in existence since the emergence of rhetorical skill in speech. Through these techniques, he effectively fulfills his role as a self-proclaimed “leader of his people.” However, despite these endeavors, President Zelensky overlooks numerous significant facts within the context of his four speeches, completely disregarding both the concealed and apparent underlying causes of the Russian war on Ukraine. These causes are intricately connected to Russian national security concerns and its existential anxieties towards NATO, as well as the extent of American influence in critical Russian domains. Such a deliberate omission warrants independent scholarly scrutiny. Can it be asserted that Zelensky's articulated statements encompass the entirety of the truth? Or is it plausible that the unspoken aspects hold greater importance, pose graver consequences, and

are more closely aligned with reality than the content of his speeches?

References

- Address by President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy to the US Congress — Official website of the President of Ukraine.* (March 16, 2022). Official Website of the President of Ukraine. Retrieved July 27, 2022, from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-pered-kong-73609>
- Angermuller, J., Maingueneau, D., & Wodak, R. (2014). *The Discourse Studies Reader: Main currents in theory and analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Benoit W. (2022). *Communication in political campaigns: functional analysis of election messages*. Peter Lang.
- Beukeboom, C. (2014). Mechanisms of linguistic bias: How words reflect and maintain stereotypic expectancies. In J. Laszlo, J. P. Forgas, & O. Vincze (Eds.), *Social cognition and communication* (pp. 313–330). New York: Psychology Press.
- Beukeboom, C., & Burgers, C. (2017). Linguistic bias. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.439>
- Charteris-Black J. (2016). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2017). *Fire metaphors: Discourses of awe and authority*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse, and metaphor*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (2022). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh university press.

- Claridge, C. (2014). *Hyperbole in English: A corpus-based study of exaggeration*. Cambridge University Press.
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2018). *The mediated construction of reality*. John Wiley & Sons.
- De Fina, A., & Georgakopoulou, A. (2019). *The Handbook of Narrative Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Duranti, A. (1993). Truth and intentionality: An ethnographic critique. *Cultural Anthropology*, 8(2), 214–245. <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1993.8.2.02a00050>
- Fairclough N. (2015). *Language and power*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- Hariman, R. (2010). *Political style: The artistry of power*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hodges, A. (2013). *Discourses of war and peace*. Oxford University Press.
- Howarth, D., Glynos, J., & Griggs, S. (2016). Discourse, explanation and critique. *Critical Policy Studies*, 10(1), 99–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2015.1131618>
- Jamieson, K. (2013). *Electing the president, 2012: The insiders' view*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Katz, R., & Mair, P. (2018). *Democracy and the cartelization of political parties*. Oxford University Press.
- Kenski, K., & Jamieson, K. (2017). *The oxford handbook of political communication*. Oxford University Press.
- Kiewe, A. (2020). *The rhetoric of antisemitism: From the origins of Christianity and Islam to the present*. Lexington Books.
- Law, V. (2003). *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600*. Cambridge University Press.

- Mercieca, J. (2020). *Demagogue for president: The rhetorical genius of Donald trump*. Texas A&M University Press.
- Mohammd, K. (2022). Persuasion Strategies in Political Discourse: A Case Study of Boris Johnson: First Speech as Prime Minister. *resmilitaris*, 12(3), 624-632.
- Newstalk. (2022,). President Zelenskyy's full speech to the European Parliament [Video]. In *YouTube*.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IycwCjg4f8Y>
- Ponton, D. (2020). *Understanding Political Persuasion: Linguistic and rhetorical analysis*. Vernon Press.
- Richards, I., Rae, M., Vergani, M., & Jones, C. (2021). Political philosophy and Australian far-right media: A critical discourse analysis of The Unshackled and XYZ. *Thesis Eleven*, 163(1), 103–130.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/07255136211008605>
- Sahmeni, E., & Afifah, N. (2019). Using critical discourse analysis (CDA) in media discourse studies: Unmask the mass media. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 1(2), 39–45.
<https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v1i2.2764>
- Smith, S., & Kabele, J. (2020). Political discourse and mobility of worlds: Arguments for methodological narrative\institutional dualism. *Social Science Information*, 59(4), 604–631.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018420977019>
- Speech by President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy in the Knesset — Official website of the President of Ukraine*. (March 20, 2022). Official Website of the President of Ukraine. Retrieved July 27, 2022, from
<https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-v-kneseti-73701>

- Speech by the President of Ukraine at a meeting of the UN Security Council — Official website of the President of Ukraine.* (April 5, 2022). Official Website of the President of Ukraine. Retrieved July 27, 2022, from <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-na-zasidanni-radi-bezpeki-oon-74121>
- Tannen, D. (2010). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. (2010). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach.* Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. (2015). Critical discourse studies. A sociocognitive Approach. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, 3(1), 63-74.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2017). *Discourse and power.* Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Williams, D., Young, M., & Launer, M. (2022). *The rhetorical rise and demise of democracy in Russian political discourse. Volume 2: The Promise of Democracy During the Yeltsin Years.* Academic Studies Press.
- Wodak R. (2011). *The discourse of politics in action: politics as usual.* Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak R. (2022). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. *Handbook of Pragmatics: Manual. Second Edition* 426–18.
<https://benjamins.com/catalog/hop.m2.hop.m2.cri1>