

DOI: 10.31548/hspedagog14(4).2023.190-195
УДК

THE ROLE OF MEDIA DISCOURSE IN COVERAGE OF MILITARY CONFLICTS

HEIKO S. M., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and
International Communication

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: svt.geyko@gmail.com

HEIKO T. M., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Romance Philology at
the Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

E-mail: t.heiko@knu.ua

LAUTA O. D., PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Inter-
national Communication

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

E-mail: elena.lauta@gmail.com

PRYTYKA O. I., Postgraduate student

Department of Management and Educational Technology

E-mail: kondratochka@gmail.com

Abstract. *The article is researched the role of media discourse in the coverage of military conflicts in the philosophical dimension of modernity. The attitude of social groups towards military actions often depends on how these events are presented by the media. The discourse on war should only be considered at an interdisciplinary level. We get this opportunity thanks to the critical analysis of the discourse, which embodied and expanded the research credo about the sociality and psychology of human language, formulated in the middle of the 21-th century.*

Key words: *culture, language, discourse, mediadiscourse, mass media, communication, military conflicts, text, intertextuality.*

Introduction. In the most general terms, discourse can be considered as a system of signs and images representing certain ways of marking, interpretation and representation, which produce the generation of meaning. At the same time, discourse is power, the power of the symbolic order, because discourse exercises control over people's minds, forms a certain system of meanings, meanings, ideas, values, preferences, mythologized images, and stereotypes in public consciousness. Its main agents are representatives of the «symbolic elite» - writers, teachers, journalists, orators, propagandists, as well as political ideologues, cultural figures, show business, advertising creators, popular TV presenters, bloggers.

As we have already seen, today the media are the main providers of information, thanks to which the audience is aware of what is happening, and also forms its opinion about current events. In the conditions of a conflict, especially a military one, the influence of mass media on the audience is in the most general terms, discourse can be considered as a system of signs and images representing particularly clear. They can act both as a propagandist of the official point of view and as an oppositional actor in the political process.

Such an initial attitude contributes to the fact that the mass media act as both an opportunity and a threat for the parties involved in a military conflict: the opportunity is manifested in the favorable coverage of events for one of the parties, the

threat is in the generation of negative information for the other party.

Analysis of recent researches and publications. The problem of analysis of mass media discourse about war is closely related to the institutions of propaganda, ideology, information warfare and manipulation of public consciousness. They are actualized in the discourse, being «the basis of social practices... and influencing them» [2, p. 249]. Therefore, when analyzing media discourse, only structural analysis is not enough, since discourse is not only a textual structure, but also a complex communicative phenomenon that includes the social context (perceptions of mass communication participants and their characteristics) and various strategies (underlying media news production).

Purpose. The purpose of the article is to study the role of media discourse in the coverage of military conflicts in the philosophical dimension of modernity.

Methods. Complex of cognitive methods, in particular, scientific methods of historical and cultural research, critical analysis of cultural, historical, literary sources, specific historical analysis and interdisciplinary synthesis, induction and deduction, semantic-semiotic, hermeneutic and comparative methods will serve as the methodological basis of the cultural reflection of media discourse. Of the concrete scientific methods, problem-chronological and system-structural methods were used, as well as the method of socio-phenomenological analysis.

Results. As the French philosopher M. Foucault wrote, «discourse is not just something that conveys a struggle or a system of domination, it is the thing through which this struggle takes place, discourse is the power that needs to be seized» [5]. Therefore, in addition to the concepts of propaganda and ideology, the media's discourse on war is also associated with power.

Power is a complex concept that encompasses social, political and economic features and can be understood from different perspectives. Understanding power can be useful from the perspective of hegemony, that is, a system of domination based not on violence or economic control, but on political, cultural, and institutional influence. Hegemony establishes institutional control over ideas and, as a result, influences social practices, so it is a path to power that encompasses the public. Cultural dominance, dominant ideas, events or things, are introduced into society through discourse. Therefore, there is power over language, power that gives legitimacy to language. This is what can be called power over the discourse.

However, it is necessary to distinguish between the exercise of power through discourse and the power of discourse. Researcher Jean Blommart states that «the mass media have the power to create deep ideological messages out of trivial, sociologically insignificant events or phenomena. The passing of a message through mass media transforms it into a message of great importance» [5]. In this way, the mass media exercise a certain power – the power to formulate and transmit messages to the public. The researcher claims that the power of discourse represents a secondary power, an authorized power that serves the interests of the higher power.

The researcher Pierre Bourdieu notes that the linguistic exchange, that is, the communication between the addressee and the addressee, is similar to the economic exchange established between the producer, who has a certain power, and the consumer. Thus, utterances not only need to be understood, «they are also signs of wealth to be valued and signs of authority to be obeyed» [1].

The term «ideology» is closely related to power and is crucial to this concept, as it embodies power, legitimizes it

through cognitive processes. Ideology is a set of beliefs, a conceptualization of ideas, which, even if they are considered neutral in themselves, through the representation of social reality in the media carry out manipulation. From this point of view, ideology is considered as an idea, discourse or practice in the service of the struggle for obtaining or maintaining power.

However, the whole concept of ideology is more complex. In a narrow sense, ideology can be considered as a representation of ideas or tools of the struggle for power. However, a more abstract concept of ideology, formulated by Bourdieu, Althusser, Foucault, states that ideology is not focused on one specific object and does not belong to one specific actor – it penetrates through all societies or communities and leads to a normalized model of thought and behavior [1]. Ideology, being a symbolic representation of organized ways of thinking, shapes public opinion and thereby implants the meaning it is supposed to represent. Values circulate and become common ways of thinking. Most of these processes are hidden, not revealed to the public, and therefore effective. People tend to take what they read for granted, and that is how they are controlled. According to van Dijk, people control themselves with the help of ideologies that they have in their heads [2, p. 164].

Cognitive processes are involved in the production and interpretation of discourse, so knowledge is an important link between discourse and society. In other words, «social interaction, social situations and social structures can influence through the interpretation of people of this social environment» [2, p. 143]. Memory (short-term and long-term), mental models (our personal experience, which has a standard hierarchical structure of a spatio-temporal setting, participants, actions/events, goals, semantic models that take into account personal interpretation

of discourse, contextual models that represent the communicative situation) and social cognition (general and abstract knowledge of the world, attitudes, ideologies), all of this consists of cognitive structures that help produce and understand discourse [2, p. 195].

While knowledge is universal and common to all, attitudes and ideologies are shared only by certain groups. Ideology is a system of beliefs shared by groups in order to promote their interests and conduct social and political practices [2, p. 166]. Ideology is the «definition» of a group in terms of their identity, actions, goals, norms and values, resources, interests; in addition to this, ideology is usually addressed in relations with other social groups. According to van Dijk, discourse plays a key role in the exercise of power. He understands power in terms of controlling the actions of certain groups and controlling their personal and collective feelings (attitudes, knowledge, ideology). Since control is often manipulative, it is not always easy for the public to expose ideologies.

This manipulative function of mass media discourse, which was previously discussed, is becoming more and more noticeable today. The media actually control culture, passing it through itself as a «filter», isolating certain elements from the general mass, giving special weight to some, devaluing others. What does not get into mass communication channels, in today's world, has practically no effect on the development of society. Often, the appearance of any topic in the press is determined by the interests of the ruling elites, who benefit from a certain orientation of public opinion and consciousness. A person, therefore, cannot avoid the influence of the media.

In the process of covering military events, the mass media form discursive versions of reality, with the help of which a program is set that orients the readership. Discursive versions of reality produce stereotypes and prejudices.

It is worth noting that war is a socio-political phenomenon that represents the extreme form of solving socio-political, economic, ideological, as well as national, religious, territorial and other contradictions between states, peoples, nations, classes and social groups by means of military violence. According to the norms of international humanitarian law, a war is considered as such if there is an official declaration of war.

Today, countries rarely declare war on each other, but as we can see, wars do not disappear. In such conditions, the Geneva Conventions of 1949 introduced the concept of «armed conflict», in particular, an interstate armed conflict means a situation of «declared war or any other armed conflict arising between two or more Contracting Parties, even if one of them does not recognize the state of war». According to this article, international armed conflicts arise between states when one or more parties use their military resources against another party regardless of the reasons or strength of the confrontation.

However, everyone knows that today there is a hybrid version of war, for which the norms of international humanitarian law do not apply. It takes place without announcement, while the aggressor party tries and can remain publicly uninvolved in the resolved conflict. It is important that the media play one of the main roles in the hybrid war – they can create internal social contradictions through propaganda with the transition to information warfare.

Also, the signs of a hybrid war are:

- 1) creation of economic problems with the transition to an economic war, and most importantly – opposition to the ties of the victim country with neighboring countries;
- 2) support for separatism and terrorism;
- 3) promoting the creation of irregular armed formations (insurgents, partisans, etc.) and their equipment.

All these signs are inherent in the actions of the Russian Federation and indicate that it is waging a hybrid war against Ukraine. It is important that this is understood not only in Ukraine, but also at the international level. The mass media serve as the best indicator of the moods and perceptions of the international community.

Language is widely used as a tool to exercise power, ideology, establish discrimination and build inequality. In fact, language can be considered as a secret weapon, because the hidden meanings and consequences that can be deliberately embedded in texts are not always obvious to the public. Mechanisms of mind control and manipulation applied through discourse contribute to the reproduction and reinforcement of power and control. Therefore, the role of language in these processes should not be underestimated. Even more important is the role of language and discourse in armed conflict. The attitude of the readership to the parties involved in the conflict, and to the conflict itself, often depends on the first assessments and opinions, on those versions of the events that were the first to get into the mass media.

Language means have unlimited possibilities in creating and spreading ethnic prejudices, in building different versions of reality, as well as in orienting public consciousness. Researcher I. V. Zhukov notes that communication according to the «media-recipient» scheme has an asymmetric nature: there is a temporal and local disconnection of the communication participants, which weakens the discursive protection of the mass audience and opens up the possibility of manipulating the consciousness of the collective recipient. The version of military reality that is actualized in the mass media is taken for granted due to insufficient personal military experience of the audience and the status of the source of information.

Also, the military discourse of the media is characterized by the selection of language means for the special nomination of the parties to the conflict, their actions, polarization of the version of reality along the lines of collective – WE-THEM – and individual – I-YOU, WE, THEM – polarization. Linguistic features of military media discourse are:

- in the special functioning of the lexical-semantic field (LSF) «war» (does not depend on the composition of WE-GROUPS and THEY-GROUPS);

- in the use of lexical restrictions and euphemisms, which perform the functions of minimizing the speaker's responsibility, hiding the relationship to information, protecting against false interpretations, etc.;

- in the predominance of lexical stylistic means (ideologically evaluative epithets, metonymy, metaphor);

- in the peculiarities of temporal deixis (indication of the preceding aggressive actions of THEM-GROUP and – as a result – in response to the reaction of WE-GROUP) and discourse deixis (reference to an unclear source of information, double references characterizing the degree of data interpretation);

- in the structure and methods of argumentation and counter argumentation of discursive versions of the conflict.

Viewers are used to reading conventional language without thinking about the laws of its construction, about what is hidden behind external rules, ideological and technical restrictions. Since printed newspapers and their online versions are the main sources of information for the lion's share of the population, studying the discourse of war in online publications allows us to learn how the mass media can influence public opinion and shape views on important political events.

Conclusion. The attitude of social groups towards military actions often depends on how these events are presented by the media. Here we can even talk about the programming of thinking, since

a ready-made thought (interpretation of reality) placed in any ideological template is presented to the readership. Limiting yourself to the description of only the manipulative influence of media discourse is incorrect, because it is carried out along with informational, psychological and ideological influence. However, the manipulative component plays a significant role in orienting public opinion and is of undeniable interest for describing the linguistic structure of the media's discourse on war.

The discourse on war should only be considered at an interdisciplinary level. We get this opportunity thanks to the critical analysis of the discourse, which embodied and expanded the research credo about the sociality and psychology of human language, formulated in the middle of the 20th century.

References

1. Бурдые, П. (2011) О телевидении. Эффект скрытой структуры [Bourdieu, P. Television. Hidden structure effect]. Online. Режим доступа: <http://bourdieu.name/content/bourdieu-o-televidenii> [Accessed 15 Aug. 2022] (in Russia).
2. Дейк, Т. А. (2010). Язык. Познание. Коммуникация [Dyck, T. A. Language. Cognition. Communication]. Б.: БГК им. И. А. Бодуэна де Куртенэ. (in Russia).
3. Павленко, Н. О. (2015). Основні підходи та методи дослідження дискурсу [Pavlenko, N. O. Main approaches and methods of discourse research]. Вісник Житомирського державного університету ім. І.Франка, 22, 126–128. (in Ukraine).
4. Шевченко, И. С. (2021). Дискурс и его категории [Shevchenko, I. S. Discourse and its categories]. Вісник Харківського Національного Університету ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 973, 6-12. (in Russia).
5. Molinier, P. Gutermann, M. (2004). Dynamique des descriptions et des explications dans une représentation

sociale. Textes sur les représentations sociales, 13, 2.1 - 2.12. (in French).

РОЛЬ ДИСКУРСУ МЕДІА У ВИСВІТЛЕННІ ВІЙСЬКОВИХ КОНФЛІКТІВ

Гейко С. М., Гейко Т. М., Лаута О.Д., Притика О.І.

Анотація. Метою статті є дослідження ролі дискурсу медіа у висвітленні військових конфліктів у філософському вимірі сучасності. На сьогоднішній день поняття дискурсу є одним з основних філософських понять, має інтерактивну природу, містить у собі взаємодію, діалог. Поняття медіадискурсу є похідним від загальної концепції дискурсу і становить сукупність процесів і продуктів мовленнєвої діяльності у сфері масової комунікації. Медійний дискурс надає вичерпне уявлення про мовленнєву діяльність у сфері мас-медіа, оскільки охоплює численні екстралінгвістичні фактори, пов'язані з особливостями творення медіаповідомлення, культурно обумовленими способами кодування та декодування, а також соціально-історичним та політико-ідеологічним контекстом. Масова комунікація, тексти якої ви-йшли на позицію домінування над усіма іншими типами текстів у суспільстві, відіграє у сучасному світі провідну роль у здійсненні репрезентації соціальної реальності. Медіа є основними постачальниками інформації, завдяки яким аудиторія усвідомлює те, що відбувається, а також формує свою думку про поточні події. В умовах конфлікту, особливо військового, вплив ЗМІ на аудиторію проявляється особливо чітко. Вони можуть виступати як в ролі пропагандиста офіційної точки зору, так і опозиційно налаштованого актора політичного процесу. Проблема аналізу дискурсу ЗМІ про війну тісно пов'язана з інститутами пропаганди, ідеології, інформаційної війни і маніпуляції суспільною свідомістю. Вони актуалізуються в дискурсі, будучи основою соціальних практик і впливаючи на них. Тому при аналізі дискурсу медіа недостатньо тільки структурного аналізу, оскільки дискурс є не тільки текстовою структурою, а й складним комунікативним явищем, яке включає соціальний контекст (уявлення про учасників масової комунікації та їхніх характеристик) і різні стратегії (лежать в основі виробництва новин ЗМІ). Ставлення соціальних груп до військових дій часто залежить від того, як ці події подаються ЗМІ. Дискурс про війну слід розглядати лише на міждисциплінарному рівні. Таку можливість отримуємо завдяки критичному аналізу дискурсу, який втілює в собі і розширює дослідницьке кредо про соціальність і психологічність людської мови, сформульоване ще в середині XX століття.

Ключові слова: культура, мова, дискурс, медіадискурс, мас-медіа, комунікація, військові конфлікти, текст.