

Ideologeme «Order» In Modern American Linguistic World Image

Aygul Z. Ibatova^a, Larisa V. Vdovichenko^b, Lubov K. Ilyashenko^a

^aIndustrial University of Tyumen, ^bSurgut State University, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

The paper studies the topic of modern American linguistic world image. It is known that any language is the most important instrument of cognition of the world by a person but there is also no doubt that any language is the way of perception and conceptualization of this knowledge about the world. In modern linguistics linguistic world image is referred to as integral global world image which is the result of all mental activity of a person and comes out of during all contacts of a person with the world itself and his ideas about the world. The paper touches upon the idea that political thinking, political activity and language are in close interaction. The paper also considers the problem of an ideologeme as a linguo-cognitive phenomenon. The authors suggest some examples of the use of «order» ideologeme as a means of ideological representation and expression of political sentiments and political hopes, and also ambitions of both an individual and the whole society in general.

KEYWORDS

American linguistic world-image, ideologeme

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 04 July 2016

Revised 24 July 2016

Accepted 9 August 2016

Introduction

The relevance of the study

The relevance of cognitive-discourse study of the ideologeme “order” in Modern American linguistic world image is principally conditioned by the need of ideologemes research, prospects for political linguistics development, and defined by the problems of ideological use of a language and language changes connected with them. The discourse nature of ideologies regeneration makes linguistic approach the integral component of wide-ranging multidisciplinary studies of an ideological phenomenon.

CORRESPONDENCE Aygul Zufarovna Ibatova ✉ Email: aigoul@rambler.ru

© 2016 Ibatova, Vdovichenko and Ilyashenko. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

Modern problems in linguistic world image and the term “ideologeme” research

Conceptualization of the world is developed by a person during his interaction with the world around him and is verbalized by linguistic means. Thereby a lot of researchers use the term “linguistic world image” (Yu.D. Apresyan, G. Gachev, N.V. Dmitryuk, Yu.N. Karaulov, G.V. Kolshansky, M.M. Makovsky, S.Ye. Nikitina, V.I. Postovalova, N.Ye. Sulimenko and others). World image is represented as some global image, the combination of values and world views. All mental spheres of a person turn to take part in developing it. World image is the way in which the information about the real world is to be structured; it seems to be the way of understanding the world since a person sees the world around him as a “picture”, in which all objects and phenomena are interchanged and interdependent. Mental world image is based on extra occupational colloquial model or naïve world image (Yu.D. Apresyan, S.A. Kosharnaya, V.I. Postovalova, N.Ye. Sulimenko and others), which includes both traditional conceptualizations and cultural dominant ideas of a particular ethno-cultural community and new ones as well.

In modern linguistics linguistic world image is referred to as “integral global world image which is the result of all mental activity of a person and comes out of during all contacts of a person with the world itself and his ideas about the world” [3, p. 120]. Representatives of different epochs, social, national and aged groups can have different world images. These world images can be transformed by way of acquiring new knowledge and new information about the real world. Modern linguistics also admits that each language reflects its own picture of the world reflected in a language. Therefore in linguistics it is accepted to speak about a linguistic world image. In the linguistic world image of every nation and every native speaker it is reflected how a person sees the world around him, how he comprehends and interprets it.

As ideologeme functioning is widely used within political discourse, we think it is necessary to consider modern linguistic theories of political discourse, its main characteristics and functions. A lot of Russian and foreign scholars (V.N. Bazulev, A.N. Baranov, R. Wodak, N.A. Gerasimenko, T. A. van Dijk, P. Chilton, A.P. Chudinov, Ye. I. Sheygal and others) believe that political thinking, political activity and language are in close interaction. That’s the reason why political discourse can be the target of cross-disciplinary research. P. Chilton, analyzing the theory and practice of political discourse, points out that “there is important but still unclear interrelation between language and politics in spite of the fact that political discourse studying dates back to the western classical rhetoric. Generally speaking politics is nothing but the use of a language” [2, p. 14]. In reference to linguistics this interest in political discourse studying lead to the origin of a new independent scientific discipline – political linguistics – the development of which was established by the society’s growing interest in the conditions and mechanisms of political communication. A subject of political linguistics has become “political communication, i.e. language behaviour, focused on propaganda of some ideas, emotional impact on citizens of the country and their motivation to political activity in order to formulate public consent, acceptance and justification of socio-political decisions under the conditions of

multiplicity of views in the society” (URL: <http://www.philology.ru/linguistics2/chudinov-03a.htm>).

Concerning the term “ideologeme” nowadays there are several approaches to its study as a linguo-cognitive phenomenon. On the one hand there is a traditional approach known as a linguistic one. A narrow (lexicological) and a wide (semiotic) approaches are usually differentiated in its framework. On the other cognitive-oriented approach has been actively developed in recent years [Malusheva, 2009; Nachimova, 2011]. In modern political linguistics under cognitive approach “an ideologeme is thought out as a phenomenon forming conceptual schemes and categories, specifying the processes of perception, adaptation and evaluation of the information given about this or that ideologically important object. Semantic and emotional content of ideologemes can be differently understood by addresses as ideologemes represent a specific point of view on the corresponding reality” [4, p. 194].

In a narrower sense an ideologeme is considered as a word, a set phrase, a phraseological unit which has a certain ideological meaning, a shade of meaning, some kind of a verbal stereotype. Signs of estimation of words relating to the ideologemes semantic field are arranged, as a rule, according to the state ideological attitudes as the ideology is “a special way of society creation which assumes unequal structure of power and social order” [5, p. 18].

A number of studies provide an opportunity to insist that in a language an ideologeme is the most widespread means of ideological representation and expresses political sentiments and political hopes, and also ambitions of both an individual and the whole society in general.

We will rely on some ideas of cognitive-oriented approach while discussing the term “ideologeme” (N.I. Klushina, A.A. Miroshnichenko, Ye.G. Malusheva, Ye.A. Nachimova and others). The essential message is that an ideologeme is defined as a special cognitive unit which gives a specified ideological meaning and emotional content to a fact or an action and has an increased axiological degree, the characteristics of which depend on ideological positions, regulations and party instructions.

The 21st century has brought not only an economic crisis, but also certain changes in political life, political views and preferences of Americans, and, thus, in their linguistic world image: «We are just now stuck between eras. The old order – the Reagan-age institutions built on the premise that do no wrong and the government no right – is dying. A new order, in which Wall Street plays a diminished role, is emerging [Newsweek, 02.10.2008].

According to the American mass media when Barack Obama, the current U.S. President, the 15th from the Democratic Party, ran for his presidency, he personified a new order. «Obama is trying to emerge in the role as Restorer of Order – the deal-doer and peacemaker, the one who can bring hope by listening to everyone and working with anyone»[Newsweek, 30.09.2008].

But in a year the American political discourse records a great deal of critical comments. For example, «For a guy whose campaign was renowned for order, Obama’s Cabinet appointments have been a tad messy. But let’s face it: he’s the most powerful man in the world» [Time, 19.03. 2009].

At the beginning of the 1990-s the USA claimed to be a global leader and the Americans themselves believed in overwhelming power of their ideology. “No

wonder the USA considered itself to be the leader of progressive mankind called for leading the world in its movement to freedom and prosperity. The works justifying the right of the USA for the world supremacy began to be published one by one over the sea. All of them approved the idea that the United States are the author and leader of the gaining pace process of globalization. Moreover this country appears to be the guarantor of this process as well. The burden of a lawmaker, a judge, a sheriff who leads, moves up underperformers, punishes troublemakers lies heavy on America”[1, p. 18]. Since then the ideologeme “order” has taken some special place in the American political discourse. After Saddam Husayn’s regime fell there was a lot of talk everywhere in the world about Washington-run world order, the USA absolute domination by virtue of which this country took the liberty to intervene into affairs of other states. Consequently, in the American linguistic world image the ideologeme “order” is referred to as a medium of expressing the value “observance of legality and law and order in different countries of the world”: “Russia’s political “stability” hasn’t produced a society based on any conventional sense of law and order” [Andrew Nagorski. Newsweek, 09.02.2009].

Modern American world image reflects a lot the Americans’ interest in the present-day world order as well as in the new one. The thing is at the beginning of the 21st century the international community happened to face the new world order. “Last year President of Iran Mahmoud Ahmadinejad spoke at one of his press-conferences about new order which will be created by new world powers. America alone became really unable to secure world order; even in Bagdad we can’t establish any order” [David Ignatius. New World Disorder. The Washington Post, 04.05.2007].

According to many political scientists, after Saddam Hussein's regime fell, in the international relations the era of a monopolar world has come which was understood as the USA supremacy. “Washington tried to create “Pax Americana” in the whole world. American power is something like incredible, nobody can come anywhere near it; therefore the USA allows itself to attack objectionable, and all the rest have to either ingratiatingly agree with Washington or cowardly to keep mum. As for this tendency, it will grow stronger and stronger. But these conclusions, however, were incorrect” [1, c. 18]. Realities of modern international policy are such that the economy of the USA turned to be in deep crisis. In the American society a new value appeared i.e. search for its own niche and understanding its own role in the new world order. The appearance of this new value cannot but be fixed in the American linguistic world image. The lexeme “order” received a powerful ideological meaning therefore in political texts the ideologeme “order” appeared as well. “Obama promises the world a renewed America. With a steel never so pronounced in his campaign, he challenged America’s adversaries – and, recently, some of its oldest friends – who have spied an America diminished by economic distress and war, and heralded a new world order in which America would give up much of its power” [The New York Times, 20.01.2009].

In 2014 Henry Kissinger's book “The World Order” went out and the name of the author speaks for itself. Kissinger, who held a post of the U.S. Secretary of State, used to work with such American presidents as Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford. Kissinger served not only to these two presidents, but practically to all leaders of the recent times as a national security adviser. In his book he gives

insight into many difficult issues. Among which are ISIS (“Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant”), Ukrainian crisis, Syria, relationships with Iran. Rana Mitter, a British historian, Professor of the History and Politics of Modern China at the Institute for Chinese Studies at Oxford University analyses the book and notes: “Kissinger was a key shaper of a world order that remained stable for a quarter century or more until our own post-cold war era. This urgently written book is a fine account of world order in the *longue duree*, and also a memorandum to future generations of policymakers that the next half-century will be no easier to manage than the most recent one” (URL: <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/oct/01/world-order-by-henry-kissinger-review-account>).

It appears to be that in Henry Kissinger's book “The World Order” values and regulations of modern America were mirrored. The author writes: “The concept of order that has underpinned the modern era is in crisis”. Henry Kissinger's message, or to be more exact, his ideological message is simple and clear enough: “The world is drifting, unattended, and America, an indispensable part of any new order, has yet to answer even basic questions, like “What do we seek to prevent?” and “What do we seek to achieve?” (URL: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/henry-kissinger-on-the-assembly-of-a-new-world-order-1409328075>).

Thus to play a responsible role in the 21st century world order evolution, the United States must be ready to give the answer to a number of questions. The most important of them are “What do we aim not to allow? What do we aim to reach?”

Needless to say, the new world order cannot be created by efforts of the only one country. The global system should get broad international support. When studying the lessons of difficult decades it is necessary to see and recognize an exclusive role of America. Summing it up, Kissinger makes a conclusion that in this question the USA can be only the leader though it must be said it is controversial enough.

As the analysis shows, the ideologeme “order” updated in the American linguistic world image hinges on native speakers’ political and ideological ideas.

Methods of study

This data was collected by the following groups of research methods: contextual analysis, cognitive-discourse analysis, linguistic and cultural analysis, and continuous sampling method, some elements of quantitative analysis, and ideologemes arrangement and classification.

The experimental base of the study

The research was conducted during 2007-2014 years. The data for study was represented by political texts from American printing and electronic mass media: “New York Times”, “The Washington Post”, “Newsweek”, “Time”, www.humanevents.com, www.voanews.com and others. About 800 ideologemes were analyzed, 560 of which – the ideologeme “order”, others – the ideologeme “

CONCLUSION

Taking into consideration the results of this research, we'd like to note that the value of the new world order is quite typical for the American linguistic world image nowadays. Semantics of the ideologeme "order" specifically "observation of law and order in different countries of the world" squares with the existing in the USA system of values. It's a testament to the fact that the USA seeks global leadership.

Summing it up, we make a conclusion that the ideologeme "order" is an example of potent indoctrination effect.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Aygul Zufarovna Ibatova is an associate professor of the chair "Sciences and Humanities", Industrial University of Tyumen, Surgut, Russia

Larisa Vladimirovna Vdovichenko is an associate professor of Surgut State University, Russia

Lubov Kiryalovna Ilyashenko is an associate professor of the chair "Sciences and Humanities", Industrial University of Tyumen, Surgut, Russia

References

- Bazhanov, Ye. «Pax Americana» failure // The echo of the planet. - 2009. - №45. – P. 18.
- Chilton, P. Analyzing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice / P. Chilton. – London: Routledge, 2004. – 224 p.
- Maslova, V. A. Modern trends in linguistics / V. A. Maslova. – M.: Akademia, 2008. – 272 p.
- Nachimova, Ye.A. Precedent onims in modern Russian mass-media: theory and methods of cognitive-discursive research: monogr. / Ye.A. Nachimova. – Yekaterinburg: SEE HPE" Ural state pedagogical university", 2011. – 276 p.
- Wodak, R. Disorders of Discourse / R. Wodak. – London and New York: Longman, 1996. – 200 p.