

ISSN 1392-8295



UK
Uniwersytet
Jana Kochanowskiego w Kielcach

mokslo darbai transactions

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS

2013 Nr. 23 (28)

RESPECTUS PHILOLOGICUS Nr. 23 (28)

MOKSLINIS TĖSTINIS LEIDINYS

Leidžia Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas ir Jano Kochanovskio universiteto Humanitarinis fakultetas Kielcuose du kartus per metus (balandžio 25 d. ir spalio 25 d.).

Mokslo kryptis: filologija (04H). Mokslo sritys: gramatika, semantika, semiotika, sintaksė (H 352), bendroji ir lyginamoji literatūra, literatūros kritika, literatūros teorija (H 390).

Pagrindinės kalbos: lietuvių, lenkų, anglų, rusų.

CZASOPISMO NAUKOWE

Wydawcy: Uniwersytet Wileński – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kownie oraz Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach. Ukazuje się dwa razy w roku: 25 kwietnia i 25 października.

Kierunek naukowy: filologia (04H). Dyscypliny naukowe: gramatyka, semiotyka, semantika, syntaktyka (H 352), literatura ogólna i porównawcza, krytyka literacka, teoria literatury (H 390).

Podstawowe języki: polski, litewski, angielski i rosyjski.

ONGOING ACADEMIC PUBLICATION

Published twice a year (April 25, October 25) by Vilnius University Kaunas Faculty of Humanities and The Jan Kochanowski University Faculty of Humanities in Kielce.

Scientific field: philology (04H). Research areas: grammar, semantics, semiotics, syntax (H 352), general and comparative literature, literary criticism, literary theory (H 390).

The journal accepts articles and correspondence written in English, Lithuanian, Polish and Russian.

DUOMENŲ BAZĖS / BAZY DANYCH / ABSTRACTING AND INDEXING

**Elektronische
Zeitschriftenbibliothek (2002)
Arianta (2002)**

Frei zugängliche E-Journals
Universitätsbibliothek Regensburg
Naukowe i branżowe polskie czasopisma elektroniczne
Biblioteka Uniwersytetu Śląskiego
Russian Language, Literature and Cultural Studies

Balcan Rusistics (2004)

Russian Language, Literature and Cultural Studies

C.E.E.O.L. (2005)

Central and Eastern European Online Library
DFG Nationallizenzen

EBSCO (2006)

Humanities International Complete
Humanities Source
Current Abstracts
Humanities International Index
TOC Premier

MLA (2007)

Modern Language Association
International Bibliography

Index Copernicus (2008)

Index Copernicus International
Journal Master List

Lituanistika (2011)

The database of the humanities and social sciences in Lithuania

Linguistic Bibliography Online (2012)

Brill Leiden, Netherlands

Ulrichs (2013)

Ulrich's Periodicals

PATIKRA / WERYFIKACJA / VERIFICATION

CrossCheck, EPAS

Redakcijos adresas / Adres redakcji / Address of the editorial board

Žurnalas „Respectus Philologicus“
Vilniaus universitetas
Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas
Muitinės g. 8, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lietuva
Tel. +370 37 750 536

Respectus Philologicus
Vilnius University
Kaunas Faculty of Humanities
Muitines 8, Kaunas 44280, Lithuania

El. paštas / E-mail respectus@gmail.com

Interneto svetainė / Strona internetowa / Homepage <http://filologija.vukhf.lt>

Moksliniai ir kalbos redaktoriai / Redakcja naukowa i językowa / Proof-readers

Gabija Bankauskaitė-Sereikienė (lietuvių kalba / język litewski / Lithuanian language)
Kazimierz Luciński, Beata Piasecka (lenkų kalba / język polski / Polish language)
Algis Braun (anglų kalba / język angielski / English language)
Eleonora Lassen, Viktorija Makarova (rusų kalba / język rosyjski / Russian language)

Pagrindinė redaktorė / Redaktor prowadzący / Publishing editor

Viktorija Makarova

Vertimas / Tłumaczenie / Translation

Živilė Nemickienė, Beata Piasecka

Print ISSN 1392-8295, Online ISSN 2335-2388

© Vilniaus universiteto Kauno humanitarinis fakultetas, 2013

© Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego – Wydział Humanistyczny w Kielcach, 2013

Vilma Linkevičiūtė*Vilnius University**Kaunas Faculty of Humanities**Muitinės g. 8, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lietuva**Tel.: +370 37 422 477**E-mail: l.vilma@mailcity.com**Research interests: cognitive linguistics, political discourse, conflict communication*

**OPPOSITIONS AND THEIR MEMBER NOMINATIONS
IN THE CONFLICT COMMUNICATION DISCOURSE
OF ROLANDAS PAKSAS (2003–2004)**

The object of this article is the linguistic means of political conflict communication that are characteristic of the political discourse of the former President of the Republic of Lithuania, Rolandas Paksas (2003–2004). In modern democratic societies, political life is founded upon the actions of political parties, their duly elected leaders, and various political ideologies. In this context, political discourse, which records a variety of opinions and, frequently, their conflict, becomes an inseparable element of political culture. Conflict communication in political discourse may be perceived as the main research object of political linguistics, because the attack and winning of governmental positions occur in the context of the conflict of various political forces. That conflict is expressed through discourse.

The aim of this study is to analyze how conflict communication was manifested in Lithuania during the period from 2003 to 2004. In political communication, an initial situation of verbal and non-verbal actions can become a source of conflict, while disapproval of such a situation is verbalized in political communication. Any individual who wants to influence political events becomes the subject of such communication. Moreover, this article discloses the fact that linguistic means are closely related to the ideology of the speaker and linguistic practices are conditioned by culture.

KEY WORDS: conflict communication, political discourse, domain, meaning field, concept.

Conflict communication has become an object of research in modern conflictology, which mainly focuses on interpersonal conflict and effective methods of managing conflict solutions. Political conflict communication, which is generally analysed on the basis of parliamentary debates, does not have a precise definition. Conflict communication can be defined as verbalizing conflict situations, which are determined by disagreements about set objectives or their means of implementation, and by discrepancies between the interests and wishes of

the agents involved in the conflict. In political communication, an initial situation of verbal and non-verbal actions can become a source of conflict, while disapproval of such a situation is verbalized in political communication. Any individual who wants to influence political events becomes the subject of such communication. The object of this study is the linguistic means of political conflict communication that are characteristic of the political discourse of the former President of Lithuania, Rolandas Paksas (2003–2004).

The aim of this research is to analyze how conflict communication was manifested in Lithuania during the period from 2003 to 2004. Pursuing the aim, the following tasks were set out: 1) to identify meaning fields significant for the communication of the Lithuanian political subject; 2) to identify the linguistic means of the discourse of the Lithuanian political leader Paksas; 3) to identify the particularity of Paksas's political communication as an expression of political conflict. From the perspective of linguistic methodology, the research was performed within the framework of comparative analysis and descriptive-analytical methods.

The data are randomly selected speeches and interviews delivered in the period of 2003–2004. Ten speeches made by the former President of Lithuania, Rolandas Paksas, were investigated. The data were taken from official government and media internet sites.

Political discourse is inseparable from politics, and politics is inseparable from ideology. Political social life may be regarded as the object of political discourse. The combination of these phenomena is the society's ideology. "Discourse and politics can be related in essentially two ways: (a) at a socio-political level of description, political processes and structures are constituted by situated events, interactions and discourses of political actors in political contexts, and (b) at a socio-cognitive level of description, shared political representations are related to individual representations of these discourses, interactions and contexts" (van Dijk 2002: 204–205).

Lassan (1995) approaches discourse as an ideologized phenomenon based on binary oppositions where one member of the opposition is perceived as positive

and legitimate and the other member as negative. The aim of political discourse is to consolidate the content of the positive member as the society's value landmark, while denying that the content of the other member of the opposition could be feasible in social life.

The democratic system divides the political power between a political majority and an opposition. Van Dijk (1995) suggests that from the ideological point of view there are *us* versus *them* dimensions, "in which speakers of one group will generally tend to present themselves or their own group in positive terms, and other groups in negative terms" (van Dijk 1995: 22). The political majority is the political leader him/herself and his/her colleagues from the same political party which won the majority of votes. The political majority has the aim to motivate their right to be in power and, for this reason, they legitimize their actions. The opposition, on the contrary, controls the power by watching the majority and expressing declarative protests, if necessary. Such a situation determines disapproval of power actions and leads to conflict communication.

Laclau and Mouffe (1985) suppose that groups in society are always formed during political discursive processes. The question of identity is also very important in political discourse. According to Jorgensen and Phillips (2004), a subject acquires identity through discursive practices. An individual may have different identities, which may also vary. When shared underlying identities emerge, people start to cluster into groups; on the basis of such groups, they ignore other identities and so eliminate them from political games. The identities that are ignored become classified as *others*. This aspect is of crucial importance in conflict communication as analysed

in this article, where one communication partner is defined as *we* (the *insiders*) and the other as *they* (the *outsiders*).

Researchers of conflict communication stress its cognitive nature and indicate reasons for such cognitive conflict. Gurdjan (2008) points out that cognitive conflict may be attributed to communicative-pragmatic factors which appear as a result of the violation of cognitive-communicative norms. Cognitive conflict emerges as a clash of two conditions, two possible worlds, and is expressed by the interlocutors in real (explicit) and virtual (implicit) propositions. The relevance of such propositions is denied during the resolution of the cognitive conflict. According to Phillips and Jorgensen (2008), political conflict communication helps to eliminate alternative ways of perceiving the world and suggests that only one attitude is possible.

In conflict communication, the choice of nominations—the adjectives, nouns, verbs and phrases which are attributed by political leaders to their opponents—is determined by the aim to negatively affect the attitude of society towards them, their ideology and behaviour. Certain nominations are used in order to form stereotypes about political and personal opponents. These stereotypes are beneficial to those in power, to win their fight for power and to achieve their personal aims. Nominations are also used to create a more positive image of the political leader and his/her colleagues. According to Bolinger (1987), the choice of nominations is essential in order to create the intended picture of the world; thus, particular nominations are used for particular reasons in propaganda to manipulate the consciousness of the addressees.

Conflict may be expressed both directly and indirectly. The main reasons for political conflict in Lithuania are based on the fact that the President protects his right to

power and expresses his dissatisfaction with the performance of the Government and the Parliament.

Rolandas Paksas stayed in the President's position for slightly more than one year, during which time the Constitutional Court initiated three indictments related to his breaches of the Constitution. The Parliament supported the indictments and initiated the impeachment process. In this situation, the Constitutional Court and the Parliament may be treated as the President's opponents, while Paksas is a defendant protecting himself from their accusations.

In his conflict communication during the impeachment, Paksas employed two strategies—the integration of the addressee (i.e., himself) and the segregation of the opponents. These strategies are represented through the already presented dichotomy *I-THEY*. This model discloses an antithesis between *I*, which is identified with the citizens of Lithuania and claims to be the defender of national interests, and *THEY*, who are fictitious supporters of national interests and democracy.

The *benefit* domain prevails in Paksas's discourse. This domain includes all the beneficial things that this political leader has done for the state and the citizens during his short period of governing. On the other hand, that *benefit* is contrasted with the actions of all of his opponents.

Firstly, Paksas puts emphasis on the state; therefore, the meaning fields *welfare-detriment* are investigated in his political discourse. Naturally, this political leader associates *welfare* with his performance (*I*) while a large number of his opponents (*THEY*) are blamed for all the negative issues and decisions. This is emphasized by the President's identification with the state, which is revealed with the help of the inclusive pronouns *mūsų, mes (our, we)*:

(1) „*Visa tai stiprina mano tikėjimą, kad mes, Lietuvos žmonės, išlaikysime mums tekusį išbandymą.*“ (2004); (2) „*Mūsų šalis siekė ir sieks, kad Europos Sąjunga būtų demokratiška ir efektyvi organizacija, kurioje girdimas kiekvienos šalies balsas.*“ (2004); (3) „*Be to, pabrėžiau, kad šiuo metu Lietuvoje sukelta politinė sumaištis neturi sulėtinti mūsų žingsnių.*“ (2004).

These statements, delivered to the foreign ambassadors living in Lithuania, are complemented by inclusive pronouns and the following words: *mes, Lietuvos žmonės; mums* (*we are the Lithuanian people; for us*) (see example (1)) and *mūsų* (*our*) (see examples (2) and (3)). These examples express the idea of solidarity and introduce Paksas as a mental subject—the President believes and thinks, but he does not talk about any real actions. On the one hand, this politician appears to be a victim, but on the other hand, he looks like an inactive President who wants to do something.

As a result of his identification with the state, Paksas perceives that the charges on the indictment refer to not only his personality but Lithuania, as well: (4) „*Apkaltos procesas yra ne tik mano asmeninė drama ar tragedija, bet ir labai rimtas išbandymas valstybei, jos institucijoms ir visai Lietuvos teisės sistemai.*“ (2004).

This example enables the target audience to perceive Paksas as a subject of feelings. This makes the communication intimate and, as a result of his openness, may evoke the society's sympathy with the latter politician as being attacked by his opponents.

The latter example is instantly followed by another which implies a *detriment* characteristic employed to describe his opponents: (5) „*Tai, be abejo, ir kai kurių politikų bei pareigūnų padorumo, sąžiningumo, moralumo egzaminas, kurį įvertinti teks istorijai.*“ (2004).

In this case, an important *THEIR* (some politicians') nomination is present. It excludes some politicians from the total number of Lithuanians, and also reveals the fact that such people are not numerous. This *THEIR* nomination has a pejorative meaning: if a politician is not named, it means that he is not important. The phrase *egzaminas, kurį įvertinti teks istorijai* (*the exam that will have to be evaluated by history*) stands as an appeal to history. Obviously, the speaker is sure that history is on his side, therefore, he is right.

In order to protect himself from the opponents' accusations and to get the support of society, the President expresses a direct *I–SOME OF THEM* counter-position, based on the features of *benefit* and *detriment* meaning fields: (6) „*Augantis Lietuvos žmonių palankumas ir pritarimas mano veiksams išgašdino kai kurias politines jėgas.*“ (2003).

This *I–SOME OF THEM* dichotomy discloses the idea that *I* am together with every citizen of the Republic of Lithuania. Paksas may be promoting this idea as a strategy to integrate into the society. Because of the society's approval of his actions, as seen in example (6), the actions of the Parliament can be seen as directed against all of Lithuania.

The *I* nomination, expressed through the presentation of *benefit* characteristics, may be analysed on the basis of the President's interests and values, which are presented as beneficial for the state and the society. In the context of the conflict communication taking place during the process of impeachment, this nomination may be treated as purposeful, aimed at presenting Paksas as guiltless, his actions as performed only for the welfare of the Republic of Lithuania. The nomination could be interpreted as meant to evoke the compassion of the electorate

and to make it change its opinion and decision: (7) „*Dabar Jūs priimsite sprendimą. Kad ir koks jis būtų, priimsiu jį garbingai, kaip žmogus, kuriam rūpi ir visada rūpės valstybės, tautos, demokratijos, teisingumo ateitis.*“ (2004).

This claim also helps Paksas to achieve the intended aim of defending himself from his opponents; it introduces him as an honourable, law-abiding person, a supporter of democracy. The intended aim is reinforced by an attack and attribution of the *detriment* characteristic to all his opponents. *THEY* are introduced as active, physically *detrimental* subjects because *THEIR* particular actions are characterized as detrimental: (8) „*Mielieji Lietuvos žmonės, kviečiu nepasiduoti nesantaikos kurstymui ir visuomenės skaldymui.*“ (2003); (9) „*Norėčiau pridurti, kad galvojant valstybės požiūriu, privačios bendrovės akcininkų turtiniai santykiai labai menkas tyrimo objektas palyginti, pavyzdžiui, su milžinišką žalą Lietuvos žmonėms atnešusiu „Mažeikių naftos“ ar kitų bendrovių privatizavimu.*“ (2004); (10) „*Ar ne Lietuvos žmonių nuskurdinimas, vis didėjantis turtinis atotrūkis, grobstomos Europos Sąjungos lėšos, tamsūs privatizavimo sandėriai, korupcija, iš Tėvynės išvažiuojantys žmonės, narkomanija ir organizuotas nusikalstamumas – argi ne visa tai yra tikrosios grėsmės valstybės nacionaliniam saugumui?*“ (2004); (11) „*Pirminiai, dabar jau neminimi kaltinimai ilgus mėnesius ne tik nuolat drumstė Jūsų mintis, skleidė nepasitikėjimą ir skaldė visuomenę, bet ir padarė didžiulę žalą Lietuvai pasaulio akyse.*“ (2004); (12) „*Nors dirbtinai sukeltas skandalas padarė milžiniškos žalos Lietuvai [...].*“ (2004).

The examples presented above were used by Paksas in his political discourse as important weapons in his conflict com-

munication with his numerous opponents; moreover, the politician employs the tactics of blame and accusation. Accusation tactics are evident in example (10). The sentence indirectly, without indicating any agents in particular, points to *THEIR* actions as dangerous to the state. Other statements emphasize the negative results of the opposition's performance to the society. In example (8), the encouragement *kviečiu nepasiduoti* (*I invite you to resist*) is a word subject, while other sentences express action subjects, which may be treated as disclosing the passive role of Paksas in political life.

The *detriment* meaning field is closely related to the *self-interest* meaning field applied to the President's opponents: (13) „*Visi įstatymai, tarp jų ir tie, kurie reguliuoja slaptumą, turi tarnauti ne politinių jėgų interesams, o teisingumui. Jeigu įstatymais slepiama tiesa, jeigu slaptumo žyma uždedama tam, kad būtų galima nuslėpti nusikaltimus, tuomet tokie teisės aktai savo esme yra antidemokratiniai. Tuo dar kartą įsitikinau, susipažinęs su bendrovės „Alita“ privatizavimo byla. Kai Valstybės saugumo departamentas teigia, jog jokių pažeidimų šioje byloje nėra, man yra visiškai aišku, kad ir specialiosios tarnybos mūsų šalyje yra ištrauktos į politinius procesus. Šį faktą aiškiai patvirtina ir Seimo Laikinosios tyrimo komisijos darbo metodai. Ši komisija, kurios funkcija Prezidento apkaltos procedūroje net nėra numatyta, nuo pat pradžių siekė politinio, o ne teisinio vertinimo.*“ (2003); (14) „*Žinau, kad Jus žeidžia neslepiamas įtakingųjų cinizmas: jūs, atseit, nemokėjote, nesugebėjote atsilaužti savo kasnio nuo valstybės kepalą, o mes mokame ir sugebame.*“ (2004).

In example (13), Paksas directly defines his opponents as subjects who perform inadmissible actions, and accuses them of *self-interest*. The State Security Department and

the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament are two major institutions which, according to Paksas, should be perceived by the citizens as acting in their own interests; they are presented as the negative competing agents in the conflict communication. The President's words, with the help of the negation *ne* and contrast, express the segregation of the already introduced opponents (*THEIR*) and an indictment of *THEM*: *turi tarnauti ne politinių jėgų interesams, o teisingumui; nuo pat pradžių siekė politinio, o ne teisinio vertinimo ([...] have to serve not the interests of political forces, but justice; [...] from the very beginning aimed at political but not legal assessment)*. In example (14), the President dissociates himself from the Government and the Parliament, defines *THEM* as influential (*itakingujų*), and blames *THEM* for having and serving their own *self-interest* and *benefit*. In this case, the negative prefix in the verb *nesugebėjote* (*did not manage*) presents a totally different connotation than in example (13). It is meant to emphasize the innocence and positivity of Paksas, who, he claims, did not have *self-interest*: *nesugebėjote atsilaužti savo kėsnio nuo valstybės kepalą (you did not manage to bite out of the state loaf)*.

Another opposition which can be observed in the *benefit* domain is *equality–inequality*. These meaning fields are formed on the basis of the key words *vienodai* (*equally*) and *lygus* (*equal*). Paksas introduces the period of his governing as one of *equality* while treating other political ideologies as being responsible for *inequality*: (15) „*Neturiu mylimų ir nemylimų pareigūnų. Vertinu žmones pagal darbą.*“ (2003); (16) „*Valstybė, kurioje kiekvienas – nuo paprasto piliečio iki šalies vadovo – turi būti vienodai lygus prieš įstatymą ir kiekvienam žmogui turi galioti dar Pirmojo Lietuvos Sta-*

tuto postulatuose formuluoti principai kaip nekaltumo prezumpcija bei vien teismo teisė nustatyti kaltę ir skirti bausmę.“ (2004); (17) „*Manau, kad ir dabar, ir ateityje vienodai sugebėsiu skirti dėmesio visoms partijoms ir visuomeninėms organizacijoms bei institucijoms. Tokia yra Prezidento priedermė.*“ (2004); (18) „*Tikiu, kad ir Lietuva pamažu pripildys demokratijos sampratą tikrojo turinio, išvalys ją nuo dvigubų standartų, organizuoto užsakomojo teisingumo, politinių sprendimų viršenybės prieš teisę.*“ (2004).

In examples (15), (17) and (18), the President introduces himself as a mental subject and expresses his *I* integration with the help of the following verbs: *vertinu, manau, tikiu* (*assess, think, believe*). The last example contains an implication that under the government of other political parties and powers, *inequality* existed in Lithuania. The latter concept is expressed with the help of such expressions as *dvigubi standartai, organizuotas užsakomasis teisingumas, politinių sprendimų viršenybė* (*double standards, organized justice on order, the superiority of political decisions*), which suggest the idea that society is divided into two parts, one having better conditions than the other. These expressions are very beneficial in Paksas's conflict communication, as they help to describe this political leader as being more positive than those in the opposition. Moreover, they are also employed to justify the President and to propose that the opponents are much worse and indifferent to the citizens.

The *inequality* characteristic is closely related to the violation of Paksas's human rights, as presented by himself in the speech of 6 April 2004: (19) „*Praktika, kai vieniems – slapta, kitiems – neslapta, vyravo viso proceso metu. Tokia nuostata akivaizdžiai varžė mano teisę į gynybą, tačiau net ne tai yra svarbiausia.*“ (2004).

As a result, the opponents' performance evokes a negative connotation. They are seen as *violators of human rights*.

The justification process and formation of Paksas's positive image are reinforced by a dichotomous presentation of moral values: *honesty/justice–dishonesty/injustice*. It is obvious that this political leader associates himself with *honesty* and *justice*. Considering the following statements, all the opponents are introduced as dishonest and unfair. This contrast of moral values is one of the most significant, beneficial and successful weapons employed in conflict communication.

Paksas does not avoid direct *I–THEY* (opponents) counter-position of actions: (20) „*Vakar paskelbtos Seimo laikinosios tyrimo komisijos išvados. Šis dokumentas iš tikrųjų neatskleidė nieko naujo, nes visų lapkritį Jums nuosekliai, emociškai ir be faktų buvo brukama mintis, neva Prezidentą yra supančiojusios nusikalstamos struktūros.*“ (2003); (21) „*Kitas dalykas, kad pagal Konstituciją Prezidentas sustabdo narystę partijose, ir tai yra padaryta. Trečias dalykas, kad kiekvienas patarėjas iš liberaldemokratų ar kitų komandų irgi yra sustabdę narystę partinėse organizacijose. Tai nėra privaloma, tačiau tai yra padaryta.*“ (2003); (22) „*Norėčiau paklausti, kaip valstybės paslaptis sergėjantys pareigūnai šį man inkriminuojamą prasižengimą palygintų su faktu, kad nuo 1994 metų iki mano kadencijos pradžios iš valstybės vadovo institucijos dingo 175 dokumentai su slaptumo žymomis?*“ (2004); (23) „*Atsakingai pareiškiu, kad akcininkų sprendimams nesu daręs jokios įtakos, juo labiau, kaip nurodoma kaltinime, siekdamas įgyvendinti man artimų asmenų privačius interesus. Taip, man buvo skambinama, bet aš gerai suvokiau, kad neturiu teisės kištis į privačios bendrovės turtinius santykius*

ir neketinau to daryti. Neatsitiktinai nė vienas iš liudytojų nepatvirtino man priimamo kaltinimo neva dariau įtaką šiems procesams.“ (2004); (24) „*– Pastebėjau kai kurių politikų susijaudinimą ir mano klausimas labai paprastas: jei viskas tvarkoje tuose dokumentuose, ko jaudintis. Kodėl toks susierzinimas. Gal Valstybės saugumo departamento atstovams reikėtų atvažiuoti pas valstybės vadovą ir padėti išsiaiškinti. Parodyti, kas čia buvo. Galbūt pridėti telefoninių pokalbių išklotines, kad patvirtintų savo teisumą, – spaudos konferencijoje R. Paksas komentavo kai kurių politikų reakciją į „Alitos“ privatizavimo dokumentų paėmimą.*“ (2004).

The above examples present accusations aimed at *THEM*, and also express a direct attack against the opponents, indicating the invalidity of their actions. Furthermore, these statements emphasize that *THEY* treat and assess their own performance differently, more indulgently than his own actions of the same or similar kind. In this case Paksas is disclosed as a victim, and the counter-position *I–THEY* is expressed. This opposition is evident in this politician's discourse. *THEY* in most cases have some particular referent—the Parliament and, especially, the State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament. There are a number of negative *ne* prefixes in the investigated statements which are of special importance in Paksas's conflict communication. They create the impression that this person is honest, fair and innocent. Several rhetorical questions serve to set a stern mood, as they disclose and indicate the *dishonesty/injustice* of the opponents. Example (21) further emphasizes the concept of political ethics that the President applies to himself, for it implies that Paksas and his colleagues are so honest that

they even perform actions which are not obligatory but which are very significant in showing to the citizens, the Parliament and the Government that the President is not guilty.

The *dishonesty/injustice* meaning field attributed to the opponents is reinforced even more by a number of other negative characteristics, such as *transgressors*, *malpractice*, *negligence* and *bias* which are also included in the *benefit* domain. In order to consolidate his position in the conflict communication, Paksas suggests that the impeachment process is taking place despite numerous breaches of statutes and regulations. Naturally, the guilty *transgressor* part is played by the opponents: (25) „*Gerai suvokiu, kad Prezidento nušalinimo procesą lydėjusių teisės normų pažeidimų vardijimas neturėtų itakos apkaltos vykdymo tempui. Pažeidimų priežastys ir jų esmė liks istorikams ir Lietuvos teisės raidą studijuojantiems specialistams.*“ (2004).

The preceding example does not contain any direct accusation aimed at a particular person or institution. The accusations are only implied, but the example does contain a direct expression that the President's suspension process was not fair, full of violations of the law. The words *gerai suvokiu* (*I understand well*) once again present Paksas as a passive mental subject. Moreover, the President again appeals to history. This enables the target audience to evaluate his actions as fair and to evoke the society's approval. This idea is emphasized by another feature, *bias*, indicated to define *THEM*, Paksas's two main opponents: the State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament: (26) „*Nors Valstybės saugumo departamento pažymoje, kurios pagrindu pradėtas tyrimas dėl galimų grėsmių Lietu-*

vos nacionaliniam saugumui, Prezidentas apskritai neminimas, vienpusiškas Komisijos tyrimas buvo nukreiptas tik į Prezidentą ir jo instituciją. Tyrimo tendencingumą patvirtina ir tai, kad Komisija neapklausė Valstybės saugumo departamento pažymoje minimų asmenų, kurie Prezidento aplinkos žmonėms neva darė neigiamą poveikį. Tai dar vienas įrodymas, kad Komisija matė tik tai, kas galėtų būti naudinga, siekiant nušalinti Prezidentą.“ (2003).

These statements are purposely used by the President in his political discourse to indicate the actual opponents who act against him and the actions he has performed for the welfare of the state. The above statements, focused on *THEIR* (the two institutions') *bias* are beneficial in this conflict communication, as they show that the others, *THEY*, are guilty because *THEY* violated laws and human rights.

From the preceding examples it becomes evident that Paksas treats and presents himself as a victim. The following examples further illustrate this idea: (27) „*Prezidentai Algirdas Brazauskas ir Valdas Adamkus išimties tvarka suteikė pilietybę 847 asmenims, tarp jų dviem šimtams žmonių, kurie neturėjo jokių nuopelnų Lietuvai. Kai kurių pilietybę gavusių asmenų nuopelnai Lietuvai, švelniai tariant, labai kuklūs, pavyzdžiui, „Kaimynai apie jį atsiliepia palankiai.“ Arba kitas pavyzdys. Cituoju: „Nors išimties paprastai daromos žymioms, Lietuvai nusipelnusiems žmonėms, tačiau, žinodamas Jūsų humaniškumą, drįstu tikėtis, kad priimsite palankų sprendimą.“ Citavau Seimo nario, tuometinio Seimo Pirmininko pavaduotojo Aloyzo Sakalo kreipimąsi dėl pilietybės suteikimo piliečiui ar pilietei Sokolko. Lietuvos pilietybę yra gavę ir daugelis asmenų, kurie apskritai neturėjo jokių sąsajų su mūsų šalimi.*“ (2003); (28) „*Paradoksalu, kad*

teisiniais įrodymais nepagrįstos Komisijos išvados tapo pagrindu visam tolesniam teisiniam procesui.“ (2003); (29) „*Neabejoju, kad teisininkai, išsigilinę į Seimo laikinosios komisijos išvadas, pripažins jų nepagrįstumą, nes ir ne teisininko akimi matyti, kad Komisija, turėjusi tirti grėsmes nacionaliniam saugumui ir atlikti situacijos teisinį įvertinimą, iš tikrųjų tyrė Prezidento politinio pasitikėjimo klausimą.*“ (2003); (30) „*Kalbama, gal kažkas ne taip apiforminta, gal į ne tokį voką buvo įdėta medžiaga, bet nekalbama, kad Valstybės saugumo departamento pažyma su grifu slaptai buvo pagarsinta žmonėms, kurie neturėjo teisės dirbti su slapta medžiaga.*“ (2004).

Example (27) introduces particular individuals, *THEM*, who are credited with the *bias* characteristic. They include two former Presidents of the Republic of Lithuania and the former chairperson of the Parliament. This enumeration is performed on purpose, in order to compare the incumbent President with his predecessors and to reveal the fact that the latter did the same things (granted Lithuanian citizenship) without being indicted. Therefore, the conclusion is drawn that there are certain actions which are legal for some people but illegal for others. Moreover, these words serve as a reference to the breaches of the law that occurred due to the actions of the predecessors of Paksas. These statements, together with the word subject *citavau* (*[I] quoted*), once again suggest the idea that Paksas is not guilty, that he is merely a victim of circumstances and political opponents. Examples (28–30) help to form or even reinforce the negative image of two major opponents of Paksas—the State Security Department and the Provisional Investigation Commission of the Parliament. All the statements and

ideas concerning those institutions that are used in the President's political discourse are intended to form a particular negative stereotype in the minds of the society, to weaken or even destroy the trust in the latter Department and Commission and to raise doubts as to the justice and necessity of their actions. This effect is reinforced by the attribution to *THEM* of the *negligence* meaning field. This is expressed with the help of Paksas's preferred contrast between the actions of the President and his opponents, and emphasized by an accusing question: (31) „*Norėčiau paklausti, kaip valstybės paslaptis sergėjantys pareigūnai šį man inkriminuojamą prasižengimą palygintų su faktu, kad nuo 1994 metų iki mano kadencijos pradžios iš valstybės vadovo institucijos dingo 175 dokumentai su slaptumo žymomis?*“ (2003).

There are two non-opposite meaning fields in the President's conflict communication: *unity*, with the help of which Paksas reveals his efforts to unite the country, and *disrespect*, attributed to his opponents. The benefit of *unity* is conveyed by such significant words as *vienyti* (*unite*) and *konsoliduoti* (*consolidate*): (32) „*Stengiuosi vienyti valdančiąją daugumą – ir viešais pareiškimais, ir darbu, kurį atlieku.*“ (2003); (33) „*Atėjau konsoliduoti, o ne skirstyti.*“ (2003).

These statements, with the help of the verbs *stengiuosi*, *atėjau* (*strive*, *came*), imply the intentions of the President but not his actions. From the context of the investigated political situation it becomes obvious that *THEY*, the opponents, have restricted Paksas's actions. Therefore, this politician discloses his intentions in order to defend himself and to win the society's support.

The negative *disrespect* characteristic reveals the attitude of the opponents to-

wards the President. As already mentioned, Paksas identifies himself with the state, making the *disrespect* expressed towards his personality and his actions equal to *disrespect* towards the state. The following statement contains such a characteristic, expressed through a direct *I-THEY* model: (34) „Komisija pasipriešino mano valiai atsakyti į visus ją dominančius klausimus tokia forma, kuri būtų pagarbi Seimui ir nežeistų Prezidento institucijos.“ (2003).

The latter example includes not only the institution of the President but the institution of the Parliament as well, in order to draw the society's attention and to gain more support from the electorate. This is aimed at that part of the society which does not support Paksas, but yet may have favourites in the Parliament, which is also treated with *disrespect*. As a result, the *disrespect* characteristic may raise doubts about and dissatisfaction with the actions of the President's opponents; this introduces the intended aim that Paksas is innocent and that his actions are not harmful but beneficial to the state and its citizens. This is a very popular defence strategy: the revelation of action reasons, as described by Aristotle (1994). Furthermore, this phrase contains the antithesis *pagerbti-pažeisti* (*honour-violate*), expressed through a negative structure, which implicates the idea that the honour of the President was offended.

The analysed period includes the President's impeachment. During that process, the very important meaning field *innocence* was introduced into Paksas's political discourse. He presented himself as innocent and his actions as beneficial to the state. The *I-THEY* nomination, expressed through this characteristic, helps to contrast the President with the accusing side, while showing that he

is positive and the other side is negative and guilty: (35) „Kartu norėčiau priminti Lietuvos Respublikos Konstitucijos 85-ajame straipsnyje įtvirtintą nuostatą, kad atsakomybė už dekretą, kuriuo suteikiama pilietybė, tenka jį kontrasignavusiam ministrui.“ (2004); (36) „Pabrėžčiau, kad nė vienas Teismo nusikalstamais pripažintų mano veiksmų nepadarė žalos valstybei.“ (2004); (37) „Dar kartą pabrėžiu: nė vienu pasirašytu dekretu, nė vienu savo veiksmu nepažeidžiau Lietuvos Respublikos Konstitucijos, įstatymų ir Seime duotos priesaikos. Sukeltą skandalą ir nesiliaujančius reikalavimus atsistatydinti vertinu tik kaip prieš mano asmenį ir mano pradėtas iniciatyvas nukreiptą politinį veiksmą.“ (2004).

Example (35) does not directly indicate the *innocence* of the President, but as the target audience is already acquainted with the broader context of the situation and knows that one of the indictments is related to his illegal granting of citizenship, it should perceive the implied idea that the President must be *innocent* because there is a particular Minister responsible for the citizenship granting process.

The *innocence* characteristic may also be analysed on the basis of the human factor, by admitting the mistakes which have been made during the period of governing and instantly explaining their reasons. This should suggest the idea that the President is not guilty because he is a human being, one of the common people with the same right to make mistakes: (38) „Per vienerius – pirmuosius – darbo valstybės vadovo poste metus aš padariau didesnių ir mažesnių klaidų. Kai kurios iš jų virto praėjusių savaitę paskelbtais kaltinimais, apie kuriuos jau kalbėjau. Veikiamas penkis mėnesius neatslūgstančios psichologinės įtampos, balansuodamas tarp žmogiškųjų

jausmų ir pareigos, prieš porą savaitių, pakvietęs visuomeniniu patarėju Jurijū Borisovą, padariau klaidą, kurios privalėjau išvengti. Suprantu, kad Prezidentas, net ir pikčiausiai įjudomas ir juodinamas, neturi teisės daryti klaidų. Ištaisiau ją, atsiribojau nuo Jurijaus Borisovo, atsiprašau Jūsų, gerbiamieji Seimo nariai, ir dar kartą – visų Lietuvos žmonių.“ (2004); (39) „*Dabar, kai pateiktos Konstitucinio Teismo išvados, kiekvienas iš Jūsų galite įvertinti mano, kaip Respublikos Prezidento, prasižengimus. Nusikaltau ar padariau klaidų? Neneigiu klaidų. Padariau jų ir mažesnių, ir didesnių. Neseniai apmaudžiai suklydau, bandydamas remtis vien žmogiškaisiais jausmais. Šią klaidą ištaisiau. Atsiribojau nuo buvusio savo rėmėjo. Dar kartą nuoširdžiai atsiprašau Jūsų, jei Jus užgavo kai kurie mano sprendimai ar poelgiai. Pripažindamas klaidas, kurių neišvengiau, vis dėlto noriu pasakyti: jos nebuvo tokios, kad padarytų žalos Lietuvai. Jokiu savo sprendimu ar veiksmu nepadariau žalos Lietuvai ir nepakenčiau mūsų šalies žmonių interesams.*“ (2004).

In example (38) Paksas presents a professional confession of his fault. He seems to be attempting to establish common ground for all further actions, essentially offering a hand to the opponents. Both examples reveal the fact that President Paksas, as would every person in such a situation, tries to justify his actions and win the society's support and sympathy.

In addition to the open conflict which has already been analysed, conflict communication without public conflict is also present in Paksas's political discourse. A conflict with his predecessors, with previous governments, is expressed in the inaugural speech of the President. The negative characteristic of *selfish values* is attributed

to the previous government: (40) „*Žinau, kad neįmanoma sugrąžinti šių vertybių neištrynus atgrasaus valdžios atotrūkio nuo žmonių.*“ (2003)

This example contains a covert counterposition in which the previous government is blamed for being distant from the society. This example is also taken from the inaugural speech, and it is therefore evident that although open conflict is not yet present, the new President still presents his intentions as a contrast to the performance of the previous government. This is a foreshadowing of the forthcoming conflict, which is not expressed in the extra-linguistic context. However, the procedure of elections may be treated as a conflict of programme and promises. If this conflict is carried over into the inaugural, resistance is inevitable.

Covert conflict related to *opportunities* may also be seen in Paksas's inaugural speech: (41) „*Negailėdamas pastangų sieksiu, kad išsilavinusiems, pasitikintiems savimi piliečiams būtų suteiktos galimybės atskleisti savo galias.*“ (2003)

The phrase *būtų suteiktos* (*would be granted*) implies the idea that, until now, the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania have not had any opportunities to express their talents and potential. Naturally, this serves as a basis for the *limited opportunities* characteristic and its attribution to the opponents.

The research has shown that Paksas's conflict communication takes place in two situations:

1. In an open public conflict situation involving major agents—the President, the Parliament and the State Security Department. In this case, direct linguistic features of conflict may be observed in Paksas's discourse. They are defined by the

President's defence during the process of impeachment.

2. In the situation where public conflict is absent. This communication is inevitable in electoral situations, which demonstrate a conflict of programmes, regulations and/or promises. The conflict with his predecessors may be observed in this President's inaugural speech.

This conflict is implied through the concepts of *selfish values* and *limited opportunities* that he attributes to the previous governments. In the context of the post-election situation, this form of communication excludes Paksas from his predecessors and implies that he will be more helpful to the state and the society than the others were.

References

LACLAU, E.; MOUFFE, C., 1985. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

VAN DIJK, T. A., 1995. Ideological Discourse Analysis. In: E. VENTOLA and A. SOLIN (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Discourse Analysis*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 135–161.

VAN DIJK, T. A., 2002. Political Discourse and Political Cognition. In: P. A. CHILTON and C. SCHÄFFNER (eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytical approaches to political discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 204–236.

БОЛИНДЖЕР, Д., 1987. Истина – проблема

лингвистическая. In: *Язык и моделирование социального взаимодействия*. Москва: Прогресс.

ГЮРДЖЯН, Н. С., 2008. *Речевые манифестации когнитивного конфликта в диалоге (на материале английского и русского языков)*. Пятигорск.

ЛАСАН, Э., 1995. *Дискурс власти и идеология в СССР: когнитивно-риторический анализ*. Вильнюс: Вильнюсский университет.

ФИЛИПС Л., ЙОРГЕНСЕН М. В., 2008. *Дискурс анализ. Теория и метод*. Харьков: Гуманитарный центр.

Sources

<http://www.paksas.lt> (Accessed 30.06.2007–31.08.2007)

<http://paksas.president.lt> (Accessed 30.06.2007–31.08.2007)

Vilma Linkevičiūtė

Vilniaus universitetas, Lietuva

Moksliniai interesai: kognityvinė lingvistika, politinis diskursas, konfliktinė komunikacija

OPOZICIJOS IR JŲ NARIŲ NOMINACIJOS ROLANDO PAKSO KONFLIKTINĖS KOMUNIKACIJOS DISKURSE (2003–2004)

Santrauka

Straipsnio objektas – kalbinės politinės konfliktinės komunikacijos išraiškos priemonės, būdingos Lietuvos Respublikos vadovo Rolando Paksas

Vilma Linkevičiūtė

Uniwersytet Wileński, Litwa

Zainteresowania naukowe: lingwistyka kognitywna, dyskurs polityczny, komunikacja konfliktowa

OPOZYCJE I NOMINACJE CZŁONÓW OPOZYCJI W DYSKURSIE KOMUNIKACJI KONFLIKTOWEJ ROLANDASA PAKSASA (2003–2004)

Streszczenie

Przedmiotem niniejszego artykułu jest analiza środków językowych stosowanych w konflikto-

politiniam diskursui (2003–2004). Jis išsiskiria konfliktine komunikacija – pasisakymais, nukreiptais prieš kitų politinių subjektų nuomones arba veiksmus, o nepritarimas tokiai situacijai verbalizuojamas kaip politinė komunikacija, kurios subjektais tampa bet kurie asmenys, norintys daryti įtaką politiniams įvykiams.

Prezidentas R. Paksas konfliktinėje komunikacijoje per apkaltą gynybai pasitelkia dvi strategijas – adresato integraciją ir oponentų segregaciją, kurias išreiškia per dichotomiją *AŠ–JIE*. Šiame diskurse analizuojamas *naudos* domenas, aprėpiantis tokias opozicines prasmės sritis: *nauda – žala, lygybė – nelygybė, sąžiningumas / teisybė – nesąžiningumas / neteisybė*. Jame galima išvelgti ir tokias prasmės sritis, kaip *savanaudiškumas, nekuklumas, tendencingumas, nepagarba*, priskiriamas oponentams, bei *vienybę ir nekaltumą*, siejamus su Prezidentu R. Paksu.

Galima teigti, kad R. Pakso konfliktinis diskursas susijęs su dviem situacijomis. Pirmoji – atviro viešojo konflikto situacija, kurios pagrindiniai veikėjai – Prezidentas, Seimas ir Valstybės saugumo departamentas. Šiuo atveju R. Pakso diskurse galima išvelgti tiesioginius kalbinius konflikto požymius. Antroji – konfliktinė komunikacija be viešojo konflikto. Šio Prezidento inauguracinėje kalboje galima išvelgti konfliktą su savo pirmtakais, kuris implikuojamas *atotrūkio* bei *galimybės trūkumo* sąvokomis.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: konfliktinė komunikacija, politinis diskursas, domenas, prasmės sritis, konceptas.

wey komunikacji politycznej, charakterystycznej dla dyskursu politycznego przywódcy Republiki Litewskiej Rolandasa Paksasa (2003–2004). W dyskursie politycznym zachodzi komunikacja konfliktowa, występująca w wypowiedziach skierowanych przeciwko opiniom i działaniom innych podmiotów politycznych, a dezaprobata wobec takiej sytuacji wyrażana jest w komunikacji politycznej, której podmiotami stają się wszystkie jednostki, pragnące wywierać wpływ na wydarzenia polityczne.

W komunikacji konfliktowej, zachodzącej w sytuacji impeachmentu, prezydent R. Paksas wybiera dwie strategie obrony: integrację adresata (tj. własnej osoby) i segregację oponentów, zawierające się w dychotomii *JA–ONI*.

W dyskursie R. Paksasa analizowana jest domena *korzyści*, obejmująca takie opozycyjne pola znaczeniowe, jak: *korzyść – strata, równość – nierówność, uczciwość / sprawiedliwość – nieuczciwość / niesprawiedliwość*. Można również wyodrębnić pola znaczeniowe wyrazów: *interesowność, nieskromność, tendencyjność, brak szacunku*, przypisywane oponentom, oraz *jedność i niewinność*, związane z prezydentem R. Paksasem.

Można sformułować wniosek, że w dyskursie R. Paksasa komunikacja konfliktowa zachodzi: a) w sytuacji otwartego konfliktu w sferze publicznej, którego głównymi stronami byli: Prezydent, Sejm i Departament Bezpieczeństwa Państwa (w danym wypadku w dyskursie R. Paksasa można dostrzec specyficzne cechy językowe charakterystyczne dla konfliktu); b) w sytuacji nie będącej otwartym konfliktem. Już w mowie inauguracyjnej tego prezydenta można dostrzec konflikt ze swoimi poprzednikami, implikowany przez pojęcia *oderwania i braku możliwości*.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: komunikacja konfliktowa, dyskurs polityczny, domena, pole znaczeniowe, koncept.