TACTICS AND STRATEGIES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Svetlana DOMUSCIU,

studentă, anul III, Facultatea de Litere, USM

CZU: 81`42:32=03.135.1=161.1 E-mail: sd0573063@gmail.com

Lucrarea are ca scop explorarea strategiei limbajului dublu utilizat de politicieni, și profund încorporată în discursul politic. O atenție distinctă este acordată specificului traducerii discursului politic din limba engleză în limba rusă, precum și metodelor și tehnicilor de traducere aplicate, din moment ce actorii politici tind să camufleze ideea mesajelor expuse, folosind diferite metode de îmbogățire a stilului.

There is no single, generally accepted definition of the term "strategy" in linguistics. In this context, we understand it as a planned combination of speech actions aimed at achieving a certain communicative goal.

O.N. Parshina argues that a politician's choice of strategies and tactics depends on several factors, including the overall communicative goal, the specifics of the situation, and the speaker's individual linguistic identity. Based on this, she proposes a classification of strategies and corresponding tactics used in political discourse. The *first group* includes *persuasion strategies*, which involve campaign tactics such as appealing to the public and making promises, as well as argumentative tactics like using examples, comparisons, future-oriented references, and reasoned judgments. The *second group* focuses on *strategies for maintaining power*, such as creating an emotional connection with the audience through unity, emotional appeal, and aligning with shared values, or using information and interpretation strategies that involve acknowledging issues, highlighting positive aspects, explaining and commenting, reframing problems, and offering solutions. The *third group* relates to *power struggle strategies*, including self-defense through criticism and justification, manipulative strategies using subtle influence and offensive tactics like accusations or personal attacks aimed at discrediting opponents. Finally, the *self-presentation strategy* includes tactics of contrast, solidarity, and identification, all aimed at shaping the speaker's image in the eyes of the audience [4, p.43].

Among the diversity of strategies used in political discourse, some are more overt and structured, whereas others operate at a more subtle, indirect level. It is noteworthy that not all strategies and tactics are aimed at outright persuasion, some are intended to obscure, soften or shift meaning altogether. Given its intentional and often manipulative nature, political discourse frequently operates through ambiguous, euphemistic, or ideologically charged language—what William Lutz famously termed "double-

speak”. This linguistic phenomenon is not accidental but rather an inalienable part of political language, aimed at shaping perception and shaping public opinion without openly stating controversial truths [3, p.70]. Therefore, understanding the nature, typology and functions of political discourse is of a high importance for decoding the mechanisms of doublespeak and its implications across cultures.

It is in this context that the concept of ***doublespeak*** becomes particularly relevant, functioning as an intricate way to influence perception without explicitly stating it. In the following, we are going to consider the strategy of doublespeak in a more detail, since this study is primarily focused on the handling doublespeak in the political discourse. We will examine interpretations of the definition, the historical background of the term, and the main classifications proposed by linguists, in particular William Lutz, who contributed most to the investigation of doublespeak phenomenon. Furthermore, doublespeak can involve deliberate ambiguity or even a complete reversal of meaning, ultimately masking the real nature of the truth [3, p.13].

We now proceed to the classification of this strategy/tactic. In his influential work, *Doublespeak*, William D. Lutz offers a comprehensive framework for understanding the various forms of deceptive or misleading language commonly used in public and/or political discourse. He distinguishes four different types of doublespeak: euphemism, jargon, gobbledygook (bureaucratese), and inflated language. Through these categories, Lutz provides a critical lens for identifying and analyzing how language can be used not to communicate clearly, but to manipulate public perception. Further each type will be examined more closely [3, p.16].

To begin with, according to Merriam-Webster, a ***euphemism*** involves “the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant” [1]. When selecting such expressions, speakers and writers often tailor their language to suit their audience and communicative intent, meaning that the significance of a euphemism is largely shaped by its cultural and situational context. Euphemisms have long been employed to address delicate or controversial subjects in a more tactful manner, thereby maintaining decorum and sensitivity — for instance, using “passed away” instead of “died,” or “go to the restroom” avoiding to say “defecate”. This tactful use of language is particularly common in governmental or diplomatic environments, where the wrong vocabulary can influence interactions with opponents and may strain diplomatic affairs.

According to Gibson and Lutz, doublespeak occurs when language is used to exaggerate the significance of everyday things, giving a sense of grandeur or complexity to matters that are otherwise ordinary or simple. This type of language manipulates perception by elevating the unremarkable and masking straightforward realities under an illusion of importance. A specific form of this is ***inflated language***, sometimes referred to as puffery, where exaggerated terms are used to make something seem more impressive than it actually is. Employed to gain admiration or approval, inflated language appears frequently in advertising and marketing, where companies aim to influence public perception [2, p.7]. As a rule, such language

tends to be filled with dramatic claims that may stretch the truth or present it in a misleading way.

Gibson and Lutz provide concrete examples of this phenomenon, especially within official or military contexts. For instance, when the Pentagon refers to an initial military strike as a "preemptive counterattack", or labels a retreat as a "tactical redeployment", it is reshaping reality through euphemism. Likewise, describing an ambush of U.S. forces as "engaging the enemy on all sides" distorts the actual scenario. In the commercial world, calling a black-and-white television a "non-multicolor capable device" is another example of how inflated language can be used to mask limitations by dressing them up in technical jargon [2, p.142].

Thus, we can say the language of political discourse is far from accidental. It serves not only to express ideas but also to influence, persuade, and often redirect attention. Metaphors and metonymies help simplify complex issues or shift focus, while pronouns and voice choices reveal how much responsibility a speaker is willing to take. All these features come into play to create a certain image, structure the message, and shape the way it is received by the audience. Recognizing these linguistic peculiarities helps us better understand the strategies behind political communication and the intentions hidden between the lines.

References:

1. *EUPHEMISM. Definition & Meaning* [online]. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. [cited: 20.05.2025]. Available from: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/euphemism
2. GIBSON, W., & LUTZ, W. *Doublespeak: A Brief History, Definition*. 1991. 232 p.
3. LUTZ, W. D. *Doublespeak: From Revenue Enhancement to Terminal Living: How Government, Business, Advertisers, Others Use Language to Deceive You*. New York 10163, e-book. 1989. 151 p.
4. PARSHINA, O.N. *Russian Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. *Moscow,* 2007. 256 p.

Recomandat
***Svetlana CORCODEL**, lector universitar, master în Studii Europene*