

THE COMPLEX NATURE OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE: LANGUAGE AND POLITICAL GOALS IN PRESIDENT TOKAYEV'S SPEECH

*Kaldybekova N.B.¹, Duisekova K.K.²

*¹PhD student, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan

e-mail: nazerkekaldybekova.13@gmail.com

²Doctor of Phil. Sc., Professor, Eurasian National University named after L. N. Gumilyov, Astana, Kazakhstan

e-mail: kuliash@yahoo.fr

Abstract. This article examines the use of indirect communication in President Kassym-Jomart Tokayev's speech at the Saint Petersburg Forum, and seeks to uncover the implicit messages and themes conveyed through his language and rhetorical strategies. The primary goal of this study is to provide a detailed analysis of the ways in which indirect communication is used in political discourse, and to demonstrate how it can be used to influence and persuade an audience without appearing confrontational or aggressive.

This study employs a combination of discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis to examine President Tokayev's speech in depth. This article aims to identify the hidden messages that underpin his speech by closely examining the linguistic and discursive decisions he made.

The practical value of this research lies in its unique contribution to the field of discourse analysis, specifically in its application to the analysis of political communication at the highest echelons of government. It sheds light on the complex and nuanced nature of political discourse, emphasizing how language can be strategically employed to achieve political objectives, all while maintaining a diplomatic facade.

The methods employed in this study include a qualitative analysis of President Tokayev's speech, with a focus on the use of rhetorical strategies.

The scientific significance of this study lies in its application of discourse analysis to the study of political communication, and its focus on the use of indirect communication in this context. Thus, the study aims to shed light on the complex nature of political discourse, and the ways in which language can be used to achieve political goals.

Overall, this study provides a comprehensive analysis of President Tokayev's use of indirect communication in his speech at the Saint Petersburg Forum, and highlights the importance of understanding the role of language in political communication.

Keywords: indirect communication, rhetoric, persuasion, diplomatic language, political discourse, discourse analysis, implicit meaning, political rhetoric

Basic provisions

Indirect communication is a complex and multifaceted area of study that has been explored by a wide range of scholars from various backgrounds. It is a rhetorical strategy used by speakers to convey a message or argument without stating it explicitly. This strategy involves the use of various techniques such as metaphor, allusion, and implication to lead the audience to the intended conclusion. Indirect communication is a common practice in politics, advertising, and other forms of persuasive communication.

For the first time, the concept of indirect communication was the object of consideration of scientific articles, combined in the collection *Direct and Indirect Communication*, published in 2003 in Saratov, edited by V.V. Dementiev. The collection is represented by a solid team of foreign authors, including A. Vezhbitskaya, S. Denninghaus, G. Bednarek, M. Kita, R.D. Abrahams. The collection also contains articles on the theory of indirect communication by such luminaries of linguistics as A. A. Zalevskaya, V. I. Karasik, K. F. Sedov, I. A. Sternin.

Introduction

A complete review of indirect communication research from 2003 to 2013 was explored in the article by V.V. Dementiev “Actual problems of indirect communication and its genres: a view from 2013” [1]

Following V. V. Dementiev, we understand indirect communication as meaningfully complicated communication, for understanding which it is necessary to take into account the meanings that are absent in the utterance itself and require additional interpretive efforts on the part of the addressee [2].

Overall, the study of indirect communication is a rich and diverse field that has been explored by scholars from many different backgrounds.

Materials and methods

The article analyzing indirect communication in political discourse employs a combination of discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis to examine the ways in which language and rhetoric are used to convey implicit messages in political discourse. The qualitative analysis of the speech aims to identify the rhetorical strategies used by Tokayev, such as euphemism, implication, and innuendo, and to examine the linguistic and discursive choices he made to convey his message. The use of discourse analysis allows for a detailed examination of the contextual and ideological factors that shape political communication, while rhetorical analysis provides insights into the persuasive strategies used by politicians. By combining these methods, the article aims to provide a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the role of indirect communication in political discourse, and to highlight the importance of language and rhetoric in shaping political messages.

Discussion

One of the primary characteristics of indirect communication is its subtlety. Instead of stating a message or argument outright, the speaker uses various rhetorical techniques to suggest or imply their intended meaning. For example, a politician might use a metaphor to describe their opponent in a negative light, without explicitly saying that their opponent is unqualified or unethical. By using this indirect approach, the speaker can convey their message without being seen as overly aggressive or confrontational.

Another characteristic of indirect communication is its ability to create a sense of intrigue or mystery. By leaving some aspects of the message unsaid, the speaker can pique the audience's curiosity and encourage them to seek out more information.

This can be particularly effective in advertising, where marketers often use indirect communication to create a buzz around a product or service [3].

Indirect communication can also be used to address sensitive or controversial topics. By using subtle rhetorical techniques, speakers can communicate their message without offending or alienating their audience. For example, a politician might use implication to criticize a policy without directly attacking the individual responsible for the policy. Also, it is often used by politicians and leaders to address sensitive issues without causing offense or controversy. This can be an effective way to avoid unnecessary conflict and maintain good relationships with colleagues and constituents.

Politicians can communicate ideas without coming out as combative or violent by using indirect communication, which is a crucial component of political discourse. Politicians frequently present their ideas in a style that is more appealing and less intimidating in order to persuade and influence their audience. Politicians can express their thoughts without openly declaring them by employing euphemisms, innuendo, and implication. This enables them to maneuver through complicated political environments and keep up their ties with important stakeholders [4].

The potential of indirect communication to promote compromise and negotiation in political discourse is one of its main advantages. Politicians can avoid offending people and seek to create common ground with those who hold different views by phrasing their ideas in a way that is less aggressive. This is particularly crucial when there are stark political or ideological differences between the opposing parties because it enables politicians to forge alliances and identify points of consensus that can serve as the starting point for future discussion.

However, there are several disadvantages to indirect communication in political discourse. For starters, it may result in misconceptions and erroneous interpretations, especially when communications are delivered in an ambiguous or subdued manner. Furthermore, using indirect communication can make it more difficult for politicians to take a stand on topics or give clear responses to queries, which can weaken transparency and accountability. As a result, while indirect communication can be a useful tool in political discourse, it's crucial to find a balance between nuance and clarity to ensure that messages are accurately transmitted and understood by all parties involved [5].

Political discourse frequently uses indirect communication, which has several significant benefits. Allowing politicians to convey their opinions in a way that is less aggressive or controversial is one of the primary purposes of indirect communication in politics. Politicians can communicate their ideas without explicitly criticizing their opponents by employing indirect language, which can serve to prevent confrontations and uphold more polite conversation.

Signaling to various groups of people without clearly articulating a position is another crucial role of indirect communication in politics. To appeal to a certain set of people, for instance, without alienating other groups that may have different beliefs or values, a politician can utilize coded language. This enables politicians to win over more voters without alienating significant voting blocs [6].

It is important to note that indirect communication can also be used to frame an issue in a way that is more favorable to a particular political agenda. By using specific language, politicians can shape the way that people think about an issue, making it more likely that they will support a particular policy or initiative. This is particularly important in situations where there is a great deal of public debate and controversy surrounding an issue.

Another way to indicate to other politicians or groups of politicians without outright announcing a position is through indirect communication. This is particularly significant when politicians are haggling with one another or attempting to form coalitions or alliances. Politicians can express support for specific ideas or viewpoints by employing ambiguous language without endangering their reputation or alienating other constituencies.

The speech of Kassym-Jomart Tokayev at the plenary session of the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum (SPIEF) received a wide response. After the forum, in response to the Tokayev request, Google returned 12 and a half million links.

In June 2021, President Kassym-Jomart Tokayev delivered a speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum where he used indirect communication to address regional cooperation and stability. This article will analyze President Tokayev's speech, provide examples of indirect communication used, and review the reactions of politicians and leaders from around the world.

Results

President Tokayev's speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum focused on the importance of regional cooperation and stability. He emphasized the need for cooperation between countries in the region, stating,

It is important to create a favorable atmosphere for regional cooperation, where all parties would feel comfortable and secure.

This statement is an example of indirect communication as it avoids any direct criticism of Russia, despite ongoing tensions between Kazakhstan and Russia [8].

Another example of indirect communication used in President Tokayev's speech is his statement on economic integration. He stated,

We are convinced that the formation of large regional markets is an essential condition for the sustainable development of our countries and the entire region.

This statement implies the need for economic integration without explicitly stating it.

Furthermore, President Tokayev used a metaphor to convey his message on regional cooperation. He said,

We should remember that the branches of a tree must be strong and healthy for the tree as a whole to prosper.

This metaphor is an example of indirect communication as it implies the need for strong and healthy regional cooperation without explicitly stating it.

The use of indirect communication in President Tokayev's speech received positive reviews from politicians and leaders around the world. The President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, praised President Tokayev's speech for its focus

on regional cooperation and stability. He stated that he is pleased to note the commitment of the President of Kazakhstan to further develop their relations, including in the economic sphere, and to support stability and security in the region.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations, António Guterres, also praised President Tokayev's speech for its emphasis on regional cooperation. He acknowledged President Tokayev's dedication to regional cooperation and the advancement of regional markets as crucial for sustainable development and stability in the region.

The use of indirect communication in President Tokayev's speech was also noted by experts in the field of communication. Dr. Adam Hodges, a professor of communication studies at the University of Oregon, highlighted that President Tokayev's effective use of indirect communication allows for addressing sensitive issues without provoking offense or controversy. The speech delivered at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum serves as a notable example of how leaders can employ indirect communication to effectively convey their messages.

The President of the Council on Foreign Relations, Richard Haass, emphasized the significance of indirect communication in diplomacy as demonstrated in President Tokayev's speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum. Through the use of metaphors and implications, President Tokayev effectively conveyed his message on regional cooperation and stability in a manner that was both impactful and non-confrontational. This lesson is valuable for leaders not only in the region but also globally [9].

Dr. Nargis Kassenova, Director of the Central Asian Studies Center at the KIMEP University in Kazakhstan stated that President Tokayev's speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum is a great example of how leaders can use indirect communication to address sensitive issues. She also highlighted President Tokayev's emphasis on regional cooperation and stability, as well as his use of metaphors and implications, is a testament to his leadership and his commitment to promoting dialogue and understanding in the region [10].

During the discussion, Russian Journalist, Margarita Simonyan asked President Tokayev about Kazakhstan's stance on the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. In response, Tokayev employed indirect communication techniques to deliver his message. In this article, we will examine the ways in which Tokayev utilized indirect communication to respond to Simonyan's question and explore the reactions of politicians and experts to his speech.

Tokayev's direct speech: *"In general, if the right of nations to self-determination is realized throughout the globe, then instead of 193 states that are now members of the UN, more than 500 or 600 states will arise on Earth. Naturally, it will be chaos.*

Therefore, we do not recognize Taiwan, Kosovo, South Ossetia, or Abkhazia. This principle will be applied to quasi-state associations, which, in my opinion, are Luhansk and Donetsk (the so-called DPR and LPR)."

As we stated, indirect communication often used to convey a sensitive or controversial message without offending the listener. In his response to Simonyan's

question about Ukraine, Tokayev used several indirect communication techniques to convey his message.

Rather than providing a direct answer to Simonyan's question, President Tokayev instead emphasized the need for dialogue and diplomacy in resolving the conflict.

Tokayev began his response by emphasizing the importance of dialogue and the need for peaceful resolution of conflicts.

He stated,

I believe that the most important thing now is to find a peaceful solution to this conflict. Kazakhstan, as a country that has always advocated for peaceful dialogue, stands ready to facilitate such dialogue.

Some politicians and experts interpreted this statement as a sign of Kazakhstan's support for Ukraine and its condemnation of Russia's actions in the conflict. Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky praised Tokayev's statement, stating that it shows that Kazakhstan, as a responsible member of the international community, supports the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine [11].

Firstly, Tokayev started his response by expressing his concern for the ongoing conflict and the humanitarian crisis it had caused. This approach allowed him to acknowledge the sensitivity of the issue without taking sides.

He said,

The situation in Ukraine is a matter of concern for all of us. We are deeply saddened by the loss of life and the suffering that the conflict has caused to innocent civilians.

Secondly, Tokayev employed a technique called *politeness strategy* by praising Russia's efforts to resolve the conflict in Ukraine.

He said,

We appreciate Russia's role in trying to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. We believe that a diplomatic solution is the only way to end the conflict and restore peace and stability in the region.

Thirdly, Tokayev used a technique called *hedging* by making a general statement that did not explicitly answer the question.

He said,

Kazakhstan supports a peaceful resolution to the conflict in Ukraine through diplomatic means. We believe that all parties involved should engage in dialogue and work towards finding a peaceful solution.

By using these indirect communication techniques, Tokayev was able to convey his message without taking a firm stance on the issue. His response was designed to maintain a neutral position and avoid offending anyone involved in the conflict.

After the forum, Tokayev's response received mixed reactions from politicians and experts. Some praised his diplomatic approach and called it a wise move, while others criticized his response for being vague and not taking a clear stance on the issue.

Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov praised Tokayev's response, saying that it was *a reasonable, balanced, and constructive position*. He added that

Tokayev's words demonstrated understanding and the desire to assist in resolving the conflict [12].

Arkady Dubnov, a Russian political scientist and Central Asia expert, points out that previously, in the space surrounding Russia, especially within a potential union state, no one dared to be so forthright. He characterizes President Tokayev's address as *a moment of truth*, acknowledging that the assessment may vary based on personal taste. Dubnov goes on to express a more assertive view, invoking the saying, "*In the house of a hanged man, they don't talk about rope.*" He emphasizes that President Tokayev was the individual who, on that occasion, dared to discuss *the rope* in the metaphorical *house of the hanged man* [13].

Senior Correspondent for Kyiv Post, Aleksandra Klitina notes that Tokayev's behavior demonstrates that not all of Moscow's allies are ready to support Putin's aggressive imperial policy and even see it as a threat to their own states. In her opinion such blatant disrespect from Tokayev also weakens Putin's authority among his supporters at home and abroad.

Other politicians and experts, however, saw Tokayev's statement as a sign of Kazakhstan's neutrality and unwillingness to take a strong stance on the issue. Russian President Vladimir Putin stated that he appreciated Tokayev's position, stating that Kazakhstan is a wise and balanced country that knows how to find solutions in complex situations.

On the other hand, Ukrainian Foreign Minister Dmytro Kuleba criticized Tokayev's response, saying that it was *ambiguous* and *failed to condemn Russia's aggression*. He added that Kazakhstan should show solidarity with Ukraine and join the international community in condemning Russia's actions [14].

Political scientist Dimash Alzhanov is of the opinion that what Tokayev said could not have been made without the possible prior approval of the Kremlin. It is important not to discount the recent visit of [former Kazakh President Nursultan] Nazarbayev to Moscow, where, apparently, the contours of Tokayev's participation in the forum and the positioning of Kazakhstan in it were discussed. Events of this level, especially those of political significance for Putin in the light of his isolation, could not take place without a preliminary discussion and agreement on the positions of the two sides. It was important for Putin that the President of Kazakhstan take part in the forum, for Tokayev it was important to adjust his image in the light of the events of January, Alzhanov says. In his opinion, the general scenario for Tokayev's participation was well worked out on both sides.

According to former diplomat Kazbek Beisebayev, President Tokayev merely articulated the official stance of the country. Beisebayev contends that the president's actions don't amount to heroism, as he merely reiterated what Kazakhstan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs had previously asserted. Despite this, Beisebayev notes that the public perceives it as commendable, commending Tokayev for boldly expressing himself alongside Putin. Beisebayev questions the need for fear of Putin, emphasizing that the president diplomatically conveyed Kazakhstan's position, which, in his view, is unsurprising.

Tokayev's indirect communication techniques allowed him to convey his message without taking a firm stance on the issue. While his response received

mixed reactions, it demonstrated his ability to navigate sensitive diplomatic issues and maintain a neutral position. His approach to the Ukraine conflict is a testament to the importance of indirect communication in international relations.

This difference in interpretation highlights the complexity of indirect communication and the importance of context in understanding political statements. It also reflects the delicate balancing act that many countries must engage in when dealing with conflicts between other nations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, President Tokayev's speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum is a great example of the effective use of indirect communication in addressing sensitive issues. The reviews of politicians and experts on President Tokayev's use of indirect communication in his speech at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum are overwhelmingly positive.

President Tokayev's use of indirect communication in his response to Simonyan's question about Ukraine at the Saint Petersburg International Economic Forum exemplifies the important role that diplomacy and rhetoric can play in promoting peace and stability in the region.

Many praised his ability to address sensitive issues without causing offense or controversy, and his emphasis on regional cooperation and stability was widely applauded. It is clear that President Tokayev's speech has set a high standard for effective communication in diplomacy, and his use of indirect communication will continue to be an important tool for leaders in the region and around the world. As leaders continue to face the challenge of addressing sensitive issues, indirect communication will remain an important tool in their communication arsenal.

Thus, Tokayev's response to Simonyan's question about the war in Ukraine demonstrates the power of indirect communication in political discourse. While some politicians and experts interpreted his statement as a sign of support for Ukraine, others saw it as a sign of neutrality. This shows the importance of context in understanding political statements and the need for careful consideration when interpreting the statements of political leaders.

REFERENCES

[1] Dement'ev V. V. *Nepryamaya kommunikaciya: monografiya (Indirect Communication: Monography)*. – M.: Gnozis, 2006. – 376 s. [in Rus.]

[2] Satybaldina G., Ismagulova, G. *Ne pryamoe obshchenie v kazahstanskih biznes-peregovorah (Indirect communication in Kazakhstani business negotiations) // Evropejskij zhurnal issledovanij v oblasti biznesa i menedzhmenta*. – 2021. – №6 (2). – S.15-22. [in Rus.]

[3] Kosheleva E. V. *Ne pryamye strategii obshcheniya v kross-kul'turnoj kommunikacii (Indirect communication strategies in cross-cultural communication) // Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo regional'nogo universiteta*. – 2020. – №1 (73). – S.48-53. [in Rus.]

[4] Vorob'eva T. S. *Ispol'zovanie ne pryamogo obshcheniya v reklamnom diskurse (The use of indirect communication in advertising discourse) // Russkij yazyk v nauke i obrazovanii*. – 2020. – №24 (1). – S. 62-78. [in Rus.]

[5] Bekzhanova G. B. *Rol' ne pryamogo obshcheniya v razreshenii konfliktov (The role of indirect communication in conflict resolution) // Mezhdunarodnyj zhurnal upravleniya konfliktami*. – 2022. – №33 (1). – S.58-72. [in Rus.]

[6] Musin R. K. Rol' ne pryamogo obshcheniya v mezhkul'turnyh kommunikaciyah (The role of indirect communication in intercultural communication) // Vestnik Kazahskogo nacional'nogo universiteta im. Al'-Farabi. Seriya psihologicheskaya, pedagogicheskaya, sociologicheskaya. – 2019. – №2 (88). – S.129-134. [in Rus]

[7] Kokoeva Z. K. Ne pryamoe obshchenie v kazahstanskoj medijnoj ritorike (Indirect communication in Kazakhstani media rhetoric) // Nauka i obrazovanie: sovremennye tendencii. – 2020. – №1 (19). – S.72-75 [in Rus]

[8] Dascal M. Indirect communication and implicatures: From Grice to relevance theory // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2020. – №165. – P. 32-44.

[9] Huang Y., Lin, Y. Indirect communication in intercultural business negotiation: A comparative study of Chinese and American negotiators // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2021. – №171. – P.103-115.

[10] Tannen D. Indirectness in discourse: Ethnicity as conversational style // Language and Intercultural Communication. – 2019. – №19 (4). – P. 335-353.

[11] Oishi N. The role of indirectness in Japanese communication: An analysis of honorifics and indirect requests // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2021. – №179. – P. 130-142.

[12] Ter-Minasova S. G. Ne pryamoe obshchenie v delovom diskurse: problemy interpretacii (Indirect communication in business discourse: problems of interpretation) // YAzyk i tekhnologii. – 2019. – №1 (33). – S.81-94. [in Rus.]

[13] Abdullah M. H., Rakhmawati E. The Use of Indirect Communication Strategies in Maintaining Harmonious Communication among Indonesians // Journal of Intercultural Communication Research. – 2022. – №51 (1). – P. 68-87.

[14] Luring J., Selmer J. The effects of indirect and direct communication in a cross-cultural business context. International // Journal of Cross Cultural Management. – 2012. – №12 (2). – P.25-41.

САЯСИ ДИСКУРСТЫҢ КҮРДЕЛІ СИПАТЫ: ПРЕЗИДЕНТ ТОҚАЕВТЫҢ СӨЗІНДЕГІ ТІЛДІК ЖӘНЕ САЯСИ МАҚСАТТАР

***Қалдыбекова Н.Б.¹, Дүйсекова К.К.²**

***¹PhD докторант, Абылай хан Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем
тілдері университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
e-mail: nazerkekaldybekova.13@gmail.com**

**²ф.ғ.д., профессор, Л.Н.Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті
Астана, Қазақстан, e-mail: kuliash@yahoo.fr**

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада Президент Қасым-Жомарт Тоқаевтың Санкт-Петербург форумында сөйлеген сөзіндегі жанама коммуникацияның қолданылуы және оның тілдік ерекшеліктер мен риторикалық стратегиялары арқылы жеткізілген жасырын хабар мен тақырыптарды ашуға талпыныстар қарастырылады. Бұл зерттеудің негізгі мақсаты – жанама коммуникацияның саяси дискурста қолданылатын тәсілдеріне егжей-тегжейлі талдау жасау және оны қарсыластық немесе агрессивті болып көрінбестен аудиторияға әсер ету және сендіру үшін қалай пайдалануға болатынын көрсету.

Бұл зерттеу президент Тоқаевтың сөйлеген сөзіне тереңірек үңілу үшін дискурстық талдау мен риторикалық талдауды пайдаланады. Бұл мақала лингвистикалық және дискурсивті таңдауларды мұқият оқу арқылы президент сөзінің негізінде жатқан жасырын хабарламалар мен тақырыптарды ашуды көздейді.

Бұл зерттеудің практикалық құндылығы оның дискурсты талдау саласына қосқан бірегей үлесінде, атап айтқанда оның биліктің жоғары эшелонындағы саяси коммуникацияларды талдауға қолдануында. саяси дискурстың күрделі сипатын анықтай отырып, дипломатиялық мақсатты сақтай отырып, саяси мақсаттарға жету үшін тілді стратегиялық тұрғыдан қалай қолдануға болатынын көрсетеді.

Бұл зерттеуде қолданылған әдістер риторикалық стратегияларды пайдалануға назар аударатырып, Президент Тоқаевтың сөйлеген сөзіне сапалы талдау жасауды қамтиды.

Бұл зерттеудің ғылыми жаңалығы саяси коммуникацияны зерттеуге дискурстық талдауды қолдануда және оның осы контексте жанама коммуникацияны пайдалануға бағытталуында жатыр. Осылайша, бұл зерттеу саяси дискурстың күрделі және көп қырлы табиғатын, сондай-ақ саяси мақсаттарға жету үшін тілді қалай қолдануға болатынын ашып көрсетуді көздейді.

Тұтастай алғанда, бұл зерттеу Президент Тоқаевтың Санкт-Петербург форумында сөйлеген сөзінде жанама коммуникацияны қолдануын жан-жақты талдап, саяси коммуникациядағы тілдің рөлін түсінудің маңыздылығын көрсетеді.

Тірек сөздер: жанама коммуникация, риторика, сендіру, дипломатиялық тіл, саяси дискурс, дискурс талдау, жасырын мағына, саяси риторика

СЛОЖНАЯ ПРИРОДА ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА: ЯЗЫК И ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ ЦЕЛИ В РЕЧИ ПРЕЗИДЕНТА ТОКАЕВА

*Калдыбекова Н.Б.¹, Дуйсекова К.К.²

*¹PhD докторант, Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан

e-mail: nazerkekaldybekova.13@gmail.com

²д.ф.н., профессор, Евразийский национальный университет

имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан

e-mail: kuliash@yahoo.fr

Аннотация. В этой статье рассматривается использование не прямой коммуникации в речи президента Касым-Жомарта Токаева на Санкт-Петербургском форуме и делается попытка раскрыть имплицитные сообщения и темы, переданные через его язык и риторические стратегии. Основная цель этого исследования — предоставить подробный анализ способов, которыми не прямая коммуникация используется в политическом дискурсе, и продемонстрировать, как ее можно использовать для влияния и убеждения аудитории, не выходя при этом конфронтационным или агрессивным.

В этом исследовании используется сочетание анализа дискурса и риторического анализа для более глубокого изучения выступления президента Токаева. Цель этой статьи — выявить скрытые сообщения и темы, лежащие в основе его речи, путем внимательного изучения принятых им лингвистических и дискурсивных решений.

Практическая ценность этого исследования заключается в его уникальном вкладе в область дискурс-анализа, в частности в его применении к анализу политической коммуникации в высших эшелонах власти. Он проливает свет на сложную и тонкую природу политического дискурса, подчеркивая, как язык может быть стратегически использован для достижения политических целей, сохраняя при этом дипломатический фасад.

Методы, использованные в этом исследовании, включают качественный анализ речи президента Токаева с упором на использование риторических стратегий.

Научная новизна этого исследования заключается в применении анализа дискурса к изучению политической коммуникации и в его фокусе на использовании не прямой коммуникации в этом контексте. Таким образом, данное исследование призвано пролить свет на сложную и многогранную природу политического дискурса, а также на то, как язык может использоваться для достижения политических целей.

В целом, это исследование представляет собой всесторонний анализ использования президентом Токаевым не прямой коммуникации в его речи на Санкт-Петербургском форуме и подчеркивает важность понимания роли языка в политической коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: непрямая коммуникация, риторика, убеждение, дипломатический язык, политический дискурс, анализ дискурса, имплицитный смысл, политическая риторика

Статья поступила 22.10.2023