

- Books Ltd, 2003. – 224 p.
29. Clarke A. *A Fall of Moondust* / A. Clarke – London: Gollancz, 2002. – 224 p. – (S.F. Masterworks).
30. Crofts F. W. *Fatal Venture* / F. W. Crofts – Cornwall: House of Stratus, 2001. – 290 p.
31. Fletcher J. *Murder She Wrote* / J. Fletcher, D. Bain. – London: Penguin Books Office. – 2003. – 383 p.
32. Gray J. *Garden of the Sun* / J. Gray – Toronto, Winnipeg: Harlequin Books, 1983. – 191 p.
33. Holden J. *Dangerous Legacy* / J. Holden – N. Y.: Lancer Books, 1986. – 192 p.
34. Kendrick M. *The Curse Of Set-Ra-Kahtep* / M. Kendrick – London: G. Swan, 1988. – 200 p.
35. Lark J. *A Crow on the Roof* / J. Lark – London: Penguin Books, 2004. – 195 p.
36. Marcus F. *The Formation Danger* / F. Marcus // *Plays of the year*. – N. Y.: Belmont Tower Books, 1985. – P. 218-327.

Summary

The presented work is dedicated to systematic description and defining the functional role of the paratext represented in of the author's commentaries to the literary dialogue. The article contrasts paratext in drama and epic works. In the process of linguistic analysis some conclusions are made concerning the grammatical status of the author's words, their classification and role in the text.

LANGUAGE IN THE SERVICE OF POLITICAL AND POST-WAR PROPAGANDA

Mudrák Boris

University of Pavol Jozef Šafárik, Košice, Slovakia

Language, unquestionably, plays one of the principal roles in political and post-war propaganda. It is powerful politicians who have true control over public language and for the sake of achieving their purposes they often misuse the language, making it a disastrous force against their opponents. Politicians treat language or precisely 'hate speech' as "a powerful, mobilizing device, a means of silencing or removing opponents – often in preparations for a war or in the course of one" (Bugarski 2000:131). 'Hate speech' is not something that has emerged in recent years – it was a tool of destroying enemies during numerous political and military-like conflicts throughout the century. Well-known examples are Hitler's racial propaganda, the wars in Korea or the ongoing conflict in Iraq where from the point of view of the Iraqi

nation the so called ‘bad guys’ are the American troops as well as the American administration, whereas ‘the good ones’ are the Iraqi political parties hostile to the U.S. and different Islamic groups that have control over state media and try to direct as many Iraqi people against the Americans as it is possible. And, here again, we deal with falsely pictured reality. The American army is considered by the Iraqi political parties and the media as aggressors, foreign occupants, murderers and the like, which many ordinary people started to believe in. And those who think differently, who silently support the Americans may be considered traitors and easily removed by the soldiers of Hussein’s army who are consistently trying to gain support of their nation in their fight with the Americans and are determined to remove the ‘foreign occupant’ at all costs, which is proved by an avalanche of anti-American attacks.

As regards the political opponents of the Americans, they know how to bend reality for their own need, for achieving their own purposes. They know how to manipulate people taking advantage of different slogans full of hatred and inducing to violence. They call themselves patriots, defenders and the like but what they actually do is nothing else like putting a pretty mask on an ugly face.

‘Euphemistic speech’ standing in sharp contrast to ‘hate speech’, is the second most important component in the hands of powerful people which is taken advantage of in political rhetoric, as well as in war and post-war propaganda. ‘Euphemistic speech’ is a kind of justification of one’s own actions in order to cover up ugly facts. During the course of war in Vietnam, the United States, using a number of euphemisms and military expressions tried to present the situation in a favorable light or simply deny what it was doing. If we take into consideration the recent Iraqi conflict we come across the same thought as a lot of euphemistic phrases can be found in media reporting.

“*Operation Iraqi Freedom* (for an invasion unauthorized by UN), *Shock and Awe* (massive bombing), *Embeds* (reporters traveling with troops), *Collateral Damage* (civilian casualties)” and the like. (http://www.cp.org/asp/mb_copytalk.asp 03/2004).

As we can see the media are not beyond manipulation. It happens so due to the political and economic correlation between them and the US government. The journalists sent to Iraq had severe limitations imposed on them in what they could or could not report. Those of them who did not want to abide by the rules had a guarantee of quick home coming. For this reason, just at the beginning of the military conflict in Iraq, we received false reports on chemical and biological weapons, the number of Iraqi casualties or the fall of Iraqi cities. According to Bell – veteran war correspondent “*Journalists on TV were consistently reporting rumors that that would have helped the allies as if they were fact*”. For instance, “*Umm Qasr was reported as ‘taken’ on Friday and on nine further occasions over the next three days*” says Bell (Byrne’s work, 2003). So undoubtedly, there was no objective reporting during the course of war in Iraq. The media were far from telling the truth. “*the print pundits, TV anchors and correspondents in the field were all speaking the same lingo, spoon fed to them by Pentagon*” says David Olive. (<http://foi.missouri.edu/polinfoprop/language.html>).

It can clearly be noticed that broadcasting from Iraq was a pure propaganda on the side of journalists. They simply wanted to create a proper publicity towards their dying soldiers. The administration used journalists for its purposes. It was a war, which did not like the media as any other war. The reporters were not independent; they

controlled the picture of war only to some extent. A lot of information was censored. As a result, the reality that we saw on our screens was somehow distorted and partial.

Literature

1. Olive, D. 2003, March 23. "Language as a casualty of war". The Toronto Star on the Web. <http://foi.missouri.edu/polinfoprop/language.html>
2. "Style and other fallouts from the war on Iraq". The Canadian Press. 2003, April. http://www.cp.org/asp/mb_copy/talk.asp
3. 'The Guardian'. 1998. London.
4. 'The Independent'. 1999. London. Independent Newspaper UK Ltd.
5. "War and Peace: Iraq debate dominates discourse". 2003, February 23. Media General Inc.
6. Wilson, K. 2003, March 20. "Another dark, tough day in U.S. history". Nowaday News Leader. <http://www.mssu.edu/iswne/editorials/edit26.htm>

Summary

To sum up, in order to improve journalism, making it a reliable source of information instead of the one camouflaging reality through language manipulation, there should not be government restrictions on the media. It can clearly be noticed that broadcasting from Iraq was a pure propaganda on the side of journalists. They simply wanted to create a proper publicity towards their dying soldiers. The administration used journalists for its purposes. It was a war, which did not like the media as any other war. The reporters were not independent; they controlled the picture of war only to some extent. A lot of information was censored. As a result, the reality that we saw on our screens was somehow distorted and partial.

The US government says it abides by the rules of the First Amendment, but does something completely different. "...*Healthy journalism culture would offer broad debate, independent, accurate information and journalists asking tough questions – especially tough questions of people in power*" says Rendell (Diemend's work, 2003). Healthy journalism, however, should not be connected with a complete removal of euphemisms because without them it would be difficult to imagine the co-existence of small or big social groups. Sometimes, it is necessary that linguistic figures somehow distort reality. Of course, there must be limit to this in order for the world, depicted by the language, not to depart from reality.