

Political Ideologies Language from the Perspective of Modern Western Society



Mariia A. Abysova, Olha P. Antipova

Abstract: *The research is aimed at revealing the linguo-discursive features of political interaction within the framework of liberal-democratic ideological communication in the modern perspective. The task of substantiating the key foundations for the perception of language of political ideology as a linguo-discursive process of mutual adaptation of the state and civil society as subjects of political communication is addressed. The study is anchored in the neoclassical scientific paradigm, within which framework critical rethinking of the political discourse-analysis methodology is carried out. We proceed from the fact that ideology is a representation of a certain set of language elements, so the study of the ideology language serves to reconstruct the discursive base of ideology and the imperatives underlying it. It is shown that the study of language of political ideologies engenders the emergence of parallel centers of power in the sphere of statehood. The growth of destructive elements of communicative interactions in liberal democratic society is revealed, in particular an increase in the discursive means that serve an effective tool of denying the democratic process is identified. his study can be useful in the area of political science, namely in the political practice of liberal-democratic society. The findings are applicable in establishing the factors of destruction of social and political dialogue. In this context, the research can offer solutions, provide resources for politicians and organizations in optimizing the dialogue of political communication subjects. Drawing from Freeden's morphological approach of studying the ideological discourse, as well as critical discourse studies of van Dijk, the research bridges the gap between the studies of the classical philosophical thought and neoclassical scientific paradigm in comprehending the role of political ideologies language. The current study urges a critical rethinking of methodology of political discourse analysis.*

Keywords: *civil society, liberal democracy, political communication, political ideology, political science.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Today, the issue of “language and ideology” is experiencing a real resurgence, provoked by social upheavals, change of political and economic regimes, disappearance of some and intensification of the other ideologies in different regions of the modern world, and respective reflection of these changes in language.

Revised Manuscript Received on November 30, 2019.

* Correspondence Author

Mariia A. Abysova*, Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Linguistics and Social Communications, National Aviation university, Kyiv, Ukraine. Email: maria.aabysova@gmail.com

Olha P. Antipova, Department of the Preparation of Educational and Scientific Literature, National Academy of Internal Affairs, Kyiv, Ukraine. Email: maria.aabysova@gmail.com

© The Authors. Published by Blue Eyes Intelligence Engineering and Sciences Publication (BEIESP). This is an [open access](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) article under the CC-BY-NC-ND license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The philosophical study of various aspects of ideology is an objective need, stemming from qualitative changes in the modern society, in particular from its informational and communicative nature. Under these conditions, ideology becomes an indispensable institution in life of modern states and the society as a whole. The topicality of this issue is also determined by the fact that the study of political ideologies phenomenon, especially their language in the context of modern Western society, makes it possible to establish a productive inter-civilization dialogue as the only possible way to overcome multiple crises, which have marked the globalization processes. It is the language of ideology that can develop a platform of coexistence acceptable to everyone [1], which would ensure multidisciplinary framework drawing on social, cognitive and discursive conditions [2].

The multidimensionality and relevance of this issue are confirmed by discussions presented in modern publications on philosophy, political science, law, cultural studies, sociology, and other knowledge domains. Research papers of a number of researchers [3]-[8] give the most fundamental insights into this issue. Conceptualization of ideology in the modern world is inextricably linked with the processes that take place in another important object of research, language of politics.

The philosophical foundations of political ideology, the basic principles and laws of its development, the structure of existing ideological concepts have been analyzed in works of such Ukrainian and foreign researchers [9]-[11]. According to [9], the study of ideology should be conducted within the framework of a multidisciplinary structure that combines social, cognitive and discursive components. In the social and cognitive aspects, ideologies, or “systems of ideas”, are defined as fundamental understandings of the world. They are the basis for self-assessment of a social group and they define identity, goals, norms and resources of social groups. In work [10] author maintains the same position. In his works, ideology is displayed as one of the key factors that determine development of societies and, together with politics, ethics, religion, external influences, enable movement of societies along various trajectories of historical development. It is logical that, in the context of formation of an information-oriented society, examination of ideology through the lens of trends of globalization, intercultural communicative, changes in discursive practices becomes relevant [12], since ideology is based on the idea of changing the world and galvanizing into action, even a false or destructive action.

Author in [13] considers the aforementioned issue in the context of network-based nature of modern communication ties, and states that the anthropological content of the public sphere of politics is gaining now in critical importance.

Numerous studies of modern researchers confirm that in the days of rapid political change, modern society is marked by an ideology, which is fused together with certain meanings and identities, undergoes external influence both from the side of multiculturalism, total transformation of ideological systems [14], and the many-colored matrix of political practices, philosophical and political traditions [11]. In [15] author contends that the effect of using the language means is threaded across fostering ideology in human thought and behavior.

Research indicates that political ideology produces an action orientation from ideas about politics and government, it provides a program, and incites activism [1], [16]. An extensive literature documents a long-standing link of ideology and such considerations as the purposes of collective life, the appropriate manner on which to pursue social goals, the relationship between the individual and others, how resources should be developed and distributed, and the like.

Despite the fact that results of studies of classics of philosophical thought and modern scholars enabled to notably approach the comprehension of essence of language of political ideologies, some aspects of the problem have remained beyond the attention of the theorists, and the current study aims to bridge this gap. In particular, today's neoclassical scientific paradigm urges a critical rethinking of methodology of political discourse analysis, establishment of linguistic and discursive features of the state and civil society dialogue, its trends and new forms.

Taking in consideration the above, the purpose of this study is to identify discursive strategies for objectification of ideology in the mono- and multicultural linguo-communicative environment, which involves the successive tackling of tasks as follows: a) analysis of classical models of ideology; b) substantiation of key foundations for the perception of language of political ideology as a linguo-discursive process of mutual adaptation of the state and civil society as subjects of political communication; c) establishing the factors of destruction of constructive social and political dialogue. The political language then can be considered as a kind of discursive framework that helps the subject perceive and interpret the world in which he lives, new forms and trends of political communication.

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research indicates that any political ideology is a coherent image of ideal reality, and this image has some linguistic correlate. Thus, the description of ideology can be understood as a description of its language, that is, a system of concepts that structure the image of reality that underlies ideology. We proceed from the fact that ideology is a representation of a certain set of language elements. In this case, the study of the language of ideology serves to reconstruct the discursive base of ideology and the imperatives that structure it. This point of view is anchored in [17], [18] approach of studying the ideological discourse, as well as critical discourse studies,

developed in [19], [20] and his successors in [21]. The ideological content of discourse can be very different, however in the course of the analysis strategies for its ideologization and deideologization are revealed [2].

In the current study of political ideologies, we largely rely on the approach outlined in [1] and [22]. Nowadays the theory and method proposed Freedon are actively used in the study of political ideologies.

The material of this study is the modern ideological discourse, in which takes place a struggle of meanings for dominance in the basic concepts in the political and social environment. Ultimately, ideology is the choice of meaning and the struggle of the concepts in the discourse. Many scholars content the notion of concept in ideology to play a key role; therefore, it seems expedient to involve the morphological approach in the conceptual (morphological) analysis of ideologies. In this sense, Freedon himself refers to the conceptual history and its methodology, as well as its link with morphological analysis [17].

We draw on Freedon's idea that political thinking possesses such noteworthy dimensions as philosophical, rhetorical, historical, and "ideological attributes in it are striking, expressive and inevitable" [17]. According to [17], any form of political thinking contains an ideological aspect as an attempt to semantically "solve" the messiness and uncertainty in perceptions and understandings of the political world. With this in mind, it should be noted that morphological analysis "departs from the linearity postulated in the field of conceptual history", towards the interpretation of concepts simultaneously placed in different semantic fields.

Another methodological aspect of the conceptual history is the relative narrowness of sources for analysis, which attract scientists to their work, preferring lexicographic analysis to the use of a wider range of data: written texts, oral sources, and visual materials. The ideologies in the morphological approach differ to a greater degree not by the presence or absence of any concept, but by the weight and significance, which the concept has within the ideology.

The term "ideology" emerged almost two hundred years ago. Destutt de Tracy, a French philosopher, was the first to introduce this term into scientific use [24]. In his four-volume work "The Elements of Ideology", which was published at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the philosopher made an attempt to develop a methodology that could systematize the ideas of the renowned thinkers of the New Age and create a "common theory" of ideas, or a science dealing with ideology, which enabled to delve into natural origin of ideas and unravel the so called illusive thoughts.

Throughout its existence, this term took different meanings. Marx and Engels [25] were the first to turn attention to a close relationship between the civil society and the state as two subjects of ideology. The thinkers defined ideology as a collective expression of ideas of the bourgeoisie, which manages the civil society and enables to control the state. In [25] was admitted that, in this context, not all ideas belong to ideology.

Ideology is a special collection of ideas that forms a set of prevailing concepts aimed at concealing the relations of power in the civil society, and therefore to protect them from public criticism and socio-political activity (however, this goal is unattainable).

The bourgeois ideology makes it possible to conceal the rigidity of social gradations. It acts as a precondition for pseudo-compromise and cohesion of potentially conflicting groups – mainly, the hired labor and the capital. Under these conditions, it seems paradoxical that the function of legitimization is effectuated by giving the dominant private interests of the civil society a veneer of commonality, which leads to false representation of private interests as some abstract panhuman interests. Dominant ideas that pretend to be common to humanity are always ideas of the ruling class [26]. The classic Marxist theory of ideology outlined above is marked by a critical attitude to domination of the bourgeoisie over the civil society, that is, to ability of the private capital to define results of the state policy [27]. Thus, it is no surprise that this period is regarded as the time of origination of thought that different classes turn the same ideas to their own advantage [28].

Analyzing the socio-historical conditionality of thinking, Manheim [29], founder of sociology of knowledge, defined ideology in a similar way – as a set of false assumptions. In his opinion, the key function of ideology is its ability to band people together, to accumulate their political energy. The philosopher was distinguishing ideology as it is from utopia. He interpreted ideology as a collective unconscious thinking of certain groups, which concealed the actual state of society both from the society itself and from the others, thereby stabilizing the former. The utopian thinking, by contrast, is inherent in social groups interested in destroying and transforming the existing society. In view of this, they involuntarily, see only those constituent elements of the situation that are aimed at achieving the specified goal. Such kind of thinking is as well unable to adequately diagnose the actual state of the society; it can only serve as a guide to action.

III. RESULTS

Our approach recognizes that ideologies envisage close entwinement of reliable knowledge about society with social interests. As author in [30] contends, “ideas are weapons”. At the same time, it is erroneous to define ideology as a purely false perception. The key features of society today are its tangled differentiation and stratification. In the process of dividing people into social strata with different (often opposing) interests, there evolve certain stable visions of life, values, social ideals and ways to achieve them. This provokes formation of the so-called mental prism, through which these social strata perceive the world. Ideologies reflect the socially significant situations that arise in life and require a conscious choice. In the process of decision making and consistent implementation of this decision, social ideals come forward as the dominant aspirations of a stratum.

The above facts enable to interpret ideology as a socially significant, theoretically structured system of ideas, which objectifies interests of certain strata and which is meant to

establish or transform social relations. Ideology actually serves as a binding systematized method of social-group thinking.

The key function of political ideology is the legitimation of power, since it enables to justify the right of certain social and political forces to obtain it. Political ideology is intended to capture collective consciousness, implant it with certain criteria for assessment of the past, present and further development of the society, generate a positive image of the proposed or implemented policies and political forces that promise to pursue this course, strategic directions of the reformational processes, etc.

While in the pre-modern period the process of legitimation had a sacral and religious nature, in the art nouveau period, given the significant diminishing in the influence of religion on the society, the people, and not God, is recognized as the ideal source of power. The right to vote is granted to more and more social strata. Crisis of management occurs, when the former methods become ineffective in terms of impact on the population, who has acquired the ability to manage the state independently. Attempts to restore controllability of the masses led to different ways of society development. Thus, those societies, in which a party's ideology became a quasi-religion, eventually developed into one-party dictatorships. Military dictatorships that gained power by force, often could not provide a legitimate continuity of this power. This led to the situation when one day power belonged to civilian government, the other day – to the military order.

IV. DISCUSSION

Let's consider the specifics of legitimation of power in the context of a liberal-democratic model, the main feature of which is the ability of the authorities to actively address the demands of citizens equalized in the political context.

The guarantee for existence of a truly democratic society is the establishment of relations of social partnership, presence of productive socio-political dialogue in communicative interaction of the society members, both vertically (between society and government) and horizontally (between different social groups).

According to the stated position, political ideology is focused not so much on propaganda of certain ideas, emotional influence on citizens in order to motivate them to certain political actions, but as on elaboration of social consensus, making and substantiation of socio-political decisions under conditions of actually existing political pluralism and multiplicity of ideological points of view. Hence, political ideology serves as a linguo-discursive process of mutual adaptation of the state and civil society as subjects of political communication, process of bargaining and negotiation, symbolic exchange, reaching understanding and compromises, when people who are guided by different interests and values adopt decisions that are acceptable to all as a result of political communication and dialogue. Since the outcome of negotiations is not achieved by manipulation of sentiments of individuals and society as a whole,

and is not based on deception or “handed down” directives, but is provided by communicative skills and ability of the parties to reach agreement, one can foresee that this result may receive support of the majority of citizens with due account made for minority opinion during elaboration and adoption of a political decision.

Analysis of socio-political situation in the world community makes it possible to acknowledge active formation of new mechanisms and methods of political participation. Thus, various public evaluations, civilian control, public hearings, expert evaluations, public opinion research by means of numerous polls and voting, including those via Internet, formation of online government and public television, submission of electronic petitions, etc., are becoming very popular. These and other communicative mechanisms are intended to improve functional capability of feedback mechanisms between citizens and authorities, civil society and the state. Mediocracy and mediatization of politics as means of organization and implementation of e-democracy, in which the dialogue-based information and communication relations become a key mechanism for formatting political space and ensuring interaction between authorities and society, gradually become a political reality.

By contrast, the conventionally totalitarian model implies takeover of civil society by the state, absolutization of political power, and the ideological charge of all spheres of life. This type of statehood is based on perception of civil society as a main source of social antagonisms, that is, a key threat that hinders the achievement of harmonious development. Within the framework of this project, ideology involves active use of monological and propagandistic methods of social management that manifests itself in linguistic violence, which confirms the dominance of a party to the dialogue and ultimately leads to suppression of communicative interaction.

In a mono-cultural environment, linguistic violence is based on the strategy of division into “us” (who have the right to vote) and “them” (who do not have the right to vote). The “them” category, as a component of the binary opposition “us/them”, is traditionally opposed to everything positive contained in the “us” concept. Negative assessment of “them” is conditioned by cultural and historical, ethnic and social factors. In this context, “them” is close to image of an enemy.

The monologies of ideology in [7] is analyzed within the framework of the interpretation of power as a prohibitive voice. Power is perceived as someone saying “no”. This leads to double subjectification. From the position of realization of power, it is interpreted as an absolute subject that formulates prohibition, and from the position of those over whom ascendancy is exercised, power is subjectified within perception of the prohibition [7]. In view of this, the dominant influence of the power is interpreted by the philosopher as “a linguistic act, that is, proclamation of a prohibiting law, discourse..., which takes on a form of emphatic expression ‘you must not’”[7].

Theories of political ideologies within democratic and totalitarian state systems lose the credit of trust that meets the declarative statements about death of ideology and transition of humanity to a new phase of development [31], [32]. At the same time, we share assumption of [33] that the world's

ideological squared circle is not vacant. Neoliberalism (proprietary liberalism) is dominating classical ideologies (liberalism, conservatism, socialism), and its basic concepts (individual rights, freedom of choice, constraint of state power and leading role of the market) are perceived as elements of a legitimate political system [33].

Liberal ideology has defined the state structure in countries where it prevailed. Division of power into three branches – legislative, judicial and executive – is a common principle for all liberal democracies. Such approach is intended to prevent concentration of power in a single pair of hands, which will inevitably lead to dictatorship. The key to efficient functioning of power distributed in such a manner is the existence of a common strategic goal and a consensus on how to achieve this goal.

In the art nouveau period, parties were emerging as mass organizations professing different ideologies, and political race between them was of fundamental nature. To reach triumph of their ideologies, the parties tried to win as many supporters as possible striving to come to power and change society in accordance with their ideological attitudes by means of controlling masses. Capturing of majority was just vital to ideological parties that created ramified organizations, which were influencing even the everyday life of people.

It is enough for the parties currently present in liberal democracies to have a passive support of the voters to get seats in the parliament or other government bodies, which is quite possible to achieve by efforts of the party bureaucracy and propaganda. To get financial support of the apparatus and for propaganda campaigns, the parties are forced to cooperate closely with big business. The big business drags through the state authorities the decisions that are favorable to it and often harmful to other social strata or even the whole society. In the end, a situation arises when, under formal equality in rights, rich social groups retain their actual independence from state power, political and economic conditions. These people influence the ruling circles of society, the privileged strata; they are well-known personalities interconnected by personal knowledge and in many cases by family bonds. This financial elite is structured both in its social status and in importance of its role in functioning of supranationalism. Apart from elite per se, there are a lot of people who service it, implement its decisions and render it life support in other ways.

The actual transformation of the ruling elite and elite institutions of the civil society into a source of political power contradicts the regulatory canon of liberal democracy and replicates the power mechanisms characteristic of elitist rather than of democratic forms of government. Under these conditions, the political struggle of parties involves the systematic transfer of power within the elite. However, the system of supranationalism does not contain democratic power at all, since there are no political parties, division of powers; the publicity has been minimized or completely excluded, the principle of secrecy, cliquishness, and individual conspiracy prevails. The superstructural phenomena of supranationalism have no legislative functions, which remain to be functions of the statehood.

However, if the superstructure needs any changes to be made in legislation, it employs the non-state means and forces the state to act in the way it requires it. It goes about such means as, for example, “personal relations, appointing inside men to the positions of responsibility, lobbying, manipulating finances and mass media, manipulating parties and masses, bribing, etc.” [34].

The electoral system, which ensures the competition of political forces according to established rules, is essential to the system of liberal democracy. However, under conditions of equal rights of voters, when citizens, who are clueless about the complex economic and political problems, have the right to vote, political competition becomes impossible. The politicians are forced to adapt to this state of things and to promise voters all sorts of benefits during the election race, even if these promises cannot be accomplished.

This phenomenon in politics is not new; it was studied by ancient thinkers. In particular, Aristotle in [35] was quite accurate and thorough in describing demagoguery, which is especially important for determining the nature of modern populism. The ancient thinkers paid attention to the fact that citizens and leaders used eloquence and political freedoms not only to get the majority of votes, but to suppress the opposition and completely deprive it of its significance. While the democratic procedure involves making a decision on basis of quantitative majority, the demagoguery is aimed at transferring interests of the winners to the law without spending time on mediation and compromise.

Like demagoguery, populism, that is, a movement based on skillful use of verbal resources and mass media, is aimed to dispose the majority to a policy, which may not meet interests of the majority [18]. According to [36], two most important components of populism are polarization of the majority and the minority, which implies criticism of representative institutions, and presence of a leader or central governance. Without these two components, a movement with populist rhetoric, aimed at controlling the majority, is not yet populism.

In particular, for populism to evolve from a movement to a form of state power management, it needs “an organic polarizing ideology and a leader who wants to turn people's dissatisfaction and protests into a strategy of mass mobilization for the purpose of establishment of a democratic government” [36].

Thus, populism is a project of power, aimed at conquering the state in order to help its supporters, to consolidate and amplify them. It ignores open, pluralistic, lengthy discussion and employs a strategy of new unification of people for implementing claims for the acme of power.

Success of D. Trump in presidential elections in the US is indicative of attractiveness of populism, not only in Europe, but also beyond the seas. A person with no experience in political leadership and skills of meaningful political communication, who replaces the latter with primitive demagogic techniques of right-wing populist nature, who accuses the establishment and manipulates fears of ordinary citizens and prejudices about uncontrolled migration, security threats, etc., has taken the lead in a respected republican party. In fact, D. Trump is part of the establishment, his financial segment. Prerequisites for his appearance have formed long

ago. Suffice it to recall phenomenon of the Tea Party movement, which gained particular popularity in the United States during the 2010's. Ideology and rhetoric of the Tea Party had many populist components, but it lacked a unified vertical structure, inherent in populism. This party was looking for a leader able to unite the movement, change the republican party and the whole country, since from the very beginning its members wanted to be something more than just a protest movement. The emergence of D. Trump in American politics means that the Tea Party, as a movement with populist project of power, has found the missing element – the nation-wide leader [37].

The political statements of the US president were extremely controversial, the program was unclear, but his nationalistic calls in economy to re-create workplaces for white Americans attracted the voters' attention, since over 2.5 million people have lost their jobs in this country in recent years [38].

The characteristic features of populism are as follows: infusing belief in fast and easy solving of complex problems; offering activities that are understandable; domination of well-defined activities; appeal to the general public; presence of a strong personality, a charismatic leader.

In a society with high level of democratic development, a politician who came to power using a populist technology is actually implementing economic and social programs. He is making efforts to raise the standard of living of the population and this is the key criterion for activity of a political leader in a democratic society. If his words do not meet his actions, it is unlikely that he succeeds during the next elections, because his opponents will use all the mechanisms of democratic influence on the voters. However, it often turns out that as a result of assumption of power by such leader, populism becomes not a form of denunciation of existing shortcomings of the system, but a project of political renovation in centralization of power, weakening of the check-and-balance system, strengthening of executive branch, neglecting political opposition, transformation of the election into plebiscite, which meets interests of the leader, etc.

Apart from the ruling elites and their social institutions, which form the core of civil society, the constituent elements capable of destroying the foundations of modern state and forming power centers that are parallel to the state are as follows: analytical structures, non-governmental supranational organizations, religious and ethnic associations, mass media, organized crime, shadow economy, private security agencies and intellectual communities (that are termed “think tank” in the Western world, i.e. “research center”, and are translated in various sources as “factory of thought”, “brain trust”, “intellectual corporation”, etc.) [39].

Ratings are one of the effective tools of pressure on public opinion. Rating characterizes the subject, allows comparing it with a similar subject in order to estimate the potential competitive advantage, positive indicators or miscalculations at certain time intervals. Today, ratings are compiled in a variety of fields; mass media is actively using these data, in particular for coverage of various aspects of social and political life.

Their popularity is explained by the fact that the audience wants to know the current priorities in a certain critical area. Voters, for example, need to know who is topping the rating and who is the outsider.

The “rating” category is closely related to concepts of expert system, expert. A person, who makes an important decision (for example, a representative of a governing body, a journalist, an ordinary citizen) may, if necessary, refer to the opinion of a group of experts and obtain a conclusion on a specific issue. Experts often have profound knowledge in the field of decision making. In fact, they are informal leaders of opinions with a pro-active attitude to life. These may be a group of people, an organization, including a rating agency. Popularity in the media and recognizability is the most important task for the experts, since it guarantees them the trust of society. Besides, the number of publications is an indicator of evaluation of performance of an analytical center. However, more and more politicians and their teams are facing the fact that public opinion in politics is difficult to determine. That is why in recent years, especially among politicians, “services” of people who are directly influencing the formation of a necessary image and promote ideas to the masses have become “particularly popular”.

The so-called opinion leaders may include subject-matter experts, journalists and informal public leaders. The opinion leaders – experts in a particular field – are most relevant in a national-level campaign. Undoubtedly, it is very difficult for politicians to spark interest of a significant number of experts with their topics, and moreover with their personality [16]. That is why the most adequate format is the initiation and carrying out of joint activities, both public and private. Such actions help to maintain bilateral communication and receive up-to-date information on the activities of politicians and political forces, while politicians receive a good opportunity to submit the high-quality information to those who directly influence formatting of the information space and formation of image in media. The experts are often invited to events arranged by politicians in order to maintain the confidence of citizens at the appropriate level.

Fukuyama [40], “father of modern liberal democracy”, believes that the matured tendencies weaken the statehood. The scientist claims that weakening of the state, which has been observed over the last thirty years and inspires enthusiasm in liberals, has led to the fact that the space freed from the state control has been captured by “patchy gathering of international organizations, criminal syndicates, terrorist groups, and others, who may be given some kind of authority and legitimacy, but rarely a combination of both” [40].

The current situation forces him to urge politicians and public to resist this process, “to go back to a sovereign nation state and try again to understand how to make it strong and successful” [40].

V. CONCLUSION

The growing interest in the issue of “language and ideology” has been provoked by the hegemony of liberal democracy. In the political practice of liberal-democratic society, the authors identified an increase in the linguo-discursive means that serve as an effective tool of

gentle denying the democratic process with preservation of formal institutions of democracy.

Since modern democracy is legitimated in the field of public policy during interaction between the state and civil society, it is expedient to draw attention to the fact of formation of parallel state power centers in the sphere of statehood. Subjects of civil society, represented by financial elites, intercept political power by linguo-discursive means of replication of power mechanisms characteristic of elitist forms of state administration.

In this context, it would be challenging to uncover ways to optimize the dialogue of subjects of political communication. This issue may well constitute promising directions for further research in this area.

REFERENCES

1. M. Freeden, “Ideology and political theory,” in *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2006, pp. 3-22. DOI: [10.1080/13569310500395834](https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310500395834).
2. T. A. van Dijk, “Ideology and discourse analysis,” in *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2006, pp. 115-140. DOI: [10.1080/13569310600687908](https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908).
3. R. Bart, “Myth Today,” in *Selected Works: Semiotics. Poetics*. Moscow: Progress, 1994, pp. 72-130.
4. P. Bourdieu, *Le Sens pratique*. Paris: Minuit, 1980.
5. H. Marcuse, *Heideggerian Marxism*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
6. F. Skinner, *Cumulative Record*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.
7. M. Foucault, *Intellectuals and power: selected political articles, speeches and interviews: in 3 Vols. Vol. 2*. Moscow: Praxis, 2005.
8. Heywood, *Political Ideologies. An Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Publishers, 2017.
9. L. Wati, Analyzing of political Ideologies and discourse analysis. Ideology and Discourse Analysis. *INA-Rxiv*, 2018. Available: <https://osf.io/preprints/inarxiv/c5dhj/>
10. A. Ivin, *New philosophy of history: monograph*. Berlin: Direct Media, 2016.
11. Kologrivova, *The language of political ideology: development trajectories*. Moscow: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2011.
12. L. Drotianko, and S. Yahodzinskyi, “Information environment as the intercultural communication space,” in *Matec Web of Conferences*, vol. 106, 2017, 01006. doi:10.1051/mateconf/201710601006.
13. A. Tretyak, “The public sphere of politics: the anthropological dimension in contemporary communicative theory,” in *Anthropological measurements of philosophical research*, vol. 12, 2017, pp. 62-71.
14. R. H. Kochesokov, L. M. Ashnokova, K. Kh. Unezhev, and B. M. Zumakulov, “Posthistorical factor in the failure of the politic of multiculturalism,” in *Humanities of the south of Russia*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2017, pp. 135-146.
15. J. Skidmore, “Political language and political ideology,” in *History of European Ideas*, vol. 19, 1994, pp. 715-720.
16. J. Clarke, and J. Newman, “People in this country have had enough of experts’: Brexit and the paradoxes of populism,” in *Critical Policy Studies*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2017, pp. 101-116. DOI: [10.1080/19460171.2017.1282376](https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2017.1282376).
17. M. Freeden, “The morphological analysis of ideology,” in *Oxford handbook of political ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013, pp. 115-137.
18. M. Freeden, “After the Brexit referendum: revisiting populism as an ideology,” in *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 22, no. 1, 2017, pp. 1-11. DOI: [10.1080/13569317.2016.1260813](https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2016.1260813).
19. T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse, racism and ideology*. La Laguna (Spain): RCEI Ediciones, 1996.
20. T. A. van Dijk, *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: SAGE, 1998.
21. R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE, 2001.

22. W. B. Gallie, "Essentially contested concepts," in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, vol. 56, 1956, pp. 167-98.
23. M. Freedon, *Ideologies and political theory: a conceptual approach*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
24. S. Ivanova, "The Elements of "Ideology": Antoine Destutt de Tracy and his Science of Ideas," in *Voprosy filosofii*, vol. 8, 2013, pp. 146-148.
25. Marx, and F. Engels, *Criticizing Hegel's philosophy of law*. Moscow: Politizdat, 1957.
26. Marx, and F. Engels, *The German Ideology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974.
27. J. Kin, *Democracy and civil society*. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya, 2001.
28. K. D. Bracher, *The Age of Ideologies: A History of Political Thought in the Twentieth Century*. London: Methuen, 1984.
29. Manheim, *Favorites. The diagnosis of our time*. Moscow: Yurist, 1994.
30. M. Lerner, *Ideas are Weapons: The History and Use of Ideas*. New York: Viking Press, 1943.
31. D. Bell, *The End of Ideology: On the Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties*. New York: Free Press, 1965.
32. F. Fukuyama, "The End of History?" in *The National Interest*, 1989. Available:
https://www.embl.de/aboutus/science_society/discussion/discussion_2006/ref1-22june06.pdf
33. D. Shvartsmantel, *Ideology and politics*. Kharkiv: Gumanitarny tsentr, 2009.
34. A. Zinovev, *Logical sociology*. Moscow: Sotsium, 2002.
35. Aristotle, *Works in 4 vols. (Series "Philosophical Heritage")*. Moscow: Mysl, 1975-1983.
36. Urbinati, *Distorted democracy. Opinion, truth and people*. Moscow: Izd-vo Instituta Gaydara, 2016.
37. V. Glukhova, "Populism as a political phenomena and the challenge of the modern democracy," in *Polis. Political Studies*, 4, 2011, pp. 49-68.
38. F. Fukuyama, "American Political Decay or Renewal? The Meaning of the 2016 Election," in *Russia in Global Affairs*, vol. 5, 2016. Available:
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2016-06-13/american-political-decay-or-renewal>
39. S. V. Beloshitsky, *Liberal democracy in the XXI century: resources, challenges, prospects*. Khmel'nitsky: PE Melnyk A. A., 2012.
40. F. Fukuyama, *Strong state. Governance and world order in the 21st century*. Moscow: AST, 2007.