

LEGE ARTIS

Language yesterday, today, tomorrow

Vol. VIII. No 1 2023 (Special issue)

SETTING AN OPPOSITION:

ANTITHESIS IN PROPAGANDA FOR 1960 UKRAINIAN SSR

Svitlana Shurma 

Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Zlín, Czech Republic

Received: 9.11.2022 **Reviewed:** 15.01.2023 and 15.02.2023

Similarity index: 1%

Bibliographic description: Shurma, S. (2023). Setting an opposition: Antithesis in propaganda for 1960 Ukrainian SSR. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Trnava: University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, VIII (1), Special issue, p. 129-146. ISSN 2453-8035 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34135/lartis.23.8.1.09>

Abstract: The study zeroes in on the propagandist discourse of the Communist Party and its leaders in one of the official newspapers of the Ukrainian SSR, targeted at the young men and women, the *Molod Ukrajinu* published during January – June 1960. Cognitive antithesis (PEACE :: WAR, SOCIALISM / EAST :: CAPITALISM / WEST and THE PEOPLE :: THE PEOPLE'S ENEMIES) is used as a rhetoric tool for propaganda of Socialist values and Khrushchev's political agenda.

Keywords: cognitive antithesis, propaganda, Khrushchev, ideology, Us/Them, CDA.

1. Introduction

In 1928 Bernays defined propaganda as "a consistent, enduring effort to create or shape events to influence the relations of the public to an enterprise, idea or group" (Bernays 1928: 25). Early in the century he saw propaganda as a positive aspect driving the society and progress (ibid., 38). By the end of the 20th century, the attitude to it changed especially in connection with the Nazi's and the Soviets' applications (Auerbach & Castronovo 2013: 2; Cull et al. 2003: xv), though as Bernays (1928: 21) writes, it is by the virtue of public opinion that the term is treated as either good or bad. Welch (Cull et al. 2003: 317-323) offers the scope of the definitions circulating over the last century, showing the shifts in its core. Nowadays, propaganda studies continue, and it is a popular topic of research in such fields as linguistics, journalism, psychology, sociology, and some other disciplines. Within the domain of linguistics, critical discourse analysis (e.g., Hassan 2018; Moss 1985; Patrona 2018; van Dijk 1997) and rhetorics (e.g., Kampka 2015; Lee & Lee 1939; Molek-Kozakowska 2010; Prato 2018; Propaganda and rhetoric... 2016; Yang 1994) specifically focus their attention on



propaganda discourse.

Propaganda uses a variety of means to ensure that it works (Jowett & O'Donnell 2012), and its effectiveness is typically measured by the number of followers, voters, or buyers that accept it. In ideological propaganda, a productively used mechanism for achieving an aim is setting the opposition between *Us* and *Them* (Ross 2002: 20; van Dijk 1998; 2006; Wirth-Koliba 2016; Wodak 2009). The **aim** of the article is to look at how polarization is enhanced through the rhetoric tool of antithesis in the ideologically-charged discourse.

2. Literature review

2.1 *Some aspects of propaganda and its analysis*

Ellul states: "Propaganda is a set of methods employed by an organized group that wants to bring about the active or passive participation in its action of a mass of individuals, psychologically unified through psychological manipulations and incorporated in an organization" (1973: 61). In the propaganda model, three key elements are tightly linked: sender – message – receiver (Panasenko & Greguš 2022: 131-132; Ross 2002: 18), and through the methods used by the sender that shape the message and have effect on the receiver, propaganda becomes effective in its persuasive power. As a persuasive tool, propaganda requires an intention of the sender, who should adhere to some view of justice or social order, to deliver an emotionally appealing message to a targeted social group the opinion or belief of which the sender wants to influence (Ross 2002: 19-21). In Ellul's (1973: xiii) broad sense, it embraces psychological action and warfare, re-education and brainwashing as well as public and human relations. For a linguist, the focus on the methods applied within these six domains becomes of much importance, as the verbal mode of communication is important for propaganda.

To be successful, propaganda should rely on the following characteristics: simultaneous appeal to individuals and masses, spread over all communication channels, continuous nature, strict organization, orthopraxy, psychological appeal, working with social constructs and collective "foci of interest", timely nature, and truth / falsehood correlation (Ellul 1973: 6-61). In this view, the presentation of argumentation allows the effectiveness of persuasion. Ftorek (2017: 23-25) outlines a number of argumentative strategies common in propaganda, of which the "black or white" technique is of special interest for the present discussion, since it is typically connected with "contrasting some kind of version of the world" (Jeffries 2010: 51). Additionally, for a success of propaganda, it should be penetrated to every aspect of the society, as was the case with Communist propaganda (Bryan, *s.a.*). With regard to propaganda in the USSR, a retrospective view and visibility of some of its effects make analysis more thorough. For instance, 1960 is the year of Khrushchev in power. Today we

perceive Khrushchev époque as marked by changes in the societal perception that included denouncing the Stalin cult and substituting it by the cult of the Great Patriotic War, intellectual thaw and mass festivities, freeing prisoners and announcing peaceful initiatives, reorganizing industry and agriculture, space programs and increasing role of propaganda (McCauley 1995: chap. 3; Taubman 2005). The Party leader's image is often associated nowadays with his allegedly banging a shoe during the UN General Assembly in 1960. At the same time, the picture painted in the print media of the Ukrainian SSR of that time was very different: filled with reports on achievements, party speeches and directives, celebrations of peace initiatives, sport and science advances, and praise of Soviet lifestyle and order as opposed to the capitalist one. The foreign affairs propaganda of that year concentrated on anti-Americanism, anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism, pro-peace, pro-disarmament, and support of the countries of the Soviet Camp (Barghoorn 1964: chap. III). To secure its place, the ideology became "an illusion and deliberate deformation that serves on as an environment for establishing and keeping power of a small group of Communist elites and creates dubious appearance of regime legitimation" (Kopeček 2003: 226-227).

2.2 Us and Them as part of propaganda mechanism

It is typical of any society to classify the world around, making it a mental, personal, and social act (Zerubavel 1999: 53). In this sense, discourse (and language constructing this discourse) reflect the power relations in it (Renkema & Schubert 2018: 348; Zerubavel 1999: 66-67) and thus the social division of the world (Zerubavel 1999: chap. 4). Zerubavel (ibid., 58) distinguishes social divisions that rely on rigid-, fuzzy-, and flexible-mindedness. Those distinctions, which either blur or polarize society, become the part of common ideology, and therefore, propaganda. Most totalitarian propaganda was based on the rigid division of the world into Socialist camp with its supporters and Capitalist West. Building an Iron Curtain was a way to protect the society from knowing the truth or getting influence from the outside.

"[T]he senders of propaganda often aim at creating an 'us' against 'them' mentality" (Ross 2002: 20), where 'them' is in opposition to 'us'. Polarization as a propaganda tool is connected with its orthopraxical nature (Ellul 1973: 29). As Ellul (ibid., 28-29) writes, by making an individual act, propaganda becomes a governing mechanism of the individual's choices since it justifies and authorizes the actions. Through this commitment an individual is given a place in society and is automatically offered carefully constructed images of his friends and enemies. Yet, the enemy is given a special role in the discourse, as it becomes a supporter of regime through the use of "self-criticism" of the opponents of this regime to justify its rightful nature (ibid., 11-12).

The *Us / Them* polarization is a powerful persuasive tool relying on positive Self-presentation and negative Other-presentation (van Dijk 1998), where clusivity becomes a discursive mechanism of this polarization (Wirth-Koliba 2016). *Us / Them* strategies are often used as a way to indicate allies and enemies, dominating and inferior, credible and deceptive, good and bad parties to the audience (Wirth-Koliba 2016: 23-25, 29; also van Dijk 1993; 2006). Polarization is also part of ideologically-charged discourse, since it helps to make conflicts, power imbalances, and even worldview seem legitimate (van Dijk 2006: 730). The ideological discourse uses the language that enhances positive Self-presentation and negative Other-presentation that is typically known as an ideological square (ibid., 734).

In this sense, the visual and verbal emphasis or its lack are used to legitimize power and authority (Re/reading the past... 2003). *Us / Them* social division presupposes that some social actors are included, or approved, while others are excluded from the shared discourse space, or disapproved of. This clusivity means that the propaganda mechanism uses "a number of linguistic forms by means of which the speaker communicates (lack of) belongingness of chosen notion / actors in political discourse" (Wieczorek 2009: 119). The discourse itself would therefore rely on two schemata: container and center-periphery (ibid., 120). *Us* would presuppose that the elements, actions, notions rest inside a container or close to center, while *Them* and *Their* associates would be pushed outside or to the periphery. This movement is dependent on "physical, historical, and socio-ideological localization of discourse elements" (ibid., 121). Toying with center / periphery and in / out results in a discursive strategy of proximization (Wirth-Koliba 2016: 26). Through spatial, temporal, and axiological proximization the events and people are presented as dangerous / safe, important and needing action / unimportant and obliterated, ideologically accepted / ideologically unacceptable (ibid., 26), respectfully. In fact, it means that for a discourse of this sort, antithesis should have a high polarization potential. Cap claims, "[antithesis triggers] are, from the axiological perspective, all the ideological premises that the addressee identifies with and, consequently, whose conceptual oppositions he or she would not find not only unacceptable but also plainly threatening" (2010: 131). In the next section I will discuss antithesis as a rhetoric device used for creation of polarized ideologies.

2.3 Antithesis as a rhetoric tool of propaganda

As a rhetoric tool, antithesis was described by Aristotle (2008) in *The art of rhetoric*. He defines antithesis as pairs of opposites that are placed in close proximity. He states that "the significance of contrasted ideas is easily felt, especially when they are thus put side by side, and also because it has the effect of a logical argument; it is by putting two opposing conclusions side by side that you prove one of them false" (ibid., 195). This ease of perception granted antithesis a place in propaganda

discourses. In fact, cognitive potential of antithesis has been discussed in a number of publications (see Fahnestock 1999; Kaluža 1984; Shurma & Lu 2018); yet, its place in linguistic and discourse studies is still underestimated.

From the perspective of a text, antithesis is based on parallelism of semantic antonyms. It is "[t]he juxtaposition of contraries: the contrast of ideas, sharpened or pointed up by the use of words of opposite or conspicuously different meaning in contiguous or parallel phrases or clauses" (The new Princeton encyclopedia... 1993: 79). Conceptually, the +/- factor is important (Kaluža 1984: 107; Shurma & Lu 2018: 145) in antithesis. Depending on how antithesis is formed, direct antithesis would require polarity of only one feature within the two elements of the trope, while in an indirect one the "secondary characteristics" (Kaluža 1984: 108) of two contrasting elements will be in opposition. The emergent meaning in antithesis will retain the dichotomy, rather than merge two opposing concepts together (Shurma & Lu 2018: 146). One more type of antithesis that exists in the discourse is an extended one, where the parallelism of contrasting ideas is realized via foregrounding in a wider context (ibid., 149-150). This kind of antithesis requires interpretative strategies and activation of familiar schemas that will allow the addressee to spot the opposition. Typically, at least two viewing frames (*sensu* Harrison 2017: 22-23) should be created that would lead the reading and further interpretation to the juxtaposition of the ideas, events and other elements of the knowledge required for processing or noticing antithesis (see discussion in Shurma & Lu 2018). Fahnestock (1999: 58-59) points out to the argumentative status of antithesis, drawing attention to the fact that for antithesis to be perceived as such, there should be either acceptance of the opposition on part of the audience or (con)textual motivation.

If we accept that propaganda is "a consistent, enduring effort to create or shape events to influence the relations of the public to an enterprise, idea or group" (Bernays 1928: 25), then antithesis is a great tool for achieving the aim. Its persuasive potential lies not only in the possibility to make inferences, but also in enhancing the ideological square. The +/- factor in antithesis serves negative Other-presentation versus positive Self-presentation: - factor will always accompany *Them*, while + factor will work for the legitimation of *Us*. Through this rhetoric tool the world projected in the propagandist material appears as divided into "discrete, quasi-insular mental chunks" (Zerubavel 1999: 66). Through repetition, antitheses enter into and shape the memories in the way suggested by the propagandists. Once in regular use, the semantic contrast ascribed to the elements of antithesis becomes accepted. In the sections below I will focus on verbal and discursive characteristics of antitheses in ideologically charged discourse of the Ukrainian SSR.

3. Material and method

Regarding the **methodology** of the analysis, the articles from the *Molod Ukrajinny* are viewed from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis, or CDA (Fairclough 1989; 2013; Krzyżanowski & Forchtner 2016; van Dijk 1997) and Critical Stylistics (Jeffries 2010). As an interdisciplinary methodology, CDA deals with the issues such as ideology and power, combining the knowledge from linguistics, social and cognitive sciences, pragmatics, and some other. CDA looks into the textual and contextual issues of the text interpretation (Huckin 1997: 78) especially with regard to polarization as a means of political propaganda.

The paper is part of a bigger project on the rhetoric of violence. The articles used as the **material** for this research were collected with the view of their relevance to the topic. Yet, the material showed that as part of symbolic violence (*sensu* Žižek 2008) some of the articles dealing with violence of different sort used antithesis for propaganda. The year 1960 was not chosen at random. From a contemporary standpoint, Pankin and Svanidze (Панкин & Сванидзе 2016) called 1960 "the year of fantastic deceit", when the propaganda was at its highest. Since the interpretation and counting was done manually, to minimize the error in calculations, only the first six months of 1960 were analyzed. I suggest that the first half of the year is enough to see the trends and patterns in the use of antithesis since the rhetoric is quite consistent and ideologically motivated. A total of 211 articles from the *Molod Ukrajinny*, a Ukrainian language daily newspaper directed at the young Communists of the Ukrainian SSR, served as the material. The articles were photographed from the archives, and the corpus includes the texts published within the period of January 1 – June 29, 1960.

4. Findings and results

We earlier identified antitheses as words, phrases, chunks of clauses, sentences, or text fragments that contextually relied on +/- factor in their semantics or discursive role. This section deals with the semantic, cognitive, and pragmatic properties of the figure of speech with the view of its propaganda potential as discussed elsewhere.

As can be seen from the analyzed material, antithesis finds its way on three levels: (1) antithesis *per se* realized in shorter context of 1-3 sentences; (2) discursive antithesis, where the opposition is presented in a wider context at different textual levels; and (3) conceptual antithesis where certain linguistic structures provoke the opposition in the mind as a way of dichotomizing elements of schematic knowledge thus contributing to or setting an agenda. In total, 211 articles in the *Molod Ukrajinny* contain one or both types of antitheses, and the number of antitheses analyzed is equal to 347. Since there is a degree of subjectivity in antithesis interpretation, I focused only on the antitheses

which were verbally explicated in the text either by the syntactical parallelism or textual (narrative) structure. Fahnestock indicates that if antithesis becomes too salient to be immediately recognizable, "it is possible to use what could be only half an antithesis and still secure the effect of a whole" (1999: 59). The present analysis did not take these types of antitheses into consideration.

Conceptually, about 90% of antitheses analyzed can be attributed to one of the following dichotomies within the ideological square (see Table 1):

Table 1. Conceptual antithesis in the *Molod Ukrajinny* articles. Source: Own processing

Us	Them
PEACE THE PEOPLE SOCIALISM / EAST	WAR THE PEOPLE'S ENEMIES CAPITALISM / WEST

The PEACE :: WAR dichotomy is presented as both simple and discursive antitheses and is verbally explicated in 98 articles, though the number of the articles that thematically deal with war/fights and/or peace is almost twice as much. "The argumentative uses of antithesis depend on the rhetorical status of the opposed lexis [...] the figure writes itself by drawing on known contrasts, and its effect with a particular audience depends on their prior recognition of these contrasts" (Fahnestock 1999: 59). It seems that the Soviet propaganda understood the argumentative potential of the known, especially something that referred to the painful past. Since 1960 was marked by Khrushchev's idealistic doctrine of world peace and calls for disarmament, naturally PEACE :: WAR antithesis enters the rhetoric at all levels of text and discourse. This opposition relies on the memory of World War II, on the current-to-the-reader experience of the Cold War and fear of the future "atomic war" or "imperialist invasion".

For example:

(1) *Ukr.* – "Скрізь юні проти **війни**. Їх еднає спільна мета – **мир**" ("Words that come from heart", 3.02.60). [*Eng.* – "All around, the youth is against war. They are united by a common goal – peace¹"].

The article exploits the letters to the editor, quotes from which constitute its framework. These quotes allegedly coming from people of different background and nationalities deal with their memories of WWII, danger of the atomic and hydrogen explosions that can "exterminate the inhabitants of the world", and the words of gratitude to Khrushchev for his peaceful policies. Antithesis occurs in the end of the article as a way of summary of what the young people, the audience of the newspaper, allegedly believe in. Antithesis is based on the semantic tautology of ideas expressed in both sentences; thus, the reinforcement makes it stylistically stronger (Panasenکو et al. 2018). The position

of juxtaposed elements at the end of the sentences makes these ideas appear as new. Through overgeneralizations, used in the article, such as "the workers of the whole world", "common teacher", "common worker" and "the youth" from Example 1, propaganda creates and exploits the *Us* space where the unity of the ideas and believes legitimatizes support of the Party initiatives led by Khrushchev.

In fact, Khrushchev, party officials and the newspaper within the analyzed period of six months set a complex PEACE :: WAR agenda, where salience is achieved through antithesis among other methods. The Labor Day, traditionally celebrated on May 1 and the Victory Day, celebrated in the USSR on May 9, become the days when the concentration of PEACE :: WAR rhetoric was increasingly high. What also contributed to this was the Vienna summit and Lockheed U2 spy plane incident², which Khrushchev widely used for promoting his own ideas not only of disarmament, but also discrediting the USA, which he chose both as an enemy and benchmark for comparing the country's achievements. The PEACE :: WAR agenda becomes so important for the 1960 articles, that other types of antitheses identified in Table 1 contribute to it. For instance, on January 15, 1960, Khrushchev incorporated into his talk "Disarmament – A Way to Strengthen Peace and Provide Friendship Between Nations" at the Supreme Council of the USSR pairs of semantic opposites (Fahnestock 1999: 52) to make the rhetorical effect stronger:

(2) Ukr. – *"Ясно, що імперіалісти намагатимуться знову зібрати сили прихильників 'холодної війни'. Миролюбні люди повинні бути пильними і не ослабляти боротьби за міцнення миру."*
[Eng. – *"It is obvious that the imperialists will try again to collect the powers of the 'cold war' supporters. Peace-loving people should be vigilant and not stop fight for strengthening peace."*]

The following example (2) juxtaposes social actors that the Communist propaganda sets as enemies: "imperialists" and "peace-loving people". Built upon THE PEOPLE :: THE PEOPLE'S ENEMIES antithesis, Khrushchev reinforces the idea that *Us* "container" includes anyone who supports peace, and at the same time reinforces the Socialist dogma that those are the common people, working class, the majority as opposed to those in power who do not support Socialist ideology, and thus impede progress and peaceful development. This part of antithesis is based on the parallelism of grammatical subjects, while the second part of it is strategically placed at the end of two sentences. In this case, the speaker alludes to the situation of immediate danger and fear for the readers, set by the politically chosen agenda – "cold war", yet, cognitively offers a paradoxical but legitimate solution – "fighting for peace". The whole idea of war metaphor to speak about political, economic, and social rivalry of the two Camps, make Khrushchev actions and initiatives legitimate (not much unlike the example of the "War on Terror" described by Lakoff (2009: chap. 6)).

The PEACE :: WAR discourse antithesis is realized on several textual levels, and usually forms viewing frames, or selected "aspects of shared knowledge" (Harrison 2017: 23), that are stipulated by key words or other salience features of the texts. For example, discourse antithesis in the article as of April 19, 1960, relies on the juxtaposition of the title "*Світ без війни*" – "The World Without War" and the first sentence that opens the article *Мир!* – "Peace!" (see Fig. 1); there is a clear dichotomy of war and peace, emphasized by the position of the elements in the discourse. There is also an interesting graphical arrangement: the word *Мир!* appears to the left in the article block, in the same font as the rest of the article, and on the same line as the upper part of the title. The title itself is positioned to the right, and is in block letters that appear to be as big as the first four lines of the deck. Graphically *Мир!* is positioned to the left as "known" information (Kress & van Leeuwen 2006: 179-185), thus, "*Світ без війни*" is what draws most attention.



Figure 1. Typesetting arrangement of antithesis (19.04.1960)

Another type of discursive antithesis is typically based on juxtaposing two narratives: (1) based on time frames, such as WWII narrative versus present peaceful time narrative, or (2) place frames, such as fights outside the USSR and peace inside the USSR. In this case the propaganda makes positive *Self*-presentation by painting the pictures of safe idealistic Socialist present led by the Communist party against the unsafe and traumatic past or unsafe *Others*.

Such idealism in presentation is based on the juxtaposition SOCIALISM/ EAST :: CAPITALISM/ WEST. In the Soviet propaganda EAST was associated with the Eastern Bloc countries that adopted Communism as major ideology. This dichotomy is also closely connected with the THE PEOPLE :: THE PEOPLE'S ENEMIES antithesis, as the USSR saw the Capitalist West led by the "imperialists", "colonialists" or/and "capitalists" as the enemy of THE PEOPLE not only of the Socialist camp, but also within the countries considered as enemies. However, Communist projection was that once the people know about the merits of Socialism doctrine and values, they would "shake off" capitalism and join the Socialist Camp. To promote the ideology, the USSR targeted and sponsored the overthrows of colonial governments in the African, Caribbean and other colonies as well as Communist Parties in other states (see Walter 1956: 270-273). Yet, on the territory of the republics, such as the Ukrainian SSR, propaganda highlighted the idea of advanced and positive life in the USSR. For example, antithesis in Example 3 juxtaposes positive aspects of Socialist life and negative aspects of the Capitalist West.

(3) *Укр.* – "Глибока безодня лежить між щасливим і безтурботним дитинством у соціалістичних країнах і тяжким, безрадісним становищем дітей трудящих у капіталістичному світі" (1.06.60). [*Eng.* – "There is a deep abyss between the happy and carefree childhood in the Socialist countries and hard, joyless position of the workers' children in the Capitalist world"].

In Example 3 the effect of antithesis set through the coordinative sentence structure is enhanced by the metaphoric expression *глибока безодня* [deep abyss]. In fact, almost every word in the first coordinate clause has its contrasting equivalent in the second: *щасливий* [happy] – *безрадісний* [joyless], *безтурботний* [carefree] – *тяжкий* [hard], *дитинство* [childhood] – *становище дітей* [children's position], *соціалістичні країни* [Socialist countries] – *капіталістичний світ* [Capitalist world].

Within antithesis of this kind, the articles set the following groups of oppositions: (a) ideologies: the USSR vs the USA or Britain, the USSR vs Capitalist countries, Socialism vs Capitalism, Communism vs the Nazi, new Socialist relations vs old traditions; (b) good and bad social actors: Soviet youth / patriots vs old people in power, new human vs vestiges of the past, winners vs losers; (c) national welfare and industry achievements: increased national wealth vs unemployment and deficit, state protection vs lack of civil rights, educated vs uneducated, collectivism vs individualism; (d) good and bad epistemological qualities: might and power vs weaknesses, freedom and justice vs suppression, colonialism and injustice, truth vs lies, freedom and happiness vs exploitation, happiness vs grief, cooperation vs destruction, equality vs segregation / inequality.

Let us look at the example of complex discursive antithesis that sets the opposition between the ideologies and important epistemological qualities relevant for the propaganda. In several articles, to make a strong statement, the rhetorical arrangement is based on the chunks of text that are distributed throughout the text but are perceived as contrasting. Depending on whether the writer wants to highlight the positive idea or negative one, the size of the chunks and appearance in the text will differ. So, if the author(s) wants to highlight the positive part of antithesis, it would appear in the final sections of the text, and vice versa. For instance, the article "*Нас виховали партія і комсомол*" – "We were raised by the Party and Komsomol" of April 5, 1960, stresses upon the positive impact of the Communist Party and Komsomol Organization, and thus strategically focuses on the merits of the worldview. The article presents an interview with Poplavskyj and Kriuchkovskyj, two crew members of barge T-36 that was adrift for 49 days until it was finally rescued by the American aircraft carrier *Kearsarge*³.

Typographically the text is arranged in three columns. While the first one contains the - factor chunk, the second and third offer an opposite idea. Antithesis here is quite intricate, as on the one hand, it is realized at the level of narration, where two stories about a similar event are presented as having a negative vs positive outcome. The two opposing narratives are a story of a British ship that sunk in the Indian Ocean and whose survivors got wild⁴, and, naturally, the story of T-36 survivors who saved their human faces despite the adversity of conditions. Additionally, the other part of antithesis relies on the opposition of ideas verbalized through respective vocabulary.

Antithesis is based on the oppositions Capitalism vs Communism, negative human traits (profit-seeking and egoism) vs positive human traits (love for the country, grit, patriotism, cooperation, hard work, heroism), and individualism (dog eats dog) vs collectivism (friendship, Party, Fatherland, Komsomol, Soviet person). The text, propagandistically, is very consistent: the words *Party* and *Komsomol* are repeated in the article 5 times, *Soviet* – 8 times in combinations with *люди* [people], *Ukraine* and *Союз* [Union]. Another element of propaganda that enhances the feelings of patriotism is the epithet *рідний* [dear] a very popular epithet in the combinations of *рідна мати* [dear mother], *рідна країна* [dear country], *рідна земля* [dear land] and *рідна Москва* [dear Moscow]. The juxtaposed elements come in textual fragments that repeat the idea over and over. The heroes thank the Party and their Fatherland, the USSR, in an exaggerated manner which might not reflect what the real speakers believe in. In line with the Party standards, the young Soviet sailors are the embodiments of "high moral values" as opposed to the Western "wolves".

In fact, THE PEOPLE :: THE PEOPLE'S ENEMIES antithesis is the most stylistically varied one, since it employs "(mis)labelling" (*sensu* Molek-Kozakowska 2010) of the enemies, through various word-formation techniques, metaphoric and metonymic transfer. It is also the most popular rhetorical means as it was identified in 193 articles. This type of antithesis employs appraisal and collectivization (van Leeuwen 2008: 283, 291) to refer to the opposing groups: e.g., *камерунський народ* [Cameroon people] vs *англо-французькі імперіалісти* [English and French imperialists] (9.01.60), *борці-комуністи* [Communist fighters] vs *фашисти* [Fascists] (11.02.60), *людина* [human] vs *вбивця, виродок* [killer, degenerate] (18.03.60), *корінне населення* [native people] vs *расисти* [rasists] (24.04.60), *маси* [the masses] vs *продажні політики* [rogue politicians] (8.05.60), *миролюбні сили* [peace-loving forces] vs *сили війни та агресії* [forces of war and aggression] (22.06.60).

Some of the used labels are based on forms of the words created via affixation or prefixation through which they acquire negative or positive connotation. The following example is taken from an article about building Hitler's bunker in Vinnytsia region (6.03.1960). The article is built on a strong opposition

in presenting Fascists and those who opposed them. This extended antithesis appears at several text levels but is most visible through the use of words where +/- factor rests on positive vs negative connotations. This concerns the nomination of social actors. In Example 5 the polarization is based on the stylistic potential of suffixes in the Ukrainian language to change the connotation of the word.

	<i>Them</i>	<i>Us</i>
(5)	<i>retelnyj sluzh=aka</i> (about Fascists) thorough.ADJ.M serve=ak=a.M thorough serviceman ^{derog}	<i>narodnyj mesnyk</i> (about Vinnytsia guerrillas) national.ADJ.M avenge=nyk.M national avenger

Two groups that oppose each other are labelled as "avengers" and "servicemen". Suffix *-ak* is used in the Ukrainian language to name the persons by their properties or characteristics (Карпіловська 2014: 279), depending on which the word may typically have positive or negative connotation. In case of *sluzhaka*, the word is perceived as derogative.

Other words that label the enemies, appear in the articles more than once, and have negative connotation in the context: with reference to WWII – *гітлерівці* [Hitlerites], *фашисти* [Fascists], *нацисти* [Nazi], *зрадник* [traitor], *недруг* [detractor], *кат* [hangman], *вбивця* [murderer]; with reference to ideological enemies – *капіталісти* [capitalists], *імперіалісти* [imperialists], *буржуазія* [bourgeoisie], *мілітаристи* [militarists], *фанатики* [fanatics], *поборник* [proponent], *божевільні* [insane], *руйнівники* [destroyers], *агресори* [aggressors], *расисти* [rasists], *поліцаї* [cops], *гангстери* [gangsters], and some other. Part of the labels are created through metaphoric or metonymic transfer: e.g., *хижаки-імперіалісти* [vulture imperialists] (24.04.60), *палії війни* [war incendiaries] (22.03.60). They are also simply labelled as *вороги* [enemies] that oppose in the antitheses to "patriots" (10.01.60), "Socialist countries" (15.01.60), "the people" (18.03.60, 16.04.60), "Lenin" (22.04.60), "heroes" (30.04.60) and other. Thematically, the labels as parts of antitheses appear in: (1) the articles where parts of narratives deal with WWII, such as a campaign against Oberländer, whom the USSR accused of atrocities during the war, especially in Lviv; (2) reports regarding riots and protests in colonies and disputed territories around the world, such as March riots in the Union of South Africa; (3) narratives about hard life in the capitalist countries; (4) news about the world leaders whom Khrushchev considered his political opponents or enemies, such as the German statesman Adenauer. As Molek-Kozakowska indicates, "[a]s a result of labeling, complex categories are simplified, sometimes through straightforward associations to what the majority finds loathsome or scary" (2010: 84). In case of Soviet propaganda, the texts create and instill the feelings of loath and fear towards a targeted group of people and at the same time make the support the Soviet Union offers to those fighting for the common "beautiful future" legitimate. As Khrushchev himself

said, "Мир треба завоювати" [The peace should be won with arms] (6.03.60).

The repetition of the same labels and antitheses is important for propaganda as this is how the propagandist makes sure that the idea gets instilled in the memory: "Simplicity and repetition amount to pure behavioral conditioning. See it, hear it, associate it with the source and repeat until imprinted" (Patrick 2013: 104). The war vs peace agenda had a strong message behind it: it reminded of the atrocities of WWII, but also portrayed the Soviet Union and Khrushchev as safe and peaceful, or as longing for the eternal peace, while the West appeared as hostile and unsafe, battling over the armament, nuclear weapons, racism, inequality and so on. Balancing on the memories of the war still fresh in the minds of the masses and adding the new layer of references to Cold War, militarism and atrocities, the propaganda in press created an emotional "bubble" around the same topic. Taubman writes about Khrushchev's foreign policy in 1960s that is clearly traced in the propaganda:

"Khrushchev was convinced that the USSR was in danger. Hadn't the West intervened against Bolshevism in the Russian civil war? Hadn't the United States waited sixteen years to recognize Soviet Russia? Hadn't the Anglo-Americans tried to 'bleed us dry so that they would come in at the last stages [of the war] and determine the fate of the world'? When the war was over, the Americans 'wanted to drive us into bankruptcy.' Thank goodness the Soviet Union had broken 'the ring of capitalist encirclement.' That there were now many socialist countries in Europe and Asia 'was a consoling and inspiring thought for all Communists who had been fighting with such dedication for socialism and justice' " (2005: 331).

This rigid-mindedness (Zerubavel 1999: 58) identified and promoted the idea of the polarized world for the Soviet individual as presented in the official newspapers of the time. To make this propaganda effective, the antitheses were strategically inserted by the writers along with arguments *ad personam*, reductions *ad absurdum*, the "deck of winners" arguments and "black or white" technique (Ftorek 2017: 23-25). Yet, it is the "eternal repeating" (ibid., 23-25), that was aimed at perpetuating the ideas of enemies in the minds of the readers and creating a secure Socialist world against the background of aggressive and oppressive capitalism.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The analysis of propagandist discourse was focused on antithesis used by the Soviet newspaper disseminated among the Ukrainian-speaking inhabitants of the Ukrainian SSR. Antithesis turns out to be a popular tool for setting an agenda and promoting ideology among masses.

The analysis shows how antithesis works as a proper rhetorical tool of propaganda used for both submissiveness and polarization in the society. Antithesis as a cognitive tool explains and labels "good Communists" or "good working class" as opposed to the *Others* which range from the collective West, to the memories of the Nazis and their local collaborators during WWII, and to those

opposing the Communist regime, who were still plenty at the time of the publications. To keep antitheses – both direct and indirect – rhetorically effective the news of 1960 included false or misleading information, which allowed, on the one hand, to make the effect more vivid and, on the other, to promote submissiveness among the public – after all the world outside the USSR was portrayed as dangerous, poor and unhappy. The propaganda made this "living in a lie" mode acceptable for the general public also partially due to the fact that the nationals were devoid of access to alternative information, while the Party could successfully solidify its power and keep support of the masses. Through the antitheses used in the news, the Party and its leader Khrushchev not only legitimized but also popularized their activities among the population: e.g., Khrushchev's peace initiatives, prosecution of the alleged "traitors of the state", the USSR direct involvement in the affairs of the foreign countries, such as Kongo. At the same time, antithesis made belonging to the ingroup of "good Communists" prestigious and sharing the believes desirable, as seen in some of the examples mentioned above, where the ingroup is equaled to the family (see discussion of the article "We were raised by the Party and Komsomol" of April 5, 1960).

Yet, the most important characteristic of antithesis used for propaganda is its repetitive nature: it was through constant repetition that the Party changed and shaped the memories of the citizens. The "idyllic" world of the 1960s was aimed to substitute the painful memories of the great losses, especially in Ukraine, during the Great Famine or WWII, to suppress the memories of fights for freedom especially during the first half of the 20th century, by highlighting the fights for freedom elsewhere in the world, and to cloud the judgement of economic situation in the country, quite rich in natural resources, by making other countries look poorer compared to the USSR.

Notes

1. The translation is done by the author. To keep the translation as close to the original as possible, the literal translations are made. Yet, with the difference in semantics and structure of the languages, some translations might still not reflect the original in the best possible way.
2. On May 1, 1960, a US spy plane flying over the territory of the USSR was shot down by the Soviet military over Sverdlovsk oblast. In his speech on May 6, 1960, Khrushchev accused the USA of espionage and lies, and called it an "act of aggression" against the USSR aimed at discrediting his peace initiatives (6.05.60).
3. Additional information about the event in English can be found, for example, here: <https://www.warhistoryonline.com/instant-articles/49-days-in-the-ocean.html>.
4. There is obviously a mistake in the article about the presentation of events. It seems that the story is about a Dutch ship *SS Rooseboom* which sunk in the Indian Ocean downed by a Japanese

submarine. The *Molod Ukrajinu* article appears to be using the story told in 1952 book by Walter G. Gibson. The reason for ship's sinking is not mentioned, but the article mentions 26 days of lifeboat drifting, 30 initial survivors in the lifeboat and 6 survivors that reached the shore of an island. The accuracy of details and references is not important in propaganda: it is the message and emotions that are made salient.

List of abbreviations

CDA – Critical Discourse Analysis

Ukrainian SSR – Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic

USSR – Soviet Union

WWII – World War Two

References


1. Aristotle. (2008). *The art of rhetoric*. Megaphone eBooks.
2. Auerbach, J. & Castronovo, R. (2013). Introduction: Thirteen propositions about propaganda. In *The Oxford handbook of propaganda studies*. Auerbach, J. & Castronovo, R. (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 1-16. DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199764419.013.023](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199764419.013.023)
3. Barghoorn, F.C. (1964). *Soviet foreign propaganda*. Princeton: Princeton Legacy Library.
4. Bernays, E.L. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: Horace Liveright. Available at: https://www.voltairenet.org/IMG/pdf/Bernays_Propaganda_in_english_.pdf
5. Bryan, A. *Introduction to Soviet propaganda*. Beloit: Wright Museum of Art: The Soviet Poster Collection. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/10388987/Soviet_Poster_Collection_The_Soviet_Poster_Collection_Wright_Museum_of_Art_Introduction_to_Soviet_Propaganda
6. Cap, P. (2010). Proximizing objects, proximizing values: Towards an axiological contribution to the discourse of legitimization. In *Perspectives in politics and discourse*. Okulska, U. & Cap, P. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 119-142. DOI: [10.1075/dapsac.36.11cap](https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.36.11cap)
7. Cull, N.J., Culbert, D. & Welch, D. (2003). *Propaganda and mass persuasion: A historical encyclopedia, 1500 to the present*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
8. Ellul, J. (1973). *Propaganda: The formation of men's attitudes*. New York: Vintage Books.
9. Fahnestock, J. (1999). *Rhetorical figures in science*. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge. DOI: [10.4324/9781315834368](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368)
11. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York: Longman.
12. Ftorek, J. (2017). *Manipulace a propaganda: Na pozadí současné informační války*. Praha: Grada.
13. Harrison, Ch. (2017). *Cognitive grammar in contemporary fiction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: [10.1075/lal.26](https://doi.org/10.1075/lal.26)
14. Hassan, A. (2018). Language, media, and ideology: Critical discourse analysis of Pakistani news bulletin headlines and its impact on viewers. In *SAGE Open*, 8 (3), p. 1-15. DOI: [10.1177/2158244018792612](https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018792612)
15. Huckin, T.N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In *Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications*. Miller, T. (ed.). Washington: United States Information Agency, p. 78-92.

16. Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical stylistics: The power of English*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
17. Jowett, G.S. & O'Donnell, V. (2012). *Propaganda and persuasion*. 5th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.
18. Kaluža, I. (1984). Antithesis – a linguistic approach. In *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 17, p. 101-114. DOI: [10.2478/stap-2018-0010](https://doi.org/10.2478/stap-2018-0010)
19. Kampka, A. (2015). Contemporary Polish political rhetoric. In *Rétor*, 5 (2), p. 192-210. Available at: http://www.revistaretor.org/pdf/retor0502_kampka.pdf
20. Karpilovska, Ye. (2014). Word-formation lexis categorisation in Inter-Slavonic parallels. / Karpilovska, Ye. *Zasady slovotvornoji katehoryzatsiji leksyky u mizhslovjanskykh paraleliakh.* / Карпіловська, Є. Засади словотвірної категоризації лексики у міжслов'янських паралелях. In *Slavische Wortbildung im Vergleich*. Mengel, S. (ed.). Berlin: LIT Verlag Münster, p. 272-291.
21. Kopeček, M. (2003). *Obraz vnitřního nepřítelě – revizionismus na stránkách Otázek míru a socialismu v letech 1958-1969.* In *Bolševismus, komunismus a radikální socialismus v Československu*. Kárník, Z. & Kopeček, M. (eds.). Praha: Ustav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR, vol. I, p. 225-252.
22. Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. 2nd ed. London – New York: Routledge.
23. Krzyżanowski, M. & Forchtner, B. (2016). Theories and concepts in critical discourse studies: Facing challenges, moving beyond foundations. In *Discourse & society*, 27 (3), p. 253-261. DOI: [10.1177/0957926516630900](https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926516630900)
24. Lakoff, G. (2009). *The political mind: A cognitive scientist's guide to your brain and its politics*. New York: Penguin Books.
25. Lee, A.M. & Lee, E.B. (1939). *The fine art of propaganda: A study of Father Coughlin's speeches*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/LeeFineArt/page/n5>
26. McCauley, M. (1995). *The Khrushchev era 1953–1964*. London – New York: Routledge.
27. Molek-Kozakowska, K. (2010). Labeling and mislabeling in American political discourse: A survey based on insights of independent media monitors. In *Perspectives in politics and discourse*. Okulska, U. & Cap, P. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 83-96. DOI: [10.1075/dapsac.36.08koz](https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.36.08koz)
28. Moss, P. (1985). Rhetoric of defense in the United States: Language, myth and ideology. In *Language and the nuclear arms debate: Nukespeak today*. Chilton, P. (ed.). London: Frances Pinter, p. 45-62.
29. Panasenko, N. & Greguš, L. (2022). *Media text in the mirror of linguistics*. Prague: Wolters Kluwer ČR.
30. Panasenko, N., Greguš, L. & Zabuzhanska, I. (2018). Conflict, confrontation, and war reflected in mass media: Semantic wars, their victors and victims. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Poland, III (2), December 2018, p. 132-163. DOI: [10.2478/lart-2018-0017](https://doi.org/10.2478/lart-2018-0017)
31. Pankin, I. & Svanidze, N. (2016). The year 1960. Nikita Khrushchev. Obkom Secretary. In *Radio Komsomol'skaya Pravda.* / Pankin I., Svanidze N. 1960 god. Nikita Khrushchev. Sekretar' Obkoma. In *Radio Komsomol'skaya Pravda.* / Панкин И., Сванидзе Н. 1960 год. Никита Хрущев. Секретарь Обкома. In *Радио Комсомольская правда*. June 15, 2016. Available at: <https://www.kp.ru/radio/26542/3558897/>
32. Patrick, B.A. (2013). *The ten commandments of propaganda*. London: Arktos Media.
33. Patrona, M. (2018). Mediated conversation and political propaganda: A discourse analysis of news practices on Greek prime-time news. In *European journal of communication*, 33 (2), p. 185-199. DOI: [10.1177/0267323118760321](https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323118760321)
34. Prato, A. (2018). *Le forme della manipolazione e della propaganda nel discorso politico contemporaneo*, E/C, p. 1-6.
35. *Propaganda and rhetoric in democracy: History, theory, analysis.* (2016). Henderson, G.L. & Braun, M.J. (eds.).

Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

36. Renkema, J. & Schubert, Ch. (2018). *Introduction to discourse studies: New edition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: [10.1075/z.219](https://doi.org/10.1075/z.219)
37. *Re/reading the past: Critical and functional perspectives on time and value*. (2003). Martin, J. & Wodak, R. (eds.). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. DOI: [10.1075/dapsac.8](https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.8)
38. Ross, Sh.T. (2002). Understanding propaganda: The epistemic merit model and its application to art. In *The journal of aesthetic education*, 36 (1), p. 16-30.
39. Shurma, S. & Lu, W. (2018). The cognitive potential of antithesis: 'To be, or not to be' in Hamlet's signature soliloquy. In *English text construction*, 11 (1), p. 141-168. DOI: [10.1075/etc.00007.shu](https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.00007.shu)
40. Taubman, W. (2005). *Khrushchev*. London: Simon & Schuster.
41. *The new Princeton encyclopedia of poetry and poetics*. (1993). 3rd ed. Preminger, A., Brogan, T.V.F. & Warnke, F.J. (eds.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
42. van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: SAGE.
43. van Dijk, T.A. (2006). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics, section language and politics*. Wodak, R. (ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier, p. 728-740. DOI: [10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00722-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00722-7)
44. van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. In *Discourse & society*, 4 (2), p. 249-283. DOI: [10.1177/0957926593004002006](https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006)
45. van Dijk, T.A. (1997). What is political discourse analysis? In *Political linguistics*. Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, Ch. (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, p. 11-52. DOI: [10.1075/bjl.11.03dij](https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.11.03dij)
46. van Leeuwen, Th. (2008). The representation of social actors. In *Discourse studies*. van Dijk, T.A. (ed.). London: SAGE, p. 268-302.
47. Walter, F.E. (1956). *The Communist conspiracy: Strategy and tactics of world Communism*. Part 1. Communism Outside the United States. Foreword. General Introduction. Section A: Marxist Classics. Washington: Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives. Ebook.
48. Wieczorek, A.E. (2009). This is to say you're either in or out: some remarks on elusivity. In *Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines*, 3 (2), p. 118-129.
49. Wirth-Koliba, V. (2016). The diverse and dynamic world of 'Us' and 'Them' in political discourse. In *Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines*, 8 (1), p. 23-37. Available at: https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/journals/cadaad/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Volume-8_Wirth-Koliba.pdf
50. Wodak, R. (2009). Language and politics. In *English language: Description, variation and context*. Culpeper, J. Kerswill, P., Wodak, R., Katamba, F. & McEnery, T. (eds.). Basingstoke: Palgrave, p. 577-593.
51. Yang, X-M. (1994). *The rhetoric of propaganda. A tagmemic analysis of selected documents of the cultural revolution in China*. New York: Peter Lang.
52. Zerubavel, E. (1999). *Social mindscapes: An invitation to cognitive sociology*. Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press.
53. Žižek, S. (2008). *Violence: Six sideways reflections*. London: Profile Books.

Contact data

	<p><i>name:</i> <i>academic title / rank:</i> <i>department:</i> <i>institution:</i> <i>e-mail:</i> <i>fields of interest:</i></p>	<p>Svitlana Shurma PhD (Linguistics) Assistant Professor Department of Modern Languages and Literatures Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Faculty of Humanities Štefánikova St., 5670, 760 01 Zlín, Czech Republic shurma@utb.cz Critical discourse analysis, stylistics, cognitive poetics, propaganda studies.</p>
---	---	---