



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation



International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation

ISSN: 2582-7138

Received: 02-06-2021; Accepted: 18-06-2021

www.allmultidisciplinaryjournal.com

Volume 2; Issue 4; July-August 2021; Page No. 324-329

Linguistic means to cover and naturalize ideology in the translated speech of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (V.I. Lenin) Delivered at an International Meeting in Berne, Russia during the European War

Ahlam Abid Fayadh

Department of Education, Al-Fallujah Secondary School for Girls, Anbar, Iraq

Corresponding Author: Ahlam Abid Fayadh

Abstract

Language is a way of exercising power. It is always seen to be carrying some ideologies, purposely or not. So, one essential means of the struggle over power is the ideology conveyed implicitly or explicitly in languages. This means that ideologies are conveyed, covered, and naturalized by the constituents of the language used and the way they are put together to form the speech.

Just like all politicians, Lenin has been realizing the power of language and thus employing it as a weapon to promote for his own beliefs and thoughts, i.e. the ideologies that he stands for. The current study is trying to uncover both the linguistic tools and the ideologies they convey in Lenin speech. It is a

critical study that aims to show how language can be utilized for specific political purposes and how it can look so natural to audience, specifically to those who are not aware of language power.

The study follows Fairclough's approach (2010) as it provides the study with three needed stages of analysis. The first is going to be purely linguistic analysis. The second is ideological. The third is a thematic one, in which the ideas are linked together in a coherent way to form themes. The study ends with conclusions and a suggestion for a continent study.

Keywords: Linguistic, tools, ideology, Lenin, speech, Berne, Proletarian, critical, CDA

1. Introduction

Language is the mirror of human thoughts, beliefs and desires. It is also one of the best means to control ongoing actions of real life. A word can change a lot of things in life. So, language can be and is used as a container of ideology. It reflects the speaker/writer's ideas and at the same time it affects listeners/readers, in both conscious and unconscious way. People get affected by what they are listening to or reading and their attitude can be changed accordingly. Specifically, when the piece of language being in use is structured in an intended and naturalized way to maintain ideology and its contents are selected on purpose to serve its ideological purpose.

The current study tries to show how linguistic tools (such as lexical choices, mood, etc.) can serve ideological purposes for politicians to naturalize and strengthen their speech that is ideologically formed. It shows the indirect ideologies that may have strong effect on audience, and thus contribute in the changing of the ongoing actions for the favor of the speaker and his/her elites.

The current study chooses a speech delivered at the international meeting in Russia (February 8, 1916) in which Lenin directs it to the labor, the proletariat. The speech is originally presented in Russian, but officially translated into English. Thus, the translator, who is unknown in person but belongs to Marxists Internet Archive, may contribute in the formation of ideology within the speech. However, the themes, which are ideological, belong to Lenin as they are the main ideas in his speech.

To reach the aim of the study, the speech is analyzed according to Fairclough's model. It is the most suitable model for the study as it reflects the linguistic tools, ideologies, and themes in the speech all together. So, the study is carried on three levels or steps: (i) linguistic analysis, (ii) ideological analysis, and (iii) thematic analysis.

The study ends with the main conclusions that have been arrived at. It also suggests an idea for a further study that can be conducted by other (more qualified) researches, those who can speak Russian.

2. Ideology and Naturalization

In 1796, Destutt de Tracy presented a term for the first time named "ideology". The term got the attraction of many scholars from many disciplines. Every scholar tried to present a definition. They varied their focus though they had emphasized similar concerns. They dealt with the term from a wide-range of different perspectives. (Alaghbari *et al.*, 2015:2) ^[1].

Richardson (2007:134) ^[12] refers to one of the simplest perspectives that is represented by the Marxist. In Marxist simple perspective, ideology is the study of beliefs and ideas. In a similar vein, Eagleton (1991:30) states that ideology "signifies ideas and beliefs" and helps to legitimate the interests of a ruling group or class specifically by distortion and dissimulation. It "retains an emphasis on false and deceptive beliefs".

More deeply, Languages are seen to be homes of ideologies of their users. In turn, the central point in Languages is the concept of ideology. Therefore, this concept starts to be a core concern for many linguistic studies, such as Critical Linguistics (CL) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Alaghbary, 2015:6) ^[11].

Ideology in CDA studies is seen in two views. Firstly, it is seen as a natural system of beliefs and ideas. Secondly, it is seen as a misrepresentation of reality in addition to false values and beliefs (ibid).

Van Dijk (1998:1) ^[15], as a CDA scholar, views ideology as a system of values, ideas, beliefs and attitudes. For him, It is a representation of a picture of shaped relationships and identifications and a way of spreading particular values. It is a promotion of "Us" and "Them" values.

For others such as Fairclough's (2003), ideologies are means of power relationship maintenance and establishment. They enhance relations of power. They represent aspects of the world. Also, they can be seen as reflection of identities, interactions, genres, style, and so on. So, text analysis is an important aspect of ideological analysis and critique. It tells so much about the world and its users and their intentions (p.28).

Since ideologies affect people's ideas and beliefs, studying them is a matter of studying social identity constructions (ibid). Ideology effect can be seen when most people in a society start thinking alike about certain thing. Sometimes they even forget that there are alternatives to the current states of affairs. This in turn leads us to the concept of hegemony (Parsa, 2008:62) ^[11]. So, ideology leads to hegemony; it has a real effect that should not be neglected.

Fairclough (1992: 67) states, "discourse as an ideological practice constitutes, naturalizes, sustains and changes significations of the world from diverse positions in power relation", i.e., ideology is a way of exercising power and one dimension of the struggle over it. It serves power.

He also adds that, in any text, unmasking ideologies can be seen as "partly" a matter of "intertextuality". It requires to be analyzed in terms of "the matization".

Moreover, a property that is often given to ideologies in discourses is named "Naturalization". It is a property where ideologies are represented as common sense, invisible and opaque (Fairclough, 1995:42). A naturalized text sheds the light away from the idea of ideology. It reflects itself as holding no specific ideological side. It pretends being direct and a mirror of reality, with no self-effect or bias (Fairclough, 1989:92).

3. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The real emergence of CDA started in the early 1990s. Since then, many trends are founded, which are defined by their goals instead of techniques and tools of analysis. Generally, for all the trends, as Hyland (2005:4) puts it, uncovering often hidden values, positions and perspectives is the main aim of CDA.

According to Fairclough (1995:135), CDA is defined as

follows:

Discourse analysis aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.

Generally, CDA is far away from dealing with methods and theories of analyzing discourses per se. It develops a wider approach in which both social theories and discourse analysis ones are combined (Wodak and Meyer, 2001:8) ^[16]. So, CDA studies aim at showing some complex kind of relationships namely those between ideology and language on the one hand and identity and language on the other hand. Thus, CDA as a field of study assumes that language use is mainly social and for that the whole social world is meant to be reflected and constructed by the languages used (Rogers, 2004:5) ^[13].

More precisely, for CDA, it is believed that languages cannot be free of inferences of the world. They can never be neutral, at least on a personal level (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997:258) ^[10]. This consequently means that languages are always doing ideological works so they can always be explanatory and interpreted under approaches like those of CDA.

4. Fairclough's Model

Norman Fair Clough's approach is the one that provided the most significant contribution to CDA studies. Fair Clough (2010:94) states that, in analyzing any communicative event, there are three analytical focuses: (i) "it is a spoken or written language text", (ii) it is an instance of discourse practice involving the production and interpretation of text; and (iii) "it is a piece of social practice"

These analytical focuses require a three dimensional framework. Thus, Fairclough's model consists of three-step process of analysis which is tied to three inter-related dimensions of discourse:

1. Description: the part of the procedure which deals with the analysis of texts.
2. Interpretation: the part which deals with the analysis of interaction (or discursive practice).
3. Explanation: the part which deals with the analysis of social practice.

Textual Analysis (Description) is the very first interest of Fairclough by which he focuses on the text itself. He analyses the linguistic means of the discourse. According to Fairclough (1995), "linguistic analysis includes the analysis of the grammar, vocabulary, sound system, semantics and cohesion organization above the sentence level" (p.57). That is, it works on the formal properties of texts.

Fairclough (1992:75), in his textual analysis, makes use of Halliday's SFL because as it is mentioned in Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999:134) "SFL theorizes language in a way which harmonizes far more with the perspectives of critical social science than the other theories of language".

Discursive practice (Interpretation) is the second dimension of this approach. It is the part that distinguishes the approach from the others. It shows the relationship between discourse

processes and the text. It involves three processes which are production, distribution, and consumption. The shape of these processes differs according to the type of discourse. They differ as a result of social factors differences.

Social practice (Explanation), on the other hand, is the third dimension of Fairclough's approach and it deals with things other than discourse and language. It analyzes discourse in relation to power and ideology, viewing power as a means for hegemony (Fairclough, 1992:86)

Within the third dimension, Fairclough employs an analytical device that he refers to as "Thematization", that is to uncover ideologies in a text in form of themes. To set ideas into themes means to put the ideological elements of texts into one coherent whole, to un-naturalize the overall picture. The matization provides the best way to show how essential issues, groups or events in a particular society are covered in specific planned manner. It shows how the planned image is spread as being common sense. (Fairclough, 1995:42).

5. Data Analysis

The speech chosen is going to be analysed according to Fairclough's (2010) model. The focus of the analysis is going to be as follows: (i) explaining the main linguistic tools (such as the use of some lexical choices, tense and reference) utilized in the speech, (ii) uncovering ideology, and (iii) showing the main themes within the speech.

5.1 Linguistic Analysis

The speaker, Lenin, makes use of some linguistic items and means for ideological purposes. They contribute in naturalizing specific ideas (themes) in unconscious way to the public. His main focus is on the choice of lexical items. He also utilizes tense. In addition, many forms of "reference" can be seen.

Though it is his main building block for his speeches, it may not be obvious that Lenin's lexical choices are limited, selective and simple in a specific organized way that contributes to build specific image in people's mind. First, it needs to be noted how many times he repeats specific words like: (war 35 times), (Capitalist 8 times, capitalism 1 time), (comrades 5 times) (revolution 4 + revolutionary 5 + revolutionist 1 = 10 times), (truth 3 times), (clearer 2 + clear 2 = 4times), (defence 5 times), (fight 3 + fighting 2= 5times) (true 1+truth 2= 3 times) (struggle 2 times), (largest 3 times), (workers 9 times), (great 8 times), (proletarian 4 times), (millions 4times) (suffering 3 times). He repeats the lexical items in accordance with some organized ideas. For instance, he repeats the words "capitalist" and "proletarian" to emphasise the existence of two contrastive groups. Moreover, he repeats grand adjectives such as "great" and "large" and collocates them with the "capitalists" and what relates to them. On the other hand, he shows the opposite for the proletarian indicating their "suffering" and contrasting the space between the two groups, them VS us.

Moreover, Lenin chooses two accurate expressions "war" VS "revolution". He repeats each one for purposes (see ideology analysis). Furthermore, Lenin emphasizes the idea of period by repeating lexis and expressions such as "more than eighteen months", "each month", and "each day". Repeating such idea can sever to make people feel the time deeply and, in turn, feel the suffering and dream to an end for it.

Another emphasizing technique can be seen in Lenin's choice of some lexis and expressions that show certainty about what he says. Several lexical items of this kind are seen. Those are

"clearer", "true", "truth", "becoming more evident", "nevertheless true", and "no more doubt". They give the impression that the ideas must be taken as granted.

Another linguistic means is the use of quotations (references). The use of such means helps to make the audience feel that the speech is more trustworthy. Instances of reference include: "defence of the fatherland", "war of defence," "war of defence", "war of defence," "defence of the fatherland.", "I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of rite plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight for the ruling class.... I am opposed to every war but one; I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world-wide war of the social revolution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ruling class may make it necessary....".

Also, Lenin refers to some historical events in order to support his speech. For instance, he refers to the 1912 events. He tries his best to show clearly how war has been considered as a crime at that time and revolution as a necessity. He also refers to the 1915, and specifically to a part of a speech said by Comrade Eugene Debs in which the latter has also been a supporter of proletarian revolution.

Grammar is clearly utilized in serving purposes. For instance, the use of each tense shows specific ideology. In some parts of the speech, when Lenin wants the audience to take the idea as "taken for granted" and as a fact, he gets to use the present simple which serves the goal.

5.2 Ideological Analysis

Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, who is better known as Lenin for he developed the Leninism movement which is a variant of Marxism, is a revolutionist from Russia. He is a communist known for his standing revolution against the Russian empire. He has been standing against the capitalism. Thus, in his speech during the European war, he has been promoting for his anti-capitalist ideology by all means. Directing his speech to the working-class people who are known for their suffering and difficult life and who are, nerveless, supporting the European war, he promotes his ideology in a naturalized and hidden way. For instance, he repeats the word "war" thirteen times and in each time he tries to shed the light on the negative effect of the war on people on the one hand and the benefit that it derives for the capitalists on the other hand.

He clearly defines a line between war and revolution. He tries by his selective linguistic choices (see above 5.1) to convince people that what they need is not supporting the European war lead by the capitalists, they need a revolution of their own. He tries to highlight and put in people's mind in unconscious way the idea that revolution is their only way to salvation, salvation from both war and suffering.

The continuant and organized repetition of the word "war" serves greatly his ideology. It may cause people to feel depressed and start to well to be against it. The repetition motivates the ANTI attitude which defined by him as a revolution. Beside that and as another way to support his desire, he tries to convince people about the lie that the capitalist and the Russian Government promoting for, which is about "defence" for "homeland".

He, moreover, wants to convince the public about the space between the goal of capitalists and the ordinary people and the way the latter is being exploited using lies for the formers best. He describes the former as (robber) and tries to make people see that it is their right, tier, blood (as people fight in

wars and get died), and goods that they steal.

He uses a simple present tense in saying "it becomes clearer and clearer to the masses of the workers" to convince people about his belief, that is, the capitalists are deceiving workers when they claim a "defense of homeland" story and this is a fact that is, or must, be known for everyone and taken as a fact. Again he states "It is becoming more evident everyday" indicating that people can observe the ongoing situations and actions to see that what he claims is true and undeniable. Also, Lenin refers to other people's speeches (quote them) in a selective and exaggerative manner to make the labor support his ideology and follow it.

Also, he implicitly raises the idea that the world are diving into the *them* and *us* groups in which *them* includes the capitalists and the largest countries that support them and *us* includes the workers and simple people (the proletarians as he calls them) who are treated as salves and their tire is stolen by the robbers (them).

Lenin, also, tries to hit peoples feeling and emotion in several different ways. Firstly, he refers to the death of millions of people during the war and calls for a revolution for them. He describes how miserable life they lived and how miserably they died. Secondly, he repeats the lexical item "comrades" five times to make the audience feel that they are on a common ground.

He uses sarcasm too, to underestimate and undergo other ideologies in an indirect way. This is seen in his indicating to United States. He describes it sarcastically as "the great and rich". He directs the labor to note that they are enslaved and the supportive (for capitalists) large countries are considered as "great" and "rich",

He tries to get people upset and angry by making them feel that they are nothing but salves and that they just have been manipulated as weapons to gain goods in a war that has nothing to do with them, a war that is in reality "between capitalists, between big robbers".

He, thus, calls indirectly for revolution. He puts his desire (a revolution against the capitalist) into a what-has-to-be done shape. He repeats the word "revolution" and supports its need with number of selective reasons such as the bad condition of labors, the death of millions, the good condition of the capitalists, the underestimating and deceiving attitude of the government, etc.

Lenin, in many places, during his speech uses his personal opinions and beliefs expressing them as facts to convene and persuade audience. For instance, he states no clear evidence for his open claim when he calls the capitalists robbers. He also refers to misleading information about the supportive and the oppressed countries.

5.3 Thematic Analysis

In Lenin speech, the following themes can be seen to be promoted for:

1. **Revolution:** it is the main them in the speech. Lenin clearly calls for revolution of proletarians against the capitalists. He supports his call with reasons. First he tries to raise the negative sides and effects of the war held. Then, he tries to destroy the image of "homeland defence" and describes it as a means of deception. He shows people that their love to their homeland is being exploited for personal benefits by the capitalists. Moreover, he naturalizes the idea that people are the victims of capitalists. Thus, he insists on the need to a revolution. He faces people with their suffering and

directs them to dream of a different shiny life. Moreover, he tries to convince them that they can have the life they deserve if only they succeed their revolution.

2. **Them and US:** this is the theme of setting people into two different groups (The capitalists and the proletarians). It is another basic theme. Lenin by his careful lexical choices makes a clear cut line between two groups of people. He makes people feel that there is no shared goal between the two, thus they should not support whatever the "them" group seeks, namely the war. Instead, those who find themselves to be belonging to the proletarians must prepare for a revolution to get out of slavery. He uses number of dichotomies to highlight the them Vs. us theme such as: RobbersVS Salves, Rich Vs. striving, and Great powers Vs. workers.
3. **The Illusion of Defense:** one of the famous believes that the capitalists have been relying on to motivate people to participate in the European war has been "homeland defence" doctrine. For that, this has been another point that is focused on by Lenin. So, it is obviously another central theme, to persuade people against the homeland defence doctrine. He fights strongly against promoting for the motivating idea of "defence". He insists that there is no "land" for the poor to defend and the land serves and belongs only to the capitalists. So, people are deceived and they are serving and dying only for the benefits of the capitalists.
4. **Oppression and Unfairness:** they are the two themes that are promoted highly as the reasons that call people for revolution. They are supported by several examples such as the miserable way working-class people live and the miserable death that they reach, the death of millions of them, and the unpaid scarify of fighting in the European war. Lenin accurately pictures the miserable situation that people seem to be accepting. He starts directing their attention to the long period that they have been suffering because of a war that serves other people than themselves. Then he clarifies that they are a lot, millions, and they all share the suffering for the benefit of the minority who live in luxuriate. Also, he directs their mind to the idea that there is no gain at the end of the war, nothing will change to better in their life, unlike the revolution that will bring its fruits all for them and only for them.
5. **Future Vision of Victory:** as the four above mentioned themes all serve to picture the present as deeply dark and set a plan for a solution (revolution), this last theme serves to picture the shinning future that they may reach. Lenin pictures the upcoming days, if a revolution happens. He even tries to make people belief that the revolution is coming and it is inevitable, and thus everyone, from the proletarians, should be part of it. He claims that socialism and the revolution will prevail and workers throughout these nations will claim victory over the capitalists.

The themes that are seen above are promoted in a naturalized way to audience. That is, it is hoped by Lenin that the audience will belief and get persuaded by them. The themes are strongly related to one another and each of them supports the other.

6. Conclusions

The current study has arrived at the followings:

1. Linguistic choices can be super powerful if well organized to picture some purposeful ideological themes.
2. Each linguistic choice has specific ideological meaning. So, they serve power and hegemony.
3. Lenin uses language in a covered way to naturalize his beliefs to audience and conceive them that he is working for them and has no self-effect.
4. Emotion of audience can be controlled by simple linguistic tools (such as the use of lexical item – comrades) which in turn plays role in naturalizing ideologies.
5. Five different themes are found within Lenin speech which are: revolution, them and us, the illusion of defence, oppression and unfairness, and future vision of victory. The all work together for one goal specified by a speaker.

7. Suggestion for Further Research

This suggestion is directed to those scholars who know Russian and English language. It is suggested to make a contrastive study between the ideology in the original and translated text of Lenin speech (source and target) or to make a study showing whether translation affects the accuracy of conveyed ideology in Lenin speech or not.

8. Appendix

Speech Delivered at an International Meeting in Berne, February 8, 1916 by V.I.Lenin:

Comrades! The European war has been raging for more than eighteen months. And as each month, as each day of the war goes by, it becomes clearer and clearer to the masses of the workers that the Zimmerwald = Manifesto [2] expressed the truth when it declared that phrases about “defence of the fatherland” and the like are nothing but capitalist deception. It is becoming more evident every day that this is a war between capitalists, between big robbers, who are quarrelling over the loot, each striving to obtain the largest share, the largest number of countries to plunder, and the largest number of nations to suppress and enslave.

It may sound incredible, especially to Swiss comrades, but it is nevertheless true that in Russia, also, not only bloody tsarism, not only the capitalists, but also a section of the so-called or ex-Socialists say that Russia is fighting a “war of defence,” that Russia is only fighting against German invasion. The whole world knows, however, that for decades tsarism has been oppressing more than a hundred million people belonging to other nationalities in Russia; that for decades Russia has been pursuing a predatory policy towards China, Persia, Armenia and Galicia. Neither Russia, nor Germany, nor any other Great Power has the right to claim that it is waging a “war of defence”; all the Great Powers are waging an imperialist, capitalist war, a predatory war, a war for the oppression of small and foreign nations, a war for the sake of the profits of the capitalists, who are coining golden profits amounting to billions out of the appalling sufferings of the masses, out of the blood of the proletariat.

Four years ago, in November 1912, when it had become clear that war was approaching, the representatives of the Socialist Parties of the whole world gathered at the International Socialist Congress in Basle. Even at that time there was no room for doubt that the impending war would be a war between the Great Powers, between the great beasts of prey; that responsibility for the war would rest upon the

governments and the capitalist classes of all the Great Powers. The Basle Manifesto, which was adopted unanimously by the Socialist Parties of the whole world, openly stated this truth. The Basle Manifesto does not say a word about a “war of defence,” or “defence of the fatherland.” It castigates the governments and the bourgeoisie of all the Great Powers without exception. It said openly that war would be the greatest of crimes that the workers would consider it a crime to shoot at each other, that the horrors of war and the indignation these would rouse among the workers would inevitably lead to a proletarian revolution.

When the war actually broke out it was realised that its character had been correctly defined at Basle. But the Socialist and labour organisations were not unanimous in carrying out the Basle decisions; they split. We see now that in all countries of the world the Socialist and labour organisations are split into two big camps. The smaller section, the leaders, functionaries and officials, have betrayed Socialism and have deserted to the side of the governments. Another section, to which the mass of class conscious workers belong, continues to gather its forces, to fight against the war and for the proletarian revolution.

The views of this latter section also found expression in the Zimmerwald Manifesto.

In Russia, from the very beginning of the war, the workers’ deputies in the Duma waged a determined revolutionary struggle against the war and the tsarist monarchy. Five workers’ deputies—Petrovsky, Badayev, Muranov, Shagov and Samoilov—distributed revolutionary manifestoes against the war and energetically carried on revolutionary agitation. Tsarism ordered the arrest of those five deputies, put them on trial, and sentenced them to lifelong exile in Siberia. For months the leaders of the working class of Russia have been pining in Siberia; but their cause has not gone under; their work is being continued by the class-conscious workers all over Russia.

Comrades! You have heard the speeches of representatives of various countries, who have told you about the workers’ revolutionary struggle against the war. I merely want to quote one other example from that great and rich country, the United States of America. The capitalists of that country are now making enormous profits out of the European war. And they, too, are agitating for war. They say that America must also prepare to take part in the war, hundreds of millions of dollars must be squeezed out of the people for new armaments, for armaments without end. And in America, too, a section of the Socialists echoes this false, criminal call. Let me read to you what Comrade Eugene Debs, the most popular leader of the American Socialists, the Presidential candidate of the American Socialist Party, writes.

In the September 11, 1915, American weekly, *The Appeal to Reason*, [3] September 11, 1915, he says: “I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of rite plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight for the ruling class.... I am opposed to every war but one; I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world-wide war of the social revolution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ruling class may make it necessary....”

This again shows you, comrades, that in all countries of the world real preparations are being made to rally the forces of the working class. The horrors of war and the sufferings of the people are incredible. But we must not, and we have no reason whatever, to view the future with despair

The millions of victims who will fall in the war, and as a consequence of the war, will not fall in vain. The millions who are starving, the millions who are sacrificing their lives in the trenches, are not only suffering, they are also gathering strength, are pondering over the real cause of the war, are becoming more determined and are acquiring a clearer revolutionary understanding. Rising discontent of the masses, growing ferment, strikes, demonstrations, protests against the war—all this is taking place in all countries of the world. And this is the guarantee that the European War will be followed by the proletarian revolution against capitalism.

9. References

1. Alaghbary G, Alazzany M, Al-Nakeeb O. Linguistic Approaches to Ideology, Review of Work Between 1979 and 2010. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. 2015; 4(5):1-10.
2. Eagleton T. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
3. Fairclough N. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity, 1992.
4. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, (1st ed.). London: Longman, 1995.
5. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: polity Press, 1999.
6. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis of Social Research*. London: Routledge, 2003.
7. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed). London: Longman, 2010.
8. *Language and Power*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 1989.
9. Hyland K. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum, 2005.
10. Wodak R. *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In Van Dijk (Ed.) (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage, 1997, 258-284.
11. Parsa F. *Islamic Fundamentalists and Islamic Reformists: A Discourse Analysis of Ideological Conflict between The Liberal Islamic Reinforcement and Communication Islamic Fundamentalists on The Concepts of Freedom and Democracy in Iran 1997-2001*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Roskilde University, 2008.
12. Richardson J. (Mis) Representing Islam: The Racism and Rhetoric of British. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 2004.
13. Rogers R. *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers, 2004.
14. Teo P. Racism in the News: A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reporting Two Australian Newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 2000; 11:7-49.
15. Van Dijk T. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage, 1998.
16. Wodak R, Meyer M. (Eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 2001.