

УДК 811.111'373.4

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.42.1.18>

CHALLENGES IN TRANSLATION OF PROPAGANDA NARRATIVES IN CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL NEWS

ТРУДНОЩІ ПЕРЕКЛАДУ ПРОПАГАНДИСТСЬКИХ НАРАТИВІВ У СУЧАСНИХ ПОЛІТИЧНИХ НОВИНАХ

Zaichuk V.I.,*orcid.org/0000-0002-3030-2523**5th year Student at the Faculty of Foreign Philology
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University***Kauza I.B.,***orcid.org/0000-0002-3030-2523**Candidate of philology,
Associate Professor at the Department of Applied Linguistics
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University*

The article is devoted to the analysis of propaganda narratives in modern political discourse, in particular, to the study of rhetorical and stylistic means used by world leaders in periods of conflict and the challenges of their translation. The work reveals communication strategies that reflect the construction of reality and influence the formation of public opinion and worldview. The article focuses on how linguistic means used by political leaders during military conflicts and political crises contribute to social mobilization, the formation of national identity and the legitimization of political decisions.

The article views the role of political discourse as a specialized form of communication aimed at mass influence through emotionally charged statements and propaganda techniques. In times of crisis, language serves as a tool for shaping mass consciousness through metaphors, repetitions, antitheses, intertextual references, and symbolic constructions that create images of unity, heroism, and national superiority, while establishing clear distinctions between "us" and "them." These linguistic tools have a profound impact on the formation of collective identity and the moral positioning of political entities.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in a comprehensive comparative analysis of rhetorical strategies that form the propaganda effect. Examining examples of propaganda and manipulation in the media. The article reveals both negative manifestations and promising changes in the industry. The study of stylistic techniques, intertextual references, and communicative strategies is combined with the practice of political discourse in times of war and crisis. The article also contributes to the general analysis of political discourse, revealing the mechanisms of the functioning of linguistic strategies that shape the collective perception of propaganda and manipulation in modern news. The article demonstrates new approaches to the analysis of political influence, contributing to the disclosure of manipulative practices and the formation of narratives focused on transparency and objectivity in the political space.

Key words: political discourse, propaganda, rhetoric, intertextuality, critical discourse analysis, military communication, manipulation, narrative.

Статтю присвячено аналізу пропагандистських наративів у сучасному політичному дискурсі, зокрема, вивченню риторичних та стилістичних засобів, що використовуються світовими лідерами в періоди конфліктів та криз та труднощів їхнього перекладу. У статті визначено комунікаційні стратегії, що відображають конструювання реальності та впливають на формування громадської думки та світогляду. Стаття демонструє як лінгвістичні засоби, що використовуються політичними лідерами під час військових конфліктів та політичних криз, сприяють соціальній мобілізації, формуванню національної ідентичності та легітимізації політичних рішень.

У статті розкрито роль політичного дискурсу як спеціалізованої форми комунікації, спрямованої на масовий вплив через емоційно заряджені заяви та пропагандистські прийоми. У часи кризи мова служить інструментом формування масової свідомості за допомогою метафор, повторень, антитез, інтертекстуальних посилань та символічних конструкцій, що створюють образи єдності, героїзму та національної переваги, водночас встановлюючи чіткі розмежування між «нами» та «ними». Ці лінгвістичні засоби мають глибокий вплив на формування колективної ідентичності та моральне позиціонування політичних утворень.

У статті проведено комплексний порівняльний аналіз риторичних стратегій, що формують пропагандистський ефект та окреслено труднощі їхнього перекладу. Розглядаючи реальні приклади пропаганди та маніпуляцій у ЗМІ, стаття окреслює як негативні прояви, так і перспективні зміни в індустрії. Вивчення стилістичних прийомів, інтертекстуальних посилань та комунікативних стратегій поєднується з практикою політичного дискурсу у воєнний та кризовий часи. Дослідження також робить внесок у загальний аналіз політичного дискурсу, розкриваючи механізми функціонування лінгвістичних стратегій, що формують колективне сприйняття пропаганди та маніпуляцій у сучасних новинах. Стаття демонструє нові підходи до аналізу політичного впливу, сприяючи розкриттю маніпулятивних практик і формуванню наративів, орієнтованих на прозорість та об'єктивність у політичному просторі.

Ключові слова: політичний дискурс, пропаганда, переклад, риторика, інтертекстуальність, критичний дискурс-аналіз, військова комунікація, маніпуляція, наратив.

Problem statement. This work is devoted to analyzing propaganda and manipulative strategies in the political discourse of world leaders and the difficulties of their accurate translation. The relevance of the study is determined by the growing interest of contemporary linguistic research in identifying communicative intentions aimed at influencing public opinion, forming collective identity, and constructing political reality. From the perspective of the functional paradigm in linguistic research, special attention is given to the role of stylistic and rhetorical means in mobilizing society and legitimizing political decisions. The significance of this analysis is supported by the actualization of propaganda forms and manipulative techniques identified in a wide range of political speeches, including those by V. Zelensky, U. von der Leyen, and D. Trump.

Analysis of recent sources. The study of political discourse has become an essential aspect of contemporary linguistics, as it displays how public opinion and social consciousness are influenced. Recently, particular attention has been paid to research in the field of critical discourse analysis and media linguistics, which focuses on the study of manipulative strategies and persuasion techniques. The phenomenon of propaganda is understood as a system of linguistic and communicative tools designed to shape ideologies and consolidate collective identity. Communicative-pragmatic and communicative-discursive approaches emphasize the manipulative potential of language, highlighting its ability to create emotional appeals and symbolic narratives that function as powerful tools of persuasion.

Political discourse has been and remains a field of interest to scientists such as N. Fairclough, R. Wodak, and J. Kristeva, among others. They approach the study of political discourse from a variety of perspectives, reflecting the phenomenon's multifaceted nature and revealing new insights into how language shapes (and actively manipulates) public opinion and collective identity. Researchers identify the following characteristics of propaganda and manipulation in political discourse: emotional appeals, strategic repetition, polarization through the creation of "us versus them" dichotomies, frequent use of exaggeration and metaphor, intertextual references to cultural and historical figures, and the framing of events through simplified narratives.

Highlighting previously unresolved parts of the overall problem. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the fact that it is the first time in modern linguistics that a comprehensive analysis of communicative markers of stylistic devices has been carried out within the framework of linguocultural and pragmanarrative approaches using the speeches of world

political leaders as material. The communicative and pragmatic features of the semantics of stylistic devices in political discourse have been identified and characterized.

Purposes of the article. The purpose of this study is to identify and analyze propaganda narratives in contemporary political discourse taking into account the challenges in the process of their translation, based on speeches by political leaders (V. Zelensky, V. Zaluzhny, U. von der Leyen, D. Trump), and to determine the rhetorical and stylistic devices that influence mass consciousness.

Presentation of the main material. Political discourse during wartime is characterized by heightened emotionality and an abundance of propaganda elements that serve a dual function: on the one hand, they mobilize and unite citizens by creating a positive image of the struggle; on the other hand, they demoralize by creating a negative narrative of propaganda. The speeches of military leaders in contemporary news demonstrate vivid examples of the use of linguistic strategies aimed at the mass consciousness.

Researchers of critical discourse analysis emphasize the special nature of communicative practices during wartime. In particular, within the theoretical framework of social constructivism, it has been established that crises actualize latent mechanisms of ideological influence through speech [3, p. 87]. Contemporary research in political linguistics has identified a tendency toward the intensified use of emotionally charged lexical units and rhetorical figures in public speeches by government officials during armed conflicts [8, p. 154].

The address by Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy on February 26, 2022, shows active manipulation of public emotions.

"A real battle for Kyiv was fought on our streets, in the skies over Kyiv, in Vasylkiv, in Vyshhorod, and even in the surrounding fields. The enemy used everything against us: missiles, fighter jets, drones, artillery, armored vehicles, saboteurs, and paratroopers. The occupiers are striking residential areas, including with rocket artillery, and trying to destroy energy facilities. Their tactics are very despicable. Residential buildings destroyed by rockets and artillery are the final argument for the world to join us in stopping the occupation. In every city, the occupiers are facing fierce resistance. Uman, Odessa, Kherson, Mykolaiv, Donbas, Kharkiv, Sumy, Chernihiv, Kyiv – wherever the enemy is killing our people, the Armed Forces of Ukraine are doing everything they can to stop and destroy the occupiers. Every Ukrainian must remember one thing. If you can stop and destroy the occupiers, do it. Glory to Ukraine!" [11].

He notes: *"In every city, the occupiers are facing fierce resistance. Uman, Odessa, Kherson, Mykolaiv, Donbas, Kharkiv, Sumy, Chernihiv, Kyiv—everywhere the enemy is killing our people, the Armed Forces of Ukraine are doing everything to stop and destroy the occupiers."* Several key propaganda techniques are worth highlighting in this excerpt. The list of cities – *"Uman, Odessa, Kherson, Mykolaiv, Donbas, Kharkiv, Sumy, Chernihiv, Kyiv"* – serves a dual purpose. First, it creates a sense of the geographical comprehensiveness of the struggle, emphasizing that the war has affected every region of the state. Second, such rhythmic repetition acts as a rhetorical marker of massiveness, forming in the audience an idea of unity in common misfortune.

The phrase *"the occupiers are being dealt a harsh blow"* creates the impression of the Ukrainian army's absolute superiority. The use of the word *"harsh"* adds drama and inspires confidence in the outcome. Such exaggeration is characteristic of military propaganda and it is crucial to preserve it in the translation, as it not only boosts the morale of citizens but also shapes the international community's image of Ukraine as a strong state capable of stopping the aggressor.

Instead of rational argumentation, propagandists appeal to emotions, exaggerating potential threats and negative consequences. The mechanism of influence is based on the subconscious desire of people to avoid danger and discomfort. [2, p. 14]

In the statement *"The Armed Forces of Ukraine are doing everything to stop and destroy the occupiers,"* the personification of the army as the main defender comes to the fore. The use of the verbs *"stop"* and *"destroy"* creates an image of the Armed Forces of Ukraine as a powerful force capable not only of deterring aggression but also of eliminating the threat. This is an example of propaganda that glorifies defenders and at the same time creates a belief in society in an inevitable victory.

The phrase *"in every one of our cities"* emphasizes that war is a common cause that concerns all citizens without exception. The use of the pronoun *"our"* reinforces the effect of unity and solidarity, transforming the local struggle into a nationwide front.

One of the most striking stylistic devices used by Zelensky in this speech is the rule of three. The rule of three is one of the oldest techniques in the art of rhetoric. All speakers know that they can get thunderous applause if they use a triple structure with parallelism [4]. This is a rhetorical technique based on a three-part structure of speech, which is perceived by the audience as complete, rhythmic, and easy to remember. *"The country, the land, the future of children"* is a three-part structure that emphasizes the object of protection. All three words represent the highest values,

which are difficult to argue with. *"All those who can stop and destroy the occupiers – do it. All those who can return to Ukraine, return... All friends of Ukraine who want to join the defense, come, we will give you weapons!"* Here, the three-part structure through the repetition of *"all those who..."* creates the effect of a call for general mobilization. In the finale: *"We will defeat everyone. Glory to Ukraine!"* combined with the previous imperative *"hold on"* also forms a trinity. The result is a complete rhetorical circle that ends the speech emotionally and aphoristically.

In Volodymyr Zelenskyy's speech to the British Parliament on March 8, 2022, the use of intertextuality as a propaganda tool is clearly evident. The President of Ukraine deliberately references key elements of British cultural and historical discourse, particularly the figure of Winston Churchill and the creative legacy of William Shakespeare. This technique enables him to establish an emotional connection between Ukraine and Great Britain, thereby reinforcing the sense of shared historical experience and values.

The concept of intertextuality was introduced by Julia Kristeva, who interpreted this phenomenon as a process in which each newly created text arises based on previously created texts and is constructed as a kind of mosaic of quotations. Intertextual connections are chaotic and large-scale in nature, interacting with different cultures at all possible levels of manifestation, where possible. In such a complex system, texts can contradict, intertwine, and unravel in relation to each other through repetitions, illogical and irrational constructions, allusions, etc. [1, p. 8].

The first example of intertextuality appears in the phrase: *"We will fight to the end. We will not give up and we will not lose. We will fight until the end at sea, in the air. We will continue fighting for our land, whatever the cost"* [12]. This excerpt is reminiscent of Winston Churchill's famous speech *"We shall fight on the beaches"* (1940), delivered at the height of World War II. Zelensky reproduces the rhythm and structure of Churchill's statements, adapting them to the Ukrainian context. There is an anaphora (We will fight...), which gives the statement rhythm and enhances its evocative effect, as well as hyperbole (to the end, whatever the cost), which exaggerates the scale of the struggle and creates an image of uncompromising resilience. The use of this technique serves a propaganda function, as it associates the Ukrainian people with the British during the war against Nazism, emphasizing heroism and shared values of freedom and resistance.

The second example of intertextuality is found in Zelensky's reference to classical literary heritage: *"To be or not to be? Thirteen days ago this question could have been asked about Ukraine. But now,*

absolutely not. It is obvious, we will be. It is obvious, we will be free.“ Here, a direct quote from William Shakespeare's tragedy, *Hamlet*, is applied to the modern political context. The use of this expression is symbolic, as the question “*to be or not to be*” is associated with the dilemma of life and death in world culture. Zelensky creates an antithesis (“*to be or not to be*” – “*we will be, we will be free*”), in which he denies the very possibility of Ukraine's disappearance and transforms a classic literary image into a political slogan. The repetition of the phrase *It is obvious...* serves to rhythmically reinforce and affirm confidence. This technique emphasizes the inevitability of Ukraine's freedom and independence, while demonstrating cultural proximity to the British tradition.

Similar rhetoric is used by Ukrainian military commander and retired general Valery Zaluzhny. In a speech at the RUSI conference in London on July 22, 2024, he referred to the classic Latin aphorism: “*Si vis pacem, para bellum – these words attributed to the ancient Roman historian Cornelius Nepos unfortunately resonate perfectly with democratic society even today, in the 21st century. If you desire peace, prepare for war. Yes, this statement is absolutely correct. I confirm this, having served as Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, and the entire Ukrainian people, who have truly and painfully internalized this.*”[9] This is an example of intertextuality that links Ukraine's contemporary military experience with the historical wisdom of antiquity. Zaluzhny uses the aphorism as a leitmotif, lending his words universality and historical weight. Using this technique, he emphasizes that Ukraine is acting not out of aggressive intentions, but out of the need for self-defense, appealing to the classic formula of international security familiar to Western audiences.

Thus, intertextuality in Zelenskyy and Zaluzhny's speeches serves as a powerful rhetorical tool that provides not only emotional but also intellectual impact. References to Churchill, Shakespeare, and ancient aphorisms create a bridge between Ukraine's present and Western cultural heritage, shaping a positive image of Ukraine as part of European and global civilization and helping to mobilize international support.

In her speech delivered in Florence on May 5, 2023 (State of the Union, European University Institute), Ursula von der Leyen constructs an ideological image of Europe as a morally superior, stable, and just community that resists threats and at the same time embodies the values of peace, unity, and the future.

“Europe is still a peace project. We don't have bros or oligarchs making the rules. We don't invade our neighbors, and we don't punish them. The West as we knew it no longer exists. In Europe, children can

go to good schools, however wealthy their parents are. We have lower CO2 emissions, we have higher life expectancy. Controversial debates are allowed at our universities. These and other values must be defended, and they show that Europe is more than a union. Europe is our home. And people know that.”[7]

Ursula von der Leyen's speech effectively employs stylistic techniques to shape a positive image of the European Union while distancing it from authoritarian regimes. The very first thesis, “*Europe is still a peace project,*” serves an essential function of appealing to historical memory: Europe is presented as a peacekeeping project created after World War II, reinforcing the association “*EU = peace.*” This technique serves as a moral imperative—supporting Europe is equated with supporting peace.

The following phrase, “*We don't have bros or oligarchs making the rules,*” employs emotionally charged vocabulary (“*bros*”) that is atypical for official political style but reinforces the distancing effect. Here, an antithesis is realized: “*we*” are democratic and transparent institutions, “*they*” are corrupt oligarchs. This technique is evident in the statement “*We don't invade our neighbors, and we don't punish them,*” where the repeated construction “*we don't*” creates a rhythmic effect and emphasizes Europe's moral distinction from aggressor states. At the same time, this thesis contains an allusion to Russia's war against Ukraine, which reinforces the propaganda effect and shapes the image of Europe as a guarantor of security.

Particularly striking is the phrase “*The West as we knew it no longer exists,*” which, through paraphrasing and intertextuality, refers to the idea of a “*turning point in history.*” Here, the dramatization of political reality is used to mobilize the listener, creating a sense of threat and a need for unity. Furthermore, the statement “*In Europe, children can go to good schools, however wealthy their parents are*” appeals to a universal value – the future of children. Europe is portrayed as a space of social justice and equal opportunities, in contrast to “*other systems*” where education is often dependent on wealth.

In the sentence “*We have lower CO2 emissions, we have higher life expectancy,*” the author employs the rule of three: the list of arguments, created through the repetition of “*we have...*,” creates rhythm and lends the speech completeness and persuasiveness. The final chord – “*Europe is more than a union. Europe is our home. And people know that*” – contains a vivid emotional appeal. The personification of Europe as a “*home*” reinforces the image of security, warmth, and belonging, forming a positive propaganda narrative.

Donald Trump, in turn, systematically uses various rhetorical and stylistic devices aimed at mobilizing society and forming a clear ideological framework. An example of this is his inauguration speech on January 20, 2017.

"We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and to restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come. We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done. Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. January 20th, 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again". [5]

This excerpt demonstrates a comprehensive system of rhetorical devices that simultaneously constructs a positive image of a *"united people"* and delegitimizes previous political elites. The opening phrase, *"We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort,"* echoes the preamble to the US Constitution (*"We the People"*), reinforcing the effect of legitimacy and a *"return to the roots."* The lexemes *"joined"* and *"great national effort"* set the framework for collective mobilization: the country is conceived as a subject that is organized to engage in joint *"work."* This is followed by a metaphor – *"to rebuild our country and to restore its promise"* – where the nation is likened to an object that can be *"repaired"* and the abstract *"promise"* (*"promise," "destiny"*) is personified and presented as a lost blessing. This wording is a typical *"glittering generality"*: a positive yet vague concept that is difficult to refute and easy to incorporate into any policy. The addition of *"for all of our people"* serves an ethically inclusive function, but implicitly assumes that this *"promise"* was previously unjustly taken away or unavailable – thus laying the groundwork for a presumption of prior injustice.

The sentence *"Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come"* raises the stakes: *"we"* gain not only national but also global agency. The expression *"the course of America and the world"* employs a metaphor (*"course"*) that suggests a controllable history. The modal marker *"will"* sets the tone of certainty, while *"for years to come"* creates the effect of a long-term historical mission. Next are three short, fragmented statements: *"We will face challenges. We will confront hardships. But we will get the job done."* This is the classic rule of three with the anaphora *"We will..."*, which works like a rhythmic march: an escalation of *"challenges, difficulties, getting the job done."* The conjunction

"But" provides a sharp positive climax, and the colloquial *"get the job done"* constructs the image of a *"practical"* leader who does not philosophize but *"gets things done."* Short, punchy sentences lower the cognitive barrier and reinforce suggestion.

The next block consists of three consecutive antitheses, separated by dashes and the conjunction *"but"*: *"Washington flourished – but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered – but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country."* Here, *"Washington"* is a metonymy for the federal capital as the embodiment of the ruling class, and *"the establishment"* is a general label without specification. The triad builds a populist dichotomy of *"elite/people"*: the capital's prosperity – the people's lack of share in the *"wealth"* the prosperity of politicians – the *"flight"* of jobs and *"closed factories"*, the establishment's self-preservation – the vulnerability of citizens. The repetition of *"but"* cements the zero-sum game, where any benefit *"theirs"* automatically means a loss *"ours."* Passive constructions (*"jobs left," "factories closed"*) and generalized agents remove complex causes (globalization, automation), replacing them with moral condemnation of *"the system"* This is the core of negative propaganda: personified culprits (*"they"*) and aggrieved *"we"*.

The final sentence, *"January 20, 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this nation again"*, serves several purposes. First, it is a performative prophecy: the speech not only describes, but also sets the framework for memory (*"this day will be remembered as..."*), attempting to fix the interpretation of the event in the historical canon. Second, the myth of restoration is at work here: the adverb *"again"* presupposes that the *"people"* once *"ruled"* but were later deprived of power. Thirdly, this is culminating legitimization: *"the rule of the people"* is declared to have been achieved at the moment of inauguration – a rhetorical device of *"straight to the point"* that emotionally closes the previous block of accusations.

After analyzing Donald Trump's speech during his inauguration on January 20, 2025, it can be argued that it is a striking example of propaganda aimed at mobilizing society.

"We will move with purpose and speed to bring back hope, prosperity, safety, and peace for citizens of every race, religion, color, and creed. My recent election is a mandate to completely and totally reverse a horrible betrayal and all of these many betrayals that have taken place and to give the people back their faith, their wealth, their democracy, and, indeed, their freedom. From this moment on, America's decline is over." [6]

In the very first lines, he states: *"We will move with purpose and speed to bring back hope, prosperity, safety, and peace for citizens of every race, religion, color, and creed."* Here, he employs a rhythmic list, adhering to the rule of three or more elements. This structure creates a precise rhythm and sounds convincing, appealing to the fundamental values of society—hope, security, and peace. This allows the speech to be perceived as a plan for decisive action, rather than just a declaration. Trump then emphasizes: *"My recent election is a mandate to completely and totally reverse a horrible betrayal..."* Here, hyperbole (*"completely and totally"*) is used to intensify the emotionality of the statement.

K. Lototska defines hyperbole as a stylistic device for enhancing expressiveness or creating a comic effect. Hyperbole is based on extremes and/or absurdity in the assessment of reality. It is conveyed through verbal exaggeration [2, p. 46]. The very construction *"mandate to reverse betrayal"* creates a dichotomy between *"the betrayed people"* and *"the savior-president"*, where the latter gains the right to take radical action, legitimizing his policies. This technique works to shape the image of himself as the sole defender of the interests of ordinary citizens.

Particular attention should be paid to the statement: *"From this moment on, America's decline is over"*. It is based on the presupposition that the country has been in decline for a long time. However, a new stage is now being proclaimed – *"the end of decline"*. This approach corresponds to the classic propaganda scheme of *"crisis – salvation"*, where the speaker appears as a savior capable of reviving the state. The following words – *"Our liberties and our nation's glorious destiny will no longer be denied"* – appeal to abstract values. The concepts of freedom and glorious destiny serve as *"glittering generalities"* – attractive but vague notions that have a substantial emotional impact but do not require specific explanations. They create an image of the moral duty of the people to support this *"new course"*.

No less expressive is the statement: *"And we will immediately restore the integrity, competency, and loyalty of America's government"*. The list of values used here (honesty, competence, loyalty) reinforces the idea of restoring trust in state institutions, which were supposedly destroyed by previous elites. The climax of the speech is the proclamation: *"For American citizens, January 20, 2025, is Liberation Day"*. The use of such a symbolic image gives the date a sacred meaning, turning it into a new *"starting point"* in US history. This is a typical propaganda technique that allows events to be mythologized, creating a sense of national rebirth and renewal. Finally,

Trump emphasizes the historical significance of his own victory, noting: *"It is my hope that our recent presidential election will be remembered as the greatest and most consequential election in the history of our country"*. Here, hyperbole is used to reinforce the image of the event as epoch-making, elevating the speaker himself and making him the center of the historical process.

Thus, Trump's 2025 speech is built on a combination of hyperbole, emotionally charged lists, appeals to abstract values, and symbolic images. All these techniques work to create a propaganda effect, mobilizing society, legitimizing the new president's policies, and shaping the image of a *"savior"* who is capable of stopping the decline and reviving the nation's greatness.

Conclusion and directions for further research in this area. The results of the analysis revealed that propaganda holds a central position in political discourse, serving as a crucial tool for shaping mass consciousness. In the speeches of Volodymyr Zelensky and Valery Zaluzhny, propaganda elements are primarily manifested in the emphasis on the heroism, unity, and indestructibility of the Ukrainian people, which contributes to the mobilization of society and the consolidation of citizens in the face of external threats. Ursula von der Leyen's rhetoric, on the other hand, focuses on defending European values, appealing to the identity and typical home of Europe, to strengthen the positive image of the EU. Donald Trump, using a different style, appeals to the American people by contrasting *"the people"* with *"the political establishment"*, creating an image of a struggle to return power to *"real citizens"*.

Common to all these politicians is the use of repetition, antithesis, metaphors, allusions, and intertextual references, which enhance the emotional impact and make the messages more convincing. Such rhetoric has both positive and negative dimensions: it simultaneously strengthens national identity while also exacerbating conflict by emphasizing the division between *"us"* and *"them"*.

Thus, the speeches of Zelensky, Zaluzhny, Ursula von der Leyen, and Donald Trump demonstrate that propaganda in contemporary political discourse is not only a tool of manipulation but also a strategic resource that shapes public opinion, legitimizes political decisions, and determines the direction of development of nations and international associations.

This study further demonstrates that propaganda exerts broad influence as a communicative practice. Rhetorical strategies not only persuade audiences but also contribute to the construction of collective identities. While political speech can promote social

cohesion, it may simultaneously intensify conflict. Future research should compare political systems and cultures to identify both differences and commonalities in national discourses. Additionally, examining audience reception of political messages and the impact of propaganda on public attitudes and decision-making would provide valuable insights.

In summary, the study of propaganda in political communication reveals its complexity as a mechanism linking language, ideology, and power. These findings contribute to research in political linguistics, media studies, and communication theory by providing new perspectives on the role of language in shaping collective cognition and international relations.

REFERENCES:

1. Корнієнко В.В. Інтертекстуальність як категорія поетики : кваліфікаційна робота. Бердянськ : Бердянський державний педагогічний університет імені П.Д. Осипенка, 2022. 8 с.
2. Федина М. Гіпербола як один із засобів вираження мовленнєвої неввічливості в американському вечірньому ток-шоу «Real Time with Bill Maher». *Наукові записки Національного університету «Києво-Могилянська академія». Мовознавство*. 2019. Т. 2. С. 44–50. DOI: 10.18523/2616-8502.2019.2.44-50.
3. Шахова П.М. Методи глибинного навчання для виявлення елементів пропаганди у текстових даних : дис. ... магістра / наук. керівник А.М. Волокита. Київ : Національний технологічний університет України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», 2024. 89 с.
4. Fairclough N. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992. 87 p.
5. The Rule of Three in Rhetoric. *Yale University Press*. 2017. URL: <https://yalebooks.yale.edu/2017/05/16/how-to-hook-your-audience-the-rule-of-three/> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
6. Trump D. Inaugural Address. 20 January 2017. *Trump White House Archives*. URL: <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/articles/intern-series-pushing-envelope-american-people-presidents-desk/> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
7. Trump D. The Inaugural Address. 20 January 2025. The White House. URL: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/remarks/2025/01/the-inaugural-address/> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
8. Von der Leyen U. State of the Union Address. European University Institute, Florence, 5 May 2023. *Euronews*. URL: <https://www.euronews.com/my-europe/2025/04/16/the-west-as-we-knew-it-no-longer-exists-von-der-leyen-says-amid-trump-tensions> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
9. Wodak R. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vol. 1. London: SAGE Publications, 2001. 154 p.
10. Zaluzhny V. Speech at RUSI Conference. London, 22 July 2024. *United24 Media*. URL: <https://united24media.com/latest-news/if-you-desire-peace-prepare-for-war-former-general-zaluzhnyi-speaks-in-london-1349> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
11. Zelensky V. Address by the President of Ukraine. 26 February 2022. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/news/mi-vistoyali-zvernennya-prezidenta-ukrayini-u-tretij-den-vij-73197> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
12. Zelensky V. Address to the British Parliament. 8 March 2022. *Official website of the President of Ukraine*. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/zvernennya-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-do-parl-73441> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).
13. Zelensky V. Address to the UK Parliament. 8 March 2022. *The Guardian*. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2022/mar/08/thirteen-days-of-struggle-volodymyr-zelenskiys-speech-to-uk-parliament-transcript> (дата звернення: 28.08.2025).

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 29.09.2025
Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 30.10.2025
Дата публікації: 28.11.2025