

The internal conflict of the concept CIVIL SOCIETY in mass media discourse

Andrii Kaptiurov

Research and Educational Center of
Foreign Languages NAS of Ukraine, Kyiv
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9961-7953>

Abstract. *The paper explores the internal conflict of the concept civil society in English language mass media. Based on discourse analysis, it reveals how ideological and effective polarisation transform civic organisations from agents of cooperation into opponents. The study highlights linguistic markers and media framing that shapes antagonistic representations of activism.*

Keywords: *Civil society, discourse analysis, polarization, ideology, media framing.*

The concept of CIVIL SOCIETY has long been central to democratic discourse, representing the collective of organizations, associations, and movements that mediate between individuals and the state. However, in contemporary media environments, the internal conflict within civil society itself has become increasingly evident. This paper explores how ideological and effective polarisation reshaped the linguistic representation of CIVIL SOCIETY concept in English language mass media, transforming this sphere from a space of cooperation into a field of confrontation.

The complexity of civil society lies in its heterogeneity. It encompasses a multitude of factors with distinct goals and identities. As Dalton demonstrated, ideological polarization manifested in the growing distance between political elites and citizens has deepened over time [1]. Mason and Iyengar, Sood and Lelkes add that effective polarization, or the emotional investment in political identity, amplifies hostility between groups [4, 5]. Social media serve as accelerators of this process, enabling rapid mobilization and identity-based conflict, as noted by Pocheptsov [6].

Media texts reveal that civil organizations increasingly act not as partners within a shared civic framework, but as rivals. Lexical markers such as *left-wing vs. right-wing*, *liberal vs. conservative*, or *pro- vs. anti-* encapsulate this polarisation. For example, the New York Times reports clashes between Italian left-wing and hard-wing students over migration [3], while The Guardian documents conflicts between liberal and conservative activist groups on U.S. campuses regarding the Israeli-Palestinian war [7]. These discursive oppositions linguistically encode antagonism, transforming ideological difference into moral enmity.

In this polarised environment, even organizations traditionally associated with humanitarian goals can become ideologically framed. In media coverage Caritas, a

Catholic charity assisting migrants, is juxtaposed with Forza Nova, a right-wing movement opposing immigration [3]. The same event thus generates diametrically opposed narratives, one of compassion and integration, the other of protection and exclusion. The lexical framing *to help* vs. *to defend* positions each side as morally superior.

Similarly, in US media, the confrontation between Antifa and Moms for Liberty exemplifies discursive dualism. Both groups identify as defenders of freedom, yet their ideological underpinnings are mutually exclusive. Through evaluative language (*attack, confrontation, fear, anarchists*), outlets like Fox News linguistically construct these groups as combatants rather than participants in a pluralistic dialogue.

Polarisation also shapes coverage of global issues, particularly environmental discourse. Studies by Dunlap and Brulle show that denialism functions as a counter-movement to mainstream climate activism [2]. However, mass media often frame climate skeptics as irrational or marginal. BBC's reports on Kenyan farmer Jasper Machogo and Ugandan leaders depict climate change denial as an outlier narrative associated with misinformation on platforms like TikTok and YouTube [8, 9]. Through this framing CIVIL SOCIETY appears hierarchized, where some voices are amplified as legitimate, while others are delegitimized as harmful.

The recurrent use of adversative lexemes (*clash, violence, attack, denial, agitators*) and evaluative constructions signal an erosion of neutrality in mass media representations. Civil society no longer serves as a collective platform for public good, but as a battleground of competing ideological identities. This linguistic polarisation mirrors the socio-political process of effective division, where discourse contributes to reinforcing in-group cohesion and out-group hostility.

In essence, civil society is shown not as a monolithic democratic force, but as an internally conflicted entity. The study of its media representation underscores that linguistic polarisation reflects deeper structural tensions of the digital age, where communication platforms amplify emotional discourse, erode shared meaning, and destabilise traditional boundaries between activism, journalism, and propaganda.

Thus, the internal conflict of civil society is both a linguistic and sociocultural phenomenon. It manifests in the discursive opposition of ideological groups, the evaluative framing of social actors, and the asymmetrical visibility of narratives. Understanding this transformation requires an interdisciplinary approach that unites discourse analysis, media studies, and political linguistics, revealing how language mediates the ongoing struggle over meaning, legitimacy and moral authority in contemporary democratic society.

References

1. Dalton, R. J. (1987). Generational change in elite political beliefs: The growth of ideological polarization. *The Journal of Politics*, 49(4), 976–997. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2130780>.

2. Dunlap R. E. & Brulle R. J. (2020). Sources and amplifiers of climate change denial. In *Social and Political Science 2020*, pp.49 – 61. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789900408.00013>.
3. Horowitz, J. (2018, July 7). *This Italian town once welcomed migrants. Now, it's a symbol for right-wing politics*. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/07/world/europe/italy-macerata-migrants.html>.
4. Iyengar, S., Sood, G., & Lelkes, Y. (2012). Affect, not ideology: A social identity perspective on polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 76(3), 405–431. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfs03>
5. Mason, L. (2018). *Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity*. University of Chicago Press.
6. Pocheptsov, G. (2012). *Vid Facebook'u i Glamuru do WikiLeaks: mediakomunikatsii* [From Facebook and Glamour to WikiLeaks: Media communications]. Kyiv: Spadshchyna.
7. Robins-Early, N. (2024, April 30). *Why are pro-Palestinian US student protesters wearing masks on campus?* *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/apr/30/why-are-pro-palestinian-students-wearing-masks-campus>.
8. Silva, M. (2024, June 16). *How a Kenyan farmer became a champion of climate change denial*. *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c133r4gyx1no>.
9. Silva, M., & Ahmed, M. (2023, June 30). *The climate change-denying TikTok post that won't go away*. *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-66023797>.

UDC 81'25:811.111'255.4:32

Stylistic and lexical features of translating protocol speeches in different cultural contexts

Kateryna Hiltay

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, Ternopil

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0111-4372>

Abstract. *The article analyzes the stylistic and lexical features of translating protocol speeches in different cultural contexts. Particular attention is paid to diplomatic etiquette, maintaining the official style, and accurately conveying culturally marked elements, clichés, and terminology. It is emphasized that translation must balance accuracy with cultural adaptation, requiring the translator to possess high intercultural competence for effective international communication and preserving the state's image.*

Keywords: *protocol speeches, translation, diplomatic etiquette, intercultural competence, official-business discourse.*