

CULTURAL ASPECTS OF CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL TOLERANCE IN UNITED STATES, FRANCE AND ARMENIA*

UDC 8 (808.5)

DOI: 10.52063/25792652-2022.1.12-163

ELYA DAVTYAN

*Eurasia International University,
Department of the Foreign Languages and Literature, lecturer;
Yerevan, the Republic of Armenia,
davtyanelya@gmail.com*

The purpose of the article is to show that the culture of a society is expressed in language in general and in political communication in particular. Therefore, it is possible to study the political discourse and identify the cultural symbols, archetypes and values that dominate in a given society. Using the examples of American, French and Armenian political discourse, we intend to show that in all three cases we are dealing with different cultural meanings and values. During the study, a comparative method and a content analysis method were used. The main conclusions are consistent with the assumptions. In American culture, political discourse expresses such a cultural phenomenon as the American dream, while in French political discourse the concepts of country, history and citizenship are central, and in traditional Armenian society, political discourse is focused on traditional values - homeland, family, morality.

Keywords: *tolerance, culture, tradition, identity, multiculturalism, value, political discourse, freedom.*

Preface

Tolerance is one of the most studied phenomena in the modern world by various social sciences. Despite the fact that tolerance is considered a political phenomenon, as it is most often used by politicians and leaders of countries, tolerance is also a cultural phenomenon. The cultural aspects of tolerance relate to the norms of behavior adopted in a given society, the peculiarities of the national language and thinking. The article examines the cultural foundations of political tolerance on the examples of American, French and Armenian cultures. The author concludes that tolerance in every society manifests itself in a special way, and this is primarily due to the culture, traditions and way of life and thinking of people in this society.

Cultural Aspects of Contemporary Political Tolerance

Tolerance is an object of study in many social sciences and humanities. The reason is that as a result of globalization, in the context of the increasing cultural and ethnic diversity of societies, the differences between people become more obvious, which are broadly divided into two parts: biological (racial, gender, etc.) and social (national cultural, linguistic, political, etc). People who differ in many ways tend to distrust a stranger and be hostile towards him, which can manifest itself at all levels of relationships, from everyday communication to political assessments. In these conditions, in the modern world, it is very important to study tolerance, one of the basic principles of

* Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է 20.01.2022 թ., գրախոսվել՝ 10.02.2022 թ., տպագրության ընդունվել՝ 10.04.2022 թ.:

ensuring the peaceful coexistence of people, which makes it possible to form and apply more effective mechanisms for spreading tolerance.

Tolerance is a feature of the moral, political and legal culture of a given society. The main requirement for tolerance is as follows: free choice of religious, political, ideological and other views, as well as respect for the choice of others. From the foregoing, it is clear that tolerance is not a legal phenomenon, but a moral one, which makes it difficult to effectively use it - study, since tolerance belongs to the sphere of society's culture. In other words, tolerance is a cultural phenomenon, it directly depends on the cultural heritage, experience and conditions of a given society.

The purpose of this article is to analyze how political tolerance manifests itself in modern American, French and Armenian societies, depending on cultural characteristics.

The relevance of the topic is due to the fact that modern societies, on the one hand, are involved in the processes of globalization, becoming the same politically and economically, on the other hand, they are more culturally different. The theories of a number of scientists, which have recently become widespread, also indicate that the main differences between people in the modern world lie in the field of culture. "In the new world, the most potential conflicts will arise not between social classes, rich and poor, but between peoples with different cultural identities." (Huntington 24-25). If S. Huntington sees the resolution of cultural contradictions in the cultural dialogue of nations and peoples, therefore another famous scientist F. Fukuyama argues that world development is the development of Western culture itself, and that the spread of Western politics and economics around the world will not meet cultural resistance. which will put an end to Western ideological and economic struggles. F. Fukuyama is known, in particular, for his concept of "the end of history". "We see not only the end of the Cold War or other post-war period, but also the end of history as such, the end of the ideological development of mankind and the generalization of Western liberal democracy as the highest form of government." (Fukuyama 33-34).

The issues of cultural characteristics and differences of different societies concern not only cultural scientists, but also political scientists, diplomats, philosophers, etc. Of course, questions that are so important in today's reality cannot but interest linguists, given the fact that people live primarily in a linguistic reality, and this reality is built on the basis of culture.

Tolerance, as one of the basic conditions for a safe and secure life in the modern world, also needs to be studied from the point of view of the cultural characteristics of various societies. Therefore, it is necessary to solve the following tasks in the article:

- to formulate the common and essential features of the American, French and Armenian cultures;
- to show the expression of these traits in political discourse,
- to substantiate that modern political tolerance is based both on general civilizational norms and on local cultural characteristics.

In recent years, linguists have discussed various issues related to the cultural characteristics of modern political tolerance. The works of Yulia Yuzhakova are well-known, in which the author discusses the expression of cultural factors in political discourse (Yuzhakova 464-472).

A wider range of issues is discussed in the book by Melnikov, dedicated to the national characteristics of political culture. Here the author illustrates the differences between European and American political cultures, which have their own manifestations in political discourse (Melnikov A.P. National models of political culture. Minsk: RIVSH, 2013. 164 p).

Dedicated to the analysis of the cultural aspects of French political discourse, V. Fenina's work explores many examples of the connection between French thinking and French political tolerance (Фенина 102-115).

The article also examines the speeches of politicians, which makes it possible to substantiate the main thesis of the work, that is, the cultural characteristics of a given society are expressed in political discourse to make it more understandable and persuasive.

The science of analysis is ensured by the fact that the study is based on a pattern according to which linguistic thinking is influenced not only by education, profession and social status, but also by the cultural characteristics prevailing in a given society, since they determine the value of an integral part of words and phrases. For example, in American linguistic thinking the word house can be perceived primarily as a dwelling, while, for example, within the framework of Armenian linguistic thinking, a house is associated with family, tradition, holiness. Or, for example, the concept of homeland, which in Western linguistics coincides with the concept of the state, and Armenian linguistic thinking clearly distinguishes between the name of the entire territory of historical Armenia as homeland and the state, the Republic of Armenia, which actually occupies only a small part of the historical homeland. It can be stated that the culture of a given people or nation has a significant influence on linguistic thinking, the latter gives additional meaning and value to words and expressions. Therefore, by studying how politicians construct and express their thoughts, it is possible to identify cultural characteristics that influence and condition the linguistic thinking of a given politician. As a social phenomenon, language is a part of culture and takes first place among the national signs of culture. That is, the language shows the belonging of a person to a given society. Tolerance, expressed in communication, is determined by the rules, norms and stereotypes rooted in the socio-cultural traditions of a given society (people, nation). They are different in different cultures, and therefore the peculiarities of language tolerance in different countries are different.

The empirical material of this study consists of a number of themes and language used in American, French and Armenian political discourse that have a significant impact on the general public due to the fact that they reflect the political culture of a given society and people's ideas about freedom, rights and the state.

The American type of political culture has its own characteristics, which are due to the uniqueness of the formation of personality in American culture. Unlike European societies, American society lacks a common ethnic base. Hence, identity is not based on ethnicity, but on citizenship. Thus, we can say that in the case of the United States, identity is based on the principles of civic engagement and democracy. American culture is not a classic example of the formation of European-Western identity in general, because the history of American society can be described as the history of immigration. Mainly from European countries, but from the East, they brought with them differences in their linguistic thinking, which created additional difficulties in public discourse and speeches aimed at the political organization of coexistence. This is why political discourse pays as little attention to cultural, ethnic and religious differences as possible, and political discourse is usually described as "ethnically neutral". The second cultural feature is that American political discourse is based on the principle of citizenship. The fact is that public opinion largely depends on the stereotypes that have been expressed in American society. For example, in the United States in the 19th century, the court confirmed racial discrimination against people, discrimination on the basis of race in law enforcement, and so on. It was not until the 1960s that major reforms in the US judicial system began to address the political, civil, economic, religious, and ethnic rights of minorities. Thus, the country's judicial system intervened in the political process, bringing

with it a new perception of things, a new terminology, a new discourse. The problem was clear: so that American society in all its diversity can enjoy the same rights and opportunities. Accordingly, guarantees of human rights and freedoms, ensuring fair competition and justice occupy an important place in political discourse, which have entered political discourse as a response to the cultural differences of society and the need for their effective management. American society is diverse, and political discourse expresses the goals, interests of various groups, classes that can conflict with each other and cause conflicts. This reality is known in the professional literature as "multiculturalism", in which tolerance is necessary for the peaceful coexistence of people with inherent differences. This is the third feature of American political culture that distinguishes it from European political culture. Only in conditions of tolerance can a person be different, not be afraid of his own cultural characteristics. This is why tolerance has been declared one of the highest values in American political discourse, which means the promotion of tolerance and its application at all levels of public relations. Due to the cultural diversity of American society, due to the large number of immigrants, the idea that the United States is a unique smelter, where immigrants merge, accept the local socio-cultural values, and become part of American society. Today, the idea of the country as a cultural mosaic that better reflects the existing cultural diversity is taking an increasing place in public and political discourse.

Thus, the cultural situation has a direct impact on the political discourse of a given society. Culture is embedded in politics with a moral understanding of the values of life as well as coexistence. Politics, in turn, determines the direction and perspective of the cultural development of society, makes it possible to use the achievements of culture. The close convergence of these two areas, politics and culture, has allowed specialists to talk about political culture. It is defined as a set of indicators of the organization of political processes, the normative legal norms of participation in them, the behavior of political actors, the political life of an individual and society (Melnikov, *National features of political culture* 189-208).

The political culture is a qualitative description of the political life of a society. Political culture is characterized by traits that only reflect norms, values, stereotypes, political participation and relations with the government. The formation of political culture is influenced by the historical conditions of the development of society, national characteristics, even the geographical position of the country, the geopolitical position of a given society. The stability of the political system depends on the level of development of political culture. For example, one of the basic foundations of the stability of the US political system is the Constitution, which was adopted in 1787 and is still in effect without major changes, although in many countries the Constitution has changed several times during this time. In the American political system, the constitution and the democratic system that is provided for by the constitution are highly valued. Of course, American democracy is viewed differently in the United States and other countries, but the fact is that there are many factors in American political culture that ensure stability. They also created a somewhat exaggerated view of democracy in the United States, which is perceived by the American public as a priority over the political systems of other critical countries. It is on this basis that the global mission of the United States and American society as a carrier and disseminator of freedom and democracy is being formed. They find their expression in the speeches of the country's leaders, and occupy an important place in the socio-political discourse. The notion of the uniqueness of US superiority can be summarized in the following provisions. The path of development of the United States was different from the historical experience of other countries; more favorable economic, political and cultural conditions were created here for development, expression of human potential, thanks to which the United States can serve as an example for other countries.

Therefore, the so-called "American" values - democracy, freedom - human rights - should be spread throughout the world and applied in other countries. This is a feature of the American political system and political discourse that can be characterized as pragmatism: politics in this case is perceived and applied not as an abstract struggle between the forces of good and evil or verbal right and wrong ideas, but as a clash of different groups - a struggle, a system of concrete actions aimed at protecting group interests and goals. It can be noted that all subjects of political struggle accept the "rules of the game" - the norms of speech and behavior and certain common values that should not be violated. In the US political system, the African American factor occupies a special place in the discourse of public policy. African American organizations and the women's rights movement have a huge impact on the political process. This indicates that the so-called casting effect does not always work or does not always work with the same high efficiency. Over the past decades, groups of African Americans, Mexicans, Jews, and Asians have emerged in the United States, whose political orientations coincide with or derive from their ethnic preferences. So the popular notion in the United States that all groups of immigrants would be assimilated into a single American culture did not come true. This cultural diversity has a direct impact on the political culture and political discourse of the country, since the political actors - the country's leader, party leaders, the media and others - necessarily belong to the ethnic groups living in the country and try to include their interests in their political programs. In general, American political discourse is divided into three main types: moralistic, traditionalist and individualistic. The first emphasizes the importance of discussing everything related to a person from the point of view of moral standards. Coexistence is based on the principle of cooperation of all within this approach.

Traditional political discourse prevails in the southernmost states of the United States, where family and friends play an important role in the political process. Here they prefer not to deal with faceless state structures, but to resolve emerging issues through the mediation of specific individuals and clans.

And finally, the third type of political discourse, individualistic, is the most obvious manifestation of the American national mentality, in which the main value is not society, state or family, but the individual. The rooting of such thinking was primarily promoted by immigrants, who left their homeland for various reasons and could only rely on themselves in the United States. And although there are obvious contradictions between the individualistic and moral approaches, each of them has its place in political discourse, since it is used in different situations. Individualism - when it is necessary to reach out to a person in order to do something, and morality - when it is necessary to discuss what to do.

Unlike the American, the political culture of France is very unstable, which is associated with the historical characteristics of the country. First, in France, several forms of government have changed over time. Secondly, over the past two hundred years, more than a dozen new constitutional norms have been applied, electoral systems have changed. The third circumstance is that the government in France has changed not only by constitutional means, but also as a result of revolutions, coups, and army intervention. Fourthly, the country's political system is quite mobile, it reacts quickly even to cardinal changes. All of this has shaped the political culture and discourse of French society.

Echoes of the revolutionary principle of "liberty, equality, fraternity" can still be found in French political discourse. The French are truly proud of their complex political history and regard the republic as their greatest achievement. According to a number of researchers, the political system of France is inherited by many other countries in the appropriate terminology, and the French political language, having left its homeland, became part of the wider European universal political vocabulary (Салмин 192-211).

One of the features of French political culture is the decline in interest in revolution, which is associated, at least, with the existence of many revolutions and sharp political upheavals throughout history. At the same time, people's interest in politics, in general, decreases, which is reflected in the fact that the French, instead of creating political parties or actively participating in the activities of existing parties, create non-political organizations in accordance with their interests. This is due to distrust of politicians, negative experience of previous decades, modern postmodern culture, where individual self-realization, free choice and quality of life are of paramount importance. As a result, the problem of improving everyday life and satisfying personal benefits and interests occupies a large place in French political discourse. To substantiate the cultural characteristics of a given society in political discourse, it is necessary to state that any culture is formed around certain values that permeate all spheres and levels of people's relations with this culture: communication, life, art, politics, etc. (Бабаева; Карасик). In contrast to everyday communication, the application of these values is more common in the case of institutional ideological communication, the most typical manifestation of which is political discourse. Political values almost always include important values for the people living in that country. This is evidenced by a number of studies on this issue (Шейган; Светоносова). In French political discourse, cultural characteristics are most often expressed in the form of concepts such as freedom, republican values, love, chivalry, individualism, elegance, and the comfort of life (Кирнозе 197-214). Some researchers also use the French phrase "savoir vivre"¹ as a kind of generalization that indicates the attitude of the French towards life. Since the main goal of political discourse is the struggle for power, it defines the linguistic tactics that can be used to achieve the goal. Some of these tactics are directly related to the inclusion of cultural values that are accepted by the general public so that a political force using these tactics can get more votes during elections. Since cultural values are created over a long historical period, secular values cannot play an important role in political discourse, but instead belong to traditional values that have proven their vitality and attractiveness throughout history.

Various linguistic devices are used to provide the valuable content of political speech: slogans, tactics, euphemisms, metaphors, etc. (Бабаева 2004).

Cultural values are used to provide the most ideological aspect of political discourse. Phrases such as "progress", "national dignity", "proud citizen", etc. have more ideological weight and are divided into several groups. The first group consists of universal and moral values: kindness, dignity, conscience, intellect. The second group consists of group values: patriotic (homeland, state, history), patriarchal (protection, justice, security, care), liberal (freedom, democracy), professional - practical (professionalism, honesty, integrity).

Of course, from a professional point of view, it is also of great interest that the cultural characteristics of a given society are expressed not only in the content of political discourse, but also in the style of work and relations of political subjects. For example, sessions of the United States Congress begin with a prayer, after which members of Congress take an oath of allegiance. (Pledge of Allegence to the Flag) (Абрамян 30-31).

It is noteworthy that the word gentleman is used to designate them during meetings, to which is added the name of the state that he represents, for example, a gentleman from California. And when applying to a female representative, they use more tolerant form of a *gentlewoman*. This feature is based on the application of the principle of equality inherent in the culture of American society, the principle underlying American culture in general.

¹ Eng. «to know to live».

Tolerance for American political discourse is also a reference to a fundamental cultural ideal known as "The American Dream". If the application of the principle of equality in political discourse is associated with tolerant cultural norms such as humanism and justice, the reference to the American Dream shows that the subject of politics (leader, politician, etc.) shares the values of society and purpose in life. Almost everyone in American politics has a positive view of the American dream.

The cultural features of the Armenian political discourse are associated with the cultural image of the Armenian society, which is distinguished by the fact that two poles are clearly expressed here: the national-conservative and the globalist. The national-conservative culture is reflected in the discourse of such values as a strong family, traditions, the desire for identity, not modernization. Traditional culture manifests itself in political discourse in the form of an ethical assessment of events. In this case, the speech often uses the terms "homeland", "cultural heritage", "shame", "historical heritage", "community", etc. On the contrary, the expression of the so-called globalist culture in Armenian political discourse is marked by the spread of anti-national or supranational values, the propaganda of modern identity, the proclamation of individualism and democracy, and so on. Since the main goal of political discourse is to convince people, manipulation plays an important role in this. Thus, the expression of cultural values in political discourse inevitably accompanies the manipulation of mass consciousness. For example, in one of the speeches of the Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia, the following wording can be found: "... *A new page* opens in the history of Armenia and Artsakh, and we must start that page by consolidating national and public potential, re-establishing *new values*, truly *democratic values* ..." (Փաշինյան). The manipulation is obvious here, because this speech was preceded by a war, a capitulation signed by the Prime Minister, parliamentary elections marred by massive violations and numerous cases of the use of administrative resources by the authorities. In the speech of the leader of one of the opposition political powers of Armenia, acting on a nationally conservative basis, one can see a reference to the corresponding cultural characteristics. "The goal of the movement is to unite all *those devotees* ... who understand very well the situation in which our *homelandis*, who are ready to *unite* to lead our *country* out of this deep crisis, who have faith, the desire to restore Armenia, which does not want to be left without a *homeland*. and joins the list of *nations* that exist but do not have a *homeland*. The future of *our country* is under threat, it is our *duty* to stop this danger" («5165» ազգային շարժման անդրանիկ համագումար).

It is possible to single out a number of expressions built on national-cultural factors that have taken place in the Armenian political discourse quite recently. Ishkhan Saghatelyan, a representative of one of the largest political parties in Armenia, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation-Dashnaksutyun, vice speaker of the National Assembly, commented on their high result in the recent local elections in one of the Armenian settlements. "Last time we got 45%, this time 77%, before that the Armenian Revolutionary Federation got 75-80%. Our residents always show that they support us, our family, our party. "Because we were born, we lived, we grew up, we earned this respect." (Սաղաթելյան). Obviously, the politician connects the victory of his party primarily with such traditional cultural factors as the respect and fame of his family in the village. It is also noteworthy that Ishkhan Saghatelyan compared the Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia Nikol Pashinyan with the Brave Nazar, since the latter is known as a fairy-tale character with cowardice, lies and adventurism, and when someone is called the Brave Nazar, they do not particularly emphasize his courage, but, on the contrary, his cowardly nature. That is, in this case we are dealing with the use of irony, when the word user must be understood in the opposite sense.

The categories of morality, shame and heroism occupy a large place in traditional Armenian culture, which is also reflected in political discourse. Thus, in the speeches of the representatives of the Armenian opposition political power Karin Tonoyan and Gegham Manukyan, one can find similar formulations. "There is no morality in our politics to talk about morality. ... Captives are made heroes in such a way that in the next war no one is afraid of being captured, surrendering is very easy, he is still a hero. Why sacrifice your life for the sake of the Motherland if he is called a hero even after he was captured? («Դեմ դիմաց»)." "There is no more shame in our country. How was it at the time? Ashamed to do that, ashamed to do that ... And now there is no unwritten law. This disgrace must be from top to bottom" («Դեմ դիմաց»).

It seems that in the political discourse one can clearly distinguish traditional cultural and political features, which are expressed, respectively, through the homeland-state, a person-citizen, duty-responsibility, a dream-goal, a person-society, professional dedication, and other concepts.

Degree of Tolerance in Verbal Actions

The expression of tolerance in political discourse is directly related to the value position or assessment of the issue under consideration, which is expressed verbally at an implicit or explicit level. An explicit form implies an open, direct expression of a relationship or assessment, an implicit form is an indirect, hidden expression. In this respect, linguistic means of expressing tolerance have a twofold expression. show a tolerant attitude towards the object, but at the same time treat it negatively. Verbal tolerance is a measurable phenomenon, and tolerance for expression also depends on the ratio of implicit and explicit forms in this speech. One of the essential features of the implicit value situation in speech is the absence of elements of the value structure, since the implicit act of value attitude or evaluation is carried out indirectly, through non-value actions (Трипольская 55).

Thus, it is possible to distinguish between the types of verbal actions that convey an indirect attitude or assessment, and to discuss the degree of their tolerance. These types are verbal expressions of advice, prohibition, reproach, regret, consent-disagreement, condemnation.

1. The existence of *advice* is expressed in the fact that in speech there is an opinion on how to act in a given situation, and in English it is expressed in the forms "should" and "why not." Since they soften the negative attitude towards the subject of speech, give the right to choose whether to follow the advice or not, they can be viewed as a means of tolerance.

2. The *prohibition* is mainly expressed by the words "do not" and "stop". As a rule, the presence of a prohibition in speech is mitigated by explanations and justifications for why something should be stopped or why it should not be done, which shifts the emphasis from the prohibition to its explanation.

3. A *reproach* expresses dissatisfaction, dissatisfaction with the created situation, in fact, contains accusations against a specific person, because of whom such a situation was created. Common forms of reproach "could have done better", "might have done better", which implicitly contain a negative assessment. Indirect expression of this negative content contributes to a softer expression of thought, which is based on the principle of respect for the opinions of others - a common practice in American culture.

4. *Regret* expresses feelings of remorse, sadness, and sometimes disappointment, based on the realization that it is impossible to achieve or change anything. Expressing these feelings is discouraged in American culture because behavioral and verbal norms of being happy or pretending to be happy are more common. Regret is expressed in the form "might have helped if", "it would have been better if", which forces the speaker to

indirectly express a negative attitude or assessment. The meaning of summarizing linguistic forms is to prove the discrepancy between the expected and real events and results, which means that the current situation is given a negative assessment.

5. The purpose of *condemnation* is to express dissatisfaction, accusation, for which concepts in the field of ethics are often used: shame, guilt, etc. The use of judgmental expressions in speech implies that the speaker takes on the role of judge, so this form is not so common in political discourse, as it simply indicates intolerance.

6. Disagreement indicates that the speakers do not have common approaches and positions on the object, which is expressed in the ways of criticism, rejection, and devaluation of the opinions of others. Implicit assessment is expressed through disagreements in political discourse, especially in the form of a rhetorical question: "Do you really think ...?", "Don't you think ...?". By the nature of the rhetorical question, it can be concluded that a question with denial contains confirmation, and a rhetorical question without denial is used for denial. It is noteworthy that disagreement can be expressed in both rhetorical and non-rhetorical terms (Постоенко 20).

Conclusions

The above descriptions and examples testify to the presence of a clear connection between the culture and linguistic thinking of a given society, which is expressed at all levels of communication, including political communication. One of the important components of modern political communication is tolerance, which in this context is also influenced by the culture to which the subjects of this political communication belong. The expression of tolerance at the verbal level testifies to the linguistic thinking of a person (society) and cultural factors influencing his linguistic thinking. American culture, without a common ethnic basis, a common historical memory and a sense of homeland, is not turned to the past, but is oriented to the future and has become more pragmatic. Hence, for example, the great place of the American dream in political communication related to a more prosperous life in the future. French linguistic thinking, in turn, has a rich historical memory, in which the difficult history of the creation of the republic occupies a large place. This is due to the fact that French political communication expresses such socio-cultural values as the state, citizen, homeland. The political communication of the Armenian society, in turn, is largely conditioned by historical memory, where, due to the long absence of the state, it is more important not legal, but moral standards for organizing life, as well as the idea of the Motherland instead of the state. As a result, the concepts of morality and homeland occupy an important place in Armenian political communication.

LITERATURE

1. Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of the Story?*. Problems of Philosophy, No. 3, Free Press, 1992.
2. Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations*. Simon & Schuster, London, 2007.
3. Бабаева, Елена. *Лингвокультурологические характеристики русской и немецкой аксиологических картин мира*. Волгоград, 2004, <https://www.dissercat.com/content/lingvokulturologicheskie-kharakteristiki-russkoi-i-nemetskoi-aksiologicheskikh-kartin-mira>. Доступно: 19.08.2021.
4. Карасик, Владимир. *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. Гнозис, Москва, 2004.
5. Кирнозе, Зоя. *“Французское”. “Межкультурная коммуникация”*. Учебное пособие. Нижний Новгород, 2001.
6. Мельников, Адам. *Национальные модели политической культуры*. РИВШ, Минск, 2013.

7. Postoenko Irina. *Situacija nesoglasija/ otkaza v dinamike anglijskoj rechi*. Dis. na sois. uchen. step. kand. filol. nauk, Habarovsk. [Situation of Disagreement/refusal in the Dynamics of English Speech. Dis. of cand. of phil. sciences. Khabarovsk] 2001.
8. Shejgal, Elena. *Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa*. Volgogr. Gos. Ped. Un-t, Peremena, Volgograd. [Semiotics of Political Discourse. Volgogr. State Ped. University, Change, Volgograd] 2000. (In Russian)
9. Svetonosova, Tatjana. *Sopostavitel'noe issledovanie cennostej v rossijskom i amerikanskom politicheskom diskurse*. Avtoref. dis... kand. filol. nauk, Ekaterinburg. [Comparative Study of Values in Russian and American Political Discourse. The Summary of the thesis of the candidate of phil. sciences, Yekaterinburg] 2006. (In Russian)
10. Tripol'skaja, Tatjana. *Jemotivno-ocenochnyj diskurs: kognitivnyj i pragmaticheskij aspety*. Izd-vo NGPU, Novosibirsk. [Emotive-Evaluative Discourse: Cognitive and Pragmatic Aspects. NSPU edition, Novosibirsk] 1999. (In Russian)
11. Abramjan, Samvel. "Lingvokul'turnye osobennosti sovremennogo anglojazychnogo politicheskogo diskursa". *Foreign languages for special purposes*, YSU Press, No. 4 (13), str. 30-41. ["Linguistic and Cultural Features of Modern English-language Political Discourse". *Foreign languages for special purposes*, YSU Press, No. 4 (13), pp. 30-41] 2016. (In Russian)
12. Mel'nikov, Adam. "Nacional'nye osobennosti politicheskoy kul'tury". *Sacyjal'na-jekeanamichnyja i pravavyja dasledvanni*, No. 3, str. 27-43. ["National Peculiarities of Political Culture". *Social-legal and legal succession*, No. 3, pp. 27-43] 2010. (In Russian)
13. Salmin, Alexei. "Priroda i rol' bazovyh politicheskikh orientacij (na primere Francii)". *Politija*, № 3. str. 192-211, <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/text/50400696/>. Dostupno: 19.08.2021. ["The Nature and Role of Basic Political Orientations (on the example of France)". *Politia*, № 3, pp. 192-211, Accessed: 19.08.2021] 2005. (In Russian)
14. Yuzhakova, Yulia. "Peculiarities of Ethnic Stereotypes Usage in English Political Discourse". *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, Volume 9. No. 4, December 2018, (<https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.34>) <https://www.awej.org/images/AllIssues/Vol9/9/AWEJVolume9Number4December2018/34.pdf>. Accessed: 04.03.2020.
15. ««Dem dimac». Karin Tonoyan VS Gegham Manukyan». *Youtube*, teghadrvac e 5 TV Channel-i koghmic, 30 hulis 2021, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pTIKXM-m3_Q. Ditvel e` 10.12.2021. ["Face to face". Karin Tonoyan VS Gegham Manukyan". *Youtube*, uploaded by 5 TV Channel, 1 July 2021. Accessed: 10.12.2021]. (In Armenian)
16. Fenina, Viktorja. *Reprezentacija kul'turnyh cennostej vo francuzskom politicheskom diskurse*. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/reprezentatsiya-kulturnyh-tsennostey-vo-frantsuzskom-politicheskom-diskurse>. Dostupno: 19.08.2021. [Representation of Cultural Values in French Political Discourse. Accessed: 19.08.2021]. (In Russian)
17. Pashinyan Nikol. <https://www.primeminister.am/hy/statements-and-messages/item/2021/06/21/Nikol-Pashinyan-Speech/>. Ditvel e` 15.12.2021. [Pashinyan Nikol. Accessed: 15.12.2021].
18. Saghatelyan, Ishkhan. <https://hetq.am/hy/article/131871>. Ditvel e` 10.12.2021. [Saghatelyan Ishkhan. Accessed: 10.12.2021].
19. «5165» azgayin sharjman andranik hamagumar. <https://hetq.am/hy/article/130137>. Accessed 18.11.2021. Ditvel e` 10.12.2021. ["5165" The first congress of the national movement. Accessed: 10.12.2021]. (In Armenian)

**ԺԱՄԱՆԱԿԱԿԻՑ ԶԱՂԱՔԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՆԴՈՒԹՈՂԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ՄՇԱԿՈՒԹԱՅԻՆ ՀԱՅԵՑԱԿԵՏԵՐԸ ԱՄԵՐԻԿԱՅՈՒՄ,
ՖՐԱՆՍԻԱՅՈՒՄ ԵՎ ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆՈՒՄ**

ԷԼՅԱ ԴԱՎԹՅԱՆ

*Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի
օտար լեզուների ամբիոնի դասախոս,
ք. Երևան, Հայաստանի Հանրապետություն*

Հոդվածի նպատակն է ցույց տալ, որ որևէ հասարակության մշակույթը առհասարակ դրսևորվում է լեզվում, մասնավորապես քաղաքական հաղորդակցության մեջ: Հետևաբար առաջադրված խնդիրներն են ուսումնասիրել քաղաքական խոսույթը և դուրս բերել մշակութային խորհրդանիշները, արխետիպերն ու արժեքները, որոնք գերակշռում են տվյալ հասարակության մեջ: Ամերիկյան, ֆրանսիական և հայկական քաղաքական մշակույթի օրինակով փորձել ենք ցույց տալ, որ երեք դեպքերում էլ գործ ունենք տարբեր մշակութային իմաստների ու արժեքների հետ: Ուսումնասիրության ընթացքում կիրառվել են համեմատության և բովանդակության վերլուծության մեթոդները: Ամերիկյան մշակույթում և քաղաքական խոսույթում արտահայտված է այնպիսի մշակութային երևույթ, ինչպիսին է ամերիկյան երազանքը, ֆրանսիական քաղաքական խոսույթում հիմնական տեղը զբաղեցնում են «երկիր», «պատմություն» և «քաղաքացի» հասկացությունները, իսկ հայ ավանդական հասարակության քաղաքական խոսույթը կենտրոնացած է ավանդական արժեքների վրա՝ հայրենիք, ընտանիք և բարոյականություն:

Հիմնաբառեր՝ հանդուրժողականություն, մշակույթ, ավանդույթ, ինքնություն, բազմամշակութայնություն, արժեքներ, քաղաքական խոսույթ, ազատություն:

**КУЛЬТУРНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ
ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТИ В АМЕРИКЕ, ФРАНЦИИ И АРМЕНИИ**

ЭЛЯ ДАВТЯН

*преподаватель департамента иностранных языков
Международного Университета Евразии,
г.Ереван, Республика Армения*

Целью статьи является показать, что культура общества выражается в языке в общем и в политической коммуникации в частности. Поэтому возможно исследовать политический дискурс и выявить культурные символы, архетипы и ценности, которые доминируют в данном обществе. Проявления американской, французской и армянской политической культуры показывают, что во всех трех случаях имеется дело с разными культурными смыслами и ценностями. В американской культуре и политическом дискурсе выражается такой культурный феномен, как «американская мечта»; во французском политическом дискурсе главное место занимают «страна», «история», «гражданин», а в армянском традиционном обществе политический дискурс ориентирован на традиционные ценности – «родина», «семья», «нравственность».

Ключевые слова: *толерантность, культура, традиция, идентичность, мультикультурализм, ценности, политический дискурс, свобода.*