Manifestations of tolerance in political discourse

Davtyan Elya V.
Lecturer at Eurasia International University (Yerevan, RA)
davtyanelya@gmail.com

Հանդուրժողականության արտահայտությունը քաղաքական խոսույթում
Դավթյան Էլյա Վ.
Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարան, դասախոս (Երևան, ՀՀ)
davtyanelya@gmail.com

Ամփոփագիր. Հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվում են քաղաքական առաջնորդների հանդուրժողական լեզվական վարքագծի տարբեր դրսևորումներ, որոնց նպատակն է լսարանի վրա առավել բարենպաստ տպավորություն թողնել, ցույց տալ նրանց դիրքորոշման ժողովրդավարական բնույթը և, միևնույն ժամանակ, այլ տեսակետների ճախողված լինելը: Ցույց է տրվում, որ քաղաքական դիսկուրսի հանդուրժողականությունն ապահովելու համար կիրառվում են տարբեր ռազմավարություններ և մարտավարություններ, որոնք ընտրվում են՝ հաշվի առնելով քննարկվող թեման, հաղորդակցության սուբյեկտներին և այլ գործոններ: Էմպիրիկ նյութերի հիման վրա հոդվածում հիմնավորվում է, որ հանդուրժողականությունը մեծ մանիպուլյատիվ ներուժ ունի, որը հաճախ օգտագործվում է քաղաքական առաջնորդների կողմից՝ իշխանություն ձեռք բերելու կամ պահպանելու համար:
Հանգուցաբառեր՝ քաղաքական դիսկուրս, հանդուրժողականություն, հոգեբանական տեխնիկա, լարվածություն, համոզում, թուլացում, ռազմավարություն, մարտավարություն, մանիպուլյացիա

Проявления толерантности в политическом дискурсе
Давтян Эля В.
Международный университет Евразия, преподаватель (Ереван, РА)
davtyanelya@gmail.com

Аннотация. В статье изучаются различные проявления толерантного языкового поведения политических лидеров, целью которых является произвести наиболее благоприятное впечатление на аудиторию, показать демократичность своей позиции и одновременно – несостоятельность других точек зрения. Показывается, что для обеспечения толерантности политического дискурса используются разные стратегии и тактики, которые выбираются с учетом обсуждаемой темы, субъектов коммуникации и других факторов. В статье на основе эмпирического материала обосновывается, что толерантность имеет большой манипулятивный потенциал, что зачастую используется политическими лидерами для получения или удержания власти.
Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, толерантность, психологическая техника, напряжение, убеждение, расслабление, стратегия, тактика, манипуляция.

In political and scientific debates, tolerance is seen as a key tool for constructive and effective dialogue. Starting a political debate, the participants, as a rule, try to express their opinion on a particular political issue, know the opponent's point of view, highlight the merits of his point of view, point out the shortcomings of the opponent's views in the political struggle, convince the audience of the correctness of their own proposals, thereby attracting the latter "on his side". However, with the intention to realize his own intentions, the participant in the debate cannot present himself as an inadequate, stubborn, narcissistic politician. That is why political debaters use tolerance, the tactics of which allow them to maneuver between criticizing the opponent and "maintaining their own reputation." Tolerance in political debate includes the following **provisions**:

1. *Joint solution of the issue. I am not against you, but we are against this problem or some of its components.*

An example of this is the first of three debates for the presidency of the United States, which took place in 2008. The September meeting was attended by Republican Senator John McCain and Democratic Senator Barack Obama. Presidential candidates are equal in status, which gives them equal freedom to choose a strategy of behavior. In Senator McCain's opening speech, there was this passage. «*Because as we 're here tonight in this debate, we are seeing, for the first time in a long time, Republicans and Democrats together, sitting down, trying to work out a solution to this fiscal crisis that we're in*» [**22**, p. 2]: This quote is a tolerant position, as it demonstrates the desire for a joint exit from the crisis: ***«Republicans and***

Democrats together, sitting down, trying to work out a solution to this fiscal crisis that we're in».

Application of long-term measurements (we are ... sitting down, trying ...) shows the candidate's willingness to debate, his openness to discuss controversial issues between Republicans and Democrats.

2. *using the technique of psychological rapprochement. Everyone can be wrong;*

The first of three debates for the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, held in April 2010. Labor MP Gordon Brown, Conservative leader David Cameron and Liberal Democrat leader Nick Clegg took part in the debate. Despite the fact that Gordon Brown was prime minister, the candidates had equal status in the elections, which allowed them to freely choose their tactics during the debate. The following is an excerpt from Cameron's introductory speech: *«The expenses saga brought great shame on parliament. I'm extremely sorry for everything that happened. Your politicians, frankly all of us, let you down»* [**23**, p. 3]: In his opening speech, David Cameron apologized to voters for the financial fraud of some MPs. *(I'm extremely sorry for everything that happened. Your politicians ... let you down).* The presence of an emphasis on stress (extremely) indicates a high degree of regret. Admitting his guilt, Cameron also emphasized that not only the Conservative Party, but all parties are to blame *(all of us)*: The point of this statement is that all politicians can make mistakes. After all, politicians are people too.

This phrase calls on the addressee (audience) to accept the politicians as they are, to adequately perceive what happened, to restrain emotions, and to the addressees to put aside the conflict and seek agreement for the benefit of the whole country. In this passage, David Cameron uses a tolerant tactic - to appeal to the public, that is, to try to influence the feelings of the audience, on their opinion, in order to win them over to his side.

3. *Demonstration of willingness to continue the discussion*

For example: the first of three debates for the presidency of the United States took place in 2004. In September, it was attended by a representative of the Republican Party, incumbent President George W. Bush, a representative of the Democratic Party, John Kerry. During the debate, although Bush was President of the United States, the candidates have equal status. At the end of the first round of debate, Senator Kerry delivered a closing speech that included this section: «***My fellow Americans,*** *as I've said at the very beginning of this debate,* ***both President Bush and I love this country very much.*** *There's no doubt, I think, about that. But we have a* ***different set of convictions about how we make our*** *country stronger here at home and respected again in the world»* [**24**, p. 30].

In his speech, Senator Kerry used such tolerant tactics as approaching the audience, which is expressed in the phrase "my fellow Americans", as well as approaching the rival *(both President Bush and I)*. Bush's address shows respect for him. Using this tactic, Kerry is trying to create a positive image in the eyes of the electorate, which may have suffered a little as a result of disputes and recriminations, and also tries to somehow sum up the debate. *The strategy of relying on patriotism (love this country very much) can be considered as a special case of addressing the public.* Such tactics are a necessary element of the election campaign, since love for the motherland is one of the main qualities of American values. However, by pursuing a strategy of rapprochement with his rival, the senator modernizes his tolerant attitudinal strategy (we have a different set of convictions), based on the differentiation of ways to achieve prosperity for his own country. *(how we make our country stronger* ***here at home and respected again in the world).***

4. *Mitigation of conflict, transition to facts, not emotions*

For example, in one of three presidential debates, Senator McCain accused Obama of negotiating with terrorists without preconditions for working through and discussing the issue at the government level. «***What Senator Obama doesn't seem to understand*** *that if* ***without precondition you sit down across the table from someone who has called Israel a "stinking corpse," and wants to destroy that country and wipe it off the map,*** *you legitimize those comments.* ***This is dangerous. It isn't just naive; it's dangerous.*** *And so we just have a fundamental difference of opinion. ... without precondition, as Senator Obama said he did twice, I mean,* ***it's just dangerous***»:

Obama answered this way: *« Look, I mean, Senator McCain keeps on using this example that suddenly the president would just meet with somebody without doing any preparation, without having low-level talks.* ***Nobody's been talking about that, and Senator McCain knows it This is a mischaracterization of my position***» [**22**, p. 23]:

In this section, Senator McCain, trying to win over the audience to his side, uses a number of intolerant tricks: exaggerating the problem, openly displaying the ignorance of the opponent, expressing a one-sided position in the opinion of the opponent. *The exaggeration of the problem is that in addition to criticizing Obama for not knowing the correct sequence of actions for the president in carrying out possible actions for the country,* such as international negotiations, which should be

preceded by a detailed study of issues *(What Senator Obama doesn't seem to understand;* negotiation with terrorists *without precondition)*, Senator McCain addresses voters' feelings distinguishing that fact as dangerous and exacerbating it through tricks such as repetition (it's dangerous - 3 times), grading (It isn't just naive; it's dangerous), where the definition of the actual action as a naive action (naive and dangerous), a feature of which also indirectly refers to Obama, reinforces the negative impact of his actions on voters. The aforementioned criticism of Obama that he does not understand the problematic behavior of the president in negotiations is the implementation of the tactics of openly demonstrating that the opponent does not know the problem. *(What Senator Obama doesn 't seem to understand)*:

The strategy of expressing a one-sided position in the opinion of the opponent is reflected in the simplification of the negotiation process described by McCain (you sit down across the table from someone who has called Israel a "stinking corpse," and wants to destroy that country and wipe it off the map).

The above tactic aims to control the minds of the audience in order to create a negative image of a political competitor among voters. Senator McCain's use of intolerant tactics in this area characterizes him as an intolerant person. Senator Obama uses the tactic of denying the accusations to soften the communicative power of the accusations against him. *(Nobody's been talking about that, and Senator McCain knows it)*, which makes it possible to judge that he has facts, and not a position of conveying emotions. Obama's tactics can be considered flexible, because, while disagreeing with the opponent's criticism, he defends his position without emotion, without criticizing the latter and without lowering his rating.

Thus, in response to McCain's use of emotionally expressive language tricks, Obama uses his opponent's intelligence and uses stylistically neutral language. Accepting McCain's challenge, Obama does not respond with a counter-accusation, but emphasizes his unreliability. (***This is a mischaracterization of my position)***. This part of the political debate shows the intolerant behavior of Senator McCain and the tolerant behavior of Obama, who seeks to bring the debate to a constructive level.

Tolerance for verbal strategies and tactics

Despite the fact that politics is initially a sphere of intolerant communication, consideration of tolerance and politics from the point of view of the implementation of verbal strategies and tactics is considered relevant. O. Issers defines verbal strategy as "a system of verbal actions aimed at achieving communicative goals." [**4**, p. 54]: Verbal strategies are implemented through tactics and communicative steps. At the same time, the set of strategies for implementing a particular verbal strategy is not unchanged, but can change, differentiate depending on the hierarchy of goals, which, in turn, are divided into primary and secondary. The primary goals are "to initiate the process of communication, stimulate it and control verbal action" [**6**, p. 54]. According to O.S. Issers, the basic principle of inviolability of personal space is aimed at "protecting the boundaries of interpersonal space." *The basic principle of equality of the parties implies a proportional distribution of initiative and equality of speakers in a dialogue. The basic principle of constructivism is based on the speaker's conscious desire to bypass the negative aspects of communication* [**7**, p. 218]:

These basic principles partially correspond to the basic principles of J. Leach's etiquette, formulated in combination. [**21**, pp. 132-138]. Thus, for example, the basic principle of inviolability of the personal space intersects with the basic principle of J. Leech sensitivity, as both basic principles are aimed at maintaining the boundaries of the private sphere. The basic principle of equality of the parties corresponds to the basic principle of generosity, which is designed to exclude the dominance of any of the speakers in the process of communication. The basic principle of constructivism and creation is partly reflected in the basic principles of encouragement and empathy. Basic principles, like strategies, are implemented through tactics and communication skills. However, unlike strategies, the basic principles "require unconditional implementation, work the same at all stages of communication", and strategies imply flexibility and manageability [**6**, p. 101]:

The characters of the author and the addressee are also modern characteristics for the consideration of verbal strategies. Regardless of the goals set, the speaker seeks to create and maintain his own image, reputation, which is not only a "relatively independent" problem, "not related" to a specific communication situation, but also a problem "closely related" to others [**6**, p. 75]. The presentation of the author as a tolerant person has a positive effect not only on his reputation, but also on his relationship with the addressee, so we can talk about the maximum usefulness of tolerant communication. J. Sternin and K. Shilihina points to the need to master conflict-free communication strategies that demonstrate tolerance. Moreover, the choice of strategies for the implementation of these strategies depends on the validity or principle of the issue. For example, in key issues it is advisable to use cooperation strategies, and in non-principled

issues compromise strategies are allowed [**13**, pp. 20-21].

The choice of strategy for implementing the strategy of conflict-free communication can also be determined depending on the individual qualities of communicators. Considering tolerance as an "integrative strategy for conflict resolution", L. Shkatova singles out the tactics of tolerant verbal behavior, which correspond to those of conflict individuals, V. Sheynov's classification. For example, based on the type of conflict, L. Shkatova suggests a particular situation to get out of the conflict situation. The "get off the stage" tactic is used to respond to the demonstrative type of conflict maker (the person stepping into the center of the conflict to be the center of attention), In order to respond to an unshakable (without taking into account the opinions of others) conflict, it is advisable to have a trade union management strategy; In the event of an uncontrolled (lack of self-control) conflict, a "program crash" or unexpected action must be taken, Praise can serve as a response tactic to a superstitious (very demanding environment) conflict[**16**, pp. 393-399].

In addition to the tactics listed above, the following tactics and strategies of conflict-free communication are often used in political discourse: tactics of indefinite reference, tactics of subtle change, softening of expression (thought), focusing on the subject. Introduction of metatext, objection in the form of agreement, humor, etc. The use of weakly referential language units such as metaphor, politically correct vocabulary such as aphorisms and quotations, gives the phrase a variety of interpretations, allowing the speaker to advance his position without exacerbating social contradictions. The creation of soft replacements, according to L. Crissin, stems from the need to "disguise or mitigate the essence of phenomena that are considered inconvenient in an educated society" [**8**, p. 203]. The use of soft substitution tactics allows the speaker to soften the undesirable meaning or evaluative characteristic of the issue under discussion without prejudice to the general essence of the problem. A sharp weakening of the expression (thought) suggests that the speaker accepts other opinions and shows that the addressee does not consider his assessment to be the only true and unshakable one. A similar pragmatic goal is pursued by the speaker when he emphasizes the subjectivity of his own assessment, but in this case the emphasis is more on the possibility of error in the speaker's opinion. An objection under the guise of consent is a tolerant way of expressing disagreement with the addressee. Partial agreement, and then the expression of the opposite point of view, create the impression of a balanced assessment and objectivity of the speaker. The introduction of metatext is relevant in case of violation of the requirements of "understanding", which is one of the criteria for tolerant communication. According to N. Burvikova and V. Kostomarova, misunderstanding of the intricacies of the speaker's speech increases the distance between him and the addressee. In this regard, when formulating an expression (thought), it is necessary to take into account such factors as the availability of a thought (expression) for perception, the transparency of its structure, and the appropriate choice of vocabulary. I. According to Vepreva, clarity, aptitude and purity of speech are communicative qualities that "directly demonstrate the idea of tolerant verbal behavior" [**3**, p. 176]. At the same time, if the speaker is not sure that the addressee fully understands him, it is advisable to use a metalinguistic interpretation or argument in your favor. This comment is the speaker's reflection, the fluctuation of novelty, complexity, stylistic emphasis, I-position in his speech and is a way to prevent possible criticism from the interlocutor. Examples of metalinguistic interpretations are explanations of the use of a marked vocabulary, the meaning inherent in a word, or translation.

Humor is also a means of harmonizing communication. According to G. Shamenova, an appropriate joke and humor reduce tension, have a friendly attitude towards the interlocutor and defuse the situation, restoring the communicative balance [**15**, p. 194].

Thus, from the point of view of strategy and tactics, tolerance is a multi-level set of basic principles, strategies, tactics and means, the main pragmatic function of which is to maintain a cooperative basis in communication, as well as to prevent and resolve conflict situations.

Manipulative potential of tolerance

Researchers of tolerance have repeatedly spoken about the ambiguity and paradoxical nature of this category. Tolerance in various works is often associated with such concepts as manipulation, misinformation, covert aggression, indifference, hypocrisy, double standards policy. Let us consider the negative aspects of the expression of the category of tolerance, which are relevant for political discourse.

Manipulation is one of the key categories in the theory of verbal influence. According to K. Sedov, verbal manipulation "is a hidden influence on a person through communication, the purpose of which is to change his emotional and psychological state" [**12**, p. 183]: Despite the fact that in everyday consciousness the concepts of tolerance and manipulation have conflicting contexts (manipulation is negative, and tolerance is positive), they have many points of contact. For example, E.

Denisyuk draws attention to the fact that tolerant communication is possible with the implementation of a manipulative idea. The verbal behavior of the manipulator can be perceived as non-aggressive, even friendly, when the essence of what is happening is hidden [**4**, p. 197]: Studying this feature of the manifestation of tolerance, Yu. Yuzhakova considers indirect linguistic aggression as direct, open tolerance as different levels of the same expression (thought) and emphasizes the relative nature of linguistic tolerance. Tolerance is, according to the researcher, a means of "retouching instrumental aggression" or "mitigating an openly expressed negative assessment" [**18**, p. 11]: In addition, tolerance and manipulative strategies may overlap. One of these strategies is primarily mitigation - a euphemism [**17**, p. 152]. Hiding negative aspects through euphemisms is more typical of political discourse, which often leads to the implementation of a policy of double standards, which is a language game based on the opposition of "friend or foe", as well as to the use of bilingualism. which "makes the bad good, the negative positive, the unpleasant attractive or at least acceptable." [**19**, p. 176]. According to O.Vdovina, the use of such a language can be considered a characteristic feature of any politician" [**2**, p. 43].

The relationship between the policy of euphemisms and double standards calls into question the sincerity of the use of euphemisms, which, in turn, leads to the need to distinguish between euphemisms and ambiguities. According to William Lutz, euphemisms "turn into double entenders if they are used to deceive the addressee." [quote by: **2**, p. 43]:

There are other aspects of tolerance monitoring that make up its manipulative potential. As A. Ryazanova emphasizes, the use of the term "tolerance" "in modern Russian reality is sometimes hidden, sometimes frankly manipulative." [**11**, p. 83]: According to this study, tolerance refers to a number of manipulative notions-concepts that are introduced into the communicative space and form reality "in the direction necessary for the groups that control the information space" [**11**, p. 84]. This use of tolerance is aimed at realizing the interests of institutions that manage global and local processes of social development. Calls for tolerance can reduce the social, economic and political activity of certain groups of society that are targeted by manipulative influence. Political discourse dictates certain rules of verbal behavior, but in most cases it is in the interests of a politician to be tolerant, which in itself precludes sincerity. Researchers of speech communication have repeatedly emphasized the importance of such a factor as commercial interest in the object of communication when choosing one or another communicative strategy of speech behavior [**10**, **14**]. In particular, R. Ratmayr's survey showed that excessive politeness is often seen by Russians as an outgrowth of hypocrisy and a tool for material gain (especially in business situations of communication) [**10**, pp. 78-79]. Phrases built in accordance with the principles of tolerance are devoid of sharpness, expressiveness and are more typical of the official business style of communication, which is characterized by concern for "not losing face", the rating of the interlocutor and, to the extent possible, maintaining a neutral tone of communication.

The expression of indifference is associated with such a concept as "apparent tolerance", which implies the rejection of dialogue in order to avoid conflict. Such a policy of non-intervention gives additional negative connotations to tolerance. Tolerance, by its very nature, implies a desire to resolve the conflict, while ignoring the issue can lead to its deepening. "Apparent tolerance" indicates that the participant in communication is not ready to compromise. Political correctness, which is part of tolerance, is often criticized for the fact that the creation of more restrained expressions does not solve the problem itself, but only creates the illusion of a solution. In this case, it is appropriate to quote Sh. Galloway, whose thought is quite appropriate in the context of a conversation about tolerance: "The problems of prejudice, racism, inequality and disempowerment cannot be overcome on their own without honest and open dialogue, no matter how irregular and unpleasant it may sometimes seem. Forbidding or not encouraging the use of certain terms and expressions will not speed up the process, but may, on the contrary, drive a wedge of various kinds into relations between groups of people who have to deal with problems that already divide them [**20**]. Thus, this analysis showed that an initially positive trend can be taken to extremes and acquire negative characteristics. Tolerance is characterized by such negative characteristics as hidden aggression, manipulation, a decrease in the political activity of certain groups of society, hiding the negative aspects of reality, the policy of double standards and the language of ambiguity, misinformation, hypocrisy, commercial interest, indifference. However, tolerance has many positive aspects that outweigh the criticisms listed above. First of all, this is a manifestation of respect for the opinion of another person, the desire for non-aggressive conflict resolution and the spread of a high culture of communication.

Political discourse is a special kind of discourse in general, endowed with institutional and non-institutional features, which is due to the "blurring"

of the boundaries between political and other types of discourse. Diplomatic discourse can be considered a kind of political discourse aimed at foreign policy, which is due to the presence of a number of common characteristics of these types of discourses: the use of language as a tool for creating the necessary perception of reality, orientation to the definition of control and the exercise of power, "own-other" basic opposition, theatricality, interaction with other types of discourses, use of deliberate means of uncertainty.

Political discourse is on the border of tolerant and intolerant spheres of communication. Violation of tolerant norms of communication or, conversely, excessive tolerance can damage the reputation of a politician. Tolerance is a desirable feature of a politician, one of the necessary components of his communicative competence.

The communicative category of tolerance in political discourse is manifested in the willingness of the authorities to accept other views, allow dissent, openly and constructively resolve conflicts, find a balance and is implemented through a multi-level system of principles, strategies, tactics and means aimed at harmonization. society, prevention and smoothing:

Tolerance can contain such negative aspects as manipulation, hidden aggression, hiding the negative aspects of reality, the policy of double standards and the language of ambiguity, disinformation and the illusion of a solution to the problem.

Literature

1. **Бурвикова Н. Д.** Костомаров В.Г. Единицы лингвокультурного пространства (в аспекте проблемы толерантности) // Философские и лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Коллективная моногр. / Отв. ред. Н. А. Купина и М. Б. Хомяков. М.: ОЛМА-ПРЕСС, 2005. с. 419-433.
2. **Вдовина О. А.** Полиполярность мира и языка дипломатического общения // Вестник Южно-Уральского государственного университета. Серия: Лингвистика. 2009. № 2. с. 39-47.
3. **Вепрева И. Т.** Коммуникативные качества речи в аспекте толерантности // Лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Тезисы докладов Междунар. науч. конф. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал, ун-та, 2001. с. 174-177.
4. **Денисюк Е. В.** Возможно ли толерантное общение при манипуляции: к постановке вопроса // Лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Тезисы докладов Междунар. науч. конф. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал. ун-та, 2001. с. 196-197.
5. **Дьяченко И. А**. Симулятивные знаки политической корректности в англоамериканском манипуляционном дискурсе: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук / И.А. Дьяченко. Иркутск, 2009. 18 с.
6. **Иссерс О. С.** Коммуникативные стратегии и тактики русской речи. - М.: Издательство ЛКИ, 2006. 288 с.
7. **Иссерс О. С.** Максимы толерантности в аспекте коммуникативных стратегий и норм // Лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Тезисы докладов Междунар. науч. конф. - Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал, ун-та, 2001. с. 217-218.
8. **Крысин Л. П.** Эвфемизация как один из путей к коммуникативной толерантности // Лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Тезисы докладов Междунар. науч. конф. - Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал, ун-та, 2001. с. 229-232.
9. **Михайлова О. А**. Толерантность в речевой коммуникации: когнитивные, прагматические и этические основания // Культурные практики толерантности в речевой коммуникации: Коллективная моногр. / Отв. ред. Н. А. Купина и О. А. Михайлова. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал, ун-та, 2004. с. 15-26.
10. **Ратмайр Р.** «Новая русская вежливость» - мода делового этикета или коренное прагматическое изменение? // Вопросы языкознания. 2009. №1. с. 63-81.
11. **Рязанов А.В.** Манипулятивный потенциал концепта «толерантность» // Философия и общество. 2007. №1. с. 82-97.
12. **Седов К. Ф.** Речевая манипуляция как стремление к власти над человеком // Проблемы речевой коммуникации. Саратов: Изд-во Сарат. ун-та, 2004. Вып. 4. Власть и речь. с. 183-190.
13. **Стернин И. А., Шилихина К. М.** Толерантность, интолерантность и агрессия // Язык вражды и язык согласия в социокультурном контексте современности. -Екатеринбург, 2006. с. 20-30.
14. **Тер-Минасова С. Г.** Язык и межкультурная коммуникация: учеб. пособие. М.: Слово/Slovo, 2000. 624 с.
15. **Шамьенова Г. Р.** Вежливость как качество хорошей речи // Хорошая речь: Коллективная моногр. / Под ред. М.А.Кормилицыной и О.Б. Сиротининой. Саратов: Изд-во Сарат. ун-та, 2001. с. 179-197.
16. **Шкатова Л. А.** Речеповеденческие стратегии и тактики в конфликтных ситуациях // Философские и лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Коллективная моногр. / Отв. ред. Н. А. Купина и М. Б. Хомяков. - М: ОЛМА-ПРЕСС, 2005. с. 389-402.
17. **Шейгал Е. И.** Толерантность в системе дискурсивных категорий // Лингвокультурологические проблемы толерантности: Тезисы докладов Междунар. науч. конф. Екатеринбург 24-26 окт. 2001г. Екатеринбург: Изд-во Урал, ун-та, 2001. с. 152-153.
18. **Южакова Ю. В**. Толерантность массово-информационного дискурса идеологической направленности: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук / Ю.В. Южакова. Челябинск, 2007. 20 с.

19. **Crystal D.** The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 489 p.
20. **Galloway Sh.** Politically Correct Speech, 1999. URL: http://www.cyberpat.com/shirlsite/samples/polcor.html
21. **Leech G.** Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman, 1983. 250 p.
22. The First Presidential Debate between Senators John McCain and Barack Obama. URL: http://elections.nytimes.com/2008/president/debates/transcripts/first-presidential-debate.html
23. First Prime Ministerial Debate between David Cameron, Gordon Brown and Nick Clegg. URL: http://news.bbc.co.Uk/2/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/16_04_10_firstdebate.pdf
24. The First Presidential Debate between President Jorge Bush and Senator JohnKerry. URL: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/debatereferee/debate_0930.html