Բանբեր Երևանի համալսարանի. Բանասիրություն
2026, Vol. 17, No. 2 (50), հունիս, 67-78
https://doi.org/10.46991/BYSU.B/2026.17.2.067

FABRICATING REALITY AND MANUFACTURING ENMITY: HATE SPEECH AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF WAR DISCOURSE

GAIANE MURADIAN[*], **ANI SIMONYAN**[**]
Yerevan State University

The escalation from interpersonal clashes to systemic state violence is a reality skillfully constructed through language. In today's digital world, the line between free expression and deliberate verbal aggression or hate speech has become dangerously blurred, allowing political leaders and media outlets to fuel war-mongering discourse through multimodal means. Therefore, this article explores the complex mechanisms of hate speech and its ability to manipulate public opinion and fabricate consent for hostility. Using discourse analysis (including narrative analysis, critical discourse analysis, and multimodal analysis) as the primary methodology, the study identifies manifestations of hate speech that frame opponents as existential threats through systemic bias and manipulation. The findings suggest that linguistic brainwashing provides moral justification for aggression and emphasize that understanding the nature of provocative language is a vital societal defense. In an era where social media dictates the boundaries of truth, decoding military discourse is essential to countering polarization and preserving a shared objective reality.

Key words: *hate speech, war discourse, provocative language, falsified data, discrimination. in-group/out-group*

Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed numerous transformations in the fields of media and technology. Modern media is filled with social advertisements, psychological videos,

[*] **Gaiane Muradian –** Dr. of Philology, Professor at the YSU Chair of English Philology
Գայանե Մուրադյան – բանասիրական գիտությունների դոկտոր, ԵՊՀ անգլիական բանասիրության ամբիոնի պրոֆեսոր
Гаянэ Мурадян – доктор филологических наук, профессор кафедры английской филологии ЕГУ
Email: g.murad@ysu.am ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7588-5849
[**] **Ani Simonyan –** PhD Student at the Chair of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University
Անի Սիմոնյան – ԵՊՀ միջմշակութային հաղորդակցության անգլերենի ամբիոնի ասպիրանտ
Ани Симонян – аспирант кафедры английского языка для межкультурной коммуникации ЕГУ
Email: ani-simonyan-94@mail.ru ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7403-1913

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Ստացվել է՝ 20.04.2026
Գրախոսվել է՝ 23.04.2026
Հաստատվել է՝ 09.06.2026
© The Author(s) 2026

and shows productive, meaningful and peaceful conversations in various speech situations, however, rules and regulations are often violated during interactions making it impossible to avoid hate speech and war discourse respectively. Even if there are some rules to control the discriminatory discourse, there can always be found ways to violate them.

Social media sites and online news broadcasts serve as a mirror to reflect the current situation in the world. The fact that the Internet is now full of hatred and threats is very upsetting. Feeling free to express their ideas, people lose control and stop distinguishing the boundaries between freedom of speech and hostility. The problem requires immediate action as it is not realized only at a level of an individual but rather at a state level. The language of media is very often biased, antagonistic and often misleading as technology has made self-expression much easier than ever before.

It is not always easy to decode and understand the information behind the actual words used to construct and convey meaning. Hence, there is a need to think critically and have awareness about how to comprehend discourse in any interaction or speech situation with the aim of revealing the true message, the psychology of the speaker, the hidden intent and power relations. To go deeper into the meaning and to try to understand the various layers in the intent – discourse analysis can be applied. Discourse analysis is a qualitative research method of studying written, spoken and visual language in context to reveal meaning, power and social dynamics. It goes beyond the words and sentences and examines the context revealing the ways that contribute to the construction of meaning including non-verbal communication, sound, color, images (Shaw & Bailey, 2009).

As a comprehensive term, discourse analysis encompasses narrative analysis, critical discourse analysis and multimodal analysis. This method aims at examining natural language and the ways it can be used to construct meaning and social identities, and is commonly employed in such fields as political, social and cultural studies where context is of utmost importance. Without context, sentences are most often merely individual texts that do not reveal the entire message and serve as obstructions for the perception of information. It is only through their interconnection with other texts preceding and very often following them that the meaning becomes clear. Discourse analysis is trying to detect the factors that make texts meaningful and how they contribute to the constitution of social reality by "making meaning" (Phillips & Hardy, 2011, p. 4).

According to J. P. Gee (2011) language is always the reflection of different contexts and various perspectives. Consequently, discourse analysis allows us to decipher the latent messages in every speech situation and the nuances emphasizing power and authority. Discourse analysis is widely used in politics to go below the surface-level information and penetrate into the real message which is not obvious without context and additional cues.

Building Enmity: How Language Maps the Road to War

Being a natural human emotion, hatred can be manifested constantly and transitorily. Hence, we can distinguish between temporary severe anger and permanent hatred that might not be very conspicuous but can flare up at times. Hatred is conveyed verbally, visually and in written texts leading to the formation of **hate speech/hate discourse** which can be expressed in a variety of ways including the spread of disgust, contempt, blasphemy and slander, disapproval verbal arrogance and belittling.

When nothing is done to overcome hatred, it can culminate to its peak which is highly dangerous, posing threat to diverse social, ideological, racial, religious, ethnic and political groups. It can result in cleansing and symbolic or physical elimination of the opposite side. What is very important, hatred mostly revolves around identity-related issues. Sometimes differences in social, racial or ethnic identities become a reason for a conflict especially when one of the sides has a wish to expand its geography or to reach economic, religious or political power in the region or in the world (Hannachi, 2023). This is generally expressed in the form of reciprocal accusations, isolation of the side that is in a less favorable position, through discriminatory language trying to exalt one nation over the other to show how just, rightful and fair one side is, and how unjust and unfair the other side is. As a matter of fact, people do not take much notice of the language encouraging hatred and violence, thinking that those are merely words which will not escalate into serious actions or a full-blown conflict. However, it has been proved in a number of instances that words can prepare the ground for further action.

According to Hrant Dink Foundation (HDF), factors like cultural background, national identity, ethnicity, race, sex are the basis of hate speech and contribute to the marginalization of the vulnerable ones. The HDF posits that the media acts as a **"culture transmitter"** that can normalize and legitimize conflict (Güvengez, et al., 2020, p.8). When media outlets use identity markers, such as race, ethnicity, or sex, as a basis for **"symbolization"** (using an identity trait to convey a negative message) or **"distortion"** (making unfair generalizations), they contribute to the social polarization and the systematic marginalization of these groups (ibid, p.10). Although media has the power and influence to soften the tense situation, to normalize the differences and to promote diversity, today the opposite is being done more often than not.

As the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) suggests, hate speech is defined as the use of expressions that spread, incite, promote, or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, or other forms of hatred based on intolerance and comes in many forms of expression advocating, inciting, promoting and justifying hatred, violence and discrimination against a person or a group for various reasons (ECRI, 2015). It is a threat to the democratic society as, in case of being ignored, it can lead to violence and violation of human rights. Being an extreme form of intolerance, it can result in hate crimes as violence and hate speech are closely intertwined. Of course, it is very important to ensure freedom of speech but open calls to incite violence should be prohibited, and the boundary between hate speech and freedom of speech should not be blurred.

War discourse (call of arms in the outbreak of a war or an armed conflict) and hate speech are expressed widely in today's political speeches in particular. Language and social conduct play their mediating roles in persuading people to join one of the sides involved in the conflict by dividing masses into **in-groups** and **out-groups**. For example, the quote below from an interview of President of Ukraine V. Zelensky to the BBC on April 14, 2022 (conducted by Clive Myrie in Kyiv) focuses on his frustration with European countries (specifically Germany and Hungary) that were at the time resisting a full embargo on Russian energy exports.

*We don't understand how you can **make money out of blood**. Unfortunately, this is what some countries have been doing. European countries. For example, the oil embargo. I think this is one of the key issues. We do see that some are not ready for it.*

All trade must be stopped with Russia so that it can't sponsor the killing of our children so that dollars and euros shouldn't be paid for our blood.

This example shows how political discourse uses moral high grounds to draw sharp lines between *us* and *them*. By framing an economic decision (energy imports) as a moral choice between life and death, Zelensky effectively humanizes the victims while dehumanizing the financial transactions of the opposition. The in-group is defined by shared suffering and moral clarity. It includes Ukraine and its citizens (identified as the ones shedding *blood* and losing *our children*) and the allies (by implication, any country that has agreed to the embargo and stopped trading with Russia, aligning themselves with the "right" side of the conflict. The out-group is defined by greed and complicity. It includes Russia (the primary aggressor, framed as the entity that *sponsors the killing*) and hesitant European countries (specifically Germany and Hungary) which are framed as prioritizing *dollars and euros* over human life. By choosing trade over an embargo, they are cast as others who are indirectly profiting from the blood of the in-group. The humanizing mechanism is worked out through the following expressive means:

- ✓ The metonymy replaces *oil revenue* with *blood money***.** This makes the trade feel like a physical assault rather than a commercial contract;
- ✓ By stressing vulnerability, by mentioning *our children*, Zelensky appeals to universal protective instincts, making the out-group's hesitation seem not just politically slow, but fundamentally inhumane.
- ✓ The language emphasizing the in-group/out-group divide forces the listener to choose. You are either with the *children* (in-group) or you are with the *dollars and euros* (out-group). There is no middle ground for neutral economic policy in this rhetorical framework.

From a multimodal perspective, it should be mentioned that beyond the text, the multimodal impact is amplified by Zelensky's visual presentation. Dressed in a military fleece rather than a formal suit, he sits in a darkened, functional room in Kyiv. This visual uniform strips away the persona of a distant politician and replaces it with that of a front-line commander. It serves as a non-verbal anchor for his words; when he speaks of *blood* and *our children*, the visual reality of his wartime surroundings validates his moral authority and reinforces the urgency of the in-group's suffering. The weight of the discourse is also carried through the heavy pauses, the direct eye contact with Clive Myrie (and by extension, the Western viewer), and a tone that fluctuates between exhaustion and sharp indignation. These multimodal elements transform the oil embargo from a dry policy debate into an innate plea. By leaning into the camera when mentioning *dollars and euros*, he uses his physical presence to confront the viewer, making the out-group's economic hesitation feel like a hateful personal betrayal witnessed in real-time.

War is a type of organized social behavior and the role of language in mobilizing powers against the enemy and legitimizing open violence cannot be underestimated. The aim is to urge smaller groups to join larger ones. The construction of a shared identity ensures the success of the process. The out-groups are viewed as enemies and their actions are treated like a threat to the well-being and safety of the nation. Hence, the aim of political leaders is to justify their cause in starting the war and make their people believe in the final success. War rhetoric is used to emphasize the defensive aspect of the conflict which means that leaders need to persuade their nations that entering the war is the only sensible solution and the right way out of the situation. It is crucial to point

that the enemy has started the conflict posing a threat to their safety, thus the out-group or the aggressive enemy leaves no choice but respond to their action. For example, Azerbaijani President Aliyev's speech delivered during a meeting on July 15, 2022, reveals a sophisticated rhetorical strategy. Like the Zelensky example provided above, Aliyev uses moral high grounds to transform a complex territorial conflict into a binary struggle between justice and injustice.

The Second Karabakh War is our ***glorious history****. This war was* ***inevitable****. I have said this many times, and I want to say it again:* ***the war was inevitable and led to the restoration of justice, international law, and the national dignity of the Azerbaijani people.***

By stating the war was *inevitable,* Aliyev employs a common legitimization tactic. If a war is inevitable, the leader is merely responding to a historical necessity. This frame removes the moral burden of the outbreak of conflict. It suggests that diplomacy (the out-group's failed domain) was exhausted, leaving no choice but a military solution. It positions the state as a passive actor forced into an active role by the circumstances or the enemy's obstinacy. Aliyev defines the Azerbaijani in-group not just through territory, but through emotional and psychological restoration. By mentioning *national dignity***,** he taps into decades of collective trauma: specifically the feeling of humiliation following the First Karabakh War in the 1990s. The in-group is now framed as a proud people who have finally stood up. The war is presented as a healing of the national psyche, making the military action a prerequisite for the people's self-worth.

While not explicitly named in this specific sentence, the out-group (Armenia and the OSCE Minsk Group) is defined by their failure. If Aliyev is restoring *justice and international law*, the out-group is implicitly categorized as the embodiment of injustice and lawlessness**.** By framing the conflict as a legal and moral *restoration*, the opposing side's presence in the territory is categorized as an "error" that needed correction. He uses specific high-value keywords to bridge the gap between small groups and the larger national cause. This appeals to the intellect and the global community, justifying the war as a "police action" to enforce UN resolutions and framing the 2020 conflict not as an act of aggression, but as a "liberation war" that enforced UN Security Council resolutions regarding territorial integrity which had remained unfulfilled since the 1990s. In Aliyev's discourse, the hateful language serves to legitimize violence by coating it in the language of legality**.** He moves the conversation away from the horror of war and focuses on the *glorious* result. By framing the war as the only way to achieve *justice*, he ensures that any internal dissent or external criticism is viewed as an attack on the Azerbaijani *national dignity*. Visually, Aliyev frequently delivers such addresses from government halls or at the inauguration of reconstruction projects in recaptured territories. In this way he transforms the *glorious history* from a rhetorical claim into a physical reality. His formal suit and the prominent placement of the Azerbaijani flag serve as a non-verbal signal of state stability, suggesting that the war was not a descent into chaos, but a disciplined, institutionalized restoration of *international law* and *national dignity*. This multimodal impact is intensified by Aliyev's assertive delivery. He employs a steady, rhythmic cadence and a firm vocal tone that conveys finality. When he speaks of the war as *inevitable*, he often uses downward hand gestures or taps the podium – a kinesic marker of authority. This top-down communicative style reinforces the in-

group's identity as a disciplined nation that has successfully transitioned from victimhood to victory, making the *restoration of justice* feel like an objective, accomplished fact. Aliyev's direct gaze into the camera targets the in-group to instil pride, and the out-group to project defiance. By maintaining a posture of victor's composure, he reinforces the narrative that the military solution was the only "sensible" path, visually legitimizing the state's use of power as an act of historical necessity.

The provocative, biased, hateful discourse of war leaders cannot appear immediately. Its roots should be looked for in history, culture, ethnicity, religion (Güvengez, et al., 2020). Such discourse aims at suppressing and deemphasizing every piece of information that seems to be positive and favorable for those who are not in-group. It is argued that war language is not just about describing conflict but is a discursive tool used to construct social identities – specifically by framing the *us* (in-group) as morally superior and the *them* (out-group) as a hostile threat that must be neutralized. In other words, speakers who spread hatred and hostility, try to illustrate the in-group in the best light emphasizing their **"rightfulness"** and **"legitimacy"** (Hodges, 2015, p.1). It is crucial to show that war is imposed to them and the most reasonable response in the existing situation is to fight, and here come various language means to persuade that war is the only means to achieve their goals. To sound more convincing, the above mentioned war leaders and the media use literary tools (euphemism, metaphor, idiom) extensively: *border conflict* instead of *war* (Armenian media), *rival* instead of *enemy* (Armenian media), *individuals who left voluntarily* instead of *refugee* (Azerbaijani media), *special military operations* instead of *war* (Russian media and BBC), *only black and white, good and evil* (Zelensky), *brave enough to put an end to evil* (Zelensky), *They just need to do their homework* (Aliev), *They wanted more than they could digest* (Aliev), *not a cold war, not a hot war* (Zelensky), *fighting the occupiers with fire and sword of international law* (Zelensky), *on the white horse again* (Aliyev), *raise the white flag* (Zelensky).

When media and political actors normalize hate speech under the guise of national interest, they do more than justify a current conflict; they form a ground for the next one. Understanding war discourse and hate speech patterns is not just an academic exercise in linguistics, it is rather a necessary act of defence. By recognizing how our natural emotions of fear and belonging are being engineered, we gain the ability to question the so-called *inevitable* and find a path back to a language of humanization rather than elimination.

State-led indoctrination in modern war discourse

There are a number of cases of conflict situations all over the world but we have taken a look at two of them: Armenia-Azerbaijan and the Russia-Ukraine wars. In this respect there are numerous instances of hate speech and violent behavior on the Internet and social networking websites, recorded videos about war crimes to scare, intimidate and spread an atmosphere of fear and hostility.

The Russia-Ukraine war actually started in 2014 when Russia invaded the Crimea, and again escalated on February 24, 2022. As in case of any war situation, hate speech and war discourse are an inextricable part of war leaders' speeches, articles and various presentations of the conflict. Some instances of provocative language are discussed below.

On June 20, 2025 International Economic Forum's plenary session of question-and-answer part, Putin made the following "joke":

*I consider Russians and Ukrainians to be **one people**. In that sense, all of Ukraine is ours. There is a saying: **wherever a Russian soldier sets foot, that is ours**.*

Analysing a war time "joke" requires looking past the surface-level humour to the underlying geopolitical assertions. In the context of war discourse, jokes are rarely just jokes; they function as rhetorical tools to normalize aggression, assert dominance, and dehumanize the opposition. In war discourse, humorous language is as well used to justify territorial expansion and delegitimize the sovereignty of the opponent. By stating Russians and Ukrainians are *one people*, the speaker employs a **unification narrative.** While seemingly humorous, in a war context it serves to erase Ukrainian national identity. If they are the same, then Ukraine has no right to a separate state, culture, or borders. The phrase *that is ours* is a direct rejection of international law and sovereignty. It frames a sovereign nation not as a neighbor, but as a lost province or property. The line *wherever a Russian soldier sets foot, that is ours*, recasts military invasion as a natural method of border-making. It moves the discourse from special operations or defense into the realm of open imperialism. While the "joke" doesn't use traditional opinion, it fits the criteria of **systemic hate speech** as defined by international monitoring bodies. Denying a group's right to exist as a distinct entity is a precursor to more violent forms of hate speech. By subsuming Ukrainians into the Russian identity against their will, the speaker "others" those who resist as being anti-Russian or traitors. In the context of the recorded war crimes mentioned above, this joke functions as a **veiled threat**. It suggests that the presence of a *soldier* (an agent of violence) is the only legal requirement for ownership. This contributes to the atmosphere of fear by suggesting that no part of the country is safe. Hate speech often involves a dominant power mocking the agency of a marginalized or attacked group. Finding humor in the physical occupation of a territory where civilians are dying is a form of **moral deactivation**, making it easier for a population to accept violence committed in their name. Overall, the "joke" is an example of **aggressive humor**. It uses the folk-style proverb to make an illegal occupation seem like a common-sense reality. By humanizing the speaker, the discourse attempts to make extreme territorial claims feel approachable which is a common tactic in wartime propaganda to mask the gravity of human rights violations. In a multimodal framework, Putin's joke is not just a linguistic event but a performative act where his relaxed body language and the formal setting of the plenary session work together to soften the delivery of an aggressive geopolitical claim. The contrast between the auditory mode (the laughter of the audience) and the referential meaning of the text (territorial erasure) serves to validate the expansionist rhetoric, transforming a violation of international law into a shared, cultural common-sense moment. In multimodal discourse analysis, the humor serves as a semiotic bridge to connect the grim reality of the **visual mode** (warfare and soldiers) with a lighter **linguistic mode** to stimulate consent among the domestic audience.

Let us discuss another example by President of Ukraine v. Zelensky:

We don't understand how you can make money out of blood. Unfortunately, this is what some European countries have been doing. Russian oil is being paid for with blood money.

V. Zelensky's quote is from an exclusive BBC interview conducted by Clive Myrie in Kyiv on April 14, 2022. In the interview, Zelensky specifically singled out Germany and Hungary, accusing them of blocking efforts to embargo energy sales from Russia. He emphasized that for Ukraine, the issue was no longer about *business and money* but about *survival.*



Figure 1: President Zelensky about Russian aggression

When Zelensky says, *We don't understand how you can make money out of blood,* he is not just talking about economics; he is performing a **moral intervention**. In the world of international relations, in diplomacy, countries often separate trade from conflict. *Business as usual* is often a shield used to avoid taking sides. Zelensky's words are designed to shatter that shield. By using the expressive epithet *blood money,* Zelensky collapses that distance. He argues that a euro spent on Russian oil doesn't just stay in a bank; it transforms into the fuel for a tank or the casing of a missile. He wants to make it impossible for European leaders to look at their energy bills without seeing the human cost. He is moving the discourse from the financial to the existential (life vs. death). Unlike Putin's unification narrative, which attempts to erase an identity, Zelensky's rhetoric aims to indict an audience. By specifically calling out Germany and Hungary, he uses a **shame tactic**. In the context of 2022, this was not just a cry for help; it was an attempt to make the political cost of buying Russian oil higher than the economic cost of stopping it. Zelensky's language acts as a dehumanizer of the trade process. He wants the listener to stop seeing oil (a commodity) and start seeing blood (a human life). In this way he forces a choice: either with the victim, or funding the victimizer. Multimodality considers the environment of the speech. Zelensky's 2022 BBC interview is characterized by military-style t-shirt as a visual signifier of a nation under siege. It strips away the "suit and tie" of traditional diplomacy, signaling that the time for polite bureaucracy has ended. The visual reality of a war zone validates the urgency of his linguistic claims.

Though there are innumerable historical facts about the territory of Nagorno Karabagh being part of ancient Armenia, the Azerbaijani government and media claim Azerbaijan is the rightful owner of the land. The conflict has a long history, however, it escalated in 2020 and resulted in the deportation of all the Armenians from their native land. During this period and to this date, the Azerbaijani media and President Aliev have constantly tried to mislead international community and distort historical information to give rise to suspicion about Armenians being native in the Armenian highland. Not only is the direct opponent (Armenia) targeted but also those who support Armenia. Emmanuel Macron, the president of France, has always expressed his support for Armenians. As a result, the campaign against the French President drew in Azerbaijani children, who were enlisted to sing a song on public television insulting E. Macron and accusing him

of being pro-Armenian. The children's choir sang a song ridiculing the President of France (Natiqqizi, 2022). The three-minute song, as well posted on the network's Facebook page on October 18, 2022, features the presenter, Aziz Aliyev, singing along with the chorus of children. You can see the lyrics of the song below:

He is pro-Armenian,
What can you say to this person?
He gives us false promises
He dances with Pashinyan
He ***humiliated*** *himself like this*
Say – who is that person
At the very center of Paris?
In ***fluent French***
Someone ***talks nonsense***
As if he is drunk*.*
Say – who is that person?
EM-MAN-U-EL!



Figure 2: Azerbaijan public television video. children singing a song insulting French President Emmanuel Macron

Let us now look at how power is maintained and how the "other" is constructed through language. The [Grab your reader's attention with a great quote from the document or use this space to emphasize a key point. To place this text box anywhere on the page, just drag it.]

lyrics perform three primary functions: **(1)** the de-legitimization of the diplomat by describing President Macron as someone who *talks nonsense* and acts *as if he is drunk*: the discourse moves from political disagreement to character assassination. By stripping Macron of his status as a rational world leader, the song suggests that French support for Armenia is not based on international law or ethics, but on an incompetent individual; **(2)** the guilt by association narrative via the line *He dances with Pashinyan*: The metaphor of social intimacy is used to frame diplomatic relations as betrayal. In the context of the conflict, d*ancing* with the enemy is framed as humiliation, i.e. you are either with the Azerbaijani cause or you are a humiliated puppet of the opposition; **(2)** the elimination of sovereignty by mocking Macron's *fluent French* and his presence *at the very center of Paris*: the song mocks the very identity and culture of France, signaling that even the *center* of Europe is subject to Azerbaijani ridicule if it opposes their territorial narrative. Multimodal analysis shows that the strongest semiotic choice is the use of children. In human communication, children represent purity and objective truth. By having children sing these insults, the state naturalizes hate speech. It suggests that even the youngest members of society know

that Macron is the enemy, making the geopolitical stance feel like an indisputable, generational fact. The presence of Aziz Aliyev (an adult authority figure) leading the children, serves as a visual bridge between state policy and social education. It is a literal performance of **indoctrination**, where the adult provides the so-called "truth" and the children provide the voice. The rhythmic chanting of *EM-MAN-U-EL*! transforms a political name into a mocking object. Music lowers the cognitive defences of the viewer; it is easier to remember a catchy melody than a dry political speech. The festive tone of the music contrasts sharply with the aggressive intent of the lyrics, creating an inappropriate experience for an outgroup listener but a unifying, celebratory experience for the in-group audience. Thus, the Azerbaijani song represents a shift from war discourse to hate-culture. While Putin uses historical revisionism and Zelensky uses moral existentialism, this song uses socialization. By involving children in the ridicule of a foreign head of state, the discourse ensures that the conflict is not just a matter of borders, but a core component of cultural identity. It transforms a complex geopolitical dispute into a simple, rhyming "truth" for the next generation.

On August 8, 2025 Armenia, The USA and Azerbaijan announced about peace through a common treaty referring to a road that would connect Azerbaijan to Nakhijevan via Syunik region. However, this did not stop Aliev's war rhetoric. He made it clear that if any Armenian government ever decides to deviate the agreement, there will be serious geopolitical consequences. Moreover, he aspires to see changes in the Armenian constitution referring to the Declaration of Independence and claims about more of Armenian territories.

Through the analysis of the Russa-Ukraine and Armenia-Azerbaijan conflicts, we see that language is not merely a reflection of war, but a primary engine that sustains it. Whether it is the use of aggressive humour to normalize imperialism, the appeal to *blood money* to collapse diplomatic distance, or the chilling enlistment of children to sing political songs, these rhetorical strategies serve a single purpose: the dehumanization of the other nation or the outgroup, carefully constructed on the image of fear, mockery, and existential threat.

Conclusion

The compelling analysis of how language and media are weaponized in modern conflict, demonstrate that modern wars are not merely a clash of arms, but a sophisticated construction of language. Through the lens of discourse analysis, we see that the transition from peace to systemic state violence is paved with the deliberate blurring of free expression and calculated hate speech. By reframing opponents as existential threats through systemic bias, political actors and mass media provide the moral justification necessary for aggression. As this paper has shown through the rhetoric of leaders like Zelensky, Putin, and Aliyev, the linguistic brainwashing of the 21st century utilizes multimodal tools, from military declarations to folk-style jokes to manufacture consent for hostility.

The urgency of these findings is emphasized by the fact that during the drafting of this research, the world witnessed a rapid escalation in global instability, most notably through additional dehumanization cycles: the Gaza-Israel and Iran-Israel-US conflicts. In these cases, social media does not just reflect the current situation; it acts as a force multiplier for provocative language. The use of dehumanizing metaphors, labeling entire

populations as *occupiers* – creats a digital environment where the boundaries of truth are dictated by tribal loyalty rather than objective reality. The escalating tension today offers a unique case of permanent war discourse. To counter this global trend of fabricating reality, it is essential to promote critical discourse literacy, enforce digital accountability, humanize the out-group. By focusing on shared human experiences rather than identity-related markers, it is possible to dismantle the in-group/out-group divide.

ԳԱՅԱՆԵ ՄՈՒՐԱԴՅԱՆ, ԱՆԻ ՍԻՄՈՆՅԱՆ – *Իրականության կեղծում և թշնամանքի հրահրում. ատելության խոսք և պատերազմի խոսույթ* – Միջանձնային բախումներից մինչև պետական համակարգված բռնություն այն իրականությունն է, որը հմտորեն կառուցվում է նաև լեզվի միջոցով: Ժամանակակից թվային աշխարհում ազատ արտահայտման և կանխամտածված խոսքային ագրեսիայի կամ ատելության խոսքի միջև սահմանը վտանգավոր կերպով լղոզվել է՝ թույլ տալով քաղաքական առաջնորդներին և զանգվածային լրատվամիջոցներին բորբոքել պատերազմական խոսույթը բազմաեղանակային գործիքների միջոցով: Հետևաբար, հոդվածում հետազոտվում են ատելության խոսքի բարդ մեխանիզմները և դրա՝ հանրային գիտակցությունը մտաշահարկելու և թշնամանքի համաձայնություն ստանալու կարողությունը պատերազմի խոսույթում: Որպես հիմնական մեթոդ կիրառելով դիսկուրսի վերլուծության մեթոդը (ներառյալ նարատիվ վերլուծության, դիսկուրսի քննադատական վերլուծության և բազմամոդալ վերլուծության մեթոդները)՝ ուսումնասիրությունը բացահայտում է ատելության խոսքի դրսևորումները, որոնք համակարգային կողմնակալության և մտաշահարկման միջոցով հակառակորդին վերաձևակերպում են որպես գոյաբանական սպառնալիք: Արդյունքները փաստում են, որ լեզվական «ուղեղների լվացումը» բարոյական հիմնավորում է տալիս ագրեսիային և ընդգծում, որ սադրիչ լեզվի էության ըմբռնումը հասարակական կենսական պաշտպանական միջոց է: Մի դարաշրջանում, երբ սոցիալական մեդիան թելադրում է ճշմարտության սահմանները, պատերազմի դիսկուրսի վերծանումը էական նշանակություն ունի մեդիայով հրահրվող բևեռացմանը դիմակայելու և ընդհանուր օբյեկտիվ իրականությունը պահպանելու համար:

Բանալի բառեր – *ատելության խոսք, պատերազմի դիսկուրս, սադրիչ լեզու, կեղծված տվյալներ, խտրականություն, ներխմբեր/արտախմբեր*

ГАЯНЭ МУРАДЯН, АНИ СИМОНЯН – *Фабрикация реальности и производство вражды: язык и конструирование военного дискурса* – Эскалация от межличностных столкновений до системного государственного насилия является реальностью, искусно выстраиваемой с помощью языка. В современном цифровом мире грань между свободой выражения мнений и преднамеренной речевой агрессией или языком вражды опасно размылась, что позволяет политическим лидерам и средствам массовой информации разжигать военный дискурс с помощью мультимодальных инструментов. В связи с этим в данной статье исследуются сложные механизмы языка вражды и его способность манипулировать общественным сознанием и фабриковать согласие на враждебность. Используя дискурс-анализ (включая нарративный анализ, критический дискурс-анализ, мультимодальный анализ) в качестве основной методологии, исследование выявляет проявления языка вражды, которые представляют оппонентов как экзистенциальные угрозы посредством системной предвзятости и манипуляций. Полученные результаты свидетельствуют о том, что лингвистическое «промывание мозгов» обеспечивает моральное оправдание агрессии, и подчеркивают, что понимание сути провокационного языка

является жизненно важной защитой общества. В эпоху, когда социальные сети диктуют границы истины, декодирование военного дискурса необходимо для противостояния поляризации и сохранения общей объективной реальности.

Ключевые слова: *язык вражды, военный дискурс, провокационный язык, фальсифицированные данные, дискриминация, ин-группа/аут-группа*

Ethics Statement
The authors confirm that all ethical requirements regarding the research have been met.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The authors confirm that there is no conflict of interest.

References

ECRI (European Commission against Racism and Intolerance). (2015). *ECRI General Policy Recommendation No. 15 on Combating Hate Speech*. Council of Europe. https://www.coe.int/en/web/european-commission

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. London:* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203847886

Güvengez, S., Özkan, Ş., Saç, E., Sert, G., Söyler, M., & Tekin, F. (2020). *Hate speech and discriminatory discourse in media 2019 report*. Istanbul: Hrant Dink Foundation Publications.

Hanaachi, A. (2023). Spread of Hate Speech and Non-acceptance of the Other – From Social Factors to Political exploitation. *International Military Council on Climate and Security (IMCTC)*. https://www.imctc.org/en/eLibrary/Articles/Pages/article20122023.aspx

Hodges, A. (2015). War language. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1-10. London: John Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi077

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis: Investigating Processes of Social Construction*. SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412983921

Shaw, S. E. and Bailey J. (2009). Discourse analysis: what is it and why is it relevant to family practice? *Family Practice*, 26, 413-419. doi:10.1093/fampra/cmp038

Sources of Data

Aliev, I. (2022, July 15). War was inevitable, Minsk group dead. Aliev's speech on Hetk. https://hetq.am/en/article/145646

Natiqqizi, U. (2022, October 18). Azerbaijan public TV enlists singing children to insult Macron. Eurasianet. https://eurasianet.org/azerbaijan-public-tv-enlists-singing-children-to-insult-macron

Putin, V. (2025, June 20). Plenary session of the 28th St. Petersburg International Economic Forum. Speech and Q&A. St. Petersburg, Russia. http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/77222

Zelensky, V. (2022, April 14). An Interview to Clive Myrie on the BBC. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qCSt1GDG-JI

Zelensky, V. (2022, April 14). Blood money being paid for the Russian oil. BBC news article. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-61107725

Zelensky, V. (2022, April 14). Russian Oil is being paid for with blood money. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qCSt1GDG-JI