

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2025.21.1.13>

CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ARMENIAN CAUSE

Anahit Margaryan*

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6010-2936>

University of Cadiz, Spain

In this research, we aim to shape the understanding of Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) and its relation to the Armenian Cause. By examining the interdisciplinary approaches of CDS, we explore how language, power, and societal structures act within the context of the Armenian Genocide and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. This study identifies key discourse units such as *statehood*, *genocide*, *ethnic cleansing*, and *us vs. them*, and emphasizes the importance of international recognition and engagement in conflict resolution. Our research highlights the significance of legal frameworks, psychological healing, and socio-cultural structures in achieving sustainable peace and stability, thereby contributing to the broader discourse on social equality and justice. Through this analysis, we aim to enhance the academic and practical understanding of CDS and its application to complex historical and contemporary conflicts, the Armenian Cause.

Keywords: *Critical Discourse Studies (CDS), Armenian Cause, Armenian Genocide, Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, Interdisciplinary analysis, Language and power dynamics.*

Introduction

In modern discourse analysis, the relationship between language, power, and social systems is a crucial field of research. This study uses Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) methodology to investigate the Armenian Cause, with a particular focus on the Armenian Genocide (AG) and the Nagorno-Karabakh (NK) conflict. The significance of this research is in understanding how language and power dynamics shape and are shaped by socio-political realities, particularly in the context of historical and ongoing conflicts such as the AG and the NK conflict. Previous work has highlighted the role of language in maintaining power structures and influencing societal perceptions.

* anahit.margaryan@alum.uca.es

Received: 15.01.2025
Revised: 29.02.2025
Accepted: 23.03.2025



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

© The Author(s) 2025

The application of modern linguistic research allows scientific problems to be addressed and examined using concepts and practical methods that, at first glance, may seem unrelated to linguistics. Being incorporated into several sciences, CDS is considered an interdisciplinary field allowing to integrate and include the experiences of multiple disciplines within the context of a single research topic. CDS represents a micro- and macro-level (extralinguistic and intertextual) study (Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E., 2009, p. 212) that focuses on social, political, and cultural issues associated with the environment in which discourse is produced, disseminated, and perceived (Pardo Abril, 2012, p. 43).

The theoretical framework of CDS is rooted in the ideology of Louis Althusser (2011), the genre theory of Mikhail Bakhtin (1996), and the philosophical traditions of Antonio Gramsci (1959). The works of prominent scholars such as Zellig Harris, Michel Foucault, Norman Fairclough, Michael Halliday, Ruth Wodak, Teun van Dijk, and others have significantly contributed to the field of CDS whose research has been deeply influenced by cognitive models of text planning (Titscher, S. et al., 2009, p. 195).

In the field of linguistics, *discourse analysis* was initially introduced in 1952 when Zellig Harris employed the term to describe the formal patterns of sentences in relation to the syntactic connections between sentence elements (Discourse Analysis, 1952). The development of the field known as critical linguistics has undergone a lengthy historical formation. Among the founders of critical linguistics are Roger Fowler, Bob Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Trew, who published the fundamental work *Language and Control* (1979).

Starting from the 1980s and 1990s, we can certainly talk about the birth of a relatively new and young scientific direction, which was established in linguistics and became known as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In this context, discourse research is directed toward the study of the structure and units of discourse, with the speech act being its minimal material basis. CDS emerges later as an innovative framework offering valuable insights into the complex relationships between language and power dynamics with a strong commitment to social equality and justice (van Dijk, 2016, p. 169).

CDS is critical for two main reasons. Firstly, it aligns with the Frankfurt School traditions, and secondly, it is intertwined with critical linguistics. As a field, CDS does not have specific unitary models; instead, each research topic develops its model suited to its goals. What is innovative in this field is that each research project gets the opportunity to complement and expand the theory of discourse analysis, covering areas that indicate potential problems and key focus areas. A fundamental principle of CDS is that language and social structure are mutually impactful factors, therefore, it is essential to study them together (van Dijk, 2016, p. 31).

This study hypothesizes that the discourse of the Armenian Cause plays an essential role in shaping both national identity and international perceptions. The objectives of our research are to identify key discourse units, and to explore their roles in the Armenian Cause. These hypotheses and objectives align with the broader goals of CDS, which seeks to uncover how language and power intersect to influence social and political outcomes. We employ a multidisciplinary approach, incorporating methodologies from linguistics, political science, and social studies.

Text and discourse

To effectively understand and differentiate between the concepts of *text* and *discourse*, it is crucial to define their boundaries of inclusion in relation to the CDS perspective. It is widely recognized that discerning the definitions of *text* and *discourse* can be achieved with the help of certain linguistic criteria, including semantic and syntactic connections. However, a superficial approach to the *text*, which concentrates only on linguistic aspects such as coherence and unity, is no longer adequate in present times (Titscher, S. et al., 2009, p. 37). Initially, it's important to acknowledge that CDS discusses the concepts of *text* and *discourse* as interrelated.

The *Dictionary of Discourse Analysis* by Patrick Charaudeau and Dominique Maingueneau (2005) elucidates the contrast between *discourse* and *text*, “Discurso versus texto” (p. 180), asserting that *discourse* is understood as the inclusion of a text within its context, encompassing the conditions of production and reception (Adam, 1999, p. 39). This distinction highlights the importance of situational factors in interpreting meaning, emphasizing that discourse analysis must consider the dynamic interplay between textual content and its contextual framework.

According to Halliday, the concept of *text* has not yet been definitively defined. He notes that *text* can be anything that holds meaning in a particular context. Halliday describes *text* as a continuous process of semantic selection, or semiosis (1978). On the other hand, Teun van Dijk argues that *text* is defined by the consistency and sequence of sentences, forming a macro-structure based on thematic and propositional elements (van Dijk, 1980). The definitions proposed by Robert de Beaugrande and Wolfgang Dressler have gained considerable recognition and are widely used, as they have consistently emphasized the social, political, and other contexts of the *text*, making them the central point of interpretation (Titscher, S. et al., 2009, p. 44).

As we see, the CDS perspective views it as essential to adopt a comprehensive approach to defining text, considering its linguistic and contextual dimensions. In light of this, we recognize that each of the aforementioned contributions underscores the intricate and continually changing nature of the phenomenon, which is influenced by a multitude of social, cultural, and historical factors, as well as the significance of language in the field of discourse studies, and more specifically in CDS.

Principles of critical discourse studies

In general terms, the principles of the CDS theoretical framework are (Titscher, S. et al., 2009, p. 17-20):

1. CDS is oriented towards social issues and considers the linguistic characteristics of socio-cultural processes and structures, rather than focusing solely on language or its use.
2. Discourse is a form of manifestation of social behavior, CDS is a social science, an interdisciplinary field.
3. CDS examines the direct relationship of discourse with power and its dynamics. Its goal is to investigate the role of power within discourse.
4. The relationship between society, culture, and discourse is dialectical and constantly evolving society and culture both shape discourse and are shaped by it.
5. Language use can be ideological. In such cases, analysis is based on the text, considering social perceptions and interpretations of ideology's influence within a given society.
6. The nature of discourse is inherently historical. This is primarily because discourse context is historically shaped and embedded within specific cultural, ideological, and historical realities. It is interconnected with other discourses, meaning that it maintains its intertextuality with both present and past contexts, and maintains its continuity from the past.
7. The connection between text and society is indirect and always corresponds to the socio-psychological model of society through which discourse is perceived. In other words, the socio-psychological state of society acts as a filter through which discourse is processed.
8. CDS is a method that interprets and explains processes in four dimensions: text, certain social conditions, equivalent ideology, and discourse relationships with power.

In his interdisciplinary cognitive theory, Teun van Dijk argues against the use of hierarchical linguistic categories, which he believes could weaken its interdisciplinary and critical potential. Meanwhile, his concept of CDS stands poised to be recognized as a distinct academic discipline in linguistics. He outlines CDS across three primary dimensions (2000, 23):

- Discourse itself is considered as a fundamental linguistic entity.
- Discourse is a form of knowledge or cognitive process.
- Discourse as a social phenomenon, emphasizing speech as a social act.

As a result, CDS focuses on addressing pressing social issues such as power management and abuse, racism, fascism, ethnic prejudices, stereotypes, repression, terrorism, hate speech and legal persecution, stereotyping of minority perspectives, social inequality, discrimination, feminism, environmental and gender concerns,

hegemony, and more. These issues require not only objective scientific analysis but also, as mentioned by van Dijk, advocacy by scholars against contemporary governmental abuses, manipulations, repression, discrimination, hate speech, xenophobia, and related discourses (van Dijk, 2016, p. 169).

Categories of researchers in critical discourse studies

It is evident that CDS is a part of the socio-political critical trends, and the researchers of conflict discourse are not in a so-called neutral position in relation to the object of their study. This is confirmed by its founder, Teun van Dijk, who states that he is only proud of such interest and engagement (van Dijk, 2013, p. 24). Instead, these researchers have assumed the commitment and responsibility to share and carry on themselves the problems of the object of their scientific investigation, particularly the issues faced by various social groups. For this reason, van Dijk steers clear of the term CDA, as it implies a specific methodology of discourse analysis rather than a critical stance or attitude within discourse studies (DS) that employs various methods from the humanities and social sciences. The critical approach in ECD defines the scholars themselves rather than their methods (van Dijk, 2016, p. 169). The goal of scientists in the field of CDS is to reform the tense socio-political situation and implement effective measures aimed at solving existing problems. Researchers adopt a certain position and talk about it openly, mentions van Dijk who adds that this contrasts with neutral social researchers who claim to have no social, political, or ideological stance. Consequently, he concludes that successful discursive research should be considered the research that leads to social changes within the scope of the studied issues. He argues that it is essential for critical discourse researchers to be aware of their social role, rather than adhering to the traditions of non-evaluative sciences. According to him, discourse analysts conduct research with the groups under investigation, driven by a goal of solidarity and cooperation (van Dijk, 2013, p. 112).

Interdisciplinary fields of critical discourse studies

It should be noted that discourse analysis did not initially function as a clearly defined system or method in linguistics, but rather emerged from a philosophical perspective. Today, it is widely utilized across numerous modern disciplines, including political science, cultural studies, linguistics, linguo-conflictology, psychology, psychoanalysis, psycholinguistics, sociology, social psychology, conflict sociology, sociolinguistics, anthropology, ethnography, literary studies, cognitive philosophy, and theories of international relations among others. This broad application highlights the promising future of critical discourse research as a significant scientific direction.

The concept of CDS has been redefined over time, transforming into a multifunctional and innovative field with a broad comparative scope. This status explains the variety of interpretations regarding the typology, content, interdisciplinary

correlations, ideological influences, historical significance, conditions of applicability, forms, targets, structure, goals, and specific scientific issues involved. It also includes the relationships among related concepts, reflecting the complex interactions that the CDS framework seeks to describe, interpret, and analyze.

Through the integration of various interdisciplinary perspectives and approaches, CDS can now develop a synthetic methodology that connects with diverse theories. This framework serves as a response to acute socio-political problems posed by modernity. CDS requires researchers to examine both discursive and cognitive, as well as discursive and social, relationships simultaneously. It views discourse not as an isolated speech event with its own linguistic existence, but as a social act with an orienting character that serves specific social groups to satisfy or address their particular interests.

Critical discourse studies and the Armenian Cause

Within the context of the Armenian Cause, CDS is examined specifically focusing on the history of the first genocide of the 20th century—the Armenian Genocide (AG) and the Nagorno-Karabakh (NK) conflict, the contemporary ethnic cleansing of Armenians in NK, and the genocidal war that resulted in Azerbaijan's success in precluding the historical possibility of resolving the Karabakh issue through a Kosovo-precedent approach.

The content of the Armenian Cause is the re-creation of free, independent national statehood across all historical territories of Armenia. It was an integral part of the Eastern Question, and after the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878, it became paramount, as Russia's victory over the Ottoman Empire raised a wave of enthusiasm among Armenians. Two significant events, Articles 16 and 61 of the San Stefano (1878) and Berlin (1878a) treaties, marked the beginning of the diplomatic history of the Armenian Cause.

As for the issue of NK, then the depopulation of NK indicates that Turkey, Azerbaijan, Iran, and Russia cannot be considered guarantors of regional peace in the South Caucasus. It is evident that contemporary conflicts, such as those in Israel-Palestine, Russia-Ukraine, Azerbaijan-Armenia, etc., seek international recognition as a crucial element for their resolution. However, the extent to which they achieve international recognition varies significantly, directly influencing their trajectories and outcomes. Conflicts that attain substantial international recognition, exemplified by the Russia-Ukraine situation, often benefit from increased global intervention, including diplomatic initiatives, economic sanctions, and humanitarian aid. Such international involvement significantly shapes the conflict's development and resolution. In contrast, conflicts that fail to secure significant international recognition, such as the Azerbaijan-Armenia dispute, tend to remain localized, leading to prolonged violence and obstructed peace processes.

The significance of internationalization was also emphasized during the tripartite meeting in Brussels on April 5, 2024, involving the U.S., EU, and Armenia. It was reiterated that the U.S., EU, and Armenia see a resilient Armenia as vital for ensuring stability and peace in the South Caucasus region. Accordingly, the Armenian Cause, is a matter of international diplomacy that extends beyond individual states or regions, impacting global politics and universal goals. These matters cannot and should not remain unanswered or unpredictable given the modern security challenges faced by nations.

It is also important to note that the South Caucasus comprises three recognized states (Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan) and three unrecognized or partially recognized republics (NK, also known as Artsakh, which has been occupied and depopulated, South Ossetia, and Abkhazia). This region borders Russia to the north, Turkey to the west and southwest, and Iran to the south. The South Caucasus covers an area of 186,100 square kilometers, while Armenia spans 29,800 square kilometers and Artsakh encompasses 12,000 square kilometers.

In light of these dynamics, it is obvious that the engagement of the international community in the South Caucasus is essential to support conflict resolution and regional stability.

Defining the unit of discourse: state, ideological theses and ideological apparatus

The main questions for this research is to identify what are the discourse unit(s) of the Armenian Cause; what is the relationship between these unit(s) and the CDS, and how we can differentiate the discourse unit from other components of the discourse.

In addressing this issue, R. Wodak notes that due to intertextuality, it is objectively impossible to identify a definitive beginning or end for these entities. Each discourse is connected to multiple discourses, and a discourse unit can only be delineated based on its relationship with other discourses. Consequently, the researcher's choice of the unit of analysis depends on the specific problem they are investigating, which ultimately guides the direction of their research (Titscher, S. et al., 2009, p. 47).

Below, we outline the discourse units to be considered in the analysis of the Armenian Cause CDS, guided by the theses proposed by Louis Althusser (2011):

a) Every practical activity exists solely in the form of ideology and is dependent on it. Each ideology represents a form of collective and group consciousness.

b) Ideology exists exclusively within the realm of the subject and for the subject.

The *ideological apparatus* (IA), is another aspect of the state which differs from the *repressive state apparatus*. This ideological apparatus includes the following institutions:

- Religious IA: Various churches and religious organizations

- School IA: The public and private education system
- Political IA: The political apparatus, comprising various political parties
- Union IA: Labor unions and similar organizations
- Information IA: Media outlets such as newspapers, television, and radio
- Cultural IA: Institutions related to art, theater, sports, and other cultural activities.

The Armenian Cause discourse units

In the context of the Armenian Cause, CDS emphasizes the significance of the concepts of *statehood*, *state power*, and *state apparatus*. We have identified four key units of discourse related to the Armenian Cause: *state*, *genocide*, *ethnic cleansing*, and *us vs. them*.

The notion of the *state or statehood* during the Ottoman Empire is characterized by the *non-existence of Armenian statehood*. In contrast, the history of NK's self-determination issue is primarily associated with the concept of *Armenian independent statehood*.

Concerning the post-Soviet transformation period, Gerard Libaridian notes that the future of the Republic of Armenia could involve either a) becoming part of Russia without statehood, or b) existing as a state dependent on Russia for all matters dictated by Moscow (Libaridian, 2021, p. 16). According to his approach, Armenia and any other Armenian statehood face one dominant interest, the interest of existence or survival, to which all other real or potential interests must be subordinated.

It is conceptually obvious that the central research subject of the Armenian Cause is Armenian statehood, which addresses the rejection of racial discrimination based on ethnicity. This issue falls within the framework of international law and norms, irrespective of whether it occurred in the *absence or non-existence of Armenian statehood* or the presence of an *independent Armenian state*.

Units connected with the Armenian Cause have existential, epistemological, and legal significance. They refer to the right of nations to self-determination, the protection of fundamental human rights, the promotion of the international truth-telling agenda, and international accountability in military operations.

The Armenian Cause, especially in the context of the Armenian Genocide, is framed not merely as a local or national issue but as a crucial matter whose resolution is essential for achieving peace, progress, and prosperity in the Middle East, as asserts Pascual Ohanian (1994).

However, there are other perspectives that view the Armenian Cause, especially the NK issue, as primarily a local conflict that sought internationalization but ultimately resulted in a local resolution. This process of internationalization failed to achieve its intended outcomes, emphasizing the complexity of the situation. While the

significance of the Armenian Cause extends beyond regional borders, it is also shaped by local dynamics and the realities of the conflict itself.

The first unit of the CDS of the Armenian Cause is the *state*. The term "state" refers not only to the special apparatus understood through legal practice—such as the police, courts, and prisons—but also includes the army, which serves as an additional repressive force when the police and special services are unable to manage a situation (Althusser, 2011). Together, according to Althusser, these elements constitute what can be termed the *repressive state apparatus*. The term *repressive* indicates that this state apparatus operates through the use of violence; however, repression by the administrative apparatus can also manifest in non-physical forms. The state, government, and administration have control over the above mentioned institutions.

The next unit of the Armenian Cause discourse is *genocide*, which is fitting as it represents the most extreme form of ethnic conflict resolution. The term was coined by Polish-Jewish jurist Raphael Lemkin in 1943, combining the Greek root "genos," meaning "family, tribe, or race," with "cidio," derived from the Latin "caedere," meaning "to kill." Lemkin used this term to describe murders motivated by racial, ethnic, or religious factors. His research specifically highlighted the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire against the Armenian people in 1915.

Regarding the adoption of the term "genocide" in international law, Conti Gómez highlights that this milestone was first recorded in an official document: United Nations General Assembly Resolution 96 (I) on December 11, 1946. This resolution emphatically proclaimed that Genocide was declared to be a crime under the law of nations, in contradiction with the spirit and purposes of the United Nations, and which the civilized world condemns (Conti Gómez, 2012, p. 5).

Despite the adoption of the UN Convention on the Prevention of Genocide, the risk of mass violence remains real, as it is not possible to entirely prevent manifestations of racism in areas of inter-ethnic tension. Even international interventions to end conflicts may not always be effective. This was evident in Kosovo, where the Serbian population continues to face challenges, and migration and evacuation persist to this day.

The first genocide of the 20th century set a precedent for subsequent atrocities, paving the way for genocides against Jews, Kosovars, Rwandans, Tutsis, Palestinians, Yezidis of Sinjar, and others.

Vartan Matiossian (2023, p. 136) provides a detailed analysis of the evolution of the term "yeghern." He explains how the word, initially associated with moral (evil) and legal (crime) transgressions, developed to encompass the meanings of "crime" and "heinous crime." This transition in meaning highlights the intensified perception of crime associated with the atrocities committed before, during, and after 1915. Matiossian notes that after 1915, "yeghern" also came to mean "massacre," alongside "crime." This metaphoric identification of "medz yeghern" with "genocide" gradually

led to their semantic convergence by 1965, paralleled by the normative use of "tseghasbanutium" (race murder) as a calque for "genocide" over competing terms like "azkasbanutiun" (nation murder) and "zhoghovertasbanutiun" (people murder).

On the other hand, during the Karabakh movement, the usage of "yeghern", "tseghasbanutium" or genocide gained new dimensions. Banners displayed in the massive demonstrations of Yerevan from 1988 to 1991 emphasized the continuity of the Medz Yeghern (Armenian Genocide) of 1915, and phrases like "Sumgait is the continuation of the Medz Yeghern," or "If the government of the USSR had recognized the genocide [tseghasbanutiun] of 1915, Sumgait would not have happened in 1988" reflect the parallels drawn between historical and contemporary events, (Matiossian, 2023, p. 81), the two poles of the Armenian Cause, AG and NK conflict.

When it comes to the contrast between *us* and *them* as a unit of Armenian Cause, it is a manifestation of ethno-religious xenophobia towards national minorities, emerging when the atmosphere of tolerance and mutual respect ceases to prevail in society. Terminology assumes a crucial role in these discussions, as it is intricately linked to the large-scale discourses that prevail today (Casas Gómez, 2020, p. 38). These terminological units, with their various manifestations, appear in narrative and argumentative texts not only with accurate historical usage, confirming their conformity with international norms and principles, but also sometimes intentionally avoiding their exact meaning. Their meaning can be presented as infiltrated, mediated, subjected to a change of meaning, and subject to political euphemism. These practices contribute to the spread of disinformation, propaganda, and often racist rhetoric, which in turn fosters the continuous development of political falsehood. For example, the terms "massacres," "ethnic murders," "ethnic cleansing," and "yeghern" refer to reality but do not explicitly acknowledge the crime recognized by international law—"genocide". While these terms describe significant events, they often fail to encompass the legal definition of genocide as established by international jurisprudence.

At first glance, the seemingly innocent manipulation of legal terminology is not an end in itself; rather, it has a radiating effect on societal consciousness and its members. The circulation of discourse for selfish purposes aims to control the perceptions of a specific social or ethnic group, often one of the conflicting parties, in a negative manner.

This discourse reproduces negative historical narratives, power dynamics, and ideologies, while simultaneously shaping attitudes and legal assessments within the international community. Given that discourse reflects the linguistic thinking of a particular culture, the translator must exercise extreme care and professionalism when conveying sensitive concepts, themes, originals, subtexts, sign systems, metaphors, archetypes, ideologies, and more from one linguistic culture to another.

Let's take another example. The examination of narrative sources related to events at the beginning of the 20th century, such as Rafael de Nogales' *Four Years Under the*

Crescent (2003) and G.H. Guarch's *Armenian Tree* (2023) and *Armenian Testament* (2021), reveals that Turkish society quickly labeled those who challenged rigid thought patterns and refused to use common derogatory terms for Armenians, such as "gyavur," "Armenian abortion," or "idiot."

The noun "Gâvur" referred to an ethnic group characterized as "non-Muslim," "without faith," "Christian," or "godless," and it was commonly used to describe Christian minorities, particularly Armenians, Greeks, and Assyrians among others. Furthermore, neologisms derived from the term "gâvur" were widely used in everyday Turkish language, including words like "kafir," which denotes "disbelief" (Dermenjyan, 2013, p. 33-34). This indicates that hate speech manifested as a reflection of extralinguistic perceptions and circumstances. The prevalence of such expressions in the everyday vocabulary of ordinary people underscores the deep roots of xenophobia in Turkey. These public attitudes resulted from xenophobic and denialist propaganda that was perpetuated throughout society, from preschool education to higher education institutions, as well as in books, journals, and everyday life. This does not mean that discriminatory ideology is always ethnic; rather, it suggests a regressively oriented context that shifts from "us" to "them", as describes van Dijk (2013, p. 130).

Expected outcomes of the Armenian Cause in critical discourse studies

The expected outcomes of the Armenian Cause in Critical Discourse Studies aim to contribute to the resolution, regulation, or transformation of the conflict, ideally achieving these goals without the use of violence.

In the social context, the concept of *overcoming the conflict* cannot be confined to the actions of a single state or government. Discourse studies assume interaction between conflicting states, governments, social organizations, social groups, symbolic elites, and individuals—all direct participants in a specific discourse. The proposed socio-cultural transformations for overcoming the inter-ethnic conflict are as follows:

a) Establishment of a legal-normative framework: examples include the signing of the Azerbaijan-Armenia peace treaty and the opening of the Armenia-Turkey borders.

b) Improvement of the morale-psychological atmosphere: This involves discussions about existing problems between the symbolic elites of the conflicting countries. For instance, in an interview with the Armenian media in July 2024, Turkish writer and translator Yiğit Bener stated that Turkish writers can testify that Armenians existed in the country in the past, still exist today, and will continue to exist in the future. This is an example of interrupting the Turkish denial of the Armenian trace.

However, the resolution of the issue requires considering not only the Turkish side but also the socio-cultural and socio-ethno-psychological characteristics of the Armenian side, including the Armenian communities worldwide post-genocide, the population of the Republic of Armenia, and their public perception regarding Turkey and the Turkish role in their life. As noted by Gerard Libaridian, the stereotyping of

this role leads to new challenges arising almost daily for the Armenian state and people, or old challenges resurfacing with new names and forms. Mutual understanding and the easing of negative emotional tension should be priorities for the conflicting parties.

c) Creation of socio-cultural structures/institutions: These structures would mitigate conflict interactions and provide opportunities for involved parties to engage in joint activities. Such transformations, and even their attempts, can encounter both positive and negative attitudes in Armenian and Turkish societies at various levels of orientation, assessment, and management. However, this does not imply that these attempts are irrelevant or will be futile.

Conclusion

The exploration of Critical Discourse Studies within the context of the Armenian Cause presents significant insights into the profound interplay between language, power, and societal structures. The research elucidates how CDS, as an interdisciplinary field, brings together various theoretical frameworks and methodologies to analyze and address critical social, political, and cultural issues.

One of the key findings of this study is the identification of essential discourse units related to the Armenian Cause, such as *state*, *genocide*, *ethnic cleansing*, and the dichotomy of *us versus them*. These units are instrumental in understanding the historical and contemporary dimensions of the Armenian Genocide and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. The research demonstrates that these discourse units are not merely linguistic constructs but are deeply embedded in the socio-political realities and power dynamics of the region.

The study highlights the significance of international recognition and engagement in the resolution of conflicts. It emphasizes that conflicts, such as the Armenian Cause, require not only local efforts but also substantial international involvement to ensure stability and peace. The engagement of the international community is crucial in legitimizing the discourse surrounding the Armenian Genocide and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, thereby facilitating diplomatic initiatives, economic sanctions, and humanitarian aid.

Furthermore, the research underscores the importance of establishing a legal-normative framework as a foundational step towards conflict resolution. Examples such as the Azerbaijan-Armenia peace treaty and the opening of the Armenia-Turkey borders illustrate how legal agreements can pave the way for improved relations and reduced tensions. These frameworks are essential for creating a stable and predictable environment conducive to peacebuilding efforts.

Improving the morale-psychological atmosphere between conflicting parties is another vital aspect highlighted in the study. By fostering mutual understanding and addressing negative emotional tensions, symbolic elites from both sides can play a

pivotal role in changing public perceptions and promoting reconciliation. The research suggests that discourse studies must go beyond mere academic analysis and engage actively with the social realities and emotional landscapes of the communities involved.

The creation of socio-cultural structures and institutions is presented as a critical strategy for mitigating conflict interactions. These structures provide platforms for joint activities and dialogue, which are essential for building trust and cooperation between conflicting parties. While these initiatives may encounter resistance and challenges, their potential for fostering long-term peace and understanding cannot be underestimated.

In conclusion, the study of CDS in the context of the Armenian Cause offers a comprehensive framework for understanding and addressing complex socio-political issues. By integrating interdisciplinary perspectives and methodologies, CDS contributes to the ongoing discourse on social equality, justice, and conflict resolution. The findings of this research underscore the necessity of international recognition, legal frameworks, psychological healing, and socio-cultural structures in achieving sustainable peace and stability. Through these multifaceted efforts, CDS provides valuable insights and practical strategies for addressing historical grievances and contemporary conflicts, ultimately contributing to a more just and equitable world.

Conflict of interests

The author declares no ethical issues or conflict of interests in this research.

Ethical standards

The author affirms this research does not involve human subjects.

References

Althusser, L. (2011). Ideologija i ideologicheskie apparaty gosudarstva [Ideology and ideological state apparatuses]. *Neprikosnovennyj Zapas*, 3. Retrieved February 10, 2022. (in Russian)

Aristotle. (1961). *Poetics*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1996). *Problema rechevykh zhanrov* [The problem of speech genres]. Collection of works (Vol. 5). Moscow: Russkie slovari, 156-206. (in Russian)

Bener, Y. (2024, July). *T'o'wrqian nax bedq e' Sp'h'o'wr'qi hah'eri hed hashdvi* [Turkey must first reconcile with the Diaspora Armenians] [Video]. Retrieved December 12, 2024.

Bourdieu, P. (2011). *Las estrategias de la reproducción social* [The strategies of social reproduction]. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno Editores.

Casas Gómez, M. (2020). Perspectivas actuales en el estudio del léxico [Current perspectives in the study of lexicon]. *LynX. Panorámica de Estudios Lingüísticos*, (19), 5-72.

Charadeau, P., & Maingueneau, D. (2005). *Diccionario de análisis del discurso* [Dictionary of Discourse Analysis]. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.

Conti Gómez, M. E. (2012). El "Genocidio" armenio desde la óptica del derecho penal internacional [The "Armenian Genocide" from the perspective of international criminal law]. Retrieved February 20, 2022.

Dermenjyan, M. P. (2013). *Hayeren-t'owrgeren bar'aran* [Armenian-Turkish Dictionary]. Yerevan: Heghinakayin hratarakowt'yown. (in Armenian)

Faber, P. (2011). The dynamics of specialized knowledge representation: Simulational reconstruction or the perception-action interface. *Terminology*, 17(1), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1075/term.17.1.02fab>

Fillmore, C. (1982). Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm: Selected Papers from SICOL-1981* (p. 111). Seoul: Hanshin Pub. Co.

Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & K. Pau.

Gramsci, A. (1959). *Izbrannye proizvedenija, v 3-h tomah, tom 3 "Tjuremnye tetradi"* [Selected works, in 3 volumes, volume 3 "Prison notebooks"]. (in Russian)

Guarch, G. H. (2021). *El Testamento armenio* [The Armenian testament]. Córdoba, España: Almuzara.

Guarch, G. H. (2023). *El árbol armenio* [The Armenian tree] Córdoba, España: Almuzara.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harris, Z. (1952). Discourse Analysis. *Language*, 28, 1-30.

Libaridian, G. (2021). *Hayastan-T'owrqia. patmowt'iwn, petakanowt'iwn, qaghaqakanowt'iwn* [Armenia-Turkey: History, Statehood, Politics]. Yerevan: Antares. (in Armenian)

Matiossian, V. (2023). *The politics of naming the Armenian genocide: Language, history and "Medz Yeghern"*. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Méndez, R. N. (2003). *Four years beneath the crescent*. London: Taderon Press.

Ohanian, P. (1994). *La cuestión armenia y las relaciones internacionales*, tomo IV. Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Pardo Abril, N. G. (2012). Análisis crítico del discurso: Conceptualización y desarrollo [Critical discourse analysis: Conceptualization and development]. *Cuadernos de Lingüística Hispánica*, 19, 41-62.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., & Vetter, E. (2009). *Metody analiza teksta i diskursa* [Methods of text and discourse analysis]. Kharkov:Gumanitarnyj centr. (in Russian)

Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Texto y Contexto. Semántica y Pragmática del discurso* [Text and context: Semantics and pragmatics of discourse]. Madrid: Cátedra.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *El discurso como estructura y proceso: estudios sobre el discurso I: una introducción multidisciplinaria* [Discourse as structure and process: Studies on discourse I: A multidisciplinary introduction]. Barcelona: Gedisa. Retrieved February 10, 2022.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2013). *Diskurs i vlast': Reprezentacija dominirovanija v jazyke i kommunikacii* [Discourse and power: Representation of dominance in language and communication]. Moscow: Knizhnyj dom "LIBROKOM". (in Russian)

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

**ՈՒՍԿՈՒՐՄԻ ՔԱՆԱԴԱՍԱԿԱՆ ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՐՑԻ ՀԱՄԱՏԵՔՍՈՒՄ**

Անահիտ Մարգարյան

Հոդվածում վերլուծության է ենթարկվում Հայկական հարցի բովանդակությունն ու նրա պատմական զարգացումը՝ իենվելով դիսկուրսի քննադատական հետազոտության (ԴՔՀ) մեթոդաբանության վրա: ԴՔՀ-ն, իբրև միջզիտակարգային գիտածովով, հնարավորություն է տալիս համադրել լեզվաբանական, պատմագիտական և սոցիոլոգիական տվյալները՝ նպաստելով Հայկական հարցի հիմնախնդրի լուծմանն ուղղված ջանքերին: Հոդվածում առաջարկվում է լեզվի, իշխանության և հասարակական կառուցվածքի փոխներգործության վերաբերյալ տեսակետ: Հայկական հարցի համատեքստում սույն ուսումնասիրությունը ներառում է նաև արցախյան հակամարտության վերջին զարգացումները՝ 2020 թվականի քառասունշորսօրյա պատեսրազմի ընթացքում: Դասակարգվում և բնորոշվում են Հայկական հարցի դիսկուրսի միավորները՝ պետություն-պէտականություն, ցեղասպանություն, եղեռն, երնիկ զտումներ, տեղահանություն, որոնց տրվում են իրավագիտական, պատմագիտական, սոցիոլոգիական և տերմինարանական բացատրություններ: Մեկնաբանվում է, թե ինչպես են միմյանց վրա փոխազդում լեզուն, իշխանությունը և հասարակական կառուցվածքը: Իբրև համադրական գիտակարգ՝ ԴՔՀ-ն առաջնային կարևորության խնդիր է համարում Հայկական հարցի իրավական գնահատականի ձևակերպումը, սոցիալ-մշակութային հաղորդակցության միջոցով կոնֆլիկտի մեղմացման ռազմավարությունը, հոգեբանական վերականգնողական աշխատանքների ներդրումը, որոնք անհրաժեշտ են Հարավային Կովկասի տարածաշրջանում տևական խաղաղության հաստատման համար:

Բանակի բառեր՝ դիսկուրսի քննադատական հետազոտություն (ԴՔՀ), Հայկական հարց, Հայոց ցեղասպանություն, արցախյան հակամարտություն, միջզիտակարգային վերլուծություն, լեզվի և իշխանության դինամիկա: