

## THE “WE–THEY” MODEL AND THE CRITERIA OF SUBJECTIVITY AND OBJECTIVITY IN POLITICAL AND DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE

Karimov Rivojiddin Gulamjonovich

PhD, professor, rector of Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages named after Isxakhan Ibrat

E-mail: [rivojiddink77@gmail.com](mailto:rivojiddink77@gmail.com)

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1944989>

**Abstract:** Language plays a crucial role in shaping ideological positions, social identities and communicative strategies in political and diplomatic discourse. One of the most widely used rhetorical mechanisms in these domains is the “we–they” model, which constructs symbolic boundaries between in-groups and out-groups. This article examines how linguistic means are employed to represent ideological positioning and communicative intentions in political and diplomatic discourse. Using qualitative discourse analysis, the study investigates the linguistic indicators of group representation, ideological positioning strategies and the criteria of subjectivity and objectivity in different types of texts. The findings demonstrate that political discourse frequently relies on explicit opposition between “we” and “they” in order to mobilize audiences and reinforce ideological legitimacy, while diplomatic discourse tends to soften such oppositions through indirect expressions and neutral formulations. The analysis also shows that subjectivity and objectivity function as important methodological criteria for identifying ideological stance in discourse. The study contributes to contemporary critical discourse analysis by demonstrating how language operates not only as a communicative tool but also as a mechanism for constructing social reality and power relations.

**Keywords:** political discourse, diplomatic discourse, we–they model, subjectivity, objectivity, critical discourse analysis, ideological positioning

## SIYOSIY VA DIPLOMATIK DISKURSDA “BIZ–ULAR” MODELI HAMDA SUBYEKTIVLIK VA OBYEKTIVLIK MEZONLARI

Karimov Rivojiddin G‘ulomjonovich

Filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), Professor, Is‘hoqxon Ibrat nomidagi Namangan davlat chet tillari instituti rektori

E-mail: [rivojiddink77@gmail.com](mailto:rivojiddink77@gmail.com)

**Annotatsiya:** Til siyosiy va diplomatik diskursda ideologik pozitsiyalarni, ijtimoiy identifikatsiyalarni hamda kommunikativ strategiyalarni shakllantirishda muhim rol o‘ynaydi. Ushbu sohalarda keng qo‘llaniladigan ritorik mexanizmlardan biri — “biz–ular” modeli bo‘lib, u ichki guruhlar (ingroup) va tashqi guruhlar (outgroup) o‘rtasida ramziy chegaralarni shakllantiradi. Mazkur maqolada siyosiy va diplomatik diskursda ideologik pozitsiyalash hamda kommunikativ niyatlarni ifodalashda lingvistik vositalarning qanday qo‘llanishi tahlil qilinadi. Sifat tahliliga asoslangan diskurs tahlili yordamida tadqiqot turli matn turlarida guruh vakilligini ifodalovchi lingvistik indikatorlar, ideologik pozitsiyalash strategiyalari hamda subyektivlik va obyektivlik mezonlarini o‘rganadi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, siyosiy diskurs ko‘pincha auditoriyani safarbar qilish va ideologik legitimlikni mustahkamlash maqsadida “biz” va “ular” o‘rtasidagi ochiq qarama-qarshilikka tayanadi, diplomatik diskurs esa bunday oppozitsiyalarni bilvosita ifodalar va neytral formulalar orqali yumshatishga intiladi. Tahlil shuningdek, subyektivlik va obyektivlik diskursda ideologik pozitsiyani aniqlashda muhim metodologik mezonlar sifatida xizmat qilishini ko‘rsatadi. Tadqiqot zamonaviy tanqidiy diskurs tahliliga hissa qo‘shib, til faqat aloqa vositasi emas, balki ijtimoiy reallik va hokimiyat munosabatlarini shakllantiruvchi mexanizm sifatida ham faol ishlashini namoyon etadi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** siyosiy diskurs, diplomatik diskurs, biz–ular modeli, subyektivlik, obyektivlik, tanqidiy diskurs tahlili, ideologik pozitsiyalash

## МОДЕЛЬ “МЫ–ОНИ” И КРИТЕРИИ СУБЪЕКТИВНОСТИ И ОБЪЕКТИВНОСТИ В ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ И ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

**Каримов Ривожиддин Гуламжонович**

доктор филологических наук по философии (PhD), профессор, ректор Наманганского государственного института иностранных языков имени Исхакхана Ибрата

E-mail: [rivojiddink77@gmail.com](mailto:rivojiddink77@gmail.com)

**Аннотация:** Язык играет важную роль в формировании идеологических позиций, социальных идентичностей и коммуникативных стратегий в политическом и дипломатическом дискурсе. Одним из наиболее распространённых риторических механизмов в этих сферах является модель «мы–они», которая формирует символические границы между внутренними группами (ingroup) и внешними группами (outgroup). В данной статье рассматривается, каким образом лингвистические средства используются для выражения идеологического позиционирования и коммуникативных намерений в политическом и дипломатическом дискурсе. На основе качественного дискурс-анализа исследуются лингвистические индикаторы группового представления, стратегии идеологического позиционирования, а также критерии субъективности и объективности в различных типах текстов. Результаты исследования показывают, что политический дискурс часто опирается на явное противопоставление «мы» и «они» с целью мобилизации аудитории и укрепления идеологической легитимности, тогда как дипломатический дискурс стремится смягчить подобные противопоставления посредством косвенных выражений и нейтральных формулировок. Анализ также показывает, что субъективность и объективность выступают важными методологическими критериями для выявления идеологической позиции в дискурсе. Данное исследование вносит вклад в современный критический дискурс-анализ, демонстрируя, что язык функционирует не только как средство коммуникации, но и как механизм формирования социальной реальности и властных отношений.

**Ключевые слова:** политический дискурс, дипломатический дискурс, модель «мы–они», субъективность, объективность, критический дискурс-анализ, идеологическое позиционирование

### INTRODUCTION

Political and diplomatic discourse represents a complex communicative domain where language functions not only as a medium of information exchange but also as an instrument of ideological construction and social positioning. One of the most prominent mechanisms used in such discourse is the “we–they” model, which establishes symbolic boundaries between in-groups and out-groups. Through linguistic choices, speakers create collective identities, construct ideological alliances and distinguish between supporters and opponents.

In political communication, this model is often used to mobilize audiences and legitimize political authority. Political actors frequently present themselves and their supporters as representatives of the collective good (“we”), while opponents are portrayed as threats or obstacles (“they”). In contrast, diplomatic discourse usually seeks to avoid open confrontation and therefore expresses group distinctions in more indirect and neutral forms.

Another important analytical dimension in discourse studies is the distinction between subjectivity and objectivity in language. Subjectivity reflects the speaker’s personal evaluation, emotions and attitudes, while objectivity refers to neutral and fact-based communication.

Identifying linguistic indicators of these categories allows researchers to understand the ideological orientation and communicative intention of a text.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the linguistic realization of the “we–they” model and the criteria of subjectivity and objectivity in political, diplomatic and journalistic discourse.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The present research is based on qualitative discourse analysis within the interdisciplinary framework of contemporary linguistics, sociolinguistics and critical discourse studies. The methodological design of the study aims to examine how linguistic mechanisms construct ideological positioning, represent collective identities and reflect the opposition between “we” and “they” in political and diplomatic discourse.

The research methodology integrates several complementary analytical approaches, allowing the phenomenon to be examined from structural, functional and ideological perspectives.

**Descriptive analysis:** The descriptive method served as the initial analytical stage of the research. This method allowed the identification and classification of linguistic elements that represent social groups and ideological positioning in discourse. Particular attention was given to lexical, grammatical and stylistic features that construct the dichotomy between in-groups (“we”) and out-groups (“they”).

The analysis focused on the following linguistic indicators: personal pronouns (we, they) representing collective identity; valuative vocabulary expressing ideological attitudes; metaphorical constructions emphasizing confrontation or solidarity; modal expressions indicating speaker stance; passive and impersonal constructions used in diplomatic discourse.

Through descriptive analysis, the study systematized the linguistic mechanisms used to construct ideological boundaries and collective representation in political communication.

**Comparative analysis:** The comparative method was applied to identify similarities and differences in the use of discursive strategies across different types of texts. Political speeches, diplomatic statements and journalistic materials were compared in order to determine how ideological positioning varies across discourse genres.

The comparative analysis examined several parameters: frequency of “we–they” opposition; degree of emotional or evaluative language; presence of neutral or indirect formulations; communicative purposes of group representation.

This approach made it possible to reveal genre-specific patterns and to demonstrate how political discourse tends to intensify ideological polarization, while diplomatic discourse often attempts to mitigate confrontation through neutral language.

**Contextual analysis:** The research also employs contextual analysis, which considers linguistic expressions in relation to their communicative and socio-political environment. In discourse studies, meaning is strongly influenced by institutional roles, communicative intentions and audience expectations.

Political speeches were analyzed in relation to domestic political communication, including electoral campaigns, ideological debates and policy discussions. Diplomatic statements were examined within the context of international relations, negotiations and global political communication.

By incorporating contextual factors, the study demonstrates how linguistic choices are shaped by social norms, institutional constraints and communicative strategies.

**Critical discourse analysis:** The study is further grounded in the theoretical principles of critical discourse analysis (CDA) developed by scholars such as Teun A. van Dijk, Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak. CDA examines the relationship between language, ideology and power structures in society.

Within this framework, the research focuses on discursive strategies commonly identified in political discourse, including: positive self-presentation, which emphasizes the legitimacy, moral superiority or competence of the in-group; negative other-presentation, which portrays opponents as threats, failures or ideological adversaries; These strategies are particularly visible in political rhetoric, where linguistic structures are used to strengthen collective identity and legitimize political authority.

The CDA framework also allowed the identification of implicit ideological meanings, persuasive techniques and rhetorical mechanisms embedded in political and diplomatic discourse.

Data collection and corpus: The empirical material for the study consists of representative discourse patterns found in political speeches, diplomatic statements and journalistic texts. The selected examples reflect commonly occurring communicative structures used in institutional and political communication.

The analyzed data include: political statements addressing domestic audiences; diplomatic declarations and international policy statements; journalistic texts reporting political events and public debates.

The examples were selected according to their relevance to the research objectives and their representation of typical discourse structures involving group positioning and ideological framing.

Analytical procedure: The analytical process was conducted in several stages:

Data identification – selecting representative discourse examples from political and diplomatic communication. Linguistic classification – identifying linguistic indicators related to group representation and ideological positioning. Discourse comparison – comparing the linguistic features across different discourse types. Ideological interpretation – interpreting the discursive strategies within the framework of critical discourse analysis.

Through the integration of these analytical stages, the study reveals how linguistic choices contribute to the construction of ideological narratives and social identities.

Analytical framework: The methodological framework of the research can be summarized in the following analytical model

Analytical stage	Research focus	Linguistic indicators
Descriptive stage	Identification of linguistic forms	pronouns, evaluative vocabulary, modal expressions
Comparative stage	Cross-discourse comparison	political vs diplomatic discourse strategies
Contextual stage	Interpretation in socio-political context	institutional roles, communicative goals
Critical stage	Ideological interpretation	positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation

This integrated analytical framework allows the study to explore the interaction between language, ideology and social power in political and diplomatic communication.

The study of political and diplomatic discourse has become an important area within contemporary linguistics, sociolinguistics and discourse studies. Researchers widely acknowledge that language not only reflects political realities but also actively constructs them through representation, categorization and ideological framing. In this respect, critical discourse analysis (CDA) has played a significant role in understanding how discourse is connected with ideology, power relations and social structures (Fairclough, 2010).

Fairclough argues that discourse should be understood as a social practice that simultaneously shapes and is shaped by social processes. According to his theoretical model, discourse operates at the intersection of language, ideology and institutional power. This

perspective allows researchers to examine how linguistic choices contribute to the construction of political narratives and social identities (Fairclough, 2010).

One of the most influential theoretical contributions to discourse studies is provided by Teun A. van Dijk, who emphasizes the ideological organization of discourse. His research demonstrates that discourse often constructs social groups through polarized representations, typically referred to as positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (Van Dijk, 2008). These strategies are particularly relevant to the “we–they” model because they show how political actors represent their own group as legitimate, moral and competent while portraying opponents as threats or adversaries.

Van Dijk also highlights that ideological polarization is frequently realized through linguistic structures such as pronouns, evaluative adjectives and metaphorical framing. These elements contribute to the formation of collective identity and strengthen the ideological boundaries between “us” and “them” in political discourse (Van Dijk, 1998).

Another important contribution to the methodology of discourse studies is presented in the work of Wodak and Meyer, who describe critical discourse analysis as an interdisciplinary approach combining linguistic, sociological and political perspectives. Their framework emphasizes the importance of analyzing discourse in relation to historical, institutional and social contexts. According to Wodak and Meyer (2016), discourse analysis should focus not only on textual structures but also on the social conditions that shape communicative practices.

The analysis of political discourse has also been developed by Chilton, who argues that politics and language are inseparable because political communication involves the construction of worldviews, identities and ideological positions (Chilton, 2004). Political discourse frequently relies on persuasive rhetoric, symbolic representations and emotional appeals in order to mobilize public support. Within this context, binary oppositions such as “we” and “they” serve as powerful rhetorical tools for simplifying complex political realities and reinforcing ideological narratives.

In contrast to political discourse, diplomatic discourse tends to operate within a more constrained communicative environment characterized by institutional norms, politeness strategies and the need to maintain international cooperation. Diplomatic communication often avoids explicit antagonism and instead uses neutral or indirect formulations when referring to opposing actors. Expressions such as “parties”, “actors” or “certain forces” allow diplomats to express disagreement without escalating political tensions (Chilton, 2004).

Another important dimension in discourse studies concerns the distinction between subjectivity and objectivity in language. Subjectivity refers to the speaker’s personal stance, evaluation and emotional involvement in discourse, while objectivity is associated with neutral and fact-based representation of information. According to discourse scholars, these categories should not be viewed as strictly opposed but rather as points on a continuum that varies across discourse genres (Gee, 2014).

In scientific discourse, objectivity is typically emphasized through empirical evidence, methodological transparency and impersonal language structures. In political discourse, however, subjectivity often becomes more visible because persuasive strategies require the use of evaluation, emotional appeals and ideological framing. Journalistic discourse frequently combines both elements, presenting factual information while simultaneously shaping interpretation through narrative framing and evaluative language (Fowler, 1991).

Overall, the existing literature demonstrates that discourse plays a crucial role in constructing ideological positions, social identities and communicative strategies. The theoretical perspectives of Fairclough, Van Dijk, Wodak and Chilton provide a strong analytical foundation for examining how the “we–they” model and the criteria of subjectivity and objectivity function within political and diplomatic discourse.

## RESULTS

The “We–They” Model in Political and Diplomatic Discourse: The analysis demonstrates that the “we–they” model is realized through different linguistic strategies depending on the communicative context.

**Table 1. The “We–They” Model in Different Types of Discourse**

Discourse type	“We” representation (ingroup)	“They” representation (outgroup)	Linguistic means	Communicative purpose
Political speech (domestic)	Biz xalqimiz uchun xizmat qilamiz	Ular bu millatga doimo zarar yetkazgan	Personalizatsiya, qarama-qarshilik metaforalari	Ichki safarbarlik, siyosiy legitimlik
Political speech (populist)	Biz haqiqiy islohotchilarmiz	Ular — korrupsion tizimning qoldiqlari	Emotiv epitetlar, antonimik oppozitsiyalar	Antagonizm, dushmani ajratib ko‘rsatish
Diplomatic speech	Biz xalqaro huquq me‘yorlariga sodiqmiz	Ularning harakati global xavfsizlikka tahdid soladi	Rasmiy frazeologiyalar, yumshatilgan passiv shakllar	Neytrallik, muvozanat, ixtilofni yumshatish
International statement (UN)	Biz tinchlikni saqlashga sodiqmiz	Ayrim kuchlar beqarorlikka olib kelmoqda	Nomzodsiz subyektlar (“ayrim kuchlar”), evfemizm	Diplomatik neytrallik, mas‘uliyat cheklash

The analysis indicates that political discourse typically emphasizes strong ideological polarization, whereas diplomatic discourse tends to soften conflicts and maintain neutrality through indirect language.

**Indicators of Subjectivity and Objectivity in Discourse:** Subjectivity and objectivity represent important linguistic categories that influence the interpretation of discourse.

Subjectivity is usually expressed through personal pronouns, modal expressions and evaluative vocabulary. Objectivity, in contrast, relies on factual information, statistics and neutral grammatical structures.

**Table 2. Indicators of Subjectivity and Objectivity in Different Text Types**

Text type	Indicators of subjectivity	Indicators of objectivity
Political speech	“Biz bu xalq uchun xizmat qilamiz”, “afsuski, haligacha...”	“2024-yilda ishsizlik darajasi 6,7% bo‘ldi”
Scientific article	“Bu kuzatuv bizning nazariyamizni qo‘llab-quvvatlaydi”	“Eksperiment 10 soat davom etdi va 3 bosqichda o‘tkazildi”
Journalistic text	“Bu voqea odamlarni larzaga soldi”, “g‘alati holat yuz berdi”	“Vaziyat yuzasidan ichki ishlar boshqarmasi tekshiruv boshladi”

The results demonstrate that subjectivity and objectivity do not function as strictly separate categories but often appear simultaneously within the same discourse.

## DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study confirm that the “we–they” model represents one of the central discursive mechanisms through which political actors construct ideological narratives and

shape collective identities. By emphasizing a shared collective identity through the use of the pronoun “we” and distinguishing it from external groups labeled as “they”, political discourse establishes symbolic boundaries that separate supporters from opponents. This discursive strategy strengthens group cohesion, reinforces collective solidarity and facilitates the mobilization of public support around particular political agendas.

In political communication, the “we–they” opposition often functions as a rhetorical tool that simplifies complex social realities into a binary ideological structure. Through such dichotomous framing, political actors are able to present their own positions as morally justified, legitimate and aligned with national or societal interests, while portraying rival groups as threats, obstacles or sources of instability. As a result, discourse becomes not only a medium of communication but also an instrument for constructing ideological narratives and shaping public perception. This tendency becomes particularly evident in populist rhetoric, where the opposition between “we” and “they” is intensified and emotionally amplified. Populist political actors frequently portray themselves as authentic representatives or defenders of “the people”, while their opponents are framed as corrupt elites, ineffective institutions or illegitimate actors. In such contexts, linguistic choices often include emotionally charged vocabulary, evaluative epithets and moral dichotomies that divide the political landscape into two opposing camps. These strategies increase emotional engagement among audiences and contribute to the strengthening of ideological polarization within political discourse.

At the same time, the analysis indicates that diplomatic discourse operates according to a different communicative logic. Diplomatic communication typically aims to maintain stability in international relations and to avoid unnecessary escalation of conflict. Therefore, instead of openly confronting opposing actors through explicit “we–they” oppositions, diplomats often rely on indirect linguistic strategies and neutral formulations. Expressions such as “the parties”, “actors”, “certain forces” or “stakeholders” allow speakers to refer to opposing groups without explicitly assigning blame or negative evaluation.

Such linguistic choices serve several important communicative functions. First, they enable diplomats to express disagreement or criticism while maintaining formal politeness and institutional neutrality. Second, they reduce the potential for direct confrontation by framing political differences in more neutral and generalized terms. Third, they preserve the possibility of further negotiation and cooperation between actors within the international arena. In this sense, diplomatic discourse demonstrates a higher degree of linguistic caution and strategic ambiguity compared to domestic political rhetoric.

The analysis of subjectivity and objectivity in discourse further reveals that different discourse genres demonstrate varying balances between personal evaluation and factual representation. In scientific discourse, objectivity is typically considered a fundamental principle of academic communication. Scientific texts prioritize empirical evidence, methodological transparency and neutral presentation of findings in order to ensure credibility and reliability.

In contrast, political discourse frequently relies on subjective persuasion and rhetorical strategies aimed at influencing public opinion. Political actors often use evaluative language, emotional appeals and ideological framing in order to strengthen their arguments and mobilize audiences. These elements reflect the persuasive nature of political communication, where the primary objective is not only to inform but also to convince and influence.

Journalistic discourse, on the other hand, often represents a hybrid form that combines both subjective and objective elements. While journalistic texts typically present factual information about events, they may also include interpretative commentary, evaluative language or narrative framing that shapes the audience’s perception of those events. As a result, journalistic discourse frequently operates within a continuum between factual reporting and interpretative analysis.

From the perspective of critical discourse analysis, these linguistic patterns demonstrate that language functions not merely as a neutral instrument of communication but also as a powerful mechanism for constructing social realities and negotiating power relations. Through strategic linguistic choices, speakers are able to frame events, shape ideological interpretations and influence the ways in which audiences perceive political actors and social groups.

Consequently, the study of discursive strategies such as the “we–they” model and the linguistic indicators of subjectivity and objectivity provides valuable insights into the interaction between language, ideology and power. Understanding these mechanisms is essential for analyzing contemporary political communication and for revealing the ways in which discourse contributes to the formation of collective identities, ideological narratives and social hierarchies.

### CONCLUSION

The study shows that the “we–they” model plays a central role in political and diplomatic discourse by establishing ideological boundaries and shaping collective identities. Political discourse tends to employ explicit opposition and emotionally charged language in order to mobilize audiences and reinforce legitimacy. Diplomatic discourse, by contrast, relies on indirect and neutral expressions that reduce confrontation and maintain communicative balance.

The analysis also confirms that subjectivity and objectivity serve as important methodological criteria in discourse analysis. Their distribution varies depending on the communicative context and genre of the text.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that language in political and diplomatic communication functions not only as a means of information exchange but also as a powerful instrument for constructing ideological narratives, shaping public perception and influencing social power structures.

### REFERENCES

1. Fairclough, N. *Language and Power*. – London: Longman, 1989.
2. Fairclough, N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. – London: Routledge, 2010.
3. Van Dijk, T. A. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. – London: Sage Publications, 1998.
4. Van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse and Power*. – New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
5. Wodak, R., Meyer, M. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. – London: Sage Publications, 2016.
6. Chilton, P. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. – London: Routledge, 2004.
7. Lakoff, G. *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
8. Charteris-Black, J. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
9. Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. – London: Routledge, 2014.
10. Gee, J. P. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. – New York: Routledge, 2014.
11. Fowler, R. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. – London: Routledge, 1991.
12. Karimov, R. G. *Zamonaviy sotsiolingvistika asoslari*. – Toshkent: Fan, 2019.
13. Karimov, R. G. *Diskurs tahlili va kommunikativ strategiyalar*. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston Milliy universiteti nashriyoti, 2021.
14. Habermas, J. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. – Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
15. Bourdieu, P. *Language and Symbolic Power*. – Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.