

violence and power in internet: critical discourse analysis of news flow

Arturkyzy Reuna Arturovna

Студент

American University in Central Asia, Sociology department, Бишкек, Киргизия

E-mail: rhine.lp@gmail.com

The recent tragic events in the Kyrgyzstan of April and June 2010 indisputably challenged the environment within Kyrgyz mass media. Articles, Tv shows in different ways were mostly dedicated to the explanation of situation. Consequently enormous amount of delivering the information have captivated a mass media space, which definitely had particular direction and orientation. Those local printed newspapers with double-page spreads pictures of killed ones and with reports on victims, victimizers, murders, violence, militarism, high crime rates; those local broadcast television translation of funerals and acts of murders, those blocked livejournal-blogs of “free” correspondents... it evidently shows continuous “violenzation” of local mass media. In this research I examine the development of discourse on violence in several internet newspapers during June events in the Kyrgyzstan, those articles from 11-31, because I assume that this time framework was overwhelmed by discourses on violence. The main research question: “How does the discourse on violence develop in internet newspapers?” My focal point subjects of studying are internet newspapers- Gazeta Belyi Parus(www.paruskg.info); and independent informational agency of Uzbekistan(www.uznews.net). The internet is a very advanced phenomenon. So the novel form of news delivering through the internet consequently leads to novel forms of discourse (re)production and development. Critical discourse analysis was employed to identify development of discourse on violence in the internet newspapers over a two-week period that Kyrgyzstan faced struggled period of contradictions, conflicts unfolding events in the south.

Findings:

Violenzation of news. The new forms of communication and distribution of information – introduction and using of computers – lead to the overflow of information, consequently to the harder techniques of selection. Frames introduced by editorials of internet newspapers in advanced determine scope of understanding. The space and flow of news during of Osh event, obviously, were dedicated to the explanation and description of violent situations, so Belyi Parus and Uznews.net were overwhelmed by news posting on violence at that period, because majority of them contained huge amount of texts with violence determination, description messages, pictures of violence acts, videos. Belyi parus (June 2, 2010): *“The war we have here. All Fired - cafes, restaurants, shops, owned by Uzbeks. A lot of the victims around, the hospital did not take the wounded. Here, you hear gunshots? With the weapon and then walk around without a warning shot. Roads are blocked. we have no weapons, what we can do? On the home attack in Cheryomushki 40 percent of homes burned - all homes belong to Uzbeks. Tank? No, if there were so many victims would not have been;* The language use is organized according to a finite set of metaphors that structures the way violence is expressed. Such words as guns, rocket launchers, shootings, killing, and murders (etc.) are overwhelming the posting news. Even in one article of Belyi parus, which contains 612 words at all, 118 words are violence expression items, which mean 1/6 of the whole text. Those grammatical constructions, used metaphors, and questions with underpinnings

are those marks of violence discourse, which I found in the articles. Editorials sometimes portray violence so frequently as a normal way of dealing with a problem, which indirectly encourage or at least lend justification discourses of certain forms of violent behavior in posted commentaries.

Alignment of forces in violence. In the first stages of discourse analysis on violence, I started to bear in mind that great quote by William Shakespeare - "*All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players: they have their exits and their entrances*", because it was possible for me to reveal that 'alignment of forces' within performance between stage director, actors, audience, and theatre critics. **Stage directors** are characterized, as those powerful structures, which have huge economic, political forces and advantages, which are independent from opinions of actors and audience, because they act in the purpose of their own directors' interest. Making an illusion or a vision of some stage, where "directors" in the face of Provisional Government (Vremennoe Pravitelstvo), Bakievs' supporters, and third director are in outside international society (USA, Russian Federation, Uzbekistan, etc.) are acting in their subjective and harmful way, the articles asset, that the real major part of guilt in violence. **Actors** in the stage are introduced here as militias, military forces, and other representatives - instigators and provokes, which contribute to the worsening of violence in conflict by the making illusionary "peaceful settlement". They are some kind of marionette in the stage, which are controlled by directors, and actors are stupid to some degree, since they come under director's influence and are some kind of victims, or protégé of directors. **Audience** is represented as most dependent personage in the stage, which are under pressure of director and actors in the scene. They cannot leave theatre, since they perceive it as 'reality' and have no force and opportunities to escape. They are not just passively watching, but actively experiencing. The victims of June events in the south (+*peaceful citizens*) as major part of audience. The audience is presented by editorials as some sufferers, which have no force, and have to just keep themselves alive. Editorials present themselves, as forces, which are only who do really understand the logic behind and the perception of real situation- **Theater critics**. Moreover, it is supposed, that they are outside and even "under" the theatre, they are not included in violence and power relations themselves, but they sympathizers, therefore they can critically analyze the situation. However, they have to go to the theatre and analyze, because they are part of society. Also editorials employ the technique of 'inclusion' of readers. They call and use language tools in order to make a sense, that they represent "the smartest and critically skilled" ones with the readers, like correspondents and readers are "US", which directed toward denunciation of actors and directors, and help to poor audience.

Ethnitization of Discourse on Violence. It seems, that these two newspapers did not provide readers with alternative interpretation of violent events, with that interpretation, which describes the Kyrgyz sufferers also, which tells about the actions of provisional government taken in order to settle the conflict, which contain more peaceful and not-so-dramatic description, or with alternative interpretation of conflict not in a so fully "ethnitized" manner. The absence of these displays, which in 'reality' did exist and had happened at least can 'undermine feeling' of concern, empathy or sympathy readers might have toward Kyrgyz before, or mostly provoke to harsher continuation of ethnic conflict. The frames of "ethnitized" manner of delivering of information, where majority of actors and audience are defined by ethnicity only, and claiming on disturbances as ethnic-rooted does not provide alternative

options for commentaries and discussion of readers under.

Findings allow to conclude, violence in drama and news demonstrates power. It portraits victims as well as victimizers. It intimidates more than it incites. It paralyze more than it incites. It defines majority might and minority risk. It shows one's place in the pecking order that runs society.

Слова благодарности

Thanks to my supervisor Gulnara Ibraeva and to professor Alexander Wolters for invaluable advices and stimulation in advanced sociology.