

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Types and Linguistic Features of Texts Posing A Threat to Sociopolitical Security

Nargisa Soliyeva

PhD at Republican Centre for Forensic Expertise named after Kh. Sulaymonova, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue10 2026

PAGE: 14-17

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This article examines manipulation and the linguistic features associated with texts that promote national, racial, or religious hostility or contain messages directed against the constitutional order. The study adopts a qualitative, conceptual approach, drawing on the cited literature and combining conceptual analysis with lexical-semantic and pragmatic interpretation. The discussion identifies several potentially relevant indicators, including negative group stereotypes, assertions of inherent superiority, attribution of hostile intentions, conspiracy allegations, and explicit or implicit calls for discriminatory or violent action.

KEYWORDS

Forensic linguistics, sociopolitical security, political discourse, manipulation, incitement, lexical-semantic analysis, pragmatic analysis, implicit meaning.

INTRODUCTION

In forensic political and linguistic examinations, texts deemed socially dangerous or threatening to the constitutional order constitute the primary objects of analysis. Their classification as socially dangerous is established through observation, examination, and analysis. Whereas messages threatening sociopolitical security initially appeared in the form of unsigned letters and anonymous correspondence, they now circulate rapidly and widely across the globe in various forms via the internet. This development necessitates identifying and assessing the harmful aspects of information and the factors contributing to its harmfulness, as well as providing impartial, substantiated conclusions regarding its content. Information shared among social media users and published in blog posts often generates extensive discussion. Such exchanges may, in turn, become a means of expressing personal emotional responses or pursuing purposes of propaganda and incitement. Conflict-laden texts that threaten political security may be posted anonymously on social media by multiple

authors. Their principal purpose may be to manipulate members of society and provoke various forms of conflict among them.

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative, descriptive approach to examine the linguistic features of texts that may pose a threat to sociopolitical security. It is conceptual rather than corpus-based: the analysis draws on the scholarly and reference sources cited in the article, together with the categories of potentially harmful discourse discussed in relation to the Uzbek context. No systematically collected sample of social media posts, quantitative dataset, or experimental procedure is reported. Accordingly, the discussion develops an interpretive framework rather than measuring the frequency or effects of particular linguistic features.

The analytical approach combines conceptual analysis, lexical-semantic interpretation, and pragmatic analysis. Conceptual

analysis is used to distinguish manipulation from influence and persuasion and to examine the classifications of manipulative behaviour presented in the literature. Lexical-semantic interpretation addresses evaluative vocabulary, expressions referring to national, racial, and religious groups, and phrases that convey hostility, superiority, collective blame, or threats. Pragmatic analysis considers how such expressions may function as explicit or implicit calls to action within a particular communicative context.

The discussion organises potentially relevant indicators into several categories: negative stereotyping, assertions of inherent group superiority, attribution of hostile intentions, allegations of conspiracy, calls for discriminatory or violent action, and the justification of repression against particular groups. These categories are treated as interpretive guides rather than a validated diagnostic checklist. Their significance depends on the relationship between individual expressions, the text as a whole, its intended audience, and the circumstances of its communication.

A distinction is maintained between linguistic interpretation and legal qualification. Linguistic examination can clarify expressed meanings, implied evaluations, the targets of statements, and their possible communicative functions; it cannot, by itself, establish criminal liability or demonstrate an author's psychological intentions. Where interpretation requires specialised cultural, historical, religious, or psychological knowledge, the proposed approach supports consultation with relevant specialists.

RESEARCH AND DISCUSSION

Since the mid-twentieth century, manipulative influence has been a central issue discussed across various fields of knowledge and contemporary research. Initially, manipulation was examined within disciplines concerned with interpersonal relationships in society. Subsequently, scholars began to investigate it from different perspectives, depending on their choice of research object, subject matter, methods, and, above all, disciplinary orientation.[1] Online dictionaries define manipulation as follows: "At its most extreme, manipulation is a tactic employed by schemers, fraudsters, and liars who disregard ethical principles, deceive others, and exploit their vulnerabilities and credulity. At a minimum, manipulation involves exerting influence to establish control, secure benefits, or obtain advantages at the expense of others.

Manipulation differs from ordinary influence and persuasion. Influence is generally considered harmless because it respects an individual's right to accept or reject it and does not involve undue coercion. Persuasion is the ability to guide others towards a desired course of action, usually in pursuit of a particular goal. Influence and persuasion are neither inherently negative nor inherently positive."[2]

The structure of manipulation comprises four elements: (1) the subject; (2) the object; (3) the subject matter; and (4) the outcome. Particular attention should be paid to the subject of manipulation and its various types, as this issue is significant in forensic analyses concerning the authors of political texts. The subject, or manipulator, is an individual who produces a manipulative effect to achieve an outcome favourable to themselves. In *Anti-Carnegie, or Man the Manipulator*, E. Shostrom presents the following classification of manipulators:

a) The active manipulator, whose outlook centres on power and dominance, seeks to control others through active methods and is afraid to reveal personal weaknesses.

b) The passive manipulator, in contrast, gains the upper hand by presenting themselves as helpless and unintelligent, manipulating others into doing the work.

c) The competitive manipulator combines features of the active and passive types. Such individuals perceive life as a contest of victories and defeats, regard those around them as opponents, and remain constantly prepared to compete.

d) The indifferent manipulator, despite appearing detached and seeking to avoid contact, remains deeply interested in the outcomes of the manipulative struggle.[3]

One of the principal forms of manipulation involves deliberate attempts to control individuals' minds and worldviews and to secure their submission. Authors of political texts with negative content disseminated through social media frequently employ manipulative strategies.

The legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan prohibits incitement to national, racial, or religious hatred and establishes liability for such offences (Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Article 256).

Observations indicate that texts inciting national, racial, or religious conflict frequently rely on selectively presented, distorted, misinterpreted, or fabricated facts, as well as unsubstantiated assertions. Various rumours and falsehoods

are incorporated into these texts to attract public attention, encourage destructive acts, conflict, and rebellion, and foster negative attitudes. Some disseminated information may provoke interethnic conflict, while other content may discredit an individual belonging to a particular national or religious group, construct a negative image of that individual, and generate public discontent.

Social media also contain information in which signs of incitement to conflict are not immediately apparent. Nevertheless, the distorted interpretation of particular facts and the use of emotionally charged language may generate discontent among audiences. Determining whether a particular text seeks to incite national, racial, or religious hatred requires an examination of the characteristic indicators of such incitement. From the perspective of its potential harm to society, the principal indicators of attempts to provoke national conflict or incite racial or religious hatred include:

- creating and reinforcing negative ethnic stereotypes and unfavourable representations of a particular national, racial, or religious group;
- asserting the inherent superiority of a particular national, racial, or religious group;
- portraying a particular national, racial, or religious group as engaging in hostile activities or harbouring dangerous intentions towards other groups;
- alleging that a particular national or religious group has devised secret plans or conspired against other groups;
- inciting action against a particular national, racial, or religious group;
- encouraging or justifying genocide, deportation, or repression targeting members of a particular national or racial group;
- threatening individuals or inciting violence against them on the grounds of their national, racial, or religious affiliation.

The presence of one or more of the aforementioned indicators in a text may lead to the initiation of criminal proceedings. However, such calls may also be implicit. In such cases, a forensic linguistic examination is required to determine whether the text falls within the specified category. This examination should involve a multidisciplinary team comprising a forensic linguist and specialists in related fields, such as political scientists, religious scholars, psychologists,

and historians. The expert opinion is then formulated on the basis of these specialists' substantiated assessments.

Texts containing threats to sociopolitical security, particularly those directed against the constitutional order of the Republic of Uzbekistan, may constitute grounds for initiating criminal proceedings. The legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan provides a legal basis for imposing penalties for encroachments on the constitutional order in accordance with established procedures. The legal provisions governing such offences are explicitly set out in the section of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan entitled "Crimes against Sociopolitical Security."

Once legal grounds have been established for considering a text to contain elements of offences against sociopolitical security, it may be submitted for forensic linguistic examination. The forensic linguist must identify the linguistic devices through which the addressee's communicative intent is expressed, determine whether implicit meanings are present, and establish whether the statements target a particular individual or the state administration. The examination must also provide a substantiated account of the lexical and semantic characteristics of the phrases used in the text.

CONCLUSION

The discussion identifies manipulation, negative group representation, and explicit or implicit calls to hostile action as central concerns in the linguistic examination of texts that may threaten sociopolitical security. Such texts may construct antagonism through negative stereotypes, claims of group superiority, allegations of conspiracy, and the justification of discriminatory or violent conduct. These meanings can be communicated directly or emerge through the interaction of evaluative language, contextual assumptions, and implied messages.

The presence of an emotionally charged expression or a negative assessment does not, on its own, establish incitement. A substantiated interpretation requires attention to the complete text, the relationship between its statements, the group or institution being addressed, and the action that the audience is encouraged to undertake. This contextual approach is particularly important when distinguishing criticism and expressions of dissatisfaction from language that advocates hostility or violence.

Forensic linguistic examination should therefore explain how a particular interpretation is supported by identifiable linguistic evidence. Where the material involves complex political, religious, historical, or psychological issues, contributions from specialists in these fields can strengthen the contextual basis of the assessment. The respective responsibilities of linguistic experts and legal decision-makers must nevertheless remain clear.

The article offers a conceptual basis for organising relevant linguistic indicators. Its conclusions remain limited by the absence of a systematically collected corpus and an independently tested analytical procedure. Further research should examine contextualised examples and assess the consistency with which different analysts identify and interpret the proposed indicators.

REFERENCES

1. Bessonov, B. N. (1971). *Ideologiya dukhovnogo podavleniya* [The ideology of spiritual suppression]. Moscow.
2. Manipulyatsiya. Uzbek Wikipedia.
<https://uz.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manipulyatsiya>
3. Shostrom, E. (1992). *Anti-Karnegi, ili Chelovek—manipulyator* [Anti-Carnegie, or Man the Manipulator]. Minsk.