POLITICAL SLOGANS, FRAMING AND MEANING INTEGRATION

Leyla Jumayeva Arif
PhD, Lecturer
Azerbaijan University of Architecture and Construction
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3363-913X

Political slogans and impactful sentences have become essential strategic tools in modern political communication, serving to build public opinion, solicit support and strengthen ideological environmental design in both domestic and international fields. Their power to persuade comes from being capable of packing multifaceted political programs and complex socio-cultural narratives into short, memorable and emotionally vibrant linguistic units. In a world of rapid global information sphere flows and digital media weapons, English-language political discourse whether in populist electoral slogans or as spoken by national heads of state is increasingly dependent on integration of multiple meaning spaces for its immediate persuasive impact and long-term symbolic potency. By comparing Western populist campaigns with state-level creations from Azerbaijan, the paper shows how these cognitive and rhetorical strategies are universal but can also adapt themselves to particular national, regional and geopolitical contexts.
Keywords: *political slogans, ideological framing, meaning integration, English-language political discourse, conceptual blending.*

ПОЛІТИЧНІ ГАСЛА, ФРЕЙМІНГ ТА ІНТЕГРАЦІЯ ЗНАЧЕННЯ

Лейла Джумаєва
кандидат філологічних наук, викладач
Азербайджанський університет архітектури та будівництва

Політичні слогани та впливові висловлювання стали ключовими стратегічними інструментами сучасної політичної комунікації, оскільки вони формують громадську думку, мобілізують підтримку та зміцнюють ідеологічний простір як у внутрішньому, так і в міжнародному контекстах. Їхня переконливість полягає в здатності упакувати багаторівневі політичні програми та складні соціокультурні наративи у короткі, запам'ятовувані та емоційно насичені мовні одиниці. У світі стрімких глобальних інформаційних потоків та цифрових медіаінструментів англомовний політичний дискурс як у популістських виборчих кампаніях, так і у висловлюваннях глав держав дедалі більше залежить від інтеграції множинних смислових просторів, що забезпечує його негайний переконливий ефект і довготривалу символічну силу. Порівнюючи західні популістські кампанії з державними комунікаційними практиками Азербайджану, у статті показано, що

ці когнітивні та риторичні стратегії є універсальними, але при цьому здатні адаптуватися до конкретних національних, регіональних і геополітичних контекстів.
Ключові слова*: політичні слогани, ідеологічне фреймування, інтеграція значень, англомовний політичний дискурс, концептуальне змішування.*

Introduction. In political communication of the 21st century, which seeks to pull tight the net of public sentiment and forms collective identity, short as well as resonant statements prevail. These include political catchphrases and concise expressions through which it is possible to re-say a complex political position in language that is easily memorable as well as understandable. That track record is mainly due to the fact that they are brief, appeal emotionally and evoke shared cultural or historical memories.

International political campaigns have repeatedly shown this power Trump's "Make America Great Again," which his entire run for president was based on from last year onward, is an excellent example; the Brexit movement too went and turned "Take Back Control" into something far more than a simple slogan. It shows that direct language can muster public opinion, consolidate political identity, and ensure that a certain aspect of the past as represented by words carries on into future generations.

Within the Azerbaijani political scene, President Ilham Aliyev's English-language public pronouncements also reflect a strategic approach to language. His comments in diplomatic and media settings are in line with a considered effort to render national positions in terms that have echoes beyond an exclusively domestic audience. By use of precisely selected language, his addresses integrate historical background, legal arguments and national priorities so that they become comprehensible as well as convincing statements on the world stage.

This paper, combining discourse analysis, framing theory, and concepts developed from cognitive linguistics (Fauconnier, Turner, 2002), investigates how these statements can create meaning through spatially blending different conceptual domains. In looking at linguistic form, cognitive structure and speech motivation, we stress that English-language political discourse serves as a means of projecting power, fitting perception on the international stage.

Literature Review. Political slogans have been widely studied as a concise form of political communication (Charteris-Black, 2014). They are designed to be easily remembered, emotionally gripping, and loaded with

ideology. Populist rhetoric often offers slogans to present a clear "us vs. them" dichotomy that mobilizes audiences around shared grievances and aspirations.

Framing theory (Entman, 1993; Lakoff, 2004) clarifies how political actors define issues, delimit the field of interpretation and forward certain solutions. Frames come alive through verbal pointers, metaphors and cultural references, enabling audiences to read information in line with their own beliefs.

Conceptual blending (or integration) theory (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002) explains how the human mind blends elements from different mental spaces to produce new meaning. Political slogans and statements typically combine at least two input spaces (for example, historical memory and modern-day reality), resulting in a blended space that shows emergent meaning greater than the sum of its parts. For example, "Make America Great Again" blends an idealized past with an ideal vision for the future, creating a powerfully affecting emotional and intellectual effect.

Methodology. The research employs a qualitative approach to discourse analysis and aims at understanding how the selected English-language political slogans and statements are rhetorically constructed, cognitively structured and ideologically framed. To enhance its international reach, this study picks up the question of trans-linguistic (i.e., literally "between-languages") communication in an age when many people live in several linguistic worlds.

The corpus is divided into two main types: International examples — Slogans widely recognized and politically significant from recent history, namely "Make America Great Again" (Donald Trump, United States presidential campaign), "Take Back Control" (Brexit referendum campaign, United Kingdom), and "Yes We Can" (Barack Obama, United States presidential campaign). These examples are selected for their high degree of public recognition, rhetorical effect and persisting symbolic meanings in political discourse.

Azerbaijani examples — English-language excerpts from speeches by President Ilham Aliyev, where direct or indirect references to Donald Trump and Nikol Pashinyan are made. The selected material comes from diplomatic meetings, international press conferences, and official addresses in habitat settings where the President communicates Azerbaijan's positions for view by world audiences. Its guests feature athletes who have won prizes for Azerbaijan, as well as representatives of major international companies

like TOTAL, Statoil, and BP. These speeches allow an assessment of how English-language political rhetoric behaves within high-level state communication from a non-Western but internationally attentive perspective.

The methodological framework integrates three complementary analytical tools: Frames In Use: Applied to identify the dominant conceptual frameworks within each slogan or statement. To understand frames as organizing structures that direct audience interpretation, call into being shared cultural models, and position political actors within particular ideological stories is for UTC's readers.

Intertextual Analysis: Derived from Fauconnier and Turner (2002), this method is used to draw maps showing interaction between different mental spaces, such as historical memory, national identity, legal discourse and political vision. The process shows how these input spaces connect up in blended spaces with new meaning that was not directly present in any one input form. Meaning-Management for reducing pollution in a river results in increased tourism on the banks of that same river.

The texts selected for this analysis are transcribed where necessary, segmented into analyzable units, and coded in terms of theme, rhetoric and thought. Interpretations are grounded on both the linguistic forms and broader socio-political contexts of each instance. This ensures that the analysis is sensitive to issues such as target audience, situationally relevant discourse and media environment.

A composite methodology such as this enables detailed examination of how rhetorical strategies translate into politics and tactics. Starting with elections, transitions through diplomatic declarations; English-speaking societies become battlegrounds for meaning integration, ideological framing and communication strategies, all mediated through the power of language.

All of the political expressions under investigation share a similar trait from the point of view of their internal composition: lexical economy. Both international slogans such as the US "Make America Great Again (MAGA)" consist of monosyllabic and disyllabic words possible to process, repeat, and remember easily. The simplicity of language is, therefore, useful in reaching everyone, especially those with varying levels of political engagement or education. The minimalistic syntactic form of the formula enhances the memorization possibility, and it is an imperative that guides as conviction.

President Ilham Aliyev, for his part, often makes even simpler direct and assertive statements in English. While expressions like "We reinstated justice and international law" or "Azerbaijan worked in line with universal stan-

dards" are high-frequency ones we already know, they have strong political implications. This kind of language clarity is good for proper understanding and remembering messages, and it can help facilitate the transfer of these messages to media abroad. When Aliyev speaks in English, his language is unambiguous as to choice of words, but at the same time, it abides by diplomatic formalism which adds to credibility and authority.

International slogans often draw their punch from being able to resound in shared cultural and historical contexts. It taps into a nostalgic American dream of a bygone "golden age" the time after World War II when the US was rich and its notions of democracy were exported untainted throughout the Americas. "Take Back Control" likewise echoes through the ages to touch an earlier era of UK independence of a place with its national autonomy intact and well before Brussels started being beastie (stinging...).

President Aliyev conceptualizes historical justice and territorial integrity in a larger international legal framework through his discourse, taking into account the specific scholarly foci in the context of Azerbaijan. Allusions to the liberation of lost lands and compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions situate recent events as both a righting of wrongs from past history and a validation of Azerbaijani sovereignty. Drawing upon these two "jurisprudential degradations," the president seeks to graft national accomplishments in Iraq to internationally accepted norms of legitimacy, all of which seem to be bound up with this language of legality.

The examples cited and some others that I could cite have both different and related framing strategies, as a frame analysis shall demonstrate. MAGA uses a restoration frame, calling on the idea of restoring some previous greatness. Through an empowerment frame, "Take Back Control" exhorts the reader to gain authority over themselves. From his side, Aliyev has rarely strayed from the legitimacy frame a language of lawfulness, moral rightness and fulfilling obligations, in all his speeches.

Despite being so different, greatness, control and justice are emotionally loaded concepts drawing from a wide pool of cross-cultural resonance and these three cases tap into some aspect(s) of these. By referring to the core values that are most important to the audience, these terms connect the inspiring speaker with what they want you (the reader) to do. For Aliyev, legitimacy is not an ethereal notion but rather a set of actual outcomes territorial liberation and compliance with international legal norms.

However, unlike the monohedric style of metaphor, Conceptual Integration Theory is able to explain how two or more mental spaces come together

here to create emergent meanings in these expressions. We restored justice and international law. (President Aliyev)

Output Space 1: Historical Loss — History of land occupation and displacement, continued struggle. It enlists the collective memory of unaddressed land conflicts and their human costs.

Input Area 2: Norms — Legal Rules (and applies to the provisions of the UN Charter, the principles of sovereignty and legal decisions recognizing the territorial integrity of Azerbaijan)

Blended Space: Restorative Legitimacy The connection of the spaces above yields a pattern in which Azerbaijan reads its political and military endeavors as morally legitimate and lawfully grounded. This cocktail supports patriotism with the international message that what the state does is no different from what anyone else would do in its place because it rests on binding law.

The same mash-up takes place in international cases. MAGA = Pride in history (Input Space 1) + forward-looking political agenda (Input Space 2) → Vision of national revival? Perceived loss of sovereignty (Input Space 1) coalesces with the promise of renewed political autonomy (Input Space 2), resulting in a mix that deems pulling out from the EU as a reassertion of rightful authority for "Take Back Control."

Results and discussion. The use of integration as an element on the level of meaning in several conceptual spaces historical memory, language of law and emotional appeal is suggested to play some role in responding to a list of characteristics common for political messages powerful rhetorically and contextually adaptable. Collective memory ensures the discussion is rooted in a shared experience, prompting common stories that create both unity and justification. This kind of language, however, is backed by a formalized international legal framework it gives credibility to what you are saying. Even more, emotional appeal elicits the audience on an emotional level by sharing a desire to calibrate vision and values of the speaker. It is when these three dimensions mesh through the process of conceptual integration that the content becomes items with intellectual scope, and thus emotional depth.

Political leaders who effectively employ this type of integration are successful at connecting with constituents on multiple levels of audience engagement. These both affirm national identity, celebrate success, and simplify the political legitimacy for domestic constituencies. By replacing law with morality, when it comes to international institutions, the possibility

of making coherent jurisprudential judgments is no greater. And doing so makes empirical research on the effects of 'law' (identified through positive means) all but impossible moral reasons for compliance are not open to examination under positivist methods because they are largely unobservable. The integration of legal and moral considerations serves to buttress the status quo by affirming that a state acting in accordance with norms has acted responsibly. The message of justice, control and restoration is universal in such a way that it does not need to be constrained between specific political boundaries but can find a common language amongst those culturally or nationally miles apart around the globe.

The Azerbaijani example shows how these avoidant strategies can still work even in very formal diplomatic settings. Juxtaposed to his English-language statements are those of Azerbaijani President Ilham Aliyev, which demonstrate the perfect pitch between forceful assertion and diplomatic etiquette. He casts Azerbaijan's historical narratives and plays, in his words, with the greatest persistence Azeri cards against contemporary accomplishments, placing both within the language of international law and moral righteousness. This eerily echoes the structural and cognitive devices used by some of the most famous global populist and electoral slogans, only now translating for the demands of state diplomacy. What Queen lays out is a discourse that, while effective in the moment in political terms (it works at least as well when invoked for domestic consumption and regional signaling as it does vis-a-vis more global actors), maintains symbolic durability so long as Azerbaijani actions are represented, through its structure (performance and denial/recognition and emphasis), to remain within the bounds of international norms worthy of respecting.

Conclusion. The analysis shows that English-language guarantees and political statements rely on layered meaning-making and frame construction, where Conceptual Integration Theory explains how mental spaces historical narratives, cultural identity, legal norms and political vision blend into persuasive messages. Because these expressions operate on multiple interconnected levels, they shape perception, mobilize support, and simplify complex issues for broader audiences. The Azerbaijani context demonstrates that cognitive and rhetorical mechanisms function similarly across globalized political discourse. The strategic use of English in official communication enables the integration of national achievements with internationally recognized principles of sovereignty and justice, producing narratives that resonate both domestically and internationally. In an age of rapid

information exchange and narrative competition, concise and well-crafted statements whether diplomatic or political serve as effective tools for shaping political reality. The Azerbaijani example illustrates how political leaders can leverage historical legitimacy, cultural resonance and legal authority through clear and succinct English-language messaging to achieve long-term influence on the global stage.

Literature

Cantorne A., Pacol J. Broken vows or real promises? A preliminary assessment of political slogans in the 2025 midterm election in the Philippines. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 2025. Vol. 7(3). P. 374—392. DOI:https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v7i3.2175.

Castells M. Communication power. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2009. 592 p.

Chadwick A. The hybrid media system: Politics and power. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2013. 368 p.

Charteris-Black J. Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 272 p.

Entman R. M. Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*. 1993. Vol. 43(4). P. 51—58. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x.

Fauconnier G., Turner M. The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities. Basic Books,2002. 464 p.

The history of political slogans reveals words are not enough. *Financial Times*. 2025. July 12. URL:https://www.ft.com/content/d9b0ba95-b26e-4973-9843-4c883cf00ef2 (дата звернення: 13.10.2025).

Khurshid A. The spectacle of slogans: Media, populism, and the emotionalization of political communication. *Advance Social Science Archive Journal*. 2025. Vol. 4(1). P. 702—720.

Lakoff G. The political mind: A cognitive scientist's guide to your brain and its politics. Penguin, 2008. 304 p.

Letter from the President of the United States to the President of Azerbaijan. *President of Azerbaijan*. 2025. April 10.URL: https://president.az/en/articles/view/68536 (дата звернення: 04.10.2025).

Transcript: Donald Trump remarks on Armenia-Azerbaijan agreement. *Roll Call*. 2025. August 8. URL:https://rollcall.com/factbase/trump/transcript/donald-trump-remarks-trilateral-agreement-armenia-azerbaijan-august-8-2025 (дата звернення: 07.10.2025).

Trump D. J. Remarks at the Armenia-Azerbaijan peace agreement ceremony. *The Washington Post*. 2025. August 8. URL: https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2025/08/08/azerbaijan-armenia-nagorno-karabakh-trump (дата звернення: 07.10.2025).

References

Cantorne, A., & Pacol, J. (2025). Broken vows or real promises? A preliminary assessment of political slogans in the 2025 midterm election in the Philippines. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies, 7*(3), 374—392.https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v7i3.2175

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.

Chadwick, A. (2013). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power*. Oxford University Press.

Charteris-Black, J. (2014). *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51—58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.

Financial Times. (2025, July 12). *The history of political slogans reveals words are not enough*. https://www.ft.com/content/d9b0ba95-b26e-4973-9843-4c883cf00ef2

Khurshid, A. (2025). The spectacle of slogans: Media, populism, and the emotionalization of political communication. *Advance Social Science Archive Journal, 4*(1), 702—720.

Lakoff, G. (2008). *The political mind: A cognitive scientist's guide to your brain and its politics*. Penguin.

President of Azerbaijan. (2025, April 10). *Letter from the President of the United States to the President of Azerbaijan*. https://president.az/en/articles/view/68536

Roll Call. (2025, August 8). *Transcript: Donald Trump remarks on Armenia-Azerbaijan agreement*. https://rollcall.com/factbase/trump/transcript/donald-trump-remarks-trilateral-agreement-armenia-azerbaijan-august-8-2025

Trump, D. J. (2025, August 8). *Remarks at the Armenia-Azerbaijan peace agreement ceremony*. The Washington Post. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2025/08/08/azerbaijan-armenia-nagorno-karabakh-trump

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.10.2025 року