



THE ROLE OF LANGUAGE AMBIGUITY AND ITS
INFLUENCE ON POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

Amirova Parizoda Ibragim qizi

parizodaamirova30@gmail.com

Student at the University of Economics and Pedagogy

In the field of Philology and language teaching English

Abstract: This article delves into Simone de Beauvoir’s philosophical insights from *The Ethics of Ambiguity* examining the intricate moral dilemmas surrounding freedom, violence, and ethical resistance. It highlights de Beauvoir’s stance that violence is justifiable only within strict ethical boundaries and underscores the significance of responsible actions, personal accountability, and solidarity with others. By reflecting on various human attitudes and moral decisions, the article encourages readers to embrace ambiguity, act with mindfulness, and pursue justice while maintaining compassion and humanity.

Аннотация: Статья посвящена философским взглядам Симоны де Бовуар, изложенным в её работе *Этика неопределённости*. Основное внимание уделяется моральным дилеммам, связанным со свободой, насилием и ответственным сопротивлением. Автор отмечает, что насилие может быть оправдано лишь в исключительных случаях и при строгом соблюдении этических норм. Через анализ различных типов человеческого поведения статья призывает принимать неопределённость, действовать осознанно и стремиться к справедливости, не утрачивая человечности и уважения к свободе других.



SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola Simone de Beauvoirning Noaniqlik etikasi asaridagi falsafiy qarashlarini o‘rganadi. Unda ozodlik, zo‘ravonlik va axloqiy qarshilikka oid murakkab masalalar chuqur tahlil qilingan. Muallif de Beauvoirning zo‘ravonlikni faqat qat’iy axloqiy cheklovlar doirasida oqlashini ta’kidlaydi va mas’uliyatli harakatlar, shaxsiy javobgarlik hamda boshqalar bilan birdamlikning ahamiyatini yoritadi. Maqola insoniy xatti-harakatlarning turli shakllarini o‘rganib, o‘quvchilarni noaniqlikni qabul qilishga, ongli harakat qilishga va adolatga insoniylikni yo‘qotmasdan erishishga undaydi.

Keywords: Simone de Beauvoir, ethics of ambiguity, moral responsibility, freedom, violence, ethical resistance, personal choice, solidarity, justice, human behavior, existentialism[4], moral boundaries, duality, compassion, philosophical ethics.

Ключевые слова: Симона де Бовуар, этика неопределённости, моральная ответственность, свобода, насилие, этическое сопротивление, личный выбор, солидарность, справедливость, человеческое поведение, экзистенциализм, границы морали, двойственность, сострадание, философская этика.

Kalit so‘zlar: Simona de Bovuar, noaniqlik etikasi, axloqiy mas’uliyat, erkinlik, zo‘ravonlik, axloqiy qarshilik, shaxsiy tanlov, birdamlik, adolat, inson xulq-atvori, ekzistensializm, axloqiy chegaralar, ikkiyuzlamachilik, hamdardlik, falsafiy etika.

Language and politics are deeply intertwined, forming a dynamic relationship that shapes not only our thoughts but also how we perceive ourselves and the world



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

around us. Far from being a neutral tool for communication, language is the foundation upon which political realities are constructed. From ancient Athens to modern online forums, the role of language in shaping political discourse has remained pivotal. Aristotle once argued that the polis—the city-state—could not function without the discursive engagement of its citizens, a principle that still holds true today. Every word spoken by a political leader carries immense weight, influencing emotions, decisions, and collective perceptions. Politicians wield language with remarkable precision, carefully selecting terms that can inspire hope or incite fear, foster unity or deepen divisions.[7] Phrases like "tax relief" evoke a sense of liberation, while "tax burden" stirs resentment toward government policies. Similarly, "climate action" paints a picture of collective heroism, whereas "economic constraint" suggests sacrifice and hardship. These linguistic choices

are far from accidental; they frame public debates in specific ways, steering conversations toward predetermined conclusions. [7]Through subtle shifts in phrasing, leaders shape not only the issues at hand but also the emotional responses of their audiences.[7]Beyond framing issues, language determines who gets to participate in the political arena. The selection of official languages for constitutions, legislatures, and international agreements can elevate certain groups while marginalizing others. Minority languages—and the cultural identities tied to them—are often sidelined, sparking struggles for recognition and representation. In times of crisis, such as wars, pandemics, or economic upheavals, the power of rhetoric becomes even more pronounced. Leaders can rally people around shared values with unifying speeches, or they can exploit fear and division through carefully crafted narratives. What makes political language so powerful is not merely the literal meaning of words but their emotional resonance, metaphorical depth, and ability to



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

construct compelling stories.[7] By weaving together tales of past triumphs and visions of a hopeful future, politicians create collective myths that justify sweeping policies or social movements. Churchill’s iconic “fight on the beaches” speech galvanized Britain with a narrative of heroic resilience, while Barack Obama’s “Yes, we can” slogan transformed a campaign into a symbol of generational change. To truly understand the workings of power in democracies and authoritarian regimes alike, we must delve beyond [6] surface-level policy discussions and explore the [6] rhetorical, cultural, and psychological dimensions

of political speech. Language is not just a medium of communication—it is a tool of empowerment and control, capable of carving out new possibilities for action or reinforcing existing hierarchies.[1] Without appreciating this deeper interplay, any analysis of political behavior risks overlooking the threads that bind words, ideas, and power into the fabric of society. The interplay between language and politics has always intrigued me. It’s not merely about the words we choose—it’s about the immense power they wield and how they shape our perception of the world. Language, by its very nature, is deeply political. It crafts narratives, defines identities, and often determines whose voice is amplified and whose is silenced. Far beyond being a tool for communication, language serves as an instrument of control, persuasion, and even resistance. This dynamic is evident throughout history and is particularly pronounced in today’s political landscape. Politicians, leaders, and activists carefully select their words to evoke emotions, garner support, or suppress dissent. A subtle shift in phrasing can completely transform the meaning of a message.[6] For instance, calling for “a second referendum” might resonate as a democratic choice to some, while others might interpret it as



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

betrayal or hesitation. This is the [6]power of framing in political discourse. Consider the nuances of political language. When someone describes an idea as a “coherent proposition” that “deserves to be considered,” they aren’t necessarily endorsing it. [4]They may simply be acknowledging that the idea fits within a logical framework, even if they personally disagree. I recently heard a speaker refer to a second referendum as a “perfectly coherent position.” He clarified that, while many oppose the idea, it shouldn’t be dismissed outright. This was a refreshing display of intellectual honesty. He wasn’t advocating for the referendum but was affirming its legitimacy within a fair debate. That distinction is crucial. In political arguments, especially those online, people often conflate recognizing someone’s right to speak with agreeing with their stance. Yet true democratic discourse demands that we listen to perspectives we don’t share and allow space for them to be considered. What struck me most was how this brief clip highlighted a broader issue in politics: the tendency to oversimplify or misrepresent people’s words.

Just because someone calls an idea “valid” or “worthy of debate” doesn’t mean they endorse it. Unfortunately, in today’s fast-paced media environment, such nuances are frequently lost. People are quick to label, judge, and react—often without hearing the full context. This knee-jerk response stifles dialogue before it has a chance to flourish. And when dialogue is silenced, democracy suffers. This reminds me of the critical importance of thinking deeply about political language. Words carry immense weight, and every choice matters. Whether spoken by a prime minister, a protester, or a podcast guest, language reveals not just beliefs but intentions—how individuals hope to shape the thoughts of others.[1] As someone committed to truth and fairness in debate, I believe we all have a responsibility to listen attentively, challenge assumptions, and resist the urge to jump to conclusions. Political language is more than policy—it’s about people, emotions, and the stories



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

we tell about ourselves and our world. If we aspire to a healthier political future, we must improve how we listen, speak, and understand one another. Language is an incredibly powerful tool in political speeches and debates—not merely a means of conveying information, but a mechanism for shaping how people think and feel. Politicians excel at using words to connect with emotions, simplify complex issues, and subtly guide public opinion, often without the audience even realizing it. [1]A key strategy lies in the use of emotionally charged words like “freedom,” “justice,” or “tyranny.” These terms resonate deeply because they tap into universal values, historical contexts, and personal aspirations. By invoking such potent concepts, politicians make their arguments feel urgent and relatable, stirring emotions that drive engagement and support. Similarly, metaphors serve as a crucial tool for breaking down intricate topics.[2] For example, describing a country as a “family” fosters a sense of unity and shared responsibility, while likening an economy to a “machine” helps people visualize its structure and functions. These vivid images transform abstract ideas into something tangible and easier to understand. Another subtle yet impactful technique is metonymy—using a single word or phrase to represent a broader concept. For instance, saying “the crown” instead of “the monarchy” or “Wall Street” to symbolize financial power condenses complex ideas into simple, digestible symbols, making the message more memorable.

Even small linguistic choices, such as pronouns, can significantly influence perceptions. [2]Using “we” fosters a sense of togetherness and shared purpose, while “they” creates division, framing an opposing group as adversaries. Questions also serve as a clever rhetorical tactic. When a politician asks, “Why are we allowing foreign powers to control us?” the phrasing subtly implies that foreign control is already an issue, steering the audience toward a specific assumption. Similarly, repetition is a powerful way to embed ideas into people’s minds. Catchy slogans like



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

“Yes we can” or “Make America great again” stick because they are simple, rhythmic, and emotionally resonant, becoming rallying cries that unite supporters and reinforce central messages. Rhythm and contrast further amplify the persuasive impact of political language.[2] By juxtaposing hopeful visions with dire warnings, politicians make their ideas more compelling and memorable.

Alternating between formal and casual speech also allows them to connect with a wide range of audiences, from intellectuals to everyday citizens, adapting their tone to suit the occasion. Altogether, these linguistic strategies make political language extraordinarily persuasive. Politicians skillfully weave emotional appeals, symbolic imagery, and rhetorical techniques into their speeches, shaping public opinion in ways that are often subtle yet profound. It’s a striking reminder of the immense influence words can wield in the political arena. Diplomacy stands as a unique yet equally influential domain where the nuances of language take on profound and far-reaching importance. Unlike the fiery rhetoric often seen in domestic political settings, diplomatic communication prizes precision, restraint, and a shared vocabulary capable of transcending cultural and ideological boundaries[3]. Every word choice—whether it’s a modal verb, an adverb like “only” or “merely,” or even a subtle change in tense—can carry significant legal and moral weight, particularly in high-stakes scenarios like treaty negotiations or official statements. Diplomats, including ambassadors, envoys, and negotiators, are not just representatives of their nations but also linguistic tacticians adept at advancing national interests while maintaining respect and trust with their counterparts. Diplomatic protocol often embraces ambiguity to allow for plausible deniability, yet it simultaneously demands enough clarity to avert misunderstandings that could lead to international crises[3]. The Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations encapsulates this delicate balancing act, emphasizing confidentiality, decorum, and



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

mutual respect as essential principles. Within global institutions like the United Nations, the stakes for precise wording are even higher: formal resolutions, verbatim records, and multilateral agreements undergo meticulous line-by-line negotiation and scrutiny. A single phrase can shift the burden of responsibility or redefine collective commitments. Euphemisms such as “collateral damage” or “enhanced interrogation” reflect the strategic softening of language—an effort to maintain diplomatic civility while addressing sensitive or divisive issues. While such linguistic strategies may blur ethical clarity, they also enable dialogue to continue where direct confrontation might impede progress. Although English has emerged as the dominant lingua franca in international diplomacy, largely due to historical and geopolitical factors, ceremonial and legal registers in French and other languages remain integral to the richness of diplomatic tradition. In today’s interconnected world, advancements like real-time translation tools and digital diplomacy platforms are reshaping traditional norms, allowing for faster, broader, and more inclusive communication.[5] Yet despite these innovations, the core of diplomacy remains unchanged: the careful, deliberate, and respectful use of language to nurture peace, foster cooperation, and promote mutual understanding. Ultimately, diplomacy serves as a testament to the enduring belief that dialogue, grounded in the power of words, can bridge even the most profound divides and pave the way for a more

harmonious global community. In the complex realm of politics, language serves as a potent instrument—not only for persuasion but also for strategic maneuvering. Political discourse often strikes a precarious balance between clarity and concealment, employing two distinct yet interrelated tactics: ambiguity and vagueness. These linguistic strategies are not merely rhetorical flourishes; they are deliberate tools wielded to navigate the intricate dynamics of voter behavior, party competition, and public accountability. Ambiguity arises when political leaders or



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

parties convey mixed messages on the same issue. For instance, a party might simultaneously promise tax cuts and increased public spending without detailing how they intend to reconcile the fiscal gap.

This approach allows various voter groups to interpret the message in ways that align with their own preferences, thereby broadening the party’s appeal in a fragmented or polarized electorate. [3]Ambiguity operates across multiple statements, creating a spectrum of meanings that can resonate with diverse constituencies. Conversely, vagueness involves the use of broad, non-specific language that sidesteps clear commitments. Phrases like “we will reform the welfare system” leave ample room for interpretation while offering few grounds for accountability. Research indicates that opposition parties and those with more radical platforms often lean into vague language, preserving flexibility should they transition into power. Unlike ambiguity, which spans multiple messages, vagueness resides within single expressions, reflecting a calculated choice to remain open-ended. These rhetorical strategies fulfill critical political functions. Ambiguity enables parties to maintain cohesion within diverse internal coalitions, as conflicting interpretations can coexist without fracturing the group.

Vagueness, on the other hand, serves as a protective shield against backlash when concrete promises prove too challenging to fulfill. [4]Parties frequently employ vagueness when addressing issues they “own,” allowing them to project confidence and expertise without committing to specific policies that might later constrain their actions. The strategic use of language in politics is far from random. It reflects an acute awareness of the complexities of voter behavior and the demands of governance. By mastering these tools, political actors can shape trust, influence decisions, and redefine democratic accountability. For voters, understanding how ambiguity and vagueness function is essential for decoding political messages and fostering more informed civic engagement. In an era where words wield immense



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

power, the nuanced deployment of language presents both a challenge and an opportunity to enhance democratic discourse. In the dynamic and ever-evolving world of democratic politics, language serves as much more than a tool for communication— it’s a strategic weapon, a means of influence, and a cornerstone of political survival. Politicians rarely choose their words haphazardly. Instead, their rhetoric is meticulously crafted to maneuver through complex electoral landscapes, meet diverse voter expectations, and address the inherent uncertainties of governance. Central to this calculated use of language are two indispensable tools: ambiguity and vagueness. [5]Far from being signs of confusion or weakness, these rhetorical strategies often serve as sources of adaptability, strength, and long-term resilience. Ambiguity arises when politicians deliver mixed or seemingly contradictory messages within the same policy domain. Picture a political party promising both lower taxes and increased social spending without outlining how they’ll reconcile the two. [6]This deliberate lack of clarity creates what experts call “aggregate positional variance,” allowing for multiple interpretations. One voter may hear “economic growth,” while another hears “social protection,” and both feel validated by the message.

In highly polarized societies, where taking a firm stance on one side risks alienating the other, ambiguity becomes a unifying force. It enables parties to form broader coalitions by appealing to diverse groups without committing to rigid extremes. Vagueness, on the other hand, operates differently. Instead of sending mixed signals, vague language avoids specifics altogether. [3] Statements like “we will reform healthcare” or “we aim to improve education” sound inspiring but leave out critical details such as timelines, methods, or measurable outcomes. This approach provides politicians with a safe space to generate hope and support without the risk of backlash[3] from unmet expectations. Research indicates that



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

vague rhetoric is particularly prevalent among opposition parties or those with more radical platforms, as it offers flexibility. If they ascend to power, they can adapt their policies to evolving circumstances without being accused of breaking promises. These two strategies—ambiguity across multiple statements and vagueness within individual ones—are far from accidental linguistic quirks. They are deliberate tools designed to handle scrutiny in different ways. Interestingly, political parties often become more vague when addressing issues they are perceived to “own.” This vagueness allows them to project confidence and competence while avoiding the pitfalls of overly rigid policy commitments. Conversely, overusing ambiguity can backfire, potentially damaging a party’s perceived coherence and credibility. When used judiciously, ambiguity and vagueness serve as powerful assets in the political arsenal. They help leaders manage internal divisions, anticipate governance challenges, and maintain electoral viability over time. In a world that demands clarity but punishes missteps, strategic uncertainty isn’t just clever—it’s essential. Ultimately, understanding these dimensions of political language enriches our ability to analyze campaigns, decipher party platforms, and engage with politics more critically. It reminds us that in politics, what is left unsaid can be just as impactful as what is spoken—and often, the silence is intentional. As voters, scholars, and citizens, recognizing the calculated brilliance behind these rhetorical choices equips us to navigate political discourse with greater insight and optimism. Ambiguity is a fascinating feature of language, emerging when a single word or sentence can be interpreted in multiple ways, often leaving us puzzled until further context clarifies the intended meaning.[7] It manifests in two primary forms: lexical ambiguity, which arises when a word carries multiple meanings, and syntactic ambiguity, stemming from unclear sentence structure.[7] For instance, the statement “I saw bats” [7] might conjure images of either baseball bats at a game or flying mammals in a cave.



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

Without additional context such as “I was at a stadium” or “I explored a cave,” the meaning remains uncertain. Similarly, syntactic ambiguity can lead to confusion, as illustrated by the sentence, “The chicken is ready to eat.”[7] Does this imply the chicken is hungry or that it’s cooked and ready to be served? The sentence structure accommodates both interpretations. While ambiguity can sometimes cause misunderstandings, it also injects humor, creativity, and depth into language, enriching wordplay, poetry, and even marketing strategies. [7]Context—whether conveyed through supplementary sentences, tone, or gestures—typically resolves ambiguity, showcasing the dynamic and adaptable nature of communication. Ambiguity also plays a significant role in political language, where terms often carry dual meanings: their literal definitions and their implications in power dynamics. Words like “communism” or “democracy” exemplify this. Communism, theoretically advocating for workers’ control, is often distorted into a fear-inducing concept of authoritarian rule. Conversely, democracy, which champions governance by the people, frequently fails to reflect the majority’s influence, with policies often shaped by the wealthiest factions. Even terms like “Free Trade Agreements” can be misleading, as they often prioritize corporate interests over genuine economic fairness, fostering monopolistic practices and inflated prices.

Political elites increasingly leverage propaganda [3] to manipulate public perceptions, investing billions in shaping beliefs rather than fostering informed decision-making. To reclaim true democracy, dismantling centralized power structures, promoting community-driven initiatives, and ensuring access to accurate information are essential steps for empowering citizens to challenge institutions that thrive on division and misinformation. Language itself is a living, evolving entity shaped by historical, social, and cultural forces. Its development mirrors the



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

complexities of human interaction, as evidenced by the structural similarities between French and German or the dialectal diversity within nations like Italy and Germany. National standardization through education and media often overshadows rich linguistic variations, yet these nuances reveal how language adapts to conquest, commerce, and technological advancements. Prescriptive grammar rules, often detached from natural speech, reflect societal efforts to impose cohesion or prestige, while pronunciation differences highlight the challenges of mutual comprehension across dialects. Despite these constraints, humans exhibit an innate drive for creative expression, as seen in slang, youth registers, and artistic conventions. Humor and rapid vocabulary acquisition further demonstrate the extraordinary capabilities of the human mind, suggesting preexisting cognitive frameworks that facilitate language learning. For educators and parents, fostering a linguistically rich environment can nurture curiosity and growth, enabling children to thrive during critical developmental stages. Ambiguity is not merely a linguistic quirk but a cornerstone of human communication, influencing everyday interactions and even high-stakes scenarios like aviation and medicine. Lexical ambiguity arises when words like “bank” or “bats” have multiple meanings, while structural ambiguity stems from unclear sentence construction, as in “The tourists saw a monkey with a telescope,” which could mean either the tourists using a telescope or a monkey possessing one. Psychological studies reveal that ambiguity is more common than often realized, frequently exacerbated by emotional states or overconfidence in being understood. In critical domains like aviation, misinterpretations of phrases such as “I’ve got it” or “Pull up” have led to near-misses and tragedies. Similarly, digital communication, which lacks nonverbal cues, is prone to misinterpretation, underscoring the importance of clarity in emails and other written exchanges. Strategies such as standardized phrasing in safety-critical fields, fostering open dialogue in hierarchical



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

settings, and adopting disambiguating practices in everyday communication can mitigate risks and enhance understanding.

Recognizing the prevalence of ambiguity encourages us to become more mindful communicators, transforming potential misunderstandings into opportunities for clearer, more effective exchanges. In political discourse, acknowledging a proposal as “coherent” without endorsing it reflects intellectual respect for its internal logic while maintaining neutrality regarding its consequences. For example, describing a second referendum as “coherent” recognizes its democratic principles without committing to its outcomes. This distinction allows policymakers to foster inclusive debate and merit-based evaluation of ideas, diffusing polarization and encouraging compromise. However, theoretical coherence does not guarantee practical feasibility; factors such as public sentiment, economic impacts, and diplomatic considerations often influence decision-making. By separating the merits of an argument from its adoption as policy, politicians and citizens alike can engage in thoughtful scrutiny, ensuring democratic legitimacy while balancing

sound reasoning with actionable outcomes.

1. How does Simone de Beauvoir’s idea of existential ambiguity push back against traditional efforts to define human nature in rigid, fixed terms?

2. How does de Beauvoir’s moral framework—from the sub-man to the truly free individual—highlight the connection between personal freedom and the ethical responsibility we hold toward others?

3. Why does de Beauvoir claim that “disinterested objectivity” is both impossible and morally troubling in art and politics, and what does this mean for intellectual involvement during moments of crisis?



SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025

In *The Ethics of Ambiguity* Simone de Beauvoir delves into a profound and enduring question:[4] can violence ever be morally justified in the fight against oppression? Her response is nuanced yet resolute — it can be, but only under stringent conditions. She asserts that violence may be warranted solely when it serves to dismantle systems that strip individuals of their freedom,(**book-epigraph**)reducing them to mere objects devoid of agency and voice. However, de Beauvoir does not romanticize or glorify violence. She stresses that even in the pursuit of justice, we must guard against losing our humanity or becoming a reflection of the very forces we opposes.This profound idea is brought to life in the podcast 20 Minute Books, which explores de Beauvoir's powerful concepts with clarity and depth. Through her philosophy, she reminds us that human beings are not static entities but ever-evolving projects — we are "nothing" in the sense

that we are always in the process of becoming. With this freedom to continually shape ourselves comes an ethical obligation: not only to liberate ourselves but also to fight for the liberation of others. Freedom, for de Beauvoir, is not an isolated endeavor but a shared responsibility.De Beauvoir’s analysis categorizes people based on their approach to life and freedom. The "sub-man" drifts through life passively, unaware of their choices. The "serious man" clings rigidly to ideas, forgetting they are human constructs.The "nihilist" rejects meaning altogether, surrendering to inaction. The "adventurer" seeks personal thrill without regard for consequence. Only the truly free individual — one who embraces uncertainty, responsibility, and compassion — can live ethically and authentically. For de Beauvoir, true freedom is not about selfish pursuits but about actively engaging with the world and its complexities.[**B-page2**] She also critiques the notion of neutrality, arguing that silence in the face of injustice is not a neutral act but a form of complicity. [**P-2**]Ethical living requires action. It demands resistance against



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

systems like colonization, patriarchy, and authoritarianism — structures that deny people their dignity. Yet, even resistance must be ethical. Violence, if employed, must be carefully scrutinized and justified, never used as a pretext to perpetuate the same cruelty we seek to dismantle. De Beauvoir illustrates this with examples like Salazar’s authoritarian regime, where abstract ideals such as nationalism and tradition were exalted at the expense of real human lives. In these systems, suffering was rationalized in the name of ideals disconnected from actual human needs, highlighting the danger of prioritizing abstractions over people. Ultimately, *The Ethics of Ambiguity* is more than a philosophical treatise — it is a guide for living with awareness, courage, and integrity[4]. It calls us to reflect, to act, and to choose freedom [4] not just for ourselves but for others as well. De Beauvoir reminds us that ethics is not about adhering to rigid rules but about continuously reassessing our decisions and remaining steadfast in our commitment to humanity in all its complexity. Simone de Beauvoir’s *The Ethics of Ambiguity* tackles one of humanity’s most profound moral dilemmas: can violence ever be justified in the pursuit of justice and liberation? Her response is neither simplistic nor dismissive but deeply thoughtful and grounded in ethical reasoning. She acknowledges that, under rare and carefully considered circumstances, violence might be necessary - particularly when it is the last remaining option to dismantle oppressive systems that rob individuals of their freedom, dignity, and voice[p-17]. Yet, de Beauvoir does not glorify violence. Instead, she issues a cautionary reminder: even when fighting against injustice, we must avoid becoming unjust ourselves. This nuanced perspective challenges us to approach moral decisions with reflection and care. Where de Beauvoir’s ideas are made accessible and emotionally resonant. Central to her thinking is the belief that human beings are not born into fixed roles or identities; rather, we are perpetually in the process of becoming, shaping ourselves through our choices and actions. With



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE "THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT"
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

this freedom comes immense responsibility—not only to liberate ourselves but also to take action when others are oppressed.[p-20]De Beauvoir's ethical framework calls for active engagement with the world, urging us to confront injustice rather than retreat into passivity or indifference. In her exploration of human freedom, de Beauvoir vividly categorizes different approaches to life. She critiques the "subject," who passively conforms to routines without questioning them, and the "serious man," who blindly adheres to dogmas, forgetting that all systems are human constructs. She examines the "nihilist," who abandons meaning altogether, and the "adventurer," who pursues thrill without regard for consequences. Yet, the truly ethical individual, in her view, is one who embraces uncertainty, takes responsibility for their actions, and demonstrates compassion toward others. [P-40]This is the kind of freedom she advocates—not a selfish or chaotic liberty,

but one rooted in solidarity and ethical responsibility. One of de Beauvoir's most striking assertions is that neutrality is not an option. Silence in the face of oppression is not a neutral stance; it is a choice that often enables injustice to persist. Ethical living, she argues, demands action—actively resisting systems such as colonialism, patriarchy, and authoritarianism that strip human beings of their right to live freely and fully[.P-56]. But even in resistance, she warns against the misuse of violence, cautioning that it must never become a justification for replicating the cruelty we seek to eradicate. Her critique of Salazar's authoritarian regime, where ideals like tradition and nationalism were prioritized over human lives, exemplifies the ethical failures she condemns. To de Beauvoir, such regimes betray the very essence of morality. Ultimately, The Ethics of [p-2]Ambiguity transcends philosophy; it is a call to live with courage, reflection, and moral clarity. De Beauvoir teaches us that ethics is not about adhering to rigid rules but about remaining vigilant—constantly examining our choices, questioning our motivations,



**SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL CONFERENCE “THE
FUTURE STARTS WITH US: TOWARDS THINKING,
TECHNOLOGY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT”
VOLUME 1. ISSUE 1. 2025**

and staying connected to our shared humanity. In a world fraught with injustice and uncertainty, she offers no easy answers. Instead, she equips us with the tools to navigate ambiguity with integrity, compassion, and hope.

REFERENCES:

- 1.RSIS International. The Power of Language: Exploring the Role of Language in Politics. Retrieved from: <https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/the-power-of-languageexploring-the-role-of-language-in-politics/>
- 2.The California Aggie. (2016, March 10). Political Ambiguity: Political Language and Its Effect on the Public. Retrieved from: <https://theaggie.org/2016/03/10/political-ambiguitypolitical-language-and-its-effect-on-the-public/>
- 3.Gaffney, D., & Rowe, D. (2023). The Use of Political Language in Contemporary Governance. European Journal of Political Theory. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/13540688231195272>
- 4.Beauvoir, S. de. (1948). The Ethics of Ambiguity. New York: Citadel Press.
- 5.YouTube. (n.d.). The Power of Language in Politics – TEDx Talk. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yautjvfaD9w>
- 6.YouTube. (n.d.). Language and Politics – A Sociolinguistic View. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nLyKEri0qCE>
- 7.Nambisan, B. (2019). Ambiguity. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j496SjZ7QmY>