

THE XXV ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL ACADEMIC CONFERENCE, LANGUAGE AND  
CULTURE, 20-22 October 2014

## Political Linguistics as a Constituent Part of Modern Political Theory

Valeriya V. Petrenko<sup>a</sup>, Anna S. Potapova<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>ab</sup>National Research Tomsk State University, 36, Lenin Ave., 36, Tomsk, 634050, Russia

---

### Abstract

This article deals with the problem of new understanding of traditional political theory. The contemporary structure of this theory includes the questions concerning the subject of power used as the subject of speech. Now political linguistics can be considered as the part of modern politics. The main principles of methodology in this research are connected with the key ideas of structuralism and poststructuralism in the sphere of language. The interest in political linguistics opens the field of political communication for contemporary investigations.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

Peer-review under responsibility of National Research Tomsk State University.

**Keywords:** Political linguistics; subject of speech; communication; structuralism; poststructuralism

---

### 1. Introduction

Modern political theory and its methodology are interrelated with an interdisciplinary character of modern human cognition: all its components and analysis of socio-cultural and theoretical issues are closely connected.

Wide interpretation of discursive practices that structuralize various cultural resources in concealed or open manner, including political practices and practices of discourse of power as a whole, helps to make effective comparative analogues in modern socio-cultural analytics. They considerably refer to the sphere of methodology. Widely used linguistic theories play an important role in assertion of priority of methodological models in social and humanitarian studies.

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +7-3822-52-98-96; fax: +7-3822-52-97-42.

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

Modern European political thinking is formed as a culture of political rhetoric based on a specific function of linguistic manipulation. In other words, communicative strategy of power in its liberal manifestation is deeply rooted in the pragmatic context, and that is why it is effective, practically feasible, but, paradoxically, random. All these factors make a language dangerous, but attractive and magnificent world where special “machines of powerful intentions” and “powerful dreams” are becoming firmly established, while linguistic “content plane” is not represented in “expression plane”. Under such conditions, linguistic articulation, which is regarded as an open rhetorical and obscure semantic representation, becomes the subject of analysis of political situations.

What methodology should be used for the research? What are the preferences?

## 2. New methodology of political investigation: lingua-pragmatic aspect

Traditionally, power is a common life-forming principle. Its logic and formal structures turn to a subject whose thinking, speech and acts are continuation of above-individual power impulse. The idea of nature of political activity corresponds to purposeful-rational, “legitimate” way of thinking, language and social act. Recent decentration and desubordination in social and political spheres and, thus, unpredictability of any powerful institutions, change a strategy in understanding the power as it is. The picture of power has got lost in its generality and necessity so it is as accidental as any other coincidences. Political analysts and experts have to focus on “regional” representation and manifestation of power. They monitor different techniques that are responsible for the game of heterogenic powerful impulses and speeches.

### 2.1. *Linguistics as a methodological a priori of actual social theory*

In this respect general methodology of analysis proves its interdisciplinary character. It comprises various general theoretical directions that are mandatory for serious research in political science. In this paper we use the works of structuralists and poststructuralists (M. Foucault, J. Lacan, R. Barthes, J. Derrida, J. Kristeva, P. de Man, C. Ginzburg, J. Starobinski). The corpus renders new information about the language. Here these works are added with the ideas of socio- and psycholinguistics, perceptual psychology and political sociology. These scientists investigate pragmatic and linguistic aspects of political practices. The main achievement of this methodological scheme is determination of a common object of integral political interest that is the space of political discourse.

It is important to mention that classical language theory – Saussure’s opposition of “language” and “speech” – allowed powerful nature of a sign in usage of language units as a code system. Description of the integral spatial functioning of the language in the context of political communication is crucial.

Sociocultural, historical, and psychological aspects in political communication understanding are not accidental. They give additional opportunities for language explication and political discourse phenomena investigation. While a language is considered as a fixed system of signs, limiting language communicative freedom, speech, as free use of signs, it preconditions the individualization of communicative strategy as a whole (political, in particular). This reflects a common tendency of European value system, liberalization in the establishment of political world and modern European standards. A large variety of social, historical, cultural, and psychological determinants turn our attention towards people as agents of verbal behavior, and in this research – towards a subject of political discourse and action.

Political theory is closely connected to philosophy of cognitive science because speech activity accumulates and transmits diverse individual’s experience. Philosophical research now has a common feature that is obviously different in terms of philosophical writings and traditional texts that are analytically and logically discursive and pragmatic. Philosophy uncovers “mirror” presupposition of mind and language.

Renunciation from generalizing metaphysical claims and actual institutionalization of individual mental lexicon form a ground for language heteronomy. It makes political sciences a shareholder on the “linguistic competence” market. It means that methodological support of technologies, used in political sphere, serves to develop dynamic criteria of interpretation of different forms of political discourse.

Lacoue-Labarthe (1997) wrote that “*transcendence ends in politics*”. We can suppose that *transcendence* ends in political communication because political science with a common tendency to humanitaristics loses privileges of semantics of “political text” with constant “meaningful” content and becomes the pragmatics of communicative –

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1113079>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1113079>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)