

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА
МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ**

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ДАВЛАТ ЖАҲОН ТИЛЛАРИ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ ҲУЗУРИДАГИ
ЧЕТ ТИЛЛАРИНИ ЎҚИТИШНИНГ ИННОВАЦИЯВИЙ
МЕТОДИКАЛАРИНИ РИВОЖЛАНТИРИШ
РЕСПУБЛИКА ИЛМИЙ-АМАЛИЙ МАРКАЗИ**

ДИСКУРС ТАҲЛИЛИ МОДУЛИДАН

ЎҚУВ-УСЛУБИЙ МАЖМУА

Тузувчи:

доц. У.Б.Азизов

Tashkent– 2015

МУНДАРИЖА

ИШЧИ ЎҚУВ ДАСТУРИ.....	3
МАШҒУЛОТЛАР МАЗМУНИ.....	5
Topic 1: Introduction to the course: what is discourse analysis?	5
Topic 2: Discourse analysis and representation.....	7
Topic 3: Discourse analysis and speech acts (Austin and Searle).....	8
Topic 4: Metaphorical discursive analysis.....	9
Topic 5: Post-structuralist approach (Foucault’s genealogy and Derrida’s deconstruction) and discourse analysis	10
Topic 6: Political discourse analysis	14
Topic 7: Rhetoric discourse analysis.....	17
Topic 8: Non-linguistic approach to discourse analysis	19
Topic 9: The new materialist turn to discourse analysis	21
Topic 10: Discourse analysis in Edward Said’s <i>Orientalism</i>	22
LITERATURE	23

ИШЧИ ЎҚУВ ДАСТУРИ

Кириш

Маълумки, мамлакатимиз мустақиллиги миллий таълим соҳасида ислоҳотлар амалга ошириш учун замин яратди. Зеро бу давргача республикамиз Собих Иттифок таркибига кирар ва унинг таълим соҳасидаги марказлаштирилган, ҳудуд имкониятлари ва минталитети эътиборга олинмаган, мафкуралашган, зарур касбий йўналтиришга эътибор берилмайдиган ҳолатлари амалда эди. Мустақилликнинг илк даврларида мавжуд таълим соҳасидаги ижобий натижаларни сақлаб қолиш ва ўтмишдан қолган мероснинг салбий жиҳатларини ҳамда ўтиш даври билан боғлиқ қийинчиликларни бартараф этиш учун жиддий чоралар кўриш зарур эди.

Зеро, юртбошимиз И.А.Каримов таъкидлаганидек, “Таълим-тарбия тизимини ўзгартирмасдан туриб, биз кўзлаган олий мақсад – озод ва обод жамиятни барпо этиб бўлмас” эди.

Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг ташаббуси билан МДХ давлатларида биринчи бўлиб Ўзбекистон Республикаси таълим соҳасида қатъий ислоҳотлар амалга оширила бошланди. Айниқса “Таълим тўғрисида”ги қонун ва “Кадрлар тайёрлаш” Миллий дастурининг амалга киритилиши янги босқични бошлаб берди. Натижада таълим тизими ва мазмун-моҳияти бозор муносабатлари шароитидан келиб чиқиб такомиллаштирилди. Зеро Собих Иттифок даврида “таълим – бир умрга” тамойили “бешиқдан қабргача илм изла” мақолидан келиб чиққан ҳолда “бир умр таълим” тамойилига алмаштирилди ҳамда узлуксиз таълим концепцияси ва касб-хунар таълимининг ислоҳати самараси ўлароқ меҳнат бозорини муайян касбий кўникмаларга эга шахслар билан таъминлаш имконини берди.

Бундан ташқари таълим соҳаси ҳам бозор муносабатларига мослаштирила бошланди. Зеро таълим соҳасини 100 фоиз давлат бюджетидан амалга оширилган ажратмалар эвазига ташкил этиш бозор қонуниятига талабларига зид эди. Мактабгача таълимда хусусий муассасаларнинг фаолият юритиши, кўп бўлмаса-да айрим хусусий ўрта таълим мактабларининг очилиши, олий ўқув юртларида контракт тўловлари асосида таълимнинг жорий этилиши, касбий ва малака ошириш таълимининг ҳақ эвазига амалга оширилиши соҳада ўзини-ўзи молиялаш тизимини вужудга келтириш учун асос бўлди. Зеро, таълим соҳасида кўрсатиладиган пулли хизматлар таълим берувчиларнинг молиявий қўллаб-қувватланишига, муассасанинг моддий-техника базасини ривожланишига ва соҳада рақобат муҳитини вужудга келишида муҳим омил бўлди.

Республикамизда таълим-тарбия тизимини тубдан ўзгартириш йўлида олиб борилаётган ислоҳотларни амалга ошириш ва бу борада қабул қилинган ҳужжатлар моҳиятини кенг жамоатчилик томонидан чуқур англаб олинishiга ҳар томонлама шароит яратиш - давлат бошқаруви идоралари, таълим-тарбия муассасалари ходимларининг энг долзарб вазифаларидан бири ҳисобланади.

Ушбу дастурда таълим ва тарбия жараёнларини ташкил этиш ва бошқаришнинг меъёрий ҳуқуқий асослари жумладан: Ўзбекистон Республикасининг Конституцияси, Ўзбекистон Республикасининг “Таълим тўғрисида”ги Қонуни, Кадрлар тайёрлаш Миллий дастури, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президентининг фармонлари, қарорлари ва фармойишлари, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Вазирлар Маҳкамасининг қарорлари ва фармойишлари ҳамда олий ва ўрта махсус таълим вазирлигининг буйруқлари баён этилган.

Модулниң мақсади ва вазифалари

“Дискурс тахлили” **модулининг мақсади:** педагог кадрларни қайта тайёрлаш ва малака ошириш курс тингловчиларининг инглиз тилидаги мант тахлили (discourse analysis) қилиш бўйича билимларини такомиллаштиришдан иборатдир.

“Дискурс тахлили” модулининг вазифалари:

- хозирги пайтда Ғарб мамлакатларида ривожланиб бораётган discourse analysis предметининг мақсад ва вазифалари билан таништириш;
- тингловчиларнинг матн таҳлил этиш, матннинг когнитив хусусиятлари билан ишлаш бўйича кўникма ва малакаларини шакллантириш;
- discourse analysis ва унинг структур лингвистикадан (structural linguistics) фарқли томонлари таҳлил этиш ва шу асосида “discourse analysis”нинг тингловчиларга методологиясини очиб бериш.

Модул бўйича тингловчиларнинг билими, кўникмаси, малакаси ва компетенцияларига қўйиладиган талаблар

“Дискурс тахлили” курсини ўзлаштириш жараёнида амалга ошириладиган масалалар доирасида:

Тингловчи:

- дискурс (методология сифатида) тушунчаси;
- дискурс тахлилининг турлари (predicate analysis, metaphorical analysis, deconstruction, genealogy);
- матнни дискурс таҳлил қилиш кўникмаларини эгаллаши;

Модулни ташкил этиш ва ўтказиш бўйича тавсиялар

“Дискурс тахлили” курси амалий машғулотлар шаклида олиб борилади.

Курсни ўқитиш жараёнида таълимнинг замонавий методлари, ахборот-коммуникация технологиялари қўлланилиши назарда тутилган:

- амалий дарсларида замонавий компьютер технологиялари ёрдамида презентацион ва электрон-дидактик технологиялардан фойдаланиш назарда тутилади.

Модулнинг ўқув режадаги бошқа модуллар билан боғлиқлиги ва узвийлиги

“Дискурс тахлил” модули мазмуни ўқув режадаги “Интеграллашган тил кўникмалари амалиёти” ўқув модули билан узвий боғланган ҳолда тингловчиларнинг инглиз тилида мант тахлили – re-reading, interpretation, deconstruction, double reading – бўйича касбий педагогик тайёргарлик даражасини орттиришга хизмат қилади.

МАШФУЈОТЛАР МАЗМУНИ

Course Content

Topic 1: Introduction to the course: what is discourse analysis?

Plan

1. Discourse as a critique of structural linguistics
2. Discourse as a method of analysis of oral and written narratives
3. Discourse as social action

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
<p>Lesson outline: In the 1960s (especially with the critical works of Austin, Searle, Foucault, Derrida), we could observe a fundamental shift from traditional way of interpreting texts. This shift is characterized by the fact that the meaning of a word, sentence, text, etc. is placed within social construction, and not in a word, sentence or text themselves (F de Saussurian linguistics). Thus, to study the meaning of a word, sentence, text is started to be sought within social context, within societal circumstances, dialogic properties of everyday communication. Text as a social action has become a central object of analyzing in discourse analysis.</p>	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -discourse analysis is not a single approach; it can be <u>predicate analysis</u> (Said), <u>metaphorical analysis</u> (Lakoff and Johnson), <u>deconstruction</u> (Derrida), and <u>genealogy</u> (Foucault); -relativism and discourse; discourse analysis as a bearer of Relativist research (there is no absolute truth; subjective value according to differences in perception, culture, etc.); -discourse approaches are based upon 'documents' in the form of: speeches, policy papers; posts, media interviews, books, articles, curricular, etc. -the social manufacture of 'danger', 'threat', and 'fear'; they do not reside in material structures, but in ideational, in the practice of representation through intertextuality, discursive formations. -one starting point is the following quotation from M.Stubbs' textbook, in which discourse analysis is defined as (1) concerned with language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence/utterance, (2) concerned with the interrelationships between language and society (language use in social context) and (3) as concerned with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication.¹ -discourse analysis as a reaction against and as taking enquiry beyond the clause-bound "objects" of grammar and semantics to the level of analysing "utterances", "texts" and "speech events". Discourse analysis foregrounds language use as social action (speech acts), language use as situated performance (language-games), language use as tied to social relations and identities, power, inequality and social struggle, language use as essentially a matter of "practices" (we construct the world rather than passively describe it) rather than just "structures", etc.² -According to Milliken³, discourse refers to 'structures of signification which construct social realities' so that 'things do not mean (the material world does not convey meaning); rather, people construct the meaning of things, using sign systems (predominantly, but not exclusively linguistic)'. <i>Second</i>, Milliken argues that discourse is itself a productive system that produces subjects and their authority to speak and act, shapes different kinds of knowledge practices, and 	

¹ Stubbs (1983:1)

² Slembrouck.

³ Milliken (1999: 227).

enables/disables multiple ways of thinking and doing politics. *Third*, discourse analysis is characterised as efforts ‘made to stabilize and fix dominant meanings’ through the subjugation or exclusion of other forms of knowledge. On this basis, Milliken argues: ‘A discourse analysis should be based upon a set of texts by different people presumed (according to the research focus) to be authorized speakers/writers of a dominant discourse or to think and act within alternative discourses.’⁴

Activity type:

Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

⁴ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:8).

Topic 2: Discourse analysis and representation

Plan

1. What is representation?
2. The relationship between (social) representation and discourse
3. Representation as a social textual intercourse

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
<p>Lesson outline: Within discourse analysis, a linguistic model “signifier-signified” has been changed; now, the meaning of a word is not the “signifier-signifier”, but the “signifier-signifier”. Consequently, the social world – word, sentence, and text – is not “out there”, but that which is represented (constructed) by people. Thus, discourse analysis targets at representations rather than on objects (referents) in the world.</p>	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -representation, which pervades both modern and postmodern social theory, finds its epistemological roots in the evolution of Western thinking since the Enlightenment (reason at the centre) and the scientific revolution⁵; -representation is a set of significations that an observer imposes on the things ‘on the ground’ (representational observation). -constructivist interpretations of rule-based behaviour (thinking that rule-based behaviour is there and try to apply this logic to understand social action); -the taken-for-granted knowledge (observer thinks as such prior to practice and as such imposes certain frameworks on practices) that informs appropriateness necessarily begins as representational and conscious; -rules in language, rules in internalized norms; -the logic of appropriateness deals with norm- and rule-based action conceived “as a matching of a situation to the demands of a position; -Schimmelfennig’s notion of rhetorical action — “the strategic use of norm-based arguments” — follows a similar logic of limited strategic action constrained by constitutive communitarian norms and rules; -a second possibility is to conceive of appropriateness as a logic that relies on reasoned persuasion. Building on Habermas’s theory of communicative action, several constructivists theorize that the “logic of arguing” leads actors to collectively deliberate “whether norms of appropriate behavior can be justified, and that norms apply under given circumstances.” Other constructivists build on the notion of “social learning” to explain the workings of argumentative persuasion in social context; -finally, a third externalist interpretation of appropriateness emphasizes cognitive processes that take place at the level of the human mind. Relying on psychological notions such as the acceptability heuristic, omission bias, and images, Shannon argues that “actors must feel justified to violate a norm to satisfy themselves and the need for a positive self-image, by interpreting the norm and the situation in a way that makes them feel exempt; -overall, most constructivists construe appropriateness as a reflexive logic of action based on thin rationality, reasoned persuasion, or the psychology of compliance (Pouliot: 263). 	
Activity type:	Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

⁵ Pouliot (2008: 260)

Topic 3: Discourse analysis and speech acts (Austin and Searle)

Plan

1. Speech acts as a social action
2. Performative utterances vs. constatives
3. *How to Do Things with Words*

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
Lesson outline: With the work a British philosopher of language John Austin, not all words have started to be considered as constatives, but performatives. While constatives are utterances which describe something outside the text and can therefore be judged true or false), performatives are neither true or false but which bring about a particular social effect by being uttered. Discourse analysis is that which examines what has been brought about by being uttered in a certain social context.	
Lesson content: -it was the particular search for the (purely) constative (utterances which describe something outside the text and can therefore be judged true or false) which prompted John L. Austin to direct his attention to the distinction with so-called performatives, i.e. utterances which are neither true or false but which bring about a particular social effect by being uttered (e.g. "With this ring I thee wed" - by speaking the utterance you perform the act). For a performative to have the desired effect, it has to meet certain social and cultural criteria, also called felicity conditions ⁶ ; -speech acts are social acts (How to do things with words). They do not passively describe the outside reality (what we observe), but they bring this reality into being by saying. -language use as social action. Searle says in this regard: ⁷ theory of language is part of a theory of action, simply because speaking is a rule-governed form of behaviour. -meaning of a word is not in semantics (static), but in social context which is dynamic.	
Activity type:	Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

⁶ Slembrouck.

⁷ Searle (1969: 17).

Topic 4: Metaphorical discursive analysis

Plan

1. Metaphors as a social phenomenon
2. Metaphors are active in constructive the social world
3. *Metaphors we live by*

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
Lesson outline: Within traditional linguistics, metaphors have long been interpreted as words which cause a rhetorical or aesthetic effect on a reader. From a viewpoint of discourse analysis, metaphors are seen as performatives which order the way how people live, think, and act upon the world.	
Lesson content: <p>-<i>Metaphors We Live By</i> changed our understanding of metaphor and its role in language and the mind.</p> <p>-Metaphor, the authors explain, is a fundamental mechanism of mind, one that allows us to use what we know about our physical and social experience to provide understanding of countless other subjects.</p> <p>-Because such metaphors structure our most basic understandings of our experience, they are "metaphors we live by"—metaphors that can shape our perceptions and actions without our ever noticing them.</p> <p>-In this updated edition of Lakoff and Johnson's influential book, the authors supply an afterword surveying how their theory of metaphor has developed within the cognitive sciences to become central to the contemporary understanding of how we think and how we express our thoughts in language.</p> <p>Book description is at: http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3637992.html</p>	
Activity type:	Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

Topic 5: Post-structuralist approach (Foucault's genealogy and Derrida's deconstruction) and discourse analysis

Plan

1. Post-structuralism and its critique of structural linguistics
2. Discourse analysis and genealogy
3. Discourse analysis and deconstruction

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
Lesson outline: Post-structuralist theory of discourse asserts that that the process of meaning making in relation to people and objects is caught up in an infinite play of "horizontal" difference. Meaning is never finally fixed; it is always in an unstable flux.	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Derrida's saying "<i>there is nothing outside the text</i>"; -Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985:108): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that every object is constituted as an object of discourse has nothing to do with whether there is a world external to thought, or with the realism/idealism opposition. An earthquake or the falling of a brick is an event that certainly exists, in the sense that it occurs here and now, independently of my will. But whether their specificity as objects is constructed in terms of 'natural phenomena' or 'expressions of the wrath of God' depends upon the structuring of a discursive field. What is denied is not that such objects exist externally to thought, but the rather different assertion that they could constitute themselves as objects outside any discursive conditions of emergence. -post-structuralist theory of discourse asserts that that the process of meaning making in relation to people and objects is caught up in an infinite play of "horizontal" difference. Meaning is never finally fixed; it is always in an unstable flux; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laclau and Mouffe challenge the 'closure' of the [structuralist] linguistic model, which reduces all elements to the internal moments of the system. This [closure] implies that every social action repeats an already existing system of meanings and practices, in which case there is no possibility of constructing new nodal points that 'partially fix meaning', which is the chief characteristic of an articulatory practice.⁸ -discourse fixes a meaning in a chain of signification which defines an identity of an object. Certain period of time, context structured into discourse (articulatory practice) shape what the meaning of a certain social object/phenomenon. Example, god, nation, bombing, etc. It is these articulatory practices within which certain objects take their sociality make social hegemony possible. Such a discourse never succeeds in imposing completely social order, as it is assumed. -historic or legal facts are discursive constructions. Under this logic, discourse analysis takes its importance; -post-structuralism came with a critique towards structural linguistics of F. de Saussure, who argued that language is just one among many systems of signs (e.g. visual forms of communication). Linguistics, therefore, should be seen a sub-discipline of the wider, overarching discipline of semiotics, the science of sign systems; -Derrida and deconstruction; -when Derrida refers to 'text', '(inter)textuality' or 'the generalised text', he does not limit this to 'the graphic, nor to the book . . . and even less to the semantic, representational, symbolic, ideal, or ideological sphere'; 	

⁸ Slembrouck.

-the concept of the generalised text opens up his analysis of difference – the endlessly differing and deferring nature of meaning in chains of signification – across those artificial divides;

-Derrida's treatment of the generalised text as a field of forces takes on added significance for political analysis and IR. It points to the way in which meaning, identity, and subjectivity are always constituted through force. This is where the ethical-political dimension of deconstruction is perhaps most obvious: it calls for detailed attention to all moves that entail closures in the attempt to delimit a specific context;

-what Derrida offers, then, is a deconstruction of the language/materiality binary within which both matter and language are typically framed. Far from negating material factors, a Derridean approach provides for an alternative theorisation of matter and language as mutually constituted-to deconstruct oppositions – binary oppositions structure the reality;

-for Derrida, the signifier animal is an 'appellation that men have instituted' in order to imbue humanity with the authority to authorise its own privileged status. In turn the human/animal distinction – neither a purely linguistic nor material 'discourse' – permits violence globally: 'genetic experimentation ..., the industrialization of what can be called the production for consumption of animal meat, artificial insemination on a massive scale, . . . the reduction of the animal not only to production and overactive reproduction . . . all . . . in the service of a certain being and putative human well-being of man'. Far from being locked inside a world of linguistics, in this example Derrida takes as his focus the violent zoopolitical architectures of late modern capitalism in order to diagnose what is at stake in the (re)production of the 'human' today – central not only for those interested in animal welfare, but the inter-national politics of human rights, human security, and humanitarianism⁹;

-Foucault:

-for Foucault, the humanist discourses of modernity are knowledge systems which inform institutionalised technologies of power. Foucault's main interest is therefore in the origins of the modern human sciences (psychiatry, medicine, sexuology, etc.), the rise of their affiliated institutions (the clinic, the prison, the asylum, etc.) and how the production of truth is governed by discursive power regimes. The latter, however, should not be understood exclusively in "language"-terms (cf. the attention he pays to the power-dimensions of the ways buildings are designed). Foucault's work can be divided into three stages: **archaeology**, **genealogy** and **post-modern ethics**¹⁰;

-archaeology:

-the production of scientific truth cannot be separated from the discourse formations of scientific disciplines (applied by Foucault to psychiatry and the birth of modern medical science). Particularly relevant to discourse analysis is Foucault's insistence on a reversal of the subject-statement relationship: the subject has to conform to the conditions dictated by the statement before s/he can become the speaker of it (in other words, **the structures of discourse prevail over human agency**). Archaeological analysis reveals that the notion of a subject who exists prior to language and is the origin of all meaning is an illusion, created by the structural rules that govern discursive formations¹¹;

-Foucault says: If there is one approach that I do reject [it is the one] which gives absolute priority to the observing subject, which attributes a constituent role to an act, which places its own point of view at the origin of all historicity - which, in short, leads to a transcendental consciousness. It

⁹ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015: 23-4).

¹⁰ Slembrouck.

¹¹ Slembrouck.

seems to me that the historical analysis of scientific discourse, in the last resort, be subject, not to a theory of the knowing subject, but rather to a theory of discursive practice¹²;

-meaning does not originate in the speaking subject; instead it is governed by the formative rules of discourses. Thus, the speaking subject is "de-centred";

-the acquisition of social identities is a process of immersion into discursive practice and being subjected to discursive practice. For instance, the process of becoming a teacher is a process in which a novice gradually adopts and subjects him/herself to the multiple modes of speaking and writing which are available in the teaching profession¹³;

-genealogy:

-genealogy is not as a form of 'discourse analysis' that merely traces the historical usages of different words;

-Michel Foucault's genealogical method: to focus on the deconstruction of conditions of possibility of dominant problematisations in a specific socio-political context, in short, an interest in dissolving power/knowledge complexes in order to know how what is discoursed has power and truth claim;

-the focus is now on truth/power regimes with particular reference to bodily practices (applied by Foucault to the "objectifying" practices of prisons and the "subjectifying" discourses of sexuality;

-the body is the inscribed surface of events (traced by language and dissolved by ideas), the locus of a dissociated self (adopting the illusion of a substantial unity), and a volume in perpetual disintegration. Genealogy, as an analysis of descent, is thus situated within the articulation of the body and history. Its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and the processes of history's destruction of the body¹⁴;

-here Foucault¹⁵ moves to the core of the institutionalised power techniques in modern societies, in particular the role of its key "discursive technologies": (i) the "confession" (cf. the salience of counselling & therapy-oriented practices in institutions) and the (ii) "examination" (cf. the salience of all kinds of recordkeeping for different purposes as central to everyday, routine practices and decision-making within modern institutions);

-power and discourse analysis: For Foucault, power does not repress or separate the haves from the have-nots. Instead, power produces and its working is "capillary" - using a similar metaphor: it flows through the veins of society, permeating all levels. See, for instance, Foucault¹⁶ (1980:96):

Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here and there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power;

-Foucault is sometimes associated with a narrow conception of discourse – one mainly concerned with language, meaning-making practices, and the politics of representation. This dimension of his work is perhaps most evident in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*(1969), where Foucault dispenses with 'things' and focuses instead on the linguistic conditions that enable certain objects to emerge, acquire meaning, and gain significance;

-Foucault also pays to materiality according to Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams: One example of how Foucault explores the radical interplay of language and materiality is his

¹² Foucault (1973a:172).

¹³ Slembrouck.

¹⁴ Slembrouck.

¹⁵ Foucault (1984:83).

¹⁶ Foucault (1980: 96).

examination of practices that render things visible as well as articulable. Emerging in the second half of the eighteenth century, disciplinary power de-ployed punishment mainly as a technique for the coercion of bodies, with the aim of making those bodies into useful parts of society. Instead of being the king's property, the body of the 'condemned man' became the 'property of society, the object of a collective and useful appropriation'. The forms of punishment involved in this process included: the correction of behaviour; training the habits of the body; controlling the body through surveillance; and targeting the 'soul' of the body as something that must be punished and ultimately set free. When explaining the emergence of disciplinary power Foucault points among other things to the various practices involved in rendering the crime as well as the criminal visible. The primary example of such practices can be found in the spatial arrangement of the 'modern prison', which made it possible to 'establish presences and absences, to know where and how to locate individuals, to set up useful communications, to interrupt others, to be able at each moment to supervise the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities and merits;

- As Deleuze noted, by rendering the crime and the criminal visible through the architectural figure of the Panopticon the prison does not only 'display the crime and the criminal but in itself it constitutes a visibility, it is a system of light before being a figure in stone'. There is in this sense a certain materiality of the prison, which is directly linked to the production of a mode of visibility, gaze, or way of seeing. The materiality of the prison belongs to its architectural form and spatial arrangement as a specific 'system of light'. It is a system that, moreover, must be grasped as an 'instrument and vector of power'. The same point can be made in relation to other material arrangements such as hospitals, factories, and schools. According to Foucault, all of these institutions were based on a particular gaze or mode of seeing that emerged in the eighteenth century, with the purpose of controlling and correcting the behaviour of patients, workers and schoolchildren, in accordance with the mechanisms of disciplinary power. In this way, rather than 'representing' the content and meaning of the 'visible', language and ideational factors can be said to interact with material practices of rendering things visible. Both forms of practices must be taken into account and seen as important when analysing the way disciplinary power works and manifests itself. The latter happens both by making it possible to speak in a certain way: to name and categorise criminals, students, and workers; and by imposing a particular gaze or mode of seeing to render their bodies visible through surveillance. Both seeing and saying – the visible and the articulable – participate in the mechanisms of disciplinary power¹⁷;

Activity type:

Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

¹⁷ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:20).

Topic 6: Political discourse analysis

Plan

1. Essentialism and its critique
2. Discursivity of an object
3. Discourse as a what to analyze power in societies

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
<p>Lesson outline: Political discourse analysis distances from <i>essentialism</i> in linguistics. According to <i>essentialism</i>, the idea that a society or the subjects/objects that we encounter in social life, have fixed essences that represent <i>what</i> these subjects/objects are. As against essentialism, discourse theorists draw upon the writings of Foucault, Derrida, to stress the contingency (not fixed and universal) of subjectivity/objectivity, as well as the primacy of politics and power in its formation.</p>	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <p>-political Discourse Theory (PDT) stems initially from attempts by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe¹⁸ to use the work of Gramsci and Althusser to tackle problems of class reductionism and economic determinism in Marxist theory, that is, the problem of <i>essentialism</i>: the idea that a society, human subject, or the objects that we encounter in social life, have fixed essences that exhaust <i>what</i> these entities are. As against essentialism, discourse theorists draw upon the writings of Foucault, Derrida, Lacan, and Žižek to stress <u>the contingency and historicity</u> of objectivity, as well as the primacy of politics and power in its formation¹⁹;</p> <p>-but <i>what</i> is discourse in this approach? Let us begin by recalling some of the opening remarks of the <i>Philosophical Investigations</i>, in which Wittgenstein asks us to imagine a builder A and an assistant B building with assorted stones: A calls out the words ‘block’, ‘slab’, ‘beam’ and ‘pillar’, and B passes the stones to A who inserts them into the building or wall. Wittgenstein calls this ‘whole’, consisting of both ‘language and the actions into which it is woven’ a ‘language-game’ (Wittgenstein 1967: 4). In a microcosmic form, what Wittgenstein calls a ‘language game’ more or less corresponds to what we call a ‘discourse’ or a ‘discursive structure’. We can flesh out at least four features of this idea²⁰;</p> <p>-first, as John Dryzek suggests, ‘discourse is a shared way of apprehending the world’, which ‘enables those who subscribe to it to interpret bits of information and put them together into coherent stories or accounts’ (Dryzek 1997, p. 8). Each discourse rests on certain assumptions, judgments, and contentions that provide the basic terms for analysis, debate, agreement and disagreement about an object. Natural, physical and cultural objects are thus understood and acquire meaning in discourses;</p> <p>-but, secondly, discourse is not <i>only</i> about representations and systems of meaning, where the latter are understood in purely cognitive or ideational terms. This is because discourse is also an <i>ontological</i> category in PDT that captures something about the <i>character</i> of the objectivity and social relations. Hence the idea of a language game highlights the fact that discourses are <i>relational configurations</i> of elements that comprise agents (or subjects), words and actions. These elements are individuated and rendered intelligible within the <i>context</i> of a particular practice, namely, the activity of constructing the wall. Each element acquires meaning only in relation to the others;</p> <p>-when formalised, a third feature of the concept of discourse is that the relational and differential character of language holds for <i>all</i> signifying or meaningful structures. Here the work of linguists like Louis Hjelmslev and the Copenhagen School of Linguistics are of particular importance. This</p>	

¹⁸ Laclau and Mouffe (1985)

¹⁹ Glynos, Howarth, Norval, and Speed (2009: 7).

²⁰ Glynos, Howarth, Norval, and Speed (2009: 7).

does not mean that everything *is* language, but rather that the properties of language hold for all meaningful structures. Institutions like states or governance networks can be conceptualized as more or less sedimented systems of discourse, that is, partially fixed systems of rules, norms, resources, practices and subjectivities that are linked together in particular ways;

-finally, drawing on Derrida and Lacan, proponents of PDT stress the *radical contingency* and *structural undecidability* of discursive structures. This arises because they assume that all systems of meaning are in a fundamental sense lacking. And this absence or negativity prevents the full constitution of discursive structures. In their jargon, every structure is thus dislocated. This ‘out of joint-ness’ is evident in particular *events* that show their incompleteness. In short, then, objects of discourse are radically contingent constructs, not essential; they can be interpreted and understood in many different ways;

-another prominent example of discourse as language can be found in Richard Jackson’s *Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-Terrorism* (2005, Manchester University Press), which claims to employ a ‘critical discourse analysis’ approach to the language of the war unleashed by the US in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001. Jackson argues that what marks out his approach as ‘critical’ is his insistence that ‘the language of the war on terrorism is not simply an objective or neutral reflection of reality’. Rather, he emphasises that it is a ‘carefully constructed discourse’, which creates the world it refers to thereby harnessing one of the key insights of the linguistic turn that language is constitutive of reality. On this view, the discourse of the war on terrorism is said to be ‘a deliberately and meticulously composed set of words, assumptions, metaphors, grammatical forms, myths and forms of knowledge’²¹;

-‘In *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (1992) and *National Deconstruction: Violence, Identity and Justice in Bosnia* (1998) Campbell offers an examination of how the identity of subjects and the meaning of threats, dangers, and enemies are constituted through practices of representation and interpretation. Drawing on Laclau and Mouffe’s concept of discourse, as well as Foucault’s notion of the discursive formation of objects, Campbell says that he does not deny the existence of an external material reality. However, he argues that such a reality has no meaning in and of itself, which, in turn, entails that it cannot constitute a political force independently of the ways in which we speak and try to make sense of ‘it’: ‘the world exists independently of language, . . . but we can never know that (beyond the fact of its assertion), because the existence of the world is literally inconceivable outside of language and our traditions of interpretation’. As Campbell puts it in *National Deconstruction*: ‘There’s no way of bringing into being and comprehending non-linguistic phenomena except through discursive practices.’ By analyzing practices of representation, he does not seek an objective way of representing or interpreting an external reality as found in some Realist IR scholarship. Rather, Campbell is concerned with exploring how different practices of representation and interpretation constitute aspects of social life that they otherwise merely purport to describe’²²;

-Lene Hansen’s *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War* (2006) aims to explore ‘poststructuralist discourse analysis’ and its application to the study of Western debates about the Bosnian conflict. Hansen claims to build her theoretical approach on the work of poststructural thinkers including Foucault, Derrida, Kristeva, and Laclau and Mouffe. She invokes the concept of ‘intertextuality’, attributed to Kristeva, in order to refer to the way that ‘the meaning of a text is . . . never fully given by the text itself but is always a product of other readings and interpretations’²³;

²¹ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:9).

²² Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:9).

²³ Hansen (2006: 55).

-“It is only through the construction in language that “things” – objects, subjects, states, living beings, and material structures – are given meaning and endowed with a particular identity”²⁴;
 -‘an inter-textual understanding of foreign policy argues that texts build their arguments and authority through references to other texts: by making direct quotes or by adopting key concepts and catchphrases’. “References in this context to ‘direct quotes’, ‘key concepts’, and ‘catchphrases’ are all indicative of a language-based understanding of ‘discourse’ throughout Hansen’s book. ... Such a view follows from Hansen’s assertion that ‘discourse analysis has . . . a discursive epistemology, and its methodology is, as a consequence, located at the level of explicit articulations’. Therefore, despite Hansen’s ostensible commitment to intertextuality as understood in the context of poststructuralist scholarship, it is in fact a **much narrower version** of discourse that arguably characterises *Security as Practice*”²⁵.

Activity type:

Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

²⁴ Hansen (2006: 41).

²⁵ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:10).

Topic 7: Rhetoric discourse analysis

Plan

1. Rhetoric and discourse analysis
2. Rhetoric and the role of addressee in it
3. Speech acts and Rhetorical discourse analysis

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
<p>Lesson outline: Rhetorical analysis in politics is concerned with argumentation and how this argumentation defines power/knowledge relations. Drawing on speech act theory, attention is given to the analysis of the constitution of various speaking positions / positions of enunciation in the speech situation, as well as the constitution of the addressee of an argument.</p>	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -rhetorical analysis in politics is concerned with argumentation; -drawing on speech act theory, attention is given to the analysis of rhetorical situations in which argument takes place (Finlayson 2007), the constitution of various speaking positions/ positions of enunciation in the speech situation, (Austin 1986; Foucault 1972) as well as the constitution of the addressee of an argument; -rhetorical style concerns the ‘arrangement of the narrative’. Specific political events may throw up very specific narratives, ‘but there are also broader and subtler narratives’ that stand in need of analysis. Here again RPA echoes wider concerns in the analysis of rhetorical styles in politics, in particular the classical writings of Hirschman (1991) on the rhetoric of reaction. RPA, however, also seeks to build upon its Aristotelian roots to furnish us with a picture of different styles of political argumentation as featuring differing combinations of <i>logos</i>, <i>ethos</i> and <i>pathos</i>; -hence, drawing on classical rhetoric, but without the <i>a priori</i> privileging of <i>logos</i>, it delineates three modes of rhetorical appeal: ethos-centric, pathos-centric and logos-centric. In politics, logocentric analysis, it is argued, relies not on syllogisms, but on enthymemes (three-part deductive argument) or quasi-logical arguments based on premises that are probable rather than certain. Drawing on Skinner’s work on classical rhetoric, Finlayson notes that in politics enthymemes often rely on what Cicero has called commonplaces²⁶ (Skinner 1996), which are either activated or deactivated (Finlayson 2007: 558). For Finlayson (2007: 558) this means that one of the tasks of RPA is to ‘identify how commonplaces become accepted and employed in the reasoning processes of political actors and in the arguments they then employ with others’; -ethos-centric styles of argumentation refer to and rely on the character of the speaker or on their authority, as for instance, ‘when someone claims expertise, experience or qualifications to be well-situated to address a particular issue; (Finlayson 2007: 558); or relies on trust respect, authority, honesty, credibility (Gottweis 2006: 243). In poststructuralist terms, this echoes Foucault’s concern with the enunciative position of a speaker. For instance, Presidential speeches may too be ethos-centric, meaning that ‘the speaking subject will adopt the role of authority and will often perform this role connected to his position or function in the institutional hierarchy of the state’ (Gottweis 2006: 246); -pathos-centric styles of argumentation function to move the speaker, and concerns empathy, sympathy and sensibilities (Gottweis 2006: 243). This is a particularly potent form of argument in a media-age and, hence, one which is treated with a fair degree of circumspection by analysts. In a pathos-centric mode, emotions play a central role, e.g. public hearings where interested parties present their views (e.g. public hearings where ‘sufferers’ are presented); 	

²⁶ A statement or bit of knowledge that is commonly shared by members of an audience or a community.

-the constitution of the subjectivity of the addressee as well as of the speaker is often analysed in post-structuralist-inspired analyses that take up insights from speech act theory. Against essentialist understandings of meanings and of the nature and character of political identities, post-structuralist RPA emphasizes the constitutive character of rhetoric/discourse. Hence, attention is given not only to the content and styles of argumentation, but also the ways in which different subject positions are constituted in the very process of political argumentation. This is true both for the constitution of the identity of the addressee as well as of the speaker.²⁷

Activity type:

Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

²⁷ Glynos, Howarth, Norval, and Speed (2009: 13-17).

Topic 8: Non-linguistic approach to discourse analysis

Plan

1. Nonlinguistic dimensions of discourse
2. Photographs as a text
3. Sinification and discursive formations

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
<p>Lesson outline: Some authors Hansen and Campbell took various attempts to conceptualise discourse so that it is inclusive of nonlinguistic dimensions of contemporary political life. We can point at such nonlinguistic dimensions of discourse analysis as (the effects of) photographs which in different social contexts reproduce the violence of disasters, famine, war, etc. These nonlinguistic dimensions of discourse also cause meanings, order social life, bring new significations about.</p>	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <p>-“It might be argued that a potentially expanded treatment of the concept of discourse may be found in some of Hansen’s and Campbell’s more recent works. Both authors have made various attempts to conceptualise discourse so that it is inclusive of nonlinguistic dimensions of contemporary political life: for example, the effects of photographs in reproducing the violence of disasters, famine, and war in the case of Campbell²⁸; and the otherwise overlooked role that visual phenomena play in acts of securitisation – as exemplified by the 2005 Danish cartoon crisis – in the case of Hansen”²⁹;</p> <p>-<u>Campbell:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the effects of photographs in reproducing the violence of disasters, famine, and war: Focusing on elements of the news media, film and documentary photography, this article explores how these diverse genres have contributed to the expression of collective identity. -the state is an artefact of a continual process of reproduction that performatively constitutes its identity. The inscription of boundaries, the articulation of coherence, and the identification of threats to its sense of self can be located in and driven by the official discourses of government. -reproduction also takes place in sites as ‘unofficial’ as art, film and literature. -As Michael Shapiro argues, cultural governance involves support for diverse genres of expression to constitute and legitimise practices of sovereignty, while restricting or preventing those representations that challenge sovereignty.³⁰ -In this sense, cultural governance is a set of historical <i>practices of representation</i> – involving the state but never fully controlled by the state – in which the struggle for the state’s identity is located. <p>-“However, while the move to consider visual phenomena may indeed extend discourse analysis beyond an exclusive focus on language, Campbell’s and Hansen’s treatments of images nevertheless continue to work within the framework of the politics of representation. In other words, despite adding visual phenomena to the study of discourse they recycle rather than displace the distinction between meaning-making practices on the one hand and an external material world ‘in need’ of representation on the other. Thus, despite the move to the visual, they continue to</p>	

²⁸ Campbell (2003).

²⁹ Hansen (2011).

³⁰ Michael J. Shapiro, *Methods and Nations: Cultural Governance and the Indigenous Subject* (New York: Routledge, 2004), especially chs. 4–6.

downplay the possibility that the discourse analyst may be interested in the role materiality might play politically beyond meaning-making practices. In other words, the place of materiality is still secondary to the politics of representation through which it acquires political significance".³¹

Activity type:

Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

³¹ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:11).

Topic 9: The new materialist turn to discourse analysis

Plan

1. Objects and discourse analysis
2. Objects as meaning-making entities
3. Objectified subjects and discourse analysis

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
<p>Lesson outline: Some scholars (Bennett, for example) criticize discourse analysis which underpins the politics of representation – that ‘things are always already humanized objects’. Bennett moves beyond the representational model of language: things are not reducible to the contexts in which (human) subjects set them, but they also meaning-making objects by themselves, i.e. how, for example, buildings are built or how technologies are developed order the way how people discourse about the social reality.</p>	
<p>Lesson content:</p> <p>-from Bennett’s perspective³², ‘this is not a world, in the first instance, of subjects and objects, but of various materialities constantly engaged in a network of relations’. ... Bennett’s move is to contest the common assumption – and one that undergirds the approach to discourse analysis as the politics of representation – that ‘things are always already humanized objects’. ... Bennett moves beyond the representational model of language: things are ‘not entirely reducible to the contexts in which (human) subjects set them, never exhausted by their semiotics³³;</p> <p>-more recently Coward has developed his treatment of contemporary urban politics via an explicit engagement with Bennett’s work on the vibrancy of matter. He draws on the idea of the city as a complex ecology to discuss how global urbanisation poses a direct challenge to the way contemporary citizenship is usually imagined. Instead of viewing the citizen as an autonomous, atomised individual – as Coward claims is usually the case in political theory – subjects are rethought as part of ‘an assemblage composed of human and non-human materials’. Thus, he argues, ‘the shopper is . . . part of a wider assemblage that includes the trucks/planes that transport goods, the electricity station that lights the supermarket, and the personal computer through which consumption is shaped (and perhaps performed via online ordering)’. What emerges from this vitalist-materialist perspective is a decentring of the citizen-subject such that life in the city is connected by and forms part of a complex infrastructural assemblage. This alternative diagnosis has manifold implications for the way in which we think about citizenship, ethical obligations to human and nonhuman others, and the politics of who and/or what is included/excluded from vital infrastructures that knit political communities together³⁴;</p> <p>- the performativity of ‘things’.</p>	
Activity type:	Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

³² Bennett (2004).

³³ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:13-14).

³⁴ Lundborg and Vaughan-Williams (2015:15).

Topic 10: Discourse analysis in Edward Said's *Orientalism*

Plan

1. Discursive approach in literature
2. Discursive approach in *Orientalism*
3. Orientalism is a way to discourse about the Orient

Length: One hour and twenty minutes	Number of learners: 18
Lesson outline: The last practical class of discourse analysis is dedicated to interpreting a discursive approach taken (in his <i>Orientalism</i>) by a leading literary critics of the last quarter of the 20th century, professor of English and comparative literature at Columbia University, New York. <i>Orientalism</i> , a critical study of cultural representations, is an accumulated discursive knowledge of the Occident (West) with regard to the Orient (East).	
Lesson content: -Orientalism is a critical study of the cultural representations -it is the Western discursive knowledge about the East -Orientalism is a discursive frame through which things in the Orient get their social representation -discourse analysis allows to examine how things in terms of Orientalism have been historically ordered in the Western scholarship	
Activity type:	Individual, small group, whole class (professor-listeners)

LITERATURE

- Adler, Emanuel. 1992. "The Emergence of Cooperation: National Epistemic Communities and the International Evolution of the Idea of Nuclear Arms Control." *International Organizations* 46 (1): 101-145.
- . 2007. "Imagined (Security) Communities: Cognitive Regions in International Relations." In *International Security*, edited by Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, Volume III, 340-367. London: SAGE.
- Austin, John. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Azizov, Ulugbek. 2015. *Freeing from the "Territorial Trap": Re-reading the "Five Stans" Central Asian Spatial Discourse*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- . 2015. *Конструктивизм в международных отношениях: интерпретация Николаса Онуфа, Фридриха Кратохвила и Александра Вендта*. Санкт-Петербург, Россия: Алетейя.
- Bennett, Jane. 2004. "The Force of Things: Steps Towards an Ecology of Matter." *Political Theory* 32(3): 347–72.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1980) 2008. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. California, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Campbell, David. 1992. *Writing Security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- . 2003. "Cultural Governance and Pictorial Resistance: Reflections on the Imaging of War." *Review of International Studies* 29(S1): 57–73.
- Collins, H.M. 2001. "What is tacit knowledge?" In *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, edited by Theodore R. Schatzki, Kanin Knorr Cetina and Eike Von Savigny, 107-119. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1973a. *The Birth of the Clinic: an Archaeology of Medical Perception*. London: Tavistock.
- . 1973b. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Science*. New York: Vintage Books.
- . 1979. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books.
- . (1969) 2002. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by Tavistock Publication Limited. London: Routledge.
- . 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. 1980 (ed. C. Gordon). Brighton: Harvester.
- . 1984. "Nietzsche, genealogy, history." In: P. Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Glynos, Jason, David Howarth, Aletta Norval, and Ewen Speed. 2009. "Discourse Analysis: Varieties and Methods." Centre for Theoretical Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Essex.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1984. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Volume one, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- . (1987) 2005. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Volume two, translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hansen, Lene. 2006. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- . 2011. "The Politics of Securitization and the Muhammed Cartoon Crisis: A Post-structuralist Perspective," *Security Dialogue* 42(4–5): 357–69.

- . 2011 “Theorizing the Image for Security Studies: Visual Securitization and the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis.” *European Journal of International Relations* 17(1): 51–74.
- Howe, R.B.K. 1994. “A Social-Cognitive Theory of Desire.” *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior* 24 (1): 1-23.
- Jost, John. 1995. “Toward a Wittgensteinian social psychology of human development.” *Theory and Psychology* 5 (1): 5-25.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Laclau Ernesto & Mouffe Chantal, 1985. *Hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Lundborg, Tom and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2015. “New materialisms, discourse analysis, and International Relations: a radical intertextual approach.” *Review of International Studies* 41: 3-25.
- Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. “The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods.” *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (2): 225–54.
- Neumann, B. Iver. 2002. “Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy.” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31 (3): 627-651.
- Pouliot, Vincent. 2008. “The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities.” *International Organization* 62(2): 257-288.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1990. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally, translated and annotated by Roy Harris. London: Duckworth.
- Searle, John. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1975. “A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts.” In *Language, Mind and Knowledge*, edited by Keith Gunderson, Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol. VII, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1979. *Expression and Meaning: studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1998. *Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in the Real World*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 2011. *Making the Social World: the Structure of Human Civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Slembrouck, Stef. (1998-2003). What is meant by discourse analysis?.
- Smith, Steve. 1996. ‘Positivism and beyond’ in *International theory: positivism and beyond*, Edited by Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, 11-44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steffek, Jens. 2010. “Norms, Persuasion and the New German Idealism in IR.” In *On Rules, Politics and Knowledge*, edited by Oliver Kessler, Rodney Bruce Hall, Cecelia Lynch and Nicholas Onuf, 191-201. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stubbs, Michael, 1983. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Walker R.B.J. 1993. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. (1922) 2014. *Tractatus Logico-philosophicus*. Translated by D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness. New York: Routledge.
- . 1958. *Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.