

Political Discourses in Contrast

Conveners

Daniel Z. Kadar Dalian University of Foreign Languages/Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Juliane House Hellenic American University, Athens/University of Hamburg

Email: dannier@dlufl.edu.cn ; jhouse@fastmail.fm

1. Overview

This workshop aims to merge contrastive pragmatics and the study of language and politics. While language and politics has studied data drawn from various languages and cultures in parallel (see e.g. Wodak et al. 2013), no large-scale attempt has been made to contrastively examine the pragmatics of politics in various linguacultures, in spite of the fact that, in the field of contrastive pragmatics, contrastive discourse analysis has been one of the most important areas. The workshop will fill this knowledge gap, by bringing together various studies written by some of the best-known experts of the pragmatics of politics. The studies will examine political data drawn from a range of cultures, and from various contexts and time periods.

The event will be hosted by the Research Institute for Linguistics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (Benczur utca 33, Budapest, Hungary 1068), at the main lecture hall of the Institute (Ground Floor). Participation is free of charge.

2. Programme

Each talk is 40 minutes long and is followed by a 10 minutes Q&A session, plus 5 minutes technical break.

10:00 – 10:30 *The Contrastive Pragmatics of Politics* (Daniel Kadar, Juliane House)

10:35 – 11:15 *Political Discourses in Contrast* (Paul Chilton)

11:30 – 12: 10 *Rhetorical Devices in Political Speeches* (Peter Bull)

12:30 – 13:45 *Lunch Break*

13:45 – 14: 25 *Political Speech Acts in Contrast: The Case of Condemnations in International Relation* (Zohar Kampf)

14:40 – 15:20 *A Contrastive Analysis of the Use of “Strategic” in Populist Communication* (Themis Kaniklidou)

15:35–16:15 *Contrastive Historical Pragmatics and Politics: The Case Study of German and Japanese War Apologies* (Daniel Kadar and Juliane House)

16:30–17:15 *The Development of the Concept of ‘Nationalism’ in China – A Contrastive Pragmatic Perspective* (Dan Han)

18:05 – 18:40 *Focus on the Perlocutionary - Contrastive Discourse Analysis in Global Times* (Claire Kramsch) via Skype

18:40 – 19:00 *Discussion* (convened by Juliane House and Daniel Kadar)

Abstracts

Political Discourses in Contrast

Paul Chilton (Warwick University)

What does “democracy” mean? This word is a prime candidate for contrastive study. In the UK it is used by political parties of left, right and centre alike, as if they all meant the same thing by it. But do they? I shall contrastively examine the varying meanings of “democracy” as evidenced in current campaigning materials. The aim is to elucidate how divergent concepts and values are obscured under a single lexeme and to reflect on the implications for the stability of political discourse in the UK. My presentation will also consider what methods of semantic analysis are available and productive.

Focus on the perlocutionary - Contrastive discourse analysis in global times

Claire Kramersch (UC Berkeley)

Communicative language teaching (CLT) has predominantly put the focus on the locutionary form and illocutionary force of utterances but largely ignored their perlocutionary effects. And yet globalization forces us to consider such effects. A shift toward the perlocutionary would require much greater attention given to context and recipient design in communicative language use as well as to interpretation as a performative process. The paper takes as data a particular speech act by Donald Trump and its perlocutionary effect both on his addressee and on the readers of the incident as reported in the *New York Times* , *Le Monde* and *Die Zeit* in their online versions. It shows the value of contrastive discourse analysis as a research tool for studying political discourse in global times. It also shows what pedagogical purchase can be gained by focussing on perlocutionary acts and effects in CLT, rather than exclusively on locutionary and illocutionary acts.

Rhetorical Devices in Political Speeches

Peter Bull (Universities of York & Salford, UK)

The paper will present a review and theoretical integration of research conducted by the author and colleagues on speaker-audience interaction, based on the microanalysis of videorecorded political speeches delivered in the UK, USA, Japan, Korea, France, and Norway. The principal focus is on rhetorical devices used by speakers to invite audience applause, but also included are other audience responses, such as laughter, cheering, chanting and booing. Overall, it is argued that many of the cross-cultural differences in the behaviour of both speakers and audiences at these political rallies reflect distinctive features of both individualist and collectivist societies.

Political Speech Acts in Contrast: The Case of Condemnations in International Relation

Zohar Kampf (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

This paper adopts a contrastive perspective in studying political speech acts. Our analysis looks at the role of condemnations - evaluative speech acts designed to 'mobilize shame' by publicizing disapproval of an alleged transgression - in advancing moral discourse and transforming power relations in both national and global arenas. Comparing the discourses of condemnation voiced by a variety of institutional actors (B'Tselem, BDS, UN, and EU) against Israel's violations of human rights, we trace stylistic and functional differences among the four organizations' epideictic of blame, explain how do public manifestations of disapproval construct and constructed by particular and universal moral scripts, and demonstrate the benefits of studying political speech acts contrastively.

A contrastive analysis of the use of “strategic” in populist communication

Themis Kaniklidou (Hellenic American University)

This contribution analyzes the use of *strategic* in populist political speeches. I argue that *strategic* is a discourse marker that assigns overtones of centrist populism to a more traditional left-wing populist ideology. It will be shown how it is used in English and Greek political speeches to build trust with 'the people' and essentially operating as a mechanism for increasing legitimization for policies underway. I argue that the semantic associations established between the business domain and that of politics, by the consistent use of the lexical item *strategic*, in various collocational clusters, is key for the audience rapport with political actor

Contrastive Historical Pragmatics and Politics: The Case Study of German and Japanese War Apologies

Daniel Kadar a& Juliane House

In this paper, we will merge historical and contrastive pragmatics by looking at the linguistic realization of apologies given by the representatives of the German and Japanese states respectively. Our preliminary findings show that the nature of the apologies offered by German politicians mostly refrain from explicitly apologizing, resorting instead to a strategy of accepting responsibility for the atrocities the Third Reich committed in the name of the German people. In addition, German apologies operate with the strategies of giving explanation or account. The Japanese apologies, however, are mostly explicit. Through our contrastive analysis will set up a model by means of which political apologies can be studied across linguacultures.

The Development of the Concept of ‘Nationalism’ in China – A Contrastive Pragmatic Perspective

Dan Han Dalian University of Foreign Languages and Hungarian Academy of Sciences

‘Nationalism’ has been featured as an essentially negative phenomenon in Western media and culture. However, to many in the Chinese linguaculture there is essentially nothing wrong with “being nationalist”. Thus, the study of Chinese ‘nationalism’ as a concept begs for a contrastive pragmatic analysis, and it also s raises self-reflexive questions, such as whether we can accept Western value systems to analyze data drawn from other countries. To examine this phenomenon, I will analyze Chinese leaders’ speeches centered on nationalism. I will focus on two issues: 1) What are the metaterms that Chinese leaders apply in contexts in which ‘nationalism’ emerges? 2) How have concepts (rather than a single concept) of ‘nationalism’ evolve over the modern history of China?