

Semantic Strategies as a Means of Politics: Linguistic Approaches to the Analysis of "semantic struggles"

1. Introduction

Political power and its exertion by the various agencies of politics (i.e. politicians, civil servants, political institutions) can be described as a kind of symbolic action (cf. Edelman 1964, 1971). Social and political reality, its perception or constitution by the participants of politics (politicians and citizens), is shaped and determined by communication and its means. That is, it is shaped by linguistic expressions provided by the language of public discourse. This language opens and restricts due to the semantic rules of its linguistic signs the possibilities of constituting symbolic meaning and sense within a range of socially accepted definitions of political and social reality. Linguistic sense within a discourse can only be socially effective if it is an intersubjectively accepted sense. The constitution of public sense as a part of the process of linguistic communication is an important part of linguistic action. This semantic (or semiotic) constitution of public sense can determine which social and political events and facts are accepted (and with which connotations) as a part of social reality, which are "existent" (in a certain sense of that term) and which are not. In other words, the semantic possibilities of linguistic signs correspond to the form (the view) of reality admitted by society. Politicians or political agencies wanting to influence the publicly accepted view of political reality will try to dominate the linguistic possibilities within the discourse of politics (cf. Edelman 1964; Mey 1979, 423). Thus language (especially the semantics of political terminology) becomes a means of political action: the so-called "semantic struggles" are born (cf. Dieckmann 1975). To succeed in determining the social interpretation (or definition) of political reality can be seen as a result of such semantic struggles.

With regard to the important role of dominating interpretations of social reality there must be a strong interest for the bearers of political power to defend their interpretation against competing interpretations. / This includes the interest to maintain the belief that there is only *one* reality and that this reality is the same as the official reality defined in the political discourse. This also implies, that the belief has to be maintained that only the words (i.e. their meanings) used by the bearers of political power denote the ("one and only") reality. Competing definitions and interpretations of political events and facts have to be denounced as wrong: as "the wrong use of words", as "ideological speech", as part of a semantic struggle (whereas one's own speech is declared to be the correct use of the words denoting the "real" reality) and so on (cf. Smith 1973, 105; Lasswell 1968, 12). Semantic strategies take place in public political discourses, in newspapers, tv- and radio-news, interviews with politicians, etc. The function of such media for the public political discourse is not only to give information about political events, but, more than this, to offer interpretations which are not dangerous for the stability of political power. The official interpretation must be on the market of public opinion before competing interpretations can occur and be effective. Interpretation of reality by means of the language of politics works by dominating the selection of certain linguistic ex-

pressions to denote the political events. Words have to be chosen which bear semantically preferred connotations. It is more efficient if the words chosen not only have the desired meanings or connotations, but open the way for a whole range of semantic possibilities, including significations, connotations and associations. Semantic strategies are more successful if they not only refer to events, facts, and things, but also enable a specific discourse to have the desired effects on the constitution of social reality. "Semantic struggles" often do not only involve single words or meanings, but complete meaning-systems.

2. Methodological reflections

Methodological reflections about the analysis of political semantics and semantic strategies can be found in historical semantics ("Begriffsgeschichte") and the linguistics of language in politics (cf. Busse 1987). The majority of empirical studies analyse single words or concepts but not semantic strategies (or, in other words, discourse strategies - in Foucault's sense). Analytical instruments for a semantic analysis of discourses have yet to be developed. From the viewpoint of contemporary linguistic pragmatics the so-called "semantic struggles" can be described as conflicts about the rules of usage of linguistic signs. The "winner" of a semantic struggle / has succeeded in establishing his own rule-of-use as the linguistic norm for his linguistic community. A linguistic analysis of such attempts to establish a new linguistic norm has to describe semantic deep-structures, covert predications and presuppositions. These can then serve as a means for attempting to define, redefine or constitute political reality. The rules-of-use of linguistic signs can be analysed by describing paradigmatic uses in different linguistic and situational contexts. The first step in the analysis has to be a reflection on word-semantics; but the meaning of the analysed word cannot be taken from dictionaries, but has to be reconstructed within its immediate linguistic context, the so-called "collocations". Collocations as fixed combinations of two or more words can be an important instrument in defining a new word-meaning or creating new connotations. Collocations can be seen as verbally expressed connotations. If these connotations become a part of the rule-of-use of the analysed word, they will have introduced a change in word-meaning. But collocations can still have another function within discourse strategies. They can epistemically open the way for new discourse, i.e. to a complete semantic network as an epistemic horizon of understanding and realization of sense. It is this dynamics of epistemic associations provided by a discourse which is one of the most effective means of semantic strategies in politics. Semantic strategies often operate through the linking of different discourses and can be seen as an attempt to attach to the word or phrase used a complete semantic sphere with the intended epistemic and - in the long run - political consequences.

123

3. Political stigmatization

These semantic strategies can be exemplified by the strategies of stigmatization used by West German politicians against radical political minorities (cf., for extended analysis, Busse 1989). The situations to be defined and interpreted are demonstrations against nuclear sites in construction and the participants. In 1986 there were large demonstrations in Wackersdorf (Bavaria) with occurrences of militant resistance against the police by a minority of the demonstrators. One referred to these people by using the word "Chaoten" (chaotic people) with a conspicuous frequency. Before (in 1968 and the seventies), expressions like "communists" or "anarchists" were more frequent. The new word "Chaoten" ("chaotics") is not only used as a single word to refer to the demonstrators. Such new words for an old thing not only refer to and / denote an existing reality but have a linguistic function of predication. The meaning of such a predication, for example, could be: "These demonstrating people are not only pure

124

demonstrators, but are chaotic, irrational and violent people." Following the German linguist P.v. Polenz (cf. Polenz 1985), the revelation of such covert predications is one of the most important instruments in the linguistic analysis of political language. Covert predications are those words or phrases, which have, syntactically speaking, the function of reference (noun-phrases), but, in fact, semantically function as predications. A profound analysis of political texts can reveal for relatively short sentences a complex and extensive structure of covert predications. These covert predications have the purpose of insinuating semantic definitions and interpretations of reality without revealing the fact that a linguistic act of predication has taken place and that there are agents responsible for these acts.

In our example, the word "chaotics" ("Chaoten") was constantly used not as a single noun but in fixed collocations. The most frequent collocations can be interpreted as headings for complete semantic (or epistemic) spheres which are then attached to the denoted events and people. In my material the most frequent collocation was "Chaoten und Gewaltt[ät]ter" (chaotic and violent people), followed by "Chaoten und Kriminelle" (chaotics and criminals) and "Reisechaoten" (travelling chaotics). Within the semantic strategy of stigmatization the collocation "chaotic and violent people" has the core function of restricting the semantic possibilities (possible uses) of the word "Chaoten". As a single lexical unit the word "Chaoten" could also be interpreted as a reference to 'harmless, confused people'. So it is necessary to combine the word with another expression that has the required connotations.

Only if "chaotic people" are defined as "violent people" can the word "Chaoten" be used like a proper name for the demonstrators and can develop its function as the central organizing term of a complete system of meanings and connotations (or, in Foucault's words, a discourse). Once defined as "violent people" the demonstrators can semantically be attached to a discourse about criminality. The collocation "chaotics and criminals" opens up access to a wide range of words, phrases, definitions and connotations which all have a pejorative function in common. As we will see, it also opens up access into the discourses of legal policy and the policy of law and order. It is important to remember that, as far as the linguistic analysis is concerned, the semantic strategies are not only based on explicitly expressed words or phrases, but also on insinuated epistemic contexts. My material contains examples of the attachment of the basic / word "Chaoten" to the discourse spheres of "paramilitary organisations", "civil war" and "terrorism". These links are not based on explicit collocations but on the textual context. The main function of fixed collocations is to define the rule-of-use of the linguistic sign being analysed.

125

4. The aims of political discourse

Public speech within the political discourse has its own aims and ends. One of these aims can be the attempt to influence further acts of legislation. One of the means to achieve this aim can be the attempt to link together political and legal discourses. If expressions like "criminals" ("Kriminelle") are used to refer to demonstrators, this can (but does not necessarily have to) be the part of a semantic strategy which has as its aims the field of legal policy. To refer to demonstrators as "criminals" not only stigmatize these people, but also prepares and justifies legal measures against them. Thus, the speech event comprises the step from the interpretation of a political event to efforts in the policy of law. The act interpreting social reality is thus secondary to the political aims. This will be shown with some remarks from the West-German Chief Federal Prosecutor. He states that "among the 'heutigen Protest-Chaoten' (the chaotics protesting today) exist a few wandering groups which 'hook on' to peacefully planned demonstrations with acts of violence" or, in another translation, "violently infest" peaceful demonstrations (in German: "sich gewaltig einklinken"). He added that these groups of demonstrators could be compared to ("nahekommen") 'criminal organizations' because of their organized cohesion. "Kriminelle Vereinigungen" (criminal organizations) is a legal term in West German criminal law. The German word "einklinken" (hook on) presup-

poses that there are two different objects which are connected. For example, the word is used to denote something to be hooked on to something else. The presupposition (or insinuation) of two different things is not accidental. It is the aim of the utterance to insinuate that the allegedly well-organized groups of people cannot be referred to as "demonstrators" but are people with aims and ends differing from those of normal demonstrators (or, differing from those, normal demonstrators - according to the law - should have).

The remark of the Federal Prosecutor about the groups of demonstrators being "similar" to "criminal organizations" can be interpreted as an attempt to insinuate that the behaviour of those people cannot be described with words like "demonstration", or similar words for their / acts of civil disobedience (a concept that is unusual in West German public discourse), but has to be described with the terminology of criminal law. According to the West German Criminal Code, groups of persons cannot be prosecuted for belonging to "criminal organizations" if the "aim to commit criminal acts is secondary to other aims" of the group.

126

According to this law, it would not be possible to prosecute demonstrators for belonging to "criminal organizations" since their aim is to demonstrate against the nuclear power plants. If they commit criminal acts while demonstrating, this is secondary to their aim to demonstrate. If the Federal Prosecutor insinuates, by using the word 'hook on' ("einklinken"), that demonstrators and "Protest-Chaoten" ('anarchists') are two different sorts of things, he is attempting to presuppose that, for some demonstrators at least, the aim of demonstrating is secondary to the aim of committing criminal acts. If this is the case, they can then be prosecuted for belonging to "criminal organizations". The semantic strategy is to introduce connotations into the political discourse which insinuate that demonstrators can be punished for belonging to "criminal organizations". This aim is not a juridical aim (since prosecutors and judges have to interpret the existing law and should not be allowed to discuss about changes in law), but it is an aim within the discourse of legal policies. The Federal Prosecutor has uttered his opinion as a politician, but not as a civil servant.

5. Defining "violence"

A further example of semantic strategies is the semantic change of core concepts of criminal law concerning the so called criminal acts against public order. This semantic change can be found in the written judgements of the West German Federal Supreme Court concerning the concept of "Gewalt" (violence). In German Criminal Law the concept of violence is referred to in the paragraphs about 'coercion' or 'breach of peace', etc. The legal paragraph about 'coercion' is applied to people who demonstrate against nuclear weapons, who participate in sit-ins in front of the gates of military bases.

In German the concept "Gewalt" can have three meanings: it can refer to the English word "force", the word "power" and to the word "violence". Some years ago, the term "Gewalt" was interpreted as "violence" so that the paragraph about 'coercion' could not be applied to sit-ins. But in the meantime the Supreme Court has widened the sense of the term "Gewalt" step by step in a long series of judgements going away / from the meaning "violence" to the meaning "force" or "power". Nowadays a wide range of acts of civil disobedience can be criminalized as "acts of violence" and thus prosecuted as acts of "coercion". For example, a speech at a large demonstration explicitly calling for a peaceful sit-in can be prosecuted for being "Gewalt" ("violence") in the sense of the paragraph about 'coercion', even if the speaker himself has not participated in the sit-in. The series of judgements shows a semantic strategy beginning to influence the public use and meaning of the term "violence".

127

6. The complex aims of political discourse

It is a special aspect of discourse strategies in politics that the intentions behind public utterances do not concern single, unilateral aims. In addition to the intention of expressing certain thoughts, of communicating ideas, there can be very complex intentions to influence not only public opinion but also special discourses.

The political discourse about demonstrators being prosecuted for belonging to a criminal organization firstly aims at influencing public opinion about policy of law. Secondly, it aims at influencing the opinions of judges and courts. The legal discourse about legal terms such as "violence" firstly aims at influencing the courts and judges; secondly, it aims at influencing public opinion. Semantic strategies as a means of politics can work by attaching special discourses (as in the case of legal discourse) to the public discourse and vice versa. The semantic (or semiotic) analysis of semantic strategies has to examine such ambiguous intentions of political discourse. The analysis of interference between different kinds of discourse (public and political; political and, for example, legal; legal and public, etc.) can be an important contribution to semantic analyses.

References

- Busse, Dietrich (1987): *Historische Semantik*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta 1987.
- Busse, Dietrich (1989): "Chaoten und Gewalttäter." Ein Beitrag zur Semantik des politischen Sprachgebrauchs. In: Armin Burkhardt/Franz Hebel/Rudolf Hoberg (eds.): *Sprache zwischen Militär und Frieden: Aufrüstung der Begriffe?*, p. 93 - 121. (= Forum für Fachsprachenforschung No. 7) Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag /
- Busse, Dietrich (1991a): Der Bedeutungswandel des Begriffs ‚Gewalt‘ im Strafrecht. In: Dietrich Busse (ed.): *Diachrone Semantik und Pragmatik*, S. 259-276. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Busse, Dietrich (1991b): Juristische Fachsprache und öffentlicher Sprachgebrauch. In: Frank Liedke; Martin Wengeler; Karin Böke (eds.): *Begriffe besetzen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, S. 161-185.
- Dieckmann, Walther (1975): *Sprache in der Politik. Einführung in die Pragmatik und Semantik der politischen Sprache*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Winter Verlag.
- Edelman, Murray (1974): *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. 6th ed. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press.
- Edelman, Murray (1972): *Politics as Symbolic Action*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Markham Publishing Corp.
- Heringer, Hans Jürgen (ed.) (1982): *Holzfeuer im hölzernen Ofen. Aufsätze zur politischen Sprachkritik*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag 1982.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1968): The Language of Power. In: H.D.Lasswell a.o: *Language of Politics*. Cambridge Mass, p. 3 - 20.
- Mey, Jacob L. (1979): Zur kritischen Sprachtheorie. In: Jacob L.Mey (ed.): *Pragmalinguistics. Theory and Practics*. The Hague: Mouton, p. 411 - 435.
- Polenz, Peter von (1985): *Deutsche Satzsemantik. Grundbegriffe des Zwischen-den-Zeilen-lesens*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Smith, David M. (1973): Language, Speech and Ideology. A conceptual framework. In: Roger W.Shuy/Ralph W.Fasold (eds.): *Language attitudes: current trends and prospects* Washington D.C., p. 97 - 112.