Language and Linguistics Compass 6/11 (2012): 735–751, 10.1002/lnc3.365

Political Discourse Analysis: Exploring the Language of Politics and the Politics of Language

Patricia L. Dunmire*
Kent State University

Abstract

This essay overviews the body of research known as political discourse analysis (PDA). I begin by situating this work within the linguistic and political turns that took place in the latter part of the 20th century within the human and social sciences. I then discuss different conceptions of what comprises *the political* and the appropriate objects of study for PDA. Adopting an inclusive conception of politics and discourse, I consider the relationship between PDA and critical discourse analysis (CDA). I close with a review of studies of political discourse in terms of their theoretical and analytic frameworks and the socio-political issues they address.

Introduction

"Necessary," "inextricable," "essential," "inseparable." Each of these terms is invariably invoked by discourse analysts and political scientists alike in answer to the question, "What is the relationship between language and politics?" Chilton and Schaffner (1997), for example, insist that "It is surely the case that politics cannot be conducted without language, and it is probably the case that the use of language in the constitution of social groups leads to what we call 'politics' in a broad sense" (206). Noting that the study of language extends beyond the domains of literature and linguistics, Pelinka (2007) contends that "language must be seen (and analyzed) as a political phenomenon" and that politics must be conceived and studied as a discursive phenomenon (129).

This recognition of the fundamental relationship between language and politics can be traced to classical Greek and Roman treatises on rhetoric. Because of the vital role political oratory played in the affairs of the state, Aristotle viewed the art of rhetoric as key to citizenship during the rise of city-states in ancient Greece (Aristotle 1954). Cicero, likewise, understood rhetoric to be a powerful political weapon for shaping political belief and action. Indeed, it was the art of rhetoric that enabled people to live and engage in civilized communal life (Bizzell and Herzberg 1990).[1] The legacy of the classical rhetorical tradition manifests in research on political communication within rhetorical and communication studies.[2] Although this work is certainly important and instructive, the following review focuses on what's been termed "political discourse analysis." PDA comprises inter-and multi-disciplinary research that focuses on the linguistic and discursive dimensions of political text and talk and on the political nature of discursive practice. This research is interdisciplinary in that it recognizes that discourse analysis can not operate solely within a linguistic and discursive framework and must draw upon methods, frameworks, and contents of other disciplines to adequately analyze its object of study. It is multidisciplinary in that it brings together multiple disciplines to investigate socio-political issues and phenomena pertinent to various areas of scholarship.

The following review focuses on the lineage of PDA and how the enterprise has been conceived theoretically and practically. I then outline studies of political discourse in terms of their theoretical and analytic frameworks and the socio-political issues they address.

Taking Turns: The Politics of Language and the Language of Politics

The phrase ''political discourse analysis'' points to the janus-faced character of both the nominal and its enterprise. As van Dijk (1997) explains, PDA can refer either to the analysis of political discourse, defined as the text and talk of politicians within overtly political contexts, *or* to a political, i.e., critical, approach to discourse analysis (15, 11). PDA, then, is concerned with understanding the nature and function of political discourse and with critiquing the role discourse plays in producing, maintaining, abusing, and resisting power in contemporary society. Such work, van Dijk (1997) insists, ''should be able to answer genuine and relevant political questions and deal with issues that are discussed in political science'' (11–12). Chilton (2004) grounds his approach in a fundamental question: ''What does the use of language in contexts we call 'political' tell us about humans in general?'' (xi). This question assumes a link between language, politics, culture, and cognition and entails a ''socially concerned'' linguistic framework for examining those linkages and the intricacies of political thought and behavior (x). Such work is concerned with understanding the language practices through which political speakers ''imbue their utterances with evidence, authority, and truth'' and, thereby, achieve legitimacy in particular political contexts (23). Chilton situates the emergence of this linguistic approach in a transition by a cohort of linguists from Chomsky's generative framework to Halliday's (1978, 1994) social semiotic and systemic-linguistic framework (x).

Okulska and Cap (2010) prefer the term ''analysis of political discourse'' (APD) and conceive of it as socially-oriented studies of ''polity and/or politics, located at the intersection of political/public discourse and political/social institutions'' (4). Their project is anchored in the ''heterogeneous and fragmented domain'' of ''Political Linguistics,'' (PL) generally conceived of as the study of language and language practices ''mainly (but not exclusively) within political contexts'' (3). As Blommaert (1997) explains, PL originally concerned the ''interplay between language and politics'' and was contextualized within a ''renewed critical awareness'' of the dynamic, constitutive, and reciprocal relations between language and politics that ''had penetrated various domains of language study'' (1, 2).[3] This ''modest'' paradigm shift within linguistics witnessed: (1) the emergence of critical linguistics and CDA; (2) attention to language ideologies and ideologies of language within linguistic anthropology; and (3) macro-societal studies of language and nationalism and language policy and language planning (2–6).

This political turn in linguistics ran parallel to and was informed by a linguistic turn in political science as scholars came to recognize the linguistic, discursive, and symbolic dimensions of their enterprise.[4] Bell (1975) describes this trend as a new paradigm which conceived of language as the ''perceptual lens'' for examining political phenomena and of political deeds as being ''built of and around words'' (ix, 12). He argues that the key terms of politics – power, influence, and authority – refer to linguistic modes of interacting with others in pursuit of political goals and effects (ix; see also Bell 1988). According to Hudson (1978) language should be understood as a strategic resource whereby politicians gain and hold power. Within this view, political ''statements'' do not represent ''cool,'' ''objective,'' and ''comprehensible'' utterances but rather function as a ''screen, a false scent, a safety net'' designed to achieve political goals, create alliances and

oppositions, and present an image of national unity (61, 41). Dallmayr (1984) argues that political scientists should focus on the ways in which linguistic and symbolic communication maintains and regulates political communities and systems (2). Such work, he insists, should acknowledge the ''architectronic role'' language serves as ''a cast or grid for an entire way of life, that is, for preferred manners of thinking, speaking, and acting'' (4, 2).

Pelinka (2007) argues that although the primary contributions to research on language and politics have typically come from linguists and socioliguists, political scientists have also made important contributions (130). Political science research has articulated the ways in which language is conceived within political science (e.g., Dallmayr 1984); examined the role language and language policy have played in developing the modern nation state and national identity (e.g., Bugarski 2004); identified the verbal interactional features of international negotiation (e.g., Bell 1988); and analyzed the ''mobilizing force'' language serves with respect to the ''social cleavages'' (Pelinka 2007: 135, 134).

Murray Edelman's (1964, 1971, 1977, 1988) work on language and the symbolic nature of politics exemplifies the linguistic turn in political science. His approach assumes that creating meaning is essential to political practice and to the ''construction of beliefs about events, policies, leaders, problems, and crises that rationalize or challenge existing inequalities'' (1988: 104). Indeed, he insists that ''If there are no conflicts over meaning, the issue is not political, by definition'' (1988: 104). The meaning-making practices of politics involve both political actions and the political language used to describe them. Both are symbolic forms that shape and disseminate public meanings of intrinsically ambiguous and complex political phenomena (1964: 1). In short, ''politics is a symbolic form,'' and, given that the public's experience of events is mediated by language, Edelman insists that ''political language *is* political reality'' (1964: 1; 1971: 65; 1988: 104; emphasis in original).

Michael Shapiro (1981, 1984, 1988) has also worked to alter how political scientists understand the role language plays in political practice and in the discipline of political science by insisting on and examining the ''radical entanglement between textual and political practices'' (1988: xii). He faults the discipline for adhering to an ''anachronistic philosophical ideal of objectivity'' and for conceiving of political experience as an ''autonomous, fully formed entity'' which needs only to be described through the ''correct speech patterns'' (1981: 19). To truly understand political phenomena, Shapiro urges analysts to attend to the ways the discursive practices of describing, categorizing, and evaluating render the ''world of things'' meaningful (1981: 19). Key to this analytic focus is politicizing the language practices of everyday life and of social science inquiry by identifying and demystifying the dimensions of power and authority implicit in a range of texts.

Defining the Political

So how is PDA carried out, what are its objects of study, and what can it tell us about the discourse and practice of politics? Addressing these questions requires addressing the prior question of how politics and political discourse are conceived by PDA practitioners. For Wodak and de Cilia (2006), what counts as politics and political action is a key issue within research on language and politics (713). At a minimum, *politics* is understood as the province of the polity and to comprise the actions and practices of professional politicians, formal political institutions, and citizens who participate in the political process. Moreover, political practice is generally understood to involve struggles over power and acts of cooperation in furtherance of a society's or group's goals (Chilton 2004; Chilton

and Schaffner 2002; van Dijk 1997). It is the means by which social actors assert, produce, maintain, and resist positions of authority, claims of legitimation, and the like (Chilton 2004: 4).[5] The enactment of politics occurs at both the ''micro'' and ''macro'' levels of society. Micro politics take place between individuals, genders, and social groups and is enacted through acts of persuasion and argumentation, threat, bribes and so on (Chilton 2004: 3). At the macro level, politics involves conflicts between and within political institutions and manifests in legal codes, precedent practices, and democratic constitutions (Chilton 2004: 3).

Although van Dijk (1997) advocates a relatively restricted conception of politics and political discourse, arguing that analysis should focus on discourse produced by the ''central players in the polity'' (13), others view the domain of politics as not ''unambiguously delimited but [as] socially constructed'' (Fairclough 2006: 33). Conceptions of politics and political discourse should extend beyond the polity into the domain of the ''life-world'' (Fairclough 2006: 33). Wodak and de Cilia (2006) note that ''everyday language'' is continuously and unavoidably infiltrated by terms from institutionalized politics (709). Discourse ''of any kind,'' Seidel (1985) contends, is political because it serves as a site of struggle, a ''semantic space in which meanings are produced and/or challenged'' (45). Similarly, Lemke's (1995) conception of ''textual politics'' holds that understandings of politics and political discourse must account for acts of meaning making as political acts and for texts as the sites in which such acts manifest (1). Fairclough (2006) understands the political sphere as encompassing relatively stable institutionalized structures and practices of the polity, ''unstable, fluctuating, and emergent'' grassroots social movements, and ''mediatized politics'' (33). Okulska and Cap's (2010) view includes virtually ''any kind of human communication'' oriented to a variety of discourse goals in different social settings, organizations, and relations that are marked by differences in power (6). A key assumption underlying this view is that what counts as political must be determined situationally and, in the end, is a matter of interpretation (Chilton 2004; Chilton and Schaffner 1997; Joseph 2010).

Chilton and Schaffner (1997) conceptualize the political as ''the potentially political,'' arguing that the designation of *political* results from a process of politicization whereby social actors, phenomena, institutions, and communicative acts are rendered as potentially political. This process involves viewing communicative behavior in terms of four functions: coercion, resistance/opposition, dissimulation, and legitimation (212). This conception of politicization, Muntigl (2002) argues, is needed to expand the ''conceptual horizon of politics'' of political discourse, beyond studies of ''stable, rigid forms of political actions'' and media representations of political action (45, 47). Politics, Muntigl insists, is a set of discursive practices that do political work. As such, PDA focuses on a myriad of ''contingent, alternative forms of doing politics'' – a form of sub-politics that the process of ''repoliticization'' has made possible (45).

Critical Discourse Analysis as Political Discourse Analysis

The critical study of political discourse closely aligns with the discourse analytic approach of CDA.[6] Aligning PDA and CDA assumes that political discourse is (and ought to be) carried out through a critical lens and that CDA is, at its core, a political endeavor. In his argument for a ''more critical reading of the label'' PDA, van Dijk (1997) contends that this domain of research should be understood as encompassing the analysis of political discourse *and* a political approach to discourse analysis. Moreover, he insists that to be ''studied most interestingly,'' political discourse analysts should assume a critical vantage.

This ''critical-political discourse analysis'' examines the means by which ''political power, power abuse or domination'' manifest in and are enacted through discourse structures and practices (11).

Depending on how inclusively or exclusively one defines political discourse, most CDA research could be characterized as PDA or only that which focuses specifically on the discourse of formal political institutions and actors would be so considered. I adopt an inclusive definition of political discourse which recognizes both the key role language plays in struggles over power, meaning, and material resources and in acts of cooperation and resistance and the political nature of discursive practice (Muntigl 2002). Furthermore, I adopt Luke's (2002) characterization of CDA as an ''explicitly political inquiry into social, economic, and cultural power'' (97).

Fairclough (1985) and van Dijk (1990) offer the earliest articulations of CDA.[7] Fairclough urged discourse analysts to attend to the broader macro-level social and political conditions that give rise to micro-level interactions and behaviors (758). Such critical analysis, he argued, should focus on the distribution and exercise of power in social institutions and social formations (753, 758). Moreover, ''critical discourse analysis'' should examine and clarify the means by which ideology is naturalized (Hall 1982) through discursive practices and structures and, relatedly, should make more apparent the social determination and effects of discourse typically invisible to discourse participants (739).

van Dijk (1990) outlined a new critical paradigm as a corrective to more traditional approaches to discourse analysis. He faulted mainstream discourse analysis for focusing on academic problems such as theory formation and discourse description to the neglect of political and social issues (7). Discourse analysts, van Dijk insisted, should examine the ways structures and strategies of text and talk are conditioned by, and, in turn, help condition, social, political, and cultural processes and structures and should address issues of power, domination, inequality, resistance and so on (7). The goal of such a project would go beyond merely understanding social problems; it would also seek to intervene in and solve problems of inequality, discrimination, modern power abuse and the like (10). Toward this end, van Dijk outlined a multi-disciplinary discourse analytic approach that recognized processes of social and cultural reproduction to be largely discursively mediated and, thus, that sought to ''reconceptualize the analysis of both discourse and society'' (9).[8]

Blommaert and Bulcean (2000) note that since its inception CDA has become ''one of the most influential and visible branches of discourse analysis'' (447). Indeed, since its early articulations, CDA has been further developed, refined, and modified through numerous books and essays (e.g., Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard 1996; Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; van Dijk 1993a; Fairclough 1989, 1992a, 1995a,b, 2003; Kress 1993; van Leeuwen 1993, 2008; O'Halloran 2003; Titscher et al. 2000; Weiss and Wodak 2003; Wodak 1996; Wodak and Chilton 2005; Wodak and Meyer 2001; Young and Harrison 2004) and reviews and critiques (e.g., Blommaert 2005; Blommaert and Bulcean 2000; Luke 2002; McKenna 2004; Schegloff 1997; Slembrouck 2001; Verschueren 2001; Widdowson 2004).

Blommaert's (2005) account of the CDA ''programme'' offers an encompassing assessment of its contributions and shortcomings.[9] Briefly, he credits CDA with helping legitimate a socially concerned approach to discourse analysis and applauds its commitment to linking linguistic analysis to other social science research programs and its focus on institutional (rather than mundane) environments for critiquing the relationships between power, language, and social processes (6, 34). He points out, however, that these features

are not unique to CDA as they can be found in other critical approaches, such as linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics (6).

The weaknesses of CDA, Blommaert argues, reside in its theory and method and in its capacity as a viable approach to critical language study (31). Regarding method, CDA is faulted for producing biased and restrictive interpretations of data (31); for collapsing semantics and pragmatics by assuming that textual function resides in textual meaning (32); and for assuming, a priori, the relevance of certain aspects of context (e.g., power) rather than identifying relevant contextual features through systematic analysis (32).[10] As a critical paradigm, Blommaert charges that CDA's overreliance on an SFL framework restricts analysis to texts and ignores the analytic significance of the contexts of production and interpretation that surround them (35). In addition, because it focuses on societies and institutions at the ''core of the world system'' (i.e., late-modern, Western), CDA is insensitive to non-Western societies and what analysis of them can tell us about discursive practice in an era of globalization (35). Finally, CDA's ''closure to a particular timeframe'' – the present – privileges the here-and-now of texts and neglects their historical development (35, 37).

Overview of Research

As an analytic approach, CDA research is often characterized as following a Hallidayan systemic-functional linguist approach (e.g., Achugar 2008; Dunmire 2011; Young and Harrison 2004) or a Vienna School discourse-historical approach (e.g., Graham et al. 2004; Heer et al. 2008; van Leeuwen and Wodak 1999; Triandafyllidou et al. 2009; Wodak 2001).[11] Luke (2002) argues, however, that CDA is best understood as a ''repertoire of political, epistemic stances'' rather than a ''formalized corpus of analytic and methodological techniques'' (97).[12] Within this more encompassing perspective, the theoretical and analytic frameworks used by CDA practitioners prove to be quite diverse and expansive.[13] They include (but are not limited to): sociolinguistics (e.g., Boussofara 2011; Myers 2010; Schiffrin 2001); ethnography and linguistic anthropology (e.g., Blommaert 2001; Critical Discourse Studies 2011; Silverstein 2010); discursive and social psychology (e.g., Billig 1991; Discourse & Society 2005; Goodman and Speer 2007); conversation analysis (Ekstrom 2009; West and Fenstermaker 2002; Wetherall 1998); and pragmatics (Blum-Kulka 1997; Harris et al. 2006; Mazid 2007).[14]

The inclusive conception of politics and political discourse outlined above, combined with a ''perspective'' conception of CDA (Blommaert 1997: 8) leads to the inclusion of a range of socio-political issues and phenomena within the scope of PDA: race and racism; ideology; neoliberalism and globalization; war; migration, asylum, and refugees; gender and sexuality; and language ideology. Clearly, a review of the research addressing all of these issues is beyond the scope of a single essay. As such, the following discussion will briefly outline work addressing issues of race, war, and language ideology.[15]

RACE AND RACISM

Race and racism have long been understood as intricately tied up with language and discursive practice and, accordingly, have garnered significant attention from critical studies of discourse. This research has explored the ways in which race and racism figure in elite discourses (i.e., media, politics, education, etc.) and in the discursive strategies and interactions of and between non-elites. van Dijk's foundational work examined racism in news media (1987, 1991; see also Teo 2000) and in politics, education, and corporations

(1993b; see also Del-Teso-Craviotto 2009 and Martin-Rojo and van Dijk 1997). He has also examined the ways in which elite articulations of racial attitudes are linguistically mitigated (1992, 2000; see also Bonilla-Silva and Forman 2000) and reproduced through the text and talk of non-elites (1987, 1993b).

Since this early work, research has come to include studies of the discursive interactions between non-elites in various social settings. Bailey (2000), for example, examines interracial contact that occurs during service encounters between Korean shop owners and African-American customers. This field-based study explores the culturally specific communicative conventions of the two groups and argues that each group's characterizations of the others' behavior helps explain the conflict between them. While the African American customers view the shop owners as avoiding interpersonal involvement and engagement, the shop owners view African American customers as lacking personal restraint (90–91). Bailey ties these local ways of interacting to micro-communicational patterns and linguistic and cultural differences and to broader social conflict (99).

Buttny and Williams (2000) also examines interracial contact to understand participants' discursive positioning around issues of respect/disrespect, focusing in particular on their use of reported speech in talking race. They present data from two studies: discussions between African American, Latino, and White students of a documentary on racism and African Americans' accounts of service encounters with White shop owners. The first study reveals three structural features of the reported speech used in discussions of the documentary: the performative aspect of repetition of ''respect''; a ''like'' vs. ''respect'' contrast; and participants' framing the addressee of their comments as White people (121). The second study examines narratives of disrespect that African Americans participants drew upon in their accounts of service encounters which cited the type of attention (either too much or too little) they received as evidence of the shop owners' disrespect (123). The authors conclude that ''ordinary symbols of respect'' are often seen as problematic by African Americans in their interactions with White people (128).

Del-Teso-Craviotto (2009) examines the ways in which the xenophopic and racist discourse of Spanish elites filters down to Argentinian immigrants. Noting the need for research on how the subjects of racist discourse respond to elite xeno-racist ideology, the author analyzes how participants in an Internet forum appropriate, contextualize, and, sometimes, embrace elite discourses about them (586). Their postings reveal three features which have been identified as comprising discourse about race: the construction of in-group and out-group identities (578); positive characterizations of in-group actors and negative characterization of out-group actors (582); and the stance adopted by the poster (583).

A special issue of Discourse & Society (2011) calls for recasting the language-race relationship by examining how race and racialization are produced between groups and across multiple linguistic and social dimensions of gender, class, occupation, religion, etc (Alim and Reyes 2011). Using interactional analysis and ethnography, Bucholtz (2011) examines the intersection of race and gender in a study of how European American students at an ethnoracially divided high school talk about minority groups. Her data reveal the phenomenon of ''racial reversal'' which manifests in three discursive practices: white students' expressions of resentment over ''perceived reverse discrimination''; ''tales of racialized fears and white persecution''; and ''interracial fight stories'' (387). Buckhotz found that gender and race intersected within the fight narratives. While the girls tended to highlight verbal confrontation and to make only vague references to danger, their male counterparts focused on actual violent encounters (389, 395). These accounts drew on ideologies of masculinity as the boys placed themselves on a hierarchy of masculity based

on physical strength vis-à-vis their non-white peers (395). Chun (2011) examines the practices through which high school students read race during interacial encounters, focusing on the means by which they label people or practices with racial terminology. She approaches this racialized discursive practice as a negotiated process that intersects with ideologies of gender, class, race, and authenticity. Chun found that race reading depended on local ideologies of authenticity and that this discourse practice served as a strategy for commenting on gender and class in locally meaningful ways, specifically through a terminology of ''prep girls'' and ''ghetto boys'' (417).

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGY/POLITICS OF LANGUAGE

Research into the politics of language and language ideology focuses on identifying and critiquing ''any sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use'' (Silverstein 1979: 193). As outlined by Davies (1994), language ideologies figure prominently in policies and decisions concerning official and standard languages, language planning, language academies, and language education policies (3212). Woolard (1992) identifies language ideology as a crucial yet largely neglected phenomenon that mediates between social structure and forms of talk (235). Consequently, she and her colleagues have worked to position language ideology as a necessary area of inquiry by examining the impact dominant cultural models have on linguistic and social behavior; the institutional enactment of language ideology; and the ''multiplicity, contradiction, and contention'' between different ideologies that circulate within a given society or group (235, 244–5).

Blommaert and Verschueren (1992), for example, offers a ''view from below'' by examining conceptions of language ideology that manifest in newspaper coverage of ethnic conflict, separatist and other movements, and minority politics (355). Through pragmatic analysis of word patterns, the authors identify two key themes: language as a distinctive feature and language in Empire (357, 370). They argue that lay opinion privileges social homogenization as a natural state of affairs and marginalizes heterogeneity as impossible and problematic. They also note a discrepancy between ''popular language ideology and the way in which language is used in multilingual society'' (375). Kroskrity (1992) applies Silverstein's conception of language ideology to the Arizona Tewa community to understand how cultural actors rationalize their language activity. This study reveals how rules governing the community's use of ritualized ceremonial talk (i.e., Kiva talk) impact local models of everyday discursive forms and practices (299). Kroskrity argues that the functions of specialized language practices extend beyond expression of belief and serve to legitimate systems of social organization and power (307).

The edited volume Language Ideological Debates explores what Blommaert (1999) identifies as a neglected question: how are language ideologies produced and reproduced? (1). This question encompasses a range of issues, including how language ideologies come into being; why some ideologies become dominant and others marginalized; and the relationships between language ideologies and broader social and political developments (1). The volume's essays consider these issues by examining a range of language debates from around the world. The goal of the volume, Blommaert explains, is to ''reform and redocument'' central processes within social approaches to language study and to provide a ''refined approach'' to discourse data that effectively accounts for the lived dimension of ideology (33).

Peled (2011) offers a political science perspective on the politics of language, focusing on the debate among political theorists over their prioritizing the language rights issue

within research on normative language policy (NLP) (441). He argues for a new conceptual framework that engages political theorist more directly with sociolinguistic research on NLP. Such a framework, Peled contends, would enable political theorists to integrate their analytic tools with those of sociolinguistic research; recognize the costs and benefits of focusing primarily on language rights issues; extend their project to include language ethics; and develop an applied dimension to their work by engaging with real world issues (447–9).

Okulska and Cap's (2010) volume seeks to draw attention to ''the often neglected areas of the field that confront cases of discursive and political violation of linguistic human rights'' (14). Blackledge's (2010) contribution addresses minority language rights (MLR), that is, ''who has the right to use their own language, where, when, and how'' (301). He argues that policies and practices concerning multilingualism embed two opposing ideologies: one which characterizes the ''use and visibility of minority languages'' as a ''threat to social cohesion, security, and national identity'' and one which holds that a bilingual approach is the most effective way to educate some children (311). Blackledge examines these conflicting positions through an ethnographic study of students, teachers, parents, and administrators involved with a Bangladeshi complementary school in Birmingham England. He found that bilingualism was the uncontested norm within the family context. However, in response to state-sanctioned monolingualism, community members created their own spaces for teaching children their native language. Blackledge also explains how students creatively integrated linguistic resources circulating at the global level (e.g., Bollywood films) with those provided within the community. It is in this practice of integrating global and local linguistic resources and practices that Blackledge locates the ongoing debate concerning MLR: ''at the interstices of nation, heritage, global movement, and new communication'' (322).

Pfaff (2010) examines multilingual developments in post-reunification Germany to highlight the role language and language policies play as instruments of social policies. She examines specific language policies and practices as well as official and popular discourses about them and identifies two countervailing ideologies: the symbolic equation of language and nation and an instrumental/educational conception of language as a means of empowerment (328). Pfaff argues that language proficiency has been used as a means for controlling and regulating immigrant families' options for residence, occupation, and education.

LANGUAGE AND WAR

Critical inquiry into the discursive dimensions of war and militarism has featured prominently in PDA, particularly in the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the ensuring ''war on terrorism.'' This work has examined a range of discursive and linguistic phenomena, including the naming practices used by U.S. officials (Arkin 2005; Collins and Glover 2002), media representations of 9/11 (Chermak et al. 2003; Kellner 2004; Stoltz 2007), the Bush administration's policy of ''preventative war'' (Dunmire 2009; Ferrari 2007), the use of metaphor (Cienki 2004; Lakoff 2001; Lule 2004; Skinner and Squillacote 2010), and legitimation strategies (Cap 2008; Chovanec 2010; van Dijk 2007; Hodges 2011; Oddo 2011).

Silberstein's (2002) study of the language and politics of 9/11 focuses on several discursive events in the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks. She focuses on how language was deployed at a moment of national crisis and how that language served to justify the war in Afghanistan and the broader war on terrorism. Silberstein examines, for

example, grammatical choices (e.g., pronouns, militrary terminology) comprising President Bush's statements in the immediate aftermath of the attacks and how they construct the U.S. as a nation at war. Her analysis of media narratives considers the specific identities built up through them and how the narratives were transformed from real-time stories of events on the ground into highly produced and preformulated tales. Silberstein also focuses on a report by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) which accused specific individuals of engaging in a ''blame America first'' campaign. She analyzes the argumentative fallacies underlying the report and argues that it represents ''The New McCarthyism'' characterizing the post-9/11 environment.

Both Discourse & Society (2004) and Journal of Language & Politics (2005) dedicated special issues to the discourses of 9/11, the Iraq War, and the ''War on Terror.'' For Edwards (2004), examining a ''momentous event'' such as 9/11 puts into relief various aspects of the sociopolitical landscape (155). He considers the perceptions and images of the terrorist attacks, particularly the claim that they changed the world in a fundamental way.[16] The author identifies rhetorical strategies designed for ''raising the psychological ante'' by emphasizing the scope of the attacks and demonizing their perpetrators and those who oppose official policy responses to them (157). Such rhetoric, Edwards argues, is designed to galvanize the public around particular policies and actions. He further argues that rather bringing about significant change, the 9/11 attacks enabled the continuation of long-standing U.S. foreign policy strategies and objectives for the Middle East and Central Asia, as well as the continuation of domestic consumer practices.

The contributions to the Journal of Language and Politics special issue ''The Soft Power of War'' focus on the symbolic war ''that has been raging around military operations'' by examining politicians' public statements and various media forms and outlets (Chouliaraki 2005: 1). Using a corpus of public statements by George W. Bush, Tony Blair, and John Howard, Graham and Luke (2005), for example, argue that the post 9/11 global economy is best understood not as a capitist economy but as a form of ''neofeudal corporatism'' (12). They ground their argument in an analysis of specific features of this economic system and their manifestation in Iraq War and war on terrorism discourses. The authors contend that neofeudalism best represents the social relations that have come to define the post-9/11 era which is marked by ''the reinvention of an embodied and lived warrior state'' (12). The authors argue that this discursively-driven and mass mediated form of political and economic relations allows for a type of elite control that replaces personal responsibility, civic choice and entrepreneurship with a system rooted in ''loyalty, secrecy, and bondage'' (35).

Arguing that contemporary Hollywood movies and video games are the sites of ''the most important political discourse'' of the post-9/11 environment, Machin and van Leeuwen (2005) examine how the movie and video game ''Black Hawk Down'' represent the 1993 U.S. conflict with Somalia (119–20). Their analytic focus is three-fold: a linguistic analysis of ''special ops'' discourse and of social actors; the political history of the U.S.-Somalia conflict and special ops discourse; and, a critical account of the collaborative relationship between the U.S. military and the entertainment industry (119). They argue that the movie's and video game's design seeks to align audiences with the U.S. military's geopolitical goals and actions by using documentary lead-ins, strategies for representing, naming, and categorizing participants, and special ops discourse (120). The authors conclude that the special ops discourse has come to dominate public understanding of global relations and events and provides a ready-made rationale and set of rules for U.S. military intervention (136).

Contributions to Hodges and Nilep's (2007) Discourse, War, and Terrorism illustrate how post-9/11 discourse shaped interpretations and understandings of the terrorist attacks and helped constitute sociopolitical reality in their aftermath. Taken as a whole, the volume examines the discursive construction of identities, ideology, enemies, and the reactions of national leaders and citizens to the attacks.

Lemons (2007), for example, draws on feminist theory in her study of two key tropes embedded in articles from the New York Times temporary section, ''The Struggle for Iraq: Equal Rights'': the comportment of the female body as signifying relative progress and Islam as a force of repression (89). These tropes, Lemons argues, prohibit critical engagement with differing conceptions of liberty and religion by limiting the conception of freedom to negative liberty and religion to ''a practice indifferent to and therefore both protected from and unable to interfere with the State'' (90). Lemons further argues that the articles situate discussions and assessments of progress in the female body and in Islam, a practice which does not allow for critiquing their underlying arguments or for considering their complexity and nuance. Consequently, they ''participate in a discourse and regime with which readers … are familiar'' (101).

Becker (2007) examines two different news organizations' television interviews of German chancellor Gerhard Schroder to illustrate his strategies for avoiding taking sides in the debate over the U.S.-led war against Iraq. She examines the chancellor's response to a prompt seeking ''a German position'' on the Iraq War in terms of how Schroder constructs Us and Them and negotiates these constructions in relation to various topics (163). Becker's analysis reveals that the interviews differ as to the degrees of abstraction versus personalization in their use of pronouns and transitivity structure (171–2). She also discusses specific ways in which the appraisal elements of graduation and engagement are used by participants to navigate a range of different, often conflicting, positions (176).

Concluding Remarks

In the latter part of the 20th century, social scientists examined the vital role discourse plays in constituting ''social formation and discipline, economic exploitation and power'' (Luke 2002: 97). By drawing on diverse conceptual frameworks, methods, and data, PDA has made important contributions to this discursive turn by elucidating the role discourse plays in a range of political contexts and practices, as well as the intrinsically political nature of discursive practice. This work has explicated the structure and function of political discourse, the connections between political cognition, behavior, and discourse, and the ways in which properties of text and talk bear on political processes and systems and vice versa. Moreover, by attending to discourses and issues outside the domain of politics proper, PDA has participated in the politicization of social life more broadly.

No longer a nascent area of scholarship, PDA has been and will continue to play a significant role in the 21st century, the first decade of which has been defined by a myriad of complex issues and phenomena, not the least of which include: the proliferation of new media technologies; the global war on terror; and the rise of popular resistance movements seeking to challenge oppressive regimes, neo-liberal austerity programs, and U.S. hegemony. Of course, these phenomena, and the issues, problems, and possibilities they present to contemporary global society, are not wholly discursive and demand attention from various analytical approaches. PDA, nevertheless, has much to offer in ferreting out the particular ways in which they manifest discursively, affect both macro socio-political processes and micro socio-political interactions, and impact the course of socio-political life in the new millenium.

Short Biography

Patricia L. Dunmire draws on systemic-functional linguistics, CDA, and narrative theory to examine the linguistic construction and rhetorical function of political discourse, focusing on post-Cold War foreign policy and national security discourse of the U.S. She also examines how modernist conceptions of the future are projected through political and policy discourses and how those projections function ideologically. Her recent book, *Projecting the future through political discourse: the case of the Bush Doctrine* (John Benjamins 2011), examines projections of the future as they manifested in various genres comprising the Bush Doctrine. Her current work focuses on articulations of ''democratic peace'' in a range of national security documents and considers how these articulations serve to legitimate the militarization of U.S. foreign policy. Her work has appeared in *Discourse & Society*, *Prose Studies*, and *Written Communication*, and in edited volumes published as part of John Benjamin's Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society, and Culture book series. Dunmire is an associate professor in the English Department at Kent State University and is a member of the Rhetoric and Composition graduate facutly. She earned an MA and PhD in Rhetoric from Carnegie Mellon University.

Notes

* Correspondence address: Patricia L. Dunmire, Department of English, 113 Satterfield Hall, Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242, USA. E-mail: pdunmire@kent.edu

[1] See Chilton (2004) for a more extensive review of the relationship between classical rhetoric and political discourse.

[2] For example: rhetorical criticism (Bitzer 1981, 1987; Black 1965; Vickers 1988); mass media and political communication (Graber 1976, 1981; McLeod 1999); presidential rhetoric (Cambell and Jamieson 1990; Hart 1984, 1987; Jamieson 1988; Windt 1983, 1990; Zarefsky 2004); and political and protest movements (Jarana et al. 1994; Miller and Simons 1974; Morris and Browne 2001). See Chilton (2004), Chilton and Schaffner (2002), van Dijk (1998), and Gastil (1992) for more extensive reviews of this domain of analysis. See Gastil (1992) and Geis (1987) for critiques of some of this work.

[3] Wodak and de Cilia (2006) trace the inception of political linguistics to work by German linguistics studying the language of National Socialism during the 1950s.

[4] This linguistic turn in political science was part of the ''late 20th century acknowledgement'' within the social sciences writ large of the constitutive function of discourse (Luke 2002).

[5] See Wodak and de Cilia (2006) for a schematic representation of key political domains and genres.

[6] For a non-critical descriptive approach to PDA see Wilson (1990).

[7] CDA grew out of and further developed the text-analytic work of the late 1970s known as ''critical linguistics'' (Chilton 1985; Fairclough 1992b; Fowler 1987, 1991; Fowler et al. 1979; Kress 1983, 1985; Kress & Hodge 1979; Wodak 1989). See Wodak (1995) for an account of the relationship between CDA and critical linguistics.

[8] Extended explications of the premises, principles, and goals of CDA can be found in Fairclough (1989, 1992a), van Dijk (1993a), Wodak (1995), and Wodak and Matouschek (1993). Blommaert and Bulcean (2000) identify Discourse and Social Change Fairclough (1992a) as the ''most elaborate and ambitious'' effort to develop a theoretical framework for CDA (448). According to Blommaert (2005), Language and Power Fairclough (1989) is widely recognized as the ''landmark publication'' for CDA (23).

[9] Blommaert conceptualizes CDA as a '' 'school' of scholars'' led primarily by Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, Teun van Dijk, and Paul Chilton who are in general agreement concerning analytical principles, the discursive objects and social issues warranting critical study, and the institutional tools for carrying out that study (21). Political discourse (that is, the discourse of politicians) is identified by Blommaert as one of the key area of inquiry for CDA, along with ideology, racism, media, advertising, and institutional discourse (21). In the following section I discuss other conceptualizations of CDA.

[10] For this part of his critique, Blommaert summarizes and synthesizes critiques made by Schegloff (1997), Slembrouck (2001), Verschueren (2001), and Widdowson (1995, 1996, 1998).

[11] See Titscher et al. (2000) for an overview of these two key approaches to CDA.

[12] See Blommaert (2005) and van Dijk (1993a) on the status and characterization of CDA as a domain of scholarship.

[13] McKenna (2004) adopts a more restrictive conception of CDA and positions it as one approach within the broader domain of "critical discourse studies." He traces the emergence of CDS to work within "the Frankfurt and neo-Marxist tradition … anthropological linguistics … CDA … literacy studies … gender studies … and Foucault" (10). Like CDA, CDS is concerned with examining the relationships and power dynamics that hold between discourse and society.

[14] See Luke (2002) and Wodak (1995) for general categorizations of CDA research.

[15] The following studies are presented as suggestive of work in these areas rather than as an exhaustive account of significant studies done in their respective areas of research.

[16] Also see Lazar and Lazar (2007) and Dunmire (2009) for analyses of the claim that 9/11 "changed everything."

Works Cited

Achugar, Marianna. 2008. What we remember: the construction of memory in military discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Alim, H. Samy, and Angela Reyes. 2011. Complicating race: articulating race across multiple dimensions. Discourse & Society 22(4). 379–84.

Aristotle. 1954. The rhetoric and poetics of Aristotle. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Modern Library.

Arkin, William. 2005. Code names: deciphering U.S. military plans, programs and operations in the 9/11 world. Hanover, NH: Steerforth Press.

Bailey, Benjamin. 2000. Communicative behavior and conflict between African-American customers and Korean immigrant retailers in Los Angeles. Discourse & Society 11(1). 86–108.

Becker, Annette. 2007. Between 'us' and 'them': two TV interviews with German chancellor Gerhard Schroder in the run-up to the Iraq war. Discourse, War, and Terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 161–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bell, David. 1975. Power, influence, and authority: an essay on political linguistics. New York: Oxford.

——. 1988. Political linguistics and international negotiations. Negotiations Journal, July 4(3). 233–46.

Billig, Michael. 1991. Ideology and opinions: studies in rhetorical psychology. London: Sage.

Bitzer, Loyd. 1981. Political rhetoric. Handbook of political communication, ed. by Dan Nimmo and Keith Sanders, 225–48. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

——. 1987. Rhetorical public communication. Critical Studies in Mass Communication 4. 425–8.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. 1990. The rhetorical tradition: readings from classical times to the present. Boston: Bedford.

Black, Edwin. 1965. Rhetorical criticism. New York: MacMillan.

Blackledge, Adrian. 2010. The practice and politics of multilingualism. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 301–26. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.

Blommaert, Jan. 1997. Language and politics, language politics and political linguistics. Belgian Journal of Linguistics 11. 1–10.

—— (ed.) 1999. Language ideological debates. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

——. 2001. Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. Discourse & Society 12(4). 413–49.

——. 2005. Discourse: a critical introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——, and Chris Bulcean. 2000. Critical discourse analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology 29. 447–66.

——, and Jef Verschueren. 1992. The role of language in European nationalist ideologies. Pragmatics 2(3). 355–75.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. 1997. Discourse pragmatics. Discourse as social interaction (Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction Vol. 2), ed. by Teun van Dijk, 38–63. London: Sage.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo, and Tyrone A. Forman. 2000. 'I'm not a racist but…': mapping white college students' racial ideology in the USA. Discourse & Society 11(1). 50–85.

Boussofara, Naima. 2011. Bleaching a dialectical voice in political discourse: sociolinguistic choices in re-writing political speeches. Journal of Language and Politics 10(2). 204–26.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. 'It's different for guys': gendered narratives of racial conflict among white California youth. Discourse & Society 22(4). 385–402.

Bugarski, Ranko. 2004. Language policies in the successor states of former Yugoslavia. Journal of Language and Politics 3(2). 198–207.

Buttny, Richard, and Princess L. Williams. 2000. Demanding respect: the uses of reported speech in discursive constructions of interracial contact. Discourse & Society 11(1). 109–33.

Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa, and Malcolm Coulthard. 1996. Texts and practices: readings in critical discourse analysis. London: Routledge.

Cambell, K. K., and K. H. Jamieson. 1990. Deeds done in words: presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cap, Piotr. 2008. Legitimization in political discourse: a cross-disciplinary perspective on the modern U.S. war rhetoric, 2nd edn. New Castle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Press.

Chermak, Steven, Frankie Y. Bailey, and Michelle Brown (eds). 2003. Media representations of September 22. Westport: Praeger.
Chilton, Paul. 1985. Language and the nuclear arms debate: nukespeak today. London: Pinter.
——. 2004. Analysing political discourse: theory and practice. London: Routledge.
——, and Christine Schaffner. 1997. Discourse and politics. Discourse as social interaction, ed. by Teun van Dijk, 206–30. London: Sage.
——, and Schaffner, C. 2002. Introduction: themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. Politics as text and talk, ed. by Paul Chilton, Christina Schaffner, 1–41. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Chouliaraki, Lilie. 2005. Introduction: the soft power of war: legitimacy and community in Iraq war discourses. Journal of Language and Politics 4(1). 1–10.
——, and Norman Fairclough. 1999. Discourse in late modernity: rethinking critical discourse analysis. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Chovanec, Jan. 2010. Legitimation through differentiation: discursive construction of Jacques Le Worm Chirac as an opponent to military action. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 61–82. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.
Chun, Elain. 2011. Reading race beyond black and white. Discourse & Society 22(4). 403–21.
Cienki, Alan J. 2004. Bush's and Gore's language and gestures in the 2000 US presidential debates: a test case for two models of metaphors. Journal of Language & Politics 3(3). 409–40.
Collins, John, and Ross Glover. 2002. Collateral language: a user's guide to America's new war. New York: New York University Press.
Critical Discourse Studies. 2011. Special issue: ethnography and critical discourse analysis: toward a problem-oriented research dialogue 8(4). 231–309.
Dallmayr, Fred. 1984. Language and politics: why does language matter to political philosophy. London: University of Notre Dame.
Davies, Alan. 1994. Politicized language. The encyclopedia of language and linguistics (vol. 6), ed. by Ron E. Asher, 3211–4. Oxford: Pergamon.
Del-Teso-Craviotto, Marisol. 2009. Racism and xenophobia in immigrants' discourse: the case of Argentines in Spain. Discourse & Society 20(5). 571–92.
van Dijk, Teun. 1987. Communicating racism: ethnic prejudice in thought and talk. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
——. 1988. News analysis: case studies of international and national news in the press. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
——. 1990. Discourse & Society: a new journal for a new research focus. Discourse & Society 1(1). 5–16.
——. 1991. Racism and the press. London: Routledge.
——. 1992. Discourse and the denial of racism. Discourse & Society 3(1). 87–118.
——. 1993a. Principles of critical discourse analysis. Discourse & Society 4(2). 249–83.
——. 1993b. Elite discourse and racism. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
——. 1997. What is political discourse analysis? Political linguistics, ed. by Jan Blommaert and Chris Bulcean, 11–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
——. 1998. What is political discourse analysis? Political linguistics, ed. by Jan Blommaert, 11–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
——. 2000. Parliamentary debates. Racism at the top, ed. by Ruth Wodak and Teun van Dijk, 45–78. Klagenfurt/Celovek, Austria: Drava.
——. 2007. War rhetoric of a little ally: political implicatures and Aznar's legitimization of the war in Iraq. The soft power of war, ed. by Lilie Chouliaraki, 61–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Discourse & Society. 2004. Special issue: approaches to tragedy 15(2-3). 147–359.
Discourse & Society. 2005. Special issue: developments in discursive psychology 16(5). 595–747.
Discourse & Society. 2011. Special issue: complicating race: articulating race across multiple social dimensions. 22(4). 379–504.
Dunmire, Patricia L. 2009. '9/11 changed everything': an intertextual analysis of the Bush Doctrine. Discourse & Society 20(2). 195–222.
——. 2011. Projecting the future through political discourse: the case of the Bush Doctrine. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Edelman, Murray. 1964. The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
——. 1971. Politics as symbolic action: mass arousal and quiescence. Chicago: Markham Publishing.
——. 1977. Political language: words that succeed and policies that fail. New York: Academic Press.
——. 1988. Constructing the political spectacle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Edwards, John. 2004. After the fall. Discourse & Society 15(2-3). 155–84.
Ekstrom, Mats. 2009. Power and affiliation in presidential press conferences: a study on interruptions, jokes, and laughter. Journal of Language and Politics 8(3). 386–415.
Fairclough, Norman. 1985. Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. Journal of Pragmatics 9. 739–63.
——. 1989. Language and power. London: Longman.

——. 1992a. Discourse and social change. Cambridge: Polity Press.
——. 1992b. Critical linguistics. The Oxford international encyclopedia of linguistics, ed. by William Bright, 314–5. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
——. 1995a. Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language. London: Longman.
——. 1995b. Media discourse. London: Edward Arnold.
——. 2003. Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.
——. 2006. Genres in political discourse. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics (vol. 5), ed. by Keith Brown, 32–8. Boston: Elsevier.
Ferrari, Federica. 2007. Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. Discourse & Society 18(5). 603–25.
Fowler, Roger. 1987. Notes on critical linguistics. Language topics: essays in honor of M.A.K. Halliday, ed. by Ross Steele and Terry Threadgold, 481–92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
——. 1991. Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press. London: Routledge.
——, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Trew. 1979. Language and control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Gastil, John. 1992. Undemocratic discourse: a review of theory and research on political discourse. Discourse & Society 3(4). 469–500.
Geis, Michael. 1987. The language of politics. New York: Springer-Verlag.
Goodman, Simon, and Susan A. Speer. 2007. Category use in the construction of asylum seekers. Critical Discourse Studies 4(2). 165–85.
Graber, Doris. 1976. Verbal behahavior and politics. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
——. 1981. Political languages. Handbook of political communication, ed. by Dan D. Nimmo and Keith R. Sanders, 195–223. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Graham, Phil, Thomas Keenan, and Anne-Marie Dowd. 2004. A call to arms at the end of history: a discourse-historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror. Discourse & Society 15(2-3). 199–221.
——, and Alan Luke. 2005. The language of neofeudal corporatism and the war on Iraq. Journal of Language and Politics 4(1). 11–39.
Hall, Stuart. 1982. The rediscovery of 'ideology': return of the repressed in media studies. Culture, society, and the media, ed. by Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Woolacott, 56–90. London: Methuen.
Halliday, Michael. 1978. Language as social semiotic. London: Edward Arnold.
——. 1994. An introduction to functional grammar, 2nd edn. London: Arnold.
Harris, Sandra, Karen Grainger, and Louise Mullany. 2006. The pragmatics of political apologies. Discourse & Society 17(6). 715–37.
Hart, Roderick P. 1984. Verbal style and the presidency. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
——. 1987. The sound of leadership. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
Heer, Hannes, Walter Manoschek, Alexander Pollak, and Ruth Wodak (eds). 2008. The discursive construction of history: remembering the Wehrmacht's War of Annihilation. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hodges, Adam. 2011. The war on terror narrative. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
——, and Chad Nilep. 2007. Discourse, war, and terrorism. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Hudson, Kenneth. 1978. The language of modern politics. London: MacMillan.
Jamieson, Kathleen H. 1988. Eloquence in the electronic age. New York: Oxford University Press.
Jarana, Enrique, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. 1994. New social movements: from ideology to identity. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Joseph, John (ed.) 2010. Language and politics (vol. IV). New York: Routledge.
Journal of Language & Politics. 2005. Special issue: the soft power of war 4(1). 1–168.
Kellner, Douglas. 2004. 9/11, spectacles of terror, and media manipulation. Critical Discourse Studies 1(1). 41–64.
Kress, Gunther. 1983. Linguistic and ideological transformation in news reporting. Language, image, media, ed. by Howard Davis and Paul Walton, 120–38. New York: St. Martins.
——. 1985. Ideological structures in discourse. Handbook of discourse analysis, ed. by Teun van Dijk, 27–42. New York: Academic Press.
——. 1993. Against arbitrariness: the social production of the sign as a foundational issue in critical discourse analysis. Discourse & Society 4(2). 169–91.
——, and Hodge, Bob. 1979. Language as ideology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Kroskrity, Paul V. 1992. Arizona Kiva speech as a manifestation of linguistic ideology. Pragmatics 2(3). 297–309.
Lakoff, George. 2001. The power of images. Metaphorik.de. http://www.metaphorik.de/aufsaetze/lakoff-september11.htm
Lazar, Annita, and Michelle Lazar. 2007. Enforcing justice, justifying force: America's justification of violence in the New World Order. Discourse, war, and terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 45–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
van Leeuwen, Theo. 1993. Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: a synopsis. Discourse & Society 4(2). 193–225.

——. 2008. Discourse and practice: new tools for critical discourse analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
——, and Ruth Wodak. 1999. Legitimizing immigration control: a discourse-historical analysis. Discourse Studies 1. 83–118.
Lemke, Jay. 1995. Textual politics: discourse and social dynamics. London: Taylor Francis.
Lemons, Katherine. 2007. Discourses of freedom: gender and religion in US media coverage of the war on Iraq. Discourse, war, and terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 89–104. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Luke, Allan. 2002. Beyond science and ideology critique: developments in critical discourse analysis. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 22. 96–110.
Lule, Jack. 2004. War and its metaphors: news language and the prelude to war in Iraq, 2003. Journalism Studies 5(2). 179–90.
Machin, David, and Theo van Leeuwen. 2005. Computer games as political discourse: the case of Black Hawk Down. The Journal of Language and Politics 4(1). 119–41.
Martin-Rojo, Luisa, and Teun van Dijk. 1997. 'There was a problem, and it was solved': legitimating the expulsion of 'illegal' migrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse. Discourse & Society 8(4). 523–66.
Mazid, Bahaa-eddin M. 2007. Presuppositions and strategic functions in Bush's 20/9/2001 speech: a critical discourse analysis. Journal of Language and Politics 6(3). 351–75.
McKenna, Bernard. 2004. Critial discourse studies: where to from here? Critical Discourse Studies 1(1). 9–39.
McLeod, James. 1999. The sociodrama of presidential politics: rhetoric, ritual, and power in the era of teledemocracy. American Anthropologist 101(2). 359–73.
Miller, Gerald R., and Herbert W. Simons. 1974. Perspectives on communication in social conflict. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Morris III, C. E., and Stephen Browne. 2001. Readings on the rhetoric of social protest. State College, PA: Strata Publishing.
Muntigl, Peter. 2002. Politicization and depoliticization: unemployment policy in the European Union. Politics as text and talk: analytic approaches to political discourse, ed. by Paul Chilton and Christine Schaffner, 45–79. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Myers, Greg. 2010. Stance-taking and public discussions in blogs. Critical Discourse Studies 7(4). 263–75.
Oddo, John. 2011. War legitimation: representing 'us' and 'them' in four presidential addresses. Discourse & Society 22(3). 1–28.
O'Halloran, Kieran A. 2003. Critical discourse analysis and language cognition. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press.
Okulska, Urszula, and Piotr Cap. 2010. Analysis of political discourse: landmarks, challenges, and prospects. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap's, 3–22. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.
Peled, Yael. 2011. Language, rights and the language of language rights: the need for a new conceptual framework in the political theory of language policy. Journal of Language & Politics 10(3). 436–56.
Pelinka, Anton. 2007. Language as a political category: the viewpoint of political science. Journal of Language & Politics 6(1). 129–43.
Pfaff, Carol W. 2010. Multilingual development in Germany in the crossfire of ideology and politics. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 327–58. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.
Schegloff, Emmanuel. 1997. Whose text? Whose context? Discourse & Society 8(2). 165–87.
Schiffrin, Deborah. 2001. Language and public memorial: 'America's concentration camps.' Discourse & Society 12(4). 505–34.
Seidel, Gil. 1985. Political discoures analysis. Handbook of discourse analysis: discourse analysis in society, ed. by Teunvan Dijk, 43–60. London: Academic Press.
Shapiro, Michael. 1981. Language and political understanding: the politics of discursive practices. New Haven: Yale University Press.
—— (ed.) 1984. Language and politics. New York: New York University Press.
——. 1988. The Politics of representation: writing practices in biography, photography, and policy analysis. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
Silberstein, Sandra. 2002. War of words: language, politics, and 9/11. London: Routledge.
Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language structure and linguistic ideology. The elements: a parasession on linguistic units and levels, ed. by Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks and Carol L. Hofbauer, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
——. 2010. Society, polity, and language community: an enlightenment trinity in anthropological perspective. Journal of Language & Politics 9(3). 339–63.
Skinner, Daniel, and Rosa Squillacote. 2010. New bodies: beyond illness, dirt, vermin and other metaphors of terror. Perspectives in politics and discourse, ed. by Urszula Okulska and Piotr Cap, 43–60. Amsterdam: John Bejamins.
Slembrouck, Stef. 2001. Explanation, intepretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. Critique of Anthropology 21. 33–57.

Stoltz, Gergory Ian. 2007. Arabs in the morning paper: a case of shifting identity. Discourse, war, and terrorism, ed. by Adam Hodges and Chad Nilep, 105–22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Teo, Peter. 2000. Racism in the news: a critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspaper. Discourse & Society 11(1). 7–49.
Titscher, Stefan, Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak, and Eva Vetter. 2000. Methods of text and discourse analysis. London: Sage.
Triandafyllidou, Anna, Ruth Wodak, and Michal Krzyzanowski (eds). 2009. The European public sphere and the media: Europe in crisis. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
Verschueren, Jef. 2001. Predicaments of criticism. Critique of Anthropology 21. 59–81.
Vickers, Brian. 1988. Indefense of rhetoric. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Weiss, Gilbert, and Ruth Wodak. 2003. Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
West, Candace, and Sarah Fenstermaker. 2002. Accountability in action: the accomplishment of gender, race and class in a meeting of the University of California Board of Regents. Discourse & Society 13(4). 537–63.
Wetherall, Margaret. 1998. Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. Discourse & Society 9(3). 387–412.
Widdowson, Henry G. 1995. Discourse analysis: a critical view. Language and Literature 4. 157–72.
——. 1996. Reply to Fairclough: discourse and interpretation: conjectures and refutations. Applied Linguistics 19. 136–51.
——. 1998. The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. Applied Linguistics 19. 3–16.
——. 2004. Text, context, and pretext: critical issues in discourse analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.
Wilson, John. 1990. Politically speaking: pragmatic analysis of political language. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Windt, Theodore. 1983. Presidential rhetoric: 1961 to the present. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
——. 1990. Presidents and protesters: political rhetoric in the 1960s. Anchorage: University of Alaska Press.
Wodak, Ruth (ed.) 1989. Language, power, and ideology: studies in political discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
——. 1995. Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. The handbook of pragmatics, ed. by Jef Vershueren, Jan-Ola Ostman, Jan Blommeart and Chris Bulcean, 205–10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
——. 1996. Disorders of discourse. London: Longman.
——. 2001. The discourse-historical approach. Methods of critical discourse analysis, ed. by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 95–120. London: Sage.
——, and Paul Chilton (eds). 2005. A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: theory, methodology, and interdisciplinarity. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
——, and Rudolf de Cilia. 2006. Politics and language: overview. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics vol. 9, ed. by Keith Brown, 707–17. Boston: Elsevier.
——, and Bernd Matouschek. 1993. We are dealing with people whose origins one can clearly tell just by looking. Discourse & Society 4(2). 225–48.
——, and Michael Meyer (eds). 2001. Methods of critical discourse analysis. London: Sage.
Woolard, Kathryn A. 1992. Language ideology: issues and approaches. Pragmatics 2(3). 235–49.
Young, Lynn, and Claire Harrison. 2004. Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis. London: Continuum.
Zarefsky, David. 2004. Presidential rhetoric and the power of definition. Presidential Studies Quarterly 34(3). 607–19.