

USC 141.7:32.001

## **FEATURES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE, ITS RESTRICTIVE MECHANISMS WITH REGARD TO REPRODUCE THE PHENOMENON OF ALIEN BY MICHEL FOUCAULT**

**Andriy Garbadyn**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
Universytetska str., 1, Lviv, 79000, Ukraine,  
e-mail: garbadin@gmail.com*

The specific of understanding by Michel Foucault directly derived from his research discursive practices were proven. It is shown that in addition to all Foucault holds the position according to which the production of discourse in society is controlled by nature. In the political dimension of being human and the appropriate level of discourse also manifest themselves exclusion procedure. The specific operation of these procedures, ways and means of creating them alien. Characterize the process of forming a an alien at present, in terms of definition of discursive socio-political practices.

*Keywords:* alien, political discourse, power, discipline.

Specificity understanding a alien M. Foucault directly derived from his studies of discursive practices. Discourse itself, unlike J. Derrida, M. Foucault understands wider than the textual formation, including in its analysis and extratextual factors as the writing of the status of the vacant expression of meaning, which means that “writing is a game characters, not so much for its orderly signified meaning, as the very nature marked with” [4, p. 17]. This momentous game takes place outside of the rules that define the internal logic of writing. Thus, specific tracking a alien in political discourse consist primarily in the discovery space of its existence, not in the reconstruction of the experience of its existence, as the latter generally problematic in terms of a discrete approach to reality in discursive practices in general – “at that status, which has the concept of writing today without question, really, about the gesture of writing, nor indicate that someone seems to want to say” [4, p. 17].

In this context, it is advisable to recall the concept of death by Michel Foucault. It consists in a statement: author – is not just an element of discourse, and the way his organization, function classification, separation and opposition. It organizes a set of texts. Finally, the “author function to describe a certain way of life discourse” [4, p. 21]. In political discourse is presented as thematic structuring verbal practices designed to provide a hierarchical stratification of expression, to develop a series of indicators that determine their feasibility and cost appropriately identifying those provisions that go beyond logic operation such discourse. This extra-limilarity and is a medium formation the alien.

Appropriate organization of discursive practices, including in their political interpretation preserves their content (usually even ideological ) unity reductioning difference based on the

principles of evolution to the “permissible error”. This approach helps to overcome contradictions also because of the presence of ideological discourse center enables the organization around it even mutually exclusive things.

Foucault, among adheres to the position according to which the production of discourse in society is controlled by nature – “in every society the production of discourse simultaneously monitored undergoes selection, organized and redistributed through a certain number of procedures whose function – to neutralize his power credentials and related hazards curb its unpredictable events, avoid it this full, this dangerous materiality” [3, p. 51]. Heuristic discourse dangerous potential for political institutions in power just because of the power of the features in discourse, and this much-needed control.

In the political dimension of human existence, it is political, not political, and the appropriate level of discourse also manifest themselves exclusion procedure. It is the operation of these procedures creates the alien. The most obvious of these is – a ban. The very specificity of functioning political discourse implies that you can not say all - there is always the whole scheme of the rules and procedures that determine the order of expression, its content and theme, the circumstances preceding and the subject factor as competence and status factor is also important. “The taboo on the object, ritual circumstances, privileged or exclusive right subject that says – we are dealing with the effect of three types of prohibitions that overlap, reinforce or offset each other, forming a complex network which continuously changes” [3, p. 51–52].

Another procedure is the distinction exclusion and rejection. Their action is based on the binary opposition of constructs. Foucault is illustrated by the ratio of the mind and madness. In political discourse examples are numerous. For example, the deduction of the alien political discourse takes place as the articulation of the impossibility of representing him the position that is most useful, because the latter, in accordance with democratic principles, has the right to determine the direction of movement of the discourse.

The third procedure Foucault considers the opposition of true and false – “of course, if you sit at the level of expression inside of a discourse, the division between true and false does not prove nor arbitrary, nor prone to changes associated with some institutions or violent. But if we take a different starting point, raise the question if what was and what it always is, going through all our discourses – this will to truth, which has gone through so many centuries of our history ... we’ll see then, perhaps, as emerges something like it on a system exception (system of historical, subject to change, institutionally enforced)” [3, p. 55]. About a third system of exclusion Foucault said most – in his opinion, during the first two centuries it was erected in the third. They are full of what he calls the “will to truth”, which defines the third procedure. In fact, this – here “will to truth” and blocks the deployment of real discourse in terms of intertwining expression by building them according to a certain logic, centering around a principle – “true discourse that its mandatory form devoid of desire and released from authorities may not recognize the will to truth which pervades it, and the will to truth, in turn – one that has long been imposed on us yourself – this is the truth that it volyt can not this will not obstruct” [3, p. 58–59]. So we are faced with only the truth actually is universal in its essence, and the discourse is reduced to harping different ways, according to the discrete distinction of in which it occurs, only its sides, without the ability to change its semantic component. In political discourse in different stages such truths were the state, citizenship, nationality, indirect influence and create the alien.

In addition to external and internal discourse involves exclusion procedure – “it – procedures that act more as principles of classification, ordering, distribution, though this time the point was

to rein in another dimension of discourse: its event and chance” [3, p. 59]. They form a discipline. The latter is not simply the sum of all that can be truly contained in the discourse, but rather the internal order of its deployment that provides ordering feed sense on the one hand and block chance, the impact of the event, as appropriate, and display of the alien.

Moreover, Foucault identifies and third group exclusion procedures which he classifies under the heading determination discourse in terms of bringing the action, as well as individuals by imposing certain rules to which access is not open all comers. This is another dimension to the formation of an alien – a kind of a status definition and structuring of expression of individuals, as well as the existence of common rules, albeit in a biased, does not guarantee equal opportunities in their application – “this time it comes to thinning of subjects, say, in order of discourse never come one who does not meet certain requirements, or from the beginning has no right to it” [3, p. 69]. The last sentence is particularly remarkable in that there are mentions of right to expression, which is the evidence of biased discourse status, especially political, despite the fundamental foundation of its operation. It presents evidence that not all areas are open political discourse – differentiation manifests itself particularly clearly in these matters one way or another affect government institutions, or they may carry a threat to change the power dispositif. More open discourse are those areas that are civil in nature, because their subject matter is practically not carry the impact of the fixed effects on the functioning of the mechanisms ruling.

The most superficial, therefore, traceable form of restriction of Michel Foucault believes ritual. Last provides qualifications which must have subjects for expression, as dialogism, founded in discourse, they require a clear position formed certain type of the expression. Any form of contradictions such training is already doing with the alien entity. Also, “defines ritual gestures, behavior, circumstances and the totality of signs, which must accompany the discourse, he finally captures the anticipated efficacy or sane words – their effect on those to whom they are directed and limits their coercive power” [3, p. 71]. Political discourse is difficult to separate from the ritual. Last distinguished actors, the special features that characterize them, and at the same time determining the alien that does not fit into this logic. It is also important to emphasize nonidentical alien and marginal in this respect, because the latter implies the existence of functioning political discourse, given the need for excess indicative of a position that does not fit in the “will to truth” he articulate. The alien is a position that can not be reduced because of the binary construct of this minimum allowable error.

An example of political discourse in this context can be a political doctrine, as it is able to link the subjects expression of their specific types, measurements of expression of a particular vision of political phenomena, with this imposing a ban on all other features of his interpretation. To this must be added the horizontal level of communication that reveals the connectivity between a business and requires the use of very specific statements. The political doctrine is able to keep itself around opposition supporters and an alien to itself, which goes beyond the referred discourse, not sharing those statements that its form – “the doctrine of a double subordination: subjects, say - a certain discourse and discourses - a particular group, at least virtually, individuals who speak” [3, p. 74].

When individual features are reduced to concepts that “cements” the basic foundations of discourse with a view to rationalization, the discourse itself from the ideological center of a world shifting to the periphery, getting rid of their heuristic inclination. Instead, the center position becomes built, worked and suggested, only able to stratify, hierarchically around. This is just becoming evident in the political doctrine. “And if it finally can take the form of discourse, if anything can be said and discourse can speak about everything – it’s the fact that all things

find their meaning and exchanged it can return to its silent interior, the consciousness of most itself" [3, p. 78]. Foucault rightly notes, "the discourse – it is never more than a game. Game of writing in the first case, reading – in the second, sharing – in the third, and this exchange is reading, writing is always dealing only with signs. Entering thus into the category signified, discourse is canceled in its reality" [3, p. 77–78]. Almost impossible to talk about free discursivity when it comes to the principles of structuring and grouping. In this context, it can be concluded that it is the presence of an alien and allows discourse, including political, but then when it endures beyond the various mechanisms of avoidance, it is advisable to talk about the handling and operation of the compliance authoritative discourse, or it depends on some idea that has structures.

All this puts certain requirements before the study of discourse. Foucault solves them through a series of principles. First is the principle of reversal, which is to avoid the discipline of figures, the author of the "will to truth". Second, is the principle of finitude – can not speak of the continuity of discourse, it remains unchanged and the evolutionary growth of heuristic strength because "discourses should be seen as a finite practices that overlap and sometimes are neighbors to each other, but also to ignore or exclude each other" [3, p. 79]. Thirdly, the principle of specificity – not idealized world measurements of its manifestation, which are the subject of discourse activity, do not try to find the hidden meaning of his intense definitions. Fourth, the external rule – "do not go from discourse to its inner and hidden kernel ... but taking the top point of the discourse itself, go to the external conditions of its possibility, before giving place to a random series of events and fixing their boundaries" [3, p. 80].

The regulative principle analysis, according to Foucault's position, must be based on the following four concepts: the concept of events, the concept of the series, the concept of regularity concept conditions of possibility, "they are opposed to, respectively, the event – creative series – unity, regularity – originality and condition possible – meaning" [3, p. 80]. The fundamental concept which should be considered in the analysis of political discourse, it is an alien because it is a concept quite fit in the above study rules, while the concept of continuity of consciousness and lost its relevance. It should merely look at the doctrinal variations discursivity XX century political thought in their totalitarian dimension to see this.

One of the options for the consideration of the discursive approach to research works of Michel Foucault's analysis of power is. Immediately it should be emphasized that Foucault explores the notion of power, regardless of its conceptual separation of political, economic and social. With this in mind, the focus of our study had been made on the interpretation of power at this stage – because all its historical aspect too extensive to review the format of one study. Understanding government at this stage clearly just extrapolated on the specific political discourse.

Panoptikon subtle power describes the specifics of modern society, with its fears and concerns – terrorism, asociality, marginality – all this and only overcome through a nonviolent visibility since the days of total violence, threats and visible bloody protests has expired. Now the threat of watches in most grey strata of society – and there is no obvious characteristics of illegality. Only "seeing eye" can capture and eliminate the threat. In fact, panoptikon – a democratic analog "Big Brother". Visible control – the most perfect. The feeling of total traceability works harder for supervision organized because no guarantee is no peace, all semblance soothes and brings with him. The difference is only in the location of the procedure of "correctness".

Overall difference panoptikon all previous versions disciplinary authority is the following characteristics:

1. Functional inversion disciplines. If they ever had a negative status – their role was to neutralize the dangers of direct intervention and limited life, now they value highly positive and implies an increase in the utility of individuals.

2. Reproduction of disciplinary mechanisms. Controls continuously distributed, divided, specializing penetrate all spheres of human existence. There is growing institutional supervision and control of branching.

3. State control over disciplinary mechanisms. It is clear – to be the central institution panoptikon tower that would to monitor the disciplinary mechanisms. Also, the state is central to the supervision and control by the government.

For the most part, the discipline can not be identified with any institute or the status of the person or of the machine is a type of power, it is essentially a new filling mechanism that relies, is based on a combination of tactics and strategic orientation, which in turn are based on the idea of control. As Foucault notes, “our society – a society oversight, not of sight” [2]. In place of the exponential power of greatness comes its apparent absence invisible ubiquity. The government now total due to the fact that it is impossible to trace. And this silent power of surveillance is much more effective – in fact, merged with a positive necessity of its own existence in the mind, it actually saves the last self-release ways of controllability.

And finally, it is advisable to give the specifics of the formation of the disciplinary society in the historical procedural (the unity of the legal, political, scientific factors), derived by Foucault:

1) It is necessary to state that the discipline faces techniques that are designed to organize people's lives and their multiplicity. But discipline is a feature that “it tries to tactics of government that meets three criteria: the use of power should be as cheap (lean) of this social power should be as strong and extended as far as possible without failures and gaps, and finally “economic” growth of power must be linked to the production units (educational, military, industrial, medical) within which power is, in short, you need to simultaneously increase both obedience and usefulness of all elements of the social system” [2].

2) Panoptikon modality of power in conjunction with all its mechanisms are not directly dependent is not a consequence of the institutional system of political and legal relations, but it is not completely independent – “social contract can be regarded as an ideal foundation of law and political power; panoptyzm serves as a common technique over coercion” [2].

3) Separately, these techniques have their own history, but at the current stage of power they intersect, complementary and mutually reinforcing.

Thus, the current government strategy is presented in the mechanisms disciplinarity. This discipline helps to turn people into objects from different spheres of life – from medicine to politics. Disciplinarity provides normalization of the functioning of social and state system – through discourse, based on the ratio of power – knowledge.

It should be noted that Foucault identifies and slight shift in modern strategy authorities at one time and noticed G. Deleuze. He said, “disciplinary society, in turn entered into a stage of crisis, gradually freeing space for new energy ... now we no longer live in a disciplinary society, we no longer such” [1, p. 26].

Instead disciplinarity comes control. This is completely absolutisation essence panoptyzm – disciplinary institutions such as famil, education, prisons constantly reforming blurs the boundaries between them in terms of disciplinary isolation. No more disciplined citizen – it is under constant review, in accordance with discipline – only his personal priority. Human nature is now very self discipline, while possessing a fiction of freedom – the freedom of personal choice.

Control – this module is the new reality of power, which characterizes an unprecedented non-static, constant turnover of the structural component, as well as modifications due to exposure to changes in transcendental knowledge. That power is like the control – this is the result of balance of power and knowledge in modern society and the state.

Power should be understood as a strategy for the operation of specific control mechanisms and the organization of social and political dimension of human existence. It is this interpretation of power reveals its specificity in political terms.

In fact, likened the political power in terms of its dysemination – power is also difficult to trace out its specific mechanism of manifestation, beyond isolation archive its consideration. Power – as a strategy – fuzzy, scattered, dispersed in all social and political relations. It fills the operation of an extensive system of social and political relations. Power is not a closed concept in this sense, as a set of mechanisms that are correlated according to their own operation strategies, the specifics are mobile, constantly changing according to the specifics of knowledge.

Power is difficult to interpret as an act that is able to hold the position of the individual against someone else. Lost their relevance is binary scheme, in which the alien made a part of oppression is always on the side that was defeated. We should not exaggerate the importance of local networks of influence, such as state-owned media - “cold war”, mostly made in the past. The era of the Internet removes these haloes local authorities. Instead, it becomes a priority this elusive control, the right to knowledge, not as universal, and as a strategy of penetration into the awareness of the existence of the individual. Last turns into a alien in circumstances where such rules directly restrict his or contributed to increasing individualization, in particular due to the loss of political identification in any way possible forms.

In summary it should be noted that we have studied especially the formation of the stranger within political discourse, according to Foucault's position. This space deployment not prove its reconstruction within these practices, but the antecedencedevel-revision exactly discursive practices, specific operation which creates conditions for the formation of the phenomenon of alien power through exclusion procedures present in any discursive formation, particularly political. Feature tracking alien in political discourse, in such circumstances, be to open a space of its existence, not in the reconstruction of the experience of its existence, as the latter generally problematic in terms of a discrete approach to reality in discursive practices.

*Author's translation of the article*

#### LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Делёз Ж. Переговоры. СПб.: Наука, 2004.
2. Фуко М. Надзирать и наказывать. Рождение тюрьмы //?Фуко М. Порядок дискурса // Фуко М. Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет. М.: Касталь, 1996.
3. Фуко М. Что такое автор? // Фуко М. Воля к истине: по ту сторону знания, власти и сексуальности. Работы разных лет. М.: Касталь, 1996.

*An article received by the Editorial Board 31.01.2014*

*Accepted for publication 17.02.2014*