„BABEŞ-BOLYAI" UNIVERSITY
CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY

Concepts on the role of

political discourse

in strengthening democracy

Resume of Doctoral Thesis

Doctoral coordinator: **Doctoral student:**

Prof. univ. dr. Zăpârţan Liviu Petru   **Tişe Alin**

2014

Table of contents

Key words

Political discourse

Democracy

Democratization process

Political regime

Sovereignty

Legitimacy

Subsidiarity

Freedom

Freedom of opinion

Rule of law

Constitution

Power

Power segregation

Institutional

Europe

European Union

Public domain

Philosophy of politics

Political ideas

Political ideologies

Political doctrines

Political communication

Message

Manipulation

Analysis

Synthesis of ideas

The doctoral thesis entitled „Concepts related to the importance of political discourse in democracy consolidation" is structured as follows: the Introduction, four basic chapters, a chapter of Conclusions, two Annexes and the Reference List.

The Introduction describes the objective of our study, more precisely to analyze and establish the connection between political discourse, political communication and democracy consolidation and to determine if another type of political discourse and another way to make politics can exist, to prove that another politics than those practiced until now can exist and that we, as a society can evolve towards the correct path leading to the democratic future of a country.

I started this study in an attempt to answer the questions concerning the connection between the political regime and the field of communication and political discourse and whether political communication and political discourse are essential in democracy? Is communication specific only to democratic regimes? Is communication necessary in another type of political regime? Thus, I tried to identify the elements defining the connection between communication and political regime by a succession of systematical approaches, considering that man is out of necessity and by excellence an agent of social communication while his survival and inclusion in a democratic society depends on subsequent social relations.

Our analysis tried to identify and clarify the connection between political communication - political discourse and democracy consolidation by a succession of systematical approaches, especially as long as there is no standard analysis method neither of discourses nor of messages or even of the importance they have for democracy.

In the 1st Chapter: „What is the democracy?" we proposed that starting from the manner in which the democracy occurred and evolved to succeed in identifying the elements defining the democratic systems. Thus, even since the ancient Greek stronghold, although unofficial and lacking of a constitutional form, the people's sovereignty is the feature that comes first, and later the historical evolution would lead to other elements as every one's participation in taking decisions, freedom of opinion, the majority vote, etc., the ancient thinkers summarizing the concepts supporting the idea of democracy as an environment where the political life manifests as well as the relation of these concepts with the state as the performance stage have not only slackened and even fallen back during the middle ages.

Nevertheless, we find out that the modern era of democracies, especially of the "constitutional" ones is reshaping, reasserting and somewhat defining itself in the 17th and 18th centuries, during Illuminism, once with the new rational thinking highly influenced by Locke and Montesquieu.

Once with this evolution we also find out the manner in which the democracy transformed itself from a direct and participatory regime into a semi-direct and representative regime, which in the modern era within the European Union evolved up to a mixed register, a coexistence of participatory and representative democracy, which shows once again that in democratic regimes the power/sovereignty belongs to the people and their participation through voting in choosing the governors proves the legal recognition of these organisms of powers.

In the 2nd chapter "What is the political discourse?" we intended that starting from the origin and manner in which the political discourse has evolved, by analyzing the types of political discourse and also the main ideologies and doctrines which influenced for centuries the political world, to present the importance of political discourse for creating elements of democratic evolution – as national identities – and to analyze the relation between the political discourse and democracy, whether the political discourse has influence on democracy or to the contrary, the democracy is the one influencing the political discourse, since the political discourse cannot be seen otherwise than in direct relationship with the political action, therefore the political discourse is placed in the same general context as the proper political communication with all its effects – doctrines, regimes, governing types and also with the elements pertaining to rhetoric, oratory practices, psycho-sociology, in fact the language represents the most important instrument of human communication.

From the rhetorical perspective, we find out that this art has developed especially in ancient times and once with the end of the ancient culture, the fall of oratory art took place since the power of guns and domination of dogma replaced the power of words. Only when the new political doctrines developed did the passion for shaping and adjusting the political discourse rekindled, which gradually passed from its persuasive and many times propagandistic role calling for mobilization to the role of communicating a political message. In the contemporary period the political discourse gains definite features and in certain political regimes faces the misdemeanors caused by propaganda or censorship and practically involves all aspects of social life becoming more and more important for the political environment and not only.

The oratory art comes to public attention once with the Winston Churchill's discourses and we refer here to his political discourses that revealed in a visionary manner the problems of a united Europe built on the principle of subsidiarity, which is the key factor for the success of this "supra state", while the debates referring it begun only at the mid 70's, its completion took place at mid of 80's being and was regulated by treaties in 1992 by the Maastricht Treaty.

We consider that the importance of debating the subsidiarity principle is given by the fact that by segregating the levels of competence and by solving issues and laws enactment on local levels close to the citizens enable a higher degree of democracy due to the participation in taking decisions of a more significant part from the national society, while on the other hand these action allow the real analysis of the "power" concept even in case of delegated power because it derives from sovereignty and legitimacy.

This is why I believe that we should consider not only the forms of political discourse but also its context, because the message cannot be efficiently transmitted unless it is correlated with time and geographical region as well as with the political regime. Therefore, we think that the democracy is a real concept defining a certain social and political reality which in its manifestation forms is far from being unitary, even if a standardized definition may lead to the idea that the governance is performed by elected representatives with the approval of those governed by them, the differences being caused by the diversity of democratic systems, either in incipient or contemporary forms. In this circumstances we have considered as being important to approach the issues of political communication and political debates starting from ancient times and up to the present.

However, in this chapter we cannot analyze the occurrence of ideologies and doctrines from historical perspective without presenting a brief history of political ideas and their transformation starting from the mythology of ancient time and up to the rational concept first introduced also by the ancient philosophy and then reiterated by Illuminism. We cannot speak about a liberal doctrine based on the writings of Hobbes, Locke and Montesquieu if we weren't familiar with the fact that their common root is represented by the search of the most suitable form of government simultaneous with the preservation of individual freedom which is the supreme value in democracy. If the ancient peoples believe that the reason as positive value is enough for the leader to provide the adherence to these values, the British thinkers, then the French, Italian and subsequently the American thinkers believe that the reason is necessary but not sufficient, that it has to be conceptualized and then pragmatically wrapped as political powers, assigned to several

representative organisms based on delegation or transfer of the sovereignty, but still divided not in a single bunch and thus to control and balance each other which results in a better government and individual freedom. Naturally, these transitions form one stage to another of the political ideas was achieved with external influences of the social and political environment from that period.

Although initially the ideologies occupied a strong position up to the period of great illuminist thinkers, in the new "world order" imposed by the changes brought by the cold war these were rapidly and almost immediately contradicted by "the ideologies" of freedom movement under communism, still on the large scale they remained the engines leading to mobilization in the environment of some actual concepts for societies and nations.

We couldn't speak about an evolution that starts from the ancient stronghold and Greek demos and reaches to the high philosophical trends influenced by the Christian „doctrines" without the fall of the Roman Empire and the occurrence of the new territorial and state separation which involves the division ad multiplication of the government forms. We couldn't witness the return to the power of stronghold, the medieval town – stronghold this time, to the power of ideas based on reasoning in search of a common good philosophy, even with both influences of the Christian church learning and the Catholic church as institution, if the Christian doctrine, the canonical law and pope's power hadn't developed in such way in which it swallowed up and subordinated the political power, which determined the pursuit for other ways and the return to the bases of ancient ideas.

Thenceforth, the history development encouraged strengthening of monarchic powers and absolute monarchies, but also caused negative effects for the peoples. All these will create debates and reasons proving once again the source of the political power but emphasize the natural rights of the human being, which previously represented the basis of liberal doctrines or the necessity of the state existence and organization by respecting freedom. However, the dissimilarity of thoughts between German and British thinkers at these levels becomes irrelevant when speaking about the occurrence of the anarchism or socialism ideologies.

The history also underlines that the ideologies survived only when they had a pragmatic purpose. The triumph of a political power based on political discourses, but more often based on violence – as it is the case of the beginning of 20th Century - although promoting the separation of the modern world from the political myths shaking the societies up, while in the contemporary period the political interests of the countries – especially in the case of European Union – on one hand overcomes the ideological and doctrinarian interests and on the other hand in case of EU

parties as actor and institutional framework have forced the ideological modification of the parties' discourses in the purpose of their affiliation while in the case of the citizens, the individual political behavior can be influenced by the alteration of the original political values and by mixing them.

However, the great merit of the ideologies is that they succeeded in imposing values and principles to the societies, even if these societies are subsequently organized based on more practical reasons and use only some of the concepts incorporated in political doctrines belonging not only to the political parties but even to the (European) political families the final purpose being to access the political power and thus to govern.

In this manner the political doctrines succeed in arguing the positions of different social groups "performing" on the political stage which try to accede to power. Certainly, the doctrinarian sub-layer of a party or a political person will influence the public and political discourse being closely related to the political convictions to which the person or party adheres to and sustains in the public domain and the doctrinarian arguments continuously influenced the publicly conveyed message but also the language used.

As presented before, the main contemporary political doctrines historically and territorially belong to England and France of the 17th and 18th century with German and American contributions and in most of the cases were imposed through revolutions or following the disproof of a previous doctrine or due to some social and economical circumstances as the effects of post-industrial era that cause the blooming of the socialist and subsequently of the fascist doctrine.

In 18th century France occurred the dichotomy considerably simplified and reductionist of the "left-right" policy, and what we are pointing out here is that in the contemporary period the "left-right" dichotomy is more easily to be embraced by the large public even if the "currents" may be different in various countries and the precise definition of the terms was not established.

In addition to classical doctrines that may fall under this dichotomous classification, which on European level have correspondence within PE, respectively PE and PPE groups, we have approached several doctrines created in the globalization era, as the feminism (which initially occurred in the 18th century in some form and was reinvented in the contemporary period) and the ecologism, which initially were critical thinking movements more than doctrinarian movements, have a strong political discourse even if many times was unidirectional and which in the end succeeded in changing the manner in which the political world takes decisions and due to the fact that is based on scientific researches as: the fight for defending the gender interests and equal

treatment or the fight for preserving the environment which succeed in generating public policies on macro-European level that either changed the perception of the European actor in the globalization performance or caused an economic progress.

As a first conclusion, we point up that the values and practices but also the political discourses from the societies having democratic regimes are targeted on the individual freedom, the equality of citizens before the law, the laws supremacy, the citizen rights, legitimacy, tolerance towards the pluralism and multiculturalism and the fair election competition, power segregation within the state, values that can be mostly found in doctrines and democratic political discourses of liberal or Christian-democratic nature focused on the "welfare state" which is seen both as an integrated and efficient economic system related more to the social and economic rights than the natural rights.

In addition to the doctrinarian discourses we succeed in identifying the existence of the identity discourses that overcome the border of nationalism and if we refer solely to the European identity, the common ideas of these discourses is the uniformity of expression of the principles defining an identity and the transformation and permanent adjustment to a dynamic and lawful process which developed in the last half of century and consolidated an European identity in line with the ideal of its founding parents while permanently keeping as the main values the freedom, democracy, security and prosperity.

By observing the political discourse occurrence and evolution, especially the Anglo-Saxon discourse and the evolution of the process of creation of a modern and democratic state, we ascertain that it is important that the political discourse to be addressed to anyone not only to elites, as guaranteed by the civil rights and freedom and by the national constitutions which offer the equal right of expression but did not automatically guarantee the existence and an equal power of influence of the political discourses while bring foreground the discourse based on law and equality principle as a source for legitimacy and the "new actors" from the public stage are represented by "apolitical" entities - civil society that lead to the approach of some relatively new subjects of general interest.

At the same time, I have considered that it is worth following the direction of political discourse research in this globalization era when the evolution, scientific progress and access to the communication and information technologies lead to the fast exchange of ideas and information but also of populations, phenomenon not neglected by the political actors which continuously adapted their manner of conveying messages and also forced them to approach an unitarian discourse, as in

the case of European Union, the settlement of the new common policies as the security or JAI policy.

I have analyzed the importance for the contemporary era of the mass-media and especially of the television as a media sub-category in creating and modeling political discourses, as a broadcasting and information mean and not only, as well as the modifications of the purposes undergone by the mass-media during the last century. In the contemporary period, the media actually establishes the political agenda or reveals undesired facts concerning the private and not public life of the officials.

Unfortunately for the societies and democratization process, the modification of the objectives and the desire to sell media, the competition for gaining audience and resources represent another cause of reduction of the democratic culture by distorting the informational, educational and responsibility role of media and its transformation into entertainment mean that provoke conflicts by broadcasting "sensational" news causing the loss of people's trust in politics and politicians, in political discourses and the loss of credibility in politicians as well.

The relationship between these doctrinarian discourses and the political regimes represents the object of our research from this chapter in an attempt to prove the implications of political doctrines into the democratic process, the influences of these doctrines upon the actual political discourse and the high importance of the foredoom of expression for building and consolidating a democracy.

Another point of interest consisted in the value and efficiency of the political discourse for the democratic process, when this is only pure theory and when it is supported by practical or concrete actions and its importance in strengthening or diminishing the governmental institutions representative character. At this point, I have studied by comparison the situation of political discourses and actions made by two European prime ministers in two cases having similar elements.

Thus, we find out that by public consistency and Unitarian discourse can consolidate both the role of powerful political leading a cabinet and the image of that cabinet, while the duplicity and contradictions of the political discourses, followed by contradictory measures and the lack of responsibility or failure to adhere to the campaign promises weaken not only the role of the politician but also affect the cabinet authority.

In the 3rd Chapter entitled "Analysis of the Political discourse" we tried a multidisciplinary approach (linguistic, non-linguistic, historical, political, ideological) and an analysis of the existing

theories related to the discourse analysis and theory, as well. We have considered that the relationship between the political discourse and the political regime or between the political discourse and social- political transformations is a two-ways road because not only the political regimes and the political transformations cause the modification of political discourse but the political discourse causes the regimes and social-political transformations in a society as well.

We believe as being relevant and important the fact that a political discourse analysis represents both an instrument for critical thinking even when it uses data and empiric procedures, and a manner to develop social and political or institutional behaviors while the analysis of political discourse or the theory of discourse represents an identification mean of the importance of discourse for political analysis and for understanding the purpose given to the political act by the culture of a nation or the specific environment.

After the evaluation of the existing theories from the academic environment, especially in the Anglo-Saxon environment, we notice that most of approaches relates to an analysis from linguistic perspective aiming to express and accurately determine the goal of the discourse, to clarify the structure of a reality subordinated to the words meaning. However, there were certain approaches sustaining that such analyses lead to the mystification of the discourse purpose, the transformation of its content, which will remain only in theoretical and scholar fields without practical effects on political communication or with no influence upon society.

Therefore, we consider that the public, excepting the theoreticians, will never give much importance to lexical or grammar elements contained by the political discourse – although everyone assigns the general and social accepted meanings to the words – but rather will focus on the political discourse content and try to consider the words depending on the social and political environment perceived in order to establish the manner in which the information contained by discourse have influence upon him/her and this is a correct communication agreement. Thus, we draw the conclusion that the analysis of the political discourse can provide a practical result only if it relates to the analysis of the message content considered from the perspective of the environment where the discourse is communicated.

Nevertheless, the idea of the language analysis cannot be removed from the discourse analysis because, in our opinion, the language and style chosen by the politician establishes the communication direction in the relationship between the politician and his public and the langue is and will remain a personal trademark of each public speaker.

We have also tried to identify if there is a reliable method to measure the impact upon the public of the political discourse especially upon electors and the manner in which voting take place and we come to the conclusion that such method should start from a linguistic analysis, because the politician image depends to a great extent on his discourse, the elements of the show can easily be identified and removed.

Simultaneously, we were preoccupied with identification of a boundary between political discourse – communication and political discourse – manipulation. We ascertain that the manipulation, which is a negative communication type, relates not only to communication but the lack of it or to other censorship actions, the purpose of manipulation actions and techniques consists in revealing the "official" information and impeding the public access to other information, to other knowledge and the identified outcome is the diminishing and annihilation of will or of the freedom of will sometimes with the purpose of inducing a certain behavior and other times to determine the abstention from certain behavior, especially when we speak bout election behaviors.

On the other hand, we argue that somewhat political discourse means manipulation and the manipulation means communication and we also mention that as a main form of manifestation of the freedom expression we cannot fight against communication or legally limit it, reason for which we face a paradox and that is the freedom of expression which is permanently accompanied by a "negative" freedom which is the freedom of manipulation, however the effects of manipulation can be reduced or overcame.

In conclusion, we do consider that the effects of manipulation can be diminished or eliminated only by re-educating the public on the relevance and importance of the political discourse but especially by providing a high level of education and culture to the public and by developing a critical spirit of the population, which will provide not only the capacity to judge the purposes of discourses but to identify the potential manipulation risks hidden by them.

However, education and the high level of critical and civil attitude determine another effect as well: a greater involvement of the population in the public and political life and a more active participation in public debates and information campaigns, political campaigns, including the democratic election procedures, thus determining a higher degree of legitimacy, both for elected authorities and for the public policies that they shall implement.

Although the modern era and the technological development have led to the multiplication of means of information as well as to the extension of the "online agora" and may determine us to

assert that today the wide public have a greater and more active participation in community life and political communication, than they had half a century ago, we strongly consider that the we are facing a paradox: the passive participation of the public, as spectator at the media show offered by the political discourse, especially during the political campaigns, also determines a civil apathy and lack of interest and involvement, and moreover we can assert that it undermines the role of the discourse as instrument of democracy.

Another negative effect of the transformation and adjustment of the political discourse in the era of television or internet broadcasted shows is the reverse of the classical paradigm, by adapting the political discourse to what the society wishes to hear, which, again, determines, from our point of view, the lack of efficiency of this instrument stimulating and promoting democracy.

In this chapter we have also approached the topic of the public life and especially the European public life, as we consider that this concept is the one extending the field of political communication and connects the political discourse to the wide public, transforming it from simple addressee of the message, or "recipient", into a genuine partner for dialogue and political action, which implicitly confers them a role in extending the degree of democracy within the Union member states, while also generating a sense of involvement and belonging to the idea of global and European action, placing it under the scrutiny of the electors and making the elected persons of the European structures more responsible.

At macro level, we have considered that this concept of the European public life has even succeeded to modify the European political discourse, among which the topics of sovereignty and national or foreign politics, changing the focus from the collaboration among member states on conceding certain attributes of the national sovereignty to the European institutions, shown by radicalizing certain discourse ideas towards the direction of setting up the United States of Europe, only in a different vision than what Winston Churchill had proposed in 1946.

We consider that, although on one hand, the European Union has regulated a form of participative democracy – the citizen initiative, that we were speaking of in chapter I, leading to the increase of democracy degree, such measures, as those proposed by the European leaders in the discourses delivered between 2011-2012 have a potential danger of reducing democracy, by leading to a mimics of democratic debates practice, discourse trend relatively unitary of the European leaders, which may result in political measures that would reduce public participation to formal

practices, while institutions and governments shall communicate decisions, without actually debating solution proposals.

This is why, in this context, we also approached the theory of Lasswell, according to which politics refers to who says what to whom, how they say and what the effect is, because political discourse is still an instrument defining political strategy that will generate the outcomes on the entire society. However, this involves that in order to accomplish its objective, political discourse will use techniques to influence public opinion. In this respect, we consider that manipulation, misinformation, advocacy, censorship, political marketing or any combination thereof, are "weapons" by which both the construction and perception of the political discourse are influenced, in their attempt to meet the expectations of the public, as it is well known that the populations are always influenced by the mobilizing spirits of the ideas expressed especially in their fields of interest, even if the message must be adapted in relation to population segments.

We consider, however, that over time, these techniques also had a positive impact, not only the outcome intended by the political category, namely the involvement of more and more social categories in the public life and the extension of the democratic process, strengthening the idea that the democracy with a higher degree of participation generates social and economic progress.

This is the moment when we approach the involvement of the media in the public life, and especially the transformation of its role of means of information and education into a political actor with its own discourse and its own methods – however still depending on internal interests – economic, political – namely the media does not simply convey the political discourse, or analyzes it, offering the public certain elements to analyze and discern upon the consequences of the political actions, but in modern history and especially in the contemporary period, the media actually establishes the political agenda and has its own political discourse or even propels the political discourse and policy makers to sometimes embrace attitudes that are against their own beliefs, only to succeed in "selling" their news. We also consider that the media also changes, not necessarily in the most elegant manner, the way public policies are generated, thus justifying the belief that the influence of the media on political discourse is most often a negative one.

On the other hand, the influence of the media and the more and more advanced technological means of communication have also imposed a different approach of the political discourse and especially of language, adapting it to the wide public, more and more. Thus, in the past, political professions as well as political discourse automatically imposed an association to a distinguished

discourse manner and an official and rigid language, defining realities and public policies or strategies, but today, we observe that the language used contains metaphors, analogies, epigrams, ironies, humor, etc. For this reason, we can assert that the political discourse, manifested as language, is more "casual", thus more accessible, but without necessarily diminishing the seriousness of topics or solutions proposed through the discourse. An example, in this respect, regards the use of humor in the areas and during the historical periods of authoritarianism or dictatorships, when the "humoristic discourse" – both as form and as content, was a method of opposition and fighting against official political communication, finally transforming, in the postmodern period, the use and role of humor and redefining classical political and democratic concepts, without representing their distortion or interpretation in a subjective, erroneous way.

We conclude here that in order to obtain a pragmatic result from the discourse analysis, it cannot be only a linguistic one, but it is necessary to make a multidisciplinary analysis and content analysis, considering especially the context when the discourse was delivered and its topic, to allow an understanding of the meaning of communication, but most importantly, understanding the domain and the message conveyed by it, although sometimes the topic may prevail even the message itself, as it is the main element that can really shape the image of a political man, not only his rhetoric.

For this reason, we considered necessary to continuously mention the elites' political discourse, the real trend-setters in the field, through the conveyed message – although even elites sometimes adapt their topic to the expectations of the public segments, since the public opinion and the wide public in general manifests a tendency to rally to the elites' opinions that they admire or they believe they identify with, even more than they rally an ideology itself.

Chapter IV approaches the connection between the political discourse and the democratization process, and how this discourse could produce or influence changes within certain political regimes less democratic, knowing the revolutionary context in the period between 1989 – 1991 which changed both the Eastern European regimes and the geopolitical configuration in the area, aligning most of these states to a democratization or westernization trend, which even today, as we can see, still strongly influences the evolution in the international environment, analyzing both the ideological-doctrinarian transfer, and the impact and role that the political discourse has had in the fall of communism in the Eastern Bloc.

The topic of political discourses in the period of transition from communist totalitarian regimes to democratic ones, reveals once again the interdependence between political action and

political discourse, but also the mobility of transmitting cultural concepts in the European space, especially the concept of freedom, and freedom of will and choice.

Thus, we find that a mobilizing engine for these revolutionary movements is similar to the engine of the revolutions occurred at the end of the 18th century, namely the principle of freedom, although the definition of this concept has had different meanings then and now, or from one territory to another, but its base is universal and focuses on the lack of constraints, something that in the case of totalitarian regimes was so constrained that we could consider it as abolished. Thus, we observe that one of the main constrained or inexistent rights and freedoms regarded the freedom of expression and thus the existence of political discourse and its limitation to a statism related discourse direction.

We consider that it was the moment when, in these new democratic nations, a clear relation between political discourse and social-political development was being defined, but when the mutual conditionings and interdependencies were also developing: the discourse favored democratic development but at the same time, the democratic system favored discourse – in terms of content and manifestation manner, however under a strong influence of elites which should manifest responsibility and dedication, initiate an inspirational and motivating political discourse that would otherwise be the beginning of a major debate allowing the expression of multiple and various opinions, strategies, arguments, thus creating the national public domains and the opening towards an European public domain.

If the post-December discourses, doctrinarian as they are, were most often lacking the mobilizing and innovating force, they had a great merit and their own existence has produced a progress, the ideological and discursive pluralism being a fundamental feature of a real democratization process, compared to a mono-discursive direction or mimic, or even substitution of the sole party's political discourse which would have been only a replacement of an authoritarian single party system with another one, limiting a priori the potential of democratic development included by a multi-party system and absolute freedom of expression.

From the discourse point of view, we consider that the opportunity of a new political regime, precisely of a democratic one, has offered the context required for the overall modernization of society, but also the opportunity of this new beginning of political discourse and political construction – with a new typology, message, language, which would also manifest in a new, quite unfamiliar, domain, that succeeded however to create the premises of existence and development of

a public domain with wide addressability, that we also consider to have reformed not only the idea of political discourse, but the very idea of freedom of opinion and expression.

On the other hand, we considered even from the beginning of this paper – and we emphasize – that communication is only the means conveying the discourse to the public and although not any communication forms a political discourse, we still take into consideration that any political discourse represents a communication and although we approached the matter of political discourse both in antiquity and at the dawn of democracies, in authoritarian regimes as well as democratization periods, in text format (philosophical and literary, too), in oral or media form, one of the preoccupations was to identify the differences of message between political discourse and political communication, to identify the "border" between them, but also to identify whether political communication and political discourse are essential in democracy, whether communication is specific only to democratic regimes, and whether it is required in another type of political regime as well.

A major conclusion that we emphasize relates to the fact that it is not the linguistics or syntax, but the message of the political discourses, which influences the public. We also observe that political discourses, as opposed to simple political communications, contain multiple messages, not just one, usually approach multiple subjects or a major subject and refer to a very developed sequence of democratic values, without limiting to a single idea or democratic principle. Messages identified in political discourses strengthen the idea that the political discourse has a major relevance in the democratic journey of a state, and in strengthening democracy.

Another objective that we aimed at, is related to determining the existence of another type of political discourse and another manner of making politics, to demonstrate that there can also be another type of politics that what has been practices until now, and that we, as society, can evolve in the right direction, which is actually why we made a comparative analysis of certain political discourses, keeping in mind mainly that there is no standard methodology for such studies.

Thus, we consider that the beginning of certain democratization processes, the initiation and sustainability of a political discourse and especially a democratic one cannot certainly represent an easy undertaking and an objective easy to attain, and especially to maintain. The process of maintaining the discourse on a democratic direction, especially if the political context is a troubled one, requiring certain measures that might seem anti-democratic and centralizing, is never over; it is a continuous process. And if external challenges may bring changes in the message conveyed by the

discourse, on the whole, the discursive direction cannot change, it can only be adapted and balanced, as its main purpose is to permanently communicate the real situation to the population and to determine them to acknowledge the common objective they engaged in, which cannot be diverted even by the barriers or challenges occurred along the way.

Whatever the formula or institutional structure that discursive political structures may be wrapped in, maintaining a dynamic and significant discourse may be accomplished only if the elites and political leaders comply with a strong reaction wave, coming from the population. This is the only way to validate any principle and democratic value and to valuate the main idea of a political discourse for the creation or re-creation of a new national identity or a new state project. And this is the only way - through the dialogue of political discourses - that each member of a society can identify the democratic authentic principles and values to adhere to.

In order for a society in its democratic beginnings to be able to progress, it is necessary to have the will of the people and the existence of state institutions established in a democratic and responsible way, but also the existence of an independent media, to point out possible drifts. The legal system must be independent and guarantee the protection of human rights, especially freedom of expression, a guarantee that the other institutions comply with the public interest.

Democracy is the only political regime that allows a certain state to modernize itself and its institutions, even if it is making the transition after a long totalitarian regime, and to integrate in a space that appreciates values and principles defined throughout the centuries as being democratic, but also establish a precise path for the accomplishment of this vision.

Still, democracy involves a real existence and exercise of civil freedoms, among which freedom of expression and especially of criticism are clearly standing out, together with the right of the society and nation to defend against small groups and promote general, national interests; the democratic right and freedom to request elected – thus representative – institutions to govern in a responsible way, to act responsibly and respect the majority and its will.

Only democracy and its sustainability following correct principles guarantee the unity of Europe on one hand, and the safety of the continent on the other hand, and its future role of global actor.

From the chosen examples, we clearly understand that a democratic state, regardless of its position on the world map, and regardless of how old its democracy or democratization process may be, must embrace certain values (freedom, right of criticism and self-determination, etc.) and

absolutely reject processes that affect democracy, that do not allow its evolution, such as corruption. Thus we clearly infer that a state affected by endemic corruption, does no longer respect, but only avoids the very democratic principles, the very existence and balance of divided powers in the state; but in their absence, we are no longer speaking of democracy.

Our analysis attempted to identify and clarify the connection between public communication – political discourse and the strengthening of democracy through a sequence of systematic approaches, considering that there is no standard method for discourse or message analysis, or even their relevance for democracy.

We consider that in previous chapters, dedicated to doctrinarian political discourses and/or related to state political regimes, we can assert with precision that freedom of expression – its real existence and guarantee of this civil right, is what encourages communication of political discourses, not preventing the diversity of ideas or their expression.

Thus it is certainly pointed out that political communication and political discourse are specific only to democratic political regimes, while in authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, they are absent or mimed by the state apparatus.

However, even in democracy, where absolute freedom of conscience and expression seem to be the basis for the strengthening of political discourse and encourage democratic debates and thus the democracy level, there still are dangers, which seem to affect only the freedom of the media, but by affecting the most powerful vector creating opinions, affects democracy itself.

As we have shown, these dangers come from economic-financial reasons, which determine the media resources to either resort to political patronage, which automatically affects their opinion independence and can even determine their editing policies to obey the patronage, in a "doctrinarian" way, thus altering their role in objective information, or, while chasing profits, they turn to tabloids, giving up the seriousness of journalism and transform important domains of communication, including political discourse, into amusement for the wide public, altering and distorting the quality of communication and the message itself. If changed, the message of the political discourse looses its mobilizing force that generates social energies and synergies that bring economic and social progress, as well as consolidate the democracy level.

Finally, this is a major problem, because in the globalization era, the media represents the most powerful vector for disseminating information and therefore, political discourse. Thus, other means of communication remain open to the public and unaltered: direct discourses – before

ceremonial meetings, demonstrators, official or unofficial meetings, within parliamentary debates or conferences before a specialized audience.

We were initially wondering whether communication and political discourse are necessary in another type of political regime. They certainly are! For sure, they cannot manifest, or manifest in a constrained, limited, secret, encoded manner, within totalitarian political regimes, engaging a major apparatus of pressure.

We believe that the overall political environment must turn towards the public even more, and to involve them in political debate more. The system of political discourse as monologue, either because the power of majority communicates in an uncooperative manner, ignoring the opposition, or because political figures communicate one way only, ignoring the public and its wish of involvement, sometimes even disregarding their will – represent only an imitation of democracy and of the democratic process.

We believe that such disregarding of the people's will by ignoring the involvement of civil society and at the same time an a priori assumption of the fact that political figures are elected, thus, authorized by the population to decide and govern and that in between two political campaigns is no longer interested by political discourse and action, is a completely wrong approach for democracy, but also for the political group.

As we have directly observed, from the experience of political and administrative life, the Romanian political discourse is still depending on certain expressions deeply related to non-democratic regimes, not by the lack of constitutional regulation of principles and rule of law, but by how they are implemented and applied.

The majority of the political class considers that public opinion and electors are an auxiliary element, necessary only in political campaigns when they fuel them with political discourses, loaded with promises, but without any substance or without actually publicly debating alternatives – even doctrinarian ones – for governing or for valid political and economic programs, but once the elections over, not only do they fail to comply with them, but they also breach them.

Another major problem that the political experience of the last 25 years has revealed is related to the civil and political education of the entire society and its capacity to receive and analyze the political discourse. Unfortunately, precisely for the purpose of serving the interest of the political class, they are making no efforts to educate this public and forming a correctly based public opinion. In order to perform an easy manipulation through the political campaign discourses, the political

class prefers that a major public segment reason only with those one-way messages that they communicate and do not obey themselves, but which brings them advantages and intended short-term results.

This is a wrong attitude towards the electors and towards the political discourse itself as genre, and affects the democratic or democratization process that some of the societies in Eastern Europe, including Romania, are going through.

We strongly believe that debates between power and opposition or between the political class and civil society must be serious, based on arguments, applied on solutions, measures and based on principles, not on political interests. This is the only way to evolve towards a superior democracy, otherwise the result of the political process shall not be correct, or promising for the future.

In this respect, the process of revising the Constitution and constitutional debate is an example. If generating the first Romanian post-December Constitution (on November 21st 1991) required many months of real and effective parliamentary debates, the political discourses delivered at that time, for establishing the new political and constitutional regime included hundreds of pages of political, doctrinarian and legal arguments, resulting in a true pillar on which, for 25 years, Romania has built its way to democracy, the last procedure regarding the modification of the fundamental law was a failure, both regarding the public and political debate (thus undermining democracy), and regarding the political discourse – in terms of content, language and message. It is even more serious, because if a power holding an enormous majority insists on this manner of regulation – similar to the strategy of "shutting people's mouth up", the democratic process will be a complete failure.

We consider that such a process, by which the actual outline of a country's democratic regime is established on long term, is a very complex process, requiring a powerful political debate, a really deep assessment of all political options, involving a long series of political discourses. Such a process requires, to some extent, the collaboration, not the permanent fight, of political powers, among themselves and against civil society. The Constitution represents the basis of the legal system and the rule of law, it guarantees the citizens' rights and also the existence of a democratic state, the expression of the will of people's sovereignty. We consider that a true rule of law, a democratic state, is built on a balanced and stable Constitution, where the national interest and human rights come first, not the political groups' interests of the moment.

However, as we revealed, only taking certain risks and spreading democratic discourses – especially by the elites – can produce a change and generate a democratization process.

Selective references

Alexandru, I. şi colab., Drept administrativ european, Lumina Lex, Bucureşti, 2005,

Alfonso, Isabel, Kennedy, Hugh, Escalona, Julio, Building Legitimacy, Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies, Brill, Leiden, Boston, 2004.

Almond G. A., Verba S., Cultura civică. Atitudini politice şi democraţie în cinci naţiuni, Du Style, Bucureşti, 1996

Altieri, Charles; Wittgenstein on Consciousness and Language: A Challenge to Derridean Literary Theory, MLN, Voi. 91, No. 6, Comparative Literature (Dec., 1976), 1397-1423, published by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Aristotel, Politica, Antet, Bucureşti, 1966

Aristotel, Statul atenian, traducere Şt. Bezdechi, Casa Şcoalelor, Bucureşti, 1994

Augustin, Despre cetatea lui Dumnezeu, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1998

Balandier G., Antropologie politică, Amarcord, Timişoara, 1998

Bell, D., The end of Ideology Revisited , Government and Opposition, Volume 23, Issue 3, pages 321–331, July 1988

Bell, Daniel; The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York, 1978

Berciu, Camelia, Comunicare politică, Comunicare.ro, Bucureşti, 2002.

Bertrand, Claude, Jean; Deotologia mijloacelor de comunicare, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2000

Bertrand, Claude, Jean; O introducere în presa scrisă şi vorbită, Polirom, Iaşi, 2001

Besnier, Jean-Michael (coord.), Conceptele umanităţii. O istorie a ideilor ştiinţifice, politice, sociale, religioase, filozofice, artistice, Lider, Bucureşti, 1997

Binkley, Timothy; Wittgenstein's Language; Mar Tinus Nijhoff, The Hague, Netherlands 1973

Boboc, Alexandru, Limbajul între "tăcere" şi referenţialitate, Wittgenstein şi filosofia contemporană a limbajului, Revista de filosofie, nr. 6, noiembrie – decembrie, 1987, Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, Bucureşti

Boboc, Alexandru, Limbaj şi Metalimbaj în "Tratatul logico – filosofic" al lui L. Wittgenstein, Analele Universităţii Bucureşti, Filosofie, anul XXVI , 1977

Boc, Emil, Separaţia puterilor în stat, Presa universitară clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2000

Boia, Lucian (coord.), Miturile comunismului românesc, Nemira, Bucureşti, 1998

Boudon, Raymond (coord.), Tratat de sociologie, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1997

Botez, Angela; Wittgenstein şi filosofia britanică, Revista de filosofie, Academia Română, tomul XLKVIII 3 – 4, mai – august, 2001, Academiei Române, Bucureşti

Braud Ph, Grădina deliciilor democraţiei, Globus, Bucureşti, 1991

Brechon, Pierre, Partidele Politice, Eikon, Cluj Napoca, 2004

Brucan Silviu, Pluralism şi conflict social. O analiză socială a lumii comuniste, Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1990

Brucan Silviu, Stâlpii noii puteri în România, Nemira, Bucureşti, 1995

Budai-Deleanu, Ion; Ţiganiada, Litera Internaţional, Bucureşti, 2001,

Burcea Dan, De la zoon politikon la zoon logon. Polisul şi tehnologiile culturale şi cognitive, în Observatorul Cultural, nr. 491 din 10.09.2009

Cernica, Viorel, Cetatea sub blocada ideii. Schiţă fenomenologică a istoriei gândirii politice, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2005

Chamoux, Fr., Civilizaţia greacă, Meridiane, Bucureşti, 185

Cheek, H. Lee, Jr., Calhoun and Popular Rule, The Political Theory of the Disquisitions and Discourse, University of Missouri Press, Columbia and London, 2001.

Chilton, Paul, Analysing Political Discourse, Theory and Practice, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2004.

Chilton, Paul A., Ilyin, Mikhail, Mey, Jacob, (editors), Political Discourse in Transition in Europe 1989 – 1991, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1998,

Chilton, A. Paul; Schaffner Christina; Political Text and Talk, Analytic approches to political discourse; John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2002

Chirot D., Societăţi în tranziţie? Societăţi în schimbare? Athena, Bucureşti, 1996

Cicero, Despre supremul bine şi supremul rău, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1968

Cicero, Filipice, Editura pentru Literatură Universală. Bucureşti, 1968.

Ciupercă Ioan, Totalitarismul, fenomen al secolului XX, Universităţii "A.I. Cuza", Iaşi, 1995

Clarck, J.C.D., The Language of Liberty 1660 – 1832, Political discourse and social dynamics in the Anglo-American world, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1994.

ClastreS P., Les formes de l'histoire. Essai d'anthropologie politique, Gallimard, Paris, 1978

Clergerie, J.L., Le principe de subsidiarite, Ellipses, Paris, 1997,

Constantinou, Costas M., States of Political Discourse, Words, Regimes, Seditions, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2004.

Collin, Denis; Marile noțiuni filosofice – 2. Societatea, puterea, Statul; Institutul European, Iaşi, 1999

Coman, Claudiu, Sfera publică şi imaginea politică, C.H.Beck, Bucureşti, 2010

Compagnon, Antoine, Seebacher, Jacques, Spiritul Europei, Cuvinte şi lucruri, Polirom, Iaşi, 2002.

Corbu, Nicoleta, Boțan, Mădălina, Telepreşedinţii – radiografia unei campanii electorale, Comunicare.ro, Bucureşti, 2011.

Crepon Marc, Stiegler Bernard, De la democratie participative. Fondements et limites, editions Mill et une Nuits, Collection "Essai", Paris, 2007

Creveld Van, Martin, The Rise and Decline of the State, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,1999.

Cristache, Gheorghiu, Tradiție, sau liberul arbitru, www.globusz.com/ebooks

Culianu I. P., Religie şi putere, Nemira, Bucureşti, 1993

Dahrendorf, R., Il futturo dello Stato nazionale, Micro-Mega, 5, 1994,

Dallmayr, Fred, Margins o Political Discourse, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1989

Demostene, "Discursuri politice; Discursuri judiciare", în volumul Demostene, Eschine, Licurg, Pagini alese din oratorii greci, pentru Literatură, Bucureşti, 1969

Denni, Bernard;Lecomte, Patrick; Sociologia Politicului, volumul 2, e. Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2004

Denton R.E., Woodward G.C., Political Communication in America, New York: Praeger, 1998

Diamond, Larry; Chu, Yun-han; Plattner, F. Marc; Tiem, Hung-mao; Cum se consolidează democrația, Polirom, Iaşi, 2004

Dolon, Rosana (Editor); Todoli, Julia (Editor); Analysing Identities in Discourse, Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture, Volume 28, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2008

Dryzek, John S., Holmes, Leslie Templeman, Post-Communist Democratization, Political discourses across thirteen countries, Cambridge University press, 2004.

Duculescu, V, Principiul subsidiarității – principiu fundamental al Tratatului Constituțional European, în Revista de Drept Comercial, Serie nouă, anul XIV, nr.1/2004

Edelman, Murray, Politica şi utilizarea simbolurilor, Polirom, Iaşi, 1999

Eminescu, M., Opere, XI, Academiei RSR, Bucureşti, 1980,

Eminescu, M., Opere, XI, Academiei, Bucureşti 1984

Fairclough, Isabela, Fairclough, Norman, Political Discourse Analysis, A metod for advanced students, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2012.

63.   Faist, Thomas, Schade, Jeanette, (editors), Disentangling Migration and Climate Change, Methodologies, Political Discourses and Human Rights, Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg, New York, London, 2013.

Fetzer, Anita; Lauerbach, Gerda, Eva; Political Discourse in the Media; John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2007

Finlayson, Alan, Democracy and Pluralism, The political thought of William E. Connolly, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2010.

Finlayson, Alan; „From belief to arguments: interpretative methodeology and rhetorical political analysis" în British Journal of Politics and International Relations 9(4), 2007

Fisichella Domenico, Ştiinţa politică: probleme, concepte, teorii, Iaşi, Polirom, 2007

Flonta, Mircea; Ludwig Wittgenstein şi philosophia perennis, Revista de filosofie, Academia Română, tomul XLKVIII 3 – 4, mai – august, 2001, Academiei Române, Bucureşti

Florian, Alexandru, Fundamentele doctrinelor politice, Universitară, Bucureşti, 2006,

Galasinska, Aleksandra; Krzyzanowski, Michal ; Wright, Sue; Kelly-Holmes, Helen; Discourse and Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe Language and Globalization, New York, 2009

Gasset Jose Ortega y, Revolta maselor, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1994

Gerstle, Jacques, Comunicarea politică, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2002

Geuss, Raymond, Skinner, Quentin, Cambridge text in the History of Political Thought, Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK, 1997

Girardet Raoul, Mituri şi mitologii politice, Institutul European Iaşi, 1997

Glotz, G., Cetatea greacă, Meridiane, Bucureşti, 1992

Goebels J., Journal, Blit, Iaşi, 1997

Graber, Doris, Media Power in Politics, CQ Press, Washington D.C., 2006

Graf, Alain; Marile curente ale filosofiei antice; Insitutul European, Iaşi, 2005

Griffin, Roger, in Blamires, Cyprian P.; Jackson Paul, Editor , World Fascism: A Historical Encyclopedia, vol I, ABL-Clio, Santa Barbara, California, 2006

Grotius, Hugo, Despre dreptul războiului şi al păcii, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti 1968

Gunnell, John. G., American Polity, Political Science and the Discourse of Democracy, The Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park, Pennsylvannia, 2004

Habermas Jurgen, Conştiinţă morală şi acţiune comunicativă, Bucureşti, ALL Educational, 2000

Harris,Sandra, Being Politically Impolite: Extending Politeness Theory to Adversarial Political Discourse, Sage, http://sagepublication.com, 2001

Hastings Michael, Abordarea ştiinţei politice, Institutul European, 2002

Hayek Friedrich A., Drumul către servitute, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1993

Hermet, Guy, Istoria naţiunilor şi a naţionalismului în Europa, Institutul European, Iaşi, 1997

Hermet Guy, Poporul contra democraţiei, Institutul European, Iaşi,

Hermet Guy, Sociologia populismului, Artemis, Bucureşti, 2007

Hobbes, Thomas, Léviathan , Éditions Gallimard, Paris, 2000

Hodges, Adam, The "War on terror" Narrative, Discourse and Intertextuality in the Construction and Contestation of Sociopolitical Reality, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011.

Howarth, David; Norval, J. Aletta; Stavrakakis, Yannis; Discourse theory and political analysis, Identities, hegemonies and social chance, Manchester University Press, Manchester and New York, 2000

Howarth, David R.; Torfing, Jacob; Discourse Theory in European Politics, New York, 2005

Huntington, Samuel P., Ciocnirea civilizaţiilor şi refacerea ordinii mondiale, Antet, Bucureşti, 1998

Huntington, Samuel, The Third Wave. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century, University of Oklahoma Press: Norman and London, 1991

Huntington, Samuel P., Viaţa politică americană, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1994

Iacob, L.M.; Bălan, B.; Boncu, S.; Comunicarea în câmpul social, Texte alese, Universitatea Al. I. Cuza, Iaşi, 1997

Iliescu, Adrian-Paul, Socaciu, Emanuel-Mihail, (coordonatori), Fundamentele gândirii politice moderne, Polirom, Iaşi, 1999.

Huspek, Michael, (editor), Oppositional Discourses and Democracies, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2010.

Ioncioaia Florea, Revolta ierarhiei. O discuţie asupra temei elitelor şi a proiecţiei sale istoriografice, în Xenopoliana, Iaşi, IV, 1-4/1996

Isocrate, "Panageric", în volumul Andocide, Lisias, Isocrate, Pagini alese din oratorii greci, pentru Literatură, Bucureşti, 1969

Jarosson, Br., Istoria ideilor ştiinţifice, pp. 21 – 22, în volumul Besnier, Jean-Michel (coordonator), Conceptele umanităţii. O istorie a ideilor ştiinţifice, politice, sociale, religioase, filozofice, artistice, Lider, Bucureşti, 1997

Kelly, Colleen Elizabeth, The Rhetoric of First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, Crisis Management Discourse, Praeger Westport, Connecticut, London, 2001

King, Anthony, Running Scared, Martin kessler Books, The Free Press, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Singapore, 1997.

Koopmans, Ruud, Statham, Paul, (editors), The Making of a European Public Sphere, Media Discourse and Political Contention, Cambridge University Press, 2010

Lapierre Jean-William, Viaţă fără stat?, Institutul European, Iaşi, 1997

Lagroye Jaques, Sociologie politique, Dalloyz, Paris, 1993

Lassman, Peter, Seirs, Ronald, (editors), Political Writings, Weber, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000

Lasswell, Harold, D., Politics, who gets wath, wen, how, New York, Peter Smith, 1950

Le Bon, Gustave, Psihologia mulţimilor, Antet XXPress, Bucureşti, 2007

Lecomte Patrick, Comunicare, televiziune, democraţie, Tritonic, Bucureşti, 2004

Lenain, P., Manipulation politique, Economica, Paris, 2001

Liga pro Europa, Ce este democraţia?, Tg. Mureş, 1995.

Linz Juan Jose, Stepan Alfred C., Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America and Postcommunist Europe, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996

Lijphart, Arend, Modele ale democraţiei. Forme de guvernare şi funcţionare în treizeci şi şase de ţări, Polirom, Iaşi 2000

Lipset, M.; Radicalism or reformism: the source of working-class politics. American Political Science Review, 1977

Lipset, S.M., Political Man: the Social Bases of Politics; Doubleday, New York, 1960

Lochard, Guy,; Bozer, Henri,; Comunicarea Mediatică, Insitutul European, Iaşi, 1998,

Locke, J., Al doilea tratat despre cârmuire. Scrisoare despre toleranţă. Nemira, Bucureşti, 1999

Luther, Kurt Richard, Muller.Rommel, Ferdinand, (editors), Political Parties in the New Europe, Political and Analytical Challenges, Oxford University Press, New York, 2002.

Machiavelli Niccolo, Principele, traducere de N. Luca, Minerva, Bucureşti, 1994

Macridis, Roy; Hulliung, Mark; Contemporary Political Ideologies. Movements and Regims, Harper Collins College Publisher, New York, 1969,

Marcus Aurelius, Către sine, Minerva, Bucureşti, 1977

Marga Andrei, Filosofia unificării europene, Cluj-Napoca, 1995

Marga Andrei, Criza şi după criză, Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2009

Marga Andrei, Ieşirea din trecut (documente şi reflecţii), Alma Mater, Cluj-Napoca, 2002

Marga Andrei, Raţionalitate, Comunicare, Argumentare, Grinta, Cluj-Napoca, 2009

Marga Andrei, Argumentarea, Fundaţiei Studiilor Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 2006

Marino, Adrian, (în dialog cu Sorin Antohi), Al treilea discurs, Cultură, ideologie şi politică în România, Polirom, Duplex, Iaşi, 2001.

Marino, Adrian; Pentru Europa, Integrarea României, Aspecte ideologice şi culturale, Polirom, Iaşi, 2005

Marino, Adrian; Libertate şi cenzură în România. Începuturi, Polirom, Iaşi, 2005

Marx, K., Engels, F., “ 18 Brumar al lui Ludovic Bonaparte”, în Marx, K., Engels, F., Opere, vol. VIII, Politică, Bucureşti, 1960

Marx; Engels, Friedrich, Opere alese, vol. I, PMR, Bucureşti, 1949,

Maxwell, John C., Cele mai eficiente 21 de minute din ziua unui lider, Life Publishers International, Oradea, 2002.

Măgureanu Virgil, Studii de sociologie politică, Albatros, Bucureşti, 1997

McLean, Lain, coord. Oxford, Dicţionar de politică, Univers Enciclopedic, Bucureşti, 2001,

McLellan, David, Ideologia, DU Style, Bucureşti, 1998.

McLellan, David, Ideologia, DU Style, Bucureşti, 1998,

McNair Brian, Introducere în comunicarea politică, Polirom, Iaşi, 2007

McNair, Brian, An introduction to Political Communication, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 1995.

McQuail, Denis; Comunicarea, Institutul European, Iaşi, 1999,

Mill John Stuart, Despre libertate, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1994

Miller William Lockley, Ase B. Grodeland, Koshechkina Tatyana Y., A Culture of Corruption? Coping with Government in Post-communist Europe, New York Central European University Press, 2001

Millon-Delsol, Chantal, Ideile politice ale secolului XX, Polirom, Iaşi, 2002.

Millon-Delsol, Chantal, Statul subsidiar, Efes, Cluj-Napoca, 2000.

Mirgheşiu, Florin, Elitele politice şi modernitatea românească, Napoca Star, Cluj-Napoca, 1998.

Miroiu, Mihaela, (coordonator), Ideologii politice actuale, Semnificaţii, evoluţii şi impact, Polirom, Iaşi, 2012,

Montesquieu, Despre spiritul legilor, vol. 1, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1964,

Morgenstern, Mira, Conceiving a Nation, The Development of Political Discourse in the Hebrew Bible, The Pennsylvania University Press, University Park, Pennsylvania, 2009.

Morus, Thomas, Utopia, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1958

Mouchon, Jean, „La communication presidentielle en quete de modele" în Hermes 17 – 18 , Communication et politique, CBNRS editions, Paris, 1995

Mowlana, Hamid, Global Communication in Transition, The end of Diversity?, Sage Publication Inc., Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 1996.

Mucchielli, Alex, Arta de a influenţa, Analiza tehnicilor de manipulare, Polirom, Iaşi, 2002.

Murgescu, Bogdan, România şi Europa, Acumularea decalajelor economice (1500-2010), Polirom, Iaşi, 2010

Musolff, Andreas; Metaphor and Political Discourse, Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe; Palgrave Macmillian, Hamshire, New York, US, 2004

Mutz, Diana, Sniderman, Paul M., Brody, Richard A., (editors), Political Persuasion and Attitude Change, The University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 1996.

Nackenoff, Carol, The Fictional Republic, Horatio Alger and American Political Discourse, Oxford University Press, New York, Oxford, 1994.

Nay, Olivier; Istoria ideilor politice, Polirom, Iaşi, 2008

Năstase, A., Drept internaţional public, Şansa, Bucureşti, 1997

Neculau Adrian (coord.), Psihologie socială. Aspecte contemporane, Polirom, Iaşi 1996

Negrea Radu, Banii şi Puterea, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1990

Negulescu P.P., Partidele politice, Garamond, Bucureşti, f.a.

Nimmo D., Combs J., Political Communication, Longman, New York, 1983

Nozick Robert, Anarhie, stat şi utopie, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1997

Obeng, Samuel Gyasi, Hartford, Beverly A.S., (editors), Political Discourse Analysis, Nova Science Publishers, Inc., New York, 2008

Okulska, Urszula - Dr.; Cap, Piotr; Perspectives in Politics and Discourse, Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2010

Olimid Anca Parmena, Transition and Democratic Consolidation in South-Eastern Europe: Strategies, Models, Theories and Concepts, in Revista de Ştiinţe Politice, Revue des Sciences Politiques, Nos. 18-19, pp. 64-69, 2008

Olsen M.E., Marger M. N. (coord.), Power in Modern Societes, Wersview Press Inc. Boudler, San Francisco, Oxford, 1993

Papahagi, Adrian, ABC-Darul creştin – democraţiei, Curtea veche, Bucureşti, 2012.

Pasti Vladimir, România în tranziţie. Căderea în viitor, Nemira, Bucureşti, 1995

Pasti, Vladimir; Noul capitalism românesc, Polirom, Iaşi, 2006

Păun Nicolae, Istoria construcţiei europene, Fundaţiei pentru Studii Europene, Cluj-Napoca, 1999

Păun Nicolae, Păun Adrian-Ciprian, Ciceo Georgiana, Europa unită, Europa noastră, Presa Universitară Clujeană, Cluj-Napoca, 2003

Peet,Richard;Watts, Michael, Liberation Ecologies: Enviroment, Development, Social Movements, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 2004

Phillipson, Nicholas, Skinner, Quentin, (editors), Political Discourse in Early Modern Britain, Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Platon, Apărarea lui Socrate, în Opere, I, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1975

Platon, Omul politic, în Opere, VI, traducere de Elena Popescu, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1989

Platon, Republica, în Opere V, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1986

Platon, Timaios, în Opere, VII, traducere de Cătălin Partenie şi Andrei Cornea, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, 1989

Platon, Legile, traducere de Ştefan şi Elena Bezdechi, Iri, Bucureşti, 1995

Portelli, Alessandro, The Text and the Voice, Writing, Speaking, and Democracy in American Literature, Columbia University Press, New York, 1994.

Predescu, B., Predescu, I., Roibu, A., Principiul subsidiarităţii, Regia Autonomă Monitorul Oficial, Bucureşti, 2001,

Pridham Geoffrey, Vanhanen Tatu, Democratization in Eastern Europe: Domestic and International Perspectives, Londra, Routledge, 1994

Pripp, Cristina, Marketingul politic, Nemira, Bucureşti, 2002.

Puşcaş Vasile, Negociind cu Uniunea Europeană, Economică, Bucureşti, vol. I-IV, 2003

Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius, Arta oratorică, vol. I-II-III, Bucureşti, 1974 (Ediţie îngrijită de Maria Hetco).

Rad, Ilie, (coordonator), Forme ale manipulării opiniei publice, Tribuna, Cluj-Napoca, 2008.

Ramonet, Ignacio, Tirania comunicării, Doina, Bucureşti, 2000.

Rădulescu-Motru Constantin, Cultura română şi politicianismul, Scrisul Românesc, Bucureşti, 1995

Roşca, Viorica, Mediatizarea discursului electoral şi imaginea publică a candidaţilor, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2007

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, Despre contractul social sau principiile dreptului politic, Nemira, Bucureşti, 2008.

Russell, Bertrand, The Problems of Philosophy, www.Abika.com

Russell, Bertrand, Political Ideals, Published: 1917, Source: Project Gutenberg, http://www.feedbooks.com (Copyright: This work was published before 1923 and is in the public domain in the USA only.)

Russell, Bertrand, Power - A new social analysis, Routledge, London, New York, NY, 1996

Russell, Peter; De la ştiinţă la Dumnezeu, Călătoria unui fizician în misterul conştiinţei, Omra, Braşov, 2005

Russell, Peter; The Awakening Earth, The Global Brain, Arkana, London, 1982

Sandu, Antonio, Dimensiuni etice ale comunicării în postmodernitate, Lumen, Iaşi, 2009.

Sandu Dumitru, Eurobarometru 69. Opinia publică în Uniunea Europeană. Primăvara 2008. Raport naţional pentru România. Comisia Europeană, pp. 3-4.

Sartori, Giovanni, Teoria democraţiei reinterpretată, Polirom, Iaşi, 1999

Sălăvăstru, Constantin, Critica raţionalităţii discursive, Polirom, Iaşi, 2001

Sălcudeanu, T., Aparaschivei, P., Toader, F., Bloguri, Facebook şi politică, Tritonic, Bucureşti, 2009,

Săvulescu, S., Retorica şi teoria argumentării, Bucureştii, 2000, Partea I, III; Pagini alese din oratorii greci, vol. I-II, Bucureşti, 1969 (Antologie şi traducere Andrei Marin)

Severin Adrian, Tranziţia democraţiei către populism, www.fisd.ro

Schwartze, J., European Administrative Law, Office for official publications of the European Communities, Sweet and Mawell, 1992

Schwartzenberg, Roger-Gerard, Statul spectacol, eseu asupra şi împotriva star-sistemului în politică, Scripta, Bucureşti, 1995.

Sfez, Lucien, Comunicarea, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2002

Simon, Adam F., Mass Informed Consent, Evidence on Upgrading Democracy with Polls and New Media, Rowman&Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Lanham, New York, Toronto, Plymouth, UK, 2011.

Simon, Adam F., The Winning Message, Candidate Behavior, Campaign Discourse, and Democracy, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2004.

Sinescu Călin, Comunicare politică, Universitară, Bucureşti, 2007

Spinoza, B., Tratatul teologico-politic, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1960

Stanyer, James, Comunicarea politică modernă, CA Publishing, Cluj-Napoca, 2010

Streeet J., Mass Media, Politics and Democracy, Palgrave, Houndmills, 2001

Strydom, Piet, Discourse and Knowledge The Making of Enlightenment Sociology, Liverpool University Press - Studies in European Regional Cultures, Liverpool , 2000

Şandru Daniel, Democratizare şi valori politice în România postcomunistă, în Cultura politică şi politici culturale în România modernă, Universităţii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2005, pp.417-433

Tannen , D., Spoken/Written Language and the Oral/Literate Continuum. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 207-218, 1980

Taylor, Charles, Multiculturalism and „the Politics of Recognition", Princeton University Press, Princeton, New York, Jersey, 1992.

Teodorescu, Bogdan, Cinci milenii de manipulare, Tritonic, Bucureşti, 2007

Teodorescu, Bogdan, Marketing politic şi electoral, Facultatea de Comunicare şi Relaţii Publice "David Ogilvy" – SNSPA, Bucureşti, 2001

Teodorescu, Gheorghe; Putere, autoritate şi comunicare publică, Nemira, Bucureşti, 2000

Teodorescu Gheorghe, Comunicare şi opinie publică, Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza" Iaşi, 1995

Teodorescu Gheorghe, Putere, autoritate şi comunicare politică, Nemira, Bucureşti, 2000

Terestchenko, Michel; Marile curente ale filosofiei politice, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2000

Thoma din Aquino, Summa theologiae, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 2000

Thoveron, Gabriel, Comunicarea politică azi, Antet, Oradea, 1996

Tismăneanu ,Vladimir, Fantasmele salvării, Democraţie, naţionalism şi mit în Europa post-comunistă, Polirom, Iaşi, 1999.

Tismăneanu, Vladimir, Noaptea totalitară, crepusculul ideologiilor radicale in secolul 20, Athena, Bucureşti, 1995.

Trăsnea Ovidiu, Filosofia politică, politică, Bucureşti, 1986

Trencsenyi, Balazs ; Kopecek, Michal; Late Enlightenment - Emergence of the Modern National Idea , Volume One, Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe, Central European University Press, Budapest, 2006

Trencsenyi, Balazs ; Kopecek, Michal; National Romanticism Formation of National Movements, Volume Two, Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe, , Central European University Press, Budapest, 2007

Tsakona, Villy, Popa, Diana Elena, (editors), Studies in Political Humour, In between political critique and public entertainment, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2011

Tsoukalis, Loukas, Ce fel de Europă?, Bic All, Bucureşti, 2005.

Ungureanu Ion, Paradigme ale cunoaşterii societăţii, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 1990

Vanhanen, Tatu, Prospect of Democracy, a study of 172 countries, Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, London and New York, 1997.

Vatimo, Gianni, Societatea transparentă, Pontica, Constanţa, 1995

Volkoff Vladimir, Dezinformarea – armă de război, Incitatus, Bucureşti, 2001

Waelle, De, Jean-Michel, Consolidare democratică, partide şi clivaje în Europa Centrală şi de Est în Partidele politice şi democraţie în Europa Centrală şi de Est, Bucureşti, Humanitas, 2003

Walace, Wiliam, , The Dynamics of European Integration, Printer Publishers, London and New York, 1990

Wats D., Political Communication Today, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1997

Weber Max, Politica, o vocaţie şi o profesie, Anima, Bucureşti, 1992

Weber, Max, Politica, o vocaţie şi o profesie, Anima, Bucureşti, 2003.

White, James E., Contemporary Moral Problems, Fourth edition, West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Minneapolis, 1994.

Williams D.C.; Young, M.J.; (editori), Discourse, Debate and Democracy; Idebate Press, New York, 2009

Wittgenstein, Ludwig; Lectures on Philosophy, Wittgenstein's Lectures, 1932 - 35, Edited by Alice Ambrose, publ. Blackwell, 1979. The 1932-33 Lecture notes, pp2 - 40 reproduced here.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig; A Lecture on Ethics, http://lib.freescienceengineering.org / view.php?id=360680

Wodak, Ruth (editor); Language, Power and Ideology, Studies in Political Discourse, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 1989

Wodack , Ruth; Reisigl, Martin; The Discourse of Politics în Action, Palgrave, Macmillan, London, 2009

Wolfe, Alan, Katznelson, Ira, (editors), Religion and Democracy in the United States, Danger or Opportunity? Russell Sage Foundation, New York, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, New York , 2010.

Zăpârțan Liviu Petru, Negocierile în viața social-politică, Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2007

Zăpârțan Liviu Petru, Doctrine Politice, Iaşi, Chemarea, 1994

Zăpârțan Liviu Petru, Construcția europeană, Oradea, Editura Imprimeriei de Vest, 2000

Zăpârțan Liviu Petru, Mecanisme şi politici ale integrării europene, Cluj-Napoca, CFID, Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai, 2002

Zăpârțan, Liviu Petru, Reflecții despre Europa Unită, Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2011

Xenofon, Amintiri despre Socrate, Univers, Bucureşti, 1987

Xenofon, "Statul spartan", în volumul Statul Spartan, Statul Atenian, Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1958

Zub Alexandru, Lumea postmodernă şi criza elitelor, în Xenopoliana, Buletin al Fundaţiei Academice "A.D. Xenopol", Iaşi, 1-4/1996

www.winstonchurchill.org

www.administratiaprezidentiala.eu

www.obamaspeaches.com

www.americanrhetoric.com

www.jfklibrary.org