



ORIGINAL PAPER

Diplomacy and Motivation in the Political Discourse

Anca Păunescu*
Ileana Mihaela Chirițescu**

Abstract

Communication and politics are consubstantial. Communication relationships are inseparable from power relations, which, by their form and content, depend on the material or symbolic power accumulated by political institutions and agencies engaged in these relations. Political communication has as a specific the manifestation of a tension between cooperation and conflict. Political discourse allows for agreement, but the same kind of speech promotes conflict and domination. Whether persuasion or conviction, negotiation or intimidation is desired, recourse to political language is an alternative to physical violence. Public space has a conflicting character, but compromise is negotiated within its perimeter. Differences are balanced, the representation of those who are not in power becomes more lenient, those in power regulate their discourse. What is dominant in political communication is the word, written or spoken. In society, any problem can become politics. Politics evolves into the dynamics of economic, social, cultural, religious, ethnic, linguistic stakes. Political activity is focused on the emergence of collective issues, the formulation of questions addressed to public authorities, the development of solutions, the conflict between these projects and their regulation. In each of these processes communication is involved and its contribution to political activity is omnipresent, whether it is socialization and participation, agenda development, mobilization or negotiation. Communication impregnates all political activity to the extent that almost all such behaviors involve the recourse to some form of communication. The specificity of contemporary political relations and activities is the political belief crisis, which forces political people, as Gabriel Thoveron said, to invest more and more in the communication: "as soon as there is any difficulty between them and those who mandate them, it is considered to be a communication problem, to convince citizens of the basis of their acts or decisions."

Keywords: *Elements of political discourse; expressiveness; strategies; theatricality of argumentation; adaptation to interlocutor; intertextual intensity.*

* Associate Professor, PhD, University of Craiova, Department of Applied Modern Languages, Phone: 004 0251411552, Email: anca.paunescu@yahoo.com.

** Lecturer, PhD, University of Craiova, Department of Applied Modern Languages, Phone: 004 0251411552, Email: chiritescumihaela@yahoo.com.

Diplomacy and Motivation in the Political Discourse

Introduction

Political discourse should be both diplomatic and motivational. In order to truly attract political followers and sympathizers, politicians should be motivated by high levels of aspirations and ideals, such as the harsh desire to work for the benefit of their own people. They should not only seek personal motivation through their political career. Like any other profession, that of a politician should be adopted by people who are really meant to follow the path of politics. Politics should not only be a profession adopted in the absence of any other possibility or vision, or because the mere conjuncture of existence guides you to it. Moreover, the political career should not be followed simply because it is fashionable to be a politician, to appear on television or to be a leader of opinion. Politics should be made and thought for citizens and for the benefit of nations, not for politicians, to the detriment of the state. The diplomacy and motivation of political discourse should be self-understood, not forced, but studied.

Diplomacy in the political discourse

The political discourse can be directly addressed to the general public on television or radio, or it can be indirectly addressed through written press. Usually, if the member of the press does his job loyally, the political discourse of the politician cannot be a staged one. In the written press, however, one can speak of some sort of analysis of what the politician said, a speculation that may be for or against.

Steluta Coculescu asserts that: "The dialogue discourse of the moderator and his guests, the second discourse, the speech-agent that distorts the orator's discourse - considered a primary speech - forms an interdisciplinary controversy. In this situation, two strategies would be possible: integration, thus the semantic assimilation of the adverse discourse, criticizing only the claim of monopoly on truth, or the exclusion, thus the rejection of the adverse semantic universe as incompatible with the truth. Given the televised nature of speech on a show, the distortion of the presidential ethos, exclusion is preferred and the proliferation of the discourse is incompatible with the truth. Incorporating the voice and the image of the president into the verbal and visual components of the television statement, DA (the distorting agent) interprets the source discourse semantically to disqualify it. The speech-agent proposes a pejorative reading of the source discourse, then pass it into negative and reject it as incompatible" (Coculescu, 2008: 81).

During a television show, the relationship between the politician and the moderator can become harmonious or conflicting, depending on the interests of the television network, or the sympathy or antipathy the moderator has for the politician concerned or for the political party he represents. When one of the two wants to attack the other's speech in one way or another, usually this is targeted and even prepared in advance to highlight the defects of the interlocutor and implicitly of the political party represented by him or of the television in the case of the moderator. So, we can not say that the discourse is a personal one, because neither the politician nor the moderator speaks in the name of their own person, but they represent genuine interests or well-established groups.

On the other hand, if we talk about the encounter between two people who have the same interests and political visions, things are radically shifting. The moderator raises the ball to the politician in order to highlight the successes and achievements of the political formation he represents, in turn the politician praises the television that is

his partner and enjoys his favors whenever necessary. We are talking here about a double success and advantage, both in terms of politics and visibility.

The critical analysis of discourse delineates research trajectories which predominantly allocate an elevated degree of behavioural extension in the attempt to comprehend the prerequisites of power and the need for control as they are inextricably generated on the foundations of social and political understanding. Language, as a methodology of expressive playfulness, will ultimately explore all valid options that are relevant in assuming fields of ideological representation which aim to capture the very thoughts and emotions of the listeners.

In fact, political discourse involves an act of language from which a text, context or intent is revealed. Usually, if we report to the written press we are talking about a text. If we are referring to a television program that has political purpose, we speak of a context (as described above: favorable or unfavorable to both dialogue partners - moderator and politician as the image of a political party in question), or an intention that may be good or bad (the moderator's intent, which through questions can favor the politician who knows both the weaknesses and the strengths, or the intention of the politician as a guest who can attack or praise the television, of course in a positive or negative way).

Clearly, political discourse can be a source of power. That is why it appears as a struggle between two visions, between two individuals, between two powers. In general, the characteristics of a political discourse are as follows: it requires the struggle between Good and Evil; it is aimed precisely at action in a concrete sense, for example, a certain political party calls the world to vote or to abstain; targeting the masses; having a strong psychological and emotional component, so there are politicians who appear on television and shed some tears in the name of the underprivileged nation because of the bad decisions taken by the political party with which is in opposition; controlling and manipulating, so he does not leave anyone indifferent.

In their analysis of political discourse Colodeeva and Pricopciuc argue that: "In a more general sense, political discourse is held in relation to power management. In other words, political discourse only works where the people or their representatives take part in political affairs. Political discourse is a form of discourse through which the locator follows the intention of power in a political struggle against other politicians or political groups" (Colodeeva, Pricopciuc, 2014: 53-54).

The utility of a political discourse is to inspire voters (the citizens of a larger or smaller community), so he does not have the gift of describing a phenomenon or a special success (these things may exist, but they are in the second plane of the politicians' intentions), determining the citizens of a community to resonate with the proposed intentions of a concerned political party.

Ever since Aristotle we know that argumentation is the art of persuasion and conviction, therefore politicians must have the diplomacy to persuade citizens to follow them with the arguments they think most powerful. Simply put, political discourse is clearly a public discourse; politics is not a career to be followed in silence because without public visibility it is practically non-existent.

Diplomacy is, in turn, an art of presenting this speech either harmoniously or incisively. Being a diplomat is somewhat on the psychological side of each individual, and the politician must acquire this art from the military rather than from the public.

Diplomacy must be thoroughly studied, not only the psychological or temperamental features of the politician, but also the characteristics that resonate with

Diplomacy and Motivation in the Political Discourse

the voters of the community in question. The diplomatic aspects of the political discourse differ from one community to another depending on the social, family and moral dimension, but also the intellectual level of the individuals forming that community.

For example, the mayoral elections in a rural community where the average age of citizens is over 50, places emphasis on the development of agriculture, on the state of the roads in that community, so the target of the discourse deals with the concrete side of everyday life. Unlike the mayor's choices in a city, there are other aspects: improving the city, attracting more investors to create jobs, changing peripheral areas in order to incorporate all areas of discourse.

A description of assertive communicative protocols can and must formulate the analytical subject of a connection between politics and discourse effectively practising a plethora of schematics that articulate the art of manipulation and dissimulation in the world of public discourse.

A special vision belongs to Christian Le Bart who claims that the political discourse is the one that holds men and women in politics in the exercise of their function. (Le Bart, 1998). Bonnafous tells us that politics presupposes “any value judgment that targets a community” (Bonnafous, Ciron, Ducard, Levy, 2003: 87).

The elements concerned should be different from one community to another and still applied to diplomatic aspects. In parliamentary elections, where the purpose is common to all the citizens of a nation, and the names found on ballot papers, unlike local elections, are relevant, the ways politicians use to convince citizens to vote are different. In the rural area, the elected mayor is the one who plays a key role in assembling the citizens of a community to give the vote to the representatives of a particular political party. In the city, politicians' speech must be higher, more concrete, and address aspects of strong ties with the outside of the country. Political functionalities can assume a multitude of expressive forces in areas that are enshrined in collective consciousness as major values.

The theatricality of argumentation, adaptation to the interlocutor, intertextual intensity, staging, meets the theatricality of language games as a strategy of chance and discursive creation.

Furthermore, Thoveron tries to convey the fact that: “Political discourse manifests itself in a socio-political context as a reaction to a concrete and dynamic reality. This type of discourse, therefore, has an event character as a direct reaction to the present political situations, and is also challenged by events and future phenomena. At the same time, political discourse gains a greater capacity to influence if it is spoken in a concrete setting in front of an audience and is accompanied by elements of non-verbal communication: mimics, gestures, posture, attitude.” (Thoveron, 1996: 17). Diplomatic political discourse should target all voters regardless of which category they would fall into and the politician's vision should coincide with the wishes and needs of the community's voters.

Motivation in the political discourse

As pointed out above, the motivation must come from the politician rather than the voter, but the advantages of the politician's motivation should be rather the voters instead of the politician's own interests. According to Schopenhauer, the “art of persuasion is the use of the human concepts that can be achieved with skill.” (Schopenhauer, 1891: 73).

The roles of politicians and moderators in the case of a politically-oriented television show are interpreted according to rituals that bring to attention notions such as action schemes, speech contracts, interaction rules and interpretation. From this perspective, the verbal-nonverbal interaction is obvious, and it has a decisive contribution to the fulfillment of the communication. The world of nonverbal premises includes a variety of ways of communication.

Gestures are as important as discourses, and gestures “errors” have institutional or interpersonal consequences as serious as linguistic errors, as gesture configures the identity and image of the orator politician, optimizing or distorting communication. That is why the political locator will have to have purpose, becoming the recipient of his own speech, anticipating his effects and feedback. Therefore, gesture in political communication should focus on the possibilities of modulating the complementary nature of gestures, language and gestural communication strategies.

Gestures are determined and regulated in a cultural way and express a social belonging, a group identity that becomes observable by permissible behaviors and by forbidden behaviors at the level of a society that any political person has to know.

To be successful among voters, politicians should be charismatic and have a certain gesture force to make citizens vote for them. Voters are sensitive both to the political candidate's speech and to his gestures and mimics. A certain rigor imposed by the use of hands, for example, lifting from the eyebrow at the right time, sometimes has the force to change public opinion. Managing his emotions, or, on the contrary, the intense vibration of voters' emotions, changes the face of a candidate from a common one, usually into a favorite one. The intonation also has its important role. The willful emphasis on ideas that could change the results of the vote, the adoption of a natural and very relaxed posture, attracting attention through a very careless, but not excessive work, and they can be the strengths that a political candidate can rely on if studied in advance and applied diligently. Certainly, any politician plays a role for his voters. It is important that the role fits and also matches the profile of its voters.

Let's take the example of Nicolas Sarkozy, who adopts a natural, relaxed, atypical posture (or, at least, this is the case of his appearances).

In the article *La gestuelle des politiques*, we are informed that this posture is the most difficult for politicians: “Nicolas Sarkozy uses slow and horizontal gestures, rather sudden, fast and vertical. These gestures accompanying verbal discourse reinforce its credibility” (<http://la-gestuelle-des-politiques.e-monsite.com/pages/ii-les-gestes-conscients-de-la-politique.html>). Daniel Murgui-Tomas, passionate about non-verbal communication, is a former journalist who studied child psychology and analyzed in detail in the article *Gestuelle des politiques* the gestures of important political leaders of the world. The article also reminds that Nicolas Sarkozy is an innate leader, not only politically but also socially. He uses as a weapon the provocation of the interested voter to follow the smallest gestures that are usually positive, because he is aware that as you attract sympathizers, you are on the right track to be a political leader. The same article says that the most representative manipulator through gestures is the political leader Adolf Hitler: “His gestures and mimics were calculated in a scholarly way. Hitler carefully prepared each of his speeches: He stood right in front of the viewership, adopting a combative, imperative, ironic, visionary posture. Behind him a gramophone broadcasts the speech in question. His gestures: raised arms, tight fists, the exalted mimic of his face, glassy or dreamy eyes, his lips sketching an ironic smile - were all meant to strengthen his words and communicate to his listeners his mood. Hitler gives

Diplomacy and Motivation in the Political Discourse

his mimics and gestures a special importance for the obvious purpose of attracting, manipulating and controlling followers.” (<http://la-gestuelle-des-politiques.e-monsite.com/pages/ii-les-gestes-conscients-de-la-politique.html>)

In order to prepare his public discourse, Hitler relied on the gesture used in theater and opera. It was through this gigantic gesture that his speech became a hypnotic one. An excellent example of this was the speech that Adolf Hitler held in 1933 in the building of the German Parliament, called the Reichstag. Warmly aspiring to hypnotize the masses, Adolf Hitler used the power of impressive voice, gestures of force (tight fists, hands fluttering in the air, raised either laterally or upward, stating or denying gesture, delivering speech as a theater scene). The audience responded with the same gestures, which made it even louder.

An example to the opposite of Adolf Hitler is that of François Hollande, a non-expressive politician with a poor gesture repertoire, even impoverished after the 2011 elections, which meant that before this year, he was pushing to do all those gestures. Hollande “makes little use of his hands”, but rather uses them unconsciously as a tic, in the opinion of Joseph Messinger, who also says of Hollande that he “loves people and is a sincere politician who wants to present himself exactly as he is” (Messinger, 2006)

A charismatic leader with an all-encompassing discourse, with an attempt to convey the discourse in an interactive way (questions and answers), captivates the audience through abundant laughter or jokes more or less appreciated by the public.

Obama's speech was built using positive politeness, and he tried to emphasize his interest and appreciation for his receiver (the crowd at Denver Stadium, Colorado, as well as the viewers watching TV on public television). The message intended to seek out the approval of the broadcaster and its common points with the interlocutor (which in this case is also a receiver) whose main objective is a construction that cannot be interpreted as hostile.

Necessity is expression of listening, of dialogue, of meeting a populated space of ideas in perpetual becoming, creating timely moments in politics. If this need is evident, if social dialogue can evolve, its lack does not necessarily mean a loss to everyone. On the contrary, an entire generation of politicians still experience trust deficits, trying to recover dynamics similar to other problems.

The gesture of a televised media discourse is thoroughly studied in our times, or especially in our society. We live in the age of visibility and communication, so if a politician has vision and qualities, he also needs visibility. The fierce fight for television appearances is a clear example that politicians demand the participation in television shows and, despite public opinion, they are especially encouraged by incisive moderators because such a show is being watched by a large number of viewers, and advertising of any genre would be most efficient.

The way in which the politician, in his communicative position, justifies his change of opinion on the basis of the alliance game must be examined. To the extent that political stakes are trading from one area to another, political responsibility becomes the Achilles' heel where the collapse of the justification act is orchestrated. The function of engaging the word and asking the speaker to be coherent in its actions emphasizes the difficulty in assuming a contradictory discourse without appearing discordant. From a political point of view, it would be surprising to produce both a stability and panic on the opponent's side without being criticized. Even if the politician makes a justification, he suggests that his *modus operandi* of control is heavily reliant on the political lie.

Ducrot says that “the idea to take control of speech does not represent, at least in the forms of civilization we know, a free act or a gratuitous one” (Ducrot, 1972: 8).

Such a definition implies that the politician, speaking on topics of public interest, de facto accepts the code of conduct that defines this activity by aiming to change a certain socio-political situation. Speaking, therefore, becomes a legal act, capable of transforming political relations and public opinion.

At a political talk show, everything is organized and studied long before. Nothing, but absolutely nothing happens unless it is necessary and with the intended intensity. Motivation is the key point of the political discourse, not just the discourse, but also the debate or the simple discussion on political issues. The politician is the one who gives the tone and decides what he wants to highlight, and the moderator helps or, on the contrary, disturbs him in his intentions.

Kendon distinguishes as many categories of gestures as there are functions: “referential, pragmatic and interactive gestures” (Streeck, 2009: 23-24). Instead of privileging this functional distribution, we prefer to focus on the pragmatic effect. Thus, we will speak of impulsive gestures for modal pragmatic gestures and gestures for referential undertakings. The implications of this option, somewhat daring, but necessary to understand intra-discursive conflict, are directly perceptible to coding and the descriptive approach. Therefore, there will be gestures whose coding will be reduced to the simple use of alphabetic letters to facilitate word labeling. The combination of two or more gesture forms is what we call a gestural attitude. Switching from one attitude to another or one specific gesture corresponds to a movement; however, the return to the attitude (or gesture) of departure should not be confused with the withdrawal from which Kendon carries out the analysis of gestures.

Impulsive gestures incorporate impulsive acts that in some way “violate the self-control that one has to preserve in the presence of others and thus gives witnesses a glance at what is hidden under the mask” (Goffman, 1987: 129). Their interpretative relevance is acquired in combination, and it is in this complexity that they provide information about the contribution of self-obedience to the idea of being contradictory.

However, motivation is usually very strong inside, and this happens not only in the case of political discourse. Politicians know how to talk while keeping their ace up their sleeve for the end when they want to get the applause of their audience.

Politicians are well aware of the actual structure of the discourse in public, they know the presentation steps, they know exactly what the theoretical and practical aspects needed to be met, and when to ask for feedback and interact with the participants or with viewers. In conclusion, the attack plan is well-established. Perhaps, however, something is lacking in order to achieve maximum appreciation? Of course, there are innumerable factors that intervene to get to that point. It can be charisma, intonation, innovative elements, etc. Or it may be the impact of Columbo's technique, that of waiting very calmly for the end, of breathing, intonation, voice, mimic intact, and when the world would expect it to end, that is exactly the moment that hides the key, and the politician marks the decisive point.

Motivational speech is currently a trend without which it would not be a problem for the politician to come out in public. The art of oratory weighs a lot during a speech. Unfortunately not everyone has this ability. Phrases such as: “When you come to me with suggestions or problems, I encourage you to think about options as clear and concrete as possible so I can say yes or no as easily. On the other hand, if you do not know what to do, do not hold for yourselves, the problems needed to be discussed

Diplomacy and Motivation in the Political Discourse

quickly. I'm a moral man. Not crunchy, not shaky, not timid, but very honest, transparent, trustful" - necessary to capture attention and gain public confidence.

In her research regarding political discourse, the author Nicoleta Neșu expounds the fact that: "A speech is political if it assesses situations of public interest; from this point of view, its specificity would consist of the conventionality it assumes and which is just a materialization in and through the discourse of the institutional character of the specific political interaction. As a result, any political discourse operates on the basis of conventional or institutionalized argumentation which, on a first level, argues the role played by the institution it represents, and then at a second level justifies the image of the institution that represents it. In close connection with this value of truth, in the political discourse there must also be some "credibility strategies", activated by the political actor during the discursive construction. They are meant to communicate the truth on the one hand and, on the other hand, to make the politician the person who can be perceived as the only one able to communicate these truths in general, independently of the actual discursive situation, to become the "guarantor" of these values" (Neșu, 2003: 232). In a controversial situation, justification is the very common strategy of reconciliation between politicians and public opinion (Charaudeau, 2005: 96-105). How can the politician take responsibility for previous opinions that have become contradictory to his new positions? The feasibility of such action is rooted in the linguistic bases of political discourse, legitimacy in this case.

In front of a contradictory statement, the politician justifies the changes of his thinking through the legitimacy of the circumstances. Each discursive being is responsible for a position that the speaker is telling to assume in the temporal space where it was declared: it is the recognition that certain aspects of his discourse are overcome. On a gestural plane, space serves rationally and symbolically to the act of justification. Specifically, the right hand represents the events that interlocutors cling to in order to fuel the debate. The center translates the place of the semantic distortion of its political approach while the left presupposes and attempts to contextually explain the misunderstandings.

The author Maria Preda believes that: "Motivation is the result, the consequence of the interaction between the individual, the task to be fulfilled, and the external environment" (Preda, 2006: 106). In this sense, the motivation of a high-ranking politician is to overcome adversity and the hostility of those in the political party he is part of, because only through his way can he differentiate, gain capital of image and why he can not become an undeniable leader. While it may be difficult to believe that we are dealing with current Romanian politics, there are also politicians who are motivated by intrinsic factors such as devotion and love for political career, opportunity for promotion, social recognition. The financial reward is also a motivating factor that should not be neglected.

Conclusions

Diplomacy and motivation are absolutely necessary in any type of discourse, especially for politicians who want to gain notoriety. Above we gave examples of diplomacy and political leadership, and how they represent qualities, especially as media representatives have become more and more incisive, and the press has gained more power than ever, often challenging the rules of the state itself.

Nicholas Kralev, a 21st Century expert in diplomacy, said in an interview for the television station Digi 24, to journalist Cristina Cileacu: "For a journalist it is an

opportunity that few have. Traveling with the US State Secretaries on the same plane and talking to them about politics, events, and everything they do in their work unofficially is extremely valuable to any journalist. My tendency is to look at all of this from another angle, because I believe it is a rare chance to get there, especially for someone who has never dreamed that he or I in this case would have the opportunity to do so, especially if we think about growing up in Bulgaria. I remember seeing George Schultz when he was a state secretary in the 1980s, as he descended the stairs of the plane, and I did not dream that such a thing was something to achieve. Thus, being on a plane and traveling around the world with the head of US diplomacy is simply an invaluable fact and I do not think I have ever thought of any negative aspect of this. Because, for a journalist who loves diplomacy and foreign policy and wants to understand exactly what the US wants to do all over the world, the opportunity is invaluable” (Kralev, 2015). Therefore, diplomacy and motivation go hand in hand, both being the subject of study and analysis. Both have become things without which they cannot aspire towards a public life.

References:

- Bonnafous, S, Ciron, P., Ducard, D., Levy, C., (2003). *Argumentation et discours politique*, Rennes: Rennes Publishing House.
- Charaudeau, P. (2005). *Le Discours politique. Les masques du pouvoir*, Paris: Vuibert.
- Coculescu, S. (2008). *Distorsionarea ethosului locutorului în discursul politic televizual românesc*. Retrieved from: http://www.philippide.ro/distorsionari_2008/073-084%20COCULESCU_RED.pdf.
- Colodeeva L., Pricopciuc, D. (2014). Les caractéristiques définitives du discours politique. *Scientific Annals of the State University B.P.Hașdeu from Cahul*, vol. 10, Cahul: Centografic, 53-54.
- Ducrot, O., (1972). *Dire et ne pas dire. Principes de sémantique linguistique*, Paris: Hermann.
- Goffman, E. (1987). *Façons de parler*, Paris: Minuit.
- Kralev, N., Interview given to Digi 24, 26.12.2015. Retrieved from: <https://www.digi24.ro/stiri/externe/mapamond/interviu-nicholas-kralev-expert-in-diplomatia-secolului-21-sa-ne-gandim-la-diplomatie-doar-cand-izbucneste-un-razboi-este-o-problema-471056>.
- Le Bart, C. (1998). *Le discours politique*. Paris: PUF.
- Neșu, N. (2003). *Specificul strategiei argumentative în discursul politic*. Retrieved from: http://www.dacoromania.inst-puscariu.ro/articole/2002-2003_17.pdf.
- Messinger, J. (2006). *Les gestes des politiques*. Paris: Éditions Flammarion.
- Preda, M. (2006). *Comportament organizațional. Teorii, exerciții și studiu de caz*. București: Polirom.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1891). *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*: 1. Bd. Vier Bücher, nebst einem Anhang, der die Kritik der Kantischen Philosophie enthält. 4. Aufl // A. Schopenhauer's sämtliche Werke / Hrsgn. v. Julius Frauenstadt. 2. Aufl: Neue Ausgabe. Bd. 2, Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Streeck, J. (2009). *Gesturecraft. The manufacture meaning*, Amsterdam- Philadelphia: John Benjamins, B.V.
- Thoveron, G. (1996). *Comunicarea politică azi*, Oradea: Antet Publishing House.

Diplomacy and Motivation in the Political Discourse

*** *La gestuelle des politiques, Les gestes conscients de la politique* (II). Retrieved from:
<http://la-gestuelle-des-politiques.e-monsite.com/pages/ii-les-gestes-conscients-de-la-politique.html>.

Article Info

Received: April 09 2019

Accepted: May 10 2019
