

- Howarth, David. , (1999) "Theory of Discourse: David Marsh and Jerry Stokes, Method and Theory in Political Science." Translated by Amir Mohammad Haji Yousefi (Tehran: Institute for Strategic Studies Publications.
- Hubert, Dreyfus; Robino, Paul (2006). "Michel Foucault beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics." Translated by Hossein Bashirieh, Tehran, Fifth Edition, Ney Publishing.
- Jahandideh, Sarkhosh (2007). "Michel Foucault; Iran, the Soul of a Soulless World." Tehran, Ney Publishing.
- Jorgensen, Marianne & Philips, Louise,(2002), Discourse Analysis As theory & method, London, Sage Publications, 2002.
- Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal,(2001) Hegemony & Socialist Strategy, London: Verso, 2nd Ed, 2001.
- Laclau, Ernesto (1996). Emancipation (s), London, Verso.
- Laclau, Ernesto, Discourse, in R. E. Goodin and P. Pettit (eds), A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Laclau, Ernesto, New Reflections on the Revolutions of Our Time, London, Verso, 1990.
- Laclau, Ernesto. "Discourse." Discourse Quarterly, Translated by Hossein Ali Nozari, No. 0 (Spring 1998).
- McDonnell Dayan (2001). "Introduction to Discourse Theories." Translated by Hossein Ali Nozari, Tehran, Farhang va Gofman Publishing.
- Nash, Keith (2001). "Contemporary Political Sociology." Translated by Mohammad Taghi Delfrooz, Tehran: Kavir Publications.
- Robertson, Donald (2001). "Globalization, Social Theory and Culture." Translated by Kamal Molapour, Tehran: Third Edition.
- Sajjadi, Abdolqayyum (2004). "Discourse Analysis of Globalization." Political Science Quarterly, No. 28.
- Schultz, Ian Art (2007). "A closer Look at the Phenomenon of Globalization." Translated by Massoud Karbasian, Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- Scott, A (1997) (e d) The Limits of globalization, London. Institute for strategy.
- Zimran, Mohammad (1999). "Michel Foucault: Knowledge and Power." Tehran, Hermes Publications.

References

- Ahmadi, Babak (2005). "Intellectual Work."Iran. Tehran, Markaz Publishing.
- Azdanlu, Hamid (2001). "Discourse and Society."Iran. Tehran, Ney Publishing.
- Bahrapour, Shaban Ali.(2000) "Introduction to Discourse Analysis, Collection of Articles on Discourse and Discourse Analysis."Iran. Tehran: Farhang Gofman Publications.
- Behrouz Lak, Gholamreza (2006). "Globalization and the Result of Conflict of Discourses, a Critique of the Discourse Analysis of Gobalization." Quarterly Journal of Political Science, No. 36. .Iran. Tehran.
- Castells, Manuel (2001). "The Age of Information and the Emergence of a Network Society." Translated by Ahad Aliqlian, Afshin Khakbaz and Hassan Chavoshian. Tehran: Nashrenow Publishing. .Iran. Tehran.
- Clarck, Ian (2003). "Globalization and the Theory of International Relations." Translated by Faramarz Taqi Lou, Publisher of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. .Iran. Tehran.
- Clarck Ian. Lobulization and International Relations Theory, 1992.
- Fairclough, Norman, Language & Power, London, Longman, 2nd ed, 2001.
- Fairahi, Davood. (1999) "Power, Knowledge and Legitimacy in Islam." Tehran: Ney Publishing,.
- Foucault, Michel (1974). The Archaeology of Knowledge, London, Tavistock.
- Foucault, Michel (1977), Security, Territory, Population, Lectures at the College De France.
- Foucault, Michel (1999). "Speech Order." Translated by Baqer Parham, Tehran, Agah Publications.
- Foucault, Michel (2004). "The Will to Know." Translated by Niko Sarkhosh and Afshin Jahandideh, Tehran, Ney Publishing.
- Gol Mohammadi, Ahmad, (2002). "Globalization of Culture and Identity." Tehran, Ney Publishing.
- Haghighat, Seyed Sadegh (2006). "Methodology of Political Science." Qom: Mofid University Press.
- Howarth, David,(2000) Discourse, Buckingham, Open University Press2000.

Some have considered the discourse of globalization as a transition to postmodernism. According to them, the nature of globalization is the formation of its discourse rules. These rules are multiple and invisible and are reflected in the hidden levels of modernity. From this perspective, like modernity, which, according to Foucault, developed in the heart of classical discourse and then emerged from within, globalization has emerged as a result of the crisis in the components of modernity and at the end of its unilateral process. Thus globalization can be compared to the discourse of modernity, with the difference that modernity occurred in Europe and defined itself by the creation the myth of "us" and "the other," on the contrary, globalization is a new development on a global scale that, by interfering with subjectivity and objectivity, has shattered the other constructing metaphysics of modernity and exposed the false propositions of modern times by creating new propositions.

Analysis of the discourse of globalization sees globalization as a new representation of the construction of power relations. In these relationships, new signs and concepts are established in specific meanings and signifiers. These signs are articulated around the central signifier of the universality of liberalism. In this discourse, neoliberalism is the central signifier and signs such as democracy, human rights, security, justice and liberal economy are among the floating signifiers that are given meaning by referring to the central signifier of neoliberalism. The alienation of the globalization discourse takes place through the negation of meanings and signs in rival discourses. Therefore, it can be said that the basis of globalization depends on power, which as a strategic institution has a complex situation and has led to new developments, including globalization, a situation whose central signifier is neoliberal globalization. This discourse is considered as the dominant discourse today because it has become a common social concept.

referring to neoliberalism. The controversy between discourses over assigning meaning to justice goes beyond the general debate about the relationship between justice and globalization. This is not about developing or limiting justice in a discourse, because different discourses come to a different meaning of justice. If the critical view of globalization claims that globalization limits justice and exacerbates injustice, it has precisely refers to a meaning of justice that is far removed from liberal justice. The fluidity of the sign of justice leads us to the different meanings of it in different discourses. The optimistic view of the spread of justice in the light of globalization by Western thinkers considers a meaning of this sign, which is based on the Western neoliberalism. The critical and pessimistic view that considers globalization as the cause of the destruction of justice proposes justice within the framework of socialist discourse. Therefore, as long as there is no semantic commonality for the sign of justice, talking of constructiveness or destructiveness of globalization for it will have no result. What is important here is not the intrinsic relationship between globalization and justice, because such a relationship probably does not exist, rather, it is important what meaning of justice and by whom constructs the collective mind and public opinion (ibid. 291-326).

VI-Conclusion

In this paper, we attempted to represent globalization in the framework of discourse theory in a different way from conventional analyzes. Although in some papers globalization has been mentioned as a new global situation and a new process, globalization as a discourse has received more attention. From the perspective of discourse analysis, globalization can be examined in two different ways: first, the notion of a "single globalization discourse" which we have reviewed some examples of such notions. According to these views, the discourse of globalization has either a modern or a postmodern character. But the common denominator of such analyzes is that they consider globalization as a single and coherent whole that has specific articulations and minutes of discourse. But in contrast, globalization can be viewed in another way that is more analytically flexible and therefore more explanatory. Such an approach can be called "globalization as an arena of discourse conflict."

and security, because globalization undermines the importance of most military conflicts (borders control) and, on the other hand, provides the possibility of arms control through international treaties.

Global Security in the globalization discourse is security with liberal approach that seeks order and stability based on the teachings of liberalism. As threats are defined as political and cultural currents that are contradictory and inconsistent with the model of liberalism. The globalization explains world security and peace along with the threats of communism during the Cold War and Islamism after the fall of Soviet Union (for a detailed discussion of the effects of globalization on security and insecurity, see Schult, 2001: 255-290).

V.5. Signifier of Economy

Neoliberalism is in the context of the globalization discourse. This view is based on the idea that in the view of neoliberals, in order to become global formal government surveillance of citizens on a large scale must be abandoned. The removal of economic constraints from the market flow and the movement of goods and capital should be on the agenda of this policy. Globalization as a discourse speaks of the integration of the national economy in the world economic system; but this integration does not mean putting together the fragmented parts of the local economic model. Rather follows the path of homogeneity. National economies are connected to world markets in the process of globalization of economy, but at the same time accept the rules and regulations governing the world market.

Thus, the globalization of the economy in the most optimistic analysis is the pervasiveness of the opportunities and capacities of the neoliberal economy and its spread to the national markets. This indicates the hegemonic nature of the neoliberal economic model on the course of the global economy and the world financial markets, which is formulated in the discourse of globalization. This process will naturally face resistance and opposition from rival discourses (Ibid: 233-235).

V.6. Signifier of Justice

The concept of justice is one of the important signs of world politics that the discourse of globalization tries to make sense of it by

V.2.Signifier of Democracy

There are different interpretations of the relationship between globalization and democracy. It also depends on the fluidity of the signifier of democracy and the possibility of meaningfulness in it in discourse articulations. Democracy has different meanings for different people; but today, when we talk about the existence or non-existence of democracy in the countries of the world, and especially in the discussion of the compatibility or incompatibility of this or that culture with democracy, it reflects the meaning of liberal democracy in the collective imagination, and this suggests that the dominant discourse has been able to give meaning to the signifier of democracy by referring to the central neoliberal concept and present it as something natural (Ibid: 228-229).

V.3.Signifier of Human Rights

The signifier of human rights is one of the important signs in the globalization discourse. Irrespective of the theoretical and philosophical foundations of human rights, and regardless of the cultural and political differences of most societies, the current governments have paid serious attention to human rights, so that today it is considered as one of the most important issues in world politics. The general tendency of the world opinion on the issue of human rights has transcended it to the level of a universal and general signifier. The discourse of neoliberalism took the lead in human rights and to hegemonize itself, raises the issues of the protection and preservation of human rights in Eastern and authoritarian societies. Self-belief in the concept of the originality of human cognition and wisdom and humanistic attitude which was crystallized in the idea of western individualism (humanism) is one of the most important principles of human rights. (Ibid: 229-231).

V.4.Signifier of Security

Security is one of the most important and crucial signifiers in the international politics. The issue of security and globalization has been raised mainly from the perspective of the impact of globalization on increasing or decreasing security. The concept of peace is also a sign of globalization discourses. In the discourse of neoliberalism, globalization has a positive and constructive effect on world peace

created by us. Therefore, they do not have a fixed and intrinsic meaning; we understand and apply these concepts as they are represented. The discourse of globalization and power are in conflict and competition over assigning meaning to the floating signifiers of the above-mentioned spheres. These signifiers are dominated by discourse and established on the axis of a special central signifier. Thus, the signifiers of politics, democracy, human rights, security, economics, and justice can be considered as the main signifiers of the globalization discourse, all of which find meaning around the central signifier of neoliberalism. We now briefly discuss the important and influential signifiers in the globalization discourse.

V.1.Politics Signifier

Politics in a special sense (political and social management style) is one of the signs that is at the center of the conflict of globalization discourse. Global discourse seeks to portray secular politics as justified and acceptable in the collective human imagination. Globalization considers politics to be completely secular and customary and seeks to expand it. The generalization of the pattern of secular politics is one of the manifestations of globalization and the force influencing the process of globalization is mainly the force inclined to secular politics.

The discourse of globalization masks politics on the axis of the central signifier of neoliberalism, thus speaking of the end of ideologies and the hegemony of liberalism. In his idea of the end of history, Fukuyama recalls the ultimate victory of liberalism and liberal democracy, which is largely secular irreligious politics and acknowledges that modernization and globalization will be the central builder of the remained history. The discourse of globalization has become the source of the emergence and expansion of religious movements called Islamic and Christian fundamentalism in the contemporary world by intensifying the process of secularization and weakening the social role of religion. Castells refers to this religious movement as feedback on globalization in the form of resistance identities. Giddens also analyzes the growth and emergence of Islamic fundamentalism in the context of the power / resistance relationship between the two discourses of globalization (secularization) and political Islam (Sajjadi, 2004: 227-228).

IV.6.Ronald Robertson

Ronald Robertson states that the purpose of his research on globalization is the need to review social science theories, especially sociological and political theories. In his view, globalization is a conceptual framework for the issue of world order in the most general sense; a framework that anyway does not have the desired epistemological aspect without discussing historical and comparative issues. The discourse analysis of globalization seeks to understand the meaning of cosmopolitanism, which is considered in Robertson's theory as a starting point in the theorizing of social and political sciences. Globalization as a discourse considers the conflict of discourses over the meaning of the floating signifiers of global existence and seeks to explain this point that how a particular discourse presents its concepts and points as universal and general concepts. (Ibid: 220).

IV.7.Kate Nash

In explaining the nature of globalization and Western culture, Kate Nash is more inclined to discourse analysis of globalization. She believes that the globalization led to the relativity of Western culture so that it is no longer easy to speak of the universality of Western values everywhere and at all times, but that Western culture itself is faced with multiplicity and diversity and its attribute of every time / everywhere has changed to now / here. In fact, it can be reasonably argued that there was never a homogeneous West, and that such an idea could only be constructed by confronting others, who were considered fundamentally different. Therefore, understanding the nature of globalization as a discourse is a seemingly paradoxical formulation of the global and local nature. A phenomenon that Robertson refers to as "globalization-localization." Globalization always takes place in a local context; while at the same time, the local framework itself is created through the discourses of globalization as a special place (Kate Nash, 2001: 113).

V-Signifiers Related to Political Power and Globalization

In world politics, we always refer to signs and concepts such as democracy, peace, justice, human rights and security as signs of globalization, but their meanings are neither intrinsic nor necessarily

theoretical implications of globalization on theories of international relations (realism, structuralism, and pluralism). According to Clarck, globalization of the theory of realism requires the transformation of the processes of international relations with the continuous reduction of the dimensions of power and security. From the pluralistic point of view, globalization is accompanied by an intensification of the challenge of pluralism. Finally globalization can be discussed as part of a redefined structuralist intellectual framework.

Clarck seems to be more sympathetic than others to globalization as a theory or theoretical framework for analyzing international issues. He raises the question of whether the study of globalization in itself suggests a different approach that applies to the theory of international relations. Therefore, he focuses the discussion on the theoretical challenges of international relations affected by globalization and its consideration as an analytical framework. According to Clarck, globalization necessitates a new formulation and re-conceptualization of theories of international relations. Clark's main argument starts from the point that the theories of international relations are based on the dualism of the political sphere with the demarcation between inside and outside, and globalization collapses this duality and thus causes the revision of classical and dualism-related theories. Clark argues that there is a consolidating reciprocal relationship "between globalization and the state" in which change in the global arena and the state occur simultaneously and affect each other.

This interpretation of the historical demarcation of globalization provides a satisfactory theoretical and analytical framework. Clarck, based on one definition of globalization, sees it as the process by which power is embedded in the institutions of the world community and is transmitted more through global networks than through land-based governments. Clarck, citing social science theorists, discusses the theoretical and behavioral evolution resulting from globalization. Behaviorally, globalization is an important turning point in the spatial form of human activity and social organization. Hence it is said that a world social system is emerging in which there is no longer any boundary between internal and external. Theoretically, the globalization pushes back the assumptions of social and political sciences, and according to Scott, the social sciences should free themselves from territorial assumptions (Sajjadi, 2004: 222-223).

Appadurai's theory of landscapes goes back to disruptive cultural currents and makes historical processes inherently unpredictable; but it helps to see how the uneven and risky development of globalization can be regulated. The valuable subject in this case is that it shows how social reality has a nature based on a particular point of view. That is, it accepts that social reality is seen from different angles in different ways. Appadurai's perspectives consider the representation of images for the worldview possible that its precise and clear formulation is drawn through the cultural policy of the actors and the discourse conflict.

Appadurai's ethnic perspectives historically consider ethnic boundaries constructive, fluid and floating. Appadurai's ideological perspectives are interesting and significant in the present discussion. He sees democracy as a world-wide ideological visions because at the end of the twentieth century, there is no regime in the world that does not seek to legitimize itself by referring to the symbol of democracy. But assigning meaning to this signifier is highly controversial. Different discourses argue over the meaning of this empty signifier. Ideological perspectives within which democracy is a key term vary widely around the world. In former communist countries, for example, democracy is closely linked to economic liberalization, whereas in Western liberal democracies, social movements play an important role in challenging current democracies. This discussion contains serious and important questions: what kind of democracy is really considered democracy? What institutions are needed to create it? What is the role of citizenship rights in it? How can it be protected?

Globalization as a discourse gives meaning to the democratic signifier on the centrality of the universality of liberalism. But this is only one of the possible images for democracy. The hegemony of liberal discourse leads to the temporary consolidation of the democratic signifier in the concept and meaning of liberal democracy (Appadurai, 1990).

IV.5. Ian Clarck

Ian Clarck examines globalization implications for theories of international relations while acknowledging the disturbing nature of its process. From this perspective, the author seeks to study the

IV-3.Fairclough

Fairclough mentions the discourse of globalization. His argument is that the new use of power confronts us with the globalization of discourse. This does not mean that discourse is easily assimilated on a global scale, but that what happens in one place is also reflected on the world horizon. Fairclough believes that if there is a globalization of discourse, the discourse of globalization will also be raised (Fairclough 1989: 198).

Fairclough refers the controversy over the globalization of discourses or the discourse of globalization to another question, and says that in this important study the question arises as to whether globalization is a real / objective process or merely part of a new discourse? In response, he confidently chooses the second alternative, saying that globalization is certainly part of the discourse, because when one thinks and speaks about the nature of the contemporary world and its evolution, he uses this concept. Fairclough separates the discourse of globalization from the state of globalization. His demarcation between the two is organized by the hegemony of the liberal discourse. "I referred to the discourse of globalization, but what is really going on is a special discourse of globalization between different and probable alternatives," he says. Although Fairclough sees globalization as a possible and arguable discourse, he recognizes that the discourse of globalization is primarily concerned with the dominant and superior global discourse. Therefore while globalization of other discourses is possible, what is available as a valid discourse is a special image of globalization that the neoliberal discourse presents (Haghighat, 2006: 570).

IV.4John Appadurai

Explaining the heterogeneous nature of world culture in an article by R. John Appadurai's entitled "Breaks and Differences in the World Cultural Economy" is more intertwined with discourse analysis. In his view, the world cultural economy is a complex, mixed, overlapping, and disruptive order. To this end, he proposes a theory called perspectives that encompasses five dimensions of the global cultural flow: technological perspectives, media perspectives, financial perspectives, ethnic perspectives, and ideological perspectives.

peacefully, one should try to offer a credible alternative to the neoliberal system. This requires the design of new frontiers and the recognition that radical politics cannot exist without the definition of otherness and conflict. That is, it requires the inevitable acceptance of the relations of conflict and constitution of otherness (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985, quoted by Sajjadi, 2004: 215-216).

On the other hand, Laclau and Mouffe's description of understanding and introducing power and globalization emphasizes a special formulation of concepts that takes place within power relations. The emphasis on the declining dominance of neoliberalism, which has gradually become the dominant constructive discourse of this discourse in the process of globalization, suggests the possibility of formulating the discourse of globalization and its partial and temporary consolidation in a specific signified (neoliberal universality). Inspired by the ideas of Laclau and Mouffe's, it can be said that the discourse analysis of globalization helps us to explore this issue in power relations. On the other hand, discourse analysis takes us away from the relatively common claim of globalization as a process or project and presents it as a discourse; a discourse whose central signifier is neoliberal universality and other signs are articulated around this concept. In considering the discourse of globalization, the neoliberal hegemony of cosmopolitanism makes this model normal and natural as globalization and exposes other discourses to itself. Simultaneous attention and emphasis on the semantic burden of globalization and its political aspect presents a relatively comprehensive and up-to-date analysis that can be explained in the context of discourse analysis.

Laclau and Mouffe's expression, as the above phrase is well used, is more sympathetic to the discourse analysis of globalization, because in this view which is denied liberal globalization is a product of information technology, which considers this phenomenon as a historical and inevitable necessity. In the context of discourse and citing the concept of hegemony, neoliberal domination has an ideological burden and its semantic burden can not be separated from the political dimensions and power relations. In the framework of discourse theory, Laclau and Mouffe consider political and social formulations and discourse articulation as unnecessary and therefore deny the necessity of the process of globalization (Mouffe, 2001).

thinking about it can be provided by designing an opposite interpretation. When a phenomenon is considered from a certain angle, its other angle and horizon can also be considered (Zamiran, *ibid.* 39).

In Foucaultian genealogy, subjects do not preexist, but they appear and play a role in the realm of battle and conflict that opens up space. Thus history is considered a structural domain for conflicts, one that arises from a strong combination of knowledge and power. Foucault tries to discuss the interactive and dialectical relationship between power and knowledge and to analyze the coexistence of the two within discourse (Dreyfus. 1997: 31). For Foucault, power and knowledge are not alien to each other, but throughout history they are reciprocally productive and constructive. These internal relations are not easily understood, but in fact it is these relations that reveal the role-playing subjects (*Ibid*: 32).

According to Foucault, the relationship between no two discourses can be defined outside the power relations. Power also does not act neutrally and morally. Therefore, drawing a common human geography between discourses and the birth of the phenomenon of "globalization" in the context of this common human geography is nothing more than an illusion (Jahandideh. 2007: 17).

IV.2.Laclau and Mouffe

In the introduction to the second edition of "Hegemony and Socialist Strategy," Laclau and Mouffe say:

"The common justification for claiming the absence of an alternative to the neoliberal is globalization. Representing globalization as the result of the information revolution has removed the connotation of globalization from its political dimensions and made it [a globalization] a situation to which we must all submit. In fact, the dissection of globalization through the category of hegemony developed in this book can enable us to understand that the current situation, beyond the mere possible social order and naturalness, is the manifestation of a special classification of power relations. This situation is the product of the movements of special political forces and is capable of creating profound changes in the relationship between capitalist corporations and nation-states. Such domination is challenging and instead of just trying to deal with it

a kind of rationality, which, by crossing the boundaries of various sciences, shows the dominant unity of a subject, or a historical spirit, or an era. It is a set of relationships that can be found between sciences in a particular era, provided that we analyze these sciences at the level of discourse classifications. (Dreyfus, Robino, 2006: 83). Rejecting transhistorical and timeless discourses, Foucault emphasizes that different periods differ significantly in the nature and functions of their discourses. In each period, a special discourse and epistemology prevail. In fact, he turns away from any interpretation based on the originality of a fixed nature and, relying on the concept of rupture, claims that each age has its own characteristics. The characteristics of each era can be identified in the context of the discourse governing that era. The discourse that governs every era is a symbol and manifestation of a meta-discourse reality. According to Foucault, the world does not have its own eloquence and expression till we translate it into our own language.

In the archaeology of knowledge, the principle of overthrow is the most important basis of Foucault's work. This principle prevails on three other principles of archaeology, namely; discontinuity, specificity and externality. The principle of discontinuity means that the connection between events is challenged. Relying on the concept of rupture, Foucault claims that each age has its own characteristics. The characteristics of each age can be identified in the context of the discourse governing that age.

The principle of characteristic (Difference): is the principle that the order and knowledge of each era has its own characteristics.

Externality also means negation of deep digging to understand the hidden meaning and nature of things. Deep digging has been a constant occupation of thinkers since the time of Plato. Foucault sought to prove that deep digging causes man to be oblivious to the most trivial and tangible manifestations of truth which are on the surface. For this reason, he avoided searching in depth and instead focused on the perceptible procedure of events, small details and displacements and fine lines (Zamiran, 2005: 56). As mentioned, the principle of overthrow dominates Foucault's other principles. Overthrow as Foucault says is what man may revive in his mind, assuming the opposite concept. This means that when a tradition or school offers a specific interpretation of an event, a new way of

According to Foucault, discourse is never eternal and ideal, but from the very beginning has its root in history and time, as well as embodying meaning and social connection and shaping the mentality and socio-political connection (power).

Foucault believes that the concept of discourse should be discussed and analyzed in two bodies: genealogy and paleontology. The teachings of Michel Foucault, his genealogical theories, teach us that there is no individual or collective mind that moves history; hence, no one is responsible for the emergence of a historical event (globalization). In his view, historical events always take place within cavities, and the action of forces in any particular historical situation is made possible by the space that determines and defines them. This primordial and superior open space is itself perceived as both the result of long-term actions and the power scope of those actions. What is happening in this space is not just transformation and turn of meaningless verbal actions, but these transformations are very important social maneuvers for the people involved (Dreyfus, Robino, 2006: 83).

Foucault says that archaeological analysis has nothing to do with the history of ideas or the history of science. Rather, it is a study that aims to discover how cognition and theory have emerged, and within what space of order and knowledge they are founded, and on the basis of what a priori-historical categories, ideas are reflected in philosophies and rationalities are formed. In his archaeological analysis, Foucault introduced the concept of episteme or knowledge. In fact, understanding Foucault's archaeology is not possible without understanding the concept of the episteme. Foucault refers to the concept of episteme as a special epistemological field in the framework of which a special knowledge, discourse and narrative are formed in a specific culture and a certain field. In fact, episteme is the symbol of the spirit of the time. Foucault applies the principle of alteration or contradiction to the rupture between different epistemes and claims that each period has a different identity and essence in comparison with other periods and tries to analyze the conditions for the realization of phenomena. He continues that by episteme we mean the whole of relations which, in a particular age, unite discourse practices that give rise to epistemological forms, science, and possibly formal systems. Episteme is not a form of knowledge or

discourse and turn it to the central horizon of society. Acceptance and superiority of a discourse has another condition and that is validity.

After establishing a discourse and in the process of objectification and deposition of a discourse, its internal structure can be explored. In discourse analysis, this is explained by focusing on the central sign of a discourse, its articulation, and the way the signs and symbols coexist in it. Each discourse contains a set of signifiers. In discourse theories, signs have a floating character. But no particular relationship between signifier and signified is pre-accepted. Signs within any discourse are never fully established and there is the possibility of any semantic change in them. Laclau, for example, speaks of a floating sign. "Floating signs are signs that different discourses try to give meaning to them in their own special way." Signs and symbols absorbed in a discourse form an articulation. The concept of articulation plays an important role in Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory. Different elements, which may be meaningless apart, acquire a new identity when they come together in the form of a discourse. Laclau and Mouffe use the concept of articulation to relate and weld these elements together. In other words, "articulation is about gathering different elements and combining them into a new identity." They call any action that leads to the establishment of a relationship between the elements in such a way that the identity of these elements is modified and defined as a result of this act, articulation. The central point in articulating a discourse is the central signifier. Each discourse implements its ideas and concepts through using signs and symbols. These signs are temporarily fixed around a central point. The focal point is a prominent and distinguished sign in the shadow of which other signs are arranged and articulated. (Behrouz Lak, 2006: 39-42). Here we briefly introduce the views of some of the most important theorists who have tried to analyze and explain the power and globalization from a discourse perspective:

IV-Analyzing the Discourse of Power and Globalization from the Perspective of Theorists

IV.1.Michel Foucault

Among those who made a dramatic change in the concept of discourse is the French post-structural philosopher Michel Foucault.

The discourse approach deals with the significant role of social behaviors and ideas in political life. This approach analyzes the way in which systems of meanings or "discourses" shape people's understanding of their role in society and influence their political activities (Howarth 1999: 195).

III-Model of Analysis, Discourse Analysis

Among the theories of discourse analysis, Laclau and Mouffe's analytical model provides a suitable analytical framework for studying the macro-developments of a society. Instead of providing causal explanations of social changes, this theory seeks to understand and describe the meanings formed in the social process.

The first step in applying Laclau and Mouffe's discourse analysis is to identify the atmosphere of conflict and constitution of otherness between different discourses in society. In such a situation, one of the discourses becomes hegemonic and suppresses other discourses, or at least marginalizes them. The assumption of different discourses requires their identification through the process of constitution of otherness.

For Howarth, social conflict is important for discourse theory in three ways. First, the creation of a otherness-constitution relationships, which always involves the production of an "other" is of great importance for the establishment of political boundaries. Second, the formation of otherness-constitution relations and the establishment of political boundaries are important in the temporary establishment of the identity of discourse organizations and social actors. Third, the doctrine of hostility and otherness-constitution is a good example of possibility and conditionality of identity. Thus, otherness-constitution is found where discourses collide. But social strife does not always last and is temporarily eliminated through hegemonic intervention. Hegemonic intervention provides articulation that reconstructs a given situation with the help of power.

Conditions are necessary for a discourse myth to become the horizon of society or the dominant discourse. The victory and dominance of a discourse is the product of its accessibility. That is, availability in a context and situation in which no other discourse presents itself as a real and hegemonic alternative discourse. Therefore, availability can pave the way for the victory of a particular

have been studied. Data collection technique is using documentary study (books, magazines, Internet and valid domestic and foreign articles). Presenting thematic literature and theoretical foundations, the distinguishing feature of globalization discourse and expressing different points of view and proponents and opponents views, examining different signs and articulating globalization discourse, and finally discussion and conclusion and presenting suggestions are among the results of this article.

II-Statement of the Problem

The inability of positivism to explain and analyze new issues in modern societies led to the emergence of new theories such as hermeneutics, poststructuralism and their new perspectives on political and social studies, and paved the way for the discourse theory to enter the field of new humanities studies. The term discourse is used in many disciplines, from linguistics to literature and philosophy to politics.

The concept of discourse emphasizes social processes that produce meaning. From different discourses, different worlds are perceived. Discourse is not only about what one can say or think, but also about who can speak, at what time, and with what authority. Discourse embodies meaning and also shapes mentality as well as socio-political relations (power) (Azdanloo 2001: 17).

Discourse is a generality in which each sign is fixed in relation to one dimension and by its relation to other signs. This is done by rejecting all other meanings that the sign could have: discourse is an attempt to prevent the signs from slipping from their position relative to each other and thus creating a new semantic system (Jorgensen and Phillips, 70: 030).

The prevalence of discourse analyses in the study of humanities paved the way for extensive changes in classical concepts and ideas. Concepts such as power, politics and globalization also found new meaning in the context of discourse approaches, a meaning beyond what is common in everyday language and the conventional concept of the humanities. From this perspective, these approaches try to create new contexts for the development of their analyses in the field of political and social studies by applying classical concepts in different forms.

I- Introduction

Since entering the field of theoretical discussions, discourse theory has had profound effects on theorizing about language, power, and society. Discourse theory combines language, power, ideology, politics, and society, and presents a dynamic field of analysis of political and social phenomena. The fabric of language surrounds us so intensely and we are immersed in it so deeply that we are unaware of the profound effects it may have on our social life. History, religion, culture and politics are flowing in language. In the light of discourse theory, the effects of language on the political and social life of nations can be discovered. This theory has great potential for analyzing the mechanisms of the power flow in different societies, and can open new horizons for us to understand the political and social phenomena.

How can globalization be studied on the basis of discourse analysis? The existing literature on this subject indicates a serious disagreement. The ambiguity stems from the fact that some have spoken of the discourse of globalization without expanding their views on the basis of discourse analysis. In cases where such a pattern has been developed, there is a serious disagreement over the nature of the globalization discourse.

Given the nature of discourse analysis, how is the discourse of globalization perceived? The answer to this question, at least from the point of view of discourse theorists, is positive and simple, because there is nothing outside of discourse; there is no inherent distinction between mental representations and perceptible real things. In this view, all subjects (objects) and behaviors are discourse centered. According to the proponents of discourse theory, the meanings of signs and behaviors can not be understood except within discourses. (Howarth david.p8). The present article seeks to examine the historical background, intellectual sources, epistemological foundations of the theory of power discourse and its ability to analyze political and social phenomena, including globalization, as well as critiques of it from different perspectives.

In this article, through using the analytical-descriptive method, the existing theories, views and paradigms in the field of globalization

Abstract:-

The present article examines the concept of power and globalization in discourse theories. Globalization is a term that has been used since the mid-1980s and means the collapse of borders and transcending them at global level in economic, cultural, political and social dimensions.... the process of which is the transformation of local structures into global structures. The process of globalization, its dimensions and scope are so wide and extensive that it has affected all aspects of human life. Consequently, in the light of the development of the electronic communications revolution over the past few decades, the concept of distance and space has become unimaginably disrupted. Therefore, globalization is not a new situation but a new discourse. Globalization represents a new information-driven society that has led to a structural transformation in power relations. With the spread of discourse analysis, extensive developments in concepts such as power and politics emerged in the context of discourse approaches, and the concept of power also found a wider scope in the discourse perspective. Prior to this, however, the concept of power was a political concept and its origin was limited to political relations. Discourse analysis and access to post-text is based on a series of assumptions; the most important of which are: 1. Different people look at text or speech in different ways; 2. Discourse has many levels and dimensions; 3. The text should be viewed as a meaningful whole and this meaning is not necessarily in itself; 4. Each text is related to a source of power or authority (not necessarily political); 5. No text is neutral and the texts have a value and ideological burden; 6. Meaning, as much as it arises from the text, is also affected by the social and cultural context or background.

The important goals of discourse analysis are as follows: 1. Demonstrating meaning instability 2. Clarifying the deep and complex structure of text production, that is, the flow of discourse production; 3. Explaining the conditions for producing discourse.

Key words: globalization, power, globalization discourse, discourse, neoliberalism, modernism.

المخلص:

تبحث هذه المقالة في مفهوم القوة والعولمة في نظريات الخطاب. العولمة مصطلح تم استخدامه منذ منتصف الثمانينيات ويعني انهيار الحدود وتجاوزها على المستوى العالمي في الأبعاد الاقتصادية والثقافية والسياسية والاجتماعية... عملية تحويل الهياكل المحلية إلى عالمية الهياكل. إن عملية العولمة وأبعادها ونطاقها واسعة وواسعة النطاق لدرجة أنها أثرت على جميع جوانب الحياة البشرية. وبالتالي، في ضوء تطور ثورة الاتصالات الإلكترونية على مدى العقود القليلة الماضية، أصبح مفهوم المسافة والفضاء معطلاً بشكل لا يمكن تصوره. لذلك فإن العولمة ليست وضعاً جديداً بل خطاباً جديداً. تمثل العولمة مجتمعاً جديداً مدفوعاً بالمعلومات أدى إلى تحول هيكلية في علاقات القوة. مع انتشار تحليل الخطاب، ظهرت تطورات واسعة في مفاهيم مثل السلطة والسياسة في سياق مناهج الخطاب، ووجد مفهوم القوة أيضاً نطاقاً أوسع في منظور الخطاب. قبل ذلك، كان مفهوم القوة مفهوماً سياسياً وكان أصله مقصوراً على العلاقات السياسية. يعتمد تحليل الخطاب والوصول إلى ما بعد النص على سلسلة من الافتراضات؛ أهمها: ١. ينظر الأشخاص المختلفون إلى النص أو الكلام بطرق مختلفة. ٢. للخطاب مستويات وأبعاد عديدة. ٣. يجب أن ينظر إلى النص ككل ذي مغزى وليس بالضرورة أن يكون هذا المعنى بحد ذاته؛ ٤. كل نص مرتبط بمصدر قوة أو سلطة (ليس بالضرورة سياسي). ٥. لا يوجد نص محايد والنصوص لها قيمة وعبء أيديولوجي. ٦. المعنى، بقدر ما ينشأ من النص، يتأثر أيضاً بالسياق الاجتماعي والثقافي أو الخلفية. الأهداف المهمة لتحليل الخطاب هي كما يلي: ١. إظهار عدم استقرار المعنى. ٢. توضيح البنية العميقة والمعقدة لإنتاج النص، أي تدفق إنتاج الخطاب. ٣. شرح شروط إنتاج الخطاب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: العولمة، القوة، خطاب العولمة، الخطاب، الليبرالية الجديدة، الحداثة

Explaining the concept of power and globalization in discourse analysis theories

Seyed Yaghoub Mohammadnia

PhD Student in Political Geography , University of Tehran ,
Albourz campus , Iran
seyedyaghoub@yahoo.com

Rasool Afzali

Assistant Professor , Department of Political Geography , Faculty of
Geography , University of Tehran , Iran
Rafzali@ut.ac.ir

Yashar Zaki

Assistant Professor , Department of Political Geography , Faculty of
Geography , University of Tehran , Iran

Kiomars Yazdan Panah,derow

Assistant Professor , Department of Political Geography , Faculty of
Geography , University of Tehran , Iran

شرح مفهوم القوة والعولمة في نظريات تحليل الخطاب

سيد يعقوب محمد نيا

طالب دكتوراه في الجغرافيا السياسية ، جامعة طهران ، ايران

رسول افزالي

أستاذ مساعد بقسم الجغرافيا السياسية ، كلية الجغرافيا ، جامعة طهران ، ايران

ياشار زكي

أستاذ مساعد بقسم الجغرافيا السياسية ، كلية الجغرافيا ، جامعة طهران ، ايران

كيومرس يزدان بناه درو

أستاذ مساعد بقسم الجغرافيا السياسية ، كلية الجغرافيا ، جامعة طهران ، ايران