

chantal mouffe und ernesto laclau zum diskurs-begriff

„Now, turning to the term discourse itself, we use it to emphasize the fact that every social configuration is meaningful. If I kick a spherical object in the street or if I kick a ball in a football match, the physical fact is the same, but its meaning is different. The object is a football only to the extent that it establishes a system of relations with other objects, and these relations are not given by the mere referential materiality of the objects, but are, rather, socially constructed. This systematic set of relations is what we call discourse. The reader will no doubt see that, as we showed in our book, the discursive character of an object does not, by any means, imply putting its existence into question. The fact that a football is only a football as long as it is integrated within a system of socially constructed rules does not mean that it thereby ceases to be a physical object. A stone exists independently of any system of social relations, but it is, for instance, either a projectile or an object of aesthetic contemplation only within a specific discursive configuration. A diamond in the market or at the bottom of a mine is the same physical object; but, again, it is only a commodity within a determinate system of social relations. For that same reason it is the discourse which constitutes the subject position of the social agent, and not, therefore, the social agent which is the origin of discourse—the same system of rules that makes that spherical object into a football, makes me a player.“

New Left Review (1987), Volume: 166, Issue: 1987, S. 82.

[diskurs](#)

From:

<https://wiki.zhdk.ch/repraesentation/> - **Repräsentation und Repräsentationskritik**

Permanent link:

https://wiki.zhdk.ch/repraesentation/doku.php?id=wiki:text:vertiefung:mouffe_diskurs

Last update: **2012/12/18 01:42**

