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For the past three years the Rhetorics of Democracy project, funded by the Spanish National Research Plan (FFI2008-00039), has convened a series of international workshops around the study of democracy as an argumentative form of government. Cooperation began early on in 2008 with the Academy of Finland Politics of Dissensus project. A selection of both team members’ contributions along with commissioned papers form this new issue of the journal Res Publica. Yet the studious preparation through a peer-review process for over a year has made possible that this publication becomes the first joint outcome from the Civic Constellation project (FFI2011-23388), of which eight out of the thirteen authors are members.

A cross-disciplinary interest in rhetoric provides the common thread of the articles, whose breadth gives a fair idea of the ‘rhetorical turn’ in the human sciences. Long-lasting and recent research topics are dealt with in a lively way by addressing usually unexplored aspects of politics and ethics. In many cases the reader will see that the terms ‘rhetoric’ and ‘rhetorical’ are used as synonyms for ‘argumentation’ and ‘argumentative’. To talk about rhetoric is to talk about argumentation. Thus, understandably, a great deal of the articles enter into methodological discussions when arguing their focus.

Structured into three sections, Rhetoric, Ethics and Democracy sheds light on debates in ethics and politics from the perspective of rhetorical analysis. The selection covers different epochs and countries paying attention to the argumentative uses of concepts and ideas central to the languages of modern ethics and politics and, in particular, to the language of modern democracy. By critically examining the arguments, rhetoric turns a most revealing angle to look into moral and political debates. That way, what begins as a conceptual, pragmatic inquiry ends up by confronting undeclared assumptions and evaluative codes in apparently neutral accounts.

After the introduction, the first section presents a number of studies on the argumentative political culture of parliamentarism. Kari Palonen’s “Parliamentary Procedure as an Inventory of Disputes” compares the doctrinal
contributions by two classics of parliamentarism, Jeremy Bentham and Thomas Erskine May, pointing out how decisive for political arguments turn rules and discussion procedures. The singularity of parliamentary practices is though extended to debating associations as Taru Haapala illustrates in her article “Debating Societies, the Art of Rhetoric and the British House of Commons”. Significantly, the nineteenth-century parliamentary imprint keeps inspiring debating styles well into our time. The next article appraises an example of parliamentary culture in early twentieth-century Europe, namely Finland’s. In “Disputing the ‘(Un)parliamentary’”, Onni Pekonen examines the Finnish Parliament’s procedural rules. Partly imported from Swedish, British, French and German precedents, their adoption meant a major step into the creation of a novel, European-like debating culture.

Ethics, Politics and Rhetoric, the second section, includes six studies covering different historical periods and thematic approaches, some of them focusing on moral features of rhetorical studies. Cristina Lasa Ochoteco’s “Paradoxes of Emancipation” is an analysis, inspired by La Boétie’s treatment of ‘voluntary servitude’, on how Baltasar Gracián in his publishing endeavours and Denis Diderot’s Encyclopédie project successfully challenged censorship. Rosario López studies Mill’s argumentative uses of the idea of history in her “John Stuart Mill’s Idea of History” pointing out the influences of both Comte and Saint-Simon. Tapani Turkka’s “Of Locke’s Presence” vindicates a reinterpretation of modern political thought based on Peter Laslett’s historiographical contributions to Locke debates, which have opened a research path of their own. In “Intentions and Cooperative Activity”, Irene Boragno discusses the advantages of Michael Bratman’s notion of “shared intention” to study collective action. Hanna-Mari Kivistö’s “The Concept of ‘Human Dignity’ in the Post-War Human Rights Debates” examines the rhetorical formulations of the concept of dignity in the preparatory debates to the drafting of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Finally, Manuel Toscano’s “Language Rights as Collective Rights” discusses the legal status of language rights arguing that their presumed character as basic human rights rests on an unproven assumption.

The third section deals with democracy’s rhetorical dimension. Jussi Kurunmäki’s “The Lost Language of Democracy” reviews the democratisation literature of the past four decades to underline the missing reference to a rhetorical analysis of the language of democracy, arguing for its necessary role in democratisation comparative research. Antonio Rivera’s “Are We at Home in a Liberal Democracy?” is an analysis of Agnes Heller’s ‘home’ metaphor as referred to politics. Using Hans Blumenberg’s metaphorology, the article shows its ambivalent adequacy to think liberal democracy, in spite of its evocative meaning. In her “Emergency Rhetoric in the US Congress:
Debating the National Emergencies Act of 1976”, Anna Kronlund dissects the partisan debates on the constitutionality of the 1976 National Emergencies Act. Her paper examines the precarious constitutional credentials of emergency powers in a democratic order. José María Rosales’ “Democracy as a Way of Life” discusses the reasonability of democracy’s ideals as applied beyond the realm of politics, arguing for a political interpretation of democracy’s value.

*Rhetoric, Ethics and Democracy* invites the reader to explore a series of moral and political debates and research topics from the perspective of rhetoric. The combination of methods and approaches has made the team cooperation a worthwhile endeavour illuminating some of the most interesting crossdisciplinary arguments in the human sciences.
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