

Discourse on Safety/Security in the Parliamentary Corpus of Latvian Saeima

Ilva Skulte^[0000-0002-4589-6600] and Normunds Kozlovs

Riga Stradins University, Faculty of Communication, Dzirciema 16, LV-1007, Riga, Latvia
ilva.skulte@rsu.lv
normunds.kozlovs@rsu.lv

Abstract. The discourse on (individual and public) safety and (social) security in the political communication has an impact on community feelings through the ideas of risk and emergency. Indeed, the many aspects of insecurity / un-safety make this to be elaborated in speeches as a rather manifold and complex concept. How is this conceptual nexus used and perceived in the speeches of MP's of Latvian parliament, and what impact it may have had on political discourse in general and construction of identities and power relations between political elites and the people in this discourse? These are the main issues addressed in this research that combines critical discourse analysis and corpus analysis tool created for Corpus of Debates in Latvian parliament - Saeima (1993 – 2017) (<http://saeima.korpus.lv/>). Findings show that the discourse on safety and security is provided by Latvian MP's mainly from protectionist point of view. The main stream of discourse indicate the uses of the meaning of 'security' or "the state of being free from danger or threat"; this is why it is sometimes referred to as taken for granted or the term is often used in Saeima debates in both administrative and populist contexts.

Keywords: Parliamentary Discourse, Safety, Security, Ideology, Governmentality.

1 Introduction

The world wide comparative research on value systems in change shows that the value of security (understood as existential security) is gradually losing its importance in the context of developing economic well-being, prosperity and post-materialist values (Inglehart, 2008). However, only in the number of most developed Western societies this change was really completed in terms of percentage of population expressing post-materialist values surpassing the percentage of people expressing materialist values. In the last decade a cultural backlash is taking place in form of waves of success of political populism that often implies the rhetoric of danger to raise awareness of social security and individual and public safety [Norris, Inglehart, 2019]. It is nevertheless clear that physical, emotional and economic security as the state of being free of risk is still perceived as exclusively important in many parts of the world. It is especially true also for Latvian society [Rungule, Senkane, 2018] where democracy was (re)introduced along

with consolidating of its national identity based on traditionalist conservative ideas. [Kruk, 2018] Being one of the Post-soviet societies Latvia re-gained independence in the year 1991 and joined EU in 2004, introducing neoliberalism and having reached certain level of well-fare (rising its GDP from 4.5 in 1993 to 35,66 in 2008 and 34.31 billion US dollars last year [Trading Economics, 2020] but at the same time scholars discuss anomia in psychological description of Latvian society. [Ļevina, Mārtinsone, 2018].

In this context we wanted to stress the perplexity and complexity of the concept and / or semantic field in question in order to find out how it is used in the given context to have an advantage in discussions in Latvian parliament – Saeima – or to follow particular (situative) political goals. So, the main aim of the research was to study critically the discourse of parliamentary debates to find out how exactly the notion(s) of safety/security were used in parliamentary debates from the first independent Saeima after re-gaining independence in 1993 to the year 2017, who (individual MP's, political parties, gender etc. characteristics) are using those notions more extensively and what goals and purposes were tried to reach with mentioning of safety / security. The main question here was – what is the meaning(s) MP's include into those notions in discourse of debates, and how this discourse may have influenced the conceptualization of national identity?

2 Theoretical Aspects of Safety/Security Discourse in Parliament

2.1. Semantic Field of Safety/Security

The first challenge we encountered while designing research model for this paper was the fact that the word “drošība” in Latvian can be translated into English as two units of lexicon, respectively “security” and “safety”. The word “drošība” is listed with three meanings in the on-line Dictionary of Contemporary Latvian Language, respectively, “condition of not being in threat, endangered; 2. The complex of characteristics or measures ensuring an event or process without mistakes, accidents, traumatism, element of such an insurance, 3. insurance, warrant. [Zuicena & Roze]. Latvian Academic Dictionary of Terminology (an online terminology source combing data from several dictionaries) links Latvian “drošība” to lexemes with similar meanings in English, Russian, German and French. It allows understanding of how semantic fields are constructed in languages that through translations and everyday cross-linguistic usage might have influenced understanding and usage of the concept in Latvian.

Comparing semantic fields in all respective languages can see that even if the meanings in all languages are slightly differing ranging from ‘being sure’ to ‘being untouched’, however, core concept is that of not endangered, protected against risks caused by human activity or processes enacted by some other source. Research in the field of safety studies shows that safety can be defined in relation to risk and full or acceptable partly absence of unwanted events. [Hansson, 2012; Aven, 2014] Zedner

noticed a similar inconsistency of the notion “security” as well when observing four paradoxes connected to the strengthening security – presuming persistence of crime, expansion of the penal state, increase of anxiety and the social exclusion. [Zedner, 2003] Both security and safety can be defined as antonyms of risk (complementary (as absence of potential of unwanted event) and contrary (as low potential of unwanted event)) [Boholm, 2017] Accordingly, there are two terms in English meaning respectively the condition of being protected from or unlikely to cause danger, risk, or injury (safety), and the quality or state of being free from danger or threat (security) whereas 1) both can be treated also in the instrumental sense (instrument, document, measures, device), 2) term “security” covers a broader concept 2.1) including in its main meaning besides safety as a freedom from danger other sub-meanings and 2.2) being used as synonym of “surety” and “protection” [Merriam-Webster On-line].

Both are connected to the same semantic field that is represented by the one and the same word “drošība” in Latvian. Like in other languages this word is derivative from adjective “drošs” meaning brave, safe with help of suffix –ība, a unit usually used in Latvian to build nouns with abstract meaning.

2.2. Uses of safety/security discourse in parliament.

Links and networks of semantic fields are structuring the discourse defining reality, structured perceptions of which are influencing back the way reality is perceived. In fact, discourse works in three dimensions – language use, communication of beliefs and social interaction [van Dijk, 1997]. Parallel to this, in the act of communication the identities are formed [De Fina, 2012], understood and legitimized. Parliamentary discourse is a form of discourse, yet, very important form that strongly influences identities and beliefs of the society because this is the site where power relations are legitimized and identities of social groups set up and defined along with their needs and aims in the social interaction outside parliament – in many specific genres of speaking MP's are driving the motivation of “the audience to act in a certain way with regard to real-life issues” [Ilie, 2015, 7]. The discourse of parliamentary debates is therefore an excellent source of data to understand what views and beliefs and what models of actions are projected to the experience of social reality where the identity is constructed in everyday intercourse. As a part of political discourse that is discussed most through the prism of ideological positions, value systems and beliefs [van Dijk, 2004; Wodak, 1987; Wodak, 2013], even if it is sometimes difficult to identify ideologies in connection with particular parties in the times of populism [Auers, Kasekamp, 2013, 339].

In the late 1970ies Michel Foucault elaborated the notion of governmentality in his work on relationships between state power, society and subject in liberal democracies of the time. He described this as the art of governance, form or reflection of government by government (reflective governance) that is a positive power implying voluntary subjection of subjects to governance, but, nevertheless, is based in biopolitical thinking. [Foucault 2008]. Discourse here serves as both instrument of reflection and instrument of governing, as it connects mental aspects (structures of cognition), with practical impact, effects of communication. We used Foucauldian approach to understand the role

of the discourse on safety/security that projects the idea of future danger and therefore legitimizes power relations between protected and protectors. So it provides a form of disciplinary and bio-political control and is a form of governmentality. [Foucault, 2008; Henriqson, 2014; Evans 2010]. As Giorgio Agamben puts it, this view actually brings under question categories used for understanding the political communication in terms of ideology and values, and the meaning of reality it refers to: “ Only within a biopolitical horizon will it be possible to decide whether the categories whose opposition founded modern politics (right/left, private/public, absolutism/democracy, etc.) – and which have been steadily dissolving, to the point of entering today into a real zone of indistinction – will have to be abandoned or will, instead, eventually regain the meaning they lost in that very horizon”. [Agamben, 1998, 10] Semantically connected to the concept of risk (endangering well-being and life), discourse of safety/security is an instrument of application of the biopolitical horizon in the politics.

3 Methodology

According to these theoretical assumptions we employed for our study two methods resulting in both quantitative and qualitative data. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 1993, 2001, 2003; Kress, 1990; van Dijk, 1997; 2003; Wodak, 2001, 2009) was employed to find out how using the term in question in a specific context the conceptual understanding of the social and political situation was developed but also semantic structures build and strategically enacted to establish larger power relations allowing governance and identity building. Critical discourse analysis is increasingly used for the analysis of hidden legitimization and naturalization of power relations and social inequalities in political communication (Sengul, 2019). Around this aim various research practices are mobilized in what is in fact wide interdisciplinary field of diverse approaches with different theoretical and methodological backgrounds (Fairclough, Mulderrig, & Wodak, 2011, 357). In this study we combined two approaches - Dialectical-Relational model by Fairclough (Fairclough, 1993), especially, 2nd (critique of the neoliberal discourse) and 3rd (deliberative) phase in the development of his approach (Fairclough, 2017, 14) based on M. Foucault's and M. Halliday's ideas (Sengul, 2019) and van Dijk's Socio- Cognitive model (van Dijk, 2001, 2003, 2011). In other words, for understanding and describing of conceptualization of existing social reality as “in danger” or “facing risks” by talks in parliament (allowing an adequate fixing of roles between power and people), we applied the normative (value based), circumstantial, explanatory and action seeking (change oriented) (Fairclough, 2017) ways of reasoning.

Corpus analysis was used to have a quantitative overview on speakers, their groups and intensity of safety/ security discourse and to access longer fragments of texts of debates for qualitative research. For this purpose we were working with corpus analysis tool developed by researchers from Riga Stradins university and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory of the University of Latvia for The Corpus of Debates in Latvian Saeima

[Auziņa, Dargis, Kruks, Rābante-Buša, Skulte, 2015). The parliamentary corpus of Latvian Saeima consists of the transcriptions of speeches from the 5th Saeima and gives an opportunity to use full text stem search, order the data, filter by period, search for specific speakers as well as in-depth searching and limitation of criteria (Dargis et.al, 2016). The analytical tool is public access for multidisciplinary research covering data from first Saeima after re-gaining independence in 1993 to 12th Saeima that ended in 2017. We used here the specially created website that makes it easy to work with data (<http://saeima.korpuss.lv/>). This analysis was aimed on the statistical overview of contexts, situations and producers of the discourse on safety/security in Saeima. Our research interest here was to find out what political agenda and ideological background or individual style of speakers could be seen as drivers for usage of safety/security term(s), what are proportional relations between respective backgrounds and styles, how did this possibly change over the time in scope. We used the research possibilities provided by the tool to analyze gender variety, political and ideological spectrum (party belonging of speakers, representation of government or other group of speakers, coded as Group, see Table 1), taking in account variables such as time the speech was produced, number of fragments produced and mentioning safety/security (Number of cases, see Table 1), size of the group (e.g. political party of election block, government ministers or other, Size of the group, see Table 1), and percentages from all results (number against the number of results found) and from the total of category (number versus the number that would be obtained in this category by searching without criteria) calculated by the software (see Table 1). The results obtained were used further to understand the context of discourse production in the qualitative part of the research. The website provides also access to longer pieces of text of the parliamentary debates that was used for discourse analysis.

4 Findings

4.1. Quantitative approach: corpus analysis data.

Lemma “drošīb*” (meaning ‘security/safety’) appears in 3287 fragments. To avoid entries with usage of the word in appellations, (e.g. titles of laws and names of institutions) the nominative singular form was used for searching. This search produced 340 fragments making 0.11% of all entries. The safety/security talk¹ is maintained mostly by male MP’s, however, female MP’s traditionally build only under 20 from hundred seats in Latvian Parliament (less, respectively 8 and 14 in the Saeimas form 1990ies, more – 31 – in present parliament, since 2018) [CSB, 2019]. This makes the difference between those who are referring to security/safety in both groups practically insignificant (respectively 12% and 10% from category total).

¹ Here and further: the term “safety/security talk” is used to refer to all the expressions of MP’s mentioning the term “drošība”.

Table 1. Top groups of speakers, addressing safety/security in Saeima discourse.

Group	Number of cases	Size of group	% from all results	% from the total of category
MP's / Latvian Way /Latvijas Ceļš	26	23010	7,65	0,11
MP's/ Social Democratic Workers' Party of Latvia / Latvijas Sociāldemokrātiskā Strādnieku partija (LSDSP)	19	2844	5,59	0,67
MP's /Green and Farmers' Union /Zaļo un Zemnieku savienība (ZZS)	18	8958	5,29	0,21
MP's / For Fatherland and Freedom/ Latvian National Independence Movement /Tēvzemei un Brīvībai/Latvijas Nacionālās Neatkarības Kustība / (TB/LNNK)	17	11927	5	0,14
MP's Unity / Vienotība	17	12554	5	0,14
MP's/ All For Latvia /For Fatherland and Freedom/ Latvian National Independence Movement Visu Latvijai/Tēvzemei un Brīvībai/Latvijas Nacionālās neatkarības Kustība (VL/TB/LNNK)	15	4711	4,41	0,32
MP's / Latvian Farmers Union/ Latvijas Zemnieku Savienība	14	3263	4,12	0,43
MP's/ Latvian Association of Regions / Latvijas Reģionu apvienība	13	744	3,82	1,75
MP's/ For Human Rights in Unified Latvia/ Par Cilvēktiesībām Vienotā Latvijā (PCTVL)	13	2689	3,89	0,48
MP's / Latvian National Independence Movement, Latvijas Nacionālās neatkarības kustība (LNNK)	12	1828	3,63	0,66
MP's/ Peoples Party / Tautas partija	12	22686	3,53	0,05
Ministers of Finance	12	401	3,53	2,99
Prime Ministers	12	158	3,53	7,59
MP's/ Harmony Centre	9	3767	2,94	0,27
Saeima officials	9	105391	2,65	0,01

If we look at the groups of speakers that are more often speaking of the concept(s) of safety/security, in the top of parties whose representatives have used the term “drošība” in their utterances more than others (see Table 1), it is interesting that leading are parties that were more active in the political life of Latvia in the end of 1990ies, some of them like Green and Farmers Union (Zaļo un Zemnieku Savienība, ZZS or Latvian National Independence Movement (Latvijas Nacionālās neatkarības kustība (LNNK) still active today. In the case of parties included into several parliaments or / and whose members are active speakers in debates we can say that they have not neglected the safety/security. Right centrist *Latvijas Ceļš* (Way of Latvia, LC), for example, was one of the leading parties in several Saeimas during 1990ies. If we look at the number of mentioning of safety/security during all period of time covered by corpus, this party leads with 26 times where some of its MP's used the term. However, if we calculate a coefficient of usage against all items of corpus from this category (all utterances by MP's of *Latvijas Ceļš*) the percentage is relatively small – only 0,11%. *Vienotība* (Unity) is another right centrist party that emerged in the middle of 2000nds that also was one of the dominant parties in parliament and part of the government. Here we see the same situation relatively high number of mentioning of the term is connected to number and activity of MP's from the party in all Saeimas it entered, but it gives only moderate coefficient, so that we can speak of relatively moderate use of the term by the MP's of this party (17 times, 0,14%). There is no surprise that such political forces as the Union of Farmers and Green (ZZS) are relatively solid in the top 3 of the list (see Table 1), and this seems to be obvious that the MP's from the blocs with the strongly nationalist orientation must support the security discourse (the parties in different periods forming different election blocs of this group include MP's from mainly three parties - For Fatherland and Freedom (Tēvzemei un Brīvībai, TB), Latvian National Independence Movement (Latvijas Nacionālās neatkarības kustība (LNNK)) and All for Latvia (Visu Latvijai, VL)) – usage of security terms is important part of their political rhetoric. If we look at the coefficient of the usage of the safety/ security term in the context of all speeches by their MP's, we see that for LNNK in the earlier Saeimas (until 1997) and for the National Union (VL/TB/LNNK) this percentage is higher than for unified TB/LNNK in the period of time from 1997 – 2010 (respectively , 0,66%, 0,32% and 0,14%, see Table 1).

However, notable fact is that the Latvian Social Democratic Workers Party (LSDSP) shortly represented in the Parliament, was a very active user of terms in question. This party was represented with 14 seats only in 7th Saeima (1998-2002) (except 1 disputable case in 10th Saeima [lsm, 2011]), but is second in the top of number of uses of the term “drošība” in the debates (19 times that makes 0,64% of all speeches). It is obvious that the new-coming parties that stay in opposition and often are not so stable (do not have the stability and success in the long term context of Latvian politics) are tended to use security/ safety talk more independent from the ideological position (however this description matches more often leftist parties in Latvian politics). This is, of course explainable by the attention and emotion that the politicians succeed to raise with mentioning of security/ safety in their speeches. Another example for such a strategy is Latvian Association of Regions (Latvijas Reģionu Apvienība (LRA)). However,

frequent use is often context - depending. Particular topic can raise the number of use of the terms (more see in next section of this paper).

More significant difference, however, is seen in comparing with representatives of the government speaking in Saeima. Most frequent users of the safety/security terms in Latvian Saeima are Prime Ministers (7,59% from the category total) and Ministers of Finance (2,99%, see Table 1). The most significant here is the usage of this term by Valdis Dombrovskis, the Executive Vice President of the European Commission for An Economy that Works for People since 2019 and European Commissioner for Trade since 2020, who was, Minister of Finance (2002–2004) and Prime Minister during and after global economic crisis (2009–2013). He uses this term 9,62% from this category in total. Second biggest user of the word “drošība” is Juris Viļums (Reform Party, LRA, 3,97%), followed by Kārlis Krēslīšs (VL/TB/LNNK; 3,49%)

Comparing all convocations of Saeima after 1993 it is clear that the highest numbers of mentioning ‘safety/security’ in the first parliament of re-gained independence (1993–1995), whereas another increase in observable in the recent years (2014–2017), even if it is statistically not significant (percentage of uses from all fragments of speeches rises from 0,01% to 0,02%). Both periods of time are connected to the situation outside Latvia and perceived dangers from the side of Russia.

4.2. Qualitative approach: discourse analysis results

The qualitative part of the research was made by using the opportunity to obtain longer parts of conversation context where the lemma “drošība” appeared in the parliamentary discourse. We used this context to re-construct main semantic structures and representations as well as mental models (van Dijk, 1997) behind the discourse construction.

Dominant understanding of the word “drošība” by Latvian politicians of different parties speaking in Saeima is connected to the idea of protection, i.e. the meaning of the word is understood by MP's as 'protectness'. It is used in both senses differed by English terms 'safety' and 'security'. The concept of security is discussed as a system, a (major) plan for protection of citizens (and non-citizens) against (political, economical, financial, ecological etc.) instability and possible other dangers. This mental model implies the description of possibly hostile environment, rarely has indication to a particular evil force behind the danger but certainly underlines the role and responsibility of Saeima and each particular MP as agents in ensuring and guaranteeing the stability and trust in secure living and development. This sense of the word, however, is shadowed by the traumas of the Soviet past, when mentioning KGB (The Commity of State Security), especially, in the earlier periods of Post-Soviet Saeima. The reference to this traumatic experience of violence and breaking human rights is used to enact the critical view on the instrumental understanding of security, if, for example, discussing personel questions of people involved into security organs. In the early 1990ies, the discourse of security is connected to the establishment of the new system for national security as well organized, centrifed and interconnected, so that the instrumental understanding is unavoidable:

“Not internal or external security systems should be created in Latvia, but one Latvian security system with two levels: with a peacetime strategy and appropriate forces that would help to ensure it, namely, with security forces on duty, and the second level – for a crisis situation.” (Odisejs Kostanda, LNNK, 1993)

There we see that the idea of security transforms into the concept of universal machine of protection in particular context of Saeimas discussions. In general, security in the political rhetoric is being seen as a(n automatic) part of the complex of wellbeing of people of Latvia throughout all discussions in parliament. But there is particular and deep concern about protection of national independence as a historical heritage in Latvian politics.

How to protect national independence? There are two main narratives that are oscillating around Saeima debates.

The first, mainly used by National conservative MP's constructing the image of permanent danger from outside enemies (and even allies). It starts in form of ideological differences that grow into possible physical damage:

“Then we can ask: isn't our security threatened by political correctness and self-censorship? Because we know that in Germany, nothing was reported in the media for four days - on the radio, on television or in the press. There are currently more than 700 applications in Cologne. Is the violation of human security, personal injury, rape, beatings and robbery terrorism or not? [...] and perhaps then we will be clear about what threatens the borders more - whether they are threatened, say, by some terrorists, or whether they are threatened by Merkel and Mogerini, who invite a million guests. As Landsbergis (the youngest) put it in Lithuania, nothing threatens the security of the Baltic States, and therefore the security of Lithuania and, I think, the security of Latvia, like German Chancellor Merkel's action - to invite a million guests to lunch and then ask the neighbors to pay the bill.” (Aleksandrs Kiršteins, VL-TB/LNNK, 2016)

The second is keener on diplomatic and bureaucratic solutions and tells the story of mighty allies (arguing the need to make allies), that allows sometimes take the security for granted:

“As the security of Latvia as a NATO member is in safe hands, there is no reason to worry”. (Iveta Grigale, ZZS, 2012)

It is interesting, however, how the discussion about the meaning of the word “drošība” breaks out in Saeima in the context of Iraq war. The life and security is brought in relation and foregrounded, but also neglected by strategic thinking of politicians:

“Security does not mean more army participation in wars: “The more tanks and submarines we have and the more we participate in wars, the safer our country will be! If we go now and beat the Afghans or Muslims in Iraq or elsewhere, the safer we will be! ” Security doctrines are also completely opposite, security presupposes both neutrality and non-violence, and so on. So that all their national patriotism should not be turned into security!” (Arvīds Ulme, ZZS, 2003)

“The essence of the matter is not the word 'security' and it is not visible, as Mr Dobelis said here, in NATO decisions. That is the essence of the matter. See what is happening in Europe and around the world, we see that Europe is what it is today -

there is no consensus in Europe on many issues. And that is why a small country like Latvia has a very difficult situation". (Jānis Jurkāns, PCTVL, 2003)

There are, however, a completely other approach to the term "drošība" more connected to safety concept in English. The social safety is approached in "small man's" perspective and looked at in particular aspects of normative life:

- financial/economic:

"There are a number of things involved, including the security of our savings, the future of our savings at the second tier of the pension fund". (Kārlis Leiškalns, People's Party, TP, 2008)

- health, employment or traffic:

"So there is no story here that the issue of road safety ... And let's face it ... Here is a situation where the victim can decide whether to be in criminal proceedings or not." (Andrejs Judins, Vienotība, 2015)

The role of opposition is significant in pointing on the issues of inside country aspects of security and social safety. This opportunity to show their attentive treatment of people is in part explaining why opposition MP's from various parties are active users of safety/security discourse:

"[...] the opposition, I think, has succeeded in the most important thing - attention is paid by the society and the ruling coalition to the problems connected to security, because in pre-election campaigns a lot of parties wer making promisses to their voters in municipalities, that the security [...] is the priority, which will be implemented in each municipality and in the country as a whole". (Pēteris Salkazanovs, LSDSP, 2001)

"Wake up! We live in the 21st century, national security has long been no longer just a matter for the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of the Interior. National security is also about education, health and culture." (Mārtiņš Bondars, LRA, 2014)

So we see that the ideas about the changes of discourse establishing needed and sought (criticism from value position) and orientation to solution (taking in account broader field of reference) are actually present in the Saeima discourse itself even if it is doubtful that the politician follows this road in a case of becoming a member of a group building ruling position.

5 Discussion

The importance of the task of (re)construction of national identity and consolidation of community after collapse of USSR is an important aspect that helps to understand political discourse in the country. From one side, the building of democracy in Latvia is taken for granted, from another side, narrowed concept of national identity was introduced that interacted with psychological feelings of instability and imagination of dangers, risks and emergencies (in face of which people of Latvia must survive) followed by what can be described as "pluralism anxiety". [Kruk, 2018] This is why politicians, especially, those from national and conservative parties often use a safety/ security terms for argumentation of their political views that is appealing to their electorate, and in political field concentrated around identity issues it gives a certain forehand in debate. However, this strategy is considered to be successful per se, as the popularity of

security / safety discourse among politicians from new-coming parties in Saeima and opposition MP's show. According to this paradigm, frequency of the use increases in the contexts where outside dangers (in particular, in regard to Russia) are perceived as growing. It must be underlined that, ideological differences do not seem to play crucial role in speaker decision to talk about or refer to safety / security. The reference to security/safety certainly is connected to the rather conservative and traditionalist discourse, but as this discourse in the process of construction of national identity is in part brought in the fundament for building of democracy [Kruk, 2018], opposition MP's (from leftist and centrist parties) are even more active in the usage of the term. The differences between political ideologies disappear also when MP's are looking for the precise meaning of the word in the context of responsibility in face of "bare lives" of people (discussion in the context of Iraq war, 2003) In the same time there is certain influence of the factor of personality (profession, position, a personal linguistic style) of speakers that also plays role in usage of the term. Nevertheless, the biopolitical perspective of protection including conceptual deprivation of individual autonomy is dominating.

So, term(s) in question is an important element of self-reflection of MP's in Saeima discourse – their main role is perceived as to safeguard people of Latvia, to ensure their security (as norms and laws) and safety (based on idea on bodily and life risks). This shows that the mental model involving understanding security/ safety can be seen as part of the governmentality in Latvian politics. The fact that the government representatives speaking in Saeima are very much using the term(s) is supporting this thesis.

6 Conclusions

Discourse on security/safety is permanent in Saeima's debates during the years of independence. MP's from wide spectrum of political parties use it, and it is a stable part of discourse of national conservative parties. The opposition parties (both leftist and centrist) are often mentioning security/safety to bring attention to specific issues of life inside country.

The usage of the terms safety/security (and especially security) tends to be more intense in two Saeimas analyzed – in the early 1990ies and after 2014, in the context of unstable geopolitical situation and for gaining attention (however, there is no increase in safety/security mentioning during global financial crisis). The issues of specific forms and fields of safety are also making its way to discourse in Saeima.

The discourse on safety and security is provided from protectionist position by Latvian MP's. In Saeima, most frequent uses of the terms are in Prime Ministers and Ministers of Finance segments of the corpus. MP's reflect they role as MP's in regard to security of people, government representatives often describe their achievements and concerns in security/ safety terms, particular safety problems are discussed in the context of respective laws and regulations.

The main stream of discourse indicate the uses of the meaning of 'security' or "the state of being free from danger or threat"; this is why it is sometimes referred to as

taken for granted or the term is often used in corpus in both administrative (titles of Laws) or populist contexts.

The meaning of “safety” appears, when the term is applied in some specific (professional) field where the risks or dangers appear, for example, traffic safety or work place safety. The word in this meaning is more typical for the rhetoric of opposition MP’s.

The main conclusion here is that the discourse on safety/security is one of the elements characterizing the treatment of political elites of people of Latvia throughout the history of Post-soviet period and thus encouraging building of power relations, but also self-image and identity of Latvians in a certain way. We propose the interpretation that this is done in mode described by Foucault ([1978/1979]2008) as governmentality – even if the individualist perspective of “small people” is used to explain dangers and risks, the MP’s in their speeches are tended to show that they – administratively and symbolically – are taking over all the responsibility and active role, describing people as protected and protectable – unable to protect themselves. The discourse shows many cases where speakers are reflecting on their role of good and skillful governor by drawing their arguments on emergency in the situation of constantly endangered by lack of stability. The main and persistent danger for the country and its people is imagined in the speeches as danger for the national independence coming from outside. This element is permanent part of speeches of conservative MP’s, but it is nevertheless a valued discursive tool for drawing attention to one’s political agenda and justify the biopolitical attitude.

References

1. Abdi, R., & Basarati, A. Legitimation in Discourse and Communication Revisited: A Critical View towards Legitimizing Identities in Communication. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 6(1), 86-100 (2018).
2. Agamben, G. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power And Bare Life*. Stanford University Press (1998).
3. Akadēmiskā terminu vārdnīca.
<http://termini.lza.lv/term.php?term=DRO%C5%A0%C4%AABA&lang=LV> , last accessed 2020/10/10.
4. Amoussou, F., Ayodele A. A. (2018) "Principles, theories and approaches to critical discourse analysis." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature* 6.1: 11-18.
5. Auers, D., Kasekamp, A. Comparing Radical-Right Populism in Estonia and Latvia. In: Wodak, R., KhosraviNik, M, Mral, B. (eds.) *Right-wing populism in Europe: Politics and discourse*. A&C Black, 235-248 (2013).
6. Auziņa, I, Darģis, R., Kruks, S., Rābante-Buša, G., Skulte, I. (2015). *Saeimas debašu korpuss*. <http://saeima.korpuss.lv/> last accessed 2021/22/03.
7. Aven, T. What is safety science? *Safety science*, 67, 15-20 (2014).
8. Boholm, M. The semantic field of risk, *Safety science*, 97, 205-216 (2017).
9. CSB (Central Bureau of Statistics). *Sieviešu īpatsvars Saeimas deputātu vidū*. <https://www.csb.gov.lv/>, last accessed 2020/11/22

10. Da Fina, A. Discourse and identity. In: Van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. 2nd ed. 263-282 (2012).
11. Dargis, R., Rabante – Buša, G., Auziņa, I., Kruks, S. *ParliSearch – A system for large text corpus discourse analysis. Human Language Technologies – The Baltic Perspective*, IOS Press (2016).
12. Evans, B. Foucault's legacy: Security, war and violence in the 21st century. In: *Security Dialogue* 41.4 413-433 (2010).
13. Fairclough, N. Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 133–168 (1993).
14. Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 2nd ed. pp. 357–379 (2011).
15. Fairclough, N. CDA as dialectical reasoning. *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies* 1, pp. 7-16 (2017).
16. Fišer, D., de Maiti. K.P. Voices of the Parliament. In: *Modern Languages Open*. (2020).
17. Foucault, M. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (2008).
18. Hansson, S. O. Safety is an inherently inconsistent concept. *Safety science*, 50(7), 1522-1527 (2012).
19. Henriqson, É. et al. The constitution and effects of safety culture as an object in the discourse of accident prevention: A Foucauldian approach. In: *Safety science* 70. 465-476 (2014).
20. Ilie, C. Parliamentary discourse. In: Tracy, K. (ed) *The International Encyclopedia of language and social interaction*. Wiley Blackwell, 1-15 (2015).
21. Inglehart, R. F. Changing values among Western publics from 1970 to 2006. *West European Politics*, 31(1-2), 130-146 (2008).
22. Kruk S. Enabling Agency among Latvians: Cultural Socialization and Political Procedures. In: Kruk, S. (ed.) *Pluralism Anxiety. Acting Socially in Latvia*. Riga Stradins University, Rīga. 17 – 44. (2018).
23. Latvijas Nacionālais Terminoloģijas portāls. <https://termini.gov.lv/at-rast/dro%C5%A1%C4%ABba>, last accessed 2021/22/03
24. Ļevina, J., Mārtinsons, K. Anomia. In: Kruk, S. (ed.) *Pluralism Anxiety. Acting Socially in Latvia*. Riga Stradins university, Rīga. 67-90. (2018)
25. LSM: LSDSP izslēdz Ati Lejiņu (12.01.2011). <https://www.lsm.lv/raksts/zinas/latvija/lspd-izsledz-ati-lejinu.a39714/>, last accessed 2020/22/11.
26. Merriam Webster On-line. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/safety> last accessed 2020/11/22.
27. Norris, P., Inglehart. R. F. *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press, New York (2019).
28. Rungule, R., Senkāne, S. Values of Latvians Across Socio-Demographic Groups. In: Kruk, S. (ed.) *Pluralism Anxiety. Acting Socially in Latvia*. Riga Stradins University, Rīga. 91-102 (2018).

29. Sengul, K. Critical discourse analysis in political communication research: a case study of right-wing populist discourse in Australia. *Communication Research and Practice* 5.4 (2019): 376-392.
30. Sommers, J. Austerity, internal devaluation, and social (in) security in Latvia. In: Sommers, J., Woolfson, Ch. (eds.) *The Contradictions of Austerity: The Socio-Economic Costs of the Neoliberal Baltic Model*. London: Routledge, 17-43 (2014).
31. Trading Economics. <https://tradingeconomics.com/latvia/gdp> last accessed 2020/11/25.
32. Van Dijk, T. A. Cognitive context models and discourse. In Stamenov, M.I. (ed.) *Language structure, discourse and the access to consciousness*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam. 189-225 (1997).
33. Van Dijk, T. A. The study of discourse. In: Van Dijk, T. A. (ed.) *Discourse as structure and process. Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Approach. Volume 1*, 1-34 (1997).
34. Van Dijk, T., A. Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (eds.) *The Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Maiden, MA: Blackwell. (2003).
35. Van Dijk, T., A. Multidisciplinary Critical Discourse Analysis: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95-120). London: Sage. (2001).
36. Van Dijk, Teun A. Text and context of parliamentary debates. In: Bayley, P. (ed.) *Cross-cultural perspectives on parliamentary discourse*. J. Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam. 339-372 (2004).
37. van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage (2011).
38. van Leeuwen, T. Legitimation in discourse and communication. *Discourse and Communication*, 1(1), 91-112 (2007).
39. Wodak, R. Critical discourse analysis: history, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* 2nd edition London: Sage. 1-33 (2009).
40. Wodak, R. What Critical Discourse Analysis is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* London: Sage. 1-13 (2001).
41. Wodak, Ruth, ed. *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Vol. 7. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam (1989).
42. www.lexico.com; last accessed 2020/11/20.
43. Zedner, L.: Too much security? *International journal of the sociology of law*. 31 (3), 155-184 (2003).
44. Zuicena, I., Roze, A. (eds.) *Mūsdienu latviešu valodas vārdnīca*, <https://tezaurs.lv/mlvv/#/sv/dro%C5%A1%C4%Abba>, last accessed 2020/11/20.