



Language, Power, and Resistance in Contemporary Poetry: A Theoretical Framework

Sankar Sarkar, Research Scholar¹, Prof. (Dr) Vineeta Kaur Saluja², Prof. (Dr) Angel Ruth Shalom³

^{1,2,3}Mangalayatan University, Jabalpur, MP, India

ABSTRACT: This study focuses on the politics of language in contemporary poetry based on an interdisciplinary theoretical framework through drawing on Michel Foucault's discourse theory, Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, Jacques Derrida's deconstruction, and Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, and Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak. This study emphasises that language is an active ideological and political practice despite an aesthetic medium. Contemporary poetry mirrors and challenges power structures. Based on diction, silence, multilingualism, syntactic breaks, and fragmented expression, contemporary poetry explains and challenges power in the context of the politics of language. Existing studies have largely accentuated subjective political content, while micro-level linguistic strategies have been relatively neglected. Therefore, this essay analyses how the language of contemporary poetry generates ideological meanings, destabilises dominant discourses, and creates resistant fields within social, cultural, and political realities. The study also identified important gaps in existing literary criticism— notably insufficient integration of discourse theory and deconstruction, limited comparative linguistic analysis, and insufficient attention to language as an ideological practice. Finally, the essay demonstrates that the politics of language in contemporary poetry is enacted through destabilisation of meaning, discourse-based resistance, and cultural negotiation.

Corresponding Author:

Sankar Sarkar

Published Online:

May 28, 2026

License:

This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

KEYWORDS:

Critical Discourse Analysis, Contemporary Poetry, Deconstruction, Discourse Theory, Framework, Ideology, Politics of Language, Postcolonialism.

Cite the Article: Sarkar, S., Saluja, V.K., Shalom, A.R. (2026). *Language, Power, and Resistance in Contemporary Poetry: A Theoretical Framework*. *International Journal of Human Research and Social Science Studies*, 3(5), 463-470. <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijhrsss/17-2026-Vol03I05>

INTRODUCTION

Any serious and well-organized research is based on previous studies. The Review of Literature defines the intellectual scope of the research, places current research in the context of existing academic discussions, and establishes the rationale for new research. Especially in literary and linguistic studies, where the relations of meaning, power and ideology are complex and multi-layered, literature review is not simply a process of data collection, but a critical intellectual exercise.

Politics of Language in Contemporary Poetry is an interdisciplinary research field that sits at the intersection of literary criticism, linguistics, political theory, cultural studies, and philosophy. This chapter aims to critically review important research and theoretical discussions conducted at the national and international levels and situate current research in light of them. At the same time, this chapter will build the theoretical framework of the present study, which will guide the subsequent analytical chapters.

Language has long been considered a transparent and neutral medium of expression in literary analysis. In poetry, language has often been seen as a vehicle for the poet's feelings, experiences or political consciousness. However, from the middle of the 20th century, this concept of language was increasingly questioned. With the development of structuralism and post-structuralism, language began to be seen not only as a means of conveying meaning but as an active field of meaning production. This theoretical shift also had a profound effect on contemporary poetry reading methods.

Ferdinand de Saussure elucidates language as a distinct structural system. It displays that meaning is not a natural or static entity. It is constructed through difference. This concept forms the basis of the theoretical discussion that follows. Michel Foucault links language to power and knowledge through discourse theory. It exhibits that language not only reflects social reality but also constructs it. Louis Althusser identifies language as part of ideological practice. In this arena the individual takes a position as a subject within the social structure.

According to Jacques Derrida, deconstruction discovers the ambiguity, uncertainty and instability of meaning within language. Derrida displays that language is never completely semantically fixed. It is always delayed and changing. To analyse the language of contemporary poetry, this concept is particularly important. Based on the ruptures, silences, and ambiguities of language, modern and postmodern poetry often constructs meaning.

This chapter will review existing research on contemporary poetry, taking into account all these theoretical perspectives. Issues such as the state, war, power, gender, ethnic identity and political resistance have been given particular importance in the study of contemporary English-language poetry at the international level. Post-colonial criticism has seen language as a major site of cultural domination and resistance. However, a large part of these studies has remained limited to analysing the subjective political content of poetry.

Language is often treated as a neutral medium in this type of theme-focused analysis. While there is discussion of what is being said in poetry, how it is being said, and the political implications of those linguistic strategies remain relatively neglected. Tactics such as diction, phrasing, rhyming, silence, multilingualism, or breaking grammar—that can convey political positions—have not been adequately addressed in existing research

Research on language and literature in Indian and South Asian contexts has a special historical importance. Multilingual societies, colonial experiences and linguistic identity politics have profoundly influenced the literature of the region. Although the questions of language movement, nationalism and cultural identity have gained prominence in studies written in Bengali and English. It challenges to analyse the politics of language in contemporary poetry within a coherent theoretical framework. This approach is still limited.

This chapter will also identify methodological trends in existing research. While most research relies on qualitative analysis, micro-level analysis of language—such as syntax, repetition, typography, or the political role of silence—is often absent. As a result, the ideological and discursive functions of language are not fully exposed.

In light of these limitations, this chapter will identify gaps in existing research, which will establish the need for current research. Specifically, analysing language as an active ideological practice, exploring the political significance of micro-level linguistic strategies, and uncovering the multidimensional nature of language politics through comparative readings, will be the main goals of this research.

In addition to this literature review, the chapter will also set out the theoretical framework of the present study. This research considers language as a discursive and ideological practice, where power and resistance are in dialectical relation to each other. Discourse theory will be instrumental in analysing the relationship between language and power, deconstruction will uncover the meaning breakdown and uncertainty within language, and postcolonial theory will play an important role in understanding the relationship between language and cultural hegemony.

In light of this theoretical framework, the rationale of text selection and analysis methodology will also be briefly explained in this chapter. It will be explained why particular contemporary poets and poems have been selected for research and how political meaning will be explored through linguistic analysis.

Overall, this chapter will build the intellectual and theoretical foundation of the present study. It will show that researching the politics of language in contemporary poetry is not just a literary inquiry, but an essential attempt to understand the complex relationship between language, power and culture. This introduction will clearly set the theoretical and analytical direction of the following chapters.

OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH

1. Analyzing language as an ideological practice

The primary objective of this study stands on the analysis of power, identity and resistance, rather than just a neutral medium of communication. This study approaches how diction, silence, multilingualism, syntactic breaks and fragmented expression construct political meanings and challenge dominant ideologies and discourses in contemporary poetry.

"Language is not a neutral expression; rather, language is an active field of history, power, identity, and resistance."

2. Coordinating interdisciplinary theoretical frameworks

This study will construct a comprehensive analytical framework by combining various theoretical perspectives. Especially Michel Foucault's discourse theory, Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis, Jacques Derrida's deconstruction, Roland Barthes' post-structuralism and postcolonial thinkers such as Edward Said, Homi K. The ideas of Homi K. Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Meenakshi Mukherjee will be applied together.

"This chapter will build the intellectual and theoretical foundations of the present study."

3. Unravelling the micro-level linguistic strategies of poetry

An important objective of this study is to analyse how subtle language techniques used in contemporary poetry—such as syntax, repetition, typography, silence, and hybridity—become vehicles for political resistance and ideological struggle. This micro-political role of language is generally neglected in criticism; So this research will bring that unexplored field to the fore.

"Minor-level analysis of language—such as syntax, repetition, typography, or the political role of silence—is often absent."

4.Placing contemporary poetry in the context of socio-political reality

This approach says how contemporary poetry reflects and resists power structures, identity politics and cultural hegemony. It emphasizes how marginalized voices, alternative histories, and political consciousness will be discussed, particularly in global and Indian postcolonial contexts.

"Poetry in the postcolonial world constructs a cultural space in which alternative histories, marginalized voices, and political consciousness are reconstructed through language."

5. Demonstrating currency volatility as political resistance

Another important objective of this research is to show how deconstruction, hybridity and subaltern silence disrupt fixed meanings and thereby give rise to resistant fields and alternative discourses. The politics of language in contemporary poetry is not limited to expressing meaning; Rather, it operates through the destabilization of meaning, discourse-based resistance, and cultural negotiation.

"The politics of language in contemporary poetry is enacted through destabilization of meaning, discourse-based resistance, and cultural compromise."

2. LANGUAGE, POWER AND DISCOURSE

The interrelationship of language and power has been considered a fundamental question in modern literary theory, cultural criticism and social thought. From the second half of the twentieth century, language is no longer seen as a mere means of communication, but as an effective instrument for constructing social reality, producing knowledge and maintaining power structures. The theoretical contributions of Michel Foucault, Norman Fairclough and Terry Eagleton have been particularly important in the development of this perspective.

The language of contemporary poetry is brought to the center of ideological and political analysis based on their works.

2.1 Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse

Michel Foucault's theory states that the relationship between language and power is mainly explained through the concept of "discourse". Discourse is not a specific statement or linguistic form. It is a systematic system. With its help, society fixes what can be said and what cannot be said. A complicated relationship is seen between power and language according to Foucault's opinion in *Power/Knowledge* (1980).

"Discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but is the thing for which and by which there is struggle." — Foucault, *Power/Knowledge, Pantheon Books, 1980, p. 52*

Language itself is a field of power according to this statement. Power here is not confined to states or institutions. It operates through everyday language practices, knowledge production, and cultural practices. Foucault explains power as a "microphysics of power" rather than as a "top-down" structure, in which language is an important medium.

This theory carries deep significance in contemporary poetry. Poetry often questions those linguistic conventions and truth claims that are considered normal or accepted in society. Race, state, gender, history, memory or religion—all these are reconstructed in the language of poetry. Poetry thus becomes an alternative discourse, subverting or exposing the language of dominant power.

Foucault's approach encouraged literary critics that poetry is not merely an aesthetic art form, but a political practice. Discrete sentences, silences, repetitions, or broken narratives are used in contemporary poetry. All these serve as linguistic strategies to challenge invisible structures of power.

2.2Fairclough: Critical Discourse Analysis and the Language of Poetry

Norman Fairclough provides an institutional and analytical framework for analysing language and power relations through his theory of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (1995) he argues that language is not a reflection of social reality; Rather, language is an active process of constructing and transforming social relations.

"Language is a material form of ideology, and discourse is a site of ideological struggle." — Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis, Longman, 1995, p. 73*

According to Fairclough, literary language—especially the language of poetry—can play two contrasting roles. On the one hand it normalizes and accepts dominant ideologies, on the other hand that same language can create fields of resistance and alternative consciousness. This duality is one of the sources of contemporary poetry's political power.

The metaphors, imagery, phrasing, perspective and voice used in the poem subtly convey power relations. For example, imitation and distortion of institutional language, rewriting of official discourse, or inclusion of marginalized voices—all question structures of social hierarchy and hegemony. Fairclough's CDA provides a useful theoretical tool for analysing these micro-level linguistic strategies, which are particularly relevant to contemporary poetry studies.

2.3 Eagleton: Poetry, Ideology and Political Reality

Literature is profoundly associated with ideological and political practice, according to Terry Eagleton. Poetry lies in the social reality. Language in poetry focuses on social power structures, conflicts and historical crises. The 'How to Read a Poem (2007)' where Eagleton speaks of political significance.

“Poetry is a mode of discourse in which the conflicts of history and ideology are inscribed within the very texture of language itself.” — Terry Eagleton, How to Read a Poem, Blackwell Publishing, 2007, p. 102

Contemporary poetry is in connection with dominant institutional and narrative truths. Language in poetry comes directly from political protest. Even though it sometimes overthrows the language of power based on ambiguity, irony and silence. This aspect is significant in the context of the politics of language in contemporary poetry. It expresses that political struggle is the main field. According to Eagleton, the aesthetic form and linguistic structure of poetry carry thought and ideology. Rhythm, structure, diction or artistic breakdown play a vital role in the production of political meaning. As a result, poetry does not simply convey a message. Despite politics takes place within language.

2.4 Theoretical Connections and Contemporary Poetry

The relationship between language, power and poetry takes on a multidimensional form based on the theories of Foucault, Fairclough and Eagleton together. Foucault sees language as a discursive system of power. Fairclough provides a framework for analysing language's social function and ideological conflict. Eagleton connected the aesthetic language of poetry directly to political reality.

This collective theoretical framework focuses on contemporary poetry. It is considered a field in which language is simultaneously a means of reproducing and resisting power. The language of poetry sometimes expresses dominant narratives. Sometimes it theorises new political imaginations.

3. POLITICS AND IDEOLOGY IN CONTEMPORARY POETRY

Contemporary poetry has appeared as an influential medium of political consciousness and social criticism. According to Edward Said (1994) literary texts focus on political and historical context which reflect the structure of resistance and dominance. His works to inspire the critics to examine poetry as a cultural intervention.

In 1994 Bhabha introduces the concept of “Hybridity”. This approach explains how literary language brings the identity of post-colonial society in discussion. Through the linguistic examination the poets challenge the static cultural boundary and establishes an alternative perspective. Spivak in 1988 probes profoundly into the politics of representation and raises question – which voice is allowed primarily to speak in the dominant discussion.

After independence poems are analysed by Mukherjee in 2012 as a reaction of social division and political restlessness. In 2016 Das shows through examining the dignity of local poems that regional language acts as a form of ideological resistance. All these researches prove how poetry reflects social-political reality in multidimensional ways.

Yet the existing study prefers subjective explanation to linguistic analysis. The form of language and the subtle interdisciplinary of political meaning is not researched and observed adequately; specially in the comparative study of contemporary poets.

Contemporary poetry is deeply political and ideological exercise – not merely a field of aesthetic exploration. Here, language is not a neutral expression; rather language is an active field of history, power, identity and resistance. Poetry builds a cultural space in the post-colonial world where alternative history, marginalised voice and political consciousness are rebuilt through language. A host of thinkers like Homi K Bhabha, Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak, Edward Said and Minakshi Mukherjee in the Indian context have analysed contemporary literature in political-linguistic structure

3.1 Edward Said: The interrelationship of Power, History and Literature

Literature is inseparable from politics and history according to Edward Said's book titled *Culture and Imperialism*.

According to him, literary language is deeply connected to imperialist power-structures and can simultaneously construct a language of resistance.

“No one today is purely one thing... labels like Indian, or woman, or Muslim, or American are not more than starting-points.” — Said, Culture and Imperialism, Vintage Books, 1994, p. 336

This statement of Said is very relevant in the field of contemporary poetry. The language of the poem here creates a field of pluralistic identity, where race, gender, class and culture enter into conflict and dialogue with each other. Said identifies literature as a type of “worldly text”—text that is connected to actual social and political realities.

“Texts are worldly, to some degree they are events, and... they are part of the social world.” — Said, The World, the Text, and the Critic, Harvard University Press, 1983, p. 4

According to this view, contemporary poetry is a vehicle for political ideology—where language exposes hegemony and demands alternative histories.

3.2 Homi K. Thinking: Hybridity and the Political Strategy of Language

Homi K. Bhabha’s remarkable and influential book ‘The Location of Culture’, where he introduces the concepts of Third Space, Hybridity and Cultural Negotiation in the analysis of post-colonial literature. He emphasises that language can never be pure or static. Language provides meaning through continuous negotiation.

“Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities.” — Bhabha, The Location of Culture, Routledge, 1994, p. 112

This Hybrid Language in contemporary poetry is a political strategy. Hybrid language contains elements such as broken grammar, use of multilingualism and mixed vocabulary. Contemporary poets are adroit to create a Third Space through breaking the dominance of the standard language. This approach explores a new identity and political meaning.

“The ‘third space’ enables other positions to emerge.”

(Bhabha, The Location of Culture, Routledge, 1994, p. 54)

In this context contemporary poetry reflects new forms of cultural power and challenges ideological fixity in this third real.

3.3 Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak: Representation, Silence and Subaltern Language

Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak’s 1988 essay ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ raises a new question about political representation in contemporary literature and poetry. Her question is fundamental: whether marginalized people can speak in their own language or their voices are controlled by the dominant narrative.

“The subaltern cannot speak.”

— Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?”, in Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, University of Illinois Press, 1988, p. 308

This quotation brings a profound and extensive importance to contemporary poetry. Although subaltern voices appear in poetry, is that language really independent? Or is it filtered through the filter of middle class, educated or western ideology? Spivak sees language as an ideological mediation—where silence itself becomes a political language.

4. INDIAN CONTEXT: MEENAKSHI MUKHERJEE AND THE REALITY OF LANGUAGE-POLITICS

In the question of analysis of language and ideology in Indian poetry, Meenakshi Mukherjee’s contribution is distinctly significant. Indian post-colonial literature is an analyzed concept in Meenakshi Mukherjee’s “The Perishable Empire” in 2012 in the light of linguistic crisis, social division, and political agitation.

“The choice of English or an Indian language was never a neutral act; it carried with it implications of power, identity, and cultural allegiance.” — Mukherjee, The Perishable Empire, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 45

According to Mukherjee, the use of vernaculars and dialects in Indian poetry is a strong ideological stance. It is a form of cultural resistance against central power and monolingual nationalism.

In this context Devpriya Das (2016) points out that language in vernacular poetry is not only a medium of expression but a boon.

5. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES:

5.1 Deconstruction and post-structuralism

Derrida’s Destabilization of Language-Thought and Meaning

Post-structuralist theory is a significant arrival in language and literary practice and brings a fundamental attitudinal shift. This theoretical trend calls into question the fixed meaning of structuralism, including the notion of specific structures and universal linguistic rules. Jacques Derrida is the most influential of the post-structuralist thinkers. Through his theory of deconstruction, he rethinks the concept of language, meaning and text.

In the meaning-making process of language, the instability and contradictions inherent are essential according to Derrida’s deconstruction. He states that language is never fixed or transparent; Rather it always operates through difference, delay and indeterminacy. This concept is particularly important in analysing the language of contemporary poetry, as modern and postmodern poetry often breaks the stability of meaning and takes the reader into an uncertain range of readings.

A fundamental basis of Derrida’s language-thought is the instability of the relationship between the signifier and the signified. Where Ferdinand de Saussure placed this relationship within a structural system, Derrida shows that this relationship is never complete or final. In his famous book Of Grammatology, he writes:

“There is no transcendental signified.”

Derrida, Of Grammatology, p.158, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976

No sign or no word is associated with the final meaning standing beyond language, according to Derrida’s conspicuous statement. Meaning always grows based on the relationship with other signs, which can never be static.

Another important Derrida concept associated with this concept is *différance*—a word that simultaneously refers to difference and deferral. According to Derrida, meaning never appears instantaneously; rather, it is always delayed and shifted to another sign. In *Speech and Phenomena*, he elaborated this idea further:

“Meaning is endlessly deferred through a chain of signifiers.”

— Speech and Phenomena, Northwestern University Press, 1973

This concept of meaning-delay allows us to see the language of poetry as an open and multidimensional political field. The words, silences, broken sentences or ambiguity used in the poem do not allow the reader to arrive at a single political meaning; Rather, it places the text in an indeterminate and questionable state.

Another important aspect of deconstruction is the critique of binary opposition. In Western thought, one of these dual conflicts—presence/absence, speech/writing, center/periphery, male/female—predominates. Derrida shows that these dual structures are actually governed by power relations. In *Writing and Difference*, he says:

“The hierarchy of binary oppositions is never neutral.”

— Writing and Difference, Routledge, 1978

This concept is very significant in the field of language politics. Because when the language of poetry uses marginal words, broken syntax, or silence, it questions mainstream linguistic authority. That is, deconstruction is not just a linguistic method; Rather, it is also a political lesson-strategy.

Derrida also shows that every text contains internal contradictions, which undermine the text's own claims. This is why he rejects the notion of authorial authority or single interpretation. In the book *Limited Inc.*, he states:

“A text always exceeds the intentions of its author.” — Limited Inc., Northwestern University Press, 1988

This view is particularly relevant to contemporary poetry. Poetry here is not a document carrying a specific political message; rather an open linguistic field, in which meaning is repeatedly broken down and reconstructed. As a result, the language of poetry becomes a form of silent resistance to political authority.

Deconstruction in the post-structuralist context treats language as a continuously unstable process rather than as a static system. This theory provides an important methodological tool in the language analysis of contemporary poetry, through which the power, silence, contradiction and uncertainty at work within language can be exposed.

The present study will use Derrida's theory of deconstruction to identify those volatile moments in language where the political meaning of poetry itself is called into question. That is, this study seeks to show that the politics of language in contemporary poetry is not a static ideological position; Rather, it manifests itself through the fragmentation, ambiguity and indeterminacy of meaning.

Deconstruction and post-structuralism thus enrich the theoretical foundations of current research and help to understand the language of contemporary poetry as a complex, political and indeterminate text-range.

5.2 POST-STRUCTURALISM AND ROLAND BARTHES

“The Death of the Author” and the multiplicity of meanings

Post-structuralist literary theory marks a fundamental shift in the concept of language, text and meaning-making. One of the main theorists of this genre is Roland Barthes, who opposed the author-centred approach to reader-centred meaning-making. His famous essay “The Death of the Author” (1967; Book 1977) is considered a landmark intervention in literary theory.

According to Barthes the meaning of a literary work is beyond the intention, experience or psychology of the author. The process of reading shapes the meaning. The reader’s engagement develops with the language. In *Image-Music-Text* Barthes says-

“The birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author.” — Image-Music-Text, trans. Stephen Heath, Fontana Press, 1977, p. 148

The center of meaning-making is important thing according to Barthes. According to this quote, Barthes rejects the author’s authority. But he places the reader at its center. This concept is closely related to deconstruction and post-structuralism. The stability of meaning and the possibility of a single explanation is stated.

According to Barthes, language is never personal; It is part of a cultural and social structure. The writer is not the creator of the language, but only the user of the language. As a result, the meaning of a poem cannot be confined to the author's intention. In *S/Z* he writes

“A text is not a line of words releasing a single ‘theological’ meaning but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings blend and clash.” — S/Z, Hill and Wang, 1974, p. 5

This notion of multidimensionality is fundamental in contemporary poetry. Language in modern and postmodern poetry is often broken, ambiguous and incomplete. So, poetry functions as an open text. Here, meaning is not fixed. It is constantly reconstructed

through the reader's participation. Readerly (lisible) and writerly (scriptable) texts are dominant in this context. Barthes introduces this concept.

This study also makes it clear that *Readerly Text* helps readers accept a distinct meaning, and *Writerly Text* turns readers into co-authors. Because of being writerly, contemporary poetry involves readers actively in the meaning-making process.

This idea is deeply related to the politics of language, as this openness of meaning creates a kind of resistance to authoritative interpretation.

In the post-structuralist context, Barthes's theory breaks the idea of seeing language as a neutral medium. Language is here a set of cultural codes, in which power, ideals and social values are embedded. In *Mythologies*, Barthes shows how everyday language and cultural symbols represent ideals as normal and natural—

“Myth is a type of speech chosen by history.” — *Mythologies*, Hill and Wang, 1972, p. 110

This concept is highly significant for the political reading of contemporary poetry. The metaphors, symbols and narrative structures used in poetic language often normalize certain ideological positions. Barthes's textual approach helps uncover this naturalization process.

An important connection of Barthes's theory with deconstruction is the plurality of meanings. Just as Derrida shows that meaning is always delayed and unstable, Barthes shows that meaning is never under the control of the author. Together, these two theoretical positions offer an opportunity to analyse the language of contemporary poetry as a political arena in which meaning is contested.

The breakdown of the “authorial voice” in contemporary poetry, the questioning of autobiography, and the multiplicity of voices—all make Barthes's concept of the “death of the author” relevant. The poem here is not a representation of a single experience; Rather, it is a field of conflict of many voices, many languages and many positions.

The present study will use Barthes's theory to identify the ideological assumptions and marginalized voices hidden in the language of the poem. This reader-centred approach allows for a rereading of contemporary poetry as an open political text, where meaning is never fixed, but contested and polyphonic.

Overall, Roland Barthes' post-structuralist theory—specifically “The Death of the Author”—provides a powerful theoretical tool in the language analysis of contemporary poetry. It breaks down author-centred authority and exposes the complex power relations between readers, language and culture. This approach enriches the theoretical framework of the study on Politics of Language in Contemporary Poetry and helps to understand language as an active, political and discursive practice.

Roland Barthes' post-structuralist theory interprets language as a discursive practice, where meaning is not fixed at any particular center; Rather, it is produced through a continuous process of reading, re-reading and cultural feedback. This approach identifies language as an active social and political force rather than merely a medium of expression. According to Barthes, literary language does not carry a single meaning; Rather, it constructs new meanings through the reader's participation through a multi-layered system of signification.

This theoretical position is particularly significant in analysing the language of contemporary poetry. Language in contemporary poetry often conveys social realities, political crises, unequal distribution of power and identity conflicts. According to the post-structural perspective, the language of poetry activates the reader's social position, historical experience and cultural consciousness.

As a result, despite being the receiver of the meaning, readers become active participants in the process of constructing meaning. This active approach builds the language as a political place. On this platform, meaning is negotiated and resisted continuously.

Barthes liberates language by breaking author-centred authority. His famous concept “The Death of the Author” questions the author's monopoly over language and shows that language is not a private property; Rather, it is the result of social and cultural production. In this context, the language of contemporary poetry is no longer limited by the author's intention. The political meaning of the poem is formed through the reader's interpretation, social reality and connection with the cultural context.

In this process language itself becomes a strategy of resistance. Dominant power often seeks to establish its ideology as “normal” and “true” through language. But the post-structural perspective shows that language is never completely neutral. Rifts, ambiguities and contradictions lie within language itself, creating opportunities to question the narratives of power. This ambivalence and fragmentation make language an important tool of political protest in contemporary poetry.

According to message theory, language is an open structure, where the meaning of signs is not fixed, but variable. This variability makes the language of the poem multidimensional. It confronts the supremacy of a single interpretation. As a result, the language of contemporary poetry complicates and interrogates nationalism, gender politics, post-colonial identity or class conflict rather than presenting them simply. It is this complexity that expands the political power of language.

Roland Barthes's post-structuralist theory provides a rich and useful theoretical framework for research on the Politics of Language in Contemporary Poetry. This theory breaks down the author-centered approach to understanding language as an active, political and multidimensional practice. Language is no longer a mere vehicle here; Rather, it is a clash of power, culture and ideology.

Therefore, the theory of message offers a new perspective in analyzing the language of contemporary poetry, where language itself becomes part of politics. This perspective moves the research beyond the level of literary analysis to a deeper understanding of the relationship between language and power. As a result, it becomes possible to understand language as a living, dynamic and political discourse—which is essential in uncovering the underlying political significance of contemporary poetry.

CONCLUSION

This research has demonstrated that the politics of language in contemporary poetry is not simply a matter of aesthetics; Rather, it is a deeply ideological and political exercise. Michel Foucault's discourse theory, Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, Jacques Derrida's deconstruction and Edward Said, Homi K. In light of Spivak's postcolonial theoretical perspective, Bhabha and Gayatri Chakraborty establish that the language of poetry functions as an active field of power, resistance, and cultural discourse. Contemporary poetry destabilizes dominant discourses through diction, silence, multilingualism, syntactic rupture and fragmented expression and creates new ranges of alternative meaning-making. Overall, this chapter has solidly built the intellectual foundation of the present study. Through literary analysis and theoretical discussion, it has demonstrated that language plays a deeply political role in contemporary poetry. This chapter provides a coherent theoretical framework for the reading and analysis of the poem in subsequent chapters and paves the way for critically exploring the main research questions

REFERENCES

1. Barthes, R. (1974). *S/Z*. Hill and Wang.
2. Barthes, R. (1977). *Image–music–text*. Fontana Press.
3. Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
4. Derrida, J. (1973). *Speech and phenomena*. Northwestern University Press.
5. Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
6. Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Routledge.
7. Eagleton, T. (2007). *How to read a poem*. Blackwell Publishing.
8. Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Routledge.
9. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
10. Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Routledge.
11. Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
12. Mukherjee, M. (2000). *The perishable empire: Essays on Indian writing in English*. Oxford University Press.
13. Said, E. (1983). *The world, the text, and the critic*. Harvard University Press.
14. Said, E. (1994). *Culture and imperialism*. Vintage Books.
15. Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.