

A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF HUGO CHAVEZ' COUNTER DISCOURSE TO UN:A STUDY OF HEGEMONY AND WORLD PEACE

**Dr. Shaista Zeb*

Abstract

The current study explores the concerns of Language and Power that are critically entrenched in the dialectics of Voice and Counter-discourse and being caused through discursive and hegemonic practices. With these undercurrents, this study centers around the tense and twisted relationship between America and Venezuela and the consequences of such power dialectics in the shape of resistant rhetoric emanating from the political discourse of former Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez specifically at the forum of United Nations. Critical Discourse Analysis as a theoretical construct in van Dijk's framework has been applied to analyze the counter hegemonic discourse of Chavez against USA to the United Nations forum about world peace. The current critical discourse study also attempts to determine and explore how America is accused of injustice and peace issues in world. From the perspective of CDA, such resistant discourses can be of great concern towards effecting a possible social change in the current consumerist age of international politics; as such this study is of a valuable contribution to the dimensions of research previously available in the domain of political discourses.

Key Words: Critical Discourse Analysis, hegemony, counter discourse, United States of America, world peace, United Nations General Assembly

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

The socio-political missions a language may carry out is the execution of Power in the way that it is not only a means of exercising power by those who are in power, but can also be used effectively as a way of showing resistance to such exercise of power (Stevenson and Carl, 2010). Hegemony struggles for closure but it always encounters ruptures that destabilize its coherence; as such, hegemony is always on the making. Hegemony is achieved through political acts; all forms of politics strive for hegemony (Mouffe, 2005). In ontological terms, hegemony is never total or coherent (Laclau, 1996).

Latin America has an extensive historical context of planning policies exploited by powerful and powerless regimes generating utmost inequalities around the globe (Berry, 1997). In the same context a counter-hegemonic discourse of Chavez has been expressed through the condemnation of the hegemony on patriotic grounds extending it further

**Lecturer, NUML, Islamabad, Pakistan*

to my research concern that speaks about the same power relations and the associated dynamics of the marginalizer and marginalized specifically on the forum of UN.

Hugo Chavez, the late Venezuelan president came to power in 1999 and changed the political scenario of Venezuela. He deconstructed the organizational systems of democracy and constituted a system that he termed participatory. Chavez redefined the power dynamics for those who were direct stake holders. That was the reason that Venezuelans' entire system had a support of the poor Venezuelan masses, disillusioned by the earlier establishments. The masses had also earlier been demanding political, social and economic empowerment that was possible with due recognition of their rights. Chavez raised his voice on many international forums being the representative of the victimized souls all over, not only in Venezuela but around the globe.

The present speech, having been delivered by a political figure and focusing on its content, issues pertaining to the politics of that day, is labeled under the category of Political Discourse. CDA of van Dijk focuses on dominant groups and institutions and on the ways that they create and maintain social inequality through communication and language use (van Dijk, 2004). CDA of van Dijk relates both micro (linguistic practices) and macro level (social practices) of discourse (van Dijk, 2003). In the backdrop of the same theoretical framework the research has to explore how Chavez makes clever use of language in its verbal form (micro level) while at its macro-level, how he pays keen attention to the notion of 'domination' by resisting hegemony.

Chavez tells the General Assembly some of the ploys that the U.S. employed to exert hegemony not only in Venezuela but the world over and how false notions are spread to control people's minds through the media and political discourse and also how as a more direct intervention, wars are waged on target communities such as His, to achieve the meanest monetary and political targets.

1.2 Background of the UN

War is an old phenomenon. Among our own fellow creatures, certain countries which happen to gain power somehow would look no further than spreading the borders of their domains by attacking, capturing, colonizing and enslaving masses belonging to relatively weaker and marginalized nations. The U.S. became the first – and hitherto the last –

country to use nuclear weapons when it dropped bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II. The number of deaths and scale of destruction went far beyond imagination. This tragic scenario once more compelled world leaders to devise more effective strategies to leave our planet a peaceful place to be peopled. After long deliberations, a new international organization was founded, named the United Nations (UN) and became operational on October 24, 1945. Among its aims was to make certain worldwide peace, protect human rights, assist weaker member states to gain economic stability and provide humanitarian assistance wherever it was deemed necessary.

Among the UN's six principal organs is the General Assembly. The UN's official website calls it "the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ" which is mandated to take up important questions. Issues pertaining to peace and security need a two-thirds majority for their adoption; whereas simple majority is enough for other, relatively simple questions. Following this norm, heads of all member states or their representatives are in attendance each year in the U.S. Each member is allowed to address the meeting. So, in September 2011, Chavez represented Venezuela at the UN Headquarters in New York. This was the 66th session of the General Assembly. The total number of sessions stands at 69 as of now.

Chavez in this speech presents his anti-U.S. and anti-war stance with special reference to military interventions mainly in two Muslim countries, namely, Libya and Syria. Libya, a North African country, was led by Colonel Muammar Gaddafi until. The 'dictator', as the men in uniform are generally called when they enter the political arena, ruled Libya for 42 years. Chavez, in his 2011 speech at the U.N., expressed serious concerns over the situation, saying "Mankind is facing the very real threat of a permanent war".

In Syria, Chavez sees a repeat of the Libyan model against the Assad regime and the same imperialist pattern being repeated against Syria. The real reason behind not carrying out just another military mission in Damascus lies here: "If some permanent members of the Security Council had not taken the firm stance that was missing in the case of Libya, it would have authorized shooting missiles and bombs in Syria" (Chavez, 2011). Chavez was concerned with the U.S. strategy of reverting to war in order to hold its sway over the world. He asks: "Why

is the United States the only country that scatters the planet with military bases? Why has it unleashed so many wars, violating the sovereignty of other nations which have the same rights on their own fates?" (Chavez, 2011).

The U.N. was formed basically to protect the poor and weak nations throughout the world. Seeing the sad state of affairs at the U.N., where its members continuously violate international law, Chavez thinks the current model has been exhausted and proposes its refurbishing and reformation as soon as possible: "If we do not make a commitment, once and for all, to rebuilding the United Nations, this organization will lose its remaining credibility. Its crisis of legitimacy will be accelerated until it finally implodes. In fact, that is what happened to its immediate predecessor: the League of Nations" (Chavez, 2011). Chavez also proposes "an immediate, in-depth revision of the U.N. Charter with the aim of drafting a new Charter."

1.3 Research Objectives

The research aims at the following objectives:

- Exploring counter discourse in Hugo Chavez speech to UN on world peace and the role of USA.
- Exposing the strategies of resistant discourse used by Chavez on the forum of UN to counter the hegemonic discourse of the USA (through application of Van Dijk's theoretical intervention).

1.4 Research Question

- How has Hugo Chavez used his resistant rhetoric in favour of world peace at UN to forge/evolve a Counter Hegemonic Discourse to the American stance?

1.5. Delimitation

The study is delimited to and analysis of:

- The shades of tense and strained relationships between Venezuela and the United States of America.
- The political speech of Hugo Chavez, the President of Venezuela, on the forum of UN showing his resistance to American hegemony in the region focusing on world peace.

1.6. Significance of the Study

The significance can be extended to extreme political polarization and mutual disregard that the antagonist groups have endeavored to influence

the governments by any ways at their retention. To conclude the significance of the study, two things are of utmost importance about the current political processes. One is that Chavez and his government had touched upon the fundamental issues of change and courage that was not the part of political struggle alone but a vast and extended philosophy of human existence with due human rights. The other one is to elaborate the issues such as national power, autonomous development, equality, social unity, as well and the need for modes of participatory democracy in order to transcend the limitations of representative democracy have been highlighted either achieved or not.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Contemporary theorists and researchers in the domain of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provide support to the current study which is aimed at investigating and exploring a close connection or a critical link between the phenomenon of 'Power' and 'Resistance' and how it affects the peace of world in the context of US Venezuela ties. As van Dijk (1995) puts it, CDA is a special approach in discourse analysis focusing mainly on discursive conditions, components and certain consequences of the power abuse as exploited by the dominant groups or institutions within a society. In this regard, Benwell (2006, p. 105) opines that according to van Dijk, CDA actually, though implicitly, treats identities as effects of the ideological work at hand. It has its extended roots in language theory of systematic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1994).

In contrast to other communicative critical approaches – for instance critical rhetoric (McKerrow, 2009), critical ethnography (Vannini, 2009), or critical organizational communication (Ganesh, 2009) – CDA is inductive, when its comparison is drawn with other critical approaches; yet it becomes deductive when it is compared with other discourse approaches like conversation analysis (Drew, 2005), ethnography of communication (Philipsen and Coutu, 2005) or action-implicative discourse analysis (Tracy, 2005). CDA is based on ideas derived from Marxist theorists like Althusser, Habermas and Gramsci and Foucault. To Hammersley (1997), the term 'critical' came to life as a euphemism (p. 244). As 'Marxism' was thought to be a taboo term in a purely American context, the word 'critical' fast grew to be used when making references to approaches that grew out of Karl Marx and

Friedrich Engels' theories.

Jaeger (2001) affirms that it is customary for each human to yearn for power to triumph, to get his own way and to determine what his position in society is. Fairclough (2011, pp 128-9) believes that the power of the new capitalism is a distinctly made network, comprising practices; fractions of whose distinctiveness are the ways language functions within them. Fatih Behram (2010) explores the dimensions of language in sociolinguistics, focusing on the importance of insight. He embarks on identity realization in the social and political discourses, exposing the discursive strategies of Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan during a debate at the World Economic Forum. Behram employs Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis to see the word game played by politicians like the Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan.

The Venezuelan political horizon (of the 80s and 90s, was heavily clouded with 'sham' democratic rules that unyieldingly conformed to the political and economic interests of the United States (Wilpert, 2007). Relations between the two countries also remained largely those of master-slave, with the US as the master. In their 2013 publication 'Hugo Chavez and the War against America: The Threat Closer to Home', two renowned U.S. writers Douglas Schoen and Michael Rowan argued that the U.S. should see in Chavez a true danger to the country for he commands what bin Laden could only dream of. To them, he had the means as well as the motivation to harm the U.S. in a way that no other country could. Being the 4th largest oil supplier to the United States, he owned the most modern weapons in the hemisphere; and made alliances with U.S. enemies like Iran and North Korea.

As Eva Golinger (2013), the Venezuelan-American author puts it: Chavez was 'a maker of dreams'. He had, long ago, dreamt to eliminate poverty and craft the poor's lives better and he left no stone unturned for the actualization of his dreams. Combating for human rights is one of the integral concerns for all movements taking place in various corners of the world and the words and rhetoric of political leaders have influenced the lives of people where politics is a gain and blame game with politicians manipulating, maneuvering and exploiting people's minds through their discourse. In this context, American hegemony stays unchallenged, especially since no other capitalist state is eager to openly challenge American supremacy.

Kozloff (2007) has suggested that Chavez was a political leader who through his critical and emancipatory role demonstrated a resistant discourse as the most important counter discourse on the contemporary world stage. He said that Chavez was important to Americans: “Chavez only stands further consolidate his status as a hemispheric leader ... clearly he will be a figure to be reckoned with by the United States...the evidences suggest that Chavez may try to follow through on his inflammatory electoral rhetoric” (2007). America and Venezuela enjoyed a sound relationship before the emergence of great political turmoil in the shape of President Hugo Chavez.

In the context of the above mentioned review of the related literature, I am hopeful that this study will not only be able to substantiate the claim that Chavez’ rhetoric is a resistant counter-discourse to American hegemonic discourse yet fills the vacuum left by other researchers on CDA and Chavez in the way that it may have prospective to carry the transformation of the masses’ mentality, and consequently a social change in the concurrent vulnerable geo-political situationality too and the criticality of all the Voices in world on various international forums like UN being an ever going phenomenon.

3. Theoretical Framework

An interdisciplinary approach to the critical study of discourse, CDA is of a greater significance in social and political terms. It is for the same reason that the theoretical framework of the present dissertation stems from van Dijk’s models. Teun Adrianus van Dijk, the professor-turned-linguist’s first contributions to the field appeared in 1993 and 1994. They were later expanded in the years of 1999 and 2004. He arms the marginalized social groups with a sort of cultural resistance – which in Chavez’ case comes in the shape of counter-discourse. Having been empowered hence, they air their concerns more freely and actively.

Van Dijk terms Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a type of discourse analytical research that focuses on the concerns of social power abuse, dominance, and inequality as enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. As an unorthodox research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position; explores and ultimately resist social inequality (Van Dijk, 2004). The current research will deal with van Dijk’s model of CDA as adopted by Forough Rahimi (2011) sketching an overall picture of Van Dijk’s theoretical

underpinnings that bridge the gap between micro (linguistic devices) and macro level (social orders and social institutions) as manifested through any political media discourse.



Forough Rahimi (2011), *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 1

4. Content Analysis

4.1 Application of van Dijk's CDA Model

Application of the CDA model of van Dijk (as adopted by Forough Rahimi, 2011) to Chavez' speech 2011 at UN, highlights certain elements that are significant for any form of resistance raised to counter the power. These include:

1. Actor

Van Dijk holds that certain members of a group who use language to engage themselves in an interactive discourse are the actors. What Chavez speaks of is not his individual viewpoint but the policy of a country (Venezuela), a region (Latin America) and the world at large since he seeks their attention in several matters). Raising his clear, bold voice at an international forum as an activist, Chavez assumes an anti-American stance throughout his resistant discourse. This discourse helps

him challenge U.S. dominance and hegemony. As per the CDA principles put forward by van Dijk, here, we may divide Chavez' rhetoric into two broad categories to get a better understanding

Actors in positive self-presentation are in-group members who are presented in a positive manner. Chavez' treatment of himself, his country and his plans in this speech are a case in point to portray a positive picture of his stance in order to justify his resistance. Chavez uses personal pronouns and possessives to show In-group members (self) such as: 'I' 'We', 'Our' and 'That' (for referring to victimized bodies). Chavez elucidates: "We will continue calling for respect for international law; We ask this assembly; ... General Assembly, We expressed; The balance that cannot be found within war; To support a violent upheaval against that country's legitimate government; The worst situation is that of Somalia; I address these words; If We answer these questions sincerely ..."

Besides singing praises of the Self, van Dijk's model of CDA also necessitates a negative presentation of the Other. Others are an embodiment of 'all bad'. They are the people, groups, communities or countries whose views and opinions vary from ours. In this particular speech of Hugo Chavez, the late Venezuelan President, the 'chief culprit' among a great many others is the United States of America since it continues to launch wars against weaker countries, its allies also, being sharers in opinion and participant in action, become bad. Among them is NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) termed as 'the Armed Wing of the Yankee empire' by Chavez, it 'puts into practice' war decrees legitimized by yet another Other in the U.N.'s Security Council. Also in Others are included certain elements within the oppressed nations who side with the foreign invaders for their immediate and personal interest. Some media groups, by spreading lies, come under the category of others too. Chavez elucidates. Chavez also lays blame on the NATO for having "introduced thousands of heavy weapons to support a violent upheaval against that country (Libya)'s legitimate government." (Chavez, 2011). War, according to Chavez, is Washington's favorite pastime. They destabilize the peaceful parts of the world; back certain factions, encourage them for great agitations, sell them weapons to make the movement bloodstained, and finally launch their own forces into the battle field with the pretext of protecting people's rights.

In this speech, Chavez refers to the U.S. as an imperialist state as in the following instances: "Imperialist war threatens us all; Within the imperialist view of the world, politics is the continuation of war by other means; We have no choice but to believe that such cruel actions ... result from imperial arrogance; ... Nascent Yankee imperialism in 1818" (Chavez, 2011). Chavez calls them colonizers. For instance: "A new cycle of colonial wars which started in Libya; Turning Libya into a colonialism protectorate; Re-colonizing Libya to capture its wealth; Nobody colonizes innocently; Defend ourselves against the new colonialism" (Chavez, 2011).

Talking about the Syrian war, Chavez observes: "Syrian people can solve their problems and decide their fate in light of the people's right to self-determination, which is an inalienable right in all respects" (Chavez, 2011). Chavez declares the U.S. and its policies as evil: "The evil power of military force, of nuclear bombs; we will not remain silent in light of the evil intention of destroying the basis of its sense and reason" (Chavez, 2011). This very evil, in his view, prevents good from ruling our world.

Chavez implies that by openly backing terrorists and then by adopting the same anti-human strategies to attain evil aims, the U.S. itself indulges in terrorism. This is precisely what the following demand conveys: "From Venezuela, we believe it is time to demand of the U.S. not only an instantaneous and unconditional end to the criminal blockade imposed against the Cuban people, but also the release of the five Cuban antiterrorist fighters held captive in the prisons of the American Empire for the mere reason of trying to prevent the illegal actions of terrorist groups against Cuba, under the shelter of the U.S. government" (Chavez, 2011).

Chavez is not ready to trust Washington's words anymore since he keeps the history alive in his conscious. According to him, the US has intervened everywhere, killed humanity, plundered wealth and fled unharmed. And they are likely to remain the same. He resists by saying that the U.S. was perfectly the same almost two centuries back: "Paraphrasing Bolivar when he spoke of nascent Yankee imperialism in 1818, we have had enough of the weak following the law while the strong commit abuses" (Chavez, 2011).

There have always been tall claims like: “we want to make this world a peaceful place”. Yet, their very actions seem to tell a totally different tale” (Chavez, 2011). Chavez resists that they don’t allow other countries to make lethal weapons. At the same time, however, there is absolutely nobody to stop them and their allies from such dangerous practices. Chavez states that apparently they are with democracy, nonetheless, when they see some democratic rulers beginning to rebel against their hegemonic designs, they rarely hesitate to back generals to topple these legitimate governments elected by people’s votes.

Chavez makes a more direct attack when he says: “Unfortunately, the UN, through all its history, instead of adding and multiplying efforts in favor of peace among nations, ends up supporting, sometimes through its actions and other times by omission, the most ruthless injustices” (Chavez, 2011). Besides, in the world’s most poor nations like Somalia, Kenya, Djibouti and Ethiopia, large populations – children in particular – keep dying of hunger and diseases: “Most serious news agencies report that 20-29,000 children under the age of 5 have died in the last three months” (Chavez, 2011). Chavez comments: “According to (Dennis) Kucinich (a U.S. congressman) himself, with the amount spent during the first three weeks in Northern Africa to massacre the Libyan people, much could have been done to help the entire region of the Horn of Africa, saving tens of thousands of lives” (Chavez, 2011).

2. Generalization

Chavez speaks on behalf of the whole world. By so doing, he appears to counter Washington: “they wage wars; he preaches peace” (Chavez, 2011). In his opening remarks, he terms the U.N. General Assembly a “great forum where all the people of the earth are represented” (Chavez, 2011). To draw the world’s attention towards the dangers of wars, he invites “the governments of the world to reflect” (Chavez, 2011.). The U.S. warmongering, to Chavez, is a great threat to ‘global’ peace ‘mankind’. ‘Humanity’, he believes, is ‘on the brink of an unimaginable catastrophe’. ‘Addressing ‘Peoples of the World’, Chavez suggests: “The future of a multi-polar world, in peace, resides in us, in the organization of the majority of the people on earth to defend ourselves against the new colonialism, in order to achieve a balance in the universe that is capable of neutralizing imperialism and arrogance” (Chavez, 2011).

3. Authority

It is a common practice of Powers across the world not to call a spade a spade. Under the attractive attires of democracy, diplomacy or pretended gestures of goodwill, most matters go unsaid in political discourse. Yet rebels, though rare, dare to challenge even the strongest of the opponents. Chavez, being one such, without mincing words, challenges the U.S. within the U.S. asserting himself as a true leader of resistance. While at the U.N., he talks about fighting and defeating Washington's war-based hegemonic designs. Though belonging to a small nation, Chavez' brave tone puts many so-called big countries to shame since he succeeds in doing what they couldn't do all together.

The late Venezuelan leader is full of suggestions. When compared with 'must', 'should' shows a meek shift in the speaker's suggestive manner. Some instances from this discourse include: "It should always be remembered; the case of Libya should alert us; Coordination among emerging powers should become a pole of influence" (Chavez, 2011). By using 'should', Chavez seems to plead with his audience to act upon advice which he gives solely for their benefit. If they comply with it, it will benefit nobody but themselves. If, on the contrary, they take no heed, the ensuing harm should also be theirs" (Chavez, 2011).

4. Categorization

There are two main categories of some rich elites led by Washington who do violence to countries in order to get richer and richer. Those whose resources are ransacked forcefully get poor every day. Chavez also draw a distinction between "the warmongers under Washington "and the "peace-loving under Caracas" (Chavez, 2011).

5. Comparison

According to Chavez comparison can be made between Our 'positivity' and Their 'negativity'. If one compares the points proclaimed by the U.N. charter and what that world organization actually does, there appears to be a total and complete contrast. Likewise, through their killing of innocent people, the U.S. and its Western allies are comparable to the very terrorist against whom they apparently fight wars.

6. Disclaimers

According to Chavez the disclaimers make the ideological base to present oneself in a positive light and the other in a negative manner. For Chavez, this comes in the figure of Simon Bolivar and his pro-peace and anti-war ideology follows in the footsteps of the Liberator. He proposes:“Let’s build the balance of the universe foreseen by the Liberator, Simon Bolivar – the balance that, according to his words, cannot be found within war; the balance that is born out of peace”(Chavez, 2011).

7. Euphemism

Chavez glorifies his own soil in fulsome terms. As opposed to the U.S. war tactics, he advocates peace – definitely a preferable alternative–from the Venezuelan point of view. Even in his opening remarks, while claiming to reveal certain truths – as opposed to the U.S. lies – he proudly adds:“(I address) ...to reassert our inalienable commitment to justice and equality, that is to say, to peace. Peace, peace, peace... We do not look for the peace of the cemetery, as said Kant ironically, but a peace based on the most zealous respect for international law” (Chavez, 2011).

Distinguishing the U.S. backing of Israel, Chavez decides to stand strongly and firmly with the Palestinians. While introducing the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) summit, he says:“Caracas, the capital of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, is proud to host ...” (Chavez, 2011). The use of the phrase ‘proud to host’ instead of simply ‘we are hosting’ conveys a specific meaning: Venezuela has nothing to fear or envy anybody; it is content with what it has; it is by no means ashamed or embarrassed; has no complexes of whatever kind and is, proud of itself.

Throwing light on what the world under imperialism is like, he reverses Clausewitz’s axiom(principles of war 1942):‘politics is the continuation of war by other means’ and makes it ‘war is the continuation of politics by other means.’ Calling NATO ‘the armed wing of the Yankee Empire’, he does show some leniency and avoids calling it the ‘terrorist wing’. NATO’s Libya offensive has been referred to, quoting the US’ ridiculous justifications of ‘humanitarian bombing’(Chavez, 2011).

Chavez concludes his speech by quoting from a musical piece of Ali Primera, a Venezuelan singer, where yet again humanity has been called to unite under the flag of peace. In this manner Chavez proves himself a loyal son of the land where he was born; never deserting it or forgetting it for a moment no matter where he goes. Euphemism thus is a rhetorical device via which the speaker/writer uses a word or phrase so as to avoid saying an offensive or unpleasant word. Questioning the U.S. continual destruction of various lands and killing of people throughout the world, he most innocently links the committing of such heinous crimes in accordance with the orders from a judge. "If we answer these questions sincerely we would understand that the empire has awarded itself the role of judge of the world, without being granted this responsibility by anyone, and, therefore, imperialist war threatens us all" (Chavez, 2011). Throwing light on what the world under imperialism is like, he reverses Clausewitz's axiom (principles of war 1942): 'politics is the continuation of war by other means' and makes it 'war is the continuation of politics by other means.' Calling NATO 'the armed wing of the Yankee Empire', he does show some leniency and avoids calling it the 'terrorist wing'. Chavez, then, traces the roots of the Libyan war in the Malthusian notion which says 'there are just too many people in the world' and believes the U.N.'s Security Council to be 'some sort of club with privileged members' (Chavez, 2011).

8. Hyperbole

This semantic rhetorical device, which enhances or exaggerates meaning, is one of Chavez' favorites and thus, has been used frequently. In this speech, Chavez calls the U.N. charter a 'dead letter' to let his audience know of its inactivity through decades of global conflicts. He tells the world to 'keep in mind that war is capital's *modus operandi*.' Chavez finds humanity 'on the brink of an unimaginable catastrophe' and the world at large, to be 'marching inexorably toward the most devastating ecocide' because of global warming. Not ready to accept any reforms, the U.N., according to Chavez, is suffering from an 'illness at its core (which) is deadly' (Chavez, 2011).

9. Implication

Certain information is clearly suggested by a certain discourse, though it is not directly communicated. Hence, though the word 'terrorist' isn't used for the U.S. anywhere in the present speech, yet it is communicated

all the same. Similarly, Chavez implies Washington to be the greatest threat to humanity and democracy the world over. His role as a Latin American or even world leader is conveyed indirectly. Implication is an implicit term that is clearly suggested by a certain discourse, though it is not directly communicated. Hence, though the word ‘terrorist’ isn’t used for the U.S. anywhere in the present speech, yet it is communicated all the same. Similarly, Chavez implies Washington to be the greatest threat to humanity and democracy the world over. His role as a Latin American or even world leader is conveyed indirectly.

Chavez uses adjectives in his discourse with great frequency. They are blunt, stingy, ruthless and cuttngly critical; they appear to be enlivened: they are animating, breathing, laughing, crying, criticizing, pleading, requesting, imploring. All four kinds of adjectives have been used in his discourse to obtain maximum benefit: “Terrifying reality; A staggering budget; An irreversible reality; Very real threat; The absolute power; Destructive voracity; An unimaginable catastrophe; Such a meager outlook; A widespread global war; A peaceful and negotiated solution; An intense propaganda; Irresponsible and hasty decisions; Ignominiously silent; The immediate admission; Intolerable; Powerful; Impossible; The criminal military engagement ...” (Chavez, 2011). For instance: “How much is being spent to destroy Libya? There are too many people in the world; why has it unleashed so many wars? This new war will cost us \$500 million during its first week alone (Chavez, 2011). These are some of the adjectives that Chavez uses in the speech under discussion.

10. Presupposition

If not already established, truths are mostly presupposed. Having presupposed the U.S. war rhetoric to be a bunch of lies, he declares in the very opening of his speech at the U.N. to instead ‘express Bolivarian Venezuela’s truths’ (Chavez, 2011).

11. Polarization

Chavez is an intelligent speaker. Knowing well the worth of certain words, he makes great use of them throughout his speeches in a most effective manner. Most frequent examples of the ‘words used instead of nouns’ include ‘I’ and ‘We’: ‘I’ as in: “I address this forum; I want to call on the governments of the world; I believe there is a greater power in the world than the evil power of military force, of nuclear bombs; I believe

in the power of the human spirit; I want to conclude. 'We' as in: We do not look to the peace of the cemetery; We see, once again, Libya destroyed and bloodstained by the will of the powerful; We have to look directly at the terrifying reality of the world we live in; Threats we face; If we answer these questions sincerely... we would understand; How can we say that an arms embargo was imposed on Libya? We call for the immediate cessation of bombing operations in Libyan territory; if we direct our eyes to; We ask ourselves how much is being spent to destroy Libya; We want to reiterate that it is impossible to ignore the crisis of the UN; If we do not make a commitment; We also require an immediate, in-depth revision of the UN Charter with the aim of drafting a new Charter; We can together design the policies that will ensure our wellbeing; If we leave the world as it is, the present and future will be determined by perpetual war" (Chavez, 2011). While first person singular pronoun 'I' has been used just five times, Chavez makes use of the first person plural pronoun 'we' seventeen times in this speech. This choice by no means is random, accidental, meaningless or clueless. It is one man (I) who addresses, holds certain beliefs and concludes a speech to the U.N. The hearers, observers, critics or analysts cannot and must not, however, ignore the repeated usage of 'We'. This pronoun may mean all the U.N. members, Venezuela, Latin America or the world at large. When it's the U.N. members, he means those alone who share his opinions on international issues. When 'we' is Venezuela, this serves to convey a positive, democratic sense: that every citizen has his voice and I, Chavez, am here only as my people's representative, speaking about nothing but their aspirations. This also means that when it comes to the foreign policy matters, there's no dissent among Venezuelans. They are one; they are unified; and would fight and defeat their common hegemonic enemies.

Present tense is used throughout the speech, for instance: "I address; we do not look; the U.N. ends up; Washington knows; why does the U.N. do nothing to stop Washington?; Venezuela calls; If we direct eyes; we believe; nothing has been done; the U.N. does not accept any reform; we go together; we are currently preparing; mankind is facing; and so on" (Chavez, 2011). Chavez lives in the present and would like it to be a better time for his own people as well as for those in other countries. He does not shut his eyes. He keeps a close watch on what goes

on around him. The U.N.'s perpetual policy of favoritism annoys him most. He is an active and agile person who takes no rest but is always on duty; he not only makes plans, but likes them to be put into action immediately.

Chavez remarks with concern: "Washington knows that a multi-polar world is already an irreversible reality. Its strategy consists of stopping, at any price, the sustained rise of a group of emerging countries, by negotiating great interests with its partners and followers in order to guide multi-polarity along the path the empire wants" (Chavez, 2011). Hugo Chavez is an intelligent speaker. Knowing well the worth of certain words, he makes great use of them throughout his speeches in a most effective manner. Most frequently examples of the 'words used instead of nouns' include 'I' and 'We': 'I' as in: I address this forum; I want to call on the governments of the world; I believe there is a greater power in the world than the evil power of military force, of nuclear bombs; I believe in the power of the human spirit; I want to conclude. 'We' as in: We do not look to the peace of the cemetery; We see, once again, Libya destroyed and bloodstained by the will of the powerful; We have to look directly at the terrifying reality of the world we live in; Threats we face; If we answer these questions sincerely... we would understand... (Chavez, 2011).

12. Irony

In the very opening passage, Chavez refers most respectfully to the U.N. as 'this great forum where all the people of the world are represented'. Of course, he does not mean it seriously. The later assertions confirm U.N. to be anything but 'great'. And, as for its representing 'all the people of the world', we soon realize that its actual representatives, who could make a difference in the global nation's lives, are a chosen few of the powerful elite. Others, doubtless, are there just to keep calm, make no unnecessary noise and look around during its important sessions. 'Empire has decided', 'empire wants', 'empire is ready', 'the Yankee empire' and 'the American empire' are a few of the phrases that refer to the U.S and denote how Washington is ruled by a single sovereign i.e. the President. Chavez appears to be very respectful for the empire, but the truth is far from this and his comments are full of irony, whenever he refers to the US. While introducing the subject of peace, he refers to what Immanuel Kant, the famous German philosopher, once said ironically: 'we do not

look for the peace of the cemetery,' instead, he advocates 'but a peace based on the most zealous respect for international law' (Chavez, 2011).

Chavez states that its job has been reduced to authorizing 'shooting missiles and bombs' in various parts of the world. Chavez' ironical remarks and comments serve to reveal the U.S. and hence the U.N.'s hidden agendas and in so doing to challenge his opponents via discourse.

13. Victimization

In order to focus on any nation's bad characteristics, their bad stories are told time and time again. As Hugo Chavez relates incidents of the U.S. wars and other hegemonic or imperial practices repeatedly, Washington emerges as 'victimized' – discourse-wise! Ground realities, however, are different, although it is the Libyans, Syrians, Cubans and Venezuelans who are presented as war victims. Repetition too is a device that is used for victimization as Chavez tries to bring forth the significance of the matter under consideration and shows the speaker's most grave concern regarding the particular issue.

In this speech, the word 'Libya' appears 14 times while he also uses phrases like Libyan conflict, Libyan case, Libyan Air Force, Libyan people, Libyan government, Libyan territory and the Libyan seat in the U.N. In similar fashion, the word 'Syria' appears 6 times; with 'Syrian people' used once. The words war/wars have been spoken 17 times; with warmongers once. The word colonial appears twice; with colonialism having been used thrice. The word threat/threats appear thrice; with threatening appearing only once. Repetition is used as strategy to victimize the listeners and especially the US delegates.

5. Conclusion

CDA is used to investigate the role of language in power abuse and manipulation. It explores how dominant groups maintain the hegemony with the exercise of power using power tactics and communication channels. Thus in the same context, CDA is hypercritical, subjective and endeavors to find out imaginable possibilities stating ideologies as discursive practices. So, resistance emerges with an idea of mind change; and change is indispensable as political discourse determines and re-determines the ideologies. Chavez the late Venezuelan president evoked such interests among mainstream sectors in Latin America and made it visible to challenge the Washington Consensus on the issues of world

peace.

Every research project has its scope. It is conducted in a specific context or situation, over a particular time period, while concentrating on specified masses. It cannot, and does not, cover everything that is probable. In the same manner my study, although it refers to other fields of knowledge, is still limited in its treating the subject linguistically, socially, historically and politically only. It must also be recognized here that the presence of these inadequacies by no means limits the scope of the research project. As a matter of fact, it is this very sense of 'something missing' that makes research an ever-growing field.

Thus this research explores that in contemporary politics, the most powerful weapon any nation can possess is that of its rulers' exceptionally wonderful oratory and manipulative language skills. The individuals of eminence the world over, universally called politicians, literally control their nations on a smaller scale and the entire globe on the larger level; solely through the exploitation and investment of a language that best serves their hidden exploitative agendas and purposes. It is with the preference of particular or specified words in their political speeches and interviews that they deliver on various occasions that are integral to leave a mark on their political personalities and political career. The weaker ones too would exert to pose a serious challenge to the evil designs of their powerful fellow states provided they are lucky enough to find a bold, daring and determined voice to lead them.

The current study exposes the truth that is considered towards emancipation for those who have been the victimized bodies resulting from hegemony around the globe. The linguistic tone and structures serve as means that challenge and critique the dominant discourse of American and His hegemonic stance and help in bringing about social change all over including the peace in Venezuela by exposing the hidden agendas.

The principal agenda of the counter discourse in this very speech is to specify the present world geopolitical context, characterized by the US government's new policy and its role in maintaining or abolishing world peace with specific reference to Libya and Syria. Chavez' counter discourse aimed at justifying his policies and emancipated the hidden and shaded realities of US – Venezuela and US – World ties as he brought various examples to the forum of UN in this very speech.

While Bush and Obama made extensive foreign expeditions, Chavez worked on the ground-level to give voice to the oppressed and bring improvement in Latin America through his rhetorical power. The current counter discourse is one of those examples. In the current counter speech, Chavez raised voice of resistance against the hidden agenda of Washington and international corporations in order to fight for the rights of his people, whereas his resistant discourse is counter attacks on American policies that are hurdling and spoiling world peace revealed through Van Dijk's CDA model in the study.

During this research, I used English translations of Chavez' original speeches delivered in Spanish but what might have been a handicap in earlier times, proves to be not so since the speeches analyzed were translated by professional translators whose job is to translate the speeches of the world leaders, statesmen and politicians. However, since research is an ongoing process a few suggestions can be made regarding future work namely that the study can be given new and interesting dimensions by comparing and contrasting Chavez' resistance with that of certain other political figures of prominence. For instance, Fidel Castro of Cuba, Evo Morales of Bolivia and Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva of Brazil would make good subjects, from the South American continent. The former Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Chavez' ally also carries the same potential in terms of his challenging rhetoric and all others Voicing against Hegemony or for peace cause. It may be interesting and beneficial for future studies to compare Chavez' resistant strategies with other politicians' especially from the US or Pakistan.

References

- Behram, F. (2010). *Ideology and political discourse: A critical discourse analysis of Erdogan's political speech*. Annual Review of Education, Communication and Language Sciences, 7: 23-40.
- Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Berry, A. (1997). The Income Distribution Threat in Latin America. *Latin American research review*, 32 (3): 3-40.
- Drew, P. (2005). Conversation Analysis. In Kristine L. Fitch and Robert E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of language and social interaction* (pp. 71–102). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse and society*, 4 (2): 133-168.
- (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- (1996). A Reply to Henry Widdowson's Discourse Analysis: A Critical View. *Language and Literature*, 5 (1): 49-56.
- (2013). *Language and power*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. & Graham, P. (2002). Marx as a Critical Discourse Analyst: The Genesis of a Critical Method and its Relevance to the Critique of Global Capital. *Estudios de sociolingüística*, 3 (1): 185-229.
- Flores, L. (2009). Critical Race Theory. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (pp. 232-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Ganesh, S. (2009). *Critical Organizational Communication*. In S. W. Littlejohn and K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Communication Theory* (pp. 226-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London: Routledge.
- Golinge, E. (2006). *The Chávez code: Cracking U.S. intervention in Venezuela*. Havana: Editorial Jose Marti.
- (2013). Why did Washington Hate Hugo Chavez? An Interview with Author and Revolutionary Eva Golinge by Mike Whitney- Counterpunch, August 2, 2013.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of antonio Gramsci*. (Q. Hoare & G. N. Smith, eds. & trans). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as a social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hammersley, M. (1997). On the Foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Language and communication*, 17 (3): 237-248.
- Jaeger, S. (2001). Discourse and Knowledge: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of a Critical Discourse and Dispositive Analysis. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M.

- (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Jones, J. E. (2011). Why is Hugo Chavez called a Dictator? Retrieved on May 31, 2015 from <http://venezuelanalysis.com/analysis/5966>
- Jorgensen, M. & Louise, J. P. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.
- King, L. (2003). Counter-Discourses on the Racialization of Theft and Ethics in Douglass's Narrative and Jacobs's Incidents. MELUS 28: 55-82.
- Kozloff (2007). "Hugo Chavez's Holy War," "Chavez: We'll Give Health, Education Expertise to ALBA Countries," EFE News Service, April 29, 2007.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Laclau, E. (1996). *Emancipation(s)*. London: Verso.
- McKerrow, R. (2009). Critical Rhetoric. In S. L. Littlejohn & K. A. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of communication theory* (pp. 235-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. New York: Routledge
- Rahimi, F. & Riasati, M. J. (2011). "Critical Discourse Analysis: Scrutinizing Ideologically-Driven Discourses." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 1 No. 16; November 2011. Retrieved from the Internet on July 07, 2015.
http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_16_November_2011/13.pdf
- Schoen, Douglas and Michael Rowan. (2013). *The threat closer to home: Hugo Chavez and the war against America*. New York: Free Press.
- Scollon, R., Scollon, S. W. & Jones, R. H. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (3rd Edition). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stevenson, P. & Carl, J. (2010). *Language and Social Change in Central Europe: Discourses on Policy, Identity and the German Language*, Edinburgh University Press, p. 206.
- Vannini, A. (2009). Critical Ethnography. In Littlejohn, S. L. & Foss, K. A. (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of communication theory* (pp. 224-227). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Van.Dijk. T. A. (1988a). *News analysis: Case studies of international and national news in the press*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Van.Dijk.T.A. (1988b). *News as discourse*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.
- Van.Dijk. T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Van.Dijk. T. A. (1995). "Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis". In Schaffner, C. & Anita L. W. (eds.). *Language and peace*. Dartmouth: Aldershot. pp. 17-33
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). "Discourse, Opinions and Ideologies". In Schaffner, C & Kelly-Holmes, H. (Eds.), *Discourse and ideologies* (pp. 7-37). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd. pp. 7-37.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998a). *Ideology – A multidisciplinary approach*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Van.Dijk, T. A. (1998b). "Opinions and Ideologies in the Press".In Bell, Allan & Peter Garrett (Eds.). *Approaches to media discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1999). "Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis". *Discourse and society*, 10 (4): 459-450.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). *Racismo y discurso de las elites*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). Discurso y dominación. Grandes conferencias en la Facultad de Ciencias Humanas. Congreso Internacional de Lingüística, 18 de febrero. Universidad Nacional de Colombia-Sede de Bogotá, p. 435. Cited in Simounet, A. "Delegitimizing Oppressive culture: The voice of Counter-discourse in Umpierre's poetic work." *Centro Journal*, Volume XX Number I SPRING 2008, p. 25.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilpert, G. (2007). *Changing Venezuela by taking power*. London and New York: Verso.