

THE ARGUMENTATION IN SOME POLITICAL SPEECHES IN COLOMBIA

Andrés Felipe Yama Rosero

University of Nariño



Traducción: Cepeda Ortiz Diego Orlando
Revisión: Franco Yanez Henry
Departamento de de Lingüística e Idiomas
Facultad de Ciencias Humanas -Universidad de Nariño

Reception date: June 30, 2023
Acceptance date: October 23, 2023

Abstract

The following writing discusses about the analysis of political discourses based on the theories of Teun Van Dijk, Pierre Bourdieu, Christian Plantin and Roberto Ramírez, among others. Three political discourses are assumed: Jorge Eliécer Gaitán (1946), Iván Duque (2014-2018) and Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022). The following methodology is applied: Qualitative paradigm and documentary hermeneutic historical approach. The purpose of this project is to identify the construction of discourses from the perspective of argumentation, to specify the coincidences and discrepancies found in the texts, to recognize the argumentative approaches, in the same way to reveal the fallacies, ideology and racism through the argued word.

Keywords- Analysis of political speeches, argumentation, ideology, power, political formation.

Resumen

El siguiente escrito discurre sobre el análisis de discursos políticos con base en las teorías de Teun Van Dijk, Pierre Bourdieu, Christian Plantin y Roberto Ramírez, entre otros. Se asumen tres discursos políticos: Jorge Eliécer Gaitán (1946), Iván Duque (2014-2018) y Gustavo Petro Urrego (2022). Se aplica la siguiente metodología: Paradigma cualitativo y enfoque histórico hermenéutico documental.

El fin de este proyecto es identificar la construcción de los discursos desde la perspectiva de la argumentación, precisar las coincidencias y discrepancias encontradas en los textos, reconocer los planteamientos argumentativos, de igual forma develar las falacias, ideología y racismo a través de la palabra argumentada.

Palabras Clave- Análisis discursos políticos, argumentación, ideología, poder, formación política.

Introduction

Colombia is facing a circumstantial moment with President Gustavo Petro as a progressive government after years of leading the right. Therefore, it is important to study this historical moment for the country from different angles. Likewise, it is an opportunity to raise awareness of the need to create new spaces to perceive and conceive the world with new paradigms. Situation which becomes a plausible challenge at this time where we are experiencing a civilizing crisis, which is considered as an unsustainable model of production and consumption that threatens life. It is a crisis that reflects economic depression, the destruction and concentration of capital, the deepening of unequal development, labor exploitation, social exclusion, the

food crisis, racism, discrimination, patriarchy and abuse of authority.

Education cannot be absent in the critical reading of the country's political situation, which is partially reflected, in the arguments from some leading figures' political speeches in the country.

The political dimension requires a variety of discourses in multiple settings for diverse audiences. The speaker in the argumentation of the speech has different communicative intentions, the interlocutor is the one who gives meaning, significance and legitimizes the speech. In this case, argumentation is assumed in political speeches with specific purposes to reveal the meaning and social impact of the argumentation that these narratives have in a period of "a civilizing crisis" that Colombia is facing.

Besides, it is necessary to invite university youth to critically read the arguments of the speeches as a form of participation and awareness of the situation in the country. It is important to identify argumentation and linguistics in the analysis of political discourses at this time to understand social perception, analyze the need to exercise a critical role in the face of discourses, observe similarities, ideological polarization and politics of the left and the ones the right, transparency, the credibility of the speakers, the citizens' perception, the conviction, the discursive persuasion and manipulation of these political leading figures, among other aspects. It is interesting to get closer to knowing the intentions of the rulers in terms of generating expectations, distrust or demonstrating corruption to citizens by using argumentation in their speeches.

Methodology

The paradigm for this research is qualitative because the thematic focus of this project addresses social issues and the relationship that society has with politics, as mentioned by Sandoval (2002, page 11): "[...] those of qualitative order point more to an effort to understand social reality as the result of a historical construction process which is seen from the logic and feelings of its protagonists." In this case, the paradigm for this research focuses mainly on the analysis of some political speeches together with the process of a documentary study, since it tries to show the educational, pedagogical and social commitment of teachers and students of the Master's Degree in Education.

According to Ramírez, R. (2012), qualitative research attempts to understand and describe the context of a specific population. Thus, information is collected through written documents to recognize the commitment related to training and citizen participation, through the

application of interviews with teachers and students of the Master's Degree in Education, class XVII.

Given the characteristics of its essence, the present study assumes the historical hermeneutical documentary approach proposed by Marín Gallego (2009), which states that: "The historical hermeneutical paradigm proposed science as a complex system that intended understandings mediated by language, which led to interpretive processes of social and human reality." Aguilar, A. (2004, page 62), for his part, mentions that Gadamer, who is considered father of hermeneutics, speaks of the "need to learn the "hermeneutic virtue": the requirement of, above all, understanding the other." and also quotes the words of Hegel to highlight that: "Hermeneutics entails a moral requirement: reaching the other through the word and the effort of the concept" and he points out that to understand the different phenomena it is necessary to leave an open dialogue beyond limits, which are evident in its immediate context.

Results and discussion

First of all, to begin the critical analysis of discourses it is essential to talk about the ideologies on which each discourse is based. Van Dijk (2005) states that "not only some ideologies can work to legitimize domination, but also to articulate the resistance in power relationships", it is evident that some discourses are influenced by a resistance ideology, such is the case with Jorge Eliécer Gaitán, candidate for the Presidency of Colombia in 1946 and assassinated on April 9, 1948. Both Gaitán and Petro want to change an ideology of resistance, their political desires have the same dream of a more just Colombia. In the same way, Gaitán had the support of the middle and lower social classes; in his speech he used an argument of analogy when he is identified himself with social needs of workers, students, adolescents, the most vulnerable and least benefited, and this remains evidenced in his famous phrase: "I am a people that follows me, because it follows itself when it follows me, as I have interpreted." (Gaitán Vigente, 2017, min. 2:50)

In the argument, Gaitán calls for unity, an alliance at the polls and in the liberal political parties in order to fight against the continuity in power of both the conservative oligarchy and the liberal oligarchy, for which he begins his speech with generalization arguments, such as: "Colombia knows that there are two leaders who hate and abhor each other, due to different natures from diverse order" (Gaitán, 1946, para. 6), for the purpose of arguing that war between the conservative and liberal parties has been repeated throughout Colombian history and that has led Colombia to develop disputes between the same residents, which is why it invites all Colombians to unite in order to change that situation,

but we must not lose sight of the main objective that Gaitán has in his speech: "clean up his name" in the face of the fallacies of the conservatives and some liberals to gain strength in the presidential elections that took place on May 5, 1946. Gaitán continues his speech and he uses arguments from personal experience such as: "I say that my conferences with Dr. Turbay were to form a front against the Santos and López axis. "What a great inaccuracy! If I brought them, I did so in the first place out of my duty to protect and provide for the defense of liberalism." (Gaitán, 1946, para. 8), in order to clarify that these meetings were a duty to defend liberalism and a responsibility for being one of the people who led the elections. Straight away, he uses cause and effect arguments to claim that the conservative oligarchy has managed to manipulate the media to distort his intentions by entering into dialogue with Turbay, with the purpose of dividing and generating panic among the liberals to remain in power through of his presidential candidate Ospina Pérez, all of this for selfish purposes and interests on the part of politicians.

Gaitán continues his speech to persuade the public from the economic side, in which he argues that the economy must be at the service of man and not that man is a slave to the economy. According to Gaitán, the psychological and physical health of individuals comes before money. He rejects the abuses that the oligarchy has against the workers, who are exploited and squeezed to the last drop by this minority, in order to obtain more economic profits without taking into account the well-being of the people, that is why he uses arguments from personal experience again, such as: "They want to have a pariah and imbecile country, that works for their interests... Their interests that are sometimes strategically pivoted with a red seal and other times with a blue seal, but always in the banks' boxes to drafts and discounts" (Gaitán, 1946, para. 15). In the social sphere, Gaitán expresses that both conservatives and liberals, socialists and communists are equal and are included in his government. Similarly, Gaitán talks about the reception and welcome that foreigners should have in Colombia, he encourages people to be in favor of non-xenophobia and non-racism in the country. Furthermore, Gaitán uses an exemplification argument that he has repeated during his campaign: "A solitary clean flag on a summit is better than a hundred flags lying on the mud" (Gaitán, 1946, para. 22) to denote that he prefers to work alone and not with a corrupt party. Finally, he incites to fight against the conservative oligarchic regime through words which encourage the people to stop working for men insatiable with money, and he calls for attention to the people not to generate public disorders and avoid sabotage and he also invites them to demonstrate peacefully how to make their own decisions and have them reflected at the ballot box.

Within the same ideology of Gaitán, we have Gustavo Petro, which is clearly reflected in the following fragment

taken from his inauguration speech:

Today begins the Colombia of the possible. We are here against all odds, against a history that said we were never going to govern, against the usual ones, against those who did not want to let go of power. But we did it. We really made the impossible possible. With work, traveling and listening, with ideas, with love, with effort. From today we start working to make more impossible things, things that can be possible in Colombia. If we could, we can. (Petro, 2022, para. 16)

This generalization argument denotes that the country has been run in recent years by the right, and he previously used an argument of authority, citing "One Hundred Years of Solitude" by Gabriel García Márquez: "Everything written in them has always been unrepeatable." and forever because the races condemned to one hundred years of solitude did not have a second chance on earth" (Petro, 2022, para. 13), in order to point out that Colombia did manage to achieve a second chance that allows change unlike those races. With the above in mind, it can be inferred that the persuasion that Petro wants to reach is: "Convince the people that his presidency is a second chance for the Colombian people", likewise, he uses several statistical arguments when giving figures, percentages and generalization arguments to highlight the part of history that shows the need for change for the Colombian people.

The argument in Petro's speech, in addition to being clearly conciliatory, is one of opposition and resistance, it also has a pacifist ideology; Throughout his speech he talks about complying with peace agreements, seeking common paths where all people have participation despite differences, he uses cause and effect arguments for this as cited below: "Peace is possible if we unleash in all regions of Colombia the social dialogue..." (Petro, 2022, para. 20) and "Peace implies that we change, undoubtedly" (Petro, 2022, para. 24), with this last argument, Petro insists again that Colombia needs change and to do so, he invites armed groups to engage in dialogue that will allow peace agreements to be reached. Also, he invites the anti-drug policy to change to be a strong policy to prevent drug consumption, wherefore he uses statistical arguments such as: "It is time for a new International Convention that accepts that the war on drugs has failed resoundingly, which has left a million Latin Americans murdered, most of them Colombians, during these last 40 years [...]" (Petro, 2022, para. 25) to persuade the International Convention, the United Nations and the community it is proposed that it is necessary "to change anti-drug policy in the world so that it allows life and does not generate death" (Petro, 2022, para. 29), which corresponds to a cause-and-effect argument.

On the other hand, he denotes social inequality through generalized arguments and mainly by using the following statistical argument: "10% of the Colombian population has 70% of the wealth. It is nonsense and it is a true amorality" (Petro, 2022, para. 32), which is why he expresses that his government is going to develop a more egalitarian Colombia through reallocation policies and justice programs, in addition to generating more opportunities for all, all this in order to achieve total peace in Colombia.

Another important aspect within Petro's speech is the economic dimension, in which it is mentioned: "The time has come to be aware that hunger advances today. That everything advances throughout the world" (Petro, 2022, para. 44), this generalization argument allows him to propose the development of a Colombia that has food sovereignty, where more food is produced than imported.

In the educational field and from an argument of personal experience, Petro mentions that "The time has come to return the debt to our public education" (Petro, 2022, para. 43), in order to reflect the lack of interest of past governments with education and he points out that he also seeks all citizens have access to free public education with the aim of Colombia becoming a knowledge society, with comprehensive and quality academic preparation.

On the other hand, in the social dimension there is talk about gender equality, which is why generalization arguments are mentioned where it is said that women have fewer possibilities to obtain a job and earn less than some men; it is then sought that women have the same treatment and opportunities as men. Furthermore, he invites Colombians to be united and work together for a better Colombia. Another element to highlight within the social sphere is the fight against racism; It is evident that black people are important for Petro and they will be included in his government, starting with his right hand, Vice President Francia Márquez, who is a representative of the Afro community and a permanent activist for the rights of this community, who has also been violated and despised by right-wing governments. It should be noted that Vice President France has been the target of ridicule and contempt not only by right-wing political parties and their followers, but also target of some media outlets which are controlled by groups of the bourgeois elite, and this elite flood the media with racist messages through audiovisual communication. And, according to Van Dijk (2001): "[...] racist messages can also be transmitted through photos, films, derogatory gestures or other non-verbal acts [...]", messages that become fallacies.

Regarding the political issue, Petro uses arguments from personal experience to denote the absence of

the State in some places in the country and talks about a decentralization of power, where he suggests the government be present in every corner of Colombia.

The environment is another relevant topic in Petro's speech, he mentions the following generalization argument: "Climate change is a reality. And it is an urgent issue. Neither the left nor the right say it, science says it" (Petro, 2022, para. 52), with a view to express his concern about this issue and highlight that his main purpose is to combat climate change in an effort to save and protect the Amazon rainforest, which is considered one of the lungs of the planet. This is how he will annually provide economic resources for the care of the jungle. He calls for global contributions to this cause. Petro seeks the mobilization of humanity to correct the course and find a development model that is economically, socially and environmentally sustainable for Colombia and also for the rest of the world, in the same way, he calls for public and global planning.

Change is necessary and this historical moment raises awareness of the need to create new spaces and conceive the world to think with new paradigms with the aim of assuming the multidimensionality of the human being. Changing paradigms is a plausible challenge at this time when we are experiencing a civilizing crisis.

In contrast, we have the speech of former president Iván Duque (2018-2022). The ideology of Duque's speech is right-wing and conservative, which seeks to legitimize the domination of the oligarchy and elite groups that have governed Colombia for decades; although he tries to mask this ideology by mentioning: "I want to govern Colombia with values." and unbreakable principles, overcoming the divisions of left and right" (Duque, 2018, para. 5), which is a statement that becomes a fallacy because he never fulfills it. Additionally, he uses generalization arguments to remind the Colombian people of their commitment to build and not destroy, a commitment based on Colombia's history that dogmatism can lead to failure just as happened during the time of the called Patria Boba. He takes arguments under personal and general experience, highlights that many problems had no solution, which he repeats very frequently in his speech and it is denoted when he says: "We received a country in convulsion" (Duque, 2018, para. 16), implying that the main objective of his speech is: "Question the government of Juan Manuel Santos and persuade the Colombian people that his government will mark the change and provide solutions to the problems that citizens suffer."

For the economic issue, Duque uses the following generalization argument: "A tax policy motivated by the expansion of spending has led to us having suffocating burdens that affect savings, investment, formalization and productivity" (Duque, 2018, para. 18), to argue

that it should be developed: "[...] a tax and productive development system oriented to investment, savings, formalization, productivity and competitiveness of our economy" (Duque, 2018, para. 42). During the pandemic and in order to encourage the local economy with the aim of generating more income in commercial premises, Duque proposed days without value added tax, however who benefited the most from this measure were chain stores, a situation that is contradictory to his initial argument, since Colombians were invited to make unnecessary expenses. He also increased the minimum wage to 1 million pesos and decreased taxes for large companies.

In terms of social aspect, Iván Duque uses generalization arguments to argue that peace is built by defeating drug cartels, thus pointing out that illegal armed groups commit crimes such as: kidnapping, drug trafficking and extortion, but they acquired benefits by camouflaging them, which is why they are a threat in different parts of Colombian territory, then he prohibits the personal dose penalizing and sanctioning it. On the other hand, and despite the arguments of analogy to replicate his ideology on equity and his pact with different populations, his government did not support the LGBTI community, it did not guarantee social protection for artists and there was not economic support for athletes. Duque tries to give hope to the people with the peace agreements in his speech, but it was just another fallacy. He expresses: "He who lives by the sword, dies by the sword" (Duque, 2018, para. 31). He highlights an argument of generalization when he mentions: "We want to move forward, but the Colombian people will not tolerate violence being legitimized as a means of pressure on the State" (Duque, 2018, para. 33). This statement is reflected during his government, he modified and reformed the peace agreements and completely disregarded them, so he caused disagreements with the guerrilla leaders by not taking them into account in the peace negotiations, attacking them as well and in addition to not giving them political participation, he also wanted to put an end to the JEP making it difficult to change from war to peace.

Finally, he invites all Colombians to build a new country together, alluding that this change is an effort by everyone.

On the other hand, it is important to highlight some results of the analysis from the interviews applied to teachers and students of the Master's in Education, class XVIII, in which it is evident that in general the teachers of the Master's in Education consider it important to relate the knowledge of the subjects with the reality of the country. All of the above, in order to raise awareness in students regarding the situation in Colombia, motivate students to make decisions that positively influence their lives, so they can lead changes that affect social, cultural and educational life in their community.

The majority of teachers consider that it is important to analyze the argumentation in political speeches, with the purpose that the student can understand the real intentions that politicians have in their speech, search for the truth and better elect the rulers, understand that politicians' decisions greatly affect the social, work, family, environmental and academic future. This is where the importance of incorporating the critical analysis of the argumentation of political speeches in all academic curricula of university careers lies in order to prepare students for life, so that they fundamentally assume argued and reasonable positions regarding different circumstances that arise.

Regarding the interviewed students, the majority of them consider it is important that the University trains in politics, culture and citizen participation, this training would significantly contribute to raising awareness to actively participate in politics, by raising knowledge about the democracy importance about how to choose the rulers who are in charge of the country. Likewise, students affirm that citizenship training would empower them to have another perspective on life, in defense of their identity, beliefs and customs, it allows them to be critical, where they can intertwine their knowledge and behaviors with citizen participation with the intention to actively contribute to the development of the community through respect, democracy and empathy. In this order of ideas, both students and the community that surrounds them can live together and be active participants within society, an inclusive and egalitarian society, with the aim of achieving change policies that improve the political, social, cultural, academic and environmental context of the community in general.

However, although theoretically both teachers and students recognize the importance of participating in the political sphere and being critical of the arguments in political speeches, in practice the interviewees reveal a serious shortcoming within the context of political training, disinterest. The University does not include these topics in the curriculum yet included; while some students demonstrate indifference and lack of commitment to the current political situation of the country, which is in crisis due to the poor election of rulers, among other factors.

Conclusions

It is necessary to have knowledge about the argumentation used in political speeches to reveal the essence of the arguments used by politicians. In addition, this allows us to advance in the level of critical consciousness where the argument underlies and differentiates the conviction, persuasion or manipulation that exists in the analyzed political speeches.

It is necessary that university students also receive training that goes beyond the subjects of their careers, training that covers topics such as citizen participation, critical analysis of argumentation in political speeches, democracy, politics and culture, this with the objective of raising awareness among university students about the important role they have in helping to improve the social, cultural, economic, environmental and coexistence conditions of the country and promoting policies of change based on justice, respect, democracy and empathy. As a purpose and having in mind that the community that surrounds the student as well as the student can coexist and be active participants within the inclusive and egalitarian society.

The University must provide the necessary training so that university students develop attitudes and behaviors with which they can contribute to the community and its context, being social leaders who guide the community to have a more civilized and developed culture.

Furthermore, it is relevant that the teaching given at the university is contextualized, so that university students are coherent with being, knowing and doing, articulating knowledge and knowledge to the needs and realities of the community, especially everything that generates a sense of belonging and pride in being Colombians.

Finally, it is important to highlight that academic training in the critical analysis of political discourses is necessary and fundamental, in order to develop in the university students a broader and more critical vision that would allow them to differentiate arguments from fallacies and inconsistencies in some political speeches where their arguments are based: speeches that are transmitted daily in the unethical media that serve the powerful in the country and generate fear in uninformed and uncritical people, without citizen training to support the least suitable people to govern the wonderful Colombia.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to my daughter, to God for guiding me and enlightening my mind in the development of this research, to my thesis advisor Mg. Esther Patiño Concha for her valuable collaboration and knowledge in the writing of this article, to my girlfriend Andrea for her good disposition and help during the process of carrying out this project, and to my family for providing me with sufficient resources to be able to successfully complete my Master's studies.

Referencias

Aguilar, L. A. (2004). La hermenéutica filosófica de Gadamer. *Sinéctica, Revista Electrónica de Educación*(24), 61-64. [fecha de Consulta 29 de Junio de 2023]. ISSN: 1665-109X. Obtenido de <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=99815918009>

Duque, I. (2018). Este fue el discurso de posesión del presidente Iván Duque, léalo aquí. Bogotá, Colombia. Obtenido de El país: <https://www.elpais.com.co/colombia/este-fue-el-discurso-de-posesion-del-presidente-ivan-duque-lealo-aqui.html>

Gaitan Vigente. (27 de diciembre de 2017). Jorge Eliécer Gaitán - Yo no soy un hombre, soy un pueblo. Obtenido de https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JZO558I8emI&ab_channel=GaitanVigente

Gaitán, J. (1946). Discurso de la candidatura liberal para las elecciones de mayo de 1946. Bogotá, Colombia. Obtenido de Wikisource: https://es.wikisource.org/wiki/Discurso_en_el_Teatro_Municipal_de_1946

Hernández, R., Fernández, C., & Baptista Lucio, P. (1991). *Metodología de la Investigación*. Naucalpan de Juárez, México: McGRAW - HILL INTERAMERICANA DE MÉXICO, S.A.

Marín Gallego, J. D. (2009). El conocimiento pedagógico fundamentado en una epistemología de los sistemas complejos y una metodología hermenéutica. *Magistro*, 3(6), 13-25.

Orozco Gómez, G. (1996). La Perspectiva Cualitativa. En *La investigación en comunicación desde la perspectiva cualitativa*. (págs. 67-93). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Ediciones de Peridodismo y Comunicación N°1.

Petro, G. (2022). Palabras del Presidente de la República, Gustavo Petro Urrego, al tomar posesión como Jefe de Estado. Obtenido de Embajada de Colombia en Países Bajos: <https://paisbajos.embajada.gov.co/newsroom/news/palabras-del-presidente-de-la-republica-gustavo-petro-urrego-al-tomar-posesion>

Ramírez Bravo, R. (2012). Breve historia y perspectivas de la argumentación. San Juan de Pasto: Universidad de Nariño.

Salas, L. M. (2023). Fortalecimiento del discurso argumentativo oral en los estudiantes del grado octavo de la Institución Educativa Nuestra Señora de las Nieves de Guaitarilla- Nariño. [Tesis de Maestría, Universidad de Nariño]: Universidad de Nariño.

Sandoval, C. (2002). *Investigación cualitativa*. En ICFES, Programa de especialización en teoría, métodos y técnicas de investigación social. Bogotá: ARFO Editores e Impresores Ltda.

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). "El estudio del discurso", en T. A. van Dijk (ed.) (2003). *El discurso como estructura y como proceso. Estudios sobre el discurso I. Una introducción multidisciplinaria*, Barcelona: Gedisa, 21-65.

van Dijk, T. A. (1999). El análisis crítico del discurso. *Anthopos*(186), 23-36.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discurso y racismo. *Persona y Sociedad*, 16(3), 195-205.

van Dijk, T. A. (2012). *Discurso y contexto*. (A. Lizosain, Trad.) Barcelona: Gedisa.