

"MOTHERLAND, SOCIALISM, OR DEATH": A NARRATIVE LOOK AT
MORALITY AND THE CITIZEN
IN HUGO CHAVEZ'S BOLIVARIAN REVOLUTION

by

Sarah Ochs
A Thesis
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Science
Conflict Analysis and Resolution

Committee:

David Altshuler

Chair of Committee

Sara Colby (DR)

Mark Goodale (DR)

David Altshuler

Graduate Program Director

Thomas O'Connell

Dean, School for Conflict
Analysis and Resolution

Date: *01/17/14*

Spring Semester 2014
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

“Motherland, Socialism, or Death”:
A Narrative Look at Morality and the Citizen
in Hugo Chávez’s Bolivarian Revolution

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Science at George Mason University

By

Sarah Ochs
Master of Science
George Mason University, 2014
Bachelor of Arts
St. John’s College, 1998

Director: Daniel Rothbart, Professor
School of Conflict Analysis and Resolution

Spring Semester 2014
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Copyright: 2014 Sarah Ochs
All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my family, whom I can credit for my love of Latin America.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge the tremendous support, help, and encouragement from the following people: My parents, Bienvenida and Alfred Ochs, Susanna Campbell for our weekly chats, Isaac Regelson, for absolutely everything, Mimi Regelson, for editing my thesis and conversations about writing, the library at George Mason, the Digital Library of Latin America (dLOC), Sally Evans and team at UDTs, and most importantly, my committee, Daniel Rothbart, Sara Cobb, and Mark Goodale.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract.....	vi
Chapter One	2
Section 1.1 Introduction.....	2
Section 1.2 Scholarly Context.....	6
Section 1.3 An Atypical Conflict.....	9
Section 1.4 Venezuela Background.....	12
Section 1.5 Methodology.....	15
Section 1.6 Structure of the Thesis.....	18
Chapter Two.....	19
Section 2.1 Methodological Review.....	19
Chapter Three.....	30
Section 3.1 Case Study	30
Section 3.2 Speech One	33
Section 3.3 Speech Two.....	39
Section 3.4 Speech Three	49
Chapter Four	58
Section 4.1 Analysis.....	58
Section 4.2 The Three Miraflores Speeches	59
Section 4.3 Interview With Democracy Now!.....	66
Section 4.3 “Hugo Chávez, The 60 Minutes Interview”.....	69
Chapter Five.....	75
Section 5.1 Final Thoughts and Conclusion	76
Section 5.2 Discussion	80
Section 5.2 Conclusion.....	81
List of References.....	85

ABSTRACT

“MOTHERLAND, SOCIALISM, OR DEATH”: A NARRATIVE STUDY OF HUGO CHÁVEZ’S BOLIVARIAN REVOLUTION

Sarah Ochs, MS

George Mason University, 2014

Thesis Director: Dr. Daniel Rothbart

This thesis addresses Hugo Chávez’s construction of the citizen in his discourse on Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution. In an effort to understand his moral frame regarding the state and its citizens, and to better understand the possible relationship between citizenry and social movements, this thesis analyzes Chávez’s speech using narrative and positioning analysis.

Listen.. people be askin' me all the time,
'Yo Mos, what's gettin' ready to happen with Hip-Hop?'
(Where do you think Hip-Hop is goin'?)
I tell 'em, 'You know what's gonna happen with Hip-Hop?
Whatever's happening with us
If we smoked out, Hip-Hop is gonna be smoked out
If we doin' alright, Hip-Hop is gonna be doin' alright
People talk about Hip-Hop like it's some giant livin' in the hillside
comin' down to visit the townspeople.
We are Hip-Hop. Me, you, everybody. We are Hip-Hop.
So Hip-Hop is goin' where we goin'.
So the next time you ask yourself where Hip-Hop is goin',
ask yourself.. where am I goin'? How am I doin'?
'Til you get a clear idea.

Mos Def, "Fear Not Man"

CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The movement surrounding Hugo Rafael Chávez Frías, president of Venezuela from 1999 to 2013, was called a revolution. Chávez named this the “Bolivarian Revolution” after a great personal hero of his, Simón Bolívar, the man held largely responsible for much liberation of South America from Spain. This revolution had a domestic goal, the creation of a socialist state and the eradication of poverty, inequality, and the prevailing environment of corruption and patronage. It also had an international one, which was a global economic system equitable for poor and rich countries alike under a banner of South American unity (Shifter 2006). The primary message of the Bolivarian Revolution, and the driving spirit of Chávez’s political force, were based upon his ideals of the economic and political order being more accommodating to all people of Latin America, but particularly those who needed it most in his mind, the poor (Shifter 2006, Ellner 2008, 5 and 2002, 88-89). One notable aspect of this movement was its lack of bloodshed. This was a nonviolent revolution (Aponte-Moreno and Lattig 2012), arguably something the world needs more of.

Chávez was a despised and polarizing figure, to be certain, but many others across the Earth adored him, millions in fact. A seven hour funeral procession was held in Caracas when he died. There were massive parades of grief across Venezuela and in

Cuba. There are songs, poems, even tattoos, devoted to him. World leaders, elected officials, celebrities, and luminaries from almost everywhere mourned this messianic figure, and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter recalled Chávez's search for autonomy from the U.S. and unity with the rest of Latin America. Upon his death there were official displays of grief and moments of silence at the African Union and Organization of American States' Headquarters. In Bolivia, Uruguay, Iran, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, and other states, days of mourning were called and dozens of heads of state and government representatives flew in for his funeral and released statements. How did this revolution catch hold with the world-wide fervor it did?

In pursuing the ideals of the revolution, Chávez instituted a set of reforms intended to politically strengthen local populations. For example, nationally instituting a system of "communal structures" which had been in place informally for hundreds of years (Rosen 2013). Chávez also worked to position Venezuela as a leader in a revolutionized world in which opponents to the global status quo have strength, dignity, and means. This can be seen from the creation of a system of economic and political alliances which promoted the profile and communal strength of Latin American countries, such as PetroCaribe and ALBA (*el Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra America*¹). In the words of Fernando Bossi, director of the Emancipation Foundation, ALBA's online portal

[ALBA] is a proposal of unity between Latin American and Caribbean peoples, following the ideals of the Liberator, Simón Bolívar, who intended to create a Confederation of Republics. It was in sum, the opposition between an imperialist

¹ The Bolivarian Alliance for the People of Our Americas. At times ALBA is translated to the Bolivarian Alternative to the Americas or the Bolivarian Alliance of the Americas.

proposal and a proposal of liberation... We must therefore understand that the ALBA is founded on the precedent of an independentist struggle for unity (English translation from the ALBA website, *n.d.*).

While the “imperialist proposal” against “a proposal of liberation” may be one way of putting it, what Bossi (and Chávez) means is that ALBA was created to manifest an “ancient and permanent confrontation between the Latin American and Caribbean peoples and imperialism” (Hirst *n.d.*). In Chávez’s view, there were enemies everywhere: at home was the old political guard, and an oligarchical support of neoliberalism, and abroad were the imperialists (Spanakos 2008 and 2010).

Studying Chávez’s revolutionary discourse from afar one can see the various storylines of institutions and dynamics he opposed: the contentious political and economic environment of Venezuela, a legacy of a colonial past, a dynamic between the global North/West and Latin America. At first pass, Chávez appeared to represent the rancor of his people and built his revolution around it (Spanakos 2008, 528 and 2010). In studying his words it seems at least one intention of Chávez’s was to create a unified force with which to oppose this scenario – a non-violent army, in a sense. Upon a closer inspection, which this thesis will perform, it becomes clear Chávez was attempting to construct an identity for his citizenry, and that identity was to serve as his army. (Whether that was his intention, whether he was successful or not in that identity construction, or whether that identity differed from one before it could be the topic for another study.) In so describing this identity, he was describing a moral order for the Venezuelan people, a polity in its idealized sense. Understanding the role of the citizen might contribute to a better understanding of not just the Bolivarian Revolution, but it

could contribute to a better understanding of the nonviolence of this revolution, as well. One reason for this possible link in understanding is because “only in Venezuela, under the government of Hugo Chávez that came to power in 1998, had electoral politics played an important role in resisting neoliberalism” (Lander 2005, 21. See also Ellner 2002, 88-89). Thus, a motivated electorate can become a revolution, at least for Chavez. This is not to say that where there is citizenship there is equal access to democracy or electoral participation (Yashar 1998, 33), but this thesis will show Chávez implied citizenship was a *result* of supporting the revolution and positive electoral participation.

In his article “The Communal State”, Dario Azellini wrote, “both from the government and from the rank and file of the Bolivarian process, there is a declared commitment to redefine state and society on the basis of an interrelation between top and bottom and thereby to move toward transcending capitalist relations” (n.d.). Azellini is talking about morality, namely, the rights and responsibilities humans have for one another in society. His frame is useful here because he is saying it is possible to redefine state and society through relationships in such a way as to achieve a political goal. In this thesis I will study Chávez’s discourse on citizenship and his narrative construction of the people as a way to understand the role of the citizen in this nonviolent revolution.

Phrased as a question, how did Chávez construct the Venezuelan people in his discourse? This thesis will show that in talking about the Bolivarian Revolution Chavez narrativized and positioned the citizenry in such a way as to reconceptualize the Venezuelan polity, often in ways that suppressed opposition. It will further show this discourse of his served as a moral condemnation of both those who would oppose him and of his northern

neighbors, and that the storylines of poverty and resentment were the lynchpins of his argument.

1.2 SCHOLARLY CONTEXT

Little literature exists on narrative understandings of the role of the citizen in the discourse of Hugo Chávez, but there does exist writing on the importance and value of citizenship in society and the significance of the citizen in Latin America. In Western democratic societies “citizenship, at least theoretically, confers membership, identity, values, and rights of participation and assumes a body of common political knowledge” (Abowitz and Harnish 2006, 653), so citizenship may define many aspects of the very existence of a Venezuelan. Citizenship is not naturally occurring, it is dependent upon various economic, political, and social forces (Abowitz and Harnish 2006, 654), thus a full exploration of the political role of the Venezuelan citizen outside of Chávez’s conception could be performed, but suffice it to say that citizenship will depend upon the context in which the citizen finds him- or herself. One determinant of this context is the treatment and concept of citizenship by head of state, being in this case Chávez.

Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar in the opening of their book on social movements in Latin America discuss citizenship as something possibly one *does* or may *exercise* as opposed to what one might *have* or *be*. The possibility of citizenship thus conceptualized stems from the political, social, or economic climate of the country (also mentioned earlier), and has the potential to greatly impact social

movements – and vice versa. In other words, “[s]ocial movements not only have sometimes succeeded in translating their agendas in public policies and in expanding the boundaries of institutional politics *but also, significantly, have struggled to resignify the very meanings of received notions of citizenship*, political representation and participation, and, as a consequence, democracy itself” (Alvarez, Dagnino, and Escobar 1998, emphasis mine). Citizenship is not homogeneously granted, expressed, or rewarded within a given country or nation (Alvarez, Dagnino, and Escobar 1998). Chávez, as will be seen in the pages to come, granted citizenship to only a certain class of person, regardless of their passport. It is a question if this tactic was a foundational aspect of his revolution².

Anthony Spanakos conducted two research projects on Chávez, citizenship, populism, the state, and social movements. There were several major conclusion of his research. An overarching conclusion is “the Bolivarian citizen...is the one who accepts and adopts the vision promoted by Chávez” (2008, 527) and that “Chávez identifies ‘the people’ as the fundamental social and moral unit of the nation” (2010, 19). This emphasizes the hold Chávez had over his supporters, and the unity between himself and his people he tried to portray, a theme which I take up again later. Chavez required *Chavistas* to engage in the revolution; their participation in Bolivarian structures and their actions counted as much as votes in their being counted as citizens (Spanakos 2008). Because Chávez’s conferral of citizenship was so dependent upon support of his

² Throughout this thesis I refer to the revolution. The Bolivarian Revolution, as anything, evolved over time and was not in its beginning the same thing as in its end (and some say it has not yet ended). For clarity, as I refer to this revolution I only mean the period of time covered in my data, from 2002 to 2005.

leadership, Spanakos argues that the opposition believed that previous conceptions of Venezuelan citizenship were possible if Chávez left office (2008, 532). The implication of this is that the coup of April 2002 may have been avoided had Chávez conceived of citizenship differently. At its heart, for Venezuelans interviewed, citizenship is a deeply political act in which one engages. It references opponents at home and abroad, history, and power:

The most ideologically committed *Chavistas* see their citizenship in their daily struggle against empowered and entrenched elites in order to assert and preserve their own power. Citizenship is thus an agonistic struggle against enemies, internal and external, and it calls for alliances spurred by local political initiatives, mass rallies, as well as support for struggling ‘people’ (people who struggle against similarly perceived enemies) in other contexts (geographic or historical). This presumes that the political is a broad and expansive category in which popular participation is critical for both legitimacy and consciousness-raising. (Spanakos 2008, 527)

And Chávez encourages this thinking in his supporters (Spanakos 2008 and 2010).

The notion of citizenship in Chávez’s revolution also influenced conceptions of what was possible, not just identity and ideology as the previous paragraph suggested. Many *Chavista*³ interview subjects referenced frequent political thinking. They also referenced Chávez’s political opinions, about which Spanakos believes, “Chávez has changed the way that citizens interact with and dissect a concept of politics” and in so doing have liberated themselves from neoliberalism and oligarchy (2008, 529). This engagement with politics and the political process (even if, as some critics have stressed, actual citizen political power was superficial) Spanakos found provided a sense of

³ “*Chavista*” is the adjectival version of “*Chavismo*” (Chavez’s ideology and the social movement in support of him), i.e. a political party or an individual may be *Chavista*.

empowerment (2010, 20). Oil and oil revenue was continually promoted by Chávez as being “for the people”, and while that is not a direct description of who the citizen is, it is a strong endorsement of what the citizen is owed, implying a morality. Increased ability to consume consumer goods is seen as a byproduct of *Chavismo* citizenship, as well as belief in C.I.A involvement in the opposition (Spanakos 2008). Finally, he states that Chávez’s conception of citizenship is “new” insofar as the citizen is an active participant in the creation of the movement (2010, 24).

1.3 AN ATYPICAL CONFLICT

The conflict surrounding Chávez’s revolution is atypical not merely because it was nonviolent, but also because a main motivating aspect was resentment – resentment on behalf of the poor and others who resented the corruption, patronage, and concentration of state wealth in the pockets of the few. Spanakos suggests that because Chávez saw a decline in his popular support as his revolution crystallized from its earliest incarnation of merely being a revolution of change to being “Bolivarian”, the revolution was more than just a “politics of hope or resentment” (2010, 19). I agree, but nonetheless Chavez gained and kept a vast majority of followers through his play on resentment and grievance, and this rancor or resentment is no small matter. For this reason a small discussion of resentment, which comprised a significant storyline in Chávez’s narrative on citizenship and the revolution, is warranted.

In conflict resolution we are accustomed to affect playing a big role in the conflict, such as theories on “grievance” (Ramsbotham, et al. 2012, 108-111) or “frustration” (Dollard, et al. 1939). Ramsbotham, et al. divide analytical styles into two. They assert an “expressive” view which is focused on subjective aspects such as on “feeling...belief...[and] desire”, and an “instrumental” view which is focused on objective matters such as structure, “material interests”, or behavior (2012, 10). There are also analytical and practical methods which focus on the parties’ experience or framing of the conflict (narrative analysis is a big example), and others which are organized around the concept of “issues”, as in mediation techniques like Problem Solving Workshops and Insight Mediation. While many of these issue-based and “instrumental” approaches are not necessarily focused on emotions, per se, it may be difficult for those in the conflict to separate their issues or perspectives from their feelings. I offer that to separate expression from instrumentality is not useful, and presume Chávez would agree. Taking Chávez as a conflict analyst, this thesis will show that he made the “instrumental” assertion that the Venezuelan opposition and the U.S. were involved in a coup against him in 2002 and further, engaged in a legacy of economic practices which proved to be quite harmful for his people and many people of Latin America. He also made the “expressive” assertion that hundreds of years of patronage, Western/northern hegemony, and neoliberalism was untenable and was an offense and an affront to Venezuelan dignity. Narrative analysis embraces the two styles of analysis presented by Ramsbotham, et al. in a manner which is useful for this conflict.

Perhaps most importantly, it can be argued that the *global* state of affairs Chávez was responding to (since Chávez aimed his rhetoric at home *and* abroad) was what Galtung would call structural violence (1969) on an international scale. Defining violence as “when human beings are being influenced so that their actual somatic and mental realizations are below their potential realizations” (1969, 168), he lays the groundwork for a classification of violence which goes beyond killing. Had Chávez read Galtung I firmly believe he would assert that the global system in which the U.S. is dominant and his opponents support would constitute structural violence, defined by Galtung as having no specific actor, but rather, built into a given social system (1969, 170). Studying Chávez’s words, it appears his perception was the U.S. employed psychological threats, its coercive tactics were often “positive” (i.e. there was reward of his opponents), the “violence” toward Venezuela was diffuse, there was frequently no subject (the U.S. is not a person, after all), and many of the effects of the violence were unintended (such as World Bank policies ultimately having a damaging effect on the poor) (Galtung 1969, 169-172).

Solon Simmons, in his article “The Most Dangerous Word in the Field: Class” accuses capitalism of being the villain, not just in class conflict, but in many conflicts. Even reasons such as religion or ethnic background are the “playthings” of class structuration.

As economies develop, there is a tendency for those who have been successful to hold on to their competitive advantages and to perpetuate them at the expense of others... This is a no-brainer idea, but we seem not to be able to admit what all implicitly know: the capitalist game has a tendency to rig itself unless carefully cultivated by custodians of the public good. Ironically, even the winners lose this game in the end because they undermine the stability of the economic system as a

whole...one wonders how much damage will have been done in the interim (Simmons 2013).

This is Chávez's point precisely. Chávez's supporters were by no means exclusively poor, but many were and by elevating the status of the poor and by manipulating power to work for the poor and for Venezuela he saw a way out of this class structuration. My interpretation, aided by Galtung and Simmons, moves the conflict from being one caused by a damaged and complex relationship between Chávez, *Chavistas*, colonialists, the corrupt patriarchy, and the global North/West, to one provoked by an unbalanced world, complicating and broadening the conflict substantially. This case may be atypical, but within it there are many conflict and pre-conflict processes which make this it significant.

1.4 VENEZUELA BACKGROUND

There is good reason why Chávez focused on poverty and the patronage which was often accused of keeping the poverty in place as the motivating spirit of his revolution: wealth disparity was a tremendous problem. The inequality stemming from such extensive poverty, and such a tight political climate created deep rifts in the country. Venezuela has struggled with high poverty, inflation, corruption, and crime for much of its history as a country (McCoy and Diez 2011). From 1982 to 1999, before Chávez came to power, the country strained under the low price of crude oil which undid much of the petroleum-driven economic bounty it had enjoyed in years before (McCoy and Diez 2011). This undoing, coupled with frustration over corruption as usual, ultimately brought about great social unrest which culminated in a series of violent protests in 1989

called the *caracazo*. It is a widely held belief that the events leading to the *caracazo* and its aftermath ushered in the possibility for a change in the dominant political system, and hence the Chávez era. Chávez did not come to power in a country completely at peace with either its political system or its economy, to say the least.

The overall rate of poverty decreased under Chávez's time in office. From 1999 to 2011 it went from nearly 50% to around 27% (CIA Factbook 2011). Even so, a 27% poverty rate is awfully high. Even after the decrease in Venezuelan poverty, according to the CIA Factbook by 2011 one-quarter of rural residents did not have access to fresh drinking water, there was a 26% inflation rate, and Venezuela's maternal and infant mortality rates were 80th and 94th, respectively, in the world. The U.N. Human Development Report outlines even darker figures describing the lives of those living in poverty, "two out of every 10 households living in extreme poverty have at least one child who has not had compulsory vaccinations, while 44% of all children are excluded from school....only 55% of all households have daily access to safe water pipe-line supplies and 27% of all households do not have access to proper sewage facilities" (UNDP 2000). These are stark figures for a country labeled by the United Nations to be otherwise high on the human development scale (Human Development Index 2012).

The results of poverty are far-reaching. A study conducted by the World Bank Human Development Sector Management Unit showed the first 1,000 days (starting from conception) of any human life are the most important. Beginning with the pregnant mother, the quality of care and nutrition in those months affect the ability of that person to procure a job later in life. Good nutrition and positive social skills received in those

1,000 days aid in brain development in such a way as to make thriving in life possible (Arias 2011 and World Bank Human Development Report 2011). Furthermore, there is a strong correlation between the poor and marginalization of racial, ethnic, and other social groups. This exacerbates the already alienating effects of poverty, and we see that what was once an economic problem becomes a socio-economic problem. Cleavages between identity groups grow as some are included in the wealth of society and others are not (World Bank 2013). Identity-based social exclusion has the potential to affect every aspect of life from birth to death. This poverty is what Galtung would describe as structural violence.

...Violence is built into the structure and shows up as unequal power and consequently as un-equal life chances. Resources are unevenly distributed, as when income distributions are heavily skewed, literacy/education unevenly distributed, medical services existent in some districts and for some groups only, and so on. Above all the power to decide over the distribution of resources is unevenly distributed. The situation is aggravated further if the persons low on income are also low in education, low on health, and low on power - as is frequently the case because these rank dimensions tend to be heavily correlated due to the way they are tied together in the social structure. (1969, 171)

Poverty, for Chávez, was not just insufficient money, but also a poverty of living in a globalized system which prevented his people from easily finding a way out of their circumstances.

In summary, in his discourse Chavez discusses the grand ideas of his revolutionary objective, but upon closer inspection within this speech one can see he constructed an identity for his citizenry, an identity to serve as nonviolent foot-soldiers in this nonviolent revolution. A revolutionary discourse constitutes an identity in this case because, for Chávez, citizenship was something exchanged for full participation in and

support of the revolution. Thus, at least in the Bolivarian Revolution, it appears possible to achieve widespread social and political goals based on the meaning of citizenship.

1.5 METHODOLOGY

In seeking an answer for the question how did Chávez construct citizenship, I will study Chávez's public discourse and will take a narrative frame for analysis of his speech. This type of analysis is an outstanding way to understand that which moves people and how people construct their realities and identities. Conflicts are held in place by the narratives each side tells about the other and about the conflict itself. While narratives are constrained by institutions, narratives have the potential to change these institutions and influence the conflict for the better (Archakis and Tzanne 2005, Cobb 2003, Hajer 1995, Nelson 2001, to name but a few). For the analysis of this text I mixed different qualitative methodological approaches, just as did some of the authors whose methods I employ. Drawing mainly from *Varieties of Narrative Analysis* (2012), for initial parsing of these speeches I begin with the approach employed by Martha S. Feldman, and Julka Almquist who wrote about the implicit in stories. As noted in the preceding chapter, I began with the process described by Feldman and Almquist by providing a text from the original speech, a synopsis of the speech called a storyline, oppositions which highlight some of the implicit (2012), and then an assemblage of themes.

In defining citizenship, it appears Chávez launched a revolution of national identity which called for a set of rights and responsibilities for his fellow citizens. These “rights and responsibilities” can be understood through positioning theory, which is a mapping of the moral world of a given society. Positioning analysis offers a perspective for understanding relations between several parties, in this case Chávez, his supporters, his opponents, and the U.S. Positioning analysis’s predominant strength will be in understanding Chávez’s conception of the moral obligation he believed humans have to one another particularly through citizenship. To this end I will then look for the positions in Chávez’s speeches, per Harré, et al.’s suggestion that this type of analysis “reveal[s] the explicit and implicit patterns of reasoning” (Harré, et al. 2009, 5). Lastly, after tracking the explicit and the implicit in his discourse, I will take note of other narrative patterns in order to describe his particular counterstory and the Bolivarian identity he tried to create for Venezuela. I made the decision to primarily cover a broad overview of Chávez’s narrative, as opposed to honing in on a particularly fascinating section – and there were so many! I wanted to get at the bigger story he tried to tell, as opposed to tracking the various small turns in his speech.

Lastly, this is not an impact study. I will not address Chávez’s influence on global economic structure or policy. I will not make assessments about how his conception of citizenship may have impacted the Venezuelan people, or how it changed the social movement that was his revolution. The data I will use and exact methods I will employ to achieve this research goal are specified below.

The revolution, in some sense, played out at the podium in the presidential palace, and three speeches of Hugo Chávez delivered from Miraflores Palace will be the field for my analysis. I propose to study the discourse around citizenship and moral order in Chávez's speeches and public acts, as focused around the time period of an unsuccessful coup d'état on April 11, 2002. Around the time of the coup there were massive strikes by oil company workers, a national referendum to recall Chávez, as well as allegations of U.S. involvement in the coup. (Al Jazeera 2013, CFR *n.d.*, CTV 2013). I will anchor my analysis in three speeches delivered by Chávez on the 9th, 11th, and 14th of April 2002 and will analyze them to comprise a case study of Chávez's narrative construction of the Bolivarian Revolution. To augment the three speeches I will briefly draw from two interviews with Chávez from U.S. journalists given later in 2002 and in 2005.

The attempted coup and its surrounding incidents (namely, the protests and alleged U.S. involvement) will serve as a small case study of a domestic incident with an international aspect. This coup came as a direct response to Chávez's moves to create a socialist state and deny excessive foreign influence in his country. While the coup occurred because of mainly domestic matters, the Carter Center intervened in the crisis over the space of two years (McCoy and Diez 2011) and during the years after the coup Chávez increasingly condemned the U.S. for its alleged involvement and focused his revolution toward assembling a viable alternative to what he believed was the economic hegemony of the West. Spanakos observed that for Chávez the definition of citizen was not bound by geography or time (2008, 527) and it will be interesting to see his treatment of the concept of citizen in a foreign context.

1.6 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

In chapter one I presented an overview of the project, stating the questions and giving some background to context and events related to this thesis. I briefly summarized the Bolivarian Revolution, the poverty in Venezuela, the theoretical concepts and the literature I will cover, and presented my methodology. In chapter two I first define “story”, “narrative”, and “discourse” and further describe why narrative analysis is the right type of analysis for this project. I cover narrative’s contribution to the creation of identity and reality, and how narrative positioning reveals the values and expectations of the narrator. In chapter three I present a shortened version of three speeches delivered by Hugo Chávez, one delivered two days before the April 11th coup, one on the day of the coup, and one a little over 48 hours after Chávez was taken prisoner. Directly after each speech I present a synopsis, called a “storyline”, which captures the main theme of each speech. Chapter four contains the analysis of the case study, which is augmented with narrative snips from other interviews. There I identify primary themes in his speeches and find implicit statements within those themes. I also make the case for Chávez’s framework about his struggle of good versus evil and his predestined revolution. The conclusion in chapter five restates the question, the main claims and further thoughts, the significance for conflict resolution, and I give some indication of new avenues for research and implications for the field.

CHAPTER TWO

2.1 METHODOLOGICAL REVIEW

Chavismo and the Bolivarian Revolution were public social movements which drew on themes of equality and community that had deep resonance in Venezuela, Latin America, and for humankind in general. Chávez was a charismatic leader, skilled at leveraging public support through a mixture of attention-grabbing acts, lengthy speeches, and programs that affected masses of people. A garrulous man, he purported to speak on behalf of the true sentiment of great masses of people and also for a way people ought to be in society. Leaders sometimes try to position themselves as knowing better what people need and want than they perhaps know themselves. Chávez amplified this approach by presenting himself as near-literally *one* with the people and by striving to represent masses of people all over the world, not just the ones who elected him at home. As Chávez worked to create a revolutionary identity, he continually characterized those who opposed the revolution in a highly negative manner, such as heavily positioning his adversary as, for example, “the devil” or “The Empire”, “corrupt” or “fake”⁴. However, Chávez’s positioning of his adversaries and his creation of Venezuelan identity were means to an end; he intended to create a counter-narrative to the dominant narrative of U.S. hegemony in an effort to achieve legitimacy. These narrative devices Chávez

⁴ George W. Bush, The United States, and his political opposition, respectively.

employed – identity creation, positioning, and counter-narrative strategies – will be explored further in this review of the literature.

Much research has shown that humans not only make sense of our lives and the world through stories but also the world as we know it is created by the stories we tell. In this regard Chávez was a master storyteller. Narratives and stories (which are a type of narrative) comprise a large part of the activity of the human mind. To this point William Casebeer and James Russell (with serious help from Johnson, et al.) suggest that the majority of complex human cognition is involved in and influenced by hearing and telling stories, which are “a set of analogy making and metaphor mapping abilities that form the core of human cognition” (2005, 6). Quoting Mark Turner, Casebeer and Russell suggest, “story is a basic principle of mind. Most of our experience, our knowledge, and our thinking is organized as stories” (2005, 6). There is science which strongly supports that our motivations, the way we learn and categorize information, and our recollection of and emotional response to events are all influenced by storytelling (Casebeer and Russell 2005).

While stories and narratives have long histories in literature, in the social sciences they have been increasingly considered for their role in the lives of humans outside of the world of fiction (Elliott 2005, 5). This is because narratives are suffused with meaning; they are born of a relentless human need to interpret events, and to therefore find the meaning in life that all humans seek. In *Acts of Meaning* Jerome Bruner titles the first chapter of his powerful book, “The Proper Study of Man” (2004), mincing no words about the centrality of meaning as the preeminent manner by which to understand

humankind. As the core interest of much of the social and natural sciences is the study of humans in all their complexity, in that chapter Bruner insists it is futile to separate what people *do* and *why* from what people *say* and *why* they say it. The “saying” – that is, the interpretation of things – is as critical a field of inquiry as the “doing” (Bruner 2004). In a similar vein, David Maines tells us, “interpretive processes are at the center of human conduct, and to fail to understand that point is to fail to understand what human beings as a species of animal are about” (1999, 318). By calling something a story I make no claim as to its falsity or truth (nor claim regarding the *cause* of the ills Chávez described, see Harré, et al. 2009, 6 for supporting literature) but instead to Chávez’s active creation of a narrative on citizenship that hooked into the cultural and emotional psyche of much of his populace and that of others, as well.

Throughout this thesis I will use the terms “story”, “narrative”, and “discourse”. To define story I first draw on Maines who simplifies the definition of a story by having it be anything with a plot (1999, 318). He equates plot with story, both being discursive forms containing a series of events whose value lies in what they seek to convey. Storytelling is the act of “performing” a story in conversation (Maines 1999, 318) – and I will add as well that storytelling may be the performance of story in some other public forum (such as onstage or, perhaps, by Tweeting). While not all narratives are stories, all stories are narratives. That said, what is narrative? There are ways to define narrative in terms of its component parts or “fundamental narrative structures”, as in “any sequence of clauses which contains at least one temporal juncture is a narrative” (Labov and Waletzky 1967, 28) or as in all narratives contain “abstracts, orientations and codas”

(Labov 1997). However, an analysis of the functions or structures of a narrative does not necessarily describe fully the interpretive strength of said narrative. Jane Elliott quotes Hinchman and Hinchman, who define narrative as "...discourses with a clear sequential order that connect events in a meaningful way for a definite audience and thus offers insights about the world and/or people's experiences of it" (2005, 3). Instead of giving a traditional definition of narrative, Elliott summarizes the main aspects of narratives as being "chronological...meaningful...and inherently social" (2005, 4). Most or all of the three elements of time, meaning, and audience, society, or context occur most often in definitions of narrative (Mishler 1995, Labov and Waletzky 1967, Maines 1999, Bruner 2004, Wibben 2011, to name a few). This description of narrative and Maines' definition of story appear to be very similar. However, there are broader definitions of narrative which include humans' cultural milieu, understanding of reality, and sense of self and identity. As I am interested in the story Chávez told as directly referential to prevailing political, economic, and social climates, less functional or structural conceptions of narrative will be more useful to this thesis.

Focusing, then, on the broader social aspect narrative, Maines defines narrative as referring to "cultural paradigms or structures of group culture" and goes on to state that "narratives are cultural frames and ideologies that prefigure some stories insofar as group beliefs and values contain already-articulated plots" (1999, 318). In this regard, stories are typically "overt" – you will know when someone is telling you a story – but narratives are not necessarily so noticeable (Maines 1999, 318). This is in part because culture's existence goes often unnoticed. (While by no means his main point, Kevin

Avruch touches on culture's "disappearance" briefly in his 2003 article, entitled "Culture". See also Avruch and Black 1991). Narrative includes all of that which one is discursively and cognitively trying to understand, reflect upon, and convey: the implicit, the explicit, the context, the pretext, etc. While stories may colloquially be thought of as being fictions, given their potency as a lens for the analysis of man they may be more appropriately thought of as a narration of a given cultural milieu.

...The story, its (telling and listening) interlocutors, and the situation in which it is told are linked to an underlying cultural-historical fabric. Put differently, our local repertoire of narrative forms is interwoven with a broader cultural set of fundamental discursive orders that determine who tells which story, when and where, why and to whom...What is true is that every culture of which we know has been a storytelling culture. (Brockmeier and Harré 2001, 41-42)

It follows that analysis of certain kinds of narratives offers insight into a culture, and vice versa. This will be useful as we think about and question Chávez's popularity regarding the typically unpopular topic of economic inequality.

Narratives are neither true nor false in any conventional understanding, more to the point is that one's sense of reality does not exist without narrative. Mishler touches on this by acknowledging that while many scholars see narratives and stories as representing or mirroring what is commonly thought of as "reality", one may also "impose" a narrative on reality which may be every bit as valid (1995). Thus, while I might yell, "my car was hit by a drunk driver last night!" someone else may point out "Sarah is terrible at parking – her car always juts out in the middle of the street"⁵, illustrating two potentially true aspects of reality which nonetheless do not match one another. Hence, one may

⁵ Neither of these statements is true. Nonetheless, implicit in the first statement is a victim narrative in which trust is better used sparingly and I am blameless. Implicit in the second statement is a more agentive narrative in which our actions determine what befalls us and I need to go back to driver's education class.

consider narrative to be an ordering or representation of the “told” (to use Mishler’s term for what we many of us think of as “reality”), or one may consider it to be that which the narrator or researcher makes from the “told” (Mishler, 1995, certainly acknowledges these two possibilities for viewing narrative, and I will address other scholars’ discussion of the intricacies of narrative creation presently). It is important here to note that try as we might to construct or reconstruct narratives, they often exist without our input whatsoever. In the U.S., for example, there is a terribly insulting ‘African American men are violent’ narrative which no one person created and which persists in spite of many people working to undo it. Every society establishes its social categories – what I earlier called themes – through narratives. Narrative analysis reveals tacit assumptions about categories of people that are created and reproduced in society. Thus, when I use the word narrative I mean a presentation of experience which makes sense of that experience, is intended for a particular audience (to persuade, dissuade, or otherwise affect), and conveys a specific message of some utility. Narratives are the means of creating and reproducing those social categories, or themes, which ultimately create society as we know it.

Discourse, like story, falls under the heading of narrative. While many, many pages could be written on the complexities of discourse (addressing Foucault’s contribution alone could be its own thesis. For example see *The Archaeology of Knowledge* [1969] or *The Order of Discourse* [1971]), often discourse is used to mean, more or less, “words”. Jens Brockmeier and Rom Harré describe discourse as the both the result and process of “linguistic production”, acknowledging that there are numerous

ways humans communicate, of which verbally is but one. They place narrative as a subtype of discourse, and while I do not wholly agree with them, they make a good point that there are many, many discursive forms, including “speaking, writing, [and] listening” and narrative (2001). While it seems that Brockmeier and Harré are content to focus on the quantifiable and more observable communicative aspects of discourse and narrative, for me, narrative spans from the innermost workings of the semi-conscious human mind (see my paragraph on narrative and identity below) to the intentional propagation of a particular narrative by a decisive group (see Sara Cobb’s 2003 article addressing violent narratives where she mentions the case of Tutsi-Hutu relations before Rwanda’s 1994 genocide).

Suffice it to say, then, that discourses are typically more overt than narratives, more complex than stories, and often refer to institutions which create and support said discourse. The history, context, and audience of and for what is said is relevant in any analysis of discourse, as is its institutional element writes Maarten Hajer (1995). He also offers this definition

Discourse is...defined as a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorizations that are produced, reproduced and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities. As such, physics is an example of a discourse, but the radical environmentalists have their own discourse too. (1995, 44)

When I use the term “discourse”, then, I mean the words and their attendant society of thought, concepts, ideas, et cetera. Chávez was a highly political being who told stories that corresponded with existing discourse and narrative regarding intra-American

relations, power, and inequality. By tapping into a narrative that ran counter to the traditional U.S. discourse, a revolution was born.

Thus, Chavez created a revolution through a counterstory (or counternarrative), which is, to quote Hilde Nelson, “a story that resists an oppressive identity and attempts to replace it with one that commands respect” (2001, 6). Counterstories are created in counter to master narratives, which Nelson defines as “...the widely circulated stories summarizing the socially shared understandings that make communal life intelligible...” (Nelson 2001, 106). From this it follows that counternarratives and stories do not come about without already existing tensions in the relationships between the people who are described by those stories. In the case of Chávez, I believe he was not merely attempting to swap one oppressive story for a more emancipatory counterstory, he was trying to address the whole dominant Northern/Western narrative and the historical narrative of colonialism and its effects with one that he perceived gave Venezuela the respect it deserved. Nelson is saying that there is an implicit relationship between narrative and identity. She writes that identity is a composite of ever-changing and continually interacting stories and “they are therefore structures of meaning, ways of understanding, who we and others are...[and] these narrative constructions draw in part on master narratives” (Nelson 2001, 106). Identities get damaged when dominant groups construe the less dominant group’s identity as one which only serves the purposes of the dominant group (Nelson 2001, 107). Chavez believed that that his opposition and the U.S. perceived Venezuela as having only one option: to be amenable to their economic, political, and security goals. In narrative terms, Chávez perceived them as morally

requiring Venezuela to follow their frameworks, and he vehemently disagreed. One way he disagreed was through his definition of citizenship.

It has thus been made clear, narrative has a strong sociocultural element. Next it will be important to explore *how* that comes to be – just how is it that narratives are socially created? While narratives may be simply thought of as accounts of “lived time” (Bruner 2004) there is a complex interplay between the one doing the living (and the telling) and the life being led. Narratives do not live in a vacuum. They are firmly embedded in the lives of the people who create them. But how can a person with a given identity tell narratives which simultaneously create his or her identity? The answer is not as delineated as one might think, and this will be relevant as we think about identity-making in societies. A major component of storytelling, as well as narrative, is that they both “help create identity” (Bamberg 2004). Mishler writes that there is much work – often in psychology – showing that the sense of self and therefore, identity, is created through narratives and stories we tell. This does not end with mere personal identity, but with group identity, too (Mishler 1995). This identity-construction may be conceived as a dynamic process that occurs between the teller and their social groups (Archakis and Tzanne 2005, Cobb 2003, DuToit 1997, Elliott 2005, among others).

Argiris Archakis and Angeliki Tzanne performed research on this dynamic – the construction of identity through the process of interaction between the narrator, his or her audience, and a third party who was, in their case, the researcher. They found that, “identity is something that people *do* in social activities, and not something they *are*...[and they] understand identities to be dynamically constructed in interaction rather

than given or static..” (2005, 269, emphasis added). Quoting Bamberg, they identify three levels at which the narrative construction of identity occurs, “the story world, the interactional context in which the story is told, and the wider social context which is beyond the local conversational situation” (Archakis and Tzanne 2005, 269). In her piece, “Fostering Coexistence in Identity-Based Conflicts”, Cobb addresses the strength of narratives in the context of violence and ethnic identity, writing that narratives of origin myths within identity-based conflicts take a deep hold on people precisely because they help construct our very sense of self (2003). Thus, conflict, narrative, and identity very much go hand in hand.

Thus, narratives and identities are continually created in coordination with the audience and with wider society. It follows that the narrator is not simply discussing him or herself alone. It has also been shown that often there is no single, human narrator with which we must contend (recall the example earlier of the ‘violent African American male’ narrative). So there is the distinct sense that narratives are not only constituted by sociocultural elements but they are also a constituent element of society. This constituent aspect is well-described by the concept of positions, which are inherent in narrative. The word “position” implies a relationship between two things. Positioning theory explains a crucial area in human cognition, “...namely concepts and principles from the local moral domain, usually appearing as beliefs and practices involving rights and duties” (Harré, et al. 2009, 6). In other words, the positions we outline in our stories describe our beliefs regarding what we owe one another. There are “constraints” to positions, write Harré, et al., which are the “locally valid patterns of rights and duties” (2009, 6) and analysis of

narrative “reveals” these constraints (2009). Thus, it is not easy, or even possible, to simply position another in any way one pleases; any given act of positioning must negotiate with its narrative, and therefore its social context. In positioning theory there are the levels of prepositioning and first- and second-order positioning. These three levels of positioning describe the ways one comprehends and delegates the given moral status of another, and how the other may acknowledge, accept, or reject this status (Harré, et al. 2009).

Positions and positioning reside within daily speech and life, “positions are clusters of beliefs about how rights and duties are distributed in the course of an episode of personal interaction” (Harré, et al. 2009, 9). Put more beautifully, “[positions] are features of the local moral landscape...which consists of practices: for example, taking notice of someone or ignoring them, giving them tasks, praising them, and so on” (Harré, et al. 2009, 9). Harré, et al. take note of the ‘speech act’, or storyline, as first-order positioning. The speech act, in this case, is Chávez’s public speeches, made all the more powerful given the heightened intensity of the time period. Fortunately, “positioning theory also allows for a very natural expansion of scale, from the analysis of the dynamics of person-to-person encounters to the unfolding of interactions between nation states” (Harré, et al. 2009, 6). Chávez was so vehement in his stance against his opponents when he spoke against them he often ultimately positioned everyone as either against or for them. In fact, it will be shown that Chávez’s treatment of citizenship was in and of itself a positioning.

CHAPTER THREE

3.1 CASE STUDY

Hugo Chávez's political life, it has been often said, came into being during a coup d'état. On February 4, 1992 he was a leader of an attempted coup after which he stated on live national television that, "lamentablemente, por ahora..." ("unfortunately, for now") the plans for the coup were not met ("Los hechos" March 2013, 0m19s). Six years later he won the presidency of Venezuela, and many believe it was that initial, brazen comment which garnered so much national attention and branded Chávez as someone with big goals, someone to be reckoned with. I watched a biography of Chávez where he credits his rise to the presidency to his love of baseball and to having been a soldier, not to the coup of 1992. Nonetheless, many see the birth of this president in the fire of a coup and, if true, there is a sort of literary circularity in Chávez's rebirth as a result of the second notable coup in his life, and the coup which will serve as the focal point of this project, that of April 11, 2002. But first, a bit of background.

Chávez came to power with an "antielite message" which represented an increasing number of dissatisfied Venezuelans (McCoy and Diez 2011, 4). He was intent on dismantling existing systems he felt "represented the old order" of corruption and political party hegemony (McCoy and Diez 2011, 6). This dismantling brought about the first of several strikes in October 2000 by people who were uninterested in replacing the old with the new. Chávez instated 49 decree laws without the consultation of traditional sectors of power, which led them to call for more general strikes in December 2001. His

popularity levels dropping, cracks appeared in his own party, and several active members of the military called for his resignation in January and February of 2002. Fedecámaras (the Federation of chambers of commerce and production) and the directors of CTV (the Confederation of Venezuelan Workers) added to the call for his resignation. The final blow was when Chávez appointed a new director of PDVSA (Venezuela Petroleum) and the aggrieved factions of society took to the streets in early April 2002. At this point the coup was underway (McCoy and Diez 2011) .

As expected in any delivered speech, I encountered an admixture of discursive forms: stories, facts, exhortation, reasons, announcements, threats, etc. In spite of the mix, one overarching challenge was clear at the outset: Hugo Chávez spoke a lot. In no way a terse man, it would be impossible for me to reproduce his speeches here in their entirety. However, because this project is tracking the broad lines of his narrative, it is important to take an overview of the entirety of the speeches as opposed to not doing so. Second, Chávez spoke in a style which one may call “stream of consciousness” – he often travels from point to point in order to arrive at a larger point to which he does not always arrive. This, too, made the process of tracking the “story” in his speech a bit daunting.

In order to maintain the integrity of the entirety of the speech, as opposed to merely providing a synopsis, I follow the process of Martha Feldman and Julka Almquist did in their research on “Analyzing the Implicit in Stories” (2012). While Chávez could be very direct at times, he was more often tremendously indirect. Searching for the implicit, therefore, will likely yield a goldmine of subtext. Even so, Feldman and Almquist assert any given narrative will often contain implicit messages for it is a

common discursive tactic. First I will provide a shortened version – what they call a story – of his original speeches in italics below. Next, I will craft a synopsis – which they call a storyline – from the story. This storyline tells the story in a shortened form while remaining true to the overall arc of the original narrative. Third, from the synopsis I will create a list of what Feldman and Almquist call oppositions. Oppositions are rhetorical devices which help locate the implicit, for many given statements imply an opposite – such as “an exit sign...also implies an entrance” (Feldman and Almquist 2012, 211). Oppositions “reinforce the analysts’ ability to locate what is being implied in the way the story or narrative is being told” (Feldman and Almquist 2012, 211). After the oppositions I will list the themes located within the story. Themes show the social categories which people create, reproduce, and employ in order to understand one another. They are not intended to be coding in the quantitative sense, but an acknowledgement of oft-repeated, salient, and therefore meaningful concepts. After this process of looking for the implicit, I will provide a positioning analysis on Chávez’s discourse per Harré, et al. in order to identify his acts of prepositioning, first-order positioning, and second-order positioning. This will describe Chávez’s “moral landscape” (Harré, et al., 2009). Finally, I will provide my own analysis of these speeches in addition to the implicit and positioning analyses which will summarize his conception of Bolivarian identity and struggle for liberation.

For the story, below, I will use direct quotes from his speech which I have myself translated . The parenthetical portions in the story are not direct quotes but are summaries of long stretches of text which were much too long to include verbatim but nonetheless

important to include. Finally, in the story those portions in brackets are, as usual, editorial comments. In my translation I have tried to stay true to his digressions, his incomplete thoughts, his emotion and passion, and his grammatical style. To be certain there is a great amount of repetition of themes in these three speeches, but yet it is still possible to note the waxing and waning of his confidence and composure.

3.2 SPEECH ONE

“Speech of the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías, Regarding the Opposition’s National Strike” – April 9, 2002.

This speech was given by Hugo Chávez at Miraflores Palace (Chávez Frías and Eltroudi 2005), the executive office and symbolic epicenter of the state of Venezuela. It was given on the occasion of several oil company strikes which were taking place in the country.

Story: “Long live the people’s revolution!... The Venezuelan people have arrived to this place after long days of work, after many years of struggle...and, above all, we, assuming our responsibility...to live and fight in this sacred land of Venezuela have decided...to assume the reins of the destiny of the fatherland... Thus arrived the Venezuelan people, as our national anthem says, respecting the Law, respecting virtue, respecting honor, in spite of so much abuse... This is the year to consolidate the country and the revolution... We [in our youth] dreamed that when we reached the 21st century Venezuela was going to be beautiful...and today we have a crude and tough reality... Now we are fighting for

our children's future, for the future of our grandchildren so that in 2050 they will not have to fight like we have had to fight... And thus, with the conviction we have, with this consciousness we have, it is that I have come here today, in front of millions of Venezuelans, to say that this revolution must not nor will not have to go backwards, not today, not tomorrow, not ever...

Once again, the Venezuelan people have won another great victory because...I, since yesterday, am and will continue to follow the situation second by second, minute by minute... (I have been in contact with all manner of important officials and have travelled all over this 'Bolivarian Caracas'...) A journalist over in Catia asked me what I thought of the strike and I said to her, 'My child, what strike? What strike?' Just as the leaders and the orators who have preceded me here have said, I am merely going to echo the national sentiment of populist victory and of the Venezuelan workers of today, to give a powerful and strong recognition of the Venezuelan workers, the true Venezuelan workers, and of the Venezuelan factories, who have demonstrated again and again that which we have [always] said, that nobody can stop Venezuela, especially not a pitiful number of oligarchs, corrupt people, and bureaucrats... You can't blot the sun with your finger... Today, simply put, there was no strike [i.e. stoppage] in Venezuela...

"(The leaders and oligarchs of Fedecámaras [the Federation of chambers of commerce and production] and the directors of CTV [the Confederation of Venezuelan Workers] have said they are unified with the political opposition, and this is not new, they've

always said this, and just as they said they were unified in 1998 [when Chávez ran for president] when they could not stop the people from coming to power for the first time in 100 years...) Well then, there they are, continuing to be unified, trying to defend their privileges, trying to hold back the march of the revolution... Yesterday they said they were going to, for example, paralyze the Caracas Metro... I, of course, along with the government and the National Armed Forces had drawn-up and revised plans... Thus it has been several days, such as it is normal to have contingency plans, but it is better not to [have to] use them such as we have not [had to] use them... Today one could hear so many lies told through the media, such as, for example, we heard that supposedly the director of the Caracas Metro said that the Metro was running because the military was running it. Lies! It was not necessary to use not a single member of the armed forces for the Caracas Metro. It was the Metro workers who operated and ran the Metro... The Venezuelan workers are conscious of this government... which carries in front the flag of justice, equality, and dignity... (Of course there are those who for one reason or another did not go to work, but some had good reasons, such as the man who was at the beach who, when asked if he did not go to work replied 'yes I went to work early but my boss closed the factory so I came home and decided to enjoy the beautiful Venezuelan sun at the beach with my family')... Now, there are others who did not go to work, because they did not want to, a minority. For them it will be necessary to get them to reflect [on their actions] because they are victims of the media's manipulation and the manipulation of the false leaders. There are others who are not going [to work] who are not victims, simply because they do not have consciousness of what Venezuela is... (others did not go

to work because they were told they would get fired yet in spite of this Venezuela continues moving forward...) Let them continue with their little strike. They have no moral authority and no capacity, it has been shown, to hold back the country, so that is not the problem. The essential thing that we Venezuelans of today have to analyze is...the important thing that we should know is: there is a conspiracy to try to overthrow the revolutionary, Bolivarian government. That is what is important.

“Thus it is from that point where I call on all of you, to be with your “eyes peeled”, to be continually organized, and continually alert, to be continually disciplined, and above all, to be continually united, continually united, continually united. I never get tired repeating it, taking the words of our historical leader, the Chief and General Simón Bolívar when he said: ‘Let us unite and let us be invincible’. Let us unite and let us be invincible, in these moments when, I repeat, there is a conspiracy to try and overthrow Hugo Chávez... But I ask all of you, I am almost begging you, not to fall for provocation... We who have in our hands and in our hearts the dignity. We who have the utmost morals...the force of the truth... This is a revolutionary obligation... so that we don’t lose the reins, so that we don’t lose control of the situation...

Now, of course it is important to point out the following...this...conspiracy...is attempting to follow the same playbook of other conspiracies and against other governments, but particularly, it is attempting to follow the same playbook that they used against Salvador Allende, there in Chile, 1973 , trying to destabilize the economy and

from there the intent to paralyze the Venezuelan oil companies... They are attempting to create panic...to lower the morals of the Bolivarian people... (They are trying to get military support... They are hoping and waiting that the military will give me a coup...) But if that is what they are waiting for they will get as old as Methuselah... Because of the Venezuelan military...and I am one of them, I am a Venezuelan soldier, I was formed in the military schools of Venezuela... This revolution of today is the same one that Simon Bolívar started in the 19th century which was cut short by traitors... which was planted [like a seed] forever in our soil, in our blood, and in our hearts.

Like I have already said, the revolution wasn't possible back in the 19th century, in spite of our liberating fathers having done that great deed for our people of so long ago having liberated Venezuela from the dominion of the Spanish Empire. But the revolution that they had in mind, Francisco de Miranda, Simon Bolívar, Sucre, and many others, that revolution failed, they could not complete the revolution alone. I believe that they did plenty when they kicked out one of the most powerful empires in the world, not only from Venezuela and far over in the Andes, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, our people battled for their independence. This is written and will be written for ever, a million centuries will pass and that will [still] be written.”

Storylines: It has been in our destiny since time immemorial to fight and struggle to get to where we are today. We have had to work hard to arrive here, but we are not there yet. Nonetheless, we are capable; we can fight and win and retain our nobility and morality all

at the same time. I am here (merely) to be a witness to this struggle and to speak on your behalf, you, the true Venezuelan workers, the true Venezuelan people. Venezuela, having been destined to win this battle, is incapable of being stopped. Therefore there is and was no strike [stoppage] in this country. There might be a pitiful, small number of false Venezuelans who try to stop us (there is no mythology or story without some setbacks, after all) but they are insignificant and no match for us. The reasons for the strike are either bad or a mirage. There may be outside forces supporting the false Venezuelans, though, so it is important for us to train like soldiers and fight, even though we are not soldiers and we eschew violence and chaos. I, however, am a soldier, but I reject fighting. Our destiny is to be a liberated country free of any empire.”

Oppositions: Struggling or fighting/not struggling; capable/incapable; noble/base; destined for greatness/uncertain future or destined to fail; true Venezuelan/false Venezuelan; majority/minority; significant actions (support)/insignificant actions (strike); significant reasons/insignificant reasons; discipline and spirit of soldiers/lack of discipline and weakness; liberty/tyranny.

Themes: “The people” feature strongly in this speech, and while Chávez may not use the word “el pueblo” (people) in every sentence, he does say “we” with great frequency, even at times when it is clear he instead means “I” or just “the government”. “Hard work” is a frequent descriptor for what the people, the country, and what he is engaged in. The country, and the people have a “destiny” of and for greatness. Chávez is a literal

“representative”, not just a political one, standing in for el pueblo, bearing witness to its struggle and its destiny. He is also its “servant”, albeit a high-level one, speaking to all manner of important people around the world in service of the people and the revolution, as well as a “witness” to their greatness. “Truly Venezuelan” is distinct from the false Venezuelan entities, whether average people or workers or companies. “False Venezuelans”, on the other hand, are likely to have qualities that are effectively irrelevant because they are “corrupt”, “traitors”, “oligarchs”, etc. The country, the people, the destined revolution, are all marked by “progress” (which is entwined with destiny). The people and the revolution are “capable” because they are able to struggle, to fight, and to be noble and dignified at the same time (they are modern-day knights). The people are to be “like soldiers” by being disciplined and metaphorically combat-ready (through not actually bellicose). The “military” and “soldiers” are peace-loving, protectors of the people, in service to the country.

3.3 SPEECH TWO

“Message from the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías, With the Intention of Denouncing the Insurrectionist Plan of the Opposition to the Country” – April 11, 2002

This speech was given by Hugo Chávez at Miraflores Palace late afternoon on the day of the coup (Chávez Frías and Eltroudi 2005) before Chávez was taken prisoner.

Story: *“A very good afternoon my dear Venezuelan compatriots... I have taken the decision, according to my watch at quarter till four p.m., to bring together this national radio and television chain in order to send a message to all Venezuelans... This message is directed to all Venezuelans and especially, I pray to God that those Venezuelans, a minority, of course, small in number but who we do not spurn at all, who are Venezuelans as well, a minority of Venezuelans who seem to not want to hear, who seem to not want to see, who seem to not want to accept reality, according to the Bible, and I’m invoking the Word of God to begin this message with His help, His Guidance, and His illumination. The Word of God says, the Bible, that the voice of the people is the voice of God. With this invocation, with this spiritual elevation I wish to begin this message, I repeat, for all Venezuelans, for all Venezuelans within our national territory.*

“For three years, not for just one day, the entire country has been witness to the immense effort that the government, led in a dignified manner, has been doing all in order. (The political processes and constitutional changes, etc. have been done with debate, without anyone running over anyone, individuals, political, groups, social groups, religious groups, everybody gave their opinion to create this Magna Carta) which rules Venezuelan life by the will of the great majority of us.

“(From the year 2000 and also in 1999 and again in 2001, everybody participated in the making of this revolution, everybody, but especially the poor and the weak, but then also the middle class...) This country is solid.... And later, finally, in 2001 when we began to

come out from an economic slump...(and how much work to do so!) We have not had the luck to have to count on a serious opposition, an opposition loyal to the country, loyal to itself, loyal to its followers – followers who we respect – loyal to the Venezuelan people, independent of the [various] political colors. Unfortunately, however, there always have been, and are, campaigns of defamation, of lies. We are all witness to this. And we have had to travel all of the corners of the earth to explain our truth, to convince Kings and Princes and Heads of State of that which is happening in Venezuela, that here there's no tyranny, here there is no madness... Thus, what is happening here today, what has been happening in the last few hours, is a demonstration more of the level of tolerance that this government has that I have the honor of leading through the will of the majority of Venezuelans.... There has never been a government so tolerant as this one, so disposed to dialogue, to listen, to right wrongs...but also to make decisions, to make decisions to orient the life of the country to function for the interests not of a minority, whether privileged or not, of one individual or of a small group of individuals who are defending their rights... It has been written in the tablets of God and of man, the right to life, the right to education, the right to health, the right to work, the right to work with dignity... And here you all see a number of mayors who are members of the political opposition, and that does not matter to us, and not only does that not matter, we are happy they are here...

“I told a British Chancellor who came here a few days ago that one of the biggest negative things that today in Venezuela we have from a political standpoint is the lack of

serious opposition, a rational opposition... The biggest problem this country has today is not the strike... (This country has not stopped, it has kept moving forward...) Here I have, this information just arrives, the strike by sector, there are some which yes, of course, we have to accept, which have arrived at 40%, in other occasions at 50%, others 0%, small sectors or medium sectors which are well-dominated by those who have called the strike... And then of course those who went to the doors of those companies but were told there was no work...so they went to the beach...

“I will not leave from here without any justification, and for an idea which is irrational and impossible to attain. Of course I can leave here, I’m not going to be here my whole life, but it is the Constitution which defines these terms... Thus it was these small groups that for over 40 years have tried to destroy the country... In this moment it is 4:15 in the afternoon, I have just been handed a piece of paper that instructs me to say what time it is because there is a rumor saying that this speech has been recorded. This is a live message from Miraflores Palace, where I have been working night and day, following the national situation...making contact with various people and studying documents... I have not stopped working...

I am a soldier I have been trained for war but I hate war... And on that occasion, when what happened that which happened on February 4th, 1992 [which was] an extreme measure which hopefully will never be repeated... We have received thousands of calls here to the palace, many, many people, I asked [how many] a little while ago, but we

were told quite a lot, thousands, you know... The people are here, as usual... They have come to pray, to sing, they have come with little bits of paper expressing their needs, they have come to give their blessings, but above all they have come to love, all of it is love...

“They called me this morning and told me they were broadcasting news that I was being detained in Fort Tiuna (and this goes from person to person and thus reaches the world...) Look at all that irresponsibility... I am taking the opportunity to ask the minority groups which are supported by the media to reflect [on what you are doing]... I just met with [the owner of the head of one of the most powerful private television channels] two weeks ago and he gave me a document with some criticisms and we had a coffee and we shook hands... (There are those senior political leaders who want me out of here. You want a referendum? Fine, look for the signatures and if the referendum happens and I lose, then I’m going, brother, I don’t have an obsession to be the President, I have always said I am not president, I am Hugo Rafael Chávez Frías, and I am a soldier, that is what I am, man and soldier. I am fulfilling the functions of a president, but it is like a baseball player who is pitching who is all of a sudden sent to right field – [just as] he’s pitching, I’m president...

“The objective of these people is not to strike [i.e. to stop the country] but to deceive... Thus... this call is for reflection and to look for a path toward reconciliation... A new shift where we must begin to accept constitutionality, rule of law... mechanisms to become a [true] political opposition... to plan for future elections, to even request the

removal of an elected official [**Interference from sabotage of the line**] ...an insurrectionist plan. Thus to become desperate is a bad idea... (They say the opposition is coming to Miraflores but they are only trying, just some small groups. I receive people all the time, students, indigenous people, they have papers with requests, do they [those others] have requests? No. they just want to kick out Chávez ...) What can happen, I ask, at 4:30, at 4:37 in the afternoon? That is not going to happen...

“Well, I am going to make a parentheses here to explain to the country a particular situation that has to do with this presidential message...The owners of the private channels, the situation is that in this very moment channels 2, 4, and 10 do not have a signal. Why do they have no signal? ...It is important that the country know with clarity that which others do not know... (There are signals, for instance the signal that is carrying my voice to you, that belong to the state. The owner of the signal is the Venezuelan state, and just like a mine, a gold mine way over there for instance, the state is the owner. The state gives concessions to a person or to a project or to people to mine, that is to say, the state gives permission to them whether it is a mine or a radio or television signal...If the state did not give them permission they could not transmit their programs over the waves... The people have been calling me to ask me to turn off channels 2, 4, and 10... I have had enough... They have only shown negative things...) Do the owners of the private channels [have a] conspiracy [to overthrow me]? ...So that the world believes Venezuela is ungovernable, that here there is a dictator... a lie repeated over and over again until many believe it is truth. (I am calling to you who

might be confused and to those who might be against me, think of your families, think of the country... If you march here you will find 10 or 20 thousand people here, and more continue to arrive...)

“Thus this message, of calm, a call to calm, to conciliation, a call to [turn to] work and the work day will go out to almost the entire country, the country continues its march... The situation is not grave... In addition to designing a commission to look for ways out [of this situation] and accords and positive progression with Petróleos de Venezuela (I am going to put forward an idea of national round tables to seek solutions within all sectors of the country, and based in the constitution...) Mayors, governors, myself, we will meet tomorrow at mid-day to put the first steps in motion of this great table of consensus, dialogue to advance, to create with the instructions that Venezuela is for everyone and we want peace, that we want democracy, that we want to construct a great country of which we have always dreamed... I thank you all very much for your attention. We are going to continue attending to the diverse situations that we are faced with. We are going to continue working for the country, from here asking God for illumination, not just for me but for all Venezuelans. I reiterate a message of affection...of peace...of hope...an unwavering message...of solidarity...of calm and sanity for all of the Venezuelan people, to all of the Venezuelan society.”

Storyline: I have decided to direct a message to all Venezuelans, even to the small group of stubborn, difficult ones (but only the ones inside the country). I have a message for

you all, and it happens to be the same message as that of God, who I am calling upon now: that the true desires of the people are the true desires of God. We have worked very hard for three years, and we have worked with order and with constitutional sanction. Everybody wanted and worked for this revolution, but some more than others. Unfortunately the opposition we have is not of good quality. They are not loyal, not even to themselves, and are trying to undo all of the work that we have done (which is also the work of God). We [I] have had to go around the world to speak to many important people and to prove we are ordered and tolerant. They have made us look bad when, in fact, their poor behavior ought to make us look even more tolerant compared to them. Oh, the strike? It is still not a real strike, and there is a good explanation for why the numbers which are only moderately high in areas, though not really high at all. There is a small number of people who want to destroy this country and they are unconstitutional.

I have not stopped working and doing important things, I am your servant. I am a soldier and am ready to fight, but I want love not war (as do the people, too), and in spite of that one day in 1992 which hopefully will not be repeated. There are false rumors about me, and to lie about me is to insult the country. I am friendly with the opposition, and I follow the law above anything. I don't even want to be president but it is the will of the people that I serve them so I humbly stay. Those people do not want a strike, they want to deceive the people. We must reach reconciliation and adhere to the constitution, but there are procedures which we can discuss in the future. They are insurrectionists... Don't become desperate. The opposition is not really coming here, just a few people. I want to

remind you that the government has the ultimate control of the state's resources, and the people want me to take control of them. The more lies that are said about me the worse Venezuela will look. Please come to your senses and please do not come to the Palace, it is a bad idea, there are many who support me here. Everyone, be calm, everything is alright. We will have dialogue and work toward consensus, starting tomorrow, for all Venezuelans and for democracy. We [I] are [am] going to keep working for the country, and to ask God for help, which is for all Venezuelans, in unity and with calm and sanity.

Oppositions: Well-behaved/stubborn; majority/minority; with God/Against God; order/disorder; quality & dignity/low quality & ignobility; loyalty/selfishness; dignified appearance/ignoble appearance; lawful/lawlessness; soldiers who love peace/undisciplined people who love war; truth/deception; calm/chaos; reason/madness; government support is Venezuela support/government rejection is Venezuela rejection; lies about Chávez/truth about Chávez; dialogue & consensus/action & selfishness.

Themes: Chávez begins by asserting, "Control". There is begrudging acknowledgement that all Venezuelans are "true Venezuelans" (with some back-pedaling and othering). There is inherent "divinity of Venezuela" and its people, and here again "The People" sit at the head of the table (with God). "Witness" is again a prominent theme, indicating something of importance to see, remember, and acknowledge (thus the act of witnessing is important, as well as the act being witnessed). "Political order" is present and important. Same with "Democracy". Same with "Unity". The targets of the opposition

(the people, government, and Chávez) are “Victims”. “Clarity” appears in conjunction with witness, when that which is being witnessed is very obvious to all. (Positive) “Appearance” to others and to outsiders is important. “Humble servant/literal representative” appears again as it did in the first speech, along with the “Hard-Working Servant” (a blend of “Servant” and “Hard Work”, which both are present in this speech). “Destiny” reappears (often with “Divinity”), and “False Venezuelans” from the last speech transforms into “Irrelevant People” with “Irrelevant Reasons”. These “Irrelevant People”, supported by their “Irrelevant Reasons”, spread “Vicious Rumors” and, worse than being irrelevant, are “Negative Elements Within Society” who or which cannot be trusted, because “Opposition to Venezuela is Destruction”. Furthermore, the “Laws of Society and the Universe Support Chávez”. There is the “Virtue of the Soldier and Military” who, like Chávez, have “Hatred for War & Fighting” and who, naturally, fully support “The People”. There is one instance of “Remorse and Distancing” for and from a prior event (the 1992 coup). Otherwise, there is no remorse, even when “Conciliation” appears. There is one long mention of the “Immoral Media” There are increasing calls for “Calm” and reminders that the revolution is “Unstoppable” and cannot but “Make Progress”. There is some amount of Chávez distancing himself from Chávez, because he is not in control, but “The People Are in Control” just as “The State (not Chávez) Is in Control” along with God.

3.4 SPEECH THREE

“Message from the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez

Frías, With the Motive of Restoring Power” – April 14, 2002

Delivered at Miraflores Palace, early in the morning Chávez was reinstated as president (Chávez Frías and Eltroudi 2005).

Story: *“To God that which is His due, to Caesar that which is his due, and to the people that which is their due.’ I begin with these words filled with I do not know how many emotions and thoughts which cross through my chest, my soul, my mind. Right now I am like the multicolored sea...I confess to you all I am a bit stupefied, still processing the events, which we can recall in the future to write I don’t know how many books for Venezuelan history and as an example for the world, that this is a counter, counter, counterrevolution process (about which I could say a lot, and will, but not now at 4:40 in the morning...) The Venezuelan people and their true soldiers, the Venezuelan people and their Armed Forces. These soldiers of the people have written and it is not grandiloquence but the truth, it is a new page and a great page for Venezuelan history, for Latin America, and also perhaps the world... I have been reading the constitution, going over details, by the way. But before I go into too much reflection, because I want to be brief in this early morning message, like a rebirth, I want to make a cry and this is perhaps the most important thing that I want to say today the 14th of April 2002. I have been isolated for the last few hours and have not had any information about what has*

been happening and I had a great anguish and, the first and most important thing is for all Venezuelans to go home, to return to calm. A shudder came [to this country], which brought pain...blood...tears...uncertainty. The cause of that which has occurred [in the future] we will analyze with calm in order to correct those places we need to correct and in order to correct that which we need to correct, but in the meantime, [all of you, return to] 'calm and sanity'...

“(Coming here by helicopter, seeing plumes of smoke with alarm, I was informed about much of the disturbances of the past few hours...) I am making a plea to all you compatriots, return home, all of you, let us put our house back in order, let us reflect on the forward march and continue working... And I call out to the police force – with emphasis and firmness – make a call to the directors of the police force⁶ and call them to calm down, and to stop all of that... Let us put God before us, the image of Christ crucified came to me when I was first taken prisoner, two days ago, exactly 47 hours ago... Well, let us invoke Christ and God the Father and let us fill ourselves with peace, we are lacking a lot of spiritual peace...

“These events which have brought blood and pain should be nonetheless gigantic lessons for everyone...Let us be capable of reading this lesson...of extracting teachings and conclusions. Let us be capable of noticing signs calling us to correct, rectify, and deepen in order to have more faith in that which we are doing... I want to give a special salute to

⁶ It is understood, mainly without dispute, that the Armed Forces took the side of the Chávez supporters and the police took the side of the opposition during the protests of the day of the coup.

the international media. In the first place, to the international organizations, the OAS... Presidents of America, of the world, the Group of 15, The Rio Group... and it is an example of the fact that Venezuela will never be alone, that the Venezuelan people will never be alone... Let Venezuela have the respect of the international community, that the international community recognizes the legitimacy and the sovereignty, the valor and the courage of the Venezuelan people... And to the media of this country truly, truly the time has come to make profound changes, it is obligatory to make these changes that will return you to the path of reason... Thus I am saying in the name of the revolutionary and Bolivarian government, peaceful and democratic. I do not come filled with hate, nor with rancor toward anyone. But of course we need to make decisions and adjust a few things... of course nobody is going to fall to the extreme...but...here there will be no witch hunt...

“To the opposition, we need another opposition in this country, but one which is loyal to the country...loyal to the people...which presents critical truths [and] alternatives for the country. (We need to have people who disagree, from the various sectors, come and share with us their recommendations, their ideas, their critiques, no matter from what political or economic side...

“I am going to tell you a story (much of which surprised me)... I was in five different places since the day I left here... (I was trying to figure out how I would transmit my show ‘Hello Mr. President’ from where I was...) I was in five different places, and some

of the boys [soldiers] that were there cried from so much emotion. Over there in La Orchila we hugged each other...because those soldiers, you see them with rifles and their faces drawn, however, they are pure love, and one [of them] told me ‘Oh! I couldn’t breathe until I saw you, sir, I felt dead’”, and then he said to me, “...because they told me they had beaten you and tortured you so that you would sign the renunciation⁷”. No. Nobody mistreated me at all... (After that they moved me to another place, I believe because the boys [soldiers] that were there [in that first place] hugged me until they cried. When they brought me food they would stay and talk to me...) (It was then I started to realize that this movie, this virtual occurrence, was not going to last for long...)

“Later they took me to Turiamo...where the soldiers treated me very well. Later when there was no place for me to sleep...I said to them, “don’t put yourselves out for me, boys, give me a sheet that’s all because I’m a soldier just like you all”. And we stayed talking for a bit, drinking a lot of coffee, of course. Oh! But you know something? That travelling through five different military sites made me do something I haven’t done in a long time, talk to the boys at the bottom [soldiers, captains, sergeants]...they have a lot to say. Thus, it is one of the lessons I have drawn. One of the boys said “My Commander, don’t forget about us...” I felt like a soldier again...

“I don’t know if you all have seen this fax that has been sent around the world. Here, give me one. There are so many.... [Anyway] Then they were going to take me someplace

⁷ It was rumored that Chávez renounced the presidency during the days of the coup.

new, and I was rushing and I said let me get my clothes and my things...I had washed my underwear and socks, as if in the olden days, washing a flannel... (I was rushing to bathe because the helicopter had arrived) and a boy from the National Guard arrived and said, 'Look, My Commander, clear something up for me' ... (and shutting the door to my room, said) "Is it true that you resigned?" I told him, "No, I did not resign and I will not resign" and he stood up swiftly, saluted me, and said "Well, you are my president, but tell me something" – he says to me—the people need to know this, because they're walking around saying that you resigned, that you resigned and you left the country." Then I said to him: "I am about to take off". And he said to me: "Write something for me and leave it for me in the trashcan...and later I will come to collect it." ...Then I wrote this, which came from my spirit: "Turiamo, 13 April 2002 at 12:45 hours. To the Venezuelan people... (and to those who it might interest). I, Hugo Chávez Frías, Venezuelan, President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, declare: I have not renounced my legitimate power that the people have given me. For ever!! Hugo Chávez Frías.'

"And it turns out that the entire world has this sheet [of paper] now. (I was brought a small T.V. and as I dozed off to sleep I heard the voice of our Attorney General speaking to the nation, and those words were a ray of hope for me. At that moment I was given a sheet of paper to sign, one which announced my renunciation, and I said "No, keep that because I am not going to resign. I am a prisoner President, but I am not going to resign." But you know, they circulated that paper anyway. What lies!...) (Later I saw a

television on a Venezuelan channel reporter with the same sheet of paper and instead of reading it said) 'I would like to see the signed renunciation of the President. Where is it?'

"...I would like to say to those of you who oppose me: ... You Venezuelans who oppose me, well oppose me, then...but you cannot oppose the constitution... But I won't go on [talking] for much longer, [because] there are a lot of people in the street, there are a lot of things to revisit...there are decisions-some urgent-to make... [Therefore,] return to calm! ...For this reason I am telling you all that knowing the people like I know them, knowing the Armed Forces like I know them, looking at that distant star [last night in Turiamo] I reached the conclusion, something inside me said, 'Relax, Hugo, neither the people nor those military boys...are going to put up with this abuse'... 'It cannot be that so much effort is going to be lost this way' ...So I am going to rectify that which I need to rectify (and we all have work to do, everyone, in order to fulfill Bolívar's dream...I call out to all sectors of the country to join the round table discussions, let us make critiques and discuss everything...) I return spiritually filled with a great love...After this historic and long day, and this demonstration, without precedent in the world, how a people and their soldiers stopped a counter-revolution...without firing one shot, without spilling blood, and put the things back in their place...if yesterday I loved you, today I love you so much more... A very good day to all of you, Venezuela, a very good day."

Storyline: This momentous occasion and these past days are for the history books. The true Venezuelan people and the true Venezuelan soldiers have written these pages in

history. I remain close to the constitution. I have been in anguish. There was a small event which brought blood and tears and pain, but let us return to calm, and order, and we will work to make things right. I plead with you, return home, and to calm. Especially you, the police, stop what you're doing and calm down. Let us remember God, as when I was taken prisoner I thought of Christ being crucified. I say on behalf of the peaceful and democratic, revolutionary and Bolivarian government, let all of us learn from these events, let us notice when things need to be corrected. Let us thank the international media and organizations because we know we will not be alone, and let the Venezuelan media know they have a lot of changes to go through and they need to embrace reason. While I do not have hatred for anyone we [I] will have to make some adjustments, and some changes, but no one will be persecuted. And we need a better opposition, one that can disagree but one that is loyal to the country and the people.

[Chávez tells a story where he was moved from place to place under watch of the military, and was embraced literally and figuratively by them, and he saw the depth of spirit of the men he spent time with, and they reminded him of the nobility of the military and the support the military has for him, because he is one of them. In fact, one of them alerted him to the lies being spread, that he resigned, and this soldier is the reason why and how the true message that he had not resigned reached Venezuela and the world. (The country needed to know that he would be there for them, to keep the revolution alive.)] The Attorney General spoke out for me, as did a reporter, and I felt hope. You opposition, you might oppose me but you cannot oppose the constitution (and I am

bolstered by the constitution). There is a lot to do and many decisions to be made, so everyone calm down. I am very close to the people and the military and knowing them I realized that the revolution would not be lost because I have their [your] support. Let us all discuss and make positive changes. Let us also remember this historic day where a president was returned to power by the military and the people without a drop of blood (there may have been bloodshed but it was not on our hands). With love.

Oppositions: History has been written/nothing has happened; true Venezuelan people and soldiers/false Venezuelan people and soldiers; Constitution and order/lawlessness; calm/heated; learn/forget or ignore; remember God/be evil or atheistic; leniency/persecution; profound men in uniform/vain police officers; decisiveness/indecisiveness; intimacy with the country/out-of-touch with the country; selflessness/selfishness; peace/bloodshed.

Themes: He begins with a re-assertion that the “Laws of Society and the Universe Support Chávez”. “Hard Work”, “Progress”, “Venezuela’s Special Destiny”, and “Passion for Venezuela” return, and plenty of it. Same with the “Irrelevant/Insignificant Opposition”, which in this speech he says he “Does Not Heed”. There is a “Rebirth”, “Political Order”, a call for “Reason” (versus “Madness”) and “Calm”. Venezuela and Chávez are, again, is one with “The People” and “The Constitution” and “The Soldiers and The Military”. The “Bad Police Force”, one short story about the “Moral Media”, as contrasted to the “Immoral Media”, and “Suffering” are mentioned once. “Calm” and

“Reason” are asked for again and again, and “Order/Political Order” is invoked. It bears repeating the reiteration of Chávez being “Close To or One With God”, “The Constitution”, “The People”, “The Soldiers and The Military” and an “Self-Analogy to Christ”. “Appearance” is still important, but there is “International Support” (as opposed to the possible international condemnation feared in the prior speech). Chávez who is “The People” is not offended and will be lenient, but the president needs to make “Changes” and these “Changes” are not just ones the government/the people/Chávez need to make but are also actions that Chávez will take to modify the opposition (which seem somewhat ominous due to their vagueness). The opposition, not the government/the people/Chávez, draws blood. The speech ends with more “Passion” and “Optimism”.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.1 ANALYSIS

I will in the next section provide an analysis of each individual speech, but first, an overview of Chávez's three speeches. Chávez does not use the word "citizen", or "*ciudadano/a*" very often in these speeches. In fact, the word only appears twice, both cases in the phrase "*Poder Ciudadano*" ("Citizen Power" or "People's Power"). While it may be interesting to investigate and theorize why Chávez uses other words to convey citizenship, I believe in lieu of citizen he used "people" and "Venezuelan", both of which are packed with meaning, for "people" and "Venezuelan" both mean supporter of the revolution here.

Spanakos argued that in Chávez's framework citizenship was awarded only to supporters (2010). We see in the oppositions (rhetorical devices which indicate an implicit statement) culled from Chávez's speeches that *all* positive attributes were extended to his supporters and *all* negative attributes to his opponents. Therefore, in the dichotomies "true Venezuelan/false Venezuelan; majority/minority; government support is Venezuela support/government rejection is Venezuela rejection; Constitution and order/lawlessness; intimacy with the country/out-of-touch with the country; and true Venezuelan soldiers/false Venezuelan soldiers" all positive attributes refer to his supporters. They also encompass aspects of governance and nationhood, such as the Constitution, law, the country, support of government (as opposed to anarchy). I believe

the overarching message of Chávez's revolutionary discourse is unity, and all positive attributes according to this law of unity are interchangeable. Chávez, as an example of this extra-terrestrial unity is, at various turns in his speeches, at once a "soldier", "the people", a "good Venezuelan", 'not a soldier but just a man', and the literal representative of the government and order (which was mandated by God because God takes the side of the people in Chávez's framework).

IV.2. The Three Miraflores Speeches

The Miraflores speeches were not regular speeches. They came at a time when a significant portion of the population wanted Chávez to cease speaking as a president forever, and a perhaps larger portion wanted him to speak out more than ever before. Chavez comments upon the importance of being able to speak to the people. On April 14 Chávez expressed "anguish" at not having been able to communicate to his people, which is certainly understandable, but also underscores the fundamental relationship between speaking and leading, particularly for someone like Chávez who we may want to uncynically believe felt a special closeness with many sectors of his populace. At one point his 'speech act' was a note left in a wastebasket, delivered by a sympathetic Venezuelan Soldier, and later "faxed around the world". This moment of tenuous communication, accompanied by the fact that he cannot reach his people without the media (which belongs to the government, Chávez reminds us) and the hundreds of people who work in the Venezuelan communications industry, is indicative of the inherent (inter)dependency

of the office. Thus the speech-as-speech-act is mediated by the circular truth that the president can command the podium, but only if people listen and support the office.

The main storyline of the three speeches is not the coup, strangely enough. For Chávez, he must protect his country and people from the opposition (the “Oligarchs” and the “Irresponsible People”, who are “Selfishly” working to “Destroy the Country”) and the imperialists. The storyline has a number of twists and turns – notably, his removal from office, and the five locations he was carried to as prisoner. It is worth noting that as Chávez told the story of his imprisonment he hardly acknowledged the coup or his presidential office, when for many the coup against his presidency *was* the story.

Chávez’s positioning of himself is a bit slippery, if only because he moves from one position to another. With Chávez it is unclear as to where he ends and the public begins. He is simultaneously “Not Chávez”, “A Soldier”, “The People”, a “Humble Servant”, and a literal representative of the people, not just a political one, bearing witness to its struggle and its destiny. He effectively said, ‘I am not Chávez, I don’t care about being president. I am the people, who want me to be president’. Whether or not we truly believe Chávez when he says he does not care to be president is immaterial, but we can see his storyline interprets his position as a struggle against good and evil, preordained by both the History of Man and by God. Chávez is a knight who, like the pitcher he mentions who is called from the mound to right field, has traded in his armor for a suit and Presidential sash. At every turn – whether with the soldier who wept upon learning Chávez was unharmed or with the journalist who refused to accept the unsigned announcement of resignation – his narrative insisted he possessed or *was* the will of the

people. The opposition is the outlier or Other in this pre-destined locale of Venezuela. I suspect the two belong only to keep the action in the story going – after all there is no myth without a downfall, no superhero without a foe. He has the duty to serve Venezuela because God and “The People” desire it, and as such he has the right to do as he sees fit for the good of the country.

In prepositioning one “identif[ies] *qualities* which indicate which position the other should occupy” (Harré, et al. 2009, 10, emphasis is mine). Chávez prepositions himself as being selected by God to lead the country (“The will of the people is the will of God”). “The People” are prepositioned as being inherently good and certainly powerful: they are the recipients of a grand “Destiny” and are the majority in a country which respects “Democracy” and “Political Order”. They are also capable of adding pages to the ‘history books of time’. Recalling the oppositions I created from the April 14 speech, “History has been written/Nothing has happened”, being able to write History is quite a significant act. The opposition, by contrast, is “Pitiful”, “Corrupt”, “Selfish”, “Stubborn”, and “Destructive”, to name but a few of their qualities. Curiously, Chávez uses far more adjectives to describe his opposition than he does for his supporters. He does not say his supporters are good, it is implied. He hardly uses adjectives for his supporters at all – they are described through *action*: ‘standing witness at Miraflores’, ‘supplicating the president’, ‘praying for the country and its leader’, ‘weeping’ when evil approaches or triumphs, etc. They may be “Capable” of “Hard Work”, but that adjective is focused upon action and not on their state of being. Chávez worked to describe, and therefore define, the identity of his people and his project as both capable of and destined

to vanquish foes, near and far. He described them not as merely acting a particular way, but as acting in a manner which *defined* who they were. The “dynamic process” that is the act of narrative identity creation occurs between Chávez and his people at each stage of his journey through his speeches in direct relation to how much the people support Chávez.

First-order status is the first instance of positioning, second-order status is to reject or acknowledge and accept the first-order position given (Harré, et al. 2009). Chávez spends a lot of time *prepositioning* his opponents, but he also first-order positions them with the inescapable message that they do not have the right to challenge “Destiny”, “The People”, “The Constitution”, “Law and Order”, or “The Bolivarian Revolution” which their patriarch, Simón Bolívar, delivered to them. (There are images of Bolívar all over Caracas, it may be noted, presumably to remind everyone of his dominance over the region.) The opposition has the duty to be loyal to the country and its people, an absence Chávez bemoans repeatedly and emphasizes they are ‘not even loyal to themselves’. One imagines that which *is* their right to is to enjoy the Bolivarian dream. Chávez mentions that he would like a “quality opposition” that would sit at the national round tables and discuss and constructively critique the Venezuelan situation. Nonetheless, it is difficult to imagine, given Chávez’s vehemence against his opposition, what actual form a “quality” opposition would have. His prepositioning and first-order positioning of his support and opposition reveals that “The People” (his supporters) are real people and are “True Venezuelans”. The opposition are only begrudgingly considered Venezuelans, and that

only sometimes, most notably on the day after he was reinstated to the Office of the Presidency and he spoke in much more conciliatory terms.

The mutual witnessing that Chávez describes between himself and “The People” is another salient theme, as well as a duty Chávez and his supporters have to one another. You don’t witness something unless it is important; bearing witness implies an acknowledgement of the true significance of a thing. Witnessing seems to be at the spiritual heart of Chávez’s revolution. He devoted a lot of time to getting people to see the dream and the vision that he saw, and to believe it. On several occasions he recalls the ‘dream of Venezuela we had in our youth’. In this context it is understandable that to “Witness” this dream and its unfolding is among the greatest acts one could do, in his estimation.

We cannot see the individual contours of the civilian opposition who rejected the first-order positioning imposed on them by Chávez, but we do see protests, a strike, a call for resignation, and a coup, the latter being perhaps the ultimate act of second-order positioning to be done to a sitting president. Chávez, for his part, certainly rejects their re-positioning by declaring ‘there is no strike’. Additionally, while the U.S. does not figure prominently in these three speeches, it looms in the background as another kind of opposition. When he says “our destiny is to be a liberated country free of any empire” he means that Venezuela has the right to escape imperialism. By opposition, we can see in Chávez’s words there exists an empire which desires a hampered, captive Venezuela. The coup, similarly is ignored. While he calls it an “insurrection” and a “conspiracy”, he also calls those who desire a coup ‘just a small number of the opposition’ and speaks as if

tomorrow will be like any other day, when in fact the following day he becomes a prisoner at Fort Tiuna.

There are strong themes of “Fighting” versus “Peace”. When Chávez refers to Allende’s coup in Chile, and he states that the country has the right to fight that sort of threat, as well as the duty to do so:

Thus it is from that point where I call on all of you, to be with your “eyes peeled”, to be continually organized, and continually alert, to be continually disciplined, and above all, to be continually united... I never get tired repeating it, taking the words of our historical leader, the Chief and General Simón Bolívar when he said: ‘Let us unite and let us be invincible’. Let us unite and let us be invincible, in these moments when, I repeat, there is a conspiracy to try and overthrow Hugo Chávez...

This call to action has a vaguely militaristic feel to it, supported by Chávez’s insistence that even though he himself, “The Military”, and “The People” do not want to fight (because they ‘love peace’) they will do so if necessary. Coupled with Chávez’s invocation of the great generals and warriors that came before them (Sucre, Bolívar, etc.) – those who began the revolution but could not finish it – one could infer that the people have the capacity for *noble* fighting in their blood.

To return to the positioning of the U.S., it appears that Chávez, in positioning his people, simultaneously narrated the U.S. (and potentially any other “Empire”) as being supremely capable, and perhaps on the brink, of imposing itself on Venezuela and her people. He implies that the U.S. does not have the right to be involved in the affairs of his country by saying freedom is the life-blood of Venezuela. While he does not say so outright, it is implied that “The People” and Venezuela are *inherently* anti-U.S. because they are on the side of God, “Reason”, Political Order”, “The Constitution”, and

“Destiny”, and because they are the inheritors of a noble line of warriors and Generals. Harré, et al. write “it is just as important to be able to create and sustain conflicts as it is to resolve them. It is simply not true that the moral high ground belongs exclusively to those who seek peace, by whatever means” (2009, 8). Could this statement explain not just the reason for the revolution but also Chávez’s ‘peaceable militant’ language and approach? Chávez positioned himself over and over again as a fighter, one who did not like to fight but felt he had to. The sentiment has also a vaguely Christ-like feel to it, of seeking peace but being strong in the face of injustice. The threat of battle and his need to respond to that threat seems an important aspect to his “moral landscape”.

Finally, “footing” is a useful concept in positioning theory (Harré, et al. 2009, 12) and could be similarly useful in analyzing how Chávez conceived of the complex relationship Venezuela had to the U.S.. “The third-order status of ‘having a footing’ is immanent in the way one can enter into a conversation, a game, a trial, someone’ else’s private affairs, unchallenged, as of right. Someone with ‘footing’ is listened to” (Harré, et al. 2009, 12). Chávez spent much time discussing Venezuela’s “Appearance” to the rest of the world; not appearing crazy, being politically and socially ordered and dignified, and following the rule of law were the qualities he wanted his country to be seen as ruled by. Had Latin America not been positioned as it often is in the U.S. – “the backyard of the U.S.” comes to mind – then perhaps he would not feel so concerned. But appearing mad and receiving the condemnation of the U.S. is not the same thing as the U.S. deciding to help stage a coup – or is it? Chávez seemed to imply that one was, in fact, related to the other. He had to travel the world appealing the “Kings, Princes [and] Heads

of State” to “explain” what the Bolivarian project was about in order to protect not just his sovereignty but also his country’s control of the oil (oil being something he, curiously, he refers to but once in his speeches). This is because he worried that the opposition would acknowledge and accept the imposed footing of the U.S. saying that Chávez was unfit to lead. This desperation is noticeable in this passage from his speech on April 9:

Now, of course it is important to point out the following...this...conspiracy...is attempting to follow the same playbook of other conspiracies and against other governments, but particularly, it is attempting to follow the same playbook that they used against Salvador Allende, there in Chile, 1973, trying to destabilize the economy and from there the intent to paralyze the Venezuelan oil companies... They are attempting to create panic...to lower the morals of the Bolivarian people... They are trying to get military support...

Chávez believes that the U.S. believes that it has the footing to involve itself in the affairs of Venezuela, and Chávez rejects that outright. Through talking about the “Dignity” and “Destiny” of his country, people, and revolution he is attempting to legitimize not just his and their position, but also their very existence.

IV. 2. “Hugo Chávez, The 60 Minutes Interview”

On May 12, 2002 CBS Broadcasting aired an interview with Chávez by Steve Kroft to discuss the recent coup, among other topics (CBS 2013). It is worth noting that an interview deserves different consideration than a speech, to be kept in mind during this interview and the following one by Democracy Now!. To begin, during an interview the subject does not have the same level of control over the content. The interviewee, by

default, often positions the interview subject by posing his or her questions, or prepositions the subject before the interview begins through an introduction, music, images, etc.. The editing process is itself a type of positioning outside of the control of the interview subject. This particular segment was very critical, even dismissive, of Chávez, and this somewhat hostile environment may be one of the reasons why Chávez was not as strident in his critique of the U.S. as at other times. (Although the quoted segment of the interview below is not so harsh, other parts were.) I will provide a series of quote from the interview regarding the coup, and then an analysis. The interview was held in English and Chávez was dubbed over so thoroughly the Spanish was not audible.

Kroft: (Asked about why Chávez decided to go to Iraq before the coup.)

Chávez: Ah, very interesting...to revamp OPEC⁸, which was in shambles. And to ensure for you Americans and out brothers on the continent and the world a secure supply of oil...Some people believe that I am a threat to the United States and to democracy, but I have told them time and time again that this is not true.

Kroft: You knew that would upset the United States.

Chávez: Truly, I tell you frankly, no, I did not know. But if I had known I still would have gone to Baghdad, because what I'm basically doing is defending my country's interests.

Kroft: Did you resign?

⁸ Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries: Algeria, Angola, Ecuador, Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela.

Chávez: No, absolutely not, never, no...This had never happened before. For a president to have been taken prisoner by a large group of generals, a dictatorship takes over, 48 hours later the president is returned, and not a single shot is fired. I do not believe there has been anything like this in the world.

Kroft: Do you believe the U.S. had anything to do with the coup?

Chávez: I do not believe the U.S. had anything to do with the coup, no. I really need to see strong evidence... some reports have turned up, and we are looking into them. Then an unidentified naval vessel and the ambassador met the next morning with the leader of the coup. But the one that should be answering that question is the government of the U.S. I believe they owe that explanation to their own people – and to us.

In this exchange between Chávez and Kroft Chávez, for the most part, has a relaxed tone when it comes to his own attitude toward the U.S., at least relative to many other points during his presidency. This may be because he is ever-concerned with maintaining an image of control, of not being “insane” (he was often portrayed as a buffoon by the U.S. and Venezuelan media) and of the country’s stability, in order to avoid the threat of U.S. footing in Venezuelan affairs.

At the end, however, he points out that the U.S. is beholden to its people for answers, for it is a democracy. In this way Chávez turns the earlier critique against him – that he does not truly support democracy – against the U.S.. This may be one way of asserting the supremacy of people over their government and by default, perhaps, Chávez over the U.S. government for he is one with peoples everywhere.

Apart from his calm, Chavez is ready to defend his country. He backtracks by saying he believes there was no U.S. involvement in the coup, but there was suspicious activity so he will have to look into the facts. Now we now know that Chávez was warned ahead of the April events that a coup might be imminent and that the U.S. knew about it, so we can surmise he was either being cautious or disingenuous in his speech. A third notable point is his expression of being unique in the world, Chávez-as-exception, which he expressed in the Miraflores speeches. Perhaps it is true that “not a single shot was fired” ever in history during the return of a president to his post so soon after being deposed, or perhaps not. But the quality of being unique does not necessarily make something special, or destined by God, as Chávez seems to think.

IV.3. Interview With Democracy Now!

Three years and five months after the coup, on September 19, 2005, Chávez was interviewed by Amy Goodman on the leftist alternative radio program, “Democracy Now!”, which was his first formal interview in the U.S.. One of the reasons I selected this interview because it was one of the very few interviews which contained long sections of Chávez’s discourse. Many others had highly edited clips of his discourse, interspersed with editorial commentary and the opinions of others. Another significant reason I selected this interview was because Chávez was not on the defense on this program. Other interviews with U.S. reporters created a defensive, attacking state (such as the 60 minutes interview) and I wanted to contrast that with a more relaxed interview.

In this interview he largely addressed the U.S. – its role in the coup which he eventually came to believe, and its involvement in Venezuela’s domestic and foreign policy. Similar themes of a concealed or reluctant militarism arise, encapsulated in the title of the interview, “If the Imperialist Government of the White House Dares to Invade Venezuela, the War of 100 Years Will be Unleashed in South America” (Democracy Now! 2005). Chávez’s image of the Venezuelan people as being ‘pure’ or ‘natural’ can be seen in this interview, as well as themes of democracy/socialism versus dictatorship/capitalism. In the following, I will provide a quote from the interview, and then an analysis.

Telling a story about the traffic clogged streets, Chávez says: *“Cars occupying the highways, and burning fuel, how many gallons of fuel were burned yesterday morning, polluting the environment? That’s the extreme of individualism. And public transportation, we don’t see large buses coming from the airport here. So this is pure individualism, this is capitalism... That’s why they planned, first they tried to get the Venezuelan oil and, of course the coup, they staged against us. That was an oil-motivated coup. They want to have the control over Venezuelan oil before going for the Iraq, for Iraq’s oil.* While Chávez directly states that individualism and capitalism are one, and that the coup was oil related, this sentiment also relies upon a syllogism, defined by Feldman and Almquist as a rhetorical device with “a major and minor premise and a conclusion” (2012, 210). The syllogistic aspect is that “These people crave oil. These people are selfish and have no morals. Therefore they will stop at nothing to get oil.” In a contradictory move, at other points Chávez is very supportive of the American people,

particularly as contrasted to their government. He very famously created a program to donate free heating oil to needy U.S. citizens and on many occasions known to talk about loving baseball, New York, Martin Luther King, Jr., and country music.

“In any transformation process, social transformation process, economic transformation process, political – is doomed to fail without the participation of the grassroots and the population. The people, the communities, they are like the fuel... Without them there’s no revolution... That is why when you go to the plenary sessions of the U.N., I feel like oxygen is missing there. Because it is so removed from the reality of the people, of the needs of the people...” This expression achieves three things at once. It celebrates the inherent value of ‘the people’. It also aligns Chávez with the people and points out that he is exceptional for he, and not the other leaders, is able to notice that there is no oxygen at the United Nations’ General Assembly. This sentiment furthermore highlights the power and possibility of the people of being capable to counter the U.N..

“They failed in Venezuela. So they went to attack Iraq... There are still threats over Venezuela. They still think about assassinating me. There are also plans to invade Venezuela. Now, when you know the way of thinking of those in the White House, any insanity is possible. Now, let me tell you this, if the imperialist government of the White House led an invasion against Venezuela, well, the war of 100 years will be unleashed in South America. Because with our teeth, with our nails with our knees, we will go to struggle and defend our dignity in South America. Now, I aspire and I pray to God that this will never occur. We want peace. We want life. We want to have eternal relations with these sister countries, sister nations.” And when asked about his visit to the U.S.,

which he has accused of aiding in the coup against him: *“Let’s talk about life, rather than death, because we are fighting for life. However there are always threats, and those who are devoted to the struggle for life use the truth as a flag and principles as a lifeline. There is no doubt whatsoever that the U.S. government, led by Mr. Bush, planned and participated in a coup d’état in Venezuela in April, 2002. I have much evidence that my assassination was ordered on April the 11th...however thank God and thanks to the Venezuelan people and thanks to the soldiers, Venezuelan soldiers, this order was not accomplished and this order was given by Washington.”*

With these two statements Chávez here returns to the theme of reluctant, or peaceable, militarism. The U.S., by contrast, is inherently blood-thirsty, and also insane or lacking reason, much like his opponents in Venezuela. One gets the sense it stops at nothing for its selfish (“pure individualism”) interests, which was a complaint leveled at his Venezuelan opponents. Chávez acknowledges the power disparity between the two countries by mentioning the fight with “our teeth...our nails...our knees” but I believe he is also aligning himself with the strength of ‘the people’ and God (Provided one is not an atheist, it could be quite easily argued that ‘the people’ are given teeth, nails, and knees by God, and the military is given guns by the government.) Again, Chávez creates a duality with the military, for there is the corrupt military of the U.S., and then the pure military (“thanks to the soldiers, Venezuelan soldiers”). Chávez wants peace, love, and solidarity (“let’s talk about life...”) even though he is able and willing to fight. The symbolism of the power of the ‘rule of law’ and the Constitution are echoed in the statement, “those who are devoted to the struggle for life use truth as a flag and principles

as a lifeline”. Chávez and his supporters follow political order, and this order exists nearly spiritually, inherently.

Asked about his desire to see people of color united around the globe: “...*Bolívar used to say that we are a new human race in Latin America, that we are not Europeans, or Africans, or North Americans. That we are a mixture of all of those races...*”. This is another technique by which Chávez separates himself and his supporters from all others. Those who are willing and able to continue the revolution started by Bolívar are both exceptional (they are a “new human race”) and one with ‘the people’ or ‘the world’ (“a mixture of all those races”). This statement also implies that they are a superior race, for evolution requires the survival of those most adapted to their environment.

In his response to TV evangelist Pat Robertson calling for his assassination, Chávez said: “*But it’s not only Mr. Robertson here... In another TV show, people in uniform, in fatigues, like terrorists. Venezuelans and Americans and Cubans exiled in the United States, and a former agent of the CIA, very recently said on TV that Chávez should be dead already... They threatened Chávez. Chávez is nothing. Who am I? I’m nothing. They are threatening the world. That is serious. They invaded Iraq. Without any reason whatsoever. They violated international law and are ignoring the rules of the U.N. Terrorists bombard complete cities, such as Fallujah, Baghdad, innocent women and children. Now, history is long. Hiroshima for instance— Nagasaki, Grenada, Haiti, Panama, Santo Domingo. No, that is not – they do not represent the people of the United States. They are part of the imperialist dictatorship that the U.S. people are suffering today....*”. While Chávez does not believe all people in uniform or fatigues are terrorists,

he is willing to assert this if they are (supposedly) exiled from his country, from Cuba, or in the CIA. He presented a similar dichotomy at home, where opposition was evil and support was good. He, in effect, allows a social marker – such as the state of being an exile or an opponent – or a symbol – the wearing of fatigues – to stand in for an entire class of person. He prepositions the exiles and CIA agents by saying they are the type of people who would essentially commit crimes against humanity, with their bombing of innocents and breaking of laws. While many people would categorize the detonation of an atomic bomb in Hiroshima differently than the support of a human rights-abusing dictator and a military intervention in Santo Domingo, Chávez does not. These tragedies that have occurred in these locations he names are all proof of evil opponents and an evil U.S. which is the real dictator – not him! Lastly, Chávez continues the same slippery depiction of himself as in the Miraflores speeches by proclaiming he is at once “the world” (namely, ‘the people’) as well as “nothing” and in so doing implicates the people who attack him.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 FINAL THOUGHTS AND CONCLUSION

What have we learned from the way Chávez composed the discourse of citizenship in his revolution? This thesis made the claim that he drew on themes within the Venezuelan and global psyche which described Chávez's positioning of his supporters and opposition in Venezuela and abroad. These themes, his implicit statements, and his overall narrative sketched his "moral landscape". Chávez was shown expressing the supremacy of the people over government, the possibility for purity and destiny in his populace, and the perceived, if not real, likelihood of external or U.S. involvement in Venezuelan affairs. This is consistent with Spanakos' primary findings, namely that citizen was "code" (my phrasing) for "people", which in turn was code for Chávez supporter (2008). We also saw Chávez align himself with the will and the spirit of the people to a near inhuman degree and display a hypocrisy of expectation and judgment in his assessment of his opponents. True to his belief in a government truly led by the people, a participatory democracy, citizens were judged by their actions, as was mentioned earlier ("standing witness at Miraflores", 'supplicating the president', 'praying for the country and its leader', 'weeping' when evil approaches or triumphs, etc.').

V.2. Discussion

An important point about these narratives and themes, or narratively constructed social categories, is that they are resonant to Chávez's audience. Upon the hearing they signify something above and beyond the basic meaning of the word itself. We are forced to consider the implication of his some of Chávez's messages, such as the dualism concerning Venezuelan citizenry, for example, because that dualism is not just a reflection of Chávez's thinking, but very likely affects or influences his supporters, too. Doug Hartmann wrote about the significance of categories or themes in society as regards to race in the U.S.. Using the example of welfare and food stamps he writes that these social service programs are understood to be primarily associated with African Americans, while in fact they are majorly utilized by whites in the U.S.. He explains that in spite of these statistics, all one need to say is "food stamp president"⁹ and some Americans will see negative images of "lazy" African Americans being catered to by the president (Hartmann 2012). I assume there is a similar effect when Chávez says "Constitution" or "The People". These words are codes which have their own histories and power.

This discussion of coded language conceptually fits into the narrative framework known as "genre". Elliott discusses genre, which she defines as a "pattern of narrative and imagery" which can provide a "framework that is culturally shared" (2005, 46). On account of this cultural sharing, genre is "easily communicated and meaningful" (Elliott

⁹ In fact, Newt Gingrich did say this, many times, using this label for Barack Obama in 2011/2012: <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-01-25/gingrich-calling-obama-food-stamp-president-draws-critics.html>

2005, 48). Genre is more commonly used in literature studies, as in a romance or comedy, but is useful to narrators and audiences by providing established storylines with understood expectations (Elliott 2005). One knows a romance story will end with love, and a comedy with a happy ending. Analysis of genre will indicate what the meaning was for the narrator (Elliott 2005), whether to imply tragedy in spite of resistance, as with many Palestinian narratives or perhaps triumph over evil, as with Chávez. A main genre of Chávez's speech is this mythology – a classic tale of good versus evil and a personal quest which ends in the purifying and strengthening of the protagonist. (Joseph Campbell, specifically *The Hero's Journey and the Hero With a Thousand Faces*, provides an extensive discussion of the prototypical heroic mythology.) This, for me, is among the most powerful of narratives in his arsenal, for instead of being merely counter, it attempts to be self-emancipatory. When Alvarez, Dagnino, and Escobar wrote that social movements can be influenced by the conceptualization of the citizen (1998), this is one such potentially powerful conception: that of the hero.

George Lakoff does research on the impact of words and language on the human brain. Arguing that words often fit into frameworks that we carry with us from childhood, and that these frameworks tie into moral frames, we need to reframe some words and how they are used in order to emancipate them from their inhibitory meanings (Smiley and West 2013). He gave an interview on his work on the Smiley and West show, and was asked about the word “poverty”. (It must be stressed that I do not take Lakoff's research on the word poverty in the U.S. to be an exact one-to-one replacement for the word *pobreza* in any Spanish speaking environment. That research would have to be done

separately. For now, Lakoff's work is a compelling way to think about how deeply embedded language is in human society and the mind.) Lakoff answered,

The more that you hear the words that fit one frame, that is a brain circuit frame, the more you hear that the stronger the frame gets, the more of the brain circuit is strengthened and the other is weakened because they are mutually inhibitory. The strengthening of one weakens the other. If you take a word like poor, it doesn't just mean lacking money. It also means poor quality, someone who's unfortunate... That is very important because what you have in general, and very widespread across cultures, is a metaphor in our thinking, not just in words, that value is wealth... When you have a notion like poor, quality is understood in terms of value and wealth. So the idea here is that the very word poor is plugging into a conceptual system that blames the poor for their poverty. That's deep in our thinking, in everybody's thinking. It's very sad... If you start looking at the conceptual system what you find is that there is a reason why wealth is seen as a very good thing in itself, whether you need it or not. And poverty as lowly and why you blame the poor for their poverty and you think the wealthy are wonderful in general and they become celebrities. This has to do with our very conceptual system. (Smiley and West 2013)

Chávez was, I believe, attempting to weaken the brain circuitry of all who believe “wealth is up, poverty is down” (to quote Lakoff [Smiley and West 2013]) or more fundamentally, the oligarchical message of a powerful minority over the majority (recall in the oppositions that majority was on the same, positive side as “good Venezuelan”, “order”, etc.). This is another way to describe second-order positioning, and another way to talk about narrative work in resisting oppressive narratives.

Add to the concept of genre and of moral frameworks of the brain's language centers Donileen Loseke's research on formula stories, and then we may get a clearer picture of Chávez's “moral landscape”. Loseke discusses formula stories as a way to understand the social life of strangers. They are public stories which may not be “grounded in practical experience” but are highly “recognizable” and “understandable”. These stories are very useful in public life as they are frequently employed for use in

public policy, by politicians, teachers, or anyone who wishes to influence the behavior of others (Loseke 2012). Loseke uses the example of the teenage mother in the U.S. as a formula story, but Chávez had many examples of a formula story. One he employs is the story of the corrupt official or citizen. Corruption has been one of the biggest problems to plague Venezuela from the decades before Chávez was born to the time of this writing, so it is unlikely any Venezuelan draws a blank upon hearing this word. Useful as formula stories may be at times, they also run the risk of harmfully typecasting the subjects of those stories (Loseke 2012). Misplaced formula stories, namely ones appropriated to advance public policy or pass a law or fell an opponent, such as the “food stamp president”, may also misdirect public attention away from what is at stake. For example, were the protesters “corrupt” or were they unhappy with Chávez? In Chávez’s revolution, either he created or picked up on an existing formula story of the good citizen’s total participation in democracy.

Simmons argues that we need to look at how class power affects events on the ground and that “we [ought to] recognize that cultural power and class power are logically separable, even when they are rarely separate” (2013). Through his discussion of citizenship, Chávez conflated class power (and class conflict) and cultural power (and cultural conflict) in his revolution, even if he managed to despise George W. Bush but yet love American hot dogs and baseball stadiums. Flawed as Chávez’s approach may have been, he jettisoned the Cold War-era fear of *appearing* to embrace Marxism and pursued Goliath (which is ironic because in fact he actually did reject Marxism). I have my doubts

that for the vast majority of people, necessary lessons on the evils of class structuration can be gleaned from such an individual and his revolution, polemic as he was.

V.3. Conclusion

This thesis has shown that Chávez propagated dualistic categories regarding citizenship as it describes his supporters and his opponents. He also was dismissive of his opponents, describing the mass demonstrations, for example, as a handful of protestors. We may ask from a practical perspective, did he create dualities which gave this conflict life as opposed to resolve it? Spanakos writes, “*Chavista* discourse along with the opposition’s similarly polarizing language make it nearly impossible not to take sides. Polarization also encourages a centripetal tendency toward all politics around Chávez” (2008, 528). It seems clear that by positioning some elements in his country as either ‘for Chávez’ or ‘for the U.S.’, or ‘true Venezuelan’ or ‘False Venezuelan’, was likely tremendously unhelpful and conflict-producing. Complexity is inherent in life, as are oxymoronic behavior and idiosyncrasy. Narratives may either explore and reveal the complexity or they may mask it. In suppressing this complexity Chávez’s narratives about the revolution become “thin”, and do not represent a fuller truth about its subjects (Cobb 2003). Chávez picked up on and utilized some main narratives in Venezuela, but he often oversimplified them through his lack of attention to nuance, and through criticizing the very reasons his opposition opposed him. Recall that Chávez was pejorative in discussing his opponents. He described them primarily through adjective, or through exaggerated accounts of their actions (i.e. ‘They are working to destroy the

country’ as opposed to ‘they are protesting’). His supporters, by contrast, were described primarily by their actions, and this attitude reflects the fact that he did not know his opponents very well. Chávez presumed what their motivations were, which is no way to build consensus and community.

Chávez hoped for human freedom and equality, but it is not clear that it is possible to achieve freedom and equality through the suppression of alternative narratives – namely, those of the non-citizens – which is exactly what he did. Furthermore, even before the coup his stance toward the U.S. was characterized, indeed defined by, defensiveness. Judgment of this attitude aside, from counternarrative studies it is clear that defensiveness often serves to perpetrate the dominant, delegitimizing narrative (Nelson 2001) and the first-order positioning that was so offensive in the first place. In an ideal world we may position ourselves not defensively, not reactively, but simply as we choose. Impossible as this world may be, there are better and worse ways to manage unjust scenarios. For these reasons it is not clear he effectively stopped the perpetuation of existing norms, values, and power relations between not just himself and his opponents, but between his country and the United States. Chávez’s narrative refers to fault lines in Venezuelan and global society, but it does little to mend those lines.

V.4. Limitations of the Research and Possible Areas of Further Research

There are some drawbacks to performing research from afar. For narrative analysis, it is critical to study the words of Chávez in their original Spanish. I have translated all discourse in this thesis and focused my analysis on the translated product,

but there are at least two analytical approaches I will draw on for this thesis, that of Feldman and Almquist and that of Loseke , which may not work as well through a translation. Second, in spite of finding a number of interviews and speeches in Spanish, transcriptions or recordings of his speeches are less commonly available online than news articles about him. In some cases I located a recorded speech which was dubbed or interpreted so thoroughly in English the original Spanish was inaudible. Somewhat relatedly, speeches on Venezuelan domestic events are more difficult to find online than his international speeches (for instance, a Google search on Chávez’s infamous speech at the United Nations in 2006 when he called then President George W. Bush the “devil” yielded twice as many results as a search for his response to the April 2002 coup). Third, the main sources of online Chávez speeches I had hoped to access – Aló Presidente and the Government of Venezuela’s archive page – experienced such technical difficulties they were effectively unusable. However this is a factor I ascribe to being abroad, rather than blaming the websites themselves. Finally, I acknowledge the decision to only study Chávez’s speeches and not look at other data sites limited the type of analysis I could perform, such as look at his narrative within a specific context, or do a comparison from one context to another.

Rather than grumble about the inevitable drawbacks, it is important to also consider the reasons why they exist, or better yet, to consider why they are viewed as drawbacks in the first place. Do I have developed-country expectations regarding online access to presidential speeches? Might media sources privilege some sorts of news over others? The prevalence of certain types of Chávez speeches and media coverage in

English reflects, I believe, the economic and social dominance of English-speaking media producers and consumers on the internet. Finally, some of these challenges may merely reflect my imperfect Spanish (causing me, perhaps, to overlook some resources a native speaker would have noticed), my relative inexperience as a researcher, or my location (IP addresses being sometimes-constricting – in spite of entering Spanish search terms, Google knew I was in Virginia and often fed me U.S. hits!).

There are at least a couple of areas of possible future research stemming from the findings of this thesis. Dominguez, Lievesley, and Ludlam (2011) have done research on the right wing reaction to the leftist trend in Latin America. In the face of declining U.S. hegemony and the rebuke of neoliberalism, right wing movements all over Latin America have been growing (2011). While this response to leftist governments is not at an alarming level, it could grow. The work of this thesis, contributing to understanding the meaning behind the Bolivarian Revolution, could provide a starting point to resolving any conflict between these two poles.

This thesis, by design, did not explore what the significance of these words or codes were for anyone apart from Chávez (unlike Hartmann's 2012 article, which references works which study racially coded language as understood by greater American society). But applying Hartmann's concept of coded language and answering the question, what might these themes have meant for scores of Venezuelans?, could be a critical next step for research into unraveling the narratives of this conflict. Further, the concept of coded language is useful when applied to the implicit in Chávez's speech. While Chávez may have used inflammatory language to describe his opponents, he spent

much more time discussing his supporters, his cause, and the overall state of *Chavismo* in light of the opposition. Through studying what he said, and locating the implied opposing statement, one could launch of full study of coded language in Chávez's speech.

More importantly, non-violent revolutions or social movements are not only welcome, but understanding how they function is as well. Through a further look at the role of the citizen in a nonviolent social movement, contrasted with citizens' perspectives (such as Spanakos sought), and supplemented with the historical and greater contextual role of the citizen in Latin or South America, one may get a better glimpse of this fundamental aspect of massive social change.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abowitz, Kathleen Knight and Jason Harnish. 2006. Contemporary discourses of citizenship. *Review of Educational Research* 76, No. 4 (Winter): 653-690.
- Al Jazeera America. 2009. US 'likely behind' Chavez coup: Jimmy Carter says US certainly knew about plan to overthrow Venezuelan leader in 2002. September 21. <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/americas/2009/09/200992116049879437.html>. Last Accessed December 3, 2013.
- Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina Dagnino, Arturo Escobar. 1998. Introduction: The Cultural and The Political in Latin American Social Movements. In *Culture of politics, politics of cultures: Re-visioning Latin American social movements*, eds. Sonia Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, Arturo Escobar. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Aponte-Moreno, Marco and Lance Lattig. 2012. Rhetoric made in Havana. *World Policy Journal* 29, No. 33. <http://wpj.sagepub.com/content/29/1/33>.
- Arias, Omar. 2011. First two years of life are key to good jobs. World Bank, World Bank Blogs (August 24). <http://blogs.worldbank.org/latinamerica/first-two-years-of-life-are-key-to-good-jobs>. Last accessed December 6, 2013.
- Archakis, Argiris and Angeliki Tzanne. 2005. Narrative positioning and the construction of situated identities: Evidence from conversations of a group of young people in Greece. *Narrative Inquiry* 15, No. 2: 267-291.
- Avruch, Kevin. 2003. Chapter 8: Culture. *Conflict: From analysis to intervention*, eds. Sandra Cheldelin, Daniel Druckman, and Larissa Fast. London and New York: Continuum.
- Avruch, Kevin and Peter Black. 1991. The Culture Question and Conflict Resolution. *Peace and Change* 16, No. 1 (January).
- Avruch, Kevin. 2012. Chapter 9: Conflict resolution and the dilemma of power. *Context and pretext in conflict resolution: Culture, identity, power, and practice*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

- Azzellini, Dario. 2013. The communal state: Communal councils, communes, and workplace democracy. NACLA Report on the Americas. North American Congress on Latin America (Summer).
- Bamberg, Michael. 2004. Chapter 2.3: Positioning with Davie Hogan. *Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society*, eds. Collette Daiute and Cynthia Lightfoot. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bossi, Fernando. *n.d.* 10 points to understand the ALBA – Constructing the ALBA from within the people. The Bolivarian Peoples' Congress online portal. http://www.alianzabolivariana.org/que_es_el_alba.php. Last accesses January 2, 2014.
- Brockmeier, Jens and Rom Harré. 2001. Narrative: Problems and Promises of An Alternative Paradigm. *Narrative and identity: Studies in autobiography, self and culture*, eds. Jens Brockmeier and Donal Carbaugh. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bruner, Jerome. 2004. *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, Jerome. 2004. Life As Narrative. *Social Research* 71, No. 3: 691–710.
- Bullock, Marcus. 2013. The Origins of Empathy, and its Use for Conflict Resolution. Talk given at George Mason University's School for Conflict Resolution through the Center for Narrative and Conflict on October 11, 2013.
- Büthe, Tim. 2002. Taking temporality seriously: Modeling history and the use of narratives as evidence. *American Political Science Review* 96, No. 3 (September).
- Casebeer, William D., and James A. Russell. 2005. Storytelling and terrorism: Towards a comprehensive 'counter-narrative strategy'. *Strategic Insights* IV No. 3 (March).
- Cashman, Ray. 2012. Situational Context and Interaction in a Folklorist's Ethnographic Approach to Storytelling. *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*, eds. James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium. California, United Kingdom, India, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- CBS (CBS Broadcasting, Inc.). 2013. Hugo Chavez: The 60 Minutes interview with Steve Kroft. First aired May 12, 2002, published March 5, 2013. <http://www.cbsnews.com/video/watch/?id=50141941n>. Last accessed November 10, 2013.

- The Central Intelligence Agency World Fact Book (CIA Factbook). Venezuela. 2011. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ve.html>.
- Chávez Frías, Hugo Rafael and Haiman Eltroudi, Director del Despacho del Presidente. 2005. Speech of the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías, Regarding the Opposition's National Strike, April 9, 2002. *Año de la resistencia antiimperialista: Selección de discursos del Presidente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías*. Año 4, Tomo IV. Caracas, Venezuela: Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República.
- Chávez Frías, Hugo Rafael and Haiman Eltroudi, Director del Despacho del Presidente. 2005. "Message from the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías, With the Intention of Denouncing the Insurrectionist Plan of the Opposition to the Country, April 11, 2002". *Año de la resistencia antiimperialista: Selección de discursos del Presidente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías*. Año 4, Tomo IV. Caracas, Venezuela: Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República.
- Chávez Frías, Hugo Rafael and Haiman Eltroudi, Director del Despacho del Presidente. 2005. Message from the President of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías, With the Motive of Restoring Power, April 14, 2002. *Año de la resistencia antiimperialista: Selección de discursos del Presidente de la República Bolivariana de Venezuela, Hugo Chávez Frías*. Año 4, Tomo IV. Caracas, Venezuela: Ediciones de la Presidencia de la República.
- Jones, Patrice M. 2002. Chavez restored, vows changes Venezuelan urges calm after 2-day coup comes to end. *Tribune*. April 15. http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2002-04-15/news/0204150215_1_hugo-chavez-chavez-strongholds-venezuelan. Last accessed December 3, 2013.
- Cobb, Sara. 2003. Fostering coexistence in identity-based conflicts: Toward a narrative approach. *Imagine Coexistence: Restoring Humanity After Violent Identity-Based Conflicts*, eds. Antonia Chayes and Martha Minow. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Democracy Now!. 2005. Hugo Chavez: 'If the Imperialist Government of the White House Dares to Invade Venezuela, the War of 100 Years Will be Unleashed in South America'. Interview with Amy Goodman, Juan Gonzalez, and Maragret Prescod. September 19. http://www.democracynow.org/2005/9/19/hugo_chavez_if_the_imperialist_government.
- Dollard, John, Neal E. Miller, Leonard W. Doob, O. Hobart Mowrer, Robert R. Sears. 1939. *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Dominguez, F., G. Lievesley, and S. Ludlam. 2011. *Right wing politics in the new Latin America: Reaction and revolt*. Zed Books.
- Du Toit, Louise. 1997. Cultural identity as narrative and performance. *South African Journal of Philosophy* 16 No. 3: 85-93.
- Eckstein, Susan. 2001. *Power and popular protest: Latin American social movements*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Elliott, Jane. 2005. *Using Narrative in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Ellner, Steve. 2002. The "radical" thesis on globalization and the case of Venezuela's Hugo Chávez. *Latin American Perspectives* 29, No. 6, Globalization and Globalism in Latin America and the Caribbean (November): 88-93. Sage Publications.
- Ellner, Steve. 2010. *Rethinking Venezuelan Politics*. Hardcover original 2008.
- Feldman, Martha S. and Julka Almquist 2012. Analyzing the implicit in stories. *Varities of Narrative Analysis*, eds. James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium. California, United Kingdom, India, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Galtung, Johan. 1969. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*. 6, No. 3: 167-191. Sage Publications.
- Hajer, Maarten A. 1995 Chapter Two: Discourse Analysis. *The politics of environmental discourse : ecological modernization and the policy process*. Oxford : Clarendon Press, (332).
- Harré, Rom, Fathali M. Moghaddam, Tracey Pilkerton Cairnie, Daniel Rothbart, and Steven R. Sabat. 2009. Recent Advances in Positioning Theory. *Theory and Psychology* 19, No. 5.
- Hartmann, Doug. 2012. A Racial Decoder Ring. *The Society Pages*, The Editor's Desk. January 24. <http://thesocietypages.org/editors/2012/01/24/a-racial-decoder-ring/>
- Holstein, James A. and Jaber F. Gubrium. 2012. Introduction. *Varities of Narrative Analysis*, eds. by James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium. California, United Kingdom, India, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7, Nos. 1-4: 3-38.

- Lander, Edgardo. 2005. Venezuelan Social Conflict in a Global Context. *Latin American Perspectives* 32, No. 2 Venezuelan exceptionalism revisited: The unraveling of Venezuela's model democracy (March): 20-38. Sage Publications.
- "Los hechos y las frases que marcaron la vida de Hugo Chávez" (The noteworthy acts and phrases of Hugo Chávez's life). March 6, 2013. Published by Videoviviente. YouTube video.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fo3j74yGh0E&feature=em-subst_digest-vrecc.
 Last accessed November 7, 2013.
- Loseke, Donileen R. 2012. The Empirical Analysis of Formula Stories. *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*, eds. James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium. California, United Kingdom, India, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Maines, David R. 1999. Information Pools and Racialized Narrative Structures. *The Sociological Quarterly* 40, No. 2.
- Mishler, Elliot. 1995. Models of Narrative Analysis. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 5, No. 2: 87–123.
- Nelson, Hilde Lindemann. 2001. *Damaged Identities, Narrative Repair*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Petras, J. F., and M. H. Morley, 1990. *U.S. hegemony under siege: Class, politics, and development in Latin America*. Verso.
- Ramsbotham, Oliver, Tom Woodhouse, and Hugh Miall. 2012. *Contemporary conflict resolution: The prevention, management and transformation of deadly conflict (3rd Edition)*. Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Shifter, Michael. 2006. In search of Hugo Chávez. *Foreign Affairs* 85, No. 3 (May - June): 45-59. Council on Foreign Relations.
- Shuman, Amy. 2012. Exploring Narrative Interaction in Multiple Contexts. *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*, eds. James A. Holstein and Jaber F. Gubrium. California, United Kingdom, India, Singapore: SAGE Publications.
- Simmons, Solon. 2013. The most dangerous word in the field: class. S-CAR Newsletter 7, No. 6 (November).
- Smiley, Tavis and Cornell West. 2013. Radio Transcript from the Smiley and West Show. Podcast interview with George Lakoff. Download and transcript available: http://www.empathysurplus.com/lakoff_on_freedom_radio_transcript_from_smil

ey_and_west. Posted by Chuck Watts March 27, 2013. Last accessed January 5, 2014. Originally aired March 8.

Spanakos, Anthony Peter. 2008. New Wine, Old Bottles, Flamboyant Sommelier: Chávez, Citizenship, and Populism. *New Political Science* 30, No. 4.

Spanakos, Anthony Peter. 2010. Citizen Chávez: The state, social movements, and publics. *Latin American Perspectives* 38, No. 14 (October). Originally published online.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2000. Human Development Report. Venezuela.
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/national/latinamericathecaribbean/venezuela/name,3016,en.html>.

Vulliamy, Ed. 2002. Venezuela coup linked to Bush team: Specialists in the 'dirty wars' of the Eighties encouraged the plotters who tried to topple President Chávez. *Guardian*, The Observer section, "Worldview". April 21.
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2002/apr/21/usa.venezuela>. Last accessed December 3, 2013.

World Bank. 2013. Inclusion Matters (October 9).

World Bank. 2011. Strengthening Skills and Employability in Peru. Human Development Sector Management Unit, Andean Country Management Unit Latin America and the Caribbean Region. Report No. 61699- PE (May 23). Last accessed December 6, 2013.

Yashar, Deborah J. 1998. Contesting citizenship: Indigenous movements and democracy in Latin America. *Comparative Politics* 31, No. 1(October): pp. 23-42. Ph.D. Program in Political Science of the City University of New York. Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/422104>

BIOGRAPHY

After graduating from St. John's College, with a B.A. in Liberal Arts and Classics in 1998, Sarah Ochs worked in her mother's private art conservation studio in Richmond, Virginia for many years. Moving from apprentice to technician, specializing in the restoration of picture frames, she also served as the web designer, archivist, office manager, bookkeeper, and even chef. The next chapter of her professional experience was in the nonprofit field, where she primarily worked in local community programs and then branched out into early childhood education, event planning, grant research, and art gallery management. Eventually she moved into the international arena, where she focused on peacebuilding programs, research, and the study of how to merge understanding micro-level processes' interaction with the macro. One of her primary loves, however, is travel, and she has managed to make her way to different spots on the globe working in construction, in kitchens, in communications and research, as a student, and simply as a tourist. She received her Master of Science from George Mason University in 2014 and is currently applying to PhD programs in conflict resolution and sociology.