

North Atlantic Treaty - a global document in a Critical Discourse Analysis

Cao Duy Trinh*

*College of Natural and Social Sciences, Thai Nguyen University,
Quyết Thắng Commune, Thai Nguyen City*

Received 05 December 2007

Abstract. In this small piece of work, I am doing a critical discourse analysis on a global text: The North Atlantic Treaty. The document is global because it is a direct product of the globalization process world-wide where the giant, powerful and influential capitalist western countries with their joined efforts, at first, have been trying to protect their benefits and then, more importantly, imposing their foreign - affair policies on other countries at their own will. Only the application of Critical Discourse Analysis developing on the basis of the Systemic Functional Grammar will help us in working out the targeted results: pointing out the nature of the Treaty. The Systemic Functional Grammar deals with the social aspects of the language, with the relations of language and social life which are either explicitly or implicitly expressed. In the limit of an article, we cannot revise all the key notions of Critical Discourse Analysis such as Ideology, Power and Power Relation or notions of the Systemic Functional Grammar. We just have a quick introduction of Critical Discourse Analysis itself and the process of Globalization before analyzing the document. Other theoretical concepts will be taken for granted, for the readers can seek for them in the readings mentioned in the references herein and other extensive relevant ones. The purpose of the article is, expectedly, to help in unveiling, by means of a quick analysis of the North Atlantic Treaty, the hidden power relations ideologically carried in it by means of language (we know many a time they are implied elsewhere between the lines of a text).

1. Introduction

The world has been turning "flat" in the process of globalization. A "global document" means a product of the globalization process when the interests of different nations are dependent on each other, with the "inferiors" being more relied on the "superiors". In the light of Critical

Discourse Analysis (CDA), a global document is not only a linguistic discourse of socio-political reflection but it also helps to construct and build power relations ideologically in language. In this article, we are briefly reviewing some key concepts of Globalization, Critical Discourse Analysis, positions of US and NATO worldwide before doing a quick analysis of the North Atlantic Treaty, using Critical Discourse Analysis, as a small case study.

By analyzing of the text of the North Atlantic Treaty, I am hoping to find out if it,

* Tel.: 84-(0280) 856215

E-mail: trtrnhan@yahoo.com

in the Globalization process, really carries **some hidden power** and if **this power has been ideologically handled in the language of the text**. In the first place, I am pointing out the historical and political backgrounds of the Treaty as part of the analysis because Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough) [1] considers them as the context of a text production and interpretation. Secondly, as far as linguistics is concerned, I am addressing some significant indicators: the title, the structure, the wordings and the uses of verb tenses in the Treaty.

2. Globalization, Critical Discourse Analysis, North Atlantic Treaty and the analysis

2.1. Globalization

What is "globalization"- the word which has been repeatedly used nowadays?

This is one of the typical answers:

"Globalization is a process of interaction among the people, companies, and governments of different nations, a process driven by international trade and investment and aided by information technology. This process has effects on the environment, on culture, on political systems, on economic development and prosperity, and on human physical well-being in societies around the world" (Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2002).

During globalization, efforts have been said to be made for the reduction of the gaps between companies, organizations, nations. Actually, these gaps seem to have been increased. On the surface of it, this process has been operating as a natural rule, which cannot be easily denied or obtained subjectively. Thus, some people have compared it with a flame and, therefore, they

say they cannot judge whether it is good or bad. Anyway, in the "game" of the world, there is probably no "fair play" between the rich and the poor, the prosperous and the short, the developed and the underdeveloped. The "law" always supports the superiors. Is there really a "win-win" relation? - Hardly ever, we believe.

The membership in an international organization can also be regarded as one of the criteria to measure the levels of globalization. The membership in NATO of its members can be, therefore, considered as one of indicators of this process.

2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis

What R. Rogers [2] wrote below can be regarded as an appropriate definition of CDA:

"CDA is both a theory and method. Researchers who are interested in the relationship between language and society use CDA to help them describe, interpret, and explain such relationship. CDA is different from other discourse analysis methods because it not only a description and interpretation of discourse in context, but also offers an explanation of how and why discourse works. CDA is a domain of critical applied linguistics".

And Tern A. van Dijk [3] talked about it:

"CDA does not primarily aim to contribute to a specific discipline, paradigm, school or discourse theory. It is primarily interested and motivated by pressing social issues, which it hopes to better understand through discourse analysis".

There are eight principles of CDA offered by Fairclough and Wodak [4], namely (1) it addresses social problems;(2) Power relations are discursive; (3) Discourse constitutes society and culture; (4) Discourse does

ideological work; (5) Discourse is historical; (6) A socio-cognitive approach is needed to understand how relations between texts and society are mediated; (7) Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory and uses a systematic methodology; and (8) CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm.

We see that CDA is not only interested in the function of the language but, in that analysis, discourse is clearly viewed as a social practice, operating in an environment of systemic functional grammar.

L.A. Wood, R.O. Kroger [5] wrote about eight theoretical approaches to CDA introduced by Fairclough and Wodak [4]: French discourse analysis (e.g., Foucault, 1972; Pecheux, 1975), critical linguistics (Fowler, Hodge, Kress and Trew, 1998), social semiotics (Hodge and Kress, 1988), socio cultural change and change in discourse (Fairclough, 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1995), socio-cognitive studies (van Dijk, 1993b), discourse- historical method (Wodak, 1996, 1999); reading analysis, and the Duisburg School.

This type of analysis is "critical" because it is associated with studying power relations. Corson [6] wrote that his aim is to "*explore hidden power relation between a piece of discourse and wider social and cultural formations*" and he has an interest in "*uncovering inequality, power relationships, injustices, discrimination, bias, etc*".

Fairclough [1] has had the ideas in common with most of the above interpretations of CDA when he wrote that people research or write about social matters, they inevitably influenced in the way they perceive those matters, in the choice of topics and the way they approach them, as well as by their own social experiences and values

and political commitment. This viewpoint shares the idea of van Dijk who regarded CDA as an analysis "with attitude"

About the "discourse" component in CDA, Roger [2] showed that CDA framework traces its linguistic genealogy to critical linguistics and systematic functional linguistics. Language responds to the functions of language use and has different functions to perform. Language use is always social and analyses of language occur above the unit of a sentence or clause.

The term "analysis" in CDA is used due to change of a shift from traditional theoretical study to the analysis of use. It also proves the change in viewpoints about the nature of language (Nguyễn Hoà) [7]. And *language is no longer a simple a communicative tool but a social fact and practice, a way of life, an action and a part of a culture* (Cao Duy Trinh) [8].

Taking all above together, to understand a treaty, here the North Atlantic Treaty, we need to consider the social context it emerged and the community it serves (Wodak) [9], in the light of a CDA.

2.3. Critical Discourse Analysis of North Atlantic Treaty

The discourse of the North Atlantic Treaty is, in fact, a formal agreement among the 12 member signatories (for the time being in 1949) to a military collective defense among them. The discourse contains a hidden power expressed in its title, wordings, content, structure and syntax. The treaty is signed to, in the first place, protect the benefits of the western countries and to build a powerful force for their intervention in whatever affairs in the world beneficial to them. Some review may help to clarify the issues.

The North Atlantic Treaty

Washington D.C. - 4 April 1949

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty :

Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened

Article 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Article 6

For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack: on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France, (2) on the territory of Turkey or on the Islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer; on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organised as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defence committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of other signatories.

Footnotes

The definition of the territories to which Article 5 applies was revised by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey and by the Protocols signed on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany and of Spain.

On January 16, 1963, the North Atlantic Council heard a declaration by the French Representative who recalled that by the vote on self-determination on July 1, 1962, the Algerian people had pronounced itself in favour of the independence of Algeria in co-operation with France. In consequence, the President of the French Republic had on July 3, 1962, formally recognised the independence of Algeria. The result was that the "Algerian departments of France" no longer existed as such, and that at the same time the fact that they were mentioned in the North Atlantic Treaty had no longer any bearing. Following this statement the Council noted that insofar as the former Algerian Departments of France were concerned, the relevant clauses of this Treaty had become inapplicable as from July 3, 1962.

2.4. US and NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty was signed on 4th of April 1949, forming NATO - a "regional defense alliance" - at the beginning of the Cold War. NATO has its headquarter in Brussels, Belgium. The original signatories were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Greece and Turkey were admitted to the alliance in 1952, West Germany in 1955, and Spain in 1982. In 1990, the newly unified Germany replaced West Germany as a NATO member. After the formal end of the Cold War in 1991, NATO reached out to former members of the Warsaw Pact, the communist military alliance created in 1955 by the USSR to counter NATO. In 1999, former Warsaw Pact members as Hungary, Poland, and the Czech Republic became members of NATO, bringing the total membership to 19 nations.

In 2002, Russia, once the USSR's largest republic, became a limited partner in NATO as a member of the NATO Russia Council. The same year NATO invited the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, formerly part of the USSR, to join, along with Slovenia, formerly part of Communist Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, Romania, and Slovakia, once part of Czechoslovakia. These countries have become members of NATO since 29th of March, 2004. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Romania were all former Warsaw Pact members. NATO organization is now consisting of 26 countries.

It is said that "The original purpose of NATO was to defense Western Europe against possible attack by Communist nations, led by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR)". And: "NATO's purpose

is to enhance the stability, well-being, and freedom of its members through a system of collective security. Members of the alliance agree to defend one another from attack by other nations. Over the years the existence of NATO has led to closer ties among its members and to a growing community of interests. The treaty has provided a model for other collective security agreements".

It is also said that "Western leaders believed the policies of the USSR threatened international stability and peace" which "appear to many as the first steps of World War III", that resulted in the North Atlantic Treaty (Encarta) [10].

Actually, to understand the event correctly, we must be able to see that United States, though always placed at the bottom of NATO list, together with the United Kingdom due to the alphabetical order, has always been playing a very important role for its own interest in running different organizations, including NATO, when participating in them. United States has been acting as the most economically powerful and therefore the aggressive and affluent leader with its great ambition to dominate the Atlantic (together with European alliances) and the whole World, especially since the end of World War II. Trying to ignore this fact, Microsoft Encarta Library [10] still admitted that: "In its first decade NATO was mainly a military organization dependent on U.S. power for security and for the revival of Europe's economy and national governments." Some following "purges" of US and NATO show that the present situation does not much changed and other countries in the "US-led" organizations are still acting in the shade of the barbarous empire for its benefits, especially since the demise of the Soviet Union.

In 1995 the United States and NATO “began serious efforts to bring to an end the continuing war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which threatened European stability. Leaders of the NATO alliance authorized a campaign of air strikes against Bosnian Serb positions to force the Bosnian Serbs to negotiate a peace settlement” (Encarta) [10].

United States and British forces launched a four-day series of air strikes on December 16, 1998, “to punish Iraq for failing to cooperate with United Nations (UN) arms inspectors”.

In 1999, NATO forces began a campaign of air strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY, now the republic of Serbia and Montenegro). The NATO strikes were launched after Yugoslav president Slobodan Milosevic’s “refused to accept an international peace plan that would granted a period of autonomy for the Yugoslav province of Kosovo”.

In Afghanistan, American and British forces “began aerial bombing of al-Qaeda camps and Taliban military positions” on October, 7, 2001.

For U.S -Iraq War in 2003, military action led by the United States was against Saddam Hussein, the leader of Iraq. Announcing the beginning of the war in March 2003, US president George W. Bush explained that the goals were to “disarm Iraq [and] to free its people.” And “President had threatened war for months, accusing Iraq of stockpiling weapons of mass destruction and arguing that Saddam Hussein’s regime posed a grave threat to U.S. security. The United State launched the attack despite failing to win explicit endorsement from the United Nation (UN). Key members of the UN Security Council- including France, Russia, and China- strongly opposed the use of force without clear UN approval. Nevertheless, the United kingdom, Australia, and Poland agreed to contribute troops to the U.S.-led war effort” (Phan Thi Huong) [11].

US (together with NATO at times) always have some reasons for their attacks. We wonder how United States allows itself to set the world right? The military interference of US with a “warning blow” into the sovereignty of the countries is forming a precedent and making the world concerned. And it is funny that US always mention the United Nations once they make their own decision in the wars.

2.5. US and the Treaty

As we predict, in the Treaty, US always appears as the center of the organization with its initial (and decisive) role. In the articles 10, 11, 13, 14 we can find a procedure with the control of US over any accession and denunciation of any countries or in any text ratification, deposition of the Treaty.

2.6. United Nations

The United Nations, the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council are among the words repeated here. In deed, in US wars, especially the recent Iraq war, we do not find respect of US government towards the United Nations. When they attacked Iraq they said because Iraq had “weapons of massive destruction”, “weapons programs”, “chemical and biological weapons” etc. but when they found no trace of “these threatening” and neither could they prove that, they just ignored what they said in silence. They have seriously and boldly violated the Charter of the United Nations while making full use of this organization.

2.7. The title: a geographical name

The title of the treaty simply recalls geographical features of an area on earth. The

area locates in the North of Atlantic Ocean. It does not mention the real purposes of the foundation which all these Western and American signatories pursue. We can ask question like why it is not, for example, a North Atlantic MILITARY Treaty? Actually, North Atlantic is the common border of the United States and other powerful European countries (but Russian is an exception!). This organization always aims at influencing the Europe, though by the time of its establishment, many "Eastern" European countries were belonging to Warsaw Pact- the socialist system. Once people hear or see the name of the foundation, they may not find themselves thinking of a military alliance which may threaten the peace and security of other nations. Isn't it an excellent disguise?

2.8. The structure and wordings of the Treaty

We find the Treaty with a preamble and 14 articles. The preamble states the purpose of the treaty: "to promote the common values of its members" and "to unite the efforts for collective defense". Article 1 call for peaceful resolution of disputes. Article 2 pledges the parties to economic and political cooperation.

Right in the opening of the Treaty, in the preamble, we can see a lot of humane wordings like: *peace and security, stability and well-being, civilization, freedom, liberty* and the rules of law. The wars and interference of US, Britain and NATO against different nations mentioned before make people doubtful about "the real values" of these "civilizations".

The Treaty may consider the military power collection of the members of NATO to rule the world rather than to defense themselves. Anyway, from article 3 to 8 of the Treaty, NATO always talk about their "self-defense": Article 3 calls for

development of the capacity for defense. Article 4 provides for joint consultations when a member is threatened. Article 5 promises the use of members' armed forces for collective "self-defense". Article 6 defines the areas covered by the Treaty. Article 7 affirms the precedence of members' obligations "under the United Nations Charter". Article 8 about the safeguards against conflict with any other treaties of the signatories.

From Article 9 to 14, the Treaty considers the administrative procedures of the operation of the organization, opening to other countries for admission. However, we know that NATO is NATO: Russia is only a limited partner of this organization in 2002 which means that Russia can only take part in discussions about NATO decisions but have no binding vote. NATO always fear for a threat of its security and interest. This also explains why Russia have been applying for joining WTO for 13 years but is still being pended now.

So, the structure and wordings of the Treaty may bring people an impression of a "peaceful and development" organization. Unless they look at what NATO and US have done in Europe and the Middle East, they still believe in the "good will" of the Treaty and this organization.

2.9. Syntax of the Treaty: verb tenses

We are not using the grammar system of intransitivity (M.A.K. Halliday) [12] to examine "who do what to whom" in this analysis. However, the study of the repetition or majority use of some verb tenses must have indicated some power that has been significantly and ideologically expressed.

Except for the Preamble with all 5 simple present tense verb uses, in the Treaty, among

the total 33 verb phrases used in the Treaty in the main clause, there are 15 uses of "shall", 18 of "will", 6 of simple present, 2 of "may" and 2 of present perfect.

The Preamble just describes the purposes of the Organization and present verb tenses seem suitable. The message we obtain from meanings of the verbs used is that the countries involving in the Treaty are active, voluntary and determined to join this Organization. That is why the choices of verbs are like: *re-affirm, are determined, seek to promote, are solved to unite, therefore agree to* etc.

For the modal auxiliaries in the Treaty, mainly "shall" and "will" are used. This is understandable because the Treaty also operates as a law. Radolph Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum in "A University Grammar of English" [13] showed that "shall/should" have some uses to express willingness, intention and insistence. Moreover, they stated, "shall/should" can be used in legal and quasi-legal injunction. In case of "will" in this Treaty, we think it has the same meaning and it acts as an alternative to "shall" to make the text more literarily flexible. "Shall" and "will" here both indicate the obligations the partners have to fulfill. We know that a treaty/organization will not only bring its partners rights and benefits but duties as well.

For the small numbers of usage of "may" and present perfect (each used twice), we know that these are to indicate either optional choices or the events that have taken place sometimes.

The verb tense uses in the Treaty make the readers, especially the signatories of the Treaty think of necessary laws these partners are going to obey with no other choice. The pressure of "to join or not to join, to perform or not" is everywhere in the "flat world" nowadays in this globalization process, not only true to NATO members.

3. Conclusions

The analysis has shown us that there are, in terms of language, power relations ideologically handled in the Treaty. The power relations in the discourse are that of "the big countries" towards the other inferior ones. And these power relations are still hidden to us. The North Atlantic Treaty, on the surface of it, is only one of thousands of the agreements signed among the countries.

Nowadays, when US have been functioning as the world controller, it has been trying to impose its foreign policies on other countries, including even powerful ones in Europe. The membership of North Atlantic Treaty may have changed with world history but its ideas and "values" do not change. More partners have joined the Organization but the Treaty is still in full effect as it was in 1949. If globalization is a process of thousand years, then it has got most of the new features of the time now in all aspects of present world econo-political life. The Treaty is the product of the time and it is also the tool to determine the power relations of the US towards its alliances, then in their turn and together with this super-powerful imperialist, towards the rest of the world in today's globalization. It is a special kind of discourse in a special setting we should be aware of.

References

- [1] N. Fairclough, *Language and Power*, Longman, London, 2001.
- [2] R. Rogers, *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, London, 2004.
- [3] T. Van Dijk, *Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse and Society*, London, Newbury and New Delhi: Sage, 1993.

- [4] N. Fairclough, R. Wodak, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, In van Dijk, T.(Ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Sage, London, 1997.
- [5] L.A. Wood, R.O. Kroger, *Doing Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications, Inc, New York, 2000.
- [6] D. Corson, *Emancipatory leadership*, *International journal of Leadership in Education*, 3(2000) 93.
- [7] Nguyen Hoa, *Discourse Analysis: Some Theoretical and Methodological Issues (in Vietnamese)*, Hanoi National University Publisher, Hanoi, 2003.
- [8] Cao Duy Trinh, *Exploring ideological power relations in a global document: The Berne convention for the protection of literary and artistic works*, unpublished M. A. Thesis, College of Foreign Languages, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, 2006.
- [9] R. Wodak, *Orders of Discourse*, Longman, London, 1996.
- [10] *Microsoft Encarta Reference Library*, 2004.
- [11] Phan Thi Huong, *News Reporting on America's War on Terrorism: A Critical Discourse Analysis*, unpublished M. A. Thesis, College of Foreign Languages, Vietnam National University, Hanoi, 2005.
- [12] M.A.K. Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar, second edition*, Edward Arnold, Melbourne, Auckland, London, 1994.
- [13] R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, *A University Grammar of English*, Presented by the Australian Government, 1973.

Hiệp ước Bắc Đại Tây Dương - một văn bản toàn cầu dưới góc nhìn của Phân tích Diễn ngôn Phê phán

Cao Duy Trinh

*Khoa Khoa học Tự nhiên và Xã hội, Đại học Thái Nguyên
Xã Quyết Thắng, Thành phố Thái Nguyên*

Trong bài báo này, tôi đã tiến hành Phân tích Diễn ngôn Phê phán một văn bản toàn cầu: Hiệp ước Bắc Đại Tây Dương. Tài liệu này là văn bản toàn cầu bởi lẽ nó là sản phẩm của quá trình toàn cầu hoá diễn ra trên phạm vi toàn thế giới trong đó các nước tư bản phương Tây lớn mạnh, có tiềm năng và ảnh hưởng đã câu kết với nhau nhằm, trước hết, bảo vệ lợi ích của mình và sau đó, quan trọng hơn, áp đặt các chính sách ngoại giao của họ đối với các nước khác theo ý muốn của mình. Chỉ bằng cách sử dụng Phân tích Diễn ngôn Phê phán, phát triển trên cơ sở Ngữ pháp Chức năng Hệ thống mới giúp chúng ta đi đến tới đích đặt ra: chỉ ra bản chất của Hiệp ước. Ngữ pháp Chức năng Hệ thống nghiên cứu khía cạnh xã hội của ngôn ngữ, quan hệ của ngôn ngữ và đời sống xã hội được thể hiện hàm ẩn hoặc công khai. Trong phạm vi giới hạn của một bài báo, chúng tôi không thể đề cập hết các khái niệm cơ bản của Phân tích Diễn ngôn Phê phán như Tư tưởng, Quyền lực và Quan hệ quyền lực hay các khái niệm trong Ngữ pháp Chức năng Hệ thống. Chúng tôi chỉ giới hạn giới thiệu sơ bộ về Phân tích Diễn ngôn Phê phán và quá trình toàn cầu hoá trước khi phân tích tài liệu nêu trên. Các khái niệm lý thuyết khác sẽ được xem như đã biết vì độc giả có thể tìm đọc trong các ấn phẩm nêu trong mục tài liệu tham khảo và các tài liệu có liên quan khác. Mục đích của bài báo là mong muốn vạch ra, bằng cách phân tích sơ bộ Hiệp ước Bắc Đại Tây Dương, các quan hệ quyền lực có tính tư tưởng trong bản thân văn bản qua các phương tiện ngôn ngữ (chúng ta biết đôi khi chúng được hàm chi đầu đó giữa những ngôn từ của một văn bản).