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**Introduction**

We are not the first researchers who aim to analyse such complexed and compounded communicative phenomenon as discourse. In this work we will survey several the most essential approaches that, we think, may play crucial role in the development of our scientific work. We chose several works of the Austrian, American, Dutch, British, and French scholars, philosophers and researchers.

The relevance of the study is conditioned by the extreme increase of the influence of media in the world that shapes minds and offers opinions. The research will be conducted in order to define particular features that are specific to the media discourse.

**The scientific novelty** is conditioned by the fact that the research of the BBC HARDtalk media discourse is deeply examined for the first time. The work may be used in the future research works in the field of discourse analysis.

**The object of the research** is the BBC HARDtalk interview.

**The subject of the research** are linguistic features of the discourse of interview.

**Hypothesis of the work** is that despite linguistic features that are typical for the media discourse, the discourse of the HARDtalk contains allusions, other discourses and extreme amount of power relations.

**The aim of the work** is to examine the notion “discourse” and provide discourse analysis of the HARDtalk interview.

The aim of the work defined the following **tasks**:

1. Study the concept of “discourse”.
2. Study the media discourse as a form of communicative phenomenon.
3. To analyse the interview of Secretary-General of the UN António Guterres.
4. To provide the linguistic features of the interview.

**The methods** that were implemented during the research:

* Description
* Comparison
* Context and text analyses
* Social analysis
* Linguistic analysis

The theoretical base was presented by the works of Teun van Dijk, Ruth Wodak, Ferdinand de Saussure, Ludwig Wittgenstein and others.

**The material** of the research was the BBC HARDtalk interview.

**The structure of the work** consists of **introduction**, **two chapters** and **conclusions**. The novelty of the work is presented in the **introduction**. The **first chapter** examine the theoretical framework. In the **second chapter** the interview is being analysed. The **conclusions** consist of the most essential directions of the study.

**Chapter 1**

* 1. **Structuralist and poststructuralist theories**

There is no single and unambiguous definition to the concept “discourse”. It is interpreted differently in disciplines and there many approaches related to discourse studies. The word originates from Latin meaning “running to and from” and firstly, discourse was determined as a speech: “But I will be very happy to show in this discourse what paths I have followed…” (Descartes 1998: 2). Obviously, at the time of Descartes discourse was not in the interest of scholars and scientists, but over the years it became a research subject of sociology, linguistics, and other disciplines which led to emergence of different approaches of discourse studying and discourse analysis. Turning point came in the beginning of XX century. A great contribution to linguistics and other human sciences made a Swiss linguist and semiotician Ferdinand de Saussure. His essays published in 1916 created a momentum for development of linguistics – the structuralist theory of sign – and semiology. He laid the bases of structuralism introduced the theory of sign where sign is a combination of a concept and an acoustic pattern. Saussure assumed that signs acquire value from being dissimilar to other signs. A word “ball”, for example, differs from the word “bill” and therefore is a part of words structure where words are not similar to each other. He considered that structure to be a social institution that is unchangeable; an individual cannot modify the structure of that institution. He also distinguished between language (langue) and speech (parole) and summarized that the language is “…a social side of speech…”; it exists due to members of a community, “It is a system of signs expressing ideas in which the only essential thing is a union of meanings…” (Saussure 2013: 18). Soon, over the years, for linguists and philosophers it became clear that the language is non consistent and crucial aspects of theory were needed to be revised. Mikhail Bakhtin, Russian scholar and literary critic, underlined that language is not a linguistic phenomenon but a reflection of particular world views. Such a phenomenon was called “heteroglossia”. Means of language are selected by an individual and that choice characterize the will of a speaker. He wrote about the concept of dialogue and stated that a dialogue is a verbal expression of life (Bakhtin 1984: 293). Later works of Bakhtin would be revised by the French philosopher Julia Kristeva. She would present a new notion - intertextuality – based on Bakhtin’s ideas of verbal expressions, dialogical interrelations and the time (Kristeva 1986: 37). Another significant theory would have been developed already by 1960th – the poststructuralist one. It started with the presentation of the “language-games” concept. Ludwig Wittgenstein was the one who introduced such a concept. British philosopher of Austrian descent, being a representative of that early poststructuralists, continued revising the Saussure’s idea and pointed that there are language-games that people play in order to express their ideas, name objects, and etc. It is a usage of words where meanings of words are shown in that games. Consequently, if we know the meaning of words, then we can determine the meaning of sentences and the meaning of the whole expression. Language-game is “a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing: sometimes overall similarities, sometimes similarities of detail” (Wittgenstein 1958: 24-32). The meaning of words changes depending on the context of speech, the speech represent itself the expression of the language – the whole thing is that in poststructuralist theory the language is a practice, it exists in a text; there are rules of expressing ideas, the sequence of using words in texts, and the meaning emerges in the process of that practice. Later the theory implied that if one knows how to use a concept in a language-game, one knows the rules of a language-game. There are many concepts and people know how to use them: communication, language, speech, proposition, discourse; however, the question is what they represent. Obviously, Saussure and Wittgenstein did not undertake full-fledged discourse research. Indeed, their works served as bases for the future evolution of disciplines: linguistics, semiology, philosophy, sociology, literature, anthropology and etc.

In this this paper, which appears to be primarily a linguistic study, we will survey several linguistic approaches in order to develop adequate definition to the notion “discourse” in accordance with aim of the work. Already by the 1960s many researchers had focused on discourse studies. Since the research that is to be conducted implies both theoretical premises and empirical analysis, we outlined the most influential, in our opinion, works of the following scholars and researchers: Foucault, Laclau and Mouffe, Fairclough, van Dijk, Wodak, Jørgensen and Phillips, Potter and Wetherell. The theories above are all interrelated, they also do not exclude other theories and methods of interpretation and analyses. Let us start with the poststructuralist theory of Michel Foucault.

The theory played a key role in discourse analysis development, though it examines abstract concepts and does not propose particular methods of empirical research. Many significant scholars quote Foucault theory, criticize and introduce their own views on the discourse that are inevitably relate to Foucauldian theory. Without any doubt Foucauldian ideas and his approach lie at the root of many contemporary poststructuralist theories. Already in the beginning he concentrated his attention on power, social contexts and conditions. “Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere” (Foucault 1978: 93). Power manifests itself in social practices where discourse represents meaning and social relationships. The power decides on what can be talked about and who can speak, and with what authority. “Power is not something that is acquired, seized or shared, something one holds on to or allows to slip away” (Foucault 1972: 94). Discourse as written or oral communication exists in our everyday social practices. A language in reconstructing and transforming power relations is of crucial importance. He studied the rules, or discursive traces, which define the acceptance of statements as true during a specific period of time. Each society has its own regime which allows each member of this society to distinguish true statements from false ones. It is in power objects obtain their particular characteristics. For example, the word «crime» was created as a field with its institutions, e.g. prisons, subjects and practices, thus criminals and resocialization. It is hard to imagine the modern prison system without criminology (Foucault 1977: 29).

Part of his archaeology was formed by his discourse theory. He determined a discourse as: “…a group of statements in so far they belong to the same discursive formation (…) (Discourse) is made up of a limited number of statements for which a group of conditions of existence can be defined. Discourse in this sense is not an ideal, timeless form (…) it is, from beginning to end, historical – a fragment of history (…) posing its own limits, its divisions, its transformations, the specific modes of its temporality” (Foucault 1969: 154). Truth is this context is a construction – different ideologies decide what is true and what is false, what can be said and what cannot be – power and domination within social contexts. As social constructs, discourses are not created and set by individuals or groups of particular orientation but through social practices. There are repetitive statements and those which would not be accepted. The power, as Foucault wrote, is needed to be recognized as productive; it consists of discourse, knowledge, and social bodies. Foucault explained that it should not be considered as a form of control due to the fact that it produces discourse (Foucault 1969: 160). Though he outlined that each historical time had only one regime, the contemporary discourse approaches point that there are different discourses which can endeavour with each other in order to define truth.

Laclau and Mouffe, following the poststructuralist ides, pointed that social world is constructed by discourse in meaning, thus outlined again that language is fundamentally instable. As well as Foucauldian one, the theory of Laclau and Mouffe shows that discourse is not an entity, thus a discourse transforms through contact with other discourses. It is a unity of articulated signs; each discourse presents its own understanding of the social world and, as we have already said above, struggles to achieve hegemony, to define truth. Social phenomenon, as it was called, is not finished, and meanings can be different. Different meanings have different social effects. That theory is a combination and further critique of other two theories – Marxist, with fixed social and political, identification and structuralist – and introduced their view on discourse studies. Let us speak about the Marxist theory in order to represent a full and comprehensive picture.

It states that economy can explain everything. The provided notion “historical materialism” which includes material benefits and ownership of workers of their means of production are the base of a society and a state, and other institutions of meanings production, is the superstructure (Marx 1971: 525). However, the economy is at the core of everything – the base defines the superstructure which, in return, defines what people think of and talk about. In their work Laclau and Mouffe suggested that the identities of people are situated in the context of discourse struggles and “politics has primacy”, not the economy (Laclau 1990: p. 33). Politics as a social phenomenon, not a party one, for it represents a way that continuously form the social so that other ways are excluded. They, and like other poststructuralists, object to the Saussure’s idea that linguistic signs acquire meanings from certain position in an utterance. Indeed, it is the different relations of one sign to another that make it possible to acquire new meanings. “Synonymy, metonymy, metaphor is not forming of thought that add a second sense to the primary, constitutive literality of social relations; instead they are part of the primary terrain itself in which the social is constituted” (Laclau, Mouffe 1985: 110).

The theoretical concepts of Laclau and Mouffe (1985: 105) are such that if a part of a practice can be modified in consequence of articulatory experience, they will call the practice “articulation”. The signs in a discourse are moments. Laclau and Mouffe introduce a term “nodal points” (1985: 105). Other signs are arranged around nodal points since they are exclusive. For example, in democratic political discourse nodal points are “freedom of speech” and “people’s rights”. Since the set captures every sign through relations, the other possible meanings are eliminated – it is called “the field of discursivity”. It implies that in a particular discourse a sign will have a particular meaning while other meanings will be excluded. They belong to the field of discursivity. That provides a unity of meanings for a certain discourse. Nevertheless, there are other ways of fixing the meanings and in order to not be disturbed a concept of polysemic signs – elements were presented. So the discourse concept now can be defined as efforts of discourse to exclude the multiple meanings of signs; however, they can never be excluded permanently. A sign has to relate to other signs to obtain its own meaning. It is the articulation that creates interrelationship with modified elements with their own meanings. The word “case” is polysemic and its meaning is identified through the articulation. In the utterance “in his case” it means “situation” and in the utterance “suicide case” it means “a matter. Such elements are called “floating signifiers”. These are the elements that different discourses attempt to interpret in their own way. Since the elements are polysemic for most parts, an utterance is never repeated. Thus the discourse determines the meaning in specific way, but the meaning is not permanent. Discourses are structures that will never become complete. Inasmuch as discourses are structures, poststructuralist theory analyses the constitution and modification of the discourse structure.

* 1. **Critical Discourse Analysis**

Undoubtedly, the research of Karl Marx, his works in the fields of economics and sociology, gave impetus to the creation of a new approach – critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, Graham 2002: 6). One of the aims of critical discourse analysis or CDA is to study text production and interpretation, i.e. discursive practices as a part of everyday social practice, to understand how linguistics considers social and cultural practices. Discourse is an action for CDA through which the world can be changed; the action is determined by different social aspects. Norman Fairclough considered discourse to be “… a complex of three elements: social practice, discoursal practice (text production, distribution and consumption), and text, and the analysis of a specific discourse calls…” (2013: 59). He suggests that discourse cannot be interpreted independently but by analysing a relations totality. In these relations discourse brings meaning. The relationships in a family may be used here as an example of social relations. Parent-child relations partially is discursively structured. The family is an institution with particular practices, relations and identities. Such relations are called «dialectical», thus objects of the relations differ from each other but do not exclude one from others. In Fairclough’s CDA the dialectical relations between discourse and external elements are of particular analysis. Since that relations affect boundaries of linguistics, politics, sociology and other disciplines, the analysis bears an interdisciplinary nature. CDA studies real discourses and real social practices. Practices are stated to create unequal relationships in social groups and between them. These relationships are consequences of ideological effects. Some of analysts following the Foucauldian view of power as something that is productive and exists everywhere, but which makes it possible for one social group to dominate over others. So CDA is aimed to examine the role of discursive practices in promoting the interests of specific social groups, “… how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony” (Fairclough 1993: 135). CDA discloses the role of discursive practice and promotes equal relationships in the process of communication. Fairclough presented a three-dimensional framework (1992: 62) with variety of concepts that are interrelated. The significant difference between poststructuralist theories and critical discourse analysis is that CDA analysts outline the importance of regular analysis of social interactions. The linguistic approach is criticized by some CDA researchers for being concentrated on the analysis of texts exclusively; it is of crucial importance to combine text analyses with social ones as they are significantly connected to each other.

In general, the language is used in particular field, a certain institution such as medicine discourse. It is formed by discursive and not discursive nature and referred to a way of speaking. This way defines meaning from a certain approach, and in this sense the concept deals with discourses that can be distinguished from each other. Discourse constructs social identities, relationships and systems of knowledge and meaning. These are three functions of discourse: identity, relational and ideational. A specific language usage which is engaged in specific social practice is called a genre: genre of an interview and etc. The discourses and genres are used in a specific way in discursive practice. The framework that was mentioned above consist of three dimensions: text, discursive and social practice. As it has already been said, the critical discourse analysis bases on empirical research. So the communicative phenomenon is analysed on three levels: linguistic features, relation to text production and consumption, and social practice which the phenomenon belongs to. They are interrelated and the analysis of one inevitably involves the analysis of others.

Analysis of discursive practice shows how authors draw upon genres and discourses that already exist in order to create a text and also focuses on the receivers of the text, how they apply genres and discourses. For example, HARDtalk interviews, which will be analysed thoroughly in the Chapter II, is a specific genre of interview that involve various discourses: political, medical, sociological, and genres, e.g. hard-hitting and sensitive. That helps the receivers interpretate the interview and use the interpretation to discuss the covered topics and issues. Text analyses by the means of examining features such as vocabulary, grammar, structure, and etc. Discursive practice in CDA is a mediator between text and social practice, hence through discursive practice people produce and consume texts. The whole communicative experience is analysed by following aspects: genres and discourses, text and social practice levels. Fairclough uses the Foucauldian term to outline that all the genres and discourses that are used in a social field are “order of discourse” (1992: 38). The order forms particular situation of language usage and also is formed by that particular situation. It presents the available discourses and genres. Still the order is able to change, as people use genres and discourses differently. It is part of social field which follows a specific social order. Participants of that particular social field also obey that social order, hence they are aimed to achieve their goal.

So according to Fairclough, discourse analysis is the analysis of written texts,

spoken interaction, the multimedia texts of television and the internet, etc. Four stages are provided where each stage includes two or move steps to conduct critical discourse analysis:

1. Focus on social issues.

There are considerable semiotic features that have not been examined sufficiently. For instance, a topic of research can be chosen because it in the centre of attention in the field of consideration. Often, the topics are given; human trafficking, immigration, malnutrition are significant, but it cannot be assumed that the object of research is consistent.

1. Theorise topics to identify the objects of research.

For instance, the topic of the research is relations between global economy and national strategies and policies (Fairclough 2010: 236). The research can be constructed in such a way when the researcher, say, focuses on anti-inflation policy that is intended to strengthen a national currency and its competitiveness on global market. Indeed, countries attempt to adjust their economies to global one. The way towards improvements has consequences – some people still suffer and feel insecure. Theorisation means interdisciplinary approach which enhance understanding of the processes and intends to improve people’s welfare: political and economic theories can be drawn on in this example. Determine difficulties at this stage. Think of what prevents the topic from being addressed and issues from being resolved? In order to answer the question the researcher has to conduct interdiscursive and linguistic analyses. This form of critical discourse analysis includes text analysis within the frame of discourse analysis – analyse relations between semiotic elements, elements of social practices and events, and between orders of discourse (Fairclough 2013: 238).

1. Decide if the social unacceptability characterized by the social order.

If social order creates a number of unacceptability, it is worth reflecting on changing the order. That suggestion raises the question of if it possible to change at all if there is real controversy.

1. Define the ways of overcoming barriers.

From the negative critique move towards the positive one, study the ways of reacting to the obstacles, what are reactions to dominant discourse (arguments, critique, etc.).

 Mentioned above discourses and genres together cause the phenomenon of interdiscursivity. Interdiscursivity is a form of intertextuality which means “a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read ad at least double” (Kristeva 1986: 37). It means that the communicative event draws upon previous phenomena. Texts integrate elements of other texts. As an example let us speak broadly of one interview of Secretary-General of UN António Guterres to Zeinab Badawi, the host of BBC HARDtalk. Thus, the host introduces elements of Secretary-General’s statements in his report to create her text, to generate the communicative event. We, as receivers, incorporate the elements of her text, which already contains the elements of António Guterres text, and construct a new text. The compound structure of such a multi-dimensional event as discourse which includes text, practices of discourse and genres, and social dimension as well as interdiscursivity are clearly show that discourses are always interpreted differently in accordance with the participants experience and their aims, the social dimension of the communicative event and linguistic feature of the uttered or written text. It again outlines that analyst has to constitute the empirical analysis of a text, as the relations to other texts and social context enable us to understand comprehensively.

 Ruth Wodak also considers CDA to be an analysis of interrelations, namely relations between language and power (Wodak, Meyer 2001: 2). Their method of CDA includes analysis of social processes, when individuals create meanings during interaction with texts, and structures that construct texts (2001: 3). Discourse is situated in certain period of time. It is produced and interpreted in accordance with the time it is situated in. Groups that have power dictate their ideology, and CDA analyse forms of pressure and ways of resisting to it. The approach assumes that language is a social phenomenon. Institutions as well as people have meanings that are pronounced is language systematically trough social interactions where participants are active recipients. There are similarities between languages of different institutions. Both Fairclough and Wodak agrees and views discourse as “language use in speech and writing – as a form of social practice” (1997: 260). Discourse constructs and is constructed, such practice generates inequality by means of introducing positions. Though CDA is critical towards those topics which researcher brings up for a discussion and criticism, CDA is also self-critical – it criticizes itself. It enhances social changes. The critique is divided into three categories: text-immanent, social-diagnostic critique and prospective (retrospective) one (Wodak, Meyer 2001: 25). The first one deals with retrospective text analysis, the second builds on integration of socio-political context with structural and on understanding of meanings: preferences and conflicts based on text and context. The last one draws upon the previous ones and consider the social fields of preoccupation to be addressed.

 As it has been already mentioned, ideologies play crucial role in forming meaning and constructing social interaction. They are coherent, action-oriented and more powerful than perception. The communist ideology contradicts the capitalist one, the dictatorial – democratic. The notion “ideology” has transformed a lot recently due to the historical events in XX century. “Good” and “bad” became clearly distinguished. Metaphors, analogies, prejudice that is what of high interest to CDA. People can find themselves thinking the same way, even though they have different interests and experiences. They may even forget about the alternatives. CDA inquiries about the function of the ideologies in everyday social practices. Another concept that is essential to CDA is power. Those who possess power are in charge of unequal relations. How the domination produces and is produced, why one group dominates another and etc. It is of particular concern to research power in discourse in politics. We have already said that discourses struggle to define what is true, so power in discourse struggles provide different understandings of meanings, and those who have power can decide over discourse. The following subjects of research are at the top of the agenda:

1. The impact of Knowledge-Based Economy or KBE on society, its interrelation with multiplicity of forms of globalization and economies. KBE has infiltrated many areas of society, so the detailed interdisciplinary research could demonstrate global policy strategies and social changes;
2. Incorporation of cognitive sciences approaches, new tools development. For instance, conceptual metaphors. Studies of language processes have evolved into cognitive paradigms for explanation of meaning construction in society;
3. New phenomena due to the media impact and new transnational and local tendencies. The attempt to analyse and explain the influence of new media and genres. Here Wodak and Meyer introduce a socio-semiotic theory (2001: 32). The theory underlines the possible ideological nature of texts in society at the moment and study the crossing of language, images, designs, etc.
4. Interrelations between historical processes and CDA. The integration of previous practice, the current events and future perspectives. The last century demonstrated the importance of understanding and explaining the role of language in totalitarian communities. Since the politics became ceremonial, the understanding of backstage politics is more accessible for experts. The examination of political institutions and their role in social life is in the focus of contemporary studies. They show the full complexity of political processes and decision-making. Besides, the contemporary research focuses on events that demonstrate hegemonic methods of treating traumatic experiences of the past. The analysis of media, schoolbooks, official speeches illustrate new narratives without mentioning war conflicts and crimes of the past.

Each approach outlines different levels of research, and CDA demonstrates a manifold in many aspects, hence the interdisciplinarity is essential so that to understand complicated social phenomena. The analysis also requires linguistic competence, and many of CDA approaches deal with already existing data; however, political debates, public speeches are considered to be staged.

Teun van Dijk in his works related to discourse studies and critical discourse analysis determines discourse to be “systematically related to communicative action” (1977: 24). The interpretation of the term “discourse” is vague as well as the term “language” or “ideology”. Along with the researchers we referred to above, the theory of van Dijk states that discourses are forms of social action and interaction, situated in social contexts of which the participants are not merely speakers/writers and hearers/readers, but also social actors who are members of groups and cultures (1998:6). The meanings of discourse and its features are acquired by means of social interactions. Discourse and its meanings are built in social world, in its structures and vice versa. Social relationships and structures construct discourse and meanings which is demonstrated in texts and talks. Though CDA does not have certain theoretical framework, the researcher highlights some basic concepts:

1. Levels. Discourse is analysed on micro- and macrolevels. Microlevel implies the analysis of language use, interaction and communication, whereas macrolevel – power, dominant and unequal relations. Van Dijk divides the users of language into members of social groups or institutions (2015:468). The actions of individuals in those social groups are parts of social processes – news production, for example. Interactions are constitutive elements of social structure. For instance, St Petersburg International Economic Forum is a local practice of organizations and institutions as structures of macro-level. People have their own cognition and the cognition that they share with other members of their society. So people represent and link the two levels;
2. Control. Groups, organizations and institutions possess power. The power is a form of social control. That groups have privileges: knowledge, information, access to power discourse and etc. For instance, a teacher controls students in a classroom. So an individual, as well as a group, may control other people or groups in particular situations. Powerful groups or organizations may also resist or accept powers of other groups. CDA studies how powerful groups control texts, contexts, people’s actions; what the consequences are and, finally, what the properties of such discourse.

The leaders of more powerful groups can control various types of public discourses. At the same time, those who have less power have control only over their everyday talks and have passive control over mass media talks, for instance. One of the aims of CDA is to define the forms of power, especially forms of domination (van Dijk 2015: 470).

Cognitive monitoring is another example of indirect dominance reproducing. Cognition is an important mediator between discourse and social interactions. The analysis of cognition presupposes the differentiation between subjective and, more or less, objective assessment and representation of events. The speakers’ choice of topics, arguments, speech figures, vocabulary influence the mental processes of recipients, and if it happens in favour of the speakers, then it will represent an abuse of power or manipulation. The control may involve not only some specific knowledge but also general attitudes – repetitive news reports on the topic of economic recession or immigration policy. It may be either useful for the recipients – social information – or against their interests if it is a manipulation.

Usually, the recipients are more likely to accept the views of credible resources; however, there are particular situations when the recipients cannot but receive the information exactly as the speakers introduce it. For instance, lessons or some other educational materials. The speakers, we also may call them the powerful groups, use headlines or screensavers, in media discourse, in order to trigger the preferred model of mental process. Effects and premises may be used to achieve an indirect assertions of facts that may not be true. In general, the vocabulary that the speakers choose to influence the recipients’ opinions. Speech figures can make an utterance even scaring – the recession can leave deep scars – and passive constructions can diminish negative actions, for instance.

1. Inequality. Here we mean not only the social inequalities but also the gender ones. Such inequalities are interrelated with social aspects: social class, status, role.
2. Stereotypes, prejudice and derogation. Us and them. CDA studies all these structures and features in order to show how implicitly discourse produces them.

Critical discourse analysis, as we have seen, examines discursive practices and their side effects – domination, power, stereotypes, cognitive monitoring, and etc. – from a critical perspective. The framework, which is expanding due to discourses effects, covers most major aspects of CDA. The social interactions mentioned above implies monological speech, texts that are intended to give or form an opinion on a particular subject and the recipients are passive participants of the process and may either accept the statements or not, define them as true statements or not. Before we begin analysing the discourse of media and of interview in particular, let us introduce the last significant approaches.

* 1. **Discursive psychology and social constructivism**

Discursive psychology or DP that traditionally connected with cognitive dimension of language usage. It studies the process of formation of social world, deals with utterances and texts as world constructions. That constructions are focused on social interactions. Discursive psychology approach states that language is an active part of social practices, as it forms identities, relationships and world understanding. DP puts the emphasis on “…empirical study of discourse, the manner in which discourse is oriented to action, and the wat representations are built to support actions” (Potter 2011: 7). Utterances act in particular contexts, their meanings rely on language usage. The pioneers of social psychology are Jonathan Potter and Margaret Wetherell. Their theory traces the nature of discourse. The theory deals with individuals who possess a particular set of characteristics. The individuals observe the structure of the world and store the gained experience which shapes their world perception. The individuals categorize the perceived information in the mind in order to create meanings out of the constructed blocks of information: the blocks of words, categories, and so on. DP states that discourse depends on situation. For example, the utterance “It is my friend Anne”. Friend, not sister; Ann, not Sofie; my, not his. These are products of talk exactly in the moment of talk. A new context of the following talk is produced immediately. It is noteworthy that the interactions are not inherently family, it is a unity of interactions. These actions are different, and the objectives of DP is to examine the manner constructions are built and the manner they become neutral regardless of the speaker; how people do the actions and not how they treat the actions. Attitudes are important as evaluative statements, they construct either positive or negative elements of world. One can make a positive statement about another one or a group while stating that they do not have positive attitudes (Potter, Wetherell 1992: 167). DP studies how these and other statements are constructed, how attitudes are distributed in texts or utterances in particular contexts. Another principle of theory is that discourse is an action. When we utter words and write essays, we do actions. “Discourse is the primary medium for social actions; in speaking we blame, justify, invite…” (Potter 1992: 77). The final principle is that discourse is conditioned. There is sequence that proceed and sequence that follows. We see common principles in CDA and discursive psychology: both state that discourse can be understood in situation, in context.

Potter writes that DP works with “naturalistic materials” (2011: 78): everyday conversations, talks, phone calls and etc., e.g. with the issues that arises, that are of participants’ concern, during that practices. DP introduces the following structure of the research:

1. Study all the questions on the theme. As there are no obligatory steps, focus on interests. Usually, one is interested in a certain form of interactions: family conversations about children scores at school, for instance.
2. Get the permission to access the source and fix the gained information. It might be challenging, hence the participants of the research have to trust the researcher.
3. Store data. The acquired information is essential since it represents a naturally emerged interaction.
4. Transcribe data. Pay particular attention to the intonations, stresses, expressions of excitement and so on.
5. Code data in order to alleviate the search for phenomenon instances. The data can be coded several times since the boundaries of interest can also be expanded.
6. Analyse the data. How the communicative event is constructed, where it lies in the interaction, and how it is related to the actions. For instance, the phrase “It is not appropriate” or the sound “ugh” express disapproval. The aim of the researcher to study every instance of the use. Is it also referred to the behaviour or is it only refers to scores in Maths;
7. As it is discursive psychology and the researcher works with real situations, the analysis could be used to solve the encountered challenges.

Potter acknowledges that DP has constraints (Potter 2011: 86). Coherent approach is needed here so that to accomplish the analyses efficiently. We note that DP plays important role in psychological and social studies. DP is relatively a new approach, it develops empirical analyses and new research methods, the boundaries of psychology and discourse studies become wider.

Another sociological and psychological theory that is interrelated to discursive psychology is social constructivism (Jorgensen, Phillips 2002: 1). Both theories underline the key importance of social world and meanings. They are connected to each other, considering that meanings influence the construction of the world. Discourse in constructionist theory “…creates reality at the same time as representing it” (Jorgensen, Phillips 2002: 175).

Let us start with the theory of M. which is related to social constructionism.

The theory states that language is structured, and people follow certain patterns when they give utterances, and their aim is to study these patterns. They propose their own suggestion on what the discourse is: “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)” (Jorgenson, Phillips 2002: 1). The social constructionism is based on four premises:

1) Reality is not an objective truth. Our knowledge are products of discourse and the way we categorize the world.

2) The way we understand the world is historically specific. Discourse, including knowledge, is a product of social action.

3) Social processes create and maintain our knowledge. We distinguish truth from falsehood through social interactions.

4) Social understandings determine social actions.

These premises are bases. The approaches based on these premises vary according to the focus of research, either it is an analysis of everyday discourse or an abstract one, and according to the role of discourse – if it designs the social or it is a part of it.

In social constructionism, though, discourse cannot fully depict the reality. Every result of the analysis from this perspective depicts one of many possible realities. The reality depends on the meanings that are given to it. The given meanings enable us to understand the world and interact in it. In this sense people’s meanings attributed to the world construct people and the world. Being constructive does not exclude being real. The constructs give the opportunity to interact. The interactions vary on the meanings. If meanings change, the world and the individuals change, hence they start interacting differently. Meanings’ changes are “collective social processes” (Jorgensen, Phillips 2002: 178). Hardly can an individual manipulate the processor or the meaning. One of the main reason of stability is that meanings are perceived as the world rather than a view of the world.

The constructivist discourse analysis aims to reveal such meanings that are taken for granted and make them objects of study and criticism. In other words, make them accessible to change. Critical approaches include different kinds of critique. For instance, the critique of ideology. Interactions built on hegemonic relationships keep the reality from disclosure. The objective of the critique is to disclose the reality. People understand the way things are, but it does not correspond to the real state of things. Ideologies mispresent people’s views. For instance, an ideology states that everyone is equal, and at the same time some people remain to be more equal than others, thus the ideology enhances inequality. The critique is intended to expose the ideology and give an opportunity to change the reality. This is the point where such an understanding of critique faces criticism. The critique assumes that the truth about real state of things is beyond the ideology control which contradicts the social constructionist theory where truth is involved with power. Billing and Simons concludes that critique is “promiscuous”, for people have no strong belief in true political principles (Billig, Simons 1994: 6). From one side, the constructionist theory is understood to imply political research as it is always situated in certain context. So the world is constituted by certain means and not others: for instance, the traditional division into “us” and “them”. The division promoted the Western countries to dominate, and, according to social constructionist approach, the research cannot avoid a political nature at all. On the contrary, if absolute truth or truths cannot be provided, then the researcher introduces cultural relativism. It either accept or criticize everything without political underpinnings.

We will give a specific analysis of the media discourse, hence the roles in everyday social interactions are distributed: those who are less powerful control lower number of interactions and those who are more powerful – higher, whereas the particular subsection of media discourse – discourse of interview – needs a detailed examination. The discourse of media is one of the powerful groups that shapes minds and opinions, influence knowledge and social interactions. Some instances of media texts peculiarities have been presented already – language use, headlines, figures of speech and others. Reporters have authority to tell the audience what they know, the facts. The image of the reporter works together with the language usage, the reporter addresses the audience directly. They even may use gestures to put a particular emphasis on certain topics. The audience at the same time awaits the news to be told, they want to know the news. In order to analyse a news report, we need to answer three questions:

1. How are events presented?
2. What personalities are determined for participants?
3. What are the relations between the participants?

The events may be presented as a reconstruction of what happened or as a humorous, entertaining model. The image has advantage of being first: firstly, we see what was happening or is happening and then we hear the words. The reporter explains the situation and the audience accepts it or not. If it is an interview, the host of the programme may ask the interviewee to explain the situation or take the initiative and themselves. The interviewee may agree with the given explanation or deny it by presenting their own points of view. This manifests an equal type of relations, hence the participants have equal rights and equal opportunity to express their thoughts. At the same time the audience, if there any, still is in a passive position. They are the recipients, they may be influenced by or question the truth of their claims. The situation may be complicated by the recipients’ lack of specific knowledge, functions of news or, generally speaking, world knowledge. Thus, a subjective model constructed in the minds of the recipients represents a subjective understanding and judgement of events. The journalists may themselves be influenced by the organization they work and vice versa. The formed models of news events contain preferred understanding of the events and this may lead to disinformation. The structures of the models may be changed by the means of manipulations: play with important information in reports or images or absence of a particular event from the news report at all (van Dijk 1995: 14-16). The analysis of news reports, news article in particular, includes the analysis of vocabulary, textual organization, grammar, text cohesion, and interdiscursivity. The researcher may also focus on genres and allusions that are presented in news. In general, the analysis may be drawn upon text production, channel of distribution and features of language usage, in addition to those three aspects that were mentioned above. This system of aspects is a framework for the analysis of media texts:

1. Author’s or collegial text production.
2. Oral or written form.
3. Channel of distribution: news reports, newspapers’ articles, TV broadcasting, an Internet article (post).
4. Functional genre of a text. Whether it is a piece of news, a comment or an advertisement.
5. The identity of topic: political, sports, culture, world news.

This framework is a basis for the linguistic analysis of a media text. Every media text has particular features that are specific to the media discourse. These features characterize the dynamics of texts, their quality, informational content and the style of texts. Dobrosklonskaya states that media texts in English-speaking countries share basic features such as: prevalence or equal number of verb phrases, passive constructions, numerous elements, figures of speech, two- three-component syntactic compounds (2006: 24-26). Passive structures are typical for that kinds of news reports where the source of information is not mentioned. The information is provided by a broadcasting company itself or an editorial board. Sensitive topics are also among those types of news report: war conflicts, catastrophes, terrorists’ attacks, floods, immigration, and etc. For instance, the report by CNBC on Moroccan migrants at Spanish border: “*A diplomatic rift has deepened* between Spain and Morocco after thousands of undocumented migrants attempted to enter Spanish territory apparently *unimpeded by* the Moroccan authorities…”. It does not only place the emphasis appropriately but also downplays the negative actions of authorities. It is not specific about who is being discriminated, though it implies the problem of discrimination and particular view of the event, e.g. an ideological position. The aim of the mediatext is to inform about the events and stay within the time limits. Usually, if a news report is presented in an oral form, the author of the report remains unknown. It may be an individual or a group of authors, or even the reporter themselves. A written form may contain the name of the author. At the same time, BBC News, for instance, publishes authors’ names on their official website but does not do it on their Instagram page. Media texts, news reports in particular, consist of large number of clichéd expressions. They are repeated constantly and presented as final informational products. There are also clichéd forms of news presentation that all mass media have. It makes it possible to speak about global clichéd form of news reporting.

The topics are concentrated among clichéd topical constructs. The media reproduces subjects on a regular basis: political, business, international affairs, and others. The content of the subjects will depend on the national dimensions of a country. Regularly reproduced topics may irritate the audience: details of one’s personal life, anti-corruption investigation, etc.

The discourse of interview differs from it in that it has some particular features: a host of the programme, or an interviewer, or an addresser; the interviewee, or an addressee, and audience or watchers (either active or passive). It illustrates the dual relationships or even triple relationships between those components. The host addresses to the addressee and receives either the responses or counter-questions from them. They interact with each other, and if the audience is passive and do not participate in the discussion, they just accept or refuse the given information. They may be absent at all and the host and the interviewee may take their possible questions, their expectations and objections. The recipients affect the substantive content of the interview – the interviewer and the interviewee choose the optimal means of language. The interviewer, in this respect, is a representative of the possible audience and conducts the interview the way to meet the expectations of the audience. The audience may also be an active participant during an interview session and ask questions directly or object. For instance, the interview of Milton Friedman to Phil Donahue in 1979 concerning the then economic situation the US. Though the journalist had some knowledge in economics, the leading role belonged to Milton Friedman, thus the interview was constructed on open-ended questions, detailed response and interaction between the host of the programme and the guest (Milton Friedman on Donahue #2). Soon after the interview had finished, the people in the audience started asking exciting questions about protection against recession, increasing inflation, gas situation in 1979, and etc. The interview is conducted in a particular place and at a particular time. The audience may be already expecting this interview if the time and place are known for them. Usually, it implies the TV shows or radio programme. Recently, the practice of broadcasting interviews via online video platforms has shown an extreme popularity. The same conditions are applied to that practice: firstly, an interview may be streamed, and an audience may actively participate in discussions. They may write their questions in the chat, interact with the host of a programme and the guest as an interviewee, whereas just published interview would involve post-actions on behalf of the viewers: comments, reposts either with commenting on the topic of the discussion, the behaviour of the participants or further expressing their opinions. It is all inevitably interrelated with the objectives of the interview. It may be an informational, investigation, a talk show interview.

Informational interview, usually, contains some general information of a particular topic. The aim of such interview is to present to the public particular view of an event. Though it may seem that the opinions and understanding of the event are objective, they may contain preferred meaning and certain ideologies. Phrases such as *waves of immigrants* or *flows of immigrants* would rather attain a negative perception of the events. The host of the programme may share the same view, have the same understanding of the situation or not. In the case of different opinions on particular situations, the interviewer and the interviewee may be engaged in debates. Ideologies, powers or simply discourses would struggle to define truth, to introduce their perspectives. Nevertheless, the host may prefer the interviewee to explain their position and their statements. The investigation interview involves examination of a particular topic, clarifications and hearing the parties (or just one party). The addresser clears up the situation by asking questions like what happened, where it happened, what was your reaction and etc. If a situation relates to more than one party, the journalist may conduct several individual interviews with the participants of the event, or they may attend the same interview. A talk show interview, in general, is of entertaining nature. The aim is to amuse the audience, to distract people from scaring and frustrating news reports, to fill their leisure time. Indeed, many of talk show interviews are devoted to culture, films productions, social occasions, the latest news from celebrities, and etc. For instance, John Hurt in 1984 talked about The Elephant Man by David Lynch, about his later career, relations with other actors, shooting process, own attitude to the role and his character (THE ELEPHANT MAN - Interview with John Hurt). We do not see the journalist, only the open-ended questions. That let create a first-person narrative and free-form responses to the questions. It is a narrative type of interview where the key role belongs to an interviewee.

Speaking about the types of interview, we also have to mention the other two types – structured and semi-structured. The structured type implies certain number of questions that an interviewee has to answer. They are asked during the interview and the host does not depart from the plan. There is a certain structure of the interview and both participants follow it. The interviewee may not ask the interviewer in response, though the structure of the programme and the way of carrying out the interview were not discussed in the beginning. On the example of the interviews of UN Secretary-General António Guterres we can see that the guest follows implicit rules of the interview – he gives responses, explains the situation and also interprets his statements in more detail. The host, at the same time, does not give their personal views of the situation, does not suggest a possible answer. The structure of such an interview, standard and straightforward, is similar to a job one where the employer asks the potential employee a set of questions. The analysis of structured interview is fruitful when a researcher is familiar with possible implicit ideologies and attitudes towards an event. They can give explicit parties understandings of the event and also criticize, more or less, their positions or the promotion of unequal relations, if there are any. The construct of a semi-structured interview is determined by the responses of the interviewee whereas a structured interview is constructed accurately. This presupposes that the interviewer does not fully familiar with the subject matter. The discussion may deviate from a prearranged structure, thus making the interview be more interesting. The questions are arranged in advance so that the host is prepared for the discussion and yet the guest is free to express their opinions (Stuckey 2016: 2).

**Conclusions**

Despite various number of approaches toward the interpretation of the discourse concept, in our work we have distinguished the most appropriate and quoted works of French, Russian, American, and Austrian scholars and research scientists. The structuralist theories provided the development of poststructuralist theories which criticized the structural approach to the language studies. Language was no more just an ordered structure where the order of signs would define the meanings. Every sign may have more just one meaning and in order to define the meaning we have to study context which is determined by social interactions. Discourse from now and on is defined as a complexed communitive phenomenon, oral or written speech. In this work we hold the same view and add that discourse is social communitive phenomenon, it constructs social world and being constructed by it. The complexity of the phenomenon lies in the fact that interrelations in the social world is conditioned by power. Powerful groups or institutions impose almost unilaterally particular ideologies, understandings of particular events, peoples’ attitudes to social, political, economic phenomena. In everyday social activity people may influence the family talk, for instance, and may not influence news reports. The only thing they may do is to accept the proposed views of a particular event or refuse. Such unequal relations gave rise to discursive struggles and create interdiscursivity. Every discourse may contain elements of other discourses and they will struggle to define what statements and meanings are true and false. Every approach that we have mentioned above, except the structuralist and poststructuralist theories, involves empirical studies of discourse, of text and context. The analysis involves the examination of the vocabulary, figures of speech, the use of language. One of the challenges of the discourses studying and analyses is cultural dimension of society. Thus, political discourse in the USA will differ from the political discourse in the UK.

The discourse of interview is of particular concern to researchers, since it is conditioned by specific factors such as knowledge of events, roles of the participants, the type of the interview, time and place, the genre of the interview and the identity of the topic. The structure of the interview will depend on the type of interview and the topic. The interviewer may represent the public and this will be reflected in the questions they will ask, or the audience will be an active participant of the interview. As practice shows, at the moment the most delicate topics are discussed between the interviewer and the interviewee without the active audience participation. The analysis of the HARDtalk interviews will prove this statement.

**Chapter 2**

**Discourse analysis of the interview of General Secretary of the UN António Guterres to BBC HARDtalk**

The BBC HARDtalk is a TV and radio programme which covers various sensitive topics, the hosts ask in-depth and hard-hitting questions. The program was first released in 1997. The interviewees are people of politics, sports, arts, and culture. The first host of HARDtalk was Tim Sebastian who held the position till 2006. He was replaced by Stephen Sackur who became the regular host of the programme as well as Zeinab Badawi and Sarah Montague. Since we have intended to examine the features of language usage in the discourse of a HARDtalk interview, we have chosen the interview of the current UN General Secretary António Guterres – SG to Zeinab Badawi – H. The topic of the interview is COVID-19 pandemic.

 *H: “Welcome to HARDtalk with me, Zeinab Badawi. As the COVID-19 pandemic takes hold, the capacity of governments around the world to respond is being seriously tested. My guest is Secretary-General António Guterres who has just launched a humanitarian appeal mainly focused on helping 40 of the most vulnerable countries. He says that a global approach is the only way to fight the virus and that without critical support will be deep and particularly severe on poorer nations. But how realistic are his proposals? And will we pay for them?*

The program starts with the opening speech of the host: “…As the COVID-19 pandemic takes hold, the capacity of governments around the world to respond is being seriously tested”. Already in the first sentence we see passive constructions that shows that there is no particular source of the information – it is either obvious and clear for everyone or the host implicitly hints at the COVID statistics, or the news reports that remain unknown. We can suggest that the host meant not only the virus which, obviously, cannot test the capacity itself, but also the consequences: increasing level of poverty around the world, failures of health care systems, vulnerability of the less-protected population, and etc. The interview was conducted right after Secretary-General announced that the UN launched a COVID-19 Global Humanitarian Response Plan (UN launches major humanitarian appeal to keep COVID-19 from ‘circling back around the globe’).

*H: “Secretary-General António Guterres welcome to HARDtalk. You have described COVID-19 as a threat to humanity. What did you mean by that and how worried are you?*

*SG: “First of all, it is a pleasure to be with you again. It is clear, I mean that if this pandemic would not be left alone, if we would not be able to supress it will reach* ***millions and millions of people****, it would have* ***millions of people of victims*** *dying for it. It is clearly the biggest threat to humanity that we have seen in the recent past. And it is one reason why it is so important that instead of* ***acting separately****, each one is doing what each one wants, it is essential to have a coordinated international cooperation to defeat this virus, to* ***win this war*** *against COVID-19”.*

In his appeal António Guterres said that the world faced “*an unprecedented threat*”*.* Indeed, already by the March 25, 2020 195 countries had reported more than 400,000 cases and almost 20,000 deaths (UN launches major humanitarian appeal to keep COVID-19 from ‘circling back around the globe’). The word “*threat*” and “war”, meaning the pandemic, as figures of speech are hyperbole, metaphor, and comparison. Secretary-General deliberately used such a figure to:

1. Attract attention, to form an opinion on coronavirus as a very dangerous disease.
2. To tell people to treat the virus carefully considering all the recommendations of World Health Organization.
3. To urge countries to collaborate, to cooperate with each other to prevent the spread to the least developed countries.

Though he did say exactly *“a threat to humanity”* and later the host would repeat his words but *“an unprecedented threat…so the whole of humanity must fight back”*. António Guterres agreed with such an interpretation; moreover, he explained his position by saying: *“…If this pandemic would be left alone…, it* ***would have millions of people, of victims*** *dying for it. And it is clearly the biggest threat to humanity that we have seen in the recent past”*. Zeinab Badawi questioned the relevance of the language.

*H: “But when people hear the Secretary-General of the United Nations use such language as “millions could die”,* ***are you not going to scare people****? And I put to you what professor Michael Leavitt who is a Nobel laureate and Stanford biophysicist who has done various projections, and he predicts a quick coronavirus recovery. He told the LA Times this week: “We are going to be fine. What we need is to control the panic”*.

We see that Secretary-General, in this sense, imposing the understanding of the situation with COVID-19 as a very dangerous, requiring strict control and monitoring from the authorities of each and every country. Despite the reassurance of the Nobel laureate, António Guterrez continues stating, drawing upon the reports of the UN, that the number of infected people keeps growing.

*SG: “As a matter of fact, what we are seeing is exponential increase of cases everywhere in the world. We had first that in China, then we are having it the epicentre in Europe. There is strong rick of the epicentre to come to the United States. And we are seeing now in the Global South.* *The Global South is so much less* ***equipped to defeat the disease****. In the Global South we are seeing an enormous increase of cases. And the best scientific evidence indicates that unless there is a very strong effort* ***to suppress the disease****, this might reach until the so-called herd immunity is reached. This might reach 60 to 70% of the global population. Now even if this disease kills less than other outbreaks in history or like Ebola recently, this would always* ***mean millions of people dying*** *in the world. And this is absolutely unacceptable, also morally unacceptable. So, we need to make sure that we have* ***an articulated response, a coordinated response*** *under the guidance of the WHO. And* ***I believe*** *that the G20 in meeting this week is a good opportunity to create* ***a mechanism, a coordination*** *under the guidance of WHO and* ***an articulated response to suppress collective…ly this virus*** *and then once* ***suppressed*** *to be able to contain it until the vaccine is found. Because only with the vaccine we will be able* ***to eradicate this disease****.* *And* ***I truly believe*** *that in the absence of a effectively coordinated action – if each country will go on acting by itself – we risk to have this pandemic with* ***catastrophic impacts*** *in people and, let’s not forget,* ***catastrophic impacts in the global economy,*** *in the livelihoods, and specially with the most vulnerable suffering, the most…”.*

Secretary-General keep saying that the disease must be defeated as if it is an enemy of the people. It is sort of implicit personification, lofty words that are intended to encourage people to tackle the problem. By the year 2021 the number of deaths had reached over three million of people. Indeed, the total number of people died from Ebola is 11,325 (2014-2016 Ebola Outbreak in West Africa). It is 265 times less than from the coronavirus. The main and the most important difference is that Ebola virus was spread with blood or body fluids, whereas coronavirus is an airborne virus. He also mentioned that it is *“morally unacceptable”* to let the disease spread and put at risk millions lives in the most vulnerable countries. *“We have to make sure that we have an articulated response…under the guidance of the WHO”*. We dare suggest here that neither the UN nor the other countries did know exactly what to do to protect their people. After a while, the WHO announced in the report on 10 December 2020 that in order to decrease the number of infected people each individual has to wear masks. There was not a word about gloves, and the WHO after a series of reports stated that individuals also have to put gloves on in public places, reported on their official website, along with the recommendations of wearing masks, that they did not advise putting gloves on. Instead, they insisted on installation of hygiene stations in public places (Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Masks). Yet, countries obliged people to wear masks and gloves in supermarkets, underground, malls; thus, places where people accumulate in large numbers.

We could say that Secretary-General exaggerated a little bit saying “*millions”*, still he was right – the numbers of infected and dead are disappointing. The phrase *“millions of people could die”* was a hyperbole and was supposed to affect the peoples’ behaviour, the countries’ relations (the USA and China, Russia and the USA particularly). It is obvious, that Secretary-General assumed the countries to strictly follow regulated terms. By the phrase *“We have to make sure that we have an articulated response…”* he highlighted futility of uncoordinated actions. *“Articulated response to be able to suppress collectively this virus…”.* He attempted to impose the UN view of the situation. The organization that brings people together to discuss moving issues and tackle them. The UN has the power to bring the topic and call on, or even oblige, countries to settle issues. In the situation with coronavirus the UN uses its power and influence to affect the situation. In this case the UN uses its power to lessen the consequences, making attempts at least. The construction of the sentence shows that English is António Guterres’s second language. Indeed, the current General Secretary of the UN is of Portuguese decent. In this sense, we are not prejudiced about him, for it is the reasons of such sentences constructions that interest us. For instance, English is Zeinab Badawi’s first language. She pronounces words clearly, makes pauses and we can easily distinguish one sentence from another. She also could be a bilingual, but it is of low interest for us. We would like to say that in the speech of Secretary-General sentences are not always constructed in accordance with the English language rules: large number of the word “and”, repetitions, intonational accents and grammatical emphasis is also presented: And **I truly believe**. We also assume that vast number of intonational accents are conditioned by the current situation with COVID-19 in the world. *“And I* ***believe*** *the G20 meeting is a good opportunity to create a mechanism of coordination and the guidance of the WHO. Articulated response to be able* ***to suppress******collectively*** *this virus”*. António Guterres put a particular intonational accent on the words in bold style keeping underlining the importance of strict measures and coordination between countries. After the epidemic of coronavirus had started, the USA blamed China for withholding the true facts and true information about the virus. Political situation in the world was not stable. The launched humanitarian appeal needed a large amount of money. By the time the interview was conducted, there had been already half a million cases and almost 20,000 deaths.

*H:* “*You’ve put a lot in that answer. Let us just unpack it a little bit. You have just launched a humanitarian appeal to raise funds for developing nations which, you predict, are going to be struggling to cope with the COVID-19. But I put it to you that half a million cases globally, nearly 20,000 deaths. Should the UN not have done something like this much sooner”?*

The host put a particular intonational accent on the last words: “…much sooner”. Indeed, the issues in the Global South and the rest vulnerable countries have not just popped up recently. The issues had existed long before the Ebola pandemic started in 2014-2016. The host indirectly, we dare say, blamed the UN for inaction. She works on BBC, on HARDtalk particularly, and she has the power to say it. Maybe that power does not fully belong to her but to the HARDtalk as an media institution, she agrees to accept this point of view and represent it. As researcher in the field of discourse analysis, we rather agree with HARDtalk’s position than with the UNs’ one. We obviously question the ability of the UN to control and prevent such issues, hence still there were and are countries that do not share the UN position referring to the pandemic. We will talk about France and the USA, and the UK’s views. However, we have to mention that the UN nominally has the power to blame countries for inactivity and dysfunctional actions. We see hierarchy here: the host blames Secretary-General since she has the right to do it, Secretary-General, blames countries for delays and poor coordination in return since he has the power to do it. Zeinab Badawi has no access to the tribune of the UN but António Guterres does. Firstly, the politician manner of delivering a speech and speaking in public is reflected in his words. António Guterres tried to smooth the straightforward question of Zeinab Badawi saying that the current state of things is absolutely inappropriate. The answer, indeed, was full of statements that were needed to be explained. We see that the host was criticizing the UN for the delay because the developing and the most vulnerable countries always need an effective humanitarian support, and the pandemic of Ebola already had showen that. *“Well, probably, yes. We have been acting, but we* ***believed*** *that at a certain moment that we needed* ***to enhance our response****. There was a first appeal of the World Health Organization of six hundred million dollars, but this time we need to look very carefully into those situations of extreme vulnerability. I am talking about areas of conflict and talk about fragile states, refugee camps, internal displacement camps, and all other situations in the poorest countries of the world where the capacity to respond is much less effective. And the disease is now coming to those areas. And so what we want is to increase the medical capacity, increase the volume of equipment that is available but also* ***to look into*** *health…erm, water and sanitation****, to look into*** *all the things necessary to contain the spread of the disease,* ***to look into*** *livelihoods of the populations more affected. But this is just for the most vulnerable of the vulnerable. And this is why it is* ***a drop in the ocean****. We are talking about two billion dollars when, for instance, the package being discussed in the US Senate just for the US economy two trillion”.* We dare say here that the language of the interview turned into an inaugural address of a new president or public debate of two presidential candidates arguing with each other and making promises. António Guterres did not mention what kind of measures had already been taken. Undoubtedly, Secretary-General preferred to switch to the currently launched appeal mentioning how much money was spent and outlined that the help would be provided to the most vulnerable of the vulnerable. We also see here that Secretary-General admitted that the number of taken measures is not enough – *“It is a drop in the ocean”* – a metaphor and comparison at the same time. *A drop* is the measures, and *the ocean* is the number of vulnerable countries and unsettled issues. The phrase *“a drop in the ocean”* was said to demonstrate a great problem of misunderstanding and poor collaboration of many countries. We see that the UN makes lots of attempts to attract the attention to the situation in vulnerable countries and growing rate of infected people in the world. But how effective they are if later countries would take their measures to prevent the spread and, as Secretary-General says, to defeat the virus. The responses of Secretary-General are long, and this online interview, along with another one that was conducted in September of that year, differ from the previous ones that HARDtalk had done before the pandemic in that the interviewer cannot suddenly interrupt the guest. In this interview Zeinab Badawi was changing her facial expressions to draw Secretary-General’s attention without interrupting.

*H: “Where is the money going to come from and let me tell you what one former government minister in Liberia Gyude Moore said during the Ebola outbreak, of course in 2014 that killed 11,000 people in West Africa. And he says: “Now, in the past, you could look to the West for help, but they are battling the same thing, so it is not clear any help is coming at all. So, how confident can you be that the Global South, about which you are so worried, is going to get the assistance it clearly needs”?*

There is another element from another discourse – the statement of the Liberian former minister addressing the unsolved issues. The discourse of interview became more interdiscursive. First, we had the statement of the professor Michael Leavitt, then the host referred to the statement of Gyude Moore into discussion. Elements of other discourses were constructing the discourse of that interview.

*SG: “It is* ***a matter of enlightened self-interest****. We are talking of a pandemic now. First of all, our main objective with this appeal is to avoid that humanitarian support that we are already receiving for all other aspects: water and sanitation, food, protection, shelter in all those vulnerable situations in the world from Syria to Yemen, from South Sudan to the DRC. What we want is to make sure that now we have an additional support for this COVID-19. And if the money does not come from the humanitarian action that we are already having, but responding to your question, this is* ***a matter of enlightened******self-interest*** *if this pandemic is controlled in the developed world. But if it is left spreading like wildfire in the developing countries, we will have millions of cases, millions of people dying but not only that. That will create the opportunity for mutations of the virus and the virus can come back in a way that even vaccines that are developed will not be effective even in the developed world. So, there is no way to fight these in half of humanity. Either you* ***fight it globally*** *or you risk to be defeated…We cannot be defeated by the virus”* After saying that providing the help is *“a matter of enlightened self-interest”* Secretary-General started explaining that additional amounts of money are needed to provide new humanitarian support along with the already existing. The whole response seems to be confusing, since Secretary-General did not explain what kind of measures were to be taken. In the beginning of the pandemic it was not apparent what kind of help was needed. Indeed, after a while some countries needed extra supplies of ventilators, but was it really cleaver of the UN to require countries to inject their money to solve not-yet-existing problem?

*H: “Are you not trying to scare richer nations by kind of saying: if you do not fight the virus in poorer countries, it leaves the virus free to circle back around the globe and affect you”*

SG*: “It is not a method of scaring, this is the reality. It is in the enlightened self-interest of the developed countries to support the developing world* ***to suppress this virus in coordination*** *with the more developed of the world. And that is a very important thing for the G20 to take into account.* ***I believe*** *we need into G20 a* ***mechanism and the guidance of the World Health Organization*** *in order for the countries of the G20 to be able* ***to together, combining different approaches*** *in some countries, the emphasis has been more in testing, tracing and quarantine, and less in lockouts, countries with less testing capacity if there are more lockouts. In any case it needs to be tough everywhere and in combined way, in articulated way in the G20. That represents 80% of all the economy, but that is not enough. Even if it is, together by the G20 countries, suppressed in that area of the world, it is absolutely essential not to leave other countries behind. And that is why I have been* ***advocating*** *for a very strong package. A package of the level of two digits of the global economy, part of it, of course, will be spent by each country in itself. You see what the United States are doing, what the European Union is doing, what China has done, but we need to have two to three trillion dollars able to support the response to the COVID-19 in the developing countries. As a whole, not only the most vulnerable situations like we are addressing now with this appeal, but in the developing countries as whole. You have the IMF already with one trillion dollars of lending capacity, you have the possibility of special drawing rights to be issued, you have swaps among central banks that can help specially emerging economies, you have a number of instruments that can put in place* ***a coordinated way*** *and we can win this battle if we act together”.*

It is obvious that we faced an ideology. The ideology of the UN that says the richer should help the poorer. It is in our interest, hence the virus can come back*.* We have the impression that we are not offered any other choice. The UN persuading people to accept their suggestions. Secretary-General continues repeating words, continues persuading us to take the offered measures. Divergence of views are not welcome in the UN. There is also an example of offering the guest another point of view: *“Are you not trying to scare richer nations?”*. Even the facial expression of the host showed some doubting. Thus, she made him give detailed explanation of his little ambiguous statements. But we also see that the UN shares its power with the countries of the G20 and encourage them to “have a coordinated response”. During the whole interview Secretary-General did not make an attempt to clarify what other actions, except that one country does what it wants, are nor effective as they should be. Was it a reasonable, well-grounded statement or a bit biased report? We cannot say that countries did not take any kind of measures. The UN has power to lighten issues and it also has power to report that taken measures are not effective. But were the actions really ineffective since no one expected and faced the coronavirus before.

*H: “You made reference to the fact that the United States is going to be pushing through* ***a trillions of dollars*** *to ensure that the COVID-19 does not have such a* ***detrimental impact*** *in the United States. Are you kind of saying that look, rich countries like the US could cough up more for the developing nations? Is that a kind of message you are trying to put over? That they could do more.*

The host used pretty informal phrasal verb “cough up”. The statements of Secretary-General are pretty equivocal, indeed, hence he was forcefully promoting the UN ideas: have a coordinated response and lend the money. Nevertheless, the UN is still hesitating what exact sums of money are needed. Trillions of trillions or even three trillion is already a gargantuan amount of money to be shelled out. Yet, when a country borrows money from the IMF, the policy of the fund mean that the country is obliged to inject the borrowed money to the economy and reassure the fund that it is able to return the money back (IMF Conditionality).

*SG: “Yes, but there are instruments that allow it to happen. As I said the IMF has already* ***one trillion dollars capacity*** *to lend.* ***We are in a war situation*** *with…erm…with…erm…with the virus.* ***We need a war economy.*** *And as the US is printing money in the US, we can do it globally in a way that is effective to address the challenges of the COVID-19”.*

Secretary-General used a very threatening phrase again: ***“a war situation”***. In our opinion, Secretary-General abuses its power in order to make people, make countries to agree. Undoubtedly, the Global South, in this sense, will blame the Europe and the other powerful countries for inactivity, for *“battling the same thing”*. Very peculiar use of language: the situation with COVID-19 certainly became very disappointing and scaring when comparison and metaphor are used in this context. We got very negative perception of the situation and many people took the words of Secretary-General, that countries do not have a coordinated response, as the only true ones. The discourse of the interview is tough and also contains topics related to the world economy as well as the individuals’ ones.

*H: “You are clearly arguing for a coordinated international response to deal with what is, after all,* ***a global threat****. What do you think about the way individual governments have been responding to the pandemic? And we have seen quite a difference in approach. France, for instance, has more stringent measures that the United Kingdome which has taken more of* ***a wait-and-see approach****. Donald Trump in the United States seems to be more relaxed and says he wants to see the US economy going back to normal at Easter April the 12th. What is your sense of how national governments are responding? Are you content?*

As we have said before, the countries took measures proposed by the WHO, although each one their own ones. We witness that the language that had been using during the interview varied from formal and pompous to semi-formal and informal. Most informal words and phrases was used by the host of the program, whereas formal speech, lofty and intimidating ones by the Secretary-General António Guterres.

*SG: “Well, of course, I am not happy with the present situation. There is an* ***effective dysfunctionality*** *in way all this is happening. We are not a global governance systems. Of course, the World Health Organization is given authority on health. They have issued guidelines but many of the countries but many of the countries have not respected them, or sometimes they do, sometimes they do not. So, the only way out is through* ***effective international cooperation****. And* ***I believe the G20 can be the nucleus*** *of that international cooperation aiming at acting together in* ***an articulated way****. But, look, I mean this is not only the COVID-19. If you look at peace and security, I mean the relationship between* ***the biggest powers*** *have never been as dysfunctional.* ***The Security Council has been paralyzed*** *in relation to many of the conflicts in the world. For climate change, it has been so difficult to bring people together. So, we are witnessing a serious problem and that problem is that* ***international cooperation*** *has not and we have never been at this low level. And* ***we need to make sure*** *people understand that as* ***threats are becoming global****, COVID-19 is another one, climate change already existed, terrorism, global terrorism is there.* ***As these threats are becoming global****, we effectively need to have a very strong commitment to* ***international cooperation*** *and to strengthen multilateral institutions. I know this is not popular in some media, I know that many think that they can do it by themselves, that each one by the…****by itself is or himself*** *is the best way to deal with these problems, but the reality shows and the COVID-19 is showing it dramatically. Either we join, either we are in solidarity, either we are together, or* ***we can be defeated****.*

António Guterres uses the figure of speech called paradox or oxymoron – **effective dysfunctionality –** in this sentence. He highlights that the paradoxical situations that are happening in the world, particularly in the UN, **paralyze** the Security Council. Two figures of speech: oxymoron and hyperbole. He uses **“I believe”** again and again, as if assuring other countries and himself in particular that his words can be turned into actions. Phrases *“we need to be sure’, “we need to reassure”* certainly show that the situation with collaboration and cooperation is not as the UN would like it to be.

*H: “Secretary-General, you sound as a man, really* ***a world leader in despair*** *about the state of the lack of international cooperation. What do you think lies behind this dire situation where* ***key powers*** *are not cooperating in the way you would like to see them? What is the reason?*

Obviously, the relations between some countries are situations with Us and Them..

*SG: “We had in a transition moment, we lived to the bipolar world, then we lived in the unipolar world. Now we are in kind of a chaotic situation is not yet multipolar, is no longer unipolar or bipolar. Poor relations became unclear, we are seeing more and more spoilers in in international relations, less capacity to control them. And, as I said, relations between* ***the biggest powers*** *have never been so* ***dysfunctional*** *as they are today.*

The USA – Us – points on China – Them – for being the only malefactor in the situation with the COVID-19 pandemic. They used their international power to make China sell them TikTok platform. They explained their position with saying that China possesses “digital authoritarianism” (US report accuses China of 'digital authoritarianism'). The key powers like the US and China, indeed, competing with each other for the global market. Later, Zeinab Badawi will remind of Russian as *“another world power with its actions in Belarus”*(António Guterres, UN Secretary General - BBC HARDtalk). And each country – Us – struggles to represent some other countries – Them – from a negative perspective by using their powers.

*H: “Why? Why?”*

*SG: “I hope these transitional moves…”*

*H: “Can I ask you to clarify? Are you talking about the United States and China? Could you be a bit more specific?*

*SG: “Well, it is very simple. The United States and China are two fundamental pillars of the global economy, and they need to come together* ***to fight the COVID-19****. I mean it is, there are problems, there are questions, eventually failures here and there. But instead of making that the issue, the issue is to bring people and look at global supply chains. You need to have ventilators* ***everywhere****, you need to have tests* ***everywhere****, you need to have medical equipment* ***everywhere****. I mean it is a good reason to do it in a way in which there is a common planning, common supply chain and the possibility to provide it to people in the same circumstances.* ***This is not a moment to fight each other, this is not the moment for division, this is the moment to come to together****. Now, it is not easy in the present world. We know all the contradictions that exist, but the choice is between* ***chaos*** *and* ***the******united action to respond*** *to a very dramatic threat that* ***humankind*** *is facing.*

Secretary-General in this response outlines that problems exist everywhere. But at the moment it is not right time to rival and compete with each other. He uses repetitions such as *“everywhere”* and *“this is not a moment”*. Neither does he suggest that it *might be not a very good moment* nor say *“Do you not think it is not a very good moment”*. His position is clear – they have to, if not must, stop fighting with each other and unite in order to help prevent COVID-19 getting into vulnerable countries and make an articulated response to the virus.

*H: “So, it is not helpful when you hear comments in the Trump’s administration including the president himself referring to COVID-19 as* ***“that Chinese virus””****?*

Us and Them phenomenon. It is **their** problem, **they** are guilty.

*SG: “Well, I think this is* ***not the moment*** *for anyone to blame others.* ***Probably, I believe****, in the end we will need to do lessons learned, we need to see that failed and why it failed in several parts of the world. But this is the moment to come together, to unite and to defeat COVID-19,* ***to rescue our lives****.*

Secretary-General repeats again phrases that were already said. He keeps outlining that the problem that is above all at the moment, is the problem with COVID-19 and the most vulnerable countries that definitely will be affected mush more that the developed countries. *“Probably, I believe”,* after the pandemic is over, the countries may have to analyse the past in order to prevent that sort of situations. In fact, we have already seen another position of one of the most influential and famous people in the world – Bill Gates – that people would need to consider much more huge problems on the example of the Ebola epidemic in the Western African countries. At that time, the epidemic ended due to the taken measures and health professionals that went to West Africa to help people (The next outbreak? We're not ready).

*H: “I will not put you an alternative view which has just propounded by President Trump, but we have also seen, for example, Phillip Thomas of Bristol University in Britain, a professor of Risk Management saying: “I am worried that in order to solve one problem we will create a bigger problem”. And he says: “Keeping the economy going is crucial, otherwise measures will do more harm than good”. And that kind of reflects President Trump’s view that you know, he says if we were, if it were up to the doctors, they may say: “Let us shut down the entire world”, and you cannot do that. I mean you except there has got to be a trade-off between killing the economy and tackling over COVID-19.*

Returning back to the economic discourse, we see that there are people who have other views on the UN proposals. Some countries just cannot lend money – they are poor. Some countries will not bear such a negative impact on their economies – they may default. Obviously, there should be general agreement on the topic. The world simply cannot afford a total lockdown. The economies may collapsed. That is what people of the economy field concern most, and that is why the economic discourse goes along with the political one.

*SG: “But that is exactly the reason why I am saying we need to have* ***together*** *a package of a double-digit of the percentage of global economy and the package that each country can do by itself but, obviously, it is much more powerful if everything is combined, a package that is different from 2008. It is no longer to rescue the financial system,* ***this is not a financial crisis, it is a human crisis****. This package needs t be put in place in order to support salaries of those that are losing their jobs, in order to support companies for them to preserve those jobs and preserve their existence; in order to keep house all the floats, keep companies afloat, especially small and medium sized businesses in order to have the global economy able to survive to these crisis, and then to have also a concerted action in relation to the exit strategy and in relation,* ***I would say****, recovery of the economy with an opportunity. This is an opportunity to have a recovery that can be ever more sustainable, and the inclusive economy and I need to rebuild everything as it was. We can do it much better in the future.*

Secretary-General does not diverge from the planned path. He insisting again on sort of a global safety cushion and, at the same time, saying that each country has to have its own. But is it an option for the countries? He calls the COVID-19 pandemic *“a human crisis”*, and refuse calling it *“a financial crisis”*. Certainly, António Guterres uses his power to make the situation looks much more negative and threatening, but is it so in reality?

*H: “And who takes the leadership for that? You have mentioned the G20, and you can look to them, but should not the United Nations do that? I mean after all, the World Health Organization is* ***part of the UN family*** *and surely, you should be saying: “I want the United Nations empowered, which is the point that Professor Ian Golden makes, a professor of Development in Globalization: “We need to empower the UN so that we can come together to tackle this threat”. Why do not you say: “I, António Guterres, I want to be the focal point of tackling this COVID-19”.*

So, the UN has branches and the WHO is one of them. They already have power which, seems, to be not enough. Or the UN is simulating the reality and creating a hyperreality withholding the real facts and the reality itself from the public. Through the whole work we question the relevance of such scaring statements, of overwhelming repetitions and pompous words. The situation cannot be observed only by the UN reports.

*SG: “This is not* ***a question of narcissism****. What we need is a concerted action, and the UN is ready to do whatever the UN is asked for. We are now, for instance, putting together all our supply chain capacities in order to offer the international community a possibility to be much more effective in relation to, for instance, medical equipment in all parts of the world. But I believe the G20 represents 80% of the world economy. The leaders of the G20 have an opportunity with no other similar in the concentration of power because* ***power is not in the UN****, whether we like it or not, is in the Member States. They are coming together, 80%, the have the chance to approve a coordinated action”.*

António Guterres uses very similar construction: *“a question of narcissism”* which surely reminds us of *“a matter of enlightened self-interest”*. It worth mentioning that António Guterres uses pretty simple constructions, he does not try to put his whole vocabulary in one sentence. The language is uncomplicated and easy to understand. He denied the explicitly proposed idea of the host that the UN should extend their power and authority to tackle the issue. Finally, he said that the real power belong to the members of G20 as the most influential and better developed economies. We assume that they are no such a discourse that would not contain economic discourse, economic topics and issues. Almost everything, if not everything, is closely related to economy.

*H: “In terms of the message you would want to give to the world about how they should respond to COVID-19, young people in particular. Dr. Tedros Ghebreyesus, the director of Journal of the World Health Organization has said to them: “Look, you are not invincible, do not think this is just something that affects older people or people with underlined health conditions”. What is your public health message to the world”?*

*SG: “… (the speech was interrupted) …and the UN is ready to fully support it. I would, of course, would be very happy* ***if there will be a global agreement to increase the governor’s power*** *that could be placed in the UN. But* ***that is not my objective****. Objective at the present moment is* ***not to stress in the UN****, my objective is to help* ***rescue the world*** *in relation of COVID-19”.*

We dare say that powers of the G20 and the UN as organization that has its own powers implicitly rival each other. As far as we concerned, there are few of those who does not want to obtain more power. The UN is not among them, obviously. As one of the most vital organizations in the world, the UN wants to have not nominal but the real power that would be able to control and tackle issues as they consider it to be tackled. Eventually, it seems that the host desired to hear the personal health message. António Guterres represents not only the UN, as Secretary-General, but also himself and his ideas.

*H: “****You have a voice****, though, when I ask you to use it now”.*

*SG: “Be responsible, be smart, but, above all, understand that only in solidarity we can defeat this disease”.*

Vert peculiar way of letting one person to express their ideas. *“You have a voice…when I ask you to use it”*, as if it is the only moment when he may have his own opinion and may express it. We can guess that it is either the position of the BBC company or an attitude of some British people towards the UN. Both are possible here, and one does not exclude another.

*H: “Only with a solidarity but also with a vaccine which is something that you referred to earlier on this interview. So, where do you think we stand with that do? Are you optimistic about us having one quite soon? And are you also confident that when it is developed, it will be shared amongst all the countries that need it, in particular poorer countries”?*

*SG: “I am not an expert. I cannot say I am optimistic. I insist that everybody should do everything to make it happen as soon as possible which means working together instead of competing among the different research centres of the different countries. And I think it is absolutely vital that when vaccine is distributed to be distributed globally and not to have the privilege having the vaccine, and the poor submitted to the disease”.*

Though Secretary-General was insisting on the global spread of the vaccine, there are more than one vaccine at the moment, and the political situations and political relationships play crucial role in the decision-making process: not every country has registered Pfizer vaccine or Sputnik V, for instance. Political disagreement influence, as we know, also international social and medicine agreements along with businesses. And still countries have to pay for the chosen vaccine. Not every can do it.

*H: “And you have also mentioned that the most vulnerable of the vulnerable are living in conflict areas, in refugee camps, of course, as a former head of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, you know very well that what Jan Egeland, the refugees from the Norwegian Refugee Council, says: “How can you do social distancing when thousands of people are crowded together in a tiny camp or refugee settlement. This is* ***a disaster waiting to happen****”. You have got to make sure that people loke those are protected”.*

*SG: “It is* ***a nightmare that we face****. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees together with organizations of international migration, many NGOs and the Red Cross at Crescent Society are coming together. The main objective is to prevent, to avoid at all cost, the virus to come to some of these settlements. Fortunately, some of them are relatively, isolated. Others, unfortunately, not. And at the same time to boost to the extent possible the local capacity in washing hands facilities, these disinfectant devices, and all other mechanisms: the medical equipment, the medical capacity, all other forms to respond. But I have to say looking into refugee camps or into the slums of many of the big cities in the developing world. This can be* ***an effective nightmare*** *and one reason more to do everything possible to support these countries for not, for them not to become the weak point in…in the world. And let us never forget one thing…”*

The humanitarian organizations, as the UN Secretary-General reports, are looking into these areas of greater risk and trying to prevent the spread of the coronavirus into these vulnerable areas. The sentences’ construction is similar to those we have already seen. António Guterres uses the same techniques of construction. He also uses the words with the same meaning to that which already have been used. Paradoxical *“an effective nightmare”* and comparison the situation is that areas with the nightmare.

*H: “Yes”.*

*SG: “…Our global health system is as strong as our weakest health system in the world. So, there are all reasons to mobilize resources to support those that have less capacity today”.*

*H: “Finally, António Guterres, I want you to just reflect on how you think the COVID-19 crisis is going to affect the world. What is the impact going to be: socially, economically, politically? What is the long-term impact in your view, and could there be any positive benefits like, you know, people travel less, for you know reasons other than pressing ones”?*

*SG: “I think one thing is clear the digital world will have a huge boost. I think one of the big questions of humankind is not to make sure there is* ***artificial intelligence****, the cyberspace in general, force for good. And it is clear that we will have a boost in* ***digital world****,* ***digital technologies*** *because they are proving their extreme importance not to allow us to go on working. In the UN we are working but largely through digital communication mechanisms and using digital instruments. So, digital will have a boost and there must be a lot of* ***international cooperation*** *on making sure that we also address the challenges that it poses but make it really a force for good and for a much broader capacity to answer to challenges development in the world. On the other hands, this will give us an opportunity* ***to look into climate change seriously****. It is not with the virus that we fight climate change, but there is a clear demonstration that when we rebuild our economies, we will have the chance to do it in a more sustainable way.* ***We do not need now that we are consuming less energy*** *now that we are moving less. It is a moment to think* ***how we consume energy****, how we move and to do it better in the future. And in relation to many other aspects of international cooperation I hope that this will be a kind of wake-up call to make the world understand and how important multilateralism is, how important global governance is, and how important it is for international cooperation today to be the normal way in which countries relate to each other”.*

*H: “Secretary-General, António Guterres, in New York at the United Nations headquarters. Thank you very much, indeed, for coming on HARDtalk.*

Eventually, Secretary-General set future targets in the way that we are familiar with. He outlines the privilege that the digital technologies would have in the near future, once again highlights the importance and effectiveness of international cooperation. Many of the essential topics are still under discussions, and Secretary-General point that it is time of *“how we consume”* and not that *“we consume less”*. The UN is worried of how things are done. The worries are evident throughout the whole interview. Lots of crucial topics were mentioned during the interview and many inspiring objectives were set.

**Conclusions**

In the second chapter we have analysed one of the genres of the media discourse – the genre of interview. The genre represents a complexed communicative phenomenon with various feature:

1. Formal and informal language successfully coexist in BBC HARDtalk interviews. From the analysis of the interview of António Guterres, the General Secretary of the UN, we can understand that the informal phrases and phrasal verbs are typically used by the host of the program. Secretary-General, as the main representative of the United Nations, stuck to formal expressions and neutrally-constructed sentences.
2. The place and the date of the interview are planned in advance. There are no audience in the room that can participate in the interview discussion. In such interviews with sensitive and delicate topics the audience has only the passive way of participation. Thus, we can either accept the received information or reject it. We also can debate it on our level of influence – family talks, friends’ conversations, debate of neighbours. We do not possess such power that be able to influence the discussion or struggle with powers of the UN, the WHO or G20. In the case with the coronavirus pandemic we are all obliged to follow at least some of the rules introduced by the World Health Organization.
3. The discourse of the interview consists of three other discourses: social, political and economic. The economic discourse eve prevailed in some parts of the interview, hence there are debates and concerns on financial aid to the most vulnerable countries. Along with already existed humanitarian appeal Secretary-General launched another one in order to help poorer countries. Political discourse is the core of the interview. Lots of time and efforts were and are being spent in order to bring countries to negotiation table.
4. Figures of speech were used in great number in order to influence opinions and show the preferred reality, preferred understanding of the current situation with COVID-19 in the whole world. Hyperbole and comparisons were of exclusive popularity for António Guterres. Undoubtedly, the General Secretary of the United Nations tried to use his power to achieve his objectives. For instance: to bring countries together, to create an articulated response to defeat the virus, to look into vulnerable areas and etc. The pompous words were certainly said in order to demonstrate the horrible state of things. The relevance of that language usage were questioned not only by us but also by the host herself. Though they were not involved it debates, the host took the words of Secretary-General, in our opinion, with a grain of salt.
5. The UN is not the only who can influence the current situation. Much of the time were spent by outlining the importance of discussion the coronavirus pandemic within the G20 meeting. The 20 of the most influential and developed countries were supposed to come up with possible solutions of the problems.
6. The phenomenon of Us and Them could be traced in both political and economic discourses. Every country, every power struggle to be the only one to define truth.
7. The powers of the UN are limited. Still countries also take their own measures despite the WHO reports.

In our personal view, the UN is demonstrating sort of a hyperreality. It seems that problems with the Global South have just popped up, and countries struggle to kill two birds with one stone. The relations of the US and Chine were shown as the most dysfunctional as ever been. Are the demonstrations of the relations between leading countries not simulacra? May it be that the relations are not so bad as they are demonstrated by the media? The later research works may be devoted to the critical studies of other discourses in BBC programs and other media sources. We also would like to criticize one-sided reports on situations. In order to reach the objectivity, if that ever can be reached, we need to present the public more that one perspectives. In order to give the UN the most unbiased characteristics there should be provided research works which will examine the UN as organization that has the power to report on issues of paramount importance and which will study the reports by the organization on the effectiveness of the done work.

The aim of this work was to outline the most essential features of the HARDtalk interview discourse, and we believe that the objective was achieved and accomplished.
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