RESPONSES AND CO-CONSTRUCTION IN THE FIRST 2004 BUSH-KERRY US PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

by Ronald R. Jacobsen

This paper presents an analysis of the global coherence of the First 2004 US presidential debate between George W. Bush and John F. Kerry. The point of departure of this analysis are the candidates' responses and the topical threads/repetition patterns that get co-constructed across turns at talk as a consequence of these. Methodologically, the analysis draws on Tannen's (2007) approach to 'repetition' in interactional discourse. The analyses of the different types of repetition produced by the candidates not only show that it is the candidates, not the moderator, who are in charge of the debate's topics, but also that the candidates collaborate on a massive scale, despite being engaged in antagonistic debate.

Key words: Responses, co-construction, repetition, intertextuality, global coherence, paraphrase, quotation, formulation

1.Introduction

Political candidates participating in 'debates' broadcast on TV are often perceived as 'distorting', as 'evasive/non-responsive', as 'speaking at cross purposes', as engaged in 'mudslinging', as 'intentionally misunderstanding', and such like. Accordingly, one would not expect a political debate, such as, for example, the First 2004 US presidential debate between George W. Bush and John F. Kerry, to form a globally coherent discourse. Rather, one would expect the debate to include but a few isolated instances of cross-turn continuities between the candidates' responses, and hence largely to be made up of locally coherent pieces of discourse, where a candidate's response may show an initial, but brief orientation to the co-candidate's prior turn before proceeding to the candidate's own agenda.

What is more, the format and rules agreed upon by the candidates, the moderator (Jim Lehrer), and the Commission on Presidential Debate (i.e., the official sponsor of the US presidential debates) prior to the debate (see *Memorandum of Understanding*, 2004) appear to invite 16-18 'mini debates', each comprised of a topic-setting Question, a 2-minute Answer and a 90-second Rebuttal – in other words, a Q-A-R sequence with an optional 1-minute extension at the discretion of the moderator, leaving 30 seconds for follow up by each candidate, Follow-up 1 and Follow-up 2 (F1, F2). For example, it says in the *Memorandum of Understanding* (2004) that "the moderator shall (iii) vary the topics on which he or she questions the candidates and ensure that the topics of the questions are fairly apportioned between the candidates". And it (2004, my italics) says that "the moderator in his discretion may extend *the discussion* [i.e., of the Q-A-R sequence] for a period of time not to exceed sixty (60) seconds...".

In other words, it appears that the discussion of a particular topic is restricted to a particular Q-A-R sequence, unless the moderator chooses for his next question a topic closely related to the previous one.

The aim of this paper is to show that despite the common perception that politicians are 'distorting', 'evasive', 'speaking at cross purposes', etc., Bush and Kerry actually collaborate in establishing topical continuities across such 'local' Q-A-R sequences. This collaboration is evidenced by a number of interrelated repetition patterns, that is, a number of interwoven topical threads composed of identical, synonymous or near-synonymous linguistic items and constructions that link some portion of a candidate's response to a prior turn of his/her own and/or of his/her co-candidate.

To my knowledge, no previous research has attempted to describe the co-construction of meaning by political candidates engaged in antagonistic debate.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the data and some initial observations. Section 3 clarifies the key theoretic notions of 'repetition' and 'co-construction' as applied in the analysis. Section 4 presents the analysis, and section 5 concludes the paper.

2. The data, and some initial observations

The First 2004 US presidential debate was the first of three encounters between Republican incumbent George W. Bush and Democratic candidate John F. Kerry that were broadcast on national TV during the final stage of the 2004 US presidential election. The debate was held at the University of Miami on September 30. In addition to the three presidential debates between Bush and Kerry, there was held one vice-presidential debate between incumbent Dick Cheney and John Edwards. All four debates were sponsored by the Commission on Presidential Debate, and transcripts of the debates can be downloaded from the commission's official website, debates.org.

The transcripts as well as the analyses provided in this paper, however, are based on sound recordings of the first debate downloaded from The Internet Archive (see references).

At the end of this paper, two appendices can be found. The first, appendix A, offers a description of the transcription conventions used, and the second, appendix B, a number of additional examples.

Now, as regards the data itself, the first crucial observation made was the central role played in the debate by repetition, either in a pre-patterning, rhetorical, cohesive or some other discourse function. As a consequence, an initial systematic examination of the repetitions' cohesive role could identify a number of overlapping repetition patterns and/or interrelated topical threads (across the 'local' Q-A-R sequences).

To demonstrate the type of 'collaboration' between the candidates associated with these topical threads, an instance of what I call a turn-transitional repetition, shall be considered (see section 4.1). It occurs when a candidate at the outset of his turn is responding to something that his co-candidate has just said at the end of the preceding turn, such as, for example, when Kerry at the outset of his 90-second 'rebuttal' below is repeating the last part of Bush's 2-minute 'answer' (at the arrow →):

Excerpt 1 (00:07:16 - 00:08:30)

1	Bush	...
2		.hh **The best way to defeat them is to <u>never</u> <u>waver</u>,**
		to be <u>strong</u>,
3		to use <u>every</u> <u>a:ssess</u> at our disposal
4		.hh is to CONSTANTLY stay on the offensive (.)
5		.hh And at the same time spread liberty ((incredulity))
6		...
7		They are trying to defeat us, and if we <u>lo:se</u> our will,
		we <u>lo:se</u>.
8		But if **we remai:n <u>stro:ng</u> and <u>resolute</u>,**
		<u>we</u> <u>will</u> <u>defeat</u> this enemy.
9	Lehrer	Ninety second response, Senator Kerry
10	Kerry →	**I believe in being <u>stro:ng</u>** .hh **and <u>resolu:te</u>**
		and <u>determined</u>
11	.	hh And <u>I</u> <u>will</u> <u>hunt</u> <u>down</u> and <u>kill</u> the <u>terrorists</u>
		<u>wherever</u> they a:re.
12	.	hh But we also have to be <u>smart</u>, Jim.
13		...

The first thing that needs to be noted about this interchange is that although Kerry is repeating the words 'strong' and 'resolute' as well as their combined syntactic role as a conjunct adjectival phrase, the clause clearly involves a paraphrase. This is revealed, among other, by the substitution of 'remain' with 'in being' and the addition of 'and determined'.

The second thing that needs to be noted is that the object of the repetition (see boldface in l. 8) not only is used by Bush to express a specific commitment, viz. to 'winning' (the war on terror) and/or 'not giving up' (winning in Iraq) (the main topic of the 3rd repetition pattern, 'Resolute', identified in the debate), but also to express a *positive self-presentation*, and by implication, a negative other-presentation (see van Dijk 2006), viz. that contrary to himself, Kerry will not 'remain strong and resolute'.

Importantly, this hearing of the last part of Bush's 2-minute 'answer' (which itself involves a self-repetition, compare l. 2 and 8) is confirmed by Kerry's uptake/repetition which 'corrects' this understanding by

stating the opposite, as revealed by the phrase 'I believe' which signals a 'personal commitment' and the phrase 'in being strong...', the object of that commitment. The next clause offers additional support for this commitment: 'And I will hunt down and kill the terrorists wherever they are'.

The third thing that needs to be noted is that the repetition (l. 10) and the object of the repetition (l. 8) are used to express different commitments. Whereas Bush is expressing a commitment to winning the war on terror not only in Iraq but also on a global scale (by 'military' means, it appears), Kerry is expressing a commitment to being determined in 'hunting down and killing the terrorists wherever they are' (more in the line of a worldwide policing effort, it appears). The fact that Kerry is trying to communicate a different position on the 'same' issue becomes fully evident in line 12, where he adds, 'But we also have to be smart, Jim'. Importantly, the 'but' here is used not only to signal a contrast to 'being strong, resolute, and determined', but also to Bush's position, which by implication, is not 'smart'.

As a consequence, Kerry's response in excerpt 1, including the repetition in line 10, must be said to involve a 'contradiction' (in the broadest sense of the term) not only in its attempt to correct the understanding (or cancel the implicature) that Kerry is not strong and resolute, i.e., committed to winning the war on terror, but also in its attempt to 'correct' what it means to be committed to winning the war on terror. That is, 'winning the war on terror' is not the same as 'winning Bush's war on terror', according to Kerry (which interestingly implies a different view of reality/ideology).

To sum up, the repetition in excerpt 1, like most repetitions that were identified in the initial examination of the data as belonging to one or the other repetition pattern of the 2004 First US presidential debate, reveals that the candidates primarily collaborate in showing an (ideological) opposition to each other's positions, so that the co-construction of meaning (i.e., 'debating') in which the candidates are engaged primarily is manifested by different types of contradictions.

These different types of contradictions are going to be explored further in section 4.

3. Repetition and co-construction

The aim of this section is to clarify the key theoretic notions of 'repetition' and 'co-construction' as well as the analytic framework adopted for the present purpose.

The term 'repetition' is associated with at least three meanings, 'repetition', as in repeating the same words or phrases, 'paraphrase', as in repeating something using different words, and 'quotation', as in repeating something said by someone else (i.e., the assumed author/originator of the words quoted).

The particular notion of repetition adopted in this paper, however, is a *discourse* notion, where the expression(s) used are understood to repeat the 'same' topic in different ways, as evidenced by the repetition patterns/topical threads identified as part of the initial examination of the data reported in section 2. As a consequence, the three meanings, 'repetition', 'paraphrase', and 'quotation', are expected to show a considerable overlap in the data.

To this topical aspect of repetition, however, there is a corresponding action or co-constructional element, as illustrated with Kerry's other-repetition in excerpt 1, viz., the contradiction associated with his repeating Bush's words.

This means that in order for some individual repetition to bear evidence of the candidates' co-construction of meaning, it must both involve the 'same' topic as well as an instance of other-repetition/contradiction.

This brings up the other key theoretic notion of 'co-construction'. Initially, it may be characterized in terms of the CA notion of an adjacency pair, that is, as involving a particular pair type, such as, for example, a greeting-greeting sequence, a question-answer sequence, or an assessment-(dis)agreement sequence, where the second-pair-part, i.e., the 2nd

greeting, answer or (dis)agreement, can be said to collaboratively establish the first-pair-part as a greeting, question and assessment, respectively.

As regards the other-repetitions occurring in the First 2004 US presidential debate, like the one in excerpt 1, the relevant pair type appears to be that of a position-contradiction sequence, where the second-pair-part collaboratively co-constructs the object of the repetition as either involving or being associated with the expression of a candidate's position on some issue. Importantly, this implies that one is dealing with a special assessment-agreement pair type, since a 'position' implies an assessment (i.e., an evaluative component, such as, for example, a positive self-presentation and/or a negative other-presentation) and a 'contradiction' a disagreement (i.e., not only with the implied assessment, but also with the position attributed to the 'first' candidate).

Naturally, the candidate whose words are being repeated may not agree with the position attributed to him, and as a consequence, he may attempt to correct it in a subsequent Q-A-R sequence.

This, in turn, implies that the co-construction of meaning is not restricted to a particular 'local' or 'adjacent' repetition, like the one in excerpt 1, but rather may include repetitions belonging to many separate Q-A-R sequences; that is to say, it represents an entire repetition pattern, which can be said to constitute a 'global' textual element of the debate (a 'debate').

In fact, most of the repetitions that have been identified as belonging to one or the other repetition pattern of the First 2004 US presidential debate are not used to connect two adjacent turns. Instead, they are used to establish co-constructed topical links across separate Q-A-R sequences, which, in turn, implies that it is possible to dispense with the word 'adjacency' in 'adjacency pair' and simply refer to it as a pair, or a coherent sequence (see Mey 2001: 161 who makes a similar point).

Interestingly, the view of repetition and co-construction that emerges from this discussion is largely, if not fully, consistent with Tannen's (1987a, 1987b, 2007) notion of repetition. She describes repetition as "one of a range of patterns that contribute to coherence in discourse"

(1987a: 576), "a pervasive type of spontaneous prepatterning in conversation" (1987b: 215), and a clear case of intertextuality, involving "ways that meaning is created by the recurrence and recontextualization of words and phrases in discourse" (2007: 9).

Importantly, whereas the prepatterning role of repetition implies that the candidates are using each other's words, phrases, and clauses as resources for constructing their own turns at talk, intertextuality additionally invests the 'contradiction' of a position-contradiction sequence with a major recontextualization role, which, it seems fair to assume, is intended for the benefit of the overhearing audience of TV viewers for whom the debate is broadcast.

Table 1. The main repetition patterns of the First 2004 US presidential debate

Repetition pattern	Generic topic
1. Strong alliances	The nature and purpose of, and commitment to, a strong alliance
2. Plan	The kind of plan needed to succeed in Iraq
3. Resolute	The kind of commitment needed to succeed in Iraq and effectively reducing the chances of future terrorist attacks against the U.S.
4. Diverting	The issue as to whether the 'fight against terrorism' has been, or should be restricted to specific targets in specific places, i.e. places holding a clearly identifiable enemy
5. War on terror	The issue of how best to reduce the risk of future terrorist attacks in the world through international collaboration, surveillance, preemptive military strikes, policing, etc., and especially how to effectively reduce the risk of future attacks on U.S. soil and against U.S. military installations abroad.
6. Mistake	The issue as to whether past and present actions by the candidates can be said to involve mistakes or misjudgments on their part, so as to assess who is best suited to be commander in chief.
7. Changed his mind	The issue as to whether 'changing his mind' can be characterized as a general feature of one of the candidates' character/personality, especially Kerry's
8. Mixed signals	The issue as to whether the candidates' rhetoric is sending 'clear messages' to particular audiences, the implication being that sending 'mixed signals' is not a desirable property of a president who is expected to communicate clearly

In a more recent study, Tannen (2006: 597) "explores intertextuality in family discourse by tracing how three couples' conflicts about domestic responsibilities are recycled, reframed, and rekeyed over time". By recycling, she means "situations where a topic is closed, then arises later in the same or different conversation"; by reframing, "a change in what the conversation is about (i.e., a topic shift); and by rekeying, "a change in the tone or tenor of an interaction" (2006: 597).

Transferred to the repetition patterns that have been identified in the First 2004 US presidential debate, a recycling can be said to mark the boundary between two episodes of a 'global' topical thread (a repetition pattern); a reframing, to capture the recontextualization underlying a particular instance of other-repetition; and a rekeying, a candidate's emotional response to something his co-candidate has (allegedly) said – as reflected, for example, by "tone of voice, amplitude, lexical emphasis, rhythm, intonational contours, or other qualities of speech" (Tannen 2006: 601).

Significantly, in contrast to the family disputes analyzed by Tannen, where the actual participant addressed by a family member's talk is also the intended addressee of that member's talk, the recyclings, reframings, and rekeyings of a TV-transmitted US presidential debate are not intended for the actual addressee, the co-candidate to whose talk a candidate's repetition is responding, but rather for the candidate's own (actual and presumed) audience among the overhearing audience of TV viewers.

This concludes the outline of the analytic framework adopted in the present paper.

4. Analysis

The repetition patterns that were identified as part of the initial examination of the data comprise eight patterns in total. Each of these patterns can be summarized in terms of its generic topic, paraphrases of which are offered in Table 1.

Although the patterns are interrelated and show a considerable topical overlap, it is quite possible to distinguish them from one another. For example, the third repetition pattern, 'Resolute', may be distinguished from the other ones on account of it being comprised exclusively by immediate other-repetitions (see 4.1). Hence, this and other distinguishing features shall be the point of departure of the analyses presented in this section.

4.1. Turn-transitional repetitions

Generally, the repetitions identified in the first debate do not involve immediate responses to something the co-candidate just said. There are two reasons for this. First, the time allocated to each candidate, i.e., two minutes for answering and 90 seconds for rebutting, means that the candidates' 'answers' and 'rebuttals' typically have many parts, so that only a response to the last part is likely to be perceived as an immediate response. Second, the fact that the candidates take turns answering and rebutting means that the rebutting candidate is typically not held accountable for his or her views (unless the Q-A-R sequence is extended with 1 minute for follow-up by the moderator, which doesn't happen too often), but proceeds instead with giving an 'answer' to the moderator's next question.

One notable exception to the general absence of immediate responses is the third repetition pattern, 'Resolute', which includes a total of three instances, one at the intersection of an Answer and a Rebuttal (the first instance – see excerpt 1), and two at the intersection of Follow-up 1 and 2 (i.e., a one-minute extension), the second of which is represented in excerpt 2 below (and the third in excerpt 12 in appendix B).

Notice that whereas **boldface** is used to mark any member of a repetition pattern, be it the object of a repetition or a self-/other-'repetition', **boldface** in combination with an arrow (→) is used to mark other-repetitions (i.e., turn-transitional repetitions in this case):

Excerpt 2 (00:17:54 - 00:18:09)

```
1  Bush      ...
2  .         hh No, the way to win this .hh is to be steadfast and
             resolved
3            .hh and to follow through on the plan
             that I've just outlined.
4  Lehrer    Thirty seconds, Senator.
5  Kerry →   Yes, we have to steadfast and resolved, and I AM.
6  →         .hh And I WILL succeed for those troops
             no:w that we are there (.)
7            ...
```

The first thing that needs to be noted about this instance is that it involves a recycle. Not only has the topic been closed for two full Q-A-R sequences (i.e., 9 minutes and 24 seconds), it also arises in the context of an entirely different discussion. In contrast to the first instance, a position-contradiction pair which arose in the context of a discussion of the 'war on terror', the second instance, a position-contradiction pair, arises in the context of a discussion of the 'war in Iraq'.

To this, it needs to be added that this time, the object of the repetition (i.e., the first-pair-part of the position-contradiction pair) is not part of a turn-internal self-repetition, but rather of a turn-external, or cross Q-A-R sequence, self-repetition – Bush's words, 'No, the way to win this is to be steadfast and resolved' (see l. 2) involving a repetition of 'The best way to defeat them is to never waver, to be strong...' (see l. 2 in excerpt 1).

Importantly, this suggests that the candidates' collaboratively achieved topic continuities are invited by, or naturally happen in response to, self-repetitions, be they manifested turn-internally, or turn-externally. So, if, for example, Bush repeatedly mentions the US having a 'duty to defeat this enemy/ideology of hatred', as he does in his 2-minute answer to the second debate question, and subsequently in several consecutive turns (without evoking any response from Kerry), then

that must be interpreted as a decline on Kerry's part to participate in the construction of this topical line (i.e., it may be characterized as a case of 'a failed debate').

The second thing that needs to be noted about the interaction in excerpt 2 is that it involves a *reframing*. On the one hand, the repetition treats Bush's commitment to 'staying steadfast and resolved as a means to winning the war in Iraq' as two separate commitments, viz., one to being steadfast and resolved, and one to succeeding in Iraq. On the other hand, it overtly avoids expressing any commitment to 'following through on Bush's plan', which Kerry has criticized in his prior turn, i.e., a 90-second rebuttal offered in response to a 2-minute answer.

As a consequence, the reframing both concerns an alternative, or opposite, assessment of the 'same' situation as well as an alternative, or opposite, position on how to resolve that situation (and solve the associated problems).

Significantly, this reframing is accomplished by way of two contradictions, one of which corrects the view (read: the implied negative other-representation of Bush's response) that Kerry is NOT steadfast and resolved (l. 5), while the other corrects the view that Kerry is NOT committed to winning the war in Iraq (l. 6).

Thus, in contrast to the first instance in excerpt 1, where Kerry is expressing a commitment to the US 'being strong and resolute' (in the war on terror), the second instance in excerpt 2 is mainly used by Kerry to express a commitment to winning the war in Iraq (in agreement with the instance involving a recycle, i.e., a shift in topic). Notice also that in both cases, Kerry is attributing to Bush the position that only he, Bush, is offering such a commitment (in agreement with the repetition involving a contradiction and the object of the repetition a position).

The third thing that needs to be noticed about the instance in excerpt 2 is that it involves a *rekeying*. This rekeying concerns an emotional stance of assertiveness on the part of Kerry, as revealed by the lexical stress associated with 'I AM' and 'I WILL' in lines 5 and 6, which casts Bush's presentation of him as ill-founded.

4.2. Non-immediate/delayed repetitions

The next case (and its distinguishing feature) to be considered is that of a delayed repetition. It is illustrated with an instance from the first repetition pattern, called 'Strong alliances'. Only after several self-repetitions by Kerry, initiated in his 'answer' to the first question (i.e. in the 1st Q-A-R sequence) and repeated in his 'answer' to the third question (i.e., in the 3rd Q-A-R sequence), Bush finally responds to it (and thus brings it into 'collective' life) in his 'answer' to the fourth question (i.e., in the 4th Q-A-R sequence).

Interestingly, this does not end Kerry's pursuit of the topic. On the contrary, he continues his line of self-repetitions already in the second 30-second follow-up of the 4th Q-A-R sequence (see excerpt 13 in Appendix B) and repeats it again in his answer to the seventh question, whereupon an extended discussion ensues. Crucially, this discussion is comprised exclusively of non-immediate repetitions (i.e., of repetitions which cannot be characterized as turn-transitional repetitions).

First, consider the initiation of the repetition pattern, 'Strong alliances', by Kerry:

Excerpt 3 (00:03:08 - 00:03.36)

1	Kerry	...
2	.	hh <u>I</u> <u>believe</u> <u>America</u> is <u>sa:fest</u> and <u>stro:ngest</u>
3		.hh when we are <u>leading</u> the <u>world</u>
		and we are ('the') <u>leading</u> (.) **strong alliances**
4		.hh <u>I'll</u> never give a <u>veto</u> to any country
		over our security
5		.hh But I also know how to lead those alliances
6		.hh **<u>This</u> president has left them in**
		<u>shatters</u> across the globe=
7		And **we are (.) now <u>90</u> percent**
8		.hh **of the <u>casualties</u> in Iraq and <u>90</u> percent**
9		.hh of the: ahh costs.
10		I think that's <u>wrong</u>.

| 11 | | .hh and I think that we can do <u>better</u>. |
| 12 | | ... |

As evidenced by this excerpt, Kerry not only speaks for 'strong alliances', but also blames Bush for 'having left them in shatters across the globe', and complains about the (alleged) consequence of the US 'now being 90 percent of the casualties in Iraq and 90 percent of the costs'. Bush doesn't respond to this criticism in his next turns, i.e., his 'rebuttal' in the 1st Q-A-R sequence and his 'answer' in the 2nd Q-A-R sequence, and, subsequently, Kerry repeats the same criticism of Bush in his answer to the third question (i.e., in the 3rd Q-A-R sequence), now with the added twist, though, that Bush promised 'to build a true alliance', but 'pushed our allies aside'.

However, when responding to the moderator's next question, which is pursuing a response not to the 'Strong alliances' thread, but rather to the 'Diverting' thread (see excerpt 14 in appendix B), also initiated by Kerry, Bush finally decides to respond:

Excerpt 4 (00:13:37 - 00:15:46)

1	Lehrer	New question, ah Mister President. ah Two minutes.
2		What about Senator Kerry's point=
3		The comparison he <u>drew</u> between the <u>priorities</u> of <u>going</u> a:fter Osama bin Laden
4		.hh and <u>going</u> eh after Saddam Hussein.
5	Bush	Jim, we've got the capability of doing <u>both</u>.
6		.hh As a matter of fact
7		(1.0)
8		.hh <u>This</u> is a <u>global</u> <u>effort</u>.
9		(2.0)
10		We're facing a: (2.0) ah a: (2.0) group of folks=
11		who have <u>such</u> <u>hatred</u> in their heart, they'll strike anywhere.
12		(2.0)
13		.hh with any means.=

14 →	**And that's <u>why</u> it's essential that we have strong alliances, and we do**↑. ((incredulity))
15	…
16 →	.hh **And our alliance is <u>strong</u>.**
17	…

The first repetition in this excerpt (line 14), 'And that's why it's essential that we have strong alliances, and we do', involves a paraphrastic repetition which can be seen to involve an overt contradiction of Kerry's prior criticism in two ways: First, by 'and we do', which implies that somebody else does not think so, and second, by 'and that's why it's essential that', which offers a different reason ('hateful enemy') from the one stated by Kerry in his answers in the 1st and 3rd Q-A-R sequences, viz. to avoid being '90 percent of the casualties/90 percent of the costs'.

In other words, the reframing prompted by this repetition does not concern the 'desirability' of having strong alliances, but rather the 'reason' for having them, and as a consequence, it must be said to involve both a different assessment of the 'same' situation (i.e., what it means to have strong alliances) and a different position on 'strong alliances' (i.e., commitment to having strong alliances).

The rekeying associated with the repetition concerns a emotional stance of disbelief, as revealed by the intonational contour of the utterance in line 14, which casts Kerry's version of events as involving an obvious failure on his part to appreciate the 'true' nature of the world.

4.3. Formulating a co-candidate's criticism

A quite different case of other-repetition is that of a candidate *formulating a co-candidate's criticism*. In contrast to the previous cases (where the repetitions have one or several clear objects whose wording they are at least partially repeating or paraphrasing), this type of other-repetition

does not respond to a specific prior utterance or claim, but rather to what may be heard as a particular line or thread in the co-candidate's prior discourse. For example, a candidate may be responding to a co-candidate's criticism as a symptom of a less attractive or 'morally' problematic view of the world, as in the first instance in excerpt 5 (l. 4-5):

Excerpt 5 (00:17:28 - 00:18:01)

```
 1  Bush        Thank you, sir.
 2              .hh First of all, what my (.) opponent wants you
                to forget is that (.)
 3              he voted to authorize the use of force.
 4  →           .hh And now says that it's the wrong war
                at the wrong time at the wrong=
 5  →           place.
 6              .hh I don't see how you can lea:d
 7  .          hh this country
 8              (hh) to succeed in Iraq
 9  →           .hh if you say wrong war, wrong time,
                wrong place.=
10              >What message does that send our troops.<
11              .hh What message does that send our allies
12              .hh What message does that send the Iraqis.
13              .hh No, the way to win this
                .hh is to be steadfast, resolved
14              .hh and to follow through on the plan
                that I've just outlined.
```

In this case, the object of the repetition is the 'Mistake' pattern (see Table 1), where Kerry, among other things, describes the invasion of Iraq as a mistake and says that the 'president has made a colossal error of judgment' (see excerpt 14 in appendix B). Interestingly, the specific wording of the repetition, 'now [he] says that it's the wrong war at the wrong time at the wrong place' (l. 4-5), strongly indicates that Bush is treating the 'Diverting' pattern (see Table 1) as an integral part of

the 'Mistake' pattern (why else speak of 'the wrong time at the wrong place'.). Even so, the reason why the pattern is listed as a separate pattern in Table 1 is that Bush elsewhere treats it as an independent topical thread, such as, for example, in his rebuttal of Kerry's answer to the seventh question (i.e., in the 7th Q-A-R unit), where he, among other things, says: 'So what's the message gonna be: 'Please join us in Iraq. We're a **grand diversion**...' ' (see also excerpt 15 in appendix B).

Now, the reason why the repetition is treated as a 'formulation' (see Garfinkel & Sacks 1970; Heritage & Watson 1980; Heritage 1985), even though it has the form of an indirect quotation, is that it is 'summarizing' or presenting the 'gist' of a particular line of argument that has been pursued by the co-candidate, Kerry, until this point in time, rather than relating something said by him specifically – a formulation which Kerry may subsequently confirm or disconfirm.

Accordingly, what is being contradicted is not so much the line of argument itself as the utility of pursuing it, both as reflected by the apparent inconsistency it implicates on the part of the co-candidate (see l. 2-5) as well as his perceived (in)ability to lead the war in Iraq (see l. 6-9).

In other words, the reframing prompted by this repetition does not concern the actual arguments as to why the invasion of Iraq may be said to constitute a mistake or a diversion from the real war on terror, but rather the futility of pursuing such a line of argument; as a consequence, it involves a different assessment of the 'same' situation (i.e., what the implications are of describing the invasion of Iraq as a mistake or a diversion), as well as a different position on 'leading the US to succeed in Iraq' (i.e., commitment to winning the war in Iraq).

Viewed as a recycle, the repetition opens the issue of appropriate and inappropriate ways of talking about an ongoing military engagement and hence also Kerry's ability to be a commander in chief, leading international coalitions, like, e.g., the one in Iraq.

Importantly, this also explains the last part of excerpt 5 (i.e., l. 10-12), 'What message does that send our troops...', where Bush brings in the issue of 'sending the right messages', as reflected in the repetition

pattern called 'Mixed signals' (Table 1), which implicates that Kerry does not have what it takes to be commander in chief.

Finally, it is worth noting that the repetition appears to involve a parody of Kerry in that it attributes to him a rather simplistic and childish mindset, and that this rekeying is reflected in the stressed three-part structure, 'wrong war at the wrong time at the wrong place' (see l. 4-5), which repeats the same word three times and reveals an emotional stance of outrage or scorn. According to Hodges (2015: 47), 'parodied recontextualizations' are quite typical of political discourse in general.

4.4. Responding to a repeated 'counter'

A related, yet different case of other-repetition is that of a candidate *responding to a repeated 'counter'*. In contrast to the previous case, where a candidate is responding to a co-candidate's criticism by way of a formulation which presents the co-candidate's criticism as a symptom of a less attractive or 'morally' problematic view of the world, this case is one of responding to a co-candidate's repeated characterization of the other's talk as implying something negative or undesirable. For example, a candidate may be responding to a repeated charge of his criticism 'denigrating US allies', like in excerpt 6:

Excerpt 6 (00:36:11 - 00:36:39)

1	Kerry	...
2	→	.hh **The president** ahh **says that I'm "denigrating"** **these troops (.)**
3		I: I: have NOTHING but <u>respect</u> for the British, for Tony Blair=
4		and for what they've been willing to do.
5		.hh But you ca↑n't tell me
6		.hh that when the <u>most</u> <u>troops</u> any other country has on the ground=

7	is Great Britain, with 8,300
8	...
9 →	.hh that **we have a <u>genuine</u> coalition to get this job done.**
10	...

To be precise, prior to Kerry's response in excerpt 6, his criticism of the current alliance/coalition in Iraq as not being what it ought to be (viz., strong as in '<u>Strong</u> alliances', among other things), by describing the US as 'doing it alone' (see excerpt 13 in appendix B), Bush has twice countered his criticism as implying a denigration of US allies (see l. 7-8 in excerpt 7 below).

Accordingly, when Kerry is quoting Bush in line 2 of excerpt 6 as saying that he is 'denigrating' these troops, he is in fact referring to the particular way in which Bush is formulating his position/attitude toward the current military coalition in Iraq. Given that this quotation is pretty faithful to the originals (see, e.g., excerpt 7), and given that the point of the repeated formulation is to present Kerry's criticism as implying a 'denigration of US allies', Kerry's subsequent contradiction in lines 3-4, 'I have nothing but respect for the British, for Tony Blair and for what they've been willing to do', must be said to disconfirm rather than confirm Bush's formulation, in agreement with Heritage and Watson's (1980) definition of a formulation-decision sequence.

More importantly, Kerry's contradiction in lines 3-4 must be said to involve a different assessment of the 'same' situation, since Bush's criticism/line of argument mainly concerns how Kerry's message may be received by US allies (see 4.3), not which attitude the latter actually holds toward them. Similarly, as revealed by Kerry's second contradiction in lines 5-9, which includes a second other-repetition in line 9, Kerry's response must be said to involve a different position on 'strong alliances' (i.e., commitment to strong alliances). Obviously, in contrast to Bush, Kerry does not believe that the current military coalition is strong enough to succeed in Iraq.

As a consequence, Kerry's *response to a repeated 'counter'* by Bush, which in this case consists of a direct quotation followed by two consecutive contradictions, certainly appears to involve a second-pair-part of a position-contradiction sequence.

The fact that it is Bush who is 'attacking' Kerry's position on 'strong alliances', combined with the fact that it is Bush who is producing the position of the position-contradiction sequence that Kerry is responding to with a contradiction, show that we are dealing with a very different type of recycle than the ones considered in the previous sections.

Similarly, unlike the previous cases, the reframing here is not accomplished by the main repetition itself, in line 2, but instead by the two contradictions that follow it, in lines 3-4 and 5-9, respectively.

Finally, as does the structure of the response, the rekeying contains three parts. In the first part, the repetition in line 2, the intonational contour not only brackets 'denigrating' but also expresses an emotional stance of disbelief (i.e., marks the item as something the candidate is about to disagree with). In the second part, the first contradiction in lines 3-4 (viz., the stressed lexical item 'NOTHING' in l. 3) is used to express an emotional stance of assertiveness. And the third part, the second contradiction in lines 5-9, the high pitch of 'ca↑n't' (l. 5) is used to express an emotional stance of disbelief and moral outrage.

4.5. Linking a response to a specific utterance or claim

In the previous two sections, it has been demonstrated how a candidate may be responding to a larger segment of discourse, like, e.g., a co-candidate's contribution to a particular topical thread or repetition pattern, and how this helps distinguish one repetition pattern from another.

However, by far the most responses by the candidates in the First 2004 US presidential debate concern more specific utterances or claims presented by a co-candidate in a prior turn. There are several ways such responses may be accomplished. For example, a candidate may bring in

a quotation of a third party in response to something his co-candidate said in a prior turn, where importantly the 'quote' echoes or repeats the 'same' topic (see, e.g., l. 6-11 in excerpt 11 below). Or a candidate may produce a parody of his co-candidate in response to his stated position on some issue, and thus 'indirectly' contradict it (see, e.g., l. 5 in excerpt 16 in appendix B).

Apparently, such different ways of linking a response to a prior utterance or claim provide yet another way of distinguishing repetition patterns from one another.

In this section, I shall restrict myself to three different uses of 'quotation'[1] which I believe are particularly useful in distinguishing repetition patterns from one another, and at the same time expose the dialogic and audience-oriented aspect of the candidates' responses: (1) a 'faithful' quotation used as preface to a contradiction, (2) a distorting quotative repetition, and (3) a (set of) quotation(s) used to point out an inconsistency.

A ' faithful' quotation used as a preface to a contradiction

First, consider the repetition/indirect quotation in excerpt 7 below, which appears to give a faithful re-presentation of a prior set of statements by Kerry (see the self-repetition in l. 7 in excerpt 13, and then compare it with its repetition in l. 5 in excerpt 16 in appendix B):

Excerpt 7 (00:30:56 - 00:31:15)

```
1  Bush        ...
2  →           .hh My opponent says (.) we didn't have any
               allies in this war.
3              .hh What's he say to Tony Blair? ((incredulity))
4              .hh What's he say (.)
5              ahh to Alexander Kwasniewski of Poland? ((incredulity))
6              .hh I mean (.) you ca↑n't expect to build an
```

	alliance ((incredulity))
7	.hh when you <u>denigrate</u> the
	contribution↑s= ((incredulity))
8	.hh of those who are serving <u>side</u> <u>by</u> <u>side</u>
	with American troops in I↑raq.
	((incredulity))
9	...

Despite the almost verbatim report offered by this repetition of Kerry's prior statement in the second follow-up to the fourth question, 'so America isn't doing this alone', it actually involves a (re-)formulation. Why? Because the statement that Kerry produced involves a hyperbolic version (i.e., self-repetition) of Kerry's earlier claim that 'the US is now 90 percent of the casualties in Iraq and 90 percent of the costs' (see excerpt 3). By comparison, Bush's repetition treats it as a literal statement.

Thus, like the instance considered in section 4.3 (see excerpt 5), also this instance is (re-)formulating a co-candidate's criticism as a symptom of a 'morally' problematic view of the world. However, unlike the formulation in excerpt 5, this instance is responding to a specific prior claim, not to a particular line or thread in a co-candidate's prior discourse.

More importantly, like the instance considered in section 4.4 (see excerpt 6), this instance is not used to contradict a co-candidate, but merely serves as a preface to such a contradiction, as evidenced by lines 3-5, where Bush is contradicting the claim that 'the US has no allies' by offering two examples of the contrary, viz., Britain and Poland, and by lines 6-8, where Bush is contradicting Kerry's claim that he would be the one 'to bring the allies [read: France and Germany] back to the table' (see excerpt 13 in appendix B).

In other words, the reframing evoked by this repetition does not concern the absence of major players, such as, France and Germany, from the coalition forces in Iraq, but rather the problems associated with criticizing an alliance in the middle of a war, and as a consequence, it must be said to involve a different assessment of the 'same' situation (i.e., as to whether the contributions made by current coalition partners

count as significant or not), as well as a different position on 'building (/preserving) an alliance' (i.e., commitment to 'strong alliances').

As already shown in section 4.4, Bush's response in excerpt 7 subsequently gets (co-)constructed as a recycle by Kerry.

Finally, it is worth noticing the massive presence of paralinguistic clues signaling Bush's emotional response to Kerry's prior, partially fictive, criticism, which draws attention to the response's dialogic and audience-oriented aspect (i.e., the candidates are not only mimicking the audience's attitudes but also its emotional involvement).

A distorting quotative repetition

Like the first type of repetition/quotation (considered in excerpt 7), this one also involves an indirect quotation (see the first other-repetition in l. 12-13 of excerpt 8). In contrast, however, it does not appear to give a faithful re-presentation of the originals (this involves the repetition pattern, 'War on terror' in Table 1). See the bold-faced sentences in l. 6-7 of excerpt 8:

Excerpt 8 (00:11:08 - 00:11:28, 00:14:21 - 00:15:02)

```
 1  Kerry       ...
 2              .hh 200 billion dollars that could have been used for
                health care, for schools
 3              .hh for construction
 4              .hh  for prescription drugs for seniors
 5              .hh And it's in Iraq
 6              .hh And Iraq is not even the center of the focus
                of the war on terror.
 7              .hh The center is Afghanistan where incidentally
 8              (1.0)
 9              .hh there were mo:re Americans killed last year
                than the year before↑
10              ...
11  Bush        ...
```

12 →	.hh **But to say that there is only <u>one</u> focus on the war of terror=**
13 →	**doesn't really understand the nature of the war on terror.**
14	...
15 →	.hh **But the <u>front</u> on this war is more than just one place.** ((incredulity))
16	...
17 →	And <u>of</u> <u>course</u> **Iraq is a <u>central</u> <u>part</u> of the war on terror.**
18	...

As a matter of fact, the repetition/indirect quotation appears to be distorting the content of the originals quite severely, since Kerry nowhere seems to imply that 'there is only one focus on the war of terror' (not even in a prior turn of his, see, e.g., excerpt 14 in appendix B).

As a consequence, it makes little sense to treat the 'quotation' as a serious attempt at re-presenting the (content of the) co-candidate's words accurately, i.e., as a(n) (indirect) quote. Rather, it appears to be the case that the first repetition in lines 12-13 merely pretends to be offering a plausible, if not accurate, re-presentation of the co-candidate's position, so as to facilitate, or bring about, an entirely different understanding (read: assessment) of the 'same' situation.

This, in turn, implies that one is dealing with a case of a candidate 'formulating a co-candidate's criticism', i.e., as 'a formulation which presents the co-candidate's criticism as a symptom of a less attractive or morally problematic view of the world', just as did the case presented in section 4.3. However, in contrast to the instance in section 4.3, the present one is not responding to a particular line or thread in a co-candidate's prior discourse, but rather constitutes a particular utterance by the co-candidate, viz. the one in lines 6-7 of excerpt 8.

More importantly, in contrast to any of the previous cases considered, Kerry's position is not only subjected to a single formulation (Bush's initial 'quotation' in lines 12-13), but also to two subsequent formulations

(see the arrows in lines 15 and 17), all of which adds up to a different overall assessment of the 'same' situation, namely one where the 'war on terror' is understood to involve multiple fronts and foci (and thus flaws Kerry's logic for restricting its scope to one front/focus).

To be precise, each repetition/formulation is used to contradict a different aspect of the position attributed to Kerry. The first, the *distorting quotative repetition* in lines 12-13, is used to contradict Kerry's claim that 'the center is Afghanistan' (see l. 7). The second is contradicting the position tacitly attributed to Kerry, viz., that he believes, or wants the audience to believe, that 'the front on this war is just one place' (l. 15). And the third, in line 17, which clearly builds on the 'new' logic of multiple fronts/foci, contradicts Kerry's claim that 'Iraq is not even the center of the focus of the war on terror' (l. 6).

Accordingly, the reframing prompted by the first repetition (as well as by the subsequent repetitions) does not concern the issue as to whether Iraq or Afghanistan is the 'center of the focus of the war on terror', but rather the problems associated with characterizing the war on terror in terms of 'specific targets in specific places' (see repetition pattern 4 in Table 1). The first repetition must therefore be said to involve a different assessment of the 'same' situation (i.e., as to whether the Iraq engagement may be described as part of the war on terror or not), along with a different position on 'the war on terror' (i.e., commitment to fighting international terrorism).

Like Kerry's immediate turn-transitional repetition in excerpt 1, this non-immediate repetition comprises the first other-repetition of the 'War on terror' repetition pattern, and thus brings it into collective life. Therefore, it cannot be described as a recycle.

Finally, it is worth noting that the comments that could be made regarding the paralinguistic clues of Bush's response as well as his constructed dialogue with Kerry quite closely mirror those that were made with respect to the previous instance. The emotional response associated with the response's rekeying, as well as the attitude that the response is expressing toward Kerry's position, clearly appear to

be intended for the overhearing audience of TV viewers (and not just for the co-candidate).

A (set of) quotation(s) that points out an inconsistency

The third and final type of repetition/quotation to be considered in this section involves, as do the previous two instances, also indirect quotation (see l. 37-41 in excerpt 9). In fact, it can be said to involve two indirect quotations, (1) 'And he declared in 2002 that Saddam Hussein was a great threat' (l. 36), where the word 'declared' implies an indirect quotation, and (2) 'He also said in December 2003 that anyone who doubts that the world is safer without Saddam Hussein does not have the judgment to be president' (l. 37-39).

Importantly, these two indirect quotations are used by Bush to contradict a prior claim by Kerry that he, Bush, has made a mistake in invading Iraq, since there were no weapons of mass destruction, whereas 'the reason for going to war was weapons of mass destruction. Not the removal of Saddam Hussein' (see l. 8-9 in the full excerpt 14 in appendix B). Hence, when Bush adds, in line 41, 'I agree with him', he is imaginatively siding with a past version of a Kerry who 'apparently' disagrees with his present self, and is thus indirectly contradicting himself:

Excerpt 9 (00:11:57 - 00:12:25)

34	Bush	Ah My opponent looked at the same intelligence I looked at.
35		(2.0)
36		.hh And <u>declared</u> in <u>2002</u> that Saddam Hussein was a <u>great</u> <u>threat</u>. ((smacking lips))
37		.hh He also <u>said</u> in <u>December</u> of <u>2003</u> that <u>anyone</u> who DOUBTS=
38		that the world is sa:fer without Saddam Hussein

39 →	.hh **does not have the <u>judgment</u> .hh <u>to be</u>↑ <u>president.</u>**
40	(2.0)
41 →	**I agree with him.**
42	.hh The world is better off <u>without</u> Saddam Hussein.
43	...

Thus, what initially leaves the impression of an attempt by Bush to evade the issue of a 'mistake' (repetition pattern 6 in Table 1), in fact turns out to involve a counter-accusation (i.e., like the other instances considered in 4.5), which not only involves a different assessment of the 'same' situation (as to whether the invasion of Iraq counts as a mistake or not), but also a different position on the importance of removing Saddam Hussein from power (i.e., commitment to the 'war on terror'); such a reading also captures the reframing accomplished by this type of repetition/quotation.

Interestingly, the same appears to hold regarding the first co-constructed unit of repetition pattern 7 in Table 1, 'Changed his mind', because the two indirect quotations implicate that Kerry has changed his mind regarding the need to remove Saddam Hussein from power, and as such counts a response to (or other-repetition of) Kerry's claim (in his preceding answer to the third question) that 'the president finally **changed his mind**, his campaign has a word for that, and went to the United Nations' (not included in excerpt 14 in appendix B).

Accordingly, unlike the two instances considered previously, this instance does not only concern prior talk of the debate ('changed his mind' and 'judgment to be president', see l. 12-13 of excerpt 14 in appendix B), but likewise includes talk from prior occasions, which it integrates into the current flow of talk by way of a constructed, or imaginative, dialogue with a prior version of the co-candidate's self.

Finally, it is worth noting that the analysis presented here strongly suggests that, like in the two previous instances, we are not actually dealing with a genuine case of quotation, but rather with a (re-)formulation of talk belonging to different occasions.

4.6. Questions that introduce formulations of an existing topical thread

A final distinguishing feature of repetition patterns to be considered is the moderator's introduction of formulations in his 'question' turns, and their subsequent negotiation among the candidates.

This is a particularly interesting feature of the 2004 US presidential debates, since (as was pointed out earlier, in section 1), the moderator is expected to "vary the topics on which he or she questions the candidates" (*Memorandum of Understanding* 2004). Similarly, the moderator, Jim Lehrer, at the outset of the debate promises that 'the specific subjects were chosen by me, the questions were composed by me'. Accordingly, not only the rules laid down in the Memorandum of Understanding (2004), but also the moderator, Jim Lehrer's, interpretations of them strongly suggest that it is he who is in charge of the topics and that it is to him the questions belong, not to the candidates – a view which shall be seriously challenged in the subsequent analysis.

Consider, for example, Lehrer's question in excerpt 10 below (the seventh question of the 7th Q-A-R sequence):

Excerpt 10 (00:28:24 - 00:28:41)

1	Lehrer	All right. New question. Ahh two minutes, Senator Kerry.=
2		Speaking of Vietnam=
3		you spoke to Congress in 1971=
4		after you came back from Vietnam, and you said=
5		quote, "How do you ask a man to be the <u>last</u> man to <u>die</u> for a <u>mistake</u>?"
6 →		.hh **Are Americans now <u>dying</u> in <u>Iraq</u> for a <u>mistake</u>?**

This question clearly appears to be mimicking Bush's 'wrong war, wrong place, wrong time' retort (see excerpt 5), which Bush repeatedly gives in response to Kerry's criticism of his invasion of Iraq, whereas

Kerry's criticism itself belongs to the 'Mistake' repetition pattern (see, e.g., excerpt 14 in appendix B).

The moderator's question is said to 'introduce' a formulation of an existing topical thread because its understanding as such depends on the candidates' uptakes. Crucially, if the candidates did not hear it as a continuation of an existing topic, they should in principle be able to treat it as introducing a new topic, in line with the debate's normative expectations.

However, as evidenced by the following excerpt, the candidates clearly do treat it as an invitation to continue, or rather recycle, an existing topical thread:

Excerpt 11 (00:28:41 - 00:31:53)

1	Kerry	NO, and they don't <u>have</u> <u>to</u>.=
2		providing we have the <u>leadership</u> (.) that we put (.) that I'm <u>offering</u>
3		.hh I believe that (.) that we: we <u>have</u> <u>to</u> win this.
4		The President and I have always <u>agreed</u> on that.
5		...
6		<u>The</u> <u>terrorism</u> <u>czar</u>.=
7		...<u>said</u>
8	→	.hh **"INVADING Iraq in response to 9/11 would be like Franklin Roosevelt**
9	→	**invading Mexico .hh in response (.)to Pearl Harbor."**(('quoting' tone where
10		each word is enunciated carefully))
11		.hh <u>That's</u> what we have <u>here</u>. ((incredulity))
12		...
13	Bush	...
14		.hh I mea↑n (.) you ca↑n't expect to build an alliance ((incredulity))
15		.hh when you <u>denigrate</u> the <u>contribution</u>↑s= ((incredulity))
16		.hh of those who are serving side by side with American troops in I↑raq. ((incredulity))

17		.hh <u>Plus</u>, he says the cornerstone of his <u>plan</u> to (.) <u>succeed</u> in Iraq
18		.hh i:s to .hh <u>call</u> <u>upon</u> nations to serve.
19		.hh So what's the message gonna be? ((incredulity))
20		"Please <u>join</u> us in Iraq.
21		.hh for a <u>grand</u> <u>diversion</u>.
22	→	.hh <u>Join</u> us for **a war that** ahh
23	→	**is the <u>wrong</u> war at the <u>wrong</u> place at the <u>wrong</u> time?"=**
24		...
25		They're <u>not</u> gonna follow somebody who <u>says</u> (.)
26	→	**"This is the <u>wrong</u> war at the <u>wrong</u> place at the <u>wrong</u> time."**
27		.hh They're <u>not</u> gonna <u>follow</u> somebody (.)
28		whose co:re convictions keep changing because of politics in America.
29		...

As evidenced by Kerry's quoted, paraphrastic repetition (see the arrows in lines 8-9 of excerpt 11), the war in Iraq is reconstituted by Kerry as a 'real' mistake. Similarly, as evidenced by Bush's almost mantra-like repetition of 'wrong war, wrong place, wrong time', so is Kerry's criticism.

Interestingly, four other subsequent questions (the eighth, ninth, twelfth, and thirteenth in the first debate), are similarly co-constructed by the candidates as 'recycles'/formulations of the 'Mistake' repetition pattern.

Thus, in sum, it can be said that only the more central/dominant repetition patterns, such as, for example, the 'Mistake' repetition pattern, are likely to contain questions that introduce formulations of existing topical threads which get co-constructed as recycles by the candidates. As a consequence, the questions hardly can be said to belong to the moderator.

4.7. Summary

In the previous six subsections, 4.1-4.6, several important features have been identified which allow one to distinguish between repetition patterns. Crucially, the same features reveal different facets of the candidates' collaboration.

To begin with, it is worth noting that *turn-transitional repetitions* involve the most direct type of response to something a co-candidate has actually said. Not only do they 'repeat' the co-candidate in a way that leaves the impression that they are saying the 'same' thing, but they also appear to be invited by the self-repetitions produced by the co-candidate. And, even though they imply a contradiction of the co-candidate's position, they still concern the 'same' situation.

Like turn-transitional repetitions, *delayed/non-immediate repetitions* also involve a fairly direct response to something a co-candidate has actually said; they do so by using similar, if not identical, words and indicating, linguistically as well as textually, that the words are meant as a contradiction. The delayed/non-immediate aspect of their production may make them appear less direct, but it also draws attention to the self-repetitions produced by the co-candidate, often across several turns, in his or her pursuit of a response to a particular line of argument/criticism. As a consequence, delayed/non-immediate repetitions also reveal that the candidates are paying close attention to what their co-candidates are saying (even when they are not responding to it).

The third type of other-repetition, referred to as *formulating a co-candidate's criticism*, reveals that the candidates not only are paying close attention to particular claims and utterances by their co-candidates, but also to particular lines or threads in the latter's discourse; in addition, they co-construct them as such.

As in the case of formulating a co-candidate's criticism, the fourth type of other-repetition, *responding to a repeated 'counter'*, concerns a particular line or thread in a co-candidate's discourse; by contrast, however, the response is co-constructed as a 'counter' to a prior line of

criticism by the same candidate. In other words, this type of repetition reveals that the candidates not only pay attention to particular lines or threads in a co-candidate's prior discourse, but also how co-candidates are responding to their own lines or threads.

The fifth type of other-repetition (actually a group or class of types) is called *responding to a specific utterance or claim by way of 'quotation';* it shows that the candidates not only are paying attention to the specific utterances and claims of their co-candidates, but also how they may be perceived/reframed in front of an overhearing audience. For example, one of the group, a type I will call *'faithful' quotation used as a preface to a contradiction*, is mainly used to draw attention to a particular hearing of the co-candidate's prior discourse, (which actually isn't his own), before the candidate is responding to it in an emotionally charged way.

Similarly, a second type, called *distorting quotative repetition*, shows how a candidate may choose to introduce an ideologically motivated (read: biased) hearing of the co-candidate's prior discourse, and respond to this, rather than the co-candidate's actual position.

Finally, a third type, called *a (set of) quotation(s) that point to an inconsistency*, is similarly used to evoke a 'preferred' (i.e., an ideologically motivated) hearing of the co-candidate by the candidate's own (actual and presumed) audience among the overhearing audience of TV viewers.

Importantly, these three cases strongly suggest that the most central role played by other-repetitions, understood as contradictions (and hence also the most essential type of collaboration undertaken by the candidates), is that of providing the candidates with opportunities of using other-repetition to correct positions explicitly or implicitly attributed to them in front of an overhearing audience of TV viewers.

The final case considered, viz. that of a moderator's question which may be heard as a formulation of an existing topical thread, and which is subsequently co-constructed as such by the candidates, show that it is the candidates who are in charge of the debate's topics, not the moderator.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to show that contrary to the common perception that politicians are 'distorting', 'evasive', 'speaking at cross purposes', 'intentionally misunderstanding', etc., Bush and Kerry actually collaborate in establishing topical continuities across 'local' Q-A-R sequences.

As stated in the summary in section 4.7, a major finding of this study is that the candidates collaborate on a massive scale. They do so in more obvious ways, such as, for example, by repeating each other's words and phrases, and (less obviously) by, for example, using each other's distortions, evasions, and intentional misunderstandings as opportunities for clarifying their own positions.

Another finding of this study is that the rules for the first debate and its execution, as described in the *Memorandum of Understanding* (2004), in particular with respect to how they assign the control over the debate's topics to the moderator, Jim Lehrer (including his own version, as represented in his opening remarks), are pure formalities. It is the candidates, not the moderator, who are in charge of the debate's topics.

Importantly, these results were obtained by analyzing the different types of other-repetitions that occur in the debate as instantiations of the second-pair-part of a position-contradiction sequence – the main co-constructional unit of the First 2004 US presidential debate. Although a repetition is typically used to contradict a 'position' attributed to the 'object of the repetition' and thus can be said to constitute a position-contradiction pair in its own right, it also often functions as part of (or a preface to) a broader, or more elaborate, position-contradiction sequence, as evidenced, for example, by Kerry's continuation in excerpt 1, 'But we also have to be smart, Jim', or Bush's continuation in excerpt 5, 'I don't see how you can lead this country to succeed in Iraq if you say wrong war, wrong time, wrong place'.

Similarly, there are repetitions which are merely used as prefaces to a contradiction, such as, for example, Bush's in excerpt 7: 'My opponent says we didn't have any allies in this war'.

Apparently, more research is required to establish the precise operations of the individual types of other-repetitions used as contradictions, including their sequential role in executing a step-wise reframing of a co-candidate's response.

Now, as regards the argumentative aspect of analyzing other-repetitions as contradictions, viz., as implying a different assessment of the 'same' situation as well as a difference in position (i.e., commitment to some issue), it seems clear that one is not dealing with the ideal types of 'debating' studied by the argumentation theorists. Rather than studying debates while abstracting from cultural factors, one is dealing with staged Us-Them 'dialogues' in which the candidates are responding to each other's utterances, claims, and argumentative lines in a culturally biased way, so as to signal their identification with particular groups of voters in front of an overhearing audience of TV viewers.

As a consequence, the analysis presented here also suggests that there is a problem with characterizing the distortions, evasions, intentional misunderstandings, etc. that occur in a US presidential debate as 'distortions', 'evasions', 'intentional misunderstandings' etc., that is, as instantiations of the kinds of fallacies, or deceptive tactics, that argumentation theorists (see, e.g., Walton 2008) associate with those terms – but why? The answer is that the candidates are 'voicing' their voters' ideologically motivated hearings of their co-candidates (read: their political opponents) – something which hardly can be said to constitute a deception (i.e., an attempt to mislead one's voters) on its own account.

Naturally, this is not meant to imply that such language uses do not involve attempts at linguistic manipulation. Quite the contrary, it is meant to imply that there might be better, i.e., more culturally and interactionally oriented, ways of studying such language uses – ways that would be better, for example, at capturing the interface between the candidates and their own (actual and presumed) audiences among the overhearing audience of TV viewers, as well as unveiling the type of dominance exercised by them (in concert) as a consequence of the specific 'discourses' (in a Foucauldian sense) they draw upon. For example,

a topic for further investigation could be the ideological underpinnings of the candidates' other-repetitions, that is, their ideologically motivated ways of contradicting each other, and the 'choices' (or lack thereof) that this type of 'debating' leaves the voters in a western democracy.

To those discourse analysts who (as does, for example, Gastil 1992, quoted in Wilson 2001: 399) operate with a 'democratic ideal' of discourse, such as citizens' right to democratic participation in society's decision processes, such an ideologically motivated choice between candidates hardly suffices; and rightly, as this seems to lead one to question the democratic aspect of 'representative democracy'. In addition, it suggests that the real deception of the First 2004 US presidential debate is the way that the staged Us-Them 'dialogue' forces the TV viewers to side with one of the candidates at the expense of the other, and as a consequence, makes them deaf to that candidate's arguments and interpretation of reality.

Viewed from a critical discourse analysis perspective, one might even go one step further and question the candidates' choice of topics, including the particular ways in which they choose to frame current events. How come, for example, that the 'war on terror' gets framed as something that either requires 'military engagement in multiple places across the globe' or requires 'international policing' (i.e., 'hunting down the terrorists wherever they are'), and not, for example, as an expectable outcome of a globalized economy?

Such questions seem much more pertinent when addressing the deception and manipulation associated with a US presidential debate on a practical as well as on an academic level; but raising them crucially involves the adoption of a (multi-)cultural perspective.

Ronald R. Jacobsen
Vejle Sprogcenter (Give)
ronald@kmk.dk

Notes

[1]According to Tannen (1986: 311), "the term *reported speech* is a misnomer" and "what is commonly referred to as reported speech or direct quotation in conversation is constructed dialogue".

References

Gastil, John. 1992. Undemocratic discourse: a review of theory and research on political discourse. Discourse and Society 3(4). 469-500.

Garfinkel, Harold & Harvey Sacks. 1970. On formal structures of practical action. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakrian (eds.). Theoretical sociology: Perspectives and developments. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. 337-366.

Heritage, John. 1985. Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.). Handbook of discourse analysis: Vol. 3. Discourse and dialogue. London: Academic Press. 95-117.

Heritage, John & Rod Watson. 1980. Aspects of the properties of formulations in natural conversations: Some instances analyzed. Semiotica 30(3). 245-262.

Hodges, Adam. 2015. Intertextuality in discourse. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (eds.). The handbook of discourse analysis, vol. 1. 2nd ed. Chichester, UK: Wiley/Blackwell. 42-60.

"Memorandum of Understanding" (Signed by Bush-Cheney, '04, Inc. and Kerry-Edwards, '04, Inc, September 20, 2004), FindLaw.com, accessed January 3, 2014, http://news.findlaw.com/wsj/docs/election2004/debates2004mou.html.

Mey, Jacob L. 2001. Pragmatics: An introduction. 2nd ed. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Tannen, Deborah. 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative. In F. Coulmas (ed.). Direct and indirect speech. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 311-332.

Tannen, Deborah. 1987a. Repetition in conversation: Toward a poetics of

talk. Language 63(3). 574–605.

Tannen, Deborah. 1987b. Repetition in conversation as spontaneous formulaicity. Text 7(3). 215–43.

Tannen, Deborah. 2006. Intertextuality in interaction: Reframing family arguments in public and in private. Text & Talk 26 (4/5). 597-617.

Tannen, Deborah. 2007. Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational dialogue. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

"The 2004 US Presidential Debates between John F. Kerry and George W. Bush" (Sound recordings), The Internet Archive, accessed September 16, 2014, https://archive.org/details/presidential_recordings.

Van Dijk, Teun. 2006. Politics, ideology, and discourse. In K. Brown (ed.). Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. Volume 9. Oxford: Elsevier. 728-740.

Walton, Douglas N. 2008. Informal logic: A pragmatic approach. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, John. 2001. Political discourse. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (eds.). The handbook of discourse analysis. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell. 398-415.

Appendix A: Transcription conventions

(00:00:00 - 00:00:00)	Triple double digits in parentheses refer to the start and end of the temporal interval of the official recording excerpted (see references).
((disbelief))	Double parentheses enclose an emotional response by a participant.
(words)	Single parentheses enclose 'incomprehensible' words.
(0.0)	Numbers in parentheses indicates elapsed time in tenth of seconds.
(.)	A dot in parenthesis indicates a brief interval within or between utterances.
.hh	A period-prefixed row of h's indicates an inbreath.
?	A question mark indicates relatively strong rising intonation.
.	A period indicates falling, final intonation.
,	A comma indicates continuing intonation.

...	Three spaced dots indicate ellipsis: words left out.
:	A colon indicates an elongated vowel.
____	Underlining indicates that a word is stressed.
CAPS	Capitals indicate especially loud sounds relative to the surrounding talk.
↑↓	Arrows indicate shifts into especially high or low pitch.
=	An equal sign indicates no break or gap.
→	An arrow indicates a relevant instance.
word	A boldfaced word, phrase or clause indicates part of a repetition pattern.
" "	Double quotation marks indicate that some stretch of speech is prosodically and/or interactionally marked as a quotation.

Appendix B

Excerpt 12 (01:13:43 - 01:14:10)

1	Bush	...
2		(hh.) And ahh it is ahh one of the things I've learned in the White House (.)
3		is that (hh.) there's <u>enormous</u> <u>pre:ssure</u> on the president=
4		And you **cannot <u>wi:lt</u> under that <u>pressure.</u>**
5		Otherwise (hh.) the world wo↑n't be better o:ff↑. ((incredulity))
6	Lehrer	Thirty seconds.
7	Kerry →	**I have <u>no</u> <u>intention</u> of <u>wilting</u>.**=
8	→	**I've never <u>wilted</u> in my life.**
9	→	(hh.) **And I've never WAVERED** (.) **in my life.**
10		(hh.) I know EXACTLY (.) what we need(ed) to do in Iraq.
11		And <u>my</u> <u>position</u> has been <u>consistent</u>.
12		...

Excerpt 13 (00:18:20 - 00:18:32)

1	Kerry	...
2		Now, we <u>can</u> succeed.
3		.hh But I don't think this President can.
4		.hh I think we need a president who has the credibility=
5		**to bring the allies back to the table**
6		.hh And to do what's necessary
7		.hh t' <u>make</u> it **so America <u>isn't</u> doing this <u>alone.</u>**

Excerpt 14 (00:08:30 - 00:12:25)

1	Kerry	...
2		.hh And <u>smart</u> <u>means</u> **not <u>diverting</u> your <u>attention</u> from** the <u>real</u> war on=
3		<u>terror</u> in Afghanistan against Osama bin Laden
5		.hh And taking it off to Iraq
6		.hh where the 9/11 Commission <u>confirms</u> there was <u>no</u> <u>connection</u> to: (.)
7		<u>9/11</u> itself and Saddam Hussein
8		.hh And where the reason for going to war was weapons of mass destruction.=
9		<u>Not</u> the removal of Saddam Hussein
10		.hh **This president has made**, I regret to say
11		.hh **A <u>colossal</u> <u>error</u> of <u>judgment</u>**
12		.hh **And <u>judgment</u> is what we look for in the president of the United States**=
13		of America.
14		...
15		¨.hh All: believe that I would make a <u>stronger</u> commander in chief
16		.hh And they <u>believe</u> <u>it</u> (.)
17		<u>because</u> they know <u>I would</u> **not <u>take</u> <u>my</u> <u>eye</u> <u>off</u> of the goal**
18		.hh <u>Osama</u> <u>bin</u> <u>Laden.</u>
19		...
20	Lehrer	New question. Two minutes, Senator Kerry.
21	→	.hh **"<u>Colossal</u> <u>misjudgments.</u>"**=
22	→	What **<u>colossal</u> <u>misjudgments</u>** in your opinion **has President Bush**=

23	→	**ma↑de in these areas?**
24	Kerry	>Well? Where('d) you wanna me begin?<
25		.hhh <u>Ha</u>-ha-ha
26		.hh Ahh <u>first</u> of all, **he made the misjudgment**
27		.hh **of saying to America**
28		.hh that he was going to build a <u>true</u> alliance
29		.hh that he would <u>exhaust</u> the <u>remedies</u> of the United Na- tions=
30		and go through the inspections.=
31		...
32		.hh He **also promised** America that he would go to war "<u>as</u> a LAST <u>resort</u>."
33		...
34	Bush	Ah My opponent looked at the same intelligence I looked at.
35		(2.0)
36		.hh And <u>declared</u> in <u>2002</u> that Saddam Hussein was a <u>great</u> <u>threat</u>. ((smacking lips))
37		.hh He also <u>said</u> in <u>December</u> of <u>2003</u> that anyone who DOUBTS=
38		that the world is sa:fer without Saddam Hussein
39	→	.hh **does not have the <u>judgment</u> .hh <u>to be</u>↑ <u>president</u>.**
40		(2.0)
41	→	**I agree with him.**
42		.hh The world is better off <u>without</u> Saddam Hussein.
43		...

Excerpt 15 (00:46:19 - 00:46:29)

1	Bush	...
2		.hh You <u>cannot</u> <u>lea:d</u> (.) the <u>war</u> on <u>terror</u>=
3		if you keep changing positions on the war on terror ((incre- dulity))
4	→	.hh And **say**(s) things like (.)
5	→	**"Well, this is just a <u>gra:nd</u> <u>di:version</u>."**
6	→	**It's <u>not</u> a <u>grand</u> <u>diversion</u>.** ((incredulity))
7		...

Excerpt 16 (00:30:23 - 00:30:34)

1	Kerry	...
2		.hh I↑n fact, he's <u>done</u> the <u>opposite</u>.
3		.hh He <u>pushed</u> them awa:y.
4		.hh When the Secretary General Ko:fi Annan <u>offered</u> the United Nations
5 →		.hh he said, **"NO, NO, <u>we</u>'ll go do this <u>alone</u>."** ((mimicked opposition))
6		.hh To save (.) for .hh Halliburton the spoils of the war.
7		...