



# Edipo 2007

25th-28th September 2007  
*Programme and Abstracts*

## Tuesday, 25th September 2007

09:00-10:00	Registration (Entrance, C/ Palos de la Frontera)
10:00-11:00	Opening (Room: Paraninfo)
11:00-11:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
11:30-12:00	Huang yu-hsiu (National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan): "The Power of Language: A Study of Persuasive Strategies Used by Chen Shui-Bian in Taiwan Presidential Election Campaign in 2000" (Room 103)
12:00-12:30	Edward V. Budaev (Nizhnii Tagil State Social Pedagogical Academy, Russia): "Political families: a case study of Russian and British metaphors" (Room 103)
12:30-13:00	Joseph H. Campos II (University of Hawaii at Manoa, Hawaii): "Terrorism, Discourse, and the Mobilization of Power" (Room 103)
13:00-14:00	Plenary Lecture: Peter Bull (University of York, UK). (Room: Paraninfo)
14:00-16:00	Break for Lunch
16:00-16:30	Seminar:  "The Microanalysis of Political Communication", Peter Bull (University of York, UK) (Room 103)
16:30-17:00	
17:00-17:30	
17:30-18:00	
18:00-18:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
18:30-19:00	Seminar:  "Communication and Discourse: Avoidance in Interaction", Anita Fetzer (University of Lueneburg, Germany) (Room 103)
19:00-19:30	
19:30-20:00	
20:00-20:30	
21:30-22:30	Visit: Reales Alcázares de Sevilla

## Wednesday, 26th September 2007

09:00-09:30	Magaud Véronique (University of Toulon-Var, France): "Political rhetoric of French presidential candidates' discourse : dissociation phenomena" (Room 103)
09:30-10:00	Michel Dufour (Université Paris 3, Sorbonne Nouvelle, France): "When catechism meets politics and science" (Room 103)
10:00-10:30	Carmen del Solar Valdés (University of Seville, Spain): "The Speech-Gesture System in the European Parliament" (Room 103)
10:30-11:00	Teresa Fernández Ulloa (California State University, USA) y Hernán Urrutia Cárdenas (Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Spain): "Análisis pragmático y retórico del discurso político del creador del nacionalismo vasco, Sabino Arana Goiri (1865-1903)" (Room 103)
11:00-11:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
11:30-12:00	Vilelmini Sosoni (Athens Metropolitan College, Greece): "Metonymy in Political Discourse and its Implications for Translation: The case of English and Greek" (Room 103)
12:00-12:30	Oksana Chalmova (Tomsk State University, Russia): "Strategies of persuasion in Russian and British political discourses" (Room 103)
12:30-13:00	Isabel M <sup>a</sup> Íñigo Mora and Gloria Álvarez Benito (University of Seville, Spain): "Politicians' gestures and words: an analysis of a televised interview with J. L. Rodríguez Zapatero" (Room 103)
13:00-14:00	Plenary Lecture: Anita Fetzer (University of Lueneburg, Germany) (Room: Paraninfo)

14:00-16:00	Break for Lunch
16:00-16:30	Concepción Hernández Guerra (Las Palmas University, Canary Islands, Spain): "Political Discourse through last decades in the United States" (Room 103)
16:30-17:00	N. Lorenzo-Dus (University of Wales Swansea, UK): "Sound-bite politics and television: Who is persuading whom?" (Room 103)
17:00-17:30	Katerina T. Frantzi (University of the Aegean, Rhodes, Greece): "Male and Female Greek Parliamentary Discourse: A Corpus Linguistics Approach" (Room 103)
17:30-18:00	Ester Brenes Peña (University of Seville, Spain): "Discurso político y descortesía: la expresión del desacuerdo en debates políticos televisivos" (Room 103)
18:00-18:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
18:30-19:00	Manuel Mejías Borrero (Pablo de Olavide University, Seville, Spain): "Political language in the 2004 U.S. Presidential electoral process" (Room 103)
19:00-19:30	Shoji Azuma, Ritsumeikan (University of Japan/University of Utah, U.S.A): "A study of emerging political discourse in post-war Japan" (Room 103)
19:30-20:00	Wendy Allen (University of Melbourne, Australia): "Dysphemism in Australian political discourse: insults, metaphor and delegitimization" (Room 103)
20:00-20:30	B.N.Patnaik and Anil Thakur (Banaras Hindu University, India): "Two Styles in the Discourse of Resistance" (Room 103)
21:30	Conference Dinner

#### Thursday, 27th September 2007

09:00-09:30	Tetyana Sayenko (Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan): "Appeal to National and Universal Values in Political Argumentation" (Room 103)
09:30-10:00	Aurelia Carranza Márquez (University of Seville, Spain): "Usos de La Memoria en los Parlamentos Español y Británico. Aplicación del Modelo de Acción Discursiva de Edwards y Potter" (Room 103)
10:00-10:30	Annette Becker, (Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt amMain, Germany): "Drinking Hemlock, Dinner Party Wakes, and the Use of Graduation in British and German Election Night Interviews" (Room 103)
10:30-11:00	Lydia Fernández and Clara Ubaldina LORDA (Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain): "Mujeres en la cumbre: los discursos de Ségolène Royal en la campaña para la elección presidencial francesa de 2007" (Room 103)
11:00-11:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
11:30-12:00	Catalina Fuentes Rodríguez (University of Seville, Spain): "(Des)cortesía parlamentaria y fuerza argumentativa: "decirles, señorías, que..." (Room 103)
12:00-12:30	Cornelia ILIE (Örebro University and Södertörn University College, Sweden) and Clara Ubaldina Lorda (Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain): "Funciones argumentativas de incisos y comentarios en los debates parlamentarios (Francia y Reino Unido)" (Room 103)
12:30-13:00	Ryo Kuboyama (Bielefeld University, Germany): "Constructing National Interests and Legitimacy for Immigration Control —Parliamentary discourses on "Polenpolitik" in Imperial Germany and "Chinese Exclusion" in USA of late 19th century" (Room 103)
13:00-13:30	María del Mar Rivas Carmona and Aurelia Carranza Márquez (University of Seville, Spain): "Discursive strategies of 'consensus' / 'polarization' in Spanish political debates on the process of European construction" (Room 103)
13:30-14:00	POSTER: Gloria Álvarez Benito and Carmen del Solar Valdés (University of Seville, Spain): "APOLLO I: An annotation tool for the Analysis of <i>Political Language</i> and <i>Oratory</i> (Political Interviews)" (Entrance, by Registration desk)
14:00-16:00	Break for Lunch
16:00-18:00	Round Table: "Sign Language in Political Discourse" Mod.: Juan Pablo Mora Gutiérrez (Room 103)
18:00-18:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
18:30-19:00	Rosalía Villa Jiménez (University of Cordoba, Spain): The Persuasive Politico-religious Discourse in C. Marlowe's Dr. Faustus and G. W. Bush" (Room 103)
19:00-19:30	Laura Filardo Llamas (University of Valladolid, Spain): "What Can We Do Through Political Discourse? Proposal for The Analysis of its Legitimatory Function" (Room 103)
19:30-20:00	Isabel Antúnez Pérez (University of Seville, Spain): "Paralinguistic Elements in the Oral Questions at the House of Commons: A Case-Study" (Room 103)
20:00-20:30	Ana María Iglesias Botrán (University of Valladolid, Spain): "La Canción como Estrategia del Discurso Político en Francia" (Room 103)

**Friday, 28th September 2007**

09:00-09:30	YI, Peng (National Central University, Taiwan): "The Nature of Politics" (Room 103)
09:30-10:00	Oscar Alberto Morales, Ernesto Ilich Marín Altuve and Carolina González Peña (Central University of Venezuela, Venezuela): "la propaganda política en las elecciones presidenciales venezolanas del 2006: estudio de las estrategias de argumentación" (Room 103)
10:00-10:30	María Jesús Nieto y Otero (Central University of Venezuela, Venezuela): "Affective linking in political interaction of the Venezuela president" (Room 103)
10:30-11:00	Thierry Guilbert (Centre universitaire de recherches sur l'action publique et le politique, France): "Persuasion by evidence" (Room 103)
11:00-11:30	Coffee Break (Entrance, by Registration desk)
11:30-12:00	Kareen Gervasi (California State University, U.S.A): "Politics and grammar in journalistic discourse" (Room 103)
12:00-12:30	Javier Martín Párraga (University of Cordoba, Spain): "In & out of Vietnam: Rhetorical strategies during the Vietnam War" (Room 103)
12:30-13:00	Custodio Velasco Mesa (University of Seville, Spain): "La construcción discursiva de la revolución en la Europa del tránsito de los siglos XIX y XX" (Room 103)

*Tuesday, 25th September 2007, 11:30-12:00*

**“The Power of Language: A Study of Persuasive Strategies Used by Chen Shui-Bian in Taiwan Presidential Election Campaign in 2000”**

**Huang yu-hsiu**

**National Taiwan Normal University**

[sandrapp2001@yahoo.com.tw](mailto:sandrapp2001@yahoo.com.tw)

This paper focuses on the persuasive strategies used by a presidential candidate in Taiwan, Chen Shui-bian, when he was expressing his political views. The presidential election in 2000 was a cut-throat competition not only because the pre-election support rates between candidates James Soong and Chen Shui-bian were on a par but also because it signaled the first possibility to realize the transfer of power from the KMT to the DPP in Taiwan history. Based on newspaper reports on three televised political view public presentation forums in which the presidential candidates participated in 2000, this study aims to examine Chen's persuasive strategies in expressing his political views to show that political rhetoric is so powerful that it can convey puzzling concepts in the form of easily understood metaphors, introduce determined resolutions with analogies, show empathy for the citizens by telling heart-touching stories in daily life, and meet the urgent demand for reformation of the corrupt status quo with rhetorical questions. As a result, with Chen's eloquence in rhetoric, the electoral vote gap was closed, the electorate's vote decision was reversed, and he wrote a historical page.

*Tuesday, 25th September 2007, 12:00-12:30*

**“Political families: a case study of Russian and British metaphors”**

**Edward V. Budaev**

**Nizhnii Tagil State Social Pedagogical Academy, Russia**

[edbud@rambler.ru](mailto:edbud@rambler.ru)

The theoretical basis of the research is the “cognitive-discursive” paradigm which combines heuristics of cognitive linguistics and media discourse-analyses. Metaphor is seen as not the rare or isolated linguistic device, but as one of the most basic and ordinary means through which humans conceptually organize the world. Through examination of linguistic data one can reveal the structure of humans' conceptual systems. Thus, by identifying metaphorical concepts evident within a culture and “mapping” them semantically, one simultaneously gathers information on the values of a particular culture.

The empirical content of the study is an analysis of metaphorical models, which organise conceptualization of ex-Soviet republics of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia in the EU (British press) and beyond (Russian press). The metaphorical models reflect the dominant ways of cognitive construal and evaluation of the concept “Baltic States” in Russian and British consciousness. It is argued that a political misunderstanding between Russia, Baltic States and Europe is linked with the difference between metaphorical conceptualizations of the same reality in national media discourses.

*Tuesday, 25th September 2007, 12:30-13:00*

**“Terrorism, Discourse, and the Mobilization of Power”**

**Joseph H. Campos II**

**University of Hawaii at Manoa**

[camposj@hawaii.edu](mailto:camposj@hawaii.edu)

This paper will explore and interrogate how terrorism is consistently brought into the political and controlled by the power structure, specifically the ways in which language is used to create a specific knowledge structure and the ways in which discursive practices represent the mobilization of power. Language, knowledge, and power are employed within a highly contextualized national security discourse – a discourse that creates notions of terrorism. A reading of presidential rhetoric and U.S. foreign policy over the past 30 years, will allow the exploration of how terrorism has been constructed within a context of national security. National security discourse is a site of practice for the State as it interprets, manipulates, and controls terrorism through discourse's constituting and appropriating functions.

*Tuesday, 25th September 2007, 13:00-14:00, Plenary Lecture*

**“Slipperiness, evasion and ambiguity: Equivocation and Facework in the Discourse of Televised Political Interviews”**

**Peter Bull**

**University of York, UK**

*Tuesday, 25th September 2007, 16:00-18:00, Seminar*

**“The Microanalysis of Political Communication”**

**Peter Bull**

**University of York, UK**

*Tuesday, 25th September 2007, 18:30-20:30, Seminar*

**“Communication and Discourse: Avoidance in Interaction”,**

**Anita Fetzer**

**University of Lueneburg, Germany**

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 09:00-09:30*

**“Political rhetoric of French presidential candidates' discourse: dissociation phenomena”**

**Magaud Véronique**

**University of Toulon-Var, France**

[magaudv@wanadoo.fr](mailto:magaudv@wanadoo.fr)

French presidential candidates' discourse is characterized by the absence of debate. However, ideas confrontation emerge from notional dissociations. These ones reveal a lexical confusion and also a non-separation of appropriate fields (Perelman and Olbrecht-Tyteca). But dissociation also falls within rhetoric figures and linguistic means. All these means permit the candidates to defend values and depreciate the opposite ones in an implicit way.

So our purpose aims at examining the deliberative nature of these discourses through notional dissociations. On the other side, we analyse the exemplary formulations and the amplification technique used by each candidate. Indeed, that one transmutes the contingency value attached to this factual enunciation in a representative fact. It aims at captivating audience, especially as it is founded on mass memory. It also reveals the type of *topos* on which candidates found their campaign and distinguish them from each other, and introduce enthymematic argumentation strengthened by ethic and pathetic proofs and amplification means.

Our analysis compares the discourses of the three outgoing candidates in the first round of the French presidential elections (Sarkozy, Royal and Bayrou).

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 09:30-10:00*

**“When catechism meets politics and science”**

**Michel Dufour**

**Université Paris 3, Sorbonne Nouvelle, France**

[mdufour@univ-paris3.fr](mailto:mdufour@univ-paris3.fr) / [micheldufour@wanadoo.fr](mailto:micheldufour@wanadoo.fr)

A study spanning over several centuries shows that books entitled “catechism” constitute a broad literary form with topics spreading far over religious domains. Our inquiry, limited to the French area and based on the resources of the French National Library is focused on catechisms that are not connected with the dissemination of any version of the Christian religion.

A quantitative study of what is left after this selection shows the unexpected fecundity of this kind of literature with a sharp increase during and shortly after the French Revolution that published numerous political or “national” catechisms.

Their topics are certainly not what makes the unity of this genre for they are incredibly diverse. They are even sometimes funny. It is rather their obvious faithfulness to formal elements borrowed from the religious model. The catechism is a didactical tool usually addressed to a specific audience. Although rich in exceptions, this literature is usually short and based on a dialogue alternating sharp questions asked by an expert expecting precise answers from a novice.

Attention will be paid to a somewhat different kind flourishing in the eighteenth and nineteenth century and that could be dubbed “philosophical”. For the goals of these often “thick” catechisms are political in the broadest sense for mixing moral political and scientific concerns. Their structure is also germane to philosophical dialogues both by their topics and forms. Attention will also be paid to its followers of the nineteenth century with their typical scientific, progressive and positivistic flavour.

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 10:00-10:30*

**“The Speech-Gesture System in the European Parliament”**

**Carmen Del Solar Valdés**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[carsolval@alum.us.es](mailto:carsolval@alum.us.es)

Speaking and gesturing are in many ways related to each other. It has been argued (McNeill, 1985; Kendon, 2002) that the connection between speech and gesture is so compelling that the communicative system should be more suitably regarded as the speech-gesture system. Furthermore, it has been claimed that defining the term “discourse” entails a prior acknowledgement of a multi-system approach to communication (Poyatos, 1997)3.

The purpose of this study is to prove that the communication process is based on a sound interdependence between verbal elements and nonverbal cues. In this vein, I have conducted a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the speech-gesture system of 8 members of the European Parliament (henceforth “MEPs”), as exhibited over a series of video-recordings featuring the plenary sessions held in view of the 2003/2004 Intergovernmental Conference. Acknowledging that the European Parliament has evolved into an increasingly multicultural framework, the analytical section of this paper provides an empirical basis for the assessment of the verbal and nonverbal behaviours of the political actors partaking in intercultural scenarios of this kind.

I first introduce a pragmatic proposal for a coding scheme, its aim being the annotation and classification of the verbal and nonverbal elements identified in the abovementioned MEPs’ political addresses. Then, I discuss the different arguments and ideas forming the cross-cultural, multi-system approach to discourse analysis that I foster in this study. Finally, I show the results obtained, and offer some concluding remarks regarding the MEPs’ observed patterns of discourse.

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 10:30-11:00*

**“Análisis pragmático y retórico del discurso político del creador del nacionalismo vasco, Sabino Arana Goiri (1865-1903)”**

**Teresa Fernández Ulloa**

**California State University, USA**

[tfernandez\\_ulloa@csub.edu](mailto:tfernandez_ulloa@csub.edu)

**Hernán Urrutia Cárdenas**

**Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea**

[feurcah@lg.ehu](mailto:feurcah@lg.ehu)

El discurso nacionalista de S. Arana es un discurso que se sustenta en la fuerza dicotómica del mensaje, las categorías de bien y mal, de felicidad y desgracia, de beneficios y recompensas, están claramente definidas.

La función apelativa primordial de este discurso es la exposición de un proyecto histórico y político que se basa en una determinada concepción de la sociedad e historia sobre la cual se busca fundar una ideología y programa político que organice la futura sociedad vasca.

Una vez delimitados los principales sujetos y actores del discurso, veremos cómo actúan en el programa o espectáculo que desarrolla la propuesta sabiniana.

Hay un objetivo único que es la Patria independiente. Así, los actores actúan en torno de este objetivo. Positiva o negativamente, construyéndola o destruyéndola, sacrificándose o aprovechándose, sanándola o enfermándola.

Las figuras retóricas que más se repiten en el discurso político de Sabino Arana son: metáforas, hipérbolos, repeticiones anafóricas, recurrencias gramaticales, diseminaciones, perífrasis e ironía.

Además de estas figuras retóricas clásicas, encontramos ciertas técnicas discursivas que le ayudan en su propósito de convencer: técnica inclusiva, transferencia, recursos coloquiales, expresiones en contraste, etc.

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 11:30-12:00*

**“Metonymy in Political Discourse and its Implications for Translation:  
The case of English and Greek”**

**Vilemini Sosoni**

**Athens Metropolitan College, Greece**

[sosoni@athensmetropolitancollege.gr](mailto:sosoni@athensmetropolitancollege.gr)

Politics and language are so closely related that, as Lakoff (1990: 13) put it, politics is language and, at the same time, language is politics. Under that light it is evident why it is assumed that metonymy, which is interpreted in a way to include synecdoche, is widely used in the language of politics, and political speeches in particular.

This article sets out to investigate the use of metonymy in the language of political speeches both in English and in Greek and aims at shedding some light into the generic and normative constraints which translators face when going from language A to language B and vice versa. In particular, the use of metonymy is studied in 10 political speeches written in English and 10 political speeches written in Greek. Based on the findings, an assessment of the global character of metonymy is attempted. It is also attempted to establish

whether particular metonymic expressions serve particular purposes in political speeches which, consequently, need to be retained in translation. Finally, it is attempted to establish whether metonymic expressions can indeed be retained in translation, i.e. whether they are not too culture-specific to allow translators to carry them across languages.

In a nutshell, this investigation sets out to determine first if the use of metonymy is consistent with language and generic norms in English and Greek and whether metonymy is a cross-linguistics phenomenon, i.e. if metonymic expressions can be carried across languages.

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 12:00-12:30*

**“Strategies of persuasion in Russian and British political discourses”**

**Oksana Chalmova**

**Tomsk State University, Russia**

[chalmova@yahoo.com](mailto:chalmova@yahoo.com)

The challenges in the modern world are evident. New ideas, conceptions, new models and strategies of communication appear. However, the problems of saving the power and persuading the audience in political communication remain. The paper focuses on traditional and innovative strategies of persuasion relevant for modern Russian and British political discourses. Public speeches of President V. Putin and Prime Minister T. Blair are analyzed. To hold the power political speakers form discursive space through reconstruction of old traditional conceptions of power describing the model of interrelation of political actors. The idea of superman, unordinary man able governing the world and ordinary people unable doing it which explains inequality of political relationships is represented in both political discourses. Politics of power is represented with the group of metaphors constructing new social and political identity. On the first sight, general conceptualization of “governmentality” which includes ideas of obeying the audience to political leader, supremacy one political institution (state) over another one (citizen), legalization of power and activity restriction for the audience and enlargement the power and activity fields for political leader is characteristic for Russian and British political discourse. However, the analysis shows some interesting distinctions in persuading strategies to be used. So, the identical political situation concerning the hold of power finds quite different solution in Russian and British persuading strategies. The paper summarizes general and special features of persuasion in both discourses which depend on the personality of political leader, and peculiarities of political, cultural, and national constructing the dialogue.

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 12:30-13:00*

**“Politicians’ gestures and words: an analysis of a televised interview with J. L. Rodríguez Zapatero”**

**Isabel M<sup>a</sup> Íñigo Mora and Gloria Álvarez-Benito**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[isabelin@us.es](mailto:isabelin@us.es) / [galvarez@us.es](mailto:galvarez@us.es)

The goal of this paper is to analyse the use of words and nonverbal signals (eye-contact and hand movements) in a Rodríguez Zapatero’s interview and the possible relation between them. The interview, broadcast by Antena 3 TV the 17th of April 2007 at 21:15pm, is a 30 minute long programme in which three journalists (Lomana, Urdaci and Valentín) interview the current President of Spain, José Luís Rodríguez Zapatero.

The paper will focus on the study of the following aspects: 1) types of questions according to their form and content; 2) relation between question type and interviewer; 3) types of replies; 4) relation between type of reply and interviewer; 5) interviewee’s eye contact and possible relation with equivocation; and 6) interviewee’s hand gestures and possible relation with equivocation. In the analysis of questions (content) and replies, we have borrowed the terms “CC (communicative conflict) question” and “equivocation” from Bavelas Black, Chovil and Mullett (1990). Bull (2003:592) explains that a CC question is “a question to which all the possible replies have potentially negative consequences, but where nevertheless a reply is still expected”. And according to Bavelas, Black, Chovil and Mullett (1990:28) equivocation is defined as: “... nonstraightforward communication; it appears ambiguous, contradictory, tangential, obscure or even evasive.” We will use chi-square tests to determine whether there is a relationship between the interviewee’s use of hand gestures or eye-contact and equivocation.

*Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 13:00-14:00, Plenary Lecture*

**“Political interviews in context: the private-public interface”**

**Anita Fetzner**

**University of Lueneburg, Germany**

Political interviews are mediated encounters par excellence: they present a public discussion of public events for a public audience and therefore require printed or audio-visual media to be felicitous.

The intention of this talk is to investigate the discourse genre and media event of a political interview in a sociopragmatic framework accounting for both the interactional organization of the genre as a whole and for its constitutive parts, e.g. discourse identities, discourse topics, communicative strategies and style. Particular reference is given to the re- and deconstruction of the discursive identity of a politician, to her / his connectedness with public and private domains of life, and to the interactional organization of sincerity, credibility and responsibility.

The first part analyses the interactional organization of a political interview in its prototypical (or default) form. It shows that a default political interview generally constrains the coparticipants to one-dimensional figures employing one-dimensional discursive styles. The second part extends the frame of investigation by examining *critical incidents* in which the hybrid status of the genre and of its constitutive parts surfaces in a multi-voiced encounter with multiple discursive identities and multiple discursive styles. By focussing on the negotiation and recontextualization of genre-specific constraints and requirements the strategies underlying the linguistic realization of default situations and *critical incidents* are made explicit.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 16:00-16:30**

**“Political Discourse through last decades in the United States”**

**Concepción Hernández Guerra**

**Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain**

[chernandez@dfm.ulpgc.es](mailto:chernandez@dfm.ulpgc.es)

It is well-known that political discourse has certain features that characterize it. Some of them would be: the vocabulary used (that is, the one related to politics, the importance of the pronouns “you” and “we”, crucial words like freedom/ liberty, God, human rights, equality, etc.), the liking to exaggerated adjectives, the repetition and combination of certain words and phrases, the concept of strategy applied to speeches and, in general, the idea that they express a compromise and make promises. Added to this, it has a controversial background and uses clichés and old formulations, it must own a particular tone and can have doublespeak. Furthermore, there can exist other non-verbal features in these discourses as the unintentional pauses, the creation of silence and specific gestures. It is equally true that when uttering speeches politicians must have a powerful stage presence, charisma and a personal and attractive style.

But, added to this, there are other messages that are transmitted when uttering a message. One of them could be that all politicians try to speak of the problems that face society in that specific historical moment and offer solutions to them. In many cases, demagogical.

The aim of this paper is to make an analysis of what has been considered the most important problems faced in the last decades and how these orators have faced them through the speeches uttered by the Presidents of the United States in the last fifty years. In this way we shall conclude with the evolution of the problems due to the impact of globalization.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 16:30-17:00**

**“Sound-bite politics and television: Who is persuading whom?”**

**N. Lorenzo-Dus**

**University of Wales Swansea, UK**

[n.lorenzo-dus@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:n.lorenzo-dus@swansea.ac.uk)

One of the corollaries of the current *media-isation of politics* is a significant shift of the latter away from traditional to new, media-accessible, sites. In the UK, for example, politicians have come to see their appearances within the House of Commons as secondary in importance to those just outside it – on College Green (otherwise known as ‘sound-bite heaven’) or in the main television channels’ studios at Millbank (Seaton 1998). The ‘increased visibility of politicians’ (Thompson, 2000), moreover, has led to their having their political images professionally managed (or ‘made-over’) by carefully selected teams of public relations experts. It has also led to extensive media coverage of such image-making practices. It is the latter aspect of political persuasion that this paper examines, specifically television’s use of a raft of visual and verbal communication strategies to persuade viewers of its particular ‘professional vision’ (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1997) of politicians. By examining discourse practices of recontextualisation and strategic metarepresentation, this paper shows how the field of politics is persuasively sold to viewers as, amongst other things, one of emotional display and confrontation. The data upon which this paper is based consists of UK terrestrial television live news featuring sound-bites with politicians speaking in public.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 17:00-17:30**

**“Male and Female Greek Parliamentary Discourse: A Corpus Linguistics Approach”**

**Katerina T. Frantzi**

**University of the Aegean, Greece**

[frantzi@rhodes.aegean.gr](mailto:frantzi@rhodes.aegean.gr)

The paper presents a study on parliamentary discourse using Corpus Linguistics techniques. More specifically, it deals with the extraction and comparison of the content words used by male and female politicians in the Hellenic Parliament: Do women politicians use more emotive adjectives? Do men declare facts and opinions more than women do? Do men talk about things rather than people while the opposite stands true for women?

Corpus linguistics, making use of automatic processing, offers precise and complete processing of the data that could not be achieved using the traditional (manual) way. The study consists of two stages: the automated, where computer tools extract statistical information regarding language features and the linguistic analysis that is applied to the automatically extracted information. Having the first stage computerized, the process is quick and unbiased. We have constructed a corpus of Parliamentary Discourse in Greece distinguishing male from female data. We apply the corpus linguistic tools to both the male and the female data corpus for the extraction of lists of lexical information. The lists consist of the content words used and are sorted according the frequency of occurrence of the words. By content words we include the words that keep context information, e.g. nouns, adjectives, adverbs. We apply and present comparisons of the extracted content word lists of parliamentary discourse for Greek men and women politicians.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 17:30-18:00**

**“Discurso político y descortesía: la expresión del desacuerdo en debates políticos televisivos.”**

**Ester Brenes Peña**

**Universidad de Sevilla, Spain**

[ebrenes@us.es](mailto:ebrenes@us.es)

El debate electoral a múltiples bandas es un género del lenguaje político perteneciente al ámbito del discurso conflictual o polémico (G. Herrero), pues en él se enfrentan frontalmente representantes de cada ideología o partido político con el objetivo de ganarse el voto de la audiencia en las próximas elecciones. El principal objetivo de nuestra ponencia será, por tanto, analizar, dentro de la corriente de la Lingüística Pragmática (C. Fuentes, 2000), las distintas estrategias, recursos y expresiones utilizados por los interlocutores para negar, refutar, contraargumentar u oponerse a la opinión sostenida por sus adversarios en este tipo de texto en concreto.

Además, y en conexión con este aspecto, atenderemos a la relación existente entre dichas expresiones y los fenómenos de la cortesía y descortesía verbal, insertándonos así en la discusión existente en la lingüística actual acerca de la definición, delimitación y estatus de dichos conceptos.

Asimismo, tomando como base las principales teorías existentes sobre la descortesía verbal (Lachenicht 1980, Culpeper 1996, 2003, 2005, Austin 1980 o S. Kaul de Marlangeon 2005 a, 2005 b, entre otros), así como las investigaciones sobre el debate político realizadas por autores como Blas Arroyo o Fernández (2000), reflexionaremos acerca de la posible naturaleza de la descortesía como elemento constitutivo del debate electoral, como elemento no marcado del binomio cortés/descortés, trasgrediendo así lo comúnmente aceptado y desmintiendo la consideración de la misma como un fenómeno poco común e irracional (Kienpointner, 1997).

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 18:30-19:00**

**“Political language in the 2004 U.S. Presidential electoral process”**

**Manuel Mejías Borrero**

**Pablo de Olavide University, Seville, Spain.**

[mmejbor@upo.es](mailto:mmejbor@upo.es)

The paper will analyze the most important aspects of the political language in the 2004 Presidential campaign in the USA used by presidential candidates George W. Bush and John F. Kerry. The paper uses mainly the theoretical framework laid out in Lakoff (1996, 2002 and 2004) for whom North American political discourse is grounded in two moral views that stem from two different interpretations of the metaphor “nation as family”. These two moral patterns conform to the *conservative* ideology (*strict father morality*, as in the Republican candidate George W. Bush) and the *liberal-progressive* ideology (*nurturant parent morality*, as in the Democratic candidate John F. Kerry). We will discuss aspects related to conceptual frames used by both candidates to express their worldview and persuade voters.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 19:00-19:30**

**“A study of emerging political discourse in post-war Japan”**

**Shoji Azuma**

**Ritsumeikan University, Japan) / University of Utah, U.S.A.**

[shoji\\_azuma@yahoo.co.jp](mailto:shoji_azuma@yahoo.co.jp)

The present project will examine Japanese politicians' speech documented in the Japanese Diet records during the period of 1945 - 2006. The main hypothesis is that a new type of speech is emerging based on the concept of solidarity, which reduces psychological distance between the public and politicians and also improves the public image of politicians.

Politicians' speech style is often characterized as *genko meiryoo, imi fumei* ('clear-in-language, unclear-in-meaning'), stemming from former Prime Minister Takeshita Noboru's speech style. Although this rhetorical style appears to be inefficient, the present study intends to show that the speech style employed by these politicians can be interpreted as an effective way to mitigate various face threatening acts. A particular style can be used to maintain the positive self image of speakers as well as listeners within the framework of the politeness theory developed by Brown and Levinson (1978). For example, a strategy of overtly presenting "self" has been more or less considered lacking in the East (e.g., Japan), but the present study will show that Japanese politicians are going through a linguistic shift, for example overtly using the first person pronoun in their speech.

This study contributes to the theme that political speech functions as a strategy in adjusting psychological distance between addressee (e.g., the general public) and politicians. In the field of Japanese sociolinguistics, politicians' speech has been rarely studied and the present study will be the first attempt to understand this seldom examined domain of discourse.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 19:30-20:00**

**“Dysphemism in Australian political discourse: insults, metaphor and delegitimization”**

**Wendy Allen**

**University of Melbourne, Australia**

[w.allen@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au](mailto:w.allen@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au)

Schäffner (1996) and Chilton and Schäffner (1997; 2002) claim that political discourse will be analyzed successfully if the details of political behaviour and those of linguistic behaviour are shown to be related. Politics is normally adversarial and confrontational; fundamental messages of much of politicians' discourse can be simplified to: *I am good* and *My opponent is bad* (Rank 1980). The politically strategic function of delegitimation of political oppositions is served by linguistic strategies of verbal conflict, through which speakers seek to establish their party as stronger, more reliable, authoritative, trustworthy and credible while representing their opponents as the opposite (Jacquemet 2006). Such strategies include use of dysphemistic linguistic tactics like insults comparing the opposition with animals, attacking their moral character, or their rationality and sanity (Allan and Burridge 2006). Animal metaphors play an important role at an emotional and subjective level; their use is often humorous, sometimes affectionate, but most often abusive, expressing dislike or contempt (Spence 2001). A speaker using such terms intends negative connotations to be associated with the referent and, used in a political context, it delegitimizes the person referred to.

Jucker (2000) distinguishes three distinct roles in any speech act of verbal aggression: the speaker who utters the verbal aggression; the addressee to whom the utterance is primarily directed; and, the target of the aggression, which may or may not be the addressee. Political insults are invariably uttered for the benefit of the overhearing audience, i.e. to gain the support of the voting public (Ilie 2001; Ilie 2004). This paper will discuss ways in which Australian politicians talk dysphemistically about their opponents and the structure and function of the political insults they use. Data is presented from interviews, media releases, election campaigns and parliamentary interactions.

**Wednesday, 26th September 2007, 20:00-20:30**

**“Two styles in the discourse of resistance”**

**B. N. Patnaik and Anil Thakur**

**Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore Banaras Hindu University, India**

[patnaik@iitk.ac.in](mailto:patnaik@iitk.ac.in) / [mi\\_anil@yahoo.com](mailto:mi_anil@yahoo.com)

Two different styles of the discourse of resistance are there: one, inclusive and cooperative, and the other, non-inclusive, but not non-cooperative, with respect to the “other”. This paper discusses this with illustration from some writings of Mahatama Gandhi as representative of the first, and of Noam Chomsky as representative of the second kind of discourse.

The paper considers the diction, imagery and tone of the selected pieces of writing to bring out the similarities and differences between their communicative styles. Although Gandhi and Chomsky have spoken for the marginalized, neither can be charged with “behalfism”. Their writings show control, and absence of sentimentality, pedantry and ornamentation. The tone and the method of “universalization” distinguish between their writings most clearly. Unlike Chomsky's, Gandhi's tone is rather pedagogic; he often told people what to do. Chomsky believes that people need no telling, they can decide for themselves once they know the truth. He universalizes by dealing with a numerous contexts; Gandhi did so more by highlighting the abstractions underlying facts.

While not wanting to discredit the combative discourse, we wish to project here the positive aspects of the Gandhian and Chomkyan discourses, which seek to invite rather than discard the “other”, explore the possibilities of uniting rather than dividing, soothe passions and appeal to the sense of humanism, to heal rather than to hurt. Perhaps to a world torn by conflicts, the discourse of this kind provides possibilities of as much hope as language can provide.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 09:00-09:30*

**“Appeal to National and Universal Values in Political Argumentation”**

**Tetyana Sayenko**

**Nagoya University of Commerce and Business, Japan**

[tisayenko10@yahoo.com](mailto:tisayenko10@yahoo.com)

Political argumentation is based on the appeal to values recognized by the members of a certain community at a particular time in their history. These “common values” may be culturally specific or universal. They may also acquire new meaning through rhetorical re-interpretation.

The present paper discusses the effects of the appeal to cultural and universal values in national and international political argumentation. The author argues that the application of the universal “value structure” both in national and international political communication can help facilitate better understanding and mitigate differences across cultures and nations.

The paper quotes political speeches delivered by European and American leaders to national and international communities in the XX-XXI centuries.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 09:30-10:00*

**“The Uses of Memory in the Spanish and British Parliaments. Application of Edwards and Potter’s Discursive Action Model (DAM)”**

**Aurelia Carranza Márquez**

**Universidad de Sevilla, Spain**

[aurelia@us.es](mailto:aurelia@us.es)

The main aim of this work is to discern the different uses of “memory” in the Spanish and British Parliaments from a Discursive Psychology perspective (DP). We will focus on one particular question: the use of indirect and direct quotations. For Discursive Psychology (DP), and contrary to traditional Cognitive Psychology for which language is a window towards the speaker’s mind, language is a tool that all speakers can make use of in order to get specific goals in determined situations. In this sense, memory, and direct and indirect quotations as part of it, can be regarded as simple versions of past events for a specific situation. Such versions take place in contexts of causal attribution where memory is part of wider activities such as problem solving. We live in a world oriented towards action, and past is built according to the needs of the present (Heritage, 1984). In order to obtain certain coherence within this comparative analysis we have chosen two similar communicative events (debates resulting from the elaboration of two laws about domestic violence; one in the Spanish and one in the British Parliament) that took place in the same period of time (summer 2004). Also, we will enrich our analysis with theories such as that developed by Eckert & McConnell-Ginet (1999), *Community of Practice*, where factors like authority and credibility are determined by the pertinence or non-pertinence to a predetermined group, and *Critical Discourse Analysis* (Fairclough, 1989; 1995), for which power imbalance and its importance in discourse within a social perspective are central. Likewise, we will revise the importance of the speaker’s gender in a topic very much determined by it like domestic violence.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 10:00-10:30*

**“Drinking Hemlock, Dinner Party Wakes, and the Use of Graduation in British and German Election Night Interviews”.**

**Annette Becker**

**Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt amMain, Germany**

[a.u.becker@em.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:a.u.becker@em.uni-frankfurt.de)

Are British election night interviews more morbid or more fun than their German counterparts? The British political scientist David Denver suggests that studying elections is not only recommendable because of their importance for democracy but also because they are fun events, and because studying them can be fun, too (Denver 2007:3-4). The same might be said for British election night coverages, e.g. regarding the linguistic means employed by British television journalists in their election night interviews with politicians, even at the earliest stages of an election night (Becker 2005a, *forthcoming* 2007). However, the German political scientist Dieter Prokop describes media interviews in election nights as a dull, foreseeable ritual that makes the audience yawn (Prokop 2002:313). He is not altogether wrong, especially regarding their language. On the basis of an

empirical analysis of British and German election night interviews taken from the full length of the BBC's coverage of the U.K. General Election 1997 and the ARD's coverage of the F.R.G. *Bundestagswahl* 1998 which were videotaped and transcribed in the context of the research project "Television Discourse", supported by the German Research foundation (DFG) and directed by Gerda Eva Lauerbach (<http://web.uni-frankfurt.de/zenaf/projekte/TVdiscourses/lauerbach.htm>), I will present selected examples of cross-cultural differences, focusing on a comparison of linguistic means for intensification and quantification, in other words: linguistic means from the appraisal system of graduation (Martin & Rose 2003; Martin & White 2005, White 2004) including figurative expressions such as *Michael Portillo, are you ready to drink hemlock yet?* or *Lord Archer, you are holding a small dinner party this evening, is it a wake?*, bearing in mind that election night coverages are complex textual units (Lauerbach 2005:43) that are shaped in close connection to both their political context including the electoral system and their media context including the broadcasting channels' identities.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 10:30-11:00*

**“Mujeres en la cumbre: los discursos de Ségolène Royal en la campaña para la elección presidencial francesa de 2007”.**

**Lydia Fernández and Clara Ubaldina LORDA**  
**Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain**  
[lidia.fernandez@upf.edu](mailto:lidia.fernandez@upf.edu) / [clara.lorda@upf.edu](mailto:clara.lorda@upf.edu)

Un equipo de investigadoras, bajo la dirección de la Profesoras Simone Bonnafous de la Universidad de Paris XII y Marlène Coulomb-Gully de la Universidad de Toulouse Le Mirail (UTM) ha llevado a cabo un estudio internacional sobre cómo los medios de comunicación se hacen eco del “Día de las Naciones Unidas para los derechos de la Mujer y la Paz Internacional”, promovido por la ONU desde 1977. Los distintos trabajos realizados en once países sobre el impacto de esta jornada desvelaron un aspecto de la dialéctica entre lo nacional y lo internacional a la hora de construir las identidades y difundir algunas ideas y debates a escala internacional. Entre ellos, cabe referirse a España (con un gobierno paritario) y a Francia, donde por primera vez una mujer ha llegado a la segunda vuelta de las elecciones presidenciales.

El discurso de Ségolène Royal (PS), en particular durante la campaña electoral, ha sido objeto de interés tanto de los políticos (de su partido y de los partidos adversarios), como de los medios de comunicación, y también de los ciudadanos de a pie. Algunas de sus estrategias han sido claramente contrapuestas a las de su adversario final, Nicolas Sarkozy (UMP), aunque también puedan verse en ambos discursos aspectos comunes, propios de toda contienda electoral, así como, en un plano más general, del momento político y social en que vivimos. Incluso, en algún momento, han llegado a relacionarse unas y otras estrategias con la condición femenina y masculina de ambos candidatos.

Nuestro trabajo se basa en la emisión institucional de F2 para la campaña electoral, los discursos de ambos políticos el día de la primera vuelta y el debate que los enfrentó el 2 de mayo. En nuestra comunicación describiremos las similitudes y diferencias entre los modos de dirigirse a los ciudadanos de estos dos políticos franceses, trataremos de ponderar las estrategias atribuibles a la condición femenina de la candidata socialista y el peso de cada uno de estos discursos de campaña en los resultados finales.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 11:30-12:00*

**“(Des)cortesía parlamentaria y fuerza argumentativa: “decirles, señorías, que...”**

**Catalina Fuentes Rodríguez**  
**University of Seville, Spain**  
[cfuentes@us.es](mailto:cfuentes@us.es)

Las alusiones a la enunciación son muy frecuentes en cualquier tipo de comunicación lingüística. Sus funciones son diversas: desde las matizaciones del propio acto de habla, hasta los mecanismos de control llamados genéricamente reformulativos: corregir, aclarar, precisar, explicar... Pero es muy frecuente en ciertos discursos la aparición de un verbo de decir en infinitivo que introduce, generalmente, el último párrafo del texto. Este infinitivo sirve de marcador conclusivo y, al mismo tiempo, dota de fuerza argumentativa a lo dicho, presentando lo más relevante desde el punto de vista del hablante. Gramaticalmente, ha sido criticado por violar la norma de construcción oracional.

En el caso del lenguaje parlamentario, su uso es muy abundante tanto en las intervenciones de los consejeros como en las de los miembros de la oposición. Aparece en contextos de réplica, donde el hablante intenta imponer sus argumentos al interlocutor. Esto hace que tengamos que analizar también el grado de (des)cortesía comunicativa que conlleva su uso.

Nuestro trabajo se centrará en las intervenciones de los parlamentarios andaluces tanto en las Sesiones del Parlamento como en las Comisiones. En ellas analizaremos las funciones estratégicas de este verbo de decir, las circunstancias interactivas en que aparece, los contextos sintácticos, semánticos y entonativos que exige y su rendimiento en el plano argumentativo.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 12:00-12:30*

**“Funciones argumentativas de incisos y comentarios en los debates parlamentarios (Francia y Reino Unido)”**

**Cornelia Ilie**

**Örebro University and Södertörn University College, Sweden**

[cornelia.ilie@hum.oru.se](mailto:cornelia.ilie@hum.oru.se)

**Clara Ubaldina Lorda**

**Pompeu Fabra University, Barcelona, Spain**

[clara.lorda@upf.edu](mailto:clara.lorda@upf.edu)

Los trabajos actuales de la lingüística del discurso en torno a los debates parlamentarios ponen de manifiesto los distintos tipos de estrategias verbales que se despliegan en ese marco institucional, que, aunque regido por normas estrictas, permite también un amplio margen de libertad y creatividad. Por otra parte, la perspectiva comparativa ayuda a percibir, a través del análisis de semejanzas y diferencias, las especificidades de los imaginarios socio-discursivos y los estilos retóricos en los distintos parlamentos.

Proponemos un estudio sobre los fragmentos denominados parentéticos por los antiguos retóricos, esto es, incisos y comentarios que se presentan como formas de aparente digresión en un conjunto discursivo semánticamente homogéneo. Nos centraremos en varios debates pertenecientes a los géneros *Questions au gouvernement* (Francia) y *Question Time* (Reino Unido).

En un primer tiempo presentaremos una tipología de estos enunciados parentéticos, basada en las orientaciones argumentativas propiciadas por dicha estrategia discursiva; en segundo lugar, los resultados del estudio comparativo nos llevarán describir algunos rasgos discursivos significantes de los parlamentos considerados.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 12:30-13:00*

**“Constructing National Interests and Legitimacy for Immigration Control —Parliamentary discourses on "Polenpolitik" in Imperial Germany and "Chinese Exclusion" in USA of late 19th century.”**

**Ryo Kuboyama**

**Bielefeld University, Germany**

[ryo.kuboyama@uni-bielefeld.de](mailto:ryo.kuboyama@uni-bielefeld.de)

The paper deals with the fundamental transformation in internationally shared ideas and norms of the relationship between states and immigration in the late 19th century, by analyzing parliamentary discourses on the Polish labour migrants in German Empire and the Chinese contract labour migrants in the USA.

It focuses on the question why and how states historically launched regulating international migration and why and how immigration issue was abruptly put on the agenda of national policy in this period, in contrast to state's indifference to international migration itself before. Why industrial nations together began to intervene in immigration then cannot be explained in national specific contexts: neither cultural background nor domestic politics nor economical fluctuations. The presentation will explain this isomorphic and systematic change in states' behaviour on immigration within the constructivist framework.

By analyzing the records of both Prussian and Imperial German Parliament in 1885 and 1886, and the U.S. Congress in 1882 and 1888, it demonstrates how statesmen of both nations changed semantics and notion of state sovereignty to legitimate restricting immigration; how it altered their collective understanding of legal authority over international migration, from the one based on international law to based on municipal law; and how it resulted in shift of immigration issue from the realm of commerce and private law to politics and public law, which enabled enactment of the legislation to exclude Polish migrants in East Prussia from Imperial Germany and the one to limit migration of Chinese to the USA.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 13:00-13:30*

**“Discursive strategies of ‘consensus’ / ‘polarization’ in Spanish political debates on the process of European construction”.**

**María del Mar Rivas Carmona**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[marrivas@us.es](mailto:marrivas@us.es)

As Teun A. van Dijk (2004) pointed out, it seems quite apparent that discourse plays a relevant role in the wide domain of politics, the agenda of which is mainly characterized by its own linguistic practices. The analysis of this essentially linguistic agenda requires a type of approach that should bear in mind the undeniably social nature of language (Halliday 1985; 1994), able to reveal the apparently hidden connections between language, power and ideology. ‘Critical linguistics’ or otherwise ‘critical language study’ attempts to meet both goals and introduces the concepts of power, truth and knowledge through a model of text analysis (Fairclough

1992:3). More specifically, the analysts who are oriented towards a Critical Discourse Analysis, such as Fairclough, Dant, Hodge, etc., closely related to Social Psychology and Conversation Analysis, look into the discourse vs. power relationship and their apparent spin-offs in the “discursive ideological formations” (Fairclough 1995). In fact, it is in the political debate where discursive and ideological power distinctions are best seen.

There are a number of discursive strategies that materialize or reveal the ideological formations underneath. Following Chilton and Schäfer’s (1997) “strategic functions”, as well as those strategies pointed by van Dijk (2004), we will focus mainly on those of “legitimation” face to face “deslegitimation” (otherwise, ‘positive presentation’ vs ‘negative presentation’) and those of “consensus” face to face “polarization”. In political interventions we may frequently find argumentations that legitimate the own proposals, deslegitimizing those of the opponents, thus establishing a polar relationship.

The text under survey will consist of a session of the Joint Committee for European Affairs in the Spanish Parliament discussing the topic of the European Construction where the use of such strategies can be distinctively noticed. The aims of the speakers are various, some addressed to fostering a national identity within the frame of a European building-up, whereas others are addressed to creating a purely partisan identity.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 13:30-14:00*

**POSTER: “APOLLO I: An annotation tool for the Analysis of Political Language and Oratory (Political Interviews)”**

**Gloria Álvarez-Benito and Carmen del Solar Valdés**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[galvarez@us.es](mailto:galvarez@us.es) / [carsolval@alum.us.es](mailto:carsolval@alum.us.es)

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 16:00-18:00, Round Table*

**“Sign Language in Political Discourse”**

**Mod.: Juan Pablo Mora Gutiérrez**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[jmora@us.es](mailto:jmora@us.es)

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 18:30-19:00*

**The Persuasive Politico-religious Discourse in C. Marlowe’s Dr. Faustus and G. W. Bush**

**Rosalía Villa Jiménez**

**University of Cordoba, Spain**

[vijir@hotmail.com](mailto:vijir@hotmail.com)

Prone to accept and (re) formulate the self-same old conceptions and ideas of the world, we still live, traditionally develop and put in practice the fashionable distinction between Absolute Evil and Absolute Good.

The thing I pursue in this paper is go through and explore G.W.Bush’s political and religious discourse, which he gave to ‘his’ people as to encourage their *souls* to follow his [holy] command just at the outbreak of the war against the Arab world, and make a comparison with the persuasive politico-religious discourse in C. Marlowe’s *Dr. Faustus*. In this, I will take Juan B. Stam’s article “Bush’s religious language” in its translated and original form as main source to develop my point. All the more, Bush’s discourse accentuates the idealisation of a divine power with which he has been bestowed from High as well as his keen and kind words of fire echo the thirst of desire and power Dr. Faustus in his fictional universe has regaled his readers with so many times. Recovered from the clash between medieval theology and Renaissance values, Bush’s enthusiastic speech delights his readers to fancy him in a fictional universe [in our universe] where he defiantly partakes in so conflictive a struggle to sweep all evil away. Canonised and divine Bush makes use of the Good to eradicate the Evil disguised under the veil of a Faustian unsatisfied desire for mapping the world.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 19:00-19:30*

**“What Can We Do Through Political Discourse? Proposal for The Analysis of its Legitimatory Function”**

**Laura Filardo Llamas**

**University of Valladolid, Spain**

[lfilardo@fyl.uva.es](mailto:lfilardo@fyl.uva.es)

Departing from Chilton’s (2004: 23) identification of “legitimation” as one of the key functions of political discourse, we intend to propose in this paper a method for the analysis of this function. We believe that legitimation is connected to the promotion of specific representations about a socio-political reality (ibid: 154), which is, in turn, related to the ideological conception underlying specific instances of discourse. Therefore, we take Martin Rojo & Van Dijk’s (1997) identification of three different types of legitimation – which are

connected to three different elements in the communicative process – and establish a link between them and Van Dijk's (1993, 1998) and Fairclough's (1989, 1995) three-layered method of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Given that CDA is based on the intrinsic connection between discourse and society, the theory of discourse upon which this approach is based acknowledges the interaction between text and social processes. Consequently, the first stage in our methodological proposal involves the identification of those linguistic structures that may help us uncover the legitimatory function of political discourse. In the second stage, we try to interpret the legitimatory value of political discourse in relation to how it communicates ideological beliefs (Van Dijk 1997: 2), and how it relates to other elements in the political practice(s) which surround the instance of discourse under analysis (Fairclough 1989: 26). In the final stage, the legitimatory function of PD is explained by relying on its socio-political role and how this is connected to more ample political processes (ibid: 166), which are frequently discursively portrayed.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 19:30-20:00*

**“Paralinguistic Elements in the Oral Questions at the House of Commons: A Case-Study”**

**Isabel Antúnez Pérez**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[isantunezpe@yahoo.es](mailto:isantunezpe@yahoo.es)

This paper offers a study of paralinguistic elements in one session of Oral Questions at the House of Commons. First of all, paralinguistic (nonverbal vocal features) consists of one of the three cosystems involved in the “audiovisual triple structure of speech” (Poyatos, 2002a:103), together with language (words spoken) and kinesics (body movements). This paper will focus on Oral Questions, a subcategory of Parliamentary Questions. Oral Questions should “seek for information or press for action.” (Factsheet P1, 2005:4). This proposal is intended to study the role of paralinguistic elements in the communicative strategies involved in Oral Questions, both in quantitative and qualitative terms. Therefore, by means of the software ANVIL (Kipp, 2003), Oral Questions will be studied according to the taxonomy (Poyatos, 2002b) of primary elements; qualifiers; differentiators and alternants. Every element will be assigned a function, with respect to the verbal message, such as supporting, contradicting, masking, etc.. The results will indicate which type of paralinguistic elements are more relevant and the functions carried out by them. Finally, a number of conclusions will be pointed out, such as the relevance of paralinguistic elements in the communicative strategies of politicians and the need of including this nonverbal system in the studies of political discourse.

*Thursday, 27th September 2007, 20:00-20:30*

**“La Canción como Estrategia del Discurso Político en Francia”.**

**Ana María Iglesias Botrán**

**University of Valladolid, Spain**

[anabotranenfrancia@hotmail.com](mailto:anabotranenfrancia@hotmail.com)

La canción ha sido, es y probablemente seguirá siendo en Francia una estrategia política. Según L-J Calvet, “les chansons racontent la société” (1981: 118-119), y en el caso de la historia y la sociedad francesa, esta afirmación se cumple casi matemáticamente. Muchos de los acontecimientos sociales y políticos en Francia se ven casi inmediatamente reflejados en una canción en la que se habla, se critica o se protesta tras algún suceso concreto. Los dos momentos de la historia reciente del país galo que queremos destacar en nuestro estudio son las revueltas de noviembre de 2005 y la victoria de Nicolas Sarkozy en las elecciones presidenciales de mayo de 2007, ambos han ido acompañados de discursos políticos plasmados en numerosas canciones. Veremos cual es la ideología de la canción ante estos dos acontecimientos y qué estrategias lingüísticas ponen en funcionamiento estableciendo un vínculo entre los hechos políticos y la canción resultante. De esta manera, intentaremos mostrar con ejemplos concretos cómo una canción puede ser un discurso político en sí mismo para lo que nos apoyaremos, entre otros, en la Teoría de la Ideología de Van Dijk (2003).

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 09:00-09:30*

**“The Nature of Politics”**

**Yi, Peng**

**National Central University, Taiwan**

[pengyi@cc.ncu.edu.tw](mailto:pengyi@cc.ncu.edu.tw)

My paper aims to examine the crucial aspects of the term “nature” in the context of modern politics from Enlightenment onwards in order to establish its relevance and the true nature of modern politics. The topic will be tackled historically, theoretically and in one exemplary case. Historically, nature both as human nature and as “exigencies of life”, the biological and physical groundwork of human existence, become a part of political discourse since the French Revolution. According to Hannah Arendt, the passions invoked in Rousseau

and the revolutionaries speak to specific “natural” traits in man (e.g. unselfishness and commiseration) and address the issue of basic existence of the masses, i.e. the nature that has the ultimate grip on human existence. These two “natures” are often at the root of modern revolutions and continue to exert their influence well into our century. These two may have contributed to the split of the private and the public in subtle ways. But the so-called state of nature which serves as the basis for the social contract that Rousseau puts forward as the solution of the suffering he witnessed implies the demand for collective justice and rational public political activities that are mainly based on the ideal of open dialogue. In short, the “nature of politics” encapsulates the challenges of the modern politics to separate and maintain the gap between the natural and the political. Theoretically speaking then, nature is situated at the intersection of psychology, ethics, economics, and politics. Modern psychology has to deal both with the undeniable natural demands, such as hunger and sex, and higher functions that we think are also (at least belatedly) natural. Ethics needs to define the good just as it has to come to terms with evil. Politics, as the parliament of various interests, also has to consider what is human nature, man’s relationship with nature as the environment, and nature as the “genome” that sometimes flies in the face of human intellectual efforts, be they rational dialogues or social contracts. In terms of example, I will try to briefly discuss the political situation as revealed in one or two public statements from politicians in Taiwan as examples of the ever present importance of the question of nature as the original state of nature as described by Hobbes in terms of the war of all against all.

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 09:30-10:00*

**“La propaganda política en las elecciones presidenciales venezolanas del 2006: estudio de las estrategias de argumentación”**

**Oscar Alberto Morales, Ernesto Ilich Marín Altuve and Carolina González Peña**  
**Central University of Venezuela, Venezuela**

The aim of this paper is to describe and to analyze the communicative strategies used in the political campaign of the Venezuelan presidential elections in 2006. We analyzed a corpus of 420 electoral ads published in four Venezuelan newspapers during the electoral campaign between August and December 2006. Data were analyzed qualitatively. We found that Chavez’s ads proposes possible worlds (PW) inhabited by facts, truths and presuppositions, connected by means of argumentative strategies of link. Manuel Rosales’ proposes opposite possible worlds: it represents Chavez’s government as a negative one, characterized by hatred, corruption, division, and proposes future MP+ of well-being without him. We conclude that the works of government carried out by the candidates, considered good but incomplete, have a fundamental role for the construction and connection of the possible worlds and for the argumentation.

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 10:00-10:30*

**“Affective linking in political interaction of the Venezuela president”**

**María Jesús Nieto y Otero**  
**Central University of Venezuela, Venezuela**

The present process of political change in Venezuela seems to be accompanied by a new style in political discourse. We will take as a starting point the assumption that political change is linked to a change in discourse, as presented by Fairclough (1994), Fairclough and Wodak (1997), Martín Rojo and Van Dijk (1997). It seems that political discourse has been involved people with President and his project. We ask ourselves: Are there elements in those President’s speeches characteristics from him? What relations have these marks with affectivity? Which are the specific evaluative aspects of these President that predominate in his speeches?

This investigation deals with the affectivity in discourse during Hugo Chávez’s administration. The hypothesis is that the President’s affective communication (evaluations) (1) have some characteristics functions. And we propose six categories, based in Caffi and Janney (1994), to analyse affectivity in discourse.

We define affectivity in discourse as: a subjective and conscious communicative manifestation that arises in the interaction between participants in discourse, which expresses degrees of vinculation, preferences and specific particular beliefs (see Nieto y Otero 2000, 2003, 2005).

One of the possible conclusions would be a clarification of the affectivity and discourse, as well as the relationship between linguistic processes that express interpersonal relations. There seems to be a certain overlap between evaluation and politeness’s characteristics when we study affectivity. An analytical scheme could be structured for affectivity in discourse by integrating differences and similitudes. Doesn’t confirmed the status of affectivity by linguistic analyses speeches?

In brief, it is an attempt to analyze political interaction through a pragmatics grammar according to levels and analytical units in order to discover affectivity uses.

Preliminary results indicates that affectivity is a different phenomenon from evaluation because the first one is anthropological categorie and evaluation is a linguistic one. Discourse shows affectivity through evaluation; and strategy possible would be a specific type of modality, which could be named "affective modality".

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 10:30-11:00*

**”Persuasion by evidence”**

**Thierry Guilbert**

**Centre universitaire de recherches sur l’action publique et le politique, France**

[th.guilbert@wanadoo.fr](mailto:th.guilbert@wanadoo.fr)

This communication imparts an interdisciplinary work situated in Discourse Analysis which questions the constitution process of socially marked representations in common knowledge.

The concern raise that following question: how do ideological discourses turn out to present as evident, as a taken-for-granted form of presentation? How does work this form of persuasion?

We have theoretically re-worked the notions of ideology and evidence (obviousness) in their relation with language in use. Our comparative reading of Destutt de Tracy, M. Bakhtine, L. Althusser, P. Bourdieu, O. Reboul, T. Van Dijk, N. Fairclough permits to consider the former in a functional approach (i.e. a non philosophical but discursive approach) and to define the latter as non questioned evidence, common sense, doxa: a very effective form of persuasion. We have learned discursive procedures of that form of persuasion in 184 French commentary press articles which use and constitute public opinion as guarantor and truth criterion of their talks.

Our contention is that Discourse Analysis does associate fruitfully a broadened pragmatic approach with communicational and rhetorical approaches to highlight the role of implicit utterances (presuppositions, obvious statements, implied utterances), generic forms of language, taken-for-granted categorizations and shared representations, argumentative and manipulation rhetoric frames in a general discourse of power: rhetoric of power is persuasion by rhetoric of evidence.

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 11:30-12:00*

**“Politics and grammar in journalistic discourse”**

**Kareen Gervasi**

**California State University, U.S.A**

[kgervasi@aol.com](mailto:kgervasi@aol.com)

I analyze the variable use of direct discourse (DD) and indirect discourse (ID) in two Spanish language newspapers with different ideological perspectives: Granma (the official newspaper of the ruling Cuban Communist Party) and El Nuevo Herald (a Miami-based newspaper that caters to the Cuban exile community)

DD is a strategy by which the reporter conveys objectivity by preserving the authenticity of the reported speech, whereas the reporter=s use of ID, paraphrasing the original speech, tends to reflect his/her own subjectivity and to endorse the views of the person whose speech is reported.

The use of DD and ID and other reporting grammatical structures are influenced by the ideological interests of the news reporter and by the level of political and social-economic power of those whose voice is being reported.

There is a significant correlation between news reports from Granma that quote governmental officials and the use of ID, whereas in El Nuevo Herald, there is almost equal use of DD and ID. The higher frequency of use of ID in Granma correlates with the reporter=s ideology, which (officially) endorses the views of quoted government officials. Conversely, El Nuevo Herald=s reporters tend to use both DD and ID equally when reporting the voice of powerful individuals, which signals a higher degree of freedom as to whether the reporter wishes to endorse the voices he/she reports in the news. In contrast, when citizens without power or influence are quoted in either publication, DD is preferred.

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 12:00-12:30*

**“In & out of Vietnam: Rhetorical strategies during the Vietnam War”**

**Javier Martín Párraga**

**University of Cordoba, Spain**

[l92mapaf@uco.es](mailto:l92mapaf@uco.es)

From the beginning of the American military involvement in the Vietnam War it became quite evident that the American population was not very enthusiastic about sending their children to fight this war. It was a distant conflict, and the enemy didn’t really have the capacity (or intentions) to threaten the US. As the war advanced, it became even more unpopular, because the supposedly “tiny” enemy was creating serious damages to the omnipotent American Army, but also because the media started to broadcast terrible images in which both the Americans and their Vietnamese allies committed horrible crimes against unarmed civilians. As *black bags* kept arriving and the end to the conflict started to look more and more distant the task of convincing the public opinion about the necessity of keep fighting in Vietnam started to be almost impossible. It became clear it was

time to go back home... which was also difficult to explain. How could the Government bring their soldiers back without giving the impression they have been defeated by a smaller enemy, or even worse without giving the impression they were abandoning their allies?

In this paper I will analyze the main rhetorical devices to convince the American population to enter the Vietnam war (such as the “dominoes theory” that explained that all the neighbor countries would become communists if the Vietcong won the Vietnam war), to convince this same population that the US should remain in Vietnam (like the “silent majority” theory that considered that even the majority of Americans approve the war only the dissidents were noisy enough as to be noticed) and I will finally pay attention to the strategies to justify the American withdrawal from the war (all the “honorable escapes” formulas).

*Friday, 28th September 2007, 12:30-13:00*

**“La construcción discursiva de la revolución en la Europa del tránsito de los siglos XIX y XX”**

**Custodio Velasco Mesa**

**University of Seville, Spain**

[custovelasco@us.es](mailto:custovelasco@us.es)

La multiplicación de acciones colectivas obreras durante el tránsito de los siglos XIX y XX en Europa no fue únicamente la consecuencia de la evolución económica y política que atravesó el continente durante ese periodo. En buena medida tales agitaciones obreras estuvieron condicionadas por esos factores en tanto que, en esencia, constituyeron la reacción ante un orden económico y político liberal que marginaba a amplios colectivos del reparto de la riqueza y de la participación política. Sin embargo, no fueron su resultado automático. Fue necesario un proceso de conversión de elaboraciones lingüísticas en estructuras cognoscitivas compartidas; un proceso de formulación de marcos conceptuales y tramas de significado; un proceso, en suma, de difusión de un discurso que interpretara las experiencias comunes obreras en favor de la acción colectiva. Tomando como referencia dos ejemplos concretos del escenario de movilizaciones europeo de fines del siglo XIX y principios del XX, los casos belga y español, en esta comunicación se analizará el modo en que, durante esos años, los obreros articularon el discurso revolucionario, constituyendo lo que William Sewell denomina la “experiencia ideológica” de los trabajadores: un factor que contribuyó a configurar tanto la identidad de clase como la acción colectiva; y ello reinterpretando, adaptando a las nuevas circunstancias el lenguaje revolucionario ya extendido a fines del siglo XVIII por quienes se opusieron al orden social del Antiguo Régimen.