POLITICAL CROSS-DISCOURSE: CONVERSATIONALIZATION, IMAGINARY NETWORKS, AND SOCIAL FIELDS IN GALIZA

Celso Alvarez-Cáccamo and Gabriela Prego-Vázquez[1]

Abstract

Through the analysis of political rallies and parliamentary speech in Galiza, it is shown how conversationalized forms of political discourse enter into ideological manipulation and hegemony-building by professional politicians. The overall resulting phenomenon, *cross-discourse*, draws from habitual, daily and traditional forms of speech. Political cross-discourse consists of the tactical texturing of traditional political oratory templates through select informal conversational forms and themes. Three main forms of cross-discourse found in the data are exemplified. Cross-discourse indexes and constructs social spaces and networks at several levels of generality: From those of daily interactions to an imaginary supranetwork of common citizens. This form of cross-discursive circulation (from daily speech to politics) gives the illusion of fluidity between social fields in formal democracies, while it hides the very unequal nature of the distribution of discursive resources.

Keywords: Manipulation, Power, Hegemony, Galizan-Portuguese, Political discourse.

1. Introduction

In this article we would like to discuss a form of *reflexive technologization* (Fairclough 2000) of political speech which we have called "political cross-discourse". Political cross-discourse consists of the selective texturing of formal institutional talk by means of various conversational resources which personalize and de-ideologize talk, sometimes giving rise to clearly populist discourse. Neither conversationalization nor populism are spectacularly new in political discourse. What we will try to do is unveil particular cross-discursive forms in Galiza, and to show both the relevance of the notion for an understanding of hegemony-building in formal democracies, and its particularities in the context of Galiza nowadays.

We start from some basic, widely recognized premises about political institutional

discourse and the processes of discourse production, circulation, and interpretation that nevertheless are useful to remember. We start from the assumption that public political discourse is a as a form of appropriation, and an inherently asymmetric tool for power. The study of public political discourse is thus strategic in order to understand how discourse resources are differentially distributed in society, along and across social networks and fields. The political space is inherently asymmetric in several senses: (1) it is through politics that power is exercized over citizens; (2) resources for the production and circulation of political discourse are unequally distributed along social groups and fields; and (3) political discourse is differentially interpreted by the various social groups according to the likewise unequal distribution of ideologies.

With this work we attempt to establish theoretical and methodological links between core notions of the social critique of language: First, Gumperz's application of the notion of *social networks* to the study of the unequal distribution of discursive resources (Gumperz 1982a); secondly, Bourdieu's notion of *fields* as social and symbolic spaces where relationships of power are played out (Blommaert 1990; Bourdieu 1990). The link between both constructs, established through discourse, rests on an understanding of the structural position of social actors as producers of discourse with certain privileges or restrictions regarding discourse production and circulation. In Bourdieuan terms, it is the elites (technical, political, intellectual) who generate the hegemonic discourses carrying hegemonic ideologies. As to the interpretation of political discourse by recipients (the social body at large), since interpretation is an intrinsically inferential process (Gumperz 1982a; Gumperz 1982b), the effectiveness of political discourse (and *cross-discourse*) rests on the tactical use, display and manipulation of resources and themes which retrieve cultural background assumptions and contribute not only to indexing specific social networks but also to building them in dynamic, fluid ways. As we will see, this is apparent in the characteristic use of conversational resources and themes in political cross-discourse in Galiza.

2. What is political cross-discourse?

Political cross-discourse consists of the tactical texturing of political oratory templates through select informal conversational resources and themes. First, these resources circulate in interaction in *local* networks, in *habitual ordinary* conversation, and in *traditional* activities such as chatting in taverns or coffee breaks at work. In cross-discourse, these resources are re-appropriated in political events which index and construct *wider* networks and *general* audiences, in *sporadic* (not habitual) and relatively *new* social activities arising from democratization.

In sum, cross-discourse in ritualized events therefore indexes fluid, mutually compatible network memberships and social identities, and it symbolically crosses (or makes participants and audiences cross) between social spaces, specifically those of civil society and the political field.

The participation format of political discourse is significant in order to understand its role: Its direction is always from one to many (from the politician to the audience), and it is produced by legitimized speakers both in public, face-to-face events (political meetings, rallies, electoral campaigns) and in mediated forms (television and radio interviews with politicians, debates, broadcast parliamentary sessions, etc.). Crucially,

conversationalization hides the inherently asymmetrical relationships between civil society and institutional politicians based on the unequal distribution of communicative resources and roles in formal democracy, and it thus contributes to effect the naturalization (Briggs 1992; Thompson 1990) of new ideological "common sense" values about the personalization of political life and the effective "participation" of citizens in decision making.

Cross-discourse is thus intrinsically heteroglossic (Bakhtin 1981). The notion has resonances of Brigg's "entextualization" as a process (Briggs and Bauman 1992), "transposition" as discourse circulation (Silverstein and Urban 1996), Rampton's "crossing" as a sort of transgression (Rampton 1995a, 1998, 1995b), and even Goffman's "cross-play" and "by-play" as side-activities (Goffman 1981). At the level of conversational organization and footing (Goffman 1981), cross-discursive shifts of voices trigger various alignments; as in the Samoan *fono* (Duranti 1994), in public political cross-discourse the amplitude of the identity invoked, which is one of the defining parameters of formality or informality (Irvine 1984) is selectively opened or closed through texturing.

Finally, a note on cross-discourse and genres. Fairclough (Fairclough 1997, 2000) points out how "new genres" are emerging through reflexive technologization of speech which are connected to changing conditions in neo-liberal capitalism. Although in a broad sense, this is true of cross-discourse, we do not pretend to claim that cross-discourse constitutes a new genre per se in the Galizan situation, as we do not believe that it possesses identifiable, particular formal generic parameters, nor does it carry particular expectations as, e.g., a hypothetical "new parliamentary discourse". Importantly, we also lack access to many of the links in the chain of discourse circulation which constitute crucial "hidden contexts" (Blommaert 2001a, 2001b) for the understanding of recurring entextualization. We simply would like to claim that political cross-discourse is best characterized by the *penetration of elements* from and across speech styles, and thus by its structural and thus indexical flexibility toward social networks and fields, by which professional politicians selectively "narrow or widen the gap" (Briggs and Bauman 1992) between socially constructed speech styles.

3. Data

We present fragments from two political events: A meeting in the town of Carvalho during the 1997 election campaign to the Galizan parliament, and a plenary session of the autonomous Galizan Parliament discussing the Motion of Censure presented on January 21, 2001 by the Galizan Nationalist Bloc (Bloque Nacionalista Galego, BNG) against the Galizan government of the conservative Popular Party (Partido Popular, PP) ruled by Manuel Fraga Iribarne, an ex-minister from the Franco regime. Our protagonists in most of our data cases are speakers from the PP, including the Galizan president himself, Fraga Iribarne.

4. Background

Political cross-discourse is emerging in Galiza in connection with the process of urbanization, modernization and formal democratization that society has been experiencing

during the last twenty years. The recent democratization process entails an illusory involvement of civil society in the political sphere. In the lack of democratic tradition, the relationship between a barely educated rural society and the institutional realm used to be established during Franco's dictatorship through local mediators such as *caciques*,[2] *alcaides de bairro*,[3] teachers, doctors, priests, pharmacy owners, or any other educated elites. This pattern, heir to 19th century social structures, gave rise to deeply ingrained forms of clientelism and political patronage in Galizan society. Under patronage, common citizens' claims before the administration, or the carrying on of their administrative affairs and duties, were construed and acted upon as requests for personal favors, which the local mediators (or administrators themselves) would fulfill. Local mediators enjoyed the privilege of managing bureaucratic and administrative matters for illiterate people, and thus they were in turn reciprocated by favors, which would come to include, under democracy, a vote for the local ruler's party.

In a very clear way, nepotism and patronage have continued after the advent of formal democracy. Local rulers, formerly "apolitical" or "from the Regime" (*del Régimen*) under Franco's one-party system, inherited privileges and entire clienteles after the leaders' ascription to the Popular Party, the Socialist Party, local "independent" parties, or (in fewer cases) the Galizan Nationalist Bloc. That the patronage system is effective in electoral terms is the absolute majority that the Galizan PP and its leader, Franco's ex-minister Manuel Fraga Iribarne have had over the last twenty years, mostly thanks to the rural, uneducated vote from old people.[4]

In what concerns patterns of speech, personalization was and is inherent to this sort of political clientelism. Forms of cross-discourse which consist of conversationalization and personalization of the institutional and political affairs, very characteristic of the conservative ruling Popular Party, can be considered a direct continuation of old communicative practices between individuals and mediating institutions; the public sphere is thus host to the reproduction of interactions evoking daily and personal affairs. Cross-discourse thus becomes a "perverse" weapon of power, as it simultaneously brings symbolically civil society into democratic institutional life, while it evokes traditional networks based on unequal dependence relationships.

5. Forms of cross-discourse

In our examination of political discourse both in face-to-face events and in the media, we have identified several patterns of conversationalization. We present these patterns not as finished "genres" or sub-genres, but as general tendencies which may even cooccur in different texts in varying degrees. Since we are dealing with *texturing* in a very real way, we will make use of analogies with the texturing of the fabric of speech in order to illustrate

---

[2] *Cacique* is a Spanish and Galizan-Portuguese word imported from a Carib language meaning 'local chief'.

[3] Under Francoist administrative system, a delegate of the council in the neighborhood.

[4] This voting pattern is changing and the PP is losing ground to the Galizan Nationalist Bloc thanks to the young, urban constituency.

how politicians envelope their discourse.

5.1. *Thematic cross-discourse "transparencies"*

Conversational elements are manifested at the thematic level through metaphorization by which political matters are treated in colloquial terms. As in classic rhetorical *exampla*, the fabric of political arguments and positions is not shown explicitly, but cloaked under and *seen through* overall conversational transparencies.

For instance, in Example 1 the modern activity of going to the voting place is contrasted with family attendance to burials in traditional Galizan life (clear Castilianisms are <u>underlined</u>; for other transcription conventions, see the **Appendix**):

Example 1. Thematic cross-discourse (transparencies). "Galizans, Burials, and Elections". Electoral speech by Popular Party local leader José Manuel Vila, Carvalho, 1997.

```
1    os ghalheghos                    Galizans,
2    por costumbre                    by tradition,
3    em cada pueblo                   in each village
4    quando hai um enterro            when there's a burial
5    vai um de cada casa              one person per household goes.
6    aqui não vale que vaia um de     [But] here [=at elections] just
     casa                            one per household is not good
                                     enough.
7    aqui temos que ir todos da      Here all (masc.) of us household
     casa                            members must go,
8    todas da casa                    all (fem.) household members,
9    os que estemos convencidos       those of us who are convinced.
```

The case exemplifies the activation of traditional discursive domains in institutional discourse. In this example, going to the voting polls is contrasted with going to burials, an activity with great relevance in traditional Galizan society. The speaker produces this fragment when the meeting is coming to a close and, as is habitual in electoral speech, he takes advantage of the last few minutes to encourage the audience to participate in the vote and, of course, to ask for their vote for his party (off the transcript).

It must be underscored that, in Galiza, an important percentage of the rural population does not vote, and it is this sector that, as can be observed, the speaker is addressing in this episode. Thus, to demonstrate the importance of participation in the vote for community life, he resorts to a social practice that has special relevance in the public life of a Galizan farmer and, of course, in that of Bergantinhos country folk, just as other activities related to death. Attendance to wakes, funerals and burials of family members, neighbors or acquaintances is practically an obligation in the rural world; in fact, such events constitute an important social point of encounter, given the great number of attendees congregated. As the speaker expresses, at least one member from each household should attend in representation of the family. On the other hand, in cities, it is usually only family and very close friends that attend burials.

By using the term *ghalheghos*, the speaker is in effect clearly positioning himself with farmers and rural dwellers in this episode, and with those whom he is choosing as listeners-addressees. *Ghalheghos* is originally a Castilianism. Nevertheless, the presence of dialectal *gheada* (the fricativization of /g/ as [h] or other variants, commonly spelled as *gh*)

functions as a clear identity marker of farmers and traditional social networks. In fact, *ghalheghos* is how members of the most traditional networks refer to themselves. In contrast, both standard Galizan-Portuguese *galegos* and standard Spanish *gallegos* evoke urban groups.

Once again, the strategic recycling of dialectal markers in institutional discourse works as a preparatory activation task, through a metaphoric process. *Os ghalheghos* constitutes a contextualizing cue of a new framework that is opened and that involves a change of positioning, namely, and affiliative alliance with the audience.

Further, the right to vote is presented as an event that should be "as natural" in the farmer's life as attending a burial. Thus, through metaphorization and the juxtaposition of traditional vs. modern activities, the speaker naturalizes political ideology and conceals the perlocutionary and manipulative aims of his speech.

In another case, important political negotiations between governments over limits on milk production in Galiza due to European Union restrictions are compared with *tute*, a very popular card game: "Sometimes you lose, sometimes you win". By thus ethnicizing and cloaking politics in conversational terms, cross-discourse producers avoid direct politic argumentation which might be subject to contestation.

5.2. *"Meshed" cross-discourse*

The second general procedure consists of "meshed cross-discourse", that is, a play of overlapping voices interwoven in a general multitonal pattern. Conversationalization penetrates the very fabric of speech in the form of hybrid voices where high-speech and low-speech elements are intimately intertwined. Just as in meshed fabric different-colored threads may be identified while they together offer an overall hue, in cross-discourse one may at given points detect elements which micro-contextualize discourse, while the overall impression is that of an indistinct superposition of voices. The mixing, of course, is done tactically at specific points, but the overall impression which obtains is one by which the speaker is simultaneously "speaking high" and "speaking low", talking politics and small talking, simultaneously addressing the co-present audience and a broader imagined social space of common citizens. Polyphonic texturing here works for the overlapped presentation of personal and institutional identities and consequently for the strategic reconstruction of cooccurring networks with various degrees of amplitude.

In Example 2, three general, interrelated discursive procedures enter into the construction of these simultaneous spaces: (a) a play of tones between a high and a low code; (b) reported speech and play of voices; and (c) addressee selection and audience construction. The excerpt consists of part of a quotation of a letter published in the weekly Galizan nationalist publication *A Nosa Terra* ('Our Land'). Popular Party representative Jaime Pita selectively reads and quotes a passage from a letter addressed in 1988 by nationalist leader Beiras to Txema Montero, an elected representative in the European Parliament from *Herri Batasuna*, an independentist Basque party allegedly linked to ETA, In the letter, Beiras explains the reasons of his party (*Bloque Nacionalista Galego*, Galizan Nationalist Block) to "explicitly discard" armed struggle as a legitimate mean for political action.

Example 2. Meshed cross-discourse. "Armed Struggle" and "Bullying". Fragment of speech by Popular Party representative Jaime Pita in the Galizan Parliament. Debate on the Censure Motion against the PP government presented by the Galizan Nationalist Bloc. Broadcast by *Televisión de Galicia*. Galizan Parliament, Santiago de Compostela, January 21, 2001.

```
(Jaime Pita está a ler uma carta     (Jaime Pita is reading an open
aberta do líder do BNG Xosé Manuel   letter from BNG leader Xosé Manuel
Beiras)                              Beiras)

32   o bloque nacionalista           "...the Galizan Nationalist Bloc
     galego →
33   acordou descartar               explicitly decided to rule out
     explicitamente →
34   a loita armada ↓                armed struggle.
35   { em galiza [ACOTA O            In Galiza [DELIMITS REFERENT
     REFERENTE "galiza" COM AS       "galiza" WITH BOTH HANDS].
     MÃOS] } ↓
36   acordou-no →                    It was decided
37   por abrumadora maioria →        by an overwhelming majority
38   dessa assembleia nacional ↓     of that National Assembly
39➤  e sem que se produzisse         And with no [FORWARD MOVEMENT WITH
     [[ADIANTA OMBRO ESQUERDO]       LEFT SHOULDER] rrebellion
     r:ebeldia } →
40   nem escisião nenguma →          or separation whatsoever
42➤  da minoria {[ac]               by the [FASTER] dis*crepant
     discrePANte } ↓ =               minority..."=
43➤  = {[ac] [p] o sea dos que       =[FASTER, LOWER VOLUME] Y'know, by
     queriam que seguisse a          those who wanted the bullying
     lenha } ↓                       [=violence] to continue.
44   {[f] e acordou-no assim } –     "...And it [=BNG] decided so..." –
45   {[lo] senhor beiras →           Mr. Beiras,
46   que esto é o grave →            and here comes the serious part,
47   tem que perdoar que o diga ↓    you'll have to forgive me for
                                     saying it.
48   .. não me gustaria ter que      I'd like not to have to say it.
     dezi-lo ↓
49   pero *tenho que dezi-lo ↓       But I *have to say it.
50   não queria dizir isto pero      I didn't want to say this but I
     tenho que dizi-lo } ↓           have to say it:
51   {[f] e acourdou-no assim  →     "...And it [=BNG] decided so
52   por razões políticas ↓          for political reasons.
53   presta atencião } →             Pay attention..."
54   {[p] [lo] lhe di vostede ao     -- you say to the Herri Batasuna
     senhor diputado de herri        representative –
     batasuna } ↓
55   {[f] dixem razões políticas ↓   "...I said political reasons,
56   não éticas → *nem               not ethical or ideological".
     ideológicas ) ↓
```

Prior to this segment, Pita had combined two overall codes throughout his intervention: (a) a declamatory, formal code, where he reads from the letter, and (b) a more colloquial code for side comments. However, in our fragment the codes start to overlap: Pita starts to enter into colloquial performance on line 39 (*rrebeldia*, 'rrebellion'), with the co-occurrence of emphatic sound lengthening and a defiant forward movement of his left shoulder. Performance culminates on line 42 with his down-to-earth gloss of how 'armed struggle' would be said in "plain" Galizan-Portuguese: *lenha*, 'bullying'. Significantly,

cross-discursive meshing is done at the intra-utterance level: At the end of line 41, the item *discrepante* already shows a faster tempo, and Pita starts to gaze co-present Beiras, so the utterance is linked to the culminating conversational gloss in 42 in a fusion of voices. Now Pita no longer animates critically Beiras' voice, but "the People's" voice, whose common sense values Pita embodies as the legitimate representative and parliament speaker for "most of Galizans" - as he says elsewhere.

It is this utterance (42) that sets the tone as to how to interpret all of the following side-comments by Pita, that is, on the basis of a number of cultural presuppositions about what it means to 'wish the bullying to continue' as a tactical synonym for 'armed struggle'. Even though in subsequent side comments (45-50, 54) not all determining features are preserved (e.g. the characteristic features are just relatively lower volume, low melodic register, gaze toward Beiras), these markers work as "recurrent contextualization cues" (Auer 1992) for the reactivation of a number of cultural values and implicatures about common sense equivalences between 'political violence' and 'bullying'. Thus, the corresponding utterances are to be interpreted also conversationally - by virtue of "tracking" - as the voice of Pita-as-People, Pita animating the voice of the People.

In other words, the homogeneously meshed texture is obtained at the level of both discourse-as-talk and discourse-as-ideology. First - contrary to our following case - conversationalization is effected implicitly, without a noticeable mobilization of conversational objects per se, but through code elements (prosodic, melodic, gestural, gazing, kinesic) which are typical of conversational participation structures.

Secondly, in a Spanish and international context where citizens are daily bombarded with the discourse on "terrorism", Pita's text is ideologically designed around vague, common understandings of 'armed struggle' and 'violence'. Two very different political positions such as the BNG's 'explicitly ... rul[ing] out armed struggle' (33-34) and *abandoning* armed struggle are manipulatively merged by Pita into a single position by virtue of the presupposition triggered by the verb 'continue' (*seguisse*) in his paraphrase 'y'know, by those who wanted the bullying to continue' (42). Thus, regardless of whether in pragmatic terms this fact was *satisfied* or not in the real world (whether or not the BNG used to engage in "bullying"), Pita attributes the BNG this type of violence.

On a second line of argument, Pita relocates the political within personal ethics and ideology, when he emphatically reads from Beira's letter *"e acourdou-no assim por razões políticas / presta atencião" / lhe di vostede ao senhor diputado de herri batasuna / "dixem razões políticas / não éticas nem ideológicas"* (51-56, "'...And it [=BNG] decided so for political reasons. Pay attention, " you say to the Herri Batasuna representative, "I said political reasons, not ethical or ideological"'). The accusatory tone, showing *forte* and clear enunciation, is preceded by a long side-comment (46-50) where Pita addresses Beira lamenting 'hav[ing] to say it' (48).

Finally, the text is also manipulative in presenting "the evidence" as to the BNG's position: Pita's evidentiality marker *"exactly* on May 25, 1988" (off the transcript) concerning the publication of the letter does not match reality, as the letter was published in *A Nosa Terra* on May 28 of that year. More importantly, in terms of content Beiras' letter was actually a severe reply to previous statements by Txema Montero about the pertinence of political violence. The relevant fact about Pita's manipulation is that, as in practically all cases, television and radio audiences do not have access to the original text

In sum, we want to highlight that political cross-discourse is not merely a stylistic device, but a powerful tool for ideological control. Here again, strategically "bridging the

gap across speech styles" by way of conversationalizing politics both signals and contributes to reinforcing politicians' privileged position, namely, their privileged access to discourse(s) in terms of their construction and their circulation.

5.3. *Colloquial resources into formal templates*

In a third type of technologization, conversational resources are introduced into typical oratory templates which provide the basic structural skeleton. These oratory moulds are fully filled with conversational passages; oratory provides structural coherence, while conversationalization provides semantic cohesion. What obtains is a sort of nouvelle vague discursive garment, e.g. an elegantly cut formal dress coat made out of loudly colorful flowery blue-jeans fabric. With corduroy pockets.

Let us now focus on Example 3. The excerpt comes from a the same speech as Example 1. The speech was given in Carvalho by a local leader from the Popular Party (José Manuel Vila) during the 1997 electoral campaign for the autonomous Parliament. It took place in a large restaurant (used for weddings and other populous events) within a rally with other PP members, including the Carvalho Mayor. The entire speech by Vila was design to delegitimize the adversary political parties, the Socialist PSOE and the nationalist BNG. In the following fragments, Vila treats with generous sarcasm and humor what he sees as major changes in the nationalist programme regarding key issues for Galiza such as self-determination, foreign policies or language planning. Vila narrates and enacts events and words by the BNG practically as one would speak in a tavern conversation, and thus he dresses his criticisms as a logical outcome of applying "common sense" to the interpretation of events.

Example 3. Conversational resources in oratory templates. "Those BNG People Change a Lot". Electoral speech by PP local leader José Manuel Vila, Carvalho, 1997.

1	por outro lado temos o bloque [nacionalista galego] ↑	On the other hand we have the [Galizan Nationalist] Bloc.
2	hasta (1) hasta fai pouco ↑	Until... until very recently
(I)		(I)
3➤	**o bloque ↑**	**the Bloc**
4➤	**não queria saber nada .. de europa ↑**	**didn't want to know anything about Europe,**
5	para nada ↓	not at all.
6	eles deziam que nós aqui ↓	They would say: "We, here.
7	autodeterminacião ↑	Self-determination,
8	nós aqui ↑	we, here,
9	metidos em galícia ↑	confined in Galicia".
10	do pedrafita pa aló →	From Pedrafita onwards
11	não sabíamos nada ↓	we didn't know anything.
12	os nossos de malpica deziam →	"Our" [Bloc members] from Malpica would say
13	que de luzo pa aló nada ↑	that "from Luzo onwards, nothing" —
14	quando de verão →	when [actually] during the summer
15	tinhamos uma afluência <1> de turistas que vinham →	we had an influx of tourists who would come
16	e e	and and
17	havia problemas de tráfico ↑	there were traffic problems

18	e mm	and mm
19	aqui sobramos nós ↓	"here we are superfluous".
20➤	claro ↑	Right,
21➤	com estas teorias ↑	with these theories
22➤	a donde íbamos ↓	where would we go?

(II)		(II)
23➤	**não queriam saber nada do congresso dos diputados ↓**	**They didn't want to know anything about the Congress of Representatives.**
24➤	a'ora já querem saber algo ↓	Now they finally do want to know a little.
25	já tenhem dous diputados ali ↑	They have two representatives there,
26	e resultam que a'ora dizem →	and it turns out that now they say
27	que são o LÀtigo do <u>gobierno</u> da <u>nación</u> ↓	that they are the WHIP of the <u>nation</u>'s <u>government</u>.
28	é dizir →	I mean,
29	que os diputados que mandou o bloque p'a madrid ↑	that the representatives the Bloc sent to Madrid
30	são os que fão andar os outros trescentos <1> quarenta e oito ↓	are the ones that make the other three-hundred and forty eight march.
31➤	o conto é de conha →	The story's a crackup [=joke].
32➤	vamos ↑	I mean,
33➤	o conto é de conha ↓	the story's a crackup.

(III)		(III)
34➤	**não queriam saber nada das autopistas ↑**	**They didn't want to know anything about highways,**
35	porque das autopistas ↑	because... about highways,
36	não vos olvidedes ↑	don't forget
37	que deziam ↑	that they would say
38	que a autopista primeira que se fixo →	that the first highway that was made
39	que era uma punhalada →	was a knife slash
40	para cortar a galícia ↑	to cut Galiza
41	em dous cachos ↓	in two pieces.
42➤	a'ora não querem autopistas ↑	Now, they not [only] want highways —
43➤	querem autopistas já ↓	they want "Highways Now.
44➤	{[lo] autopistas já } ↓	Highways Now".

(IV)		(IV)
45➤	**incluso ↑**	**They even –**
46➤	**incluso a'ora descubrirom o castelhano ↑**	**now they even discovered Castilian [Spanish].**
47	<u>estos</u> faziam uma gherra por qualquer cousa ↑	<u>These</u> people would start a war for anything,
48	hasta o punto de que ↑	to the point that
49	{[dc] aquel (1) <u>florero</u> que temos } ↑	that <u>flower arrangement</u> we have
50	na entrada da corunha ↑	in the entrance to Corunha,
51	<u>donde</u> está o barquinho aquel de sada ↑	<u>where</u> the little boat from Sada is,
52	que ponhia <u>la coruña</u> →	that used to say "<u>La Coruña</u>",
53	{[ac] [f] fórom arrANCAR–LHE A ELE ↓	they went and pulled the "L" out!
54	eles fão um <u>follón</u> ↑	They make a <u>stink</u>
55	por qualquera cousa →	about anything:
56	por umas ervas que estavam planteadas ↑	for some grass that was planted there which was an "L"...

57 que era um ele →	Well,
58➤ bueno ↑	now they've just discovered
59➤ pois a'ora descubrirom o castelhano ↑	Castilian, because that [electoral] sign they
60 porque este letreiro que tenhem ↑	have,
61 porque nos interesa este país ↑	"Because This Country Concerns Us",
62 nem <u>chicha</u> nem <u>limoná</u> ↑	neither <u>fish</u> nor <u>fowl</u>:
63 não se sabe moi bem o que é ↑	you can't really tell what [language] it is.
64➜ a'ora são o castelhano ↓	Now they are [?] Castilian.

(V)
65➤ incluso descubrirom a <u>corbata</u> ↑

(V)
They even discovered the <u>tie</u>,

66 quando deziam ↑	when [before] they would say
67 que eles não ibam salir nos cromos ↑	that they wouldn't appear in the photos,
68 hoje não hai partido →	[well] today not a single party
69 que peghe mais carteles que eles ↑	posts more posters than they do;
70 quando diziam ↑	when they used to say
71 o:: tema o tema da indumentária ↑	— the:: issue the issue of clothing —
72 que o que andavam com <u>corbata</u> →	that those who wore a <u>tie</u>,
73 que esses éramos uns carcas ↓	those of us were reactionary.
74 bueno ↑	Well,
75 pois da noite p'á manhã →	turns out that overnight,
76 <u>a mitad de legislatura</u> ↑	<u>in the middle of the legislative period</u>
77 quero-vos dezir ↑	I want to tell you
78➤ que empeçárom a ponher todos a <u>corbata</u> ↓	that they all started to wear <u>ties</u>.
79➤ todos a <u>corbata</u> ↓	All of them, with <u>ties</u>.
80 e um dia num debate ↑	And one day, during a debate,
81 já lhe dixem ao amigo beiras ↑	I told my "friend" Beiras [BNG leader],
82 desde que vindes todos com mandilão ↑	"Ever since you've all come with aprons on
83 hasta hasta sodes moito mais bonitos →	you're even even much prettier",
84➜ porque foi assim ↑	Because that's the way it was:
85➜ cambiárom da noite p'á manhã ↓	they changed overnight.
86 [APLAUSOS DO PÚBLICO]	[AUDIENCE CLAPS]

In the episode, Vila inserts conversational resources and arguments into a classic oratory template. In terms of discourse organization, particular relevance is carried by rhetorical structures that in traditional political discourse are used emphatically and persuasively (van Dijk 1998), such as repetitions of various sorts, two-part contrasts, and listings. Anaphoric utterances such as *não queriam saber nada de...* ('They didn't want to know anything about...', lines 4, 23, 34) or *incluso* ('even', lines 45, 46, 65) function as introductions to the different thematic blocks chained in a four-part listing.

Secondly, internally the structure of each thematic block also shows certain parallels. Specifically, blocks II, III, IV and V cohere internally by a contrastive scheme typical of political oratory (see e.g. Fairclough & Mauranen 1997: 105). Here the speaker contrasts

past and recent deeds and attitude by the Nationalist Bloc in order to show its purported ideological transformation.

While each thematic block constitutes a micronarrative, overall, they form a macronarrative whose structure responds to personal experience narratives (Labov 1972; Labov and Waletzky 1967). The macronarrative starts with a framing statement as an orientation:: *Por outro lado temos os do bloque - hasta fai pouco...* ('On the other hand we have the Bloc people. Until very recently...'). A complicating action follows which includes the five micronarratives (23-85) aimed at naturalizing the speaker's final, strong delegitimizing criticism of the BNG members as "retrograde" and "violent" (87-122, off the transcript). This final part (off the transcript) functions as an evaluation/resolution, that is, as a logical argumentative consequence of the previous narratives, thus backgrounding the speaker's subjective views about the BNG.

Further, each narrative I-V shows a comparable internal order. Each starts with an orientating framing statement, (shown with arrow symbols ➤ in the transcript, e.g. 'They didn't want to know anything about highways', 34) , the complicating action structured in two contrasting parts, and finally the resolution/evaluation where delegitimation is introduced (shown with arrow symbols ➡ e.g. 'Now, they not [only] want highways - they want "Highways Now. Highways Now"', 42-44).

The personal-narrative framework paves the way for, and coheres with the use of colloquial resources and everyday life themes. In contrast to high parliamentary oratory, Vila's discourse is plainly 'low speech' into a formal mould. Colloquial expressions such as *o conto é de conha* ('the story's a crackup', 31, 33), *eles fão um <u>follón</u> por qualquer cousa* ('they make a <u>stink</u> about anything' 54-5), dialectalisms, Castilianisms, translinguistic formulae that index trans-rural and trans-urban identities (Prego-Vázquez 2000) such as *nem <u>chicha</u> nem <u>limoná</u>* ('neither <u>fish</u> nor <u>fowl</u>', 62, a Galizan calque of Spanish *ni chicha ni limoná*), etc., all point out at the speaker's selective narrowing of the high/low contrasts, in order to capture and interpellate audiences into their common-citizen identities.

Political ideologies are further cloaked under colloquial themes. Vila trivializes the Nationalist Bloc's political conduct, and its claims are presented as anecdotes. An important language revival issue such as the recovery of the Galizan toponym *A Coruña* for Spanish *La Coruña* (47-53) is represented as a dispute over 'some grass' (56) that depicted the letter *L*. Ideological symbols such as wearing or not a tie in parliamentary sessions are equated with 'being much prettier' (83). Finally, recurring "hypothetical" (Haberland 1986) reported speech of BNG's statements, to which audiences have no direct access, also adds to manipulative dramatization.

The next example comes from the first intervention of the Galizan President, Manuel Fraga Iribarne, during the Motion of Censure posed by BNG against his government on January 21, 2001. The ten-hour long debate was broadcast live by Galizan public television and radio. Fraga Iribarne is replying to criticisms by BNG leader Xosé Manuel Beiras over the *Xunta*'s (the Galizan government's) poor management of the 2000-2001 Mad Cow Disease crisis. Fraga Iribarne's reply is structured in a two-part contrast between "us" (the government) and "them", "others" (the BNG), who, allegedly, would have set obstacles to any option to solve the crisis by the Galizan administration.

Example 4. Conversational resources in oratory templates. Galizan President Fraga Iribarne Eats Up the Mad Cows. Turn by President Manuel Fraga Iribarne. Debate on the

Censure Motion against the Popular Party government presented by the Galizan Nationalist Bloc. Broadcast by *Televisión de Galicia*. Galizan Parliament, Santiago de Compostela, January 21, 2001.

```
1    poderíamos continuar ↓              We might continue.
2    pero em definitiva →                But, in short,
3    em definitiva →                     in short,
4    antes de falar das                  before talking in my final
     consideraciões finais →             remarks
5    sobre o programa                    about the [BNG's] alternative
     alternativo →                       program,
6    aqui ... hai persoas →              here ... there are people
7    {[lo] e estamos obrigados a         — and we are obliged
     elo } →                             to it —
8    que jogamos a arreglar estos        who are playing how to solve
     problemas ↓                         these problems.
9    problemass .. novos →               New ... problems,
10   problemas conjunturales →           circumstantial problems,
11   hai algum mais →                    there are still some others
                                         [problems],
12   como é o dos emigrantes na          such as that of [our] immigrants
     argentina →                         in Argentina,
13   no qua- no qual igua-               on which- on which equal- we're
     igualmente estamos                  equally working,
     trabalhando →
14   {[hi] e outros parece que           and other people seem to be
     jogam a ver } →                     playing to see
15   que partido podem sacar →           which advantage they may obtain
16   ...                                 ...
17   (qu)e dizem não enterrar →          (they) say "No burials,
18   não incinerar →                     No incinerations",
19   {[ac] que havia que                 What should be done?,
     fazer ? =
20   = ┌[GESTO MÃO]┐                     ┌[HAND GESTURE]┐
        └tenho   eu ┘ que comer          └do *I*  have  to┘ eat the cows?
     a(s) vacas ?
21   ┌[RISOS DA AUDIÊNCIA]               ┌[AUDIENCE LAUGHS]
     └evidentemente } ↑                  └Obviously,
22   não parece que fosse mui            this doesn't seem to be very
     convinte ↓                          convenient.
23   nem teria eu capacidade para        Nor would I be capable of
     tanto ↓                             so much.
24   infelicemente ↓                     Unfortunately.
25   ...                                 ...
26   é a política do não por             [Theirs] is the politics of the
     sistema →                           systematic "No":
27   não enterrar →                      "No burials,
28   não incinerar →                     No incinerations",
29   solamente amolar ↓                  only annoyance [for us].
```

In lines 17-18 the speaker appropriates the supposed voice of the BNG ('not bury them, not cremate them') to conclude with a personalizing remark, *que havia que fazer? tenho eu que comer a(s) vacas?* ('What should be done?, do *I* have to eat the cows?', 19-20). This remark shows colloquialness not only in content but in form, through the informal lambdacism in verb-final /ɾ/ -> [l], *comer as* [ko'mela].[5] The joke elicits laughs in the

---

[5] Elision of the article's final /s/ is not specifically a colloquial phonetic phenomenon. It may be idiosyncratic, and due to fast tempo.

audience in the Parliament (21). However, preplanning of the segment may be evident if we consider the moment chosen by Fraga Iribarne (20) to make a gesture of 'eating' with his right hand, not over the lexical item *comer* 'eat', but previously, over the auxiliary verb *tenho* 'have'. Personalization continues in 'This doesn't seem to be very convenient. Nor would I be capable of so much. Unfortunately' (22-24). Finally, the oratory structure is repeated in the recapitulating three-part listing, also contrastive: '"No burials, No incinerations", only annoyance [for us]' (27-29).

Cross-discourse here consists basically of the transfer of conversational topics ('eating cows') and colloquial registers into a classical template. The goal is, through personalization, the avoidance of political argumentation. Counter-arguments to the BNG's criticism are obviated by projecting the third, obviously impossible alternative, that 'Mr. Fraga Iribarne should eat the diseased cows'. The impossibility of Fraga Iribarne the person to do that symbolizes the impossibility for any politician to humanly solve the problem. Political will is again embodied in a given person, and the focus of debate is displaced from the ideological and political to the personal and quotidian on top of a straightforward rhetorical mould.

Just as in the previous case, the implication of conversationalization is the indexical summoning of various simultaneous social networks as well as the opening of social fields: The speech, tainted with masculinity, is simultaneously "political", addressed to the members of the Parliament and the audience, and conversational, as it could be uttered by anyone in a habitual social gathering in a tavern while watching the news and commenting on the Mad Cow Disease crisis. As a matter of fact, this particular segment was selected and repeatedly shown by the Galizan television in news summaries of the parliamentary debate. Finally, just as in many other cases, Fraga Iribarne's play of voices through hypothetical reported speech of the BNG's political position plays a major role in conversationalizing public politics.

In sum, as in other cases from our data, the speaker's basic cross-discursive procedure is the personalization of politics to de-ideologize and quotidianize important political issues. The political field is re-presented as a playing field for personal relationships, likings, and conducts. The boundaries between closed local networks and open, general imaginary ones, on the one hand, and between civil society and politics on the other are blurred and fused into a new discursive reality of multiple overlaps where explicit political ideologies give way to common sense beliefs and evaluations about the deeds and misdeeds of 'fellow citizens'. Just as in so much of today's popular culture, from this and other pieces of cross-discourse, particularly in TV mediated events, a *supranetwork* of imaginary, good- (or bad-) neighbor relationships emerges.

6. Conclusion

We have seen how the interplay of conversational and institutional talk which characterizes cross-discourse may surface as texturing at the levels of themes, generic moulds, or voices (or any or all of the three, simultaneously). What interests us now is how these procedures index and aid in the construction of simultaneously operating networks and social spaces contributing to the political illusion of democratic participation and representation.

Political cross-discourse is simultaneously *indexical* and *constitutive* of social processes and structures. The various procedures for discourse circulation evidence flexible

and dynamic boundaries between the civil and institutional fields. Significantly, the very direction of cross-discourse circulation (from daily life to politics, not vice versa) reveals much about surrounding social conditions. For example, in order to naturalize the ideological notion of "democratic equality.", circulation may be more effective if it proceeds from the realm of daily affairs to political discourse. In that sense, discourse circulation contributes to a naturalization of a given worldview (Hanks 1987; Urban 1996). In Galiza, cross-discourse reflects a symbolic appropriation of everyday spaces by professional politicians, aiming at (a) building the necessary ideological consensus by appeal to various levels of identities; (b) obviating political debate in properly political terms; and (c) thereby continuing to reproduce the very structures and unequal conditions for discourse production.

What are the underpinnings of such inequality? Through conversationalization and personalization, audiences are once more constructed as co-authors of an on-going social chat about family or neighborhood affairs. This results in the illusion of people's involvement in democratic processes. Cross-discourse thus inherently hides the unequal distribution of discursive resources along sectional groups and classes, and the unequal control over discourse circulation and trajectories. It is professional politicians as strategic actors (not audiences) who, through particular venues of discursive circulation, simultaneously *transform* and *naturalize* (Wodak 2000) orders of social representation at several levels of generality, and oftentimes (in cross-discourse at least) it is politicians themselves who invisibilize such strategic inequality by manipulation. Manipulation in cross-discourse thus attains two levels: (1) the selective [6] recycling and re-appropriation of 'low' (therefore 'horizontally distributed') conversational resources; conversationalization and personalization, which offers a mirage of closeness and immediacy; and (2) the textured hiding of true political argumentation.

The great degree of flexibility indexed by cross-discourse touches on several realms of social and political order simultaneously: Parallel to the opening of networks in Galiza by urbanization, we witness the permeability of social fields, plus the rooting of populist notions of "democracy" and "participation". Changes in the permeability of social fields cooccur with new conditions for the production and circulation of discourses, and it makes possible new orders of social networks, comprising simultaneous traditional and national imaginaries. We have asked ourselves, and tried to explain, what are the conditions of possibility for cross-discourse and for its persuasive effectiveness in Galiza today? (One obvious evidence of this effectiveness is the fact that members of political parties do perform cross-discourse and these political parties always do win elections and hold power!).

Firstly, cultural conditions of possibility, as we have seen, include rural Galizan traditional values and discursive practices concerning clientelism and political patronage. Secondly, political conditions include the democratic transformations that have brought elections and made possible the translocation of patronage into the political system, particularly in small and medium-sized villages. Current personalizing political cross-discourse thus owes much to old interactional patterns and institutions. Given these unequal structural conditions for discourse circulation, our analysis does not reveal the *being* of power negotiation, but the cross-discursive *appearance* of such negotiation.

---

[6] We do not imply 'deliberate', though preplanning is consubstantial to political discourse.

However, a third condition must be considered in order to understand the effectiveness of cross-discourse - that is, in order to de-essentialize Discourse as an autonomous driving force of political persuasion and decision-making. This condition concerns the ideological interpretation of texts by audiences: Their *prior interactional orientation* toward the reception of personalized, seemingly de-ideologized discourse as the paradigm of political argumentation.

Obviously, in order to understand how cross-discourse enters into spiral patterns of entextualization and re-entextualization, we would need a closer access to those "hidden contexts" (Blommaert 2001a) - particularly entire text trajectories - that help explain the socially constitutive role of discourse. We have only observed one phase in discourse circulation, and from this stage, we retrospectively assume that conversational resources have reached and continue to reach formal politics somehow, with some persuasive purpose and with some perlocutionary projection over future states of affairs. It is in this sense that we understand cross-discourse both as constitutive and indexical of prevalent representations of social structure, particularly of the imbrication between politics and civil society in formal western democracies. Through cross-discourse, ideological hegemony thus partly arises from privileged professional politicians' and other elites' simultaneously 'doing being' or 'being doing' the Voice of the People and The People themselves. This is a difficult enterprise, perhaps an inherent contradiction, but the illusion seems to work.

Appendix. Transcription conventions

```
Galizan-Portuguese
clear Castilianism
→ ↑ ↓ –    sustained, rising, falling, or truncated intonational group
{[hi]}     higher pitch over segment
{[lo]}     lower pitch over segment
{[f]}      fortis, louder enunciation
{[p]}      piano, softer enunciation
{[ac]}     accelerated, faster tempo
{[dc]}     decelerated, slower tempo
CAPS       louder volume over short segment
*          emphatic or contrastive accent
'          rhythmic accent
..         short pause (less than 0.5 sec.)
...        longer pause (between 0.5 sec. and 1 sec.)
< >        silence (in number of seconds)
–          truncated sound
:          lengthened sound
⌐abcd⌐ overlapping
Lefgh⌐
=          latching
[= ]       gloss or clarification of segment
[ ]        comment or non-verbal act
```

References

Auer, Peter (1992) Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In P. Auer & A.di Luzio (eds.), *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 1-37.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981) *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Blommaert, Jan (1990) Modern African political style: Strategies and genres in Swahili political discourse. *Discourse & Society* 1.2: 115-131.

Blommaert, Jan (2001a) Context is/as critique. *Critique of Anthropology* 21.1: 13-32.

Blommaert, Jan (2001) Investigating narrative inequality: African asylum seekers' stories in Belgium. *Discourse & Society* 12.4: 413-449.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *In other words: Essays toward a reflexive sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Briggs, Charles L. (1992) Linguistic ideologies and the naturalization of power in Warao discourse. *Pragmatics* 2.3: 387-404.

Briggs, Charles L., and Richard Bauman (1992) Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2.2: 131-172.

Duranti, Alessandro (1994) *From grammar to politics: Linguistic anthropology in a Western Samoan village*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Fairclough, Norman (1997) Discurso, mudança e hegemonia. In E.R. Pedro (ed.), *Análise Crítica do Discurso. Uma perspectiva sociopolítica e funcional*. Lisboa: Caminho, pp. 75-103.

Fairclough, Norman (2000) Language and neo-liberalism [guest editorial]. *Discourse and Society* 11.2: 147-148.

Fairclough, Norman, and Anna Mauranen (1997) The conversationalisation of political discourse: A comparative view. In J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (eds.), *Political Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 89-119.

Goffman, Erving (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gumperz, John J. (1982a) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, John J. (1982b) Ethnic style and political rhetoric. In *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 187-203.

Haberland, Hartmut (1986) Reported speech in Danish. In F. Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 219-253.

Hanks, William F. (1987) Discourse genres in a theory of practice. *American Ethnologist* 14.4: 668-692.

Irvine, Judith T. (1984) Formality and informality in communicative events. In J. Baugh & J. Sherzer (eds.), *Language in Use. Readings in Sociolinguistics*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, pp. 211-228.

Labov, William (1972) The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In *Language in the inner city. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 354-405.

Labov, William, and Josh Waletzky (1967) Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experiences. In J. Helm (ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 12-44.

Prego-Vázquez, Gabriela (2000) *Prácticas discursivas, redes sociales e identidades en Bergantiños (Galicia): La interacción comunicativa en una situación de cambio sociolingüístico*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Depto. de Galego-Português, Francês e Linguística, Universidade da Corunha.

Rampton, Ben (1995a) *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, Ben (1995b) Language crossing and the problematisation of ethnicity and socialisation. *Pragmatics* 5.4: 485-513.

Rampton, Ben (1998) Language crossing and the redefinition of reality. In P. Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, pp. 290-317.

Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban (1996) *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Thompson, John B. (1990) *Ideology and modern culture: Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Urban, Greg (1996) *Metaphysical community: The interplay of the senses and the intellect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1998) *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.