

WHEN METHODS CLASH: DOING BEING HYBRID

by
Inger Mey

0. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to establish the benefits and disadvantages of two research methods employed in linguistic anthropology: Conversation Analysis (CA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The text chosen for this comparison is a TV interview from 1988, between news anchor Dan Rather and then US Vice President George H.W. Bush. In comparing these two methods, the emphasis will be put on the different claims and assumptions that underlie each method, and how each method is able to articulate the specific problems associated with the interview format. CA is characterized by its claim to objectivity and its disregard for sociohistorical contexts. Critics of the CA method have challenged the objectivity of the method, and called for more critical awareness (Billig 1999). On their part, conversation analysts have characterized CDA as a method where projected expectations are confirmed, and the theoretical interests and concerns of the academic analyst take precedence over the concerns of the individuals studied (Schegloff 1997; Mey 2001). CDA researchers claim to pursue a clear political agenda in their analyses, in order to uncover hidden power relations between participants in different discourse events. In my analysis and comparison of the two methods, I will attempt to determine which of the methods is the most applicable in the analysis of this specific kind of text, the interview; also, I will indicate which analytical findings appear relevant for the participants involved. Finally, I will try to shed some light on the problematic relationship between the immediate and concrete interactive encounter and the broader context of society.

1. *Conversation Analysis*

1.1. Background

In the 1950s and the early 1960s, the study of language in the US was mostly structurally oriented. The rediscovery and subsequent influence of Saussure in Europe inspired several linguists in the US, and this direction resulted in a strong focus on syntax, almost to the exclusion of semantics and pragmatics. Saussure had expressed his clear preference for the study of language structure, *la langue*, over the study of language use, *la parole*, which he claimed was messy, unstructured and impossible to study in any systematic way. Sapir, Whorf, and eventually Hymes, who then belonged to the 'Americanist school' (whose focus was the study of American Indian languages), were interested in both similarities and differences between languages. Notions of universality and relativity were important features in their analyses, the latter focusing on actualities rather than potentialities. As Hanks has expressed it,

Habitual ways of speaking, the patterns of reference and description that people engage in from day to day, may influence the way they implicitly categorize experience. (Hanks 1996:173)

Out of this tradition emerged different kinds of anthropological linguistic methodologies: Ethnography of Speaking, Ethnography of Communication, Ethnoscience, and other discourse-centered approaches to ethnography. These methods differed in basic ways from the structuralist models in their focus on social and cultural contexts; their practitioners also recognized that society and its language were intricately related, such that language was seen as a social construct, and society as constructed through language. But even though language was studied from an ethnographic viewpoint, it was still not *la parole* that was in focus; rather, it was the more formal language genres like chants, narratives and other forms of verbal art that were highlighted (Sherzer 1983, 1990). When linguistic anthropologists collected language samples, the texts were almost always samples of performances, never of dinner or party conversations.

1.2. Methodology

Emphasis on mundane, everyday conversation came from sociology. By studying spoken data, Erving Goffman's student Harvey Sacks discovered that, contrary to all opinions about improvised, spontaneous talk as ungrammatical, fractured and unsystematic, telephone conversations were structured in a very orderly fashion, and he proposed that this was exactly the feature about conversation that made it work. Sacks found that the basic processes of ordinary talk seemed to have their own dynamics, and set out to investigate what it was that made conversation so successful, even between people with completely different worldviews and viewpoints.

That telephone conversations would need some orderliness came as no surprise, given the medium and the lack of other modalities than the verbal/auditory. But Sacks, who was soon joined by Emanuel Schegloff, went further, and began to explore everyday conversations between people who were physically present in the same location. Sacks and Schegloff wanted to find out if the same regularities that existed in telephone conversations held true for everyday conversation as well. Schegloff, himself a sociologist with an interest in the sociology of knowledge who had written about American literary criticism, had been influenced by New Criticism and its emphasis on the immanent and internal analysis of the text, without regard for social or political influences. Schegloff was enthusiastic about formal analyses of conversation, because he saw in it a way to conduct an objective analysis of social interactions. In looking for regularities and what could look like rules in reams of conversational data, Sacks and Schegloff found that the most basic feature about a conversation was its organization into sequences. Relationships between parts within a sequence, and relationships between sequences exhibited regularities that showed spontaneous talk-in-interaction to be far from the disorderly and chaotic entity that the structuralists had claimed that it was.

Many people shared the enthusiasm for these findings; in the end, a method for analyzing ordinary people's conversation in everyday settings was developed. In order to conduct a precise analysis of conversational data, a method of transcription had to be devised

which could account for what was going on in each interaction (down to the minutest detail). Gail Jefferson collaborated with Sacks and Schegloff at this time, and she designed a transcription format that was developed with a view to special conversation analytical requirements (Atkinson and Heritage 1984:ix-xvi). This transcription convention came to be part and parcel of Conversation Analysis (CA), as the method came to be called, although the format was sometimes too technical to be very useful in other forms of text or discourse analysis.

Central in CA is the notion of turn taking. Observing that simple ritualistic interactions like greetings, goodbyes, and question-answer sequences usually occur in pairs, Sacks and Schegloff (1973) proposed the idea of the *adjacency pair*, a class of utterance sequences that are organized as two utterances adjacent to each other, with each utterance spoken by a different speaker. Furthermore, the pairs are connected, so that any first pair part must be matched with a second pair part. Violations of this norm will provoke strong reactions, as when a question is followed by silence (absence of a second pair part); in this case the question is usually asked again, louder, or with an insistent intonation (Nofsinger 1991). Adjacency pairs organize many different kinds of conversational actions; the first pair part opens a possibility or a need for a second pair part to take place. A special kind of adjacency pair, called a pre-sequence, probes the ground for the following sequence; insertion sequences are used when clarification of a first pair part is needed. When a first pair part opens several possibilities for second pair parts, these alternatives may not all be equal. Usually, some responses are preferred and some are dispreferred. Dispreferred responses exhibit complex structures, hedging, pauses, and silences; these responses require some repair to be performed to cause the interactional balance to be regained, while preferred responses tend to be simple, short, and straightforward.

When conversation is analyzed utterance-by-utterance (or better, moment-by-moment), and adjacent sequences give meaning to each other, much emphasis will be put on how speaker's turns are constructed and managed. Turns can consist of long sentences, or they can be made up of one single word. The transition from one turn to the next can be minuscule, or clearly detectable; in the latter case, we speak of a 'transition relevance place' (TRP; Sacks et al. 1974). The

idea that participants in a conversation co-determine how the interaction is organized implies that turns can be allocated to other speakers by the current speaker, but a speaker can also 'self-select' (Sacks et al. 1974). Finally the current speaker can self-select to continue, even when a TRP has occurred, if the other participants renounce their claim to the next turn, e.g. by nodding or back-channeling.

These are the basic rules for conversation. The rules are somewhat idealized, since in almost all naturally occurring talk-in-interaction, violations of the rules happen. Examples of such violations are interruptions, or overlapping talk, when a participant does not wait for a turn completion, or takes the turn without being selected. Other violations of the conversational orderliness occur when speakers compete for the acquisition of turns or when they fail to align with their interlocutors.

Alignment in conversation implies that the participants understand the meaning of what is being said, even if they have different cultural backgrounds, experiences, and expectations. This requires some work, especially if responses show that understanding has not taken place. Disagreement is another obstacle to smooth interaction. The hearer claims to have understood, but disagrees with the speaker. In these and other cases of error detection or trouble spotting, some form of repair is required. The speaker may produce a self-repair, to correct the emerging 'trouble source', or just rephrase an unfortunate wording. Some other participant may produce an 'other-repair' of the speaker's utterance by requesting clarification or explanation. In the latter case, the speaker will usually correct the original utterance immediately. Contributions to alignment in conversation are constantly being produced by co-participants, to ensure that the verbal aspects of social co-operations are given due attention. The orientation to each other that interlocutors exhibit in talk-in-interaction, provides a pointer to the various strategies that participants must recognize in order to manage the many difficult tasks that they are expected to perform in the societies in which they live.

A departure from the strictly mundane and everyday interaction that was the foremost concern of the early CA practitioners can be found in the studies of talk in institutional settings (Drew and Heritage 1992; Atkinson 1992). These studies focus on interactions between

professionals and 'clients' from a wide variety of fields in order to explore how social organization is managed through talk, and how social asymmetries are created and maintained in many institutions in our society. The basic idea of equality between speakers that informed the early analyses of everyday conversation has been redefined to include situations where social inequality is clearly in existence, and persists as part of our cultural knowledge as members of our society. Such institutional 'talk' includes doctor/patient interviews, news media interviews, teacher/student conversations and question/answer sessions in the courtroom. In this paper, the analyses of more or less formalized conversations in the news media are of special interest, because such speech events tend to be hybrid as to genre; therefore, they must be analyzed from more than one perspective.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

2.1. Background

In Europe in the 1960s, structural linguistics dominated the study of language, and the work of Chomsky was beginning to make its influence known among mainstream linguists. In Britain and in Northern Europe, however, another trend appeared in the early 1970s, viz., the beginning of the practice of Critical Linguistics. It was not one single group who collaborated and shared the same theory and approach to analysis; critical linguists emerged from many different schools and traditions, largely due to the influence of Marxism and other critical theories on academic pursuits. During the economic and cultural boost of the late 60s, experiments on all levels of the educational system were eagerly embraced and funded; even social research criticizing the governments was tolerated. Academics, having gained social and political awareness in those years, began to criticize the contemporary practice of their own fields, and linguists turned against structuralism as being too preoccupied with formalism and describing linguistic practices without trying to explain them socially.

The major theoretical influences on Critical Linguistics (besides Marx) were the 'Frankfurt School' (including Jürgen Habermas in

Germany), and the work of Foucault and Althusser in France. These theorists gave language a prominent place in the production and reproduction of society, and theorized about how power was constituted and maintained by the powerful few at the expense of the unfortunate powerless.

Most critical discourse analysts would thus endorse Habermas's claim that 'language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power. In so far as the legitimations of power relations, . . . are not articulated, . . . language is also ideological'. (Wodak and Meyer 2001:2)

Other influences on the development of Critical Linguistics, which later came to be known as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), were sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, and pragmatics. In all three fields, scientists were looking for ways to deal with gender issues, issues of racism, media discourse, and problems of 'identity'. CDA does not constitute a uniform theory and a singular set of tools; researchers with many different approaches found the journal *Discourse and Society* to be a useful place to publish and exchange ideas.

An exhaustive description of CDA methodology will not be provided in this paper; the many different approaches makes it impossible to do justice to them all. I will, however, give a brief overview of what most analysts find essential in the methodology.

2.2. Methodology

What sets CDA apart from other forms of discourse analysis and sociolinguistic analysis is its emphasis on the advocacy role of the researcher, and how this influences the analysis. This kind of 'action research' focuses on specific research questions, and strives to gain practical results. An example would be the analysis of some media text that sought to find power relations that were hidden in the text, in order to make them explicit and transparent for everybody to see, especially for those who suffer from society's power inequality. Regardless of which 'grand theory of society' the analyst chooses,

most critical social theories find our society distinguished by inequality among its members, with institutions perpetuating existing injustice. The line between social scientific research and political argumentation is often crossed in CDA (Meyer 2001:15); this has led scientists from other traditions to question this approach as not objective and scientific. (See especially the discussion and controversy between Schegloff, Billig and Wetherell as analyzed in Mey 2001). The objectivity claim, however, is not one that CDA practitioners will subscribe to, since they are convinced that research free of value-judgments is a myth, and that 'pure' knowledge is impossible (Meyer 2001:17).

CDA operates on the premises that discourse can only be understood in reference to its context. Texts are both locally and historically situated, but no deterministic relationships are thought to exist between the text and its context, between language and society. Some kind of mediation is needed in the analysis to bring us from the 'grand theory' to the concrete incident of discourse, and back. Just as there are many 'grand theories' behind different practitioners of CDA, so, too, there are many different kinds of mediation. Some see the relationship in terms of certain linguistic theories (Fairclough 1995), some see society in terms of actions with social actors, and define the links between discourse and social action as cultural tools or mediational means, language being among the latter (Scollon 2001); others again see the connection between discourse and society in terms of mental models as part of long-term memory, where people store their personal experiences on some socio-cognitive level (Van Dijk 2001).

CDA has no particular transcription format, since the unit of analysis, the text, can be, and most often is, longer than a sentence. Also, contrary to CA, the transcription is not an essential part of the analysis, although transcriptions are not considered neutral in any way, just as the choice of the object of investigation is not neutral, but informed by the convictions of the researcher.

As far as the analysis of news media discourses are concerned, I find Fairclough's analytical framework useful. Fairclough defines each discursive event in terms of three dimensions:

1. It is a spoken or written language text.
2. It is an instance of *discourse practice*, involving the production and interpretation of text.
3. It is a piece of *social practice*.
(Fairclough 1995:133)

Language use, in Fairclough's model, is seen as social practice, a mode of action. Furthermore, language use is

always a socially and historically situated mode of action, in a dialectical relationship with other facets of 'the social' (its 'social context') – it is socially shaped, but it is also socially shaping, or *constitutive*. (Fairclough 1995:131)

What discursive events do, according to Fairclough, is to shape, and to be shaped by: (i) social identities, (ii) social relations, and (iii) systems of knowledge and belief. Different discursive events, however, engage these three elements differently (1995:131). Discursive events are defined in terms of conventions; these conventions belong to certain *orders of discourse*, defined as 'the totality of some social domain's discursive practices'. Examples of 'orders of discourse' would be schools, the media, the workplace, etc. Within these orders of discourse, we find different genres: the job interview, student-teacher interaction, and 'the news'. Genres, or styles, as we could also call these socially recognizable ways of speaking, combine in various creative combinations to form new and changing discursive patterns. Just as the discursive event in an educational setting can be a hybrid of classroom and playground genres, and the talk in the home can combine private and work-place styles, the journalistic discourse of the news media blends together conversation, interview, information, and entertainment.

One of the characteristics of contemporary media discourse is the mediation between the public sphere and the private life-world, which transforms the boundaries and the nature of publicness (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999:103). Increasingly in television, the accepted styles include everyday conversational styles, news is often presented as an entertaining conversation in a living room atmosphere or as an equally

entertaining match between adversaries in a verbal wrestling arena. If we look for sites where subtle changes in social practice can be detected through small changes in discourse practices, the journalistic field is a rich field to harvest. With its mixing of genres, its ambivalence of meaning, its hybrid identities, and shifts in political representations, the media news coverage offers particularly promising instances where discursive moments reflect social practice.

3. The Text

The text that I have chosen to analyze is a rather notorious interview that Dan Rather, chief anchor of the CBS Evening News, conducted 'live' with George Bush Sr., then running for the Republican Presidential nomination, on January 25, 1988. The fact that it was conducted 'live' prevented CBS from editing the tape, and the interview was shown in its entirety, all nine minutes of it (see Appendix).

Dan Rather had been a very controversial figure ever since he started in his position as CBS anchor, and he has a reputation for having a clear political viewpoint; he is fairly critical of Republican Presidents, but somewhat more tolerant of Democratic Presidents. Because it is generally believed by the public that journalists in the mass media conduct their investigations and do their reporting in a just and unbiased way, information coming through the media is believed by most to be factual. But,

News is not a natural phenomenon emerging from facts in real life, but socially and culturally determined. News producers are social agents in a network of social relations who reveal their own stance towards what is reported. News is not the event, but the partial, ideologically framed report of the event. (Caldas-Coulthard 2003: 272)

Rather, when confronted with what people considered his biased views, said he did not know what they were talking about.

'Now respectfully, when you start talking about a liberal agenda and all the, quote, 'liberal bias' in the media, I quite frankly, and I say this respectfully but candidly to you, I don't know what you're talking about.'

Dan Rather to talk radio host Mike Rosen of station KOA Denver, November 28, 1995. (Source: RatherBiased.com)

Walter Cronkite, Rather's predecessor in the job of anchor, had expressed on several occasions as his opinion that there was a heavy liberal persuasion among correspondents:

'I believe that most of us reporters are liberal..we are inclined to side with the powerless rather than the powerful. If that is what makes us liberals, so be it'.

Walter Cronkite in his syndicated column, August 6, 2003. (Source: RatherBiased.com)

In the interview, Rather tried to implicate Bush, then Vice President, in the so-called Iran-contra affair, by questioning him about his knowledge and possible involvement in the plan to exchange weapons for hostages. Bush did not concede anything, and after many interruptions from both sides, Rather declared, 'you've made us hypocrites in the face of the world! How could you sign on to such a policy?' and soon after, he ended the interview on a somewhat ironic note. The interview created quite a stir, Bush never talked to Rather again; the latter was prevented from conducting interviews with either George or Barbara Bush during Bush's presidency. Even Rather's colleagues thought he had gone too far and 'lost his cool' when he made his accusations, but Rather defended his interview the day after, saying: 'To be persistent about answers is part of a reporter's job'. Later, he elaborated his viewpoint to another journalist:

'I thought about that time, "Look, he was doing he felt what he had to do as a politician trying to position himself to get the presidency". I was doing what reporters do, and that is asking the tough questions and keep pressing it either until he answered or until it was clear he wasn't going to answer.'

Dan Rather to Chris Mathews on CNBC's Hardball, June 28, 1999.
(Source: RatherBiased.com)

4. *The Analysis*

4.1. What is an interview?

Schegloff (1988/89) has carried out an analysis of this interview, using the CA methodology to demonstrate that this interaction was an interview turning into a confrontation. Schegloff claims that, regardless of the identity of the participants, and, regardless of the context of this particular discursive event, the way that the participants structured their talk shows that what started as an interview, ended as a confrontation. In comparing Schegloff's CA method of analysis and his conclusions with a CDA approach to the same text, I will try to establish the advantages and disadvantages of each method.¹ By comparing the structural formalism of CA to the emphasis on agency and power that are pertinent issues within the CDA tradition, I hope to clarify the question whether or not these two methods are sufficient by themselves for an analysis of this particular type of text. Anthropological linguists have often chosen to approach a spoken or written text in a more eclectic way, by combining two or more methods of analysis; using both CA and CDA could be a productive way to proceed.

Schegloff is interested in the structural question of how to characterize a confrontational interview. He offers the following definition of 'an interview':

If there is a single, most fundamental component of what is considered an 'interview', both in vernacular or common-sense conceptions of that term and in more technical accounts, it is that one party asks questions and the other party gives answers. (Schegloff 1988/89:218)

Not only does this definition demonstrate an empirically established regularity, but it includes a definite orientation among the participants

vis-à-vis a certain practice to follow when taking part in an interview (Schegloff 1988/89). By establishing this regularity as the basis for his argument, Schegloff proceeds to demonstrate that in the interview between Dan Rather and Vice President Bush, both participants orient to this rule when they meet. In the first exchange, the two participants 'constitute this occasion as an interview, and deliver "the context" and the "definition of the situation",' (p. 219). 'The context' and 'the definition of the situation' are here understood in CA terms as the intra-textual understanding that the participants construct between themselves in the course of their talk.

(2) *Bush/Rather, 00:00*

Rather: ...Today, Donald Gregg still works inside the White House as Vice President Bush's trusted advisor.
 ((End of feature; start of live broadcast.))
 000 (1.0)
 001 Rather: 'hh Mister Vice President, tha:nk you for being
 002 with us toni:ght, 'hh Donald Gregg sti:ll serves
 003 as y'r tru:sted advi#sor, =he w'z dee:ply involved
 004 in running arms t'the Contras an' he didn' inform
 005 you. =

006 { (0.5) }
 007 Rather: = 'hhhh' + Now when President Rea:gan's, (0.2)
 008 trusted advisor: Admiral Poindexter: (0.6) failed
 009 to inform hi:m, (0.8) the President-(0.2)
 010 fired'im.hh
 011 (0.5)
 012 Rather: Why is Mister Gregg still: (') inside the White
 013 Hou@se'n still a trusted advisor. =
 014 Bush: =Becuz I have confidence in im, (0.3) en becuz
 015 this matter,Dan, ...

- # Bush brings hands together and mouth opens.
- + Bush separates hands.
- @ Bush's lips part (with in-breath?).

This portion of the transcript underscores Schegloff's claim that the interchange reported here functions as an interview: Rather asks the question without being interrupted, and Bush answers; therefore it is an interview, constructed through collaboration by the two participants.

Many interviews appear just like this. When Bob Edwards asks news analyst Daniel Schorr to comment on a particular piece of news on National Public Radio, NPR's *Morning Edition*, Edwards asks a question and Schorr gives his answer. In press conferences on the lawn of the White House, the press asks questions and the President answers. Unless the question is a particularly controversial one, and the answer less than satisfactory, there will be no interruptions.

4.2. Political Media Discourse

In his paper 'Ideology and identity change in political television', Fairclough discusses the heterogeneous nature of modern television news programs. Fairclough claims that there is a general tendency for the order of discourse which he calls 'political broadcasting', to be restructured through a persistent blurring of the boundaries of different discursive practices. The discourses of the traditional political sphere articulate with the discourses of the private sphere, and with those of the media as institution of entertainment (Fairclough 1995:167). In the specific program referred to in the paper, entitled *Midnight Special*, elements of conventional political interviews are mixed with simulated conversation and entertainment, even comedy routines. The reporter is usually a 'personality' transformed into a product image, which contributes to the popularity and eventually to the survival of the program. The reporter and his 'guest' orient to each other as if there was no audience; the studio functions as a private space, and the interview as a private conversation. The interaction is, however, carefully designed for its audience, and it places the viewer in a position of voyeur.

The Bush/Rather encounter was advertised as 'a profile'. A profile can be an interview, but it is more than that. Doing a profile of somebody means describing a person 'as I see him'; Rather was

anxious to portray Bush as candidly as he could, since this profile was intended as part of a presidential election campaign.

When CBS requested an interview with Bush, the following letter was sent to the Bush campaign:

'Part of our early coverage of the 1988 presidential election has been a series of candidate profiles produced for "CBS Evening News". We purposely saved your profile for last. Dan Rather is very interested in your profile, and has decided to do it himself'. (Source: RatherBiased.com)

Rather was eager to do *his* profile of the Vice President, since he wanted to throw some light on the Iran-contra affair; also, he hoped to make Bush admit to knowledge about the 'hostage-for-weapons' swap that evidently had taken place. I suggest that Rather, by probing into this affair, was convinced that it would help people decide who to vote for, who to trust.

'Journalists of integrity ask questions. We don't come to conclusions before getting what can be considered reasonably honest answers. Especially when an interview subject is involved with allegations of serious wrongdoing in public office, it is the responsibility of an ethical journalist to ask direct questions – and keep on asking them until the subject answers, or until it is clear he refuses to answer'.

Dan Rather in his 1994 book *The Camera Never Blinks Twice*. (Source: RatherBiased.com)

Rather starts by thanking Bush for participating in the program; after that, there is no more small talk. Rather proceeds directly to his agenda, building up the argument by some preliminary statements, clearing the way for the projected question. In the transcript from the RatherBiased.com web page, there is no conversational structural information about pauses, interruptions, false starts, or repairs. The emphasis is on the question and the answer.

DAN RATHER: Mr. Vice President, thank you for being with us tonight. Donald Gregg still serves as your trusted advisor. He was deeply involved in running arms to the contras, and he didn't inform you. Now, when President Reagan's trusted advisor Admiral Poindexter failed to inform him, the President fired him. Why is Mr. Gregg still inside the White House, is still a trusted advisor?

VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH: Because I have confidence in him and because this matter, Dan, as you well know, and your editors know, has been looked at by the \$10 million study by the Senate and the House, it's been looked at by the Tower Commission...

Questions do many things. Rhetorical questions do not really require an answer, because the answer is pragmatically so obvious that uttering the question indirectly conveys the answer. Some questions are meant to elicit information, and can be regarded as straightforward questions; the answers to such questions cannot always be predicted since they depend on the persons involved and the situation. Another type of question is the test question, used in exams, where some kind of prediction can be made. Although not all exams are of the 'multiple choice' kind, many test questions presuppose just one 'right' answer. In between such well-defined questions, there is a host of functions that questions can have, which explains why it is hard to identify a speech act of questioning. Questions often function as indirect speech acts, doing the work of commands, accusations, begging, requests and more. The present question 'Why is Mr. Gregg still inside the White House, is still a trusted advisor?' could thus be considered to be both an elicitation of information, a statement opening up a 'can of worms', as well as an indirect speech act of accusation.

As he made it clear later on in the interview, Bush did not particularly want to go into Rather's question. He would rather be questioned about some of the popular programs in his campaign.

'I thought I was here to talk about my views on education, or on getting this deficit down...'

Bush does not answer Rather's question, except with something that can be characterized as a 'brushing aside answer'. Instead, he responds to the elicitation of the Iran-contra topic as if he understood the question about Mr. Gregg to be synonymous with a question about the whole topic.

After his brief statement 'Because I have confidence in him', Bush launches into a long explanation about how the Iran-contra affair had been examined by a commission, and had been 'exhaustively looked into'. Bush expresses his displeasure with what appeared to be Rather's political profile of him, when it becomes clear that Rather only wants to talk about his role in the Iran-contra affair.

As I see this opening interchange between the interviewer and the interviewee, it was not a straight question-answer interchange (structured in Schegloff's sense). A question was taken up as an elicitation to venture into a very troublesome topic, a topic that would not be to the Vice President's advantage in the upcoming presidential campaign. In responding to this elicitation, Bush tried to steer the interview in a different direction, by rejecting the frame that had been chosen by Rather, and by suggesting other topics. There was a contest, already from the very beginning, as to who would dominate this interview and who would succeed in advancing his agenda in the end.

4.3. Confrontation or Hybrid Discourse Styles?

Having analyzed the initial exchange, where he finds the participants constructing an interview, Schegloff focuses on the numerous interruptions and overlaps. In the next segment, Bush interrupts Rather after his first preliminary statement, and even if Rather repeatedly tries to invoke the 'interview' genre, Bush continues to interrupt. When Rather points out: 'That wasn't a question. It was a statement', Bush says: 'Yes it was a statement, and I'll answer it' (Schegloff 1988/89).

Schegloff concludes from this exchange that we are no longer dealing with an interview, but with a confrontation. There is no longer any evidence in the practice and the conduct of the participants to suggest that the interaction follows the rules of the interview genre; on

the contrary, the numerous overlaps indicate that this is a spate of contentious talk (Schegloff 1988/89:224). There are other indications that point to the breakdown of the interview style: viz., the use of continuers. When Rather is halfway through his preliminary statement in the next segment, Bush produces a continuer, 'yes'.

RATHER: You have said that if you had known this was an arms for hostages swap...

BUSH: Yes.

RATHER: ...that you would have opposed it. You also said that...

BUSH: Exactly. Now, let me, let me ask...

RATHER: ...that you would have opposed it. You also said that...

BUSH: Exactly. Now, let me ask...

RATHER: ...that you did not know that you...

There are several approaches that CDA could take in the analysis of this second segment. The confrontational nature of the interview was pointed out from the start as a tug-of-war between different agendas, while the conversational mechanics of CA only demonstrated this contest 3 minutes and 10 seconds into the transcript.

The two contestants orient to their audience. Rather answers to the Network, and all the viewers who depend on him, to expose the Vice President's possible mistakes and weak sides. Bush orients both to the faithful and the undecided voters who might put him in the White House; his agenda is to divert embarrassing questions about his involvement in conflict-filled situations. In terms of the relationship between participants and audience, Rather has a composite identity as part interviewer, part conversationalist and part entertainer (Fairclough 1995:172). Bush inhabits roles of conversationalist and entertainer as well as politician and interviewee.

(6) *Bush/Rather, c. 03:10*

014 Bush: [May I May I] answer that.
 015 Rather: Tha [t wasn't a ques] tion. It was [a statement.] a
 016 Bush: (Th- right [Yes it was] a
 017 statement, = [an' I'll a: nswer it. = T h e President =]
 018 Rather: [Let me ask the question if I may first.]
 019 Bush: =created this progra:m, 'hh has testifie—er: stated
 020 publicly, 'hh he di:d no:t think it was arms fer
 021 hostages.
 022 Bush: 'hh [It was only la:] ter that- and that's] me.
 023 Rather: [That's the President.] Mr. Vice President.
 024 ()
 025 Rather: ['hh Well-
 026 Bush: [Cuz I went along with it becuz- <y'know why Dan,
 027 { 'hhh/(0.2) } becuz [I w o r r i e d w h e n] I saw =
 028 Rather: [That wasn' the question] Mister
 029 [Vice President]
 030 Bush: [=M i s t e r :] 'hhh Mister Buckley, 'hh uh'r heard
 031 about Mister Buckley being <tortured ta death.> Later
 032 admitted as the CIA chief. 'hh So if I erred, I
 033 erred on the side of tryin' ta get those hostages
 034 outta there. =

The blending of public and private spheres through the media, as a domain of leisure (ibid:173), produces heterogeneous meanings and styles; it also creates ambivalence with regard to the interpretation of contextual input. Although this particular segment does not seem to have much entertainment value, people in general watch news programs both for information and entertainment.

Rather is trying to ask his question, but having been interrupted by Bush as many as seven times in this small segment, he still has not had a chance to ask his question. In the preliminary statements, where Rather refers to something that Bush has said previously, he uses a personal style: 'You have said', 'If you had known', 'You would have opposed', 'You did not know'. But later on, when he realizes that his efforts are being aborted, he reverts to a style that is more typical of public discourse: 'That's the President. Mr. Vice President' and again later: 'That wasn't the question, Mr. Vice President'.

Bush, on the other hand, uses his political persona at first: 'The President created this program...', but as soon as Rather reverts to political discourse, Bush continues in a more private conversational discourse style: 'Cause you know why, Dan? Because I worried when I saw Mr. Buckley'. The mixing of styles reveals that Bush, while exhibiting his identity as a politician, also wants to be perceived as a private person with worries and concern for others.

The competitiveness of the participants in this interview is also evident through the number of interruptions, overlaps, and simultaneous talk. Schegloff notes that even if the audience may have heard much of what was said, the vernacular view of overlapping talk is that it 'may impair hearing or understanding' (Schegloff, 1988/89: 229). Accordingly, there will be a disparity between what the parties to an interaction attend to and respond to, and what outside observers attend to, and understand to be transpiring (*ibid.*).

As we have noted before, Bush and Rather have their own agendas in this interview, and since Bush wants to avoid at all cost talking about his role in the Iran-contra affair, the best way to escape the dreaded topic is to steer the interaction in different directions. There is no clear indication of one specific direction that he wants to take, but he seems to prefer to talk about what others have said and done in their testimonies before the Tower commission.

Rather, on the other hand, wants to pursue Bush's involvement in the affair, and whether he had told the nation the truth. The two combatants are engaged in a hybrid form of discursive event, where on the one hand they take part in a public political performance aimed at the general public, while on the other hand they participate in a private debate where both the participants orient to details of the other's talk, while talking at cross-purposes. The following transcript segment illustrates this:

(4) *Bush/Rather, c. 04:00*

043 [>That's why I wan[na get my share< in: he:re,
 044 Rather: [= 'h h h h Now
 045 Bush: [on something] other than whatchu wanna talk [about.
 046 Rather: [The President- The
 047 President- (') h's - has spoken for him: self. = I'm
 048 asking you: to speak [for your: self, which you have =
 049 Bush: [Please
 050 Rather: = not been willing t'do in the pa:st, = [if I m - =
 051 Bush: ()
 052 Rather: = if I may - u - suggest th't- that- this is what leads
 053 people to sa:y, 'hh quote, "Either George Bush wz
 054 irrelevant, (0.3) or he w'z ineffective = > he said
 055 himself he wz outta the loop < = > now lemme give
 056 [an example, you said to ask you a question <
 057 Bush: () outta the loop] May I
 058 explain "outta the loo:p." No: operational ro:le. Go
 059 ahead.

Bush clearly expresses his desire to have his share in deciding what the topic of this interview should be, and the topic should be 'something other than what you want to talk about'. When Rather continues to pursue his own agenda, by asking Bush to speak for himself, and quoting people who have described the Vice President as irrelevant or ineffective, and maybe 'out of the loop', Bush seizes the chance to explain what 'out of the loop' means. In doing so, he cannot avoid placing himself in an ambivalent position. In the Iran-contra affair, he prefers to be seen as the man who has no operational role, who cannot be blamed. As a presidential candidate, however, he must be assertive and show his leadership abilities and his sense of responsibility. Those are identities that collide; consequently, Bush restricts himself to explain what 'out of the loop' means, not admitting that he was without an operational role.

4.4. Contradiction resolved, or Different Ideologies?

In the next segment, Rather is able to pose his question. The interview has now reached its climax. After a series of interruptions, and efforts from both sides to control the messages that each of them wished to get across to their audience, the Vice President is brought in a situation where he is forced to give an answer to Rather's question.

(5) *Bush/Rather, c. 04:15*

- 070 Rather: [But Mr. Vice President, you went to Israel in]
 071 <July of Nineteen Eighty [Six? >]
 072 Bush: Yes
 074 Rather: 'hhhh And- a member of your own staff Mister Craig
 074 Fuller.- ((swallow/(0.5))) has verified. And so did
 075 the only other man the:re. Mister Ni:r. Mister
 076 Amiron Nir, 'hh who's the Israeli's 'hh to:p anti-
 077 terrorist man,
 078 Bush: [Ye: [s.
 079 Rather: ['hh [Those two men > were in a meeting with you an'
 080 Mister Nir not once, < but three: times. three times,
 081 underscored with you that this was a straightout
 082 arms [fer hostages swap.] = 'h h h] =
 083 Bush: [W h a t t h e y :: (') were doing.] =
 084 Rather: =Now [how do you- How] do you reconc-] I have (sir)]
 085 Bush: [Read the memo] Read the memo.] What they::
 086 were doing.
 087 Rather: How: can you reconci:le that you were there < Mister
 088 Nir a- underscored three:: separate occa:sions, 'hh
 089 that it was a- arms fer hostages swap an' to:ld you
 090 we were dealing with the most ra:dical elements in
 091 Iran:. You were dealing straightaway with the
 092 Ayatollah [Khomeini
 093 Bush: [I was told what they: were doing, and not
 094 what we were doing en that's the big difference...

Schegloff, in his conversation analytical interpretation of this segment, focuses on the apparent contradiction between the representations of two different events in the Vice President's political life. Bush had

stated that the first time he had heard about the arms-for-hostages swap was in December of 1986, in a briefing by Senator Durenburger. However, Bush had also participated in a meeting in Israel in July of 1986, where Mr. Amiron Nir had underscored three times in front of the Vice President that the operation was a 'straightout arms for hostages swap'. Rather asks Bush to reconcile that he was in that meeting in Israel in July, with his claim that he heard about the arms-for-hostages swap only in December the same year. Structurally, the analysis that Schegloff provides states that the contradiction was dissolved when Bush claimed that the 'swap' was what the Israelis were doing with Iran, not what the US was doing. Schegloff is here unable to go further in his analysis; on a conversation analytic view, Bush has dissolved the contradiction, even if the participants did not construct this solution together.

Critical Discourse Analysis would approach this problem in a different manner. When Vice President Bush claimed that the 'swap' was Israel's responsibility, he may not have lied directly, but he certainly put a spin on the facts. This creative, distorted version of the reality did not convince Rather, who persisted in asking the same question again.

Judgments of truth or well-groundedness are always difficult to make; but we can at least discuss the appearance of different ideologies. Fairclough, in his article titled 'Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis', claims Althusser's 'ideological formation' (Althusser 1971) and Pêcheux's 'discursive formation' (Pêcheux 1982:111) as sources of inspiration for his study of ideology.

...institutions construct their ideological and discursal subjects; they construct them in the sense that they impose ideological and discursal constraints upon them as a condition for qualifying them to act as subjects...This means that in the process of acquiring the ways of talking which are normatively associated with a subject position, one necessarily acquires also the ways of seeing, or ideological norms. (Fairclough 1995:39)

Following up on Fairclough's discussion of ideological formations, we may say that at least one of Vice President Bush's subject positions

belongs in the institutional frame of the Republican Party. This ideological formation influences the way he talks and the way he sees things. Another subject position that we can with certainty claim for Bush is his being part of a Republican government.

Rather, for his part, is an investigative reporter, part of a team of correspondents who, in Cronkite's words, 'tend to side with the powerless rather than the powerful'. The confrontation, consequently, is not about who is lying, and who is pursuing the truth in this matter; rather, it is a confrontation between representatives of two different ideologies waging an ideological war.

Bush is happy to regard the 'arms-for-hostages exchange' as an Israeli problem, irrespective of whether Israel and the US were collaborating in this.² Apparently, it is perfectly in accordance with his ideology to tweak the facts in order to appear as the responsible public servant he knows his constituency expects him to be.

'I want to talk about the values we believe in and experience and the integrity that goes with all of this, and what's -- I'm going to do about education...!' (Bush, later in the interview)

Rather, with his ideological stance, perceives a Vice President who not only evades the questions, but avoids telling the truth as well. Rather takes the high moral ground from where appeals to ethics are heard: 'How can you reconcile?' and later: 'How do you explain that you can't remember it?'

This ideological war then continues for some time. Structurally, this part of the interview does not demonstrate any interesting problems for CA; in contrast, the ideologies become more transparent as the parties sharpen their weapons:

RATHER: He (George Shultz) got apoplectic when he found out that you were...

RATHER: ...you and the President were being party to sending missiles to the Ayatollah...

BUSH: I wanted those hostages -- I wanted Mr. Buckley out of there...

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, the question is -- but you--made us hypocrites in the face of the world.

BUSH: This is not a great night, because I want to talk about why I want to be president, why those 41 percent of the people are supporting me. And I don't think it's fair...

BUSH: ...to judge my whole career by a rehash on Iran. How would you like it if I judged your career by those seven minutes when you walked off the set in New York? [Note: Rather actually was in Miami and he was off the set for six minutes.]

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, I think you'll agree that your qualification for President and what kind of leadership you'd bring to the country, what kind of government you'd have, what kind of people you have around you....

BUSH: Exactly.

RATHER: ...is much more important than what you just referred to.

This last segment is interesting in terms of the relationship it develops between the two combatants. Traditionally, a Vice President and a news anchor would be placed in positions of unequal power. The conventions pertaining to interviews with Presidents and members of the government would call for highly formal and respectful discursive manners, exhibiting markers of power asymmetry, just like in many other situations involving people of unequal institutional power: teachers and pupils, managers and workers, parents and children (Fairclough 1995).

Rather's interview with Bush, however, could be characterized by what Fairclough calls 'synthetic personalization' (Fairclough 1989):

This is the simulation of private, face-to-face, person-to-person discourse in public mass-audience discourse – print, radio, television. (Fairclough 1995:80)

Fairclough argues that neither democratization of discourse nor synthetic personalization should be interpreted as really eliminating power asymmetry, but rather as transforming such asymmetry into covert form. Although these new forms can be seen as illusions of democracy, they nevertheless promote discursive struggle directed at furthering emancipatory discursive forms (Fairclough 1995).

Rather, already in 1977, had expressed his belief in the democratization of demeanor and surely also of discourse between high and low in our society. At the same time, he talked about the ambiguity that is inherent in his job as a public figure, being responsible for entertainment and information, but also for generating economic return for the network.

'I strongly believe that in our system no citizen has to face any leader on bended knee. He is not standing before a monarch, or a descendant of the sun god'.

Dan Rather in his 1977 book *The Camera Never Blinks*. (Source: RatherBiased.com)

'Do powder puff, not probing interviews. Stay away from controversial subjects. Kiss ass, move with the mass, and for heaven and ratings' sake, don't make anybody mad -- certainly not anybody you're covering, and especially not the Mayor, the Governor, the Senator, the Vice President, or the President, or anybody in a position of power. Make nice, not news'. (ibid.)

This advice is obviously not something that Rather followed himself; it illustrates, however, the pressure that exists on journalists to follow the written and un-written conventions of their trade.

If we look at the last interchange between Rather and Bush through the lens of social practice and power relations, we could ask whether the accusations that they hurl at each other express 'synthetic personalization' and illusions of democracy, or if they are indicative of

changes in the media and in the society towards more extensive democracy. If we look at the outcome of this controversial interview, Rather did not lose his job, and Vice President Bush became President Bush, albeit for only one term. They both used strategies involving high risks for possible consequences, and both escaped unscathed.

'I won the battle with Dan Rather that night, but he won the war. His coverage of my campaign and presidency was consistently negative'.

George H. W. Bush in his 1999 book *All the Best, George Bush*. (Source: RatherBiased.com)

'...he was at the very least skirting the truth about his involvement in sending some of America's best technology to the Ayatollah Khomeini'.

Dan Rather to Chris Mathews on CNBC's Hardball, June 28, 1999. (ibid.)

Conclusion

My aim in this investigation has been to establish the assumptions and claims pertaining to two methods: CA and CDA, as well as to compare and verify the results derived from each of their analytical approaches. I found CA to be an eminent method for analyzing conversational mechanics and structure; its transcription format, with all its useful, although laborious details, is indispensable for detecting minuscule features in the text that otherwise would be ignored. If one has to obey CA's constraints on what are considered permissible contextual features, however, I find that explanatory aspects of situations are lost, just because they were not 'talked-about' specifically in a particular segment.

Interviews are never encounters between two people; just like ordinary conversations, they presuppose 'thicker' contexts than those provided by the immediate situation. The fact that an interview usually is commissioned by an institution, like a TV network or a radio station, makes the event both a discourse practice, subject to certain

constraints of production, distribution, and interpretation, and a social practice, involving participants and audience, political context, and sometimes even global concerns. If an interview on TV can change the way citizens vote in the next election, then surely this particular interview had ramifications beyond the mere structure of the conversational sequences.

Social interaction can lead to social change; as linguistic anthropologists, we are interested in the fragile and opaque relationships that obtain between the level of the discourse event and the level of society. Several efforts have been made to mediate between these two levels; however, no single method has demonstrated the existence of a direct relationship. CDA practitioners usually perceive the relationship between the discourse event and the society to be a dialectical one, where changes in one level result in changes in the other, in one continuing spiral. However, as substantial examples from daily life are hard to come by, the relationship is described, but not really made evident, using examples on either level. Comparing Conversation Analysis with Critical Discourse Analysis, with the aim of discovering a method for informing the relationship between the individual discourse event and the larger societal context, may seem unfair to CA, since the conversation analysts never expressed any wish to give up their sociological neutrality. However, when the event under scrutiny is an interview (a social event, in my opinion), the CA method of analysis is inadequate to represent the totality of aspects of the situation. Even if the method manages to disclose some interesting features in the conversational mechanics, the interview has not been mined for its full revealing potential as an essentially multifaceted social event.

The University of Texas at Austin
Department of Anthropology
Austin, TX 78712
USA

Notes

1. In the analysis, I have relied on the transcript made available on the RatherBiased.com website, which is a transcript without clearly marked overlaps and pauses. Schegloff's own detailed and comprehensive transcript has also been very helpful, especially regarding who interrupted whom and when.
2. Israel was shipping arms to Iran on Danish ships, and the Danish Sailors' Union alerted the news media in Denmark about this cargo; this was how the weapon shipment became common knowledge.

References

- Althusser, Louis. 1971. *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses, Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: New Left Books.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell. 1992. Displaying neutrality: formal aspects of informal court proceedings. In: Paul Drew & John Heritage (eds.), *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 199-231.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell & John Heritage. 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..
- Billig, Michael. 1999. Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in *Conversation Analysis*. *Discourse and Society* 10(4).543-558.
- Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa. 2003. Cross-Cultural Representation of 'Otherness' in Media Discourse. In: Gilbert Weiss & Ruth Wodak (eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 272-296.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie & Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Drew, Paul & John Heritage (eds.). 1992. *Talk at Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Hanks, William. 1996. *Language and Communicative Practices*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mey, Inger. 2001. The CA/CDA controversy. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33.609-615.
- Meyer, Michael. 2001. Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA. In: Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 14-32.

- Nofsinger, Robert. 1991. *Everyday Conversation*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Pêcheux, Michel. 1982. *Language, semantics and ideology: stating the obvious*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
<http://www.ratherbiased.com/transcript.htm>
<http://www.ratherbiased.com/bushattack.htm-top>
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4).696-735.
- Schegloff, Emanuel & Harvey Sacks. 1973. Opening Up Closings. *Semiotica* 8.289-327.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1988/1989. From interview to confrontation: Observation of the Bush/Rather encounter. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 22.215-240.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1997. Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society* 8(2).165-187.
- Scollon, Ron. 2001. *Mediated Discourse, The nexus of practice*. London: Routledge.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1983. *Kuna ways of speaking: An ethnographic perspective*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Sherzer, Joel. 1990. *Verbal art in San Blas: Kuna culture through its discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, Teun. 2001. Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In: Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 95-121.
- Wodak, Ruth & Michael Meyer (eds.). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Appendix

Interview Transcript

The interview lasted approximately nine minutes. Before the interview, there was a six-minute piece on what Rather thought was Bush's role in the Iran-contra affair. When CBS had requested to do an interview, it asked, 'Part of our early coverage of the 1988 presidential election has been a series of candidate profiles produced for "CBS Evening News'. We purposely saved your profile for last. Dan Rather is very interested in your profile, and has decided to do it himself'. Iran-contra did not appear to be the subject.

DAN RATHER: Mr. Vice President, thank you for being with us tonight. Donald Gregg still serves as your trusted advisor. He was deeply involved in running arms to the contras, and he didn't inform you. Now, when President Reagan's trusted advisor Admiral Poindexter failed to inform him, the President fired him. Why is Mr. Gregg still inside the White House, is still a trusted advisor?

VICE PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH: Because I have confidence in him and because this matter, Dan, as you well know, and your editors know, has been looked at by the \$10 million study by the Senate and the House, it's been looked at by the Tower Commission. The Rodriguez testimony that you put on here I just think it's outrageous because he was totally vindicated, swore under oath that he never talked to me about the contras. And yet this report you're making, you told me, or your people did -- you have a Mr. Cohen that works for you -- was going to be a political profile. Now if this is a political profile for an election, I have a very different opinion as to what one should be. Don Gregg works for me because I don't think he's done anything wrong. And I think if he had, this exhaustive examination that went, that was gone into by the Senate and by the House, would have showed it. And you've impugned the--my integrity by suggesting with one of your little boards here that I didn't tell the truth about what Felix Rodriguez -- you didn't accuse me of it, but you made that suggestion. And other people were in the meeting, including Mr. Nick Brady, and he has said that my version is correct. And so I find this to be a rehash and a little bit, if you'll excuse me, a misrepresentation on the part of CBS, who said you're doing political profiles on all the candidates, and then you come up with something that has been exhaustively looked into.

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, what we agreed to or didn't agree to, I think you will agree for the moment, can be dealt with in another way. Let's talk about the record. You say that we've misrepresented your...

INGER MEY

BUSH: Let's talk about the full record.

RATHER: ...record. Let's talk about the record.

BUSH: Yeah.

RATHER: If we've misrepresented your record in any way, here's a chance to set it straight. Now, for ex...

BUSH: Right. Can I just set it straight on one count, because you implied from that little thing, I, I have a little monitor sitting on the side here -- that I didn't tell the truth [CBS had a six-minute piece about Bush and Iran-contra before the interview]. Now this has all been looked into. It's just a rehash.

RATHER: Where did we imply that, Mr. Vice President?

BUSH: Well, just here, on this board, where you have the idea that Bush says that he didn't tell, didn't tell, didn't tell about the contras' supply from Felix Rodriguez.

RATHER: Mr. Vice Pres...

BUSH: Felix Rodriguez testified under oath, he has been public, and you could have at least run a little picture of him saying that I never told the Vice President about the contras. I'm asking for fair play, and I thought I was here to talk about my views on education, or on getting this deficit down...

RATHER: Well, Mr. Vice President, we want to talk about the record on this...

BUSH: Well, let's...

RATHER: ...because it...

BUSH: Well, let's talk about the full record. That's what I want to talk about, Dan.

RATHER: The framework here is that one-third of the Republicans in this poll...

BUSH: Yeah.

WHEN METHODS CLASH: DOING BEING HYBRID

RATHER: One-third of the Republicans, and one-fourth of the people who say that, you know, they rather like you, believe you're hiding something. Now if you are, here's a...

BUSH: I am hiding something.

RATHER: Here's a chance to get it out.

BUSH: You know what I'm hiding? What I told the President, that's the only thing. And I've answered every question put before me. Now, if you have a question, what is it?

RATHER: I do have one.

BUSH: Please please fire away.

RATHER: You have said that if you had known this was an arms for hostages swap...

BUSH: Yes.

RATHER: ...that you would have opposed it. You also said that...

BUSH: Exactly. Now, let me, let me ask...

RATHER: ...that you would have opposed it. You also said that...

BUSH: Exactly. Now, let me ask...

RATHER: ...that you did not know that you...

BUSH: May I answer that...directly?

RATHER: That wasn't a question, it was a statement.

BUSH: Yes, it was a statement and I'll answer it.

RATHER: Let me ask the question, if I may, first.

INGER MEY

BUSH: The President created this program, has testified or stated publicly he did not think it was arms for hostages, and it was only later that....

RATHER: That's the President, Mr. Vice President.

BUSH: ...and that's me, because I went along with it -- because you know why, Dan? Because I...

RATHER: That wasn't the question, Mr. Vice President.

BUSH: ...worried when I saw Mr. Buckley, heard about Mr. Buckley being tortured to death, later admitted is the CIA chief. So if I erred, I erred on the side of trying to get those hostages out of there. And the whole story has been told to Congress.

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, you set the rules for this talk here. I didn't mean to step on your line there, but you insisted that this be live, and you know we have a limited amount of time.

BUSH: Exactly, and that's why I want to get my share in here on something other than what you want to talk about.

RATHER: The President has spoken for himself. I'm asking you...

BUSH: Please.

RATHER: ...to speak for yourself, which you have not been willing to do in the past, and if I may suggest that this is what leads people to say, "Either George Bush was irrelevant or he was ineffective. He said himself he was out of the loop." Now, let me give you an example...

BUSH: Uh, may I explain "out of the loop?"

RATHER: You said, "Ask a question."

BUSH: May I explain "out of the loop?" No operational role. Go ahead.

RATHER: Now, you've said that if you'd known it was an arms-for-hostages swap you would have opposed it. You said the first you knew it was an arms-for-hostages swap was in December of 1986, correct?

WHEN METHODS CLASH: DOING BEING HYBRID

BUSH: When the whole thing became briefed to me by Senator Durenberger...

RATHER: Exactly.

BUSH: ...and the proximity of arms to hostages much closer than we had thought on these hearings that were...

RATHER: But Mr. Vice President, you went to Israel in July 1986....

BUSH: Yes.

RATHER: ...and a member of your own staff, Craig Fuller, has verified, and so did the only other man there, Mr. Nir, Mr. Amiram Nir, who's the Israeli's top anti-terrorist man...

BUSH: Yes.

RATHER: ...those two men were in a meeting with you and Mr. Nir not once, but three times, three times, underscored with you, that this was a straight-out arms-for-hostages swap.

BUSH: What they were doing...

RATHER: Now how do you...

BUSH: Read the memo, read the mem.

RATHER: I have, sir.

BUSH: What they were doing...

RATHER: How can you reconcile that you were there? Mr. Nir underscored three separate occasions that it was an arms-for-hostages swap and told you you were dealing with the most radical elements in Iran. You were dealing straightaway with the Ayatollah Khomeini.

BUSH: I was told what they were doing and not what we were doing, and that's the big difference; and, Dan, I expressed my concerns and reservations about that. That has been testified to under oath by Mr. Poindexter. And it's been confirmed

INGER MEY

that I had reservations and spoke up by Don Regan. In fact, he said the other day that I expressed them to the President.

RATHER: That's correct.

BUSH: I don't discuss what I talked to the president because there's a principle involved. It has nothing to do with Iran-contra. It's the principle of confidentiality...

RATHER: But Mis...

BUSH: ...between the President and the Vice President.

RATHER: ...Mr. Vice President, Mr. Vice President...

BUSH: Yes.

RATHER: ...the President has said he wants all the facts out. He gave up such things as even his own diary. Every principal, including...

BUSH: He did not give up his own diary.

RATHER: ...Secretary Shultz. He gave up some of it.

BUSH: His diary, his brief. Well, Dan, let's be careful here because you're explaining a political profile.

RATHER: I want *you* to be careful, Mr. Vice President...

BUSH: I will be careful

RATHER: ...because the problem here...

BUSH: But I want to get my side of this out.

RATHER: ...is that you repeatedly sat in the meetings. You sat in a meeting in which Secretary Shultz, in the most forceful way, raised his objection...

BUSH: I wasn't there, for the most forceful way. If it was the most forceful way -- I've heard George Shultz be very, very forceful; and, if I were there and he was

WHEN METHODS CLASH: DOING BEING HYBRID

very, very forceful at that meeting, I would have remembered that. I don't remember that. And that is what I'm saying.

RATHER: Then how do you explain that you can't remember it and the other people at the meeting say he was apoplectic?

BUSH: Maybe I wasn't there at that point.

RATHER: You weren't in the meeting?

BUSH: I'm not suggesting. I'm just saying I don't remember it.

RATHER: I don't want to be argumentative, Mr. Vice President.

BUSH: You do, Dan.

RATHER: No...no, sir, I don't.

BUSH: This is not a great night, because I want to talk about why I want to be president, why those 41 percent of the people are supporting me. And I don't think it's fair...

RATHER: And Mr. Vice President, if these questions are --

BUSH: ...to judge my whole career by a rehash on Iran. How would you like it if I judged your career by those seven minutes when you walked off the set in New York? [Note: Rather actually was in Miami and he was off the set for six minutes.]

RATHER: Well, Mister...

BUSH: ...Would you like that?

RATHER: Mr. Vice President...

BUSH: I have respect for you, but I don't have respect for what you're doing here tonight.

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, I think you'll agree that your qualification for President and what kind of leadership you'd bring to the country, what kind of government you'd have, what kind of people you have around you....

INGER MEY

BUSH: Exactly.

RATHER: ...is much more important than what you just referred to. I'd be happy to...

BUSH: Well, I want to be judged on the whole record, and you're not giving an opportunity.

RATHER: And I'm trying to set the record straight, Mr. Vice President.

BUSH: You invited me to come here and talk about -- I thought -- the whole record.

RATHER: I want you to talk about the record. You sat in a meeting with George Shultz...

BUSH: Yes, and I've given you an answer.

RATHER: He got apoplectic when he found out that you were...

BUSH: He didn't get apoplectic. You have to ask Don Regan. Ask...

RATHER: ...you and the President were being party to sending missiles to the Ayatollah...

BUSH: Ask...

RATHER: ...the Ayatollah of Iran. Can you explain how -- you were supposed to be the -- you are -- you're an anti terrorist expert. We -- Iran was officially a terrorist state.

BUSH: I've already explained that, Dan.

RATHER: You went around telling -- you -- you...

BUSH: I wanted those hostages -- I wanted Mr. Buckley out of there...

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, the question is -- but you--made us hypocrites in the face of the world.

WHEN METHODS CLASH: DOING BEING HYBRID

BUSH: Before he was killed, which he has been killed.

RATHER: How could you...

BUSH: That was bad.

RATHER: ...sign on to such a policy?! And the question is...

BUSH: Well, had the same reason the President signed on to it.

RATHER: ...what does that tell us about your record?

BUSH: The same reason the President signed on to it. When a CIA agent is being tortured to death, maybe you err on the side of a human life. But everybody's admitted mistakes. I've admitted mistakes. And you want to dwell on them, and I want to talk about the values we believe in and experience and the integrity that goes with all of this, and what's -- I'm going to do about education, and you're...there's nothing new here. I thought this was a news program. What is new?

RATHER: Well, I had hoped, Mr. Vice President, that you would tell us to whom you expressed your reservations...

BUSH: Yes, I did.

RATHER: ...when you expressed them and what were the reservations?

BUSH: Poindexter testified under oath.

RATHER: What were the reservations?

BUSH: His testi -- reservation about getting the control of an operation in the hands of a foreign power. Don Regan stated the other day, and I never heard a word of it on CBS, that the Vice President, in the presence of the President, spoke up about his concern about the whole cover of an operation being blown and secret -- and people that you're dealing with putting their lives in jeopardy.

RATHER: And you weren't concerned about sending missiles to the Ayatollah Khomeini?

BUSH: And I felt that always on every covert -- every covert action.

INGER MEY

RATHER: You weren't...

BUSH: The President has explained that. The committee looked at that, and so there's nothing new on this.

RATHER: Mr. Vice President, I appreciate you joining us tonight. I appreciate this straightforward way in which you engaged in this exchange. Clearly, some unanswered questions remain.

BUSH: Fire on another one.

RATHER: Are you willing to go to a news conference before the Iowa caucuses, answer questions from all -- all comers?

BUSH: I've been to 86 news conferences since March. Eighty-six of them since March.

RATHER: I gather that the answer is "No." Thank you very much for being with us, Mr. Vice President. We'll be back with more news in a moment.

© 2000-2004 **RatherBiased.com**

Last updated 2004-02-06 14:47:31 ET

<file:///Users/ingermey/Desktop/RatherBiased.com%20%7C%20Attack%20on%20Bush%20%7C%20Interview%20Transcript.html> - top