

SOCIOLINGVISTIKA/ SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Equivocation and Challenge to Equivocation in the Proceedings of a Special Parliamentary Commission at the Lithuanian Parliament

Vilma Bijekienė

Abstract. The present article generally falls within the domain of problem-oriented sociolinguistics (Janicki, 1990, 1999) with the basic target of a sociolinguistic problem of equivocation in political contexts. Bavelas et al (1990) theory of equivocal communication has been taken as a framework for the present analysis of equivocation. The study is a qualitative analysis of two extracts from the official transcripts of the proceedings of a special parliamentary commission on the issue of the possible threats to Lithuanian national security. The work of the commission was in progress in November, 2003. By applying principles of conversation analysis (Hutchby and Drew, 1995), the study examines the respondents' attempts to evade the given questions in their turns. It concomitantly considers the questioners' turns, where they challenge the equivocation of their opponents trying to elicit the necessary information. The study results in outlining the means of equivocation and the ways of challenge to equivocation used by the participants, as, for instance, appealing to the failure of memory, attacking the question, etc. in the category of equivocation as well as specifying the question, reminding the respondents of their responsibility, etc. in the category challenge.

Introduction

In recent years the scholarly interest in a versatile interrelation between language and society has shaped out into several fast growing paradigms such as language and medicine (Ainsworth-Vaughn, 2001; Fleischman, 2001), language and law (Shuy, 1998, 2001), language and media (Cotter, 2001; Fairclough, 1995) as well as language and politics (Blommaert and Bulcaen, 1997; Wilson, 1990). All of these approaches are to a certain extent directed towards tackling societal inadequacies. This article is an attempt to join the problem-oriented sociolinguistic scholarship, more specifically, the field of political linguistics, by shedding light on a sociolinguistic problem of equivocation in political discourse. Provided that equivocation is conceptualized as an intentional avoidance of giving a straightforward reply (see section 2), its frequent use by politicians and other influential state officials can be a significant hindrance for the general public to get the inevitable information. Consequently equivocation in political discourse poses an acute language-based problem. The main goal of the present analysis is thus to examine, firstly, the means of evading a question and, secondly, the means of challenging these attempts of evasion in a question-answer type of interaction in political discourse.

Although neither research on equivocation itself nor its analyses in political contexts are deprived of a certain scholarly insight, the present study differs from the previous ones in two aspects. Firstly, it is common practice to use televised political interviews in the research on political equivocation (Bull, 1998, 2000; Bull and Mayer, 1993) where politicians are questioned by reporters. In this article, however, data are taken from the proceedings of a special parliamentary commission at the Lithuanian Parliament. In

this form of political discourse the function of questioning is fulfilled by politicians, namely members of the Lithuanian Parliament. Secondly, the present study focuses not only on the analysis of how the respondents equivocate, but also on the challenge that their attempts of equivocation receive from the questioners. Challenging the use of equivocation has scarcely received scholarly attention even though it presents an important strategy in political discourse.

Theoretical Considerations

On Problem-oriented Sociolinguistics

A route for a non-essentialist and problem-oriented sociolinguistics was introduced by Janicki in 1990. For him, sociolinguistic inquiries should primarily center around the acute practical or theoretical problems, as for instance, a language-related persecution, injustice, ignorance, prejudice and intolerance as well as communication breakdowns and misunderstandings (Janicki, 1990:51-7). As he points out, in a sociolinguistic inquiry, problems can and should be solved at the linguistic level by easing social tension through the increased language awareness of the general public. To set an example, in his own scholarly endeavors, Janicki tackles the issue of political correctness (1997), the causes of misunderstandings (1999) and the use of difficult and incomprehensible language by such public figures as lawyers, politicians, academics, etc. (2002).

On Political Discourse Analysis

Political discourse can be highlighted as one of the fields fertile for sociolinguistic problems. Although the interest in political rhetoric can reach as far as the times of antiquity, the current goals of political linguistics are

considerably different. One of the most significant features of the contemporary research on political discourse is a highly interdisciplinary approach. To put it in Wodak's terms: "Social phenomena are too complex to be dealt with by only one field" (1995:206). Consequently, in research on language and politics various perspectives have been combined, as, for instance, a cognitive perspective in the study of political ideologies (Lakoff, 1996), critical discourse analysis in the study of racism (Van Dijk, 1993), or a pragmatic approach in the study of implicatures and presuppositions in political contexts (Wilson, 1990).

On the Theory of Equivocation

Research on equivocation in political discourse, which is also a framework of the present study, should be placed among the above indicated approaches as well. The best-known theory of equivocal communication, offered by Bavelas et al (1990), stems from the discipline of social psychology and has been successfully applied in the study of manipulative and evasive discourse in political interviews and talk shows (Bavelas et al, 1990; Bull, 1998, 2000; Bull and Mayer, 1993). Bavelas et al define equivocation as "non-straightforward communication", which also "appears ambiguous, contradictory, tangential, obscure, or even evasive" (1990:28). They compare equivocation to "a reversible visual illusion" (1990:13), which keeps on changing before one's eyes. Therefore, the mission the authors set for their theory is to try to explain why people choose to sound manipulative and equivocal. According to Bavelas et al, it is a specific communicative situation that makes a person equivocate. Namely, if in a certain situation all available alternatives of a reply might have negative consequences but a reply still has to be given, a person will try to say nothing "while saying something" (Bavelas, 1990:57), i.e. he or she will equivocate. They call such situations as avoidance-avoidance conflict. For example:

Question: The meat that is on sale today, is it good?

Male: [0.5 sec.] (Pitch plummeting:) **OOOhhh** (then levelling; fast, picking up some enthusiasm at the end:) **it's- it's fairly FINE yes** (Bavelas et al 1990:14; Bavelas' et al emphasis).

Political discourse can undoubtedly be considered as one of the domains richest in the avoidance-avoidance conflict situations. On the one hand, for political figures to proceed with their successful political career, it is of vital importance to preserve their intact public image or "face" (Brown and Levinson, 1987). On the other hand, as Bull (2000) points out, in a political arena the category of face consists of three interrelated parts: one's own face, the party face and the face of the influential supporters. A politician is obliged to attend to all three faces simultaneously and thus a possibility of being trapped in an avoidance – avoidance conflict situation significantly increases.

Data and Method

The data for this study are taken from the official transcript of the proceedings of a special parliamentary commission appointed by the Lithuanian Parliament to investigate possible threats to national security in November, 2003. For the present analysis, two extracts have been chosen from the transcript, which is available on the parliamentary

website together with the audio record. The participants in the proceedings of the commission fall within two categories: questioners and respondents. All of the nine questioners are members of parliament (MP hereafter). Among the respondents there are politicians, such as MP, members of the President's office, etc., and other state officials, such as high-rankers of the police, the head of the State Border Guard Service, etc.

The most important distributive criterion among the respondents is their relation to the issue under investigation of this commission, namely the threat to national security. According to this criterion, the respondents are either suspected as involved in the activities causing the above indicated threat or interested in investigating the causes of that threat. For the purpose of the present study, the discourse of the former group is of primary importance. For these people the proceedings of the commission can present a highly face threatening situation and make them resort to equivocation in large quantities. On the other hand, the task of the questioners is to elicit as much of the relevant information as possible. The respondents' equivocation thus presents the main hindrance to the questioners' task. Consequently, a high frequency of challenge to equivocation on the part of the questioners can be expected.

As has been indicated, the study generally falls within the domain of a problem-oriented sociolinguistics with the main goal of tackling the problem of equivocation in political discourse. Methodologically, it is a small scale qualitative analysis as it focuses on the question *how* rather than *how often* and *how much* (Johnstone, 2000:35; Johnstone's italics). The study follows the main principles of conversation analysis: "to discover how participants understand and respond to one another in their turns at talk" (Hutchby and Drew, 1995:182). Here, the focus is on how the respondents use their turns to evade the given requests for information and how the questioners try to elicit that information through a challenge to the equivocation on the part of the respondents.

Analysis

The following two extracts show the joint effort of several questioners to obtain information from the respondents who are a police deputy general commissioner in the first extract and an MP in the second extract. Both the respondents are suspected as involved in the activities related to the above indicated threats to national security. Questioner 2 also serves the function of a moderate. The main difference between the two extracts is the result of the questioners' effort to challenge equivocation. In the first extract the questioners succeed in receiving the requested information, whereas in the second case their effort fails.

4.1. Extract 1

(1) Questioner 1: The honorable police commissioner, could you please tell us if you have personally received any phone calls or any other assignments on the part of the President himself or the advisors to the President regarding the intercession and support to any of the police commissioners of the regional police stations.

(2) **Respondent:** I have mentioned that I have not had any contacts either with the advisor to the President Mr. Račkauskas or with the others because I am not acquainted with them. On the other hand, even if the advisor the general commissioner wanted anything, our relationship is very specific; even if he wanted, he would never call, would never ask for anything.

(3) **Questioner 2:** Who else has questions?

(4) **Questioner 3:** I would like to specify the question, did you receive a phone call from the President himself concerning any issue?

(5) **Respondent:** Do you have the President of the Republic in mind?

(6) **Questioner 3:** Yes. The President of Republic.

(7) **Respondent:** As far as I remember, I have not received that kind of phone calls.

(8) **Questioner 2:** Mr. Steponavičius (*Author's questioner*).

(9) **Questioner 1:** The honorable police commissioner, our commission is not working for the first day and we have studied various information. Without a doubt, we have to put a plus or a minus at some pieces of information. Can you confirm that you have not received a phone call from the President of the Republic of Lithuania regarding the police commissioner of Māžeikiai police station?

(10) **Questioner2:** You promised to tell us only the truth and nothing else.

(11) **Respondent:** I have to remember because those phone calls are plentiful and so various. The President does not just call the advisors or my other colleagues for nothing. I have already answered you before, the honorable chairman, and to the commission that I do not remember any phone calls, ... that His Excellency the President would call me, anyway... it is possible to check.

Several lines of irrelevant comments on the order of the interview are omitted here (*Author's remark*).

(12) **Questioner 3:** Now I want to give a specifying question. Did you receive a phone call from R. Paksas before him giving an oath as the President of the Republic?

A considerably long pause (*Author's remark*).

(13) **Respondent:** Yes.

(transcript of the special parliamentary commission 11/13/2003).

The respondent starts his first turn (2) with a remark about having already answered the question: 'I have mentioned that...'. In the literature on equivocal communication in political interviews, this strategy is known as one of the mostly used techniques (Bull and Mayer, 1993). However, it also seems to be the one of the simplest and the easiest to challenge. Therefore, the respondent continues with a reply that might sound as a candid negation of the propositional content of the question, namely that he has had the indicated contacts with the President's office. Nevertheless, the primary impression of the respondent's candor is destroyed through his shift of focus from the President, the highest authority mentioned in the question, to Mr. Račkauskas. Although included in the scope of reference as an advisor to the President, Mr. Račkauskas is not directly referred to in the question. Thus the respondent's move invokes the following

inference. Firstly, it makes the respondent's negation of the indicated contacts with the President's office exclude his possible contacts with the President himself. And secondly, it shows the respondent's avoidance to talk straightforwardly about such possible contacts to the members of the commission.

The respondent's equivocation in turn (2) can be considered unsuccessful as it does not slip unnoticed by the questioner 3. The latter resorts to a mild form of challenge by specifying the question in turn (4). This challenge does not present an open threat to the respondent's face as it would be in the case of a direct charge with equivocation. Nevertheless, the very fact that the questioner 3 clearly voices his intention to put the same question to the respondent again — 'I would like to specify the question' — shows that the questioner 3 means to sound demanding. Moreover, the questioner 3 makes it a constructive challenge by narrowing the scope of reference of the previous question to a single person, namely the President. This formulation of a question is effective to return the respondent's attention to the person — the President of the Republic — he tried to evade talking about in turn (2).

The effectiveness of the challenge in turn (3) is also confirmed by the further exchange between the respondent and the questioner 3 in turns (5) and (6). Moreover, it forces the respondent to change his line of equivocation which he does in turn (7). Here, the respondent chooses again a traditional way of evading a question, namely reference to the failure of memory: 'As far as I remember...'. His attempt fails as it was bound to because of being too obvious and too much exposed to challenge. Therefore, the subsequent challenge is strong and it comes even from two questioners. In turn (9) the questioner 1 warns the respondent about the amount of information that the commission has: '...our commission is not working for the first day and we have studied various information'. The questioner 2 echoes his colleague in turn (10) by appealing to the respondent's conscience: 'You promised to tell us only the truth and nothing else'.

The basis for the respondent's further desperate attempts to continue with equivocation becomes clearer only after the last piece of challenge is given by the questioner 3 in turn (12). What the questioner 3 does is to disambiguate the referent of the term "the President of the Republic", which seems to have been artificially made ambiguous by the respondent. At the time, when the respondent admits having had the indicated contacts with the President, the latter had been elected President but had not yet given oath as President. This fact serves the respondent to construct his last strategy of equivocation. More specifically, it enables the respondent to ignore "the presumption of relevance" (Sperber and Wilson, 1995), according to which for the participants of the proceedings the term "the President of the Republic" refers to the person who is in office at the time of the proceedings and whose suspicious activities are under investigation. After the questioner 3 uncovers in turn (12) the keystone of the respondent's equivocation, the latter is left with nothing to take hold of and comes up with a straightforward answer: "Yes".

4.2. Extract 2

(1) **Questioner 1:** Coming back to your conversation which was already made public two weeks ago; tell us is it your

conversation with Mr. Juzeliūnas. If you confirm that it was namely the conversation with him about the money that you called 'pieces' and it could be understood as thousands, did you receive this money in cash, or was this money transferred to the special account of the University of Klaipėda, which you also mention?

(2) **Respondent:** Again first of all I would like to see an exact transcript of my phone call about what happened half a ... ago...

Interrupted (*Author's remark*).

(3) **Questioner 1:** It was publicized, the honorable colleague, it was publicized... You heard it yourself at the Seimas (the Parliament (*Author's remark*)).

(4) **Respondent:** Yes, I heard, but would you, honorable Mr. Steponavičius, be able to answer in the exact chronological order what you spoke half a year ago with a certain person, just word for word, and in this case there are so many conversations, well, let us say, the authenticity has not been confirmed yet.

(5) **Questioner 1:** What would be your answer though?

(6) **Respondent:** To what question?

(7) **Questioner 2:** To this question.

(8) **Respondent:** 'Pieces', yes, they are thousands.

(9) **Questioner 1:** And how was the money received?

(10) **Respondent:** From where?

(11) **Questioner 1:** Well, I suggest not playing a cat and mouse game. You have to answer the question which has been put to you. Was the money for this conference transferred to the...the conference you mentioned... was transferred to the special account of the University of Klaipėda? Or did you receive it in cash and later used it for conferences or other needs?

(12) **Respondent:** Do you mean from Mr. Konradas Juzeliūnas? Mr. Konradas Juzeliūnas has covered 2 thousand litas of the travel expenses of a Dutch professor.

(transcript of the special parliamentary commission 11/17/2003).

Differently from the previous extract, the respondent of the extract 2 undertakes a more aggressive strategy of equivocation. In turn (2) he starts with a demand for the transcript of his phone call he is questioned about. Even after the questioner 1 denies in turn (3) the necessity for the respondent's demand – '...it was publicized... You heard it yourself...' – the respondent continues with his demanding and attacking strategy of equivocation. In turn (4) he rewords the question put to him by adding such phrases as "the exact chronological order" or "word for word". This exaggeration is meant to show that the question he receives is impossible to answer. Finally, he finishes his turn (4) with a challenge to the members of the commission: "...let us say, the authenticity has not been confirmed yet".

In comparison to the aggressive performance on the part of the respondent, the questioner 1 assumes a relatively more reserved tactics of challenge. In turn (3), he interrupts the respondent to remind him of the facts that the latter seems to be ignoring. In turn (5), the questioner 1 voices his determination to elicit the requested information: 'What would be your answer though?'. Similarly, in turn (9) he

specifies the question: 'And how was the money received?' Nevertheless, in spite of not sustaining the respondent's aggressive tone, the questioner 1 shows his willingness to stop the respondent's equivocation. It is seen in such moves as interruption, repetition – 'It was publicized, the honorable colleague, it was publicized...' – and a straightforward assertion – 'You heard it yourself at the Seimas'.

In the meantime the respondent undertakes quite a successful strategy of equivocation to cut the given question into small fragments. In doing so, he achieves the following result: the details distracted from the context appear irrelevant and the whole discussion turns into meaningless exchanges. For example, in turns (6) and (7) the respondent gives short questions in reply: 'To what question?' and 'From where?'. However, the most significant manifestation of this strategy appears in turn (8). Here, the respondent concentrates on a single word from the initial question – "pieces". Namely, he confirms the questioner's assumption that the term "pieces" refers to thousands and thereby adds nothing new regarding the requested information.

The culmination of this episode of the interview is reached in turn (11). After tolerating the respondent's aggressive form of equivocation for a considerable part of the episode, the questioner 1 radically changes his strategy by embarking on an open and strong challenge. Firstly, the questioner 1 resorts to metaphorical use which effectively strengthens his argument: 'Well, I suggest not playing a cat and mouse game'. Then he straightforwardly points out the responsibility the respondent has to assume: 'You have to answer the question which has been put to you'. Such a move is a highly face threatening act to the respondent, who, nonetheless, does not seem to adequately react to it. In turn (12) the respondent continues with the previously adopted strategy of equivocation to touch upon separate fragments of the initial question: 'Mr. Konradas Juzeliūnas has covered 2 thousands litas of the travel expenses of a Dutch professor'. Given that an intact "face" is one of the basic attributes of a successful political career in a democratic political system, an unconstrained sacrifice of one's "face" must be a very radical and unlikely choice. To try to explain it, a principle of cost-benefit calculus could be applied. If a politician prefers to lose "face" through an open challenge of his equivocation, it means that the benefit of not giving the information that is required is bigger than the damage of a bad reputation.

Conclusions

Equivocation is a widely spread discursive strategy among politicians and a sociolinguistic problem for the recipients of their discourse, namely the general public. Therefore, it is of primary importance to enlighten the general public about the manipulative and equivocal use of language by political and other public figures. The purpose of this study was to analyze how politicians and other state officials use their turns to evade the given questions and to challenge equivocation.

As long as it was a small scale qualitative analysis no far reaching generalization are possible. However, the following conclusions can be made. Firstly, the respondents equivocate

by making reference to the failure of memory, by claiming that the question has been answered, by attacking the questioners or the content of the questions. These techniques of equivocation are among the most typical in political contexts (Bull and Mayer, 1993). In addition, the respondents also use means of evading a question that have not been widely discussed. These are: resorting to ambiguity, ignoring the presumption of relevance and cutting the question into decontextualized meaningless fragments. The last strategy seemed to be the most fruitful in evading questions in this piece of data.

As far as the challenge to equivocation is concerned, the strategies vary on the basis of strength and aggressiveness. Interrupting the respondent, repeating the question or specifying the question are among the mild ways of challenge. Appealing to the respondent's conscience or sense of duty to give the requested information as well as openly pointing out his equivocation are stronger means of challenge used in the extracts discussed. It appears that a successful way of challenge is the one which allows the questioner to deprive the respondent of his basis of equivocation. In this study this strategy was more successful than an open threat to the respondent's face.

References

- Ainsworth-Vaughn, N. (2001). The Discourse of Medical Encounters. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* ed. Deborah Schiffrin et al. Malden (USA): Blackwell. 453-469.
- Bavelas, J. B. et al. (1990). *Equivocal Communication*. London: Sage.
- Blommaert, J. and Bulcaen, C. (1997). *Political Linguistics* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Bull, P. and Mayer, K. (1993). How not to Answer Questions in Political Interviews. *Political Psychology*. Vol. 14(4):651-666.
- Bull, P. (1998). Equivocation Theory and News Interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol. 17(1):36-51.
- Bull, P. (2000). Equivocation and the Rhetoric of Modernization: An Analysis of Televised Interviews With Tony Blair in the 1997 British General Election. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. Vol.19(2): 222-247.
- Cotter, C. (2001). Discourse and Media. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin et al. Malden (USA): Blackwell. 416-436.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fleischman, S. (2001). Language and Medicine. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden (USA): Blackwell. 470-502.
- Hutchby, I. and Drew, P. (1995). Conversation Analysis. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, ed. Jef Verschueren et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 182-189.
- Janicki, K. (1990). *Towards Non-Essentialist Sociolinguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Janicki, K. (1997). Political Correctness: Conflict-ridden Language, Language-ridden Conflict, or Both? In *Political Linguistics*. (eds.) Blommaert, J. and Bulcaen, C. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 296-312.
- Janicki, K. (1999). *Against Essentialism: Toward Language Awareness*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Janicki, K. (2002). A Hindrance to Communication: the Use of Difficult and Incomprehensible Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol.12 (2):194-217.
- Johnstone, B. (2000). *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Lakoff, G. (1996). *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know That Liberals Don't*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.
- Shuy, R. (2001). Discourse Analysis in Legal Context. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed. Deborah Schiffrin et al. Malden (USA): Blackwell. 437-452.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*. Vol. 4(2):249-283.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. (1995). Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Handbook of Pragmatics*, (eds.) Verschueren, J. et al. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 204-210.

Vilma Bijekienė

Išsukinėjimas ir atkirtis išsukinėjimui Seimo specialiosios parlamentinės komisijos diskurse

Santrauka

Šis straipsnis paremtas bendraisiais į problemų sprendimą orientuotais sociolingvistikos principais (Janicki 1990, 1999). Pagrindinis straipsnio tyrimo objektas – tai politiniame diskurse paplitusi ekvivokacija, t.y. išsukinėjimas ir tiesaus atsakymo vengimas (equivocation), kurie visuomenei kelia rimtą sociolingvistinę problemą. Tyrimo medžiagą sudaro dvi ištraukos iš Lietuvos Respublikos Seimo specialios laikinosios komisijos galimoms grėsmėms nacionaliniam saugumui ištirti oficialios stenogramos. Remiantis pokalbio analizės (conversation analysis) principais, straipsnyje nagrinėjama, kaip respondentai išnaudoja savo eilę kalbėti tam, kad išsiskytų nuo informacijos pateikimo. Taip pat analizuojama, kaip klausinėjantys panaudoja savąją eilę tam, kad pareikalautų atsakymo ir išgautų reikiamą informaciją.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2004 05
Parengtas spaudai 2004 12

The author

Vilma Bijekienė, a teacher of English at Vytautas Magnus University, Centre of Foreign Languages, Lithuania and a doctoral student at the University of Bergen, Department of English, Norway.

Main academic interests relate to the fields of sociolinguistics, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis with a particular focus on political discourse analysis as well as gender and discourse analysis. The author has made presentations at international conferences in Lithuania and abroad.

E-mail: Vilma.Bijekiene@eng.uib.no

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1

(1) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. Gerbiamasis komisare, sakysite prašom, ar jūs pats asmeniškai esate sulaukęs skambučių ar kitų pavedimų, kurie būtų buvę iš paties Prezidento arba jo patarėjų pusės ir būtų susiję užtariant arba proteguojant vieno ar kito rajoninio policijos komisariato komisarų.

(2) R. A. SENOVAITIS. Aš minėjau, kad neturėjau kontaktų nei su patarėju Račkausku, nei su kitais, kadangi nesu pažįstamas. Iš kitos pusės, jeigu ir būtent patarėjas generalinis komisaras ir kažką norėtų, tarp mūsų specifiniai santykiai, jis net ir norėdamas niekada nepaskambintų, nepaprašytų kažko.

(3) A. SAKALAS. Kas dar turite klausimų.

(4) A. KAŠĖTA Aš norėčiau patikslinti klausimą, ar jūs sulaukėte pačio Prezidento skambučio, dėl kokio nors klausimo.

(5) R. A. SENOVAITIS. Turite galvoje Respublikos Prezidento.

(6) A. KAŠĖTA Taip. Respublikos Prezidento.

(7) R. A. SENOVAITIS. Kiek pamenu tokių skambučių aš neturėjau.

(8) A. SAKALAS. Ponas Steponavičius.

(9) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. Mūsų komisija dirba ne prima diena, gerbiamasis komisareir mes esame susipažinę su įvairia informacija. Be abejo, mes turime padėti pliusą arba minuso ženklą ties viena ar kita informacija. Ar jūs galite patvirtinti, kad jūs nesate sulaukę skambučių iš Lietuvos Respublikos Prezidento, dėl Mažeikių policijos komisariato komisarų?

(10) A. SAKALAS. Jūs žadėjote sakyti tik tiesą ir nieko daugiau.

(11) R. A. SENOVAITIS. Aš turiu prisiminti, nes tų skambučių daug ir įvairių. Prezidentas neskambina šiaip pavaduotojams ar kitiems kolegoms. Aš jau prieš tai esu jums atsakęs, gerbiamasis pirmininke ir komisijai į tą klausimą, kad aš nepamenu skambučio, kad būtų skambinta jo Ekscelencijos Prezidento man, juolab..... Galima patikslinti.

(12) A. KAŠĖTA Dabar noriu užduoti patikslinantį klausimą. Ar jūs sulaukėte R. Pakso skambučio, jam dar nedavus priesaikos kaip Respublikos Prezidentui?

(13) R. A. SENOVAITIS. Taip.

APPENDIX 2

(1) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. Grįžtant prie jūsų pokalbio, kuris yra paviešintas dar prieš porą savaitių. Sakysite, ar jūsų pokalbis su ponu Juzeliūnu, jeigu jūs patvirtinat, kad tai buvo būtent pokalbis su juo dėl pinigų, kur jūs įvardinot "štukomis" ir tai galima būtų suprasti tūkstančiais, ar jūs tuos pinigus gavote grynais, ar tie pinigai buvo pervesti į Klaipėdos universiteto specialiąją tikslinę sąskaitą, apie kurią jūs užsimenate?

(2) E. SKARBALIUS. Vėl visų pirma aš norėčiau matyti tikslų savo pokalbį apietai, kas vyko prieš pusę...

(3) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. Jis buvo paskelbtas... Gerbiamasis kolega, jis buvo paskelbtas... Jūs pats Seime girdėjote tai.

(4) E. SKARBALIUS. Taip, aš girdėjau, bet ar jūs, gerbiamasis Steponavičiaus, galėtumėt chronologiškai tiksliai atsakyti, ką jūs šnekėjote prieš pusę metų su vienu ar kitu asmeniu, žodis į žodį, o šiuo atveju tiek pokalbių vadinkim, autentiškumas nėra kol kas patvirtintas.

(5) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. Koks jūsų būtų atsakymas vis dėlto?

(6) E. SKARBALIUS. Į kokį klausimą?

(7) A. SAKALAS. Į šį klausimą.

(8) E. SKARBALIUS. "Štukos", taip, yra tūkstančiai.

(9) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. O kaip tie pinigai buvo gauti?

(10) E. SKARBALIUS. Iš kur?

(11) G. STEPONAVIČIUS. Na, aš siūlau nežaisti nei katės, nei pelės žaidimo. Jūs turit atsakyti į klausimą, kuris jums yra suformuluotas. Ar pinigai šiai konferencijai buvo pervesti į jūsų minimą konferenciją buvo pervesti į Klaipėdos universiteto specialiąją tikslinę sąskaitą, ar jūs juos gavote grynais ir po to su jais pasielgėt konferencijoms ar kitoms reikmėms?

(12) E. SKARBALIUS. Būtent iš pono Konrado Juzeliūno? Konradas Juzeliūnas yra apmokėjęs 2 tūkst. litų Olandijos profesoriaus atskridimo išlaidas.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.6.43197