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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

OBJECTIVES AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH

Richard Weaver's theory of argument has been widely discussed, quoted, criticized, and applied.\(^1\) Although Weaver's theses on the relationships between one's argument source and one's political position and on the hierarchical order of ethical argument have been criticized by many, his typology of different argument sources/types has been used frequently as a tool for rhetorical analysis. However, most applicants of Weaver's argument types merely employ the typology as an analytical tool without putting the typology into a theoretical framework.\(^2\) For example, these researchers hesitate to entirely accept Weaver's theory regarding hierarchical order of ethical arguments and the relationship between one's rhetoric and one's political position. Yet, they continue to employ Weaver's typology of argument sources in their work. The crux of the issue, then, is that these researchers depart from Weaver's theoretical framework, yet they apply his typology of argument without providing an alternative theoretical framework to take its place.

In view of this problem, this research has two major objectives: to examine major theses of Weaver's theory of argument, and to support Weaver's original argument types with another theoretical
framework. More specifically, the first objective is to understand how the rhetoric of liberals and conservatives might be similar/different in terms of Weaver's argument types. The second objective is to ground Weaver's typology of argument in Richard Whately's doctrine of presumption. That is, this study tries to examine whether those with political presumption and those with burden of proof might argue similarly/differently in terms of Weaver's argument types.

Weaver's theory of argument makes three major claims. First, the type of argument one habitually uses reflects one's political position. Second, argument from definition is generally used by conservative advocates while argument from circumstance is generally used by liberals. Third, argument from definition is the most ethical type of argument while argument from circumstance is the least ethical. In addition to argument from definition and argument from circumstance, Weaver also identified other types of arguments such as argument from similitude, argument from cause-to-effect, and the rhetorical-historical argument. The present research pays major attention to argument from definition and argument from circumstance because these two types of arguments have direct and ontological relationships to the conservative position and the liberal position. These relationships will be elaborated in the next chapter. Nevertheless, other types of arguments are also noted when they are present in the discourse. The present research also focuses on the first and the second theses—that is, how rhetoric reflects political position, and whether argument from definition is often used by
conservatives while argument from circumstance is often used by liberals. This focus is justified in terms of the aforementioned objectives.

While most research applying Weaver's typology of argument analyzes the discourse of individuals, the present research analyzes the discourse of political parties. This study analyzes how a conservative party and a liberal party argue, and how a party with presumption and a party without presumption argue their causes. The ultimate objective is to determine whether Weaver's major theses hold when the discourse of political parties is examined closely.

It should be noted at the outset that Weaver's conception and definition of liberal vs. conservative is somewhat different from the general conception of these terms. Weaver's notion of liberal vs. conservative has a very strong normative tone, which will be discussed in the next chapter. One task of this research will compare whether what is "generally" considered as conservative/liberal is still conservative/liberal according to Weaverian definitions. Such a comparison will aid in the task of exploring the relationship between political position and argument types, that is, whether one's rhetoric reflects one's political position, and, if it does, how rhetoric reflects one's political position.

To pursue this end, the editorials of two newspapers representing the ruling party (the Kuo-min-tang, abbreviated as KMT) and the opposition party (the Democratic Progressive Party, abbreviated as DPP) in Taiwan will be analyzed and compared. The ruling party
(the KMT) is "generally" considered as conservative while the opposition party (the DPP) is "generally" considered as more liberal. This research seeks to determine whether the KMT is still conservative and the DPP is still liberal in the Weaverian sense, that is, in respect to their argument types; and to explore whether there is discrepancy between general conception of the two parties' political positions and Weaver's definitions of liberal vs. conservative positions.

Once this determination has been made, Whately's theory of presumption will help to go beyond Weaver by grounding Weaver's original typology of argument in another theoretical framework. Whately (1963) identified six major types of presumption: presumption in favor of existing institutions, presumption of innocence, presumption against a paradox, presumptions against and for Christianity, presumption against logic, presumptions for and against the learned. Whately suggested that whoever is arguing against a given presumption has the burden of proof:

There is a Presumption in favour of every existing institution. Many of these (we will suppose, the majority) may be susceptible of alteration for the better; but still the "Burden of proof" lies with him who proposes an alteration; simply, on the ground that since a change is not a good in itself, he who demands a change should show cause for it. (114)

On this view, the KMT government, because it represents the status quo, has presumption while the DPP, as the opposition party, has the burden of proof. This will be further explained in Chapter IV (Backgrounds of the KMT and the DPP).
Part of the goal of this research is to examine how the party with/without presumption would argue their causes in terms of Weaver's argument typology. Will the political status quo use one type of argument more often than the other types? Will a political opposition group with the burden of proof use one type of argument more often than the other types? Are the political status quo and political opposition groups different or similar in argument types? How are the political status quo and the opposition party different or similar in constructing arguments and defending their causes? The answers to these questions would tell us how political parties with presumption and those without presumption approach their audiences.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

A number of assumptions ground this research. First, there are important similarities as well as differences in rhetorical practices between/among different cultures for at least one major reason: human beings have the potential of having similar experiences, regardless of cultural/ethnic origins. This assumption needs to be emphasized because when people talk about cultural study or cross-cultural study, people tend to pay more attention to cultural differences than to cultural similarities. Although understanding of cultural differences is necessary, cultural differences should not be overemphasized as to blind our view of how similarly human experiences can be.
People from different cultures may perceive the same thing in a somewhat different way. Nevertheless, as human beings, individuals have the potential of experiencing things similarly and embracing what others might perceive from similar perspectives. This is the foundation that makes human communication possible. Indeed, were it otherwise, communication could not take place. As Joseph Pilotta and Algis Mickunas (1990) put it: "... communication is possible not only because we have a world of common objects, but primarily because we can have the same experience, which can be directly communicated" (14). Pilotta also contends (1986) that "the universality of human sensuous process is such that ... each experiencing subject can take the same perspective to the same thing and experience it in the same sensuous way" (384). Thus, although Weaver's theory was developed in America during the post-World War II era, its applicability may well transcend its original place and time of invention.

A second assumption of this study is that spoken discourse and written discourse are much the same from an argumentation perspective. Spoken discourse might be perceived by the audience somewhat differently from a written text because of its accompanying prosodic and paraverbal content. However, as far as the argument itself is concerned, spoken discourse and written discourse are essentially the same. There is no one particular type of argument or proof that is applicable only in spoken discourse while not applicable in written discourse. In fact, even when rhetorical analysts are analyzing spoken discourse, they frequently analyze the
written/printed text itself rather than the entire setting or context of the speech. Based on this assumption, although Weaver's theory seems to have been developed with major attention to spoken discourse, its applicability to written discourse should be granted. In fact, in his own analysis of Lincoln's and Burke's discourse, Weaver included written discourse as objects of analysis (such as letters).

A third assumption of this study is that the presence of strong, invention-imbued, oral and written rhetoric is an index of a society's level of democracy. "Rhetoric operates in freedom and for freedom" (Eubanks & Baker 1962, 162). It is only in a democratic society, where freedom of expression and where anti-establishment rhetoric is protected, that rhetoric can flourish **publicly**. Rhetoric is not only protected by a democratic society but also helps a society moving toward democracy. In a democratic society, rhetoric becomes the dialogue between/among different groups of people, which further enhances the democratization process.8

The **quality** of rhetoric in a totalitarian society may be significantly different from that in a democratic society. By "quality of rhetoric" I mean in a totalitarian society we are less likely to see **argumentative exchange publicly**--especially when the issues are politically sensitive. We are also less likely to see **dialogue** between the status quo and the opposition groups. Public debates on politically sensitive issues are rare as communication channels are often tightly controlled in a totalitarian society.

This does not mean that in a totalitarian society there is no rhetoric at all. In a totalitarian society, rhetoric might exist in a
different way—for example, it might exist more privately or secretly than publicly. The outlet of rhetoric might also be different in a totalitarian society. For example, written discourse might be a "safer" outlet than oral discourse in a totalitarian society. In the Medieval Period, under Christian authority, the ancient Greek democratic institutions declined. Written discourse—namely, Dictamin, or the art of letter writing—took the place of oral discourse as a major outlet of rhetoric. In ancient and traditional China, under the myth of "Son of Heaven" authority and the imperial institution, people were expected to take orders rather than encouraged to speak out. Thus, oral discourse did not get a chance to flourish in traditional China. These examples suggest that the type and variety of rhetorical forms and the level of rhetorical exchange in the public domain are good sources of finding out how democratic a society is.

A fourth assumption of this study is that rhetoric has substantive content as well as instrumental content. Although rhetoric is an important instrument in a democratic society, this does not mean that rhetoric has only instrumental content. Rhetoric has substantive content as well. We often hear people say: "it is not rhetorical, it is real," or "it is mere rhetoric." The underlying assumption of such statements is that rhetoric is not real, and rhetoric won't really tell us anything. That is, rhetoric is viewed as merely an instrument of the rhetor to achieve certain ends. Such a view also implies a distrust of the rhetor's intention or sincerity and a speculation about the facticity of rhetorical content.
It is contended in this research that no matter how "unreal" rhetoric is, it always tells us something—at least, it offers clues about what the rhetor thinks or perceives about certain issues. Through the selection of topics, the construction of arguments, and the presentation of proofs, rhetorical content does convey to us how things are perceived by the rhetor. Rhetoric is thus real in its own right. It is not invented in a vacuum. The invention of rhetoric always involves a connection to things/issues in the real world.

It is with these four assumptions in mind that this study compares the discourse of conservative party vs. liberal party in Taiwan, and the discourse of the party with presumption vs. the discourse of the party with burden of proof in terms of Weaver's typology of arguments. Such comparisons will help us understand the relationships between political position (conservative vs. liberal) and argument types, and the relationships between political presumption (with presumption vs. with burden of proof) and argument types. This study not only re-examines Weaver's major theses in terms of their applicability to rhetoric of political parties, but also goes beyond Weaver by grounding Weaver's typology of argument in another theoretical framework.

In the next chapter, Weaver's theory of rhetoric in general and theory of argument in specific are presented and discussed. In Chapter III, this research tries to go beyond Weaver by introducing Richard Whately's doctrine of presumption and discussing different possible relationships between presumption and argument types. Chapter IV provides backgrounds of the KMT and the DPP and
justifies the selection of their discourse for analysis in this study. Chapter V discusses the procedures of analysis, provides theoretical foundations of the procedures, and justifies the selection of newspaper editorials as objects of analysis.

Analysis of the discourse of the KMT and the DPP are presented from Chapter VI to Chapter IX. Chapter VI gives an overview of the analysis results. In this chapter, major figures--such as ratio or percentage of argument types--are presented. In-depth analysis are left to subsequent chapters. Arguments from definition/genus used in the discourse of the two parties are discussed and analyzed in Chapter VII and Chapter VIII. Because argument from definition/genus is the type of argument most frequently used in the discourse of the two parties, it takes two chapters to cover these arguments--with different theses in each chapter. Arguments from circumstance used in the discourse of the two parties are analyzed and presented in Chapter IX. In Chapter X, theoretical implications of the analysis results are discussed and conclusions are drawn.
Notes

1 There are numerous works on Weaver from the 1960s to 1980s. Among those 23 were done in the 1960s, 44 in the 1970s, and 21 in the 1980s. The bibliography provides detailed citations of these works.


4 The ruling party is generally considered as more conservative in the sense that it is more hesitant and unwilling to make policy changes. In contrast, the opposition party is generally considered as more liberal in the sense that it advocates immediate change of those policies no longer meeting contemporary needs. Like most other parties, there are liberal faction and conservative faction in the KMT and the DPP. However, when the two parties are compared, the KMT is more conservative and the DPP is more liberal in the aforementioned sense.


6 For example, Robert Oliver (1971) points to several basic differences in the perception of communication and rhetoric in the early Western and Eastern cultures, and concludes that theses two cultures contrasted significantly in the focal points of their theories of communication and rhetoric. See Robert Oliver *Communication and Culture in Ancient India and China* (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1971): 1-11 & 258-272. In comparing communication styles of Americans and Japanese, Dean Barnlund suggests that when members of the two cultures engage in communication, some of their differing communication styles clash sharply. See Dean Barnlund,

Scholars have challenged overemphasis on either cultural similarities or cultural differences. For example, Michael H. Prosser suggests that a balanced cultural theory of similarities and differences is needed. See Michael H. Prosser, The Cultural Dialogue-An Introduction to Intercultural Communication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1978). Rita Atwood and Brenda Dervin challenges the conventional emphasis on sociocultural dimensions (such as race) as predictors of information seeking, instead, they suggest that "situation movement state" as a stronger predictor. See Rita Atwood and Brenda Dervin "Challenges to Sociocultural Predictors of Information Seeking: A Text of Race Versus Situation Movement State," Communication Yearbook, vol. 5 ed. M. Burgoon (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1982): 549-69.


8 When democracy is inhibited, rhetoric repairs to style and delivery. For example, with the decline of democratic institutions and the influence of Christian authority during the Medieval Period, style and delivery became the foci of rhetoric. The rise of "Dictamin" (that is, the art of letter writing)--with major emphasis on style and arrangement--became another outlet for rhetoric.
CHAPTER II
RICHARD WEAVER'S THEORY OF RHETORIC

Weaver's well-known works include Ideas Have Consequences (1948), The Ethics of Rhetoric (1953), Visions of Order (1964), and his dissertation, published under the title, The Southern Tradition at Bay (1968). Other than these works, Weaver wrote numerous articles. Two anthologies collecting his articles are Life Without Prejudice and Other Essays (1965) and Language is Sermonic (1970). The latter deals exclusively with his works on rhetoric. The Ethics of Rhetoric is probably his most scholarly work in which his theory of argument is proposed and elaborated.¹

Described by Richard Johannesen (1966) as a "Platonic idealist and political conservative,"² Weaver was concerned with developing an ethical rhetorical stance for conservatives—or specifically, the Republican Party—to enhance the Party's success in the post-World War II period. In view of the decline of ethical standards, cultural values, and the rhetoric of his time, Weaver sought to find a proper way of using rhetoric as a tool of reviving and maintaining traditional cultural values. In Platonic Idealism, Weaver found the grounds for his conservative position and his theory of rhetoric. In this chapter, to fully understand Weaver's theory of rhetoric, we have to first understand Weaver as a conservative and as a Platonic
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Idealist. Then, we will look at how Weaver conceived rhetoric, how his theory of argument is laid out, and how he defined conservative vs. liberal. Finally, the critique on Weaver's theory of argument is presented and examined.

CONSERVATISM AND PLATONIC IDEALISM

Weaver's conservative position and his Platonism are inseparable. Weaver's conservative position is best shown in two of his works: Ideas Have Consequences (1948) and Visions of Order (1964), in which he strongly criticized the degeneration of American society in particular and Western culture in general during the post-World War II period. Weaver was deeply concerned with societal stability and social order. He condemned the doctrines of relativism, nominalism, general semanticism, pragmatism, utilitarianism, and materialism on the grounds that they resulted in social instability and the degeneration of traditional values. For example, Weaver saw relativism as a major cause of social instability because it operates in the realm of becoming and it denies any fixed, stable value.

Relativism denies outright that there are any absolute truths, any fixed principles, or any standards beyond what one may consider his convenience. A theory is true only relative to the point of view of the individual, or to the time in which it is asserted, or to the circumstances which prevail at the moment... Relativism is actually the abdication of truth. (1961, 4)

For Weaver, relativism resulted in contemporary American liberalism or middle-of-the-roadism. "The greatest injury that the idea of relativism had done to political thinking . . . lies in the encouragement it gives to middle-of-the-roadism" (1961, 5). Weaver
wrote about the consequence of such middle-of-the-roadism or liberalism:

It is a politics of infinite dispersion. Everything goes flying off in its own direction; liberalism becomes ever more liberal; hierarchies are toppled so that there is no longer any means of judging one thing as better or worse than another. Moral order is collapsed into something like the universe of modern astrophysics, with everything moving away centrifugally, nobody knows where or why. (Modern Age, 1960, 320)

Weaver saw the importance of establishing some scheme of stable values and ideals for establishing and maintaining social order. In Platonic Idealism, Weaver found both a source of social order and the basis for an ethical rhetoric.

Like Plato, Weaver held that things have a nature, principles, and essences which are independent of human judgment. These principles and essences are ultimate, finite, and stable. They are ultimate in the sense that they are not contingent upon such external factors as time, place, and people. They are intrinsic in that they exist in the object itself. And they are finite in the sense that they accept only a limited number of possibilities. Relativism, nominalism, and general semanticism, on the other hand, argue an infinite-valued position which, for Weaver, may result in instability of values and may eventually lead to no value at all. Weaver saw relativism as an inability and/or unwillingness to take a position or make a commitment and he believed such a failing to be unethical. In addition, relativism argues that things should be treated as a matter of degrees.3 And these degrees are potentially infinite. For Weaver, relativism is one of the main reasons that caused declining
ethical and moral responsibilities. The essences of a thing/issue are also stable because they do not change from time to time. For relativists, things are in a state of flux. As a result, human subjective judgment plays a key role in determining what things are. And, since people vary in their judgment, how things are perceived will vary.

By contrast, Platonic idealism holds that principles and essences are ultimate and finite. Essences, then, become a stable force of social order; and social order is a major tenet of conservatism. "Order . . . is the goal which most if not all conservative thinking has in view" (1960, 318). For Weaver, a true conservative is a Platonist who is concerned with the essences of a thing/issue. Weaver defined the true conservative as one

who sees the universe as a paradigm, of which the phenomenology of the world is a sort of continuing approximation. Or, to put this another way, he sees it as a set of definitions which are struggling to get themselves defined in the real world. (1953, 112)

In *Life Without Prejudice* (1965), Weaver also contended that "a conservative is a realist, who believes that there is a structure of reality independent of his own will and desire" (158-9). This independent reality is "amenable by him [the individual] in many ways, but it cannot be changed radically and arbitrarily." In other words, "The conservative holds that man [sic] in this world cannot make his will his law without any regard to limits and to the fixed nature of things" (158-9).
In Platonism, the essence of a thing or issue is transcendental, existing as a participant in its own paradigm or perfect exemplar in some non-spatio temporal realm. A thing or concept's essence manifests itself in terms of an ideal Form toward which the thing or concept strives in order to attain perfection. According to Weaver, this ontology has direct implications for political theory and ethics: "... the conservative image of history arises out of primal affection and a desire to follow transcendental ideals of justice. And it is this that gives content to the philosophy of conservatism" (1960, 319).

Consistent with the Platonic emphasis on values and on their hierarchy, Weaver argued that conservatism had its passion for "an order reflecting a meaningful hierarchy of the goods" (1960, 318). For Plato, justice is at the apex of a hierarchy of values. So it is in Weaver's vision of the ideal order. A society with a hierarchy of values is, for Weaver, a society of differentiation which "afford[s] pleasure to the moral imagination as an aesthetic design affords rest to the eye" (1964, 16). In a society of differentiation:

A just man finds satisfaction in the knowledge that society has various roles for various kinds of people and that they in the performance of these roles create a kind of symphony of labor, play, and social life. There arises in fact a distinct pleasure from knowing that society is structured, diversified, balanced, and complex. (1964, 16)

For Weaver, a society of differentiation is a society of order. A differentiated society is a society embodying a hierarchy of values which ensure justice of a society. Weaver's emphasis and belief in justice is consistent with the Platonic tradition.
WEAVER'S CONCEPTION OF RHETORIC

In The Ethics of Rhetoric, Weaver defined rhetoric as "truth plus its artful presentation" (15). This definition is in line with the Platonic tradition that knowledge is a prerequisite for genuine rhetoric. Knowledge of an issue/thing is obtained through rhetorical invention—or more specifically, obtained through dialectic. In addition to the emphasis on knowledge, Weaver was aware that dialectically obtained knowledge must be artfully presented so to move the audience.

Weaver's definition of rhetoric is also classical in the sense that he sees rhetoric as the art of persuasion:

Rhetoric is anciently and properly defined as the art of persuasion. We may deduce from this that it is essentially concerned with producing movement, which may take the form of a change of attitude or the adoption of a course of action or both. This art, whether it presents itself in linguistic or in other form . . . meets the person to whom it is addressed and takes him where the rhetor wishes him to go, even if that "going" is nothing more than an intensification of feeling about something. This means that rhetoric, consciously employed, is never innocent of intention, but always has as its object the exerting of some kind of compulsion. (1959, 20)

Rhetoric is never innocent of intention because rhetoric aims to move people. This movement can include different levels—an attitudinal level, an emotional level, and a behavioral level. Weaver broke with the general semanticists who suggested there could be a dispassionate or antiseptic use of language. Weaver strongly held that language is sermonic and asserted that objective use of language is impossible. He said that "... it impressed me as impossible and even ridiculous that the utterances of men could be neutral" (1970,
221). Language is always a "carrier of tendency" (1970, 222). The following frequently quoted passage shows clearly his position:

We are all of us preachers in private or public capacities. We have no sooner uttered words than we have given impulse to other people to look at the world, or some small part of it, in our way. Thus caught up in a great web of inter-communication and inter-influence, we speak as rhetoricians affecting one another for good or ill. (1970, 224)

For Weaver, all language involves a persuasive dimension. Thus, in our daily communication, we are all "rhetors" who try to persuade others into some kind of movement. This sermonic nature of rhetoric is related to another character of rhetoric that Weaver emphasizes: the axiological nature of rhetoric.

Because language/rhetoric is always intentional, a rhetor should always be responsible for what is said. Weaver agreed with Quintilian that a true orator is a "good man skilled in speaking"--good in his formed character and right in his ethical philosophy" (1970, 224). In a concluding remark in Language is Sermonic, he said:

Finally, we must never lose sight of the order of values as the ultimate sanction of rhetoric. No one can live a life of direction and purpose without some scheme of values. As rhetoric confronts us with choices involving values, the rhetorician is a preacher to us, noble if he tries to direct our passion toward noble ends and base if he tries to direct our passion to confuse and degrade us. (1970, 225)

Because rhetoric embodies some scheme of values, the ends of rhetoric should be of our concern. Weaver held that "rhetoric at its truest seeks to perfect men by showing them better versions of themselves, links in that chain extending up toward the ideal . . . " (1953, 24-25). Concomitant with the intentional nature and
axiological nature of Weaver's conception of rhetoric, Weaver saw rhetoric as advisory in that it performs the function of advising people toward some action and hence harbors ethical dimensions:

Rhetoric seen in the whole conspectus of its function is an art of emphasis embodying an order of desire. Rhetoric is advisory; it has the office of advising men with reference to an independent order of goods and with reference to their particular situation as it relates to these. The honest rhetorician therefore has two things in mind: a vision of how matters should go ideally and ethically and, a consideration of the special circumstances of his auditors. Toward both of these he has a responsibility. (1970, 54)

Weaver's persistent emphasis on the intentional nature, axiological nature, and advisory nature of rhetoric tells us that rhetoric has a very close tie with society and culture, and a rhetor must always assume his/her social responsibility. By examining more closely Weaver's conception of this relationship between rhetoric and culture, we can attain a better understanding of his conception of rhetoric.

RHETORIC AND CULTURE

To understand how Weaver perceived the relationship between rhetoric and culture, we have to first understand how he perceived culture. Weaver defined culture as follows:

... the collective consciousness of the group creates a mode of looking at the world or arrives at some imaginative visual bearing. It "sees" the world metaphorically according to some felt need of the group, and this entails an ordering which denotes dissatisfaction with "things as they are." (Visions of Order, 1964, 10)
In other words, culture represents the vision of a group of people and this vision entails how the group thinks things should be ordered. "There is at the heart of every culture a center of authority from which there proceed subtle and pervasive pressures upon us to conform and to repel the unlike as disruptive" (1964, 11). At this center of authority, there lies a "tyrannizing image."

This image is the ideal of its excellence. The forms that it can take and the particular manifestations that it can find are various. In some instances it has been a religious ritual; in others a sacred scripture; in others a literature which everyone is expected to know; codes of conduct (and even of warfare) may be the highest embodied form. (1964, 11)

The manifestation of the tyrannizing image of a culture is symbolic in the sense that it represents some scheme of values upheld by a culture. In some instances, this tyrannizing image is presented through "uncontested terms." Uncontested terms (or God terms) embody some values consensually upheld by a culture. Uncontested terms are usually presented without further explanation or argument.

Rhetoric is an important means through which the tyrannizing image of a culture is conveyed--either consciously or unconsciously. Rhetoric is the force that binds a culture together. Weaver argued in both *Ideas Have Consequences* and *Language is Sermonic* that rhetoric is the vehicle of order. Thus Weaver assigned to rhetoric a special role in resolving the cultural crisis of his time. In his chapter, "The Cultural Role of Rhetoric" (1970, 160-184), Weaver first tried to prove the proposition that "in the social realm dialectic unaided by rhetoric is subversive." Then he tried to show that "Modern (or
General) Semantics is a modern attempt to exalt pure dialectic at the expense of traditional rhetoric." General Semantics' emphasis on pure dialectic, for Weaver, is "one of the things eating away the fibre of our society" (1970, 160). Weaver offers Socrates as an example of a subversive dialectician. By applying his dialectical skill to persons and institutions of his time, Socrates became an enemy of the ancient Greek society. Socrates was charged with being a subverter and a corrupter by the Anthenians. He was literally charged as "a transgressor and a busybody, investigating things beneath the earth and in the heavens, and making the worse appear the better reason and teaching these things to others" (1970, 166).

Weaver contended that pure dialectic is subversive because it does not deal with the real world.

... dialectic, when not accompanied by a historical consciousness and responsibility, works to dissolve those opinions, based partly on feeling, which hold a society together. It tends, therefore, to be essentially revolutionary and without commitment to practical realities. (1970, 182)

Dialectic is "abstract reasoning upon the basis of propositions" (1970, 162). Dialectic is epistemological and logical; it is concerned with "discriminating into categories and knowing definitions" (174). Although dialectic helps to promote understanding in the realm of thought, it cannot move people to action. Weaver held that "the end of living is activity and not mere cognition" (174). Dialectic ends at the level of cognition. Weaver thus concluded that a society cannot live without rhetoric because rhetoric links dialectically obtained understanding to the real world and to real world issues. "Rhetoric,
on the other hand, tries to bring opinion into closer line with the truth which dialectic pursues. It is therefore cognizant of the facts of situations and it is at least understanding of popular attitudes" (1970, 182).

It should be noted that at this point Weaver associated rhetoric with historical consciousness (or memory) and sentiment. "Rhetoric speaks to man in his whole being and out of his whole past and with reference to values which only a human being can intuit" (1970, 183-4). Weaver contended that "if Plato provided the reasoning, Paul and Augustine supplied the persuasion" (177). Because Paul and Augustine showed us the importance of speaking to "feeling," "Christianity provided all that Greek dialectic left out. It spoke to the feelings" (176). Implicit in these arguments is that Weaver saw the importance of both invention and style in a sound rhetoric. While Plato provided the reasoning for rhetorical invention, Paul and Augustine provided style to present the dialectically obtained argument artfully.

Weaver contended that the decay of Western culture is closely connected with the decline of rhetoric (177) and the rise of pure dialectic. Weaver saw rhetoric as "the most humanistic of all the disciplines" (183). Weaver saw the recovery of social order and cultural values has to lie in the recovery of rhetoric.

THEORY OF ARGUMENT

While rhetoric can tie a culture together, rhetoric can also tear it apart. The latter is a result of an unethical use of rhetoric. Weaver
sought to establish a theory in which ethical rhetoric and unethical rhetoric can be distinguished. The result is his theory of argument.

In The Ethics of Rhetoric (1953), Weaver presented his well-known classification of arguments. He identified three major types of arguments: argument from definition/genus, argument from similitude, and argument from circumstance. Argument from definition/genus is an argument form constructed on the basis of the essential nature of a thing or issue. A statement like, "Abortion should be legally banned because it is basically a killing of a life," will belong to this category because in this statement, the nature of abortion is defined as killing a life. Argument from similitude is an argument form constructed on the basis of the correspondence of two things or issues. An example of this type of argument is: "We strongly oppose to the U.S. involvement in the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait because we don't want to see another Vietnam War." Argument from circumstance is an argument grounded in present condition. An example argument is: "A woman should have the right to make her abortion decision under the circumstance that the pregnancy is the result of rape."

As mentioned earlier, Weaver was concerned with the ethical use of rhetoric. In this book, he placed these three types of arguments in a hierarchical order. Argument from definition/genus is the most ethical form of argument, followed by argument from similitude. Argument from circumstance is the least ethical among the three. Weaver grounded his hierarchical order of arguments in Platonic philosophy in which the essence of a thing/issue is rigorously sought.
Argument from definition/genus is most ethical because its argument is constructed on the basis of the essence and nature of a thing/issue. Argument from definition is different from argument from genus as the former requires the rhetor to define the classification during the rhetorical process while the latter assumes that the classification has already existed in an audience's mind. They are both concerned with the nature, essence, and principle of a thing/issue. Those who habitually argue from genus tend to be idealists in their personal philosophy and tend to be conservatives in political stance. For Weaver, a true conservative habitually argues from definition/genus. Weaver gave Abraham Lincoln as an example of a rhetor who constantly employed argument from definition.

Argument from circumstance is considered by Weaver to be the least ethical type of argument, for it only takes emergent circumstances and present situation into account with no regard for the essential nature of an issue. It is a subspecies of argument from cause and effect and is even less ethical than argument from cause and effect because it fails to explain the cause. "It is the least philosophical of all sources of argument, since theoretically it stops at the level of perception of fact" (57). Weaver argued that this type of argument is mainly employed by liberals and pragmatists. Edmund Burke was considered by Weaver as a liberal according to Burke's constant use of argument from circumstance.

Burke is widely respected as a conservative, yet Weaver pointed out that Burke habitually used argument from circumstance. Abraham Lincoln, although he has become a patron for liberals and
pragmatists, habitually used argument from definition. Weaver concluded that ". . . a man's method of argument is a truer index in his beliefs than his explicit profession of principles" (58). This conclusion involves two levels of theses. First, one's rhetoric reflects his/her philosophical and political stance. And second, one's rhetoric is a truer index of his/her beliefs than one's expressed political position. These assumptions have been criticized by some scholars, as we shall see later.

Another major type of argument discussed in The Ethics of Rhetoric is that from similitude. This is also an ethical type of argument next to argument from genus/definition. "Whereas those who argue from genus argue from a fixed class, those who argue from similitude invoke essential (though not exhaustive) correspondence. . . . this type of argument is used widely by poets and religionists" (1953, 56). Uses of analogy and metaphor belong to this category. Weaver considered that John Bunyan and Emerson constantly used argument from similitude.

Argument from definition/genus, from circumstance, and from similitude are three major types of argument that Weaver discussed in The Ethics of Rhetoric. Two other types of arguments were discussed in his later works: argument from authority and testimony, and argument from history (or rhetorical-historical argument). While arguments from definition, from circumstance, and from similitude depend on internal sources, argument from authority and testimony depends solely on external source (1970, 209-210). They are, in Aristotle's term, inartistic proofs.6 They are mostly evaluated
in terms of how credible the authority or the source of testimony is. A reference to Bible is an example of argument from authority.

Rhetorical-historical argument was developed later in his life. It was mainly presented in *Language is Sermonic* and "Two Orators." This is a composite argument combining argument from definition and from historical circumstance. While the former tells people what it is, the latter relates people to real world experiences. This type of composite argument reflects Weaver's effort to make dialectic and rhetoric go hand in hand.

Weaver's theory of argument is grounded in his Platonism. His arrangement of these three types of arguments into a hierarchical order reflects his Platonic heritage in at least in three ways. First, it shows Weaver's Platonic belief in essence. Things, including political philosophies, are believed to have natures or essences. "Definition is an attempt to capture essence. . . . Definitions accordingly deal with fundamental and unchanging properties" (1970, 209). Second, Weaver's theory of argument reflects an emphasis on a hierarchy of values. Argument from definition, circumstance, and similitude are in fact three basic ways of understanding the world of reality: being, cause, and relationship. The reality of being is constant and fundamental, while reality of cause belongs to the realm of flux, and constant change. Weaver placed argument from definition on the top of the hierarchy because argument from definition seeks to deal with essence rather than appearance. For Weaver, such a hierarchy is important for distinguishing ethical rhetoric from unethical rhetoric. And third, Weaver's theory reflects his quest for order which is
equivalent to the quest for "justice" in Plato. At this point, Weaver's theory is axiological and normative in nature. Weaver's theory tells us what ought to be rather than what things are.

DEFINING CONSERVATIVE AND LIBERAL

Weaver's definitions of conservative and liberal are not quite the same as general contemporary conceptions of the two terms. At the same time, his conceptions of the two terms do not depart totally from such general conceptions either. One way to distinguish conservative vs. liberal positions is that a political conservative is more suspicious and cautious of making change while a political liberal is more open and ready to make change in the realm of political institutions and policies. In other words, a conservative is more likely to maintain and defend what originally is/are, while a liberal is more ready to accept other possibilities. This general conception of liberal vs. conservative positions is the result of consulting several dictionaries and several works on liberalism and conservatism.7 For example, in The American Political Dictionary, conservatism is defined as "Defense of the status quo against major changes in the political, economic, or social institutions of a society" (1985, 7); liberalism is defined as "A political view that seeks to change the political, economic, or social status quo to foster the development and well-being of the individual" (15).

For Weaver, a true conservative is the one "who sees the universe as a paradigm, of which the phenomenology of the world is a sort of continuing approximation" (1953, 112). A conservative believes that
things have an essential nature and is concerned with finding and preserving the essential nature of those things. That is, a conservative is philosophically a Platonist. It thus makes perfect sense that a conservative will characteristically argue from definition/genus. It should be noted that Weaver's definition of conservative is normative in nature. He is not merely saying that a true conservative "is" the one who sees the universe as a paradigm, but rather that a true conservative "should be" the one who sees universe as a paradigm.

Weaver's definition of "liberal" is not so clear as that of conservative. Not many scholars go further to examine exactly what liberal means in Weaver's thought. John Bliese's (1979) interpretation of Weaver's thought about liberal appears to be quite convincing because his interpretation shows how Weaver's possible definition of liberal is philosophically consistent with Weaver's beliefs. Bliese argued that by liberal Weaver meant a "centrist," not a "leftist."

By "liberal" he [Weaver] does not mean one who identifies with the political left. Rather, he means one who identifies with the center, a "middle-of-the-roader" (282)

Weaver sometimes prefers the term "Whig" rather than "liberal." He refers to "Whiggism" as "a position which is defined by other positions," which "will not conceive ultimate goals, and . . . will not display on occasion a sovereign contempt for circumstances as radical parties of both right and left are capable of doing." (283)

Weaver did not explicitly define "liberal" in The Ethics of Rhetoric nor in Language is Sermonic. However, Bliese points out that there
are sources providing indications of Weaver's definition of the term. For example, in "The Middle Way: A Political Meditation" (1957), Weaver reacted to those in the Republican Party who would move the Party to the left behind the Democratic Party. Weaver labeled these reformers as "liberal 'middle-of-the-roaders' " (63). Weaver criticized them for lacking principles because "the Liberal arrives at the notion that there are no truths" (64). In "Relativism and the Crisis of Our Times" (1961), Weaver criticized the relativist position of denying any absolute, fixed truths or principles. Bliese concluded that "liberal" is equated with "relativist" or "middle-of-the-roader" in Weaver's thought. "Weaver, in other words, contends that the leftist has an intellectually respectable position, but the liberal does not" (283). This interpretation is convincing because it is quite philosophically consistent with Weaver's beliefs. If we accept liberal to mean relativist in Weaver, then it appears quite reasonable that a liberal is more likely to argue from circumstance, because, for a middle-of-the-roader, things do not have an absolute nature. Instead, things/issues are often seen as circumstantial or in terms of degrees. It becomes clear, then why Weaver considered argument from circumstance to be a liberal argument form.

Compared with the general contemporary conception of liberal vs. conservative, Weaver's definitions are different at two points. First, Weaver's definitions traced the philosophical beliefs behind the two political positions. For Weaver, a conservative is philosophically a Platonist while a liberal is philosophically a relativist. Second, Weaver defined the two positions in terms of their argument types.
A conservative habitually uses argument from definition/genus, while a liberal habitually uses argument from circumstance. Current conceptions do not ground the two terms in this foundational, philosophical way, though they may imply such a grounding.

On the other hand, we cannot say that Weaver's definitions completely depart from the general contemporary conceptions. A relativist who sees things in terms of degrees and takes an infinite-valued position seems to be more ready to accept different possibilities and more ready to make change. In contrast, one who is concerned with the nature of a thing/issue and takes a finite-valued position seems to be more cautious in accepting change. For a conservative to accept other possibilities (other than the status quo), he/she will seek the essence and nature of alternative possibilities to decide those options' acceptability. Thus, a conservative will appear to be more suspicious and cautious in accepting change. At this point, Weaver's definitions of the two terms are consistent with general conceptions.

The question now becomes, to what degree does a person's political position (conservative or liberal) become evident in one's rhetoric? Weaver contended that a person's habitual use of argument types is a truer index of one's political position than his/her explicitly announced position. This is a thesis questioned by many researchers and scholars in the field. Their arguments require inspection. In the next section, we will look at major criticism on Weaver's theory and examine validity of the criticism.
CRITIQUE OF WEAVER'S THEORY OF ARGUMENT

Weaver's theory of argument stirred considerable controversy among scholars. He was criticized mainly for the following points: (1) his ethical hierarchy of argument types, (2) the relationship between one's rhetoric and political position, and (3) his Platonic belief of ultimate, finite value. Dennis Bormann's article (1971) represents a synthesis of these major criticisms.

In his "The 'Uncontested Term' Contested" (1971), Bormann attacked Weaver's conclusion that there is one superior kind of argument applicable in all rhetorical situations. He disagreed with Weaver's upholding argument from definition/genus as the most ethical type of argument. He argued that we must examine the context in which a certain type of argument is employed. Bormann held the assumption that "the rhetorical situation in which a speaker finds himself will have a great influence on the type of argument he must use if he is trying to be effective" (302). Bormann implied that Weaver failed to take Edmund Burke's rhetorical situation--as a member of the minority and opposition party--into account when concluding Burke was a "liberal rather than a conservative." One might defend Weaver against Bormann's critique by noting that Bormann failed to keep in mind that Weaver's theory is normative in nature. Weaver discussed "what ought to be" more often than "what is." It is not legitimate to use a "what is" standard to evaluate a normative theory. For Weaver, argument from definition "should be" the most ethical type of argument, regardless of situations. By
confusing this distinction, Bormann obfuscates the real issue and misanalyzes Weaver's central claim.

Bormann also called in question Weaver's contention that one's rhetoric reflects one's political position. He argued that, within a particular rhetorical situation, one can use "all available means" of persuasion. Bormann questioned that a person can be labeled a conservative or a liberal merely from the rhetorical position one adopts, because rhetoric may only reflect one's rhetorical choice with respect to a particular situation.

Here Bormann appears contradictory in his analysis. On one hand, he argued that rhetorical situations have a great influence on the type of argument one "must" use (as noted above). This implies that argument type is more situation-determined. Recall he concluded that we cannot say that there is one type of argument superior to others in all situations. On the other hand, in his second indictment Bormann claims that one's rhetoric does not necessarily reflect one's political position because one can use "all available means" of persuasion within a rhetorical situation. That is, rhetoric is the result of one's strategic choice and so it may not reflect one's political position. At this point, Bormann seems to suggest that rhetoric is rhetor-determined, contradicting to his previous contention that rhetoric is situation-determined.

The position I will defend in this study holds that rhetoric is neither completely situation-determined nor completely rhetor-determined. There is a universal aspect and a particular/individual aspect of one's rhetoric. The universal aspect reflects how a situation
might affect one's rhetorical choice, while the particular aspect reflects how one's predispositions (e.g., beliefs, attitudes) might affect one's rhetorical choice.\textsuperscript{10} No two rhetors will have exactly the same rhetorical choice towards the same rhetorical situation. Individual differences in rhetorical decision reflect how one perceives the rhetorical situation in his/her own way. This "particularity" will be an indicator of one's beliefs and attitudes. This is why Weaver argued that one's "habitual" use of certain argument type reflects one's world view and political position. While not all rhetoric reflects one's world view, those \textit{habitually-used} arguments do reflect one's world view. The key is to discover among the panoply of a rhetor's arguments those argument types that are used persistently.

Weaver's belief in finite, ultimate values has also been criticized by Bormann, relativists, and general semanticists for its "two-valued" system of logic. General semanticists see things in terms of degrees and hold an "infinite-valued" orientation. They urge people to keep an "open mind" towards every issue. This is strongly objected to by Weaver, for he was concerned that the multiple-valued orientation might result in no value at all. For Weaver, the kind of "open mind" suggested by general semanticists discourages people from taking \textit{any} position and from making \textit{any} commitment. Weaver saw this as an unethical escape from responsibility.\textsuperscript{11} Whether one is a realist or a relativist in terms of the ontological status of values is the subject of a dissertation in itself. What is more important for the purposes of this study is whether or not one believes in such transcendental
values. If one does, then one is, as Weaver argued, likely to be a conservative, based on the arguments sketched above.

Despite these criticism of Weaver's theory of argument, Weaver's typology of argument has frequently been used by rhetorical critics as a tool for rhetorical analysis.\textsuperscript{12} Weaver was also considered as very consistent in his thought and his theory, and was praised as having "had the courage to stick to his core of values and his own vision, even when they were unpopular."\textsuperscript{13} His major contribution to rhetoric is to emphasize the important role of rhetoric in maintaining a stable society, and thus to elevate the position of rhetoric in the academy. As my arguments suggest, his method survives inspection as an useful way to explore the political position of rhetor. Weaver's theory can be made all the more stronger when considered within the context of another major doctrine in the history of rhetoric, namely, the doctrine of \textit{presumption}. This I shall do in the following chapter.
Notes


4 It should be noted that by "good" Quintilian means "good vis a vis traditional Roman values." For Quintilian, a good rhetor should possess such characters as: fulfilling the responsibility as a Roman citizen, knowledge of philosophy, a man of bravery and justice. See James Murphy, ed. *A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric* (Davis, Calif.: Hermagoras Press, 1983) 172-75.

5 For detailed discussions on uncontested terms, see Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric* 166-71, 184.

6 Aristotle distinguished artistic proofs and inartistic proofs in his *Rhetoric*. Artistic proofs are constructed by men, while inartistic proofs are found externally. Aristotle identified three different types of artistic proofs: ethos, pathos, and logos. Examples of inartistic proofs are testimony and evidence.


CHAPTER III
BEYOND WEAVER’S THEORY OF RHETORIC

In the last chapter, we saw how Weaver’s theory of argument operated to distinguish among liberal and conservative political rhetors. In this chapter we will supplement Weaver’s views by conjoining them with Richard Whately’s doctrine of presumption. This will offer us an improved and powerful methodological grounding for the study of the KMT and the DPP discourse.

WHATELY’S DOCTRINE OF PRESUMPTION

In Elements of Rhetoric (1963), Whately developed his well-known doctrine of presumption (112-132).\textsuperscript{1} Whately contended that it is important to identify, in each rhetorical case, "on which side the Presumption lies, and to which belongs the Burden of Proof" (112). Presumption and burden of proof are defined as follows:

... a "Presumption" in favor of any supposition, means, not a preponderance of probability in its favour, but, such a pre-occupation of the ground, as implies that it must stand good till some sufficient reason is adduced against it; in short, that the "Burden of proof lies on the side of him who would dispute it. (112)

The importance of deciding on which side the presumption lies is that one can identify where the arguments are and how the opposition arguments can be refuted. A rhetor who fails to identify
his/her presumption will lose his/her ground. For those who have the burden of proof cannot win unless the grounds of the presumption are identified. For the members of a particular audience, an ability to identify presumption and burden of proof helps them to make judgment about the argumentation process. Whately identified six major types of presumptions: presumption in favor of existing institutions, presumption of innocence, presumption against a paradox, presumptions against and for Christianity, presumption against logic, presumptions for and against the learned. In this study, presumption of existing institutions is relevant to our concern about the relationship between political presumption and argument types. An existing institution has presumption because it is assumed that such an institution exists for good reason. Thus it is assumed good or appropriate and consequently, it does not need to be constantly defended.

There is a Presumption in favour of every existing institution. Many of these . . . may be susceptible of alteration for the better; but still the "Burden of proof" lies with him who proposes an alteration; simply, on the ground that since a change is not a good in itself, he who demands a change should cause for it. (114)

In the political context, an existing institution may include rules, regulations, laws, bureaucracy, and those who carry out the bureaucracy. These rules, regulations, laws, and bureaucracy are also presumed acceptable, good, and appropriate, and need not be constantly defended until some kind of challenge arises.

While an existing institution is assumed as good and acceptable, this does not suggest that there is necessary advantage to the side on
which the presumption lies. "It might be hastily imagined that there is necessarily an advantage in having the presumption on one's side, and the burden of proof on the adversary's. But it is often much the reverse" (129). Whately used the Christian belief as an example to elaborate this point. When a person was brought up in a Christian country, he/she took Christian belief for granted. Christianity is nothing new to this person. When opposition to Christianity arises, that person is likely to be struck by the novelty of the oppositional argument and is likely to inquire more about the controversy. The novelty and the newness of the opposition argument might thus become an advantage to the adversary.

Arguers are not always aware of the presumption they employ. A presumption is often taken for granted before a counter presumption is presented. Especially, there is a type of presumption of which people are often unconscious, that is, what Whately called "deference." Deference is apt to depend on feelings -- such as like/dislike about a person. Whately contended that "men often self-deceived as to their feelings of deference" (121). A presumption is accepted as what it is. Thus a presumption is neither constantly re-examined nor thought of, unless challenge arises.

Whately also suggested that the burden of proof can be transferred. "It is to be observed, that a Presumption may be rubutted by an opposite Presumption, so as to shift the Burden of proof to the other side" (124). For Whately, in an argumentation process, the burden of proof can be shifted between two parties. Scholars have different opinions about whether presumption and
burden of proof can be shifted. For example, Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede (1968) proposed the concept: "the burden of going forward with the debate," and suggested that the burden of going forward with the debate constantly shifts back and forth between the contesting parties, but the burden of proof does not constantly shift.

From beginning to end it [the burden of proof] always rests with him who challenges the existing order. Unlike the burden of going forward, it is not a subsequent or contingent obligation. Rather, the burden of proof represents the risk involved in originating the action by advancing the proposition in the first place. Since the challenger puts forward the proposition, he must accept as his permanent and unshiftable obligation the task of making good on whatever risk it entails. (1968, 43)

Ehninger sees presumption and burden of proof as quite stable. The only thing that constantly shifts is the burden of going forward with the debate. This makes better sense than viewing presumption as constantly shifting. If presumption and burden of proof constantly shift, then these concepts won't really help us to understand the argumentation, as we will be unable to identify on which side the presumption lies.

**POLITICAL PREASSUMPTION AND ARGUMENT TYPES**

The present study seeks in part to find the relationship between political presumption and argument types. Specifically, it will examine how those with political presumption and those lacking political presumption argue differently/similarly in terms of their habitual uses of argument types. It is at this point that this study
tries to go beyond Weaver by grounding Weaver's original typology of argument in Whately's conception of presumption.

As discussed earlier, although Weaver's theory of argument has been criticized by many, his typology of argument has been used by many rhetorical analysts as a useful tool for rhetorical analysis. Most applications of Weaver's typology of argument departed from Weaver's original theoretical framework while failing to provide their own theoretical grounding. There were few exceptions. One of these was the essay by Sonja K. Foss (1982), "Abandonment of Genus: The Evolution of Political Rhetoric." Foss used Weaver's typology of argument to analyze several speakers' discourses and proposed her own theory:

Prior to and shortly after taking office, a politician is likely to use genus as a major rhetorical source, reflecting the idealism that is likely to result from an outsider's or novice's view of what can be accomplished in office. (371)⁴

After the campaigner holds office for sometime, he or she begins to experience certain constraints on his or her actions. As a result, the office holder's world view would change and will be reflected in his/her discourse. The office holder will gradually abandon argument from genus/definition.

The experience of the constraints of the political office, however, demands that the politician alter the idealistic view of the political system he or she once held and also pressures him or her into abandonment of argument by genus . . . Thus, argument by cause and effect, circumstance, and similitude are used as the rhetorical sources by which to justify his or her actions . . . (371)
In short, Foss proposed a theory that a politician's rhetoric changes from frequent use of argument by genus before taking office to abandonment of genus after taking office for sometime. That is, after a politician becomes a member of existing institutions, he/she gradually abandons argument from definition/genus. While this theory sounds reasonable in its framework, Bormann's article seems to suggest a conflicting possibility.

Bormann (1971), in defending Edmund Burke's uses of argument types, seemed to suggest that Burke used all available means of persuasion when he was a member of the minority and opposition party--i.e., when he was not a member of the institution in power. As a member of the opposition, Burke had the burden of proof. What Burke had to do to fulfill his burden of proof was to show how the current circumstances called for another policy. The implication is that those without presumption are more likely to argue from circumstances. This is contradictory to the predictions of Foss' theory, which suggests: before holding office (without presumption) one is more likely to argue from definition while after holding office (with presumption) one is likely to argue from circumstance. It should be noted that the contexts Foss and Bormann discussed are not identical. The implications about the relationship between political presumption and argument types are drawn implicitly rather than explicitly. Nevertheless, the implicit conflicting possibilities lead to some of the questions this research tries to answer: whether those who have presumption and those without presumption will argue in significantly different ways, whether those
with/without presumption are more likely to use certain types of argument, and why.

The above questions lead to another crucial question: What are the relationships between political presumption and political position (in terms of conservatism vs. liberalism)? Some articles/works seem to suggest that conservatism is consonant with presumption while liberalism is consonant with those with the burden of proof. For example, in The American Political Dictionary, conservatism is defined as "defense of the status quo against major changes in the political, economic, or social institutions of a society" (1985, 7); while liberalism is defined as "a political view that seeks to change the political, economic, or social status quo to foster the development and well-being of the individual" (15). William Safire defines a conservative as a "defender of the status quo who, when change becomes necessary in tested institutions or practices prefers that it come slowly and in moderation" (1968, 137). These definitions seem to suggest that a conservative position is consistent with those with presumption because a conservative tends to defend the status quo. In contrast, a liberal position is more consistent with those with burden of proof because a liberal intends to change the status quo.

In Elements of Rhetoric (1963), Richard Whately claimed that "... 'Burden of proof' lies with him who proposes an alteration; simply on the ground that since a change is not a good in itself, he who demands a change should cause for it" (114). That is, those who demand changes have the burden of proof. The implication is that a
liberal position is more likely to face the burden of proof since the liberal is more ready for change and proposes change more often.

However, some scholars may disagree that the relationships between presumption and political position are so neatly linked. For example, Thomas Goodnight does not consider presumption as invariant, that is, presumption may shift. This implies that the conservative does not always stand with presumption and the liberal does not always have burden of proof (1980, 311). Thomas R. Nilsen may also disagree that conservatism is consonant with presumption while liberalism is consonant with the burden of proof because he argues that "what is liberal in one context may not be so in another" (1958, 32).

It is not the objective of this study to examine the relationships between political presumption and political position. Despite the above disagreements, the implications are: if a conservative is more likely to argue from definition (as Weaver suggested), and if a conservative position is more consonant with those with presumption, then those with presumption are more likely to argue from definition. By the same logic, those without presumption are more likely to argue from circumstance.

The purpose of the above discussions is not to come up with hypotheses; rather, it intends to lay out some grounds of different possibilities. There are five possibilities if we limit our concern to argument from definition vs. circumstance:

1. Those with political presumption and without political presumption tend to argue similarly. They both argue from
definition more frequently.

2. Those with political presumption and without political presumption tend to argue similarly. They both argue from circumstance more frequently.

3. Those with political presumption and without political presumption tend to argue similarly. They both argue from definition and from circumstance equally often.

4. Those with political presumption tend to argue from definition more frequently, while those without political presumption tend to argue from circumstance more frequently.

5. Those with political presumption tend to argue from circumstance more frequently, while those without political presumption tend to argue from definition more frequently.

To determine the relationship between political presumption and the use of argument types, editorials of two newspapers representing the ruling party (the KMT) and the opposition party (the DPP) in Taiwan are analyzed and compared. Before discussing the analysis procedures of this study, a brief background of the two parties and how they have/have not political presumption is presented in the next chapter. The procedures of analysis are discussed in Chapter V.
Notes


2 See Whately Elements of Rhetoric 114-29.


4 In her article, Foss analyzed the discourse of Jimmy Carter, Lyndon Johnson, and Jane Byrne in the course of their terms of office.
CHAPTER IV
BACKGROUNDS OF THE KMT AND THE DPP

This chapter provides a brief background of the Kuo-min-tang and the Democratic Progressive Party, from which we can see how their discourse is an appropriate object of inquiry for this study. This chapter also discusses the emergence of public sphere in Taiwan and offers examples of key issues debated in this public sphere. Thus the readers can have a basic understanding of the backgrounds of political rhetoric in Taiwan.

FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE KMT AND THE DPP

The KMT (the Kuo-min-tang, or the Nationalist Party) has gone through several reorganizations in this century. There were two major reorganizations before the party becomes known as Kuo-min-tang. In 1914, the KMT, which was then called the Tung-meng-hui was reorganized and became known as the Chinese Revolutionary Party (the Chung-kuo ko-ming-tang). In 1919, the party was reorganized and the name was changed to the Chinese Nationalist Party (the Chung-kuo kuo-min-tang), the name currently in use. However, it was not until the reorganization during 1923-24 that the KMT became a real modern political party.
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In view of the disunity and insubordination problems of the party, Dr. Sun Yat-sen--the father of the KMT and the Republic of China--felt the need to strengthen organization of the party. In 1922, Sun decided the policy of "alliance with the Soviets; admission of the Communists" (Lien-O Yung-Kung). Under this policy, the Chinese Communist Party members were allowed to enter the KMT as individuals, not as a group--so to avoid the problem of "party within a party." The Soviets sent Mikhail Borodin to help Sun to reorganize the KMT in 1923. Sun appointed a Provisional Executive Committee to draft a new party programme and constitution (October 25, 1923). He appointed Borodin adviser of the Committee. Borodin drafted a new constitution for the KMT, "modeling its structure on that of the Russian Communist Party/Bolshevik" (C. Martin Wilbur, 1984, 8). This draft suggested five levels of organization: national, provincial, county, district and sub-district. On top of this five-level organizational structure, there were annual National Congresses of Representatives and the Central Executive Committee (CEC). The National Congress was to elect a CEC. Between congresses, the CEC would run the party. This organizational structure, following the model of Bolshevik invented by Lenin, was highly centralized. The party members should conform to strict party discipline. Those with membership in other organizations (such as labor unions, merchants associations) were to form "party fractions" and must unite themselves in order to assert influence in the other organization.\(^1\)

Borodin's draft became the model for the constitution adopted by the first National Congress of the KMT in January, 1924.\(^2\) From then on,
the party practiced Lenin's "democratic centralism," with "the inevitable emphasis on centralism and dictation by a very few" (Wilbur 1989, 421). This centralized character of the party structure might be an important source of the top-down rhetorical character of the KMT as discussed in Chapter VIII.

The Provisional Executive Committee established a journal to publicize the intended reorganization and explain the revolutionary ideology and set up a school to train members of district and sub-district executive committees. During this 1923-24 reorganization, a propaganda department was established for the first time to expand the party's mass foundation—to attract more laborers, peasants, women, businessmen, and young students and intellectuals whom were used to be ignored by the KMT. The first National Congress of the KMT was held in January, 1924, in which Sun delivered several speeches and emphasized the importance of party unity and strong party organization.

Although the Communists were expected to join the KMT as individuals, the Communists still took orders from the Chinese Communist Party and formed a bloc within the KMT. In other words, they were "nominal KMT but real CCP members." The tension between real KMT members and the CCP members rose. The KMT and the Chinese Communist Party (the CCP) finally split in 1927 and the KMT completely liquidated the Communists. After its split with the KMT, the CCP adopted tactics of strikes, sabotage, and uprisings to challenge the KMT and to expand the CCP's mass foundation. As the Sino-Japanese War broke up in 1937, the KMT had to fight with
Japanese and face the Communist challenge in the same time. The Civil War between the KMT government and the CCP became heated as the World War II and the Sino-Japanese War ended in 1945. After the defeat to the CCP, the KMT government retreated to Taiwan in 1949. Since then the policy of recovering Mainland China and practicing the Three People's Principles in Mainland has been insisted by the KMT government. And since then the KMT has been the ruling party in Taiwan and has not been challenged by any formal political party until 1985.

The DPP (the Democratic Progressive Party) had "illegally" existed before the ban on forming new political parties had been lifted. The DPP filed for formal status on September 28, 1986. The DPP was founded by several political dissidents and was a collaboration of different opposition groups and individuals. The party soon grew rapidly by attracting many industrial workers, farmers, intellectuals and students. In the December 1986 elections, the DPP won 11 seats in the National Assembly with 18.9% of the popular vote and 12 seats in the Legislative Yuan with 22.17% of the popular vote.\(^5\) The DPP claims to protect benefits of weaker social groups such as veterans, women, laborers, peasants, old people, and whoever is economically and/or politically oppressed.

There are different factions in the DPP with different political ideas and propositions. The two major factions are the Formosa faction and the New Tide faction. The former is more liberal and more willing to negotiate and compromise, while the latter is more extreme and less compromising. They disagree on such issues as
whether the party should take parliamentary approach or mass
approach, whether the party should make appeal to the middle class
in addition to low and lower-middle classes, whether the party
should publicly propose "Taiwan independence." The Formosa
faction seems to be somewhat dominant in the DPP.6 And the
current Chairperson Huang Hsin-chieh is from the Formosa faction.7
But the unity of the DPP has been a problem. The DPP claimed to
have been supported by "one million and three hundred thousand"

Compared with members of the KMT, the DPP attracted more low-
to-middle class members and suburban residents. In contrast, more
middle-to-upper class individuals are in the KMT camp. Because the
KMT represents the currently-institutionalized political, social, and
economic power structure, it represents the status quo, that is, those
who have presumption, while the DPP represents those without
presumption. For this study, one of the objectives is to explore how
those with political presumption and those without presumption
would argue in terms of Weaver's argument types. The discourse of
the KMT and the DPP is appropriate for analysis in this study as they
represent those with political presumption and those without
presumption respectively.

Another reason that the discourse of the KMT and the DPP is
appropriate for this study is their conservative vs. liberal positions.
One of the objectives of this study is to look at how conservatives
and liberals would argue similarly/differently in terms of Weaver's
argument types. The KMT is more conservative in the sense that it is
more cautious in making significant and major policy change--such as implementation of the Martial Law for almost forty years. The DPP is relatively more liberal in the sense that it rigorously proposes all kinds of major policy changes--such as proposing Taiwan independence instead of unification. Thus, their conservative vs. liberal position meets the objective of this study.

**THE EMERGENCE OF THE PUBLIC SPHERE**

The flourishing of political rhetoric--publicly--in Taiwan in recent years is closely related to the emergence of public sphere. "Public sphere" is defined as "a domain of our social life in which such a thing as public opinion can be formed" (Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics 1989, 231). There are several characters of this public sphere. First, people's freedom of expression is guaranteed.

Citizens act as a public when they deal with matters of general interest without being subject to coercion; thus with the guarantee that they may assemble and unite freely, and express and publicize their opinions freely. (Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics 1989, 231)

In a public sphere, people are free to express their opinion publicly. This relates to the second character that such a freedom of expression is institutionalized. Public sphere is "a sphere between civil society and the state, in which critical public discussion of matters of general interest was institutionally guaranteed, ..." (Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere 1989, xi). This institutionalization may include legislation, or institutionalized channels of expressing opinion, such as through
certain media or through legislatures. Third, the public sphere is "a sphere mediating between state and society." A political public sphere is a sphere in which "the discussions concern objects connected with the practice of the state" (Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics 1989, 231). The coercive power of the state is not a part of this public sphere. The public sphere becomes a link between state and society because in this sphere public discussions and debates on political issues are protected and are not subject to the coercive power of the state. In other words, communication between state and society (or people) is made possible through the realm of the public sphere.

In Taiwan, political rhetoric flourishes publicly in recent years because the public sphere is emerging. During the last two years (1986-1988) of Chiang Ching-kuo's presidency, Taiwan has gone through dramatic changes. The 38-year-old Martial Law was lifted on July 15, 1987. Formation of new political parties was legalized. People's freedom of public gathering and demonstration is now protected. Founding of new newspapers and increase of newspaper page numbers were permitted on January, 1988. People now are better protected by law to express themselves publicly and are able to have more channels of expressing what they think. The results are the mushrooming of new newspapers, increase of political parties, and frequent resort to public demonstration in recent years. Under the surface of these activities is the public and heated debates on certain key issues. Political rhetoric flourishes publicly and real dialogue between/among different groups comes true.
This study of contemporary Chinese rhetoric is especially timely because it examines how rhetoric plays a role in a society moving toward democracy. By examining the confrontational rhetoric which emerges as Taiwan is moving toward a more democratic society, we may not only learn much about how rhetoric plays a role in this democratization process in Taiwan, but in emerging democratic countries generally.

SOME KEY ISSUES DEBATED

Some key issues--related to the practice and the policy of the state--are debated heatedly in recent years such as the debates on unification vs. Taiwan independence, on partially revising the Constitution vs. completely re-institutionalizing the Constitution, on the Mainland policy, on president systems vs. cabinet systems, on the representativeness of the National Assembly members, and on party politics in general. The disagreements on unification vs. Taiwan independence and on revising the Constitution are two key issues that have been debated for a long time. These two issues also represent basic disagreements between the KMT and the DPP and are more difficult to resolve than other issues. By looking at these two key issues as they occur in heated debates, we can have a basic and preliminary understanding of what the arguments are in the political domain.

The debates on unification vs. Taiwan independence reflect the most basic disagreement between the ruling party (the KMT) and the major opposition party (the DPP). The KMT insists that unification of
China—that is, unification of Taiwan and Mainland China—is the government's ultimate goal. This policy has been repeatedly emphasized—as a policy that will never be changed—by high officials in the government on public occasions. The unification should be achieved on the basis of implementing the Three People's Principles in Mainland China as well as in Taiwan, and the Chinese Communists have to give up their doctrines.

The opposition party argues that unification is an unrealistic dream, mainly on the ground that Taiwan and the Mainland—including their political, economic, and social dimensions—have very little in common. The DPP proposes that Taiwan should be independent and argues that people in Taiwan can benefit more from "Taiwan independence" than from unification. The idea of Taiwan independence was proposed long before the aforementioned political bans were lifted. But it was not until recent years that Taiwan independence can be discussed and debated publicly, that is, the rhetoric of Taiwan independence flourishes publicly as the public sphere emerges.

Another issue under heated debate is whether the Constitution should be partially revised or should be completely re-institutionalized. The Constitution was written over forty years ago, before the KMT government retreated to Taiwan. The content of the Constitution takes the whole China—Mainland and Taiwan—into consideration. As the magistrate of the KMT government is now limited to Taiwan, the rules listed in the Constitution no longer meet current needs. For example, the current governmental bureaucracy,
institutionalized by the Constitution, is considered too complicated and inefficient for Taiwan. The KMT opposes complete re-writing of the Constitution and argues that the Constitution should be partially revised mainly because the Constitution has to be brought back to the Mainland when unification occurs. The KMT also argues that the legal continuity of the spirit of the Constitution should be maintained—thus the Constitution should not be completely re-written.

In contrast, the opposition party argues that partial revision of the Constitution will bring in more contradictions in the Constitution and will not actually take the will of Taiwan's people into account. The DPP sees the major problem of the current constitution as the fact that it fails to recognize the reality of the separation of the Mainland and Taiwan and fails to recognize Taiwan as an independent magistrate. The consequences are that the rules listed in the Constitution do not meet current needs and the whole political bureaucracy under the Constitution can not work effectively for Taiwan. Thus, the DPP proposes that the Constitution should be completely re-worked to meet current needs and realities.

It is impossible to exhaust all of the issues under debate in the rhetoric of the KMT and the DPP in recent years. But after looking at the above two issues, readers can have a basic and preliminary understanding of the backgrounds of major arguments. In later chapters, we will see more specifically how these two issues are presented and argued.
This chapter has sought to provide readers with the general backgrounds of the KMT and the DPP and to indicate why political rhetoric flourishes publicly in Taiwan. These backgrounds justify why the political discourse of the KMT and the DPP is appropriate for analysis in this study. These backgrounds will also help readers to grasp the contents of the analysis chapters (Chapter VI to Chapter IX). Before looking at analysis of the discourse, the next chapter discusses analysis procedures and their justification.
Notes


2 The constitution adopted by the National Congress in 1924 contained some differences from Borodin's draft. For example, a new chapter was added in which Sun Yat-sen was named as Party Leader, and was made chairperson of the National Congress of Representatives and of the Cnetral Executive Committee. The Party Leader was given veto power over the decisions of the National Congress and the CEC. See C. Martin Wilbur and Julie Lien-ying How, *Missionaries of Revolution: Soviet Advisers and Nationalist China 1920-1927* 93.


4 For example, a coup was staged at Nanchang, Kiangsi on August 1, 1927; the Autumn Harvest Uprising of September 7, 1927 was the first uprising led by Mao Tse-tung. See Hsu, *The Rise of Modern China* 552-3.


6 The power struggle between the Formosa faction and the New Tide faction is intense and the disagreements between the two are hard to resolve. Although the Formosa faction appears to be somewhat dominant for the time being, its dominance status is not very stable as the New Tide faction is also supported by many people.
7 Huang was elected in 1987 as the third chairperson, and was re-elected in 1989 as the fourth chairperson of the DPP. He is considered as capable of coordination and has contributed to the improvement of relationship between the KMT and the DPP. But disunity within the DPP remains a problem under Huang's leadership.

8 It should be noted that the public sphere does not abruptly emerge in recent years. The emergence of the public sphere can be traced back to the late eighteenth century and the early twentieth century when China was experiencing a transitional period. However, it is not until recent years that the emergence of the public sphere becomes accelerated and mature.

9 Chiang Ching-kuo, son of Chiang Kai-shek, was elected president in 1978 after the elder Chiang's death in 1975. Chiang Ching-kuo was elected to a second term in 1984. Chiang died on January 13, 1988. Vice-President Lee Deng-hui was sworn in as the new president. See Hsu, The Rise of Modern China 910-13.

10 According to the 1951 "Wartime Newspaper Papers-saving Rule," newspaper can only publish one and a half sheets of papers for each copy. In 1958, the space of newspapers can be increased to two sheets of papers. In 1975, the space was increased to three sheets of papers. Starting from January, 1988, the space of newspapers can be increased to six sheets of papers. See Chen Rui-chen, Seeing Through Mass Media (Taipei: Common Wealth, 1988) 24.

11 Before the ban of founding new newspapers was lifted, there were a total of 31 different newspapers in 1987. The ban was lifted on January, 1988. By the end of May, 1988, forty-three new newspapers filed for publication, among which 17 has already published. See Chen, Seeing Through Mass Media 22.

12 "The Three People's Principles" was developed by the national founding father: Dr. Sun Yat-sen in the late nineteenth century. The Three People's Principles include: People's National Consciousness, or Nationalism; People's Right, or Democracy; and People's Livelihood, or Socialism--which are considered as equivalent to Lincoln's "of the people, by the people, and for the people." See Immanuel C. Y. Hsu, The Rise of Modern China 518-19.
CHAPTER V
PROCEDURES

This chapter outlines the procedures of conducting this study. The objects of analysis are editorials from two newspapers representing the ruling party (the KMT) and the opposition party (the DPP) in Taiwan. This chapter indicates how Richard Weaver's theory of argument is used to analyze these editorials. The chapter also defends the qualitative approach as more appropriate than a quantitative approach for this study.

OBJECTS OF ANALYSIS

Editorials of two newspapers representing the ruling party (the KMT) and the opposition party (the DPP) in Taiwan are analyzed and compared. There are several reasons for choosing newspaper editorials as objects of analysis. First, the kind of Western oral tradition developed since ancient Greece does not seem to have developed in Chinese society. For this reason, the study of written political rhetoric--editorials--offers a better source for understanding politics in Taiwan. This issue merits explanation. Western rhetoric has emerged from the oral tradition and the development of democratic society in ancient Greece as early as the fifth century B.C. For many reasons, this kind of oral tradition does
not seem to have developed in ancient China.² The influence of emphasis on action and practice (hsing) over words (yen) in Confucian tradition might have been one of the major causes. Confucian teachings suggested that a gentleman should not say something he cannot practically meet. That is, don't say something that you cannot achieve. There are at least seven evidences³ in Confucius' Analects that Confucius discussed the relationships between words and practice/action. For example, in Book IV the Master said, "In old days a man kept a hold on his words, fearing the disgrace that would ensue should he himself fail to keep pace with them" (No. 22).⁴ In Book XIII, "... the gentleman ... only says what he can practice" (No. 3).⁵ In Book XIV, the Master said, "A gentleman is ashamed to let his words outrun his deeds" (No. 29).⁶ By contrast, in the Western tradition—and especially in political rhetoric—discourse is frequently oriented to future goals, actions, and events and often makes promises it cannot or does not keep and predictions that are never satisfied.

As a result of the emphasis on deeds over words, Confucius taught people to be cautious in saying things which are shown in at least nine places in Analects.⁷ The consequence is that Chinese tend to be very cautious in saying things and taking positions, especially in public settings. Confucius even went so far as to deplore skillful talking. "Those who talk cleverly and behave pretentiously are seldom benevolent" (Book I, No.3).⁸ For Confucius, clever talking can confound one's cultivation of morality (Book XV, No. 26). In one anecdote, some one commented, "Yung is benevolent, but he is a poor
speaker." Confucius replied, "Why does he need to be a good speaker? Those who speak cleverly are often disliked by people" (Book V, No. 4). It appears that Confucius' emphasis on practice/deeds and cultivation of morality overshadows the role of speaking in ancient China.

Another major reason that no Western type of oral tradition developed in ancient China is because no democratic institutions had been developed. The emergence of rhetoric in ancient Greece paralleled the growth of Greek democratic institutions, especially in political and legal domains. Eubanks and Baker (1962) contend that "... the basic and sweaty burden of rhetoric is the maintenance of freedom" (161) and rhetoric "operates in freedom and for freedom" (162). The ancient Greek democratic institutions required and allowed people to speak out and to defend their own causes in political and legal settings, which circumstances did not exist in ancient China. Under the traditional imperial system and the myth of "Son of Heaven," the emperor's words were like laws. The Chinese people were ruled by "people" not by "law." Chinese people were expected to obey and conform to whatever rules were imposed on them. Even high officials in the bureaucracy had to be very cautious to avoid offending the emperor when making suggestions to him. Under a tradition which discouraged people to speak out and express their opinions, the Chinese developed a tendency to "talk little, do more." Even today, high officials in government or CEOs of private organizations in Taiwan seldom give formal speeches on public occasions, even when circumstances require them to explain and
verify public matters. The old Chinese saying "Talking too much will always result in more problems" is still observed. Thus, spoken discourses are not so much typical of political discourse in Taiwan as they are in Western society, thus justifying this study's focus on non-oral artifacts.

A second reason for choosing newspapers as objects of analysis is that newspapers have been a major means of spreading political thought by political groups in modern China since the late nineteenth century. The influence of the reform movement in 1890s resulted in "a mushrooming of newspapers more politically oriented and more ideological in content" (Hao Chang, 1971, 6). Although the history of Chinese newspapers can be traced back to the Han Dynasty (202 B.C. - 8 A.D.), it was not until the late nineteenth century that private newspapers (as opposed to governmental newspapers) flourished. Newspapers became the forum where intellectuals presented and debated political ideas such as reform or revolution. Since then newspapers have been the sources to which people looked for political ideas. Newspapers are thus quite representative of the discourses and arguments of their representing parties--especially after political bans on founding new political parties and new newspapers have been lifted in Taiwan in recent years.

Editorials are chosen for analysis in this study because they are generally considered as representing the political stands of a newspaper (Hynds, 1976 & 1984). Specific issues discussed in editorials are especially important ones on which the newspaper feels the need to take a stand. While objectivity has traditionally
been important in news reporting, editorials are the only section where the subjective stand of a newspaper can be presented. Whereas objective news reporting is mainly based on what Aristotle called inartistic proofs (such as factual data, testimony), editorials go beyond inartistic proofs and argue mainly on the basis of artistic proofs. Artistic proofs are the focus of the present study. The procedures of analysis are outlined in this section.

The two newspapers chosen for analysis are The Central Daily News representing the ruling party--the KMT (the Kuo-min-tang, or the Nationalist Party), and The Capital Morning News representing the opposition party--the DPP (the Democratic Progressive Party) respectively. There is no doubt about the representativeness of The Central Daily News as a political organ for the KMT. The Central Daily News was first published in Canton in 1926. It had been published in other major cities in mainland China, such as Shanghai and Nanking before the Chinese Communist Party took over mainland China. When the KMT government retreated to Taiwan in 1949, The Central Daily News was republished in Taiwan the same year. Since then, The Central Daily News has been the official party newspaper of the KMT, and has become the dominant newspaper (in terms of circulation) in Taiwan. Its editorials, of course, reflect the political ideas of the KMT government:
The editorial of *The Central Daily News* speaks for the ruling party on both internal issues and international issues, and has been taken into serious consideration by different groups of people. Its opinions on internal issues has often been used by different levels of government officials as references for administration. Its opinions on international issues has been considered by governments of different nations as reflecting the ruling party's attitudes. (Li, 1966, 513)

Compared with *The Central Daily News*, *The Capital Morning News* was quite short-lived. It was first published in May 1989 by one of the DPP's leading figures—Kang Ning-hsiung. It announced its last issue on August 28, 1990 due to financial deficit. Nevertheless, *The Capital Morning News* is still representative of the political discourse of the DPP. Other newspapers published by the DPP members are either quite local or enjoyed very limited circulation. During its span of publication, *The Capital Morning News* was a very politically oriented newspaper. Its stand represented the liberal and critical faction of the DPP, rather than the extreme radical faction of the DPP. It is generally considered to have been liberal, critical, and rational-- not extremist.

In this study, fifty editorials of each newspaper are randomly selected from the analysis period: September 1989 to August 1990. This is the one-year period before *The Capital Morning News* ceased publication. Editorials selected from both newspapers are of the same dates. For example, if January 1, 1990 is randomly selected, then editorials of both newspapers on that date will be selected. By doing so, we are more likely to find editorials of the two newspapers discussing the same issues considered important at that time.
The random selection process includes two stages. First, the month is randomly selected by drawing lots numbered one to twelve. After the month has been selected, the second stage is to randomly select the date by drawing lots numbered one to thirty-one. Through this process, a specific date of editorials from the two newspapers is selected. This selection process is repeated until fifty dates of editorials have been chosen. The editorials are analyzed by applying the rhetorical theory of Richard Weaver, specifically, his treatment of major sources of arguments discussed in his *The Ethics of Rhetoric*.

**THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS**

As we have seen, Richard Weaver developed his theory concerning the sources of argument in *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Recall, three major types of arguments are identified in this book: argument from definition/genus, argument from similitude, and argument from circumstance. The following passage shows how argument from definition/genus is conceptualized and how argument from definition and from genus are distinguished:

*The argument from definition . . . includes all argument from the nature of the thing. Whether the genus is an already recognized convention, or whether it is defined at the moment by the orator, or whether it is left to be inferred from the aggregate of its species, the argument has a single postulate. The postulate is that there exist classes which are determinate and therefore predictable.* (1953, 86)

For Weaver, the argument from definition/genus involves a philosophy of "being" (87). According to Weaver, this type of argument is mainly used by idealists--such as Lincoln. In Chapter IV
of his *Ethics*, Weaver analyzed Abraham Lincoln's several speeches as examples of argument from definition. Weaver contended that "Lincoln came early to the conclusion that human nature is a fixed and knowable thing" (87). "The evidence that Lincoln held such belief is overwhelming; it characterizes his thinking from an early age; and the greatest of his utterances (excepting the Gettysburg Address, which is based upon similitude) are chiefly arguments from definition" (87). Weaver analyzed several Lincoln's speeches and presented them according to different issues, such as human nature, slavery. The *First Inaugural Address* was considered by Weaver as a typical example within which various arguments from definition were made. Fourteen arguments were identified in this address: eight were arguments from definition or genus, two were from consequences, two from circumstance, one from contraries, and one from similitude (97). The eight arguments from definition/genus include arguments from the nature of all government, from the nature of contract, from the nature of the American Union, from the nature of the chief magistrate's office, from the nature of majority rule, and from the nature of the sovereignty of the people." For example, Weaver pointed out that Lincoln argued that all governments have a fundamental duty of self-preservation. Lincoln was quoted by saying "Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments" (97). Lincoln also argued that the association of the states is "in the nature of a contract merely" (97). Lincoln argued that a contract requires the assent of all parties and violation of the contract would affect the material
interests of all parties. Weaver pointed out that by such an interpretation of the nature of contract, Lincoln argued that the Southern states could not leave the Union without a general consent (97). Although Lincoln also used other different types of arguments, he used argument from definition/genus more often than the other types. Weaver contended that "a much surer index to a man's political philosophy is his characteristic way of thinking, inevitably expressed in the type of argument he prefers" (112). Lincoln, as an idealist, constantly used arguments from definition.

Another type of argument Weaver elaborated in *The Ethics of Rhetoric* is the argument from circumstance. This type of argument is "the nearest of all arguments to purest expediency" (57). "Such argument savors of urgency rather than of perspicacity; and it seems to be preferred by those who are easily impressed by existing tangibles" (57). Weaver contended that this type of argument is philosophically appropriate to the liberal. In Chapter III, Weaver analyzed several Edmund Burke's speeches and writings and concluded that Burke was a liberal according to his habitual use of argument from circumstance. Weaver contended that although Burke was widely respected as a conservative, Burke had a "strong addiction" to the argument from circumstance which was a truer index of his beliefs (58). For example, Weaver pointed out that in *A Letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe, M.P.* (1972), Burke used circumstance to argue the propriety of admitting Catholics to the elective franchise:
If such means can with any probability be shown, from circumstances, rather to add strength to our mixed ecclesiastical and secular constitution, than to weaken it; surely they are means infinitely to be preferred to penalties, incapacities, and proscriptions continued from generation to generation. (60)

In another example Weaver showed us Burke's use of argument from circumstance by quoting a passage from Burke's *Letter to a Member of the National Assembly* (1791):

> What a number of faults have led to this multitude of misfortunes, and almost all from this one source—that of considering certain general maxims, without attending to circumstances, to times, to places, to conjectures, and to actors! If we do not attend scrupulously to all of these, the medicine of today becomes the poison of tomorrow. (70)

Weaver contended that Burke had an obsessive dislike of metaphysics and the methods of the metaphysician. Burke was quoted: "The pretended rights of these theories are all extremes; and in proportion as they are metaphysically true, they are morally and politically false" (72). Weaver believed that Burke's distrust of metaphysics and his emphasis on circumstance have been reflected in his discourse. Weaver concluded that Burke "judged the badness of the principle by the pressure of the grievance; and hence we are compelled to suppose that he believed politics ought to be decided empirically and not dialectically" (73).

Another major type of argument discussed in *Ethics* is the argument from similitude. "Whereas those who argue from genus argue from a fixed class, those who argue from similitude invoke essential correspondences" (56-57). This type of argument is widely used by poets and religionists. Weaver pointed out that John Bunyan
and Emerson used this type of argument constantly. However, Weaver did not analyze a specific figure's discourse as an example of frequent user of similitude. Although Weaver had identified several different types of arguments (in *The Ethics of Rhetoric* and in other works), Weaver paid major attention to argument from definition/genus and argument from circumstance, because these two types of arguments have direct relationships to a rhetor's political position and ontological ground (as already explained in Chapter II).

For all that Weaver accomplished, he nevertheless omitted discussion of some important methodological issues, such as: What constitutes an argument? To what level and completeness have Lincoln's and Burke's discourses been surveyed? How were the discourses of Lincoln and Burke sampled for analysis? Weaver did not show us what the basic elements of an argument are. It is also unclear that how extensively the discourses of Lincoln and Burke have been surveyed. Nor did Weaver tell us on what criteria and through what methods that those analyzed discourses have been selected. There are about twelve pieces of Burke's discourse and about seventeen of Lincoln's have been directly quoted and analyzed in the aforementioned two chapters. Weaver seemed to present his analysis of those discourse according to different issues—although not very consistently. We are not sure whether issue type is the criterion based on which he selected discourse for analysis. Weaver's analysis on Lincoln and Burke has thus been questioned about the representativeness of those selected discourse. This
omission of methodological discussion might have been because Weaver did not intend to make his theory to become a method of rhetorical analysis. As a result of these omissions, rhetorical critics attempting to apply Weaver's theory have varied in their methods of analysis. In fact, many critics do not discuss their procedures of analysis at all.¹⁸

**UNITS AND STEPS OF ANALYSIS**

Although Weaver did not specify what constitutes an argument, it is implicit in his analysis of the discourse of Burke and Lincoln that an argument can be as short as a sentence, or can be as long as an entire speech. It seems that for Weaver the length of an argument is irrelevant. More important are the elements that constitute an argument.

Scholars disagree as to precisely what an argument is, yet there is general consensus about the major features of an argument.¹⁹ Most theorists hold that an argument consists of a claim and its support. In this study, an argument, in its simplest form, will be considered as comprised of a claim and its support. A claim is generally presented in the form of a statement indicating the relationships between/among two or more things. A claim can be presented in either a "be" form or an "ought to be" form. An example of the former is "Democracy is a superior institution," while an example of the latter is "Democracy should be the ultimate goal of a country." The support of a claim—the grounds of a claim in Toulmin's term—
will be analyzed in terms of Weaver's typology of arguments—definition/genus and circumstance—as follows.

To analyze the selected editorials, the claim is identified first. Then the support for the claim and the reasoning process of each claim are explored in accordance with Weaver's major sources of arguments (including genus/definition and circumstance). Although argument from definition/genus and argument from circumstance are the major foci in this study, other types of arguments in Weaver's theory (for example, similitude, rhetorical-historical argument, cause-to-effect argument) are not ignored during the analysis process. An editorial often includes more than one argument. Generally speaking, an editorial's argument is quite well-focused on one or some limited number of issues. Even though there may be several arguments in an editorial, they are usually interrelated under a more superordinal argument/issue. For example, an editorial may advocate people's right to know and may resist governmental censorship. These two propositions are interrelated and may lead to a superordinal issue, such as freedom of the press. It is less likely that an editorial will include several unrelated arguments/issues, but where this occurs it will be carefully examined and noted. Preliminary analysis on selected issues of editorials from the two newspapers indicates that this procedure is workable.20

To assure the credibility of analysis in this study, a second person has been asked to double analyze part of the one hundred randomly selected editorials. A total of ten editorials—five from each
newspaper--from the one hundred selected editorials are randomly selected and analyzed by both researcher of this project and a second person. The analysis results--in terms of argument types identified--are compared. It turns out that there is rather high consensus on categorization of argument types. The difference mainly comes from length of arguments being identified. For example, one might look at a whole paragraph as an argument, while the other might separate the paragraph into several arguments. But this difference does not occur frequently and this difference won't affect much on the types of arguments being identified. That is, although the length of argument might be identified somewhat differently, the types of arguments being identified are much the same.

This study takes a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative approach for two major reasons. First, this study is more concerned with how arguments are presented in terms of Weaver's typology of arguments rather than merely counting the number of different argument types or the proportions of each that are presented. Although some degree of quantification is necessary--such as counting the number of different argument types being used by each party--this study seeks to have a more in-depth understanding of how arguments are presented and constructed in terms of different argument types. A qualitative approach is more capable of achieving such an end.

Second, a qualitative approach is more feasible than a quantitative approach for this study. A quantitative content analysis requires standardized units of analysis. That is, the unit of analysis
should be consistent through the entire research. It can be a sentence, a paragraph, or an article. Once a unit of analysis (e.g., a sentence) is decided, it has to be consistently used. In the present case, arguments are units of analysis. But as mentioned earlier, an argument can be as short as a sentence and as long as an article. Therefore, it is inappropriate to limit the unit of analysis to an arbitrary and standardized length. A preliminary analysis on some issues of the editorials also shows that looking for the entire argument itself is more reasonable than looking for argument of standardized length.\(^{21}\)

Several methodological issues have been discussed in this section. First, newspaper editorials are selected as the objects of analysis. The specific newspapers analyzed are The Central Daily News--representing the ruling party with political presumption in Taiwan, and The Capital Morning News--representing the opposition party which does not have political presumption. Second, the unit of analysis is the entire argument, including a claim and its support. Third, Weaver's typology of arguments (including genus/definition, similitude, and circumstance) are used to analyze the arguments identified. Finally, this study takes a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative approach for the purpose of having an in-depth understanding of how arguments are constructed, in accordance with Weaver's typology of arguments.

Up to this point, we have looked at theoretical foundations, theoretical development, justifications of this study, and research design of this project. Starting with the next chapter, we will look at
the analysis of newspaper editorials representing the KMT and the DPP.
Notes

1 James Hikins, The Origins and Development of Classical Rhetoric, unpublished (Columbus, Ohio State University, 1989).

2 It should be noted that although there is no Western type of oral tradition developed in ancient China, there might have been an oral tradition developed in ancient China that was markedly different from Western oral tradition. For example, there have been some periods, such as the Spring and Autumn Period (722 - 481 BC) and the Warring States Period (403 - 221 BC), when persuasion became important in the political domain. However, persuasion or speaking skills have never become important for the common people in ancient China as it had in ancient Greece.

3 See Confucius' Analects: Book IV No. 22 & No. 24, Book XII No. 3 & No. 20, Book XIII No. 3, Book XIV No. 29, Book XV No. 5.


5 Translated by author.

6 Translated by Waley, 187.


8 Translated by author.

9 Yung was a disciple of Confucius. His last name was Jan. See Mu Chien, New Commentary on Analects 2nd ed. (Kowloon, Hsin Ya Research Institute, 1964) 145.

10 Translated by author.

11 Ironically, Confucius himself had been a practitioner of persuasion. Confucius was born in the Spring and Autumn Period (722 - 481 BC). During this period, there were many small states in
China. These states often fought each other with little regard for the welfare of their people. Confucius, a person with political ideals, had travelled from state to state and had tried to persuade those kings of different states to practice his political ideals. However, Confucius had not been successful in persuading those kings. Confucius turned to education to spread his political ideals. Although Confucius had been a practitioner of persuasion, he had never emphasized the skills of persuasion.


13 A recent example may show how cautious Taiwan's high officials are on talking about public matters. Three policemen from Taiwan are held under custody in mainland China. When Premier Hao was asked by a legislator regarding how to solve the problem, Premier Hao said, "Under the subtle relationship between Taiwan and Mainland, it is no good to say too much on the issue." See The Central Daily News front page, international edition, March 14, 1991. Also from an editorial of The Capital Morning News (February 22, 1990) titled "The President in a Democratic Country Should Frequently Speak," we can see that even presidential speech on public occasions is still not a very common practice in Taiwan.

14 Governmental Newspaper was dominant, and very often monopolized, before the late nineteenth century. For detailed discussion, see Kung-chin Ko, History of Chinese Newspaper 2nd ed. (Taipei: Taiwan Student Book Store, 1964).

15 After several political bans have been lifted in Taiwan in recent years, there have been more oral discourse -- especially in political domain. Generally speaking, the DPP politicians are more aggressive in spreading their ideas than the KMT politicians. Among the KMT politicians, younger generation is more aggressive in speaking out on public matters. However, such an increase in oral discourse is quite limited to a few aggressive politicians in both parties. On the other hand, many politicians see publications -- magazines, newspapers, brochures, books -- as important tools for spreading their political ideas. Thus, oral discourse is still not representative of both parties.
Among the eight arguments from definition/genus, arguments from the nature of the office of chief magistrate and from the nature of the sovereignty of the people were presented twice in the address. Please see Weaver, *The Ethics of Rhetoric* 97-99.

Those twelve of Burke's discourse are: *Tract on the Popery Laws* (1765), *Speech to the Electors of Bristol, A Letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe, M.P.* (1792), *Letter to William Smith, Esq.* (1795), a second letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe (1795), *A letter on the Affairs of Ireland*, the speech delivered in the House of Commons (1775), the speech delivered in Parliament attacking Fox's East India Bill (1783), *Reflections on the Revolution in France, Letter to a Member of the National Assembly* (1791), *Speech On American Taxation*, and *Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs*.

Those seventeen of Lincoln's discourse are: *The perpetuation of Our Political Institutions* (1838), a speech delivered in the Illinois House of Representatives, an address to the Washingtonian Temperance Society, an address to young men on the subject of the law profession (1850), the speech at Peoria (1854), a speech at Springfield (1857), the *First Inaugural Address*, the *First Message to Congress* (1861), the *Second Annual Message to Congress* (1862), a response to O.H. Browning of Quincy, Illinois, a speech delivered at Baltimore (1864), the "House Divided" speech (1858), a speech at Cincinnati (1859), the address at Cooper Union Institute (1860), *Meditation on the Divine Will* (1862), the *Gettysburg Address*, and his letter to Cuthbert Bullitt.

For example, Sproule, "An Emerging Rationale for Revolution: Argument from Circumstance and Definition in Polemics Against the Stamp Act"; Medhurst, "The First Amendment vs. Human Rights: A Case Study in Community Sentiment and Argument from Definition."

For example, Ziegelmueller and Dause (1975) define an argument as a complete unit of logical proof including three basic elements: the data, the reasoning process, and the conclusion (85); Stephen Toulmin's layout of argument involves six components: claim, grounds, warrant, backing, modality, and rebuttal (1958, 99-105); Chaim Perelman contended that an argument "allows for the transference to the conclusion of the adherence accorded the
premises . . ." (1968, 49); for Whately, arguments are premises that serve to support a conclusion (1963, 39). Generally speaking, a claim/conclusion and its support are two most basic elements in an argument.

20 A total of ten editorials are randomly selected from The Central Daily News and The Capital Morning News for preliminary analysis. Each editorial has been carefully examined. Major claims can be identified without much difficulty although different types of arguments need more time to identify. Due to the limited number of editorials being analyzed, there is no obvious tendency with regard to which type of argument is more frequently used by certain party. Nonetheless, the analysis procedure is quite workable.

21 In the preliminary analysis, the length of arguments identified in selected editorials does vary. More often, those arguments include several sentences. However, some of them include limited and straightforward sentences, while some of them include more than one paragraph.
CHAPTER VI

AN OVERVIEW OF ARGUMENTS IN BOTH NEWSPAPERS

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a general overview of the analysis of establishment/opposition editorials, which provide the data for this study. A general picture of the arguments in the editorials of both newspapers is presented, and detailed analysis and discussions are left for later chapters. Key figures are presented in this chapter—such as percentage and ratio of argument types. In-depth analysis is presented in later chapters—such as how an issue is defined similarly or differently by the two newspapers. Thus, readers may find that some degree of quantification is shown in this chapter, while in-depth, qualitative analysis is presented in later chapters.

ARGUMENTS FROM DEFINITION/GENUS VS. CIRCUMSTANCE

Fifty editorials of the same dates (see Appendix A) were randomly selected from The Central Daily News and The Capital Morning News. A total of 355 arguments are identified in the editorials selected from The Central Daily News, and 309 arguments are identified in those from The Capital Morning News. Generally speaking, the editorials of The Central Daily News are a bit longer
than those of The Capital Morning News. This might have been the reason that more arguments are identified in The Central Daily News.

For both newspapers, the type of argument most frequently used is argument from definition/genus. Argument from circumstance is the second most frequently used type of argument. Other types of arguments are also noted—including argument from cause-to-effect, argument from similitude, and the rhetorical-historical argument, they are not used so often as argument from definition and argument from circumstance. In both newspapers, these three types of arguments account for less than 20% of the total arguments (see Appendix B).

The ratio of arguments from definition/genus to arguments from circumstance in The Central Daily News is three to one, with 63% of the arguments from definition/genus and 21% from circumstance. In The Capital Morning News, argument from definition/genus is also dominant, with 48% of the arguments from definition/genus and 35% from circumstance. Although both newspapers use argument from definition/genus most frequently, argument from definition/genus is by far the most dominant argument form in The Central Daily News, while this form of argument appears less frequently in The Capital Morning News. Although argument from circumstance is not used so often as argument from definition in The Capital Morning News, the percentage of argument from circumstance in The Capital Morning News is higher than that in The Central Daily News (35% vs. 21%). In other words, The Capital Morning News uses argument from circumstance more often than The Central Daily News does.
In Weaver's theory, although argument from circumstance and argument from cause-to-effect are two different types of arguments, they possess the same ontological grounding. That is, these two types of arguments are concerned with emergent conditions and how changing conditions might have certain effects. They are not concerned with the stable and constant nature of things/issues. At this point, Weaver saw these two types of arguments as belonging to the same category. The only difference is that the argument from cause-to-effect (or consequence) "attempts a forecast of results," while the argument from circumstance "attempts only an estimate of current conditions or pressures" (The Ethics of Rhetoric, 1965, 57). If the percentages of argument from circumstance and argument from cause-to-effect are added, the distinction between two newspapers becomes more obvious. The Central Daily News has 27% of its arguments from this category, while The Capital Morning News has 43% of its arguments from this category. This seems to suggest that The Capital Morning News exhibits more concern about emergent and changing conditions and effects of such conditions than the other newspaper.

As noted in Chapter II, Weaver identified argument from definition and from genus as the same category because both are concerned with the nature and essence of a thing/issue. Recall, the slight difference is that the former defines issues/things clearly in the argumentation process, while the latter assumes that the nature of certain things has already existed in the audience's mind thus is presented as genus without clearly laying out definition for it. That
is, a genus is "an already recognized convention," a definition is "defined at the moment by the orator" (The Ethics of Rhetoric, 1965, 86). In the analysis of the selected editorials, the two newspapers use argument from definition/genus most frequently. A subtle difference is that The Central Daily News argues from genus more often while The Capital Morning News tends to define issues in the argumentation process more often. Within the argument from definition/genus category, 74% of the arguments is definition and 26% is genus in The Capital Morning News. In contrast, The Central Daily News has 36% of the arguments from definition and 64% from genus (within the definition/genus category). The possible reason of such a difference will be explored in Chapter VIII.

**TYPES OF ISSUES DEFINED**

Different types of topics, either defined in the argument or presented as genus, are identified and categorized. Both newspapers have about the same number of types of argument from definition/genus—41 types in The Central Daily News (see Appendix C) and 40 types in The Capital Morning News (see Appendix D). Among different types of topics defined, "democracy" is the type that occurs most frequently, either defined or presented as a genus in the argument, in both newspapers. The word "democracy" is present in about 70% of the fifty selected editorials from each newspaper. Although democracy is defined or presented quite differently in the two newspapers (as discussed in Chapter VII), there is no doubt that democracy is on top of the two newspapers' agenda. "People's
opinion" and "administration by law" are two other common topics defined frequently in both newspapers. These common topics though are often defined by the two newspapers, they are defined from different perspectives or with different emphases. For example, in defining democracy, *The Central Daily News* emphasizes the "civil responsibility" aspect, while *The Capital Morning News* often defines democracy from a "civil right" perspective. In defining "administration by law," *The Central Daily News* emphasizes enforcement of law, while *The Capital Morning News* often questions the legitimacy of law. These distinctions will be further discussed in a later chapter.

Some topics are frequently defined in one newspaper but not in the other newspaper. For example, national security, social stability, traditional values/ethics, cultural heritage, moral character, moral cultivation, and collective interests are major topics frequently defined or presented as genus in *The Central Daily News*, but not in *The Capital Morning News*. These topics reflect the conservative position of the KMT very well. These topics reflect a concern for stable, constant, and fixed values which are consistent with conservative position--according to Weaver's conception of conservative.

In contrast, totalitarian system, human/civil right, people's power, freedom of expression, bureaucratism are topics shown constantly in *The Capital Morning News*, but not in *The Central Daily News*. The difference in the selection of topics seems to suggest that the two newspapers have quite different agendas, and imply that they make
appeal to their readers in significantly different ways. In later chapters (Chapter VII to Chapter IX), we will further look at how the two newspapers have exhibited very different rhetorical characters.

TYPES OF CIRCUMSTANCES USED

While about the same number of types of topics are defined in both newspapers, the number of types of circumstances in the two newspapers are significantly different. A total of 24 varieties of circumstances are identified in The Capital Morning News (see Appendix F), while only 12 varieties of circumstances are shown in The Central Daily News (see Appendix E). In other words, The Capital Morning News seems to be able to use a broader spectrum of circumstances to support its arguments.

The Capital Morning News not only uses larger varieties of circumstances, but also is able to make use of circumstances as argumentative support in a more flexible way. When the same type of circumstance is used by both newspapers, The Capital Morning News is able to use the circumstance to support many different propositions/arguments while The Central Daily News uses the circumstance to support quite limited types of propositions. For example, The Central Daily News mainly uses current status of the relationships between Taiwan and Mainland to propose unification idea, while The Capital Morning News uses the same circumstance to argue no basis for unification, to criticize Mainland policy and other policies of the KMT government, and to criticize certain practice of the Communist government in Mainland.
Some common circumstances are frequently shown in both newspapers—such as the democratic world trend, the declining trend of Communism in the world, the relationships/current status of Taiwan and Mainland China, Taiwan in a transitional period, and the social-economic status/change in Taiwan. In fact, these are major types of circumstances used by both newspapers. Although these circumstances are commonly used by both newspapers, they are used to support quite different or even completely opposite propositions. For example, The Central Daily News uses the current status of Taiwan-Mainland relationship to argue that the unification of China can be foreseen, while The Capital Morning News uses the same circumstance—with a different political/ideological interpretation—to argue that there is no basis for unification. There are many similar examples which will be analyzed and discussed in Chapter IX.

Some circumstances frequently used by The Capital Morning News are seldom employed by The Central Daily News, including people's opinions, and problems of Taiwan's political status (for example, constitutional crisis, legislation problem, legitimacy of old members in the National Assembly). These circumstances mostly represent the opposition party's attack on the ruling government; thus, they provide good argument sources for The Capital Morning News, but not for The Central Daily News.

In short, in terms of quantity, both newspapers use argument from definition/genus more often than the other types of arguments. As the two newspapers are compared, The Central Daily News uses
argument from definition/genus more frequently than the other newspaper, while *The Capital Morning News* uses argument from circumstance more often than the other. With this general picture in mind, in the following chapters we will then look at quality aspect of the analysis, namely, how arguments are constructed in terms of argument from definition/genus and argument from circumstance, how issues are defined, and how different circumstances are presented. As argument from definition is the type of argument used by both newspapers most frequently, it is discussed and analyzed in Chapter VII and Chapter VIII. Argument from circumstances by both newspapers are presented in Chapter IX.
CHAPTER VII
WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?
--ARGUMENTS FROM DEFINITION/GENUS

The editorials in The Central Daily News and The Capital Morning News may disagree on many issues, but they agree at least on one issue: democracy is the future of Taiwan. Democracy is a term that occurs most frequently in both newspapers' editorials. Among fifty editorials selected from each newspaper, the word "democracy" is present in thirty-five editorials of The Central Daily News and in thirty-six editorials of The Capital Morning News.

Democracy is an issue repeatedly defined, discussed, and presented to support arguments, though from different perspectives or with different emphases. Because of the diversity of discussions on democracy by the two newspapers, it will require a whole chapter to analyze how democracy is defined. With an in-depth analysis of how democracy is defined, we are also able to determine how some major rhetorical characters of the two newspapers are presented in their arguments.

In some cases, democracy is presented as a genus, that is, as a term not defined in the argument. In other cases, democracy is defined in several different ways. In the following analysis, we will first look at how democracy is defined similarly, and then analyze
how it is defined differently—with obvious contrasts—in the editorials of The Central Daily News and The Capital Morning News.

SIMILARITIES IN DEFINING DEMOCRACY

There are five similarities in the two newspapers' definitions of democracy: democracy as the "no-return" road for Taiwan, democracy as grounded in people's opinion, democracy as administration by law, democracy as a party politics, and democracy as implemented through election.

First, both newspapers' editorials agree that democracy is a road that Taiwan must take. Both newspapers define democracy as "the no-return road" for Taiwan (The Capital Morning News June 1, 1990; The Central Daily News January 12, 1990). By "no-return road," it means that Taiwan can only move toward democracy and can never move backward, for example, moving back to totalitarian politics.

Second, both newspapers agree that a democratic institution is grounded in a respect for people's opinions. The Central Daily News defines that "the purpose of democratic politics is to collaborating people's opinion, so to improve public interests" (January 4, 1990). The Capital Morning News suggests that "in a democratic country, people's opinions are presented to legislative departments and administration departments through organization/association, political parties, and legislators" (September 19, 1989). Both newspapers define people's opinion as an essential element in democracy.
Third, both newspapers also agree that administration by law is a channel for fulfilling democracy. However, in defining "administration by law," the two newspapers exhibit somewhat different emphases. *The Central Daily News* emphasizes the enforcement of law while *The Capital Morning News* emphasizes and questions the legitimacy of law. *The Central Daily News* claims that "a democratic society has to depend on administration by law" (June 1, 1990) and "law exists only when it is enforced" (December 9, 1989). On the other hand, *The Capital Morning News* reminds readers that the legitimacy of law has to be established before law can be enforced. "The essence of administration by law cannot be fulfilled when the law is institutionalized by a legislative assembly lacking the basis of people's support. Such a law is lack of legitimacy and appropriateness" (*The Capital Morning News*, September 19, 1989).

Fourth, both newspapers define that "a democratic politics is a party politics" (*The Capital Morning News*, September 19, 1989, May 13, 1990; *The Central Daily News*, July 12, 1990). By "party politics," they emphasize that in a democratic country competition between/among different parties is a common phenomenon. By "party politics," they also mean that political power is open to different groups rather than monopolized by any single party.

Fifth, both newspapers also define election as a necessary procedure of moving toward democracy (*The Capital Morning News*, September 19, 1989, November 30, 1989; *The Central Daily News* November 13, 1989). In defining election as an essential procedure
of democracy, *The Capital Morning News* pays more attention to "fair" competition principle of democratic election (November 30, 1989), while *The Central Daily News* makes appeal to "peaceful and rational competition" (November 13, 1989). As the ruling party has more resources in hand, the opposition party newspaper thus emphasizes "fairness" of election. As the opposition party often takes more aggressive or even radical actions, the ruling party newspaper thus makes appeal to "peace and rationality."

**Differences in Defining Democracy**

As the two newspapers generally agree on democracy as a road Taiwan must take, and on democracy as grounded in people's opinions and implemented through administration by law, party politics and election, the two newspapers differ significantly in how they define democracy. These differences exhibit a very marked contrast in terms of their rhetorical characters. These major contrasts include defining democracy from an actional perspective vs. a conceptual perspective, democracy first vs. societal stability first, emphasis on civil responsibility vs. emphasis on civil right, positive connotations vs. negative connotations of democracy, and regional concern vs. ethnic concern in practicing democracy.

1. Actional Perspective vs. Conceptual Perspective

In defining democracy, *The Capital Morning News* tends to have a stronger action-orientation, while *The Central Daily News* mainly defines democracy at a conceptual level. The actional-orientation of
The Capital Morning News' definition of democracy are shown in many cases. For example,

There are five essential elements in a democratic politics: routined re-election, independence of administration power, protection of basic human rights, administration by law, and party politics which are all closely related to the re-election of legislators. (September 19, 1989)

The election system in a democratic society is based on reasonable competition rules. To create a reasonable, equal, and mutual-trust society, please start with completely revising the Law of Election and Recall.1 (November 30, 1989)

The suggested "re-election of legislators" and "revising the Law of Election and Recall" indicate specific actions or policies to be taken. The Capital Morning News also proposes nationalization of military and claims that nationalization of military is an important indicator of democracy, in which an actional dimension is present.

Nationalization of military is a a common and normal phenomenon in a democratic country, and is also an indicator of democracy. During the past forty years, under the old Chiang and the little Chiang strongmen government, . . . neutralization and nationalization of military has never been carried out. (May 19, 1990)

In an editorial discussing new constitution, The Capital Morning News shows us how democracy can be practiced through civilian referendum:

To fulfill the highest democratic principle: "power in people," and to ensure the people's opinion basis of new constitution, we propose that the draft of new constitution should be approved through civilian referendum--no matter what method2 is used to institutionalize new constitution. (July 11, 1990)
In the above arguments, re-election of legislators, administration by law, revision of the Law of Election and Recall, neutralization and nationalization of military, and civilian referendum of new constitution all show a direct and specific actional dimension. By contrast, in defining democracy The Central Daily News does not show such a strong actional orientation. For example,

The major difference between a democratic president and a totalitarian dictator is that the former is always with people and always takes people's welfare into consideration, while the latter is separated from people and takes only personal and in-group benefits into concern with ruthless means. (September 15, 1989)

The purpose of a democratic politics is to collaborate with people's opinion, thus to improve public interests, rather than to pursue private interests. The result of pursuing private interests will be the bankruptcy of public interests. To develop a democratic society, we have to understand the essence of democracy. (January 4, 1990)

The above arguments do not show the kind of action-orientation that occurs in The Capital Morning News. For example, "taking people's welfare into consideration," "collaborating with people's opinion," "improving public interests," and "understanding the essence of democracy" appear to be more conceptual and principle-oriented than actional as compared with "re-election of legislators," "administration by law," "revision of the Law of Election and Recall," "nationalization of military power," and "civilian referendum" in The Capital Morning News. The suggestion of "civilian referendum" in The Capital Morning News implies a respect for people's opinion and public interests. "Civilian referendum" suggests a specific action to
be taken. In contrast, The Central Daily News' suggestions of "collaborating with people's opinion" and "improving public interests" are more like principles, and do not show a specific action dimension.

In one editorial titled "Where is the beef of Premier Hao's cabinet?" (June 12, 1980), the actional tendency of The Capital Morning News is explicitly reflected. The editorial criticizes Premier Hao's report in the Legislative Assembly on the grounds that it "states only principles without specific, actionable policies." This is the major reason that the newspaper's editorial asked, "Where is the beef?" The editorial also expresses its concern about qualification of Hao--formerly a "military strongman"--as a premier, especially when Taiwan is moving toward democracy.

However, this does not suggest that The Capital Morning News only defines democracy at the actional level. In some cases, the paper's definition of democracy is obviously conceptual and ideological. For example,

The so-called democracy does not only mean the institutional aspect, in essence it means people's bottom-up formation of will. If we ignore such a formation of will and only talk about institutionalized democracy, we will not be able to achieve the real democracy. (January 19, 1990)

The so-called "democracy" is grounded in the theory of contract. People is the political main body of such a democracy. This political main body must have its territory, which is what our government frequently call "the area reached by administration power" or what the Democratic Progressive Party's "The Great Democracy Constitution" calls "magistrate." Democracy can only be fulfilled with an obvious and definite magistrate. (June 24, 1990)
On the other hand, this does not mean that The Central Daily News does not show an actional dimension at all in defining democracy; it is rather a matter of degree. For example, The Central Daily News proposes that "we strongly oppose to violence. A democratic election is a peaceful and rational competition, not a violent revolution" (November 13, 1989). "What our country's political development at this stage needs is neither democratic slogan nor unpractical ideals. What we need is to establish democratic institution and to carry out the norm prescribed in the Constitution" (March 15, 1990). The above arguments also show an actional dimension, but this actional dimension is not as specific as those in the editorials of The Capital Morning News. For example, The Central Daily News' proposition of "establishing democratic institution and carrying out the norm of the Constitution" is not as specific as "civilian referendum of new constitution draft" in The Capital Morning News; and the "peaceful and rational election" is not as specific as "routined re-election of legislators."

Overall, in different places both newspapers include an actional dimension and a conceptual dimension in defining democracy. However, the arguments in The Capital Morning News include the actional dimension much more frequently than The Central Daily News. When the actional dimensions in both newspapers are compared, the actional propositions in The Capital Morning News tend to be more specific—in terms of what action one can actually take—than the other newspaper.
2. Democracy vs. Societal Stability: An Issue of Priority

In addition to democracy, "national security" and "societal stability" are frequently emphasized in The Central Daily News, but not in The Capital Morning News. The Central Daily News seems to suggest a potential conflict in maintaining stability and in improving democracy. For The Central Daily News, stability should have the priority. "Without a stable society, there will be only violent and orderless 'democracy'" (May 13, 1990). "It is obvious that economic development and growth can make progress only with a stable political, social, and economic environment. It is an unarguable fact that stability is a prerequisite of growth" (November 30, 1989).

Societal stability does not appear to be a major agenda in the editorials of The Capital Morning News. Only in one editorial that we can see how The Capital Morning News prioritizes democracy and stability. "It is only through peaceful democratic reform that ruling party and opposition party can be united, our society can be stable, and our nation can have bright future" (June 1, 1990). In contrast to The Central Daily News, The Capital Morning News suggests that democracy is a prerequisite for national progress and stability. While The Central Daily News seems to suggest a potential conflict between improving democracy and maintaining societal stability, The Capital Morning News does not seem to suggest such a conflict.

3. Civil Right vs. Civil Responsibility in Democracy

Civil responsibility and civil right are two sides of a coin in a democratic country. They are related to the "give-and-take" nature
of democracy. However, it is interesting to note that The Capital Morning News tends to argue for civil right more often while The Central Daily News tends to argue for civil responsibility more often. The following passages show how civil right is argued in The Capital Morning News:

Public gathering and demonstration are basic rights of people. The Constitution clearly protects people's freedom of public gathering. Under the 39-year Martial Law period, the Kuo-min-tang government has deprived people's freedom of public gathering.4 (October 13, 1989)

We always insist that "freedom of speech and freedom of thought" are basic principles of democratic constitution. They are clearly indicated in our Constitution Rule No. 11 as people's basic rights. (November 13, 1989)

Human right is one of the greatest achievements in human history, and is a basic indicator of democracy. ((March 26, 1990)

In contrast to The Capital Morning News' emphasis on civil right, The Central Daily News tends to emphasize civil responsibility in a democratic country. The following two passages show how The Central Daily News emphasizes the importance of civil responsibility in election and in maintaining social stability respectively:

Due to the importance of maintaining a safe and stable living environment, and this election as a crucial turning point in developing democracy, all voters should clearly recognize your responsibility and should value your ballots. (November 21, 1989)
We cannot solely count on government to maintain social stability. Social stability must depend on everyone's self-examination and self-discipline. When a society is unstable, everyone should assume a responsibility. By the same token, to recover stability of a society, everyone also has a responsibility. If everyone can start with oneself, leads a rational, self-disciplined, and healthy life, and collaborates with government's strong and healthy policy, our country will gradually become a society of democracy, freedom, and administration by law. (November 30, 1989)

For The Central Daily News, civilians have to fulfil their responsibility (such as voting in election) in a democratic country, they also have the responsibility to maintain stability and democracy of a nation.

4. Positive vs. Negative Connotations of Democracy

While democracy appears to be a god term in The Capital Morning News, it is not a term uncontested in The Central Daily News. In some cases, The Central Daily News tries to point out some negative aspects of democracy. For example, The Central Daily News criticizes the influence of interest groups in a democratic country.

Different interest groups lobby the legislators, or even monitor some legislators to protect their own benefits. This is a typical character of democracy and almost no one democratic country can avoid such a problem. (December 18, 1989)

The shadow of interest groups can never be cleared out of the congress. This is a "must evil" of democracy. But advanced democratic countries have all institutionalized laws to constrain lobbying activities. Our legislative department should take these legislative examples into serious consideration, and institutionalize such a kind of law as soon as possible. (December 18, 1989)
The influence of interests groups is described as a "shadow" in the congress, and defined as a "must evil" of democracy. Another problem of democracy criticized by The Central Daily News is inefficiency of legislation.

The inefficiency of legislation often results in incapability of government administration. This is almost the greatest crisis of every democracy-developing country. The excessive party power struggle in the congress result in ignorance of people's welfare. This will endanger the security of the political system itself. (December 18, 1989)

"Inefficiency of legislation" is defined as "the greatest crisis" of democracy-developing countries and is considered as "endangering" political system. The Central Daily News suggests to its readers that influence of interest groups and inefficiency of legislation are part of the nature of democracy.

In addition to pointing out the influence of interest groups as a "must evil" of democracy and legislative inefficiency as a "crisis" of democracy, The Central Daily News also criticizes those who abuse democracy. "We cannot say that democracy is a 'all-powerful medicine.' In fact, administration by law is a stunning blow to those democracy-abusers" (May 13, 1990). For The Central Daily News, those who abuse democracy are those who are concerned with self-interest without taking public interests (such as national security, societal stability) into consideration. This implies that those democracy-abusers are only concerned with their civil rights with little regard for their civil responsibility. The Central Daily News also suggests that government's democratic policy seems to result in recent social disorder and instability.
To promote democracy in our country, the government has adopted an open attitude in many aspects, and has lifted the Martial Law. These have increased energy in democratic politics, but unavoidably, it also gives some people a chance to destroy national security and social stability. (November 21, 1989)

Showing a concern with societal stability, The Central Daily News uses such a phrase as "immature democratic trend" to describe the current status of society (December 9, 1989). It also suggests that "without a stable society, there will be only violent and orderless 'democracy'" (May 13, 1990).

While The Central Daily News seems to blame democratic policy for bringing in instability, The Capital Morning News does not have similar suggestion. The Capital Morning News points out that "uncertainty" is a major character during this transitional period from totalitarian system to democratic system (June 1, 1990). "Uncertainty" appears to be a more neutral term than "instability," as the latter includes a more negative connotation. In contrast to The Central Daily News' criticism of some problems of democracy, The Capital Morning News sees democracy mainly as a protector of human rights and does not contest the nature of "democracy" as The Central Daily News does.

5. Regional Concern vs. Ethnic Concern: A Matter of Scope

Looking behind the consensus on democracy as a road that Taiwan must take, are different visions in practicing democracy which the two newspapers reflect. The Capital Morning News takes Taiwan's future as a state into concern when proposing democratic
reform, while The Central Daily News takes Chinese future as an ethnic group (mainly including people in Taiwan and in Mainland China) into consideration.

The Capital Morning News argues that "Democracy can only be practiced with a concrete magistrate" (June 24, 1990).

If we really want to practice democracy, first we have to break the traditional "one China" ideology. And we should treat Taiwan as an area to practice democracy. With respect to the so-called Han ethnic link suggested by the Kuo-min-tang government, we can show our concern for the future of Mainland China, and hope democracy and freedom can be practiced in Mainland. But we should not place such a concern under the "one China" model. Otherwise, Taiwan--as a state--will become vague. Taiwan will not be an entity with its own concrete space. (June 24, 1990)

For The Capital Morning News, Taiwan is the area that the government's power can actually reach, thus democracy can actually be practiced. To talk about practicing democracy in Mainland China is unrealistic because Mainland is not a magistrate of the government in Taiwan. By opposing to the "one China" ideology, it implies that there can be "several" China.

In contrast to The Capital Morning News' regional concern, The Central Daily News often uses the terms "Chinese ethnic" or "whole China" when proposing democratic development.

The future of the Republic of China can only exist by carrying out democratic and free unification project under The Three People's Principles. We will never allow any political proposition that has no regard for nation, ethnic, tradition, history and culture, and impedes the progress of unification. (October 24, 1989)
In *The Central Daily News*, unification of Taiwan and Mainland China has frequently been emphasized. The ideal is to establish Taiwan as a model of a democratic area, then to unite Mainland China and to practice democracy in Mainland by using Taiwan's experience as a model. For *The Capital Morning News*, this is an unrealistic ideal. But for *The Central Daily News*, those with regional concern in Taiwan are those who "deceive ancestors, and forget who they are and where they are from" (December 29, 1989). In an editorial discussing unification of China, *The Central Daily News* argues that "The constitution reform team should take the whole China into consideration, and should not limit its vision to Taiwan area" (July 12, 1990). By "whole China," it means to include Mainland China. *The Central Daily News* opposes to the regional concern and insists on the "whole China" consideration.

**SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION**

In defining democracy and using democracy as a ground to support various arguments, the two newspapers exhibit more differences than similarities. They are different in terms of different perspectives (actional perspective vs. conceptual perspective), different priorities (democracy vs. stability), different emphases (civil right vs. civil responsibility), different connotations (positive vs. negative), and different scopes of concern (regional vs. ethnic). While both newspapers agree that Taiwan has to move toward democracy, they seem to disagree on what democracy is and how Taiwan should move toward democracy. Although this chapter
focuses on how democracy is defined and used to support various arguments by the two newspapers, the differences discussed above also reflect how issues are defined and argued differently in general.

Weaver's thesis that one's habitual use of certain argument type reflects one's political position implies that one's rhetoric reflects one's political position in general. Although Weaver's original thesis is not completely supported, its implication (that is, rhetoric reflects political position) seems to be supported as we look at how democracy is defined by the two newspapers. For Weaver, social stability is the major concern of a conservative. The Central Daily News, which represents the conservative ruling party, has constantly shown a serious concern for social stability. As mentioned earlier, priority is given to social stability rather than democracy in The Central Daily News. That is, the conservative position of the ruling party has been reflected in the editorials of The Central Daily News in the way that social stability is constantly emphasized and prioritized.

Another support for Weaver's thesis comes from the different perspectives of the two newspapers in defining democracy. In defining democracy, The Capital Morning News emphasizes the actional dimension while The Central Daily News focuses on the conceptual dimension more often. Weaver suggested that "those who argue from consequence tend to go all out for action" (1965, 112). Weaver also define those who argue from circumstance tend to be liberals in political position. In other words, for Weaver the liberals are more action-oriented. The Capital Morning News' editorials
reflect the liberal position of the opposition party in the way that its
definition of democracy show a stronger actional-orientation. There
is a subtle difference should be noted. Weaver suggest those who
argue from consequence/circumstance tend to go out for action. In
*The Capital Morning News*, we found that argument from definition is
still used more often than argument from circumstance. But when its
definitions of democracy are examined, we found its definitions tend
to show an actional-orientation. At this point, Weaver's thesis that
rhetoric reflects political position is partially supported since
argument from circumstance is not the dominant type of argument
used by *The Capital Morning News*. We need to analyze the
editorials further before conclusion can be made.

*The Central Daily News* represents the party with political
presumption while *The Capital Morning News* represents the party
without political presumption. Both newspapers use argument from
definition/genus most frequently. But when the same issue is
defined, the two newspapers show more differences than similarities.
This seems to suggest that in a democracy-developing country, both
the party with presumption and the party without presumption tend
to use argument from definition/genus most frequently in their
arguments. However, those with presumption and those without
presumption tend to define the same issue in a significantly different
way. Whately's doctrine of presumption suggests that those with
presumption assume the status quo is commonly accepted and does
not need to be defended unless challenge arises. The present case
seems to suggest that as the opposition party newspaper--
representing those without presumption—begins to challenge the status quo and defines issues in its way, the ruling party newspaper—representing those with presumption—has to defend the status quo and to define issues in its way. Thus, it turns out that the two newspapers both try to define major issues, but they define them in significantly different ways or even in direct contrasts.

In the next chapter, we will look at how other issues are defined and argued, and how the differences between the two newspapers' editorials can be summarized into a crucial difference in their character, namely, the "top-down" orientation of The Central Daily News and the "bottom-up" orientation in The Capital Morning News.
Notes

1 The Law of Election and Recall is considered by the DPP as failing to meet fair competition principle. Many restrictions are considered as unreasonable such as qualifications of candidates and uses of mass media for campaign. The Law of Election and and Recall was finally revised and the revision was legitimized on July 16, 1991.

2 The method refers to either partial revision (preferred by the KMT) or complete re-writing (preferred by the DPP).

3 There have been disagreements between the KMT and the DPP with respect to whether the Constitution should be partly revised or completely re-written. The KMT prefers the former, while the DPP proposes the latter. During the Heated debate on this issue, the DPP proposes "The Great Democracy Constitution" to take place of the original constitution.

4 The Martial Law was implemented after the KMT government's retreat to Taiwan on the grounds that Taiwan was under an usual period. Under the Martial Law, people cannot have public gathering and demonstration.

5 "God term" is defined by Weaver as "expression about which all other expressions are ranked as subordinate and serving dominations and powers. Its force imparts to the others their lesser degree of force, and fixes the scale by which degrees of comparison are understood" (Weaver, The Ethics of Rhetoric 212). In other words, God term represents certain value(s) upheld by a group of people.

6 Both the KMT government and the Chinese Communist government insist that there is only one China and both claim to be the only legitimate Chinese government. Both refuse to consider Taiwan and the Mainland China as two countries. The DPP criticizes this "one China" ideology as unrealistic and argues that this "one China" ideology does not take people's opinion into consideration.

7 Whately, Elements of Ethics 112-14.
CHAPTER VIII

TOP-DOWN ORIENTATION VS. BOTTOM-UP ORIENTATION:
ARGUMENTS FROM DEFINITION/GENUS

The editorials in The Central Daily News tend to reflect a top-down character in defining issues and proposing arguments, while those in The Capital Morning News show a bottom-up orientation. It should be noted that the top-down character of The Central Daily News is implicit in the way issues are defined and emphasized; while the bottom-up character of The Capital Morning News is explicit and consciously presented with the term "bottom-up" directly shown in the arguments. In the following analysis, we will first look at how the top-down character is shown in The Central Daily News, then look at how the bottom-up character is reflected in The Capital Morning News.

TOP-DOWN CHARACTER IN THE CENTRAL DAILY NEWS

The top-down character of editorials in The Central Daily News might have been closely related to the collectivistic thinking in the Kuo-min-tang. This collectivistic thinking, when reflected in the editorials, is characterized by a national and ethnic scope of concern, an emphasis on public/collective interests and on civil responsibility. By looking at how some agendas/issues are presented in the form of
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definition or genus, one can understand how the top-down, collectivistic character is present in The Central Daily News.

1. National and Ethnic Scope of Concern

The top-down character of The Central Daily News is shown implicitly in the way that it often grounds its arguments in a national and ethnic scope of concern. The words "nation," "ethnic," "history," and "culture" occur in The Central Daily News far more often than in The Capital Morning News. The following are some examples of how national consciousness, ethnic consciousness, national security, traditional values, and cultural heritage are defined or presented as genus and how the top-down character is implicit in these arguments.

"National consciousness" and "ethnic consciousness" have frequently been presented as genera to support some arguments in The Central Daily News. For example, The Central Daily News argues that some people who lack "national and ethnic consciousness" and engaged in "irrational activities" will cause the collapse of the nation and become a "stumbling block in promoting democracy" (October 24, 1989). In other words, individuals without a sense of national and ethnic consciousness will endanger the nation. The argument is presented from a national and ethnic perspective, not from an individual's perspective.

As mentioned earlier, national security is defined as having the priority in national development.
During the process of Taiwan's economic development, although experts and scholars have debated over the priority issue of stability and growth,¹ our government has always insisted on the policy of "Seeking growth under stability, and maintaining stability under growth."

... It is obvious that economic development and growth can make progress only with a stable political, social, and economic environment. It is an unarguable fact that stability is a prerequisite of growth. (November 30, 1989)

This national and ethnic scope of concern is also reflected in consistent emphasis on traditional values and the Chinese cultural heritage. The Central Daily News shows a strong concern about the degeneration of Chinese cultural values. "The present major problem of our society is the rise of utilitarianism ... which results in the degeneration of Chinese cultural influence. The Confucian tradition has become farther and father away from our life" (February 17, 1990). The fall of traditional values has resulted in political chaos.

The disorder of current political status, on the surface, seems to result from the democratic trend, and the conflict between old and new thoughts. In reality, it has resulted from the recess of cultural values. The old values have been abandoned. And the new thoughts have not matured. Under the influence of utilitarianism, political culture is affected by economic culture, which results in a short-sighted political thought trend. Long-term stability has been ignored. (March 26, 1990)

The Central Daily News also uses "cultural values" to criticize the Democratic Progressive Party.

The so-called opposition party is just a group of people lacking historical and cultural understanding and with narrow-minded political ideas. They do whatever they want to under the name of democracy. As a result, our society seems to gradually forget where today's national prosperity has come from and where people's richness and security have come from. (October 24, 1989)
The above examples show how issues are argued from national and ethnic perspectives. Individuals are expected to conform to the needs of the nation and ethnic heritage. Individuals are "lost" or "invisible" in these arguments. It should be noted that these topics--national consciousness, ethnic consciousness, national security, traditional values, and cultural heritage--are mainly presented as genus to support arguments or claims. That is, they are assumed as generally understandable and commonly accepted; thus they are not defined in the argumentation process. These topics appear frequently in the editorials of The Central Daily News, but not in The Capital Morning News. For example, "national consciousness" appears in 18% of the selected editorials of The Central Daily News, while 2% in The Capital Morning News; "ethnic consciousness" appears in 22% of The Central Daily News editorials, while 2% in The Capital Morning News.

2. Public Interest and Collective Interest

"Public interest" and "collective interest" are like god terms in The Central Daily News; they are not contested at all. They are values that The Central Daily News constantly uses to make appeal to both the public in general and the KMT party members in particular. For example, in defining the purpose of democracy a concern for the public interest is reflected:
Democracy is operated through the National Assembly to decide the leader of the government, and through legislation to supervise government. . . . The purpose is to improve the benefits of all people. If the National Assembly members use this power to pursue their private interests rather than public interests, the beneficiaries of democracy will not be our people, but rather, the beneficiaries will be the assembly members themselves and their representative interest groups. (January 4, 1990)

A concern for collective interest is also reflected in arguing that party members should take the party's collective interest into consideration and should be willing to "sacrifice" personal interests (September 15, 1989).

People in the country and overseas and 1.1 billion Chinese in Mainland China all have great hope in our party. Chinese Kuo-min-tang members should not disappoint the expectation of all Chinese. We should unite ourselves as a body spiritually, and act collectively. By doing so, we can present our collective power, and win the trust and support of all people. (December 7, 1989)

Such an emphasis on collective interest within the KMT has a long history. For example, at the first National Congress of the KMT in 1924, the founding father of the party, Dr. Sun, made a major appeal to unity of the party and asked the members to sacrifice their personal freedom and interests. Under the emphasis on public interest and collective interest, people are viewed as an entity rather than as individuals. Individual differences and preferences are not taken into consideration.
3. Collective Concern and Selflessness as Moral Characters

"Moral character and moral cultivation" is a topic frequently used to support arguments. In one editorial (January 4, 1990), it is argued that moral character of a candidate for public office is as important as his/her capability, and voters should always take a candidate's moral character into consideration. "In a democratic era, although we often propose to elect people with capability and moral character, it always turns out that we have elected people with capability but not with moral characters at the same time" (January 4, 1990). By moral character, The Central Daily News mainly means a collective concern and a spirit of selflessness. "In a democratic era, the moral character we are looking for is a character that emphasizes public interests and ignores private benefit" (January 4, 1990). By moral character, it also means an ability to "cooperate with others" (January 4, 1990).

Based on Chinese cultural tradition, a public officer should have "qualities of both capability and moral character." Our tradition considers that a person "with capability but without moral character" is not an ideal person to take public office. A person with capability but lacking public interest conception, although he/she is capable of handling things, will have a self-interest and self-benefit orientation. . . . Thus we need a person with capability, we also need a person with moral characters. (January 4, 1990)

In suggesting that party members pay attention to moral cultivation, a top-down character is revealed. The editorial suggests that "we [party members] should closely follow the direction indicated by chairperson Li Deng-Hui. . . . [We should] start with personal moral cultivation, then try to influence morality of our
society" (December 7, 1989). The phrase "follow the direction indicated by chairperson Li" obviously shows a top-down character and the party leader is somewhat idolized.

In another editorial, it is suggested that the party members should forget about self-interest and should be willing to "sacrifice oneself." It also suggests that party members should "see the party's will as one's own will, and the party's interest as one's own interest," thus the party will become an "undestroyable entity" (February 15, 1990). The collectivistic and top-down character is shown in the sense that individual members should become selfless and follow whatever is directed by the party leader.

4. Emphasis on Civil Responsibility

As mentioned in the previous chapter, civil responsibility is emphasized by The Central Daily News and is often presented either as genus or in the form of definition. In an editorial discussing quality of environment, it is argued that everyone has "responsibility to take care of our environment" (October 15, 1989). To maintain national security and societal stability, it is suggested that "voters should develop a consensus—that is, to recognize one's responsibility, and to treasure one's ballot" (November 21, 1989). The Central Daily News' emphasis on civil responsibility also reflects its collectivistic character. Its discussion of civil responsibility often comes from a national perspective or a societal perspective, rather than from an individual perspective. The following passage clearly reflects a top-down thinking:
We cannot solely count on government to maintain social stability. Social stability must depend on everyone's self-examination and self-discipline. When a society is unstable, everyone should assume a responsibility. By the same token, to recover stability of a society, everyone also has a responsibility. If everyone can start with oneself, lead a rational, self-disciplined, and healthy life, and collaborate with government's powerful and healthy policy, our country will gradually become a society of democracy, freedom, and administration by law. (November 30, 1989)

In this passage, the phrase "collaborate with government's powerful and healthy policy" shows a top-down character in the sense that it asks people to cooperate with government's policy rather than asking people to comment on government's policy or suggesting government's policy should be grounded in people's opinion.

The top-down character of The Central Daily News is consistent with the collectivistic tradition and the conservative position of the ruling party. An overemphasis on national security and societal stability is likely to result in ignoring individual differences and concerns. Individuals are asked to conform to the needs and interests of the entire nation and society more often than are asked to express what they think.

It should be noted that "nation," "ethnic," "culture," "tradition," "public interests," "selflessness," and "civil responsibility" are mostly presented as genera rather than defined in the argumentation process. As Whately suggests, those with presumption do not need to constantly defend themselves unless challenge arises because the status quo is assumed as sound or valid or should be commonly accepted. The Central Daily News' constant use of genus (rather than definition) seems to suggest that even when the status quo is
challenged and needs to be defended, those with presumption are more likely to use genus than definition, because by using argument from genus, issues are assumed as already understood and accepted by the audience. Argument from genus is used to remind people of certain existing values. Those with presumption are thus more likely to use genus in their arguments. In other words, The Central Daily News' frequent use of genus is quite consistent with its political presumption status.

BOTTOM-UP CHARACTER IN THE CAPITAL MORNING NEWS

In contrast to the top-down character in the editorials of The Central Daily News, The Capital Morning News repeatedly emphasizes the "bottom-up" nature of democracy. While the top-down character of The Central Daily News is implicit in its arguments, the bottom-up character is explicit in The Capital Morning News in the way that the term "bottom-up" is consciously and directly presented in the arguments. For example, "The formation of democracy is bottom-up" (The Capital Morning News, June 24, 1990).

Such a bottom-up character is shown clearly in its definitions of democracy, civil right, people's power, people's opinion, and its criticism of totalitarianism. In the following analysis, we will see how the bottom-up character is reflected in arguments related to these issues.
1. Democracy as Power in People

In defining democracy, The Capital Morning News argues that "the so-called democracy . . . is mainly formed by the bottom-up will of people" (January 19, 1990). It emphasizes that people are "the major political entity" (June 24, 1990). The bottom-up character is shown in the following passage, where people are described as the ultimate decision-makers of major policy or constitutional change.

To fulfill the highest democratic principle: "main power in people," and to ensure the people's opinion basis of new constitution, we propose that the draft of new constitution should be approved through civilian referendum--no matter what method is used to institutionalize new constitution. (July 11, 1990)

The bottom-up character is shown in the sense that the Constitution is held to be grounded in people's opinion, expressed through the means of civilian referendum, rather than authorized by a top-down constraint imposed on people.

2. Civil Rights as Protected by the Constitution

The Capital Morning News' emphasis on civil rights reflects a concern for human rights from a civilian perspective. It tends to emphasize how people are protected by the Constitution and how the Constitution should fulfill the needs of the people, rather than emphasizing how the people should follow the norm prescribed in the Constitution. In other words, the Constitution is considered as a means to protect people rather than to constrain people. "Public gathering and demonstration" (October 13, 1989), "freedom of speech and freedom of thought" (November 13, 1989), and "freedom of
press" (December 7, 1989) are defined as basic civil rights protected by the Constitution.

It is interesting to note that, although civil rights and civil responsibility are both important in a democratic country, civil responsibility is not emphasized in the selected editorials of *The Capital Morning News*. This emphasis on civil rights over civil responsibility appears to be more individualistic-based. A respect for civil rights is in essence a respect for individuals, while the emphasis on civil responsibility reflects a concern for collective interests.

3. People's Power as Main Force of Change

"People's power" is a term often used by *The Capital Morning News* (for example, November 29, 1989, January 4, 1990, January 19, 1990, March 15, 1990), but not by *The Central Daily News*. People's power is considered as the major force that promotes democratic reform in many countries--such as the Philippines, Poland, Hungary, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia, and is considered to "have rewritten the history of human democratic development" (*The Capital Morning News*, November 29, 1989). The bottom-up character is shown in the sense that people's power--rather than governmental power--is considered as the main force of democratic reform.

*The Capital Morning News* also argues that, in a democratic country, the legitimacy of any governmental policy and action is attained through people's approval because "the country's power is
transformed from people's power" (January 19, 1990). It also asserts that "the people are a country's highest main power-holder," thus people's political activities "deserve the highest degree of tolerance--as long as democratic procedure is followed" (January 19, 1990). Li Deng-Hui's success in the presidential election (1990) is considered as mainly coming from "people's power" rather than from members of the National Assembly (March 15, 1990).

Concomitant with the emphasis on civil rights and people's power, people's opinion is defined as a yardstick to examine the legitimacy and appropriateness of legislation and governmental policy. "Any law, institutionalized by a congress lacking the basis of people's opinion, will be lacking legitimacy and appropriateness. Thus, the essence of administration by law will not be fulfilled" (September 19, 1989).

4. Criticism of Totalitarian System

The concept of a totalitarian system is a ground that The Capital Morning News frequently used to launch attacks on the political status of the KMT government. Totalitarian system is either presented as genus, or is defined in the argumentation process. It is argued that under a totalitarian system, police power is often abused and the ideal of administration by law can hardly be practiced.
Under the totalitarian system, political party and nation become one entity. The law-enforcement department, including police, often becomes a major tool to protect the authority. In a democratic country the law-enforcement department is independent from the influence of the political party in power, and carries out public power independently. But in a totalitarian country, the law-enforcement department becomes a private guard for the ruling party. The major officials in the law-enforcement department are all members of the ruling party. . . . The promotion and training of law-enforcement officers are full of party color. (October 13, 1989)

The judicial department under a totalitarian system . . . is likely to become a tool to hit political dissidents. Such a judicial department is unable to carry out its duty independently, and is likely to protect high officials who are outlaws. (October 15, 1989)

Although criticism of the top-down totalitarian system does not directly reflect the bottom-up character of The Capital Morning News, it does suggest that such a totalitarian system has deprived people of their basic civil rights. The argument is presented from the people's perspective. The bottom-up character is thus indirectly reflected.

The "one China" ideology held by the ruling party is criticized by The Capital Morning News as a manifestation of Eastern totalitarianism and as a transformation of Chinese traditional "orthodoxism"4 (June 24, 1990). This "one China" ideology is also criticized as "top-down" by nature, which is in direct contrast to the bottom-up nature of democracy (June 24, 1990). For The Capital Morning News, this orthodoxism has provided the basis to purge political dissidents and has become a "magic curse" used by rulers to protect themselves. "The 'one China' ideology is a manifestation of such a magic curse" (June 24, 1990). In criticizing the top-down
nature of "one China" ideology, the bottom-up character of The Capital Morning News' arguments is indirectly reflected.

In contrast to The Central Daily News' frequent use of genus, The Capital Morning News uses argument from definition more often. For example, democracy is defined as "formed by the bottom-up will of the people" (January 19, 1990). The country's power is defined as "transformed from the people's power" (January 19, 1990). This seems to suggest that The Capital Morning News, representing those without presumption, has to define issues clearly in the argumentation process rather than using genus--especially when issues are viewed differently from the status quo.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The above examples have shown that "people" is a word frequently used by The Capital Morning News--including power of the people, will of the people, people's opinion, and people as ultimate decision-makers of national policy. This is in direct contrast to the frequent use of "nation," "history," "culture," and "ethnic" in The Central Daily News. While the top-down character of The Central Daily News reflects a collectivistic thinking, the bottom-up character of The Capital Morning News does not necessarily reflect an individualistic perspective. When the word "people" is used, it still represents an entity rather than individuals. A collectivistic aspect is shown in The Capital Morning News in the way that "Taiwan's future"--as a collective concern--is a topic constantly discussed. However, in emphasizing civil right over civil
responsibility, it is somewhat more individualistic-oriented. The selected editorials of *The Capital Morning News* neither show an obvious collectivistic orientation nor an individualistic orientation.

Weaver's thesis implying rhetoric reflects political position is well supported by the editorials of *The Central Daily News*. First, *The Central Daily News*' constant use of such words as "morality" and "ethics" reflect its conservative position in the sense that some constant and stable values are emphasized. The newspaper's emphasis on morality and ethics reflects the view that things are considered as having absolute and ultimate standards, as having a stable nature rather than being constantly in flux. At this point, rhetoric not only reflects a political position, it also reflects an ontological position.

Second, *The Central Daily News* often uses such terms as "tradition," "culture," and "history" to support its arguments. These issues are mostly presented as genera in the arguments. The emphasis on tradition, culture, and history reflects a concern for "continuity." The implication of a concern for continuity is that changes are made somewhat more cautiously. As discussed in Chapter II, a conservative is more hesitant to accept changes. Thus, the emphasis on tradition, culture, and history also reflects a conservative position.

Third, the top-down orientation of *The Central Daily News* is an indication of its collectivistic ideology. The collectivistic ideology (vs. individualistic ideology) has been dominant since the late nineteenth century as China experienced a transitional period from traditional
China to modern China. This collectivistic ideology not only dominated in government but also dominated among intellectuals. This collectivistic ideology has been inherited by both the Chinese Communism government in the Mainland and the KMT government in Taiwan. As discussed earlier, the top-down character of The Central Daily News' definitions of issues reflects a collectivistic thinking. Thus, in this case, we can say that rhetoric not only reflects a political position in terms of liberal vs. conservative and an ontological position in terms of timeless values, it also reflects other political and philosophical positions (such as, in this case, collectivism).

Based on the above three points, Weaver's thesis that rhetoric reflects a specific, identifiable political position has been supported by the editorials of The Central Daily News. However, the editorials of The Capital Morning News do not show such an obvious tendency of reflecting its political and philosophical positions.

The top-down character of The Central Daily News appears to be consistent with its political presumption. Those with presumption assume status quo or existing institutions are accepted by the people. Thus, they are less likely to ask people what they think about existing institutions, while are more likely to assume people will conform to status quo. In contrast, those without presumption have to confirm their arguments with people since their arguments are not assumed as already accepted by people. It turns out that The Capital Morning News' editorials show a bottom-up character, using the word "people" very frequently.
The Central Daily News' frequent use of genus is consistent with its political presumption status, and The Capital Morning News' frequent use of definition is consistent with its burden of proof status. Because those with presumption assume status quo is accepted they use genus to remind the audience of what have already existed, even when they have to defend themselves. Those without presumption have the burden of proving why their propositions are different from the status quo. Thus, they cannot assume that the audience will be able to catch what they mean by merely presenting arguments from genus. This might be the reason that The Central Daily News uses genus relatively often and The Capital Morning News uses definition relatively often.

Thus far, we have looked at how arguments from definition/genus are constructed and how certain rhetorical characters distinguish the two newspapers. In the next chapter, we will examine how arguments from circumstance are constructed.
Notes

1 For example, Wang Tso-yung proposed that economic development should have the priority, while Chiang So-chieh considered stability as more important. They have written numerous articles to debate on this issue. Both are professors in the field of economic.


3 There was an intense power struggle within the KMT with regard to presidential candidates during the 1990 presidential election. Li was finally re-elected for another term of presidency by the representatives of the National Assembly. *The Capital Morning News* argued that Li's success in this election should be viewed as coming from people's support (which affect the decision of National Assembly representatives, rather than from the support of National Assembly representatives. Thus President Li should appreciate the power of people.

4 The Chinese orthodoxyism refers to the traditional ideology that ancient rulers have to justify themselves as legitimate successors to the throne and have to follow the tradition of ancient sages and sage kings. This ideology is used by rulers to justify their regime. *The Capital Morning News* criticizes that under such an ideology people can only conform to the orthodox tradition and are not allowed to challenge it.

5 The collectivistic ideology dominated in government. For example, at the first National Congress of the KMT in 1924, Dr. Sun emphasized the importance of party unification and called on the members to "sacrifice their personal freedom and contribute their talents unselfishly to the revolutionary objectives" (Hsu, *The Rise of Modern China* 521-2).

   Intellectuals such as Kang You-wei, Liang Chi-chao, Li Ta-chao showed collectivistic orientation in their thoughts. See Hao Chang, *Liang Chi-chao and Intellectual transition in China, 1890-1907* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971); Hao Chang, *Chinese Intellectuals in Crisis--Search for Order and Meaning (1890-1911)* (Berkeley: U of
CHAPTER IX
WHAT IS THE REALITY?
--ARGUMENTS FROM CIRCUMSTANCE

Different types of circumstances are used to construct arguments in both newspapers. The Capital Morning News employs more types of circumstances than those used by The Central Daily News (24 types vs. 12 types). Four types of circumstances are frequently used by both newspapers: the democratic world trend, the current status/relationships between Taiwan and Mainland China, Taiwan in its transitional period, and social-economic status/change in Taiwan. Although these four types of circumstances are commonly used by both newspapers, completely opposite claims are often made on the basis of the same circumstances. In other words, the two newspapers often present different or opposite views of reality with respect to the same issue. In the following analysis, we will look at these four types of circumstances respectively and how the two newspapers claim to know the "reality" they comment upon.

THE DEMOCRATIC WORLD TREND

Both newspapers agree that democracy is a world trend. However, this type of circumstance is used by the two newspapers to support different claims--sometimes conflicting claims. Under the
same circumstance of world democratic trends, the two newspapers present readers with completely different pictures with respect to what policy Taiwan should adopt and who is/are against this democratic world trend.

1. What Does the Democratic Trend Prove?

The Central Daily News uses the democratic trend to argue that the collapse of Chinese Communism is unavoidable, and the unification of China is getting closer. In contrast, The Capital Morning News uses the democratic trend to argue that the pursuit of democracy and human rights cannot be suppressed. In several editorials (for example, October 13, 1989, October 22, 1989, February 14, 1990), The Central Daily News points out that democracy is a world trend, as many Communist countries in Eastern Europe (such as Poland, Hungary, and East Germany) have undergone dramatic democratic reform. The Central Daily News argues that under such a world-wide democratic trend, the Chinese Communist government will ultimately have to give up Communism.

Unless the Chinese Communist government is able to recognize the world trend, to give up the dogmatic doctrines of Communism, to open governmental power, to practice democracy, to improve people's life, and to undergo economic development, the democratic trend in Eastern Europe will eventually come to Mainland China. Chinese Communism, like Communism in Hungary, will become a historical vestige. (October 13, 1989)
Mao Tse-Tung used to say "The Soviet Union's today will become the Chinese Communists' tomorrow." Now we can say: "The Hungarian's today will become the Chinese Communists' tomorrow." Thus, the fall of the Chinese Communist government will be far more faster than we have expected. Because this is a world trend, no one can resist such a trend. (October 22, 1989)

The Central Daily News argues that, given the democratic trends in the world, "the fate of Chinese Communism is doomed to failure," and "the unification of China based on the ideal of democracy, freedom, and equitable distribution of wealth is an unavoidable trend" (February 14, 1990). The Central Daily News uses democratic trends in the world to prove the failure of Communism and to predict that the Chinese Communists will have to give up Communism eventually. When the Chinese Communists give up Communism, the unification of China will follow.

Although the democratic world trend is also used frequently by The Capital Morning News, it is used to prove that the pursuit of human rights is an undeniable trend (for example, October 21, 1989, November 4, 1989), rather than to prove the eventual unification of China.

All the Eastern European communist countries are under great change. Even the most anti-human rights South Africa has released eight political prisoners recently, and has prepared to end the segregation policy. All these have proved one truth: democracy and human rights are the greatest goals that human beings have ever pursued. (October 21, 1989)

It should be noted that although democracy is a term frequently used by both newspapers, the term "human right" often appears with "democracy" in The Capital Morning News, but not in The Central
Daily News. The Capital Morning News also suggests that the Chinese Communist government will eventually have to adopt democratic reform under the circumstances of the world-wide democratic trend. However, it does not suggest that such a democratic trend will eventually bring about the unification of China.

2. Who Is Against the Democratic World Trend?

The Central Daily News uses the democratic trend to criticize the Chinese Communist government and its oppressive policy. The Capital Morning News uses the democratic world trend to criticize the KMT government in Taiwan as well as the Chinese communist government in Mainland China. In other words, for The Capital Morning News both the KMT government and the Chinese Communist government are opposed to the democratic world trend. In fact, the democratic trend as a circumstance is used by The Capital Morning News to criticize the KMT government more often than to criticize the Chinese Communist government. For example, The Capital Morning News questions the legitimacy of letting the old National Assembly members elect the president and the vice president. \(^1\)

Under the democratic world trend, how can the president and the vice president be elected by those old [National Assembly] representatives who have not been re-elected for forty-three years? The legitimacy and appropriateness of such a presidential and vice presidential election is very questionable. (January 23, 1990)
Taiwan ignores the world-wide [democratic] reform trend. Under this democratic trend, the ruling government in Taiwan ignores the needs of the people and leaves the presidential election to those old National Assembly representatives who have not been re-elected by people for more than forty years and have been despised by people as "old thieves." (February 17, 1990)

The Capital Morning News also criticizes the election of professional groups representatives in Taiwan as "against the democratic trend in the world." It argues that the election of professional groups representatives has become a "historical vestige" (November 30, 1989). The 1936 Constitution of Russia has abandoned such an election. The highly democratic countries—such as Britain and the U.S. have never adopted such an election. Thus, the newspaper criticizes the practice of professional groups representatives election as against the democratic trend in the world.

The Capital Morning News argues that if Mainland China or Taiwan tries to use war or military power to threaten the other, this will be against the world-wide pursuit of peace and democracy. Using war to threaten the other is both "ignorant and nasty" (November 24, 1989).

In contrast, The Central Daily News uses the democratic trend as a circumstance to criticize the anti-democratic policies and practices in Mainland China (October 13, 1989, October 22, 1989, January 12, 1990, February 14, 1990). For example, it objects that the Chinese Communists use "different national status" as an excuse to refuse peaceful, democratic reform even under the circumstance that many other Communist countries have undergone democratic reform (February 14, 1990).
In short, *The Capital Morning News* uses the democratic trend to criticize both governments in Taiwan and in Mainland China—with a major focus on the government in Taiwan, while *The Central Daily News* uses the democratic trend as a circumstance only to criticize Chinese Communist government. In other words, *The Central Daily News* shows readers that Mainland China is against the democratic world trend, while *The Capital Morning News* suggests that both governments in Taiwan and in Mainland China are against such a trend.

**THE CURRENT STATUS/RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TAIWAN AND MAINLAND CHINA**

The current status/relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China is a circumstance frequently used in arguments appearing in both newspapers. Both newspapers agree that Taiwan's Mainland policy should be *contingent* on how the Chinese Communist government responds.

With respect to the Mainland policy and the relationship between Taiwan and the Mainland, we have to emphasize the word: "interaction." This is not an one-sided business. If the Chinese Communists are still hostile toward us, if the Chinese Communists continue to isolate and discriminate against us, if the Chinese Communists constantly use military power to threaten us, how can we give up our government's "Three-No's Policy" and permit the "Three Links Policy"? (*The Central Daily News*, April 29, 1990)

The contingent nature of Mainland policy is shown in the way that *The Central Daily News* emphasizes "interaction" and it is "not an one-sided business." In another editorial, it is argued that "we
disagree with an one-sided, blind open-policy proposition. [Our Mainland policy] should be dependent on how they (Chinese Communists) respond. Thus we can make appropriate adjustment according to their response" (May 19, 1990).

The Capital Morning News also suggests that Mainland policy should be contingent on how the Chinese Communists respond.

To remove the barrier of the relationship between Taiwan and the Mainland, and to develop the two sides' relationship smoothly, both sides have to self-control and respect each other's independence and interact on an equal basis. (January 4, 1990)

We have to emphasize that the two sides' relationship has to be normalized. This is dependent on mutual respect of independence, and on willingness to proceed with negotiations on an equal basis. (January 4, 1990)

There is a subtle difference in The Capital Morning News' emphasis on the contingent nature of Mainland policy. The Capital Morning News specifically points out "independence" and "equality" should be the circumstances upon which the relationships between the two sides can be improved. The Central Daily News might have been hesitant to use the term "independence" to avoid implying "Taiwan independence."

In addition to the contingent nature of Mainland policy, both newspapers emphasize that we have to "face the reality" and "recognize the reality" with respect to the current status and the relationship between Taiwan and Mainland (The Central Daily News, October 22, 1989; The Capital Morning News, January 16, 1990, July 11, 1990). However, the two newspapers have completely opposite
perspectives when emphasizing the notions of facing reality and recognizing reality. The Central Daily News uses the current status/relationships between the two sides as a circumstance to propose unification of China and to criticize the proposition of Taiwan independence, while The Capital Morning News uses the current status/relationship of the two sides to criticize the ruling party's unification proposition.

The Central Daily News argues that "we have to face the reality and use a whole China perspective to solve the problem of two sides' relationship. Thus, we can stop the growth of 'Taiwan independence' ideology" (October 22, 1989).

It is a fact that the Chinese Communists strengthen their offending Taiwan preparation and military exercise. It is also a fact that under the brutal and dictatorial government of the Chinese Communists, China has no future. We have to give up the "Taiwan Independence" fantasy. We should promote the quality of democracy in Taiwan and develop Taiwan to become a politically democratic and economically free country. Thus, we can force the Chinese Communists to give up the "Four Cardinal Principles." Then China will eventually move toward peaceful unification. (May 6, 1990)

The Central Daily News tries to provoke readers to a sense of crisis by pointing out the military preparation and exercise of Mainland China. Because the Chinese Communist government is also against the idea of Taiwan independence, The Central Daily News implies that if Taiwan's government adopts the policy of Taiwan independence, the Chinese Communists' attack on Taiwan will come true. Thus it urges its readers to give up the Taiwan independence "fantasy."
In contrast, The Capital Morning News uses the current status and the relationship between two sides as a circumstance to argue that unification is impossible.

Under the circumstance of two sides' democratization level and people's will, the current status of the two sides' development does not have a common basis for unification. However, this does not mean that cooperation space between Taiwan and the Mainland does not exist. . . . Anyone can easily point out: unification will become a nightmare of Taiwan's twenty million people and a "return" of territory to the Mainland. Taiwan's capital, man power, and development experiences can not be obtained [by the Mainland] through military power. . . . the Chinese Communists, in their development process, need capital, man power, technology, modern management and international market information which can not be obtained through military take-over of Taiwan. . . . It is only on an equal basis that two sides can benefit from each other. (November 24, 1989)

The Capital Morning News argues that Taiwan's man power, capital, and technology—which are needed by the Mainland—cannot be obtained by the Chinese Communists through military power. The implication is that it tries to tell readers the Chinese Communists are unlikely to use military power against Taiwan. In other words, The Capital Morning News tries to relieve the "military offense crisis" that The Central Daily News tries to create. On the other hand, The Capital Morning News tries to provoke another type of crisis which is resulted from the idea of unification. The Capital Morning News suggests that unification will result in the Chinese Communists' take-over of Taiwan and people in Taiwan cannot benefit from such a unification at all. It is claimed that unification will become a "nightmare" for the people of Taiwan. The Capital Morning News
suggests "cooperation" instead of "unification." And such a cooperation should be obtained on "an equal basis." In short, while The Central Daily News suggests that the idea of Taiwan independence will bring about a military crisis, The Capital Morning News suggests that the idea of unification will result in a crisis of a mere "territory return" to the Mainland.

The Capital Morning News also points out that the Chinese Communist government considers itself the only legitimate Chinese government and sees Taiwan as "a part" of China. The Chinese Communists intend to use "one country with two systems" to forcefully "unite" Taiwan, which is a reflection of a totalitarian ideology and "will not be accepted by Taiwan's people" (January 4, 1990). In the following passage, The Capital Morning News argues that the separation of Taiwan and the Mainland is an internal problem resulting form the confrontation between the KMT and the Chinese Communist Party. It is claimed that this confrontation is difficult to resolve, and that the separation meets the current will of Taiwan's people.
The separation of Taiwan and Mainland China is different from the separation between South Korea and North Korea, and between East Germany and West Germany. The latter cases are results of powerful nations' compulsory separation, which is an external problem. The former is the result of the confrontation between The Kuo-min-tang and The Chinese Communist Party, which is an internal problem. The KMT has never been willing to be governed by the Chinese Communists. The twenty million people in Taiwan, although they are able to get in and out China freely, are not willing to stay in China permanently. The separation of the two sides is caused by the rulers. But this separation also meets the current will of Taiwan's people. (January 16, 1990)

The Capital Morning News is able to use the current status of the two sides as a circumstance to support several different claims. In addition to arguing that there is no basis for unification, it also uses the current status of the two sides to criticize the Chinese Communists, to discuss Taiwan's future and democratic reform in Taiwan.

It is also questioned how the Chinese Communists can call Taiwan "a part of China" given that the Chinese Communists have never governed Taiwan. In response to the Chinese Communist government's criticism of "Taiwan independence" proposed by the Democratic Progressive Party during its election campaign, it is argued that since the Chinese Communists have never had any democratic election and have become the target of world-wide criticism due to the Tien-An-Men Square Incident, how can they have any right to comment on Taiwan's election (The Capital Morning News, November 29, 1989)?

Taiwan's future and the benefits of Taiwan's people are often used by The Capital Morning News, along with the current status of
the two sides, to support its arguments. For example, with respect to the constitutional problem, it is argued that "we have to recognize the separation reality of two sides, . . . and take twenty million people's welfare into major consideration, thus to institutionalize an advanced new constitution to solve the current constitutional crisis" (July 11, 1990). It also encourages the ruling party to get rid of the "historical burden" by following people's opinion and letting the people in Taiwan discuss their future freely (January 16, 1990). Here we can see the regional concern of The Capital Morning News is shown again in the way that Taiwan's future rather than the Chinese future is concerned. The current status of two sides is also used as a circumstance to propose more democratic and open reform in Taiwan. It is argued that "under the circumstance of great change in the relationship of two sides, the entire national development needs to be re-planned" (November 13, 1989). The Capital Morning News goes further to argue that it is a "civilian right" to propose their national reform policy (November 13, 1989).

In short, both newspapers consider that Taiwan's Mainland policy should be contingent on how the Chinese Communist government responds. However, given the current status of the two sides' relationships, The Central Daily News argues that unification can be foreseen while The Capital Morning News argues that there is no basis for unification. The Capital Morning News suggests "cooperation" instead of "unification." The implication is that the two newspapers have completely different views of reality with respect to the current status of the two sides.
TAIWAN IN A TRANSITIONAL PERIOD

Both newspapers admit that Taiwan is currently in a transitional period as Taiwan is moving toward a more democratic society. They either use "transitional period" or "turning point" to describe the present status of Taiwan. Transitional period is often used by both newspapers as a circumstance to support their arguments. Although they agree that Taiwan is experiencing a transitional period, the two newspapers tend to have quite different analyses of this transitional period. They are also different in terms of claims they make by using the transitional period as a ground for argument.

1. Positive vs. Negative Connotations of the Transitional Period

The Central Daily News tends to show readers the negative aspect of this transitional period, while The Capital Morning News tends to be more positive. The Central Daily News sees "instability" as a major character of this transitional period, and such instability is a result of some "irrational" people who abuse democracy (November 21, 1989). The Central Daily News also suggests that both the ruling party and the opposition party are "maladjusted" during this transitional period (March 15, 1990). The ruling party appears to be maladjusted in that it becomes "indecisive" and "loss of control" occurs. The opposition party is maladjusted because of its "lack of self-discipline" and "lack of behavioral principles" (March 15, 1990).

The Central Daily News points out some "abnormal" phenomena of this transitional period which is characterized by a misconception of democracy, irrational and illegal appeals, power struggle, opposition
for mere opposition's sake, and endangering national security (February 15, 1990). The uses of such words as "unstable," "irrational," "maladjusted," "abnormal," and "illegal" represent a negative evaluation of "transitional period."

In contrast to The Central Daily News' negative portrayal of this transitional period, The Capital Morning News appears to see this transitional period in a more positive way. For example, it sees this period as a "turning point" during which Taiwan's people can "decide their own fates" (October 21, 1989). While The Central Daily News sees this period as characterized by "instability," The Capital Morning News sees "uncertainty" as the major character. ". . . Scholars who study political development all know that the most important character of a transitional period from a totalitarian system to a democratic system is uncertainty" (June 1, 1990). "Uncertainty" appears to be a more neutral term--although not a positive term--than "instability."

2. Claims Based on the Transitional Period as a Circumstance

The two newspapers uses transitional period as a circumstance to support their various arguments. As they attach different connotations to this transitional period, their propositions are also quite different. To face this transitional period, The Central Daily News tells the people to "recover rationality" (November 21, 1989) and tells party members to strengthen the party organization and to collaborate with party policy.
facing this so-called "transitional period's" abnormal phenomena, as members of the Chinese Kuo-min-tang which has had a history of almost one hundred years, we have to be very cautious in action. On one hand, we have to follow the trend of people's opinion, and to strengthen organization of our party. . . . On the other hand, we have to promote collaboration in the party. (February 15, 1990)

The Capital Morning News uses the transitional period to support several different arguments/propositions. The Capital Morning News sees this period as a chance for national reform (November 13, 1989) and a chance for the Taiwanese people's self-determination (October 21, 1989).

Under the past long period of strongman government and implementation of the Martial Law, people were unable to discuss Taiwan's future publicly. Now the strongman politics is over, and the Martial Law has been lifted, Taiwan is at a historical turning point. Taiwan's people should have freedom to discuss the nation's future, and to decide their own fates. (October 21, 1989)

The transitional period is also used by The Capital Morning News to oppose a cabinet led by a military man. President Li's nomination of Hao Bo-tsun as the premier of the cabinet is strongly opposed by many people--especially members of the opposition party. The reason is that Hao has a strong and extensive military background and is considered as lacking political administrative experience. The opposition party is afraid that a cabinet led by a military strongman will result in another totalitarian government. Thus The Capital Morning News argues:
If this [nomination of a military man as premier] happened ten or twenty years ago, there might not be significant societal shock and reaction. But it happens in this transitional period that Taiwan is moving toward democracy, . . . how can people suddenly accept such a military man as premier who has a strong military quality and character? . . . This is unfortunate and against the democratic trend. (May 6, 1990)

The Capital Morning News believes a cabinet led by a military man is likely to result in a collaboration of "military power, bureaucratic politicians, and capitalists" (June 1, 1990). Such a cabinet will result in a new totalitarian system and endanger democratic development in Taiwan. The Capital Morning News considers it as especially "unfortunate" as Taiwan is undergoing a "transitional period" (June 1, 1990).

In short, although both newspapers see Taiwan as experiencing transitional period, they present readers with different pictures of this period. The Central Daily News emphasizes the negative aspects of this transitional period, while The Capital Morning News is more positive about this period. Under the circumstance of an unstable transitional period, The Central Daily News argues that people should recover their rationality in political participation and party members should conform to party policy. In contrast, The Capital Morning News sees this transitional period in a more positive way and encourages people to discuss the nation's future and to decide their own fates. The reality--Taiwan in transition--is portrayed in completely different ways by the two newspapers.
SOCIAL-ECONOMIC CHANGE/STATUS

Social-economic change/status in Taiwan is a circumstance used in arguments by both newspapers. Both newspapers agree that it is important to be aware of rapid social change and to be able to meet the changing social needs (The Central Daily News, August 28, 1990; The Capital Morning News, September 27, 1989, October 24, 1989). However, the two newspapers have different concerns. The Capital Morning News is more concerned with social justice, social welfare, and people's power, while The Central Daily News is more concerned with social norms and social ethics under the circumstance of rapid social-economic change.

As mentioned earlier, "people's power" is a term frequently used by The Capital Morning News. For The Capital Morning News, the major concern is people's power from many different minority groups--such as disabled people, peasants, laborers, military veterans, women, environmental conservation groups, and from the low-to-middle classes. These people are considered as being economically and politically oppressed by the upper class and those with political power because national resources are "unequally distributed" (January 12, 1990). Under such a social-economic status, The Capital Morning News argues that the opposition party should "unite with these people" to prevent social inequality, thus to gain "social justice" (September 27, 1989). First of all, social justice should be gained through a healthy social welfare system.
The economic and social resources under a totalitarian system are very unreasonably distributed. The social welfare system is very unhealthy. . . . Those weaker social groups--such as women, children, old people, original inhabitants, military veterans, peasants, disabled people, and poor people--have not been taken care of. (January 12, 1990)

In contrast to The Capital Morning News' concern with social justice and social welfare, The Central Daily News is more concerned with social norms and cultural values.

Under the circumstances of world trends and our nation's social change, the traditional morality and ethics are no longer the highest principles of cultivating personal moral characters and binding interpersonal relationships. Yet, new social behavioral norms and proper, new views of life have not been established. From a cultural perspective, this is a worrying vacuum phenomenon. (June 1, 1990).

The Central Daily News thus argues that future national development should start with education and establishing cultural values and norms to meet current social needs (June 1, 1990).

PEOPLE'S OPINION AS A CIRCUMSTANCE

People's opinion is a circumstance more frequently used by The Capital Morning News than by The Central Daily News.9 The Capital Morning News often uses people's opinion to criticize the KMT government. For example, in response to Premier Hao's criticism of the Taiwan independence proposition and defining Taiwan independence as a "rebellious" proposition, The Capital Morning News argues that this political proposition has been "supported by 16% of the people according to public opinion research, and is proposed by a party with one million and three hundred thousand ballots." Thus,
how can Premier Hao call the idea of Taiwan independence "rebellious" (May 13, 1990). In the following passage, The Capital Morning News suggests that people's support is crucial for any political idea.

No matter it is "unification proposition" or "Taiwan independence proposition," the first requirement is to gain support from people in Taiwan. The unification group can undergo activities to gain people's support. The independence group can try to gain people's support, too. Taiwan's future eventually belongs to the people of Taiwan. (January 19, 1990)

The Capital Morning News criticizes the indictment of some political dissidents who proposed Taiwan independence as "against the people's opinion" (January 16, 1990), and criticizes the non-routined election of representatives of the National Assembly as "departing from people's opinion" (January 23, 1990).

While The Capital Morning News argues that people's opinions are the conditions to decide whether Taiwan independence or unification can be adopted, The Central Daily News suggests that people's opinion is against the proposition of Taiwan independence.

Almost all public opinion research have shown that majority of people are against "Taiwan independence." Thus, although some candidates [during this election] who propose "Taiwan independence" have been elected, we don't think that they are elected because of their "Taiwan independence" proposition. (January 19, 1990).

While The Capital Morning News uses "public opinion research" to show that the idea of Taiwan independence is supported by the people, The Central Daily News also uses "public opinion research" to show that the idea of Taiwan independence is opposed by people.
The implication is that both newspapers generally agree that any political idea should be grounded in people's opinion--although the two newspapers present public opinion research to support their arguments in different ways. The Central Daily News uses the "majority rule" to support its arguments, while The Capital Morning News presents the actual percentage of support (16%).

The Central Daily News also uses the results of public opinion research to show that some elected officials who are the DPP members are no longer popular because they are ranked poorly and unsatisfactorily in terms of their achievements in the office (August 8, 1990).

Generally speaking, "people's opinion" as a circumstance is not so frequently used by The Central Daily News as by The Capital Morning News. Both newspapers try to show readers that they are in line with people's opinion. But the two newspapers disagree on what policy is actually supported by people's opinion.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The editorials of The Capital Morning News do not seem to support Weaver's thesis that those who habitually argue from circumstance tend to be liberals in political position. The Capital Morning News, which represents the more liberal opposition party, uses argument from definition more often than argument from circumstance. This is different from what Weaver has suggested. However, if we look closely at how argument from circumstance is used by the two newspapers, we find significant differences. First,
although both newspapers argue from circumstance, *The Capital Morning News* is able to use a wider variety of circumstances than the other newspaper. The different circumstances used by *The Capital Morning News* can be categorized into 24 types, while those of *The Central Daily News* can be categorized into 12 types. This indicates that the circumstances used by *The Capital Morning News* show a broader variety.

Second, when the same circumstance is used by the two newspapers, *The Capital Morning News* is able to use that circumstance to support more different types of propositions than the other newspaper. For example, *The Capital Morning News* uses the current status/relationship between Taiwan and Mainland to argue no basis for unification, to criticize the totalitarian ideology of Chinese Communists, to discuss constitutional problem in Taiwan, and to suggest democratic reform in Taiwan. In contrast, *The Central Daily News* uses the same type of circumstance mainly to criticize the idea of Taiwan independence and to propose unification. This indicates that the arguments grounded in circumstances in *The Capital Morning News* exhibit a stronger diversity.

Although argument from circumstance is not the dominant type of argument used by *The Capital Morning News*, this type of argument is more flexibly used by *The Capital Morning News* as more variety of circumstances are used and more diversity of arguments are proposed. This seems to suggest that those without presumption tend to use argument from circumstance relatively more often than those with presumption. And those without
presumption tend to use argument from circumstance more flexibly. This might have been because the recognition of new circumstances provides those without presumption a new source of arguments to challenge the status quo. While those with presumption are concerned with maintaining the status quo, they are less likely to use changing circumstances as grounds of their arguments.
Notes

1 The National Assembly representatives were elected in Mainland China (1947) before the KMT government retreated to Taiwan in 1949. One of their responsibility is to represent people to elect president and vice president. The old National Assembly representatives have not been re-elected for more than forty years. Thus, The Capital Morning News questions the legitimacy of letting these old representatives to elect president and vice president.

2 The "Three-No's Policy" refers to "no contact, no negotiations, and no compromise" with the Chinese Communist regime. This policy was a response to Chinese Communist Chairman Hu Yao-pang's appeal to collaboration between the Chinese Communist Party and the KMT in 1981.

3 The "Three Links Policy" refers to communication of the people in Taiwan and Mainland China in three ways: communication through mail, business relationship, and air-and-shipping services between two sides. This policy was proposed by the CCP but was rejected by the KMT.

4 The "Four Cardinal Principles" of the Chinese Communist government include: insistence on Marxism-Leninism and thoughts of Mao Tse-tung, insistence on the socialist line, insistence on the proletarian dictatorship, and insistence on the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. The insistence on the proletarian dictatorship was changed to "people's democratic dictatorship" in 1978.

5 Both the KMT government in Taiwan and the CCP government in Mainland China are against the idea of Taiwan independence. As the Chinese Communist government publicly denies abandoning the possibility of military offense on Taiwan, the KMT government considers Taiwan independence is likely to become an excuse of the Chinese Communists' military offense.

6 The Kuo-Min-Tang and the Chinese Communist party were not willing to collaborate with each other, thus resorted to civil war (1945-49). The separation of China began when the KMT
government failed and retreated to Taiwan, and the Chinese Communist Party established its government in Mainland in 1949.

7 It was until November 2, 1987 that people in Taiwan are allowed to travel, visit their relatives and their hometown in Mainland China. A limited number of people decide to stay in Mainland China after their visits, but most people return to Taiwan.

8 By "strongman government," The Capital Morning News refers to the government under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek (the old Chiang) and Chiang Ching-kuo (the little Chiang).

9 Although "public opinion" and "popular opinion" are terms commonly used in English in the U. S., "people's opinion" is a better translation describing the actual term (and accompanied connotation) in Chinese. Public opinion and popular opinion are Western notions introduced to the Chinese. However, Chinese use the word "people's" opinion rather than "public" opinion or "popular" opinion. There seem to be important implications for these differences. Thus, the present study prefers to use the term "people's opinion."
CHAPTER X
CONCLUSIONS

This chapter provides conclusions drawn from the previous analysis. Both support for and evidence against Weaver's principal theses are discussed and possible explanations are explored. Cross-cultural application of Weaver's theory is discussed. And finally, limitations of this study are presented.

ARE BOTH THE KMT AND THE DPP CONSERVATIVE?

Weaver argued that those who habitually argue from definition/genus are conservatives in political position and those who habitually argue from circumstance are liberals. Weaver contended that "a man's method of argument is a truer index in his beliefs than his explicit professions of principles" (Ethics, 1965, 58). From Weaver's perspective, both the KMT and the DPP are conservatives as the analyzed discourse shows that they both use argument from definition/genus more often than other types of arguments. As noted in previous chapters, the DPP is generally considered as more liberal and the KMT as more conservative. The question then is: why is the discrepancy between general conception of the DPP as liberal and Weaver's definition of liberal? There are several possible explanations.
The study shows that Weaver's thesis—those who argue from definition tend to be conservatives—is well-supported by the discourse of the KMT. The editorials of The Central Daily News, representing positions of the KMT, use argument from definition/genus far more often than other types of arguments (with 63% of its arguments framed from definition/genus). In the discourse of the DPP, we do not find such a strong support. The editorials of The Capital Morning News, representing the liberal position of the DPP, do not argue from circumstance more often than other types—as one might have expected according to Weaver's thesis. The editorials of The Capital Morning News also use argument from definition more often than other types of arguments. One possible answer to this contradiction is that the DPP is a relatively young party. It was not until 1986 that the DPP was able to file for formal status—although it has "illegally" existed prior to 1986. In contrast, the KMT has become a modern political party after the 1923-24 reorganization (although it was established long before this period). The conservative position of the KMT has been quite obvious and consistent throughout its long history. With a history less than five years old, the political position of the DPP may not be so stable as that of the KMT. In general, the DPP is relatively liberal in terms of promoting major policy changes. However, like the KMT and any other political parties, there are conservative factions as well as liberal factions in the DPP. Unlike the KMT, in which the conservative faction is obviously dominant, the distinction between the liberal faction and the conservative faction of the DPP is not so
clear-cut and the dominance of liberal vs. conservative positions is hard to determine. In short, although the DPP is generally considered as more liberal than the KMT, the political position of the DPP has not been very stable. Thus, the discourse of the DPP may not have developed a very stable and obvious character in terms of the major argument types it uses.

Another possible explanation for the discrepancy between the general conception of the liberal position of the DPP and Weaver's definition of a liberal position might be due to different levels of liberal position. Liberal vs. conservative positions are not absolute terms used to describe people or parties. A political party or a person may be conservative in regard to some issues while liberal at other issues. The nature of a political party or a person is far more complicated than a single term can describe. Most of the time, when we describe a party or a person as conservative/liberal, we use the term in a somewhat relative sense rather than in an absolute sense. We do not know at this point whether or not the DPP is by nature more conservative than liberal, although the DPP is relatively more liberal than the KMT. In other words, could it be that both parties are basically conservative while the DPP is just a bit less conservative (or more liberal)? For example, the possible conservative position of the DPP is shown in its concern for national security. As previously noted, security and stability are major concerns of conservatives. Although in the discourse of the DPP, we do not find "security" being prioritized as it is in the discourse of the KMT, we do find that security is also an important ground for the
DPP's objection to the KMT's "unification" proposition. In the editorials of The Capital Morning News, it is argued that the KMT's ideal of unification will endanger the welfare of the people in Taiwan. At this point, we cannot say that the DPP is liberal.

The crux of the issue, then, is this: although it is convenient to describe a party or a person as conservative/liberal, we should always keep in mind that the complexity of the human mind and human activities is far more than a simple term can describe. That is, although Weaver's theory may help us to make sense of human discourse, we should keep in mind that Weaver's theory is a simplification of human activities in essence. However, we cannot blame Weaver for this problem alone. The advantage of a theory is its parsimony in helping us to grasp complex human activities, while the disadvantage of a theory is its frequent oversimplification of human activities.

**POLITICAL POSITION/IDEOLOGY AS REFLECTED IN RHETORIC**

Although the political positions of the KMT and the DPP are not completely reflected in terms of Weaver's typology of arguments, they are well-reflected in many other ways. For example, in defining democracy, the editorials of The Capital Morning News tend to show a stronger action-orientation while those of The Central Daily News show a more conceptual-orientation (as discussed in Chapter VI). As Weaver seemed to suggest that liberals tend to be more action-oriented (1965, 112), the action-orientation of The Capital Morning.
News' editorials seem to reflect the opposition party's liberal position.

The conservative position of the KMT is reflected in the editorials of The Central Daily News in many ways. For example, the frequent use of such words as "morality" and "ethics" in The Central Daily News reflects a concern for constant and stable values. The frequent use of such terms as "tradition," "culture," and "history" reflects a concern for "continuity." These concerns for stable values and continuity reflect a conservative position in the sense that changes should be made cautiously to avoid endanger stability and continuity. These concerns also reflect an ontological position in which things are viewed as possessing stable nature rather than in a constant state of flux.

On the other hand, the frequent use of "people's opinion," "people's power," and "people's will" in The Capital Morning News reflects the opposition party's liberal position. The liberals are more ready for making changes and often ground changes in a respect for what people think. As people's opinions vary and may change, a liberal is more willing to adjust accordingly. In other words, a liberal tends to judge things in terms of people (as in contrast to a conservative's judgment in terms of absolutes). At this point, the constant use of the word "people" in The Capital Morning News not only reflects the opposition party's liberal position but also reflects its ontological position.

In addition to reflecting political position and ontological position, the editorials of The Central Daily News also reflect its collectivistic
ideology. As discussed in the previous chapter, a top-down character is implicitly shown in the editorials of *The Central Daily News*. This top-down character is an indication of its long-term collectivistic ideology. The implication is that rhetoric can reflect different facets of a political party—as the present case shows that rhetoric reflects a party's political position (in terms of conservative vs. liberal), ontological position (in terms of realism vs. relativism), and other ideologies (such as collectivism of the KMT).

**PRESUMPTION AND ARGUMENT FROM GENUS/DEFINITION**

One of the objectives of this study is to go beyond Weaver by grounding Weaver's major argument types in another theoretical framework—namely, Richard Whately's doctrine of presumption. Whately suggests that those with presumption assume the status quo—such as existing institutions, values—as commonly accepted and not in need of defense unless challenge arises. The present research seems to suggest that in a democracy-developing country, both the party with presumption (the ruling party) and the party with burden of proof (the opposition party) tend to use argument from definition/genus more often than other types of arguments. However, they appear to define things in significantly different ways—such as with different emphases, from different perspectives, and with different priorities. The ruling party needs to defend the status quo and to define issues in its way as the opposition party begins to challenge the status quo and defines issues differently.
There is a subtle difference to be noted. Both parties use argument from definition/genus more often than other argument types. However, *The Central Daily News* (representing the ruling party) tends to use argument from genus more often, while *The Capital Morning News* (representing the opposition party) tends to use argument from definition more often. In Weaver's theory, argument from definition and argument from genus belong to the same category as these two argument types are concerned with the nature and essence of an issue/thing. The only difference between these two types of arguments is that argument from definition requires that an issue be clearly defined in the argumentation process, while argument from genus assumes that the nature and essence of an issue has already existed in the audience's mind and thus does not need to be defined in the argumentation process. Argument from genus may often be presented by grounding arguments in certain ideals or values--such as democracy, freedom--without defining the ideals or values in the argumentation process. In fact, what Weaver called "god terms" of a culture--representing the tyrannizing image of a culture--may often be presented as genus in the argumentation process.

The present case seems to suggest that the ruling party with political presumption tends to argue from *genus* more often while the opposition party with burden of proof tends to use argument from *definition* more often. When the KMT--as the ruling party with political presumption--was challenged by the opposition party, it needs to defend the status quo. The KMT uses argument from genus
more often because it can assume that the existing institutions or values have already existed in the audience's mind. Thus, the KMT only needs to remind the audience of those existing values by using argument from genus and does not need to define them in the argumentation process. In contrast, the opposition party arises to challenge the status quo. The opposition party--without presumption--cannot assume its propositions have already existed in the audience's mind. Thus, it needs to lay out its argument with clear definition.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the editorials of The Central Daily News show a top-down character while those of The Capital Morning News show a bottom-up character. Such characters appear to be consistent with their political status. Those with political presumption may assume that the status quo are accepted by the people. As a result, they are less likely to ask for people's opinions about existing institutions. They are more likely to remind people of existing institutions or values by telling people what things are or what things should be. This may be the reason that the discourse of the KMT--as shown in the editorials of its party newspaper--exhibits a top-down character.

On the other hand, those without political presumption need to constantly confirm their arguments with people and gain support from people. They are more likely to ask what people think, show a respect for people's opinion, and emphasize the importance of people in a democratic country. As a result, the discourse of the opposition party--as shown in the editorials of The Capital Morning News--
exhibit a bottom-up character explicitly. For example, in *The Capital Morning News*, we find frequent use of such terms as people's opinion, people's will, and people's power.

**PRESUMPTION AND ARGUMENT FROM CIRCUMSTANCE**

The present study seems to suggest that the opposition party--with burden of proof--tends to use argument from circumstance more flexibly. Although *The Capital Morning News* uses argument from definition/genus more often than argument from circumstance, it uses argument from circumstance *relatively* more often than *The Central Daily News*. The opposition party newspaper is also able to use a broader variety of circumstances to support its arguments. When arguments using the same type of circumstance by the two newspapers are compared, *The Capital Morning News* is able to use that circumstance to support diversified propositions.

This seems to suggest that argument from circumstance is an argument type more appropriate for an opposition party than for the ruling party. The opposition party has the burden of proving its propositions--contrary to the status quo--as better. The emergent circumstances are more likely to become sources of arguments for the opposition party than for the ruling party. The ruling party--with political presumption--is more concerned with maintaining the status quo and is less willing to make major changes. Thus, changing circumstances are less likely to become good argument sources for the status quo.
If we recall the discussion in Chapter II, Weaver analyzed Edmund Burke's discourse and concluded that Burke was a liberal because Burke used argument from circumstance more frequently. Dennis Bormann suggested that Burke's frequent uses of argument from circumstance is due to his political status—as a member of minority group. The results of this study support Bormann's suggestion that Burke's frequent use of argument from circumstance is due to Burke's political status—as a member of those without presumption. Burke's example provides further support for the conclusion drawn from this study that argument from circumstance is a better source of argument for those without presumption than for those with presumption.

CROSS-CULTURAL APPLICATION OF WEAVER'S THEORY

This study shows that Weaver's typology of arguments is an useful and applicable tool in understanding political discourse of another culture, namely, the political discourse in Taiwan. The major types of arguments in Weaver's theory—including argument from definition, argument from genus, argument from cause-to-effect, argument from similitude, and rhetorical-historical argument—can be found in the selected editorials from the two parties' newspapers in Taiwan. If rhetoric reflects the world view of or a culture, the applicability of Weaver's typology of argument to another culture seems to suggest that people from different cultures may have similar perspectives on the world.
Although the results of this study do not fully support Weaver's thesis that conservatives use argument from definition more frequently and liberals use argument from circumstance more frequently, this study finds Weaver's argument types helpful to understand political discourse in Taiwan. For example, although both parties tend to use argument from definition more frequently, they define the same issues in significantly different ways. As we further examine how things are defined differently, we may find these differences (as discussed in previous chapter) reflect the political positions (conservative vs. liberal) and political ideologies (such as collectivism, totalitarianism) of the two parties very well. Although the more liberal opposition party does not use argument from circumstance more frequently—as one might have so expected according to Weaver's thesis—the opposition party does use argument from circumstance more flexibly, in terms of varieties of circumstances used and diversity of propositions made under the same circumstance. In other words, "circumstance" still appears to be a more available source of argument for the liberal than for the conservative.

Applicability of Weaver's argument types to discourse of another culture also seems to suggest that some basic ontological issues cross cultural boundaries and are recurrently presented in human discourse. Do things have constant and stable natures, or are things always in a state of flux? Can we make value judgments based on some absolute standards, or are judgments always contingent? Can things be objectively recognized and known, or are they mere
constructions of human beings? As we look at the discourse of the KMT and the DPP, we see a struggle between maintaining tradition and changing tradition, a struggle between maintaining certain existing values/institutions and responding to emergent circumstances. Although the contexts are a bit different, we have seen similar struggles when China was in a transitional period moving from traditional China to modern China during the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century. We have also seen similar struggles in the post-World War II America when extreme liberalism and relativism arose—under which context Weaver developed his theory of argument. Weaver's theory provides us new insights into this struggle. Argument from definition/genus seems to be the only means by which one can examine the essence of an issue, while argument from circumstance only responds to changing environment. Using Weaver's typology of arguments to analyze human discourse, whatever the cultural origin is, we will be able to understand how human beings struggle to advance arguments between absolutes and relatives.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Like any research, there are some limitations to this project. First, since this research examines political discourse exclusively, its results cannot be generalized to other contexts. That is, its results tell us only about discourses of those with/without presumption and those who are liberal or conservative in a political context but not those in religious, legal, or other contexts.
Second, because this research only examines political discourses in a "semi-democratic" or a "democracy-developing" country, it cannot be predicted how the level of democratization in a nation at any given time might affect discourses of those with/without presumption in a political context. Thus, generalization of this research to nations at different levels of democratization may not be appropriate. There does not seem to be any research findings on how arguments might be constructed similarly or differently between/among nations with different degrees of democratization. Future research may want to use the same research procedure outlined in this study to analyze discourse in a democratic country, such as the U.S. or Britain.

Third, this research is concerned with the relationship between political position and argument sources and the relationship between political presumption and argument sources. Although there are many other theories of argument, this study is limited to Weaver's typology of arguments because his theory is directly related to political context and his typology of arguments appear to have more relevance with the issues under concern. Future research may want to explore whether other typologies of arguments may be related to political position and political presumption.

Fourth, this study is limited to one type of written discourse: newspaper editorials, mainly because of the consideration of representativeness. If the representativeness problem can be solved, future research may want to include other types of
publications (such as brochures, magazines, and books) and spoken discourse.

As discussed in the first chapter, this study tries to achieve two objectives. The first is to re-examine major theses in Weaver's theory of argument, namely, to examine the relationship between one's political position and one's use of argument types. The second objective is to place Weaver's typology of argument into another theoretical framework—namely, Whately's doctrine of presumption. This study seeks to find the relationship between political presumption and argument types. With respect to the first objective, this research does not fully support Weaver's thesis that conservative tends to argue from definition and liberal tends to argue from circumstance. However, this study does find that rhetoric reflects political position, political ideology, and ontological assumptions in many ways (as previously discussed). At this point, we cannot conclude that Weaver's theory is completely rejected because the results have partially supported Weaver's thesis in different ways. The major value of Weaver's theory in this study is that it provides a parsimonious framework to grasp complex political discourse. Theory is by nature a simplification and an abstraction of complex phenomenon. The simplicity of a theory, like two sides of a coin, has its negative aspect as well as positive aspect. We should not reject Weaver's theory merely on the basis of the general limitations of theory-building.

With respect to the second objective, this study has used the concepts of presumption and burden of proof to explain the different
uses of arguments by the two parties' newspapers in Taiwan. It turns out that the doctrine of presumption has been very helpful in making sense of the rhetorical characters of the two parties' newspapers. Another theoretical framework (that is, the relationship between presumption and use of argument types) has emerged from this study. This is one of the major contributions that the present study has made to the field of human communication. Future research may try to use this theoretical framework to examine rhetoric in other countries or in other contexts.
APPENDIX A

DATES OF EDITORIALS SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>9, 15, 19, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>13, 15, 21, 22, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>4, 13, 21, 24, 29, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>7, 9, 18, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>4, 8, 12, 16, 19, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>14, 15, 17, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>9, 15, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>11, 24, 27, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>6, 13, 19, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>1, 12, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>8, 14, 25, 26, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PERCENTAGE OF ARGUMENTS TYPES IN TWO NEWSPAPERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CENTRAL DAILY</th>
<th>CAPITAL MORNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRCUMSTANCE</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHETORICAL-HISTORICAL</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE-TO-EFFECT</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILITUDE</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(355)  (309)
APPENDIX C

TYPES OF DEFINITION/GENUS IN CDN

171
1. Democracy
2. Ethics of party
3. Administration by law
4. The Three People's Principles
5. Communism
6. Public power
7. Taiwan independenc
8. Social stability
9. Pluralism
10. Rationality
11. Transitional period
12. National Security
13. Value judgement
14. Collective interest
15. Ethic of the Congress
16. Fairness
17. Justice
18. Moral character/cultivation
19. Utilitarianism
20. Public opinion
21. Human nature
22. Spirit of ethnic
23. National interest vs. Local interest
24. Political balance
25. Legislative Assembly
26. Social responsibility
27. Unification
28. Sacrifice/selflessness
29. party politics
30. Violent rebellion
31. Constitution
32. Relationships of Taiwan and Mainland
33. Economic growth
34. Power of spirit
35. Militaryman's involvement in politics
36. Tradition
37. Religion
38. Culture
39. Civil responsibility
40. Ethnic consciousness
41. National consciousness
APPENDIX D

TYPES OF DEFINITION/GENUS IN CMN
1. Human right
2. Democracy
3. Administration by law
4. People's opinion
5. Social classes
6. Public trust
7. Totalitarian system
8. Freedom of speech
9. Fair competition
10. President system vs. cabinet system
11. Central authority vs. local autonomy
12. International order and peace
13. Freedom of thoughts
14. Distribution of wealth
15. Taiwan's survival and development
16. People's power
17. Rebellion
18. Taiwan independence
19. Relationships of Taiwan and Mainland
20. Justice
21. Civil right
22. National Assembly
23. Principle of the Constitution
24. Politician vs. statesman
25. Bureaucratism
26. Revision of constitution
27. Responsibility of public officials
28. Civil servant system vs. military servant system
29. Neutralization of military
30. "Gold power" politics (politics influenced by monetary power)
31. Transitional period
32. Orthodoxism
33. One China ideology
34. Theory of contract
35. Bottom-up formation of people's will
36. National consciousness
37. Capitalism
38. Freedom of press
39. Public power
40. Ethnic
APPENDIX E

TYPES OF CIRCUMSTANCES IN CDN

175
1. World trend (in general)
2. Requirements of public duties
3. Transitional period
4. Decline of Communism
5. Current status/relationships of Taiwan and Mainland
6. Diplomatic difficulties
7. People's opinion
8. Special/unusual political environment
9. Democratic trend
10. Economic development
11. Social change
12. Current political status
APPENDIX F

TYPES OF CIRCUMSTANCES IN CMN
1. Power of opposition groups
2. Economic development
3. Social structure
4. People's opinion
5. World Trend
6. Decline of public trust
7. Complete re-election of the Congress
8. Peaceful demonstration
9. Under the name of party
10. The lift of Martial Law
11. Strongmen politics
12. Transitional period
13. Decline of Communism
14. Current status of Taiwan
15. Social needs
16. Democratic trend
17. Changing relationship of Taiwan and Mainland
18. No unification basis
19. Anti-democracy of Chinese Communists
20. Before revision of the Law of Election and Recall
21. Lack of rebellion intention
22. Before revision of the Constitution
23. One China ideology
24. "Gold power" politics
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