Yasuhito ABE
(University of Southern California, California, United States of America)

"Pray for Japan": Reinventing "Japanese National Character" after the 2011 Tohoku Earthquake, Tsunami, and Nuclear Crisis

The 2011 Tohoku Earthquake, Tsunami, and Nuclear Crisis appears to be an unprecedented disaster if one takes a look at the role of social media in the triple disasters that devastated eastern Japan. Indeed, the triple disasters to which people had affective response were, in no small part, a social construct of how they talked about their individual experiences via social media. In this context, this paper seeks to examine how people said about their experiences following the triple disasters, how they situated them in history, and, as a consequence, how "Japanese national character" was reconstructed through their uses of Twitter. By investigating a corpus of messages posted to Twitter collected and presented by the website titled "Pray for japan.jp," I employ Discourse Historical Analysis (DHA) and analyze how tweets interacted with and ultimately constructed a conception of "Japanese national character." The range of discourses embodied in Japanese social media practices with the triple disasters should be also analyzed in the context of the history of Twitter as a technology, its distribution and its uses, and I incorporate some specific examples from this historical analysis in order to support my assumption. I hope that this study illustrates some of the fundamental complexity of the relationship between Twitter as a technology and Twitter as a cultural form in this particular context.

Silvia ADLER
(Bar Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel)

Silent and Semi-Silent Argumentation in the Graphic Novel Scene

In general, graphic novels convey meaning through various interactions between two communication channels: text and image.

This study focuses on the iconographic channel of the graphic novel as a particular occurrence of silence. In comics, images often orient the reader towards the identification of language in action, or towards the selection of a particular communicative intention, a process which coincides with Saville-Troike's silences that carry illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect (1985), or with Kurzon's silences – intentional signifiers – alternating with utterable contents (1998). Moreover, pictorial messages in comics, as much as silence, may be beneficial in many ways, for instance when the message is too controversial to be put into words.

Concerning argumentation, if we bear in mind the fact that comics are not specifically intended to persuade, one wonders how argumentation could be of any relevance to this domain. However, as Amossy (2008) argues, a text which does not exclusively aim at convincing, does not seek any less to exert influence over its addressees. This amplified conception of argumentation allows us to look into the silent and semi-silent components used for the purpose of arguing in favor of a point of view in the graphic novel.

In particular, we will concentrate on two sets of arguments:

- semi-silent arguments resulting from the interplay between verbal and visual language.
- silent arguments emerging within an entirely visual scene.

References

Amossy, R. (2008). "A rgumentation et Analyse du discours : perspectives théoriques et découpages disciplinaires" *Argumentation et Analyse du Discours* n 1.

Kurzon, D. (1998). *Discourse of Silence*. John Benjamins Publishing company.

Saville-Troike, M. (1985). "The Place of Silence in an Integrated Theory of Communication". In: Tannen, D. and M. Saville-Troike (eds.) *Perspectives on Silence*. Ablex.

Laura ALBERTI
(University of Southern California, California, United States)

Visual Argument in Controversy: The Greek Debt Crisis in the European Public Sphere

In the contemporary public sphere, the study of visual argument is crucial to understand the way in which controversies emerge and develop in a multi-media environment where old grievances and new challenges intersect in sometimes unpredictable ways. In this essay I analyze the controversy between Greece and Germany sparked by the February 22, 2010 cover of German magazine Focus in order to gain insight in the way that images function as proofs for argument and as justification for action in an enthymematic way. The controversy, initiated by the Focus cover that depicted the Venus of Milos making a rude gesture with the caption “Cheaters in the Euro-family,” and followed by the Greek daily Eleftheros Typos’s response – a cover featuring a depiction of the statue of the goddess Victoria holding a swastika – illustrates the influence of visual argument in the contemporary public sphere. The images reinterpret the representative forms exemplified by the statues in an attempt to delineate the contours of the conversation around the Greek debt crisis and to limit the possibility of action by a strategic performance of inclusion and exclusion in the UE political ‘family.’ In this way, the images operate through culturally shared symbols and meanings to convey a reasoned argument about what should or should not be done to solve the Euro debt crisis.

Satoru AONUMA
(Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan)
David HINGSTOMAN
(University of Iowa, Iowa, United States of America)
Joseph ZOMPETTI
(Illinois State University, Illinois, United States of America)
Michael JANAS
(Samford University, Alabama, United States of America)
Gordon MITCHELL
(University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, United States of America)

[Panel Session]

Public Debate: Should High School Students in Japan Debate Nuclear Power?

On March 21, 2011, ten days after the first report of accident from Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, the National Association of Debate in Education (NADE), the professional organization that promotes debate education and the co-sponsor of the annual national high school debate tournament in Japan, announced the decision to change the already-announced national topic. The original topic asked whether Japan should abolish nuclear power plants. The NADE (and Yomiuri Shinbun, the country's largest newspaper company that co-sponsors the national tournament) made the official statement to justify the necessity of the topic change: Having high school students debate nuclear power in the nationals would be "educationally inappropriate" in the midst of the (Fukushima) nuclear crisis and the aftermath of the earthquake. Prompted by this curious and sudden decision on the part of the NADE and Yomiuri Shinbun, this panel critically explores, by way of public debate, the value of debating nuclear power in the Japanese secondary education, especially in competitive/tournament settings. In no way does this panel attempt to launch ad hominen attacks on the NADE officers or Yomiuri Shinbun; rather, it sincerely wishes to foster and contribute to informed discussion on pros and cons of using socially and politically controversial themes (such as nuclear power) for debate and argument education. The panel features scholars of debate and public argument who themselves have extensive background in competitive tournament debating (and coaching) at high school and/or college level.

Satoru AONUMA
(Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan)

Historical Seismology vs. Nuclear Engineering:
A Case Study of Interfield Argument in the Debate over Nuclear Power Plant Siting in Japan

The aim of this paper is revisit the theory of argument fields by way of a critical case study. Specifically, the paper will reassess the utility of the field theory by applying it to the critical explication and analysis of what is called “interfield dispute” that actually took place in the official discourse over the siting of one Japanese nuclear power plant, i.e., Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant owned and operated by Tokyo Electric Power Company (TEPCO), the very facility that has caused the world’s worst nuclear power accident in 2011. The text of the dispute comes from the Japanese-language verbatim transcript of a series of Working Group meetings of the Nuclear Industry and Safety Agency’s Seismic and Structural Design Subcommittee held in the early summer of 2009. In these meetings, Yukinobu Okamura, a seismologist at the National Institute of the Advanced Industrial Science and Technology, questioned the safety assessment report of Fukushima Daiichi submitted by TEPCO: Based on the evidence of Jokan Earthquake of 869, Okamura had claimed that the TEPCO report underestimated the magnitude of an earthquake and tsunami that could possibly hit Fukushima Daiichi, which unfortunately turned/proven true two years later. The paper first takes a look at the discipline of historical seismology from a perspective of argumentation and identifies types of inference and forms of evidence that are assumed and accepted therein. The paper then engages a critical analysis of the interfield dispute in the debate over the siting of Fukushima Daiichi and its quake-proof, where the seismological argument was evaluated and weighed against the competing argument informed by the disciplinary knowledge of nuclear power engineering. While the theory of argument fields seems to have been defunct in the study of argumentation for some time, it is the ambition of the paper to validate and reappraise Willard’s 1982 proposition that “[t]he [field] theory usefully poses the problems of interfield argument” (1982, p.62).

Bernardo Alexander ATTIAS
(California State University Northridge, California, United States)

Sound Arguments:
Debating Technology in Popular Music Subcultures

This study examines the use of arguments about music reproduction technology within the technical spheres of two distinct communities of argumentation: dance music disc jockey (DJ) subculture and audiophile subculture. While there is very little discourse taking place between the two subcultures, they both engage in heated debates over technical choices, particularly those surrounding digital and analog technologies. In both communities, while the arguments differ significantly, these debates tend to have a “ships passing in the night” quality in which advocates for each position make unstated assumptions that are different and often incompatible with those of the other side. These arguments then warrant claims about differences in sound that are stated as if they were independent of these divergent assumptions. These arguments about which format sounds better, in other words, are often completely unsound when examined from the perspective of logical reasoning.

A closer examination of the arguments made on both sides of these debates suggests that these arguments are tied to conceptions of artistic identity that have more in common with epideictic performance than deliberative reasoning. By examining these arguments both in terms of their technical merits and their logical structures, I hope to move away from a simple “objective” evaluation of these matters and instead tease out the implications of understanding such technical sphere arguments as performative constructions of identity. This analysis might better illuminate the ways in which these arguments are used both in DJ culture and in audiophile culture, as well as help argumentation scholars better understand the ways in which arguments in technical spheres more generally might be manifestations of deeper conflicts of identity.

Kevin BAASKE
(California State University, Los Angeles,
The United States of America)

Argument and the Occupy Movement: Multi-Voiced Advocacy in Contemporary Protest

Strategic ambiguity has long been recognized as a potentially successful rhetorical device. Politicians, for example, have engaged in deliberate obfuscation and generalization to gain adherents without alienating other segments of the audience. Argumentation scholars typically approach such advocacy with the goal of determining the single claim made by the advocate and the reasons for that claim. This approach works well when there is one advocate and one message, yet some contemporary advocates do not conform to the demands of traditional argumentation preferring instead to proffer multiple messages from myriad voices with competing and even contradictory demands. One recent exemplar of this approach is the Occupy Movement. Beginning in 2011 and continuing into 2012, moving from Kuala Lumpur to New York to London and beyond, occupy・protests have erupted in over 95 cities in 85 countries, but there is no central organization and no focused message.

This study examines the occupy movement from an argumentation perspective. It seeks to tease out the message of the movement and examine the nature of argument, power, and effectiveness when voices share and compete for the attention of the media.

Michael D. BARTANEN
(Pacific Lutheran University, Washington, United States of America)
Robert S. LITTLEFIELD
(North Dakota State University, North Dakota, United States of America)

The Cultural Influences of Forensics Practice: The Cold Warand its Influence on American Forensics

Forensics practice is interdependent with its surrounding culture. While competitive debate and public speaking are grounded in the transcendent Western traditions first codified by the Greeks, the history of competitive speech and debate is characterized by the uneasy fusion between culture, political and academic structures and practices, and the demands imposed by competition. The onset of the Cold War in the United States had a significant effect on the nature of secondary and post-secondary education, including co-curricular activities such as forensics competition. This paper will discuss the significant changes in American forensics resulting from a societal shift towards relying on schools and universities to produce increasing numbers of scientists, government workers and teachers, and providing educational opportunities for citizens who formerly did not perceive the value or opportunity for higher education. The significant change in the number of people seeking degrees and the public's perception of the role of higher education transformed forensics. Competitive speech and debate changed from being understood and justified as a public good in the years prior to the Cold War to a private good benefitting the individual student participants. This transformation provides a useful case study of the complex relationship between co-curricular activities and the cultural practices and assumptions which affect educational practice.

J. Anthony BLAIR
(University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada)

Arguing To and Arguing With

In this paper I develop a case for a different picture of how arguments are used in society than those depicted by some current influential models. Perelman models the telos of arguing as gaining the adherence of an audience. Pragma-Dialectics models the telos of arguing as resolving a disagreement with an interlocutor in one's favor. Walton models arguing as engaging in different kinds of dialogues. I will suggest that most arguing can instead be assimilated to one of three slightly different models, and we need all three: (1) arguing to a mostly non-interacting audience with the aim of persuasion; (2) arguing with in interlocutor, either (a) with a view to defeating him or her (this can be serious or play) or (b) with a view to solving a problem together. I will itemize a variety of differences among the properties of these three models, and show how in the actual practice of arguing in various standard kinds of social situation one or another of these models tends to be predominant, how they can be mixed, and how there can be dangers in mixing them. Among the kinds of properties in terms of which these three models can be distinguished are: (a) the status of the thesis or standpoint being argued for, (b) the typical audience or interlocutor, (c) the initial disposition of the audience/interlocutor towards the thesis, (d) the interests of the parties in each model, (e) the nature of the activity being engaged in, (f) the goal of the arguing, (g) the gain vs. loss outcome possibilities, (h) typical venues for each type of arguing. I will show how the current models mentioned above fail to capture or else distort features of arguing that these three models preserve.

Peter A. CRAMER
(Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada)

Sick Stuff: A Case Study in the Micro-Rhetoric of Controversy

The Brooklyn Museum controversy, which by most accounts began in September of 1999, has made history in the sense that speakers and writers seem to have developed a cardinal narrative for it, one that has been and continues to be regularly repeated and recontextualized across many situations and texts. The analysis in this paper necessarily delivers a very partial answer to the question of how the cardinal narrative of the controversy has been shaped and how the case has come to make history; it is a case study of a very brief but often repeated text, "sick stuff." The protagonist of the controversy narrative, Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, uttered these words at a press conference on September 22, 1999 where he delivered his critical comments about the Sensation art exhibit at the Brooklyn Museum, beginning a text trajectory of these words. The purpose of the analysis in this paper is to examine in detail the travels of this small stretch of discourse, a common part of the cardinal narrative, in order to shed light on how this process has worked in the Brooklyn case. It is a case study in the micro-rhetoric of a controversy. The aim is not to intervene in the controversy or to attempt to resolve it in the manner of an agonist, and it is not to provide a framework for its effective resolution in the manner of a clinician. The aim is to adopt a constitutive attitude with the goal of understanding how the controversy came to be shaped in its particular way.

Frans H. van Eemeren
(ILIAS and University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

From Ideal Model to Situated Argumentative Discourse: The Step-by-Step Development of the Pragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation

Frans van Eemeren gives an overview of the development of the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation. Starting with designing an ideal model for critical discussion, the pragma-dialectical theorizing has step by step been brought closer to actual argumentative practice. After it has first been shown that the pragma-dialectical rules for critical discussion are instrumental in distinguishing sound argumentative moves from fallacious argumentative moves, it has been established empirically by means of experimental research that the rules for critical discussion may also lay claim to conventional validity. In addition, a method for reconstructing argumentative discourse has been developed and a heuristic has been proposed for identifying the indicators of argumentative moves in discourse. Next, the crucial step has been made of connecting in the theorizing by means of the notion of strategic manoeuvring the dialectical reasonableness dimension of argumentative discourse with the rhetorical dimension of effectiveness. Taking account of strategic manoeuvring means relating the analysis and evaluation of argumentative discourse to the specific communicative activity types in which the discourse takes place. Because of the institutional demands ensuing from the communicative context in which they occur, communicative activity types impose specific constraints on the strategic manoeuvring which are to be taken into account in its analysis and evaluation. In accounting for the consequences of these constraints in the theorizing, pragma-dialectics has made a decisive step towards dealing directly with argumentative practice in situated argumentative discourse.

G. Thomas GOODNIGHT
(University of Southern California, The United States of America)

Communicative Power & Economic Diplomacy:
Matsumoto and Clinton April 17, 2011

The Cold War was an era of summitry. The meetings of the representatives of the Free World and Communist world would meet to ease tensions, to posture and debate, and sometimes to prepare the road for change. The new world order is engaged in exchange among diplomats and officials of the government. The goal of such international work is to develop a dialogue sufficient to achieve an understanding of positions and commitments that can be sustained between nations in regard to a region. The United States was active in providing a nuclear umbrella in exchange for bases during the Cold War. It also achieved productive engagement with Japan in its rehabilitation during the 1950s through 1980s and more recently with China in the 1990s and 21st century. The goals of public diplomacy still emerge from historic traditions between nations, but more recently the domain of exchange has shifted to more broad based biopolitics. This paper initiates studies in econonmic diplomacy by examining Hillary Clinton’s efforts to create “smart power” in affirming relationships between Japan and the United States.

Elsa GUARDIOLA
(Montpellier III University, Montpellier, France)

Political Discourse in Crisis Context: Discursive Strategies and Audience to the Test Electoral Campaigns and Post-Electoral Conflicts in Mexico

On many occasions, both state and federal elections in Mexico gave rise to political crises due to the lack of confidence in the electoral and political institutions. In such a context, the political discourse -which is traditionally considered unethical and is mistakenly confused with sophistry because of its rhetorical nature-, can appear, more than ever, as a verbal jousting disconnected from the political practice. However, the political discourse, particularly in crisis context, deserves to be analyzed as a matrix that reflects the reality and simultaneously moulds it with words. The links between the issuers -the candidates- and the audience, and consequently the speeches are deeply modified by the context they happen to be.

Using the theoretical framework defined by Perelman and Tyteca in the *New Rhetoric*, we propose to study the speeches of presidential candidates during the Mexican electoral campaign and post-electoral conflict in 2006. The role of the audience was redefined by the polarization of national political life and the emergence of a post-electoral mobilization which joined forces to denounce a fraudulent poll and to question the legitimacy of the winner.

To analyze how both persuasive discourse and counter-discourse, that lies in the rejection of the oponents, could spread, we will also have recourse to quantitative analysis and automated analysis data in order to discern the complex links between the speeches and the audience they are aimed at in a context of social protests and political uncertainty.

Thomas A. HOLLIHAN and Patricia RILEY
(University of Southern California, The United States of America)

Strategic Argument and Media Diplomacy:
Framing Peace and Security in the Asian Pacific

Since World War II the Asian Pacific region has benefited from the U.S. security commitment and the investment of vast sums of money, manpower, and technology. Japan and South Korea were able to modernize and rapidly develop their economic power because they were secure under a U.S. nuclear umbrella and were not forced to invest massive sums of money in securing their own defense. Now, however, with the rise of China, the persistent instabilities due to the nuclear proliferation in North Korea, the uncertainties in South Asia given the ethnic and religious tensions in Indonesia and the lingering tensions regarding the future of Taiwan, the region is increasingly shaped by diplomatic and military tensions. This paper will examine the unfolding public arguments in this controversy paying particular attention to discussions regarding military-to-military collaboration in the region. The paper will consider arguments offered by military leaders and diplomats as well as arguments generated by public officials and media spokespersons. Finally, we will discuss differences in how nations communicate with their domestic publics, publics from other regional nations, and publics from nations beyond the region.

Yoshiko IKEDA
(Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, Japan)

Images of the Japanese and Americans in 2000s Films

At the 1st Tokyo International Conference on Argumentation, I suggested a hypothesis of stereotypes of the Other as argumentative tools for self-criticism. Having presented the hypothesis of symbolic functions of stereotypes to reinforce and criticize the identity/identities of their creators, I demonstrated these functions by examining the Japanese stereotypes from the 1940s to the 1990s. At the 4th Tokyo conference of Argumentation, I would use this hypothesis to analyze images of the Japanese in American films from the 2000s to the present. The films to be mainly examined are *Last Samurai* (2003), *Letters from Iwo Jima* (2005), *A Memoirs of a Geisha* (2005) and *Interception* (2007). In short, in these films, the images of the Japanese are more favorably depicted than those in the 1980s and the 1990s and show more critical functions of Americans. In these films except Lost in Translation, the images of the Japanese serve to highlight and relieve traumas of American characters. Of course, Ken Watanabe, the actor who appears in the above films might have influenced these depictions, but there seem to be more factors to be noted. Through a close analysis of the films based on the argumentative tools for self-criticism, this paper attempts to explore the cultural contexts behind these images which cause the differences.

Tatiana IVANOVA
(Nevsky Institute of Language and Culture, Saint Petersburg, Russia)

Argumentation, Actually… Is All Around.

The reference to the popular British film “Love, actually” is no coincidence. The film claims that love is all around and then its creators prove their point through visual (non-verbal) and verbal arguments.

I would like to show that argumentation is everywhere around us and that every second we participate in conversations that develop argumentative discourse by using both verbal and non-verbal means.

The talk deals with mini- texts that constitute our everyday life – texts on food packaging, cartoons, comic strips, adverts, public notices, and quotations of the words of famous people. These mini-texts always contain some opinion and therefore a certain claim that should be supported through arguments both verbal and non-verbal.

A combination of pragma-dialectic approach of Amsterdam school and Russian school of text analysis has been applied.

According to F. van Eemeren and R.Grootendorst argumentative discourse is a discourse aimed at resolving the conflict of opinion. In this type of discourse there is always a proponent who supports some idea and opponent, who speaks against it. Both of them are trying to persuade each other.

The specific feature of our material is that most of the arguments are implicit and the reader, being a potential opponent, is silent.

However in spite of implicit nature of the arguments, or, maybe, due to that, they may trigger a heated dispute for example after a cartoon publication and even escalate the real conflict and fight, since every participant will defend the values of the group of the society they belong to. Examples of such cartoons and comic strips and the electronic discussions development are considered.

Furthermore the research is aimed at revealing the scope of factors that would turn the discussion into conflict and shift it from rational to irrational.

Mike JANAS
(Samford University, Alabama, United Sates)

It Can’t Happen Here:
Motivated Cognition and American Arguments Regarding Fukushima Daiichi

The March 2011 disaster at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi power plant in March 2011 should have put brakes on America’s new nuclear age. While US public opinion regarding nuclear power has dipped to a record low, public officials continue to actively support planned construction. This paper examines the American response to the Japanese nuclear disaster. Using the statements of US government officials as a text, it looks at their arguments as an example of motivated cognition. Whereas argument scholars usually explain reluctance to engage uncomfortable realities as an example of the failure of argument resulting from laziness or ignorance, motivated cognition looks at the ways that argumentation works actively and conservatively to provide resources that advantage the status quo. In regard to the situation in Japan, arguments in favor of continued nuclear development tend to focus on nationalism and distinguishing the Japanese situation utterly from the American context.

Naoki KAMBE
(Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Japan)

Representations/Reconstructions of the Japanese after the Great East Japan Earthquake

The Great East Japan Earthquake on March 11, 2011 has changed the ways in which the world sees Japan and the Japanese see themselves. In the aftermath of the earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear power plant accidents, various media around the world broadcast horrific scenes of destruction. In addition to these visual images, the foreign media reported with admiration the stoic, selfless, orderly, disciplined, and civilized Japanese who responded to the disaster in a calm way with seemingly no hint of looting and violence. The Japanese media soon began to reiterate these good and encouraging images of the people and reminded them of their cultural norms. In this paper, I attend to these media discourses: 1) popular representations of the Japanese and their culture reported by a variety of American and European media; 2) their reiterations by the Japanese media. In particular, I ask why such representations emerged from the foreign media and what effects these representations and reiterations had on the (re)constructions of Japanese cultural identity at a time of national crisis. In order to answer these questions, I employ Edward Said's work on Orientalism and Stuart Hall's work on cultural identity and representation. Following Said, I argue that, on the one hand, these representations have constructed the Japanese as being different, exotic and "other" within the categories of knowledge of the West. Following Hall, I argue that, on the other hand, these reiterations have helped the Japanese see and experience themselves as "Other" through which they have reconfirmed their cultural identity. Through examining these media discourses, I aim at revealing the logic of representation of the other and its interaction with a performative nature of cultural identity.

Takayuki KATO
(Seiwa University, Chiba, Japan)

An Analysis of Royal Address by the King of Bhutan at the Diet of Japan

On November 17, 2011, the King of Bhutan Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchu made a speech in the Chamber of the House of Representatives during his six-day stay in Japan with his newly-wed wife Qeen Jetsun Pema. This address impressed the Japanese public in the gloomy mood pervasive after the devastating disasters struck on March 11, 2011. With the royal couple's visit well-received in Japan, media coverage spread nationwide about Bhutan and the idea of gross national happiness adopted as a major index in the country's administrative directions instead of gross national product in most countries'. Lack of criticism or negative attitude toward the King and his speech among the Japanese public was not only due to lack of existing confrontation in the amicable relationship between Bhutan and Japan, but also presence of culturally sharable values between the two countries effectively spurred in this address. This essay therefore aims to carefully analyze some of the key features of this speech that created a favorable impression on the Japanese, some of whom began feeling the life after the disasters as an opportunity to shift from the pursuit of material affluence. More specific focus will be put on the usage of the King's persona and the tone toward the relationship between the two nations, and the context of Japan in which value debate has been likely concurrent with arguments of policy issues, such as economic growth, energy supply or the like. Hopefully, this essay is intended to explore the genre of royal address made by a state guest in Japan, and the possibility of the public discussion that could influence Japan's administrative directions.

Takuzo KONISHI
(Tokyo, Japan)

Promise and Peril of Habermas' Conception of Public Sphere

This paper attempts to reflect and examine how much Jurgen Habermas' theory of discourse in public spheres contributes to the understanding of on-line discourse. Since Habermas published Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, scholars from different fields have investigated how his ideas on public spheres and discourse help us examine the role of argumentation in society. Although it seems to be promising to extend his ideas to the on-line discourse and critically examine argumentative exchanges, we must pause and reflect two interrelated issues. Firstly, how well does the conception of public spheres account for formation of public opinions on-line? Since Habermas' conception of the public sphere is a historically contingent normative ideal that emphasizes the formation of public opinion through face-to-face communication among bourgeois, great care must be taken in determining how much his ideas help account for formation of public opinion by various people belonging to different social strata. Secondly, how meaningful is his theory of discourse that places a great emphasis on argument for critically examining online discourse? Although Habermas and many argumentation scholars have attempted to illuminate social practice of argumentation, emergence of new media and different ways to express one's opinion publicly may limit the value of argumentation theory and practice. Attempts to deal with these issues may well better situate theory and practice of argumentation within broader scholarly and socio-political endeavors.

Manfred KRAUS
(University of Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany)

Talk at Cross Purposes:
The Role of Disagreement and Polemic Argument in Democratic Societies

All argumentation essentially needs disagreement as its starting point. Nonetheless the apparent ubiquity of utterly polemic argument in our modern societies has met with harsh criticism from those who advocate a concept of society that would be based on consent rather than dissent and on firm standards rather than permanent debate. Polemic argument seems to violate various rules of critical discussion as formulated by pragma-dialectic theory and does not seem to yield any reasonable result. Yet the discrepancy between its moral condemnation and its frequent use in pluralistic and democratic societies calls for a revision of its evaluation.

As a rule, polemic argument can be demonstrated to originate from deep disagreements that arise from a complete lack of common ground between arguers. Based on this analysis, the paper will advocate the importance of the free expression of antagonist views, and hence of conflict and polemics as the core of political interaction in democratic societies, and a democratic political culture that heartily welcomes dissent and antagonistic confrontation of ideas as its very basis, yet without undermining the ideal of a rational dialogue.

To that purpose, it will use modern revivals of the concept of the cognitive function of antilogical reasoning as well as theories about the incommensurability of conceptions and the possibility of reasonable disagreements, in an effort to establish an underlying logic and rhetoric of purely polemic arguments. It will discuss the possibilities of overcoming deep disagreements by subsuming the competing positions under a more comprehensive, overarching view, or by attributing to them the basic function of clarifying the contending positions for the benefit of a third party, namely the greater public that listens to the dispute.

Eisuke Kubota
(Aichi Mizuho College, Aichi, Japan)
Aya Kubota
(Mejiro University, Tokyo, Japan)

Rhetoric of Love in Modern Japan: Reconstructing Female Sexuality

The public discourse regarding female sexuality dramatically changed between the 1920s and 1930s. During the time, human sexology (tsuzoku seiyokugaku) became popular as popular magazines on sexual desire had explosive sales. Further, modern culture imported from Western countries came into fashion and a new image of women such as modern girl appeared. Another feature of this era was the emergence of a new sexual value symbolized as the vogue word in this era, “eroguro nansensu “which is short of “erotic grotesque nonsense.”

This paper focuses on discourse on love in the popular magazines at that time and explores how the discourse of female sexuality changed during the era. Specifically the paper employs a methodological perspective of ideographs developed by Michael McGee, and explores how the meaning of two ideographs “love” and “sex” were created and changed in the specific cultural, political and economic context. The paper proposes that “love” and “sex (reproduction)” came to be seen interconnectedly while they were regarded separately.

Lin-Lee LEE
(National Kaohsiung Normal University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan)

Exploring the Living Fossil of Daughter's Kingdom: A Rhetorical Study of the Mosuo Folksongs

The discovery of the walking marriage by the Mosuo in the remote Lugu Lake of Sichuan Province in China articulates the notion of a living fossil in the contemporary world. Consequently, the dynamics of the intriguing cultural perspective have attracted scholars of various fields to study its numerous dimensions. Recent studies lay the groundwork in deciphering the mysterious world of the Naxi and Mosuo cultures. However, none of their studies explored the rhetorical significance of the Mosuo folksongs, and the current study is the pioneering attempt to decipher the intriguing rhetorical functions of the Mosuo folksongs.

The paper aims to explore the scholarship of the Mosuo's rhetoric at the macro-level and micro-level. At the macro-level, feminist criticism and genre criticism are used. To avoid over generalize the Mosuo folksongs into fixed recurrent features, the theory of close textual criticism comes into play. At the micro-level, the close textual criticism will be employed to analyze each genre discourse respectively.

Based on the purposes of the study, the research questions are delineated as follows:

1. What are the important features of rhetoric unique of the Mosuo?
2. What constructs and maintains particular gender definitions for men and women as revealed in the Mosuo folksongs?
3. What constitutes a distinct genre of rhetorical practice for the Mosuo?
4. To what extent do the Mosuo folksongs reflect the situational demands?
5. To what extent the intriguing rhetorical patterns of the Mosuo folksongs in the matrilineal society reflect its particular culture?

Keywords: Mosuo folksongs, feminist criticism, genre criticism, close textual criticism, feminine style

Brian R. MCGEE
(College of Charleston, South Carolina, United States of America)

Barack Obama as “Committed Socialist”: Arguing from Definition in the 2012 Republican Presidential Primaries

U.S. President Barack Obama has consistently adopted or embraced policies consistent with large-state corporate capitalism. Further, he has repeatedly sought the advice and support of business leaders and capitalist financiers, including professionals with Wall Street ties who have been appointed to senior positions in the Obama Administration. Nevertheless despite these capitalist credentials, Obama has regularly been charged by his political critics, including multiple Republican Presidential candidates during the 2012 Republican Presidential primaries, with having socialist commitments and policy proposals. In response, journalists and public intellectuals frequently have alleged that the socialist charge against Obama is evidence of sloppy Republican thinking, mental imbalance, or the venality of contemporary politics. In this essay, I review the arguments from definition dealing with Obama as socialist during the 2012 Republican Presidential primaries. Specifically, in light of the history of the ideograph “socialism” in U.S. political discourse, I take seriously the definitional work that takes place in the 2012 campaign and consider the consequences of this definitional work for electoral politics, public discussion of economics, and contemporary argumentation theory.

Gordon MITCHELL
(University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, United States of America)
Satoru AONUMA
(Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan)
Takeshi SUZUKI
(Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan)

Changing Horses in Midstream: Topic Change Controversies as Rhetorical Crises

Policy debate's speedy speech and research intensiveness are often cited as sine qua non characteristics of the activity. But really, these are just manifestations of a more central feature of policy debate that accounts for its unique nature. Fast talking and the voluminous research that drives it are made possible by topic fixity. Once a topic area is selected and a specific resolution framed, that resolution serves as a stasis point of argumentation for many months and thousands of contest rounds, with the fixed nature of the target enabling deep research and extensive pre-season preparation. Little wonder, then, that calls to change the resolution mid-season tend to be very rare and encounter strong resistance. Sometimes, the impetus behind such calls come from within the policy debate community, as when a major flaw in the wording of the 1984-1985 National Debate Tournament (NDT) space topic motivated a mid-season amendment to the resolution. Other times, external events create pressure to alter resolutions already fixed by official topic selection bodies. For example, citing strategic Cold War considerations, several branches of the U.S. military pressed the Speech Association of America to change the NDT topic on recognition of Communist China in 1954. Many students and educators called for the 2001-2002 NDT resolution dealing with U.S. policy toward Native Americans to be changed in the wake of the September 11, 2001 airline attacks. And most recently in Japan, the National Association of Debate in Education (NADE) pulled the previously announced high school policy debate topic on nuclear power, arguing that it would be educationally inappropriate to debate such issues in the midst of the (Fukushima) nuclear crisis and the aftermath of the 2011 earthquake. This essay examines topic change controversies as episodes of rhetorical crisis, where unusual lines of argumentation regarding the essence and purpose of academic debate burst through the fissures of sometimes tectonic disagreement. Where do the calls for mid-season topic change come from? What motivates them? What accounts for their ultimate success or failure in triggering mid-season adjustments? Original archival research exploring such issues promises not only to contribute important content to the historical record, but also shed light on perennial questions regarding policy debate's proper role in the world.

Junya MOROOKA
(Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan)
Tomohiro KANKE
(Tokai University, Kanagawa, Japan)

Female Orators in Modern Japan

This paper attempts to shed light on women's oratory in Meiji and Taisho Japan (1868-1926). Current literature on the history of oratory in modern Japan has focused mostly on men and mentioned female orators only in passing. However, although women had been banned from delivering political speeches in public gatherings except for brief periods in the 1880s and 1920s, they had been encouraged to master the skills that would help them speak effectively in academic settings, on ceremonial occasions, and in informal social situations. Many women participated in youth oratorical contests to display their speaking skills; some of them even won national contests, beating their male competitors.

Specifically, the paper analyzes the arguments female orators made in their speeches, the styles they adopted, and their public reception by perusing relevant articles in *Yuben*, an influential magazine on oratory. Since its inaugural issue in 1910, female orators had been regularly featured in the magazine but largely portrayed as different or inferior to their male counterparts. It was usually taken for granted that female orators refrained from addressing political issues and spoke in a ladylike manner. As speech education for women was basically intended to mold them into "good wives and good mothers," those who violated gender expectations of public performance became the subjects of ridicule and criticism. At the same time, there were sporadic cases of female orators publicizing some of the most radical ideas of their time. For instance, activist women, notably Toshiko Kishida and Fumiko Nishikawa, went up to the podium to demand women's suffrage, endorse proletarian political movements, and challenge the dominant male hegemony. By attending to the various and often conflicting roles female orators played, the paper aims to expand our understanding of eloquence in modern Japan.

Tomas NILSSON
(Lund University, Helsingborg Sweden)

Arguing for Business: The Use of Prosopopoeia in Everyday Marketing Work

Despite a growing interest in the rhetorical aspects of marketing, mundane marketing work remains unexplored rhetorically. Consequently we know very little about the everyday persuasion that marketing professionals are engaged in, which is unfortunate given the immeasurable influence of commercial rhetoric in today's society. This paper contributes to this area of research by studying the argumentative strategies marketers pursue in order to accomplish business. The object of interest is marketing work in professional service firms. Fifteen people engaged in marketing and sales work, in four different Swedish firms, have been observed and interviewed. Their everyday business communication was interpreted through a Protagorean lens, emphasizing the two-sidedness of human arguing and thinking. It was then found that the marketing professionals have a significant habit of "speaking as another person" (prosopopoeia); giving the dramatic impression we are actually listening to these persons' voices. In so doing, a satisfied client, a respected colleague, a friend's wife, Jerry Seinfeld, and Jesus, suddenly appeared in the conversations, just to mention some telling examples. The use of prosopopoeia effectively animated the conversations. Moreover, by means of prosopopoeia the marketing professionals were able to cautiously add controversial yet beneficial aspects of a case to strengthen an argument. At large, these findings suggest that arguing for business involves a multitude of voices that can, potentially, be part of a complex meta-argumentation. Hence the suggestion that argumentation in everyday marketing work seems to be far more sophisticated than usually accounted for in today's research on commercial rhetoric.

Hiroko OKUDA
(Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan)

Critical Reflections on Japan's Crisis Management as Nuclear State: A Case Study of Japanese Politics and Language in the Fukushima Nuclear Accident

On 16 December 2011, Prime Minister Noda Yoshihiko informed the country that control of the overheating reactors at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant had been regained, "Today, we have reached a great milestone. … The reactors are stable, which should resolve one big cause of concern for us all." These words show the administration's effort to appease public anger over the nuclear disaster, and to deflect national attention from the reactor's remaining threats to public safety. The words simply represent the government's yearning for a relatively safe and stable state known as a "cold shutdown," a technical term used to describe intact reactors with fuel cores just one step before the cleanup. But such is not the true situation.

A euphemism often makes a kind of lie distort the reality and mislead the country. As George Orwell points out in the essay "Politics and the English Language," political language attempts "to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable." The euphemisms used in current Japanese political language take the form of polite opacity to conceal the nuclear energy commitment. Japanese circumlocution is designed to soften the sharp terms of offensive, harsh or blunt criticism. This study explores the ways in which Japan's nuclear bureaucracy, consisting of senior state bureaucrats and industrial and political collaborators, attempted to cover up its decisions' unpleasant results, make the consequences sound less offensive, and minimize its responsibilities for the "unexpected" nuclear catastrophes after the March 11 earthquake and tsunami. The study shows how government officials and the Tokyo Electronic Power Company (TEPCO), Japan's biggest utility, manipulate, cover up, or mislead news information. On the whole, the study of the Fukushima nuclear accident reveals how destructive politically correct euphemisms can be in a crisis.

Steve OSWALD
(VU University Amsterdam, North Holland, Netherlands)
Christopher HART
(Northumbria University, Tyne and Wear, United Kingdom)

Trust Based on Bias: A Cognitive and Evolutionary Treatment of the Rhetorical Effectiveness of the Ad Verecundiam and Ad Populum Fallacies

The ad verecundiam fallacy and the ad populum fallacy can be classified as fallacies exploiting people's trust in third party sources. In the former, fallaciousness arises out of improper or irrelevant expertise (see Walton 2006, van Eemeren, Grootendorst & Snoeck Henkemans 2002, Goodwin 1998). In the latter, fallaciousness is due to an irrelevant or ill-evidenced appeal to popularity (see Walton 2006).

We acknowledge these characterisations. However, what we try to provide is a twofold, cognitively grounded explanation as to why these particular fallacies have the potential to be rhetorically effective in the first place.

Our first contention is that there are cognitive reasons - based on evolutionarily selected biases - which explain people's propensity to believe in experts and the voice of the majority. On a macro level, we therefore consider how specific mechanisms for epistemic vigilance (see Sperber et al. 2010) may be improperly calibrated toward trust in certain sources of information, including authorities and majorities, regardless of whether or not truth conditions have been satisfied.

The second tier of our analysis will argue, on a micro level, that there are further cognitive characteristics inherent in the heuristic comprehension procedure (see Sperber & Wilson 1995, Allott 2007) which can account for why victims of these fallacies fail to notice improper reliance on expert opinion and majorities. We will detail how pragmatic constraints on utterance interpretation are exploited to obfuscate as much critical information as possible: crucially, the ad verecundiam and the ad populum render the critical questions needed to spot and defeat the fallacy contextually irrelevant, i.e. inaccessible or epistemically weak.

Our claims will be illustrated with attested examples of fallacious arguments from a body of political and media discourse.

Angela G. RAY
(Northwestern University, Illinois, USA)

Global Analogies and Social Knowledge:
Nineteenth-Century Americans Learn about the World

Through participating in civic debating clubs or attending popular lectures, nineteenth-century Americans generated social knowledge about the physical, cultural, and political world and their own places within it. Drawing upon data gathered from unpublished records of debating clubs and lecture-sponsoring associations as well as speech texts and newspaper reports, this paper seeks to identify the various ways that Americans defined the world in the decades before the U.S. Civil War. By labeling certain people, places, and behaviors as foreign, they also claimed their own nation as distinctive. The paper highlights civic debating questions on international themes, ranging from sweeping questions like “Would a Congress of Nations Be Beneficial?” debated in Canton, Ohio, in 1842, to narrowly targeted questions involving current events, such as “Ought the crew of the *Amistad* to be surrendered to the Spanish Government?” debated in Providence, Rhode Island, in 1839. In examining public lectures, it surveys lectures delivered by American travelers like Bayard Taylor, who, for example, accompanied Commodore Matthew Perry’s expedition to Japan in 1853, as well as lectures delivered in the United States by individuals who presented themselves as foreign, such as the Anatolian-born author Hatchik Oscanyan and the English novelist William Makepeace Thackeray. The study reveals that, in the production of nineteenth-century public discourse about the rest of the world, analogy was a recurrent and fundamental interpretive device. Nineteenth-century debaters and lecturers typically claimed simply to be asserting facts about the world outside the United States, but through analogical linkages, both overt and implied, they instead generated persuasive arguments about global and national cultures. This paper therefore proffers a rhetorical history of nineteenth-century U.S. popular education and investigates the persuasive power of the analogy, that ubiquitous argumentative device which is logically weak but imaginatively engaging and profoundly influential.

Edward SCHIAPPA
(University of Minnesota, Minnesota, The United States of America &
The Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Massachusetts, The United States of America)

Evolving Argument Strategies in the Debate over Same-Sex Marriage in the U.S.

Whether the term and legal status of marriage should include same-sex couples is the most prominent civil rights question in the United States in the early 21st Century. Like all significant definitional controversies, competing values, interests, and questions of power are at stake in how the institution of marriage and the legal right to marry are defined. In the state of California, two competing definitions emerged from two distinct argumentative spheres. On May 15th of 2008 the Supreme Court of California ruled in In re Marriage Cases (183 P.3d 384) that marriage could not be limited to opposite-sex couples, thereby redefining marriage to include same-sex couples. On November 4th of 2008, the people of California voted to approve what is known as Proposition 8, which states: only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.

Drawing on G. Thomas Goodnight's influential work on argument spheres, this essay compares and contrasts the arguments advanced in the technical sphere of legal and constitutional debate with those in the public sphere leading up to the November 4th vote with a particular emphasis on definitional arguments; that is, arguments over how marriage ought to be defined. Of particular interest is how the norms and practices of constitutional argument in the technical sphere filter out specific arguments particularly fear appeals and claims based on religious beliefs and values that are prevalent in the public sphere over Prop 8. The essay concludes with a discussion of the dilemmas facing a society in which the public and technical spheres of argument produce dramatically different performances of rhetorical reasoning, and how scholars of argument might respond.

Janice SCHUETZ
(University of New Mexico, New Mexico, the United States of America)

Renditions of Free Expression in Julian Assange's Moral Argumentation about WikiLeaks

The former computer hacker Julian Assange created a secure internet site where whistle blowers and investigative journalists could anonymously submit confidential organizational and government documents. This platform allowed the release of hundreds of thousands of documents to a global audience of millions. These documents ranged from embarrassing documents about the beliefs and practices of Scientology to the secret military videos and documents regarding the U.S.'s conduct of War in Iraq and Afghanistan. Assange's release of these documents from 2006-2010 won him the title of "Hero of Free Expression." My goal is to analyze Assange's various renditions of the free expression as examples of misuses of casuistry. I ground this study in Jonsen and Toulmin's explications of casuistry, processes of reasoning in public moral argumentation. I extend and modify this theory by considering the moral visions of the arguer, the implicit motivations underlying the moral arguments, and the character of the arguer (Julian Assange). To complete my analysis of Assange's moral arguments about free expression, I analyze several sources for his arguments, including his speeches, interviews, and internet posts.

Laurance Paul STRAIT
(University of Southern California, California, United States of America)

Argumentative Hoaxing: From Incommensurability to Mutual Understanding

In this essay, I adumbrate the way in which hoaxing is used as an argumentative strategy to produce mutual understanding. The difference between strategic action and communicative action is that the former is oriented toward success while the latter is oriented toward mutual understanding, an orientation that typically requires sincere communication that is free of intentional deception. I argue that this is not always the case, and that in certain situations, deliberate hoaxing is a valid form of communicative action. In these cases, the object of the argumentation is the validity or desirability of a communication system. As a result of the problem of self-reference, the interlocutors cannot argue about the merits of that epistemic system in a manner that is completely independent of that system. Consequently, the interlocutors are effectively speaking different argument-languages that are incommensurate. I argue that the only strategy available in these situations is hoaxing. If I believe that you are speaking nonsense, while you maintain that you are communicating meaningfully, and moreover that you are communicating ideas that I am incapable of communicating with my language, there is no way we can come to a consensus directly. However, we can reach a consensus if I attempt to use your language in a nonsensical manner – either you will be able to distinguish my hoax from a legitimate use of your language, forcing me to re-evaluate my position, or you will not, forcing you to re-evaluate your position. I present three examples of this strategy in very distinct argumentative spheres: first, the Sokal hoax, which concerned a communicative system characterized by epistemic relativism; second, the Ern Malley hoax, which concerned the merits of modernist poetry; third, the Rosenham hoax, which challenged the prevailing nosological system in psychiatry.

Masako SUZUKI
(Keio University, Kanagawa, Japan)

Fuhyo Higai [Harmful Rumors]

After the earthquake in East Japan on March 11th followed by the nuclear crisis of Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, radioactive contamination became a concern of many Japanese. As people became worried if they can keep eating food produced broadly in Tohoku(North East) region, mass-media started using this term, “harmful rumors” every single day. Mass media in Japan has never used this term before for other food concerns in the past such as bovine spongiform encephalopathy(BSE), foot-and-mouth disease, genetically modified food, Chinese-made dumpling poisoning, a series of food frauds. This term, “harmful rumors” is originally meant to accuse people who blanketly avoid products of Tohoku/Kanto region without examining the actual and specific data on which product of which specific area is how much contaminated. But as this term became used so frequently by so many people, its definition became less clear. What is the broader definition of “harmful rumors”? What is the effect of using this term? What moral value does this represent? Which voice was shunned by wide spread of this terminology? This research aimed to answer these questions by comparing printed texts by mass-media and texts anonymously written online. NHK’s documentary aired in December echoed the discrepancy between mass-media and general public this research found. After examining about the discrepancy between them, this paper further discusses how the mass-media and general public saw the announcement by Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare to reduce the accepted radioactive contamination level of food.

Masako SUZUKI
(Keio University, Kanagawa, Japan)

Topic Dividing The World

Seeking regional balance of debate topics at international debate competitions, this research first found a simple fact that debaters perform statistically better when they debate on topics from their own region. South East Asian teams performed statistically better when the topic is about South East Asia. North East Asian teams gained higher marks when they debated on North East Asian issues and Continental European teams did better when they debated about Christianity. This simply suggests that region specific topics are not fair at global tournaments.

But the complication starts when we find that the problem still exists even when the topic does not specify any region. Some of the topics are perceived very differently by different communities, logics presented by debaters less matter. Adjudicators find familiar arguments more reasonable and such topics benefit the group which shares the perception with majority of adjudicators.

This research examined data of World Universities Debating Championships in the last 15 years to see how a topic affects performance of debaters from different regions. What type of topics is dividing the world most and statistically benefiting specific regions. After showing these statistical findings, this research discusses how to improve topic selection for tournaments and adjudication pool control. It further extend the discussion to the wide society outside of debate competitions and examine how the statistical findings of this research modify the way we see the McBride Report of UNESCO’s International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems.

Takeshi SUZUKI
(Meiji University, Tokyo, Japan)

An Analysis of Elite Panic:
The Kan Administration's Handling of the Greater East Japan Earthquake

On March 11, 2011, the Greater East Japan Earthquake took place, thus, causing triple disasters: earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear accidents. In fact, the fourth disaster created a social chaos in Japan. That is, the incompetent Kan administration failed to cope with the triple disasters, and the nuclear accidents in particular. This essay applies theories of elite panic (Clarke & Chess, 2008) developed after the 9.11 in the US to the 3.11 disasters in Japan. It explores why and how elite panic was brought about in the Kan administration. In the end, the author hopes to provide critical insights about risk and crisis management.

Noriaki TAJIMA
(Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Japan)
Arata MIYAZAKI
(Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, Aichi, Japan)

Seeking an Alternative and Effective Way of Teaching: Narrative Style in “Introduction to Communication” Textbooks

Along with the advancement and increase of communication studies in college education, innovative approaches to teaching introductory courses have been recently observed. The textbook remains among the most obvious outlets in which new ideas are showcased and, motivated by these textbooks, we instructors are pressed to revise and revitalize our daily practice of teaching. In this paper, we explain the merits of adopting “narrative style” for teaching communication from a critical and cultural perspective. Setting John Warren and Deanna Fassett’s *Communication* (2011), and Fassett and Warren’s *Critical Communication Pedagogy* (2007) as exemplary examples, we argue that narrative style is effective in that it creates what Hans-Georg Gadamer calls the “commonality” (291). That is, by sharing this common field of understanding with students, narrative style enables them to: (1) become exposed to a variety of their everyday roles, such as first-year college student, citizen, child, friend, etc.; (2) recognize the meanings of their encounters and better understand the meaning-making process in relation to disciplinary knowledge; and, (3) reconsider their relationships with others, and eventually with the world (cf. Hinchman & Hinchman, 1997). This pedagogical style is distinguishable and uniquely powerful for growing “narrative identity,” whereby students are encouraged to improve their command of establishing and maintaining dialogic relationships as well as a grasp of communicative politics. We conclude that, as educators, we must meet the challenge to institute a more open and welcome learning environment.

Noriaki TAJIMA
(Kanda University of International Studies, Chiba, Japan)

Voices against Neoliberal Orders: Two Protests for Japanese Non-Regular Young Workers

Among many protests against Japanese neoliberal order, conspicuous ones are those for the labor and human rights of non-regular workers, especially those in younger generations, for they are said to be influenced directly by the two-decade long economic recessions. Focusing on two of such activists, Yuasa Makoto (1969-) and Amamiya Karin (1975-), the paper tries to read understand their rhetoric in terms of their accessibility to the domestic order of neoliberalism. Yuasa, a graduate of the law department of the top national university, develops his arguments in a quite logical and objective way. His delineation of the socioeconomic conditions of these workers, as well as his call for action, follows the traditional vein of political objection, and therefore it was appealing as to be qualified to the Special Advisor of the national Cabinet. On the other hand, Amamiya, a writer and social activist, has been featured by the description of her own fierce and difficult adolescent time to reach to their actual life. Her rhetoric is almost always effusive and empathic, drawing attentions of younger generation, probably more than Yuasa's.

Given the upheaval of studies on neoliberal bio-politics, one argues that counter-voice against it "cannot get under way without asserting the value of voice and challenging the legitimacy of forms of institutional organization" (Couldry, 2010, p.136). The activists' task, therefore, seems to make their advocacies socially and culturally *matter* in their domestic culture. Contrasting the arguments of these protests as exemplar cases, the paper seeks this possibility.

Reference:

Couldry, N. (2010). *Why voice matters: Culture and politics after neoliberalism*. Los Angeles, Sage.

Alena L. VASILYEVA
(Minsk State Linguistic University, Minsk, Belarus)

Shaping Disagreement Space in Dispute Mediation

The current project examines how participants of dispute mediation manage disagreement space and employ the resources of disagreement space to construct the process of deliberation. Disagreement space is understood as a set of commitments, beliefs, intentions of the speaker that can be reconstructed from his actions and "called out" by another participant (Jackson, 1992), thus, providing opportunities for argument.

The research is based on the constitutive view of communication that treats interaction as a process of meaning creation, on the one hand, and social construction of social entities such as personal relationships and organizations, on the other one. The study takes a conversational argument perspective developed by Jackson and Jacobs. This approach to studying argumentation focuses on the naturalistic investigation of conversation and views an argument as an interactional accomplishment, where both parties contribute to the unfolding of the argumentative situation and integrate their partners' moves into their own ones.

An existing collection of 18 transcripts from audio recordings of mediation sessions at a mediation center in the western United States serves as a source of interactional data. The participants in the mediation sessions are couples going through a divorce or divorced couples (re)negotiating their divorce decrees. The sessions involve one mediator. On the whole, eight different mediators conducted 18 sessions with 17 couples.

The study shows what is made arguable and what strategies and resources participants use in the process of argumentation are constrained by interaction process and institutions, that is by the interactional order (e.g., face concern) and the institutional order (e.g., what moves are appropriate for the given institutional talk). The mediator as an agent of conciliation court plays an active part in shaping a specific disagreement space and, to a certain degree, controls what can become arguable.

Renske WIERDA
(University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Authority Arguments in Direct-to-Consumer Medical Advertisements

In direct-to-consumer (DTC) medical advertisements, pharmaceutical companies try to convince consumers to buy medical products, such as pain killers, dietary products or prescription drugs. The term ‘direct-to-consumer’ indicates that these advertisements are directed toward the intended users of the medical products (the consumers), and not, for instance, toward doctors.

Using the pragma-dialectical argumentation theory (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004) as a theoretical framework, this paper will focus on a type of argument that is often used in these advertisements: the *authority argument*. Authority arguments are based on the idea that a claim is acceptable, simply because this claim is made by a certain authority. For instance: ‘this drug is effective, because Jacob says it is, and Jacob has used the drug himself’.

The pragma-dialectical notion of *strategic maneuvering* (Van Eemeren, 2010) will be central to this paper. A discussant always aims to be dialectically reasonable and rhetorically effective at the same time. To achieve a balance between these two goals, every discussion move involves a strategic choice about what to say and how to say it. When we regard an advertiser’s authority argument as an instance of strategic maneuvering, we can see how the advertiser’s choices are influenced by the institutional context in which the maneuvering takes place. The specific regulations and conventions of the ‘argumentative activity type’ of DTC medical advertisements constrain the possibilities for using authority arguments within this context.

References:

Eemeren, F.H. van (2010). *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse. Extending the Pragma-dialectical Theory of Argumentation.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Eemeren, F.H. van, & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation. The Pragma-dialectical Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Minghui XIONG
Yun XIE
(Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China)

Logics for Legal Argumentation

The discussion of logics for legal argumentation has a long history in our studies of law and philosophy. It stems firstly from Protagoras, the first sophist in Ancient Greece who presented the paradox of the court. Since then the search for logic in law has attracted considerable attention from both philosophers and jurists such as Aristotle, Abraham Fraunce, Jr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. More recently, the systematic study on logics for legal argumentation started from the middle of last century, and it has been carried out along two paths – formal and informal. The former is based on formal logic, whereas the latter is grounded in informal logic and argumentation theory. Scholars endorsing the formal approach try to conceive legal logic as only applied traditional logic, or applied modern logic. As a counterpart, scholars in the informal camp, following Chaim Perelman and Stephen Toulmin, try to emphasize and cherish the study of logics for legal argumentation from a perspective of non-formal logic. Although scholars of these two camps sometimes seem to be able to understand each other, for most of the time they don't. However, we think it is possible to integrate these two lines in a way to better promote mutual understanding and promising cooperation. And in this paper, we will try to show this kind of possibility.

Kaori YAMADA
(University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Wisconsin, United States of America)

Restorative Rhetoric for Ethical Rhetorical Leadership: A Critical Analysis of George W. Bush's Hurricane Katrina Speech

Studying rhetorical leadership in crisis is significant for scholars as well as citizens living in the world with risk of natural, security, and/or economic crisis. This essay firstly argues that a new category of crisis rhetoric called Restorative Rhetoric (RR) proposed by Griffin-Padgett and Allison (2010) is a desirable form of ethical rhetorical leadership. The primary concern of RR is to help victims and serve as a facilitator and sense-maker, managing the healing process from disaster as well as the crisis. Examples of crises that call for RR include but are not limited to Hurricane Katrina and September 11. Olson (2011) explains that a leader's symbolic choices help shape the group's sense of community and common interpretation of a complex situation, and such rhetorical leadership provides a basis for organized action. RR can be read as a concrete exemplar of ethical rhetorical leadership, leadership that does not impose top-down order but calls for mutual exchanges of perspectives and recognizes people in the group as agents of action, since RR is a dialogue among a rhetor, victims, and a wider public/audience.

Secondly, this essay analyzes George W. Bush's speech after Hurricane Katrina as an example of failed RR, since he could not listen to voice from victims appropriately and received criticisms on his leadership. Although Griffin-Padgett and Allison provided examples of successful RR, no literature discusses in which rhetorical situation a rhetor fails to demonstrate RR. This analysis demonstrates what makes a presumably ethical rhetoric successful by contrasting failed and successful cases of RR. The conclusion suggests applying RR to the case of rhetorical leadership in the earthquake and tsunami in Tohoku, Japan, 2011.

Shojiro YASUI
(Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan)

A Critical Review of Controversy over Health Effects of Low Dose Radiation Exposure Accompanied with Fukushima Daiichi APP Accident

After the accident of Fukushima Daiichi Atomic Power Plant in last March, there is a huge controversy over the potential for health effects of low dose radiation exposure, the ICRP's reference level of 20mSv/year which is employed for designating the evacuation areas. Confusion among general public arises because some experts have advocated that the low dose exposure has serious health risks, while mainstream experts explain that epidemiological studies are unlikely to detect any increase in risk of cancer or other serious diseases. In reaction, the government of Japan established the "working group of experts for risk management of low dose radiation exposure" in the end of 2011, which held hearings from 6 mainstream experts and 2 anti-mainstreamers, including international experts, and concluded that low dose exposure is not sufficient to result in an observable increase in the lifetime risk of cancer.

This essay critically examined the argument in the WG and surveyed educational and working background of the experts, and as results, revealed that anti-mainstream experts largely depend on their personal experiences such as clinical experiences, results of pathology researches, and results of hearings from local experts and activists, while all mainstream experts solely depend on peer-reviewed epidemiological data. It also could be seen that anti-mainstream experts do not hesitate to refer not-well reviewed epidemiological studies to reinforce their argument.

The results are consistent with a number of cognitive psychological studies which reveals that people tend to believe personalized information rather than statistical data. This analysis can be a reason why opinions of anti-mainstream experts have considerable influence to general public although the number of anti-mainstreamers is quite limited compared with the one of mainstreamers.

Claudia ZBENOVICH
(Hadassah College Jerusalem, Israel)

“Diet or Die!” Persuasive Strategies in Health Coaching Discourse

The paper explores the linguistic fabric of argumentation used by instructors in Israeli diet groups to convey the message of a preference for a healthy low-fat diet and a healthy lifestyle in general. The database for the study is 20 hours of transcribed interaction in diet classes that took place in Jerusalem in 2008-2010.

In Israeli culture, healthy dieting is dynamically presented as an acceptable and necessary practice and a natural life-long preoccupation for everyone. Paradoxically, however, people feel a tremendous amount of confusion about changing their intrinsic food habits towards the weight-loss, wellness and good health. Thus one could trace a discursive gap between everyday practices within which our eating habits are located on the one hand, and an infinite societal strive for the perfect body, that symbolizes self-control, success and acceptance - on the other.

To address this gap, there is a strong tendency for particularly forceful linguistic apparatus that adds emphasis to the argument in its aim to initiate change in eating habits. In this respect, the discourse analysis of the group interaction provides a useful analytic tool to reveal the persuasive verbal patterns used by the diet coaches, reflected in either content representation or through conversational dynamics, and what is more important, to show how these practices govern the adherence of the participants of the groups to the system of new values.

In examining the rich source of conversational patterns, attention is drawn to the techniques developed in various fields of discourse analysis: speech acts, pragmatics, conversational analysis and interactional sociolinguistics.

Joseph P. ZOMPETTI
(Illinois State University, Illinois, United States of America)
Satoru AONUMA
(Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan)

Public Argument in an Era of Global Protest

Given *Time* magazine's most recent declaration that the protester is the 2011 person of the year, we believe it is timely to discuss the nature of contemporary, public argument. With uprisings surrounding the Arab Spring, global protests related to Occupy Wall Street, and various other group and public discourse concerning issues of controversy, we feel strongly that argument scholars should revisit the concept of public argument. We explore the theoretical foundations of public argument (including the literature on public sphere), what constitutes good and bad public argument, and the significance of pubic argument for social movements and protests. As such, we hope to contribute to and re-energize the conversation about public argument in this global era of protest.