



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

"What's China's comment?" Confrontational maneuvering in spokespersons' argumentative replies at the regular press conferences of China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Wu, P.

Citation

Wu, P. (2020, February 25). "What's China's comment?" *Confrontational maneuvering in spokespersons' argumentative replies at the regular press conferences of China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/85720>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/85720>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/85720> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Wu, P.

Title: "What's China's comment?" Confrontational maneuvering in spokespersons' argumentative replies at the regular press conferences of China's Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Issue Date: 2020-02-25

PROPOSITIONS

1. Although they may only be out to rule out the possible criticisms of their intended audience, in replying to the questions of journalists spokespersons at press conferences have to take also the criticisms into account from audiences they are not out to convince.
2. Strategic maneuvering with dissociation enables an arguer to provide a new perspective to his/her intended audience in which the issue disputed is understood in a way that is more advantageous to the arguer.
3. Personal attacks are generally used by one of the parties in a difference of opinion to convince a third party of the second party's lack of credibility in stating a particular standpoint.
4. The rationale provided by arguers for declaring a standpoint unallowed or indisputable is often rooted in institutional preconditions based on ideological values of the community to which the arguers belong, which are not always shared by participants who do not belong to this community.
5. Discussion of "argumentative strategies" only makes sense when the way in which this concept is defined is based on a solid argumentation theory and is clearly defined.
6. In developing a "multi-perspective" approach to argumentation that does justice to the complexity of incorporating different outlooks on the reasonableness of argumentative discourse, the philosophical compatibility of the perspectives involved should be duly taken into account.
7. In order to attract more serious attention from the various disciplines that can benefit from it, the study of argumentation should be more oriented on real-life argumentative practices.

8. It can only be explained how Argumentation Theory and Discourse Studies can complement each other, if it is first made crystal clear what exactly is meant by “Argumentation Theory” and by “Discourse Studies”.
9. As is shown by the mutual treatments of functional and generative approaches in linguistics, scholarship in the humanities can only prosper by tolerance towards other approaches combined with accuracy and precision in dealing with these approaches.
10. Regulating the speed limit for cycling in Dutch cities would considerably increase the safety of pedestrians, especially if these regulations were also observed.

Propositions of Peng Wu

“What’s China’s comment?” Confrontational maneuvering in spokespersons’ argumentative replies at the regular press conferences of China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Dissertation, Leiden University, 2020