

January 2004

Points of Stasis in the 1960 and 2000 Presidential Debates

Kevin Stein

Southern Utah University, stein@suu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/speaker-gavel>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stein, K. (2004). Points of Stasis in the 1960 and 2000 Presidential Debates. *Speaker & Gavel*, 41, 51-62.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Speaker & Gavel* by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Points of Stasis in the 1960 and 2000 Presidential Debates

Kevin Stein

Abstract

The clash component of a presidential debate sets it apart from other types of campaign messages because the candidates are faced with a potential for “imminent rebuttal” not found in other types of messages, such as television spots or stump speeches. This study is a rhetorical analysis of the 1960 and 2000 presidential debates and attempts to identify the specific points of stasis (clash) where two arguments meet. These points of stasis are labeled in the classic rhetorical theory literature as conjectural, qualitative, definitional, and translative. The study tests the application of these categories as a precursor to future research employing content analytic methods.

Introduction

Communication scholars have long considered political debates to be an important area for research, with special attention placed on questions relating to debates occurring on the presidential level. Debates provide voters with information needed to draw distinctions between candidates, potentially guiding an election-day decision. While debates may matter less when information about candidates is readily available through other media channels or when a race is not particularly close, recent scholarship has shown that when the conditions are right, a debate can be an important tool for disseminating valuable information to voters. Scholars have focused on a wide variety of debate features, both verbal and nonverbal, yet little seems to influence the tone or impact of the debate more than the type and level of clash that occurs. After all, isn't this what debate is about—two or more people who stand on opposing sides of an issue engaging each other in direct lines of argumentation. Remove the element of clash and it's not a debate, but rather a juxtaposition of the unrelated thoughts of two speakers. The opponents share the same space, but little else.

The clash component of a debate sets it apart from other types of campaign messages. Stump speeches, acceptance addresses, television spots, Internet sites, and brochures may contain arguments about the opponent's positions, but the face-to-face element as well as the potential for “imminent rebuttal” is lacking. Days or even weeks may separate clash in non-debate campaign messages, while the defense of a position in a debate will often immediately follow an attack (Benoit and Wells, 1996). Another reason for focusing on clash is that viewers of the debates really enjoy it. McKinney and Carlin (1994) used focus groups to examine the 1992 debate series. They discovered that voters were interested in seeing a significant amount of clash as long as the exchanges were structured. If clash is a primary reason that voters tune into a debate, then it

should be worthwhile to examine how these exchanges take place and on what issues.

This paper will focus specifically on the clash present in both the 1960 and 2000 debate series by exploring the specific points of clash that define each exchange. It will first provide some insight into the unique context of each of these historically significant debate series. Second, the paper will discuss the contributions and limitations of the extant literature. Third, it will provide a theoretical framework for examining debate clash and discuss the specific methods used to analyze the debate texts in light of the theory's basic tenets. And last, the paper will offer the results of the textual analysis and discuss the implications of the results.

The 1960 and 2000 Debates

In 1960, the first ever televised presidential debate aired. Networks wanted to model these exchanges after the 1948 primary debate between Thomas Dewey and Harold Stassen. However, the primary debate had some limitations that made it less than desirable for a major television event. For one, the 1948 radio debate included twenty minute opening statements by the candidates followed by eight and a half minute rebuttals. Vice-president Richard Nixon and Senator John F. Kennedy both recognized that this would not have appealed to the television viewers. They negotiated changes in the format that would cut the opening statement down to eight minutes followed by alternating questions put to the candidates by journalists. Another limitation of the 1948 primary debate was that it centered entirely on the discussion of a single foreign policy issue. Nixon and Kennedy both agreed that this was a poor option because it might lead to slips of the tongue that would embarrass our international allies. Four debates were held between September 26th and October 21st of 1960. All of the debates had a similar format, but debates one and four omitted the opening statements and moved directly to the alternating questions (Kraus, 2000). Benoit and Harthcock (1999) report that the primary function of the 1960 debate for both Nixon and Kennedy was to acclaim their own achievements less often than to attack those of their opponent. Whether acclaiming or attacking, both candidates most often discussed policy rather than character issues. Though this finding points to a more congenial debate, Ellsworth (1965) found that the debate was much more confrontational than both candidates' acceptance addresses and stump speeches. The debates provided the candidates with an opportunity to directly question each other and to respond to any attacks. While future debates would make the 1960 debates look less argumentative, the Nixon/Kennedy debates were the first presidential debates to pit two candidates against each other on national television. The very purpose of the debate was to create a forum where the candidates could engage each other in face-to-face debate.

The 2000 debate series was very different from the 1960 debates. In 2000, there were three debates at the presidential level and, because of changes in format, each was more conducive to direct clash. Participating in the debates were Vice-president Al Gore and Texas Governor George W. Bush. Gore had a slight lead going into the first debate and was expected to emerge victorious because

of his previous debate experience (McKinney, Dudash, & Hodgkinson, 2003). In the first debate, the candidates stood behind lecterns while the moderator asked alternating questions. The candidates would have time to respond after which the moderator was given time to follow up with additional questions. The second debate was the first of its kind. The moderator, Jim Lehrer, was seated across from the two candidates in what Lehrer labeled a “conversation.” The candidates were not too confined by rules, with the only restriction being a two minute time limit on each response. The third debate was patterned after the 1992 and 1996 town hall debates. The moderator would select questions that were originally submitted by a carefully chosen group of undecided voters. Candidates had two minutes to respond to each question. The rules allowed the moderator to ask follow-up questions, but the voters were not allowed to ask additional questions. Unlike the 1960 debates, there were more opportunities for clash because each candidate had an opportunity to comment on his opponent’s response. Additionally, when Lehrer felt that a candidate was being evasive, he would follow up with a clarification question that was essentially aimed at redirecting the candidate toward a more complete answer. A few studies address the issue of clash in political debates. What follows is a discussion of the relevant literature and an assessment of the strengths and limitations of this scholarship.

Literature on Campaign Debate Clash

While some may not see a huge difference between the terms “debate” and “clash,” the literature certainly reveals various distinctions between the two. Carlin (1989) began a discussion about whether a political debate should be labeled a debate at all. She begins by citing the critics who argue that debates are merely “joint appearances” or “orchestrated” news conferences” (p. 208). She contends that political debates actually meet many of the requirements established in varying definitions of the activity. One of the primary features of a debate is that it involves participants on opposing sides of a conflict. In campaign debates, there’s no question that members of the two major parties have opposing views on many policy issues. Another feature is that participants “adhere to a formalized set of rules to present their ideas.” Candidates always negotiate a strict set of guidelines that are to be enforced during each debate. The third requisite for a debate is that “a third party is the target of candidates’ messages” (p. 209). Carlin (1989) identifies the third party as the panelists who pose the questions to candidates, but this can also consist of voter-questioners (town hall format), viewers at home, or all variety of media analysts.

But can a political debate be devoid of clash or is it simply intuitive that a political event deemed a “debate” will certainly contain moments of direct argumentation between candidates? Though some debates contain less instances of clash than others, the structure of a debate usually provides the opportunity for clash. Many of the criticisms of current debate formats aren’t without substance. Often, candidates do stand close to each other in a debate, each spouting off memorized answers to given questions; and one candidate’s answer might be the opposite of the other candidate’s response. Does this count as clash if neither candidate engages in the process of comparing the two positions and showing

how they are different from each other? Some studies help to further define what it means to engage in clash. Benoit and Wells (1996) explain that instances of clash occur in exchanges where an attack is made and a defense follows. They argue that an attack consists of two elements: 1) A candidate identifies a harmful that has been committed; and 2) The candidate attributes responsibility for the act to his opponent. Defense consists of the basic strategies offered in the apologetics literature. Some of these include denial (I didn’t do it), bolstering (The good things I’ve done outweigh the bad), defeasibility (I didn’t know what I was doing), and mortification (I’m sorry). While their work is valuable in identifying some instances of clash, not all clash centers around an attack, at least not an overt one. Sometimes candidates will engage in a process of comparison where they will argue: “Your plan is okay, but mine is much better.” Though this does begin to attack the opponent’s policy goals as being inferior, it doesn’t seem to be consistent with the examples of attack offered by Benoit and Wells (1996). These attacks go much further, revealing shortcomings in the opponent’s policy proposals or his character.

Carlin, Morris, and Smith (2001) and Ellsworth (1965) utilize a category scheme that contains different types of clash. Ellsworth (1965) uses six clash categories, but Carlin et al (2001) use nine categories, adding an additional three categories for instances labeled “non-clash.” The six clash categories include: 1) Candidate’s analysis of his own positions; 2) Candidate’s analysis of his opponent’s position; 3) Candidate’s extension of an earlier statement of his own position; 4) Candidate’s extension of an earlier statement on his opponent’s position; 5) Candidate states his position and the opponent’s and compares them; and 6) Direct statement to the opponent. The non-clash categories include: 1) Analysis of self, opponent, or world not linked to policy or character; 2) Candidate states a policy without analysis of the position; and 3) Statements that function to follow rituals.

The research reveals, to no one’s surprise, that candidate’s do engage in fair amount of clash. However, for any content analysis, the category scheme must be mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Riffe, Lacey, and Fico, 2001). The above categories are fairly exhaustive in the way that they allow for almost every utterance in the debate to be labeled. Carlin et al (2001) concede that there is some overlap in the application of the “direct statement to opponent” and the “statement of opponent’s position” categories. They claim that instances containing this ambiguity should be “double coded.” This coding decision could have a significant influence on the frequencies reported. This blurring of lines between categories should give coders a difficult time, but the authors report high levels of reliability. Perhaps this is because they report average intercoder reliability. Some categories are more clearly illustrated than others. These more obvious categories might function to counteract a severely low reliability on the more vague categories. Difficulties such as these do not show up in the final number reported for reliability. Additionally, labeling of “candidate’s statements on their own positions” as a clash category lacks justification. Clash is ordinarily defined as an instance where two opposing views meet. This category allows utterances that aren’t addressed by the opponent to be labeled clash. If Gore argues that he

is in favor of a 20% income tax cut for the middle class and Bush changes the subject to his policy on health care, the exchange should not be classified as clash, yet would be under the categories offered by Carlin and her colleagues.

The literature is limited in its explanation of what constitutes clash and on which types of issues clash usually occurs. Because of these limitations, this paper seeks to test the application of Stasis theory, which provides four distinct categories to explain the specific points at which clash (stases) take place. If a textual analysis of the 1960 and 2000 debates reveal the presence of these points of stasis, future studies can seek to apply the categories using broader content analytic methods.

Stasis Theory

Researchers of political campaign debates have drawn on many theories outside of their immediate area of specialization to explain the content and effects of these events. Theories such as Uses and Gratifications (Rosengren, 1974), Third-person effects (Tiedge, Silverblatt, Havice, & Rosenfeld, 1991), and Agenda-setting (Cohen, 1963) have all been borrowed from mass media scholarship to explain antecedent conditions contributing to the generation of debate content and the effects of such content. Interpersonal theories such as Expectancy Violation and rhetorical theories such as Aristotle's canon of invention have been used to explain communication happening in political debates. But despite the extensive borrowing of theory from outside interest areas, some important theoretical frameworks have yet to be applied to the study of political debates. One example is Stasis theory, which was first introduced by Hermagoras, developed later by Aristotle, and eventually borrowed by Cicero for use in *De Inventione*. The word stasis comes from the Latin meaning "standstill" or "conflict." Most people see it as the point of "clash" where two opposing arguments meet. It is the single most important point of order that must be resolved before a conclusion can be drawn. The theory has been most commonly used to examine points of clash in legal argumentation, since the courts in ancient Greece and Rome were an ideal locale for citizens to resolve disputes.

Stasis theory says that there are essentially four questions that can be asked about a specific point of clash. The first question deals with conjectural issues or issues of fact. For example, does something exist or is it true? The second question deals with definitional issues. One might ask about a certain object's component parts or what some examples of it might be. The third question deals with qualitative issues, meaning issues of quality. For example, is it good or bad, right or wrong? The fourth question deals with procedural or translative issues. In debating translative issues, it might be argued whether a particular person has the power to rule on an issue or if the procedure proposed for enactment is faulty.

While Stasis theory was, and still is, appropriately applied to forensic types of argument, it seems perfectly suited for other studies whose central questions explore the nature of clash between rivals. Contemporary political debate research has thus far only discovered the frequency of clash in a given contest and perhaps the major topics that serve as the impetus to argumentation. Stasis the-

ory not only furthers discussion of the content at the heart of each point of clash, but also provides labels for specific types happening in political debates.

Here are just a few literal and hypothetical examples to illustrate the theory. A point of conjecture for candidates engaged in a debate might be whether or not the deficit is rising, inflation is up, jobs are down, or the threat of terrorism still exists. A point of definition emerged in one of the 2000 presidential debates between Gore and Bush when Gore asked Bush how he felt about affirmative action. Bush proceeded to clarify the term "affirmative action" before agreeing with Gore's interpretation of the term. Some questions of quality that might also emerge. What is the impact of terrorism on U.S. security? What effect will a congressional gridlock have on the ability of the president to push through his agenda? How significant is the problem of inter-city crime? Translative issues might center on procedural issues of the debate, such as who has the right to ask questions or how much time is allowed. They might also regard procedures that the candidates promote for correcting the ills of the nation, such as their specific policy proposals. An inquiry into the specific points of stasis in the 1960 and 2000 debates seems to call specifically for rhetorical analyses or content analyses that look at the implications of such "points of clash" or the overall frequency of their use. Therefore, the rhetorical analysis conducted in this study is meant to be exploratory. It is designed to test the application of the categories of Stasis theory to presidential debates in order to pave the way for future study.

The text of the 1960 and 2000 presidential debates were collected from the website of the Commission on Presidential Debates (www.debates.org). Four debates were analyzed from 1960 and three debates from 2000. The analysis was done in three stages. First, the debates were read without consideration as to the specific categories that might be applied to instances of confrontation. Places in the debate that met the following requirements were unitized for further analysis. First, positions introduced by the candidates had to be in direct opposition to each other. If one candidate proposes a solution to a specific problem and the other candidate offers an alternative solution, the positions are considered to be opposing. If one candidate makes an affirming statement about his own policy goals or attacks the opponents policy position, it is not considered a clash unless the targeted candidate directly replies to the attack. Second, each point of clash had to revolve around a single issue. Cicero argues in *De Inventione*: "No issue or sub-head of an issue can have its own scope and also include the scope of another issue because each on is studied directly by itself." There is some difficulty in determining what constitutes an issue because there are broad issues, such as education, and there are sub-issues within the broader issue, such as school vouchers, mandatory testing, and teacher salaries. In this analysis, the primary focus is on the broader issues, which include major issues emphasized by both candidates. Third, it does not matter if there is a temporal gap between opposing arguments. Often, one candidate will attack his opponent, but the guidelines of the debate prevent him from responding for several minutes. Despite intervening discourse occurring between the attack and defense, the instance of clash can still be adequately identified. During the second reading, I re-examined the marked instances of clash and attempted to label them as con-

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 41 (2004) www.dsr-tka.org/

jectural, definitional, qualitative, or translative. The third reading was done in an effort to determine if particular patterns were evident that would illuminate differences between the two series of debates. The followings sections provide some textual excerpts to illustrate the specific points of stasis occurring within the seven debates.

Points of Stasis in the Debates

There are examples of clash on each point of stasis from both series of debates. Due to space limitations, I will paraphrase the argument that triggered the dispute and then provide textual excerpts of the candidates' responses that generated the clash.

Conjecture

Issues of conjecture center on whether something exists or not, or whether something is true or not. There were several instances of clash on conjectural issues. In the first Nixon/Kennedy debate, Kennedy made the argument that since the advent of the Eisenhower administration, America has been standing still. To this, Nixon replied:

I think we disagree on the implication of his remarks tonight and on the statements that he has made on many occasions during his campaign to the effect that the United States has been standing still...Is the United States standing still? Is it true that this administration, as Senator Kennedy has charged, has been an administration of retreat, of defeat, of stagnation? Well, we have a comparison that we can make. We have the record of the Truman Administration of seven and a half years and the seven and a half years of the Eisenhower Administration. When we compare these two records in the areas that Senator Kennedy has discussed tonight, I think we find that America has been moving ahead.

The point of stasis is the central component of a clash that must be resolved in order for the argument to reach its logical conclusion. In this example, the issue that must be resolved is whether or not America is standing still. The dispute centers on the truth or falsity of a factual claim. If Kennedy had argued that America is making less progress than other countries in the world, it would have been more qualitative, yet he begins the dispute with a conjectural declaration.

Another example of a conjectural point of clash took place in the third debate between Bush and Gore. Bush argued that under Gore's tax plan, 50 million Americans would get no tax relief. Gore's only reply was "that's not right." It was a short exchange that hinged on a single factual detail. When Bush made the attack, the implication was obviously that it is bad to enact a policy that doesn't provide tax relief to so many voters, yet he doesn't say it. As a viewer of the debate, we might assume that he is making a qualitative statement that establishes the harmful nature of Gore's policy, but it is the voters who are supplying this conclusion. It is merely implied by Bush. As long as Bush doesn't provide any additional analysis, the point of stasis remains a conjectural one.

A third example of conjecture comes from the first Bush/Gore debate. Bush made the argument that Gore doesn't support mandatory testing for schools, but rather voluntary testing. Gore provided this response: "First of all, I do have

mandatory testing. I think the governor may not have heard what I said clearly. The voluntary national testing is in addition to the mandatory testing that we require of states. All schools, all school districts, students themselves, and required teacher testing." This argument also centers on a point of fact. The issue is simply whether Gore supports mandatory testing in schools. It doesn't center on the negative implications of this position, why mandatory testing should be the policy of choice, or what "mandatory" really means.

Definition

A definitional dispute deals with what something means or what its components are. A dispute of this kind occurred in the first Bush/Gore debate as well. When Bush was asked about the types of judges that he would appoint to the Supreme Court, he said that he will put competent judges on the bench who are "strict constructionists." Gore took issue with his use of the term by arguing:

We both use similar language to reach an exactly opposite outcome. I don't favor a litmus test, but I know that there are ways to assess how a potential justice interprets the Constitution. And in my view, the Constitution ought to be interpreted as a document that grows with out country and our history. And I believe, for example, that there is a right of privacy in the Fourth Amendment. And when the phrase "a strict constructionist" is used and when the names of Scalia and Thomas are used as the benchmarks for who would be appointed, those are code words, and nobody should mistake this, for saying the governor would appoint people who would overturn Roe v. Wade.

In this example, the point of stasis is on the meaning of a single two-word phrase. The exact meaning must be established before voters can know which types of judges Bush will really appoint to the Supreme Court.

A second argument centering on the definition of a word occurred in the third Bush/Gore debate. Bush argued that he didn't support quotas in the employment process. Gore responded: "Affirmative action isn't quotas. I'm against quotas, they're illegal. They're against the American way. Affirmative action means that you take extra steps to acknowledge the history of discrimination and injustice and prejudice and bring all people into the American dream because it helps everybody, not just those who are directly benefitting." To this Bush answered: "If affirmative action means quotas, I'm against it. If affirmative action means what I just described what I'm for, then I'm for it. You heard what I was for. The vice-president keeps saying I'm against things. You heard what I was for, and that's what I support." The instance of clash might indirectly address some points of fact or quality, but its primary focus is on what is meant by the term "affirmative action." Only by resolving this question does the dispute reach its natural conclusion.

Quality

Issues of quality center on whether some is good or bad, right or wrong, significant or insignificant. In the first of the Kennedy/Nixon debates, Kennedy proposed several solutions to improve medical care for the elderly. Nixon argued that Kennedy's policy proposals would be counterproductive and actually

hurt those people that they claim to help. Nixon said: “And so I would say that in all these proposals Senator Kennedy has made, they will result in one of two things: either he has to raise taxes or he has to unbalance the budget. If he unbalances the budget, that means you have inflation, and that will be, of course, a very cruel blow to the very people—the older people—that we’ve been talking about.” The point of stasis is moved from fact to quality at the point that Nixon attaches a negative implication to the policies offered by Kennedy. If he had simply argued that the policies wouldn’t work, it would be a point of conjecture.

In the third Kennedy/Nixon debate, Kennedy argued that the Eisenhower administration hasn’t done enough to encourage disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nixon vehemently denies the attack and stresses the significance of the contributions made by the administration. Nixon argued:

There isn’t any question but that we must move forward in every possible way to reduce the danger of the war; to move toward controlled disarmament; to control tests; but also let’s have in mind this: when Senator Kennedy suggests that we haven’t been making an effort, he simply doesn’t know what he’s talking about. This has been one of the highest level operations in the whole State Department right under the president himself. We have gone certainly the extra mile and then some in making offers to the Soviet Union on control of tests, on disarmament, and in every other way.

The point of stasis centers on quality because Nixon argued that the Eisenhower administration went further in promoting disarmament than they were required to. It enhances the significance of the achievement. Simply encouraging disarmament would be a point of fact, but encouraging disarmament beyond public expectations is an issue of quality.

Translative

Translative issues always hinge on what should be done in a given situation. It asks who is responsible for dealing with a set of circumstances and what procedures should be enacted to address the problem. In the second Bush/Gore debate, Gore argued that he believes that a gun-free zone should be established in all schools and that child safety trigger locks should be a mandatory requirement. Bush provided an alternative proposal to the same problem. He said:

Well it starts with enforcing law. When you say loud and clear to somebody if you’re going to carry a gun illegally, we’re going to arrest you. If you’re going to sell a gun illegally, you need to be arrested. If you commit a crime with a gun, there needs to be absolute certainty in the law. And that means that the local law enforcement officials need help at the federal level. Programs like Project Exile where the federal government intensifies arresting people who illegally use guns.

The point of stasis centers on the necessary procedure for dealing with the gun issue. In this case the procedure is to “get tough” on those individuals who illegally carry guns. Bush and Gore offer different solutions to the same problem. Resolution of this clash depends on settling which procedure is correct for handling the problem.

Another translative point of clash took place in the third Bush/Gore debate. Both candidates debated the necessity of government control in health care. Gore’s contention was that a national health care plan was needed from the federal government. Bush argued: “I’m absolutely opposed to a national health care plan. I don’t want the federal government making decisions for consumers or for providers. I remember what the administration tried to do in 1993. They tried to have a national health care plan. And fortunately, it failed. I trust people, I don’t trust the federal government.” In this example, the point of clash is whether the federal government should be granted the power to control health care or if this power should be relegated to the people.

Implications

Differences in the points of stasis between the 1960 and 2000 debates are not entirely clear. Without generating frequency data to explain the prevalence of the strategies used in both series, it is impossible to know how they truly differ. However, it seems appropriate to point out some potential differences they may exist. First, very little of the clash in the 1960 debate series centers on qualitative or definitional issues. Kennedy and Nixon may have had fewer opportunities to engage in definitional clash because of the format of the 1960 debates. Even though the candidates had negotiated for much shorter opening statements and response times for individual questions, their statements were still relatively lengthy. The candidates would often cover several issues in each response. When a candidate was forced to reply to one of these lengthy messages, they would usually choose one or two of the major ideas in the opponent’s statement to address. Because definitional issues are often considered to be more trivial than issues of fact or procedure, candidates may have been less inclined to address discrepancies in the language choices made by the opponent. Additionally, Kennedy and Nixon may have focused less attention on issues of quality because it often requires comparison between two positions. The length of responses may have made it more difficult to make these comparisons. Instead, the candidates dedicated much of their time asserting their own positions. This lack of policy comparison is consistent with previous literature that portrays the Kennedy/Nixon debates as congenial (Benoit & Harthcock, 1999). More policy comparison would have likely created a more confrontational tone to the 1960 debates. However, this negative tone never transpired.

The 2000 debates contained all four points of clash. Many of them were conjectural and translative, but all were represented. Each strategy served a unique purpose. Candidate clash occurs on conjectural issues because the validity of claims is often based on factual evidence. If the factual support for a claim is established as untrue, the claim of the candidate is dismissed and credibility is likely damaged for other claims. Clash on translative issues is important because it establishes the workability of particular policy proposals. Candidates must convince voters that their proposals are based on sound reasoning. If an opponent can convince the debate viewers that a procedure for remedying a social ill won’t work or that there is a superior alternative, they may stand a better chance of defeating that opponent. Issues of quality are important because it may not be

enough for a candidate to establish that a policy won't work. They must establish that the policy can cause significant harm. On the other hand, when touting their accomplishments, it may not be enough to show that an enacted policy was merely adequate, but that it generated significant positive results. Clash that takes place on the meaning or definition of terms can happen for a variety of reasons. One reason is that a candidate feels his position has been misrepresented by the opponent. The candidates must clash on the precise meaning of words used to describe that position. Definitional points of clash can also occur because a candidate has been cornered into conceding an argument that they didn't want to concede. For example, Bush was allowed to admit that he supported the basic philosophy of affirmative action without technically supporting it because of the ambiguity with which the term was defined.

In conclusion, I would like to return to the initial justification of this project, which was to explore the reasonableness of future applications of Stasis theory using other methodological approaches. The points of stasis, namely conjectural, definitional, quality, and translative were all present in the debates. There were some difficulties in determining at what point a conjectural point of stasis becomes a qualitative point of stasis; however, future studies, particularly content analyses, can further develop the category definitions as well as specific rules for the coding procedure. While previous literature sets up parameters for identifying when a clash occurs, few studies have thus far identified what types of issues those clashes center on. Hopefully, this study is a step toward a closer examination of those specific instances of candidate clash.

References

- Benoit, W. L., & Harthcock, A. (1999). Functions of the great debates: Accusations, attacks, and defenses in the 1960 presidential debates. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 341-357.
- Benoit, W. L., & Wells, W. T. (1996). *Candidates in conflict: Persuasive attack and defense in the 1992 presidential debates*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Carlin, D. B. (1989). A defense of the "debate" in presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 25, 208-213.
- Carlin, D. B., & McKinney, M. S. (Eds.). (1994). *The 1992 presidential debates in focus*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Carlin, D. D., Morris, E., & Smith, S. (2001). The influence of format and questions on candidates' argument choices in the 2000 presidential debates. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44, 2196-2218.
- Cicero, M. T. (n.d.). *De Inventione*. Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, B. C. (1963). *The press and foreign policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Commission on Presidential Debates (n.d.). *Transcripts*. Retrieved from: <http://www.debates.org>, November 25, 2003.

- Ellsworth, J. T. (1965). Rationality and campaigning: A content analysis of the 1960 presidential campaign debates. *Western Political Quarterly*, 18, 794-802.
- Krauss, S. (2000). *Televised presidential debates and public policy* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McKinney, M. S., Dudash, E. A., & Hodgkinson, G. (2003). Viewer reactions to the 2000 presidential debates: Learning issue and image formation. In L. L. Kaid, J. C. Tedesco, D. G. Bystrom, and M. M. McKinney (Eds.), *The millennium election: Communication in the 2000 campaign* (pp. 43-58). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Tiedge, J. T., Silverblatt, A., Havice, M. J., & Rosenfeld, R. (1991). Discrepancy between perceived first-person and perceived third-person mass media effects. *Journalism Quarterly*, 47, 141-154.

Kevin A. Stein (M.A., Idaho State University) is a doctoral student, at the University of Missouri, Columbia