

**Political Science 4995:
Honour's Thesis**

**Deliberative Rhetoric in Electoral
Authoritarian Regimes: A Case Study of
Singapore**

Nicolette Stuart

001158635

Dr. von Heyking

University of Lethbridge

April 2015

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Introduction 1

CHAPTER ONE

Shaping the Audience with the Language of Politics 4

CHAPTER TWO

Singapore: Testing Aristotle’s Theory of “Regime Mixology” 27

CHAPTER THREE

Aristotle’s Framework for Rhetoric: The Singapore Equation 52

CONCLUSION

Conclusion 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography 79

Introduction

The power of language is often overlooked despite its influence on human interaction. Perhaps the nature of communication as pervasive in the lives of humans makes language less notable. The seemingly natural use of communication, however, does not negate the ability of language to compel human action. Political scientists describe countless ways in which governments influence their citizens' actions. Politicians employ such instruments of influence differently depending on the nature of the regime in which they govern. The question remains: just how powerful is language as an instrument of political influence? My interest in this thesis began with the possibility of analyzing the extent that language exerts power over citizens in a context where people are not free to give consent, but where the use of physical violence is not practical. In this situation, persuasion through the use of language is imperative and not overshadowed by physical coercion. I employ the rhetorical thought of the timeless philosopher Aristotle to evaluate the state of rhetoric in a modern day electoral authoritarian regime: Singapore.

Does Aristotle's understanding of rhetoric help modern scholars conceptualize the function of rhetoric in an electoral authoritarian regime? The above question arises from a brief glance at how rhetoric functions in other modern regimes. In democracy, Aristotle's deliberative

rhetoric has various opportunities to persuade individuals to take a particular course of action. Such opportunities exist in elections and everyday parliamentary debate. On the other hand, deliberative rhetoric has extremely little persuasive influence on citizens in opposing regimes such as closed autocracies. In closed autocracies, political socialization, threats, and violence are more prominent factors influencing individual choice and do not allow rhetoric to function specifically as a means of persuasion. But how does rhetoric function in a regime that is not democratic, yet relies on the legitimacy of elections and the appearance of democracy for survival? Both the theoretical and comparative literature are relatively silent on the place of rhetoric in electoral authoritarian regimes. The function of rhetoric in these regimes should be more sophisticated as freedom of choice increases. Especially, when considering that violence is not a typical means of persuasion in electoral autocracies because of its tendency to bring regime instability. I argue that Aristotle's *Rhetoric* helps modern scholars understand not only the distinctive rhetoric, but also the unique qualities of citizens' in the modern electoral autocracy of Singapore.

Aristotle lays a solid foundation for rhetoric especially when it comes to evaluating Singapore. Singapore rests outside the confines of a typical modern regime. As a case study, Singapore is interesting because its economic success exceeds that of other modern electoral autocracies and, in fact, other modern democracies. Yet, Singapore is still an electoral autocracy, in part because Singaporeans are not granted the liberties that citizens are in democracies. As an autocracy, the success of Singapore is not explained by typologies that hold all nations to a democratic standard. Therefore, Aristotle is important for analyzing a seemingly anomalous phenomenon such as Singapore. The classical philosopher is far removed from the liberal democratic bias that scholars encompass today. Second, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is particularly

important because of the timeless nature of the text. The diversity of digital media and means of communication in the 21st century is enormous. Consequently, modern theories of rhetoric tend to narrowly focus on speech through a single medium, although in all contexts. In a study of how rhetoric shapes a nation, Aristotle's guide transcends digital trends. *Rhetoric* is as widely applicable now as it was fifty years ago at the inception of Singapore as an independent nation.

The following three chapters provide an analysis of Aristotle's rhetoric in the context of Singapore. The importance of language and ultimately persuasion is outlined in Chapter One. Aristotle conceptualizes rhetoric in politics as an instrument for making audiences receptive to a particular action. The specific way rhetoric shapes audiences, for a specific means and to what end, also creates a certain type of citizen. As a means to an end, rhetoric works within the confines of a specific 'end.' The purpose of a speech as eventually bearing on a specific outcome means that identifying the 'end' of Singapore is necessary. Chapter Two illuminates the advantageous end [*telos*] of the electoral authoritarian regime of Singapore through Aristotle's regime typology. Two reasons exist for situating Singapore in Aristotle's regime typology. First, the analysis further facilitates a connection between modern electoral autocracies and Aristotle's rhetoric. Second, Aristotle's regimes are crucially divided by whether their *telos* is noble or deviant. Singapore's regime typology according to Aristotle helps evaluate the function of rhetoric in shaping citizens towards the regime's *telos*. Exactly how rhetoric shapes citizens towards Singapore's advantage is the focus of Chapter Three. Chapter Three analyzes the rhetoric of Singapore's People's Action Party (PAP) through the lens of Aristotle. Using multiracial, city-state survival, and economic rhetoric the PAP illustrate how Aristotle's rhetoric is an instrumental political tool that ultimately shapes citizens towards a particular advantage.

Chapter One

Shaping the Audience with the Language of Politics

Aristotle's philosophy is a particularly useful guide for explaining how the superior use of rhetoric helps preserve governments in a variety of different regimes. The present chapter begins with a general summary of the importance of language in all disciplines before moving on to explain why Aristotle guides this analysis. Rhetoric, in particular, is a means to an end. A proper understanding of deliberative rhetoric means recognizing that speech is a tool for persuading politicians to take a particular action. The action, in turn, helps a governing body achieve the regime's purpose or advantageous end [*telos*]. Rhetoric primarily facilitates persuasion through argumentation, that is, the logical presentation of truth. In part, truth derives from what the majority of people reason is true, in other words, common opinion. In this way, well-crafted arguments that are founded on truth come across more logically than false premises. The nature of rhetoric as a moral instrument does not mean that rhetoric does not work with false arguments. Instead, people are simply less convinced of arguments that contradict their natural reason. Regardless, arguments must accompany style and proper character. Rhetoricians use style to clarify their argument by stirring the audience's emotion with imaginative language. All three means of persuasion – *ēthos*, *logos*, and *pathos* – work together to make the audience receptive to a particular judgement. Keeping in mind the advantage of the regime, rhetoric not

only imparts receptivity in an audience, but also shapes the audience towards the goal of the regime.

The Function of Language in Politics

Creating a unified concept of language is a difficult task because communication is a diverse instrument studied by all disciplines. At first mention, a psychologist might emphasize how language differentiates humans from animals. A neuroscientist may stress the auditory and meaning associations language creates. Language as a social- and identity- building mechanism might first come to mind for an anthropologist. Conversely, a linguist would stress the science of syntax, morphology, and semantics. Regardless of its vast conceptual qualities, all scholars agree that the primary function of language is communication. Language is, first and foremost, a tool meant for a specific end with guidelines central to its use.¹ Political scientists in the last several decades have primarily understood language as an instrument for legitimacy and mobilization at both the individual and mass levels.² When used as a means for mobilization and legitimacy, language is an invaluable instrument of power. Power is a central concept in political science as the discipline examines the relations of “influence among human beings,”³ according to theorist Robert Dahl. However, some academics argue that power could also mean the *potential* ability for an actor to affect outcomes.⁴ Regardless, such ‘influence’ among others is a reflection of power or the capacity to make individuals act in a way they would not normally act. The scope of political science may be more specifically defined as “the *constrained use of social power...*

¹ Danielle Macbeth, *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), s.v. "Language, Natural and Symbolic."

² Murray Edelman, "Political Language and Political Reality," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 18, no. 01 (1985): pg. 10.

³ Robert A. Dahl, "What Have We Learned?," in *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, ed. Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pg. 377.

⁴ Daniel J. Brass and Marlene E. Burkhardt, "Potential Power and Power Use: An Investigation of Structure and Behavior," *Academy of Management Journal* 36, no. 3 (1993): pg. 442.

and the *techniques for the use of social power* within those constraints.”⁵ One significant instrument for exercising power in political science is language.

The power of language to construct the world is subtle. Many people overlook language due to its continual presence in human activity. Despite the broad audiences and vast purposes of language, the extent to which verbal communication shapes mental reality is under investigation in most disciplines. Recently, psychologists are reviving mild forms of linguistic relativity, the notion that speakers experience the environment according to the constraints of their language, set out in anthropology.⁶ Recent studies show that language encompasses a limited influence on individuals’ perceptions of space, motion, and gender in different languages.⁷ Similarly, political constructivists argue that “we cannot know the world independently of the language we use.”⁸ On a much larger scale, political psychologists have illustrated that orators who concisely define the relevant issues actually “shape mass opinion and policy outcomes.”⁹ A complex, but visible relationship exists between language and constructing reality.

Although political theorists agree that language influences individuals’ actions, academic consensus on the power of communication differs. On one extreme, George Orwell theorizes that language corrupts thought. He supposed that shades of meaning in various words were so subtle that those who spoke before they thought were giving their personal agency to language.¹⁰

⁵ Goodin and Klingemann, "Political Science: The Discipline," in *A New Handbook of Political Science*, ed. Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pg. 7.

⁶ Caleb Everett, *Linguistic Relativity: Evidence across Languages and Cognitive Domains* (Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2013), pg. 275.

⁷ Lila Gleitman and Anna Papafragou, "New Perspectives on Language and Thought," in *The Oxford Handbook of Thinking and Reasoning*, by Keith James Holyoak and Robert G. Morrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pg. 543.

⁸ Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics," *European Journal of International Relations* 3, no. 3 (1997): pg. 326.

⁹ Ronald R. Krebs and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric," *European Journal of International Relations* 13, no. 1 (March 01, 2007): pg. 38.

¹⁰ George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," 1946, *Literary Cavalcade* 54, no. 5 (February 2002): pg. 20.

Similarly, Jürgen Habermas argues that language encompasses the “capacity for decentered perception and manipulation of things,”¹¹ but ultimately provides the basis for reason. Truth is derived from language in a subtle form of Thomas Hobbes’ nominalism and, in this case, communication provides the foundation for consensual institutions. The moderate view that language is not only constructive, but also corruptible most faithfully follows the current view of communication theory. Brian McNair points out the necessary, but problematic function of persuasion in modern politics: “The distinction between ‘persuasion’, which is a universally recognized function of political actors in a democracy, and manipulation, which carries with it the negative connotations of propaganda and deceit, is not always an easy one to draw... the latter plays an increasingly important part in modern (or post-modern) democratic politics.”¹² Despite the reality that language is potentially harmful, communication is a foundational instrument of politics. When the purpose of communication is persuasion, rhetoric is the tool of choice.

Rhetoric is an especially interesting political instrument for two reasons. First, rhetoric encompasses the ability to exercise power without the use of force. Second, the legitimacy that some regimes require for survival also derives from the rhetorical art of persuasion. As political theorists repeatedly note, communication and deliberation are the foundation of politics. Murray Edelman notes that “The critical element in political maneuver for advantage is the creation of meaning: the construction of beliefs about the significance of events, of problems, of crisis, of policy changes, and of leaders.”¹³ For example, a politician must shape masses of people in a unifying manner to create the necessary policy changes that build a state. Nation-building

¹¹ Jürgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), pg. 14.

¹² Brian McNair, *An Introduction to Political Communication*, 5th ed. (New York: Routledge, 2011), pg. 24.

¹³ Murray Edelman, "Political Language and Political Reality," pg. 10.

rhetoric is especially important in consideration that “While most political language has little to do with how well people live, it has a great deal to do with the legitimation of regimes.”¹⁴

Linguistic persuasion is necessary to motivate individuals to make decisions or take actions without the use of physical force. Ronald Krebs and Patrick Jackson note that “The acquisition and maintenance of rule ultimately hinge as much on legitimacy as on physical coercion, and such legitimacy can be established only through rhetorical action.”¹⁵ Without using force, rhetoric exerts power that does not compromise the legitimacy that a nation builds.

Aristotle, a Rhetorical Guide

A number of obvious reasons exist for choosing Aristotle as a rhetorical guide over other classical philosophers. Aristotle is one of the most influential teachers of the art of persuasion. Modern scholars attribute to him the first systematic presentation of rhetoric as a mixture between method and practical art. Specifically, Aristotle’s strength lies in his understanding of rhetoric as a tool applicable to any topic.¹⁶ The pedagogy in *Rhetoric* is concise; the methodology is systematic. The tools Aristotle created were used in diverse cultures, according to George Kennedy, from the Chinese to the ancient Hebrews¹⁷ and thus were widely applicable. A wide range of applicability is important for a paper dealing with diverse cultures and a non-democratic regime. Jonathan Barnes argues that Aristotle contemplates the same political

¹⁴ *Ibid*, 14.

¹⁵ Ronald R. Krebs and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric," pg. 38.

¹⁶ Amélie Rorty, "Aristotle on the Virtues of Rhetoric," *The Review of Metaphysics* 64, no. 4 (June 01, 2011): pg. 718.

¹⁷ George A. Kennedy, *Aristotle: On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pg. 21.

questions as modern philosophers more often than other classical rhetorical teachers like Isocrates and Plato.¹⁸ Consequently, Aristotle is a practical choice for a study of rhetoric.

Despite his removal from modernity, Aristotle's political philosophy contemplates modern questions and fills gaps in modern rhetorical theory. The same applicability of his theory that allows it to reach diverse ends also connects it to modernity. Aristotle asks many of the same questions that are crucial in politics today. Such questions include topics like water and air quality,¹⁹ public and private ownership of agriculture,²⁰ and freedom and equality.²¹ Meanwhile, the precision of Aristotle's rhetorical account is what makes it pedagogically valuable more than two thousand years later. David Flemming notes that "Classical rhetoric took a remarkably precise vocabulary of public discourse and dedicated it to an ambitious political-ethical project, the new rhetoric takes a highly elastic vocabulary and puts it to rather trivial ends."²² The extraordinary amount of information individuals currently access comes from a variety of means. As a result, modern theoretical writings of rhetoric are diverse and narrowly applicable. Moreover, if the word 'rhetoric' does not arouse negative emotions than the term is generally applied to the media. Stripping away novel technology does not leave humans without rhetoric. Rhetoric, as Aristotle once experienced it, was widely applicable even over the last century.

¹⁸ Jonathan Barnes, "Introduction," in *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pg. xvi.

¹⁹ Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Joe Sachs, (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2012): 1330b10.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1329b39.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1255b20; Martha C. Nussbaum, "Aristotelian Social Democracy," in *Aristotle and Modern Politics: The Persistence of Political Philosophy*, ed. Aristide Tessitore (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pg. 47.

²² David Fleming, "Becoming Rhetorical: An Education in the Topics," in *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education*, ed. Joseph Petraglia and Deepika Bahri (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003), pg. 93.

Several less obvious reasons exist for employing Aristotle. First, Aristotle had a moderate view of the power of persuasion which relates nicely to modernity. Today, the average individual regards rhetoric as merely a tool of trickery used by the political elite. Individuals' skepticism may derive from the tendency to confuse rhetoric with 'propaganda and deceit' as noted above. Bryan Garsten attributes to Aristotle an understanding "of the limited power of speech,"²³ pragmatically comprehending that words are no stronger than laws or swords. Aristotle's understanding of the limited power of speech may derive from his understanding of the mean in *Nicomachean Ethics*. In his ethical works, all knowledge strives for the mean where nothing should be added or taken away.²⁴ The content of a speech applies to this theory, but so does the place of rhetoric in politics. Second, Aristotle resided in a city state roughly the same size of Singapore. During the early years of Singapore modern communicative technology was limited and speeches were made in an effort to nation build. Third, according to Stephen McCarthy, "Aristotle's account of tyranny in the *Politics*... complements modern comparative politics literature."²⁵ If so, Aristotle's other regime types should allow for an analysis of rhetoric in modern electoral authoritarianism.

Finally, the value of Aristotle for analyzing regime typology in modernity comes from his separation from modern liberal democratic ideology. To properly compare classical rhetoric to electoral autocracy in Singapore, an analysis of regime typology now and in the past is necessary. Aristotle provides an exceptional classical analysis of regime typology in the *Politics*. Importantly, Aristotle delivers a philosophy that accommodates for successful non-democratic

²³ Bryan Garsten, *Saving Persuasion: A Defense of Rhetoric and Judgment* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006): pg. 13.

²⁴ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Joe Sachs (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2002), 1106b30.

²⁵ Stephen McCarthy, *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism* (London: Routledge, 2006), pg. 2.

regimes such as Singapore. Aristotle encompasses a refreshing view of democracy in comparison with modern philosophers. Modern scholars, like Francis Fukuyama, tend to comprehend democracy as the best regime, if not the final regime.²⁶ The democratic bias of modern scholars compromises their ability to truly recognize an effective regime. Gerald Mara and other scholars²⁷ contemplate that “If the critical capacity of liberal theory is guided by the priorities of liberal culture or entwined with democratic politics it limits the ability to assess these priorities in distant ways.”²⁸ Considerable trouble amasses for individuals trying to look outside the dominant ideology. That Aristotle is not of the liberal-democratic persuasion benefits the objectivity of this analysis.

Rhetoric: Truth and Argumentation

Rhetoric is a persuasive instrument meant to inspire an action that corresponds to an end or goal. The three types of rhetoric, which are presented in more detail below, each have a particular purpose. Deliberative (political) rhetoric is meant to make an audience open to a particular judgement like, for example, accepting amendments to an education policy. Importantly, the judgement a rhetorician persuades the audience to make corresponds with the purpose [*telos*] of the regime. The purpose of the regime is the advantageous end [*telos*] of a city, in other words, whatever ‘good’ for which the governing body exists. The end, whether it is defined by a life of contemplation, wealth, or political domination, is not a topic for debate. Rather, the means to achieving the end are what politicians deliberate. Aristotle exclaims that

²⁶ Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 2006), pg. 42, 45.

²⁷ Stephen McCarthy, *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism*, 1.

²⁸ Gerald M. Mara, "The Culture of Democracy: Aristotle's Athenaiion Politeia as Political Theory," in *Aristotle and Modern Politics: The Persistence of Political Philosophy*, by Aristide Tessitore (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), pg. 309.

“the objective of the deliberative speaker is the advantageous [*sympheron*]... [people] do not deliberate about this objective but about means that contribute to it and these [means] are things advantageous in terms of actions.”²⁹ When the rhetorician persuades audiences about particular actions he or she also shapes them towards the end of the regime. Essentially, the orator discovers the available means of persuasion from any subject³⁰ and shapes the audience according to the advantageous end his or her regime is attempting to achieve.

The argument [*logoi*] is the principle concept of Aristotle’s rhetoric. Essentially, rhetoric is a work of moral craftsmanship [*technē*] by a rhetorician who creates a speech from logical arguments. For Aristotle, speech is systematized and follows a clear path from A to B. Central to *logoi* is a rhetorical syllogism called an enthymeme. A syllogism is a form of logical reasoning from multiple premises to a conclusion. In one perspective, an enthymeme is a truncated syllogism where either the major premise, minor premise, or conclusion is missing. The missing portion of the syllogism allows the audience to contemplate the argument and come to a conclusion on their own. Indeed, Aristotle argues that all people enjoy learning as “to learn easily is naturally pleasant to all people.”³¹ Enthymemes give the audience stake in the speech by presenting an opportunity for a quasi-interaction with the rhetorician. Of the two types of enthymemes, demonstrative [*deiktika*] and refutative [*elentika*], audiences prefer the latter. Refutative enthymemes juxtapose two opposing arguments in a manner that makes them clearer,³² an important aspect of rhetoric. The four sources of enthymemes, probability, paradigm,

²⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, in *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007): 1358b6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1355b.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*, 1400b30.

refutable signs [*sēmēion*], and evidence [*tekmērion*],³³ all derive from some aspect of truth. For example, enthymemes from probability come from situations likely true, paradigms from induction, refutable signs from a relation of something particular to universal, and evidence from something necessarily true. The latter, *tekmērion*, is least likely because rhetoric tends to deliberate about human nature.

Two more of Aristotle's *logoi* involve inductive reasoning [*paradigm*] and general assertions [*maxim*]. Reasoning from "like to like"³⁴ works within the bounds of particulars. In contrast to signs which either reason from universal to particular or vice versa, *paradigms* reason from particular to particular. A good example of *paradigm* follows: "For example, [when someone claims] that Dionysius is plotting tyranny because he is seeking a body guard; for Peisistratus also, when plotting earlier, sought a body guard and after receiving it made himself tyrant."³⁵ Two types of paradigms exist: historical and fictional which are based on comparisons and fables respectively. Paradigms are persuasive, however they become too obviously inductive when they occur before an enthymeme.³⁶ Incidentally, paradigms are second to enthymemes because they do not arouse the same emotion from the audience.³⁷ A *maxim* is an assertion not about particulars, but about general actions. A maxim evokes more emotion than a paradigm because audiences enjoy hearing orators express their personal assumptions such as: "there is no man who is happy in all ways."³⁸ Maxims are less logical because they are founded upon preferences.³⁹ Interestingly, rhetoricians can compound multiple maxims to make an enthymeme.

³³ *Ibid.*, 1402b8.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1357b19.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 1394a9.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 1356b10.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1394b.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1395b.

Rhetorical speech is neither wholly argumentative or entirely a display of style. Aristotle was critical of the popular guides to rhetoric available during his lifetime because they only taught, “verbal attack and pity and anger and such emotion of the mind [*psykhē*].”⁴⁰ Oratory displays [*epideixis*] of only style are extreme in their lacking of argumentation. The opposing extreme is scientific reasoning [*apodeixis*].⁴¹ Rhetoric is the mean between *epideixis* and *apodeixis* because the *advantage* of different rhetoricians is variable, but not without logic or reason. Rhetorical arguments regarding the advantage deal with humans actions⁴² which are not something easily quantifiable with *apodeixis*. To this day, human nature is not something predictable that acts according to a set of scientific laws. Rhetoric is a fundamental type of persuasion because it employs reason to the extent one can possibly reason about topics of human action.

Truth in rhetoric is true to the extent that it produces reasoning in accordance with an advantageous end. Aristotle believes that most people encompass the capability to differentiate truth from fiction using reason. In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle argues that “humans have the natural disposition for the true and to a large extent hit on the truth; thus an ability to aim at commonly held opinions [*endoxa*] is a characteristic of one who has a similar ability in regard to the truth.”⁴³ Aristotle conceives of truth as a product of nature; in other words, natural reason illuminates the truth of a situation.⁴⁴ If reason comes from people, then truth is hidden somewhere in common opinion. Nevertheless, not all common opinion is truth.⁴⁵ The rhetorician’s job is to sort through common opinions [*endoxa*] to create the most persuasive

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 1354a3.

⁴¹ Joe Sachs, "Introduction," introduction to *Plato's Gorgias and Aristotle's Rhetoric*, by Plato and Aristotle (Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing, 2009), pg. 17.

⁴² Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1357a14.

⁴³ *Ibid*, 1355a11.

⁴⁴ George A. Kennedy, *Aristotle: On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, 35n23.

⁴⁵ Amélie Rorty, "Ethics in the Rhetoric and in the Ethics," in *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), pg. 147.

argument possible. The best *endoxa* are those that serve to connect the action, or purpose for the speech, with its advantageous end. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle writes, “would not an awareness of it [the highest good] have great weight in one’s life, so that, like archers who have a target, we would be more apt to hit on what is needed? But if this is so, one ought to try to get a grasp, at least in outline, of what it is and to what kind of knowledge or capacity it belongs.”⁴⁶

The rhetorician that employs commonly held beliefs in accordance with the advantageous is most likely to hit upon the truth when it comes to human nature, in other words, the unquantifiable. With this in mind, rhetoricians who employ untrue arguments against the common opinion will not persuade as effectively.

Aristotle’s rhetoric is not a morally neutral concept; instead, it works most effectively when in combination with the truth. Truth is a feature of proper conduct; as a result, speaking truthfully is acting morally. Aristotle argues that “the underlying facts are not equally good in each case; but true and better ones are by nature always more productive of good syllogisms and, in a word, more persuasive.”⁴⁷ In other words, rhetoric is most effective when its logical premises are based on verifiable conditions through human experience or common opinion. Individuals are more receptive to knowledge from their own reason or common opinion. A morally neutral tool does not work more effectively for the good or for bad, but is completely under the control of the user. A hammer does not hit nails more accurately for the construction of schools and poorly for the construction of stolen items. The moral neutrality of *Rhetoric* is a topic of contention in political theory. Some scholars believe that if rhetoric was under the

⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094a20.

⁴⁷ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1355a12.

influence of morals the improper use of it would negatively affect its intrinsic character.⁴⁸

However, this belief misses the fact that it is simply *more* difficult to abuse rhetoric based on good syllogisms, but not impossible.⁴⁹ As a result, Aristotle emphasizes the paramount position of logic in rhetoric despite the inconsistencies his account may cause.

Aristotle believes that truth is more persuasive than style [*lexeōs areté*]. However, in most practical circumstances individuals do not have the proper capacity to overcome their base desires to discover the truth in logic. Only in the noble regime do facts and arguments speak for themselves.⁵⁰ Consequently, rhetoricians in most cases need to appeal to audiences' emotions to clarify the truth. As mentioned, truth is a matter of opinion. Opinion works best with rhetoric as the mean between ignorance and wisdom. For example, an ignorant individual cannot recognize the truth from reason while at the same time someone wise, with too much self-restraint, is not open to persuasion through desire.⁵¹ Aristotle believes that "it is wrong to warp the jury by leading them into anger or envy or pity; that is the same as if someone made a straight-edge ruler crooked before using it."⁵² However, the character of human beings in realistic regimes is not one of virtue for acquiring wisdom. Most individuals are not taught the self-discipline to overcome their base desires and emotions. Therefore, Aristotle argues that "it is clear that it might be needful in a speech to put [the audience] in the state of mind of those who are inclined to anger."⁵³ The seemingly contradictory claim against and for the manipulation of the audience

⁴⁸ Troels Engberg-Pederson, "The Ethical Dimension of Aristotelian Rhetoric," in *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, ed. Amélie Rorty (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996): pg. 130.

⁴⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1408a4; 1355a12.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 1404a1.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 1146a10.

⁵² *Ibid*, 1354a5.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 1380a27.

is clear in the context of morally corrupt audiences. The rhetorician requires style to clarify his or her argument.

Rhetoric: Style, Character, and Audience

Despite its peripheral position in the text, style [*lexeōs areté*] is a necessary element in the art of persuasion. Metaphor, simile, moderate glosses and epithets, proper language, and other rhetorical devices are important because they keep the audience entertained. As previously mentioned, audiences residing outside the noble regime are morally corrupt⁵⁴ and easily amused by pleasures, wonders, and subjects that pertain to themselves.⁵⁵ Corrupt audiences require the ornamentation of speech because the basis of action is the audience's opinion. The opinions of audiences outside the best regimes are less wise because of their limited control over base desires. Imperatively, ornamentation in rhetoric remains second to the argument of the speech. In Aristotle's words, "One should not forget that all such things are outside the real argument; they are addressed to a hearer who is morally weak and giving ear to what is extrinsic to the subject."⁵⁶ Understanding the proper use of ornament means being guided by the principle of moderation outlined in *Nicomachean Ethics*. Relying too much on style results in an irrelevant and frivolous speech, while relying too much on argument will quite simply bore the audience. Aristotle notes that ornamental devices work best in moderation: "But nowadays they ridiculously say that narration should be rapid [*taxeia*]. Yet, as the man said to the baker when asked whether he should knead the dough hard or soft, 'What? Can't it be done *right*?' Similarly here, one should not narrate at length, just as one should not [unduly] lengthen prooemia, nor

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 1404a5.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 1415b7.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

proofs either; for speaking well is not a matter of rapidity or conciseness but of moderation.”⁵⁷ Speech riddled with ornament not only prohibits the argument from emerging, but also makes the rhetoric look artificial.

Aristotle emphasizes the character [*ēthos*] of the speaker in *Rhetoric* as something that should conform to the audience. In rhetorical situations audiences are required to make a judgment. Audiences’ judgements are partially determined by the presentation of the speaker. As a result, “It makes much difference in regard to persuasion (especially in deliberation but also in trials) that the speaker seem to be a certain kind of person and that his hearers suppose him to be disposed toward them in a certain way...”⁵⁸ In other words, the rhetorician must present his or her character in an amiable way that poses no surprises to the audience. If the personality of a rhetorician does not fit his or her age or gender for example, the audience is less likely to trust their argument. Character is even more important when the audience is not given clear evidence or facts in the speech and needs to rely only on trust: “for we believe fair-minded people to a greater extent and more quickly [than we do others] on all subjects in general and completely so in the cases where there is no exact knowledge but room for doubt.”⁵⁹ In Aristotle’s account of *ēthos*, character is only decided by a rhetorician’s actions within the speech, not outside the speech. Regardless, Aristotle notes that those encompassing good character show practical wisdom [*phronēsis*], virtue [*aretē*], and good will [*eunoia*].⁶⁰ In this way, the audience is an invaluable aspect of building character.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, 1416b4.

⁵⁸ *Ibid*, 1377b3.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 1356a4.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, 1378a5.

The audience is a decisive factor in the production of speech. Aristotle argues that “the objective [*telos*] of the *speech* relates to the last (I mean the hearer).”⁶¹ In other words, types of speech or species [*ēide/gene*] of rhetoric are categorized according to what the audience is doing such as observing [*theōros*] or judging [*kritēs*].⁶² Though many attribute this tripartite classification to Aristotle, the three species of rhetoric were most likely characterized before *Rhetoric* and clarified in more detail in his text.⁶³ Such previous categorization could explain the disordered accounts of ‘time’ which each species encompasses. First, Aristotle characterizes epideictic rhetoric [*epideiktikon*] as a speech dealing with present matters that often also emphasize the past. Epideictic concerns praising or blaming with the end result being honour or shame⁶⁴ most often at funerals. Second, judicial [*dikanikon*] rhetoric deals with actions carried out in the past. Judicial rhetoric is found in a court and concerns accusation [*katēgori*] and defense [*apologia*]. The objective of the rhetorician employing judicial rhetoric is “the just.”⁶⁵ Finally, deliberative [*symboleutikon*] rhetoric concerns guidance through the *protreptic* or *apotreptic* (exhortation/dissuasion) about future events, although deliberative rhetoric mostly references the past. According to Aristotle, “For the deliberate speaker [the end] is the advantageous [*sympheron*]”⁶⁶ of a regime. With proper argumentation and knowledge of the audience, the rhetorician can properly create receptivity in an audience.

Forming the Audience

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 1358a1.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 1358b2.

⁶³ George A. Kennedy, *Aristotle: On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, 46.

⁶⁴ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1358b5.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 1358b6.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1358b6.

The particular specie of rhetoric that the remaining part of this analysis prioritizes is deliberative rhetoric. The principal focus of deliberative rhetoric is on political audiences such as democratic assemblies. Deliberative rhetoric creates a mental state which makes the audience members more receptive to a particular judgment. The members of a deliberative audience already know that the overall goal of the speech, as mentioned above, is an action which helps achieve the regime's advantageous end [*telos*]. For example, the *telos* of oligarchic governance is the accumulation of wealth. On the other hand, the noble regime's advantageous end is a state of contemplation regarding the good, virtue and happiness for its citizens (leisure). As a result, deliberative orators are shaping the audience towards what they believe is the best course of action in achieving the advantageous.⁶⁷ Unlike the other species, deliberative rhetoric allows the audience to later see if the orator was correct in his or her plan of action. Rhetorical speech that needs to persuade an audience to make a particular decision requires a thorough understanding of the regime's state of affairs by the orator. The subjects that deliberative audiences most often encounter are "finances, war and peace, national defense, imports and exports, and the framing of laws."⁶⁸ Thus, shaping the audience requires, on the part of the orator, knowledge of the regimes end [*telos*], the regime's state of affairs [practical wisdom/*phronēsis*], the psychology of the audience [virtue/*aretē*], and the proper use of emotions [good will/*eunoia*].

The deliberative orator must know the state of a country's affairs to find the proper means to the advantageous as well as to form the audience around his or her argument. Practical wisdom [*phronēsis*] allows the truth of the circumstance that the orator is arguing to emerge. The truth cannot be properly expressed if the orator is uneducated about his or her claims. Knowledge

⁶⁷ *Ibid*, 1362a1.

⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 1359b7.

of the deliberative subjects (finances, war and peace, national defense, imports and exports, and the framing of laws) is imperative. Furthermore, the deliberative rhetorician needs more than a broad understanding of each subject; rather, the successful orator requires both technical knowledge of the state and moral wisdom. Examples range from the details of neighboring armies to what expenses the city requires for food.⁶⁹ As a result, “it is necessary also to be willing to do research about what has been discovered elsewhere in regard to deliberation about these things [affairs of one’s own city].”⁷⁰ Knowledge of the above subjects and the constitution is imperative for aligning an action in accordance with the goals of the regime. In order to properly advise an assembly, the rhetorician must know what will preserve and destroy the regime. In the rhetorical sense, knowledge of the state allows orators to argue creatively from things like opposites: “[Thus, it can be argue that] a thing is good if its opposite is bad and if its opposite is advantageous to our enemies; for example, if it is especially advantageous to our enemies for us to be cowardly, it is clear that courage is especially advantageous to our citizens.”⁷¹ Importantly, the rhetorician employs his practical wisdom of the state to form an audience that is attuned to the goals of the state. In the above case, courageously.

For Aristotle, the soul [*psyche*] defines the characteristics and activity of the being in which it resides. Humans are distinct from animals because of their ability to reason. Furthermore, reason is the source of virtuous actions. The good human being who is also the good orator must realize that actions in accordance with virtue are pleasurable in themselves to produce “citizens of a certain sort” that will “perform beautiful actions.”⁷² Importantly, however,

⁶⁹ *Ibid*, 1360a9.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 1359b8.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, 1362b19.

⁷² Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1099b30.

not all practically wise orators are good human beings. The variable nature regimes, for example a tyrant desires power whereas democracies desire equality, mean that the good orator is not necessarily striving for the noble regime. Regardless, all people encompass a character within their soul that actively controls choice. For Aristotle, the soul is composed of sense perception which all animals have, intellect, and appetite. While intellect is the composed of intuition, scientific thought, practical judgement, and technical skill, appetite is composed of emotions associated with pain or pleasure. According to Aristotle, truth comes from both intellect and appetite.⁷³ Just as truth comes from both *logos* and *pathos*. Appetite or passion refers to the feelings people normally experience, but is also a reflection of how “we bear ourselves well or badly towards those feelings.”⁷⁴ In the rhetorical sense, *pathos* is one of the means of persuasion like *logos* and *ēthos*. In particular, *pathos* refers to the ability to make an audience feel emotion through the speech.⁷⁵

Aristotle’s *pathos* is one the earliest examples of psychology in human history. Aristotle understood two things about psychology and persuasion. First, individuals define themselves by their beliefs. In turn, individuals attract other people who encompass the same identity and beliefs.⁷⁶ Consequently, the successful rhetorician does not align his or her character with the beliefs of the audience, but aligns the audience’s character with their beliefs. Establishing a similar identity will create an increasingly receptive audience. According to Aristotle, “the proper *lexis* [language] also makes the matter credible: the mind [of listeners] draws a false inference of the truth of what a speaker says because they feel the same about such things, so

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 1139b10.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 1105b20.

⁷⁵ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1356a5.

⁷⁶ Darren G. Lilleker, *Political Communication and Cognition*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillon, 2014): pg. 50.

they think the facts to be so...”⁷⁷ Though the example is a negative effect of employing improper logic, the fact remains that hearers are drawn to those with similar opinions. Aristotle’s second key conceptualization about psychology is that audience’s beliefs are structured on both logic and emotion. A line of causality exists within the psychology of the audience. Emotions about specific pieces of knowledge form the attitudes of audience members and causes them to act in a specific way. Modern political psychologists equally value the fact that “our attitudes are logically constructed, driven by emotional reactions to knowledge we receive and that they directly influence our actions.”⁷⁸ The knowledge a rhetorician imparts to the audience helps construct the audience’s beliefs. Therefore, the proper presentation and emotional appeal are important in the formation of the audience.

Emotional mobilization is integral for decisive persuasion in audiences. In rhetoric, the formulation of a receptive audience requires the ability to mold human emotion. Shaping the audience’s emotions creates a subtle platform for persuasion. In Aristotle’s own words, “there is persuasion through the hearers when they are led to feel emotion [pathos] by the speech...”⁷⁹ Using emotions in a speech is another way to verbally illustrate the true state of affairs. Without physically showing it, the rhetorician makes the audience mentally feel the effects of the subject of deliberation. The subject could create anger towards an enemy state that has done wrong or impart friendliness towards a state in a prospective merger. Importantly, the states of emotion make the logic of the argument clear for the audience to discover or, conversely, unclear if the argument is untruthful. Aristotle believed that state of minds such as anger, friendliness, hate,

⁷⁷ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1408a4.

⁷⁸ Darren G. Lilleker, *Political Communication and Cognition*, 49.

⁷⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1356a5.

and fear were malleable if properly understood.⁸⁰ Rhetoricians, for instance, understand the definition of fear [*phobos*] as a natural reaction to “the imagination of a future destructive or painful evil.”⁸¹ Rhetoricians also know the mindset of fearful people – fearful people are more likely to deliberate: “fear makes people inclined to deliberation, while no one deliberates about hopeless things. The results is that whenever it is better [for a speaker’s case] that they [i.e. the members of the audience] experience fear, he should make them realize that they are liable to suffering.”⁸² Good orators combine the definition of fear with *the state of mind* of fearful people to create an imaginative setting that persuades people to make a decision. The rhetorician is not deceiving; rather, he or she is clarifying the state of affairs in a way that moulds the audience for reception to action. Creating the proper argument for advantageous ends and understanding attitudes and emotions are necessary in the formulation of an audience. However, the psychological aspects of rhetoric falter without the specific linguistic means, style [*lexeōs aretē*] and language [*lexis*], of creating a political reality.

Successful rhetoric will construct an audience amiable to action by forming linguistic realities. Rhetoric with positive outcomes is a coming together of linguistic and psychological strategy to compliment the central *logos*. Formally, the requirement of ornament in rhetoric is a function of clarity⁸³ which is neither so clear as to be artificial or so unclear as to spark confusion. Words are what construct the specific reality which the orator is trying to make clear. The strategic employment of the varying types of metaphor, for example, allows the audience to come to grips with the orator’s central logic. Visualization is an important way to spark thought

⁸⁰ *Ibid*, 1378a9.

⁸¹ *Ibid*, 1382a2.

⁸² *Ibid*, 1383a14.

⁸³ *Ibid*, 1404b2.

in the audience. Bringing-before-the-eyes [*pro ommatōn poiein*] is a visual metaphor that permits the audience to comprehend a manner of activity. In combination with the present tense, bringing-before-the-eyes forces the hearer to visualize future activity in the present: “for things should be seen as being done rather than as going to be done.”⁸⁴ Employing language in a specific manner is a means of creating receptivity in the audience by vividly reproducing context. Despite Aristotle’s hostility to the trickery that some rhetoricians employ with words, he does not neglect the notion that words construct political reality. A rhetorician may show anger, but without formulating the proper context around that anger through words he or she is not persuasive. The combination of the proper words, feelings, and evidence makes the argument real to the audience. Even today, modern philosophers see the potential for language to inspire action in audiences: “Because the potency of political language does not stem from its description of a “real” world but rather from its... potentialities in the future, language usage is strategic. It is always part of a course of action to enable people to live with themselves and with what they do and to marshal support for causes.”⁸⁵ Words build the context for politics while the strategic employment of language, psychology, logic, and practical wisdom shape the audience towards a particular judgment.

Conclusion

Rhetoric as a function of communication is powerful because language encompasses the capability to structure individuals’ thoughts. In this way, rhetorical language influences the decisions of citizens without the use of physical force. *Rhetoric* is a practical guide to persuading deliberative assemblies to take a particular course of action. More than simply logic and

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 1410b6.

⁸⁵ Murray Edelman, "Political Language and Political Reality," pg. 13.

character, the successful rhetorician, according to Aristotle, must also insightfully employ emotional appeal in accordance with human psychology. The rhetorician must also formulate the political context using strategic linguistic concepts if he or she desires to successfully influence an audience's decision. The nature of the action the rhetorician advises is in accordance with the ultimate purpose of the regime. Consequently, the rhetorician employs *ēthos*, *logos*, and *pathos* to not only form the audience in a receptive manner, but also educate the audience towards the advantage of the regime. The specific advantage of Singapore is the focus of Chapter Two.

Chapter Two

Singapore: Testing Aristotle's Theory of "Regime Mixology"

In the world of politics, rhetoric is a tool leaders employ to make citizens more receptive to a particular action. For the deliberative rhetorician, the result of the action will help his or her government reach its particular objective or end [*telos*]. Rhetoric, in its entirety, is a means to a specific end. Chapter One mentions generally that each species [*ēide*] of rhetoric encompasses an 'end' and that "for the deliberative speaker the end is advantageous..."¹ What the advantage consists of is the focus of this chapter. Understanding the advantage of a regime is necessary to assess the nature of rhetoric in a particular case study. Using rhetoric to mold a receptive audience requires intricate knowledge of what citizens are being shaped towards. Evaluating the 'goal' of the regime will illuminate exactly how rhetoric functions within it. Discovering the advantage of a case study like Singapore will aid in analyzing the purpose and success of Lee Kuan Yew's rhetoric.

Singapore is a particularly interesting case study because of its exceptionalism within the contemporary regime type of electoral autocracy. For a non-democratic state, Singapore's citizens are remarkably wealthy. So wealthy, in fact, that the autocracy is now richer than most

¹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, in *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007): 1358b6.

democracies. The nation fosters professional and technical education in a manner especially conducive to intellectual progress. As a result, a large majority of people living in Singapore are happy due to their economic security. The state of Singapore confounds academics today because the quality of life for people in autocracies is not typically adequate for human development. The question remains, can Aristotle's understanding of regime types help us to comprehend the nature of Singapore?

I argue that the nature of Singapore is best explained by a government particularly adept at mixing regime types. The best regime is durable because it encompasses a moral advantage, or noble end, for its regime and consistently works for the common good. Accordingly, a practical, more realistic regime lasts longer when it emulates the noble attributes of the best regime. In Singapore, the government does not look to the common advantage; rather, the dominant party looks towards its own advantage. Nevertheless, the People's Action Party (PAP) and Lee Kuan Yew, in particular, wisely mix their deviant regime with noble qualities in order to preserve their rule. The wise rule of Lee Kuan Yew gives Singapore many qualities of a kingship – a regime led by one exceptionally virtuous leader. However, the lack of political liberties Lee Kuan Yew offers Singaporeans leads to a life without leisure and gives the regime characteristics of a self-interested leader or tyrant. Singapore retains oligarchic qualities primarily because a small group of economically driven individuals govern in pursuit of wealth. Yet, the profits of Singapore's economic success are handled so nobly that the dominant party emulates the virtues of an aristocracy. The cunning use of a variety of regime qualities makes the government of Singapore appear noble. The *appearance* of pursuing the common good through the acquisition of wealth is an illusion. The true advantage of Singapore is economic success for the consolidation of power.

Singapore

In the modern comparative sense, Singapore is an electoral authoritarian regime. Electoral autocracies are political systems that acquire legitimacy through elections that are unfree and/or unfair. Legitimacy is what creates obedience, produces a particular administration to uphold a regime, and defines the mode of authority.² Ambiguous as the term is, legitimacy not only propagates regimes, but also categorizes them. In comparison, electoral autocracies differ from monarchies in that monarchies gain legitimacy from divine right, heritage, or tradition and they differ from totalitarian regimes which attain legitimacy from ideology. In electoral autocracies the *appearance* of democracy make the state's residents feel as if they are participating in representative government. The false feeling of representation, in turn, legitimates the government. Levitsky and Way provide a solid overview of the nature of these regimes:

Competitive authoritarian regimes are civilian regimes in which formal democratic institutions exist and are widely viewed as the primary means of gaining power, but in which incumbents' abuse of the state places them at a significant advantage vis-à-vis their opponents.³

Retaining power in an electoral authoritarian regime means making tactful use of democratic institutions. The difference between electoral autocracies and democracies is, according to Sarah Birch, that electoral autocracies hold elections in order to retain power while democracies hold elections in order to exercise collective choice.⁴ In opposition to most scholars, William Case

² Steffen Kailitz, "Classifying Political Regimes Revisited: Legitimation and Durability," *Democratization* 20, no. 1 (2013): pg. 41.

³ Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pg. 5.

⁴ Sarah Birch, *Electoral Malpractice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pg. 15.

argues that Singapore is not an electoral autocracy, but a semi-democracy.⁵ Garry Rodan, however, believes that this title confuses Singapore's longevity with its uncompetitive nature.⁶ That is to say, the People's Action Party is not only unique in how it maintains power in Singapore, but also skillful at manipulating observers outside the country.

Singapore's political history began in 1867 when Great Britain established the Straits Settlements, now consisting of parts of Malaysia, Singapore, and Australia. The British established a tradition of ethnic cooperation by allowing a collaborative government that included a limited legislature of upper class Chinese, Malay, and Indo-Muslims.⁷ However, racial ties unraveled in 1941 when the Japanese invaded the Straits Settlements. The ethnic division arose because the Japanese gave special consideration to Malays while simultaneously slaughtering and extorting the Chinese.⁸ When British law was re-established in 1946 revenge killing against the Malay was common, inflation was high, and the damaged machinery of imperial rule gave rise to anti-imperialist sentiments.⁹ Instability endured and in 1963 the city of Singapore gained independence from Britain to join Malaysia. Singapore's expulsion from Malaysia shortly thereafter, in 1965, led to the creation of its own independent city-state.

Singapore's dominant party balances on the fine line between closed authoritarianism and the appearance of competition better than most electoral authoritarian regimes. Despite winning a competitive election 1959, Singapore's regime quickly lapsed into authoritarianism. The

⁵ William Case, *Politics in Southeast Asia: Democracy or Less* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2002), pg. 95.

⁶ Garry Rodan, "Singapore "exceptionalism"? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation," in *Political Transitions in Dominant Party Systems: Learning to Lose*, ed. Edward Friedman and Joseph Wong, Politics in Asia (New York, New York: Routledge, 2009), pg. 232.

⁷ Joey Shi Ruey Long, *Safe for Decolonization: The Eisenhower Administration, Britain, and Singapore*, (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2011), pg. 22.

⁸ Edwin Lee, *Singapore: The Unexpected Nation* (Pasir Panjang: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2008), pg. 38.

⁹ Joey Shi Ruey Long, *Safe for Decolonization: The Eisenhower Administration, Britain, and Singapore*, pg. 22.

arbitrary arrest of key members of the opposition, Barisan Sosialis, by the PAP under the Internal Security Act on February 2nd, 1963 made the September election unfair and autocratic. In the decades following the PAP's election, Prime Minister and party-founder Lee Kuan Yew subtly molded the PAP with state infrastructure until electoral bias became part of the political system.¹⁰ The PAP employ subtle tactics like the use of state resources and laws that hinder the growth of the opposition to stay in power. In general, electoral authoritarian regimes are not durable because the subtlety required to manipulate citizens is not easy to maintain. Too much blatant electoral manipulation or violence causes citizens to revolt whereas not enough bias in favour of the dominant party may allow the opposition to win.¹¹ However, the PAP use rhetoric, political socialization, and electoral bias so skillfully that they have dominated in Singapore's parliamentary republic legislature for 45 years. Most of the PAP's tactics are hidden underneath Singapore's enormous economic success.

After independence, Singapore quickly rose to become one of the most stable states in the world. In 1959, half of all Singaporeans were residing in squatter huts.¹² In the same year, gross domestic product (GDP) per capita was \$2,186 according to the Maddison Project which controls for inflation using 1990 International Dollars. Singapore's economic success grew rapidly. By 1979, Singapore's GDP per capita was \$8,362, by 1999 it was \$19,983, and in 2010 it was \$29,083. In comparison, the electoral authoritarian regimes of Malaysia (2010) and Mexico (2000) had a GDP per capita of \$10,094 and \$7,275 respectively.¹³ Singapore's GDP per capita is also higher than most democracies including Canada, Australia, and Great Britain. Moreover,

¹⁰ Nicolette Stuart, *Singapore Research Essay*, Report for Report for Political Science 4310: Electoral Authoritarianism (University of Lethbridge: Lethbridge, 2014), pg. 9.

¹¹ Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*, pg. 5.

¹² Jon S. T. Quah, *Public Administration Singapore-style* (Bingley: Emerald, 2010), pg. 200.

¹³ The Maddison-Project, <http://www.ggd.net/maddison/maddison-project/home.htm>, 2013 version.

where ethnic division was once deadly, Chinese, Malay, and Indian groups now experience almost no violence. Aggressive multiracial language and culture policy by the PAP created a strong sense of nationalism in Singaporeans.¹⁴ Singapore's success is a result of Lee Kuan Yew who governed as Prime Minister from 1955 to 1990. Lee Kuan Yew continued to govern, with somewhat less power, behind the scenes as 'Senior Minister' when Goh Chok Tong became the second Prime Minister.¹⁵ Lee similarly governed as 'Minister Mentor' when his son, Lee's Hsien Loong, became Prime Minister in 2004 until he resigned in 2011. Lee did not govern on the pretense of any ideology. Rather, he created a *highly pragmatic meritocratic system* that still defines both Singapore's government and administration today.

Clarifying Advantage

All regimes pursue an independent path towards a specific state, goal, or reward. From the city-states around him, Aristotle observed that each political association was in the process of attaining a particular benefit for at least one of the groups within the cities' boundary. Political associations were composed of leadership, administration, and those with the potential to act politically (citizens). For Aristotle, administration and forms of government were synonymous authoritative bodies in city-states.¹⁶ Aristotle argued that political associations within the city-states organized themselves for the purpose of attaining "some good."¹⁷ The good for which a city-state existed depended on the priorities of the political association. The variable nature of city-states meant that the end goals or what was the advantage of the political associations

¹⁴ Stephen Robert Nagy, "Politics of Multiculturalism in East Asia: Reinterpreting Multiculturalism," *Ethnicities* 14, no. 1 (2014): pg. 164.

¹⁵ Diane K. Mauzy and R. S. Milne, "*Singapore Politics under the People's Action Party*," (London: Routledge, 2002), pg. 8.

¹⁶ Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Joe Sachs, (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2012): 1279a20.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, 1252a.

differed. In other words, an advantageous end for one city-state was not an advantageous end in another.

Aristotle categorically divides city-states between those whose advantage is a noble good and those whose advantage deviates from proper notions of good. Aristotle defines the greatest good as the end to which all other goods are means – a sort of excellence. The good, in relation to an advantageous end, is nurturing the ability to strive for happiness for its own sake. A political association with proper ends allows people to freely attain the highest form happiness from contemplation and virtue, in essence, allowing people to live beautifully. In the best regimes free people “come together and hold the political association together for the sake of life itself,”¹⁸ rather than simply for justice and business.¹⁹ However, the political advantage of good regimes must extend to “the whole city and the citizens in common”²⁰ and not favour one group or part of the city over another. The ideal or noble regime allows all groups to deliberate together. Deliberation is essential for citizens to discover truth and ultimately create actions that would allow humans to live beautifully. Aristotle calls intellectual deliberation about future good political prudence. Although regimes may have the common good at heart only the best, noble regime fully deliberates together. Aristotle further divides the two groups apart by the number of citizens that govern. In this classic division, regime types that govern with the common advantage in mind include a monarchy which is rule by one, an aristocracy which is rule by the few, and constitutional rule which is rule by the multitude.²¹

¹⁸ *Ibid*, 1278b20.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, 1280b30.

²⁰ *Ibid*, 1283b40.

²¹ *Ibid*, 1279a30.

The deviant category of regimes does not look to the common advantage of citizens. Instead, deviant political associations are distinct because the governing individual or group pursues their own goals. Regimes that ignore the good of the city as a whole and “look only to the rulers’ own advantage are misguided.”²² The single-minded nature of deviant regimes produces a society that does not allow human nature to develop properly for all citizens - let alone the leaders themselves. Governing elites prioritize their goals at the expense of one or more of the major necessities for a life of active contemplation through leisure such as lack of liberal education, peace, or health. Bryan Garsten notes that deviant regimes do not enable the city as a whole to act as a “distinct agent”²³ because the context empowering citizens to act as a self-propagating entity is missing. In most cases, the ruling elite does not trust their citizens²⁴ with the freedom necessary for virtue and contemplation or political self-rule. The regime types included in this category are similarly divided by number: tyrants look to their own advantage, oligarchs pursue the advantage of the wealthy (necessarily the few), and democracy attains the advantage of the poor (multitude).²⁵

Important to note is that for Aristotle, not all subjects of the city-state are citizens. Only those who are capable in mind and leisure with the potential to develop laws, judge, and rule are citizens.²⁶ Citizens are individuals who take turns participating in governing. The modern equivalent includes *intellectual* individuals with enough wealth to live comfortably without relying on continual earnings for sustenance: the professional middle class.²⁷ For Aristotle, the

²² *Ibid.*, 1279a20.

²³ Bryan Garsten, "Deliberating and Acting Together," in *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*, ed. Marguerite Deslauriers and Pierre Destrée (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pg. 334.

²⁴ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1311a10.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1279b.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 1275a20.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 1275a20.

virtue of a citizen depends on the type of regime in which the citizen resides. The virtue of a good citizen cannot be the same as the good man if the virtue of the citizen relies on his or her regime type. The diversity of regime types means that the particular virtue of a citizen is not one in common. The virtue of a citizen in an oligarchy would lead to the preservation of the regime by dividing up property qualifications since oligarchy “needs to gain its preservation from good planning.”²⁸ The virtue of citizens in the noble regime creates the context for leisure. Leisure is an active work of contemplation²⁹ where individuals partake in discussion and education about the good in order to ‘live beautifully.’ In this sense, leisure is an ‘end,’ a state of affairs where citizens are free to pursue wisdom. However, leisure is also a benefit for citizens in a more practical regime which are trying to attain the noble regime. Leisure allows citizens to gain political skills for critical thinking, deliberating, and producing actions for the common good.

Deviant regimes curtail the context necessary to educate citizens for a life of leisure. A regime must be moderate and just to attain a state of leisure according to Aristotle.³⁰

Consequently, noble regimes are equally attentive to all aspects of human development like education, physical and mental health, wealth, peace and justice. Conversely, the PAP foster an extreme concern with economic wealth. Aristotle explains that leisure – active contemplation that, in its self, creates happiness and relaxation – is not possible for those preoccupied with business.³¹ The PAP’s obsession with economics means that Singaporeans are more concerned with material wealth than contributing to politics³² and local community.³³ Additionally, the

²⁸ *Ibid*, 1321a.

²⁹ *Ibid*, 1334a10.

³⁰ *Ibid*, 1334a30.

³¹ *Ibid*, 1338a.

³² Benjamin Wong and Xunming Huang, "Political Legitimacy in Singapore," *Politics & Policy* 38, no. 3 (2010): pg. 530.

³³ Siok Kuan Tambyah, Soo Jiuan Tan, and Ah Keng Kau, "The Quality of Life in Singapore," *Social Indicators Research* 92, no. 2 (June 2009): pg. 350.

circumstances that create citizens who desire the common good require freedom and liberal education. The PAP's extreme focus on economic security explains why individuals, when asked to rate their priorities, have "no interest in 'appreciating arts and culture.'"³⁴ Singaporeans are not taught to exercise their intellectual faculties outside the most pragmatic subjects. Even so, active leisure in practical regimes leisure requires free contemplation and discussion for those with the intellectual capacity. In Singapore, however, the PAP limit the discussion of citizens in the opposition through defamation lawsuits. In 2011, Chee Soon Juan (SPD) was fined S\$20,000 for publicly speaking without a permit.³⁵ The judiciary's contribution to bankrupting the opposition is also a reflection of the justice that deviant regimes lack. Without proper justice, Singapore's multiracial policies will contribute to growing inequality between Singaporeans and privileged foreign migrants.³⁶ Currently, the noble attributes of the regime are ensuring that Singapore's deviant qualities are not creating a chaotic state. Nevertheless, Singaporean citizens and Singaporeans in general are not leading a life with leisure or a life of leisure.

Singapore falls under a deviant regime type because the PAP govern in pursuit of their own advantage at the expense of the development of politically capable citizens. The relative success of the subjects in Singapore is a by-product of the meritocratic and economic management of the state as a means of retaining power. The government of Singapore appears to pursue two advantageous ends. The first is also the main source of the government's legitimacy: a secure city-state where subjects thrive on their free choice and ability to pursue prosperity.³⁷ Such an advantageous end is the result of successful political engineering implemented to extend

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Country Reports: Transformationsindex - Singapore 2014*, report, Freedom of Expression, accessed February 21, 2015, <http://www.bti-project.org/reports/country-reports/aso/sgp/index.nc>.

³⁶ Stephen Robert Nagy, "Politics of Multiculturalism in East Asia: Reinterpreting Multiculturalism," *Ethnicities* 14, no. 1 (2014): pg. 165.

³⁷ Benjamin Wong and Xunming Huang, "Political Legitimacy in Singapore," pg. 525.

the preservation of the PAP government. The honest advantage of the Singapore government is the consolidation of power in the PAP rather than the happiness of the city-state's citizens. The limited freedoms of the political elite and other factors noted below do not allow for Singapore to obtain advantageous ends. Such factors are prominent in the PAP's preservation of power, but are hidden under Lee Kuan Yew's successful mixing of regime typologies.

Regime Mixology

The six types of regimes Aristotle provides are easy for categorizing different aspects of politics. However, Aristotle understands tangible regimes as governments that mix and match different parts of each typology. Despite the possibility of the ideal regime type, Aristotle practically suggests that beneficial, though not perfect, regimes are well-blended in terms of different political qualities. He suggests that "it ought to be the case in a government that has been beautifully mixed that it seems to be both things and neither."³⁸ In other words, political associations should choose the exact mean between the qualities that suit its political state so that one cannot pinpoint its exact regime type. For example, a strategic political association would chose a moderate property qualification for serving on assembly where the property qualification in an oligarchy would be high and in a democracy it would be low. Aristotle truly cherishes the mean because moderation instills harmony between two extremes. Not every person can encompass intellectual excellence, but all people have the capacity for virtue of character to live together for the sake of living in a city-state.³⁹ Similarly, Aristotle believes that political arrangements that stay away from extremes, like encompassing all the qualities of an oligarchy,

³⁸ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1294b30.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 1295a30.

is more stable: “A government will be more lasting to the degree that it is better mixed.”⁴⁰ True regimes, according to Aristotle, are better the more ‘grey areas’ they have in their categorization.

Singapore’s regime encompasses many ‘grey areas’ including its unique kingship qualities. Lee Kuan Yew’s lasting influence over the political elite is one reason Singapore is more similar to a kingship than an oligarchy. Just as Singapore did not flourish in one day, it was not made successful by one man. The PAP’s meritocratic system meant that Yew’s closest allies were some of the brightest men in Singapore. Indeed, deputy prime ministers, cabinet ministers, and founding members of the PAP Goh Keng Swee, S. Rajaratnam, and Toh Chin Chye, to name a few, were integral actors in the state building of the nation. Nevertheless, academics stress that Lee Kuan Yew was not only *primus inter pares*, but also the principal reason for Singapore’s success.⁴¹ If oligarchies were based on merit rather than wealth, Singapore might be an oligarchy. However, oligarchies require that only a few encompass the deciding factor of their participation (wealth) and in the Singaporean case all citizens are both highly educated⁴² and wealthy. Michael Barr argues that despite the meritocratic elite of Singapore, “the oil that lubricates it is personal power.”⁴³ Moreover, although two Prime Ministers have succeeded him, Yew is still seen as Singapore’s most prominent politician.⁴⁴

Lee Kuan Yew was a brilliant politician, but he lacked the virtue outside of political capacity to become a perpetual king in the noble regime. Lee’s practical wisdom [*phronēsis*] in

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 1297a.

⁴¹ Diane K. Mauzy and R. S. Milne, “Singapore Politics under the People’s Action Party,” pg. 5.

⁴² “Index of Cognitive Skills and Educational Attainment.” Index Ranking. January 2014. <http://thelearningcurve.pearson.com/index/index-ranking>.

⁴³ Michael D. Barr, “Beyond Technocracy: The Culture of Elite Governance in Lee Hsien Loong’s Singapore,” *Asian Studies Review* 30, no. 1 (2006): pg. 8.

⁴⁴ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Country Reports: Transformationsindex - Singapore 2014*, report, History and Characteristics of Transformation.

taking a country ‘from third world to first’ made him a superior politician. Moreover, Lee Kuan Yew personified the man of modesty necessary to appear kingly. Aristotle observes that tyrants distrust their friends who naturally envy their power.⁴⁵ Lee Kuan Yew’s circumstances, on the other hand, allowed him to forge what he claims was “camaraderie under [the] intense pressures” of nation building.⁴⁶ In his long biographies, Lee never fails to properly state ‘we’ in reference to his companions Keng Swee, Raja, Sui Sen, and Kim San,⁴⁷ and others, when detailing Singapore’s turmoil within Malaysia and eventually when building an independent nation. Instead of acting like a warmonger and making his subjects work without a life of leisure,⁴⁸ Lee Kuan Yew endowed his subjects with wealth for leisure. Yet, if Lee was a kingly leader, this type of leisure would not be excessive in the way that it blinds people from politics, but would allow people the freedom from dependence on external things like material goods and base desires.⁴⁹ Essentially, Lee’s over emphasis on material well-being is too extreme to foster a life of leisure. Although he is not a warmonger, Lee’s meritocratic system promotes economic talent as if Singapore were at war with the economy.

Singapore is not an aristocracy because Lee Kuan Yew’s supreme political tact makes the regime unequal. Aristotle concedes that the ‘ideal regime’ made from superiorly virtuous person is a nearly impossible circumstance.⁵⁰ Although not all citizens fully share in deliberation, the next best regime is an aristocracy where a few virtuous citizens govern as equals. However, Singapore is not an aristocracy because, as previously mentioned, power was consolidated in Lee

⁴⁵ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1313b30.

⁴⁶ Lee Kuan Yew, *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story 1965-2000* (Singapore: Straits Times Press, 2000), pg. 759.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 758.

⁴⁸ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1313b10.

⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 1324a20.

⁵⁰ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1284a.

Kuan Yew's hands as Senior Minister and Minister Mentor for 15 years despite retiring as Prime Minister. Aristotle notes that even if power is seemingly confined to the few that a tyranny occurs when "one person has more than the rest of those who are well off."⁵¹ According to Ho Khai Leong, a well-known aspect of Singapore politics is that the executive not only dominates the legislature and judiciary, but also defines "the collective leadership of the governing elite."⁵² Lee covertly controlled the governing elite while he was Prime Minister. Subsequently, when Lee's son, Lee Hsien Loong, became Prime Minister it was not Lee Hsien Loong who determined the rearranged hierarchy with the Prime Minister's Office, but Lee Kuan Yew.⁵³ Aristotle notes that equality is necessary amongst those with equal capabilities in order for justice to exist.⁵⁴ Furthermore, he argues that in "the case of political offices too, whenever they are organized on a basis of equality and similarity among the citizens, they expect to take turns ruling."⁵⁵ Systems that favour one equal person over another are unjust: in Singapore not even the meritocratic elite can rule without hindrance from Lee Kuan Yew. Even so, the injustice done to the governing elite does not compare to the injustice done to the equally capable opposition.

To a small degree Lee Kuan Yew's Singapore embraces Aristotle's tyrannical purposes. Every measure tyrannies employ is for the sake of three things: taking away citizens' power, "making them think small," and creating distrustful subjects.⁵⁶ The latter two objectives, limiting citizens' interests to basic sustenance and making them question one another, reduces the

⁵¹ *Ibid*, 1318a20.

⁵² Ho Khai Leong, "Prime Ministerial Leadership and Policy-making Style in Singapore: Lee Kuan Yew and Goh Chok Tong Compared," *Asian Journal of Political Science* 8, no. 1 (2000): pg. 91.

⁵³ Michael D. Barr, "Beyond Technocracy: The Culture of Elite Governance in Lee Hsien Loong's Singapore," pg. 8.

⁵⁴ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1282a20.

⁵⁵ *Ibid*, 1279a.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 1314a20.

likeliness that citizens will reclaim power from the tyrant. Without expanding too much into the techniques of the PAP, I will note the three most apparent pieces of evidence.

The lack of power for some citizens in Singapore is the result of the PAP's meritocratic system. Meritocracy is a system of governance where the selection of administration and party members is predicated upon their talents and intellectual abilities. The PAP understands that dominance in a political system requires the smooth transition of elites;⁵⁷ as such, the successful MP does not come from a specific class or race, but successfully undergoes at least five 'interviews,' and a day and a half psychological exam. According to Michael Barr,

Lee is convinced that the secret of good governance lies in the identification of those people with a genetic and almost tangible quality called "talent" through a process of "meritocracy". Identify the "talented" in school, pump all your resources into nurturing them, exposing their minds to an ever-steeper hierarchy of challenges, and then select the best. You then test these elites.⁵⁸

Meritocracy is crucial to the economic success of the Singaporean government. The management of the state in a meritocratic manner achieves the wealth necessary to maintain the PAP's power. Accordingly, Singapore's political elites are purposely chosen technocrats that have economic skill rather than political tact.⁵⁹ Diane Mauzy and R.S. Milne explain that both the difficult process of interviewing for the PAP and the party's desire for technocratic business outsiders deter individuals' with political capability from participating in government. Within the party, the intense selection process of PAP candidates is weighted against those without family

⁵⁷ Thomas J. Bellows, "Meritocracy and the Singapore Political System," pg. 33.

⁵⁸ Michael D. Barr, "Beyond Technocracy: The Culture of Elite Governance in Lee Hsien Loong's Singapore," pg. 3.

⁵⁹ Garry Rodan, "Singapore "exceptionalism"? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation," pg. 238.

connections⁶⁰ or wealth. Those politically capable citizens excluded from governing within the PAP have one more, less viable option to govern: the opposition.

The PAP takes away the power of the politically capable citizens in the opposition by biasing elections in their favour. A true kingship for Aristotle is nearly impossible, Waller Newell argues, because even those with political virtue may not accept others with “reasonable and well intentioned” views.⁶¹ Likewise, Kenneth Paul Tan argues that the PAP’s contemptuousness arising from meritocracy is vehemently intolerant “of alternative views expressed by the general public.”⁶² Those able to rule, but excluded by the PAP’s selection process are left with the public service, which also requires meritocratic ability, or the opposition. The opposition is severely hindered in Singapore. The PAP have ‘taken away the citizens’ power’ by hindering the opposition’s ability to gain access to legislation through election. The PAP gerrymander, call 9-day snap elections, bar freedom of association, and control the electoral body (Singapore Elections Department) through the Prime Minister in effort to keep the opposition from full political participation. From 1968 – 1980, the PAP held every seat in legislature. Defamation lawsuits that bankrupt the opposition in conjunction with the Undesirable Publications Act which censors the media mean that freedom of expression considerably hinders the opposition’s ability campaign and ultimately play a role in governing.⁶³

⁶⁰ Michael D. Barr, "Beyond Technocracy: The Culture of Elite Governance in Lee Hsien Loong's Singapore," pg. 14.

⁶¹ Waller R. Newell, "Superlative Virtue: The Problem of Monarchy in Aristotle's 'Politics'" *The Western Political Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (March 01, 1987): pg. 175.

⁶² Kenneth Paul Tan, "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 1 (February 2012), pg. 73.

⁶³ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Country Reports: Transformationsindex - Singapore 2014*, report, Political and Social Integration, Freedom of Expression.

In regards to “thinking small,” the PAP has spent the last 45 years educating and socially engineering its subjects⁶⁴ to the extent that Singaporeans would rather focus on their right to spend money than their political liberties.⁶⁵ The PAP’s political socialization extends as far as the opposition who, according to Garry Rodan, “either embraces key aspects of PAP ideology or struggle to conceptualize alternatives.”⁶⁶ The fact that the political opposition cannot see past PAP philosophy illustrates the extent to which social education translates into power for the PAP. Finally, an East Asia Barometer survey finds Singapore at the bottom of the list of countries when asked whether “most people can be trusted.”⁶⁷ While low social culture may not directly link to the PAP, it appears that Singapore meets the minimum qualifications of a tyranny in addition to its kingly attributes.

Singapore may be categorized as a mixed elective tyranny because it does not perfectly fit the tyrannical mold. According to Aristotle, an elective tyranny occurs “on account of being like rule of master over slaves, but kingly on account of being elected by willing subjects.”⁶⁸ For the most part, people in Singapore enjoy the PAP because the party brings them economic security. According to the BTI, 85% of Singaporeans are ‘very or fairly satisfied’ with how the government is run in Singapore.⁶⁹ In this sense, Singapore is not the typical tyranny. Aristotle explains that tyranny usually induces poverty in its subjects.⁷⁰ Yet, Singapore has enormous

⁶⁴ Michael D. Barr, "The Bonsai under the Banyan Tree: Democracy and Democratisation in Singapore," pg. 40.

⁶⁵ Kenneth Paul Tan, "The People's Action Party and Political Liberalization in Singapore," in *Political Parties, Party Systems, and Democratization in East Asia*, ed. Liang Fook Lye and Wilhelm Hofmeister (Hackensack, New Jersey: World Scientific Publishing, 2011), pg. 127.

⁶⁶ Garry Rodan, "State-Society Relations and Political Opposition in Singapore," in *Political Oppositions in Industrialising Asia*, ed. Garry Rodan (London: Routledge, 2013), pg. 76.

⁶⁷ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Country Reports: Transformationsindex - Singapore 2014*, report, Political and Social Integration.

⁶⁸ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1258b.

⁶⁹ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Country Reports: Transformationsindex - Singapore 2014*, report, Political and Social Integration.

⁷⁰ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1313b10.

economic wealth. Even more, Tambyah, Tan and Kau note that “Singapore is considered one of the best places to live in Asia, if not the world.”⁷¹ How can one of the best places to live be a deviant regime with selfish rulers? The answer lies in the regime’s concern with wealth – a seemingly oligarchic advantage. The regime’s focus on economic security creates a mass-concern for material goods. In this way, Aristotle dictates that tyrannies also make people poor so that they are too busy providing for themselves to notice politics and cannot build a military.⁷² It appears that Singapore’s political elite do the opposite – make people rich to disguise their oligarchical desire for wealth. The fact that the PAP governs according to wealth means that a significant portion of Singapore’s advantage is oligarchic.

The deviant characteristics of the PAP’s rule are hidden behind the kingly quality of life of Singapore’s subjects. Economic success gives Singaporeans the illusion of greater freedom of choice.⁷³ Greater choice allows citizens to disassociate their situation from the typical restraints of autocracies. The appearance of freedom gives the regime a significant mask to hide their true advantage under the security and economic well-being of the citizens. Nevertheless, non-economic freedoms are hindered in Singapore. The PAP limit the freedom of expression, press, association, and sexual choice. Additionally, no impartial judiciary exists for government lawsuits, the government regularly violates citizens’ privacy, and imposes indefinite detention without trial under the Internal Securities Act. According to Aristotle,

For just as one means of destruction of kingship is to make its rule more tyrannical, by the same token, one means of preservation of tyranny is to make it

⁷¹ Siok Kuan Tambyah, Soo Juan Tan, and Ah Keng Kau, "The Quality of Life in Singapore," 338.

⁷² Aristotle, *Politics*, 1313b10.

⁷³ Bertelsmann Stiftung, *Country Reports: Transformationsindex - Singapore 2014*, report, Political and Social Integration.

more kingly, if the tyrant watches out for one thing only – his power – so that he can rule not only the willing but also unwilling subjects, for if he lets go of that he also lets go of being a tyrant.⁷⁴

As long as the advantageous end of the regime remains attaining power, no kingly attribute can replace the deviant regime with a proper one. The preservation of a tyrannical regime, however, can also explain how Singapore appears to have ‘two’ advantageous ends.

Regime Preservation

Despite having selfish goals, a deviant regime can prove stable as long as it also pursues noble ends. As previously discussed, the longest regimes last due to a stability created from mixing regime qualities. In Aristotle’s words, “One ought to regard as conducive to popular rule to oligarchy not what makes the city be ruled in the most democratic or oligarchic manner possible, but what makes such rule last the longest time.”⁷⁵ A regime is not stable because it adheres perfectly to the qualifications of, for example, democracy. Instead, a regime lasts precisely because it deliberately mixes the characters of different regimes together. A deviant regime will last longer the more it takes on characteristics of proper regimes. Such is the reason that Aristotle believes students of politics and leaders must know what preserves and destroys various regimes.⁷⁶ The things that preserve a tyranny will be increasingly kingly inasmuch as it appears that the regime encompasses noble ends. The appearance will preserve the regime for a longer period of time. The leader of Singapore follows Aristotle’s practical guide closely. The following three measures are taken to preserve Singapore’s tyranny and give the appearance of

⁷⁴ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1314a30.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 1320a.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 1309b30.

noble ends: a lack of corruption or immoderation, an increasing attention on external threats, and a primary focus on education.

Lee Kuan Yew closely followed Aristotle's doctrine that people can remain happily out of office as long as they do not believe public officials are stealing common funds.⁷⁷ In order for citizens to feel comfortable with those in power they need to trust that their assets are well managed. Lee Kuan Yew assured this when the PAP introduced the Prevention of Corruption Act in 1960:

The most effective change we made in 1960 was to allow the courts to treat proof that an accused was living beyond his means or had property his income could not explain as corroborating evidence that the accused had accepted or obtained a bribe. With a keen nose to the ground and the power to investigate every officer and every minister, the director of the CPIB [Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau], working from the Prime Minister's Office, developed a justly formidable reputation for sniffing out those betraying the public trust.⁷⁸

The rampant corruption from the British colonialization period left Lee Kuan Yew with a distaste for corruption. The anti-corruption measures Singapore undertook were harsh, but necessary to gain public trust. The effects of the Act are somewhat displaced by the knowledge that Members of Parliament and top bureaucrats in Singapore are the highest paid in the world, specifically for the purposes of reducing corruption. However, also apparent is Lee's disregard for fellow political elite in order to gain full public trust. Aristotle notes that "the greatest concern in every form of government is for both the laws and the rest of its management to be so arranged that

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* 1308b30.

⁷⁸ Yew Kuan Lee, *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story 1965-2000*, 185.

there can be no profit made from the offices.”⁷⁹ Citizens in unequal, deviant regimes are upset when they witness public officials who gain what do not deserve. A disgruntled citizenry is likely to revolt against the leader if the corruption persists. Consequently, Lee has succeeded in limiting revolts against the government. In 2010, Singapore was ranked first along with Denmark for the least corrupt government in the world although Singapore has since dropped to 7th in 2014.⁸⁰ Lee has similarly performed well in regards to moderation.

The long lasting tyrant, according to Aristotle, moderates his behavior. In an aristocratic sense, the PAP are especially virtuous at moderating their behavior and the behavior of public officials. Aristotle is critical of tyrants during his time period because they continually overindulged in bodily pleasures,⁸¹ drunkenness,⁸² and insolence.⁸³ The extreme extent in which this occurs is far from the moderation that Aristotle advocates. In modernity such behavior is more characteristic of Sultanistic leaders rather than tyrants in general. In Singapore, Michael Palmer, a PAP Member of Parliament resigned after admitting he had an extra-marital affair. In regards to the event, PM Lee Hsien Loong stating that "it is necessary that all PAP MPs and advisers to grass-roots organizations uphold the highest standards of personal conduct."⁸⁴

One key aspect of Aristotle’s regime preservation is having the continual pressure of external threats. Singapore is known for what observers’ term ‘survival rhetoric.’ Aristotle’s concept works under the principle that inspiring fear regarding an external threat will make

⁷⁹ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1308b30.

⁸⁰ Jon S. T. Quah, *Curbing Corruption in Asian Countries: An Impossible Dream?* (Bingley, UK: Emerald Group, 2011), pg. 199; Transparency International, "Corruption Perceptions Index 2014: Results," 2015, <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results>.

⁸¹ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1314b20.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 1314b30.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 1314b20.

⁸⁴ Wong, Chun Hang. "Singapore Politician Quits Over Affair." *Wall Street Journal Online* (New York), December 12, 2012.

subjects feel like they require their government for survival. Aristotle relays the concept beautifully when he states that “governments are preserved not only by having the things that would destroy them far off, but sometimes also having them close. For when people are in fear they cling to the government more closely.”⁸⁵ Singapore underwent tangible external and internal threats from the 1950’s to the 1970’s from Malaya Communist Party insurgency, Indonesian confrontation, and increasing racial tension.⁸⁶ The PAP used these and newer variations of them to justify “the imprisonment of dissidents.”⁸⁷ The imprisonment of political opposition through the Internal Security Act makes it easy for the PAP to retain power. At the same time, justifying imprisonment with external threats takes the blame off of the PAP. Yet, most of the rhetoric in the early days of Singapore came from city-state survival and economics.

Just as electoral autocracies crumble with the excessive use of violence, Aristotle proclaims that tyrants lose their authority with the similar use of brutality. In electoral autocracies violence is not a typical means of persuasion due to its tendency to bring regime instability. Likewise, Aristotle warns that tyrants who take on corporal punishment risk purposeful destruction.⁸⁸ As a result, leaders in this contemporary regime type need to find a more covert way of persuading the masses. Singapore’s regime appears unpersuasive on the outside. Even so, the entire reason people believe that Singapore encompasses noble advantage is a result of the use of economic survival rhetoric as a non-violent repressive tool. Just as Aristotle suggests, “those who are concerned for the government ought to foster sources of fear, so that people will guard the government and not overturn it... they ought to make what is far off

⁸⁵ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1308a20.

⁸⁶ Stephen McCarthy, *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism* (London: Routledge, 2006), pg. 69.

⁸⁷ *Ibid*, 70.

⁸⁸ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1315a10.

close.”⁸⁹ The most effective rhetoric came from the PAP in the form of a crisis of economic development required to ensure the city-state’s survival.⁹⁰ Lee Kuan Yew proclaimed that Singapore required development to survive on its own. Consequently, he invested large sums of money in the rapid expansion of state housing which, in turn, Singaporeans perceived as necessary. Although beneficial for the citizens, the public housing system also diluted “the electoral impact of the political opposition.”⁹¹ The vulnerable city-state rhetoric Lee Kuan Yew employed helped to justify the overbearing state. Additionally, such justification permitted the PAP to peacefully force Singaporeans to vote for them by withholding or endowing housing upgrades as the decades progressed.⁹² Indeed, Magaloni and Kricheli note that most modern electoral autocracies create a ‘punishment regime’ where governments give rents to loyal subjects who depend on the government for sustenance. Such subjects, in turn, give support to the governing party.⁹³

Singapore fulfils one of Aristotle’s two major qualifications for education in a kingly regime which help to preserve its deviant nature. Above all, Aristotle believes liberal education teaches citizens to live the life of leisure in the best regime.⁹⁴ However, Aristotle also suggests that education is necessary in all regimes to safeguard the character of the regime and lead to a better government.⁹⁵ In keeping with this advice Clive Dimmock and Chen Yong Tan argue that

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, 1308a20.

⁹⁰ Loh Kah Seng, "WITHIN THE SINGAPORE STORY: The Use and Narrative of History in Singapore," *Crossroads: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 12, no. 2 (January 01, 1998): pg. 3, JSTOR.

⁹¹ Garry Rodan, "Singapore "exceptionalism"? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation," pg.236.

⁹² Kenneth Paul Tan, "The People's Action Party and Political Liberalization in Singapore," 118.

⁹³ Beatriz Magaloni and Ruth Kricheli, "Political Order and One-Party Rule," *Annual Review of Political Science* 13, no. 1 (January 26, 2010): pg. 128.

⁹⁴ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1338a10.

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, 1337a10.

“Singapore society as a whole places enormous importance on the value of education,”⁹⁶ although Singaporean’s education is technical, not liberal. The instruction of children in Singapore is crucial for the PAP because such social engineering allows them to shape children towards a life focused on wealth rather than enlightenment and creativity. In keeping with similar themes of the PAP, the authors also state that “education policy is driven largely by economic instrumentalism – efficiency and effectiveness – rather than by political ideology or doctrine.”⁹⁷ Molding children towards ‘efficiency and effectiveness’ also means preparing children for a life of meritocracy if they are capable enough to enter Singapore’s political scene. In another way, children are also learning to act as future citizens that are passive to PAP policy. The agreement of the opposition with many of the PAP’s values mentioned earlier illuminates just how effective education is in preserving the power of the PAP.

Conclusion

For 45 years Lee Kuan Yew and the PAP have skillfully mixed kingly qualities into their deviant regime. As a result of such a successful blending the PAP continue to retain power in Singapore. Singapore entertains kingly and aristocratic qualities that make it appear to have the common good at heart. Lee Kuan Yew is a loyal politician, the PAP is not corrupt or immodest, all citizens undergo a highly regarded education, and an absence of violence and an enviable quality of life continue to persist. Such factors are some of the reasons that Singapore appears to encompass the common advantage. Nevertheless, the aforementioned factors are simply tactful attempts to preserve a deviant government. The PAP cannot be a kingly regime as long as its

⁹⁶ Clive Dimmock and Cheng Yong Tan, "Educational Leadership in Singapore Educational Leadership in Singapore: Tight Coupling, Sustainability, Scalability, and Succession," *Journal of Educational Administration* 5, no. 3 (2013): pg. 321.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

advantage remains the consolidation of power. As this chapter illuminates, most of the positive consequences of the PAP are just happy by-products of government that desires power over the common advantage.

Understanding that Singapore has ‘two ends’ is crucial for evaluating Lee Kuan Yew’s rhetoric. Political education and survival rhetoric are important tactics for shaping citizens. Singaporeans typically pursue wealth over political freedom precisely because of their political socialization. The extent to which Lee Kuan Yew’s rhetoric makes Singapore citizens receptive to economic advantage and ultimately PAP power is the purpose of the next chapter.

Chapter Three

Aristotle's Framework for Rhetoric: The Singapore Equation

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is primarily a guide for educating citizens. In simple terms, *Rhetoric* makes clear a plan to 'form' the audience towards accepting a particular action. That action, in turn, brings the entire regime closer to its end goal or ultimate state. Aristotle makes, therefore, a recipe for civic education in the form of speech. The framework of *Rhetoric* is important because speech employed according to its rules creates a particular state of affairs in the regime. More specifically, the citizens' political socialization will concern the end goal or the regime and their actions will reflect the regimes 'advantage.' Aristotle's understanding of rhetoric explains why the citizens of Singapore are economically driven, politically apathetic politicians who ultimately endorse policies that limit their own freedoms. In other words, Singapore's advantage is political domination through economic wealth. The People's Action Party (PAP) of Singapore are brilliant rhetoricians. As a whole, the party use rhetoric to translate the nation's greatest threats – multiracialism, city-state survival, and economic success – into national values. Aristotle's rhetorical framework is evident in the success of the PAP. Two millennia later, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is still an integral political tool.

Ideal Political Rhetoric

Rhetoric works under the same premises regardless of whether the politician who employs it lives today or two millennia ago. Today, rhetoric is employed as a nonviolent means of political consent. Modern political theorist John Locke argues that enlightened men give legitimacy to a regime by implicitly consenting to the political arrangements of governments. In the modern fashion, consent benefits citizens by giving authority to rulers to create laws that, in theory, expand their freedoms.¹ The crucial factor in the modern sense is that consent given by enlightened individuals is free of coercion. For this reason, rhetoric is integral in modern democracies. Rhetoric is a persuasive – but not coercive – tool that results in consent for specific political actions. Two millennia ago, Aristotle similarly understood rhetoric as a diplomatic means of persuasion. In noble regimes, authorities employ rhetoric to gather consent from politically educated citizens. Aristotle similarly views rhetoric as a nonviolent tool of consent which results in the persuasion of audiences towards a particular course of action. A lesser known fact about Aristotle is that, in his noble regime, rhetoric also leads to political freedoms. Rhetoric, in the Aristotelian sense, is meant to educate citizens towards their specific regime type. The best regime “acts nobly”² and will employ rhetoric so that citizens give consent to laws which result in leisure, freedom, and happiness. In this way, the best example of Aristotle’s ideal rhetorical speech is the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle illustrates that becoming a good human being necessarily requires the knowledge of what makes good characteristics flourish. In its essence, the *Nicomachean Ethics* is a treatise on developing good human beings. The treatise provides advice on how people can become good human beings and attain a life of leisure through liberal

¹ Shannon Hoff, "Locke and the Nature of Political Authority," *The Review of Politics* 77, no. 1 (January 01, 2015): pg. 2.

² Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. Joe Sachs, (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2012): 1324b30.

education. According to Aristotle, the greatest good is the end to which all other goods are means.³ No other good but happiness is pursued for its own sake; therefore, one who lives excellently lives for the sake of happiness.⁴ Happiness is attained through an active life of leisure which is “the end of politics” for Aristotle.⁵ The best political regime is the noble regime and it strives to teach citizens the same lessons that the *Nicomachean Ethics* teaches individuals. Although it regards life beyond politics, the *Nicomachean Ethics* teachings are essential for a life of leisure within politics.

The *Nicomachean Ethics* is also the perfect political speech. A correct understanding of rhetoric relies on the notion that rhetoric, itself, is not an end, but a means to an end. To put it differently, deliberative rhetoric is meant to convince an assembly to undertake a particular action. The action could include rejecting a policy proposal or accepting a budget. Regardless, the action helps the government attain the end goal or ‘advantage’ of their regime such as wealth, happiness, or power. Similarly, Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* recommends a particular course of action for individuals, and in a narrower sense, citizens’ desiring to attain a noble regime. At the end of the treatise, Aristotle summarizes his recommendations for virtue and friendship, among other things, while reminding the reader that such qualities are courses of action to “becoming good.”⁶ Aristotle is the rhetorician persuading the audience to take specific actions to attain a good life. Indeed, Aristotle’s audience in the *Nicomachean Ethics* is comprised of individuals who are similar to the audience of the deliberative rhetorician: young scholars with

³ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Joe Sachs (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2002), 1097b.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1097b20.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1099b30.

⁶ Rachana Kamtekar, "The Relationship between Aristotle's Ethical and Political Discourses (NEx9)," in *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. Ronald M. Polansky (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pg. 370; Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1179b.

the capability to engage in politics.⁷ The first two chapters of this thesis illustrated that the notion of educating citizens to the best regime is an integral aspect of rhetoric. Thomas Smith notes that Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* presents a "pedagogical strategy that makes explicit and develops his audience's attraction to a life of action."⁸ A life of action, in this case, is a political life devoted to honourable and virtuous deeds.⁹ *Nicomachean Ethics* is a rhetorical attempt to educate individuals towards the good life. Aristotle employs not only a rhetorical framework, but also features of rhetorical style [*lexeōs aretē*] in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Carlo Natali argues that the style of the *Nicomachean Ethics* is meant to capture audience appeal¹⁰ through emotions like kindness and confidence for effective persuasion.¹¹ Finally, Aristotle's work on ethics employs similar argumentation [*logos*] to the *Rhetoric* which is detailed further on near the end of the chapter.

The difference between *Nicomachean Ethics* and the rhetoric of the People's Action Party (PAP) of Singapore derives primarily from the advantage of each regime. If Aristotle were advocating the *Nicomachean Ethics* as a political regime the book would attempt to educate citizens toward a life of happiness. Happiness, in the noble regime, comes from citizens with excellent character and intellect who do not desire material goods in excess.¹² The rhetoric of the *Nicomachean Ethics* educates citizens regarding particular actions that will create excellent character, intellect, and moderation. The creation of excellent citizens, in turn, brings happiness to the regime. Conversely, the end goal of the PAP is not the happiness of Aristotle's noble

⁷ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1095a.

⁸ Thomas W. Smith, "The Audience of the *Nicomachean Ethics*," *The Journal of Politics* 62, no. 01 (2000): pg. 167.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 168.

¹⁰ Carlo Natali, "Rhetorical and Scientific Aspects of the "*Nicomachean Ethics*"'" *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* 52, no. 4 (2007): pg. 369.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 370.

¹² Aristotle, *Politics*, 1323b.

regime, but the creation and maintenance of economic success like one would find in an oligarchy. As outlined in Chapter Two, Singapore's PAP primarily concerns itself with attaining political stability by creating wealthy citizens. In Aristotle's terms, the rhetoric of the PAP educates citizens towards a life of economic excess. Rhetoric, as argued in the first chapter, ultimately shapes citizens towards the advantageous end [*telos*] of their regime. If Aristotle's classic framework of rhetoric is applicable in modernity, then the *Rhetoric* should explain why the PAP desires wealth like oligarchs and power like a tyrant. In other words, Aristotle's logic of rhetoric hinges on the rhetorician forming the audience towards a particular judgement. That judgement, in turn, aligns the audience with the goal of the regime. Subsequently, citizens are formed with an eye to the regime.¹³ The rhetoric in Singapore corresponds with the PAP's goal of economic success. The citizens are likewise economically driven pragmatic administrators.

The Context of Rhetoric in Singapore

The following section illustrates the context surrounding the PAP's rhetoric. Rhetoric is a chronological process. In other words, the effect of multiple speeches on the nature of citizens in a regime is apparent only after the use of rhetoric. Correspondingly, the speeches presented in this analysis come from the first fifteen years of Singapore's regime: 1965 – 1980. This period precedes the development of Asian Values and Confucian Ethics nationally mandated in schools in 1982.¹⁴ Therefore, this analysis excludes the PAP's Asian Values rhetoric prominent after 1982. The first sections begins with some general comments on the nature of rhetoric in

¹³ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, in *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, trans. George A. Kennedy, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007): 1366a6.

¹⁴ Stephen McCarthy, *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism* (London: Routledge, 2006), pg. 79.

Singapore before moving on to outline the framework of rhetoric in Singapore vis-à-vis Aristotle.

Modern consent, as described by Locke, from political elites in Singapore rests on logic rather than violence. Shortly after its expulsion from Malaysia, Singapore was in a semi-chaotic state. As outlined in Chapter Two, the PAP inherited a city-state under internal, external, and economic threat. Political consent was necessary immediately to enact policies to increase the quality of life in Singapore. In the words of Lee Kuan Yew, the first Prime Minister of Singapore, “my job was to get the place going and get everybody a decent life and a decent education... I had the consent and support of the population. If they opposed me and they did not cooperate, it wouldn’t have worked.”¹⁵ The consent of political elites in Singapore was crucial to Lee Kuan Yew for not only policy, but also legitimacy. Persuasion for majority support, according to Felicitas Becker, is necessary whenever a government’s legitimation is based on the appearance of amiable competition and election.¹⁶ In Lee’s words, genuine support is best collected from those with the free ability to decide for themselves whether or not to support an action. Otherwise, individuals cannot be trusted to withhold from creating their own faction or even staging an uprising. The real threat of violence in some electoral autocracies is enough to provoke a serious revolt.¹⁷ Submission, then, requires the tactical use of persuasion. In this way, Kenneth Paul Tan notes that the use of repressive services like the police to force legislation was not a viable option for the People’s Action Party. The author states that “As an authoritarian leader, [Lee Kuan Yew] still needed to persuade his people to give their consent for his

¹⁵ "Lee Kuan Yew - Interview with Charlie Rose 2009," Lee Kuan Yew: Speeches Interviews Articles, accessed February 25, 2015, <http://www.lee-kuan-yew.com/lee-kuan-yew-charlie-rose.html>.

¹⁶ Felicitas Becker, "Remembering Nyerere: Political Rhetoric and Dissent in Contemporary Tanzania," *African Affairs* 112 (March 13, 2013): pg. 240.

¹⁷ Andreas Schedler, *The Politics of Uncertainty: Sustaining and Subverting Electoral Authoritarianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pg. 43.

decisions.”¹⁸ In Singapore consent was maintained primarily through the use of rhetoric as the state only used physically coercive practices on a few occasions. Furthermore, rhetoric was employed not only to gain consent but also, and more importantly, as a means of shaping citizens into pragmatic individuals that do not think liberally.

One reason rhetoric was so successful in building a nation of like-minded citizens was that Singapore’s policy direction had no foundation in rigid ideology. Consequently, the PAP had no ‘identity’ crisis of accountability when political action failed. The continued support for the PAP despite trial and error was due, in part, to the rhetoric of pragmatism. Political parties founded on divisive beliefs struggle to justify failures on part of strict ideology. However, when the core belief system of a party is like Aristotle’s oligarchy to “do what works” the party can skirt around explanations.¹⁹ The *New York Times* provides a good summary quote from Lee Kuan Yew:

We are pragmatists. We don’t stick to any ideology. Does it work? Let’s try it and if it does work, fine, let’s continue. If it doesn’t work, toss it out, try another one. We are not enamored with any ideology. Let the historians and the Ph.D. students work out their doctrines. I’m not interested in theories per se.²⁰

Of course, Lee Kuan yew held his own beliefs. Yet without ideology the PAP can focus on debating the most pressing physical issues. Aristotle argues that deliberative assemblymen do not

¹⁸ Kenneth Paul Tan, "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 37, no. 3 (2007): pg. 297.

¹⁹ Kenneth Paul Tan, "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 1 (2012): pg. 73.

²⁰ L. Apcar, W. Arnold, and S. Mydans, "Excerpts from an Interview with Lee Kuan Yew," *The New York Times*, August 27, 2007, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/29/world/asia/29iht-lee-excerpts.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.

waste time arguing about accomplishing impossible things.²¹ Rhetoricians' have goals that correspond with their regimes, but they deliberate about the small steps required to accomplish them, not about grand beliefs regarding human nature. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle works on the assumption of a noble regime where the highest common good in theory is put into practice. Singapore follows Aristotle's line of thought in a skewed sense. The PAP do not discuss 'doctrines' because pragmatism *is* its ideology.²² Moreover, relying on debate about the present may easily defend against the possibility of change when ideas come along that are harmful to the dominant party's self-interest.²³ Similarly, pragmatism allows the dominant party to skirt around the failure of their ideas when they do not come to fruition. Consequently, the PAP's rhetoric is heavily dependent on present crisis, such as economic recessions, to put forth probable solutions that aid them in retaining power.

The People's Action Party translated Singapore's three most significant post-independence crisis issues into national values. Consequently, the rhetorical analysis below aligns with the separate issues of *multiracialism*, *city-state survival*, and *economic success*. After independence Singapore was in a state of crisis due to unresolved racial tension, external threats, and poverty. Over time, however, the PAP's survival rhetoric surrounding multiracialism, "survivalism," and economic aptitude came to define Singapore's national values.²⁴ Keeping in line with Singapore's major rhetoric, the following section of this essay will evaluate each national theme, separately, in the form of Aristotle's three modes of persuasion. Although the

²¹ Christian Kock, "Aristotle on Deliberation," in *Let's Talk Politics: New Essays on Deliberative Rhetoric*, ed. Hilde Van Belle, Kris Rutton, Paul Gillaertes, Dorien Van De Mieroop, and Baldwin Van Gorp (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2014), pg. 14.

²² Kenneth Paul Tan, "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore," 74.

²³ *Ibid.* 75.

²⁴ Kenneth Paul Tan, "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation," 293.

PAP employ character [*ēthos*], argumentation [*logos*], and style [*pathos*] in all of their principals of rhetorical speech, this analysis will only use one of them in each discussion. For example, multiracial rhetoric is evaluated with *ēthos* because both Lee Kuan Yew and the PAP elite went through extensive trouble to learn the languages of each culture in Singapore. Second, language and psychology are known, powerful agents when they work in accordance with one another. Therefore, *pathos* is analyzed in the form of fear because the PAP are known for their city-state survival rhetoric. Finally, the last section will illustrate how the PAP build on *logos* to extend an economic driven mentality through civic education. In the end we will see that Aristotle's rhetoric *does* help us understand how a rhetorician can educate citizens to the advantage of the regime.

Multiracialism and Ēthos

Singapore is a multiracial society. As of September 2014, the ethnic composition of Singapore is 74% Chinese, 13% Malay, 9.1% Indian and 3.3% all other ethnicities,²⁵ with little variation since 1965. CMIO, in Singapore, is nomenclature for four distinct groups: Chinese, Malay, Indian and Other. According to Michael Barr and Zlatko Skrbiš, when it comes to the terminology of ethnicity, “race”, ‘racial harmony’ and ‘multiracialism,’ rather than ‘ethnicity’, ‘ethnic harmony’ and ‘multiculturalism’... preoccupy the Singapore government.”²⁶

Accordingly, this essay will use similar terms. In Singapore, the term ‘race’ includes distinct language, culture, and religion in such a way that makes the CIMO groups independent from one

²⁵ Department Of Statistics, Ministry Of Trade & Industry, Republic Of Singapore, "Population Trends 2014," September 2014, pg. 5, http://www.singstat.gov.sg/docs/default-source/default-document-library/publications/publications_and_papers/population_and_population_structure/population2014.pdf.

²⁶ Michael D. Barr and Zlatko Skrbiš, *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, Ethnicity and the Nation-building Project* (Copenhagen: NIAS, 2008), pg. 50.

another.²⁷ Multiracial rhetoric helps with the understanding of how the PAP overcome audience diversity. Moreover, multiracial rhetoric establishes excellent character in the PAP through the good will [*eunoia*], virtue [*aretē*], and practical wisdom [*phronēsis*]²⁸ that Aristotle requires for persuasion.²⁹

Aristotle illuminates an inherent problem associated with rhetoric: the diversity of the audience. Lee Kuan Yew solved the diversity problem that Aristotle presents with multilingual speeches. Aristotle stresses that the means of persuasion in speech are not only confined to argument, but also constrained by the character of the rhetorician.³⁰ The character of the rhetorician that appears most appealing to citizens is in accordance with the citizens' own character. For instance, individuals in close relationships will surround themselves with friends who have similar dispositions. Similarly, audiences prefer rhetoricians of the same character – keeping in mind the constraint that the character of the audience corresponds with the character of the regime.³¹ Lee Kuan Yew was keenly aware of the diversity in Singapore's audiences.

Early in his career he recognized that:

In a multiracial society, we had one inescapable problem. Some of our candidates might be natural open-air orators, but no one could make a speech at an election rally and move the whole audience to laugh, or sigh, or cry or be angry together. Whatever language he used and however good he was, only one

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 51.

²⁸ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1378a5.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1378a6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1366a6.

³¹ *Ibid.*

section of the crowd could understand him at any one time, so he had to reach the others through gestures, facial expression, and tone of voice.³²

Singapore's diverse ethnic composition translated into linguistic division as well. Appealing to the crowd subsequently meant using other forms of expression by the many PAP members. In consideration of Aristotle's argument that "The first principle [*arkhē*] of *lexis* is to speak [good] Greek,"³³ multilingualism is increasingly important in a diverse society. Lee Kuan Yew understood that to gain respect as a politician he first had to be resourceful enough to 'speak good Greek.' Whereupon, he began learning the languages of the CMIO groups in Singapore even before he entered politics. Lee Kuan Yew's native language is English, but during the Japanese occupation in January of 1942 Lee began learning Mandarin and in May of 1942 took up Japanese as well. When he began his political career with the PAP in 1954, Lee also acquired Bazaar Malay, a creole language, as a result of his desire to appeal to all his audiences.³⁴ Incidentally, multilingualism in multiracialism is also a means of establishing good will.

Lee Kuan Yew employed his previous experience subverting linguistic diversity as a part of Malaysia to successfully persuade later legislatures of his good will in Singapore. In 1964, when the United Malays National Organization (UNMO) controlled Malaysia legislature, Singapore only had one elected seat. However, UNMO members', intent on maintaining power in Malaysian citizens and in Kuala Lumpur, still saw Singapore as a threat. As an outsider in Malaysia, Lee needed to appeal to the predominantly Malay speaking assembly. In Aristotelian terms, Lee needed to show he was virtuous³⁵ to strangers in a way that would make them "share

³² Kuan Yew Lee, *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew, Abridged Edition* (Singapore: Prentice-Hall, 1998), pg. 153.

³³ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1407a1.

³⁴ Kuan Yew Lee, *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew, Abridged Edition*, 94.

³⁵ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1167a20.

their wishes”³⁶ with him. Three months before Singapore’s expulsion from Malaysia, Lee Kuan Yew gave a speech to parliament in response to Malay press attacks calling Lee an enemy of the state.³⁷ Lee Kuan Yew begins his speech in English. When he lays claim that he accepts Malay as the national language he gives proof by citing the constitution that Singapore agreed to in Malay. He then *continues* in Malay reiterating, “We stand by this Constitution. We intend in accordance with the oaths we have taken to preserve, to protect and defend it.”³⁸ This quote is important because through the enthymeme – a logical device like a syllogism with one part missing – Lee Kuan Yew is also showing his character:

Major Premise: If we support the Constitution

Minor Premise: And if Malay language is supported in the constitution

(Inferred) Conclusion: Then we support the Malay language

Lee does not stop reading in Malay when the constitution portion ends, instead he continues reading in Malay to illustrate the genuine nature of his character *and* his argument. Lee Kuan Yew knew Aristotle’s principle that a rhetorician expressing good will must appear genuine to the audience.³⁹ Accordingly, in his early days in politics Lee would relay most of his speeches in multiple languages. In his words, “I would be dripping in sweat by the time I had spoken in two, maybe three languages.”⁴⁰ Multilingualism was a conscious attempt to show his

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 1167a.

³⁷ Singapore, Ministry of Culture, National Archives of Singapore, *Speech by Singapore's Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, During the Debate in the Federal Parliament on 27th May, 1965, on the Motion of Thanks to the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong for His Speech to the Throne* (Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1965), pg. 2.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

³⁹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1167a.

⁴⁰ Kuan Yew Lee, *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew, Abridged Edition*, 155.

own good will. Speaking in all languages appeals to the diversity of Singaporeans in addition to establishing the virtuous character of the rhetorician.

All leaders of the PAP make excellent use of virtue in their character through their choice of language [*lexis*]. Aristotle argues that the truly virtuous person is not in excess in any of his or her qualities. Like most of Aristotle's theories, virtue lies within the 'golden mean,' in other words, the mean between two extremes. For example, courage is in excess when an individual is rash and in deficiency when an individual is a coward.⁴¹ The leaders of the PAP are similarly aware that the way they present their speech must not be too colloquial. If a speech is too informal the leaders could very well dissuade the immigrant audiences who tend to be respectful of authority.⁴² If, on the other hand, leaders are too authoritative, then the audience cannot connect with the rhetorician on a personal level. For this reason, the PAP have employed strategic language with the speech to create rhetoric "resonant with metaphors, laced with local slang and "wise sayings" from the ethnic communities quoted in the original languages, and peppered with vivid real-life examples sometimes very personal to the Prime Minister."⁴³ At the same time the PAP mediates their use of colloquialisms with inflated language to ensure what their ministers' say is acceptably intellectual.⁴⁴ In this way, the PAP leaders bring together virtue of character through multiracial appeal. In combination with the final aspect of *ēthos*, practical wisdom [*phronēsis*], rhetoric shapes multiracial policy in Singapore.

Practical wisdom [*phronēsis*], the final integral piece of *ēthos*, is illustrated in the PAP's persuasion of multiracial policy. Immediately after independence, racial riots and inter-ethnic

⁴¹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1109a.

⁴² Kenneth Paul Tan, "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation," 298.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 297.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 298.

tension created instability in the state. At the time, “racial riots constitute[d] the most serious threat to Singapore survival because such riots can undermine the multiracial basis of Singaporean society and also tear the social fabric apart.”⁴⁵ The PAP had no choice but to craft a policy that would both stop the violence and create the harmony necessary for prosperity.⁴⁶ Lee Kuan Yew was a resourceful, practically wise rhetorician. By recognizing the historical complexities of race in Singapore, Lee rationalized the necessity for harsh measures through speech in Parliament:

It is because I am fortified by this that my colleagues and I were determined, as from the moment of separation, that this lesson will never be forgotten. So it is that into the constitution of the Republic of Singapore will be [*sic*] built-in safeguards insofar as the human mind can devise means whereby the conglomeration of numbers, of likeness – as a result of affinities of race or language or culture – shall never work to the detriment of those – who, by the accident of history, find themselves in minority groups in Singapore.⁴⁷

Practical wisdom is without formula. Instead rhetoricians must illustrate their ability to respond to situations using their own judgement. Lee was wise in recognizing the minority position of some groups in a multiracial society. In the above quote, Lee plays on multiracialism to illustrate both knowledge and character. Subsequently, Lee introduced legislation that proposed to protect minorities and ultimately decrease the probability of racial frustration.

⁴⁵ Jon S. T. Quah, *Public Administration Singapore-style* (Bingley: Emerald, 2010), pg 214.

⁴⁶ Selina Lim et al., "Reconfiguring the Singapore Identity Space: Beyond Racial Harmony and Survivalism," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 43 (November 2014): pg. 16.

⁴⁷ Singapore, Ministry of Culture, National Archives of Singapore, *Speech Made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, When He Moved the Motion of Thanks to the Yang Di-Pertuan Negara, for His Policy Speech on the Opening of Parliament on the 14th December 1965* (Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1965), pg. 41.

Incidentally, Lee Kuan Yew was not the only PAP politician to comment on their multiracial policies.

The PAP play on their ‘reasonableness’ to show good character and ultimately receive support for policy. In 1966, the Bilingual Education Policy made it mandatory for children to learn English in addition to their ‘mother tongue language.’ The policy was best thought at the time to erase differences within different racial groups to facilitate distinctions between the four CMIO.⁴⁸ Division allows Singaporeans to practice their culture and respect the culture of others, for example, by speaking English in public and their mother tongue in private. Consequently, Singaporean multiracialism differs from that in Canada where Singapore accords groups fixed identities without distinguishing between minority and majority groups.⁴⁹ Aristotle notes that “All sorts of things will lead the audience to receptivity if the speaker wants, including his seeming to be a reasonable person.”⁵⁰ The PAP marketed the Bilingual Education Policy as a necessity. S. Rajaratnman, a cabinet minister and founding member of the PAP, illustrates his ‘reasonableness’ in a brief speech: “In the kind of Singapore we are creating there are no majorities and minorities but simply good men and bad men with the good men whatever their race, language and religion invariably triumphing over the bad men whatever their race, language and religion.”⁵¹ Minister Rajaratnman is like every other reasonable person. He wants good to triumph over bad. Yet, the policy itself ignores “the inherent inequalities embedded in

⁴⁸ Norman Vasu, "(En)countering Terrorism: Multiculturalism and Terrorism," *Asian Ethnicity* 9, no. 1 (June 6, 2008): pg. 24.

⁴⁹ Michael D. Barr and Zlatko Skrbiš, *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, Ethnicity and the Nation-building Project*, 51.

⁵⁰ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1415a7.

⁵¹ Singapore, Ministry of Culture, National Archives of Singapore, *Speech by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. S. Rajaratnam, at the Dinner and Dance of the Maghain Aboth Sybagogue at Hyatt Hotel on Saturday, April 8, 1978 at 8.30 P.M.* (Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1978), pg. 4.

society.”⁵² The inequalities still apparent in Singapore show that policy outcomes may not correspond with the PAP’s reasonable rhetoric.

City-State Survival and Pathos

Singapore is a city-state without much land or resources. Moreover, a limited labour pool means that Singapore is particularly vulnerable to economic turmoil.⁵³ When it comes to retaining labour at the meritocratic level, the PAP primarily draw from international talent. After independence, the PAP dealt with the ongoing effects of the Indonesian-Malaysian confrontation which included combat around the Malaysian states of Sabah and Sarawak. However, the PAP were also acutely aware of the major powers’ (US, Russia, and China) interest in the population and resources of Southeast Asia.⁵⁴ The above set the context for the PAP’s city-state rhetoric.

Rhetoricians employ psychological manipulation to clarify context – not to deceive. The rhetorician must first make citizens feel his or her emotion whether angry, sad, or frustrated, for example. Once the audience is in a receptive state of mind, the rhetorician can use the above emotions to paint a picture of the true state of affairs. Correspondingly, Aristotle notes that “The emotions [*pathē*] are those things through which, by undergoing change, people come to differ in their judgements.”⁵⁵ The action of imparting a visualization of a specific event helps the rhetorician to persuade an audience to make a particular judgement. Likewise, the language [*lexis*] Lee Kuan Yew employed was tactical. To make an audience feel what he feels, Lee Kuan Yew must first understand the composition of the audience. With his practical wisdom, Lee

⁵² Michael D. Barr and Zlatko Skrbiš, *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, Ethnicity and the Nation-building Project*, 51.

⁵³ Phua Mei Pin, "Singapore's Challenges as a City State," *Singapore's Challenges as a City State*, June 16, 2012, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/06/16/singapores-challenges-a-city-state.html>.

⁵⁴ Ang Cheng Guan, *Lee Kuan Yew's Strategic Thought* (London: Routledge, 2013), pg. 22.

⁵⁵ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1378a8.

knew that the majority of Singaporeans have immigrant roots and that these immigrants' respect derives from scholarly aptitude.⁵⁶ Aristotle notes that "The *lexis* [language] will be appropriate if it expresses emotion and character and is proportional to the subject matter."⁵⁷ Lee expressed his emotion in accordance with an authority figure with extensive educational success. By employing "bombastic diction"⁵⁸ Yew entered the minds of the audience as someone with urgent authority who had to do what was best for Singapore in order to solve critical problems. Once his emotions lined up with those of the audience, Lee further employed language to paint a picture of the way things are were or, in Aristotle's words, "bringing-before-the-eyes [*pro ommatōn poiein*]." Rhetoricians inspire imagination, particularly, to make the audience visualize the future in the present and create context.

Lee Kuan Yew created a context that generated fear in the National Assembly in order to inspire citizens to craft foreign policy with an eye towards Southeast Asian cooperation. Aristotle defines fear as the "pain and agitation derived from the imagination of a future destructive or painful evil."⁵⁹ In other words, the psychology behind fear is that fear plays on individuals' future uncertainties by making them feel uncomfortable in the present. Lee Kuan Yew similarly highlighted the nature of the fragility of Singapore to make citizens feel accordingly uncomfortable. Singapore is disadvantaged due to its size. Correspondingly, the PAP keep the threat of larger nations 'near' in the minds of citizens just as Aristotle explains in *Politics* that fear makes citizens "cling to the government more closely."⁶⁰ For example:

⁵⁶ Kenneth Paul Tan, "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation," 298.

⁵⁷ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1408a1-3.

⁵⁸ Kenneth Paul Tan, "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation," 298.

⁵⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1382a1.

⁶⁰ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1308a20.

For us, survival has always been hazardous. We sought to make it less so by seeking the larger framework of Malaysia, but it was not to be. We are on our own, not friendless, not helpless, but nevertheless in the centre of an extremely tumultuous arena of conflict. And our survival depends upon our capacity first, to discern where the dangers are for us as a distinct and separate community in South-East Asia; and second, our ability to convince the bigger powers interested in this region that it is in their interests to ensure our separate survival and, in the end whatever happens, to ensure that we have got enough will and capacity to see that no policies, no solutions are attempted which will destroy our right to be ourselves in this corner of South-East Asia.⁶¹

Despite denying the isolation of Singapore, Lee Kuan Yew creates an image a lonely state with no protection from the outside. Singapore is conveniently portrayed as a nation that could be eaten like “big fish eat small fish”⁶² if Singapore does not establish a larger Asian cooperation. In a way, Lee is ‘bringing-before-the-eyes’ a fear-inspired plea to attain consent from the National Assembly. As it turns out, “fear makes people inclined to deliberate, while no one deliberates about hopeless things. The result is that whenever it is better [for a speaker’s case] that they [ie. the members of the audience] experience fear, he should make them realize that they are liable to suffering.”⁶³ The PAP have a tendency to keep citizens in a habitual state of fear. Consistently, the PAP cite Indonesia and Malaysia as possible dangers.⁶⁴ As Kenneth Paul Tan notes, “the

⁶¹ Singapore, Ministry of Culture, National Archives of Singapore, *Speech Made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, When He Moved the Motion of Thanks to the Yang Di-Pertuan Negara, for His Policy Speech on the Opening of Parliament on the 14th December 1965*, 44.

⁶² Ang Cheng Guan, *Lee Kuan Yew's Strategic Thought*, 25.

⁶³ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1383a14-15.

⁶⁴ Kenneth Paul Tan, "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore," 70.

moral of the Singapore story is: whatever Singapore has been doing right, it must continue to do, or else face the possibility of losing everything.”⁶⁵ Fear inspires citizens to look for solutions to their problems. Such pragmatic rationalization allows the PAP government to play on fear to shape whatever policy they desire. Ultimately, citizens will consent to action simply as a result of the implicit consequences of not doing so.

Economics and Logos

Aristotle claims that the core substance of argumentation [*logoi*] is the *enthymeme*. Enthymemes are truncated syllogisms where one piece of the argument is missing. The missing piece of the argument is crucial because it allows the audience to come to their own conclusions as if the speech were a conversation. Learning, Aristotle, argues is one of the most pleasurable things for everyone.⁶⁶ Consequently, Minister of Finance Goh Keng Swee used an enthymeme in his speech to the committee of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce in 1969: “we in Singapore believe in hard work. We believe that enterprise should be rewarded and not penalized.”⁶⁷ The audience takes the conclusion from this enthymeme that Singapore believes enterprise is hard work. An interesting aspect of this rhetorical device is that it also contributes to the shaping of citizens towards hard working, economic individuals. As previously mentioned, the PAP’s oligarchic advantage – wealth – is paramount to Singaporean politics as, “political economy relationships are fundamental to the basis of the PAP state.”⁶⁸ Therefore, any argumentation of the PAP is on the foundation of economics for the sake of prosperity. Such argumentation differs

⁶⁵ Kenneth Paul Tan, "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation," 296.

⁶⁶ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1410b2.

⁶⁷ Singapore, Ministry of Culture, National Archives of Singapore, *Speech by the Minister for Finance, Dr. Goh Keng Swee, at the Swearing-in Ceremony of the New Committee of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce on Saturday, 15th March, 1969 at 3.00 P.M* (Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1969).

⁶⁸ William Case, "Southeast Asia's Hybrid Regimes: When Do Voters Change Them?," *Journal of East Asian Studies* 5, no. 2 (May 01, 2005): pg. 227.

from Aristotle's 'noble regime' in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. As a rhetorician, Aristotle similarly puts forth ideas that educate the citizenry regarding the goals of the noble regime. In the reversed syllogism below he chooses to illustrate that passions cannot be virtuous:

Major Premise: (If) we are not said to be of serious or trifling moral stature
as a result of our feelings

Minor Premise: (And if) we are said to be [of serious moral stature] as a
result of our virtues and vices

Conclusion: (Than) neither virtues nor vices are feelings⁶⁹

The difference between the two arguments is most notably how they shape the audience. The former quote from Minister Goh creates individuals who strive for hard work through enterprise. The latter quote from Aristotle creates individuals who obey their virtues and subdue their passions. Aristotle reminds the rhetorician that the 'end' of their regime is what "choices are based on."⁷⁰

If the end of the regime is different, than the nature of the rhetoric is different as well. Unlike the noble regime, Singapore's regime prioritizes political dominance and wealth over free leisure and contemplation. Moreover, economics is, if not subordinate, an equal priority to the retention of power for political dominance.⁷¹ Economic wealth brings with it a high quality of life. A high quality of life, in turn, results in popularity for PAP rule. The dual 'ends' are simply economics streamlining into political domination. Essentially, "the PAP government's twin goals

⁶⁹ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1105b30.

⁷⁰ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1366a5.

⁷¹ Jon S. T. Quah, *Public Administration Singapore-style*, pg. 200; Kenneth Paul Tan, "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore," 80.

are: to maintain Singapore's political stability; and to maximize its economic growth so that Singaporeans can attain the "good life."⁷² Indeed, Lee Kuan Yew admitted that everyone wants 'the good life' with 'health' and 'education.'⁷³ The PAP government did not hide its belief that the way to access health and education was through economic prosperity. The Singapore government had "very definite ideas as to what should and should not be included in the Singapore concept of the good life... [like] improvement in housing, urban amenities, education, and health."⁷⁴ John Quah notes that it was not until 1999 that the "definition of success" was widened from the 5 C's of cash, car, condominium, credit card, and career.⁷⁵ The Singapore 21 Committee recommended that success encompass characteristics beyond education and wealth like, "character, courage, commitment, compassion and creativity."⁷⁶ The result of the PAP's rhetoric is a society obsessed with economic wealth without, however, the fundamental freedoms of the noble regime.

The PAP's rhetoric created an economically driven, but politically apathetic citizenry. In Singapore, the PAP government did not have liberal education in mind when it established national values through speech. Instead, the PAP conceptualized the 'good life' as necessity and sustenance, not contemplation through leisure. Even though rhetoric is essentially a tool of political education to form citizens in accordance with their regime, "Lee's education of the citizenry in Singapore was neither directed towards a common standard of achievement in human rights, nor the moral education by Confucian thought for the purpose of improving the

⁷² Jon S. T. Quah, *Public Administration Singapore-style*, pg. 200.

⁷³ "Lee Kuan Yew - Interview with Charlie Rose 2009," Lee Kuan Yew: Speeches Interviews Articles, accessed February 25, 2015, <http://www.lee-kuan-yew.com/lee-kuan-yew-charlie-rose.html>.

⁷⁴ Theodore Geiger and Frances M. Geiger, *The Development Progress of Hong Kong and Singapore* (Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1983), pg. 201.

⁷⁵ Jon S. T. Quah, *Public Administration Singapore-style*, pg. 202.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

regime.”⁷⁷ Instead of educating the citizenry towards freedom and self-improvement, Lee Kuan Yew’s rhetoric educated citizens to become excellent at surmounting economic turmoil. Accordingly, Singapore’s political elites have economic aptitude rather than political skill.⁷⁸ Citizens in Singapore are granted little political freedom. Moreover, the majority of Singaporeans do not desire the opportunity for political participation through freedoms like association and speech. Instead, Singaporeans value economic success. Rhetoric in regards to city-state survival and economic security creates a citizenry that trusts in the principles of economic success.⁷⁹ This trust, in turn, “creates the conditions for political obedience, acceptance of unpopular policies and political apathy, in general.”⁸⁰ Aristotle’s rhetorical framework explains why citizens not only endorse unpopular policies, but also sanction laws limiting their own political freedoms. Unlike in the noble regime, Singaporeans cannot exercise their true political capabilities. If freedom is measured by the amount of political participation, than the PAP create, through rhetoric, a state insufficient for human development. ⁸¹

Conclusion

Aristotle’s rhetoric explains why Singapore’s citizens are economically driven and politically apathetic. Rhetoric is ultimately a tool for forming audiences towards not only a particular course of action, but also a specific regime end. The PAP’s rhetoric, from

⁷⁷ Stephen McCarthy, *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism*, pg. 103.

⁷⁸ Garry Rodan, "Singapore "exceptionalism"? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation," in *Political Transitions in Dominant Party Systems: Learning to Lose*, ed. Edward Friedman and Joseph Wong, Politics in Asia (New York, New York: Routledge, 2009), pg. 238.

⁷⁹ Kenneth Paul Tan, "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore," 71.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Stephen McCarthy, *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism*, pg. 203.

multiracialism to city-state survival, was targeted at specific issues. Ultimately, however, the goal was to establish economic security in Singapore that would lead to political dominance of the PAP. The cunning use of *ēthos*, or more specifically multilingual language, in all speeches gave the rhetorician the proper character. Making Singapore's external threats a priority subsequently allowed the PAP to use *pathos* to paint a vivid picture with fear. Finally, the use of *logos* to create economically driven politicians led to the proper education of those within a regime concerned with wealth and power. On the whole, rhetoric was an essential tool for forming Singaporean audiences towards the advantage of the PAP regime and ultimately maintaining the PAP's dominance. In this way, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* gives us an understanding of the nature of Singapore citizens today.

Conclusion

Rhetoric, as a civic practice, is an instrument of political persuasion. Philosophers and academics alike have attempted to comprehend the nature of deliberative speech from its use in ancient civilizations that pre-date classical philosophy to its effect on modern nations. The discursive quality of speech makes rhetoric an integral feature of modern democracies where governments require the consent of the masses for legitimacy. Indeed, the literature on the function of rhetoric in democratic assemblies and elections is vast. In addition to academic literature, the purpose of rhetoric in closed autocracies is also explored, counter intuitively, in-depth throughout fictional novels. Yet, a noticeable lack of literature exists on the function of persuasive speech in regimes that are not democratic, but rely on the appearance of elections to govern. Contemporary political scientist terms autocratic regimes that govern on the legitimacy of unfree and/or unfair elections electoral autocracies. In these regimes, the appearance of democracy means that the governing body requires some level of political consent through deliberative communication. This thesis illustrates that persuasive speech is one, among many, integral instruments electoral autocratic governments employ to maintain power. Governments in electoral autocracies cannot hold fair elections for the opposition could win. At the same time, governments in electoral autocracies cannot force their citizens to support them because violent

coercion often leads to civilian uprising. Consequently, rhetoric as a means of consent is an integral instrument for persuasion in electoral autocracies despite the lack of literature on the topic.

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is a useful guide for explaining how rhetoric preserves governments in a variety of different regimes. A proper understanding of deliberative rhetoric means recognizing that speech is a tool for persuading politicians to take a particular action. The action, in turn, helps a governing body achieve the regime's purpose or advantageous end. In this way, rhetoric is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. An advantageous end can take the form of a peaceful, virtuous, and leisurely life for citizens in the noble regime. At the same time, an advantageous end can be the preservation of power through the excessive desire for wealth as in Singapore. Regardless, deliberative rhetoric is an integral instrument for making assemblies receptive to action that would eventually achieve whatever purpose the regime encompasses. The logical presentation of truth, or argument, is Aristotle's primary means of persuasion. Aristotle believed that people encompass the natural ability to discover truth in reason. Because people perceive truth in reason, common opinion is a form of truth. Since truth is a moral character, rhetoric is necessarily a moral art. Nevertheless, rhetoric works for both good and deviant purposes. An audience full of morally corrupt people is less likely to encompass the intellectual skill to see the truth in logical argumentation. Consequently, character and style are also necessary elements of a deliberative speech. Style uses the audience's emotion to clarify the rhetorician's argument with imaginative language. As the rhetorician paints a picture of the truth, the audience becomes amiable to his or her logic. All three means of persuasion – *ēthos*, *logos*, and *pathos* – work together to make the audience receptive to a particular judgement. That

particular judgement is aligned with the advantage of the regime. Therefore, rhetoric not only imparts receptivity in an audience, but also shapes the audience towards the goal of the regime.

Aristotle's concept of the advantageous is crucial to understanding how rhetoric functions in a specific regime. For Aristotle, regime types are intrinsically linked to his concept of the advantage. The philosopher divides his regime types by those whose advantage is the common good and those whose end is selfish. For Aristotle, the ideal regime comes together for a noble purpose or advantage which is state of leisure where citizens actively contemplate virtues and happiness. The case study of Singapore is interesting because, despite the current literature about poverty and electoral autocracy, the nation's citizens are extremely wealthy. The technical education that creates Singapore's wealth emulates that of the noble city; consequently, Singapore appears to have the common advantage of its citizens at heart. However, Singapore looks like the noble regime simply because it tactfully mixes the different qualities of Aristotle's regime typologies. Aristotle argues that realistic, practical regimes will last longer the more they mix the characteristics of different regime types. Lee Kuan Yew's kingly attributes and the PAP's noble handling of the economy give citizens a high quality of life. However, Singapore citizens, like oligarchs, are narrowly focused on economic well-being rather than contemplation for leisure. Citizens in Singapore give up some crucial liberties, like free speech, to maintain their personal wealth. In doing so, the PAP creates economically driven citizens who care more about material goods than political participation – ultimately, leading to the retention of power in the PAP. Thus at its heart, Singapore is a deviant regime like a tyranny or oligarchy. The successful political rhetoric the PAP employ is what shapes Singapore citizens to ultimately crave wealth over leisure.

Aristotle's rhetoric explains why the PAP remain in power. The PAP is a government whose legitimacy derives from its meritocratic infrastructure. Political elites in Singapore are more like economic technocrats than politicians. Moreover, the government does not hold a particular ideology; instead, the PAP claim to do 'what works.' Such pragmatic philosophy gives the party the freedom to enact the most effective politics without hindrance from ideological accountability. After independence, the PAP manipulated the regime's biggest threats into national values. Lee Kuan Yew and the PAP's multiracial rhetoric portrayed the *ēthos* necessary to overcome audience diversity. The politicians crafted an image of racially sympathetic men by acquiring all four of Singapore's major languages, using 'bombastic diction' to appear authoritative, and appearing to care about Singaporeans' well-being. With this in mind, the PAP also played on citizens' emotions to create a mind-set in the audience amiable to action. The PAP consistently made the internal, external, and economic threats of the city-state feel imminent to the audience through *pathos*. Finally, the PAP brilliantly employed *logos* using enthymemes to ultimately form economically driven citizens. By shaping audiences towards particular judgements, rhetoric ultimately shapes citizens towards the advantage of the regime.

The case of Singapore illuminates the often subtle, but immense power of language. Language is an instrument for political power that often gets overlooked. Yet, rhetoric is one reason Singapore encompasses economically driven citizens who are willing to endorse policies that limit their own freedom for the domination of the People's Action Party.

Bibliography

- Adler, Emanuel. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 3, no. 3 (1997): 319-63.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by Joe Sachs. Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2002.
- Aristotle. *Politics*. Translated by Joe Sachs. Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2012.
- Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. In Kennedy, George A. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Apcar, L., W. Arnold, and S. Mydans. "Excerpts from an Interview with Lee Kuan Yew." *The New York Times*. August 27, 2007.
http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/29/world/asia/29iht-lee-excerpts.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0.
- Barnes, Jonathan. *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Barr, Michael D. "Beyond Technocracy: The Culture of Elite Governance in Lee Hsien Loong's Singapore." *Asian Studies Review* 30, no. 1 (2006): 1-18.
- Barr, Michael D. "The Bonsai under the Banyan Tree: Democracy and Democratization in Singapore." *Democratization* 21, no. 1 (September 11, 2012): 29-48.
- Barr, Michael D., and Zlatko Skrbiš. *Constructing Singapore: Elitism, Ethnicity and the Nation-building Project*. Copenhagen: NIAS, 2008.
- Becker, Felicitas. "Remembering Nyerere: Political Rhetoric and Dissent in Contemporary Tanzania." *African Affairs* 112 (March 13, 2013): 238-61.

Bellows, Thomas J. "Meritocracy and the Singapore Political System." *Asian Journal of Political Science* 17, no. 1 (April 2009): 24-44.

Bertelsmann Stiftung. *Country Reports: Transformationsindex – Singapore 2014*. Report.

Accessed February 19, 2015. <http://www.bti-project.org/reports/country-reports/aso/sgp/index.nc>.

Birch, Sarah. *Electoral Malpractice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Brass, Daniel J., and Marlene E. Burkhardt. "Potential Power and Power Use: An Investigation of Structure and Behavior." *Academy of Management Journal* 36, no. 3 (1993): 441-70.

Case, William. *Politics in Southeast Asia: Democracy or Less*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 2002.

Case, William. "Southeast Asia's Hybrid Regimes: When Do Voters Change Them?" *Journal of East Asian Studies* 5, no. 2 (May 01, 2005): 215-37. JSTOR.

Dahl, Robert A. "What Have We Learned?" In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, 377-81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Department Of Statistics, Ministry Of Trade & Industry, Republic Of Singapore. "Population Trends 2014." September 2014. http://www.singstat.gov.sg/docs/default-source/default-document-library/publications/publications_and_papers/population_and_population_structure/population2014.pdf.

Dimmock, Clive, and Cheng Yong Tan. "Educational Leadership in Singapore Educational Leadership in Singapore: Tight Coupling, Sustainability, Scalability, and Succession." *Journal of Educational Administration* 5, no. 3 (2013): 320-40.

Edelman, Murray. "Political Language and Political Reality." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 18, no. 01 (1985): 10-19.

- Engberg-Pederson, Troels. "The Ethical Dimension of Aristotelian Rhetoric." In *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*, edited by Amélie Rorty, 116-41. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Everett, Caleb. *Linguistic Relativity: Evidence across Languages and Cognitive Domains*. Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2013.
- Fleming, David. "Becoming Rhetorical: An Education in the Topics." In *The Realms of Rhetoric: The Prospects for Rhetoric Education*, edited by Joseph Petraglia and Deepika Bahri, 93-116. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 2006.
- Garsten, Bryan. "Deliberating and Acting Together." In *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Politics*, edited by Marguerite Deslauriers and Pierre Destrée, 324-45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Garsten, Bryan. *Saving Persuasion: A Defense of Rhetoric and Judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Geiger, Theodore, and Frances M. Geiger. *The Development Progress of Hong Kong and Singapore*. Hong Kong: Macmillan, 1983.
- Gleitman, Lila, and Anna Papafragou. "New Perspectives on Language and Thought." In *The Oxford Handbook of Thinking and Reasoning*, by Keith James Holyoak and Robert G. Morrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Goodin, and Klingemann. "Political Science: The Discipline." In *A New Handbook of Political Science*, edited by Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, 3-17. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Guan, Ang Cheng. *Lee Kuan Yew's Strategic Thought*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
- Hoff, Shannon. "Locke and the Nature of Political Authority." *The Review of Politics* 77, no. 1 (January 01, 2015): 1-22.

"Index of Cognitive Skills and Educational Attainment." Index Ranking. January 2014.

<http://thelearningcurve.pearson.com/index/index-ranking>.

Kailitz, Steffen. "Classifying Political Regimes Revisited: Legitimation and Durability."

Democratization 20, no. 1 (2013): 39-60.

Kamtekar, Rachana. "The Relationship between Aristotle's Ethical and Political Discourses

(NEx9)." In *The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, edited by

Ronald M. Polansky, 370-82. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Kennedy, George A. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford

University Press, 2007.

Kock, Christian. "Aristotle on Deliberation." In *Let's Talk Politics: New Essays on Deliberative*

Rhetoric, edited by Hilde Van Belle, Kris Rutton, Paul Gillaertes, Dorien Van De

Mieroop, and Baldwin Van Gorp, 13-25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing

Company, 2014.

Krebs, Ronald R., and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson. "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The

Power of Political Rhetoric." *European Journal of International Relations* 13, no. 1

(March 01, 2007): 35-66.

Lee, Edwin. *Singapore: The Unexpected Nation*. Pasir Panjang: Institute of Southeast Asian

Studies, 2008.

"Lee Kuan Yew - Interview with Charlie Rose 2009." Lee Kuan Yew: Speeches Interviews

Articles. Accessed February 25, 2015. [http://www.lee-kuan-yew.com/lee-kuan-yew-](http://www.lee-kuan-yew.com/lee-kuan-yew-charlie-rose.html)

[charlie-rose.html](http://www.lee-kuan-yew.com/lee-kuan-yew-charlie-rose.html).

Lee, Yew Kuan. *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story 1965-2000*. Singapore: Straits

Times Press, 2000.

- Lee, Yew Kuan. *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew, Abridged Edition*. Singapore: Prentice-Hall, 1998.
- Leong, Ho Khai. "Prime Ministerial Leadership and Policy-making Style in Singapore: Lee Kuan Yew and Goh Chok Tong Compared." *Asian Journal of Political Science* 8, no. 1 (2000): 91-123.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan Way. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Lilleker, Darren G. *Political Communication and Cognition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Lim, Selina, Wai Wai Yang, Chan-Hoong Leong, and Jerrold Hong. "Reconfiguring the Singapore Identity Space: Beyond Racial Harmony and Survivalism." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 43 (November 2014): 13-21.
- Long, Joey Shi Ruey. *Safe for Decolonization: The Eisenhower Administration, Britain, and Singapore*. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2011.
- Macbeth, Danielle. "Language, Natural and Symbolic." *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- The Maddison-Project, <http://www.ggd.net/maddison/maddison-project/home.htm>, 2013 version.
- Magaloni, Beatriz, and Ruth Kricheli. "Political Order and One-Party Rule." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13, no. 1 (January 26, 2010): 123-43.
- Mara, Gerald M. "The Culture of Democracy: Aristotle's Athenaiion Politeia as Political Theory." In *Aristotle and Modern Politics: The Persistence of Political Philosophy*, edited by Aristide Tessitore, 307-41. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.

- Mauzy, Diane K., and R. S. Milne. *Singapore Politics under the People's Action Party*. Politics in Asia. London: Routledge, 2002.
- McCarthy, Stephen. *The Political Theory of Tyranny in Singapore and Burma: Aristotle and the Rhetoric of Benevolent Despotism*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- McNair, Brian. *An Introduction to Political Communication*. 5th ed. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Nagy, Stephen Robert. "Politics of Multiculturalism in East Asia: Reinterpreting Multiculturalism." *Ethnicities* 14, no. 1 (2014): 160-76.
- Natali, Carlo. "Rhetorical and Scientific Aspects of the 'Nicomachean Ethics'" *Phronesis: A Journal for Ancient Philosophy* 52, no. 4 (2007): 364-81.
doi:10.1163/156852807X229258.
- Newell, Waller R. "Superlative Virtue: The Problem of Monarchy in Aristotle's 'Politics'" *The Western Political Quarterly* 40, no. 1 (March 01, 1987): 159-78.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. "Aristotelian Social Democracy." In *Aristotle and Modern Politics: The Persistence of Political Philosophy*, edited by Aristide Tessitore, 47-104. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.
- Orwell, George. "Politics and the English Language." *Literary Cavalcade* 54, no. 5 (February 2002). 1946.
- Pin, Phua Mei. "Singapore's Challenges as a City State." Singapore's Challenges as a City State. June 16, 2012. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2012/06/16/singapores-challenges-a-city-state.html>.
- Quah, Jon S. T. *Curbing Corruption in Asian Countries: An Impossible Dream?* Bingley, UK: Emerald Group, 2011.
- Quah, Jon S. T. *Public Administration Singapore-style*. Bingley: Emerald, 2010.

- Rodan, Garry. "Singapore "exceptionalism"? Authoritarian Rule and State Transformation." In *Political Transitions in Dominant Party Systems: Learning to Lose*, edited by Edward Friedman and Joseph Wong, 231-51. Politics in Asia. New York, New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Rodan, Garry. "State-Society Relations and Political Opposition in Singapore." In *Political Oppositions in Industrialising Asia*, edited by Garry Rodan. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Rorty, Amélie. "Aristotle on the Virtues of Rhetoric." *The Review of Metaphysics* 64, no. 4 (June 01, 2011): 715-33. JSTOR.
- Sachs, Joe. "Introduction." Introduction to *Plato's Gorgias and Aristotle's Rhetoric*, by Plato and Aristotle, 1-27. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing, 2009.
- Schedler, Andreas. *The Politics of Uncertainty: Sustaining and Subverting Electoral Authoritarianism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Seng, Loh Kah. "WITHIN THE SINGAPORE STORY: The Use and Narrative of History in Singapore." *Crossroads: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 12, no. 2 (January 01, 1998): 1-21. JSTOR.
- Singapore. Ministry of Culture. National Archives of Singapore. *Speech by Singapore's Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, During the Debate in the Federal Parliament on 27th May, 1965, on the Motion of Thanks to the Yang Di-Pertuan Agong for His Speech to the Throne*. Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1965.
- Singapore. Ministry of Culture. National Archives of Singapore. *Speech by the Minister for Finance, Dr. Goh Keng Swee, at the Swearing-in Ceremony of the New Committee of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce on Saturday, 15th March, 1969 at 3.00 P.M.* Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1969.

- Singapore. Ministry of Culture. National Archives of Singapore. *Speech by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. S. Rajaratnam, at the Dinner and Dance of the Maghain Aboth Synagogue at Hyatt Hotel on Saturday, April 8, 1978 at 8.30 P.M.* Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1978.
- Singapore. Ministry of Culture. National Archives of Singapore. *Speech Made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, When He Moved the Motion of Thanks to the Yang Di-Pertuan Negara, for His Policy Speech on the Opening of Parliament on the 14th December 1965.* Singapore: National Archives of Singapore, 1965.
- Smith, Thomas W. "The Audience of the *Nicomachean Ethics*." *The Journal of Politics* 62, no. 01 (2000): 166-87. doi:10.1111/0022-3816.00008.
- Sprute, Jurgen. "The Legitimacy of Rhetoric." In *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*, by David J. Furley and Alexander Nehamas, 117-28. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Stuart, Nicolette. *Singapore Research Essay*. Report for Political Science 4310: Electoral Authoritarianism. University of Lethbridge. Lethbridge, 2014.
- Tambyah, Siok Kuan, Soo Juan Tan, and Ah Keng Kau. "The Quality of Life in Singapore." *Social Indicators Research* 92, no. 2 (June 2009): 337-76.
- Tan, Kenneth Paul. "Singapore's National Day Rally Speech: A Site of Ideological Negotiation." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 37, no. 3 (2007): 292-308.
doi:10.1080/00472330701408635.
- Tan, Kenneth Paul. "The Ideology of Pragmatism: Neo-liberal Globalisation and Political Authoritarianism in Singapore." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 42, no. 1 (February 2012): 67-92.

Tan, Kenneth Paul. "The People's Action Party and Political Liberalization in Singapore." In *Political Parties, Party Systems, and Democratization in East Asia*, edited by Liang Fook Lye and Wilhelm Hofmeister, 107-31. Hackensack, New Jersey: World Scientific Publishing, 2011.

Transparency International. "Corruption Perceptions Index 2014: Results." 2015.

<http://www.transparency.org/cpi2014/results>.

Vasu, Norman. "(En)countering Terrorism: Multiculturalism and Terrorism." *Asian Ethnicity* 9, no. 1 (June 6, 2008): 17-32.

Weiss, Meredith L. "Of Inequality and Irritation: New Agendas and Activism in Malaysia and Singapore." *Democratization* 21, no. 5 (June 2014): 867-87.

Wong, Benjamin, and Xunming Huang. "Political Legitimacy in Singapore." *Politics & Policy* 38, no. 3 (2010): 523-43.

Wong, Chun Hang. "Singapore Politician Quits Over Affair." *Wall Street Journal Online* (New York), December 12, 2012.