Mark Aakhus (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, USA), Marcin Lewinski (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Toward polylogical analysis of argumentation: Analyzing disagreement space in the public deliberation about fracking**

Deliberation in the contemporary globalized, mediated environment presents an opportunity for reflecting on method in argument analysis. As we have argued before, one key conceptual issue is this: while multi-party and multi-position argumentation (“polylogue”) is prevalent, the analytic apparatus in argumentation studies tends toward dialectical analysis of dyadic disagreements. In this paper, we propose how to make sense of disagreement expansion from a polylogical perspective by incorporating various places (venues), players (parties), and positions (standpoints) into the analysis. We use a case about transporting oil by train drawn from the broader controversy about fracking, to which various players (companies, federal regulators, local communities, environmentalists, professional associations) contribute their conflicting views and arguments. The paper contributes to argumentation theory by developing polylogical analysis important for advancing understanding of large-scale, multi-party argumentation.

Houda Abadi (Georgia State University, USA)

**Our souls belong to God: Al Qaida’s audiovisual argumentative recruitment strategies for the Muslim public(s)**

Drawing from Al Qaida’s videos, this paper examines the audiovisual argumentative strategies designed to recruit and legitimize its operations with the Muslim audience. The visual images’ contribution to Al Qaida’s argument functions not in isolation but in concert with the audio arguments. The strategic placing of Nasheeds and selective Quranic verses that are paired within particular images strengthens Al Qaida’s overall argument for its martyrdom operations. The audio guides and intensifies the visual arguments through emotional appeals engaged in the political struggle for recognition and legitimacy. The humiliating images serve as justification for the use of violence to protect and defend the Muslim ummah from the transgressing West. These audio pieces take center stage and work hand in hand with the visual narrative as both engage in a political struggle for recognition and legitimacy.
Argument without rhetoric: Thomas Hobbes on geometrical argumentation

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was a persistent critic of rhetoric and a proficient practitioner of it. He argues that the end of rhetoric is not truth but “victory.” Hobbes is especially concerned that politicians, desirous of victory, employ the “tooles of oratory” to inflame the “passions of men.” He advocates geometrical argumentation free from rhetorical excess. But in politics even reasonable men become unreasonable because “the passions of many men be more violent when they are assembled together.” In Leviathan he proposes achieving rationality by transferring the functions of deliberation from the orator to the “counselor.” The counselor offers political advice privately, away from the “inflamed passions” of the multitude. Hobbes believes that substituting private advice for public debate will achieve geometrical neutrality and thus ensure rational political argument.

Conclusive arguments

Ralph Johnson denies that there are conclusive arguments. He states four criteria that any conclusive argument would have to satisfy and argues that no argument can satisfy all four. He concedes that mathematical proofs can be conclusive, but he maintains that proofs cannot be arguments, and are thus not conclusive arguments. However, this paper shows that even mathematical proofs cannot satisfy all four of Johnson's criteria. This highlights the problem with his account of conclusive argument: surely mathematical proof is conclusive if anything is. It also indicates a possible way out: weaken the account just enough so that mathematical proofs are conclusive. The remainder of the paper explores the prospects for an account of conclusive argument revised in this way.

Argumentative schemas in gender parliamentary rhetoric of Bulgarian transition

This paper concerns Bulgarian women’s participation in the institutions of power, particularly in Parliament (Bulgarian and European). The research focuses on the prevalent argument schemes, follow objective and subjective circumstances: Balkan ethno-cultural traditions, the heritage from the previous regime, Bulgarian membership in the EU, women’s character, style of thinking and speaking, leader’s values and abilities according to the national history. There is precise difference between feminism and gender, motivation of the mainly used terminology. The methods used in this study are combination of the parliamentary practice research, interviews, and pragma-dialectical discourse analyses of different genres parliamentary debates – speeches, questions, answers, personal explanation, etc. Results of the research work include scheme typology of most frequently used argumentation. In conclusion several rules of the effective parliamentary discussion are given.
The very idea of ethical arguments

If (metaethical) noncognitivism is correct, an ethical judgment cannot be true. If so, then on any version of the standard textbook definition of argument on which an argument (as understood in logic) involves a claim to the effect that the premises provide reasons for accepting the conclusion as true, it would appear that an argument cannot have an ethical judgment as its conclusion, and so ethical arguments are not possible. In response, it might be argued that this just goes to show that noncognitivism is mistaken, for ethical (moral) arguments ARE possible – they abound. But could it be plausibly argued instead that even if noncognitivism is correct, this does not have the consequence that ethical arguments are impossible? I will explore this question in my paper.

Rodica Amel (Bucharest University, Romania)

The synthetic function of doxastic dialectics

Regarding the synthetic function of doxastic dialectics, the present investigation will approach a single aspect: the metaphysical transubstantiation. We intend to explain, in personal terms, this idea which was introduced by P. Grice (1991) and to which we have briefly made reference several times. Grice’s idea supports our hermeneutic argument: the semantic nature of belief, crystallized by the dialectical mechanism of controversy, acquires persuasive prestige owing to a paradigmatic transfer: from a discursive paradigm to an axiological one. The demonstration will develop the thesis according to which belief has a self-referential dimension.

Corina Andone (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Pragmatic argumentation in European practices of political accountability

In this paper, the author examines the use of pragmatic argumentation in European practices of political accountability in which the politicians explain and justify a future course of action which they plan to undertake in order to solve an existing problem. The author explains some vital institutional characteristics of the practices under discussion and demonstrates that these institutional characteristics constrain the use of pragmatic argumentation. In addition, the author shows which criteria arguers commonly invoke in practices of political accountability in order to make their pragmatic arguments acceptable to the critics.

Jerry Andriessen (Wise & Munro Learning Research, The Netherlands)

Multiple Goals of collaborative argumentation in education

Since the mid-1990s, a subfield of collaborative learning research has emerged, termed “arguing to learn”. In distinction to the study of ‘learning to argue’, the aim is to analyse the processes by which students in collaborative problem-solving situations broaden and deepen
their understanding of a “space of debate”. Argumentation here serves to sustain a learning dialogue, which can be defined as the collective process (Allwood, 1997) of developing understanding in a learning domain. In this paper four fundamental types of learning goals will be distinguished (Andriessen & Baker, 2013) and related to possible dialogue-types (Walton, 1989; Keefer, Zeitz & Resnick, 2000). We will also address the issue of institutional and situational constraints affecting the developmental trajectory of arguing to learn.

Satoru Aonuma (Tsuda College, Japan)

**Changing the rule of the game?: A critical analysis of pro-militarization argument for the revision of Japan’s “peace” constitution**

This paper offers a critical analysis of the pro-militarization argument for the revision of the Japanese Constitution. Briefly sketching the historical transformation of the argument that calls for the constitutional revision, the paper specifically analyzes the pro-militarization argument strategy outlined in the 2012 amendment draft by the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP). The draft not only proposes the amendment of Article 9 that renounces war, the possession of military, and the use of force for settling international disputes; it also calls for the revision of Article 96, making it easier for a constitutional amendment motion to pass in the national parliament. The paper critiques this “changing the rule of the game” strategy by the LDP, seeking to discern how dangerously and "democratically" it proceeds with its militarization agenda.

Michał Araszkiewicz (Jagiellonian University, Poland), Marcin Koszowy (University of Białystok, Poland)

**The research on reasoning in the Lvov-Warsaw School as a predecessor of and inspiration for argumentation theory**

The hypothesis proposed in this paper holds that the Polish logico-methodological tradition of the Lvov-Warsaw School (LWS) has a chance to become an inspiring pillar of argumentation studies. Apart from the developments of formal logic, in the LWS there was present a strong “pragmatic” movement in the study of reasoning. There are two specific areas which may form a firm starting point for a research project concerning applications of methods developed in the LWS to contemporary problems of argumentation theory: argumentation schemes and legal argumentation. We will show that Bocheński’s account of dogmas in thinking (1994) may be applied to enrich the repertoire of argumentation schemes and we will argue that Frydman’s constructive account of legal interpretation of statutes (1936) is an important predecessor of contemporary constructivism in legal argumentation.

Robert Jarrod Atchison, John Llewellyn (Wake Forest University, USA)

**Don’t drink that water!: The role of counter-intuitive science in conspiracy arguments**

This essay examines the role of counter-intuitive science in conspiracy arguments. While some conspiracy theories reject the neutrality of science, other conspiracy theories rely on partial scientific explanations to access arguments from intuition. Although there are many
case studies available, this essay will examine the role of counter-intuitive science in a controversy that originated in postwar Europe but has spread globally—the use of fluoride in public water utilities. In this essay, we will review the role of these partial scientific arguments based on intuition to demonstrate that part of the difficulty in addressing these public controversies is explaining counter-intuitive science to the public at large.
Kevin Baaske (California State University Los Angeles, USA)

Freedom of expression and visual argumentation: The Ag-Gag case

The author examines the intersection of two elements of argumentation: the pre-requisite necessity of freedom of expression in testing claims of argumentative rationality and the purported power of visual arguments to overwhelm and subvert rational deliberation. This inquiry analyzes statutory prohibitions against publishing visual arguments made while undercover in American Agribusiness. Known as agricultural gag laws, or Ag-Gags, these state laws make it a crime to visually depict what occurs on a farm or in a slaughterhouse without the permission of the owner. The author examines the justifications for Ag-Gags laws in light of the inherent sacrificing of freedom of expression and postulates the effect on argumentation praxis when such prohibitions exist.

Sharon Bailin (Simon Fraser University, Canada), Mark Battersby (Capilano University, Canada)

Conductive argumentation, degrees of confidence, and the communication of uncertainty

We argue in this paper that there is an epistemic obligation to communicate the appropriate degree of confidence when asserting conclusions in conductive argumentation. This runs contrary to the position of those theorists who contend that once the conclusion to a conductive argument is drawn, it is simply asserted in an unqualified manner. We argue, on the contrary, that, in many contexts, we do qualify our conclusions and further, that we have an epistemic responsibility to do so. As an illustration, we discuss the case of the Italian scientists tried for failing to convey to the public appropriate warnings of the risks of the earthquake in L’Aquila.

Anna Baka (The University of Hong Kong, China)

International law and rationality crisis: The problem of induction in international legal reasoning

The paper examines the problem of induction is international legal reasoning. According to the mainstream view, all types of syllogisms must be submitted to the law-creating processes of international law, which all come down to the principle of state consent. The logical challenges are evident: Reason cannot be endorsable because it is the product of a natural mental process. Because of this logical distortion, international jurists rarely resort to inductive reasoning. This leads to a recycling of arguments and the limitation of legal discourse to a superficial testing of consistency. However, the progress of legal knowledge can only be achieved by means of substantial argumentation, namely logical inferences which are not exhausted in deductive reasoning.
The integration of pragma-dialectics and collaborative learning research: argumentation dialogue, externalisation and collective thinking

Since the mid-1990s, a major subfield of collaborative learning research has emerged, whose aim is to analyse how students broaden and deepen their understanding of a “space of debate”. Although some researchers in the learning sciences have drawn on pragma-dialectics in this context, there remains, however, a problem of theoretical-methodological integration: the meta-theoretical principle of “externalisation” in pragma-dialectics eschews consideration of arguers’ beliefs, consigning this to (a particular vision of) “psychology”. However, since the late 1980s, psychological theories have emerged that allow a closer rapprochement with pragma-dialectics, in viewing learning in and by dialogue as collective thinking, situated within the ‘tissue’ of exchanged discourse. The aim of this paper is to discuss an approach to reconciling the “externalisation” principle of pragma-dialectics, with these theories.

Controversy, racial equality, and American World War I cemeteries in Europe

Approximately two million U.S. soldiers were deployed to the Western Front during WWI. The vast majority of those killed were repatriated to the United States and buried in racially segregated plots. Still, nearly 32,000 remain in U.S. cemeteries in Europe which are not segregated by race, something quite remarkable given the existing social milieu. Controversy may arise over the transgression of boundaries and borrow from both discursive and nondiscursive arguments. The presence of these integrated cemeteries constitutes an argument grounded in materiality against racial segregation. But this particular argument does not engage in nor generate public discussion. The absence of public or archival records indicates the argumentative force of silence. This essay explores the importance of materiality and silence in argument and contributes to a further examination of controversy.

Interpersonal argumentation through the context of distributed cognition

The term “Interpersonal argumentation” refers to arguments which are considered not as isolated assumptions. According to the biologically oriented paradigm for the study of cognition and language, communication is not exchange of information; rather, it is joint activity aimed at creating a consensual domain of interactions, including linguistic interactions. Researchers of distributed cognition argue that cognitive processes are not concluded in the heads of the individuals, but are extended through material artifacts and social interaction. Applying this approach to the study of interpersonal argumentation gives an opportunity to view language in communication as a part of social and physical environment. The most important component of this environment is socially and subjectively conditioned values, patterns of social behavior. We argue that the aforesaid component is an implicit constituent element of persuasion.
Juan F. Barros-Martinez (Escuela de Ingenieria de Antioquia, Colombia)

**Fallacies that affect epistemic claims in learning of sciences**

In this investigation certain epistemic elements considered fundamental in construction of knowledge for learning of sciences were analyzed. This was done through an argumentative process, where the following claims were evaluated: use of rhetorical tools; use of evidence; assessment of evidence; evaluation of data; making distinctions or connections; and use of scientific language. The process was developed in engineering undergraduate science classes where discussions of argumentative characteristics were carried out in an intense interactive activity between students. The epistemic elements of the argumentative process have been compared with rules of the critical discussion proposed by Pragma-dialectics theory, where some fallacies that affect such elements are identified. The analysis shows an evident relation between the Pragma-dialectics and the process of scientific argumentation in the classroom.

Michael D. Baumtrog (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Delineating the reasonable and rational for humans**

For some, the terms “rational” and “reasonable” have long benefited from acute distinction. For others, however, the terms are often used interchangeably. I contend that using these terms interchangeably is problematic in part because it leaves a hugely broad area in which argumentation theory can be aimed. On one extreme, these terms can be understood to indicate something just better than their negations. On the other side, they can be understood to point to idealized models of reasoning and argumentation that only a computer or perhaps a god could employ. Then, there is all that lies between. This paper aims to develop some previous characterizations of the notion of the “reasonable” and defend the view that being reasonable is the best that can be expected from the average human.

Thomas Becker (University of Bamberg, Germany)

**Some critical questions about “Critical Questions”**

One theory of argumentation represents arguments by a set of argumentation schemes consisting of a set of premises, inference rules plus a set of Critical Questions (CQ). That way of representing argumentation is very useful in practice, from a theoretical point of view, however, it is not fully satisfactory. Some CQs are general rules for discourse ("Clarify notions!"); others are general rules for any scheme ("Check the premises!"); and yet others are peculiar to a particular scheme ("How credible is the expert?"). The proposed talk is an attempt to tidy up the set of CQs; the aim is to represent an argument as deductive by reconstructing the full set of implicit premises and qualifying the conclusion; the task of the opponent would be a single one: "Check the premises!"

Hilde Van Belle (K.U. Leuven Campus Antwerpen, Belgium)

**Agonism as a rhetorical project**
Chantal Mouffe rejects the model of ‘deliberative democracy’ as it aims at a rational consensus in the public sphere. This consensus is impossible, because the idea is based on the negation of conflict as the essence of modern pluralism. The aim of democratic politics is to transform antagonism into agonism, which entails that the participating parties should be considered as adversaries, not as enemies.

How can the political ideas of Chantal Mouffe be aligned with contemporary rhetoric? Rhetorical practice often is conceived of as a battle between opponents, yet it is also described as argumentative interaction that aims at cooperation and consensus. The findings of this exploration I will take back to Mouffe’s ideas about agonism in an attempt to nuance the concept.

Lilian Bermejo-Luque (University of Granada, Spain)

**A proposed argumentative schema for appealing to the Precautionary Principle**

The idea that we must be cautious about the foreseeable consequences of our actions infuses current guidelines for policy makers in the form of a principle, the precautionary principle, which is normally seen as a tool for individuals and environmental protection. However, critics of the principle abound, and there seems to be a close relationship between appeals to caution and some forms of the slippery slope fallacy: appeal to caution can be an illegitimate strategy to shortcut proposals for taking action. In light of this fact, it becomes striking the need to discriminate between legitimate and illegitimate uses of the precautionary principle. To this end, the paper proposes an argumentative schema to appraise discourses appealing to caution that shapes a political conception of the principle (nor instrumental or moral).

Sarah Bigi (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy)

**Doctors coping with patients’ irrationality in a chronic care setting: can argumentation become a therapeutic resource?**

The paper presents results from a pilot project on argumentation in the medical setting aimed at describing the most frequent argumentation schemes used by doctors in chronic care, in order to understand if and how argumentation can become a useful therapeutic tool in this professional context. Twenty patients and five doctors interacting within a diabetes outpatient clinic have been video recorded during their encounters. The analysis of the most frequent argumentation schemes revealed doctors’ difficulties in trying to impact on patients’ unhealthy behaviors and led to a reconsideration of the relationship between communication styles and patient outcomes in the medical setting. By providing many examples from the transcriptions, the paper shows how the use of argumentation by doctors can be improved, especially in the crucial phase of shared decision making.

Marina Bletsas (University of Bonn, Germany)

**The voices of justice. Argumentative polyphony in judgments of the Italian constitutional court**
The argumentation leading to the standpoint reached in the operative part of judgments can convey a plurality of voices that are not simply to be attributed to a physical plurality of judges responsible for the decision. A polyphonic argumentative reconstruction of judgment motivations based on a linguistic analysis is here suggested and conducted on a landmark judgment of the Italian Constitutional Court (440/1995) at the crossroads between religious and legal discourse. Combining the ScaPoLinE (among others Nølke et al. 2004, Nølke 2013) with the (extended) pragma-dialectical approach (van Eemeren/Grootendorst 2004, van Eemeren 2010), the judgment motivation is reconstructed as the product of a textual locutor that stages the points of view and thus the argumentation of different sources while strategically maneuvering the addressee towards accepting the final standpoint.

Emma Frances Bloomfield, Kari Storla (University of Southern California, USA)

Evolutionary arguments in the birth control debate: Casuistic shifting in conservative rhetoric

This inquiry uses a dramatistic lens to explore the birth control controversy and how it complicates conservative agent-focused argumentative resources. Recently, conservatives have borrowed from scene-focused evolutionary discourse and have argued that the female body is a vulnerable scene housing a potential (male) agent. This mirrors an evolutionary view of agents as irrational and subordinate in a scene:act ratio. In order to remain loyal to underlying religious values, conservatives situationally abandon, rather than permanently stretch, their focus on the agent. This casuistic shifting enables conservatives to undermine female agency while simultaneously remaining within their idealistic framework. The birth control controversy allows us to interrogate seemingly hypocritical argument strategies, explore similarities between human origins and birth control arguments, and unite dramatistic and argumentative inquiries.

Angelina Bobrova (Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia)

What does the choice depend on?

In common sense reasoning it is hard to say whether arguers should appeal to deductively valid forms of reasoning or to their defeasible counterparts. The matter complicates the fact that in some cases both schemes have to be acknowledged as reasonably accepted. Such condition forces us to take into consideration a possible role of context and function of an argument. An interesting question is how the latter is able to clarify the base of the choice. The presentation deals with the issue of valid or defeasible modus tollens usage. It obtains more specific when both schemes are equally good, and when a valid form is preferable.
George Boger (Canisius College, USA)

Does critical thinking entail certain truths?

Critical Thinking (CT) has long been integral to liberal arts, humanist education in a free society. Recently CT has been condemned as focusing on behavior modification with the purpose of challenging students’ fixed beliefs and undermining parental authority. Such critics affirm heterosexual marriage, condemn homosexuality as destroying the fabric of society, and undermine a woman’s right of choice. In his 1990 report on critical thinking Peter Facione asks whether critical thinking entails certain truths, sometimes called ‘progressive beliefs’ — Is CT content-neutral as formal logic or content-specific in its results? This paper reflects on the interface of two such orientations and affirms the principle that the virtues of argumentation are included among the virtues of inclusive citizenship in pluralistic society, that, for example, critical thinking and racist ideology are antithetical.

Dmitri Bokmelder (Independent researcher, Russia)

Cognitive biases and logical fallacies

The friendly discipline of cognitive psychology has identified several dozen cognitive biases which are “replicable pattern(s) in perceptual distortion, inaccurate judgment, illogical interpretation, or what is broadly called irrationality”. Some cognitive biases appear consonant with some fallacies identified in logic and rhetoric. If argumentation theorists incorporate the knowledge generated by cognitive psychology in their field, they will be able to indentify more (fallacious) argument schemes and also have a deeper insight into the habits and, thus, the nature of human thinking.

Ronny Boogaart (Leiden University, The Netherlands)

When negation may (not) be effective

The opening line of a Dutch advertisement presented as a campaign to prevent the abuse of alcohol is cited in (1) No! Liquor is not more harmful for your health than beer or wine! I analyze (1) as an instance of strategic maneuvering in the confrontation phase of a critical discussion, showing that, from the available alternatives, the choice for negation is a most effective choice in view of the rhetorical goal of the arguer. In actual fact, this goal is not to discourage the use of alcohol, but to promote the use of liquor. General questions addressed include: What can linguistic accounts of negation tell us about negation in argumentation? Does presenting ‘promotion’ in the guise of ‘consultation’ constitute a derailment of strategic maneuvering?
David Botting (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

Reasons why arguments and explanations are different

In the eighth chapter of “Problems in argument analysis and evaluation” entitled "Reasons why arguments and explanations are different" Trudy Govier defends the distinction between arguments and explanations. I will discuss what making the distinction really amounts to and try to show that the kind of distinction she wants to make is under-motivated. In particular, I will show that her discussion (fairly typical in argumentation theory) of Hempel’s covering law model, because it fails to make an important distinction in how the identity of arguments and explanations should be understood, is a terminological muddle. My thesis will be that her defence of the distinction fails because it fails to show that the distinction is a distinction between products rather than between speech-acts whose distinctness from each other is uncontroversial.

Antonio Bova (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)

Argumentation in the learning contexts of higher education. Comparing undergraduate and graduate classes in Psychology

This study aims to investigate how argumentative practices in the classroom evolve from undergraduate to graduate education. The data corpus is constituted by sixteen video-recorded lessons of one Bachelor’s degree and one Master’s degree course in Developmental Psychology. The analytical approach for the analysis relies on the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation and on the Argumentum Model of Topics. The results show that undergraduate students often ask critical questions about the arguments presented by the teacher, but in most cases they avoid to advance arguments in support of their standpoint. The graduate students, instead, ask less critical questions but often advance arguments in support of their standpoint. Moreover, undergraduate students largely draw their arguments from common sense and personal experience, whilst graduate students from the body of their disciplinary knowledge.

Emanuele Brambilla (University of Trieste, Italy)

On the benefits of applying argumentation theory to the simultaneous interpretation of political speeches

Even though the quality of an interpreting performance is often assessed on the basis of the interpreter’s ability to convey the argumentative purpose of the source text, argumentation theory is almost completely overlooked by interpreting studies. Against this background, the paper addresses political argumentation in view of its acknowledgment and reproduction in translation. By means of a corpus of American, British and French speeches on the economic crisis, selected argument schemes are analysed in connection with their lexical indicators in the attempt to highlight both their strategic role and their recurrent, predictable nature. The findings suggest the systematic adoption of argumentation analysis as a source text research methodology, providing interpreting research and training with invaluable context-bound accounts to be used for advance preparation.
Compliments and argumentation

Our aim is to analyse the universal reasons why we make / do not make, why we accept / do not accept compliments. Among the reasons for making compliments are: the wish to a) lay the foundation for the continuation of communication, b) establish good relationship with the addressee, c) win his favour, d) express politeness, receive polite treatment, e) raise the estimation of the latter f) hear a compliment in response, g) humiliate the third person. The reasons why compliments are not being paid are: gender and status differences, etc. The reasons why compliments are being rejected are: a) evading them as an indirect request to repeat them, b) modesty of the addressee, c) the insincerity of the speaker d) the doubtful character of the compliment.

Pragmatics and dialectics of rhetorical technique of ad baculum

The paper proposes a pragmatic and dialectical account of ad baculum technique. We claim that this tactic is not entirely inferential as assumed by standard models or, in other words, that at least some aspects of its structure can be best accounted for in terms of properties of speech acts (Austin 1975; van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1984) used in the dialogical context (Budzynska and Reed 2011); and ethotic conditions related to the speaker's character (Aristotle 1991). If a robber uses ad baculum and says: “Your money or your life!”, he performs: (1) a directive act which creates the respondent's obligation to give money to the robber, and (2) a commissive act which indicates -- via the mechanism involving Austinian presuppositions (cf. Witek 2013) -- the proponent's status function.

Meeting the demands of a changing electorate: The political rhetoric of Julian Castro and Marco Rubio

Rapid and unprecedented demographic changes within the United States mean that the country will soon have a majority-minority population. One group that has gained national prominence during this demographic shift is American Hispanics, who are challenging the political hegemony held by white Americans. This population change has also created more opportunity than ever before for Hispanic politicians on the national stage. This paper examines the argumentative strategies of two rising Hispanic stars of American politics: Democrat Julian Castro of Texas and Republican Marco Rubio of Florida. Both politicians emerged during their respective parties’ conventions in 2012 to become national figures. This paper analyzes the argumentative strategies that Castro and Rubio use in their public arguments in order to build political coalitions with Hispanic and non-Hispanic voters.
Frames and framing in argumentation theory and media studies: A comparative analysis

The purpose of this paper is to systematically investigate the similarities and differences between two approaches on framing, one stemming from argumentation theory, the other from media studies. In the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation, framing is tantamount to the presentational aspect of strategic maneuvering, and consists in “creating a context by verbal means in which what is put forward makes sense to the audience in a way that is in agreement with the speaker’s or writer’s intentions” (Van Eemeren, 2010, p.126). In media studies, framing is discussed mainly in relation with theoretical debates on agenda setting. The main foci of the comparative analysis are: the object of framing (typically – the issue), the analytical categories employed, the choice of units of analysis and the methodological consequences in the process of analysis.

Justification and effectiveness: critical thinking and strategic manoeuvring

Dialectical perspectives on argumentation and critical thinking theorists require considering all the possible objections to a standpoint in order to rebut, to undermine or to undercut them. Rhetorical attitudes on persuasion seem to be in contradiction with those positions. For pragma-dialecticians the tension between justification and effectiveness may be relieved by means of strategic manoeuvring. We find it necessary to link the nature of the issue and the degree of uncertainty to the rhetorical context to adapt the argumentative procedures. Uncertainty accompanies most instances of argumentative discourse in informal settings and opens a space in which the arguer’s reflexive intuitions may be as good as any other move to justify an adequate presentation of a case. Different issues and situations may shape the dialectical weight of the discussion.

Straw men and Iron Men

Recent focus on the straw man fallacy has been on distinguishing fallacious straw man distortions from harsh, but reasonable, criticism. The present paper follows along the lines of these projects of taxonomy and demarcation. As some of this work has already shown, there is more to straw manning than the distortion of an opponent’s argument. Rather, the problem lies in, to use some metaphorical language, misrepresenting the dialogical lay of the land. This means the fallaciousness of the straw man must be found elsewhere than distortion per se, but in another kind of false representation of where the critical discussion stands.
Participatory art vs social guerrilla advertising

“In recent years, many artists have been to a lesser or greater extent appropriating the roles of social workers, urban planners, or ombudsmen in order to question and critique the dominant culture by channeling voices and activities of the ones who are underrepresented, repressed or left out from political process.” (Dusan Barok, 2009) They create “Participatory Art”, an Art form that involves and engages their audience. Advertising followed this trend with its “Guerrilla Campaigns” It creates a unique and provoking concept that turns viral. Provoking a memorable brand experience and in terms of social advertising, memorable ethic experience aesthetical and behavioural terms using possible recurrent and common narratives, (specific places) fallacies, pragmatic functions and argumentative roles.

Visual argumentation: A point of view

This paper will deal with three inherently linked questions in general. The first is about the very concept of visual argumentation (VA). By virtue of what VA can learn from Chinese traditional culture, and the replies to some strong objections on VA, the author’s conclusion is that the verbal and the visual are different complementary forms for argumentation, and there is an uncontentious fact that VA exists. The second is about the theoretical basis or the philosophical ground of VA. Frege’s theory of sense and reference supplies an intellectual resource for clarifying it. The last one is about some further far-reaching questions surrounding the feasibility of VA, especially about the schemes of VA, and the relation of VA to artificial intelligence.

The sliding scales of repentance: understanding variation in political apologies for infidelity

The generic features of political apology have been identified as well as the relativity of apologetic practices across cultures. Less understood are variations within strategies of the personal political apology. Building on previous work on apology and using critical discourse analysis, this paper investigates the apologies of four US politicians whose marital infidelities were made public: Eliot Spitzer, Mark Sanford, Mark Souder, and Anthony Weiner. The paper notes the variations in the representations of the transgressions, minimization, meta-discourse, and religious language. These variations can be calibrated to the particularities of the nature of the transgression, the speaker’s established political ethos, and the mass-mediated political climate he faced. Thus, the generic qualities of the personal political apology are best interpreted as existing on a sliding scale relative to the situation.
The emotive argument "I fear the Greeks even when bringing gifts"

When the Greeks pretend they left, letting the wooden statue of a horse on Troy's shore, Laocoön argues for fear, to persuade the Trojans not to take it into the city: 'Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks even when bringing gifts', Aeneid II, 49. This quotation from the Latin poet Virgil is perhaps the best known formulation of an argumentative principle: the emotive evaluation of an action (gift) is possibly changed by the emotive evaluation of its agent (Greeks). I study the enunciation of this principle in the third book of Rudolph Agricola 'De inventione dialectica', focusing on the analogies between Agricola’s model and the recent accounts for emotive argumentation in the French-speaking contributions to the theory of argumentation. I consider as an example some excerpts from French theater.

Ioana A. Cionea (University of Oklahoma, USA), Dale Hample (University of Maryland, USA)

Dialogue orientations and argumentative behaviors

Empirical tests of the dialogue types developed by informal logicians (persuasion, negotiation, eristic, inquiry, deliberation, and information seeking) have begun recently. In this paper, we further advance this line of research. First, we develop measures for three dialogue types that have not been operationalized in previous research and test them in a study with 189 individuals in the United States. Second, we connect dialogue types with several well-established measures in argumentation research: argument frames, argument beliefs, argument competence, argumentativeness, and verbal aggressiveness. According to the results of a main study conducted with 286 undergraduates at a large west south-central university in the United States, participants prefer the persuasive dialogue to the other types, and dialogues are well predicted by argument competence as well as the pro-social component of verbal aggressiveness.

Daniel Harry Cohen (Colby College, USA)

Missed opportunities in argument evaluation

There is a curious asymmetry in how we evaluate arguments. We hold arguers culpable for ignoring obvious objections to their reasoning because their arguments are not as strong as they could be. But we do not generally hold arguers culpable for missing relevant and available positive reasons even though their arguments are also not as strong as they could be. I explain how this asymmetry arises and why it seems natural from one perspective but discordant from another with reference to two factors: the adversarial model of argumentation and the permeability of the boundaries separating argumentation, meta-argumentation, and argument evaluation. The asymmetry can often be justified by strategic considerations or arguers’ dialectical obligations; appeals to virtue argumentation theory can explain when it is not justified.

Vasco Correia (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

Argumentation, rationality and reasonableness
Unlike most argumentation theorists, Van Eemeren and Grootendorst provide a clear distinction between the “rational” and the “reasonable” and develop what they call the “critical rationalist” approach to reasonableness, partly directed against the Epistemologists’ so-called “justificationism”. One of the implications of this account, the authors suggest, is that “rationality is a necessary condition of reasonableness, but not automatically a sufficient one”. In this paper I challenge the later assumption and argue that rationality is not a necessary condition of reasonableness (neither is reasonableness a necessary condition of rationality). Drawing on an alternative distinction between reasonableness and rationality, on the one hand, and on the distinction between cognitive and practical rationality, on the other, I argue that Pragma-dialectical and Epistemic accounts are not incompatible, but pertain to different spheres of normativity.

Ana Isabel Correia Martins (University of Coimbra, Portugal)

**Visual argumentation and Rhetoric of image: the role of the exemplum and quotations**

The study of Rhetoric recognizes the perennial legacy of Antiquity and handles its epistemic precepts, invoking this classical tradition in all interdisciplinary and neighbor fields. The visual argumentation and the rhetoric of image share the same intent: to seduce, to persuade and to argue, always rooted in an epistemic framework of Aristotle. The present paper aims to shed light on the close connection between visualization, imagination and memorization, regarding ancient theories and techniques of argumentation.
The Felony Fallacy

The Felony Fallacy is an error in probabilistic reasoning that occurs when a judge thinks that it is more likely that the defendant in a criminal trial is guilty if he has been previously convicted for the same type of crime but disregards that people with a criminal record are more likely than others to be wrongfully prosecuted for a crime they did not commit. It is a special kind of Base Rate Fallacy that disregards the over-representation of defendants with a previous conviction among innocent defendants. We conducted a test with 267 judges serving on district courts in Sweden. The judges answered a questionnaire about legal decision making in criminal trials. 93% of the judges committed the Felony Fallacy.

A case study of argumentative assimilation

We propose to show a type of argumentative assimilation, a phenomenon that emerges in times of reversible conflict, based on a case study from the legal world. The source of analyzes will be some recorded audio discussions between Brazilian judges, in a Court of appeals. The study describes the moment that the speech of X overcomes interlocutor Y’s arguments. From the dichotomy between persuasion and conviction, we explore the idea of adhesion, linking the study of argumentation and rhetoric. The purpose of the study is the identification of the textual marks that witness the conflict resolution and the moment that a judge joins the opinion of the others magistrates.

Epideictic and the function of witnessing

In this lecture, I will argue that the exercise of citizenship needs that a practical model for rhetoric will be rebuilt. This means that from an epistemological viewpoint, one has to regard rhetoric as an art, as the Sophists thought it. This model was almost never practiced during past centuries but it was nevertheless defend by a humanist tradition that went from Aristotle to Perelman, passing by the Italian humanist tradition (Vico, Grassi).

Partially and over-successful persuasion in task-dialogues
Relying on the outcomes of the study of task-dialogues, I introduce two additional types of the effects of persuasion in addition to successful and unsuccessful ones (cf. Van Eemeren and Houtlosser 2002, Walton and Krabbe 1995). I propose a model which provides for modified versions of the standpoint of an agent needed for obtaining the additional effects which I label partially-successful and over-successful. I call the not yet verbalised standpoint of an agent original topic t. I explain that the modified version of original topic t is an implicature created from original topic t and a specific mental topic which belongs to, what I call, the Beneficial Cognitive Model. I define BCMi,t as a set of mental topics within the area of agent i’s interest of persuasion.

Laura Delaloye Saillen (University of Lausanne, Switzerland)

**An interactionist perspective on the constitution of parties in editorial meeting**

By taking an interactionist perspective on argumentation, the paper tackles the ongoing production of an argumentative sequence in the context of an editorial meeting. The normative dimension of the institutional context is considered as a resource to frame the argumentative activity. At the same time, the social norms are manifested and made accountable during the course of action. In the analysis of a video excerpt, one points at i) the opening of an argumentative sequence and its accountability for the social actors ii) the construction of parties (proponent, opponent, third party) in the opening question and within the course of action iii) the decision-oriented dimension of argumentation in professional context, as opposed to political debates.

Joseph Dichy (Université Lumière Lyon 2 and ICAR Research Lab, France)

**Arabic rhetoric and argumentation, a chronological and analytic overview**

Arabic Rhetoric features sets of figures suggesting origin outside Greek/Latin traditions (Awad’s edition of Ibn Rushd’s Middle Commentary on Rhetoric). Figurative expression (majâz) has crucial part in earliest Kur’ân Commentaries and literal/non-literal readings (similarly: Sa3diyya Gâ3ûn's Arabic Commentary on Bible, 9th). Mu3tazilî theologians initiated widely shared view in which figurative speech -and paralogical discourse (Al-Jâhiz)- indicate language is neither transparent nor obvious, even in Kur’ân (Dichy, 2009). Arabic Rhetoric parallels majâz with kinâya, related to indirect expression. Contribution presents overview of Arabic Rhetoric, from first Mu3tazilî theologians (8th), who included argumentation, to later rhetoricians, who reduced rhetoric to figures (compare to Genette's analyses of French Rhetoric). Periodization of Arabic Rhetoric and argumentation also includes chapters on bayân -rhetoric’s ancient denomination- appearing at beginning of Foundations of Jurisprudence treatises.

Ana Dimishkovska (Ss Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Macedonia)

**In the office of doctor House: Abductive reasoning in the medical field**

Abduction, usually defined as inference to the best explanation, is a type of reasoning that is employed in situations where there is some kind of puzzling evidence, which is to be
explained by the best hypothesis available. In this paper an attempt is made to elaborate on the practical aspects of the application of the essential mechanisms of abductive reasoning in the medical field. The analysis includes some of the most representative examples of the way in which Dr. Gregory House - a fictitious character from a popular American television medical drama - resolves complicated medical puzzles. The main purpose of this analysis is to test the plausibility of the dominant theoretical explanations of abductive reasoning in the medical context.

Gonen Dori-Hacohen (University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA), Zohar Livnat (Bar Ilan University, Israel)

**Negotiating norms of discussion in the public arena: The use of irony in radio phone-in programs**

Radio programs involving the participation of ordinary people are taken as part of the public sphere. As such, they may follow the norms of Habermas’s public sphere: open access, equality, rationality and criticism. These programs also require novel, performative and entertaining content. In the current study, we explored the negotiation of the aforementioned norms through the use of irony. Irony is a critical tool that echoes the attitudes of the participants towards the discourse content. It is also used critically towards the discursive norms that dominate the program. As an echoing utterance, irony has a dialogic aspect that naturally highlights gaps between standpoints. Through the ironic utterance, the speaker exposes both his own opinions towards the program’s norms and his beliefs about the interlocutor’s violation of them.

Marianne Doury (CNRS, France), Pascale Mansier (INSERM, France)

**The psychiatrization of the opponent in polemical context**

A variant of the ad hominem argument amounts to challenging the opponent’s mental health. Semi-technical designations borrowed from psychiatric paradigms are thus appealed to in order to qualify the opponent. In confrontational exchanges, one may thus be accused of being autistic, paranoiac, hysterical…Such attempts at denying the very rationality of the opponent – and consequently of the opponent’s standpoint – may be seen as an outward sign of cases of deep disagreement.

Based on the analysis of three instances of such disqualifying strategies in polemical discussions on political issues, we will investigate what kind of behaviour triggers such accusations, how they are justified, and how they are handled by the speaker to whom they are addressed.

Ian Dove (UNLV, USA)

**Visuals and schemes: Critical questions and the burden of proof**

Some schemes are amenable to visual elements. For example, in an Argument from Sign (Walton, Reed & Macagno: 329), the specific premise--the one that asserts the existence of a sign, symptom or indication--can be asserted by a photograph of alleged bigfoot tracks, an
ultrasound image of purported gallbladder infection or a plus-sign on a home pregnancy test. Curiously, in many presentations of the abstract Argument from Sign scheme, the critical questions associated with the argument type probe only the apparent strength of the inference from the sign/symptom/indication to the signified. In some visual arguments, though, the worrisome element is the visual itself, which wouldn't be probed were the only relevant critical questions from the Argument from Sign. Hence, there appear to be special critical questions associated with, say, Arguments from Sign when the arguments are visual. One can justify the need for these extra questions by appeal to burden of proof. For example, the use of visual evidence in judicial situations presupposes an authenticating burden on the proponent of the evidence. In this case, the evidence is authenticated prior to its use at trial; still, the authentication can be the subject of testimony, examination and cross examination at trial. Hence, even after the minimal authentication burden is met so that the evidence is allowed into the trial, there are still special potential issues associated with visual elements that are different from the considerations of verbal elements.

Michel Dufour (Université Sorbonne-Nouvelle, France)

**Dialectic and eristic**

About one century ago Th. Gomperz wrote that nobody ever applied to oneself the qualification of eristic – a term which was always insulting – and G. Grote claimed that in Aristotle’s classification eristic and critical arguments should be classified as dialectical. So, what makes an argument or an argumentation eristic? Who is entitled to decide about it? On which grounds? Since Plato, an eristic attitude has often been associated with a systematic opposition, hence the lasting behavior of an arguer. On the other hand, Aristotle based his definition of an eristic argument on punctual logical features. The talk will discuss some consequences of these different approaches to the characterization of eristic arguments.

Claudio Durán (York University, Canada)

**The September 11, 1973 military coup in Chile and the military regime 1973-1990: A case of social and political deep disagreement**

This paper intends to describe and analyze the argumentation that has taken place in El Mercurio, Chile’s main daily newspaper, both in articles in the printed edition as well as in blogs in the online edition, during the months of August and September 2013. This argumentation constitutes a case of “deep disagreement”. The nature of the disagreement lies in the ways of explaining the coup and the military regime. One side argues that the coup and the military regime were essential to save Chile from communism. The other side argues that Chile was not in danger of falling into communism and thus, the brutal repression of the military dictatorship constituted a gross violation of human rights.
Justin Eckstein (Pacific Lutheran University, USA), Sarah Partlow Lefevre (Idaho State University, USA)

**Politicizing tragedy: Third order strategic maneuvering in the response to mass shootings**

In 2012, over 88 people were killed in mass shootings prompting a swell of popular support for passing new and stricter gun laws in the United States. Yet, politicians were unable to pass any legislation. One reason is gun rights advocates’ claims that the U.S. was not in the correct climate for a meaningful discussion. These critics argued that before debating guns, we must satisfy other political, legal, ethical, and cultural concerns. Invoking the proper climate for debate gestures to the third-order condition of argumentation. We analyze an exchange in the Washington Post to evaluate if the appeal to an appropriate context is a legitimate maneuver or a derailment. Theoretically, this extends research on higher-order strategic maneuvering. Practically, we provide insight into the breakdown in the gun debate that has resulted in inaction.

Alexandra Corral Edmonds (University of Pittsburgh, USA)

**Isocrates’ moral argumentation**

How can the centripetal spirit of the ancient Greek polis be invoked through moral argumentation during a time of krisis in modern democracies? Answers to this question may lie in two unpublished manuscripts on Isocrates by Michael Calvin McGee. The first manuscript describes Isocrates as a “cultural surgeon,” who operated by utilizing “moral argumentation” to facilitate “positive cultural change.” The second manuscript recognizes the “individual” as the “cultural [fault]” in modern democracies, as it has furthered cultural and political fragmentation, which need moral argumentation in order to be repaired. To illustrate how unity may be forged via Isocratic moral argumentation, this paper will perform a rhetorical analysis of the Spanish 15-M protest logoi, focusing on how deliberative argumentation acted as a catalyst to unite people in 15-M’s encampments.

Frans H. van Eemeren, Bart Garssen, Bert Meuffels (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

**The disguised ad baculum fallacy empirically investigated**

In argumentative discourse fallacies occur regularly and seem often not to be noticed by the participants in the discourse. This also goes for the ad baculum fallacy. Threatening the other party with unpleasant consequences when that party doesn’t retract his standpoint is generally considered as a very unreasonable discussion move. In this paper it is argued that this paradox can be explained by analyzing ad baculum threats as a mode of strategic maneuvering which takes on a reasonable appearance when it mimics, as it often does, legitimate pragmatic argumentation. The hypothesis that ad baculum fallacies are seen as less unreasonable than clear cases when they are presented as if they are well-meant advices in
which the speaker can’t be held responsible for the occurrence of the unpleasant consequences was tested in two experiments.

Marco Ehrl (Central Michigan University, USA)

**Arguing about privacy and national security: U.S. And Germany negotiate rules for strategic maneuvering in light of the NSA spying scandal**

This essay addresses the debate about how the differences in foreign policy approaches between Germany and the U.S. regarding privacy and national security affect their rules for strategic maneuvering. After Germany’s controversial objection to America’s invasion in 2002, the NSA scandal appears to be the second dispute in recent German American relations with far reaching political and diplomatic consequences. While pragma-dialectics is often applied to institutionalized contexts, this analysis will try to reconstruct the German-American dialogue with particular reference to public exchanges. In that regard, pragma-dialectical argumentation theory accounts for how Berlin and Washington resolve their differences rhetorically and aids to a clearer description of German-American relations in the 21st century.

Lindsay M. Ellis (Grand Valley State University, USA)

**The ubiquity of the Toulmin model in U.S. education: Promise and peril**

Both secondary and university instructors in the United States rely heavily on the Toulmin model to teach written argumentation (Hillocks 2011; Ramage, Bean and Johnson 2001; Smith, Wilhelm, and Fredricksen 2012; Williams and Colomb 2001). Pragma-dialectics (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004; Van Eemeren 2010) is not a visible presence in composition textbooks to date, emerging, as it did, from a speech act perspective (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1991). Is this a deficiency that needs remediation? This session examines the role of critical questions in teaching writing. A comparison of critical questions in Toulmin's model and in the pragma-dialectic model of critical discussion suggests strategies for improving the teaching of writing as a heuristic for critical thinking.

Pia Marie Engel (Eberhard Karls University Tübingen, Germany)

**Rhetoric of the image**

This paper considers the one-dimensional single image as a still, neither sequences nor moving images. It does not contain a linear-temporal dimension which language uses to express causal connections that are needed in a logical argumentation. The signs are arranged in space, which may cause the observer to infer connections amongst the signs. The visual text transmits information and shows in which specific semiotic way it is made. This implies that there is no such thing as an “impartial” image. Considering the image as a fact of strategic communication rhetoric has to ask for the message it is offering. Analyzing photographs the importance of contexts and observer’s experience with images will be taken into account. The photographer is an orator in the making of an image that aims for persuasion.
Warrants in Pauline argumentation

Religious argumentation is sometimes supposed to be different from other kinds of argumentation. George Kennedy for example mentions a radical Christian rhetoric in which the message is proclaimed rather than argued, but in my study of Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians I have found deliberate argumentation. This argumentation can be analyzed with Toulmin’s model of argumentation. The warrants for the argumentation are of special interest. I have found warrants of several types. Some are based in the topoi of logical inferences common to all human communication. Others are based in the cultural values of the ancient Mediterranean world. And some are based in the religious convictions of the members of the Christian group.
Isabela Fairclough (University of Central Lancashire, UK)

**A dialectical profile for the evaluation of practical arguments**

Practical reasoning has been studied in informal logic and pragma-dialectics (Walton, Hitchcock, Garssen, Ihnen Jory) and sets of critical questions have been proposed for the evaluation of practical or pragmatic arguments. Along critical rationalist lines, this paper proposes a dialectical profile of 7 ordered questions attached to the practical argument scheme, understood as argumentation from goal, circumstantial and means-goal premises (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012). The profile integrates deliberation about means and about goals in a single recursive procedure, and also integrates the practical argument from goals and circumstances with the pragmatic argument from negative consequence. The purpose of critical questioning is to test the reasonableness of one or more proposed courses of action, thus enhancing the rationality of decision-making in conditions of incomplete knowledge (uncertainty and risk).

Norman Fairclough (Lancaster University, UK)

**Dialectic in critical analysis of practical argumentation**

I suggest that methods of critical social analysis can fruitfully be understood as forms of dialectical reasoning whose main argument type is (dialectically-based) practical argumentation, with explanation embedded within it, and which also have a deliberative character. This incorporates the claim that critical social analysis must include analysis of (practical) argumentation to address the question of how discourse may contingently have socially constructive effects, but at the same time raises the question of how argumentation/deliberation fit into the overall critical method. I address this issue in terms of the relationship between dialectical argumentation and other facets of dialectic identified within Hegelian-Marxist as well as classical dialectics, thereby questioning the widespread assumption in argumentation studies that the two are not connected.

Victor Ferry (Université libre de Bruxelles/ F.R.S.-FNRS, Belgium)

**How to blame in a democracy?**

I will focus on Theodore Roosevelt 1901’s speech, in which he issues a blame of the anarchist who killed President McKinley. Roosevelt's blame can be analyzed as a rhetorical means to support laws aiming at prosecuting and excluding anarchists from United States. How to draw a line between issuing blame in a democracy and comparable rhetorical technics in dictatorships? To what extent is it a matter of ways of reasoning or arguing? To what extent is a matter of genericness, that is, a matter of hearer’s abilities to differentiate epideictic from propaganda?

Answering those questions requires challenging traditional views on valid argumentation and rational reasoning.
Eveline T. Feteris (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

The role of argumentation referring to consequences, goals and values in the justification of judicial decisions

In my contribution I discuss the way in which arguments referring to consequences, goals and values are related in complex structures of legal justification. From a pragma-dialectical perspective I describe the stereotypical patterns of legal justification in hard cases and specify the different ways in which these stereotypical patterns can be implemented in different contexts in which judges give a decision that they justify by referring to consequences, goals and values.

Maurice A. Finocchiaro (University of Nevada-Las Vegas, USA)

Ubiquity, ambiguity, and metarationality: Searching for the fallacy of composition

The word “ubiquity” here refers to the working hypothesis that fallacies of composition are ubiquitous. “Ambiguity” refers to the hypothesis that “fallacy of composition” has three distinct meanings, often confused; i.e., fallacious inference from distributive terms or properties of parts or members, to collective terms or properties of a whole or class. “Metarationality” refers to the hypothesis that the best places to search for fallacies of compositions are meta-arguments whose conclusions attribute this fallacy to ground-level arguments. While testing these hypotheses, I have found some historically important cases, e.g.: Robert Michels’s iron law of oligarchy, as critiqued by political sociologists; Aristotle’s geocentric argument from natural motion, as critiqued by Galileo; and a step in the theological argument from design, as critiqued by Hume. Here I focus on the last.

Charles Forceville, Assimakis Tseronis, Melle Grannetia (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

The argumentative role of visual metaphor and visual antithesis in ‘fly on the wall’ documentary

In this paper, we focus on the argumentative role of visual metaphor and visual antithesis in the so-called “fly on the wall” documentary. This subtype of documentary purports to record what happens in front of the camera, without influencing the presentation of these events through a narrator's voice-over. Consequently, if the filmmakers want to guide their viewers toward reaching certain conclusions, the montage of shots or scenes is one of the few ways at their disposal to achieve this. In particular, we analyse several film scenes from two major representatives of the “fly on the wall” documentary, the Maysles brothers and Frederick Wiseman, to study how montage patterns that can be construed as “visual metaphor” and “visual antithesis” underline the argumentative stance of the filmmaker.

Amanda Frank (Nazarbayev University, Kazakhstan)
Patient (non)compliance: Advocating for the restructuring of physician-patient relationships based in rhetorical and argumentation theory

The medical community has addressed the issue of patient (non)compliance by moving to a patient-centered model. The patient-centered model neglects the underlying assumptions and structures that are inherent to biomedicine, and halts a meaningful persuasive exchange between the physician and the patient. This paper addresses the problem of patient (non)compliance by applying components of rhetorical and argumentation theory to the contemporary standard of patient-centeredness, and advocates for a restructuring of the physician-patient relationship. After a critical investigation of the physician-patient relationship, which assesses the biomedical paradigm, issues that perpetuate (non)compliance are revealed and discussed. Additionally, this paper offers future directions for research on patient (non)compliance based on rhetorical and argumentation theory.

James B. Freeman (Hunter College of The City University of New York, USA)

Identifying the warrant of an argument

An argument assumes that from its premises one may infer in some sense its conclusion, and that this inference instances a more general connection. Stating this general connection is giving the warrant of the argument, central to evaluating connection adequacy. Warrant identification involves reconstruction, since warrants are implicit. We have found applying Hitchcock’s way in “Enthymematic Arguments” problematic in certain cases. Warrants may be either formal or material. We propose a procedure for material warrants involving symbolizing the argument in a formal language which needs to be richer than required for predicate logic with identity and functors by containing modal connectives and variable binding operators. We argue for our procedure by applying it to particular examples.
Rodolfo Luján Gaeta, Nelida Alcira Gentile (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina)

**On the persuasive power of the best explanation argument**

This paper focuses on the inferences to the best explanation (IBE) as a mode of argumentation in epistemology at the meta-scientific level. Several scientific realists argue that scientific realism is the best explanation of the success of science. But serious objections have been raised against the IBE. Given the controversy generated by the issue of the IEBs, this paper explores the possibility that the greater or lesser resistance to the acceptance of inferences to the best explanation depends on differences in terms of the persuasion criteria that correspond to each context. According to our hypothesis, participants of philosophical discussions usually apply criteria that are stricter than the ones considered persuasive in other kinds of argumentation.

José Ángel Gascón (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Spain)

**What could virtue contribute to argumentation?**

Is a virtue approach in argumentation possible without committing the ad hominem fallacy? My answer is affirmative, provided that the object study of our theory is well delimited. A theory of argumentative virtue should not focus on argument appraisal, but on those traits that make an individual achieve excellence in argumentative practices -not only from a logical point of view but also from an epistemological, ethical or political one. An agent-based approach in argumentation should be developed, not in order to find better grounds for argument appraisal, but to gain insight into argumentative habits and excellence. Only this way can we really benefit from what a virtue argumentation theory really has to offer.

Anca Gata (Dunarea de Jos University of Galati, Romania)

**The strategic function of argumentative moves in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) reports**

CSR discourse has become a strategic issue by which companies claim to adopt responsible business practice towards society. The pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation allows the analyst to view businesses and other social actors as engaged in a (virtual) difference of opinion, and CSR discourse as a fragment of critical discussion on the issue of social responsibility. The company acts as a protagonist claiming that their corporate business behavior is responsible. Other social actors act as antagonist(s) by doubting or critiquing this standpoint. The study identifies and analyzes argumentative moves and rhetorical strategies used in CSR reports to build a better image of the business and persuade various audiences that the company acts responsibly towards society. Appeal to evidence, to ethos, antithesis are some of the main elements of this rhetoric.

Ingeborg M. van der Geest (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
A pragma-dialectical analysis of argumentation in favour of choices in Records of Decision

Before major projects can be carried out - for example the construction of a highway - the competent authorities have to make a choice between the proposed plan and relevant alternative options. In a Record of Decision they justify their choices by pointing to the process of balancing the pros and cons of the options. Often the argumentation is not presented very clearly, which makes it hard for interested citizens to evaluate the argumentation and respond critically. This paper focuses on the analysis of argumentation in favour of choices in Records of Decision. The pragma-dialectical analytic instrument is refined by integrating decision theoretical insights and institutional requirements of the decision-making context. I will demonstrate that by using this instrument the argumentation can be analyzed in a systematic and justified way.

Els Van Geyte (The University of Birmingham, UK)

Argumentation in Higher Education: Guiding students to academic achievement

Being able to argue well is crucial for success in Higher Education. This is especially true in countries where most academic assessment is based on the ability to produce quality argumentative essays. This paper reports on PhD research done at the University of Birmingham, England, in which a pedagogical model of argumentation developed by Mitchell and Riddle (2000) was modified to analyse and compare a corpus of short texts by expert first language (L1) writers and novice L2 writers. The results reveal a number of qualitative and quantitative differences between the use of claims, support and explanation in the micro-arguments in both sets of texts. Possible causes and effects are explored as well as pedagogical implications, especially how raising awareness of argumentation and syntax could help the novice writers to argue more successfully.

Michael A Gilbert (York University, Canada)

Rules is Rules: Ethos and situational normativity

One major question in the debate between the rhetorical and dialectical approaches concerns the availability of rules and standards. Are there objective standards as dialecticians desire, or are they changeable and situational as rhetoricians claim? In Part One I briefly identify three concepts, context, audience and ethos, that lead us from greater to finer situational identification. In Part Two I focus on ethos and how it is endemic to argument with familiars. I show in Part Three that ethos concerns many local factors, and therefore, must be situational. Finally, in Part Four, it will be shown how the pragma-dialectical Rule, “Parties must not prevent each other from advancing or casting doubt on standpoints” is situational.

Luca Gili (K.U. Leuven, Belgium)

A fortiori arguments in classical rhetoric: A logical analysis
This paper claims that the soundness of a fortiori arguments relies on the trichotomy property of comparative relations (cf. Casari 1987; Gili and Pezzini, forthcoming). Therefore, if we understand classical rhetoric as the counterpart of dialectic (cf. Krabbe 2000), we are lead to interpret rules as those expounded in Arist. Rhet. II, 23 and in Cic. Top. 23 as having ancient comparative logic as their counterpart (ancient comparative logic was expounded in Parm. 140e-141e; Arist., Top. III). This paper will present the axioms of comparative logic which are useful to state a fortiori arguments. The paper will deal with a fortiori arguments in classical literature.

Giovanni Gobber (Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy)

**On pragmatic conditions of non-typical Yes-No Questions in argumentation**

The request for an answer is perhaps the (proto)typical pragmatic function of Yes-No interrogative clauses, but a large number of questions have other pragmatic functions. A large variety of such questions has been recognized and labels such as "rhetorical question", "biased question", "deliberative question", "suggestive question", "didactic question" have been used.

In this contribution an attempt is made to describe how the pragmatic conditions of non-typical yes-no questions differ from those of canonical requests for a verbal answer. These differences will then be taken into account to explain the role of non-typical yes-no questions in argumentative moves.

Rhetorical questions will not be considered here, as they are taken to represent statements expressed by interrogative structures.

David Godden (Old Dominion University, USA)

**Against the restorative model of counter rebuttal**

What is the proper way to model the effects of successful counter-rebuttal in argument? According to restorative models, successful counter-rebuttal restores the status of a claim to that which it held prior to rebuttal. This paper argues for an alternative, strengthening model of counter-rebuttal, according to which successful counter-rebuttal strengthens an initial inference to the degree that it was threatened by the countered rebuttal. After making the initial case for a strengthening model, I demonstrate that both Walton’s and Freeman’s theories have the technical means required to model the strengthening effect of counter-rebuttal. Dialectical theories can represent the strengthening effect by closing down possible moves available to respondents, while structural models represent it by closing off paths of defeat thereby strengthening the modal qualifier attached to the claim.

Geoff Goddu (University of Richmond, USA)

**Towards a foundation for argumentation theory**

What are the constraints on an adequate theory of argumentation and are there any substantive principles that are accepted by all theories that could serve as grounds for adjudicating amongst competing theories? The challenge is to determine whether any set of
Maureen Daly Goggin (Arizona State University, USA)

**Knitting arguments: Feminist strategies for public protest**

Contemporary Western feminist activism has taken a radical turn, moving beyond and in contradistinction to traditional rhetorical strategies of public protest and confrontation among throngs of gatherers. I call this turn “soft power.” This oxymoronic phrase for contemporary activism tactics challenges the connotation of “soft” as flimsy, weak, and stereotypically feminine and the connotation of “power” as brute force, strong, and stereotypically masculine. Both words are turned inside out in many current activist movements. Among them is yarn bombing, a contemporary form of illegal street art that is used as an argument. This paper will explore the practice of yarn bombing as a third-wave argumentative strategy, specifically focusing on the creation of arguments as one of wo/men’s ways of making claims.

Vadim Golubev (St Petersburg State University, Russia)

**Western and Russian media coverage of the Ukrainian crisis: An emotional commitment or bias?**

Plato’s Socrates argued for dialectic, a type of discourse between people who wish to establish the truth of the matter through reasoned arguments. The Sophists taught rhetoric that seeks to persuade an audience. Douglas Walton distinguishes several types of dialogue ranging from discussion to quarrel, which can be placed on a scale from the most adversarial to the most cooperative one. In the media, this is often manifested by the use of a one-sided vs a two-sided approach to storytelling. In times of crisis, journalists frequently display an emotional commitment in their country’s point of view that may cloud rational judgment and lead to bias turning journalism into propaganda. The paper examines a clash between emotion and reason in Western and Russian media coverage of the Ukrainian crisis.

G. Thomas Goodnight, David B. Hingstman, Sandy Green (University of Southern California, USA)

**Market events, volatility, and explanatory argument: Financial contexts and bounded communicative rationality in the global housing bubble**

We examine strategic maneuvers that link market events to explanatory arguments. Such reasoning animates pro and cons, thereby encouraging a reasonable range of arguments.
concerning financial investment. The paper examines the movement from an economy of argument at equilibrium to one that rationalizes flight or speculation. The global 2008 housing bubble is featured as an example of practice. Finance arguments are identified as characteristic of bounded communicative rationality, a term that identifies the relationships of context to practice in argumentation.

Jean Goodwin (Iowa State University, USA)

**Climate scientist Stephen Schneider versus The Sceptics: A case study of argumentation in deep disagreement**

Can deep disagreement be managed by argument? This case study examines the 2010 exchange between prominent climate scientist/communicator Stephen Schneider and an Australian television audience of self-described climate "sceptics." An analysis of the moves made by audience members, the moderator, and Schneider himself shows that Schneider consistently reframed the interaction to conform with the norms of science. He praised audience members for exercising good (scientific) scepticism, corrected their points when they drifted away from the language of science, and also simply refused to engage when the argument was contrary to well established science. Although some of Schneider’s moves would traditionally have been classified as fallacies, in this context they served—as Scott Jacobs has theorized—as methods for reconstructing a difficult interaction in order to make it manageable.

Kira Goudkova, Tatyana Tretyakova (St Petersburg State University, Russia)

**The matrix for argumentation literacy in 21st century Russian education**

The paper deals with the problem of argumentation literacy in the field of Russian education. We conduct the analysis of argumentation that university students put forward while writing argumentative essays that are an obligatory part of their final test in English. We conduct a comparative analysis of essays written by students at different exam levels: B1, B2 and C1 according to CEFR. The command of English at these levels differs a lot and the analysis is aimed at revealing connection between students’ language ability and their argumentative ability.

Results obtained show that students act as naïve argumentators so they produce their arguments on intuition. It is argued that typical errors and fallacies in writing help working on contrastive argumentative rhetoric as a necessary cross-cultural discipline.

Sara Greco Morasso (Università della Svizzera italiana/ University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)

**Argumentation from analogy in migrants’ decisions**

Basing on the Argumentum Model of Topics (AMT) within the general framework of a pragma-dialectical viewpoint on argumentation, this paper analyses the role of argumentation from analogy in international migrants’ decision-making processes on the basis of a corpus of interviews to migrant mothers resident in the greater London area. Reasoning from analogy
allows evaluating pragmatic decisions – such as leaving one’s home country, staying over in a foreign country, etc. – in terms of reasonableness and feasibility.

This paper contributes to argumentation studies under three aspects. First, it develops a theoretical analysis of the locus from analogy, especially in relation to pragmatic argumentation. Second, it considers a hitherto largely unexplored context of argumentation, namely international migrants’ decision-making. Finally, it argues that inner discussions might be argumentative.

Ronald W. Greene, Jay Alexander Frank (University of Minnesota, USA)

**Missiles as messages: Appeals to force in president Obama’s strategic maneuverability on the use of chemical weapons in Syria**

Almost a year before chemical weapons were used in Syria, Barack Obama declared his intentions to enforce a “red line” for military engagement with Bashar al-Assad’s regime. The appeal to force was explicit: if Assad used chemical weapons, then the United States would respond with military engagement. In the aftermath of the Assad regime’s implication in the August 2013 use of chemical weapons, Obama proposed a military response that would send “a message” (ostensibly about the use of chemical weapons) via missiles. This paper explores the way that such a message blurs the line between force and persuasion in diplomatic argument, complicating the normative assumptions of argumentation theory and underwriting the conditions of possibility for Obama’s strategic maneuverability in the context of diplomatic argument.

Leo Groarke (Trent University, University of Windsor, Canada)

**How to do things with(out) words**

Many scholars have proposed accounts of visual argumentation that investigate the use of non-verbal elements in argument. They have in various ways argued that we can use the principles of pragma-dialectics to explain, analyze, and assess argumentation of this sort. While I agree with such views, they have not convinced others who maintain that pictures and other non-verbal entities cannot fully function as arguments. In my paper I try to answer the criticisms of these commentators -- and explain how non-verbal argumentation is possible -- by supplementing pragma-dialectical principles with the account of meaning offered by the later Wittgenstein in his account of “language games.”

Wendy Lee Grosskopf (the University of Rhode Island, USA)

**An examination of stasis in undergraduate composition textbooks**

This presentation reports on the findings of a project in which lines of stasis (defined by study’s author as the sequence of questions – asked either explicitly or implicitly -- that move an argument from initial conflict to resolution) is developed in a corpus of composition textbooks, commonly used in undergraduate classrooms at United States universities, through three uses of argument: for advocacy, for exploration, and for professional purposes. This work is conducted by first classifying the textbooks under one of the three uses based on how
Erhuo Gu, Shiya Zhang (Southwest University, China)

The Kenre dialectical practice

As a verbal-argumentation, Kenre is still vitality in Yi area of southwest China. It is characterized by "poetic Wisdom". Kenre is not only a kind of verbal behavior and dialogue art, but also a way of communication and inheritance. The author discusses the issue of “how kenre orator develop thinking during the dialogical education ” from the interdisciplinary perspective, which is relative to the relationship between “dialogue” and “thinking”, as well as a fundamental issue which is the development of Yi people’s spiritual word. The author gives his own answer in the several concept: “evoking” “remembering ” “deriving” “creating” “principling” “expressing” and “evaluating”, proposes a new outlook of education in the hope that it will deepen the understanding of the issue “what is Socratic education ”.
Disruptive definition as a method of deterritorialization in modern argumentative contexts

In this paper, I propose the concept of disrupting definitions as a tool to territorialize, deterritorialize, and reterritorialize argumentative space. Specifically, I examine pastoral-nomads along the Mongolian/Chinese border where argumentative space is territorialized by governments that define identity by residency. I ask how cross-border protest movements have used disrupting definitions, defining identity by culture, religion, history, or access to open space to deterritorialize and reterritorialize argumentative space. This analysis is then juxtaposed with Deleuze and Guattari’s metaphor of nomadology to study the process of cultural and identity meaning making among modern pastoral-nomadic communities. I argue that deterritorialization and reterritorialization-by-definition may produce radically expanded argumentative definitions that can be used as tools to investigate the complex terrain of political struggle in our hyper-globalized, internetworked society.

Argumentation schemes meet Bayesian argumentation: Developing a normative framework for argument quality

There is a longstanding tradition of argumentation schemes as approach to address the question of argument quality. Structurally distinct schemes are linked with critical questions; if these questions are satisfied, the argument is assumed to provide a basis for accepting the conclusion. A more recent perspective to argument quality has adopted the normative framework of Bayesian probability. We argue that one can only successfully develop a normative theory of argument quality by combining the two approaches. We discuss several example schemes (e.g., the argument from sign, the appeal to popular opinion) to demonstrate how adopting a Bayesian perspective addresses long-standing problems concerning the status of critical questions within the scheme-based approach and allows a more flexible approach to argument evaluation.

Sustainability, sustainable development, and beyond: The evolution and use of confused notions

In this paper, I draw on Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s theory of confused notions to illuminate argumentative use of the terms “sustainability” and “sustainable development” in environmental discourse. I first review the evolution of the confused notion “sustainability.” Then, I analyze how the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) successfully associated sustainability and economic development in its 1987 report Our Common Future, which popularized the term “sustainable development.” I argue that
confused notions such as “sustainability” and “sustainable development” are not liabilities in environmental discourse, but flexible argumentative resources. A consideration of how confused notions can be abused, however, is necessary to discern deceptive uses of these terms.

Kati Hannken-Illjes (Universität Marburg, Germany)

**Things, arguments and in between: An analysis of trees and their place in the protest against Stuttgart 21**

Culminating in 2010, the German town of Stuttgart witnessed an unprecedented wave of protest against the remodelling of its train station. Known as “Stuttgart 21”, the construction work demanded the cutting of 250 trees in the Schlossgarten, bordering the main station. During the protest, these trees became central as arguments against the remodelling as well as a place of protest itself.

The aim of this paper is threefold: on a theoretical level, to discuss the interrelation of the material and the symbolic in argumentation and public discourse, on a methodological level to introduce the conceptions by participants, and on a critical level to show, how by integrating the material and the symbolic the concrete trees could function as common ground in a diverse protest movement.

Hans V. Hansen (University of Windsor, Canada)

**Fallacies: Reflecting on recent research**

This presentation attempts an overview of post-Hamblin developments in our thinking about fallacies. The investigation falls into several parts. There is the question of definition: In addition to the classical psychological definitions of “fallacy”, there is now a frequency definition, a scheme definition and a procedural definition to consider. Related to this is the question of whether all mistakes are fallacies. Still another fallacy-related heading has to do with the classification of fallacies. In addition we are interested in seeing which of the newly identified fallacies have been retained in the literature. If there has been a change in the extension of “fallacy,” does it reflect anything of interest for our present research interests?

Michael David Hazen (Wake Forest University, USA)

**Testing the relationship between argument and culture**

This paper proposes a framework for testing the relationship between argument and culture. The framework is based on the ideas that: 1) the minimal requirement for what constitutes argument across different cultures is the idea of argument as “linkage”, and 2) that argument links can be conceptualized in terms of the way that cultures encode and decode information in messages on a continuum of possibilities ranging from the low context end where information is found in the explicit verbal message to the high context end where information is found in various aspects of the context. The study will use a series of print ads to explore the degree to which various argument are seen as possessing argumentative links under conditions of high and low contextuality.
Ulrich Heink, Kurt Jax (Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ), Germany)

**Of xenophobes and pragmatists – arguments on the evaluation of invasive alien species**

Environmental science and policy frequently make the case against invasive alien species (IAS), i.e., species introduced outside their natural distribution by human agency which have an adverse effect on biodiversity. We here investigate the use of evaluative arguments on IAS. Our research is guided by the questions: 1) what is the scope of arguments presented in the IAS debate?; 2) what are the normative premises underlying these arguments? We examined debates in peer-reviewed biodiversity-related journals with special regard to a debate in “Nature”. Inventory conservation (e.g., species richness), naturalness and cultural value are important motives which underlie the evaluation of IAS. However, opponents and proponents interpret naturalness und cultural value in a different way.

Michael David Hepworth (University of Leeds, UK)

**Argumentation and Citizenship in the Adult ESOL classroom**

The Adult ESOL (English to Speakers of Other Languages) classroom is a domain where adult migrants to the UK learn not only English, but also how to make and take their place as citizens. How, then, does classroom argumentation connect to citizenship? And what is the role of the teacher in this process? This paper conceptualizes argumentation in terms of competing and consensual voices, or speaking positions, and sees the ways in which students and teachers position themselves and each other in classroom argumentation as central to the performance of identities. Drawing upon data from the classrooms of a Further Education college in Leeds, it suggests that the classroom can be an agora for the enactment and modelling of full democratic citizenship, with argumentation as its key process.

Dale A. Herbeck (Northeastern University, USA)

**“For limited times”: Definitional argument and the meaning of the copyright clause**

Among the enumerated powers granted to Congress in Article One of the United States Constitution is the authority “To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.” This language, which both grants and limits power, has been litigated in a series of consequential Supreme Court decisions involving the length of time that a work is protected by copyright and whether copyright protection can be retroactively extended to works that have previously passed into the public domain. While this may appear to be a relatively simple illustration of definitional argument, the dispute over the intended meaning of “limited Terms” actually belies a large controversy over the proper purpose of copyright law.

Thierry Herman (University of Neuchâtel /University of Lausanne, Switzerland)
**A plea for a distinction between explanation and argument through explicative and argumentative uses of the French connective “car”**

Recently, McKeon (2013) argued that explanations should be considered as arguments. We will argue in favour of maintaining such a distinction, despite the similar inferential structures both phenomena involve, and ground it by resorting to semantics and the notion of metarepresentation. We will illustrate this with the French connective “car”. It is known that “car” offers a justification for the utterance of proposition P (groupe lambda-l 1975), thereby providing an unequivocal sign of argumentation. Yet, there are some rare uses of “car” which seem to explain rather than to argue. We will show how these uses communicate a sign of readiness to enter into an argument and we will evaluate the rhetorical effects of the choice of "car" over "parce que" (because).

Mika Hietanen (University of Uppsala, Sweden)

**The Swedish Democrats’ new rhetoric: hard values between the lines**

The Sweden Democrats’ (Sverigedemokraterna, SD) rise towards power has not been without problems. The party’s politics as well as its rhetoric is continuing to attract widespread critique. Since their introduction to the parliament in 2010, the party has, however, tried to clean up their image. Their previously often straightforward chauvinism and opposition to a liberal immigration policy is now more indirect. A strategic manoeuvring between politically and rationally credible communication, on the one hand, and the need not to compromise the values of the party’s core voters, on the other, has required a new rhetoric. An analysis of material from the year before the parliamentary elections in 2010 and 2014, respectively, highlights the strategies used, such as polysemic phrases, metaphors, enthymematic arguments, and loaded questions.

Edward A. Hinck (Central Michigan University, USA), Shelly S. Hinck (Central Michigan University, USA), Robert S. Hinck (Texas A & M University, USA), Salma I. Ghanem (Central Michigan University), William O. Dailey (Central Michigan University, USA)

**Cultural differences in political debate: Comparing face threats in U.S., Great Britain, and Egyptian campaign debates**

We explore cultural differences in argumentation strategies used by candidates in campaign debates for high office in Great Britain (2010), the United States (2012), and Egypt (2012). How candidates manage face concerns in the potentially threatening encounters of campaign debates is interesting since these events are held in front of audiences who watch and
deliberate over candidates’ political skills. Using a coding schema that measures the face threat of messages addressing character and leadership competence, policies and proposals, political responsibility, use of data in support of claims, disagreement with the opinions of other candidate, inappropriate campaign tactics, and ridicule, we intend to determine if there are significant differences in the politeness strategies used by candidates in U.S., British, and Egyptian debates and consider the implications for democratic political institutions.

Robert Hinck (Texas A&M University, USA)

Arguments for alliance: Normalization of U.S.-China relations during the Carter Administration

This study looks at how leaders transform potentially adversarial relationships into workable, stable understandings of each other’s interests. While arguments can function to promote discovery, appraisal, and collaboration on ideas, I argue this process alone cannot account for transcending of conflict. Analyzing declassified transcripts of negotiations conducted by high-ranking officials from the beginning of the Carter Administration until the official announcement of normalization on December 15, 1978, this study shows that only when U.S. leaders engaged in a process of argumentation directed towards identification were the two countries able to accept the others’ premises and align their interests. These results suggests today’s policy makers create strategic messages based on common enemies, interests, and benefits, while anchoring their rationales within the already establish principles for U.S.-Chinese cooperation.

David Hitchcock (McMaster University, Canada)

The linked-convergent distinction

The linked-convergent distinction introduced by Stephen Thomas (1977) is primarily a distinction between ways in which two or more reasons can directly support a claim, not between types of arguments, reasoning, reasons, or premisses. As with the deductive-inductive distinction, there may be no fact of the matter as to whether a given multi-premiss argument is linked or convergent. Despite James Freeman’s careful recent clarification and defence (2011) of the linked-convergent distinction, Geoff Goddu (2009) makes a convincing case that the distinction is useless for any purpose for which it has been advanced. Freeman (2011) rightly distinguishes from it the distinction in pragma-dialectics between coordinatively compound and multiple argumentation, which is the distinction between a single multi-premiss argument supporting a claim and multiple independent arguments for a claim.

Hans Hoeken (Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands)

Is argument quality in the standpoint of the beholder?

Lay people can - and do - use argument scheme specific criteria to distinguish strong from weak arguments. In an experiment, the question was addressed as to whether (1) people use these criteria to distinguish strong from weak arguments in an objective way or (2) people use
them to disqualify arguments that go against their opinion and to talk up arguments that are in accordance with their own standpoint - regardless of the quality of the arguments? The results provide interesting insights into how people's opinions guide the application and interpretation of argument criteria for assessing argument quality.

Michael H.G. Hoffmann (Georgia Institute of Technology, USA)

**Changing the practice of knowledge creation through collaborative argument mapping on the internet**

Only those statements can be claimed to be knowledge that can be justified by reasons. With software that allows collaborative argument mapping on the Internet, a radical change in the practice of knowledge creation is possible. Entire knowledge areas can be represented in the form of large argument maps. Collaborators might work on different “construction zones,” or there might be deliberations on points of disagreement. Bring your laptop and you will see. However, there are also problems: What about the idea authorship in collaborative projects? How to manage revisions of the structure of maps, especially when there are conflicts on how to frame things? What about the rhetorical demands of communicating knowledge? What about the idea of “publication” if there is no point in time when a map is completed?

Thomas A. Hollihan, Patricia Riley (University of Southern California, USA)

**Crossing the red line on chemical and biological weapons: Ethical, emotional, cultural, and moral arguments in the Syria controversy**

On September 9, 2013, chemical weapons killed approximately 1,400 people in Damascus. Rebel leaders and western governments blamed the Syrian government. The government and its allies claimed the rebels attacked their own supporters to encourage international intervention in the civil war. The incident provoked a heated debate in the media, in diplomatic channels, in national parliaments, and in the United Nations about appropriate responses to prevent the future use of such weapons. These highly emotional arguments reflected profound differences in argument cultures and values. This study examines these claims from the perspective of media diplomacy.

Michael Hoppmann (Northeastern University, USA)

**Shifting paradigms in argument scheme studies**

The paper will contrast three competing scientific paradigms in argument schemes studies: 1) the 'geometrical paradigm' (which understands arguments as derivative from syllogisms that can be illustrated as geometrical forms) famously attributed to Descartes and criticized by Toulmin as well as Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 2) the 'biological paradigm' (which organizes naturally occurring species of arguments into a 'tree of life' of argumentation), as well as 3) a 'chemical paradigm' (which treats natural arguments as recurring 'molecules' that can be broken up into fundamental ‘atoms’ of reasoning). The alternative paradigms will be applied to examples of the argument from authority with special attention being given to the resulting lists of critical questions.
Paul van den Hoven (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)

**Cartoons, cognitive semiotics and indeterminate arguments**

Many multimodal arguments invite complex deblending processes that allow for creative contributions of the interpreter. We show how for example cartoons convey arguments by inviting the interpreter to run a so called double-scope blend (Fauconnier & Turner 2002). Not all resulting meaning is encoded in the discourse structure and more is left to the interpreter. This raises the problem of accountability of the discourse voice as the protagonist in a discussion on the one hand, the accountability of the interpreter as a potential antagonist on the other hand. In terms of fallacies this is the question how to decide whether either a fallacy of hedging of a fallacy of a straw man may be at hand when a specific interpretation is brought in discussion.

Robert Hummer (Otto-Friedrich-University-Bamberg, Germany), Nikil Mukerji (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany)

**A general rule for arguments from analogy**

Reasoning from analogy is reasoning based on similarity: A Proposition A is supposed to hold for a case in question, because it holds for another case (case C1) similar to the one in question (C2). How does this work? It has been proposed that case1 or elements (a, b, c,…) of it may give rise to an inferential rule like ‘If proposition A is true by virtue of a, b, c,… in case C1, and if a, b, c,… are traits of both C1 and C2, then proposition A is true in case C2’.

We suggest: The rule is part of the arguments’ scheme if this is required by the participants within a dialog in order to satisfy their individual need of orientation.

Catherine Hundleby (University of Windsor, Canada)

**Fallacies in scientific reasoning: The fallacy of accident and the case of adaptationism**

Douglas Walton’s approach to fallacies (1995) can help to explain and explore the significance of adaptationist tendencies in evolutionary biology identified by Elisabeth Lloyd (2006): the assumption that all characteristics result from a distinct evolutionary adaptation. I argue this presumption qualifies the error as an example of the fallacy of accident: ignoring exceptions to the rule. On Walton’s account, the attractiveness of a presumptive error arises from the discursive familiarity of its acceptable analogues. Regarding the fallacy of accident as an explanation for adaptationism suggests that scientists are accustomed to looking for universal or law-like relationships, and often correct in this disposition. That habit would explain why they tend to make universalist assumptions even though they accept the existence of exceptions.
Constanza Ihnen (University of Chile, Chile)

Argumentation in deliberation and negotiation

Deliberative democracy has traditionally opposed deliberation to negotiation and assigned priority to the former in the sphere of political decision-making. A classic assumption underlying this view is that negotiating and arguing are mutually exclusive activities. Yet as Walton, van Eemeren and many others have convincingly argued, negotiations not only can but often involve argumentation. Which are exactly the differences between these genres of discourse then? And are these differences so (politically) fundamental? This article seeks to make a small contribution to the democratic debate by contrasting the two genres in terms of the allowable and unallowable argument schemes within each of them. To reconstruct these implicit rules for arguing, I analyse the felicity conditions of the speech acts which pragmatically organise deliberation and negotiation: proposals and offers, respectively.

Serkan Ince (Eberhard Karls University, Germany), Christoph Lumer (University of Siena, Italy)

Islamic theological arguments – An epistemological systematisation

Classical texts in Islamic theology are heavily argumentative; and much of Islamic theology tries to base faith on valid and sound arguments. This argumentative tradition so far has nearly not been studied in argumentation theory. This contribution starts to develop a critical analysis and reconstruction of the arguments in classical texts of Islamic theology (e.g. al-Māturīdī, al-Samarqandī, al-Ghazālī) from the viewpoint of the epistemological theory of argumentation. The question of the analysis is whether these arguments can be reconstructed as to be of one of the universal types of argument so far identified by the epistemological approach and in particular whether there are e.g. specifically Islamic types of argument. One preliminary result is that most of these arguments can be reconstructed as deductive arguments.

David Erland Isaksen (Texas Christian University, USA)

Internal logic: Persuasive form and hierarchy in Kenneth Burke

Kenneth Burke claims that there are structures in language which are not necessarily detectable at the level of arguments but which are nonetheless highly persuasive. In a way, every author or speaker constructs a unique vocabulary where words are given different nuances of meaning and operate within networks of form and hierarchies of values. By being consistent, these structures form an “internal logic” or “pattern of experience” which create both vertical and horizontal convergence. The covert nature of this persuasion makes it necessary to use a method for close reading which reveals these implicit argumentation structures. Kenneth Burke invented a method for such analysis, which he called "indexing," and I will show how the method can be used to give a fuller account of persuasive devices in an argument.
Deference, distrust, and delegation: Three design hypotheses

Aakhus, Goodwin, Jackson, and others have lately proposed looking at argumentation from a design perspective—as designed, and as redesignable. A "design hypothesis" in argumentation is a broad notion about how argumentative practice can be shaped toward greater reasonableness. Like an empirical hypothesis, a design hypothesis must conform with facts, but its real test is its ability to support particular human purposes in particular circumstances. Design hypotheses do not compete with one another in the way empirical hypotheses do; each may add to our overall rationality in some circumstance. This point is illustrated through discussion of three design hypotheses for incorporating expert knowledge and opinion into argumentation: deference to expert authority, distrust of authority, or delegation of responsibility to accountable experts.

Dog whistles in political campaign ads are a problem for argumentation and communication theory

Three 2008 presidential political campaign ads illustrate insinuations and allusions designed to be heard by a target audience with the sensitivities or proclivities to hear something that goes over the head of ordinary listeners. These “dog whistles” present a compelling problem for argumentation theory. Normatively, the argumentation critic must not pretend that such processes do not occur or don’t have any deleterious consequences for rational persuasion, reasonable judgment, or constructive disputation. Neither should the critic presume that if they can hear or make out an insinuation, the arguer is responsible and accountable. Analytically, concepts ordinarily associated with communication—commitment, responsibility, effect, intention, convention, negotiation, interpretation, articulation, and even awareness—can too easily provide misleading or unhelpful conceptualizations of how such messages work.

Argumentation from pairing a language with strategic goals

The pragma-dialectical “Code of Conduct” provides a set of norms that govern attacks and defenses of standpoints in argumentation, which is characterized as an interactive process of reaching a motivated end-state in a two-player dialogical game between Proponent and Opponent. In the tradition of dialogical logic logically valid inferences are treated as argumentation in dialogical games. Generalizing that approach, and drawing on a game-theoretic framework, we show that Proponent’s and Opponent’s strategic preferences in dialogical logic games can be mapped onto specifications of the norms of the Code of Conduct. In turn, (deductive) “logical argumentation” becomes a by-product of pairing a
Multimodal orientation towards argumentation: How pointing gestures embody the segmentation of long argumentative turns

The segmentation of long, empirical stretches of argumentative talk remains a challenging task, as has been frequently noted by various discursive approaches of argumentation (Plantin, 1990; Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992, 2004). At the same time, Conversation Analysis showed that the theoretical and methodological challenge of segmenting long, multi-unit turns-at-talk into turn-constructional units can be efficiently tackled by taking into account gestures: gestures are visible interpretations of the ongoing turn (Goodwin, 1981; Schmitt 2005; Mondada, 2007a,b). The question addressed by this paper is, therefore, the following: does the embodied orientation towards turn completion and multi-unit turn segmentation reflect the basic structure of argumentation (i.e. reason(s) + conclusion)? The data are taken from eight video-recorded public debates organized from 2007 to 2009 at the University of Lausanne (Switzerland) by student associations.

Reactive argument: David Barton and the rejection of modern history

David Barton is a political partisan and one of America’s most popular and powerful historians. This is not an accident. Here, I will examine the ways that Barton uses practices of Christian evangelists to argue back against the progressive standards of professional historians. First, I will examine how his vision of history claims reactive ground by rejecting scientific history. Second, I will examine how the evangelical interpretive methodology of solo scriptura, proof-texting and anachronism insulate his interpretations from academic criticisms and methodologically elevate historical debates onto theological ground. Finally, I will tease out some implications of this variety of reactive argument for the larger study of reactive argument.

“I did not do it, because I would not do a thing like that”: Conjectural strategies in public defenses

Classical conjectural topoi instruct an advocate to invent arguments about one’s motive, one’s way of life (deeds performed in the past), character, behavior etc. in order to make it likely that the accused “did not do it”. Such arguments can render only some plausibility to one’s case, but are nevertheless often used in public defenses today, e.g. by sportspersons being accused of using drugs. This paper deals with the conjectural strategy by which it is argued that the accused is not the kind of person to do the thing (s)he is accused of. The strategy is analyzed and demonstrated with examples from recent public defenses. It is argued
that, although such a strategy is rather weak, it is an appropriate means of defense when hard proof is absent.

Jeroen Jansen (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Creating (dis)agreement by self-abasement. Apologizing as a means of confrontational strategic maneuvering

I focus on the way in which exaggerated modesty and self-humiliation in the confrontation stage have been used as strategic tools. The text in question is a preface by the Dutch author Bredero (1585-1618) to his comedy Moortje, an adaptation, by way of a French translation, of Terence’s Eunuchus. As becomes clear by analyzing the different stages of this preface, the disagreement between protagonist and antagonist has been created in the confrontation stage by polarizing the parties' attitude towards each other, which is established in the opening stage. Implicitly, next to the small elite group of Neolatinist professors a secondary audience is addressed, consisting of the common readers with no knowledge of Latin, which enables the protagonist to defend himself and to meet the preferences of that audience most strongly.

Jeffrey Jarman (Wichita State University, USA)

The failure of fact-checking

Fact-checking rests on a foundation that is desirable: an educated citizenry, informed of the facts, will make reasonable and rational decisions. Unfortunately, as the theory of motivated reasoning suggests, prior attitudes strongly influence the process. This paper reports the results from two studies that investigated the effectiveness of fact-checking in the context of ObamaCare. The first study presented a statement (by Obama) and refutation on the importance of preventative care. The second study presented a statement (by Romney) and refutation on the potential cost savings by repealing ObamaCare. Approximately 400 people completed one study. The results of the studies confirm the real problem for fact-checking: prior attitude toward Obama, Romney, and health care intervened to reduce the utility of the fact check.

Hyeong-Yeon Jeon (Konkuk University, South Korea)

A study of the visual argumentation on the slogans for Korean regions

The purpose of this study is to explore how Korean regional governments influence the people's interpretation of regional representations by the visual argumentation in the slogans visualized. In particular, we try to examine visual slogans, since Korean regions’ slogans can convey any illustrative or typographical argumentation for regional brand values. Our interest includes the domain of rhetorics and semiotics, which examines the subject from an iconic and plastic, and linguistic perspective of the argumentation of slogan that is visualized. This study concentrates on the rhetorical argumentation of visual slogans from formal and structural dimensions to rhetorical dimensions and semiotic dimensions, in order to understand their communication strategy through the slogan culture of the Korean regions.
Henrik Juel (Roskilde University, Denmark)

**An experiment concerning argumentative power in different media**

I want to present and discuss the results of a classroom experiment concerning rhetoric and argumentation. The experiment brings out noticeable differences in the way persuasion and arguments work when presented in a written text as opposed to a live voice and/or a film recording of the same actual speech event. This research experiment goes to underline that the specific media form of a presentation greatly influences the credibility and argumentative power. However, it may also spark an interesting discussion about logos, ethos, and pathos in different media - and about the nature of argumentation and persuasiveness as such - and that discussion I would like to continue in this conference forum.
Hideki Kakita (Dokkyo University, Japan)

**Fine arts as visual argument: The sense of vision and visual technology**

In the current effort to delineate the new field of visual argumentation, Groarke (1996) analyzed fine arts as a visual form of argument, and the messages transmitted by painters as propositional contents. To critically extend Groarke, the present essay investigates pictorial perspective as a mediating visual technology and a presupposed frame that performatively defines a scope of arguments set in paintings. In so doing, this essay presents a way to consider the visual as an independent realm of argument, and tries to define its unique structure of argument by making references to the current notion of representation and visual cultural studies.

Takayuki Kato (Seiwa University, Japan), Takeshi Suzuki (Meiji University, Japan), Masako Suzuki (Keio University, Japan)

**A strategic maneuvering analysis of the Japan’s first internet election in 2013**

In the summer of 2013 Japan experienced its first Internet election campaign in history, which was designed to provide a new form of argumentation. This essay attempts to analyze political moves in the campaign within the framework of strategic maneuvering developed by Frans E. van Eemeren. Specifically, it intends to do the following: describing various types of Japanese electorate, examining argumentative approaches by the involved parties, and evaluating the reconstructed argumentative moves with theoretically possible moves. Different approaches were found between major and minor parties in that, for instance, one of the opposition parties, the Japan Communist Party began with target audience and topics, and effectively increased its seats. With the analysis and theoretical consideration, the authors hope to indicate the future direction of the Internet election of Japan.

Mariam Keburia (Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia)

**Analyzing political discourse in the Republic of Georgia: A critical discourse-analytical perspective on political imaginaries and means-goal arguments**

The republic of Georgia has undergone remarkable socio-political changes on the long road to statehood. Re-establishing itself from the collapsed Soviet Union as an independent state has been a painful process. This paper will look at a number of speeches delivered by the political leader of Georgia in order to analyze argumentative public communication, focusing on how practical arguments in favour of the advocated policies are developed in the speeches. The analytical framework is that of Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough 2010) and particularly the more recent version of CDA that gives primacy to practical argumentation and deliberation in political discourse (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012). Analysis of the selected texts shows that the
practical argumentation scheme from goals is used to legitimize foreign policy and implemented and/or planned reforms.

Zornitsa Keremidchieva (Macalester College, USA), Vera Sidlova (Millward Brown, Czech Republic)

**Political argument and the social relations of democracy: Recovering Vaclav Havel's vision for associated living**

In the context of post-communism, liberal discourses of democratization have interacted, and often clashed, with local conceptions of social and political engagement. Siding with current critiques of normative democratic theory, this paper recovers the public arguments of the post-communist transitions as constitutive acts and artifacts of indigenous, living democratic theory. Specifically, we argue that Vaclav Havel’s first and second presidential addresses illuminate the role that public arguments play in incubating the social relations of democracy. By bringing into focus the interaction between time and space in Havel’s rhetoric of transition, we highlight how political arguments constitute the social agents and subjects of democratic life.

Victor Khachan (Lebanese American University, Lebanese Republic)

**Argumentation construction/deconstruction: Online follow-ups in Arabic & English political discourse**

User-generated content in online media has lately been acknowledged as a powerful journalistic tool in signaling topic salience and, to a certain extent, in influencing media agenda-building. One important feature of user-generated content is users’ comments, also, referred to in the literature as ‘talkbacks’ or ‘follow-ups’. Building on the dynamic process of online users’ comments on political discourse, this paper investigates the discursive impact follow-ups have on the argumentative process initiated in the article being commented on. The dialogic aspects of follow-ups will be studied in relation to their sequential organization across 1st order, 2nd order and n-th order patterns. This corpus-based study analyses follow-ups in relation to their argumentative ‘worthiness’ in constructing or deconstructing the original argument/s in Arabic and English in the context of writer-reader and reader-reader relationship.

Arthur Andrew Kidd (Katelyn Bedard Bone Marrow Association, Canada)

**A time for truce?: “Anti-science” as a loaded word in public policy debates**

The term “anti-science” has become a regular pejorative over the past decade to describe not just hostility but a means of criticizing policy stances or political views regarded contrary to scientific consensus. An unintended consequence of this rhetorical turn has been the arbitrary assignation of the “anti-science” label against opposing policy views, as well as the ironic adoption of the term by movements genuinely opposed to science's place in the public sphere as a means of criticizing science itself. This paper examines how this rhetoric has evolved through the theories of Ceccarelli and Fahnestock, using pertinent examples of the evolution
Manfred Kienpointner (University of Innsbruck, Austria)

**Reason and passion in political rhetoric: The case of Louise Michel’s (1830-1905) revolutionary discourse**

Louise Michel was a militant member of the Commune of Paris (1871) and a legendary political speaker. She has been praised for her extraordinary courage, altruistic attitude and relentless energy (Kilian 2008, Chastre 2011, Gauthier 2013). Less attention has been paid to her anarchist arguments. In this paper, the most important arguments in some of her political speeches (Michel 1871, 1883, 1890) will be analysed as to the underlying argument schemes (Kienpointner 2014). Moreover, Michel’s techniques of verbal presentation will be described, with a focus on metaphor (Lakoff 2005). More specifically, the tension between Michel’s well-founded analysis of social injustice and the exploitation of the masses, and her passionate appeals for a revolution will be analysed on the basis of the concept of strategic maneuvering (cf. van Eemeren 2010).

Justin Ward Kirk (University of Kansas, USA)

**The ideological role of “Obamacare” as argument in the 2012 Republican primaries**

This paper will analyze the ideological impact of presidential primary debates on arguments and their use in political discourse. It will argue that surface-level analysis of political argument fails to explain the effectiveness of ideological enthymemes, particularly within the context of early primary debates. Common grounding in shared values and shared standards of evidentiary proof undergird the effectiveness of ideological arguments in this context, and the choice of terminological system limits and shapes the argumentative choices afforded the candidate. Utilizing one early primary debate during the 2012 election, this study analyzes how ideological claims are supported in political debates. The study provides an account of ideological impact on arguments, and argues that surface level analysis is insufficient for taking account of primary debates’ influence on future argumentative choice.

Gabrijela Kisicek (University of Zagreb, Croatia)

**The role of paralinguistic features in the analysis of multi modal argumentation**

This paper aims to contribute to our understanding of multi-modal argumentation by examining the role of paralinguistic features in persuasive messages. Standard analyses of advertisements already assign a key role to visuals in understanding, reconstructing and assessing the argument. However, the role of other non-verbal content is often found neglected. Vocalic or paralinguistic features refer to, amongst others, accent, emphasis, vocal quality, pitch, rate, temporal structure, and pause as either contributing to the meaning of verbal communication, or as self-standing meaningful entities. I present reconstructions of TV commercials that take into account verbal, visual and paralinguistic components. Because paralinguistic features are here especially relevant to
reinforcing the argumentation, they should not without further reasons be neglected in argumentation analysis.

Jens E. Kjeldsen (University of Bergen, Norway)

**Where is visual argument?**

There seems to be, in argumentation studies, a lack of empirical studies of how audiences actually perceive and construct argumentation from communicative stimuli. This is especially pertinent to the study of visual argumentation, because such argumentation is fundamentally enthymematic, leaving most of the reconstruction of premises to the viewer. This paper will therefore use the method of audience analysis, frequently used in communication studies, to establish how viewers interpret instances of visual argumentation such as pictorially dominated advertisements. Through interviews and focus group analysis the paper firstly determines if audiences actually perceive arguments from the visual stimuli (the advertisements). Secondly, the paper examines if different audiences construct different arguments. Thirdly, it will be explored how audiences cognitively work to reconstruct the arguments.

Susan Kline, Darcy Oaks (Ohio State University, USA)

**The effect of interpersonal familiarity on argumentation in online discussion environments**

Argument scholars have studied normative expectations for discussion, but have not examined how identity and interpersonal goals may shape argumentative conduct. We theorize about such goals in ideal discussion environments, and posit that interpersonal familiarity may establish a discussion context in which particular argument acts are more likely to occur. The supposition is tested in online environments with undergraduate students who discussed a state ban on gay marriage and wrote a letter to the local newspaper. Interpersonal familiarity was manipulated with a “get-to-know-you” session. The conversational argument coding system was applied to the transcripts along with a coding scheme to note interpersonal familiarity actions. Multilevel analyses examine the effect of familiarity on argument acts; analyses contribute to interpersonal and group argumentation, as well as to knowledge of political discussion.

Geoffrey D. Klinger (DePauw University, USA), Aaron Dicker (Ball State University, USA)

**A poem without words: Visual argumentation and the photography collections of the Black Panther Party**

The 40th anniversary of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense’s founding in 2006 brought a renewed interest in an organization linked to controversy spanning the civil rights era of the 1960s to the counterculture of the 1980s. Since the anniversary, two new collections of
photography, by Howard Bingham and Stephen Shames, have been published providing new discontinuities in the previously developed historical narratives surrounding the organization. Drawing primarily from Finnegan’s (2004) work on visual rhetoric, this essay contends that these new discontinuities, articulated in non-traditional argumentative texts, invite audiences to reevaluate accepted narratives regarding the Black Panther Party. Concurrently, this essay also challenges traditional conventions within argumentation theory by considering non-discursive visual texts.

Harm Kloosterhuis (Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands)

**Strategic maneuvering in discussions about the indirect speech act insulting**

The qualification of the criminal act insulting is often problematic because language users opt for indirect insulting. In these cases someone achieves the interactional effect of insulting, but argues that there is no commitment to this effect. Indirect insulting has received little attention in legal theory and theories about legal argumentation. This contribution aims to solve some of the problems regarding the analysis of indirect insulting by providing a framework based on the theory about strategic maneuvering. First it clarifies the communicative and interactional aspects of the speech act indirect insulting. Second, it shows how the interactional effects can be analyzed as conversational implicatures. These analytical clarifications are necessary for the reconstruction of argumentation about insulting.

Christian Kluger (Research project FAcTS, Germany)

**The variance of interpersonal argumentation in families**

The contribution will deal with a special aspect of interpersonal argumentation, specifically the way in which parents and children organize argumentative discourse in family interaction. The data are taken from a substudy of an interdisciplinary research project FAcTS, where 38 families have been video-recorded in two different argumentative tasks over a period of four years. Results will be reported with respect to three different interactive patterns primarily used in families’ argumentative practices. It will be shown how these patterns vary over families with different socioeconomic background and level of argumentative competence on the part of the children. Since these patterns should provide different developmental contexts for the acquisition of argumentative skills, we will be able to empirically investigate the interactive conditions for the development of argumentative competence.

Amnon Knoll (Tel Aviv University, Israel)

**Deliberative Democracy and argumentation theory**

Argumentation scholars and Deliberative Democracy scholars are engaged, independently, in diverse normative and descriptive aspects of political and public argumentation, advocating, in large, related goals and needs. This paper examines different normative and descriptive approaches in both deliberative democracy and argumentation theory, offering a comparison of procedural and epistemic models in the two disciplines, with an analysis of the explicit and the implicit role of reaching an ideal reasoned consensus in the differing theories. A major
focus is given to the distinctive assumptions related to prospective changes in cognitive
topics, beliefs, and attitudes, together with their consequential impact on reaching
consensus or reasoned dissensus. The closing part of the paper summarizes several
requirements and opportunities for inter- and trans-disciplinary work between deliberative
democracy and argumentation theory.

Takuzo Konishi (Showa Women's University, Japan)

Classifying argumentation schemes proper within the New Rhetoric Project

In attempting to understand the New Rhetoric Project's classification framework for
argumentation schemes, many argumentation scholars have dismissed the overarching
categories of association, dissociation, and breaking of the connecting links and focused on
clarifying specific argumentation schemes proper discussed in the Project. As a result, the
Project's unique way of classifying argumentation schemes has not been adequately
recognized. Challenging this communal understanding of the Project about argumentation
schemes proper, this paper will attempt to reconfigure the relationship between association,
dissociation, and breaking of connecting links on the one hand, and argumentation proper on
the other hand. Besides, a close scrutiny of the relationship between association, dissociation
and breaking of connecting links will pave a way to a forth overarching category of
argumentation, or 're-confirming connecting links' in the Project.

Erik C. W. Krabbe, Jan Albert van Laar (University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

That's no argument! The ultimate criticism?

What if, in discussion, the critic refuses to recognize an emotionally expressed (alleged)
argument of her interlocutor as an argument? Taken literally, this amounts to charging the
other with having committed a fallacy of non-argumentation. We want to deal with these
fallacies (especially the argumentum ad populum), by surveying dialectical possibilities, i.e.,
the proper way to criticize (alleged) non-argumentation, the appropriate ways for the arguer
to react to such criticism, and the appropriate ways for the critic to follow up on these
reactions. By making the disputants themselves responsible for the place of emotion in their
dialogues, we hope to contribute to a further development of the theory of dialectical
obligations.

Manfred E. Kraus (University of Tübingen, Germany)

Arguments by analogy (and what we can learn about them from Aristotle)

The paper intends to contribute to a recent debate about arguments by analogy, especially the
controversy about a distinction between 'deductive' and 'inductive' types of analogies and
the question how such arguments can be 'deductive', but nonetheless defeasible (Waller
I will claim that categories such as 'deductive' and 'inductive' are structural, not normative
categories, and should therefore not be used to designate argument validity.
Based on Aristotle’s analysis of enthymemes, examples, and metaphors, I will argue that arguments from analogy can be reconstructed as complex arguments that involve inductive, abductive, and deductive components. By virtue of their deductive element, they may appear conclusive, but inductive and abductive components make for their defeasibility.

Hanna Maria Kreuzbauer (University of Salzburg, Austria)

**Legal argumentation as a modern paradigm of rationality**

The traditional concept of rationality displays it as an optimization of cognition by minimizing emotional and volitive influences. Based on a modern representation of this concept the author will argue that in ancient times three main paradigms of rationality existed: (1) the Euclidian paradigm (based on formal language and construction rules), (2) the dialectic paradigm (based on discursive testing) and (3) the paradigm of topics (based on construction rules and informal language). In modern times the ancient heritage was transformed basically into two paradigms of modern rationality, which are: (1) the paradigm of scientific rationality, an amalgamation of the Euclidian and the dialectic paradigm and (2) legal argumentation, a combination of the paradigms of dialectics and topics. Consequently, also legal argumentation represents a coequal alternative of rationality.

Jeffrey Andrew Kurr (Pennsylvania State University, USA)

**Ben Bernanke’s credit card and strategic maneuvering in the 2011 debt ceiling debates**

Ongoing deliberation surrounding the economic recession and recovery has dominated the political landscape for the last half-decade. Because economic policy is inherently technical, publics are often left scratching their heads as politicians debate about debt, inflation, and the budget. The argumentative moves of liberal and conservative politicians, as well as Fed Chair Ben Bernanke, during the 2011 debt ceiling debates analogized the budget of the federal government with a family household. In this essay, I investigate the “informal presentational means” used to compare these two entities and analyze how politicians use argumentative metaphors to “strategically maneuver” the technical debt ceiling issue into a common household problem. Understanding how metaphors are (ab)used helps the critic isolate embedded ideologies and develop productive strategies to transverse the technical and public spheres.

Tone Kvernbekk (University of Oslo, Norway)

**Evidence-based practice: Evidence set in an argument**

Evidence-based practice (EBP), known as the “what works” agenda, is currently a dominating trend in many professional areas. In short EBP is about production of desirable change, and the interventions are built on evidence that shows what works. But what do we need evidence for? For a prediction that an intervention that has worked in one context also will work "here". It makes good sense, I shall argue, to view this prediction as a conclusion in an
argument - that will structure our thinking and help us focus on what we need to know to support the truth of the conclusion. This gives research data (evidence) an indirect role, as opposed to the direct role it generally is assumed to have.
Nanon Labrie, Peter Schulz (University of Lugano, Switzerland)

**Perceived authority in general practice: The effects of (un)reasonable argumentation**

General practitioners are often encouraged to provide arguments to support their medical recommendations and to actively involve patients in the treatment discussion. To date, however, it has not been studied what effect doctors’ provision of (un)reasonable argumentation has on, i.e., patients’ acceptance of the medical advice and their perceptions of the doctor as a credible authority. This study seeks to explore these effects. 450 participants were randomly assigned to 1 of 9 experimental video-vignettes of a doctor providing a treatment advice. The vignettes systematically varied the doctor’s use of (un)reasonable argumentation, starting from the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation. In a survey, participants’ responses to the videos were measured. We will discuss the design, results, and implications of the experiment and outline opportunities for further, quantitative research focusing on medical argumentation.

Niilo Matti Johannes Lahti (University of Eastern Finland, Finland)

**Paul’s argumentation in 1 Corinthians - A pragma-dialectical analysis**

Biblical scholars still have fundamental differences in their stances regarding Paul’s argumentation. This is due to the lack of studies with proper methods. Furthermore, the argumentation analysis itself is seldom depicted explicitly. In order to resolve these difficulties, one must apply a method, which takes as many facets of argumentation into account as possible. Such a criterion is fulfilled by the pragma-dialectical model. In this paper, pragma-dialectics is applied to a passage in 1 Corinthians in order to clarify Paul’s argumentation and to describe his argumentative style and technique. The text deals mostly with specific practical matters. Besides the Corinthians’ thoughts, Paul is trying to influence their behavior. Moreover, the actual purposes of his arguments are revealed. Simultaneously the aim is to further advance the methodology for studying biblical argumentation.

Julie Lee Lambert (Florida Atlantic University, USA), Robert Bleicher (California State University Channel Islands)

**Improving climate change education through evidence-based scientific argumentation**

This study examined fifteen students’ knowledge and perceptions about climate change before and after a graduate-level global climate change education course. Students’ climate change knowledge increased significantly after completing the course, and their perceptions became more aligned to those of climate scientists. Students’ post-questionnaires and science journals were analyzed for insights into the effectiveness of the curriculum and instructional approach of the course. A key assignment was to develop and present an evidence-based scientific argument and to evaluate arguments of other students. Students indicated that the integration of scientific argumentation was the most effective strategy for increasing their
understanding of climate change and confidence in educating others on the topic. Findings of this study suggest that argumentation can play an effective role in the preparation of environmental and science educators.

Lenore Langsdorf (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, USA), Darrin Hicks (University of Denver, Denver Colorado, USA)

Discovering the physiology of argument: Inference

An argument is like an organism. It has both a gross, anatomical structure and a finer, as-it-were physiological one” (Toulmin, The Uses of Argument, p. 94). In agreement with Toulmin’s “central thesis—namely the contrast between the standards and values of practical reasoning. . .and the abstract and formal criteria relied on in mathematical logic and much of twentieth-century epistemology” (“Preface to the Paperback Edition,” 1963) and relying upon the process philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead and Mark Johnson’s work on embodied cognition, we propose an account of inference that develops the “physiological” structure of argument.

Brian N. Larson (University of Minnesota, USA)

“Irreparable harm” and legal arguments by analogy and example

I present partial results of an empirical study of written legal arguments to explore the following research questions: Do American lawyers perceive differences between arguments by analogy and arguments by example, and if so, how are those differences represented in their argumentative writing? Scholars such as Brewer, Wienreb, and Posner have engaged in a lively debate regarding exemplary and analogical reasoning in court opinions, but they did not consider actual arguments before trial or appellate court judges. Macagno and Walton, following Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca and harkening to the classical tradition, discussed the distinction between legal reasoning by example and by analogy. But their discussion was largely theoretical. This study explores persuasive writing in context—legal briefs of attorneys before district court judges.

Claudio Lavin, Luis Sebastian Contreras-Huerta, Claudio Fuentes (Universidad Diego Portales, Chile)

Emotions and slippery slope arguments: An approach for studying the emotional impact and efficacy of arguments with bad reputation

The efficacy of a SSAs may not be a mere problem of the rationality of the individuals, but evidence about the way in which people interact in the real world. Impact of SSAs can be taken as an empirical problem, in which interactions of subjects based upon such arguments and their efficacy can be related to an adaptive function of human reasoning. We present a model for studying the impact of SSAs in the automatic emotional responses of subjects. Evidence from experimental psychology and neuroscience have shown that emotional reactions elicit autonomic and physiological manifestations that can be measured by different
techniques. We think that physiological basis of the emotional impact of SSAs may shed lights about the efficacy of these arguments.

Alain Létourneau (Université de Sherbrooke, Canada), Marielle Pauzé (Ordre des travailleurs sociaux du Québec (OTSQ), Canada)

**Argumentative moves in an inquisitive context about psychological harassment in the workplace: A case study in Québec**

This proposal looks at argumentative strategies between complainants and investigators around harassment issues at work. A recently (2013) completed doctoral research analyzed and commented, from an argumentative point of view, a very specific corpus: a series of four interviews, totalizing ten hours, led by four public servants, the mission of which was to ascertain a first recognition of validity for further inquiry, of claims of psychological harassment on the workplace by complainants, in Québec province (Canada). The interviews having taken place in 2006, using a convention taking back accepted notations. One interesting theoretical achievement done in the research is probably to combine a Conversation Analysis (CA) perspective, claiming that meaning obtains in speech acts constructed in interaction, with argumentative figures and cues taken in Aristotle, Perelman, Walton and Van Eemeren.

Marcin Lewinski (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Practical reasoning and multi-party deliberation: The problem of the best means**

This contribution investigates the relationship between the argument scheme of practical reasoning and the argumentative activity of deliberation. My main thesis is that the detailed layout of the scheme of practical reasoning determines the relevance of basic argumentative moves in deliberation. I elaborate the scheme by focusing on its causal premise (We should do X, because "X leads to Y", and Y is desirable). This premise typically signifies X as a necessary or sufficient means. I investigate a third option – a "conducive" means, neither necessary nor sufficient but still worth taking. In case of sufficient and conducive means, the consideration of "the best means" becomes crucial. Whenever alternative means are advocated by different argumentative parties, we end up with multi-party deliberation where different contrary alternative options are debated.

Piotr Lewinski (University of Wroclaw, Poland)

"Death penalty for the Down's syndrome" – Polish cultural symbols in discussion about IVF and abortion.

The basic unit of analysis of ideological systems is a generalized axiological proposition, in which cultural and ideological objects serve as arguments, i.e. Nation, Honour, Liberty. They
have a culturally developed interpretation and convey the subsets of assigned values. The objective of this paper is to present how such objects constitute the basis of the discourse. Analysis of chosen texts reveals, how at every stage of argumentation arguers exploit the topic and interactive potential of argumentation, and how they create ideological systems by assigning different ascriptions to cultural objects. Finally the created arguments are adapted to the beliefs and preferences of the audience.

Franck Lihoreau (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Arguing about feelings: Argumentation schemes for reasoning about emotions**

We argue about emotions all the time, telling people how they should or shouldn’t feel, contesting their “bad” reasons for feeling the way they do, and giving them “good” reasons why they should feel otherwise. Feelings, we seem to assume, are reason-based and subject to normative evaluation. This suggests the idea of an “argumentative structure of emotions” and argumentation as a mechanism for generating reasons for or against entertaining feelings. To this day, however, no attempt has been made to elucidate that structure and develop a comprehensive model of argumentation for reasoning about emotions. To remedy this situation, we provide a set of argumentation schemes for reasoning about such affects as hope/fear, disappointment/relief, etc., and the sets of critical questions associated with them. The schemes will consist in patterns to generate reasons why a certain emotion may be entertained or maintained. By investigating those argumentative patterns applying to feelings and their normative evaluation, we hope to make a first step towards elucidating the reason-based structure of affects and the rational (re-)construction of emotions.

Stephen M. Llano (St. John's University, USA)

**The fallow field: Argumentation studies and competitive debate**

Contemporary argumentation theory heavily relies on examples of argumentation for their development and practice. These theories rely heavily on the art of dialectic, or putting ideas into direct contention with one another for examination, exchange, and evolution. Likewise, competitive debate teams, conducted by university students across the world, produce argumentative texts, inventing their own standards of evaluation through a dialectic practice called “adjudication.” Most argument scholars are completely unaware of the presence of these vibrant communities of argument practitioners on their own campus, while most debaters respond in surprise when they learn their hobby is a field of scholarly research. This paper argues that both communities need to reach out to one another and reseed the fallow field of argumentation praxis.

Vincenzo Lo Cascio (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

**Argumentative connectives deletion**

Argumentative categories are normally introduced through connectives which reveal the argumentative functions of the statements. In general those connectives are obligatory on the surface in order to make clear the construction of the reasoning. Especially counter-
argumentative connectives are always obligatory. Nevertheless in order to develop a convincing or persuading strategy a speaker can evaluate if it is possible to delete connectives, i.e. to leave connective nodes empty. The deletion operation makes texts more ambiguous as to whether they are argumentative or narrative or descriptive. Descriptive or narrative texts show less epistemic modality than argumentative texts. The question is whether the deletion operation of argumentative connectives is universal and free or whether it is language specific and bound to some syntactic or semantic or pragmatic functions and rules.

Margherita Luciani (University of Lugano, Switzerland)

The evaluative and unifying function of emotions emerging in argumentation; Interactional and inferential analysis of a complex argumentation gained from a doctor-patient interaction concerning the disclosure of a bad news

This paper sets out to explore the evaluative and unifying functions of emotions in decision-making processes concerning the disclosure of a bad news, by taking into account suggestions from social psychology, argumentation and linguistics. I embrace the hypothesis that emotions, due to their capability of unifying the objects of our thought, strongly contribute to reasonable decisions and to the establishment of the Self. I claim that a clue that hints to this can be found both in the interactional analysis as well as in the inferential structure of arguments, which I investigate following the “Argumentum Model of Topics”. I will prove this empirically, analysing the interactional and the inferential structure of a complex argumentation during an interaction between a doctor and a patient concerning the communication of a bad news.

Ekaterina Lukyanova (Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia), Timothy Steffensmeier (Kansas State University, USA)

Argument schemes and personal narratives: An analysis of citizen deliberations on mental health

Personal narratives are argumentative vehicles that people employ in support of their position. In the context of public deliberation, personal experience argumentation is encouraged as a way to engage multiple voices in a policy discussion.
This project addresses the functional variations of personal narratives by analyzing citizen discourse in public deliberations on mental health. Two forums were analyzed for this study. The forums are a response to President Obama’s call for a national conversation on mental health.
The analysis makes distinctions between utterances that assert a general value-orientation on a topic and utterances that illustrate a problem statement. Moreover, we look into differences between narratives as schemes that account for change in the status of the protagonist and distinguish them from other kinds of personal experience references (e.g. identity claims).

Christoph Lumer (University of Siena, Italy)

Ethical arguments
Apart from metaethics, in ethics there are arguments of two main levels: 1. application arguments, which apply moral principles to specific (groups of) cases, and 2. justifications of moral principles. A quick analysis shows that application arguments use standard argument schemes (or combinations thereof) as they have been identified by the epistemological approach to argumentation. About arguments for moral principles, however, there is deep dissent. The contribution criticises some of the respective proposals but mainly analyses two promising types: 1. demonstration of adequacy, i.e. establishing and justifying some adequacy conditions and showing that certain moral principles fulfil them; 2. instrumentalist justification, i.e. establishing and justifying the aim or function of morality and showing that certain moral principles, norms etc. are good means to realise this function.

Natalia Luna Luna (UNAM (National Autonomous University of Mexico), Mexico)

**Evaluation of political debates by the public**

I will characterise the activity of listening political debates by the public as an argumentative practice of political argumentation, in which the public is an imaginary respondent in political debates. I will then present the conditions that enable the public to engage in a critical exercise of discussing politicians' proposals vs. passively receiving them as political propaganda. I will include a proposal of how to improve the conditions of the general public in order to promote their effective participation in political argumentation.
Fabrizio Macagno (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

A means-end classification of argumentation schemes

One of the crucial problems of argumentation schemes as illustrated in (Walton, Reed & Macagno 2008) is their practical use for the purpose of analyzing texts and producing arguments. For this purpose, argumentation schemes will be analyzed as prototypical combinations between two distinct levels of abstraction, i.e. semantic (or material) relations and types of reasoning. These two levels can justify an end-means criterion of classification, representing the intended purpose of an argument and the means to achieve it. This criterion is strictly bound to the pragmatic purpose of an argumentative move and the ontological (semantic) structure of the conclusion and the premises.

Irina Diana Mădroane (West University of Timisoara, Romania), Isabela Fairclough (University of Central Lancashire, UK)

An argumentative approach to policy ‘framing’. Competing frames and policy conflict in the Roşia Montană case

The concept of ‘frame’ is widely used in media, communication and policy studies, but has not yet received a satisfactory definition. This paper proposes a new theorization of ‘frames’, in which argumentation has a central role. To frame an issue is to offer the audience a salient and thus potentially overriding premise in a deliberative process that can ground decision and action. Values, goals or consequences can all be made salient, and so can alternative representations of the context of action. This includes the use of persuasive definitions, metaphors and analogies to redefine facts in rhetorically convenient ways. We will use this approach to analyze the Roşia Montană case, a conflict over policy that led (in September 2013) to the most significant public protests in Romania since the 1989 Revolution.

Robert Marian Maier (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)

Epistemological conditions of satisfactory argumentation

What are the kind of epistemological conditions suitable for argumentation when taking into account (1) the established insights concerning language use, (2) the conditions of conflict resolution, and finally (3) ethical conditions involved in conflict resolution using exclusively the power of argument.

My conclusions will show that epistemological theories which are based on absolute rationality, on universal procedures for deciding what are valid statements at a given moment and also relativism are not suitable.

Only epistemological conceptions based on principles of 'bounded' rationality can be considered as suitable.

Roseann Mandziuk (Texas State University, USA)
Gender and generative argument: Locating the National Women’s History Museum in the landscape of public memory

Historical memory is mediated through public argument, including debate over which aspects of history are deemed to deserve a monument or museum at a given time and why certain facets of history are celebrated or silenced. This essay analyzes the public argument associated with the 18-year effort of the National Women’s History Museum [NWHM] to establish a significant physical site in Washington, D.C. This study explores in close detail how the case for women’s history that the NWHM addressed to the U.S. public developed as various sites have been considered, efforts blocked, multiple pieces of legislation introduced, and new strategies launched. The analysis particularly focuses on the initial arguments that circulated when the Museum was founded and how it conveyed its message about the significance of women’s history.

Maurizio Manzin, Serena Tomasi (University of Trento, Italy)

Pathos and ethos in legal argumentation. The case of proceedings relating to children

The building of judge’s legal syllogism implies a series of argumentative moves. What we basically wonder in our presentation is: how much of the argumentative choice of topoi is emotional and/or ethical in nature? And to what extent emotional and ethical insights could limit judgement’s reasonableness? For answering these questions we will proceed as follows: (1) by shortly analyzing the general relationship between pathos, ethos, and logos in a cooperative argumentative model of legal syllogism, (2) by checking the argumentative model in a particular domain of legal practice, reporting an Italian case-law in proceedings relating to children. The case concerned will allow us to consider the argumentative approach of the parties in a trial procedure, which is peculiar for its non-adversarial nature and confidential attitude.

Roberto Marafioti (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina)

Argumentation and debate in Latin American political discourses

At the beginning of XXI century a group of Latin American leaders (Bolivia, Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela and Ecuador) began to argue against so-called Washington Consensus, which was imposed in the ’90s. As a result organized argumentative strategies aimed at building different perspectives to solve economic problems, social, political and cultural. On the one hand, it is a real "dialogue of the deaf" in which are faced two irreconcilable attitudes to reality. On the other hand, argumentative devices organized this new attitude in the speech that the leaders proclaimed to their citizens. The rhetoric used, the types of reasoning and argumentative sequences are interesting issues to study the tools to recover the local and regional history and propose a Latin American nation.

Noemi Marin (Florida Atlantic University, USA)
The role of the nation: Starting points of political arguments and presidential rhetoric in post-1989

In December 1989, during the political upheaval that changed the Eastern and Central European countries, Ceausescu’s last speech addressed the Romanian people calling for civic engagement, peace, and solidarity. One day later, in a building located on the opposite side of the Popular Plaza, the emerging voice of a new Romanian President was heard engaging in rhetorical appeals for democratic and political change. This paper focuses on 1989 and post-communist Presidential Inaugurals in order to examine how starting points of argument on the role of “the nation” in such appeals impact the continuously un-settled political discourse in Romania.

Danny Marrero (Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano, Colombia)

An epistemic theory of argumentation for intercultural argumentative dialogues

The resolution of legal disputes requires to apply the law according to the facts alleged by the parties. Consequently, adjudication implies epistemological evaluations. If a legal dispute takes place in a culturally unified scenario, the adjudicator becomes an archetypal cognitive agent. In scenarios of legal pluralism, alternatively, adjudicators cannot always generalize their cognitive standards because sometimes they have to resolve conflicts between members of culturally differentiated groups. How can the adjudicators assess the strength of an argument that makes sense in a culturally different view? Answering this question, I follow the strategy of epistemological theories of argumentation (i.e., to use concepts and methods of epistemology for understanding problems of argumentation), and evaluate the main theories of epistemic justification (i.e., foundationalism, coherentism and reliabilism) and group epistemology (i.e., summativism and non-summativism).

Michele Mason (University of Maryland, USA)

Refutation in slave narratives

European slavers defended the slave trade of the eighteenth century, in part, by characterizing Africans as inferior to Europeans. The 1760 edition of "The Modern Part of the University History" contained one such depiction, “they are now everywhere degenerated into a brutish, ignorant, idle, treacherous, thievish, mistrustful & superstitious people, even in those empires & states where one might expect to find them more polished, humane, docile and industrious.” To abolish the slave trade and end the practice of slavery generally, this destructive characterization needed to be refuted. Accordingly, writers and speakers of African descent began the task of dismantling these characterizations. This essay will argue that writers came up with careful refutations of arguments that attacked the intellectual and moral qualities of Africans. One of the earliest texts, Olaudah Equiano's "Interesting Narrative of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa," (1789) constructed a narrative that skillfully refuted these charges by highlighting the intellectual, moral and physical characteristics of Africans. In his narrative Equiano demonstrated a sophisticated understanding of his opponent's arguments regarding African identity as he urged the British Parliament to vote against the African slave trade.
Maureen Ann Mathison (University of Utah, USA)

Controversial text about a controversial issue: An academic arguing for and in the name of science

When academics speak out against corporate interests they often are rebuked. This paper examines a commentary by Martha Crouch, a molecular biologist, and the subsequent responses to it by academics in the field. Her text, though published as a commentary, served multiple purposes. Using her own experience to illustrate the potential consequences of experimental research Crouch explained how a process she developed contributed to a corporate application that she did not support. What is at issue, she underscored, are the social and environmental consequences of corporate science. Crouch, however, also hijacked the genre, moving away from commentary, essentially resigning from experimental science. Audience replies to her demonstrate a political arm wrestling among academics, science, and corporations. Their arguments, though acknowledging the issue, distance themselves from it through an allegiance to science.

Ivanka Todorova Mavrodieva (University of Sofia "St. Kliment Ohridsky", Bulgaria)

Argumentation in the Bulgarian political virtual forums and social networks

This study examines specific features of argumentation in virtual political forums and social networks. The corpus of research is based on political forums and Facebook groups that appear as a part of the civil protests in Bulgaria over a period of two years (2012-2013). The main goal of the current paper is to investigate the sources of the arguments used by Bulgarian politicians and citizens in their statements, comments, virtual dialogues in forums; the kinds of arguments; and the appropriateness and effectiveness of argumentation. The second research goal includes survey of specific verbal and visual arguments used in the social networks. Most of the participants in virtual political forums in Bulgaria prefer traditional manners to present their arguments in short written posts and they are ready to take part in interactive cyber communication.

Matthew May (Texas A&M University, USA)

The coalitional possibilities of argument a fortiori

Treatises on the public character of argument have for some time now provided an orientation from which scholars may view struggle as protest rhetoric. At least since Robert Scott and Donald Smith’s 1969 essay “The Rhetoric of Confrontation,” which itself synthesized earlier studies of Parke Burgess, Leland Griffin, and Franklyn Haiman, scholars have attended to what Edward P. J. Corbett has termed the “rhetoric of the closed fist.” This essay is part of a broader project on “closed fist” argumentation in the American labor movement. I argue that argument a fortiori sheds new light on the affordances of enthymematic reasoning and epideixis for the coalitional politics of labor. I provide a case study of the red rhetoric of Helen Keller to illustrate the point.
Davide Mazzi (University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy)

“This is not an arena for attempting to define ‘life’…”: On persuasive definitions in the rhetoric of the Supreme Court of Ireland

This paper investigates the discursive construction of persuasive definitions in a corpus of recent judgments delivered by the Supreme Court of Ireland in the field of right-to-life protection. The definition of issues such as ‘life’, ‘death’ and ‘abortion’ has generated a wide range of studies in argumentation, and it has been highly relevant to the recent political and jurisprudential debate in the Republic of Ireland. By combining corpus and discourse tools, the study will both provide characteristic examples of the structure of the Court’s argumentation in defining controversial terms such as ‘unborn’ and ‘miscarriage’, and highlight any recurrent phraseology correlated with the deployment of definition as an argumentative tool. These research strands tend to acquire further interest due to the challenges posed by the constitutionally bilingual nature of Irish legislation.

Johanna Mielecznikowski, Elena Musi (Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland)

Verbs of appearance and argument schemes: Italian "sembrare" as an argumentative indicator

The role of verbs of appearance as argumentative indicators will be investigated, analyzing the uses of the Italian verb "sembrare" ('seem') in a sample of 15 texts chosen from a corpus of reviews, editorials and forum posts. "Sembrare" functions as a sign of symptomatic argumentation in some of its syntactic constructions conveying an evidential-inferential meaning: it is used to signal arguments based on a major premise stating a characteristic association between entities or situations. We will examine various subtypes of argument schemes (e.g. from the parts to the whole, from definition, from effect to cause) by reconstructing the ontological relations and inferential connections (maxims) of arguments containing "sembrare" in the chosen texts within the framework of the Argumentum Model of Topics.

Maureen Carol Minielli (City University of New York, USA)

The role of ethos in argument by definition

This paper examines the notion of “ethos” in conjunction with an orator’s use of argument by definition, with the American president again serving as the examined orator. Substantial literature exists about the role of ethos in rhetoric and oratory but scant research exists regarding the use of definition in an oratorical situation by a notable figure holding a noteworthy, powerful position. One of the questions addressed by this paper regards a president’s position and institution as additional elements of ethos that may enhance or detract from his ability to successful employ a definition of “x.”

Gordon Mitchell, John Lyne (University of Pittsburgh, USA)

Hinge terms in hot arguments
Before 2004, scientist James Hansen’s arguments on climate change were almost purely technical. Soon thereafter, he began including what we call ‘hinge terms’ — such as ‘dangerous’ and ‘tipping point’ — in the discussion sections of his peer reviewed scientific articles. These hinge terms were designed to reconfigure argumentation on global warming by pre-scripting headlines of journalists reporting on the new scientific findings. Scientific peers objected to Hansen’s hinge term strategy, contending that the normative boundary separating scientific articles and public argument should be policed by peer review. The case study stands to shed light on the argumentative dynamics of the global warming controversy, and contribute to ongoing conversations in argumentation theory such as Fahnestock’s account of rhetorical figures in science and the emergent Dutch focus on ‘argument activity types.’

Silvia Modena (UPEC - Université Paris-Est Creteil, France)

**Euro: Past arguments for the contemporary debate on European currency**

My paper aims to investigate the debate on European currency and the connection between two different rhetorics: one emerged during the last French presidential election in 2012 and the other occurred during the transition from franc to euro in 1998-2002. Thus, my paper underlines that the contemporary crisis of the European monetary construction has been represented by some arguments emerged when euro has been proposed, on 1998. I will first highlight the framework of my research within the theory of Argumentation in discourse (R. AMOSSY, M. DOURY, C. PLANTIN) supported by Discourse Analysis. Then, I will analyse the types of arguments through which past and present speakers organized their speeches and I will examine any possible match between specific arguments and the positions taken by euro supporters and opponents.

Dima Mohammed (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Deliberating the European Union: What do MEPs actually do with practical arguments?**

In this paper, I examine practical arguments in European Parliamentary debates. I reconstruct practical arguments of MEP, identify argumentative moves that contribute to the discussion of several issues simultaneously, and examine their role within the structure of practical argument. My goal is to identify argumentative patterns in which moves that play a role in a practical argument play also a role in other (types of) arguments that run simultaneously. The examination will also shed light on the way challenges facing the European ‘project’ manifest themselves in MEPs’ discussions of the courses of action the EU needs to take. In a time where the shape and future of the EU is at stake, this can certainly not be overlooked.

Mette Møller (University of Copenhagen, Denmark)

**Arguing with humor: Functions, purposes and potential effects**
What makes humor a powerful, rhetorical tool? Are certain types of humor, e.g. satire or irony, especially suited for arguing? And what purposes can humor as argumentation serve? Several studies have examined the persuasiveness of humor as argumentation (e.g. Olbrechts-Tyteca 1974), outlined the functions humor in communication can have (Meyer 2000), and argued that humorous utterances function as performatives (Zwagerman 2010). Drawing on this literature and different humorous examples, e.g. from the so-called “Colbert Super PAC” case, I propose that humor makes a highly useful tool for arguing because it generally does four things: it imitates, it exaggerates, it exposes, and it surprises. This paper will demonstrate how the four techniques function and the potential effects of this use.

Sara Molpeceres (Universidad de Valladolid, Spain)

**Narratives and myths as persuasive strategies: A constructivist-rhetorical perspective**

From a theoretical and methodological standpoint that combines disciplines such as Cognitive Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, Argumentation, Constructivist Sociology, Constructivist Philosophy, and Cognitive Psychology, and always within the frame of what David Pujante has called ‘Constructivist Rhetoric’ (a perspective in Rhetoric studies that focus on how we construct, understand and explain reality by means of discourses and narratives), this paper deals with the persuasive possibilities of combining the emotional persuasion of narratives and myths with logical argumentation. A possibility that we will explore at a theoretical level and put into practice analysing a corpus of political discourses regarding the problem of national identity in Spain.

Nicolina Maria Luisa Montesano Montessori (Utrecht University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands)

**Legitimation of Lifelong Learning in Europe: An argumentative analysis**

This paper analyses the main arguments employed in the basic documents of the Bologna Declaration concerning Life Long Learning. It compares the argumentative structure of these documents (2006 and 2012) with earlier policy documents of the EU (1963 and 1976). Using the pragma-dialectical approach, it evaluates the various argumentation schemes in their socio-political context. It will then compare the concept of education which has its roots in classical philosophy and the current concept of ‘learning’. The texts have been submitted to a quantitative corpus linguistic analysis which helps to see the intensity of keywords such as ‘learning’ and ‘education’. Based on these analytical procedures, the question will be addressed whether these arguments were in any sense objective or whether they serve ideological ends and if so, for what reasons.

Esperanza Morales-López (University of A Coruña, Spain)

**Argumentation, discourse and constructivist approaches: The analysis of discourses of social change**

In the last years I have focused my research on the analysis of discourses of social change, considering them as ideological constructions: with them their actors try to build a particular vision of the world, to obtain citizens’ support to their political position and make changes in
In the analysis of these constructs, I follow an interdisciplinary approach, combining the following perspectives: a) The (constructivist) rhetoric and argumentative tradition that considers both elocutive and demonstrative discursive resources. b) The American constructivist discursive approach. c) And socio-cognitive studies which defends that human cognition operates through a network consisting of interconnected levels. In my presentation, this theoretical approach will be applied to the analysis of 15M’s discourses (the Spanish Occupy movement) and from the new eco-social alternatives.

Casie Rachelle Moreland (Arizona State University, USA)

**Testimonios, alternative rhetorics, and the problems of global-less perspectives: Promotion of the deviation from Western rhetorical traditions in writing studies**

This speaker examines David Stoll’s treatment of Rigoberta Menchú’s testimonio I, *Rigoberta Menchú: An Indian Woman in Guatemala* to show how Stoll’s investigation of Menchú’s claims is not valid when examined from wider, non-Western rhetorical perspectives. This speaker asserts, as a writing instructor at a large university in the United States, that testimonios can be used as a useful rhetorical tool that students can analyze, not only to understand their own cultures, but their own subjectivities in regards to composing written arguments for multiple audiences and can allow students to investigate non-western ways of knowing to see how others’ stories can promote a global perspective and fill in holes of what classifies “truth” in American society.

Junya Morooka (Rikkyo University, Japan), Tomohiro Kanke (Tokai University, Japan)

**Historical inquiry into debate education in early 20th century Japan: The case of intercollegiate debates in Yuben**

This paper aims at shedding light on the influence of American-style educational debate in Japan during the early 20th century by scrutinizing intercollegiate debates hosted by Yuben (1910-1941), a monthly magazine on oratory. From 1933 to 1935 Yuben held a total of 13 intercollegiate debates in which college students were invited to argue over controversial policy topics such as capital punishment. Importantly, the debates were billed as an experiment in the type of debate widely practiced in the West, especially in the United States, at that time. By examining the transcripts of the debates, relevant Yuben articles, and historical documents on intercollegiate debate in the United States, the paper seeks to trace the American influence on debate education in early 20th century Japan.

Lineide Salvador Mosca (University of São Paulo, Brazil)
Conflict and tension: The discursive dissonance at the UN

We aim at examining the governmental political marketing and its rhetorical strategies of maintenance, which also has the task of projecting an innovative image, so that the government survive and perpetuate. Among these strategies, it is included the dialogue with others governments in the international community and the engagement with common causes to the globalized world. This scenario requires an interdisciplinary field, mediated by the theories of argumentation, which constitute the core of all efforts of political nature. Speeches taken from the UN Assembly on September 23rd 2013, pronounced in a momento of great tension, not softened by diplomatic diligences, will be examined. The study of actio, the performance of political actors, is included.
Gene Navera (National University of Singapore, Singapore)

The Philippine senate impeachment trials as cases of public moral argument

The paper argues that senate impeachment trials in the Philippine context are cases of public moral argument. In examining the senate impeachment trials of President Joseph Estrada from 2000 to 2001 and Supreme Court Chief Justice Renato Corona in 2012, the paper characterizes the Philippine experience of impeachment trials in terms of the following components: (1) procedural premises, (2) conception of the trial as a process, (3) perspective toward accusatory and defensive discourse, (4) character-related goal, (5) rhetorical strategies used, (6) audience appeal, and (7) the civic right advocated by the rhetors. Based on the analysis, the paper concludes that notions of ‘good’ storytelling and characterological coherence are vital features of reasoning in a legal exercise of political nature such as the impeachment of a President or Chief Justice.

Loic Nicolas (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium, F.R.S.-FNRS), Ingrid Mayeur (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium)

Epideictic as a condition of disagreement: Coming back to the Perelmanian and Dupréelian rhetoric

Our paper will examine the status, uses, and representations of epideictic discourse. At first, the hypothesis is: when the celebration of social harmony is a recurring event in the public life of a society, the opportunities for freedom of speech can be as pregnant as deep. There is a strong correlation between the existence of epideictic opportunities and the public ability to criticize. Conversely, when the epideictic is socially neglected, the risks related to critique are regarded as too important, this requires to limit (or at least to mitigate) freedom of speech. Then, if Perelman attempted to reevaluate the position of the epideictic discourse in the public sphere, it is, specifically, because he saw this kind of discourse as a potential compensation to the public dispute and the social critique.

Douglas Niño, Danny Marrero (Universidad Jorge Tadeo Lozano, Colombia)

The agentive approach to argumentation: A proposal

We aim to outline an agent-centered theory of argumentation. Our hypothesis is that the aim of argumentation depends upon the purposes agents are disposed to achieve (agendas). Our theory, unlike the main accounts of argumentation (i.e., rhetoric, dialogic, and epistemological theories), does not establish a fixed function that arguers have to achieve. Instead, we believe that the aims of argumentation depend upon the agendas. There are two main agendas related to the act of arguing: agendas of epistemic arrival (AEA) aim to form a true belief, and agendas of epistemic defensibility (AED) intend and defend a belief previously fixed by the closing of AEA. The closure of each of these agendas is bound by a group of standards of strictness: requirements that if satisfied, would close the agent’s agendas.
Cristián Juan Noemi Padilla (University of La Serena, Chile)

**Reasoning and argumentative complexity**

In this presentation, we propose an initial model of argumentative complexity from the theoretical framework of text linguistics. For this purpose, we have explored both the ability underlying the activity of speaking (the 'dínamis') and the product created by this competence (the 'érgon'). This work supports the hypothesis that the ability of critical thinking (reasoning/‘dínamis’) of college students is related to formal argumentative complexity (‘érgon’) of their discourses. Broadly, this relationship has been only partially addressed. Using the methodological framework of the Grounded Theory we analyzed the essays in terms of Argumentative Complexity. The results showed that the subjects with higher scores in the ability of Critical Thinking produced more intricate essays, in terms of argumentative complexity. This research constitutes an initial endeavor to establish a normative model of the notion of “Argumentative Complexity”.

Marko Novak (European Faculty of Law in Nova Gorica, Slovenia)

**How an argument of analogy as the central legal argument is made psychologically**

Both in civil law and common law, argument of analogy plays a pivotal role in legal reasoning. In civil law it is indispensable for making proper deduction, and in common law it is crucial for applying controlling precedents. If someone is capable of making good analogies that person has a great potential to be a good lawyer. To be able to make good lawyers, we must know how the process of making an analogy is carried out psychologically. In such manner the context of discovery (perception) and the context of justification (evaluation) need to be considered. One way to understand this is through the study of the role of Jungian psychological types within the legal decision-making process. His type theory has been confirmed by modern cognitive science.
Hiroko Okuda (Kantogakuin University, Japan)

The legacy of the U.S. atomic superiority, supremacy and monopoly: Dispelling its illusion in Barack Obama’s Berlin speech

The nature of the dilemma facing the world living with nuclear weapons is not technical, but political. The end of the cold war changed reliance on nuclear weapons into their further proliferation. In negotiations between the United States and Russia, the desire to reduce dependence on nuclear weapons corresponds with the determination to cut back on either their number or variety. On the other hand, atomic diplomacy holds on to the position of strategic superiority. This study reflects upon the extent to which the U.S. nuclear policy has been influenced by the mistaken assumption that the nation’s nuclear supremacy should be enduring. The study focuses specifically on the speech delivered by the U.S. President Barack Obama, who advocates international cooperation on nuclear matters, in Berlin on 19 June 2013.

Paula Olmos (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Spain)

Story credibility in narrative arguments

Recent work on narrative-based arguments has insisted on the importance, for assessment, of construing a theory of story “credibility” or “believability”. The main tenet of most approaches is the idea that a credible story should resemble “reality”. This resemblance is crucial to establish parallel ways of reasoning within the world of narration itself and the “real” world of the discoursive context. However, “narrative realism” is a rather problematic concept. Narratives do not only reflect or recount “known”, but also propose or imagine “new” realities, setting hypothetical scenarios whose argumentative import maybe varied. The paper proposes a more open-minded and contextual approach to arguments involving narratives, that would not prejudge their argumentative form or function, taking care of the particularities of the rhetorical situation in which they take place.

Steve Oswald (University of Neuchâtel/University of Fribourg, Switzerland), Thierry Raeber (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)

Why rhetorical questions are more argumentative than ironical questions: A pragmatic account

As it is in the nature of irony to contain criticism (see Garmendia 2010), ironic utterances a priori convey propositions ideally suited for argumentative usages: “The use of irony is possible in all argumentative situations” (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 2008 [1958]: 280, our translation). This talk will consider one particular instance of ironic utterances, namely ironical questions, and assess i) their relationship with rhetorical questions in terms of similarities and differences, ii) their possible role in argumentative sequences, and iii) their specificity with respect to rhetorical questions, in terms of the cognitive operations their processing involves. We will argue that the point of rhetorical questions is argumentative
while the point of ironical questions is foremost interpretative, and that this distinction can be cognitively grounded.
Fabio Paglieri (ISTC-CNR Roma, Italy)

**On argument quality in virtue argumentation theory**

Bowell and Kingsbury claim that «virtue argumentation theory does not offer a plausible alternative to a more standard agent-neutral account of good argument» (2013, 23). I offer a defense against this accusation, pointing out two mitigating circumstances: (i) virtue argumentation theory focuses primarily on prolonged debates or reasoning based on critical justification, rather than premises-conclusion inferential structures; (ii) the purpose of virtue argumentation theory is to complement, not replace, a standard agent-neutral account. The relative independence between argument features and arguer virtues works both ways: accurately assessing the argument formal properties may provide little insight on the arguer virtues, since argumentative rascals can produce formally excellent arguments (e.g. sophists). Virtue argumentation theory suggests that argument assessment remains blind to many important argumentative deficits, unless it includes also the arguer’s character.

Nicholas Paliewicz (University of Utah, USA)

**The emergence of the privileged sphere of argumentation and the case of global climate change**

This paper argues that arguments advanced in the global warming debate surpass the dialectical process of argumentation and warrant reconsideration about how arguments function in public settings. Primarily, the ongoing recalcitrance of the global warming issue demonstrates the limitations of argumentation models that privilege rationality and consensus because industrial actors perpetrate scientific doubt with no intention to jointly resolve the issue or adhere to technical standards of argument. To support this argument, this paper first evaluates global warming arguments from a pragma-dialectical standpoint to demonstrate that industries invested in the carbon economy use fallacies to their strategic advantage. I then argue that this argumentative community qualifies as a distinct realm of discursive practice that I call the privileged sphere, which uses economic privilege to challenge reasoned arguments for epistemological status.

Rudi Palmieri (Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland)

**Defending and attacking the endoxical basis of analogy arguments in financial valuation disputes**

The argument scheme from analogy has manifold applications in business, particularly when the value of financial assets is estimated using relative valuation techniques. Argumentative disputes often arise when market participants refer to such techniques. I analyze argumentative moves justifying/refuting these analogy-based arguments in different rhetorical situations emerging in the financial context. The precise point at issue when a financial valuation is discussed is identified with the Argumentum Model of Topics, which distinguishes two material premises of an argument scheme: endoxon and datum. I show that
disputes typically address the endoxical basis of the analogy, thus questioning the actual comparability of the assets, which depends on the adequacy of the functional genus framed in the endoxon. The use of presentational devices for strategically defining a functional genus is also highlighted.

Edward Panetta (University of Georgia, USA)

Access denied: Crafting argumentative responses to educational restrictions on undocumented students in the United States

A number of jurisdictions in the United States have enacted immigration laws to restrict access that undocumented students have to a university education. In some of these states, there has been a push by private actors to provide affected students with a college experience. This paper describes the establishment of Freedom University for undocumented students in the state of Georgia. It highlights the ways in which this institution humanizes students for members of the public and questions the legitimacy of educational restrictions. By moving the public immigration dispute from a dialogue about border security to a discussion of educational access on college campuses, the grounds of the public dispute may be altered in a way that leads to a repudiation of restrictive education policies.

Marijan Pavčnik (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia)

The symbolic meaning of Radbruch's formula. Statutory (non-)law and the argument of non-law

Statutory “law” that “intolerably” (Radbruch) violates supra-statutory law is non-law. The content of the argument is not based on eternal and unchangeable natural law that positive law should conform to, but upon fundamental (human) rights as prevailing in a historical period. In the modern state the catalogue of the fundamental (human) rights is so extensive that it offers a sufficiently broad basis for the removal of any legal incorrectness (including statutory non-law). Thus the argument of non-law also has a great symbolic value. It persuades us that legal thought should always make sense.

Sune Holm Pedersen (University of Copenhagen, Denmark)

Constructing and justifying normative standards

Argumentation theorists often posit that some set of normative standards should govern argumentative practices. They do not, however, always agree on what those standards should be. This fact raises interesting questions: How do argumentation theorists go about constructing normative standards for argumentative practices? And how do they go about justifying the adequacy or correctness of those standards? Can their ways of constructing and justifying normative standards be improved? In this paper I attempt some answers to these questions. The approach I take consists of comparing and contrasting different theorists' methods of constructing and justifying normative standards for argumentative practices.
Anne-Nelly Perret-Clermont (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland), Francesco Arcidiacono (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland), Stephanie Breux (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland), Sara Greco Morasso (Università della Svizzera Italiana/University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland), Celine Miserez Caperos (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)

Knowledge-oriented argumentation in children

In different studies around cognitive tasks with children aged 3 to 10, we are exploring children's argumentations per se with questions such as: When do children engage in argumentation? Are their argumentations explicit and if not so, what are their implicit premises? We are observing that children's argumentative productions are more complex than usually described and that the study of their argumentative activity opens new ways to study children's thinking. The results invite researchers to reconsider the usual school situations in which children's argumentative skills are assessed in order to better understand the social, relational and emotional conditions that allow and support argumentation in children.

Pamela Pietrucci (University of Washington, USA)

A rhetoric of “disastrous reassurance” voices from the seismic crater in the trial of the major risks committee in L’Aquila

On October 22, 2012, the seven scientists who participated in the Major Risk Committee meeting of March 31, 2009 in L’Aquila, were found guilty of multiple-manslaughter and sentenced to six years in jail. The controversial sentence prompted an instant mobilization of the international scientific community. The aim of this essay is to suggest a different reading of these events by illustrating the divergent narratives about the MRC meeting produced by the main parties involved in the trial. Such a reading pays closer attention to the local discourse around the trial, and foregrounds the argumentative strategies of the Aquilani. In conclusion, this essay will explore how the Aquilani’s local testimonies about the MRC rhetoric of “disastrous reassurance” worked rhetorically to persuade the judge, and ultimately affected the outcome of the trial.

Roosmaryn Pilgram (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Ethos and authority argumentation: Four kinds of authority in medical consultation

In medical consultation, the authority that the patient ascribes to the doctor influences the way in which the consultation proceeds. In case of an argumentative discussion, this ascribed authority can affect the acceptability of the doctor's argumentation. The fact that the patient regards the doctor as an authority on his health problem might be sufficient to accept the doctor's argumentation. The doctor can also attempt to convince the patient of a medical advice by emphasising his expertise. To analyse a doctor’s use of authority in argumentative discussions in medical consultation, I shall, in this contribution, make a fourfold analytical distinction between ways in which authority can influence the outcome of an argumentative discussion. I will do so based on the pragma-dialectical theory and insights from classical rhetoric.
Rosalice Pinto (University Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Multimodal argumentative strategies in professional text genres: Empirical studies**

This paper aims at describing the role of multimodal argumentative resources in professional text genres (Bhatia, 1993). Based on Text-Discourse theoretical perspectives in argumentation studies (Pinto, 2010; Amossy, 2012) and in Social Semiotics for multimodality analysis (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2006), its objective is to analyze multimodal resources which participate in argumentative movements within these genres. In order to prove the importance of multimodal argumentation in these genres, samples of texts that circulated in Portuguese society during the last years were selected: political posters, advertisements from non-governmental associations and from enterprises. Our study provides some evidence that multimodal strategies participate in argumentative movements of these texts and are related to text genre aspects.

Christian Plantin (Lyon University, France)

**A “Dictionary of argumentation - Basic notions for argumentation studies”**

This proposal refers to a “Dictionnaire de l’argumentation – une introduction notionnelle aux études d’argumentation”, in French, to appear in 2014. This Dictionary proposes 254 main entries and 95 secondary entries, focusing not on theories of argumentation but on concepts (i.e. analytical instruments). The field is defined through a set of overlapping definitions. Three main orientations organize the set of notions:

— As a linguistic activity, argumentation has both a monologal and an interactional dimension.
— As an everyday practice, argumentative activity includes the management of persons, their interests, values, motives and emotions.
— As part of the global domain of the arts of proof, argumentative practices have to be articulated with the practices of proof and demonstration in specialized fields.

H. José Plug (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

**Adaptation to audience demand and the composite audience of judicial decisions**

One of the topics in the debate about transparency of the administration of justice includes the communicative function of judicial decisions. From an argumentation theoretical perspective, this function of a judicial decision should not only be conceived as the judge’s aim to have the argumentation underlying his decision understood (the communicative effect), but also to have his argumentation accepted (the interactional effect). The judge may be expected to have the intention to achieve these effects on a composite audience: the litigants in the case, members of the legal community, law students and the general public.
this contribution I will analyse strategies employed in judicial decisions to adjust the argumentation to a composite audience.

Gilbert Plumer (Law School Admission Council, USA)

**A defense of taking some novels as arguments**

This paper’s main thesis is that in virtue of being believable, a believable novel makes an indirect transcendental argument telling us something about the real world of human psychology, action, and society. Three related objections are addressed. First, the Stroud-type objection would be that from believability, the only conclusion that could be licensed concerns how we must think or conceive of the real world. Second, Currie holds that such notions are probably false: the empirical evidence “is all against this idea…that readers’ emotional responses track the real causal relations between things.” Third, responding with a full range of emotions to a novel surely requires that it be believable. Yet since we know the novel is fiction, we do not believe it. So in what does its believability consist?

Chiara Pollaroli (Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland)

**The argumentative relevance of rhetorical strategies in movie trailers**

What rhetorical strategies (in terms of inventio, dispositio, and elocutio) are employed in movie trailers? Are they argumentatively relevant? If it is the case, what is their functioning? Movie trailers are hybrid (combining narrative and advertising) audiovisual discourse genres that exploit a carefully selected re-montage of moving and still images, sound, music, voice-over, intertitles, etc. to persuade potential spectators/consumers that a forthcoming movie is worth watching. I hypothesize that movie trailers reach their goal by advancing monomodal (e.g. only pictorial or only verbal) and multimodal arguments and by employing monomodal and multimodal rhetorical schemas and tropes (e.g. synecdoche, ellipsis, hyperbole).

Octav Eugen Popa (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

**Suppositions in academic thought experiments: Dialectical reconstruction and strategic explanation**

In this paper I undertake to analyse the performance of argumentative moves which take suppositions as their propositional content. I will make a speech-act theoretical distinction between three such moves: proposal of suppositions, acceptance of suppositions and use of suppositions. I undertake to analyze the function of such moves in argumentative discussions by relating their communicative and interactional aspects with particular stages in the process of resolving differences of opinion. Based on this analysis, I will show how one can offer a strategic explanation of making such moves in discussion patterns known as "thought experiments".
Lotte van Poppel (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

The strategic design of pragmatic argumentation

In order to convince their audience, discussants not only strategically choose a specific type of argumentation, but they also choose a particular representation of that argument, or design. This paper examines the advantages of using a particular design of argumentation. The focus lies on pragmatic argumentation in the context of health promotion, where a particular course of action is typically advocated or discouraged by pointing to the (dis)advantageous effects of that course of action for the addressee’s health. A health brochure for HPV vaccination is used as a case study. With the help of the pragma-dialectical theory and the concept of strategic maneuvering, it is explained how a particular design of pragmatic argumentation may contribute to providing a reasonable and effective defense of the advice.

Henry Prakken (Utrecht University & University of Groningen, The Netherlands)

On probabilistic accounts of argument strength

This paper discusses recent proposals for a Bayesian probabilistic theory of argument strength. First it will be observed that probabilistic accounts of argument strength only apply to epistemic arguments and not to normative or esthetic arguments or to arguments about decision making. Then probabilistic accounts of the strength of epistemic arguments will be discussed. It will be argued that Bayesian accounts only apply to certain styles of epistemic reasoning, namely, when the direction of the reasoning is from a hypothesis to the evidence (as in inference to the best explanation). When the direction is from the evidence to a hypothesis (as in reasoning with rules of thumb) then Bayesian thinking does not apply. For such cases an alternative probabilistic account of argument strength will be proposed.

John Price (University of Kansas, USA)

Obama and the 2011 Debt ceiling crisis: The American citizen and the deliberative power of the bully pulpit

During the summer of 2011, President Barack Obama was confronted with a debate that economists labeled as insane and dangerous. The debt ceiling became a monumental thorn in the President’s side. President Obama was faced with the difficult task of breaking the partisan stalemate in Congress that threatened to plunge the free world into another recession. This study examines President Obama's rhetorical strategy during the crisis and discusses his extensive use of the bully pulpit. While the bully pulpit is normally seen as a tool to circumvent deliberative discussions. This paper argues that in the case of the debt ceiling crisis the bully pulpit served as a means to restore deliberation to a stagnated and partisan Congress.
Federico Puppo (University of Trento, CERMEG – Research Centre on Legal Methodology, Italy)

A rhetorical analysis of legal discourse. Applying Quintilian’s categories to forensic speech

According to a classical perspective, there are different types of rhetoric: the analysis of rhetoric conducted by Quintilian's Instituio Oratoria contributes to clarify the peculiar structure of argumentative speech, which is divided into four main parts (exordium, narratio, argumentatio, peroratio). The aim of this paper is twofold:
1) to present and discuss the topicality of this scheme for legal argumentation through an analysis of Italian Court of Cassation’s decisions;
2) to reflect upon the logical structure of legal discourse, assuming that forensic speech is a peculiar form of argumentative speech characterized by a peculiar nature.
Pierre-Yves Raccah (University of Orleans, France)

**Linguistic argumentation as a shortcut for the empirical study of argumentative strategies**

A recent interest for the empirical observation of argumentation through institutional practices was underlined by van Eemeren (2010). Since discourse gives empirical hints to grasp the different facets of this field, there must be ways of describing meaning which allow to account for the dynamics of this field: ‘shortcuts’ to the description of argumentative strategies, as they are partially in-formed by the institutions. Such shortcuts live aside a part of the field in question but they offer interesting perspectives for a better description of the semantics of natural languages. I also show that these ‘shortcuts’ are not a completely new idea in semantics. I insist on how such a ‘reformed’ semantic framework helps ‘extracting’ ideological and cultural preconditions from discourses, which inform the observer on the institutional conventionalized practices.

Katharina von Radziewsky (McMaster University, Canada)

**“This might make sense!” How rhetorical devices by themselves can accomplish certain argumentative goals**

While it is true that establishing claims as true is a main goal in argumentation, a discussion about whether a claim is true can only begin after it is accepted that the claim is intelligible. An arguer who wishes to defend an innovative claim that runs counter to her interlocutor’s/audience’s presuppositions must first show that her claim is intelligible before she can go on defending its truth. Rhetorical devices by themselves (not as helpful additions to other argumentative devices) are the tools through which this additional argumentative goal can be accomplished. By analyzing a purely rhetorical text – Aldo Leopold’s “Axe-In-Hand” - I will show how the use of rhetorical devices helps an arguer guide her interlocutor/audience to adopting a new perspective, thereby proving that this perspective is possible.

Chrysi Rapanta (Zayed University, United Arab Emirates), Merce Garcia-Mila (University of Barcelona, Spain)

**Current trends in educational research on argumentation. What comes after Toulmin?**

Although many education researchers exclusively use Toulmin’s model, more and more scholars opt for other Informal logic tools, such as dialogue models or argumentation schemes. The present paper describes this tendency of slowly moving from Toulmin to other models and gives a narrow focus to those articles that use other argument models than Toulmin’s to analyze and assess students and/or teachers’ arguments. As a final contribution, we provide a taxonomy of argumentation tools used in Education research in relation to a number of variables such as type of task, age of participants, disciplinary subject, and main skills assessed as significant.
Chris Reed (University of Dundee, UK)

The theory and practice of the Argument Web

Argument Technology represents a unification of computational perspectives on argumentation theory. Argument technologies do not, however, simply represent a library of disconnected components. Increasingly they are being brought together to work in concert. As a result, these sets of tools can be used interchangeably, and are starting to support the creation of a large online resource known as the Argument Web. The Argument Web reflects and operationalizes many of the key concepts that have been developed in argumentation theory, and combines them with our experience of the Web in general. This paper explores both theoretical and practical aspects of the Argument Web and includes reference to many of the argument technology tools that allow arguments on the Argument Web to be created, explored, navigated, articulated, improved and reused.

Martin Reisigl (University of Bern, Switzerland)

Arguing about the climate change. A case study on the reception of the 5th IPCC Assessment Report in newspapers and postings

The 5th IPCC Assessment Report published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change represents a set of key texts that heavily influence discourses on climate change all over the world. I will selectively look at the reception of the IPCC report in German, Austrian and Swiss newspapers and newspaper postings. Attention will be directed (a) to textual patterns relating to argumentation and explanation, (b) to argumentation schemes connected with claims of existence, causes and effects of climate change, (c) to the role of visual semiotics in the argumentation, (d) to epistemic modality, i.e. expression of un/certainty, and (e) to the comprehensibility of the press coverage. The results of the study may help to develop linguistic recommendations for science journalism and the IPCC.

Antonio Reyes (Washington and Lee University, USA)

Argumentation through strategies of legitimization, linguistic choices, text structure and voices in U.S. political discourse

From an interdisciplinary framework, this paper proposes key strategies of legitimization employed in the argumentation process by political actors to justify courses of action: (1) emotions (particularly fear), (2) a hypothetical future, (3) rationality, (4) voices of expertise, and (5) altruism. At the same time, this paper proposes new linguistic tools to look at the way political actors build intimacy in political communication with their audiences, presenting different levels of intimacy while presenting their arguments to justify political actions. The proposed linguistic variables that index different levels of intimacy range from concrete units such as lexical choices (i.e., “marked register usages”), to narratives of personal experience and belonging, to textual organization and instances of intertextuality, in particular, by means of different voices politicians bring into the here-and-now moment of discourse.
Flemming Rhode (University of Southern California, USA)

**Euphoria and panic bubbles in presidential debate evaluations**

This project examines the first presidential debate of 2012 as a disturbance of the existing “horserace” trajectory, ultimately creating bipartisan bubbles of euphoria and panic through mimetic argument evaluations. In the buildup to the debate, the expectations set by the campaigns and the media commentary about the performance and political effect became a reflexive part of the argument itself setting evaluative thresholds. These evaluative criteria resulted in a bipartisan consensus that Gov. Romney won the debate, setting in motion mimesis outside the control of either campaign, leading to radically different expectations and evaluative criteria for the next debates. Ultimately presidential debates no longer serve a deliberative function for citizens to engage but as branding events, facilitated by a media environment evaluating debates on style over substantive arguments divorced from reality.

Henrique Jales Ribeiro (University of Coimbra, Portugal)

**Karl Popper's influence on contemporary argumentation theory**

Karl Popper's influence, from the nineteen sixties to the nineteen eighties, over the dialectical schools of contemporary argumentation theory (namely pragma-dialectics and formal dialectic), is often evoked by some of these schools (as is the case of the first one). It appears suggested, at least at first sight, through a comparison between Popper's critical rationalism and the relevant normativist conceptions. In this paper, the author analyses and explores in detail all these historical and philosophical connections; and upholds that although it is possible to speak about "Popper's argumentation theory", albeit within certain important limits, we certainly may not state that he introduced an “argument theory” in itself.

Eddo Rigotti (Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland)

**Arguments from analogy in the perspective of Topics**

In Aristotle’s Topica the argument from analogy represents one of the forms of comparative reasoning, which feeds a rich source of argumentative moves that are based on various loci and maxims. To inferentially characterize this locus we need first of all to define the peculiar semantic-ontological traits of the class of extrinsic loci, to which analogy belongs, so that the ontological relation constituting analogy can be specified against other loci of the same class. The locus from analogy generates numerous maxims that are used both constructively and destructively when knowledge-, evaluation-, or decision-oriented issues are discussed. Using the Argumentum Model of Topics, I reconstruct the inferential configuration of different examples of arguments from analogy highlighting the connection between the specific maxim activated and the type of issue at stake.

Robert C. Robinson (City University of New York, USA)

**The role of intuitions in moral and political arguments about justice**
Experimental philosophers have, by distributing surveys meant to capture ordinary people’s intuitions about knowledge, criticized the role that intuitions play in our judgments, and thus our justifications, and reasons (i.e., premises). They have done this with, for example, Gettier style problems. One worry (e.g., Deutsch, Kornblith, Williamson) is that they are too psychological to work as justification for positions which are not themselves psychological. I work out what they mean by “too psychological”, and reject their claim that intuitions are not valuable as reasons. I then generalize from the epistemological arguments, to show that, when supported by certain kinds of facts, intuitions are the best kind of evidence for judgments about moral responsibility and distributive justice. Thus, any argument about moral responsibility will either appeal directly to intuition, or else rely on a premise which itself appeals directly to intuition.

Andrea Rocci (University of Lugano, Switzerland)

**It would be like building a casino beside the pyramids: Refutation by nonfactual analogy**

The paper discusses a type of destructive argument where the targeted viewpoint is refuted thanks to an analogy between its propositional content and a non-factual state of affairs. The analogy can be either same-domain or figurative. The paper proposes an analysis in terms of the Argumentum Model of Topics, showing that these refutations draw their force from the recognition of an incongruity in the content of the argument which is found to be equally applicable to the content of the refuted viewpoint. Depending on the nature of the refuted standpoint, the incongruity can be ontological, practical or moral-social. Nonfactual analogical refutations are found to have a deductive force. Yet, they are redundant when they are accompanied by arguments targeting directly the incongruity in the standpoint.

Georges Roque (CNRS, France)

**Persuasion, visual rhetoric and visual argumentation**

The relationship between visual persuasion and visual argumentation is a crucial topic. It is often said, indeed, that images are excellent persuasive means. However, if images are persuasive, can they also be argumentative? For many authors, the response is negative, for they consider that images try to influence by playing upon the emotions, so that their persuasiveness finds itself on the side of pathos, not logos. However, even though it is true that images often use a strong emotional arousal, this hardly prevents them from also having a simultaneous argumentative role, at least in some cases. It is the issue I would like to address from an analysis of the relationship between rhetoric and argumentation.

Ann Marie Ross (California State University, Dominguez Hills, USA)

**J.S. Mill's ‘The System of Logic’ and the verification of evidence**

Largely ignored today within the discipline of rhetoric, J.S. Mill's "The System of Logic" was in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries considered a classical statement of empiricist
logic. The distinctiveness of "the System" consists in its emphasis upon the verification of evidence; for Locke's insistence upon experience Mill substitutes experimentation. I will analyze the argumentative and rhetorical methods Mill uses to apply his system of empirical logic across a range of disciples, especially the social sciences emergent in the nineteenth century, comparing and contrasting the methods Mill applies to the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. Lastly, I will consider briefly ways in which Mill's "method," well known in his day, resulted in more rigorous standards of argument in the Victorian long essay, including Mill's own political-polemical works.

Robert C. Rowland (University of Kansas, USA)

**The sequester and debt ceiling talks of 2013: A case-study of the liberal public sphere**

Liberal public sphere theory can be used to test the functionality of debate in the American public sphere on issues of controversy. Four actors each play a crucial role in the liberal public sphere: the representatives of the public, the public, the media, and the expert community. Liberal public sphere theory will be applied to explicate the long-running debate about budget cuts and the debt ceiling that dominated American domestic politics for most of 2013. In that way, the essay builds on previous research applying the liberal public sphere to a number of recent controversies and provides an appropriate test of the functionality of American democracy.

Sara Rubinelli (University of Lucerne and Swiss Paraplegic Research, Switzerland)

**Classifying argument schemes: lessons from Aristotle and from modern health classifications**

Argumentation schemes - as the modern development of the classical and medieval topoi or loci - are a main topic in argumentation theory. One of the most controversial issues about argument schemes concerns their classification. Classifying topoi is not just an intellectual exercise as having a classification is an important pre-condition for actually use them. The objective of this paper is to identify criteria for classifying argument schemes. A main assumption of this paper is that in the work of Aristotle there are crucial considerations on this classification that have not been enough considered in modern approaches to argument schemes classification. A second assumption is that important lessons on how to best classify argument schemes can be derived by looking into the field of classifications of diseases and functioning in the field of health.

Francisco Ruiz (Universidad de Caldas, Colombia), Oscar Tamayo (Universidad de Caldas, Colombia), Conxita Marquez (Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, Spain)

**Changes in the use of question when teaching to argue in science**

This study shows the changes identified in the type of questions used by an elementary school teacher, who participated in a process of critical reflection on the teaching of argumentation in science class. The research had a qualitative design. Three classes were recorded (before, during and after the process of critical reflection), and after discourse
analysis realized to information collected, the results show how the teacher understands the importance of combining different kinds of questions. In the first class descriptive questions were identified, subsequently in the second and in the third classes, the questions identified were causal and evaluative, much more relevant to the promotion of argumentative processes. The participation of teachers in the process of critical reflection is shown as a mechanism for generating changes in their teaching.

Marta Wiesława Rzepecka (Bronisław Markiewicz State Higher School of Technology and Economics in Jarosław, Poland)

**Argumentation in Ronald Reagan’s presidential campaign commercials**

Political argumentation is about how politicians argue their cases to either win others’ acceptance or persuade them to change their thinking, behavior or decision. It serves to express their political positions, convey their identifications, and reveal their commitments. Political argumentation most often includes persuasion – a tool used to influence others and shape their choices. In the United States, this is especially evident during elections. This article reflects on the role of argumentation in running a successful presidential campaign. It describes the notions of “presence” and “communion” by Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca, uses them to identify and analyze arguments and argumentation strategies used in Ronald Reagan’s campaign commercials and suggests conclusions which can be drawn on the basis of the analysis.
João de Deus Sááguia (Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal)

**Practical reasoning and practical argumentation**

Practical Reasoning is an activity of the mind, and is performed on a 'solo' basis. Practical Argumentation is a specific form of dialogue (so it is not solo), and ends up, at least normally, in a product: a more or less complex argument. What are the commonalities and also the idiosyncratic features of both Practical Reasoning and Practical Argumentation? How does one impinge on the other? Are they just two contiguous layers of intentional activity, an action of the mind (the reasoning) and a complex speech act (the arguing), or is their intertwinement more complex (as it seems to be)? I will try to start a partial answer to these questions, an answer that will be philosophically minded and philosophically based. More than criticisms, I'll try to build some bridges. Argumentative strategies in adolescence school writing. An aspect of the evaluation of students’ written argumentative competence.

Paraskevi Sachinidou (Demokritius university of Thrace, Greece)

**Argumentative strategies in adolescence school writing. An aspect of the evaluation of students’ written argumentative competence**

Teaching and learning written argumentation is a challenging task for both educators and students. In this paper employing the argumentative strategies acknowledged by pragma dialectics in the writing of adolescents within an educational language evaluating and learning frame, I explore their contribution in the elaboration of students’ theses and the evaluation of their argumentative competence. I argue that despite the diversity of argumentative strategies employed in students’ writing, the validity of their standpoints is not fully elaborated and so their argumentative competence is diminished. These findings are of significant importance for the designing of argumentative teaching.

Camillia Salas (University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland)

**When argumentative speech evolves in a legal context: A discursive approach of formal testimony**

The legal order is a privileged field for argumentation and I would like to examine it in a specific context: when argumentation occurs in dialogic interactions, especially in a criminal courtroom, considering public hearings in Switzerland. When the judge rewords what the witness has said and integrates it in its own discourse, I assume that it is possible to distinguish how this process of diaphony can work as a language marker of the interpretation of its witness’ evaluation. Therefore, I would like to analyze ways used by the legal order to reconstruct an argument —since the same argument can occur several times. Adopting a comparative discourse analysis along with ethnographic observations, my major undertaking is to show how argumentative speech evolves during the dialogic interaction and its rewording process.
Margareth Sandvik (Oslo and Akershus University College, Norway)

**Argumentation in election campaign discourse**

Two questions are asked in this paper: Is there a relationship between debate climate, interview style, and argumentation? The reason for asking this question has been an interest in whether political journalists in election campaign discourse cultivate a particular debate climate. The next question is whether election campaign discourse provides voters with sufficient information so that they can make their choice on a rational basis?

Janice Ellen Schuetz (University of New Mexico, USA)

**One-sided arguments in the supreme court decision on the defense of marriage act**

This essay develops Douglas Walton's concept of one-sided arguments to explain the form, content, and significance of legal arguments in Amicus Curiae briefs in the 2013 U.S. Supreme Court decision regarding the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). Walton's existing references to legal argument are not well suited for analyzing argumentation affecting appellate court decisions. Therefore my essay extends this theory and applies it to two different and important Amicus Curiae briefs and then shows how these arguments were appropriated and reused in the final U.S. Supreme Court decision. The decision has had significant legal consequences that have led to a rapid rate of legalizing gay marriage throughout the United States.

Jan Henning Schulze (University of Bamberg, Germany)

**Think twice: Fallacies and dual-process accounts of reasoning**

Dual-process accounts of reasoning distinguish between the fast, automatic, effortless processes of system1 and the slow, controlled, effortful processes of system2. System1 yields default responses, whereas system2 checks their soundness. Concerning the felicity of this interaction, four cases can be distinguished. (a) Both systems yield the same response and they are both right. (b) The intuitive response of system1 is wrong and gets corrected by the reflective system2. (c) Both systems yield the same response, but they are both wrong. (d) The intuitive answer of system1 is right, but it is overridden due to erroneous thinking by system2. In addition to classic fallacies, some less familiar cases of thinking errors are examined in order to show how dual-process accounts might clarify and enrich our understanding of poor reasoning.

Baruch B. Schwarz, Christa S. C. Asterhan (Hebrew University, Israel)
Revisiting educational dialogues in their complexity: Tracing their goals, deployment and productivity

We will show that comprehending productive argumentation for learning requires a reconsideration of (1) the goal instructions that direct learners towards a certain type of idealized dialogue; (2) characterizations of (socio-)cognitive and interpersonal dimensions of actual learning dialogue characteristics; and (3) learning gains from dialogue participation. We will discuss the following issues about educational dialogues: (a) The fact that goal instruction directing towards interpersonal competition or deliberation both lead to learning gains suggests that further research may explore how they could be combined for learning purposes; (b) More generally, new models of productive educational dialogues should be developed; (c) Educational dialogues as they deploy in group interaction are hybrid and collaborative in nature. These and other features should be incorporated to elaborate a Theory of Argumentation in Educational Contexts.

Menashe Schwed (Ashkelon Academic College, Israel)

Argumentation as a rational choice

The talk focuses on the thesis that argumentation essentially involves a choice. I wish to show how argumentation theory might reflect this essential feature. In the last OSSA conference, I argued that practices of argumentation reflect choices made on moral and political grounds. My purpose in this talk is to develop this thesis, such that it deals with the problem of rationality in argumentation in a like manner. The general idea is that the demand for rationality is a basic choice, derived from the moral and political ones. The talk proposes that this choice requires at least a minimal concept of rationality. The thesis is that this minimal concept has to be a pragmatist one in the Wittgensteinian manner, which emphasizes its being a normative choice.

Marcin Selinger (University of Wrocław, Poland)

A formal model of conductive reasoning

The aim of the paper is to propose a formal model of representation and numerical evaluation of conductive arguments. We understand such arguments as consisting not only of pro-precis supporting a claim, but also of contra-precis (exceptions) denying this claim. Our model combines the benefits of other approaches to argument analysis: recognizes internal structure of arguments, allows infinitely many degrees of acceptability, reflects the cumulative nature of convergent reasoning, and it enables to interpret the attack relation. It offers a simple and intuitive alternative to accounts developed in the area of computational models of argument such as for example, based on the so-called proof standards, Carneades argumentation system.

Harvey Siegel (University of Miami, USA)

Contextualism and argumentative norms
Are argumentative norms contextual? Perhaps, but any genuinely contextual dimension of argumentative norms would be dependent upon a kind of context-independence: That a given argument is strong in its context is a claim that is not itself dependent upon any particular context. Thus any defense of contextualism with respect to argumentative norms would itself have to be launched from some sort of ‘context-less context.’ The contextuality of argumentative norms can be established – if at all – only from a ‘universal’ ‘a-contextual context’, and this establishes an in-principle limit on the degree to which argumentative norms can be contextual. I examine recent treatments of contextualism in argument analysis/evaluation by van Eemeren, Goddu, and Walton to further clarify this in-principle limit.

Juliele Maria Sievers (Université de Lille 3, France)

**The burden of the naturalistic fallacy in Hans Kelsen’s legal theory**

The legal theory of Hans Kelsen (1881-1973) is marked by a strong interest in drawing a formal frame of analysis for moral and legal systems. According to this author, the positive normative systems must be neatly separated from the sciences describing them. In this context, Kelsen claims that a common mistake consists in mixing those two separate domains, the “Is” domain of the facts and the “Ought” domain of the norms, what could give place to a series of problems in the field of legal theory and legal argumentation. This misunderstanding is commonly known as “Naturalistic Fallacy”. My aim is to explain how Kelsen’s theory may resolve some classical legal problems derived from the involuntary use of the Naturalistic Fallacy.

Anders Sigrell (Lund University, Sweden)

**Qui Docet Discit - the one who teaches learns. On writing popular science**

Popular Science bridges the gap between science and society. Writing popular science means teaching, and according to the Latin proverb Qui docet discit (he who teaches learns), writing popular science makes scientists understand their subject better, and can be a way for writers to disclose new perspectives on their subject. To be able to argue successfully with non-peers, you have to use argumentation that shifts between general and specific, between details and whole. To be able to write popular science could also be a way to develop your ability for critical thinking (Badley 2009). Part from shifting perspectives the importance of the figures of style for writing popular science will be high-lighted, in line with findings from for example Fahnestock (2002, 2011).

A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, Jean H.M. Wagemans (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
**Reasonableness in context: Taking into account institutional conventions in the pragma-dialectical evaluation of argumentative discourse**

In this paper, we raise the question of how to take institutional conventions into account in a pragma-dialectical evaluation of argumentative discourse. We address this question by analyzing the nature of institutional conventions and pragma-dialectical norms, the way in which they relate to one another, and the role they play in the evaluation of argumentative discourse in institutional settings. First, we describe the main steps of the procedure of a pragma-dialectical evaluation of argumentative discourse and provide an explanation of the types of norms and rules involved. Next, we present an overview of various types of discrepancies between institutional conventions and pragma-dialectical norms. Finally, we discuss the influence of the discrepancies on the pragma-dialectical evaluation of argumentation in context.

Laurance Paul Strait (University of Southern California, USA)

**A pragma-dialectical approach to the decision-making paradigm in academic debate**

Recent attempts to resolve active theoretical controversies in academic debate (e.g., conditional advocacy, alternative agent advocacy, incommensurable ballot frameworks, etc.) through an appeal to the priority of decision-making have emerged in the newly emerging meta-theoretical paradigm. I argue that the theory of pragma-dialectics offers a fresh framework that can both provide a solid theoretical grounding to the emerging decision-making paradigm and help to resolve several seemingly intractable controversies in debate theory. I show how this method would apply to the problems of conditional advocacies in policy debate and necessary-but-insufficient-burdens in value debate. Finally, I argue that this technique is not merely a tactical tool for theory debates, but a procedure that inculcates transferable decision-making skills, the pedagogical holy grail of the decision-making meta-theoretical paradigm.

Aaron George Swanlek (University of Pittsburgh, USA)

**Krisis in policy debate**

The category of judgment receives little attention in prevailing argumentation theory, yet judgment is central to the practice of argumentation in many contexts. This gap might be addressed by turning to American Intercollegiate debate, where trained experts routinely make judgments, and explain their reasons for decision following structured arguments. I argue, policy debate can provide a rich understanding of how judgment evolved from active participation in the world (the term krisis) to a passive effect based model, crisis (judgment is necessary to resolve a crisis). This paper advances international argumentation through transnational scholarship about something fundamental to every human being, krisis.
Theory of argumentation: The argumentological twist is necessary

Today we need some kind of background knowledge about theory and practice of argumentation. This kind of knowledge is a philosophy of argumentation, or argumentology. Argumentology studies ontological, epistemological, methodological etc. fundamentals of argumentation as well as ultimate presuppositions of logical, rhetorical, and dialectical approaches to argumentation. Argumentological ontology should propose the answer to the question does a Homo arguer really exists as a theoretical problem. Argumentological epistemology deals with problem of cognitive backgrounds of theory and practice of argumentation. An argumentological methodology expertise of ontological, epistemological as well as logical, rhetorical, and dialectical approaches to argumentation is up to date in the theory of argumentation too.

Ambiguity as an argumentative strategy

At the start of his investigation of ambiguity, Israel Scheffler captured the following tension: “Logicians and philosophers typically concern themselves with ambiguity either as a defect in the arguments of others or as a hazard from which their own serious discourse is to be protected. Literary critics, alive to the rhetorical values of ambiguous expression, are not equally sensitive to the philosophical demands for clarity and system.” The sharp contrast between disvalue and value is striking.
I aim to close the gap, not by imposing the logician’s demands on the literary theorist, but by drawing the rhetorical values championed by the latter into the domain of informal logic. We should consider whether logic should somehow capture ambiguity in order to stay true to its task of reflecting everyday reasoning.

Arguing against one’s indignation: Is the selectiveness argument a fallacy?

Indignation is an emotion which can become the object of an argumentation involving the pathos (genuine or phony emotion), logos (legitimacy of the beliefs and judgments concerning the state of affairs that generated the emotion) and ethos (righteousness of the Indignant Person or Institution). The speech act that manifests the emotion often takes the form of a denunciation-accusation act of the Injustice done to the Victim by the Agent held responsible for the Injustice.
I will focus on a frequent refutation of someone’s Indignation, that is its Selectiveness, which can apply to the Injustice, to the Victim or to the Agent. The de-legitimization of the emotion often leads to an Ethotic argument, directed against the Indignant.
Can constitutional rights be weighed? On the inferential structure of balancing in legal argumentation

Balancing is one of the main issues in current debates on legal constitutional argumentation. The discussion has polarized into two competing theses. On the one view, balancing is both irrational and subjective. When courts “weigh” conflicting constitutional rights, they actually make a choice based upon political and moral considerations. On a different view, balancing is a rational form of argumentation grounded on the very structure of constitutional legal orders. In this paper we argue that none of these theses is true. By analyzing the inferential structure of balancing we show that it is composed by multiple inferential steps. We then look at what inferential commitments are undertaken in the balancing process, and under what conditions these commitments can be discursively satisfied in a given constitutional legal system.
The legitimacy of inference: Argumentation strategy in Ratnakirti’s Isvarasadhanadusanam

Isvarasadhanadusanam by the Buddhist philosopher Ratnakirti is structured as a two-part dialogue. First, an unnamed Naiyayika argues for the existence of Isvara (god). Next, Ratnakirti argues against the existence of Isvara. The arguments are primarily formal in nature focusing on whether certain defects in reasoning are present in the inference establishing the existence of Isvara. We show how the dialogical framework in which the arguments are presented allows the debate to function at two levels. On one, the dispute is about whether Isvara exists. On the other, there is dispute about the scope of inference and which arguments are allowed in what contexts. Viewing the text in this way allows the investigation of the scope of inference, and what this argumentation strategy tells us about legitimate uses of argumentation.
Ekaterina Vargina (St.Petersburg State University, Russia)

Argumentation in hierarchial and non-hierarchial communication

There are two major patterns of communication – hierarchical and non-hierarchical, depending on the communicative intention of the speakers (achieving a consensus or winning the case). The same argumentative structures can make up either of these, depending on whether the context is monological or dialogical. Hierarchical communication is a monologue or a pseudo-dialogue while intrinsic dialogism is a feature of non-hierarchical communication. Some argumentative strategies are characteristic to either hierarchical or non-hierarchical pattern. The speaker’s intentions influence the choice of argumentative strategies. A line can be drawn between dialogue as an aim and dialogue as a form of communication. Both verbal and non-verbal arguments are considered. An example of non-verbal arguments in hierarchical and non-hierarchical communication is gift giving, which can be both a monologue act and a dialogue turn.

Zsófia Várkonyi (University of Orléans, France)

Self-argumentative words: the case of “nature” and “natural”

Several words are arguments in themselves: the choice of those words determines a statement’s argumentative potential. “Nature” or “natural” are of the kind of words that influence consistently the outcome of an argument. Through the analysis of sequences of public debate on topics such as, for example, gay marriage, we can observe that the inherent argumentative power of these words is independent of their relevance to reality and, in some cases, overcomes the rational argumentative power of ideas. Incidentally, some theoretical issues will be addressed, among which the relevance of the traditional distinction between connotation and denotation. Indeed, this study illustrates that, in some cases, properties that are usually relegated to the space of connotation are objectively describable semantic instructions, while denotation could only be described in vague terms.

Mariia Vasileva (University of Tver, Russia)

Topoi in bureaucratic runaround

Texts of Bureacratic runaround (BR) are analyzed by means of the Toulmin model where Warrants are regarded as topoi. The topoi help to carry out the main communicative strategy of the author. Argumentation in BR is done by using rhetorical arguments (logical, ethical and pathetic). Logos in the argumentation is represented by these topoi: general vs. specific characteristics; part vs. whole; definition; outer vs. functional property; comparison; circumstance (time, place, condition, cause, effect). Ethos in the argumentation is manifested by these topoi: ethical; pragmatic; intellectual; reference. Pathos is of rare occurrence in BR; still, there can be the topoi of emotionality and attitude. Within BR there are four subtypes, one central, the others peripheral; they are discussed in detail in the talk.
Lev Vasilyev (Kaluga State University, Russia)

A cognitive style parameter of argumentation

An important aspect of argumentation analysis is taking into consideration a person’s cognitive style, i.e. individual traits in information organization and processing. A parameter of cognitive style is cognitive complexity (CC) / cognitive simplicity (CS). CC-individuals have a highly differentiated and integrated cognitive system. Y. Fomicheva and myself checked argument manifestation for these cognitive systems. We analyzed the discourse of 200 Russian respondents interpretating the argumentation in a news article. We used a Crable 1976 extension of the Toulmin model. Claims given by both CC- and CS-respondents were mostly modal and evaluative. Data use did not differ much in the responses. Warrants were characterized mostly by grouping semantics in both CC and CS. Backings and Rebuttals were more actively used by CC-respondents, Quantifiers - by CS-respondents.

Anton Vesper (BTU Cottbus-Senftenberg, Germany)

A mediator as a pragma-dialectical critical designer of acceptance

As the context of the talk the research program of pragma-dialectics is characterized, especially the component of analysis which rests upon the theoretical component, as well as the practical component. A mediator is characterized as a pragma-dialectical critical analyst. In a mediation session a mediator employs the pragma-dialectical grid to censoriously elucidate utterances as (in)appropriate to achieve a resolution of disagreement. A mediator is characterized as a designer of acceptance. It is suggested that in pragma-dialectics a designer is a practitioner. In the sense of the pragma-dialectical grid a mediator censoriously designs a route to achieve a resolution of disagreement in the mediation session. Consequently, a mediator is characterized as a pragma-dialectical critical designer of acceptance.

Ana Maria Vicuña-Navarro (Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, Chile), Celso López (Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, Chile)

Pragma-dialectical rules and the teaching of argumentation in Philosophy for Children

Since in Philosophy for Children philosophical dialogue is considered as the main tool fostering the practice of rigorous thinking, Philosophy for Children teachers must to model a discussion that complies with a critical ideal of reasonableness. She must also use effectively all tools necessary to attract the students’ involvement and participation in a philosophical dialogue that is significant for them. The pragma-dialectical approach, especially the rules for a critical discussion and the analytical tools, would provide the teacher with valuable instruments to foster them. In the stage of a regular Philosophy for Children class, we distinguish the pragma-dialectical rules that ought to be applied and the pedagogical devices instrumental to enhance the students’ participation in a community of inquiry.
How to put it vaguely

Vagueness has been mainly investigated in philosophy (Russell 1923; Keefe 2000) with the challenge posed by the Sorite Paradox. In Linguistics it’s seen as a lack of clear-cut boundaries between categories (see Labov’s transition between cups and bowls). In cognitive terms, vagueness is defined by Poggi & Vincze 2012 as a lack of detail in what one knows and/or communicates about a topic. One may be vague either because one has vague knowledge or, although having detailed information, one doesn’t want to reveal it to the listener. In everyday conversation, many premises are left unexpressed as they go without saying. Nonetheless, certain elements are sometimes purposely omitted while speaker behaves as if they were self-evident. Here we analyze evasive communication that violates the fifth pragma-dialectical rule of denying a premise left implicit (van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1992).

Jacky Visser (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

A formal perspective on the pragma-dialectical discussion model

This paper is part of an ongoing research project with the aim of laying a foundation for computational applications of argumentation theory within a pragma-dialectical framework. One of the first steps in this project is to formalise the pragma-dialectical ideal model of a critical discussion. This model is at the center of the theory and forms the basis for the analytical and evaluative methods. The formalisation is developed in terms of a dialogue game. In the current paper I present the compositional design rationale of a basic dialogue game with complexity adding extensions, and the outline of the basic game -- its purpose and setting, and rules for the available moves, the effects of moves, the allowed sequences of consecutive moves, and the conditions for winning and losing.
Douglas Walton (University of Windsor, Canada), Marcin Koszowy (University of Bialystok, Poland)

Two kinds of arguments from authority in the ad verecundiam fallacy

Argument from expert opinion has been traditionally linked to the notion of authority and a few authors have distinguished between argument from an expert opinion, an argument from appeal to authority of a different sort, resting on a notion of deontic or administrative authority about what should be done. In this paper, an argumentation scheme for argument from an administrative authority will be put forward along with a matching set of critical questions that can be used to evaluate it. The proposed scheme will be then compared to the existing scheme for argument from expert opinion, and the hypothesis will be explored that it is the ambiguity between the two types of argument that is the best basis for explaining how the fallacy of appeal to authority occurs.

Annemarie Weerman, Hans Hoeken, Jos Hornikx (Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands)

Predicting claim acceptance: Comparing explicit and intuitive evaluation methods of perceived argument strength

Two argument strength evaluation methods were compared on their ability to predict claim acceptance: the deliberate and explicit Perceived Argument Strength (PAS) scale and a newly developed intuitive evaluation method which contains two (PAS) items and requires a speeded response. Participants provided claim acceptance scores, intuitive evaluations and explicit evaluations of arguments from consequences that varied in the desirability and probability of the consequences. Desirability and probability affected claim acceptance and explicit evaluations, but had no direct effect on intuitive evaluations. However, explicit and intuitive evaluations both predicted a unique part of the variance in claim acceptance, suggesting that each method partly identifies different active ingredients of argument strength. The findings from this experiment demonstrate the added value of using intuitive measures when assessing argument strength.

Harry Weger (University of Central Florida, USA), Edward Hinck (Central Michigan University, USA), John Seiter (Utah State University, USA)

Joe Biden’s nonverbal ridicule as a case of strategic maneuvering in the 2012 American vice-presidential debate

Following a poor performance in the first debate with challenger Mitt Romney, the Obama campaign faced a developing media narrative of a Romney comeback. Hopes for a change in the narrative were pinned on Joe Biden’s Vice Presidential debate with challenger Paul Ryan. Biden’s smiling, sneering, and laughing at his opponent throughout the debate dominated the resulting media coverage. Expressing nonverbal ridicule constitutes a calculated risk to a candidate’s image and audience perceptions of speaker competence in public argumentation.
Our paper analyzes Joe Biden’s nonverbal behavior using politeness theory and strategic maneuvering to examine Biden’s seemingly irrational behavior. Although departing from ideal standards for critical discussion, we will show how Biden’s behavior is a rational adaptation to the wider rhetorical situation and the affordances provided by televised political debate.

Sheldon Wein (Saint Mary’s University, Canada)

**Planning for legal argumentation**

The planning theory of law, which is rapidly becoming the dominant contemporary version of legal positivism, holds that legal systems are ultimately a form of extremely abstract plans for how those engaged in the shared cooperative activity of creating and sustaining systems of massively shared agency. According to Scott Shapiro (Legality, Harvard UP, 2011) the “circumstances of legality” (a subset of the standard Humean circumstances of justice) arise when the collective action problems faced by a society are such that all the viable solutions are so complex, contentious or arbitrary that non-legal means of dealing with them (say by religion, tradition, morality, or etiquette) will inevitably fail. Thus legal systems, and legal argumentation within those systems, become necessary for the continued success of the society. The implications of this for legal argumentation depend on the nature of the “economy of trust” within particular legal systems. This has the (apparently) unfortunate consequence that the standards for good legal arguments will vary from one legal system to another not just in their content but also in their form, structure, and interpretation. But at least so far as form and structure (and perhaps interpretation) what makes an argument a good one does not vary depending on the context. This paper offers an account of legal interpretation—drawn on work in the interpretation of religious texts.

Mark Weinstein (Montclair State University, USA)

**Cognitive science and the model of emerging truth**

This paper looks at the developing field of cognitive science to show how its epistemic power can be explained using the key constructions of my model of emerging truth (MET). Rather than traditional inferential relations the MET sees warrants as tied to a field of models in definable relationships that account for the relative power of the arguments in which they are employed. This paper will show how such model relationships can be identified in the various strands of cognitive science. This emerging field of model relations accounts for the increasing power of cognitive science arguments by contrast to other approaches in psychology and sociology.

Renske Wierda (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands)
Strategic maneuvers relying on experience expertise in medical direct-to-consumer advertisements

In medical direct-to-consumer advertisements (DTCA), advertisers aim to convince consumers to use a particular medical product. These advertisements often feature endorsements by people who have used a product themselves and advise others to try it as well. Such a product endorsement can be seen as a form of authority argumentation based on 'experience expertise'. In order to determine whether this authority argument is reasonable, the reader of a medical advertisement can subject the argument to several critical questions, such as the question whether the endorser has actually used the advertised product. Using the pragma-dialectical argumentation theory as a theoretical framework, this paper will focus on strategic maneuvers relying on experience expertise, and the soundness conditions that pertain to their use in medical DTCA.

Janina Wildfeuer (Bremen University, Germany)

It’s all about logics!? Analyzing the rhetorical structure of multimodal filmic text

Film analysis, and multimodal analysis in general, is no longer seen as simply decoding the semiotic resources, but asking for inferential processes of reasoning about the best and most plausible interpretation. This interpretation operates according to so-called textual cues in the artefact that clearly guide the recipient's imagination and hypothesis-making. It is assumed that these cues are mainly provided by the rhetorical structure of the filmic text which gives clear constraints on the interpretation. The talk will present a recently developed framework for analyzing these cues and the so-called logical form of filmic and other multimodal discourses. The aim is to advance knowledge about argumentation structure in multimodal discourse and its analysis from a logical perspective.

David Cratis Williams (Florida Atlantic University, USA), Marilyn J. Young (Florida State University, USA), Michael K. Launer (Florida State University)

‘Rule of law,’ ‘freedom,’ and ‘democracy’: Domestic and international building blocks of contemporary Russian political ideology

We analyze the definitional arguments of Vladimir Putin and other leading Russian politicians and strategists relative to three terms: democracy, freedom, and rule of law. We will examine the definitional relationships among these terms in political argumentation in contemporary Russia, with a focus on “rule of law.” We will look at primary appeals targeting domestic Russian audiences to identify the definitional construction of “rule of law” relative to the other key terms. We will then examine Putin’s message to the American people on possible US air strikes against Syria, looking for the definitional construction of rule of law in the discourse. We will conclude by comparing the definitional arguments involving these terms in the discourse targeting the Russian people and the discourse targeting the American people (and the international community).

Harald R. Wohlrapp (Universität Hamburg, Germany)
Some considerations concerning pragmatism and dialectics in argumentation theory

Argumentation theory’s philosophical fundament (concepts of inference and persuasion) stems from Aristotle. As it is scarcely capable to cover the dynamic and the subjective traits of today’s argumentative practice, an update is advisable. The philosophies of Dialectics (Heraclitus, Plato, Hegel, Habermas) and of Pragmatism (Peirce, James, Mead, Dewey) can be of avail here. They allow to form some new basic concepts which on the one hand embed argumentation into general human activities (concept of orientation development) and on the other hand relate it to the subjective views of individuals (concept of frame structure), which need to be kept open (concept of transsubjectivity). Thus, argumentation can be understood comprehensively as a unique self-referential human practice aiming at reasonable orientation in an incessantly renewing world.

Patti G. Wojahn (New Mexico State University, USA)

Argumentative strategies: Discipline-specific approaches to academic argument

Most academic institutions are composed of disciplines characterized by differences: specialized knowledge, approaches to problem-solving, methods of arguing cases, and tools for investigating the world. We argue that argumentative strategies, however, are often introduced arhetorically, as skills transferring neatly into the discourse of one’s field, regardless of discipline. As Linton, Madigan, and Johnson state, “truly mastering a disciplinary style means mastering the reasoning, the conventions, and the epistemological assumptions of the relevant discourse community.” Students need to learn to recognize and practice different forms of argumentation as they apprentice into a new field. In our presentation, we discuss the need for identifying key factors prominent in arguments made within specific disciplines and developing ways to introduce students explicitly to factors to keep in mind when working within their disciplines.

Jaime Lane Wright (St. John’s University, USA)

The lifenaut project: arguing consciousness

Traditionally, argumentation theory investigates practices of construction: of audiences, of publics, of motives and procedures, of reasons and reasoning. One area of research that deserves more attention from argument theory is, I think, the relationship between the construction of the subject and practice of argumentation. This paper investigates that construction, applying argumentation theory to the construction of an artificial (historical) intelligence. Typically, we imagine artificial intelligence(s) acting into and despite an unknowable future—that a reasoning consciousness must be able to look ahead. In this paper, however, I offer argumentation theory as a reverse option: perhaps the ability to reason stems from the construction of memory. The ability to argue creates a store of memory from which a consciousness may act, imagine, and reason. Argument creates the past, and the past creates an individual consciousness. Combining Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s discussion of audience construction with DeLuca’s investigation of the body’s centrality to argument construction, I explore how Lifenaut’s mindfiles work as a prosthetic memory construction performing and/or altering theoretical understanding of consciousness, reasons, and publics.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) since its birth has always been adopted as a crucial methodology in analyzing new s discourse. In practice, analysts concern much about the discursive/argumentative strategies manipulated by new s producers to convince the audience, which is also a vital research topic in pragma-dialectics. However, it is always frustrating to see how systematically these two research traditions are integrated. This study intends to bridge the theoretical and methodological gap between pragma-dialectics and critical analysis of new s discourse. First, I theorize new s discourse as argumentation, and then discuss differences and compatibility between CDA and pragma-dialectics, based on which, an integral analytic framework is proposed for new s discourse analysis. A case study of New York Time’s Report on China-US Solar Trade War is exemplified at the end.

Consideration on the notion of reasoning

In this paper, I started my discussion from Ralph H. Johnson’s view that the theory of reasoning is in need in philosophy and pointed out its significance to understand the notion of reasoning; I then examined the phenomenon that theorists had been used this notion in their own different way and tried to explain why they use it in a confusing way. In order to clarify it, I compared the notion of reasoning with the notions of argument and argumentation. In order to understand the notion of reasoning, I also pointed out some misunderstood concepts related to reasoning, such as soundness, completeness and validity.
Yun Xie (Sun Yat-sen University, China), Dale Hample (University of Maryland, USA), Xiaoli Wang (South China Normal University, China)

A cross-cultural analysis of argument predispositions in China: Argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, argument frames, and personalization of conflict

China has a longstanding tradition of stressing the values of harmony and coherence, and Chinese society has always been alleged to be a group where conflict avoidance is viewed more positively than direct confrontation and argumentation. But what are Chinese people’s feelings and understandings of interpersonal arguing? We approached this question by reporting the results of a data collection in China, using measures of argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, argument frames, and personalization of conflict. Chinese men were more aggressive than Chinese women. Chinese and U.S. means differed in complex ways, but did not show Chinese respondents to be more avoidant. Chinese correlations among variables were a reasonable match to expectations based on Western argumentation theories.

Minghui Xiong (Sun Yat-sen University, China), Wuliji Tu (Inner Mongolia Normal University, China)

Comparison of Buddhist debate in the Tibetan and in the Mongolian area

Debating, also called arguing, is a Tibetan Buddhist term, which is the main educational method that a lama learns well the words or concepts and understands fully the meaning of the Buddhist doctrine. All Buddhist debates are normally divided into two types: one-to-one and one-to-many debate. After the questioners questioning, the proponent can answers by “yes”, “no” or “undetermined”. Once questioners have no chance to continue or the proponent cannot answer any more, the debate stops and it is obvious who is the winner. As we all know, there are some similarities between the debate of Tibetan Buddhism in Tibetan area and that in Mongolian area in China, but both of them have some differences as well. In this paper, we discuss the similarities and differences.

Jiajia Xu (The University of Nottingham Ningbo China, China)

The norms of argumentation in seminar group discussion

This paper aims to set up norms of argumentation in seminar group discussion at master’s level in an English-medium university. The purpose is to establish evaluation tools for the teaching and assessing of group discussion of Chinese students in an English for Academic (EAP) programme. In this research, van Eemeren and Grootendorst’s pragma-dialectical approach (1984) and Walton’s argumentation schemes (1984) are used as the theoretical foundation. The interviews of six lecturers in humanities and social science and six EAP tutors in the Centre of English Education are used as a supplementary resource for the establishment of the norms. One group discussion of Chinese students is used as a pilot to test whether the norms can be applied in evaluating the quality of the argumentation.
Olena Yaskorska (Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland)

Recognising argumentation in dialogical context

The aim of the paper is to extend existing methods of the recognition of argumentation which typically focus on inference indicators as cues for argument detection. In the proposed approach, we aim to identify argument structures via dialogue protocols. In the dialogue “Bob: We should increase funding for science; Alice: Why?; Bob: Because science is necessary for successful industry” the standard method is not sufficient to recognise the argument. The solution is to use the Inference Anchoring Theory which allows us to understand how it is that when A asks why it is that p; and then B say q, we recognise an inference from p to q. In the paper sample analysis of the natural dialogues is presented using the transcripts of the BBC Radio4 program Moral Maze.
Igor Ž. Žagar (Educational Research Institute, Slovenia)

From topoi to fallacies: The misuse of argumentation in critical discourse analysis

After C. L. Hamblin's groundbreaking work Fallacies (1970), re-interpreting what used to be known as "mistakes in reasoning" or "bad arguments" since Aristotle (On Sophistical Refutations), the study of fallacies started to bloom, coming up with ever new perspectives of what should count as a mistake in reasoning and argumentation, and why a certain kind of reasoning should at all be considered a mistake. This paper will be concerned with two questions. First, an epistemological one: do we (everymen, politicians, the media...) commit fallacies, or do we (intentionally) use them? Second, a methodological one: when we (philosophers, sociologists ...) detect a fallacy, on what conceptual grounds do we differentiate between "committed" and "used" fallacies? Is there a difference?

Marta Zampa (University of Lugano, Switzerland)

Arguing with oneself in writing for the news

To believe that argumentation is an exclusively dialogic activity would imply that human beings reason differently in a social context than within themselves. On the contrary (in line with scholars like Blair 1998; Dascal 2005; Greco Morasso 2013), I assume that it is possible to have fully-fledged argumentation also in monologues, e.g. in the soliloquy occurring within oneself while making decisions. Evidence to this claim is provided by analysing how journalists argue about their choices in newswriting, made observable by means of cue-based retrospective verbal protocols from Progression Analysis (Perrin 2003; 2013). After having reconstructed the argumentation structure of soliloquies in pragma-dialectical terms (van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004), I apply the Argumentum Model of Topics (Rigotti & Greco Morasso 2009; 2010) to explain the relation between standpoints and arguments.

David H. Zarefsky (Northwestern University (Emeritus), USA)

Argumentation in Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address

The Gettysburg Address is the speech for which Lincoln is best known around the world. On the surface it is a brief epideictic address without argumentation. But it subtly and implicitly develops the argument that nationalism is necessary for democracy to flourish. I will explicate this argument and identify its structure and means of development. Then I will explore the strategic maneuvering by which Lincoln embeds this argument in a presumably epideictic text. These moves involve omission, ambiguity, definition, and selection of imagery. The analysis will substantiate Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's view that stylistic devices and epideictic texts can have argumentative significance.

Frank Zenker (Lund University, Sweden)
Denying the antecedent probabilized

As is well known, C is not deductively entailed by NOT A and IF A THEN C (denying the antecedent [DA]). But just as A can confer probabilistic support onto C, also NOT C can receive support from NOT A. We assume that the proponent is committed to IF A THEN C and A, and she construes probabilistic support for C; the opponent is committed to IF A THEN C and NOT A, and she construes probabilistic support for NOT C. We identify conditions that analysts must treat in evaluating such probabilistic DA arguments. Stressing the distinct effects of premise retraction vs. premise subtraction, argument cogency is shown to depend on premises that normally remain implicit.

Yiqiong Zhang (Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China), Paul van den Hoven (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)

Constructing reality with images and words: Multimodal arguments in English and Chinese news

One of the key issues in unpacking the complexity of multimodal argument lies in the logical relationships between the visual and the verbal in shaping an argument. The issue, however, remains relatively unexplored. This study therefore explores the logical relationship of visuals and verbals in multimodal arguments by adopting a multidisciplinary approach with theories and frameworks from argumentation and rhetoric, cross-cultural studies, and social semiotics.

The data for the current study consist of a corpus of online news on China report in English and Chinese, in which visuals are increasingly used to make explicit or implicit arguments. Analyses reveal that English and Chinese news on the same news topic uses similar visuals but different multimodal interactions to make arguments that are culturally sensitive.

Janja Žmavc (Educational Research Institute and University of Primorska, Slovenia)

An interplay of implicitness and authority: Some remarks on Roman rhetorical ethos

In the paper we present an analysis of ethos in the early Roman rhetoric. Since aristocratic families directed the economic and political growth of res publica, public performance was limited to the members of the governing elite. Particularly in the early Roman rhetoric arguments based on probability represent a minority compared to arguments from authority. Additionally, Roman rhetorical ethos reflects a language use that contains carriers of implicit meaning with a significant argumentative function. After a brief conceptualization of “Roman” ethos and different social roles of an orator Romanus, we apply such a view of ethos to the Verschueren’s model of linguistic pragmatics. Focusing on different types of implicit meaning we demonstrate how an interaction between the explicit and the implicit reflects a discursive construction of a speaker’s character.