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1. INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the 9th ISSA Conference on Argumentation!

Since the first conference took place in Amsterdam in 1986, the conferences of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation have become an important meeting-place for an increasing number of argumentation scholars from different nationalities and disciplinary backgrounds. This time, after a careful selection procedure, 266 out of 311 submissions were accepted for presentation at the conference. In the conference program they are grouped under the following headings:

- Analogy argumentation
- Argument schemes
- Argument strength
- Argumentation and cognition
- Argumentation and computation
- Argumentation and controversy
- Argumentation and culture
- Argumentation and debate
- Argumentation and epistemology
- Argumentation and ethics
- Argumentation and linguistics
- Argumentation and narrative
- Argumentation and politics
- Argumentation and science
- Argumentation and style
- Argumentation and translation
- Argumentation in a historical context
- Argumentation in an academic context
- Argumentation in health
- Argumentation in the media
- Argumentation in the public sphere
- Argumentation reconstruction
- Argumentative dialogue
- Conductive argument
- Deep disagreement
- Education and learning
- Ethos and pathos
- Fallacies
- Historical backgrounds
- Legal argumentation
- Metaphor and argumentation
- Multimodal argumentation
- Quantitative empirical research
- Rhetorical analysis
- Rhetorical issues
- Starting points and argumentation
- Theoretical issues
- Visual argumentation
- Warrants in argumentation

It goes without saying that in organizing this conference the Planning Committee depended very much on the help from others. For their invaluable contributions we thank our colleagues and students at the University of Amsterdam: Corina Andone, Martijn Demollin, Eveline Feteris, Andreas Finsen, Ingeborg van der Geest, Lilian Heijmans, José Alfonso Lomeli Hernández, Roosmaryn Pilgram, José Plug, Lotte van Poppel, Kiki Renardel de Lavalette, Everdien Rietstap and Francisca Snoeck Henkemans. In addition, we would like to thank the members of the ISSA 2018 Student Team for their great support.

For financial support we are grateful to the Sciential International Centre for Scholarship in Argumentation Theory (SIC SAT), the City of Amsterdam, Springer Academic Publishers, and John Benjamins Publishers.

We wish you a productive and enjoyable conference!

The Planning Committee,
Bart Garssen, David Godden, Gordon Mitchell, and Jean Wagemans
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Changes in the Planning Committee**

The present Planning Committee of the ISSA Conference on Argumentation consists of Bart Garssen, David Godden, Gordon Mitchell, and Jean Wagemans.

The ISSA conferences of 1986, 1990, 1994, and 1998 were organized by Frans van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, Anthony Blair and Charles Willard. This happy collaboration ended due to the passing away of Grootendorst in 2000. Fortunately, Francisca Snoeck Henkemans agreed to join the remaining members of the Planning Committee in organizing the ISSA Conference of 2002. In 2006 the ISSA Conference was again organized by van Eemeren, Blair and Willard, this time joined by Bart Garssen. Because it seemed time to hand over this task to a new generation, in organizing the ISSA Conference of 2010 David Godden succeeded Blair and Gordon Mitchell succeeded Willard. In 2014, Snoeck Henkemans succeeded van Eemeren and in 2018, Jean Wagemans succeeded Snoeck Henkemans.

**Conference badges and dinner ticket**

Participants in the ISSA Conference are requested to wear their conference badges during all sessions of the Conference and also at the Receptions. Those who registered for the Conference Dinner are requested to bring their dinner ticket to the venue.

**Wireless internet connection at Oudemanhuispoort during the conference**

The conference site provides connection to the “eduroam” wireless network for users from other educational institutes. Log in using the account of your own institute. You can also log on to the “UvA Open Wi-Fi” or the “WiFi-Guests” network, which does not require registration or passwords.

**Changes in the Conference Program**

The program included in this booklet has been updated until the moment it was sent to the printer. Late cancellations and room changes will be announced in the registration room (D1.18B).

**Social media**

The suggested hashtag for tweets about the conference is #ISSA2018.

**Proceedings**

All papers that have actually been presented at the 9th ISSA Conference will be included in the proceedings. The formatting guidelines and the paper template can be found on the ISSA website (cf.hum.uva.nl/issa/). The deadline for uploading your final paper is September 15, 2018. Please go to www.conftool.net/issa2018 > Your submissions > Final paper.
3. General Overview of the Conference

Tuesday, July 3

17.00-19.00 Welcoming reception and registration
Location: Main hall Oudemanhuispoort 4-6

Wednesday, July 4

08.30-09.00 Coffee
Location: Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411
09.00-10.00 Keynote speech by Marianne Doury
Location: Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411
10.30-13.00 Presentation of papers
Location: Oudemanhuispoort 4-6
13.00-14.30 Lunch
Location: Singel Church, Singel 452
14:30-17.30 Presentation of papers
Location: Oudemanhuispoort 4-6
18.00-19.30 Reception (City Council of Amsterdam)
Location: Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27

Thursday, July 5

08.30-09.00 Coffee
Location: Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411
09.00-10.00 Keynote speech by Dale Hample
Location: Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411
10.30-13.00 Presentation of papers
Location: Oudemanhuispoort 4-6
13.00-14.30 Lunch
Location: Singel Church, Singel 452
14:30-17.30 Presentation of papers
Location: Oudemanhuispoort 4-6
18.00-19.30 Reception (Springer Academic Publishers)
Location: Roof terrace, NEMO Science Museum, Oosterdok 2

Friday, July 6

08.30-09.00 Coffee
Location: Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411
09.00-10.00 Keynote speech by David Hitchcock
Location: Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411
10.30-13.00 Presentation of papers
Location: Oudemanhuispoort 4-6
13.00-14.30 Lunch
Location: Singel Church, Singel 452
14:30-17.00 Presentation of papers
Location: Oudemanhuispoort 4-6
17.30-18.30 Boat tour (Rederij Kooij, Rokin, opposite to no. 125)
18.30-22.00 Reception and Dinner (John Benjamins Publishing Company, SicSat)
Presentation of the ISSA Awards 2015 to 2018
Location: De Duif, Prinsengracht 756
### Wednesday July 4, 2018, Morning program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.30</td>
<td>Coffee (Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Keynote Marianne Doury (Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Argumentation and politics</td>
<td>van der Geest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Education and learning</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.18C</td>
<td>A1.18D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.18C</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.18D</td>
<td>Many questions room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0.17</td>
<td>Ad baculum room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0.23</td>
<td>Ad misericordiam room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1.17</td>
<td>Slippery slope room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Williams, Young &amp; Launer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Aonuma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Keremidchieva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>Murcia Sánchez &amp; Cardona Ángel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Session: Argumentation and politics

- **Chair:** van der Geest
- **Times:** 10.30-11.00, 11.00-11.30, 11.30-12.00, 12.00-12.30
- **Speakers:**
  - 10.30-11.00: Williams, Young & Launer, Peishan Chen, Rossi, Macagno & Bigi, Gudkova, Eichhorn
  - 11.00-11.30: Aonuma, Yong-Set & Hyra, Quattri & Peng Wu, Terzian, Jingjing Wu
  - 11.30-12.00: Keremidchieva, Žmavc, Goodnight & Yue Yang, Vicuña & López, Ubertone
  - 12.00-12.30: Wright, Aakhus, Mikesell, Kim & Fadem, Xiaoming Ren, Kloosterhuis
  - 12.30-13.00: Murcia Sánchez & Cardona Ángel, Snoeck Henkemans & Wagemans, Greene & Hicks

### 13.00 Lunch (Singel Church, Singel 452)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>14:30-15:00</th>
<th>15:00-15:30</th>
<th>15:30-16:00</th>
<th>16:00-16:30</th>
<th>16:30-17:30</th>
<th>17:00-17:30</th>
<th>18:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A118C</td>
<td>Argumentation in an academic context</td>
<td>Goodnight</td>
<td>Leal</td>
<td>Calcaterra</td>
<td>Rascacat</td>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118D</td>
<td>Argumentation and linguistics</td>
<td>Koszowy-Dutkiewicz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C117</td>
<td>Argumentation and epistemology</td>
<td>Klaeschies</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C118</td>
<td>Deep disagreement</td>
<td>Planitz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118C</td>
<td>Argumentation and computation</td>
<td>Plummer</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C117</td>
<td>Argumentation and epistemology</td>
<td>Klaeschies</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C118</td>
<td>Deep disagreement</td>
<td>Planitz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118C</td>
<td>Argumentation in an academic context</td>
<td>Goodnight</td>
<td>Leal</td>
<td>Calcaterra</td>
<td>Rascacat</td>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118D</td>
<td>Argumentation and linguistics</td>
<td>Koszowy-Dutkiewicz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C117</td>
<td>Argumentation and epistemology</td>
<td>Klaeschies</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C118</td>
<td>Deep disagreement</td>
<td>Planitz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118C</td>
<td>Argumentation in an academic context</td>
<td>Goodnight</td>
<td>Leal</td>
<td>Calcaterra</td>
<td>Rascacat</td>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118D</td>
<td>Argumentation and linguistics</td>
<td>Koszowy-Dutkiewicz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C117</td>
<td>Argumentation and epistemology</td>
<td>Klaeschies</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C118</td>
<td>Deep disagreement</td>
<td>Planitz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118C</td>
<td>Argumentation in an academic context</td>
<td>Goodnight</td>
<td>Leal</td>
<td>Calcaterra</td>
<td>Rascacat</td>
<td>Hackett</td>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>Wu</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A118D</td>
<td>Argumentation and linguistics</td>
<td>Koszowy-Dutkiewicz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C117</td>
<td>Argumentation and epistemology</td>
<td>Klaeschies</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C118</td>
<td>Deep disagreement</td>
<td>Planitz</td>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Akin</td>
<td>Guevara</td>
<td>van den Hooij</td>
<td>Levin</td>
<td>Raimondo</td>
<td>Amsterdam Museum, entrance Sint Luciensteeg 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Room</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.30-09.00</td>
<td>A1.18D</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Hofmann</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Hofmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00-10.30</td>
<td>C1.17</td>
<td>Many questions room</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>A1.18C</td>
<td>Ad populum room</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>C1.17</td>
<td>Ad scepticism room</td>
<td>Groarke</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Groarke</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>A1.18D</td>
<td>Ad caputorum room</td>
<td>Sablenko</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Sablenko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>A1.18D</td>
<td>Ad quidestium room</td>
<td>Sablenko</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Sablenko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>C1.17</td>
<td>Ad factum room</td>
<td>Sablenko</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Sablenko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, July 5, 2018, morning program

08.30 Coffee (Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411)

09.00 Keynote Dale Hample (Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411)

11.00-13.00 Lunch (Singel Church, Singel 452)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Schweg Schneider</td>
<td>Hofmann, Ray, Dori-Hacohen, Khomenko &amp; Hauple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Many questions room</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>Okuda, Kato &amp; Suzuki, Oinas, A. Blair, Colubbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Ad baculum room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>M. Baker &amp; Schwarz, Jianfeng Yang, Start points and arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Ad misericordium room</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Slippage slope room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Ad ignorantiam room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Rhetorical issues</td>
<td>Schweg Schneider</td>
<td>Hofmann, Ray, Dori-Hacohen, Khomenko &amp; Hauple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Warrants in argumentation</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Theoretical issues</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Argumentation in the public sphere</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Argumentation and culture</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Metaphor and argumentation</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Schweg Schneider</td>
<td>Hofmann, Ray, Dori-Hacohen, Khomenko &amp; Hauple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Many questions room</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>Okuda, Kato &amp; Suzuki, Oinas, A. Blair, Colubbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Ad baculum room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>M. Baker &amp; Schwarz, Jianfeng Yang, Start points and arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Ad misericordium room</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Slippage slope room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Ad ignorantiam room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Rhetorical issues</td>
<td>Schweg Schneider</td>
<td>Hofmann, Ray, Dori-Hacohen, Khomenko &amp; Hauple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Warrants in argumentation</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Theoretical issues</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Argumentation in the public sphere</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Argumentation and culture</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Metaphor and argumentation</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Schweg Schneider</td>
<td>Hofmann, Ray, Dori-Hacohen, Khomenko &amp; Hauple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Many questions room</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>Okuda, Kato &amp; Suzuki, Oinas, A. Blair, Colubbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Ad baculum room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>M. Baker &amp; Schwarz, Jianfeng Yang, Start points and arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Ad misericordium room</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Slippage slope room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Ad ignorantiam room</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Rhetorical issues</td>
<td>Schweg Schneider</td>
<td>Hofmann, Ray, Dori-Hacohen, Khomenko &amp; Hauple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Warrants in argumentation</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Theoretical issues</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Argumentation in the public sphere</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Argumentation and culture</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Reading, Hernandez, Goodin, Zanker, Planin &amp; Teris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Metaphor and argumentation</td>
<td>Kienpointner</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Jianfeng Yang, Khomenko &amp; Hauple, Blair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Friday, July 6, 2018, morning program

### 08.30  Coffee (Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1.18C</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>H. Jansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.18D</td>
<td>Many questions room</td>
<td>Tindale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.17</td>
<td>Ad baculum room</td>
<td>van Laar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0.23</td>
<td>Ad misericordiam room</td>
<td>Hoeken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C0.17</td>
<td>Ad hominem room</td>
<td>Boogaart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 09.00  Keynote David Hitchcock (Old Lutheran Church, Singel 411)

### Room A1.18C
- **Ad hominem room**
  - **Chair:** H. Jansen
  - **Time:** 10.30-11.00
    - Andone
    - Sigrell
    - Zarefsky
    - Bankey
    - Madroane
  - **Time:** 11.00-11.30
    - Tomasi, Manzin & Puppo
    - Jales Ribeiro
    - Livnat & Kohn
    - Baldwin & Greason
    - Ying Yang
  - **Time:** 11.30-12.00
    - Tuzet & Canale
    - Cohen
    - Goodwin
    - Zampa
    - van den Hoven & Ying Yang
  - **Time:** 12.00-12.30
    - Voss
    - Gomez
    - Hannken-Illjes
    - Peng Wu
  - **Time:** 12.30-13.00
    - Valencia

### Room A1.18D
- **Many questions room**
  - **Chair:** Tindale
  - **Time:** 10.30-11.00
    - Andone
    - Sigrell
    - Zarefsky
    - Bankey
    - Madroane
  - **Time:** 11.00-11.30
    - Tomasi, Manzin & Puppo
    - Jales Ribeiro
    - Livnat & Kohn
    - Baldwin & Greason
    - Ying Yang
  - **Time:** 11.30-12.00
    - Tuzet & Canale
    - Cohen
    - Goodwin
    - Zampa
    - van den Hoven & Ying Yang
  - **Time:** 12.00-12.30
    - Voss
    - Gomez
    - Hannken-Illjes
    - Peng Wu
  - **Time:** 12.30-13.00
    - Valencia

### Session: Legal argumentation
- **Chair:** H. Jansen
  - **Time:** 10.30-11.00
    - Sigrell
    - Zarefsky
    - Bankey
    - Madroane
  - **Time:** 11.00-11.30
    - Jales Ribeiro
    - Livnat & Kohn
    - Baldwin & Greason
    - Ying Yang
  - **Time:** 11.30-12.00
    - Cohen
    - Goodwin
    - Zampa
    - van den Hoven & Ying Yang
  - **Time:** 12.00-12.30
    - Voss
    - Gomez
    - Hannken-Illjes
    - Peng Wu

### 13.00  Lunch (Singel Church, Singel 452)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>C1.23</th>
<th>C2.05</th>
<th>C2.17</th>
<th>C2.23</th>
<th>D1.18A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Straw man room</td>
<td>Ad populum room</td>
<td>Ad verecundiam room</td>
<td>Equivocation room</td>
<td>Ad ignorantiam room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation in the public sphere</td>
<td>Zampa</td>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>17.30 Boat tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethos and pathos</td>
<td>Hazen</td>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Doroi-Hacoehn</td>
<td>(Rederij Kooij, Rokin, opposite to no. 125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation and politics</td>
<td>Hannken-Illjes</td>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>E. Hinck, S. Hinck, Dailey &amp; R. Hinck</td>
<td>18.30 Reception and Conference Dinner (De Duif, Prinsengracht 756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation and linguistics</td>
<td>Balthrop</td>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Chernyavskaya</td>
<td>C. Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation in a historical context</td>
<td>C. Blair</td>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Chunlan Jin</td>
<td>Chunlan Jin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal argumentation</td>
<td>Barebina</td>
<td>17.30 Boat tour</td>
<td>Pinto</td>
<td>Mazzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argumentation reconstruction</td>
<td>J. Jansen</td>
<td>18.30 Reception and Conference Dinner (De Duif, Prinsengracht 756)</td>
<td>Barebina</td>
<td>J. Jansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Boat tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zampa</td>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>17.30 Boat tour</td>
<td>(Rederij Kooij, Rokin, opposite to no. 125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazen</td>
<td>Doroi-Hacoehn</td>
<td>18.30 Reception and Conference Dinner (De Duif, Prinsengracht 756)</td>
<td>E. Hinck, S. Hinck, Dailey &amp; R. Hinck</td>
<td>C. Blair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannken-Illjes</td>
<td>Balthrop</td>
<td>19.00-19.30</td>
<td>Chernyavskaya</td>
<td>Chunlan Jin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balthrop</td>
<td>C. Blair</td>
<td>20.00-20.30</td>
<td>Pinto</td>
<td>Mazzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Blair</td>
<td>Chunlan Jin</td>
<td>21.00-21.30</td>
<td>Barebina</td>
<td>J. Jansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boat tour</td>
<td>(Rederij Kooij, Rokin, opposite to no. 125)</td>
<td>22.00-22.30</td>
<td>Argumentation reconstruction</td>
<td>J. Jansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(De Duif, Prinsengracht 756)</td>
<td>(De Duif, Prinsengracht 756)</td>
<td>23.00-23.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Jansen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEDNESDAY, JULY 4

Old Lutheran Church
Singel 411

Keynote
09.00  Doury
Interpreting argumentation. The insider and outsider points of view

Ad hominem room A1.18C
Oudemanhuispoort

Argumentation and politics

10.30-11.00  Williams, Young & Launer
A retrospective analysis of Russian "democracy": An historical case study of definitional argumentation

11.00-11.30  Aonuma
Terrorizing the nation kairotically: An argumentative critique of "Missile Alert" as political deception in Japan

11.30-12.00  Keremidchieva
Globalizing reasonableness: "The Law of Nations" and the creation of foreign policy in the early U.S. congress

12.00-12.30  Wright
Epicheireme in American political memory

12.30-13.00  Murcia Sánchez & Cardona Ángel
Compromise and democracy

Argumentation in an academic context

14.30-15.00  Leal
How philosophers argue

15.00-15.30  Galindo Castañeda
Interrogative burden of proof in philosophical argumentation

15.30-16.00  Muench
Socio-cultural differences in the rhetorical structure of scientific abstracts

Argumentation and politics

16.00-16.30  Sandvik
Election campaigns for agonistic democracies

16.30-17.00  Mohammed
Arguing the multiple issues in a networked public argument. Challenges and proposals

17.00-17.30  Kjeldsen
The rhetoric of shame in the immigration debate

Many questions room A1.18D

Education and learning

10.30-11.00  Peishan Chen
Support use in Chinese EFL writers’ English argumentative writing

11.00-11.30  Yong-Set & Hyra
Some critical thoughts on critical thinking: if 'ands' or 'but's should be indicators
11.30-12.00 Žmavc
*Rhetorical issues in education: how rhetorical is teacher’s authority?*

**Argumentation and linguistics**

14.30-15.00 Koszowy, Duthie & Budzynska
*Linguistic analysis of ethos elements: Wisdom, virtue and goodwill*

15.00-15.30 Raccah
*Can't Aristotle's problemata exhibit ideological cant?*

**Argumentation and cognition**

16.00-16.30 Gilbert
*Intuition All the Way Down: The Psychology of Argument, Argumentation Theory, and Critical Thinking*

16.30-17.00 Bobrova
*Have cognitive investigations influence on critical thinking understanding?*

17.00-17.30 Xiaojing Wu
*The epistemic and social function of reasoning*

**Ad baculum room C0.17**

**Oudemanhuispoort**

**Argumentation in health**

10.30-11.00 Rossi, Macagno & Bigi
*Dialogical functions and effectiveness of metaphors in medical settings*

11.00-11.30 Quattri & Peng Wu
*Epitomized argumentative strategies of disease mongering*

11.30-12.00 Goodnight & Yue Yang
*Bundled professional engagement-guessing, caring and arguing: how Chinese outpatient doctors accomplish work under system stress*

12.00-12.30 Aakhus, Mikesell, Kim & Fadem
*Designing deliberation into precision medicine*

12.30-13.00 Snoeck Henkemans & Wagemans
*A pragma-dialectical reconstruction of medical shared decision-making (SDM)*

**Deep disagreement**

14.30-15.00 Aikin
*Deep disagreement and the dialecticality requirement*

15.00-15.30 Guerrini
*What place for values in argumentation studies?*

15.30-16.00 Duran & Hamame
*Argumentative dialogue and social and political deep disagreement in Chile*

**Argumentation in the media**

16.00-16.30 Luciani & Rocci
*When journalists use counterfactual reasoning in editorial conferences: An opportunity to open a space for a critical discussion?*

16.30-17.00 Rocci & Raimondo
*The start-up’s new clothes: argumentation in the media coverage of start-ups in the age of corporate storytelling*

17.00-17.30 Meißner & Cattani
*Europe on mind: Argument, brand, stereotype or ideal?*
Ad misericordiam room C0.23

Analogy argumentation

10.30-11.00  Gudkova
Argument from analogy in policy argumentation

11.00-11.30  Terzian
A new approach to analogical reasoning

11.30-12.00  Vicuña & López
Analogical argumentation and developing critical reflection

12.00-12.30  Xiaoming Ren
Mohism’s theory of ethical and political argumentation by analogy

Argumentation and computation

14.30-15.00  Cocarascu & Toni
Mining argumentative relations "in the wild"

15.00-15.30  Selinger
Towards defining the relation of attack

15.30-16.00  Dauphin, Beishui Liao & van der Torre
Two discussions from formal argumentation

Argument schemes

16.00-16.30  van Eemeren & Garssen
Extending the pragma-dialectical approach to argument schemes

16.30-17.00  Hietanen
Topics as arguments for students of rhetoric

Slippery slope room C1.17

Legal argumentation

10.30-11.00  Eichhorn
Heated debate and the frozen trucker: Argument schemes in judicial opinions reviewing agency interpretations of statutes

11.00-11.30  Jingjing Wu
Justifying particular reasoning in constructive dialogue

11.30-12.00  Ubertone
The fallacy of semantic deference

12.00-12.30  Kloosterhuis
Fallacies about analogical reasoning and the rule of law

12.30-13.00  Greene & Hicks
How free is the freedom rule? Religious convictions and the performance of moral injury

Argumentation and epistemology

14.30-15.00  Siegel
Hinges, disagreements, and arguments: Hinge propositions and deep disagreements

15.00-15.30  Aberdein
Eudaimonistic argumentation

15.30-16.00  Chirindo
Argument and epistemic in/justice

16
Argumentation and epistemology

16.00-16.30  Kline
Explore the role of altercasting and epistemic beliefs in interpersonal argument

16.30-17.00  Dutilh Novaes
Argumentation as epistemic exchange

Straw man room C1.23  Oudemanhuispoort

Argument schemes

10.30-11.00  Shiyang Yu & Zenker
Argument schemes, critical questions, and complete argument evaluation

11.00-11.30  Baumtrog
A groundwork on critical questions

11.30-12.00  Gobbo & Wagemans
Representing first-order arguments in argumentative adtrees

12.00-12.30  Lumer
Recognizing argument types and adding missing reasons

Education and learning

14.30-15.00  Mehlretter Drury
“I’d Rather be Divisive than Indecisive:” Argumentation lessons from Hamilton: An American musical

15.00-15.30  Perret-Clermont, Schär, Iannaccone & Convertini
A contribution from argumentation theory to the study of young children’s reasoning in play activities

15.30-16.00  Sans
From technique to tactics: how to teach dispositio?

Argumentation in the public sphere

16.00-16.30  Ince
Refutation of Christian theology: Šāliḥ ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ja’farī’s use of aqlī and Naqlī arguments

16.30-17.00  Kephart III
Social media, fake news, and public argument in digital argument ecologies: Classic argumentation concepts with contemporary challenges

17.00-17.30  Palmieri & Jones
Stock issues and argumentative strategies in policy influencing communication. The case of the British Heart Foundation’s campaign against junk food marketing

Ad populum room C2.05  Oudemanhuispoort

Argumentation in the public sphere

10.30-11.00  Carr & Evans
American town halls: Public sphere turned public screen

11.00-11.30  Janas
Calling someone a racist: Orthodox and heterodox affective orientations in the context of the debate about confederate monuments

11.30-12.00  Jasinski
Specification, dissociation, and the problem of minority vote dilution in the United States
12.00-12.30  Constant
*Argumentation in Amsterdam school architectural design*

12.30-13.00  Duran Solorzano
*One does not punch a discussion partner: An analysis of the strategic maneuvering justifying radical actions in communiques issued in the midst of social conflicts*

**Theoretical issues**

14.30-15.00  Vasilyev
*Convergent structures in argument: Theoretical-linguistic detection*

15.00-15.30  Bodlovic
*Rescher’s cognitive presumptions and the notion of plausibility*

15.30-16.00  Létourneau
*Reflecting on the tensions between rhetoric and argumentation*

**Theoretical issues**

16.00-16.30  Reyes
*Algorithms as arguments: A working theory*

16.30-17.00  Paglieri
*Argument prompting: how to milk people for arguments*

17.00-17.30  Casey
*Revisiting the adversary paradigm*

**Conductive argument**

10.30-11.00  Fairclough
*Is there such a thing as a ‘conductive argument’? Redefining ‘conductive argument’ in relation to deliberation as genre*

11.00-11.30  Yanlin Liao
*Are conductive arguments a distinct type of argument?*

11.30-12.00  Knoll
*Political disagreements and public conductive argumentation*

12.00-12.30  Yun Xie
*On the logical reconstruction of conductive argument*

**Argumentation and debate**

14.30-15.00  Morooka, Kubo & Kanke
*Debate as a new mode of oratory: A critical analysis of the controversy over the value of student oratory in post-world war II Japan*

15.00-15.30  Lv
*The old and the new: The case of the Chinese online debating show, Qipashuo*

15.30-16.00  M. Baker & Détienne
*Analyzing moderators’ narratives on debates behind Wikipedia articles*

**Fallacies**

16.00-16.30  Strait & Alberti
*The role of decision-making agency in distinguishing legitimate and fallacious slippery slope arguments*

16.30-17.00  López
*Strategic maneuvering in philosophy: The charge of committing a genetic fallacy*
Equivocation room C2.23

Fallacies

10.30-11.00 Dainville
*What makes ambiguity fallacious? A historical approach*

11.00-11.30 Dufour
*Latin rhetoric and fallacies*

11.30-12.00 Kreider
*The gambler's fallacy as paradox*

12.00-12.30 Herbeck & Drury
*Donald Trump’s use of argument ad hominem: Effective rhetorical strategy or fallacious argument?*

Argumentation and politics

14.30-15.00 Jacobs
*An unabashed liberal’s defense of Richard Nixon’s “Checkers” speech: Why argumentation critics need an audience-centered principle of rhetorical charity*

15.00-15.30 Sciullo & Taylor
*The non-vote vote as anti-legal identity: Catalan independence from the shame of Europe*

15.30-16.00 Luna Luna
*Democratic values and institutional preconditions in presidential election debates: The theoretical foundations of reconstructing political argumentative discourse*

Ad ignorantiam room D1.18A

Theoretical issues

10.30-11.00 Plumer
*The non-existence of “inference claims”*

11.00-11.30 Svačinová
*The character of self-persuasion in diaries*

11.30-12.00 Verheij
*Notes on the structure of valid defeasible arguments*

Argument schemes

14.30-15.00 Lomelí Hernández
*The implications of the purpose of classifications for their evaluation*

15.00-15.30 Godden
*Bayesian accounts of testimony: Some further applications*

15.30-16.00 Wohlrapp
*The three levels of argument*

Education and learning

16.00-16.30 Bailin & Battersby
*Developing an evidence-based mode of believing in an age of ‘alternative facts’*

16.30-17.00 Phongphio
*The characteristics of reasoning in argumentation of Thai students in an EFL setting*

17.00-17.30 Ferguson & Bubikova-Moan
*Argumentation as a pathway to critical thinking*
## Keynote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>Hample</td>
<td>On the necessity of community argument, along with inherent and emerging obstacles to it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Argumentation and science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Demollin</td>
<td>Statistics in popular science: The argument from correlation to cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Brambilla</td>
<td>Argumentation and knowledge dissemination in the Greenpeace detox campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Ceccarelli</td>
<td>The defense of science in the public sphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Schwed</td>
<td>On the humanistic essence of science: an argumentative perspective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td>Reflective consensus building as a goal of argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Llano</td>
<td>The pedagogy of argument and the management of uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>M. Baker &amp; Schwarz</td>
<td>Argumentertexturing: towards a new theory of argumentation and learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Argumentation in the public sphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>M. Neville-Shepard</td>
<td>Learning while female: Decoding pragmatic arguments about school dress codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Byhring &amp; Flyum</td>
<td>Two variants of argumentation in civic education for democratic participation – The probative (academic) vs the deliberative (civic) aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Riley, Kim, Baik, Curran &amp; Hollihan</td>
<td>Narcissists and despots: mediated arguments about the North Korean nuclear threat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Metaphor and argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Renardel de Lavalette, Andone &amp; Steen</td>
<td>Countering metaphors expressing starting points in political debates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Chuanrui Zhang &amp; Cihua Xu</td>
<td>Reconstructing metaphor in argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>van Poppel</td>
<td>The relevance of metaphors in argumentative discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Wackers</td>
<td>Resistance to violence metaphors for cancer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.30-13.00 Pilgram
The effect of metaphors in argumentation: An experimental study on the perceived reasonableness of sound and fallacious arguments containing metaphors as premises

Rhetorical issues
14.30-15.00 Ray
The audience as a necessary ethical construct for argumentation
15.00-15.30 Jianfeng Wang
Incommensurability, argumentation scheme and rhetorical invention: Fact as disputable space in cross-cultural argumentation
15.30-16.00 Dori-Hacohen
The more-than-three-part lists and their use in argumentative radio call-in shows

Rhetorical issues
16.00-16.30 Kirk
Value affirmation as argument: President Obama's major gun violence eulogies
16.30-17.00 Salvador Mosca
Argumentation and self-deliberating: Speaking to oneself and speaking about oneself. From the personal to the social
17.00-17.30 Martinez Soria & Greco
Dispute mediators' reframing as an argumentation conference

Quantitative empirical research
10.30-11.00 Garssen & van Eemeren
And then you are left holding the baby! Strategic manoeuvring with the argumentum ad consequentiam
11.00-11.30 Weger & Collins
Perceptions of reasonableness and effectiveness in responses to fallacious arguments in public argument
11.30-12.00 Üzelgün & Kıcıkural
Reception and rejection of complex argumentation: When one’s business practices are contested
12.00-12.30 Dębowska-Kozłowska
Affective priming with a pragmatic argumentation scheme in non-native persuasion processing

Argumentation and culture
14.30-15.00 Okuda, Kato & Suzuki
Exploring an argumentation style of Japanese politics
15.00-15.30 Khomenko & Hample
Comparative analysis of arguing in Ukraine and the USA

Warrants in argumentation
16.00-16.30 Jackson
Warrant-establishing arguments: Defending a new kind of inference
16.30-17.00 Botting
Toulmin's warrant-establishing arguments
### Fallacies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Oswald &amp; Herman</td>
<td>Give the standard treatment of fallacies a chance: A rhetorical-pragmatic proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Hinton</td>
<td>On fallacy and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Romascenko</td>
<td>Smuggling fallacies: Joke as a Trojan horse of argumentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>M. Lewinski</td>
<td>Disagreement, misunderstanding and the straw man fallacy: A polylogical perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>Hoppmann</td>
<td>Is it reasonable to be funny?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theoretical issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>A. Blair</td>
<td>Using arguments to advocate and to inquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Olmos</td>
<td>A meta-argumentative approach to abduction and IBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Marraud</td>
<td>On the 7 logical ways to counter an argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation in health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Bigi, Piccinini &amp; Sigen Tuo</td>
<td>Understanding the role of argumentation in chronic care consultations. A comparative analysis of a multicultural corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Schneider &amp; Jackson</td>
<td>Innovations in reasoning about health: The case of the randomized controlled trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Minghui Xiong &amp; Tuosigen Chow</td>
<td>The Pattern of Reasoning in Mongolian Clinical Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Akkermans, Snoeck Henkemans, Labrie, Henselmans &amp; van Laarhoven</td>
<td>The stereotypicality of symptomatic and pragmatic argumentation in consultations about palliative systemic treatment for advanced cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30-13.00</td>
<td>Schneider &amp; Sandhu</td>
<td>Modeling Alzheimer's disease research claims, evidence, and arguments from a biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Argumentation and politics

14.30-15.00 Eriksson
Apocalyptic argumentation: Trump and ISIS

15.00-15.30 R. Neville-Shepard
Post-presumption argumentation and the post-truth world: An analysis of the 2016 Trump campaign

15.30-16.00 Golubev
American media dialogues: A discourse analysis of the 2016 presidential election campaign coverage

Starting points and argumentation

16.00-16.30 van Bijnen, Bakker & Greco
The questions that set up the opening stage in conflict mediation

16.30-17.00 Plantin & Tersis
Stasis and argument in Inuit’s duel songs (pisit)

17.00-17.30 Stevens
How argumentative roles help us reach agreements on how to argue

Legal argumentation

10.30-11.00 Könczöl
Fairness and gaps in legal argumentation

11.00-11.30 Bletsas
The Italian constitutional court ruling as an argumentative activity type and the strategic implications of its argumentativity

11.30-12.00 Alberti
Conspiracy argument as rhetorical genre: Evidence from the post-9/11 terrorism trials

12.00-12.30 Plug
Literature in law: The argumentative use in law of quotations from literary sources

Metaphor and argumentation

14.30-15.00 Steen
Metaphor and argumentation: Deliberate metaphor theory meets pragma-dialectics

15.00-15.30 Ervas & Ojha
Metaphor in argument production vs. understanding

15.30-16.00 Finsen
Is the brain a computer? Scientific metaphor and argumentation

Historical backgrounds

16.00-16.30 Jidong Li
The Mohist argumentation theory

16.30-17.00 Konishi
The first International Conference on Argumentation and Informal Logic
### Historical backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Rodriguez Lara</td>
<td><em>Pragma-dialectic analysis of Plato’s Protagoras</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Pille &amp; Raccah</td>
<td><em>Can't Aristotle's problemata exhibit ideological cant?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Hobeika</td>
<td><em>Recovering Boethius’ square for argumentation and epistemology</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation and translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Özdağ</td>
<td><em>Using linguistic analysis in the assessment of everyday arguments</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Salvato</td>
<td><em>The translator’s visibility. Translators’ critical argumentation about their translating effort</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Tretyakova</td>
<td><em>Rhetoric of effective translations: Looking for audience demand</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visual argumentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Groarke</td>
<td><em>Argument scheme taxonomies: verbal, visual, multimodal</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Kvernbeck &amp; Bøe-Hansen</td>
<td><em>Military analogy: Information or propaganda?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Larson</td>
<td><em>Flag-waving: Visual arguments, verbal reconstruction, and speaker intentions</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rhetorical analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Till</td>
<td><em>A Failed apology? – The case of the ‘Volkswagen dieselgate’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Bloomfield</td>
<td><em>Energy Darwinism, market intentionality, and environmental arguments</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation and politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Klinger</td>
<td><em>Trumped up trickle down: Donald Trump’s political and economic argumentation as Reagan redux</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Rowland</td>
<td><em>Trump's ideological worldview</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00-17.30</td>
<td>Paliewicz &amp; McHendry</td>
<td><em>The terrible beauty of fascistic argument: Donald Trump and the global warming debate</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rhetorical issues

10.30-11.00  Karageorgiev
   The identification mechanism as an argument: Its verbal and non-verbal implementation on the modern political scene

11.00-11.30  Brutian
   Compliments in the light of the theory of argumentation: reasons in compliments

11.30-12.00  Scott
   Consuetudo Pro Lege Servatur: Or what kind of relativist is Perelman (if any)?

Historical backgrounds

14.30-15.00  Linqiong Yan & Minghui Xiong
   Mencius’s argumentation on human nature

15.00-15.30  Hingstman
   The wandering scholar’s role in public argumentation and debate: The case of Erasmus

Argumentation in politics

10.30-11.00  Kienpointner
   An ideal for which I am prepared to die. Argumentative patterns in Nelson Mandela’s speech at the supreme court of South Africa, Pretoria, April 20, 1964

11.00-11.30  Reijven, Grimshaw & Dinerstein
   Prototypical argumentative patterns: the case of political argumentation on late-night talk shows

11.30-12.00  P. Lewinski
   The evolution of manipulative argumentation in “Law and Justice’s” propaganda. Comparative analysis of ad populum argument usage in 2007 and 2017

12.00-12.30  Kraus
   Trumped-up arguments: Lies, 'alternative facts' and deception in political debate

12.30-13.00  Partlow Lefevre
   Gender and enthymematic identification: Trump's argument for masculinity in the 2016 presidential debates

Multimodal argumentation

14.30-15.00  Eckstein
   Dished: food as argumentative strategy

15.00-15.30  van den Hoven
   Multimodal argumentation and the principle of externalization

15.30-16.00  Kišiček
   Auditory arguments: Importance of sound in the argumentative discourse

Multimodal argumentation

16.00-16.30  Feteris
   Argumentative patterns in visual argumentation: Strategic maneuvering in editorial cartoons

16.30-17.00  Žagar
   From verbal to non-verbal: How far can we go?
17.00-17.30  Pollaroli & Bonelli

*Argumentation about multimodal argumentation*
### FRIDAY, JULY 6

**Old Lutheran Church  Singel 411**

#### Keynote

09.00 Hitchcock  
*We justify questions, so how does that work?*

---

**Ad hominem room A1.18C  Oudemanhuispoort**

#### Legal argumentation

10.30-11.00 Andone  
*Between recommending and imposing: Arguing for a course of action in European Union soft and hard law*

11.00-11.30 Tomasi, Manzin & Puppo  
*Dressed arguments in legal speeches: the use of style formulas, maxims and Latinisms*

11.30-12.00 Tuzet & Canale  
*Chlorinated chicken: Evidence and inference*

#### Visual argumentation

14.30-15.00 Dove & Godden  
*On maps as visual grounds for inference: against isomorphism*

15.00-15.30 Tseronis  
*Nanobots, nanorockets, and other nanomachines: Verbal and visual metaphors in arguing about nanotechnology*

15.30-16.00 Ojha, Ervas, Lai & Gola  
*On the role of cognitive elaboration in persuasive visual metaphors*

---

**Many questions room A1.18D  Oudemanhuispoort**

#### Argumentation and ethics

10.30-11.00 Sigrell  
*Ethics in rhetorical education*

11.00-11.30 Jales Ribeiro  
*Argumentation as an ethics of action and in action*

11.30-12.00 Cohen  
*No argument is an island: How character and clustering connect arguments*

12.00-12.30 Voss  
*On argumentation in cognition-based therapies and cognition models in argumentation*

---

#### Quantitative empirical research

14.30-15.00 Hornikx  
*The psychological reality of argumentation schemes*

15.00-15.30 Hoeken, Hornikx & Linders  
*Empirical and normative argument quality in persuasion research: The need to distinguish convincing arguments from good arguments*
### Argumentation and politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Zarefsky</td>
<td>Beneficial violation of the language use rule: The case of Lyndon Johnson, 50 years later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Livnat &amp; Kohn</td>
<td>First speeches in the Israeli parliament: A mixed subgenre of political rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Goodwin</td>
<td>Re-framing climate controversy: The appeals of the Hartwell paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Gomez</td>
<td>Civic argumentation and political argumentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argument strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>Assessing connection adequacy for arguments with institutional warrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Weinstein</td>
<td>Why a theory of warrant strength is a necessity for argument assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rhetorical issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Pieters</td>
<td>Rhetorical issues in robotics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30-17.00</td>
<td>Tindale</td>
<td>Encounter Rhetorics and the blending of argumentative cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation and narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.30-11.00</td>
<td>Bankey</td>
<td>Make my day!: Dirty Harry as a narrative resource for 2nd amendment self-defense statutes in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.30</td>
<td>Baldwin &amp; Greason</td>
<td>Narrative and argumentation in a case of alleged child abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.00</td>
<td>Zampa</td>
<td>“What kind of story can we build around him?” An argumentative analysis of how journalists frame stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-12.30</td>
<td>Hannken-Illjes</td>
<td>Narratives in argumentation between factuality and fictionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Argumentation and controversy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.30-15.00</td>
<td>Krabbe &amp; van Laar</td>
<td>Pressure and argumentation in public controversies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00-15.30</td>
<td>Castro Amenábar</td>
<td>Argumentation and persistent disagreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30-16.00</td>
<td>Baaske</td>
<td>“Sanctuary” and immigrant controversies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Argumentation and style

16.00-16.30  Boogaart
*Exclamatives in argumentation*

16.30-17.00  H. Jansen & van Leeuwen
*Presentational choice in ad populum argumentation*

**Slippery slope room C1.17  Oudemanhuispoort**

**Argumentation in the media**

10.30-11.00  Madroane
*Media dispositives and the enactment of one-sided practical arguments: A framework for the analysis of advocacy campaigns*

11.00-11.30  Ying Yang
*Contemporary Journalism study from the perspective of argumentation theory: A pragma-dialectical approach*

11.30-12.00  van den Hoven & Ying Yang
*Editing in arguments in television news*

12.00-12.30  Peng Wu
*Confrontational maneuvering by dissociation in the spokespersons’ argumentative replies at Chinese diplomatic press conferences: A pragma-dialectical approach*

12.30-13.00  Valencia
*Exploring argumentative patterns in a commercial context*

**Argument schemes**

14.30-15.00  Goddu
*A simple theory of argument schemes*

15.00-15.30  Niamadpour
*Retrospective pragmatic argumentation in political interviews*

15.30-16.00  Visser, Lawrence, Wagemans & Reed
*An annotated corpus of argument schemes in US election debates*

**Argument schemes**

16.00-16.30  Hansen
*Scheme theory*

16.30-17.00  Saltamacchia & Rocci
*Arguments justify norms of politeness. A study of argumentative loci in a nineteenth-century treatise about politeness*

**Straw man room C1.23  Oudemanhuispoort**

**Multimodal argumentation**

10.30-11.00  Balthrop & C. Blair
*Attenuating argument: The Meuse-Argonne American cemetery visitors center*

11.00-11.30  Allison
*The museum as networked cultural infrastructure – Multimodal argumentation along the German green belt*

11.30-12.00  Cârlan
*Neither confusion, nor boredom: text as dialectical, image as rhetorical in multimodal argumentation*
12.00-12.30 Cattani
*Building communities*

**Argumentation in the public sphere**

14.30-15.00 Mitchell
*Analysis of rhetorical argumentation in public debate on brain injury risks in US youth football*

15.00-15.30 Mandziuk
*Confederate memory’s dutiful descendants: Disputed monuments and the rhetorical defenses of the United Daughters of the Confederacy*

15.30-16.00 Panetta
*Student responses to the immigration stalemate in the United States*

16.00-16.30 van der Geest
*Argumentation in support of a choice in records of decision*

16.30-17.00 Abbasi
*Towards a nonviolent foundation of argument: An ontology of needs-based identification as a strategy for reviving public argument as deliberation*

---

**Ad populum room C2.05 Oudemanhuispoort**

**Argumentative dialogue**

10.30-11.00 Gomez & González
*Metacognitive strategies for emotional regulation in deliberative dialogue protocols: Learning to argue peacefully*

11.00-11.30 Schwarz & Asterhan
*Argumentation for learning: gender differences*

11.30-12.00 Corredor
*The role of reasons in deliberative dialogues*

12.00-12.30 Ramia Gil
*On the differences between presumptions and neighbouring notions in a dialogical framework*

**Ethos and pathos**

14.30-15.00 Dori-Hacohen
*Arguing from an “Ordinary Mentor” position: A neoliberal fallacy?*

15.00-15.30 Reitan
*Rhetorical arguments: A philosophical analysis*

15.30-16.00 Runcheng Liang
*On Aristotle's maxims argument*

---

**Ad verecundiam room C2.17 Oudemanhuispoort**

**Argumentation and computation**

10.30-11.00 Prakken
*More on probabilistic accounts of argument strength*

11.00-11.30 González-Pérez, Pereira-Fariña & Reed
*The building of controversies around the management of cultural heritage*
11.30-12.00  Wells & A. Baker  
*Lying in real world argumentative dialogue systems*

12.00-12.30  Pereira-Fariña, Koszowy, Budzynska & Reed  
*Dialogical aspects of appeals to authority in Spanish and Polish disputes about cultural objects*

12.30-13.00  Bo Xianyu  
*Mining argumentation structure in philosophy text: A research based upon Aristotle’s Nicomachean ethics*

**Argumentation and politics**

14.30-15.00  E. Hinck, S. Hinck, Dailey & R. Hinck  
*Examining face threats in leader debates from Canada, U.S., and France*

15.00-15.30  Burnette & Kraemer  
*Who are the "Dreamers" in the American dream?: Characterizing U.S. immigrants in the 21st century*

15.30-16.00  Hayes  
*Terror arguments boomerang from Waziristan to Standing Rock: Argumentative frameworks and the US surveillance state*

**Legal argumentation**

16.00-16.30  Yanxiao Guo  
*An inferentialism approach to legal argumentation*

16.30-17.00  Novak  
*Multimodality and legal argumentation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equivocation room C2.23</th>
<th>Oudemanhuispoort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Argumentation and linguistics**

14.30-15.00  Chernyavskaya  
*Linguistic construction of the past: rhetorical devices in a historical description*

15.00-15.30  Pinto  
*Inference and argumentative value scheme within social practices: empirical studies*

15.30-16.00  Barebina  
*Linguistic design of the argumentation theory scientific worldview*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad ignorantiam room D1.18A</th>
<th>Oudemanhuispoort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Argumentation and culture**

10.30-11.00  Hazen  
*A taxonomy for the comparative study of argument across cultures*

11.00-11.30  Demir & Hample  
*A cross-cultural study of argumentativeness in Turkey: Is silence really golden and speech silver?*

11.30-12.00  Ferry  
*Defining and solving intercultural disagreement: a field experiment*

**Argumentation in a historical context**

14.30-15.00  Chunlan Jin  
*The persuasive ways in Chinese traditional “LUN” (argumentation essays)*
15.00-15.30  Mazzi
“...as the English do on the Irish at the present day”: History as argument in the late 19th/early 20th-century Irish press
15.30-16.00  J. Jansen
Causal patterns for justifying historical explanation. Causation in P.C. Hooft's Dutch history (1642)

Argumentation reconstruction

16.00-16.30  Reijven
Using dialogic syntax for argument reconstruction
16.30-17.00  Yanjin Chen & Shier Ju
On the reconstruction of argumentative discourse in a non-western context
6. DESCRIPTION OF CONFERENCE SITES

Oudemanhuispoort
Oudemanhuispoort 4-6

The main conference location will be the Oudemanhuispoort. Registration, the first welcoming reception and the conference presentations will take place here. As the meaning of its name, “old men’s gateway”, indicates, Oudemanhuispoort is an arcade, which used to be the entrance to an old people’s home. Above the entrance there is still an allusion to old age: a pair of spectacles. Nowadays the arcade is the entrance to one of the main university buildings and houses a number of antiquarian bookstalls.

Old Lutheran Church
Singel 411

The keynote speeches will be delivered in the Old Lutheran Church. The Church was built in 1632. Before that time the Lutherans assembled in a clandestine church, which actually consisted of a warehouse and seven houses the sidewalls of which had been removed. This ‘makeshift’ church stood on the spot where the present church is located. The City Council gave permission for building the church on the condition that the front of the church resembled the front part of the original house. Nowadays the church is used as the Auditorium of the University of Amsterdam.

Singel Church
Singel 452

Conference lunches will be provided in the Singel Church (Singelkerk), a Mennonite church built in 1607. The building is an example of the so-called “clandestine churches”. They got this name because when seen from the street, it was not apparent that the buildings were churches. From around 1530 Mennonites meetings took place in private homes because they were not allowed to set up their own church buildings. After the Mennonites were tolerated from the beginning of the 17th century, they could take their first own church buildings into use.

Amsterdam Museum
Sint Luciensteeg 27 (entrance)

On Wednesday night a reception will be held in the Amsterdam museum. The museum occupies the former Burgerweeshuis (Civic Orphanage). The orphans were recognizable by their red and black costume, which was worn until 1920. The magnificent complex is to be found in the heart of the old city and has been restored according to the most recent historical insights and converted into a museum. A unique part of its layout is the public passageway between the inner court of the museum and the adjacent historical Begijnhof (Beguinage), the Civil-Guard Gallery. This is probably the only place in the world where historical (16th and
17th century) paintings can be viewed in a street gallery. To enter the museum, take the entrance in Sint Luciensteeg 27. After entering Kalverstraat from the Spui, Sint Luciensteeg is the fourth side street on your left.

**NEMO Science Museum**
Oosterdok 2

The reception on Thursday night will take place in Nemo Science Museum. Everyone recognizes the NEMO building as the striking, copper-green shape rising high above Amsterdam’s eastern docklands. The building that has been the home of the Amsterdam’s science and technology museum since 1997 was designed by Renzo Piano. The construction of NEMO presented the architect with a major challenge: the museum had to be built on top of a tunnel. The curvature of the tunnel acted as a foundation and was also the inspiration for the curved shape of the building itself. In a kind of mathematical mirror image of the traffic descending into the tunnel, the architect designed a building that seems to rise out of the water.

**De Duif**
Prinsengracht 756

The conference dinner takes place in the neo classicist church De Duif. The church owes its name (‘the dove’) to a predecessor, the 17th-century hiding church 'Het Vrededuijfe' (‘the dove of peace’), that once stood on the nearby Kerkstraat. The first stone for the current church was laid in April 1857. Due to lack of money, the church fell into decline over the course of the 20th century. De Duif reopened in 2002 after an intensive restoration. During that restoration, the original murals reappeared under layers of wall paint.
7. AMSTERDAM GUIDE

RECOMMENDED RESTAURANTS

Approximate price for an average menu (starter, main course, dessert), wine not included
I = € 25,-  
II = € 35,-  
III = € 45,-  
IV = € 60,-
Reservations are recommended for most restaurants

**Dam and surroundings**

1e Klas, Central Station (1st class waiting-room, platform 2b) (6250131) (French) II-III  
Anna, Warmostraat 111, (4281111) (international) III  
Bridges, Oudezijds Voorburgwal 197, (555360) (Fish restaurant) III-IV  
De Brakke Grond, Nes 43 (6260044) (Belgian) II-III  
De Compagnon, Guldehandsteeg 17 (6204225) (French) III-IV  
Eye, IJpromenade 1 (589 14 02) (international) III  
Gartine, Taksteeg 7 (320 41 32) (breakfast, high tea) I  
Golden Chopsticks, Oude Doelenstraat 1 (6207040) (Chinese) I  
Krasnapolsky, Dam 9 (554 6114) (international) III  
Vermeer, Prins Hendrikkade 59 (5564885) (French) IV

**Canal area**

Beulings, Beulingstraat 9 (320 6100) (international) (IV)  
Breda, Singel 210 (622 5233) (French) (IV)  
Chez Georges, Herenstraat 3 (6263332) (Belgian) II-III  
De Gouden Reael, Zandhoek 14 (6233883) (French/Italian) III  
Johannes, Herengracht 413, 020-62 69 503 (French-International) III  
Pianeta Terra, Beulingstraat 7 (6261912) (French) III  
Indian Restaurant Mayur, Korte Leidsedwarsstraat 203, (6232142) (Indian) II  
Koh-I-Noor, Westermarkt 29 (6233133) (Indian) II  
Pastini, Leidsegracht 29 (622 1701) (Italian), III  
Singel 101, Singel 101 (7710915) (International) II  
Spanjer en Van Twist, Leliegracht 60 (6390109) (café-restaurant) II  
Van Puffelen, Prinsengracht 377 (6246270) (café-restaurant) II  
De Luwte, Leidsegracht 26-28 (6258548) (French) III  
Het Molenpad, Prinsengracht 653 (6259680) (café-restaurant) II

**Jordaan**

Bistrot Neuf, Haarlemmerstraat 9 (4003210) (French) II-III  
Bordewijk, Noordermarkt 7 (6243899) (French) IV  
De Belhamel, Brouwersgracht 60 (6221095) (French) II-III  
Daalder, Lindengracht 90 (624 8864) (French-international) II-III  
Duende Dos, Nieuwe Willemsstraat 3 (427 0204) (tapas) II-III  
Long Pura, Rozengracht 46-48 (6238950) (Indonesian) III
De Prins, Prinsengracht 124 (6249382) (café-restaurant) I-II
Donna Sofia, Anjeliersstraat 300 (623 41 04) (Italian) II-III
Hostaria, 2e Egelantiersdwarsstraat 9 (6260028) (Italian) II
Moeders, Rozengracht 251 (6267957) (Dutch) I-II
Noordwest Noordermarkt 42 (020) 624 36 89 (international) III
Paso Doble, Westerstraat 86 (4212670) (Spanish) II
Toscanini, Lindengracht 75 (6232813) (Italian) III

Spu and surroundings
Haesje Claes, Spuistraat 275 (6249998) (Dutch) III
Kantjil en de Tijger, Spuistraat 291-293 (6200994) (Indonesian) II
Lucius, Spuistraat 247 (6241831) (fish) III-IV
Vasso, Rozenboomsteeg 10 (6260158) (Italian) III-IV

Leidseplein and surroundings
De Blauwe Hollander, Leidsekwartierstraat 28 (6233014) (Dutch) II
Bojo, Lange Leidsedwarsstraat 51 (6268990) (Indonesian, open all night) I
De Smoehaas, Leidsezaand 90 (6250368) (theater café-restaurant) II-III

Rembrandtplein and surroundings
Bord’eau, Nieuwe Doelenstraat 2-8 (5311639) (French) IV
De Carrëkelder, Amstel 133 (6251071) (French) II
De Jaren, Nieuwe Doelenstraat 20 (6255771) (café-restaurant, international) II
Flo, Amstelstraat 9 (890 47 57) (French) III
Pasta e Basta, Nieuwe Spiegelstraat 8 (4222222) (Italian) III
Ponte Alcari, Herengracht 534 (6250853) (Italian) II
Shiva, Reguliersdwarsstraat 72 (6248713) (Indian) II
Sluizer, Utrechtsestraat 43-45 (6226376) (French, also fish) II
Tempo Doeloe, Utrechtsestraat 75 (6256718) (Indonesian) II-III

Nieuwmarkt and Plantage (Artis)
A Tavola, Kadijksplein 9 (6254994) (Italian) III
Bird, Zeedijk 77 (6201442) (Thai snackbar) I
Blauw aan de Wal, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 99 (3302257) (Mediterranean) III
Café Bern, Nieuwmarkt 9 (6220034) (Swiss/fondue) II
Choux, De Ruijterkade 128 (2103090) (international) III
De Plantage, Kerklaan 36 (76 06 800) (international) III
De Português, Zeedijk 39 (4272005) (Portuguese) II
De Schepskameel, Kattenburgerstraat 7, building 24 (3379680) (French) IV
Elkaar, Alexanderplein 6 (3307559) (French) III
Engelbewaarder, Kloveniersburgwal 59 (6253772) (café-restaurant) II
Entrepot, Entrepotdok 7-8 (3415722) (international) III
Ganesha Indian Restaurant, Geldersekade 5, 020 320 73 02 (Indian) II
Gebr. Harterink, Peperstraat 10 (4210699) (international) III
Greetje, Peperstraat 23, 207797450 (Dutch) III
Hemelse Modder, Oude Waal 9 (6243203) (French) III
Het Melkmeisje, Zeedijk 19 (6250640) (French) III
Kilimanjaro, Rapenburgerplein 6 (6223485) (African) II
Lastage, Gelderse Kade 29 (7370811) (French) II-III
Morita Ya, Zeedijk 18 (6242614) (Japanese) II
Nam Kee, Zeedijk 111 (6243470) (Chinese) I
New King, Zeedijk 117 (3205779) (Chinese) I
Pension Homeland, Katteunburgerstraat 7 (723 2550) III
Raan Phad Thai 2, Raamgracht 9 (6238708) (Thai) I
Sea Palace, Oosterdokskade 8 (on boat) (6264777) (Chinese) II
Van Beeren, Koningstraat 54 (6222329) (café-restaurant, garden) II

Weteringschans and surroundings

DenC, Dik & Cunningham, Kerkstraat 377 (4222766) (French-Mediterranean) III
La Storia della Vita, Weteringschans 171 (Italian, fixed menu) III
Nel, Amstelveld 12 (6261199) (international, beautiful terras) I
Panini, Vijzelgracht 3 (6264939) (Italian) II
Piet de Leeuw, Noorderstraat 11 (6237181) (steakhouse) II
Van Vlaanderen, Weteringschans 175 (6228292) (French/Belgian) III

South

Arles, Govert Flinckstraat 251 (679 8240) (French) III
Auberge Jean et Marie, Albert Cuypstraat 58-60 (8452005) (French) III-IV
Angoletto, Hemonystraat 18 (6764182) (Italian trattoria) II-III
Brasserie Van Baerle, Van Baerlestraat 158 (6791532) (French) III-IV
Ciel Bleu, Ferdinand Bolstraat 333 (Okura Hotel) (6787450) (French) III-IV
De Kersentuin, Dijselhofplantsoen 7 (5705600) (international) III-IV
Kaiko, Jekerstraat 114 (6625641) (Japanese) II
La Rive, Prof. Tulpplein 1 (Amstelhotel) (6226060) (French) IV
Le Garage, Ruysdaelstraat 54 (6797176) (French) IV
Le Hollandais, Amsteldijk 41 (6791248) (French) III-IV
Le Restaurant, Tweede Jan Steenstraat 3 (3792207) IV
Oud-Zuid, Johannes Verhulststraat 64, (6766058) (international) III
Rijks, Museumstraat 64 (674 7555) (international) IV
Rosarium, Amstelpark 1 (Europaboulevard) (6444085) (French) III-IV
Sari Citra, Ferdinand Bolstraat 52 (6754102) (Indonesian) I-II
SenT, Saenredamstraat 39/41 (6762495) (French) II-III
Teppan Yaki Sazanka, Ferdinand Bolstraat 333 (6787111) (Japanese) IV
Visaandeschelde, Scheldeplein 4 (6751583) (fish) III-IV
De Waaghals, Frans Halsstraat 29 (6799609) (vegetarian) II
Willems, Willemsparkweg 177 (7521973) (French) III

East

Bar Botanique Eerste van Swindenstraat 581(3586553) (international) III
Dauphine, Prins Bernhardplein 175 (4621646) (international) II-III
De Kas, Kamerlingh Onneslaan 3 (former greenhouse in park) (4624562) (French) III-I-IV
Firma Pekelhaaring, Van Woustraat 127 (6790460) (French) II
La Vallade, Ringdijk 23 (6652025) (French, fixed menu) II
Louie Louie, Linnaeusstraat 11A (370 2981) (international) III
Rijsel, Marcusstraat 52b (4632142) (international) III
Riva, Amstelboulevard 1 (7602030) (international) II-III
Sa Seada, 1e Oosterparkstraat 3 (6633276) (Italian) II
Wilde Zwijnen, Javaplein 23 (4633043) (Dutch) III

West

Amsterdam, Watertorenplein 6 (6822666) (in factory hall, French) II-III
Bak, Van Diemenstraat 408 (2103090) (international) III
Blue Pepper, Nassaukade 366 (4897039) (Indonesian) III
Gent aan de Schinkel, Theophile de Bockstraat 1 (3882851) (café-restaurant) II
Het Bosch, Jollenpad 10 (6445800) (French) III
Pastis, Eerste Constantijn Huygensstraat 15 (616 6166) (French) III

RECOMMENDED CAFES

Dam and surroundings

Scheltema, Nieuwezijds Voorburgwal 242
In De Wildeman, Kolksteeg 3 (wide choice of beers)

Canal district

De Doffer, Runstraat 12
Kalkhoven, Westermarkt/Prinsengracht 283
Het Molenpad, Prinsengracht 653

Jordaan

De Prins, Prinsengracht 124
't Smalle, Egelantiersgracht 12
't Papeneiland, Prinsengracht 2

Spui and surroundings

Hoppe, Spui 20
De Zwart, Spuistraat 334
De Pilsener Club, Begijnensteeg 4

Leidseplein and surroundings

Eylders, Korte Leidsedwarsstraat 47
De Pieper, Prinsengracht 424
Reynders, Leidseplein 6

38
Rembrandtplein and surroundings

Brasserie Schiller, Rembrandtplein 26-36
De Jaren, Nieuwe Doelenstraat 20
Krom, Utrechtsestraat 76
Oosterling, Utrechtsestraat 140

Nieuwmarkt

De Zeevaart, Oudezijds Achterburgwal 28
't Loosje, Nieuwmarkt 32

East

De Druif, Rapenburg 83
Eik en Linde, Plantage Middenlaan 22
Hesp, Weesperzijde 130
De Ysbreeker, Weesperzijde 23

DANCING/CLUBS

Bitterzoet, Spuistraat 2
The Cotton Club, Nieuwmarkt 5
Escape, Rembrandtplein 11
Hotel Arena, ’s Gravesandestraat 51
Jimmy Woo, Korte Leidsedwarsstraat 18
Panama, Oostelijke Handelsskade 4

THEATERS

Boom Chicago Rozengracht 117 (English spoken standup comedy)
Carré, Amstel 115-125 (musicals and concerts)
Comedy Cafe Amsterdam, Max Euweplein 43-45 (standup comedians)
Comedytrain/Toomler, Breitnerstraat 2 (standup comedians)
De Kleine Komedia, Amstel 56-58 (Dutch comedy)
Muziektheater, Amstel 3 (opera and classical dance)
Stadsschouwburg, Leidseplein 26 (traditional and experimental drama)

MUSIC

Muziekgebouw a/h IJ, Piet Heinkade 1 (contemporary classical music)
Bimhuis, Piet Heinkade 3 (jazz)
Concertgebouw, Concertgebouwplein 2-4 (classical music)
Melkweg, Lijnbaansgracht 234 (pop & art)
Paradiso, Weteringschans 6 (pop)
MUSEUMS

(Some museums are closed on Monday)

**Allard Pierson Museum**, Oude Turfmarkt 127 (antiquity)
**Amsterdam Museum**, Kalverstraat 92
**Anne Frank House**, Prinsengracht 263
**Dutch Resistance Museum**, Plantage Kerklaan 61
**Hermitage Amsterdam**, Amstel 51
**Het KattenKabinet**, Herengracht 497 (the role of cats in art and culture)
**Jewish Historical Museum**, Jonas Daniel Meijerplein 3
**Maritime Museum** (Scheepvaartmuseum), Kattenburgerplein 1 (maritime museum and VOC ship)
**Modern Art** (Stedelijk Museum), Paulus Potterstraat 13
**Museum Amstelkring**, Oudezijds Voorburgwal 40 (16th Century clandestine church)
**Museum Geelvinck**, Keizersgracht 633
**Museum of Bags and Purses** (Tassenmuseum), Herengracht 573
**Museum Willet-Holthuysen**, Herengracht 605
**Rembrandthuis**, Jodenbreestraat 4-6
**Rijksmuseum**, Stadhouderskade 42 (Dutch painting, 15th to 19th century)
**Tropical Museum**, Linnaeusstraat 2 (non-western cultures)
**Vincent van Gogh**, Paulus Potterstraat 7 (Van Gogh and contemporaries)

DEPARTMENT STORES

**Bijenkorf**, Damrak 90
**Hema**, Kalverstraat, Nieuwendijk

NOTEWORTHY SHOPS

**Concerto**, Utrechtsestraat 52-60 (old and new records and cd’s)
**Gassan**, Nieuwe Uilenburgerstraat 173-175 (diamonds)
**De Grote Tas**, Oude Hoogstraat 6 (bags)
**Hajenius, Rokin 96** (cigars and meeting place for smokers)
**Patisserie Holtkamp**, Vijzelgracht 15 (pastry shop)
**Puccini Bomboni**, Singel 184, Staalstraat 17 (chocolates)

BOOKSHOPS

**Architectura & Natura**, Leliegracht 22
**The American Book Center**, Spui 12
**Atheneum**, Spui 14-16 (academic)
**English Bookshop**, Lauriergracht 71
**Martyrium**, Van Baerlestraat 170 (English, bargains)
**Premsela**, Van Baerlestraat 78 (art)
**Waterstone's**, corner Spui/Kalverstraat (English)
SECOND HAND BOOKSHOPS

**Book Market**, Spui, Friday  
**Van Gennep**, Nieuwezijds Voorbrugwal 330 (left-overs)

SHOPPING AREAS

**Leidsestraat**, touristic  
**P.C. Hooftstraat**, fashion  
**Jordaan**, modern, fashion  
**Kalverstraat**, popular  
**Spiegelstraat**, antique  
**Utrechtsestraat**, fashion, design  
**Between Leidsestraat and Raadhuisstraat**, modern, design

MARKETS

**Albert Cuypmarkt**, Albert Cuypstraat (Pijp)  
**Dappermarkt**, Dapperstraat  
**Flea market**, Waterlooplein  
**Looiermarkt**, Elandsgracht 109 (antique)  
**Ten Katemarkt**, Ten Katestraat  
**Lindengrachtmarkt**, Lindengracht (Saturday)

OTHER PLACES OF INTEREST

**Artis Zoo**, Plantage Kerklaan 38-40  
**Hortus Botanicus**, Plantage Middenlaan 2  
**Nieuwe Kerk** (New Church), Dam Square  
**Oude Kerk** (Old Church), Oudekerksplein 23  
**Royal Palace**, Dam Square  
**Public Library**, Oosterdokskade 143
8. ISSA AWARD WINNERS

One of the highlights of the ISSA conferences is the presentation of the winners of the Annual ISSA Distinguished Research Award. This prize is awarded to scholars who have made a substantial contribution to the study of argumentation.

1990 - Douglas N. Walton (University of Windsor)
1991 - John H. Woods (University of British Columbia)
1993 - Jean-Claude Anscombe (CNRS/CELITH)
1994 - Robert Newman (University of Iowa)
1995 - Manfred Kienpointner (University of Innsbruck)
1996 - Erik C.W. Krabbe (University of Groningen)
1997 - Sally A. Jackson (University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana)
1998 - Scott Jacobs (University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana)
1999 - Michael Leff (University of Memphis)
2000 - Ralph H. Johnson (University of Windsor)
2001 - Christian Plantin (CRIC-Université Lyon 2)
2002 - Daniel J. O'Keefe (Northwestern University)
2003 - Jean-Blaise Grize (University of Neuchâtel)
2004 - Marcelo Dascal (University of Tel-Aviv)
2005 - Trudy Govier (University of Lethbridge)
2006 - G. Thomas Goodnight (University of Southern California)
2007 - Arne Naess (University of Oslo)
2008 - Maurice Finocchiaro (University of Nevada, Las Vegas)
2009 - James Klumpp (University of Maryland)
2010 - James Freeman (Hunter College, City University of New York)
2011 - Frans H. van Eemeren (University of Amsterdam and Leiden University)
2012 - J. Anthony Blair (University of Windsor)
2013 - Charles A. Willard (University of Louisville)
2014 - Jeanne Fahnestock (University of Maryland)
2015 - Marianne Doury (Centre national de la recherche scientifique)
2016 - Dale Hample (University of Maryland)
2017 - David Hitchcock (McMaster University)
2018 - Eddo Rigotti (Università della Svizzera italiana)

2015 - Marianne Doury (Centre national de la recherche scientifique)

Marianne Doury who is currently tenured researcher of the CNRS (Centre national de la recherche scientifique) at the University of Paris-Ouest Nanterre La Défense will become professor at the Department of Language Sciences of the University Paris 5 René Descartes on September 1st. She is one of the leading French argumentation theorists and is internationally known for assuming a linguistic and discourse oriented approach to the study of argumentation. Ever since she obtained her PhD in 1994 with a thesis on the argumentative exchanges in debates on parascience, Doury has productively and creatively combined her empirical observations of the linguistic and discursive nature of argumentative practices with important theoretical questions.
She has published studies in both French and English regarding a great variety of argumentative discourses in various communicative settings and genres, such as TV talk shows, internet forum discussions, letters to the editor, political speeches, public debates, and tweets, among others. In all of these studies, she eclectically combines insights from French discourse theory, modern rhetoric and argumentation theory as well as sociology and political science. She addresses questions that arise from the close observation of her empirical data which have interesting implications for the theorisation of the functions of arguing and argumentation, about ordinary language users’ argumentative norms, about the context-dependence of argumentative mechanisms and strategies, as well as their linguistic realisation.

Thanks to her position at the juncture of discourse analysis and argumentation theory, and owing to her interest in interdisciplinary dialogue, Doury has collaborated in numerous publications and projects with scholars coming from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds. She has also initiated research meetings between scholars in the Francophone and the Anglo-American community of argumentation studies. The workshop that she co-organized with Sophie Moirand in 2003 resulted in the publication of the volume L'argumentation aujourd'hui: Positions théoriques en confrontation which has also been translated in Spanish. More recently, Doury brought together scholars from the United States, Canada and France interested in empirically grounded analyses of argumentative discourses. In 2015 she edited a special issue based on this workshop for the journal Argumentation et Analyse du Discours.

Besides her international and interdisciplinary research collaborations and her membership in editorial committees in France and abroad, Doury has been teaching courses on argumentation at the University of Paris 3 Sorbonne-Nouvelle since 1999, and has been in the committee of a number of PhD candidates in France and abroad. Her textbook Argumentation. Analyser textes et discours published in 2016 is the product of her long teaching experience and the proof of her skills in presenting complicated concepts in a clear manner and of her talent in illustrating theoretical distinctions with interesting and actual examples.

2016 - Dale Hample (University of Maryland)

After earning a Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1975, Dale Hample taught at Western Illinois University as an assistant, associate, and full professor of communication. He went on in 2007 to join the communication faculty at the University of Maryland, where he continues to work today as an associate professor.

His 2005 book, Arguing: Exchanging Reasons Face to Face, is an interdisciplinary tour-de-force that won the National Communication Association’s Gerald R. Miller Book Award. It blends cognate areas of study such as psychology, cognitive science, linguistics, and rhetoric to develop a theoretically rich and empirically grounded account of interpersonal argumentation.

Hample extends this account in his most recent book, Interpersonal Arguing, which shows concretely how frames and situations shape arguments, particularly the ‘serial’ variety that play out in repeat episodes. Hample’s straightforward style of analysis sheds light on salient challenges such as how to confront cognitive bias in argumentation and ways of understanding argument dialogues in personal relationships. This ambitious project transcends national boundaries, as Hample maps the globe to compare mean differences in arguing patterns across cultures. The appendix to Interpersonal Arguing is an empirical research treasure trove, as it presents an encyclopedia of instruments and scales that Hample has developed through the years to support his quantitative studies.
Alongside these book volumes, Hample has published papers in top scholarly outlets, edited *Argumentation and Advocacy* and served on the editorial boards at journals such as *Argumentation* and *Informal Logic*. A prominent leader in the field, he has helped steer organizations such as the American Forensics Association, National Communication Association, and International Communication Association.

As an academic debater in high school and college, Hample cultivated an early sense of convivial playfulness in argumentation that has blossomed in his many original scholarly contributions. Hample’s research reminds us that products of arguing derive from human thinking, feeling and perceiving, and that study of the interpersonal exchange of reasons can reveal much about our communities, our communication, and ourselves.

**2017 - David Hitchcock (McMaster University)**

David Hitchcock earned his Ph.D. at Claremont Graduate University, having already returned to teach philosophy at his undergraduate alma mater, McMaster University, where he served for 46 years until his retirement in 2014, achieving full professorship in 2001. Professor Hitchcock is among the founding voices that shaped the Canadian informal logic community. He was the first president of the Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking (1983-1985), and was among the members of *Informal Logic*’s original, 1984, editorial board, on which he has served continuously to this day.

Beginning with his 1985 article “Enthymematic arguments” (*Informal Logic*), a central theme in Hitchcock’s research is, in his words, the problem of “how to evaluate an inference that is neither formally valid nor an obvious non sequitur.” Starting from the observation that what remains unstated in an enthymeme is typically its warrant – a rule of inference, rather than additional premises – Hitchcock developed a meticulous and robust account of *material consequence*. On his mature view, a warrant expresses a counterfactual-supporting covering generalization over non-logical content expressions occurring in the argument that is non-trivially acceptable. Distinctions typically made of arguments (e.g., inductive versus deductive) properly apply to relations of support. The distinction between conclusive and non-conclusive support is explained in terms of whether the warranting covering generalization admits of exceptions. A representative sample Hitchcock’s theoretical contributions, spanning nearly 40 years, have been anthologized in *On Reasoning and Argument: Essays in Informal Logic and on Critical Thinking* (2017).

Hitchcock’s pedagogical contributions began with a 1983 textbook, *Critical Thinking: A Guide to Evaluating Information*, which was followed in 2005 by *Evidence-Based Practice: Logic and Critical Thinking in Medicine* (co-authored with Milos Jenicek). Until recently, he taught at one of the only Canadian universities where it was possible to complete a doctorate in philosophy while receiving supervision in argumentation studies. His scholarly legacy thus includes enculturating the second generation of Canadian informal logicians. His doctoral students (directed and supervised) include several emerging voices in the argumentation theoretic community: David Godden (2004), Patrick Bondy (2012), Benjamin Hamby (2014), and Katharina Stevens (2016).

**2018 - Eddo Rigotti (Università della Svizzera italiana)**

Eddo Rigotti was professor in general linguistics at Università Cattolica di Milano from 1983 to 2002. He then moved from Italy to USI - Università della Svizzera italiana in Lugano where, as the founding Dean of the Faculty of Communication Sciences, he went on to
establish a research group on argumentation: the Institute of Argumentation, Linguistics and Semiotics (IALS). Having previously translated *Strukturnaja lingvistika* by S.K. Šaumjan from Russian into Italian (1970) and introduced *Congruity Theory* as an integrated semantic and pragmatic approach to the profound functional cohesion of discourse (Rigotti 1993, *La sequenza testuale*), Rigotti now used his linguistic background to develop research on argumentation. Rigorous in his use of discursive evidence, a meticulous attention to textual data in different languages emerges from his scientific analysis.

In the early nineties, Rigotti published on the subject of classical rhetoric as a communication model, and its educational and social value. The educational and social value that argumentation plays in different contexts of communication is the driving force behind Rigotti’s motivation; it has inspired research projects (with Andrea Rocci and other colleagues), as well as teaching and supervision activities. Aristotle’s principle, that “true and better facts are by nature always more persuasive” forms the basis of what Rigotti calls a *reasonable optimism* about argument-based persuasion. The curriculum of argumentation courses he built at USI, incorporating innovative contexts such as financial communication, was founded on this. He was also the first director of the doctoral program Argupolis (2009-2014), which trained a generation of argumentation scholars now working in Switzerland, Europe and beyond.

Rigotti’s interest in reason and discourse led him to develop, in collaboration with Sara Greco, the Argumentum Model of Topics for the analysis of inference in argumentation. In this, his ideas brought together not only those of contemporary scholars but also those of authors such as Aristotle, Boethius, Abelard, Agricola, and others; his revival of the classical tradition made a genuinely original contribution to argumentation studies.
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This book offers an introduction into argumentation theory viewed from a novel perspective. It details a pragma-dialectical approach. The author has helped develop this framework for more than four decades. Here, the author presents a clear overview of how the various components of this theory hang together. The author’s analysis puts a great emphasis on the pragmatic dimension of argumentation as a goal-directed verbal activity and on its dialectical dimension as part of a critical exchange aimed at resolving a difference of opinion. Coverage creates an interdisciplinary pragma-dialectical perspective. The author integrates insights from the dialectical and the rhetorical perspectives. Where necessary, the author supports this with insights from logic and philosophy, linguistics and discourse analysis, psychology, sociology and law, and the study of communication and debate. Readers gain a better understanding of the theorizing that takes place in the discipline. The current state of the art in argumentation theory is characterized by the co-existence of a variety of theoretical approaches, which differ considerably in conceptualization, scope and theoretical refinement. This book has as its point of departure that argumentation theory serves its purposes best if it includes both descriptive and normative research. The author argues that putting to good use the different kinds of insights gained from a systematic combination of all these perspectives will lead to a better and more complete understanding of argumentative discourse.
The Journal of Argumentation in Context aims to publish high-quality papers about the role of argumentation in the various kinds of argumentative practices that have come into being in social life. These practices include, for instance, political, legal, medical, financial, commercial, academic, educational, problem-solving, and interpersonal communication. In all cases certain aspects of such practices will be analyzed from the perspective of argumentation theory with a view of gaining a better understanding of certain vital characteristics of these practices. This means that the journal has an empirical orientation and concentrates on real-life argumentation but is at the same time out to publish only papers that are informed by relevant insights from argumentation theory. These papers may also report on case studies concerning specific argumentative speech events. The journal aims to attract authors from various kinds of disciplinary background who are interested in studying argumentative practices in their fields of interest. In all cases, in papers published in the journal an interesting and revealing connection should be established between certain insights from argumentation theory and some particular context of argumentative practice.
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The European Conference on Argumentation (ECA) is a pan-European biennial initiative aiming to consolidate and advance research on argumentation. We aim to attract scholars on argumentation worldwide from various disciplines, dealing with various themes and adopting various approaches.

The special theme of this conference is Reason to Dissent. The goal is to inquire into the virtues and vices of dissent, criticism, disagreement, objections, and controversy in light of legitimizing policy decisions, justifying beliefs, proving theorems, defending standpoints, or strengthening informed consent. Dissent may spoil the cooperation and reciprocity required for reason-based deliberation and decision making. But then, dissent produces the kind of competition and criticism required for reliable and robust outcomes. How much dissent does an argumentative practice require? What kinds of dissent should we promote, or discourage? How to deal with dissent virtuously? How to exploit dissent in artificial arguers? How has dissent been conceptualized in the history of rhetoric, dialectic and logic? Submissions are not required to focus on this special theme.

Confirmed keynote speakers:

• Katie Atkinson  
  University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
• Ruth Wodak  
  University of Lancaster, Lancaster, UK
• Jason Stanley  
  Yale University, New Haven, USA
Informal Logic, the journal

*Informal Logic*, currently in its 38th year, publishes papers on reasoning, informal logic, argumentation, critical thinking and related fields. It is a peer-reviewed journal, publishing on-line (open access) four times per year. The editors are J. Anthony Blair and Christopher W. Tindale.

The journal may be accessed at:
http://ojs.uwindsor.ca/ojs/leddy/index.php/informal_logic/index

OSSA Archive

The University of Windsor hosts the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation (OSSA) Archive, an open-access archive containing the proceedings of the eleven biennial OSSA conferences 1995–2016.

The archive is located at: http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive

CRRAR

The Centre for Research in Reasoning, Argumentation and Rhetoric (CRRAR) at the University of Windsor is a centre for individual and collaborative research into the theory and practice of reasoning, argument and argumentation, and rhetoric from the perspective of all related academic disciplines. View the CRRAR home page at: www.uwindsor.ca/crrar. CRRAR has the facilities to accommodate up to four visiting researchers per year. To receive instructions on how to apply to be a visiting research fellow at CRRAR write to The Director at:
crrar@uwindsor.ca

Argumentation Studies PhD

The University of Windsor’s interdisciplinary doctoral program in Argumentation Studies is entering its second year. Information is available at:
http://www.uwindsor.ca/argumentationstudies/

Windsor Studies in Argumentation (WSIA)

The University of Waterloo hosts the WSIA book series, publishing open-access volumes of interest to argumentation scholars. Information is available at:
https://windsor.scholarsportal.info/omp/index.php/wsia/catalog/series/wsiaseries
Designing deliberation into precision medicine  
Mark Aakhus, Lisa Mikesell, Sunyoung Kim, Sarah Fadem  
Rutgers University, USA  
A design stance expands the fundamental concept of argument – providing and criticizing reasons in managing differences - from its traditional focus on vernacular forms to patterns of reasoning and procedures for managing differences that serve as infrastructure for complex, collective action. A design stance toward argument is taken here to consider the role of deliberation in the emerging communication practices for personalized care and precision medicine. First, drawing on field-work in developing a support system for shared decision making among patients and physicians at a clinic for acute myeloid leukemia and bone marrow transplant, observations of the pervasive, polylogical character of deliberation in this context are described. Second, key implications of these observations for designing deliberation into platforms and information infrastructures for personalized, precision medicine are discussed.

Eudaimonistic argumentation  
Andrew Aberdein  
Florida Institute of Technology, USA  
Virtue theories of argumentation comprise several conceptually distinct projects. Perhaps the boldest of these is the pursuit of the fully satisfying argument, the argument that contributes to human flourishing. This project has an independently developed epistemic analogue: eudaimonistic virtue epistemology. Both projects stress the importance of widening the range of cognitive goals beyond, respectively, cogency and knowledge; both projects emphasize social factors, the right sort of community being indispensable for the cultivation of the intellectual virtues necessary to each project. This paper proposes a unification of the two projects by arguing that the intellectual good life sought by eudaimonistic virtue epistemologists is best realized through the articulation of an account of argumentation that contributes to human flourishing.

Deep disagreement and the dialecticality requirement  
Scott F. Aikin  
Vanderbilt University, USA  
Two interlocutors have a deep disagreement if they disagree and they do not have sufficient background agreement to resolve the issue with arguments. Deep disagreements are a problem, given this description, on the basis of a dialecticality requirement for arguments. The dialecticality requirement runs, roughly, that arguments must be composed of premises and forms of support an audience would find acceptable and must address standing objections and concerns. This paper will be a defense of the dialecticality requirement against two standing objections.

The stereotypicality of symptomatic and pragmatic argumentation in consultations about palliative systemic treatment for advanced cancer  
Aranka Akkermans1, A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans2, Nanon H.M. Labrie1, Inge Henselmans1, Hanneke W.M. van Laarhoven1  
1Amsterdam UMC, The Netherlands; 2University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
This paper aims to add a new dimension to both a new line of research into argumentative patterns and to research on health communication by determining whether the prototypical types of argumentation in
consultations about palliative systemic treatment for advanced cancer are stereotypical as well, that is, whether they are dominant in a quantitative sense (van Eemeren 2016: 16). For this purpose, a valid and reliable measurement instrument is developed and used in a content analysis of the transcripts of 49 consultations. On the basis of the results of this analysis, it can be concluded that the use of symptomatic and pragmatic argumentation is stereotypical in consultations about palliative systemic treatment for advanced cancer.

**Conspiracy argument as rhetorical genre: Evidence from the post-9/11 terrorism trials**

Laura Alberti  
University of Southern Mississippi, USA

After September 11, conspiracy arguments have become a major tool in the U.S. Justice Department’s prosecution of the ‘war on terror.’ Common-law conspiracy can be understood as the judicial analogue of anticipatory war and targeted strikes: Its function is to prosecute inchoate plots regardless of stage of completion, with an eye to prevention as well as to deterrence and punishment. A staple of the Anglo-American common law tradition, the doctrine of criminal conspiracy displays the three basic forms of the conspiratorial genre: a deductive/causal propositional structure, a dramatic/massively documented style, and a situation of social crisis. I explore select post-9/11 terrorism trials to illustrate how, under conditions of pressure, conspiracy rhetoric influences the argumentative norms of specialized epistemic communities such as the law.

**The museum as networked cultural infrastructure – Multimodal argumentation along the German green belt**

Marcia Clare Allison  
University of Southern California, USA

This paper explores multimodal argumentation as networks of museums become networked cultural infrastructures. I take as my case study the former division of Germany and the German Green Belt (GGB), the biodiversity conservation and historical memory project built from the former Iron Curtain. Today, these border relics are repurposed into museums for educational purposes. I argue that there is cultural knowledge that argues through displays of artifacts and to the multimodal experience of attending these sites. These Museums argue as educational artifacts in and of themselves, as well as part of larger network of cultural infrastructures along the Belt. The GGB thus uses multimodal argument to warn against repeating historical atrocities and the transboundary cooperation of previous division that now preserves the nature as a symbol of peace.

**Between recommending and imposing: Arguing for a course of action in European Union soft and hard law**

Corina Andone  
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

This paper focuses on the way in which the European Union legislator tries to convince the addressee to follow a certain course of action in legally non-binding (‘soft law’) and legally binding acts (‘hard law’). It provides an analysis of the modality of obligation employed by the legislator in arguing for a course of action on the part of the Member States. I will discuss some of the implications that the obligations enshrined in the arguments of the selected legal instruments have on the blurring nature, scope and effects of hard and soft law, and further on the quality of EU law-making, by raising inter alia concerns related to the principle of legal certainty, the principle of legality, the principle of conferral, and judicial review.
Terrorizing the nation kairotically: An argumentative critique of "Missile Alert" as political deception in Japan

Satoru Aonuma
Tsuda University, Japan

Japan has a satellite-based defense alert system to guard against unfriendly nuclear missiles. The system consists of two functions: The one is to directly send emergency warning to residents in the country; the other provides emergency information to designated government entities and other institutions. This paper will critique the "political use" of this alert system by the Japanese government. Employing the classical-rhetorical idea of "kairos," the paper will engage a critical argumentative analysis of the alert messages the government disseminated through the system. Through the critical analysis, the paper will discuss how rhetorically the government presented and exploited this apparent "crisis" to secure their own interest as well as that of their close friends, both unrelated to the country's national security.
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Developing an evidence-based mode of believing in an age of ‘alternative facts’

Sharon Bailin¹, Mark Battersby²
¹Simon Fraser University, Canada; ²Capilano University

Aspects of the contemporary context, such as the widespread distrust of expertise, disdain for facts, resistance to credible evidence (e.g., in political decision-making, health decisions, and environmental policy) underline the need for developing in students the propensity to hold beliefs based on evidence. The factors that play a role in how we acquire, hold, and change beliefs are psychological and social as well as epistemological, and some of these factors pose challenges to the development of an evidence-based mode of believing. In this paper, we describe these challenges, argue that the traditional approach to teaching critical thinking focused on individual arguments and on the solitary reasoner is inadequate for addressing these challenges, and show how creating a culture of inquiry can facilitate the development of an evidence-based mode of believing.

Analyzing moderators’ narratives on debates behind Wikipedia articles

Michael Baker, Françoise Détienne
CNRS-Telecom ParisTech, France

Wikipedia is the most consulted source of information across the globe. Following rapidly growing participation, the rise of ‘editing wars’ (repeated text deletions/reverts) has been followed by the migration of conflicts to discussion pages ‘behind’ the articles. Whilst argumentation research usually adopts the researcher-third-person perspective, here, in order to address very large amounts of data, we analyze first-person narratives of moderators in such debates. Moderators were asked to narrate the ‘life cycle’ of articles, focusing on the nature of verbal conflicts and their attendant moderation strategies. We analyze how the strategy of requiring protagonists to cite specific sources is often not effective, given that disputes then migrate to the validity of the sources to the credentials of their authors and the sincerity of protagonists.
**Argumentexturing: Towards a new theory of argumentation and learning**
Michael Baker¹, Baruch Schwarz²
¹CNRS-Telecom ParisTech, France; ²Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
Classical Argumentation theories focus on structures and on validity, mostly minimizing constructive aspects. By contrast, the negotiation of meaning and conceptual transformations are what matter most in a theory of Argumentation for Learning. This theory emphasizes relations between knowing, knowledge, meaning, discourse and argumentative structures. We call this theory “argumentexturing” because these components interweave when arguing for learning. On the side of the major theories of learning, they are ill-adapted to consideration of the kinds of subtle changes occurring in individuals and groups as a result of engaging in argumentative discussions. The theory of argumentexturing thus aims to bring argumentation and learning theory together, in a new synthesis. This presentation is based on the book (Schwarz & Baker) “Dialogue, Argumentation and Education: History, Theory and Practice”, 2017.

**Narrative and argumentation in a case of alleged child abuse**
Clive Baldwin¹, Michelle Greason²
¹St Thomas University, Canada; ²University of New Brunswick, Canada
In this paper, we explore the relationship between narrative and abductive reasoning through an analysis of pediatric expert reports in a case of alleged child abuse.
As the pediatrician’s abductive argument is undermined by the lessening of consilience and defeasibility, the introduction of ad hoc theories, and increasingly complexity, a stronger and more persuasive story becomes possible. This, we argue, is because the criteria for narrative argumentation are different to those of abduction, and incorporate factors extrinsic to the argument itself. While here we focus on a series of pediatric reports produced during child protection proceedings, we suggest that an understanding of the dynamic between narrative and abduction is relevant to many professions.

**Attenuating argument: The Meuse-Argonne American cemetery visitors center**
V. William Balthrop, Carole Blair
University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill, USA
Following World War I, the US government built eight permanent cemeteries in northern France, Belgium, and the UK to honor the more than 30,000 Americans who died and whose bodies remained in Europe. These cemeteries and the subsequent addition of memorial chapels advanced an argumentative brief on three lines: the US arrived onto the international scene, the US was a virtuous actor in that scene, and Europeans should recognize and appreciate that the sacrifice was made to save the allied nations. That brief has been given adherence over more than eight decades. This paper examines how the recently constructed visitors center at the Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, attenuates the arguments of that brief, reducing its force, effectiveness, and value to the very audiences it seeks to engage.

**A groundwork on critical questions**
Michael D. Baumtrog
Ryerson University - Ted Rogers School of Management, Canada
This paper offers theoretical insights into the generation of critical questions. In the first part the paper, I address some general concerns regarding the creation and function of critical questions. These include 1) a discussion of their purpose(s) 2) the different challenges faced when answering them internally vs. dialogically, and 3) the way they ought to be connected to their corresponding patterns of reasoning. In the second part, I review and characterize several examples of critical questions on offer across the discipline, pointing to some of their respective strengths and weaknesses. Finally, in the third part, I offer
a positive methodological proposal for the construction of questions that aims at overcoming a number of the individual and systematic shortcomings of extant question styles.

Understanding the role of argumentation in chronic care consultations. A comparative analysis of a multicultural corpus
Sarah Bigi¹, Chiara Piccinini¹, Tuosigen Chow²
¹Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy; ²Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou
Medical consultations in chronic care can be described as advice-seeking activity types, in which advice-giving is the main discursive activity that entails an argumentative component. This component appears during deliberative and evaluative sequences. In the first case, participants need to find agreement on a solution to a problem. In the second case, participants need to find agreement on how to assess facts in order to make decisions based on those assessments. We are particularly interested in understanding clinicians’ use of argumentation 1. when deciding for a certain treatment; 2. when patients disagree with them. In order to do this, we propose the analysis of a corpus composed of interviews with chronic care doctors, collected in Italy and in the Chinese region of Inner Mongolia.

The questions that set up the opening stage in conflict mediation
Emma van Bijnen¹, Maarten Bakker², Sara Greco¹
¹Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland; ²ADR Instituut Amsterdam, The Netherlands
By relating the functions of different questions to the conflict mediator’s task to design a mediation interaction that has enough common starting points for a reasonable discussion about win-win solutions to the conflict, we move one step closer to understanding how mediators may transform disputants from hostile to reasonable. This study is guided by the following question: How do different question types help (re-)establish material and procedural starting points in mediation sessions? The questions that (re)establish common starting points are presented by means of examples. The functions of these questions were further discussed by a focus group of professional mediators at the ADR Instituut.

Using arguments to advocate and to inquire
J. Anthony Blair
University of Windsor, Canada
In previous papers I proposed a difference between using arguments to advocate and using them to inquire. Advocacy requires antecedent commitment to a position. Inquiry puts antecedent commit to a position at odds with the purpose of the exercise. Inquiry begins with hypotheses to be examined, not positions to be defended; the context is cooperative, not competitive; parties are collaborators, not adversaries; and there is no role for rhetorical maneuvering. In this paper I examine four objections to these arguments, grant three of them and admit that my previous defence against the fourth was flawed. I formulate a revised version of the thesis that avoids the objections.

The Italian constitutional court ruling as an argumentative activity type and the strategic implications of its argumentativity
Marina Bletsas
University of Graz, Austria
The present contribution views the Italian Constitutional Court ruling in pragma-dialectical terms, as an argumentative activity type: in fact, a proper critical discussion between different voices can be identified in the motivations section. This is achieved by applying an integrated polyphonic pragma-dialectical model, which allows to reconstruct the speech acts aimed at overcoming a difference of opinion, even
when they are housed in a single utterance, while tracing them back to their discourse entities. This critical discussion is interpreted in light of strategic maneuvering as a rhetorical means of legitimizing the ruling in the eyes of the very specific audience of modern western citizens.

**Energy Darwinism, market intentionality, and environmental arguments**

**Emma Frances Bloomfield**  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, USA

Energy Darwinism is an emerging metaphor in environmental discourse that proposes industries will naturally become eco-friendly as fossil fuel costs increase. This project argues that the circulation of the Energy Darwinism metaphor has two important functions. First, the metaphor supports the cleansing of economic sins enacted by industry and positions the economy and technology as the ultimate saviors of the environment. Second, the metaphor anthropomorphizes markets as acting agents and engenders a neoliberal orientation that views environmental restoration not as inherently valuable, but as a fortunate byproduct of economic success and technological progress. Using the Burkean lens of the guilt-redemption cycle and Harawayan notions of cyborg intentionality, I perform a close reading of Energy Darwinism’s origination in Citigroup reports to critique an evocative and consequential transformation in contemporary environmental arguments.

**Have cognitive investigations influence on critical thinking understanding?**

**Angelina Bobrova**  
Russian State University for the Humanities, Russian Federation

Traditionally critical thinking is treated as a normative ideal of how good argument can be reached. It is regarded as a skill that can be developed by individuals. However, it seems that contemporary cognitive investigations discredit or shatter this position. In my talk, I claim that their results, on contrary, improve the relevance of the initial conception. Even if we appraise reasoning as mostly intuitive and social (Sperber and Mercier’s approach), individuals still may develop some ability to distance themselves from their own opinion. The question is how they could do it. I claim that the philosophical solution and some ‘technical’ steps are presented in Kantian introduction of critical method and maxims of how human’s understanding works.

**Rescher’s cognitive presumptions and the notion of plausibility**

**Petar Bodlovic**  
Faculty of Philosophy - University of Groningen, The Netherlands

According to N. Rescher (2006), cognitive presumptions are “truth-candidates, data that are no more certified truths than candidate-presidents are certified presidents” (p. 37). However, in order to gain presumptive status, a proposition needs to be the most plausible truth-candidate. The notion of plausibility plays, then, a crucial role. In this talk, I seek to explore whether the notion of plausibility renders Rescher’s characterization of the strength (force) of presumption untenable. Since the presumption is defined in terms of plausibility, the plausibility of P and the strength of a presumption that P should vary together. However, this may not be the case, since the conditions that determine the degree of plausibility and the ones that determine the strength of a presumption appear to be structurally different in Rescher’s theory.
**Exclamatives in argumentation**

Ronny Boogaart  
Leiden University LUCL, The Netherlands

The exclamative construction in (1) expresses uncertainty and undesirability.

(1) Straks loopt iedereen in Nederland met hoofddoekjes rond!  
(‘In a little while everyone will walk around wearing headscarfs in the Netherlands!’)

In this paper, a grammatical analysis of the construction will be combined with a pragma-dialectical analysis of its use in argumentative discourse. The construction is well suited to present negative pragmatic argumentation but it is very often fallacious (slippery slope, straw man). Why would arguers use such a stylistic device that is typically and recognizably presenting a derailed manoeuver (cf. hyperboly)? It will be shown that use of the construction is often better analyzed as a discussion rule being flouted rather than violated. As such, it may in fact be regarded an immunization strategy.

---

**Toulmin's warrant-establishing arguments**

David Simon Botting  
Universidade Nova de Lisboa, United Kingdom

In this paper I want to discuss Toulmin’s concept of warrant-establishing arguments. Toulmin says very little about the distinction between warrant-using and warrant-establishing arguments, and in the two places where he seems to describe warrant-establishing arguments, the descriptions appear to be in conflict. I will argue for a combination of these interpretations, but it will be shown that, on this interpretation, warrant-establishing arguments are a wider class than Toulmin takes them to be and have a different structure from warrant-using arguments. While warrant-using arguments fit the Toulmin model, warrant-establishing arguments do not. Although the distinction that I eventually argue for is perfectly coherent, I reject the anti-logic moral drawn from it by Toulmin.

---

**Argumentation and knowledge dissemination in the Greenpeace detox campaign**

Emanuele Brambilla  
University of Milan, Italy

At the dawn of the Anthropocene, environmental NGOs are playing a crucial role in the popularization of scientific evidence regarding the human impact on the planet. At the same time, they strive to influence consumer choices in the era of consumerism. Against this backdrop, the paper turns to pragma-dialectics to analyse the knowledge-dissemination strategies whereby scientific topics are recontextualised at the popular level in activist contexts. The study focuses on the Greenpeace Detox campaign to highlight strategic manoeuvring patterns; the findings suggest that argumentation against polluting fashion brands builds on the discursive construction of a race, in which companies compete to be the leaders of toxic-free fashion. Notably, the presentational devices used include pictorial elements that contribute to shaping and strengthening Greenpeace’s arguments.

---

**Compliments in the light of the theory of argumentation: Reasons in compliments**

Lilit Georg Brutian  
Yerevan State University, Armenia

The aim of the paper is to analyze the reasons why compliments are being/not being made, are being/not being accepted. 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) express politeness, d) receive polite treatment from the addressee, e) hear a compliment in response, f) humiliate the third person. Among 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 and ambiguous character of the compliment, e) the lack of confidence in the speaker.

Who are the "Dreamers" in the American dream?: Characterizing U.S. immigrants in the 21st century
Ann E. Burnette, Wayne L. Kraemer
Texas State University, USA

The debate over immigration has been an enduring and contentious political issue in the USA. Although Americans often refer to themselves as a “nation of immigrants,” questions of who should be allowed to immigrate to the U.S. and under what conditions are vociferously contested. Since September 11, 2001, the immigration debate has taken on additional significance as immigration arguments are linked to claims about national security. In 2012 President Barack Obama established the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy, which allowed some individuals who were not documented immigrants, but who had entered the U.S. as minors, to experience two-year periods without threat of deportation as long as they met stringent conditions. This paper examines public argument characterizing the immigrants affected by the DACA program.

Two variants of argumentation in civic education for democratic participation – The probative (academic) vs the deliberative (civic) aspect
Anne Kristine Byhring¹, Karl Henrik Flyum²
¹Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway; ²University of Oslo

This presentation concerns a theoretical issue: civic versus academic argumentation. Empirical research on students’ Socio Scientific Issues group work indicated a need for negotiation between distinct norms and values of civic and academic argumentation. Our research question is: What are the most significant differences between probative and deliberative argumentation of consequence to the civic education aspect of argumentation in teaching and research? In the light of Christian Kock's distinction between consensus versus legitimate dissensus we propose a set of relevant distinctions between the probative and deliberative aspects of argumentation. We will also comment briefly on consequences that may be relevant for teaching and research.- C -

Neither confusion, nor boredom: Text as dialectical, image as rhetorical in multimodal argumentation
Alexandru I. Cârlan
National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania

The paper initiates a methodological discussion on evaluating multimodal argumentation, against Robert Hariman’s project of setting in motion a ‘paradigm shift’ in visual culture studies. The guiding assumption will be that text is ascribed a dialectical role in such arguments, while image is ascribed a rhetorical one. This assumption is rooted in the pragma-dialectical concept of strategic maneuvering, and seems, at first, to resist the suggestion of a paradigm shift in visual culture studies, since critical evaluation of argumentation shares significant traits with the ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ denounced as dominating the analytic discourse on public visual media. Nonetheless, by analyzing fragments from a documentary movie, both the heuristic value of this assumption is illustrated, and its productivity in accounting for the role of such multimodal argumentation in broader public deliberations.
American town halls: Public sphere turned public screen

M. Kelly Carr, Jocelyn Evans
University of West Florida, USA

The raucous nature of recent American town hall meetings has captivated social media and the TV-watching public, taking politicians aback. Town halls drew their inspiration from the idyllic collective memory of colonial New England town meetings. Their contemporary form has shifted from direct democratic decision-making to constituent-representative information sessions – and sometimes, to shouting and spectacle. Politicians have increasingly turned to digital modes of engagement such as Facebook and Twitter. Constituents who value face-to-face dialectic have viewed this techno-spatial shift as a form of withdrawal from public accountability. This paper explores the intersecting lenses of public argument, public space, technological influence, and democratic accountability by examining town hall meeting controversies as exemplars of a shift from a traditional “public sphere” to what DeLuca and Peoples (2002) call a “public screen.”

Revisiting the adversary paradigm

John Casey
Northeastern Illinois University, USA

A central objection to adversarial conceptions of argument is that such notions, whatever their effect on argument practice, are extraneous to the core epistemic concept of argument. I argue that if we take argument to be about beliefs, rather than commitments, then two considerations show that adversariality is an essential part of it. The first is that beliefs are not under our direct voluntary control, and so in argument others can alter our beliefs without our consent. The second is that beliefs are costly both for the psychological states they provoke and for the fact that they are causally related to our actions.

Argumentation and persistent disagreement

Diego Castro Amenábar
University of Groningen, The Netherlands

When a disagreement arises, is argumentation the best way to deal with it? In many fields like politics, economics or philosophy, disagreements seem to be persistent, so the parties will not likely persuade their counterpart or be persuaded by them. So, how can the parties overcome these kinds of disagreements? The purpose of this dissertation is to explore different solutions to this problem. To do that it will be necessary, first, to establish what is a persistent disagreement to, then, distinguish several kinds of disagreements. Finally, I will explore the different dialogue types proposed by Walton and Krabbe (1995) to establish which dialogue types are useful to overcome which type of disagreement.

Building communities

Annalisa Cattani
Università di Ferrara, Italy

Guerrilla Advertising and Public Art affect each other and both developed from the big site specific Installation to dialectical persuasive processes that are able to build, through different visual perspectives, new communities. These projects are durational, experiential, and dialogic, and therefore the traditional aesthetics based on the analysis of representations does not adequately account for a new aesthetics of co-creation. We will try to see how similar projects in advertising and contemporary art artistic have different argumentative paths. Moreover we will try to see whether these processes are capable to ground new visual Specific Places and multimodal Specific Places. We will particularly focus on the notion of Person versus Personas, the new interlocutor of Content Marketing, closer to the notion of Spectator rather than to that of Customer.
The defense of science in the public sphere
Leah Ceccarelli
University of Washington, USA
What means of persuasion are used by scientific experts who speak out to counter the “post-truth politics” of the Trump era? This paper examines the argumentative strategies used by scientist citizens who embrace their civic responsibility to respond to the anti-science statements and actions of contemporary American government officials. From the resistive argumentative tactics of rogue social media sites such as AltUSNatParkService, to the agenda setting alarms of scientists who write newspaper opinion editorials, to the carefully crafted open letters signed by multiple Nobel Prize-winning scientists, the nascent appeals of a newly awakened expert public combine standard social movement genres and argumentative forms with assumptions and values that are drawn as much from the technical sphere as the public sphere. The result is something both familiar and entirely new.

Support use in Chinese EFL writers’ English argumentative writing
Peishan Chen
Dongguan Polytechnic, China
This study explores the linguistic subjectivity of support use in terms of speaking self and its interpersonal functions with reference writer roles and implied reading positions in Chinese EFL (L2) writers’ and English native (L1) writers’ English argumentative writing from the perspective of systemic functional linguistics. Data analysis of 60 L2 essays and 60 L1 essays shows that L2 support use is commonly incarnated as assessment, inference, prediction, empathy interpretation, and supposition, which is more subjective than the frequent L1 support embodied as fact and authoritative report. Consequently, writer roles and reading positions are also contrasting, thus resulting in different interpersonal functions, which respectively aim at maintaining harmony and delivering truth. The study assumes such divergent support use may derive from the communicating preferences in the two cultures.

Linguistic construction of the past: Rhetorical devices in a historical description
Valeria Chernyavskaya
Peter the Great St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, Russian Federation
The aim of the research is to look into specific linguistic principles of analyzing the “verbalized past”. Textual representations cannot be separated from value-based interests of text authors. These are profound changes in the ideas about the nature of historiography, which come back to the linguistic turn in the early 20th century. The key presumption is that history is a mode of knowing the reality due to the objective facts and its active interpretation. A clash of different political perspectives is a clash of different historical descriptions. Hence the political narrative can substitute the historical description of the reality. Linguistic interpretation of the verbalized past based on pragma-linguistic analysis and discourse analysis reveals ideological interests in rhetorical constructions in a historical description.

Argument and epistemic in/justice
Kundai Chirindo
Lewis & Clark College, USA
This paper explores the nexus of argumentation studies and the recent concern raised within epistemology about epistemic injustice. I argue that scene of argument is a testimonial site that is vulnerable to the types of conduct that effect epistemic injustice. There are two types of epistemic injustice I focus on in this paper: testimonial injustice, and hermeneutical injustice. Using Wangari Maathai as a case in point, I demonstrate some consequences of epistemic injustice in argument including unwarranted attributions of credibility deficits/excesses, hermeneutic/heuristic marginalization, and
limiting the variety of epistemic resources available to society. I show that epistemic injustice in argument can undermine argument’s epistemic and ethical standing. I conclude by discussing some ways that scholars of “the new rhetoric” can guard against epistemic injustice.

**Mining argumentative relations "in the wild"**

Oana Cocarascu, Francesca Toni

Imperial College London, United Kingdom

Argument mining focuses on the automatic detection in text of arguments, argument components, and relations between arguments (Relation-based Argument Mining - RbAM) using a combination of natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning techniques. Argument Mining has recently gained considerable attention within the NLP community as a standalone task. We describe two experiments "in the wild" on deploying the outputs of various RbAM classifiers to extract argumentative relations of attack and support from a dialogue and from a short text, respectively. The classifiers’ outputs can be used to construct directed “debate” graphs representing the relations between arguments from any text. These graphs can support various applications, from capturing and analyzing debates in social media to supporting decision making.

Our analysis shows that the search for an all-encompassing method is still open.

**No argument is an island: How character and clustering connect arguments**

Daniel Harry Cohen

Colby College, USA

It seems counter-intuitive, but argumentation theorists are too focused on arguments. We focus narrowly on a narrow conception of arguments, but some aspects of argumentation need a broader backdrop than the study of discrete arguments affords. Theorists who try to explain an argument with reference only to the arguers’ engagement are like historians who try to explain the events and historical significance of the First World War without mentioning anything that happened before 1914 or anything after 1918. Much of what makes argumentation important, e.g., standpoint revision, occurs before and after the arguers engage, either in preparation for, or as a consequence of, arguing, so we cannot ignore the “inter-argument” periods. Nor can we ignore arguers’ character and the “inter-argument argumentative virtues” that make this happen.

**Argumentation in Amsterdam school architectural design**

Sarah Jayne Constant

University of Pittsburgh, USA

My study explores the working-class, social housing structures designed by members of the Amsterdam School of architecture during the early 20th century. The school’s social housing project challenged shopworn presumptions about working-class housing and raised salient aesthetic questions about the built environment. Amsterdam School buildings do not passively occupy their environment; they ‘determine and manipulate’ their surroundings, a tenet of these architects’ Socialist and working-class roots. The study reconstructs argumentation that took place in the design phase of Amsterdam School projects, with particular attention to how interlocutors thematized contrasts between the ‘built’ and ‘natural’ environments. The Amsterdam School case study provides an opportunity to explore, and complicate, the architectural metaphor that undergirds Jackson (2015) and Aakhus and Jackson's (2005) argumentation-as-design research program.
The role of reasons in deliberative dialogues
Cristina Corredor
University of Valladolid, Spain

The goal of deliberation dialogues is that the participants agree on the best available course of action for implementation (Walton and Krabbe 1995). Some outstanding theoretical frameworks seem to see argumentation as only secondary for a deliberative dialogue to proceed. According to McBurney et al. (2007), the move ask-justify leads to a persuasion dialogue, but it is just one in a set of possible locutions articulating deliberation. In my light, however, an essential feature of deliberative dialogues is that it leads to an agreement on the basis of a joint recognition of the reasons given in support of a proposal, since it is in virtue of the reasons given (and the possible alternatives argumentatively dismissed) that the participants reach a joint decision on a common course of action.
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What makes ambiguity fallacious? A historical approach
Julie Dainville
Université libre de Bruxelles; F.R.S.-FNRS, Belgium

Ambiguity has been questioned since the very first reflections on rhetoric and is still a vivid question in modern argumentation studies. This contribution will address the question of ambiguity from a historical point of view, taking the Ancient rhetorical theories as a starting point, with a specific question as a guideline: what makes ambiguity fallacious?

Two discussions from formal argumentation
Jeremie Dauphin¹, Beishui Liao², Leendert van der Torre¹
¹University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg; ²Zhejiang University, China

In this presentation, we would like to explain and discuss two fundamental aspects of formal argumentation: First, we discuss the difference between ‘argument evaluation’ and ‘argument acceptance’, where ‘argument evaluation’ considers the plausibility of an argument based on its content and internal structure, while for ‘argument acceptance’ we observe how the argument relates to other arguments and whether these are accepted themselves or not. Second, we discuss the role of abstraction in formal argumentation. We observe how abstraction of arguments allows us to focus on their external relations, and discuss different principles for the local and modular evaluation of argumentation and compare them to monolithic approaches.

Affective priming with a pragmatic argumentation scheme in non-native persuasion processing
Kamila Dębowska-Kozłowska
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

The current study investigates the persuasive outcomes of the processing of message valence in L2 by non-native minds of the Faculty of English students. 160 participants took part in the study. A Likert scale was applied to measure premessage attitudes. Two types of affective priming were used, i.e. priming by negative message valence and priming by positive message valence. A modified version of the Implicit Association Test (IAT) and the Single-Item Evaluation Technique (SIET) created in the E-Prime software were used to measure postmessage implicit and explicit attitudes respectively. A highly significant main effect of compatibility in the IAT task (p < .001) indicated that persuasion occurred in
the case of negative message valence priming with a pragmatic argumentation scheme but not in the case of positive message valence priming.

**A cross-cultural study of argumentativeness in Turkey: Is silence really golden and speech silver?**

Yeliz Demir¹, Dale Hample²

¹Hacettepe University, Turkey; ²University of Maryland, USA

The aim of this study is to reveal the orientations of Turkish people to interpersonal arguing and compare them with the results of a number of studies on argumentativeness among US citizens. Key to the study is the investigation of whether Turkish people’s degree of attachment to their religion has an implication about how they view interpersonal arguing. To this end, a group of instruments, which retrieved reliable cross-cultural results on measuring argumentativeness, is utilized: argument motivations, argument frames, and taking conflict personally. Turkish data come from around 300 university students (from linguistics, theology, biology, philosophy, and engineering departments) who were asked to complete these self-report survey items. Analyses also contrast Turkish men and women, and offer comparisons to the US data.

**Statistics in popular science: The argument from correlation to cause**

Martijn Demollin

University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

A main activity within popularized science communication is the expert-to-layman transferral of scientific knowledge. The translational step to make scientific findings understandable and interesting to the greater public may cause certain complications. Especially correlative connections have proven to be a problematic concept to adequately simplify and form a relatively common source for the misrepresentation of scientific knowledge. Presenting an observed correlation between certain variables as a potential causal relation is an appealing form of adaptation, since this type of claim is more likely to satisfy the audience demand for an explanation of a particular phenomenon. Depending on the strength of the causal claim, such an inferential step can be considered an ‘argument from correlation to cause’. This paper further explores these kinds of arguments within the context of popularized science.

**The more-than-three-part lists and their use in argumentative radio call-in shows**

Gonen Dori-Hacohen

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA

The Tricolon, a list of three-parts, is a known rhetorical feature and is accepted as normative. However, lists are understudied so I researched the argumentative role of the more-than-three-part lists in USA and Israeli radio call-in interactions. First, I challenge the ‘objective’ view for lists and show their goal is to deliver a subjective meaning, bigger than that of each item on the list, to persuade the audience. Lists can come in chains, one provoking a second. In Israel phone-ins, the more-than-three-part lists has some normative features. These findings demonstrates the importance of the longer-than-normative 3-part lists in argumentative environments.

**Arguing from an “Ordinary Mentor” position: A neoliberal fallacy?**

Gonen Dori-Hacohen

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, USA

Advising may be an argumentative process, in which an adviser may use logic, ethos, or pathos to reduce the advisee’s doubts about it. I studied advice in US financial radio show, where a millionaire host advises callers, mainly based on his ethos: he establishes himself as a mentor and as an ordinary person.
This ordinariness is created via various language games, including stressing ‘common sense.’ The
‘ordinary mentor’ position is fallacious: the host cannot be both like the callers (ordinary) and their
superior (mentor). This fallacy is ideological: in the neoliberal era, “everyone can become a millionaire,”
regardless of social structures. However, these structures limit individuals’ economic abilities. Therefore
the host-adviser uses ethos, convincing callers to overlook structural barriers so they “can” become like
him and succeed.

**Interpreting argumentation. The insider and outsider points of view**

Marianne Doury
CNRS, France

As any complex speech production, argumentative discourse needs not only to be decoded, but to be
interpreted. The way this interpretation process takes place depends on the discursive role the interpreter
takes on as an insider (whether he or she is engaged in the attack or the defense of a viewpoint) or an
outsider (typically, the academic analyst’s perspective). The insiders’ interpretation of an argumentative
utterance is determined by their orientation towards the issue at stake. Based on a 2015 speech of Nicolas
Sarkozy on ‘neutral’ packaging for cigarettes, I will make clear the clues on which my interpretation is
based; I will examine the way this declaration is interpreted in the comments that were posted on the
Web. I will show that these interpretations are commanded by rhetorical concerns.

**On maps as visual grounds for inference: Against isomorphism**

Ian James Dove¹, David Godden²
¹UNLV, USA; ²Michigan State University, USA

People appeal to maps when justifying conclusions about the territory mapped. What warrants such
inferences? Christoph Lumer (2016), in responding to similarity accounts of maps-as-models, claims that
such inferences are properly warranted by an isomorphism between the territory represented and the map.
We respond that isomorphism cannot account for the variety of ways in which maps are used as
justification. Consider large-scale planar maps of the Earth. It is impossible to represent a spherical
territory with a planar map using only isomorphic properties. Moreover, one cannot distinguish merely
by visual inspection which features are, and are not, isomorphic. Therefore, while inferences from map to
territory may be warranted by an isomorphism, schemes that cite only the isomorphic relation do not
accurately depict the normative structure of the reasoning involved.

**The mystery of the interpretation: Less than a second for doing an “argumentative” abduction**

Antonio Duarte
Complutense University of Madrid, Spain

In this contribution an ironical utterance is analyzed from a pragma-dialectical perspective. At first
glance, we detect a pragma-dialectical fallacy in the course of the dialogue. However, the assertion would
be a legitimate strategic manoeuver which is based on the speaker’s assessment of the abductive
capability of the interlocutor. Hence, detecting a pragma-dialectical fallacy may act as an abductive
trigger and can help us to discover certain intentions of our interlocutor, at least as far as the
interpretation of the utterance is concerned. To correctly understand the mysterious words, an
“argumentative” abduction has to be proposed from the contextual elements. As part of this dialectical
approach, the rapid, almost instantaneous, new hypothesis arrived at by abduction could be properly
analyzed and criticized in a reasoned way.
Latin rhetoric and fallacies
Michel Dufour
University Sorbonne-Nouvelle, France

The birthplace of the concept of fallacy is traditionally located in Aristotle’s dialectical treatise On sophistical refutations. But a short chapter of the Rhetoric extends the concept of fallacious paralogism to rhetoric, a context close but distinct from dialectic. Since Aristotle’s Rhetoric has been influential on Latin rhetoric and since rhetoric is commonly associated with persuasion at any rate, including by means of fallacious moves, we wonder whether Latin rhetoric pays an explicit or implicit tribute to Aristotelian fallacies. This question is discussed on the basis of some of the most influential works of Latin rhetoric, namely the Rhetorica ad Herennium, Cicero’s On the Orator, De Inventione and De Oratore, and finally Quintilian’s Institutes of Oratory.

One does not punch a discussion partner: An analysis of the strategic maneuvering justifying radical actions in communiques issued in the midst of social conflicts
Jorge Duran Solorzano
Leiden University, The Netherlands

Social organizations use different forms of protests to produce or prevent social changes. These forms include socially accepted actions, such as demonstrations and rallies, and more radical and less accepted ones like civil disobedience and uprisings. Additionally, these actions often go accompanied by communiques in which organizations justify their views, the goals of their actions and their demands for social change. Granted that radical actions are uncooperative on a regular basis and that argumentation implies some degree of cooperation, we can ask why social organizations performing uncooperative actions make an effort to look cooperative by putting forward argumentation? This presentation aims at discussing this question. It will be illustrated with the analysis of a communiqué issued in the midst of a social conflict in Mexico.

Argumentative dialogue and social and political deep disagreement in Chile
Claudio Duran\textsuperscript{1}, Eva Hamame\textsuperscript{2}
\textsuperscript{1}York University, Canada; \textsuperscript{2}Universidad Diego Portales, Chile

The theoretical approach of this paper can be described as a flexible argumentation approach, an idea taken from Linda Carozza. It involves ideas about dialogue by Douglas Walton and Durán. Michael Gilbert’s theory of multi-modal argumentation is fundamental in this approach. The idea of dialogue as “hospitality” developed by Chilean philosopher Humberto Giannini is also introduced. On the basis of this approach, the proposed paper for the 2018 ISSA conference intends to present the conclusions of an argumentative dialogue between the authors. The authors themselves disagree about the social and political evaluation of the government of Allende. The depth of this disagreement is a main issue of the study.

Argumentation as epistemic exchange
Catarina Dutilh Novaes
VU Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Given conflicting evidence on the efficacy of argumentation, a crucial question becomes: what does it take for a process of argumentation to improve our epistemic situation? Under which conditions does argumentation improve the accuracy of our beliefs and/or lead to consensus? I develop a novel account of argumentation as a form of social exchange. Insights from social exchange theory will inform the investigation, a framework developed within sociology and social psychology that studies patterns of interactions as negotiated exchanges, emphasizing the interplay between self-interest and
interdependence. What is exchanged are epistemic resources such as knowledge, evidence, justification, critical objections; in suitable circumstances, the exchange is beneficial to all participants. This framework allows for an investigation of the role of trust, reciprocity, fairness, and emotions in argumentative processes.
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Dished: Food as argumentative strategy
Justin Eckstein
Pacific Lutheran University, USA

Food cultivation, creation, consumption, and disposal are all subject to debate. A critical figure in the debates about food are what Eckstein and Young (2014) call public chef intellectuals (PCI). PCIs translate their technical expertise into the public to shape the values, policy, and aesthetics that surround food’s cultivation, creation, consumption, and disposal. Within the context of food, I argue that PCIs can design dishes that serve as argumentative strategies. In this essay, I will turn to the case study of Dan Barber and his development of the “Honey Nut” Squash. As an argument strategy, I claim the squash dish draws the problem of industrialized agriculture into relief via: movement, taste, and visuality.

Extending the pragma-dialectical approach to argument schemes
Frans H. van Eemeren¹²³, Bart Garssen¹²
¹ILIAS & ²University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, ³Leiden University, The Netherlands

In the pragma-dialectical approach to argument schemes, each argument scheme represents a particular justificatory relationship that is supposed to legitimize a transfer of acceptability between a reason (or coordinative set of reasons) advanced in defence of a standpoint and the standpoint that is defended. The various argument schemes that can be used in an argumentative exchange and the way in which their use is to be evaluated are in principle considered to be part of the joint starting points that are by intersubjective agreement established at the opening stage of a critical discussion aimed at resolving a difference of opinion on the merits. This contribution recapitulates and extends the rationale and general outlines of the pragma-dialectical approach. It is the first instalment of more encompassing series of studies that is to result in a monograph offering a complete overview of the treatment and categorization of argument schemes.

Heated debate and the frozen trucker: Argument schemes in judicial opinions reviewing agency interpretations of statutes
Lisa Eichhorn
University of South Carolina, USA

During the confirmation hearings of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch, a senator criticized his dissenting opinion in TransAm Trucking v. ARB, which the media quickly dubbed the “Frozen Trucker” case. TransAm was a hard case in which the court had to decide not necessarily what the statutory language at issue meant, but instead what it could permissibly be interpreted by an administrative agency to mean. Thus, an initial issue was whether the language was ambiguous, and thus subject to agency interpretation, in the first place. Only if the language was ambiguous could the court decide whether the agency’s interpretation of it was permissible. Highlighting the double-layered nature of the interpretive issue, this article examines the justifications in the majority and dissenting opinions in TransAm, tracing their argumentative moves.
Apocalyptic argumentation: Trump and ISIS
Anders Eriksson
Lund University, Sweden
The strongest kind of argumentation is the one that appeals to higher ideals and realities. Apocalyptic thinking concerns the ultimate fight between good and evil at the end times. The group that knows the hidden truths about the awaited divine intervention gathers the followers for the apocalypse. The Islamic State build their propaganda on the idea of a violent fight for caliphate in the end times. The magazine Dabiq has taken its name from the town of Dabiq in northern Syria, mentioned in a hadith about Armageddon.
Donald Trump has aligned himself with evangelical Christians with an apocalyptic worldview. They see the USA as besieged by Satanic forces—communism and secularism, family breakdown and government encroachment – and they proclaim Trump to be God’s chosen leader in the end times.

Metaphor in argument production vs. understanding
Francesca Ervas, Amitash Ojha
University of Cagliari, Italy
Previous research showed that a metaphor in an argument creates a strong bias in argument understanding (Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011, 2013; Steen, Reijnenierse, Burgers 2014). Previous experiments indicate that participants have some difficulties in detecting a lexical ambiguity fallacy, especially when arguments are based on conventional metaphors (Ervas et al. 2015) and even when participants are experts, i.e. trained in logic and argumentation (Ervas, Ledda, Pierro 2016). The metaphoric effect shows its influence especially in the evaluation of arguments with plausible conclusion. The talk presents the results of an experiment where participants were asked to complete verbal argument (with true/false/plausible conclusion), selecting either a metaphor or a literal word as middle term of a lexical ambiguous argument. The aim is investigating metaphor use in argument production vs. understanding.

Is there such a thing as a ‘conductive argument’? Redefining ‘conductive argument’ in relation to deliberation as genre
Isabela Fairclough
University of Central Lancashire, United Kingdom
I propose to redefine so-called ‘conductive argument’ in relation to deliberation as genre. I argue that a ‘conductive argument’ is not a single argument, but one possible outcome of deliberative activity, understood as the critical testing of alternative proposals in light of their potential consequences. What appears to be a ‘conductive argument’ is a particular argumentative configuration that may appear in the temporal unfolding of a deliberative process. A proposal that has withstood critical testing (i.e. no critical objections have emerged that refute it), together with the ‘pro’/‘con’ reasons relevant to it, will take the form of a so-called ‘conductive’ argument in favour of that proposal. Whenever critical objections do come to light, the potential ‘conductive’ argument tentatively supporting the proposal will collapse into a deductive argument against it.
Argumentation as a pathway to critical thinking
Leila E. Ferguson¹, Jarmila Bubikova-Moan²
¹Kristiania University College, Norway; ²Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education

Drawing on theoretical advances within the field of epistemic cognition, including an expanded definition inspired by philosophical literature and insights from research on social epistemic cognition, (Chinn et al., 2011), we see reasoned argumentation as a reliable process towards achieving deeper understanding, and as a prerequisite for critical thinking. Using this as a vantage point, we have designed and implemented an eight-week intervention for freshmen in educational sciences where argumentation skills are fostered through teacher-led, small-group classroom discussions (Murphy et al., 2016), open oral participation, reflection, structured summation and formative feedback. Our presentation will provide a theoretical consideration of argumentation, as conceptualized above, as well as a brief presentation of our course features, working methods and results of the intervention.

Defining and solving intercultural disagreement: A field experiment
Victor Ferry
F.R.S.-FNRS, Belgium

What is intercultural disagreement? What is the most effective way to solve it? From October 2016 to April 2018, I conducted a field study to help to solve those two research questions. It consisted trainings for secondary school teachers (100 participants altogether). During those trainings, participants had to describe a situation in which they encountered an intercultural disagreement in class. They were then asked to turn those situations into controversies. Using this material I will, in the first part of my paper, check the relevance of existing definitions of intercultural disagreements. In a second part of the training, participants had to take part in a rhetorical exercise designed to develop intercultural conflict management skills. In the second part of my paper, I will present this rhetorical exercise and teachers’ appreciation of it.

Argumentative patterns in visual argumentation: Strategic maneuvering in editorial cartoons
Eveline T. Feteris
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

In the literature on multimodal argumentation and visual rhetoric, the way in which cartoonists convey their message is considered as a form of argumentation aimed at convincing the intended audience of a particular point of view. In my contribution I sketch a pragma-dialectical approach to reconstruct the argumentative message in editorial cartoons and I illustrate this approach by an analysis of examples of cartoons that are representative of the types of argumentative patterns in editorial cartooning.

Is the brain a computer? Scientific metaphor and argumentation
Andreas Finsen, Gerard Steen, Jean H.M. Wagemans
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

This presentation brings together metaphor theory, argumentation theory and genre studies in order to analyze the argumentative functions of the so-called computer metaphor of the brain. While recent developments in metaphor theory indicate that metaphor affords argumentation by analogy (Steen, 2013), genre-oriented studies of scientific argumentation indicate that a prototypical scientific standpoint functions as an explanatory hypothesis based on abductive argumentation (Wagemans, 2014; 2016a; 2016b). Starting from the assumption that the computer metaphor of the brain constitutes a proper explanatory hypothesis, we investigate whether and how the metaphor may be conceived as a scientific standpoint based on abduction supported by argumentation by analogy. Finally, we relate our findings to
discussions in the philosophy of cognitive science about whether the computer metaphor of the brain actually is a metaphor.

Assessing connection adequacy for arguments with institutional warrants

James Beaumont Freeman
Hunter College/City University of New York, USA

An institutional warrant is backed by a system of rules. How strongly connected are the premises of a particular institutional argument to its conclusion and when is the strength sufficient for a cogency? Considering legal rules, appraisal involves going from a transcript of laws to a statement of inference rules to an assessment of strength. Strength assessment involves Cohen’s method of relevant variables. The strength of a particular warrant is its resistance to rebutting by values of the relevant variables. Sufficient strength for cogency depends on the branch of law backing the warrant, e.g. the familiar preponderance of evidence versus proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Characterizing this distinction includes characterizing counterexample resistance. Where the warrant resists counterexampling at each level below the threshold for counterexample indifference, the warrant is sufficient for cogency.
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Interrogative burden of proof in philosophical argumentation

Joaquin Galindo Castañeda
University of Valladolid, Spain

I claim that both the biased or loaded questions in a sequence of questions and answers in various types of dialogues, as well as the order of the questions contained in a critical discussion, can be clarified by their relationships with the concept of burden of proof, in particular, by postulating an interrogative burden of proof. The main definitions of burden of proof given in various approaches are discussed as well as the function of the questions in those approaches. Next, a model is presented that uses the distinctions of the pragma-dialectics with respect to the role of the questions in some contexts, i.e., argumentative indicators. The model will be applied to examples of argumentation in philosophy, in segments of both classical and modern philosophical dialogues.

And then you are left holding the baby! Strategic manoeuvring with the argumentum ad consequentiam

Bart Garssen¹,², Frans H. van Eemeren¹,²,³
¹ILIAS, ²University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands, ³Leiden University, The Netherlands

In argumentative discourse fallacies occur regularly, but often they seem not to be noticed by the participants. In spite of the fact that people generally denounce this fallacy when confronted with clear case, this also goes for the fallacy known as the argumentum ad consequentiam. In explaining this paradox it is argued in this paper that certain types of argumentum ad consequentiam are modes of strategic manoeuvring which take on a reasonable appearance by mimicking legitimate pragmatic argumentation or reductio ad absurdum argumentation. In an experiment we tested the following hypothesis: fallacious argumentum ad consequentiam argumentation is regarded less unreasonable when it is presented in this way as reasonable pragmatic argumentation.
Argumentation in support of a choice in records of decision
Ingeborg Maria van der Geest
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Before major projects can be carried out, such as 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 the final choice must be supported by argumentation showing how the pros and cons of the options were taken into consideration. The argumentation often contains ambiguities, that make it hard for interested citizens to respond critically. The aim of this paper is to show how argumentation in RODs can be analyzed by applying an ‘analytic structure’ for argumentation in support of a choice, based on the pragma-dialectical argumentation theory and on insights into systematic decision-making. I will show how the analytic structure can be used to reconstruct the argumentation in a systematic and justified way.

Intuition All the Way Down: The Psychology of Argument, Argumentation Theory, and Critical Thinking
Michael A. Gilbert
York University, Canada

Work in the Psychology of Reasoning [PR] shows tension regarding Critical Thinking [CT]. The tension is the CT approach which puts logic and truth as the most important factors, and PR where it plays a sometimes non-existent role. CT holds that there is a disagreement, and that argument follows by putting forward claims and their defences, i.e., reasons in a rigorous and linear way. This means that Reason and the Logic that supports it is at the core of argumentation. Mercier and Sperber, however, argue that beliefs arise from intuition, and that arguing is rationalization rather than investigation. Using a discussion that took place in May of 2018 on the listserv AilactD-L I examine the consequences of their theory and of PR in general for Critical Thinking and Argumentation Theory.

Representing first-order arguments in argumentative adtrees
Federico Gobbo, Jean H.M. Wagemans
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

We combine the linguistic representation framework of Constructive Adpositional Grammars (CxAdGrams) with the argument classification framework of the Periodic Table of Arguments (PTA) in order to develop a high precision tool for reconstructing arguments in natural language. After an explanation of the two theoretical frameworks, we develop the central notion of ‘argumentative adtree’ and show its application to a number of concrete examples of so-called first-order predicate and subject arguments. The analytical tool resulting from the combination of the two frameworks is especially suitable as a point of departure for formal linguistic and computational linguistic research into the representation, analysis, and generation of argumentative discourse.

Bayesian accounts of testimony: Some further applications
David Godden
Michigan State University, USA

This paper develops Bayesian accounts of testimonial acceptance by addressing three questions: (i) How is our ordinary reliance on the testimony of strangers (sources of unknown trustworthiness) justified? (ii) How is our reaction to astonishing, or incredible, testimony (where we disbelieve some claim despite an otherwise reliable report of it) justified? (iii) What may be inferred from reports from unreliable sources? Developing existing research, this paper shows how, given certain plausible initial, situational conditions, Bayes’ Theorem [BT] provides that: (i) One need not find a source’s report to be especially reliable in order to accept it. (ii) Even a report from an otherwise reliable source may not be sufficient to accept it.
(iii) Testimony from an unreliable reporter may offer sufficient reason to accept the contradictory of what is reported.

**A simple theory of argument schemes**  
**Geoff Goddu**  
University of Richmond, USA

While there has been in depth discussion of many particular argumentation schemes, some lament that there is little to no theory underpinning the notion of an argumentation scheme. Here I shall present and defend a minimalist theory—a scheme is just a set of propositional functions—propositional structures with at least one variable. While simple, the theory contravenes several hoped for desiderata such as (i) aiding in the identification of enthymemes and (ii) keeping schemes constrained to a manageable taxonomy. I shall argue that no theory of schemes will be able to satisfy all the desired outcomes and that failing to abide by (i) and (ii) is not as problematic as one might initially think.

**American media dialogues: A discourse analysis of the 2016 presidential election campaign coverage**  
**Vadim Yurievich Golubev**  
St Petersburg State University, Russian Federation

Democracy is based on public dialogue. American presidential elections are arguably the most important world event that vividly demonstrates this fact. This study presents a discourse analysis of various media dialogues that are part of the 2016 US presidential election campaign coverage. The paper aims to: identify and describe various discursive practices in democratic media including various types of dialogue that American media were engaged in when covering the presidential election campaigns of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump; identify dialectical shifts between different dialogue types that occur when a dialogue of one type spontaneously or intentionally turns into a dialogue of another type, e.g., when an interview with presidential candidates or expert testimony turns into a persuasion or eristic dialogue.

**Civic argumentation and political argumentation**  
**Julder Alexander Gomez**  
Universidad Eafit, Colombia

The theme of this presentation is the relationship between civic and political argumentation. I would like to suggest that civic argumentation is political and I would like to clarify in what sense it is so. To do this, we need to (i) broaden our understanding of what we mean by saying that political argumentation is institutional; and (ii) attend to the dynamic nature of the political argument. This will allow us to establish that civic argumentation is political in that it elaborates declarative representations (Searle, 2010) by means of which the speaker of political speech tries to induce or increase the bond of the audience to their theses (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1971), and sometimes transforms the constitutive rules of political argumentation. In other words, civic argumentation is potentially political argumentation.

**Metacognitive strategies for emotional regulation in deliberative dialogue protocols: Learning to argue peacefully**  
**Julder Alexander Gomez, Manuela González**  
Universidad Eafit, Colombia

When a group of people take part in deliberative dialogues, using protocols, it is common to find the presence of maladjusted emotions, that hamper deliberation. Emotion is generated by cognitive
processing, and gets expressed in behavior, the presence of maladjusted emotion make the information-
processing less flexible and challenge problem-solving. With the inclusion of metacognitive strategies in
deliberative protocols that allow emotional regulation, decrease, increase or maintain one or more aspects
of emotions. We will describe the effect of emotions in deliberative protocols, characterize maladjusted
emotions, characterize then useful metacognitive strategies, and describe their inclusion in deliberations.
Constructing a wide and relevant description and understanding of the situation, we expect to facilitate
the deliberative dialogues with the metacognitive tools for emotional regulation

The building of controversies around the management of cultural heritage
Cesar Gonzalez-Perez\textsuperscript{1}, Martín Pereira-Fariña\textsuperscript{2,3}, Chris Reed\textsuperscript{2}
\textsuperscript{1}Institute of Heritage Sciences, Spanish National Research Council, Spain; \textsuperscript{2}Centre for Argument
Technology, University of Dundee, United Kingdom; \textsuperscript{3}Centro Singular de Investigación en Tecnoloxías
da Información, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain

The management of Cultural Heritage is a relevant item in the agenda both of public administrations and
civil society. However, it is not difficult to find disagreements between experts about the same cultural
object, which makes the decision making about its preservation more difficult. In this work, we describe
the controversy around the Cave of Alamtira (Cantabria, Spain) by means of two debates between experts
and how that emerges both at the dialogical level, identifying the conflicts between them using Inference
Anchoring Theory (IAT), and at the ontological one, by means of modelling the entities and properties
recognized by the experts using Cultural Heritage Abstract Reference Model (CHARM).

Bundled professional engagement-guessing, caring and arguing: How Chinese outpatient doctors
accomplish work under system stress
Gerald Thomas Goodnight, Yue Yang
University of Southern California, USA

Healthcare systems around the globe face stress. Since 1990s, medical scandals have exploded in media,
accusing capitalist and post-socialist healthcare systems of inaccessibility and high cost. How do Chinese
providers work with patients on everyday basis? Yue Yang collected and analyzed ethnographic d ata of
provider-patient interactions from clinics in Southern China. These Chinese doctors built arguments to
justify their diagnoses, treatment suggestions, correct patients’ behaviors or actions or minimize patients’
concerns. Doctors incorporate explicit guessing, and they demonstrated providers’ intention to protect the
patients’ interests. We explore possible extension of research and development of work as bundled
professional engagement.

Re-framing climate controversy: The appeals of the Hartwell paper
Jean Goodwin
North Carolina State University, USA

In the public sphere, standpoints on multiple issues often cohere into stable formations, such as party
platforms, think-tank issue lists and partisan ideologies. Argumentation on one issue tends to lapse into
argumentation on another, and all arguments tend to become ossified (i.e., made into commonplaces).
Most political argumentation takes place within these stable formations. But sometimes arguers aim to
disrupt old and create new ones. How can they manage to do so? This paper is a case study of the 2010
Hartwell Paper, an ecomodernist argument for integrating environmental action with development and
technological progress. Understanding the appeals used in the Hartwell Paper to re-align environmental
debates provides insights into how space can be opened for argumentation in a world increasingly riven
by ideological divides.
How free is the freedom rule? Religious convictions and the performance of moral injury

Ronald Walter Greene, Darrin Kenneth Hicks
University of Denver, USA

Working from cases in which individuals claim that their religious convictions should exempt them from providing services for same-sex wedding ceremonies, we examine speech acts that are purported to constitute moral injury. Specifically, we ask if speech acts that constitute moral injury ought to be considered violations of the freedom rule. Or, conversely, if an exclusion of these expressions of conviction, themselves, ought to be seen as a violation of the freedom rule. In addressing this question we address two larger issues: when does a moral injury constitute an argumentative injury and, if such injuries do occur, should the freedom rule be modified to account for them.

Argument scheme taxonomies: Verbal, visual, multimodal

Leo Alfred Groarke
Trent University, Canada

I support the development of taxonomies that will systematize accounts of argument schemes (along the lines that Hoffman and Wagemans have suggested), but argue that satisfactory taxonomies will need to include visual and multimodal schemes (like the "argument from fit" -- a scheme that Dove has identified).

Argument from analogy in policy argumentation

Kira Gudkova
Saint-Petersburg State University, Russian Federation

The paper focuses on the argumentation scheme that represents argument from analogy and its use in policy argumentation. Policy propositions concern changes in behaviour; thus, policy argumentation contemplates a potential course of action. The argument from analogy is a commonly used kind of case-based reasoning where one case is held to be similar to another case in a particular respect. The arguments used in a persuasion discourse do not have to be conclusive to be satisfactory, but they are required to be accepted by the other party. The paper argues that argument from analogy can be a very effective way of persuasion in policy argumentation, especially in the ‘post-truth’ era when objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.

What place for values in argumentation studies?

Jean-Claude Guerrini
Université Lyon 2, France

The role of the values in argumentation deserves to be better known. Many reasons to be wary about their narrowly subjective or audience-dependent dimension have been pointed out. But if we want to broaden our intelligence of everyday argumentations, particularly of the conflictual reasoning, we must not dismiss their axiological aspect. This communication will, therefore, aim to inventory the means to objectify the axiological dimension of the argumentation. It is a matter of examining, thanks to recent advances in language sciences, the forms in which values are manifested. Precisely, I shall present the case of the still very heated controversy in France concerning the maintenance of bullfighting (bull racing with killing), focusing on the period of the last 15 years.
An inferentialism approach to legal argumentation
Yanxiao Guo
Sun Yat-sen University, China
For the analysis and reconstruction and even evaluation of legal argumentation, the semantic of legal discourse is important. To how to understand the meaning of legal discourse, and analyze and reconstruct the argumentation in legal discourse based on it, Brandom’s inferentialism would be a helpful approach. According to this inferentialism, clarifying the meaning of a legal discourse amounts to inferring with rules of language use by verbal interaction in concrete context, that is to say it is also inferential the analysis of argumentation in legal discourse.

On the necessity of community argument, along with inherent and emerging obstacles to it
Dale Hample
University of Maryland, USA
Humans have evolved to participate in homogenous social communities, and the strictures of cognitive efficiency have also generated evolutionary pressures for us to search only local memory and traditional practice to generate our views and decisions. These barriers against community argument are inherent. Other obstacles to community argument are emerging in social science research that is designed to prevent critical thinking about potentially controversial topics. In the last half century researchers have been developing persuasion technologies that intentionally induce people not to think hard about persuasive messages. These technologies include distraction, narrative argument, visual argument, heuristics, nudging, and immersive virtual reality. The ISSA community is uniquely qualified to invent critical thinking principles that can be applied to all these persuasive technologies, and should.

Narratives in argumentation between factuality and fictionality.
Kati Hannken-Illjes
University Marburg, Germany
This talk asks what kind of validity claims narratives in argumentation pose with respect to their factuality / fictionality. After a brief overview of the discussion on the relation between narrative and argumentation, with a special focus on the relation of narrative and argument in the legal field as a paradigmatic case, the paper will go into the divide between fictional and factual narrative (see Harder 2006, Klein / Martinez 2009, Lagoni 2016). It will then analyze and discuss the linguistic and prosodic markers of factuality and fictionality of narratives in argumentation at the example of witness testimonies in front a commission of inquiry of the German Bundestag.

Scheme theory
Hans Vilhelm Hansen
U of Windsor, Canada
Here schemes are carefully compared with logical forms and a suggestion is made for an inventory of scheme constants and scheme variables paralleling what we have in symbolic logic. In response to the problem of where do schemes come from it is argued that there are different theories of schemes (epistemic, dialectical) with possibly different geneses. Several different conceptions of how schemes gain their normativity (instrumentalist, realist) are considered. There are different ways of incorporating norms within a theory of schemes. The motivation of the paper is to understand argument schemes better.
and to avoid logical confusions. The essay has as its point of departure earlier work by Walton, Garssen, Hitchcock, Blair and Pinto.

A taxonomy for the comparative study of argument across cultures

Michael David Hazen
Wake Forest University, USA

The idea that argument patterns and strategies may interact with cultures and not be totally universal first entered the literature in the 1980s. Since then, the resulting research has resulted in little systematic work comparing argument structures across. This paper will propose a framework for comparing argument across cultures and explore its applicability. Based on a review of studies about argument in various cultures and the possibilities suggested by theoretical work on argument, we will propose a framework for the systematic analysis of argument across cultures. The various comparative studies, as a whole, do suggest a number of elements that can form the framework for a taxonomy and the theoretical literature on argument can be used to fill in gaps in the taxonomy.

Donald Trump’s use of argument ad hominem: Effective rhetorical strategy or fallacious argument?

Dale A. Herbeck1, Sara Mehlretter Drury2
1Northeastern University, USA; 2Wabash College, USA

Most argumentation texts dismiss *ad hominem* attacks as a fallacy that should be avoided. It is surprising, therefore, that a prominent American politician has achieved considerable electoral success by delivering blistering personal attacks on the character, personality, or physical appearance of his rivals. During the 2016 presidential campaign, candidate Donald Trump denounced the character of “Lyn’ Ted” Cruz and “Crooked Hillary” Clinton, and criticized the personality of “Low Energy Jeb” Bush and “Crazy Bernie” Sanders. Trump was most vicious, however, when he attacked the height of “Little Marco” Rubio and asserted that Carly Fiorina was not attractive enough to be elected. Instead of joining the critics who express outrage at these verbal assaults, this analysis explains how argument *ad hominem* can serve as both a reasonable and effective argumentative strategy.

Topics as arguments for students of rhetoric

Mika Hietanen
Uppsala University, Sweden

Students of Rhetoric tend to find logical argumentation generally, and the topics specifically, difficult to grasp. Nevertheless, logical argumentation is an essential part of Classical rhetorical theory. In recent years, the usefulness of the topics has been pointed out in Scandinavian research. Here, I suggest the possibility to explain not only the topics but also the usefulness and logic of a basically Aristotelian topical model, building on the *categoriae* and *praedicabilis* – two often forgotten parts of the Classical basics in the education of students of Rhetoric. A model of the topics can bridge the logical aspects of argument schemes on the one hand, and the contextual considerations of Rhetoric, on the other. Also, this model easily connects with theories of argument schemes.

Examining face threats in leader debates from Canada, U.S., and France

Edward Alan Hinck1, Shelly Schaefer Hinck1, William O. Dailey1, Robert Schaefer Hinck2
1Central Michigan University, USA; 2Monmouth College, USA

This paper compares three recent leader debates in relation to concerns about trends toward more aggressive argument strategies. Using politeness theory, we assess the degree of direct and indirect face threats in the September 17, 2015 Canadian prime minister election, the last 2016 U.S. presidential
debate, and the last French prime minister debate held May 3, 2017. We assess trends in debate discourse in response to the recent turn, at least in the U.S. and France, toward positions reflected in the more extreme right of the political spectrum across these western nations. Finally, we discuss the implications of these recent argument strategies for liberal democracies seeking ways to address the political tensions of globalization in campaign debates.

The wandering scholar’s role in public argumentation and debate: The case of Erasmus

David B. Hingstman
University of Iowa, USA

Desiderius Erasmus (1469-1536) became a “wandering scholar” when he accepted an invitation to visit England in 1499. His desire to do scriptural analysis as classical rhetorical, rather than scholastic dialectical, argumentation led him to seek positions at a number of universities in which he could teach elite seminars while learning to translate Greek texts. Erasmus’ controversy with Martin Luther and argumentative development in the texts De liberal arbitrio (1524), De servo arbitrio (1525), and Hyperaspistes (1526-1527) will be examined. The claim will be that Erasmus’ decision to become a “wandering scholar” influenced his argumentative strategies against a more “homebody” Martin Luther. How this controversy reflects upon the globalization of argumentation studies will also be considered.

We justify questions, so how does that work?

David Hitchcock
McMaster University, Canada

People sometimes argue for questions. They introduce their conclusions with such phrases as ‘so where’, ‘why then’, or (as in my title) ‘so how’. There seems to be no thematic discussion of such arguments in the argumentation literature. To start such a discussion, I propose to use work on the logic of inferences to questions by Andrzej Wiśniewski, summarized most recently in his Questions, Inferences, and Scenarios (College Press, 2013). Wiśniewski’s “inferential erotetic logic” applies to natural-language arguments whose conclusions can be formalized as questions with a finite set of direct answers. I shall explore ways of extending his approach to arguments for questions that cannot be formalized in this way, such as ‘why’ questions and ‘how’ questions. Finally, I plan to describe some reasons why people argue for questions.

Empirical and normative argument quality in persuasion research: The need to distinguish convincing arguments from good arguments

Hans Hoeken¹, Jos Hornikx², Yvette Linders³
¹Utrecht University, The Netherlands; ²Radboud University, The Netherlands

Argument quality is a central concept in research of the persuasion process. Argument quality is believed to determine the persuasion process’ outcome if people are able and motivated to scrutinize the message. We will discuss how the concept of ‘argument quality’ is interpreted as being about the descriptive question “is this argument convincing?”, as well as the normative question “should this argument be convincing?” As a result, the same argument can be classified as ‘weak’ from the empirical perspective, but ‘irrelevant’ or even a ‘counterargument’ from the normative perspective. Whereas this does not pose problems for the use of argument quality as a litmus test for central processing, it does stunt our understanding of the persuasion process and blocks the ability to provide evidence-based guidelines for designing effective persuasive messages.
Reflective consensus building as a goal of argumentation

Michael Hoffmann
Georgia Institute of Technology, USA

The literature on argumentation discusses many functions or purposes of argumentation. Building on Michael Gilbert’s “coalescent argumentation” which aims at reaching “agreement based on maximally fulfilling the goals and needs of the arguers involved,” I develop the notion of reflective consensus building as a goal of argumentation. “Building” consensus does not refer to finding agreement on a given claim or “winning” an argument about a given proposition; instead, it refers to the creative process of collaboratively developing a new claim or proposal that can, at the end, be accepted by all involved. I will show how a particular strategy for building consensus is implemented in the Reflect! platform, an online learning system that is designed to train reflective consensus building on wicked problems in teams of about four students.

Is it reasonable to be funny?

Michael Hoppmann
Northeastern University, USA

Being reasonable is great – but it is not the only game in town! This paper addresses the relationship between norms of reasoning and norms of humor: To what extend can one be funny and reasonable at the same time? For this purpose, a normative system of reasoning (i.e. the model of the pragma-dialectical critical discussion) is contrasted with contemporary theories of humor in general and the so-called benign-violation-theory in particular. The interaction between the pragma-dialectical model (for reasonableness) and the benign-violation-theory (for humor) raises two central questions: Under what conditions are practical communicators exposed to irreconcilably conflicting imperatives when trying to be funny and reasonable at the same time? And, can the norms of reasonableness themselves be a source of humor in McGraw and Warren’s model?

The psychological reality of argumentation schemes

Jos Hornikx
Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

The scheme-based approach assumes that argumentation schemes are patterns of inferences that people make in argumentative discourse. Interestingly, however, we do not know much about how people actually reason with arguments. It is argued that, more than on the basis of informal logic criteria, people reason with arguments on the basis of cognitive representations of argumentation schemes. In an experiment, people were asked to indicate their thoughts about a series of arguments belonging to four argumentation schemes. The experiment tested whether people’s cognitive thoughts reflect similarities for arguments that belong to the same argumentation schemes. The results underline the schemes’ psychological relevance: (1) people’s cognitive thoughts converge for similar arguments and diverge for different arguments, and (2) people refer to scheme-based criteria more frequently than to general informal logic criteria.

Multimodal argumentation and the principle of externalization

Paul van den Hoven
Utrecht University, The Netherlands

The pragma-dialectic meta-theoretical principle of externalization is defined as: “Externalization of commitments is in pragma-dialectics achieved by investigating exactly which obligations are created by (explicitly or implicitly) performing certain speech acts in a specific context of an argumentative discourse or text” (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004, 54). In this lecture I argue that the meta-
theoretical principle of externalization does not imply that it is a requirement for an artifact to count as argumentation that externalization results in intersubjective consensus between interpreters. This is fortunate as most – if not all – written verbal discourse as well as multimodal discourse that we consider argumentative does not meet such requirement. The process of externalization, however, differs between verbal propositional and multimodal discourse formats.
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Refutation of Christian theology: Şāliḥ ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ja’farī’s use of aqlī and Naqlī arguments
Serkan Ince
Tübingen University, Germany

This paper aims to offer a critical analysis of al-Ja’farī’s arguments in his Al-radd ṭālai al-Naṣārā against Christian teaching from the perspective of epistemological argumentation theory. Determining the epistemological principles used in the arguments of al-Ja’farī is of great significance for understanding the radd (refutation). What methods of analysis can be applied to extract answers from the text based upon the underlying principles of epistemology? What methods can be applied to analyse the validity, the veracity and the adequacy of the argumentation? In additional to answering these questions, this study seeks to propose an analytical reading of the text upon which the methodical approach of an epistemological argumentation theory and analysis (cf. Lumer,1996) can be constructed; but which, of course, has been adapted for the argumentation analysis of theological texts.
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Warrant-establishing arguments: Defending a new kind of inference
Sally Jackson
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Stephen Toulmin introduced a distinction between warrant-using and warrant-establishing arguments, but offered only the most minimal and implausible suggestions about how a new inference license might be established. A more adequate account requires examination of how new warrants are actually established in naturally occurring discourse. This paper presents as a case study Stephen Wolfram’s defense of computer simulation as a general approach to inference about complex systems. Addressing an audience of scientists committed to describing natural processes with equations, Wolfram sought to establish that simulations can answer questions for which no equations exist, and he pointed out that experience with simulation quickly induces a new set of intuitions that overturn deeply held assumptions. From this and other case studies, several general conjectures about warrant-establishing argument can be drawn.

Scott Jacobs
University of Illinois, USA

Richard Nixon’s “Checkers” speech is widely regarded as one of the most persuasively successful speeches in the history of American political rhetoric. It is also widely regarded as a poster child for the kind of demagogic emotional appeals to which the unwitting public must be kept alert. More importantly for argumentation theory, the speech and its critical reception should serve as a poster child for the
dangers of cookie-cutter criticism and the smuggling in by the critic of personal values and attitudes in the guise of "objective" rules and categories.

**Argumentation as an ethics of action and in action**

**Henrique Carlos Jales Ribeiro**  
University of Coimbra, Portugal

The primary objective of this presentation is to show how and why rhetoric and argumentation arose as a revolutionary ethics of human action, with Perelman and Toulmin, in the second half of the 20th century. The thesis developed is that (1) philosophy overall can be reduced to the theory of rhetoric and argumentation; (2) that the divorce between knowledge and action established by philosophy since the modern era no longer makes sense to that theory; and (3) that said theory presents itself as both a theory of knowledge and an ethics of action, i.e., as an approach to argumentation which enables us to not only understand how one can know, but also how one can act in a more correct or reasoned way.

**Calling someone a racist: Orthodox and heterodox affective orientations in the context of the debate about confederate monuments**

**Michael Janas**  
Samford University, USA

Communication studies are in the midst of what has been termed an “affective turn” that takes a cynical view of argument. However, such handwringing over the failure of rationality and argument poses opportunities for an affective based approach to argument. Beginning with insights from Moral Foundations Theory, I examine the ways that radically distinctive communities may engage each other. Using examples of affectively-charged debates over the disposition of Confederate monuments in New Orleans and Charlottesville, VA, I attempt to identify successful and unsuccessful approaches to winning over heterodox communities. I introduce the notion of the link-turn as an effective approach to arguing in a value-laden environment.

**Presentational choice in ad populum argumentation**

**Henrike Jansen, Maarten van Leeuwen**  
Leiden University, The Netherlands

An important characteristic of populist discourse is highlighting ‘the will of the people’, i.e. an appeal to the opinion of a lot of people in order to endorse one’s own standpoint. Such *ad populum* appeals can be used legitimately in political discourse (cf. Andone 2016: 52), but convey a weak type of argument (Walton, 1999). It is therefore to be expected that politicians may not use them in a ‘blatant’ form, but make use of stylistic choices (‘presentational devices’) to present these arguments in a disguised way. In our paper, we will present the results of an analysis of speeches by the Dutch far right politician Geert Wilders. We will discuss some stylistic means allowing him to evade commitment to the line of reasoning conveyed in an *ad populum* argument.

**Causal patterns for justifying historical explanation. Causation in P.C. Hooft’s Dutch history (1642)**

**Jeroen Jansen**  
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

The practice of justifying historical explanations generates causal patterns in which several types of arguments play a role. This paper is aimed at identifying such causal patterns on the basis of an exploration of the institutional conventions regarding the nature and the shape of historical explanations as reflected in the Dutch History (1642) by the famous Dutch author Pieter Hooft. Causal patterns can
unveil bias, prejudice and strategic aims, as well explain why a text may be (or has been) interpreted in a specific way. The description of these patterns and the analysis of causation in this text will make clear how argumentation plays a role within Early Modern Dutch historiography.

**Specification, dissociation, and the problem of minority vote dilution in the USA**

**James Jasinski**  
University of Puget Sound, USA

Under the U.S. Constitution and the federal Voting Rights Act, if an individual is allowed to cast a vote and that vote is counted, can that person’s right to vote be denied or abridged? Beginning in the 1960s, civil rights lawyers raised this issue in myriad legal challenges to a range of voting practices employed throughout the U.S. (but mainly in southern states). They resolved the paradox their legal challenges posed—despite being allowed to vote, an individual’s right to vote has somehow been denied or abridged—through dissociative reasoning that “specified” the specific rights protected by the U.S. Constitution. Dissociative specification enabled legal advocates to craft arguments that challenged the constitutionality of practices such as “at-large” elections that “diluted” the votes of minority citizens.

**The persuasive ways in Chinese traditional “LUN” (argumentation essays)**

**Chunlan Jin**  
East China University and Science and Technology, China

Persuasion theories has a long history in both East and West. In Chinese long history, “LUN” (argumentation essays) has been placed in a very high place not only in the history of literatures, but also for those imperial tests for official positions. The persuasive ways in “LUN” (argumentation essays) had three main directions: ethnics, self-cultivation and contributions to others (including the nation). And the directions have determined the ways of persuasion: the sources of reasoning come first (such as The Four Books or sayings or activities by the ancient sages), then the discussion of targeted behaviors and sayings, finally the suggestion or recommendation. The study of persuasive ways in LUN can help to reveal the social and cultural thinking patterns in ancient China.
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**The Identification mechanism as an argument. Its verbal and non-verbal implementation on the modern political scene**

**Ivaylo Ivanov Karageorgeiev**  
Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski", Bulgaria

The mechanism of identification is a phenomenon which makes work the “ordinary people” approach. This approach aims to show that one person belongs to the group he/she tries to influence. Through it this belonging to the group is transferred to the value system, the ideology and the goals of this group. The mechanism of identification is a commonly used tool in modern political life. The aim of this study is to demonstrate how this mechanism is implemented not only at verbal, but also at non-verbal level. As a subject of analysis serves a corpus of image and video material from various appearances of some of the most well-known figures on the modern political scene - Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin and others.
Social media, fake news, and public argument in digital argument ecologies: Classic argumentation concepts with contemporary challenges

John Kephart III
California State University Northridge, USA

Social media and digital news sources create a distinct argument ecology. This presents a unique set of argumentative constraints and directs public argument in new and familiar ways. An increasingly digital public sphere has begun to reconfigure the terms on which public arguments are made, contested, and accepted. The increased use of social media, promulgation of fake news, adoption of online sorting algorithms, and utilization of online advertising shifts the function of ethos, pathos, and logos in contemporary argument cultures, and alters the relationship among claims, grounds, and warrants in public controversies. Social media and fake news operate on values of proliferation, immediacy, and confirmation, impacting how we make, evaluate, and refute arguments. This paper considers the resulting constraints, challenges, and possibilities for argument in global digital argument ecologies.

Globalizing reasonableness: "The Law of Nations" and the creation of foreign policy in the early U.S. congress

Zornitsa Keremidchieva
University of Minnesota, USA

Argumentation theory’s understanding of reasonableness, as Hicks, Margesson, and Warrenburg (2005) demonstrate, has generally framed reasonableness in epistemic terms, often resulting in discrepancies between the concept’s normative ideal and its appearance in actual political discourse. Alternatively, Rawls (2005) describes reasonableness as a virtue of persons or institutions engaged in “social cooperation among equals” (p. 48). This perspective advances reasonableness as an active norm aimed to encourage cooperative reciprocity and, ultimately, peace and safety. Rawles’ formulation allows reasonableness to traverse the scales of political experience from the micro-politics of local decisions to the terrains of international relations. This paper tests this presumed mobility of reasonableness by examining how appeals to the “law of nations” and the norm of reasonableness intersected in the foreign policy discourses of the first U.S. Congress.

Comparative analysis of arguing in Ukraine and the USA

Iryna Khomenko¹, Dale Hample²
¹Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine; ²University of Maryland, the USA

This paper presents the results of a cross-cultural research project that is focused on argumentation. The empirical part includes surveys conducted in Ukraine and the USA. They collect data summarizing understandings of argumentation and fundamental orientations to arguing. We compare results contrasting Ukrainian men and women, Ukrainian respondents of different age groups, and Ukrainian respondents from Central, East and West Ukraine. Also, comparative analysis between US and Ukrainian respondents will be presented at the conference. A special part of the talk will deal with explanation of the survey results in Ukraine. It will focus on things like: vocabulary and language for arguing; arguing traditions in the Ukrainian nation, freedom of speech, type of government, political debates etc. Also, it will consider certain interesting culture-focused questions.
An ideal for which I am prepared to die. Argumentative patterns in Nelson Mandela’s speech at the supreme court of South Africa, Pretoria, April 20, 1964.

Manfred Kienpointner
University of Innsbruck, Austria

Nelson Mandela’s famous defence speech is one of the outstanding documents of political rhetoric in the 20th century. In this paper, some aspects of his strategic maneuvering will be analyzed. Furthermore, constellations of “argumentative patterns” in his speech will be analyzed. This will be done in order to arrive at a more adequate position from which to assess its rhetorical and argumentative quality. Finally, Mandela’s speech will be compared with other outstanding examples of political rhetoric.

Value affirmation as argument: President Obama’s major gun violence eulogies

Justin Ward Kirk
Pepperdine University, USA

Argumentation scholars focused a great deal of attention on how argument functions in public policy rhetoric. Epideictic rhetoric typically focuses on value affirmation that can serve a crucial pre-policy function in generating support for future policy change. In this paper, I analyze how substantive arguments interweave with value and symbolic appeals, argue that President Obama used eulogies for mass shooting victims to establish arguments about gun control, and challenge common wisdom about the role of American presidents in the use of ceremonial speeches. I offer a perspective on evidence that expands the scope to which argumentation theory applies to ceremonial speaking and eulogistic rhetoric. The study contributes to argumentation scholarship by providing an account of substantive, evidence-based argument within the context of appeals to values in a ceremonial occasion.

Auditory arguments: Importance of sound in the argumentative discourse

Gabrijela Kišiček
University of Zagreb, Croatia

Recent research in the field of multimodal argumentation argue that there are more than just verbal modes which can support conclusion in argumentative discourse. In everyday discourse we often infer based on auditory arguments. Medical doctor infers on patients heart condition based on what he hears, car mechanic infers on the malfunction of the car based on the sounds he hears and also, person can infer about speakers competence, credibility, personality or emotional state based on prosodic features which accompany verbal message and which in certain context can be important part of argumentation. This paper aims to explore the methods in analyzing auditory arguments in correlation to traditional argumentation schemes. In addition, the paper will provide the specific characteristics of auditory arguments in comparison to verbal or visual mode.

The rhetoric of shame in the immigration debate

Jens E. Kjeldsen
Universitetet of Bergen, Norway

In political debates on immigration and asylum seekers the rhetoric of shame has returned to public discourse. In Denmark, for instance, artists and other public figures has expressed that they are ashamed to be Danish, because of the national immigration policies and the way immigrants and asylum seekers are treated and talked about. Others use shame as an accusation of how politicians as well as ordinary people deal with immigrants. This paper examines the use of such shaming-arguments during and after the 2015 refugee crisis and examines the rhetorical function and value of using shame as an argument. It especially examines the rhetorical use, function and public value of inflicting collective shame, and it analyses how members of the shamed collective respond to such arguments.
Trumped up trickle down: Donald Trump’s political and economic argumentation as Reagan redux
Geoffrey Klinger
DePauw University, USA
President Donald Trump has mobilized three key rhetorical tropes in advancing his political and economic agenda that unabashedly borrow from Reaganomics. First, he has pushed for significant tax reform that benefits the wealthy and big business with the claim that this will spur economic activity that will in turn “trickle down” to those less fortunate in society. Second, he has championed the cause of deregulation in areas such as education, worker safety, and environmental protection. Finally, he has undermined entitlement programs in health, education, and welfare while demonizing those who receive these benefits. Drawing from Michael McGee’s work on ideographs, this paper seeks to map out the similarities, and important differences between Trump’s political and economic argumentation, and that of Reagan.

Fallacies about analogical reasoning and the rule of law
Harm Kloosterhuis
Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Analogical reasoning is as much contested as it is acclaimed as a tool of legal interpretation to ascertain the ideals of the Rule of Law. It is rejected because it would be infinitely malleable or just a form of deduction from rules. It is defended because it is a reasoned elaboration of law. Debates about analogical reasoning are often unclear and even fallacious. In this contribution I will discuss the central fallacies in this discussion. An important clue for the right analysis of analogical reasoning in law is an adequate conception of the Rule of Law. Fallacies about analogical reasoning are the result of a specific interpretation of the Rule of Law.

Political disagreements and public conductive argumentation
Amnon Knoll
Tel Aviv University, Israel
The current literature on conductive arguments is mostly ‘product’ oriented, dealing with only few dialectical aspects of using pro/con arguments. This paper focuses, from normative and descriptive perspectives, on conductive argumentation as a distinguished comprehensive argumentation process and on its potential place in contemporary public disagreements and controversies. The paper summarizes the challenges encountered in the current literature and specifies a conductive argumentation process that is aimed at weighing and balancing considerations and counter-considerations. An analysis of the type of issues that are under substantial disagreements in the public sphere and their potential adherence to this conductive argumentation classification is then presented. The paper concludes with some compared benefits of the proposed process and the potential challenges and obstacles for using it, in the political and public spheres.

Fairness and gaps in legal argumentation
Miklós Könczöl1,2
1Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Hungary; 2CSS HAS, Institute for Legal Studies
Aristotle’s account of arguments from fairness in his Rhetoric can be read in a way that connects gap-filling and the "rectification of written law", making the latter happen through the former. In this paper I shall look at the roles the concepts of legal gaps and open texture, both cited by interpreters of Aristotelian "epieikes", can play in such a reading. I first (I) give a brief summary of what I think follows from the example Aristotle gives in the Rhetoric, then I examine possible explanations based on the
concepts of (II) legal gaps and (III) the open texture of law in turn. Finally, by way of conclusion, (IV) I seek to interpret both concepts from the perspective of arguments from fairness.

The first International Conference on Argumentation and Informal Logic
Takuzo Konishi
Showa Women's University, Japan

This paper will describe a key historical event in the argumentation community: the first Amsterdam conference on Argumentation in 1986. Because the conference had diverse ramifications on scholarship on argumentation, this paper will pay attention to two major achievements. The first one is about infrastructure/media of knowledge production, such as International Society for the Study of Argumentation and journal Argumentation. The second focus is how informal logicians and scholars influenced by the informal logic movement expressed their voices by attending this conference and interacting with argumentation scholars in different fields other than philosophy.

Linguistic analysis of ethos elements: Wisdom, virtue and goodwill
Marcin Koszowy1,3, Rory Duthie2, Katarzyna Budzynska3,2
1University of Bialystok, Poland; 2Centre for Argument Technology, University of Dundee, United Kingdom; 3Centre for Argument Technology, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

Targeting ethos, or character, of colleagues and opponents plays a pivotal role within political debates, allowing speakers to effectively persuade. To better understand and systematically study components which constitute ethos such as knowledge and morality, we develop a linguistic typology based on the Aristotelian distinction between three ethos elements: practical wisdom, moral virtue, and goodwill. Using corpus of the UK parliamentary debates from Hansard record (corpora.aifdb.org/EWVG), we extend and refine this distinction employing corpus and discourse analysis, and show how this specified typology allows for the study of different ethotic strategies which people use to support and attack each other. This linguistic model is further applied to improve the technology of ethos mining, the automatic extraction of information about politicians' ethos from natural language texts (Duthie and Budzynska, forthcoming).

Pressure and argumentation in public controversies
Erik C. W. Krabbe, Jan Albert van Laar
University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Discussants in a public controversy are also players in a social arena. In the discussion on energy transition, for example, participants argue to be judged right but also use pressure to get their own way. When can exerting pressure promote reasonable outcomes, and when is it rather a hindrance? We show how negotiation and persuasion dialogue can be intertwined. Then, we examine in what ways one can in a public controversy exert pressure on others through sanctions or rewards. Finally, we discuss from the viewpoints of persuasion and negotiation whether and, if so, how pressure hinders the achievement of a reasonable outcome. We conclude that exerting pressure can, but need not, degenerate into committing a fallacy of either the type "argumentum ad baculum" or the type "argumentum ad carotam."
Trumped-up arguments: Lies, ‘alternative facts’ and deception in political debate
Manfred E. Kraus
University of Tübingen, Germany
Recent political disputes have revealed a persuasive efficiency of lies in public debate and social media. In the public sphere, in which mass audiences are addressed, honesty and truthfulness in argumentation appear to be decreasingly relevant. While ancient theorists were divided on the issue if a speaker might resort to false statements in the interest of persuasiveness, modern approaches such as informal logic or pragma-dialectics rather focus on acceptability of premises, which does not necessarily include truthfulness. The paper analyzes the role of deception in political debate by looking at a taxonomy of mendacities, the effects of made-up ‘alternative facts’ within argument schemes, the limited ability of mass audiences to tell truth from lies, and detrimental effects of normative language and thought regulations on confidence in the honesty of arguments.

The gambler's fallacy as paradox
A.J. Kreider
Miami Dade College, USA
The Gambler’s Fallacy is often characterized as using past outcomes of independent probabilistic events (like coin flips) to inform one’s expectations of similar future events. These are taken to be fallacious, because the outcome of past flips is irrelevant to the probability of the outcome of the next flip. Martin Smith attempts to explain away a psychological motivation for committing such fallacies – that some probabilistic outcomes are “surprising”. He uses an exchange between characters in the play, “Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead”, to make the case - siding with Guildenstern - that 92 consecutive heads should not surprise. Here, I argue that in such cases, the Gambler’s and Reverse Gambler’s fallacies cannot both be genuine fallacies. Instead, reason requires that we choose one of these instances of supposed bad reasoning.

Military analogy: Information or propaganda?
Tone Kvernbekk¹, Ola Bøe-Hansen²
¹University of Oslo, Norway; ²Defense Staff, Norway
We shall in our paper discuss a specific military ad. The ad has the form of a short video, is multimodal and relies heavily on visual images. It is designed to convey a certain message about the military: security and protection of territory, interests and common values. The ad has an analogical structure. It is largely visual and speaks loudly to our emotions. In analogies we reason from observed or assumed similarities between a source case and a target case to make further predictions or conclusions about the target case. We will first discuss how the ad communicates its message, the means used in the analogy and their strength. Second, we discuss whether this communication is propaganda rather than information.

Rationality in argumentation and actions
Anna Laktionova
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
Wohlbrapp (2014) elaborates on the structure of argumentation via introducing concept of “orientation” and “frame” understood pragmatically and dialectically; grounds and clarifies argumentation concerning the human thinking abilities and rationality further realized in performed actions. Orientations get
establishment via argumentation and function pragmatically in human practice; endorse value and validity constituting justification. Philosophy of argument of Wohlrapp provides for rationality for the act of accepting/not-accepting the argument. Formal logical conclusions guarantee neither necessary nor sufficiently successful satisfactory proceeding of communication. I examine concepts of rationality, trans-subjectivity and justification by involving the discussions between Wohlrapp and other theorists (Informal Logic, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2017); conception of rationality of Lord (2017). The main intention concerns relation and consistency between rationality, argumentation, justification and actions. Argumentation is seen as realization of agency.

Flag-waving: Visual arguments, verbal reconstruction, and speaker intentions
Brian Larson
Texas A&M University, USA
This study extends previous work in visual argumentation by studying speakers’ own verbal reconstructions of their visual communicative acts. The researcher interviewed 70 persons wearing or carrying American flags at the Republican and Democratic National Conventions in Cleveland and Philadelphia in July 2016, to determine whether “speakers” make arguments by wearing or carrying it. For more than 20 years, theorists have debated whether it is meaningful to speak of "visual arguments," whether they can be purely visual, non-verbal communication, and whether and how they can be reconstructed in the form of the conclusion-support structure of an argument. This analysis provides insight into the process of verbally reconstructing visual arguments and counsels caution in attributing argumentative intent to non-verbal communicative acts absent unambiguous manifestation of that intent by the speakers.

How philosophers argue
Fernando Leal
University of Guadalajara, Mexico
Philosophical argumentation presents a puzzle for argumentation theory: both from the perspective of 2500 years of history and from what we can ourselves witness in the present, philosophers seem to be exclusively intent on strengthening and elaborating their differences of opinion. Nothing like that happens in other academic endeavors, or indeed in ordinary life. The apparent anomaly can be explained by what I take to be the ‘institutional point’ (van Eemeren, 2010) of philosophy: to create the broadest map of arguable positions. If this is true, then an interesting hypothesis emerges: philosophers may after all be pursuing a higher-order kind of consensus, bearing in particular on how many possible arguments can be marshaled around any given philosophical question as well as on which of those are relatively good.

Situating in a dialogical perspective the tensions between rhetoric and argumentation
Alain Létourneau
Université de Sherbrooke, Canada
What I propose to call the rhetoric-argumentative continuum might be better understood in a dialogical perspective. As a way of showing the difficulty, I will recall that refutation is a normal thing in dialectic, but almost forbidden if we want to preserve the sensibilities of an audience with whom the speaker is supposed to have shared presuppositions, or at least to function on the basis of mutual recognition. Is it possible to reconcile these friendly brothers, one leaning on language and poetics, the other being closer to logic and formal analysis of validity? In a continuum that is already interdisciplinary, how are we to successfully articulate competence in performance (Weigand, 2006)? It might be that we find in Dewey’s conception of communication (Dewey, 1925) a key to surmount this difficulty.
Disagreement, misunderstanding and the straw man fallacy: A polylogical perspective

Marcin Lewinski
ArgLab, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

The goal of the paper is to investigate and propose the criteria for distinguishing between rational disagreements (substantive disputes), genuine misunderstandings (verbal disputes), and manipulative uses of the straw man fallacy in argumentative discussions (fallacious disputes). (The straw man amounts to misattributing commitments to our discussants in order to easier attack and rebut their arguments.) These three seem in principle easily discernible, but no hard and fast criteria for distinguishing between them in ordinary exchanges have been proposed, despite significant recent discussions (Chalmers, 2011; Krabbe & van Laar, 2018; Lewiński, 2018; Lewiński & Oswald, 2013; Plunkett, 2015; Plunkett & Sundell, 2013; Rott, 2014; Vermeulen, 2018). Since the three phenomena rely on fundamental issues of linguistic interpretation, I will propose criteria in terms of interpretative dialogues between arguers.


Piotr Hubert Lewinski
Uniwersytet Wroclawski, Poland

Since 2015, Poland is ruled by a populist party „PiS”, which has previously ruled between 2005 and 2007. This paper discloses the essence of PiS’ propagandistic activities, namely argumentative manipulation. It relies on incorporating into public speeches an emotional element, which aims to create certain attitudes of the Poles. This is achieved both through the activation of multiple emotions as well as psychological defense mechanisms, especially in frustrating situations resulting from the failure of the society to recognize important values related to the concept of human rights, democracy and the EU. Since the previous time in office in 2007 the aggressiveness and ruthlessness of propaganda has increased dramatically. The following contrastive analysis of the arguments retrieved from 2007 archival texts in comparison with contemporary texts intends to demonstrate that process.

The Mohist argumentation theory

Jidong Li
Nankai University, China

Mohism is a distinguished philosophical school in ancient China and had once been as influential as Confucianism until the Qin Dynasty. In order to explain and demonstrate its political, ethical and practical ideas, Mohist constructed its own argumentative theoretical system, which was mainly elaborated in the Mohist Canons, is always treated as the Chinese counterpart of formal logic and has thus been researched in the paradigm of western formal logic in modern times. From a discourse-analytic perspective, I argue that the theoretical system established in Mohist Canons is more a theory of argumentation than a theory of logic. My conclusion is based on the following reasons: In Mohist Canons, Mohist put forward the core concept “Bian” and systematically expounded the general purpose, specific methods, basic principles and rules of argumentation.

On Aristotle’s maxims argument

Runcheng Liang
Sun-Yat-sen University, China

Aristotle discussed the argument related to maxims in the Rhetoric. Maxims are the criterion about people’s actions. The use of maxims is the maxims argument, one premise of maxims argument is specific maxim, and its conclusion is people’s action choice. Maxims argument can show the speaker's character, which is mainly used in the deliberative speech, and its evaluation and construction are closely
related to the subjects discussed. The argument modes which practical wisdom gives people are the ideal structure of maxims argument. Therefore, maxims argument has "ends-means" scheme and "rule-case" scheme. Moreover, if maxims argument is good, it needs to satisfy the corresponding properties in a particular topic situation.

Are conductive arguments a distinct type of argument?
Yanlin Liao
Institute of Modern Logic and Application, Department of Philosophy, Nanjing University, Nanjing, China

Whether conductive arguments are a distinct type of argument or not is a highly disputed and fundamental issue in argumentation theory. Firstly, this paper reconstructs the debate about the legitimacy crisis of conductive arguments, which focuses on coping with “Adler’s problem” and its variant. In terms of the solution, I make a criticism of Blair’s logical approach, and Xie and Xiong’s rhetorical approach. In order to better defend the legitimacy of conductive arguments, a new perspective of argument evaluation is provided and it is claimed that the logical role of counter-considerations lies in changing the criteria of argument evaluation. In conclusion, conductive arguments are a distinct type of argument.

First speeches in the Israeli parliament: A mixed subgenre of political rhetoric
Zohar Livnat¹, Ayelet Kohn²
¹Bar Ilan University, Israel; ²David Yellin College

A First/Maiden Speech is part of the institutional procedure of accepting a new member into an institution and its discourse community. Characterized as a mixture of epideictic and deliberative rhetoric, it aims to set the foundation for the speakers’ positioning as they take their first steps as politicians. This practice was first introduced in Israel in 2013, when 49 new members were elected to the Israeli Parliament. The First Speeches of these members constitute the corpus of our study. The fact that for the Israeli speakers no available antecedent patterns or exemplary models of this subgenre existed is crucial, since it allowed a free and creative selection of topics, structure, style and tone. Thus, we have the opportunity to explore a new political subgenre in the making.

The pedagogy of argument and the management of uncertainty
Stephen M. Llano
St. John's University, New York, USA

Debate and argumentation scholars are both concerned with the question of good argument in relation to structure, audience, proof, and more. Argumentation scholars are interested in reducing uncertainty to clarify the quality of an argument. In this paper, I ask what happens when we consider argumentation scholarship as a resource for debate. Considering our work as pedagogy primarily converts it from a resource for critical appraisal to one for critical creation. Such resources then become methods for managing uncertainty rather than eliminating it. Such a practice has value in contemporary society where the ideology forces elimination of uncertainty in the quest for total knowledge. I conclude by discussing how debate practice and argumentation scholarship can present uncertainty as an unavoidable given while providing practices to manage it.
The implications of the purpose of classifications for their evaluation
José Alfonso Lomelí Hernández
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
The paper explores what role the purpose of classifications has in their evaluation. Different criteria (mutual exclusivity, exhaustivity, etc.) have been used to evaluate classifications but it has never been considered whether these criteria apply to classifications irrespective of their purpose. Although all classifications have to deal with normative standards one way or another, there is no reason to think that they have to do it in the same way or for the same reasons. The hypothesis is that different purposes carry different constraints for classifications. So, for example, if a classification is meant for evaluating arguments, its commitments to normative criteria will be different compared with classifications whose purpose is producing arguments. Therefore, a violation of the evaluation criteria has different implications for different classifications depending on their purpose.

Strategic maneuvering in philosophy: The charge of committing a genetic fallacy
Federico Ezequiel López
Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Argentine Republic
Around the middle of the twentieth century, some controversy about the genetic fallacy arouse. Most articles that address the issue are intended to defend some philosophical stance against what is understood as an attempt to block some kind of philosophical research. These replies share a similar strategy: they maintain that such fallacy need not be a fallacy and question the assumptions behind which the charge is made. This paper intends to analyze and reconstruct this controversy in order to argue that this controversy throws light on some difficulties regarding the use of fallacies as an evaluation tool in Philosophy and that a suitable analysis of it must appeal to the concept of strategic maneuvering. To conclude, some remarks are made regarding the way in which such maneuvering could be derailed.

When journalists use counterfactual reasoning in editorial conferences: An opportunity to open a space for a critical discussion?
Margherita Luciani, Andrea Rocci
Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland
The main goal of this work is to provide evidence of the argumentative foundations of counterfactual reasoning and of its crucial role in the newsroom. One effective categorization of counterfactuals relies on their direction of comparison (Roese 1994). Counterfactual thinking can assume alternative hypothesis that are judged to be better than reality (upward counterfactuals) or that can be judged worse alternatives than reality (downward counterfactuals). We will show that the counterfactual reasoning’s direction of simulation leads to two different discussions’ outcome in editorial conferences. On the one hand, upward counterfactual reasoning gives rise to a discussion that deepens other topics and invites journalists to sift through other solutions. On the other hand, downward counterfactual reasoning acts in order to confirm the conclusion already reached and to defend the status quo.

Recognizing argument types and adding missing reasons
Christoph Lumer
University of Siena, Italy
This contribution 1. identifies indicators for recognizing argument types and 2. develops rules for adding reasons to complete enthymematic arguments. 1. In order to assess arguments with regard to their argumentative validity, the type of argument must first be identified. The contribution is based on the definitions of argument types developed in the epistemological theory of argumentation and extracts from them lists of indicators for the different types, which even work with enthymemes. 2. The rules for the
completion of enthymemes are also based on the structural provisions of those definitions. However, these structural requirements only define possible hypothetical completions. In addition, for a completion appropriate to the text and its author, general rules of argumentation interpretation must also be observed: charity, immanence, authenticity, argument strength and simplicity.

**Democratic values and institutional preconditions in presidential election debates: The theoretical foundations of reconstructing political argumentative discourse**

**Natalia Luna Luna**  
Leiden Universiteit, The Netherlands

From the study of argumentation in context by Pragma-Dialectics, we know that the institutional preconditions of argumentative exchanges are necessary conditions to take into account in the reconstruction and evaluation of argumentative discourse. Presidential election debates are argumentative exchanges in the political domain, I will propose here some grounds for the reconstruction of their institutional point from theory on democracy. It has been defended from instrumental, epistemological and citizen's improvement perspective. I will use the last line of defence and based also on the works of Stuart Mill, Elster, Habermas & Steiner, I will present what are the democratic values that we have to take into account for that reconstruction and I will support a view of what to present as the institutional aim of presidential electoral debates.

**The old and the new: The case of the Chinese online debating show, Qipashuo**

**Junyi Lv**  
University of Southern California, USA

This paper analyzes a popular online debating show in China, Qipashuo (literal translation: weird folks talking). As the very first online debating entertainment show, Qipashuo is unique in many ways. It demonstrates theories and features of western debate, such as Branham’s “true debate” and Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca’s “new rhetoric”. Simultaneously, it also resurrects Chinese debating traditions, which differs from Western discourse. The show manifests some similar procedures with formal college debating competitions, such discourse appeals only to a limited professional audience. Qipashuo breaks the rigid debate format and illustrates the four kinds of entertainment “alea, agon, mimicry, and ilinx”, to make the narratives circulate more widely among popular audiences and sustain for longer periods of time. In modern Chinese societal conditions, Qipashuo offers windows for public discussion and education.

- M -

**Media dispositives and the enactment of one-sided practical arguments: A framework for the analysis of advocacy campaigns**

**Irina Diana Madroane**  
West University of Timisoara, Romania

This study examines the role of institutional set-ups in relation to the (intended) persuasion effects of one-sided practical arguments in media formats such as the advocacy campaign. It focuses on the semiotic and interactional resources made available by media dispositives, the expectations and positionings they create for participants, and the modalities in which they constrain and enable arguers in making claims and giving salience to certain premises. I present a framework that I am developing for the analysis of media advocacy campaigns, which integrates elements from the socio-communicative
approach of the French School (Charaudeau 2011; Soulages 2007), the approach to practical deliberation developed within critical discourse analysis (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012; Fairclough 2016), and considerations on strategic maneuvering (Eemeren 2009) and the construction of public problems (Cefaï 1996; Gusfield 1981).

Confederate memory’s dutiful descendants: Disputed monuments and the rhetorical defenses of the United Daughters of the Confederacy
Roseann M. Mandziuk
Texas State University, USA
Examining the rhetorical dimensions of debates over the place of Confederate symbols in US public memory illuminates the argument processes that nations must engage when reconciling difficult histories. This essay explores an often overlooked dimension of Confederate monuments in the U.S.: the role of women. Many that currently are disputed, particularly those memorials in public places, were established by a women’s organization, the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC). As these monuments have engendered increased scrutiny following two notorious acts of white supremacist violence, the UDC has reasserted their conservancy through statements and legal actions that challenge their removal. The rhetoric of these women is examined, particularly how the UDC’s arguments employ concepts of morality and freedom of expression in defense of the memorials’ preservation in public spaces.

On the 7 logical ways to counter an argument
Hubert Marraud
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain
The concept of counterargument lies at the heart of argumentation. My purpose is to give a suitable definition of counterargument and a typology of counterarguments. I will confine myself to arguments criticizing another argument on account of its logical properties.

When a reason for a conclusion is presented to someone but she does not endorse it, there are three possible moves.
(1) She might challenge some of the premises: Where do you get that from?
(2) She might question that the reason offered is a good reason for that conclusion: How do you get there?
(3) Finally she might try to show that the conclusion should still be rejected, offering an opposite reason: Yes, but…

Therefore there are three main strategies for attacking an argument: objection, rebuttal and refutation, respectively.

Dispute mediators’ reframing as an argumentation conference
Chiara Martinez Soria, Sara Greco
USI - Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland
This contribution focuses on the phenomenon of reframing in dispute mediation, as a technique by which mediators help parties frame convergence, which is correlated to conflict resolution (Drake & Donhoue 1996; Shmueli 2008). We claim that reframing is not only an important mediators’ “communicative competence” (Donhoue, Allen & Burrell 1988) but also an argumentative competence, and that it is to be understood as part of a mediator’s strategic manoeuvring (van Eemeren 2010). We analyze instances of reframing involving “shifts in levels of abstraction” (Putnam 2004), taken from an empirical corpus of mediation sessions. We elicit their argumentative function establishing (a) how it is connected to a mediator’s strategic manoeuvring in terms of topical potential, audience demand and presentational devices; and (b) in which stage of a critical discussion it happens.
“...as the English do on the Irish at the present day”: History as argument in the late 19th/early 20th-century Irish press

Davide Mazzi
University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy

There is widespread agreement that the turn of the twentieth century marked a pivotal point in the history of the Irish press. However, the role of the Irish press in leading the public opinion to discover the virtually unchartered territories of the West of Ireland remains to be elucidated. The aim of this paper is to carry out a qualitative study of the argumentative implications behind historical narratives in Irish newspapers. By integrating corpus and discourse methods, the study provides evidence of the argumentative use of history within predominantly explanatory passages. Findings reveal that different perspectives and historical parallels between ancient times and the present appear instrumental in both activating the appropriate frames on the readers’ mind, and reaffirming specific commitments and standpoints on the journalists’ part.

“I’d Rather be Divisive than Indecisive:” Argumentation lessons from Hamilton: An American musical

Jeffrey P. Mehltretter Drury
Wabash College, United Kingdom

Lin Manuel Miranda’s Hamilton: An American Musical is a critically acclaimed and wildly popular musical and cast album. The show's cultural influence and emphasis on debate urge argumentation scholars to take it seriously. Consequently, this paper explores how Hamilton depicts arguers and arguing in four songs (“Farmer Refuted,” “Cabinet Battle #1,” “Cabinet Battle #2,” and “Say No To This”). Specifically, I reveal how the show portrays an ideal arguer as quick witted, personally invested, and certain. Additionally, the show portrays ideal argumentation as emotional, impulsive, honest, and competitive. These messages may be concerning to argumentation scholars for how they contradict assumptions guiding most theories of productive debate, especially within our undergraduate curriculum. Thus, I use this conflict to consider a place for non-strategic, non-logical argumentation in our scholarship and teaching.

Europe on mind: Argument, brand, stereotype or ideal?

Iris Meißner¹, Annalisa Cattani²
¹Universität Koblenz-Landau, Germany; ²Università di Ferrara, Italy

How do people develop convictions and attitudes about Europe in different cultural contexts? Beyond the standards of valid argumentation, political correctness and rhetorical elaboration there seems to be political opinion-formation, based on social heuristics. When we talk about credibility of politicians, truth and emotionality, we still value statements and utterances on the basis of ethos, logos and pathos and try to fight against populism. In this paper we like to outline the traces of a bounded rationality within a political discourse, where opinions and judgements are less a result of a dialectical process but more a result of an economical behaviour within a market of information. Taking examples from media as well as ordinary language, we will try to trace, through a multimodal analysis the ‘topos’ or specific place.

Analysis of rhetorical argumentation in public debate on brain injury risks in US youth football

Gordon Roger Mitchell
University of Pittsburgh, USA

A structured public debate is designed to resemble an ideal model for critical discussion with discrete format phases (topic formulation, opening speeches, question and answer, rebuttal speeches) mapping onto the phases of a critical discussion (confrontation stage, opening stage, argumentation stage, and
concluding stage). Reconstruction of a public debate on US football brain injury risk highlights the importance of design choices made in the confrontation stage. Transcript analysis shows how strategic maneuvering in the confrontation phase highlighted the issue of adult responsibility for children and introduced scientific uncertainty to the exchange, given the relative paucity of research on brain injuries in youth football. Study findings help develop the field of healthcare argumentation by suggesting ways that extended pragma-dialectical theory can be deployed usefully to analyze rhetorical argumentation in public debates.

Arguing the multiple issues in a networked public argument. Challenges and proposals
Dima Mohammed
Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

In today’s ‘networked’ public sphere, arguers are faced with countless controversies roaming out there. Knowing what is at stake at any point in time, and keeping under control the contribution one’s arguments make to the different interrelated issues requires careful craft (e.g. Mohammed & Zarefsky 2011). In this paper, I analyze parts of the controversy around the #MeToo movement, in order to highlight the difficulty of determining what is at stake. The challenge is for arguers and analysts alike. In order to capture what is at stake, I suggest to examine the argument as emerging to manage the disagreement (Jackson & Jacobs 1980) as part of a complex network where distinct lines of disagreement in relation to different issues crisscross and overlap (Lewiński & Mohammed 2015).

Debate as a new mode of oratory: A critical analysis of the controversy over the value of student oratory in post-world war II Japan
Junya Morooka¹, Kenji Kubo², Tomohiro Kanke³
¹Rikkyo University, Japan; ²Kanda University of International Studies; ³Tokai University

This paper examines the controversy surrounding the value of student oratory in Japan during the 1950s and 60s. Student oratory, once a respectable educational practice and a major medium of political engagement among college students, was rapidly losing its social relevance in post-World War II Japan. To reverse this downward trend a group of students set out to transform oratory into more democratic communication practices by promoting academic debate. The goal of this paper is two-fold. First, by analyzing the debate format and rules as well as excerpts from actual rounds, the paper seeks to identify their characteristics as argumentative discourse. It then explores how the idea of debate as a new mode of oratory was received in the college oratorical community by perusing archival materials on “debates about debating.”

Socio-cultural differences in the rhetorical structure of scientific abstracts
Alla Muench
Tübingen University, Germany

International academia consists of multiple communities, each with its own values, traditions and conventions, including those of scientific writing. The aim of the reported study is to reveal differences in the rhetorical structure of abstracts of research articles in the domain of Physics written by researchers belonging to the Russian and the Anglo-Saxon academic communities and to find an answer to the question if conscious adaptation of own writing style to foreign conventions can ever override the native way of expressing thoughts and ideas in discourse. The data were annotated by multiple domain and non-domain experts according to the newly proposed annotation scheme of rhetorical moves. Analysis of the resulting corpus has shown that the rhetoric of writing is strongly influenced by the cultural background of the writer.
Learning while female: Decoding pragmatic arguments about school dress codes
Meredith Diane Neville-Shepard
University of Arkansas, USA
Women's dress and societal definitions of proper womanhood have long been intertwined. Specifically, conceptualizations of appropriate female dress often serve as cultural markers, revealing presuppositions about the expectations of women in a particular moment. In this essay, I analyze instances of public argumentation that reveal the underlying sexism of secondary school dress codes. I assert that dress code defenders' reliance on pragmatic arguments is problematic. Pragmatic argument "permits the evaluation of an act or event in terms of its favorable or unfavorable consequences" (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 266). Dress codes are often justified through the lens of unfavorable consequences, the causes of which are attributed to inappropriately dressed women. Ultimately, I illustrate that such arguments further objectify the female form rather than, as defenders claim, protecting it.

Post-presumption argumentation and the post-truth world: An analysis of the 2016 Trump campaign
Ryan Neville-Shepard
University of Arkansas, USA
Building on the notion of post-truth, this essay suggests that the Trump campaign of 2016 was successful in proliferating a notion of post-presumption argumentation. While there are many theories of how presumption functions in argumentation, most scholars agree that it is largely a procedural device meant to promote deliberation. The essay suggests that post-presumption argumentation has become a new model due to a lack of faith in institutions and authorities that give presumptions force, a decline of agreed-upon social norms in political argumentation, and – most importantly – a rejection of deliberation as a communal goal. Thus, the notion of post-presumption argumentation aims to maintain chaos, solidify social fragmentation, and encourage deference to certain elites.

Retrospective pragmatic argumentation in political interviews
Vahid Niamadpour
Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Iran
In this paper, I will discuss what can be called ‘retrospective’ pragmatic argumentation as a subtype of pragmatic argumentation. Unlike the usual forms of pragmatic argumentation in which a prescriptive standpoint is argued for by pointing at the positive or negative consequences of taking a course of action in the present or in the future, in retrospective pragmatic argumentation, the speaker advances a standpoint referring to an action choice in the past and points at consequences that would have occurred if that action had not been carried out. By drawing on the pragma-dialectical theory, I will analyze and discuss specific strategies of retrospective pragmatic argumentation. In this way, I will show how politicians use such arguments to convince the public of the acceptability of their policy choices in the past.

Multimodality and legal argumentation
Marko Novak
New University, European Faculty of Law
Until very recently multimodality’s relevance for legal procedures and legal argumentation was in no manner discussed. However, Groarke emphasized a need for such a study, as well as van den Hoven and Kišiček analyzed and stressed the importance of non-verbal elements in legal cases. By respecting
multimodality in legal argumentation, it seems that we get a more realistic view of the entire process of making legal arguments, considering the fact that multimodality is usually completely neglected in the justification phase of legal reasoning although its role in (very) unclear cases it is almost impossible to deny. Although based on descriptive and rhetorical foundations, this will bring a revealing flash of reality to the theoretical framework of normative legal argumentation.

On the role of cognitive elaboration in persuasive visual metaphors
Amitash Ojha, Ervas Francesca, Noemi Lai, Elisabetta Gola
University of Cagliari, Italy

Visual metaphors are pictorial manifestation of conceptual metaphors in which something (the “target”) that is presented in images, is compared to something that belongs to another category (the “source”), which is also presented in images. We present the results of an ongoing research on the role of cognitive elaboration of visual metaphors (assumed as a contracted argument) and argumentation. We explore how cognitive elaboration influences the persuasiveness of visual argumentation, what degree of visual complexity in a visual metaphor changes the persuasiveness of a visual argument. We conclude that while complexity of a visual metaphor leads to greater persuasiveness, suggestion of intended message does not reduce the complexity, instead it increases it by forcing them to look for alternative interpretations of the visual metaphor to arrive at the intended message.

Exploring an argumentation style of Japanese politics
Hiroko Okuda¹, Takayuki Kato², Takeshi Suzuki³
¹Kanto Gakuin University, Japan; ²Seiwa University, Japan; ³Meiji University, Japan

The Japanese in general view equivocation as a way of deflecting the threats to one’s face in communicative conflicts. Not to blunder into these threats, they have long preferred to go along with ambiguous expressions rather than engaging in direct public deliberation. From the results of the five recent consecutive elections, it appears that they still do. This preference for ambiguity might be one reason why equivocation works as a highly effective instrument of political communication in Japan. Politicians equivocate as a strategy for turning difficult situations to their advantage, for advancing their agendas, and for influencing their constituencies. By focusing specifically on the use of political slogans, this study shows the way in which Shinzo Abe makes effective use of slogans in keeping him in power.

A meta-argumentative approach to abduction and IBE
Paula Olmos
Universidad Autónoma De Madrid, Spain

Abductive arguments, in which a statement –typically mentioning either unobservable or merely unobserved entities, properties and processes– is defended as offering some conceivable explanation to shared data, are common in everyday life and also in scientific practice. When advanced, they might be critically assessed by the arguer’s interlocutors and this usually brings to light their complex nature as meta-explanatory arguments. When the context allows for the advancement of different explanatory hypothesis and the agents involved in the particular situation assume the necessity to choose one among them as the “best available explanation”, a rather more complex argumentative process starts, involving the comparative assessment of the first arguments advanced and usually requiring further arguments and meta-arguments in support of the favored hypothesis, not necessarily of an abductive character.
Give the standard treatment of fallacies a chance: A rhetorical-pragmatic proposal
Steve Oswald¹, Thierry Herman²³
¹University of Fribourg, Switzerland; ²University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland; ³University of Lausanne, Switzerland

The definition of a fallacy as an argument which “seems to be valid but is not so” has been abundantly criticized, notably for its inability to identify stable and accurate norms for what should count as (un)acceptable argumentation. We submit that, leaving aside its problematic contribution to the normative issue of determining standards for argument quality, this definition is actually insightful for the rhetorical issue of argument persuasiveness, as it contains an important intuition about the rhetorical effects typically triggered by fallacious arguments: saying that fallacies appear to be valid arguments amounts to saying that they are not noticed as flawed arguments. We outline a cognitive framework building on linguistic pragmatics to account for rhetorical effects and illustrate it with conspiracist material.

Using linguistic analysis in the assessment of everyday arguments
Cenk Özdağ
METU (Middle East Technical University), Turkey

Most of the time, there is no agreement between the sentences of an argument in terms of their tense or mode. In addition, verb phrases, especially in everyday discourse, can be interpreted in terms of different modes, making argument analysis and assessment troublesome. I propose a way to analyze the arguments containing such ambiguities through linguistic analysis and through translating these phrases into another language, by taking the problem in reverse order, i.e., instead of taking understanding an argument as a prerequisite of argument assessment, taking argument assessment as a prerequisite of understanding an argument. Taking different modalities into account can show that in everyday arguments many use linguistic expressions sloppily.

Argument prompting: How to milk people for arguments
Fabio Paglieri
Istituto di Scienze e Tecnologie della Cognizione, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (ISTC-CNR), Italy

Argument is studied both as product, a network of premises standing in some inferential relationship with a set of claims, and as process, a dialogical interchange governed by specific rules. But what can help turning the process into satisfactory products – that is, how to make sure that a dialogue leads to proper articulation of an issue? My analysis focuses on interlocutors, adopting the label “argument prompting” for all techniques they use to make good argumentation happen. Analyzing argument prompting requires combining a pragmatic perspective on why audiences resist invitations to argue and how to overcome such resistance (Goodwin, Kauffeld, Manolescu), experimental work on factors determining willingness to argue (Hample, Paglieri, Cionea), and a virtue theoretical understanding of what epistemic values arguers ought to promote in dialogue (Cohen, Aberdein).
The terrible beauty of fascistic argument: Donald Trump and the global warming debate
Nicholas S. Paliewicz¹, George McHendry²
¹University of Louisville, USA; ²Creighton University, USA
The election of Donald Trump as President of the USA intensifies troubling trends of argumentation. The rise of verbal aggression, hostility, and control violate most argumentative norms, but they garner adherence. This essay studies Trump’s argumentative assemblage within the global climate change debate. We argue that Trump’s desire to control ideas and attitudes towards the environment is demonstrative of what we call fascistic argument—a form of argumentation that aesthetically regales the domination of materialities, discourse, and bodies through nationalistic structures of feeling. We explore the rise of fascistic argument as an effect of the failure of reason to compel policy. This failure generates a contagion of affects and desires which control the argumentative process and infect dialectic debates aimed at discovering consensus.

Stock issues and argumentative strategies in policy influencing communication. The case of the British Heart Foundation’s campaign against junk food marketing.
Rudi Palmieri, Benjamin Jones
University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
We examine how UK third sector organizations use argumentation in order to influence government policies on socially important issues. We suggest the doctrine of stock issues as an appropriate method to identify and reconstruct patterns of strategic argumentation in these campaigns. Taking the British Heart Foundation’s campaign against junk food marketing to children as a case in point, we reconstruct for each issue the types of argumentative strategies by which the arguer tries to construct a convincing case from a public good perspective. Our contribution is twofold: (1) We extend the use of the stock issue framework to the analysis of government-directed influencing campaigns by external organizations; (2) we integrate existing research on lobbying and government-directed strategic communication with an argumentation perspective.

Student responses to the immigration stalemate in the USA
Edward Mark Panetta
University of Georgia, USA
For more than two decades, American policymakers have debated legislation that would liberalize legal restrictions that currently drive undocumented residents underground and exclude them from American public life. In 2014, Barack Obama implemented a temporary policy, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Act (DACA). While this Executive Order extended only modest legal protections to undocumented students, it did confirm that students should be afforded the opportunity to an education. The Trump Administration has signaled that DACA will be vacated in 2018. This paper describes the ways in which Latino/a students have networked with veterans of the 1960’s Civil Rights movement to nurture a political movement to maintain and secure a right to higher education in the USA.

Gender and enthymematic identification: Trump’s argument for masculinity in the 2016 presidential debates
Sarah Partlow Lefevre
Idaho State University, USA
In the 2016 U.S. presidential debates between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, much of Trump’s gendered argument was enthymematic, appealing to audiences’ sexism. Trump’s enthymemes were hard to address, but successful in conveying an argument for masculinity to the intended audience. In this essay, I examine the Trump ticket’s argument for masculinity as inherent to the presidential office.
Building on Smith’s (2007) observation that “to be persuasive, enthymemes must identify with the common opinions of their intended audiences” (p. 120), I incorporate Burke’s (1969) definition of identification as a key component of persuasion to theorize a better understanding of verbal and nonverbal enthymematic argument. Verbal and nonverbal (visual and behavioral) enthymemes about gender created identification with some voters and sharpened division with others.

**Dialogical aspects of appeals to authority in Spanish and Polish disputes about cultural objects**

Martín Pereira-Fariña1,2, Marcin Koszowy3,4, Katarzyna Budzynska1,2, Chris Reed2  
1Centro Singular de Investigación en Tecnoloxías da Información, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain; 2Centre for Argument Technology, University of Dundee, United Kingdom; 3University of Bialystok, Poland; 4Centre for Argument Technology, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

Arguments and appeals to authority are used in a public space to resolve the disagreement about the significance of cultural objects. Contested monuments inherited from totalitarian regimes trigger specific dynamics between arguments from authority (or “group of authorities” such as victims) and arguments from expert opinion (such as historians or architects). This creates contradictory and well-supported standpoints which makes agreement difficult to achieve. To obtain an in-depth insight about how this dynamic evolves, we developed corpora of debates (broadcasted by the Polish and Spanish national radio) about the Palace of Culture and Science built during the Soviet communist dominance in Poland, and the Valley of Fallen conceived during the Spanish dictatorship. We analyze argument and ethotic structures of these discussions using Inference Anchoring Theory and OVA+ annotation tool.

**A contribution from argumentation theory to the study of young children's reasoning in play activities**

Anne-Nelly Perret-Clermont1, Rebecca Schär2, Antonio Iannaccone1, Josephine Convertini1  
1University of Neuchatel, Switzerland; 2Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano, Switzerland

Educational research has contributed to integrate argumentation (e.g., Crowell and Kuhn, 2014; Andriessen and Baker, 2014) in learning activities, and described the complexity of such educational ambitions (Rapanta and Macagno, 2016; Schwarz and Baker, 2017). Our empirical study "Argimp" considers young children's reasoning in such argumentative activities and the psychological difficulties they meet. A consideration of the dialogical (and not just individual) nature of argumentation (Plantin, 1996; van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004; Rigotti and Greco, 2010) sheds light on how young children's reasoning activity is embedded in their larger psychological activity. Often the inferences that children make are not the ones that adults expect, and this reveals the multiple overlapping worlds (material and symbolic, real and imaginative) in which children try to fit; and the developmental nature of argumentative processes.

**The characteristics of reasoning in argumentation of Thai students in an EFL setting**

Tanyapon Phongphio  
University of Bristol, United Kingdom

In this research study, an investigation of students’ abilities to construct arguments is considered as an approach to understand their critical thinking skills. This research study aims to identify the structures of arguments used in Thai students' face-to-face argumentation in English and evaluate the quality of the elements in those structures. Third-year undergraduates at a Thai university will voluntarily participate in this research. The participants’ argumentation on a topic in English will be audio recorded and transcribed. Toulmin’s model of argument pattern (TAP) will be adapted for coding the elements of the arguments before the frequency count. The quality of the elements will be evaluated using developed
scoring criteria. Insights into the current state of Thai students’ critical thinking skills will have further pedagogical implications for an EFL speaking course.

**Rhetorical issues in robotics**

Céline Pieters  
ULB (GRAL)/ INSA, LAAS-CNRS Toulouse (Gepetto)

The words used to describe robotic actions and dispositions are very familiar to our own human body (autonomy, decision, intelligence, consciousness, judgement, learning, etc.). In the meanwhile, machines seem to challenge more and more the typical way of acting of the living organisms. But how and why? We propose to observe how experts introduce robots’ performances and question the efficiency of their discourses. In this way, we intend to better understand why robots are spontaneously perceived and described (or not) as acting like living organisms. This means to explore the bond between movement/action and language, and the consequences of this bond, i.e. the rhetorical issues in robotics.

**The effect of metaphors in argumentation: An experimental study on the perceived reasonableness of sound and fallacious arguments containing metaphors as premises**

Roosmaryn Pilgram  
University of Amsterdam & Leiden University, The Netherlands

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969, p.4) argue that metaphors can be used argumentatively “to induce or to increase the mind’s adherence to the theses presented for its assent”. Through comparing a source and target domain, a discussant can make a standpoint more acceptable. The extent to which metaphors do so, however, has so far not fully been determined. In this paper, experimental research on the effects of metaphors on argumentation will be presented. By means of questionnaires, native English speakers were asked to evaluate the reasonableness of pragma-dialectically sound and fallacious arguments in which novel, deliberate metaphors were used as premises (cf. van Eemeren, Garssen & Meuffels, 2009). Do metaphors highlight the reasonableness of sound argumentation? Do they hide the unreasonableness of fallacious argumentation?

**Can't Aristotle's problemata exhibit ideological cant?**

Laetitia Pille¹, Pierre-Yves Raccab²  
¹IUT du Limousin and CNRS-UMR 7270, France; ²CNRS, UMR 7270, Orléans, France

This is an argumentative study concerning the ancient Greek. We defend the idea that it is possible to carry out an empirical semantic study on ancient texts, provided that we use:  
- a sufficiently large corpus (for example, all the known texts written in that language), and  
- the rather fine knowledge Hellenists and philosophers have elaborated concerning the intellectual debates which permeated that epoch.

We also provide a method to find evidence for or against the attribution, to an author, of a text whose origin can be considered doubtful. We restrict the study to the Greek words ὀξύ (sharp, acute) and βαρύ (low, severe), as they appear in section XIX of Aristotle’s Problemata. We pinpoint the link between semantic properties of languages units and ideologies of discourses using them.
Inference and argumentative value scheme within social practices: empirical studies
Rosalice Botelho Hakim Souza Pinto
Center of Linguistics Nova University of Lisbon, Portugal
Many scholars have been developing studies on the concept of inference. In linguistics, the concept of inference supported by formal logic has always been criticized. The theorists always pointed out that the inference in logical studies has not considered the importance of linguistic aspects. Thus, for linguistics, the concept of inference was revised and became more complex. Based on this, the purpose of this paper is to show, at first, some inferential interpretative processes materialized by the combination of the two modes (verbal and visual) in a specific kind of argument: the argument from values (Macagno and Walton, 2014). Secondly, it will be shown the relationship between the multimodal aspects and the inferential processes that can be depicted from these arguments.

Stasis and argument in Inuit’s duel songs (pisit)
Christian Plantin¹, Nicole Tersis²
¹Lyon 2 University - CNRS, France; ²SeDyL, CNRS, France
Duel songs are an argumentative genre, now disappeared, developed in the Inuit oral tradition. They can be considered as a “national court of assize”, settling cases of “open scandal or hostility” (Thalbitzer). The singers play the drum, they can be masked, and they hit their cheekbones while singing. This study is based on a corpus of Inuit songs collected in Ammassalik, East Greenland (Victor 1991). It focuses on the opening stage of this argumentative situation, that is the stasis as it emerges in the pair constituted by the appellant's (offended) first formulation of the charge and the first reply of the respondent (offender) to that charge. It provides a typology of the observed stasis situations, and some observations about some meta-argumentative elements emerging during this argumentative practice.

Literature in law. The argumentative use in law of quotations from literary sources
H. José Plug
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
While in the field of Law and Literature most studies focus on ‘law as literature’ or on ‘law in literature’, the present paper focusses on ‘literature in law’. One of the concrete manifestations of ‘literature in law’ is the use of quotations from literary sources in the process and the results of legal decision-making. In these contexts a distinction can be made between the explanatory role and the argumentative role these quotations may have. This paper examines the argumentative role of literary quotations and, more specifically, explores the possibilities of using literary quotations in order to maneuver strategically in different activity types that can be identified in the legal domain.

The non-existence of “inference claims”
Gilbert Edward Plumer
Law School Admission Council (retired), USA
Some believe that all arguments make an implicit “inference claim” that the conclusion is inferable from the premises (e.g., Grennan, the Groarkes, Hitchcock, and Scriven). Bermejo-Luque contends that it is because an “implicit inference-claim can be attributed to us…that…merely putting forward a couple of claims counts as an act of arguing.” I try to show that this is confused. An act of arguing arises because an inference can be attributed to us, not a meta-level “inference claim” that would make the argument self-referential and regressive. I develop five (other) possible explanations of the popularity of the doctrine that similarly identify confusions, e.g., misappropriating Toulmin’s notion of a “warrant.” I conclude that the postulation of inference claims has no explanatory value—there is nothing for them to do—except cause trouble.
**Argumentation about multimodal argumentation**
Chiara Pollaroli, Laura Bonelli
Università della Svizzera italiana, Switzerland

It is common to find advertising experts discussing the multimodal choices made in advertising campaigns and providing arguments in support of their opinions, proposing alternative solutions and providing reasons in support of alternative solutions. This is often done on social media, where argumentation about multimodal advertising campaigns acquires the features of polylogues. Our goal is to reconstruct the argumentative passages of the discussions about multimodal argumentative advertising campaigns in order to clarify what values, criteria, and beliefs determine the discussions themselves. In order to do this, we will rely on the analytical frameworks provided by Pragma-Dialectics – for reconstructing the argumentative structures – and the Argumentum Model of Topics – for making explicit both the logical and cultural premises of the standpoint-argument relationship.

**The relevance of metaphors in argumentative discourse**
Lotte van Poppel
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

While metaphors may be very appropriate to embellish a speech, it is controversial whether they also have an argumentative function, for example as an (analogy) argument (e.g. Garssen 2009; Garssen & Kienpointner 2011; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969). For the analysis and evaluation of argumentative discourse, it is crucial whether metaphors should be seen as a serious contribution to a discussion or not, also in light of the critical reactions they may evoke. This paper offers an overview of the functions ascribed to metaphor in argumentative discourse in the argumentation theoretical and rhetorical literature. It then proposes to integrate insights from Deliberate Metaphor Theory (Steen 2017) and the pragma-dialectical theory to clarify when metaphors can be a relevant contribution to a discussion.

**More on probabilistic accounts of argument strength**
Henry Prakken
Utrecht University & University of Groningen, The Netherlands

With the rise of big data, probabilistic arguments are increasingly common in many fields, so they deserve to be studied. There have been recent proposals to define the strength of an argument as the conditional probability of its conclusion given its premises. However, this definition is too simple in general. First, the multi-steps nature of arguments (where a conclusion of one step is a premise of a further step) raises the issue how the probability of the premises is propagated through the steps in an argument. Second, the strength of an argument is in general not evaluated on its own but in the context of possible counterarguments. In this talk these issues will be discussed against the background of nonmonotonic logics and computational models of argument developed in artificial intelligence.

**Epitomized argumentative strategies of disease mongering**
Fran Quattri¹, Peng Wu¹²
¹Jiangsu University, China; ²ILIAS International Learned Institute for Argumentation Studies

What argumentative strategies do PR agencies and pharmaceutical companies representatively use to upgrade psycho-physical conditions to disease, to promote more new and existing drugs and treatments? This research analyzes the argumentative gestalt of the marketing strategy disease mongering, which “tries to convince well people that they are sick, or slightly sick people that they are very ill” (Payer 1992). We retrieved, deduced and exemplified argumentative strategies (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 1992; Snoeck Henkemans 2016) from a systematic literature review (Moher et al. 2010) of medical
journal articles on disease mongering (2002-17). We identified argumentative stages and their strategies, as put in place by different advertisers. This investigation sheds light on how producers, consumers, and health care practitioners typify the selling of sickness, by presenting the argumentative aspects of advertised medical (mal)practice.
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**Argumentative reinterpretation**

Pierre-Yves Raccah  
CNRS, France

A careful observation of human languages leads to question the idea that argumentative utterances necessarily have an argumentative orientation (AO). The purpose of this paper is to present these observations, explain how they challenge this idea, and suggest some ideas for a position more in agreement with these observations. The first group of facts concerns the meaning that should be attributed to statements of type [A, therefore B]: if their first member [A] is clearly an utterance, is their second member [B] also an utterance? The second group of facts concerns segments containing a prosodic break. According to a recent description, the prosodic break imposes an argumentative reinterpretation: an utterance with an argumentative role, thus, would not necessarily have an AO but could also be the formulation of an AO.

**The audience as a necessary ethical construct for argumentation**

John W. Ray  
Montana Tech of the University of Montana, USA

Because persuasion involves consent of an audience, central to any rhetorical theory is a theory of audience. It is consent that distinguishes persuasion from force or coercion. Because it is consent that forms the basis of moral obligation, persuasion is therefore an ethical activity that seeks audience consent and it is the function of an audience to give or withhold that consent by rendering an ethical judgement concerning the persuasive artifact. Inherently, because it involves choice and consent, the function of an audience is an ethical function. Therefore, the audience, while partially a pragmatic construct, is foremost an ethical idea in the mind of the rhetor. This paper answers these questions by critically examining the concept of audience in the rhetorical theories of Plato, Aristotle, Franz Theremin and Ch. Perelman.

**Using dialogic syntax for argument reconstruction**

Menno H. Reijven  
University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA

Pragma-dialectics offers researchers various tools to reconstruct argumentative discourse. Ideally, this reconstruction is an interpretation as close as possible to the arguer's actual intentions. When indicators in the discourse are not conclusive, in order to be lenient to the speaker, pragma-dialectics advocates to employ a maximally argumentative interpretation. Yet, in principle, an analyst should want to avoid using this principle as much as possible, as it means to distance oneself from the discourse as actually advanced. In this paper, dialogic syntax and resonance are presented as an additional tool to help pragma-dialecticians to reconstruct argumentative discourse, while staying as close as possible to the actual words. I show that these notions can support reconstructions and explain why these reconstructions are better compared to attempts without this tool when they differ.
Prototypical argumentative patterns: the case of political argumentation on late-night talk shows
Menno H. Reijven, Eean Grimshaw, Anton Dinerstein
University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA
Late-night talk shows are not typically thought of as argumentative settings. It is preferred to avoid disagreements during such interactions. Yet, U.S. presidential candidates visit these shows as part of their campaign and thus attempt to convince the audience of the fact that they are the better candidate for the presidency. Therefore, we argue, political argumentation is advanced. In this study, we provide an argumentative characterization of the late-night talk show and focus on how these institutional preconditions affect the argumentation advanced by candidates. Many argumentative moves deal with the critical questions which belong to the argument scheme of pragmatic argumentation while the standpoint and inferring premise are usually left unexpressed. In order to show that they possess the qualities and experience necessary to be president, symptomatic argumentation is used.

Rhetorical arguments: a philosophical analysis
Magne Reitan
NTNU, Norway
In this paper we give a philosophical discussion of ethos and pathos as arguments. We analyze the structure of ethos by employing speech act theory. To analyze pathos we need a theory of emotions. We view emotions as complex attitudes involving a cognitive component, feelings and bodily conditions. This implies a divided view of the role of emotions: partly cognitive and partly causal. One can argue about the cognitive content of emotions, both pro and con, and thus give rise to, strengthen or weaken an emotion. But one cannot argue about the subjective feeling and the bodily conditions. They call for causal explanations. In working out this we exploit the notion of mechanism in the social sciences. Because of the complex nature of emotions, pathos is only partly argumentative.

Mohism’s theory of ethical and political argumentation by analogy
Xiaoming Ren
Nankai University, China
Mo Tzu was well known not only for his enthusiasm for skills of argumentation but also for his argumentative schemes. He mainly concerned with persuading the intended audience to accept their opinions with the method of argumentation by analogy. Mohism advanced the principle of argumentation: accepting some by analogy and conceding others after analogy and the three argumentation schemes: Comparison (譬pi), Paralleling (侔mou), Conclusion (援yuan). Based on them, Mo Tzu developed their own argumentation theory in order to justify their political or ethical standpoints. This theory inspires both the argumentation theories and the argumentation practices in later China.

Countering metaphors expressing starting points in political debates
Kiki Yvonne Renardel de Lavalette, Corina Andone, Gerard Steen
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
This paper studies argumentation in British Public Bill Committee debates by focusing on the way in which metaphors expressing starting points are countered in the opening stage of the discussion. Legislators sometimes frame their starting points in metaphorical terms. As conceptual tools that may have presuppositions that are not in line with the ideas of all discussants, metaphors may need to be resisted by means of argumentative countermoves in order to have a well-informed debate about the acceptability of the proposed legislation. The goal of this paper is to show how different types of metaphor are used to express starting points, and how different types of critical responses can be instrumental to achieving diverging outcomes in the opening stage of the discussion.
Algorithms as arguments: A working theory
G. Mitchell Reyes
Lewis & Clark College, USA

Algorithms are ubiquitous in contemporary society. We engage with them when we search Google, use mapping or wayfinding technologies, or search for films on Netflix. In response to their growing influence, scholars of rhetoric and argumentation have slowly begun to examine algorithms not as precise instruments of calculation but as complex networks of sophisticated argumentation that have immense social-material force. While this work remains in its infancy, it is already clear that argument scholars have much to offer when it comes to examining these algorithmic black boxes: not only can we teach others how to unpack them as arguments and read them critically, we can also illuminate the often hidden ideas and structures of judgment algorithms promote.

Narcissists and despots: mediated arguments about the North Korean nuclear threat
Patricia Riley, Hyun-Tae Kim, Jeeyun Baik, Nathaniel Curran, Thomas Hollihan
University of Southern California, USA

Beck claims (1999), “threats create society, and global threats create global society.” The discourse surrounding North Korea’s nuclear weapons program constitutes an important opportunity to analyze the argumentative structuring of a global threat as it swings from possible conflict to potential détente. Mediated events such as Trump’s threats to destroy North Korea or Kim’s visit to Xi in China generate a broad range of intense arguments in social media. This study analyzes Twitter data surrounding these events using big data topic modeling to uncover dominant narratives within the messages that focus on five actors – Kim, Trump, Moon, Abe, and Xi. The data reveal both factual and imagined strategic maneuvers as these leaders articulate contrasting narratives of global futures and local security.

Pragma-dialectic analysis of Plato’s Protagoras
Rolando Isaías Rodríguez Lara
University of Guadalajara, Mexico

One of the areas so far unexplored by pragma-dialectic theory is the argumentative analysis of Plato’s dialogues. I propose to show the fruitfulness of this approach, as applied to Plato’s dialogues, by examining one of them, the Protagoras. During the last six decades in Anglo-Saxon tradition, almost all works done about the Protagoras are characterized by (1) underestimating passages of the Platonic text that are not susceptible of logical analysis, and (2) omitting passages that have an eminently dialectical role. In this paper I will argue that the application of the pragma-dialectic theory offers a more systematic and richer description of some of the argumentative exchanges reported in the Protagoras than the exegetical models that dominate the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

Smuggling fallacies: Joke as a Trojan horse of argumentation
Viktorija Romascenko
Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen, Germany

The best way to kill a joke is to take it apart. As jokes are a great source of joy, such treatment is evidently undesirable. Consequently, this is hardly ever done outside of academic context. Some jokes, however, function as arguments and as such are prone to being fallacious. Would not a claim in a form of a joke provide then a competitive advantage? Unlike the straightforward syllogistically formulated arguments, jokes benefit from the additional screen of belonging to the realm of fictional. Thus, my thesis is that arguments that appear in a humorously amusing form are less likely to be scrutinized. The aim of this paper is to show that jokes have more than an ornamental function by examining how fallacy-containing humorous utterances are strategically used within political communication.
Dialogical functions and effectiveness of metaphors in medical settings

Maria Grazia Rossi¹, Fabrizio Macagno¹, Sarah Bigi²
¹Nova University of Lisbon, Portugal; ²Catholic University of Milan, Italy

The aim of this paper is to present the results of a study devoted to investigating the function and effectiveness of metaphors in medical interviews. The corpus consists of 39 patient-provider interactions in the context of diabetes care. The dialogical use of metaphors has been assessed by considering both their dialogical purpose and their effectiveness. From this analysis emerges that (1) metaphors – especially conventional metaphors – are positively correlated to misunderstanding; and (2) metaphors – especially creative metaphors – are used as argumentative instruments to foster patient understanding and patient self-management abilities but without a careful monitoring of their communicative effects in terms of patient understanding. Implications on the use of metaphors in medical setting will be discussed and criteria to design guidelines for health providers will be proposed.

Trump's ideological worldview

Robert Rowland
University of Kansas, USA

Argumentation scholars have noted the power of definitional argument in political movements. The election of Donald Trump shocked political scholars, as well as commentators in the mainstream press. Given his many gaffes, failure to outline a coherent policy agenda, and disastrous debate performance, the strong consensus was that he had little chance to win the election. Yet it is clear that Trump built a strong bond with the working-class, a group of swing voters large enough to elect him president. This essay confronts this puzzle by laying out the ideological and narrative dimensions of Trump’s worldview, concluding that the ideological definition in Trump’s rhetoric was well adapted to creating a sense of shared identity with working-class voters, but ill adapted to developing public policies that would improve their circumstances.

Arguments justify norms of politeness. A study of argumentative loci in a nineteenth-century treatise about politeness.

Francesca Saltamacchia, Andrea Rocci
University of Lugano, Switzerland

Melchiorre Gioja in 1802 writes a conduct manual, the New Galateo, in which reasonableness (“social reason”) becomes the only instrument capable of correctly guiding polite behaviour. In this book the argumentative justification of a prescription is at the same time a demonstration of the metacognitive reasoning that is to be performed by the reader in the world outside the book. Therefore, the study of topics reveals the basic social ontology that the polite reasoners rely on for the inferences they draw about social situations in order to deliberate a polite course of action. Using UAM-CorpusTool we have annotated about 10 collections of examples for repeatedly invoked loci which have been established as an aid to the textual interpretation of Gioja’s treatise and to better understand his notion of social reason.
Argumentation and self-deliberating: speaking to oneself and speaking about oneself. From the personal to the social
Lineide Salvador Mosca
Universidade De São Paulo, Brazil

Individuals are submitted to a number of questions in everyday life. One of these situations is the self-deliberating, exposed by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca in their Treatise On Argumentation: The New Rhetoric. These authors state that "the deliberating subject is often regarded as an incarnation of the universal audience" (op.cit.40 § 9). The self-awareness leads him to conduct his own thinking, preparing for the choices he has to make. The figures of dissociation as the dilemma and the impasse are responsible for the high tensiveness, origin of passionate conflicts. On the other hand, when talking about oneself, under a relation of otherness in a dialogical communication, the construction of one's image and identity assumes a major importance, with different persuasive values, from "me" to "we", favouring a social coexistence.

The translator’s visibility. Translators’ critical argumentation about their translating effort
Lucia Salvato
Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy

This paper explores critical argumentations in contemporary translators’ notes of literary texts, in which they provide reflections on their translating practice. Such reflections reveal the richness of translators’ encounter with ‘the otherness’ and result also from the many linguistic and cultural constraints they have to address in their work. The study focuses on the argumentation structures, argument schemes, and linguistic markers used by translators to illustrate their methodology. The aim is to show how translators’ remarks are argued and negotiated to present how they work, their translation strategies, and if and how they apply a specific theory. The method used for the analysis is a pragmatic one, as it allows developing an analytic overview, through which the argumentative structure and its elements can be determined.

Election campaigns for agonistic democracies
Margareth Sandvik
Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

According to political philosopher Chantal Mouffe, democracies can be seen as deliberative, antagonistic or agonistic (Mouffe 2005). She argues that democratic theory needs to acknowledge the ineradicability of antagonism and the impossibility of achieving a fully inclusive rational consensus (Mouffe 2000), and suggest another model of democracy, the agonistic. An agonistic democracy is based on respect for different opinions, discussions and argumentation, opposed to Habermas’ thoughts about the consensus-oriented ideal debate (Habermas 1996), as well as the confrontational and aggressive antagonistic democracy. Mouffe’s agonistic democracy will be taken a step into discourse analysis and argumentation theory, by asking the question of how agonistic democracy can be operationalized when taking a conversational and argumentative perspective. How is agonistic democracy practiced in real life election campaign discourse?

From technique to tactics: how to teach dispositio?
Benoit Sans
Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium

Based on various rhetorical teaching experiments in high school and at university, this paper will focus on the difficulties encountered by the learners on the level of dispositio (organization and structure of a speech, rhetorical strategy) and explore practical solutions, inspired by Ancient or contemporary
approaches on speech and argumentation, in order to face this task, develop new skills and improve the training.

Innovations in reasoning about health: The case of the randomized controlled trial

Jodi Schneider, Sally Jackson
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Field-dependence in argumentation comes about through forms of inference invented by specialized fields. In recent work we introduced the concept of a "warranting device": (1) an inference license (2) invented for a specialized argumentative purpose and (3) backed by institutional, procedural, and material assurances of the dependability of conclusions generated by the device. Once established, fields employ such devices across many situations without further defense, even as the devices develop in response to newly-noticed problems. Many new warranting devices have appeared over the past century to solve problems in reasoning about health and medicine, replacing and obsolescing earlier forms of medical reasoning. One such device is the Randomized Controlled Trial. This case study traces its historical evolution and discusses some current movements toward competing device types.

Modeling Alzheimer's disease research claims, evidence, and arguments from a biology

Jodi Schneider, Novejot Sandhu
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Argument visualization may help make research papers easier to understand, which could both speed quality assessment within a discipline and help build interdisciplinary knowledge networks. This paper presents a case study of the arguments in a single high-profile paper on Alzheimer's disease research. Within this one paper, we analyze and hand-annotate the main claim, which is supported by 4 subclaims, in turn supported by data, methods, and materials. We also investigate how the paper imports and uses knowledge claims from other research papers. We create a specialized argument-based knowledge representation called a micropublication. In future work, we will investigate automatic argumentation mining for experimental biology research papers. Our long-term vision is to create literature-scale claim-argument networks that help more quickly use new knowledge about human health.

On the humanistic essence of science: an argumentative perspective

Menashe Schwed
Ashkelon Academic College, Israel

This talk proposes yet another answer to the unsolved Popperian question of Demarcation from an argumentative perspective. The thesis is that science should be characterized in terms of the values and norms of Humanism. Science is rooted in politics and ideology, and as a human invention, it presupposes and advances concurrently democratic and humanistic values. The talk analyzes three presuppositions which describe three categories of humanistic values and exposit their necessity for and function in the scientific research methods. It explicates how these methods were initially selected as scientific. The argumentative function of these presuppositions is critical in two senses: First, in the ‘opening stage’ of any scientific endeavor and controversy. Second, as part of the ‘rebuttals’ component of any scientific argument.
The non-vote vote as anti-legal identity: Catalan independence from the shame of Europe

Nick J. Sciullo, Lakelyn Taylor
University of Central Florida, Nicholson School of Communication, USA

This paper analyzes the significance of the Catalan Referendum of October 1, 2017 in light of the Spanish government’s claim it is unconstitutional. It is this unconstitutionality that affords the opportunity for a new political subjectivity. The Catalan people have made an argument for their political subjectivity by engaging the unconstitutionality of the referendum. The Catalan people argue the referendum is legal and as such represents a legal affirmation of their political independence, as well as the argument that even if the referendum is illegal that they still are allowed to vote. This argument from a position of anti-legality reconfigures what it means to be a Spanish citizen, a Catalan, and a voter. This paper analyzes these developments with a focus on anti/legal argumentation and the implications of this argumentation for political participation.

Consuetudo Pro Lege Servatur: Or what kind of relativist is Perelman (if any)?

Blake D. Scott
Higher Institute of Philosophy, KU Leuven

In response to the charge of relativism raised against The New Rhetoric, I argue that Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca do provide normative criteria of argument strength that extend beyond mere effectiveness. This normative dimension of their work, however, comes into relief only when viewed from the broader perspective of Perelman’s philosophy as a whole. I will defend the claim that The New Rhetoric is not guilty of relativism in the way that many critics have claimed. From this broader perspective it becomes possible not only to re-read this important work as having an inherently normative understanding of argumentation, but also to understand why many critics have not been able to find the specific kinds of epistemic criteria they expect.

Towards defining the relation of attack

Marcin Selinger
University of Wrocław, Poland

The aim of this paper is to define the relation of attack that holds between arguments and (counter)arguments. The definition to be proposed provides the necessary and sufficient conditions of a successful counterargument, relatively to the previously developed model of representation and numerical evaluation of structured arguments. It also offers a link between the well-known from informal logic, classical approach to structured arguments, which is based on the RSA-triangle requirements, and the abstract argumentation theory, where the notion of attack is regarded as a primitive one. In the course of the exposition, three traditionally distinguished kinds of defeaters: rebutting, undermining and undercutting defeaters will be discussed. Special attention will be paid to the undercutters and their relation to the so-called hybrid arguments.

Hinges, disagreements, and arguments: Hinge propositions and deep disagreements

Harvey Siegel
University of Miami, USA

‘Hinge propositions’ are propositions that are presuppositions of our languages or conceptual schemes that cannot be rationally defended/challenged. They provide support for deep disagreements: disagreements that cannot be rationally resolved by processes of rational argumentation. I first examine hinge epistemology in its own right, and then explore its implications for argumentation theory. I argue that (1) the Wittgensteinian approach to hinge propositions is problematic, and that, suitably understood, they can be rationally challenged, defended, and evaluated; (2) while the well-known epistemological
difficulties in doing so should not be minimized, those difficulties can be, if not overcome, at least neutralized; and (3) even if not, the implications for arguments and argumentation are far less troublesome than is often thought.

Ethics in rhetorical education
Anders Sigrell
Lund University, Sweden
The question on moral and ethics in rhetorical education has been a central topic ever since the subject was coined two and half millennia ago. The perhaps most common take on the question, with some support from Aristotle, is to understand rhetoric as a tool that could be used for good, as well for less good objectives. In my paper I will try to make the argument that that is a less constructive standpoint. The argumentation will its starting point in the connection rhetoric and democracy, not only historical, but doxological as well. The perhaps most well phrased critique of rhetoric as a subject is that rhetoric tries to “Make the weaker argument the stronger, and the stronger argument the weaker”. In my presentation I will argue that the critics are right.

A pragma-dialectical reconstruction of medical shared decision-making (SDM)
A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, Jean H.M. Wagemans
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Medical consultation nowadays generally proceeds in accordance with the process of shared decision-making (SDM). In the literature on medical communication, the general characteristics of SDM seem to be agreed upon, but different alternatives are suggested with respect to the division of labour between doctor and patient. In this paper we reconstruct the process of SDM in terms of the pragma-dialectical ideal model of a critical discussion. We thereby take into account both the general characteristics of the process of SDM and the different alternatives for the division of labour proposed in the literature. The resulting analytical tool enables a more precise analysis of the process of SDM and creates a starting point for a well-founded evaluation of the contributions of doctor and patient to this process.

Metaphor and argumentation: Deliberate metaphor theory meets pragma-dialectics
Gerard Steen
UvA, The Netherlands
Deliberate Metaphor Theory (Steen, 2017) holds that there is an essential difference between the deliberate use of metaphor as metaphor (‘think of your illness as a journey’) versus its non-deliberate use (‘look how far you’ve come’). Deliberately figurative comparisons can function as standpoints or arguments in argumentative discourse, and they can elicit resistance by counter argumentation in various ways. This happens much less with non-deliberate metaphor. This paper asks how the extended version of Pragma-Dialectics (van Eemeren, 2010) can help in accounting for these phenomena and whether the phenomena themselves raise new questions for extended Pragma Dialectics.

How argumentative roles help us reach agreements on how to argue
Katharina Stevens
University of Lethbridge, Canada
Scott Jacobs recently argued that there is no opening stage. Arguers don’t agree on rules that could be broken or the distribution of argumentative tasks through dialogue types. Necessary determinations are made non-verbally during the argumentative exchange.
I argue that agreements are reached and can be broken, though I agree that this happens non-verbally as part of the exchange. I offer the concept of argumentative roles as a theoretical tool for understanding how: Arguers are socialized to know different argumentative roles. Adopting role-associated behavior sends an invitation to enter a type of dialogue. Accepting it by adopting the behaviors of the complimentary role establishes an agreement. The importance of these agreements for the way the argument will develop means that adopting an argumentative role takes on moral significance.

The role of decision-making agency in distinguishing legitimate and fallacious slippery slope arguments

L. Paul Strait, Laura Alberti
University of Southern Mississippi, USA

Despite many attempts to schematize and categorize slippery slope arguments, considerable ambiguity exists between valid and fallacious forms. Often, putative examples of fallacious slippery slope arguments are not formally invalid, but simply unjustified. But all arguments require sufficient evidence; fallacies are fallacious without respect to evidence quality. We propose that the formal validity of slippery slope arguments hinges on the decision-making agent involved in the initial action and proposed subsequent actions. If a sole agent is involved, its agency must be in some way attenuated if the slippery slope argument is valid. Our analysis incorporates Burke’s concept of the agency-act ratio and the theory of link intrinsicness. After analyzing the argument structure abstractly, we turn to specific cases in the domains of biomedical ethics, legal argumentation, and public policy argumentation.

The character of self-persuasion in diaries

Iva Svačinová
University of Hradec Králové, Czech Republic

The people keeping diaries use them to record their thoughts without intention to present them publicly. I intend to characterize the diaries as a communicative practice in that persuasion takes place. I suppose that the author of diary is in (argumentative) dialogue with a specific addressee who mirrors – in a certain degree – the author himself. I use pragma-dialectical theory extended by the concept of strategic maneuvering. I consider the diaries as a hybrid communicative activity type combining different institutional points: a record of everyday experience, self-reflection, self-persuasion etc. Although this practice is deeply individualized, it is possible to identify general conventions that regulate permissible or expected form of argumentation. The impact of these conventions will be illustrated on cases of canonical diaries of famous authors.

- T -

A new approach to analogical reasoning

Giulia Terzian
University of Campinas - UNICAMP, Brazil

This paper focuses on a widely used argumentative strategy: analogical reasoning. The key question underwriting the paper is: When can we transfer philosophical arguments from one area to another in virtue of the (formal/informal) structure that problems in the two areas have in common? I briefly present three case studies that feature analogies of varying success: (1) solutions to the set-theoretic and truth-theoretic paradoxes, (2) utilitarianism in social choice theory and Darwinism, (3) epistemic utility theory and population ethics. I then present a novel strategy for assessing analogical arguments. The rough idea:
in order to see whether a genuine analogy exists between two theories, we must see whether such a structural similarity exists between their respective underlying norms. I conclude by re-examining (1)-(3) by the lights of this proposal.

A Failed apology? – The case of the ‘Volkswagen dieselgate’
Dietmar Till
University of Tuebingen, Germany
The paper will reconstruct the main steps of Volkswagen’s failed strategy of crisis communication in 2015 and early 2016, mainly based on public statements (press statements, speeches etc.) by members of the board of managers of both Volkswagen of America and the Volkswagen Group based at Wolfsburg, Germany. Theoretically I will base my argumentation on theories of rhetorical apologia that have been developed since the 1970s: Wave’s & Linkugel’s (1973) four strategies of apologia, Benoit’s (1995) ‘Image Restoration Theory’ and Coomb’s (2004 and 2006) ‘Situational Crisis Communication Theory’ (SCCT).

Encounter Rhetorics and the blending of argumentative cultures
Christopher W. Tindale
University of Windsor, Canada
Extremist positions, understood as positions of a radical nature that resist the status quo, underlie many of the social and political debates that create a valuable diversity in society and prevent a stagnation of ideas. But we still need to consider ways in which to argue constructively with people who hold radical views in uncompromising ways, regardless of the issues. A step toward this is the understanding of people who hold such views and why they hold them. One approach is to “return” to moments when the radically different encounter each other and witness the rhetorical situations that emerge, calling into existence a common rhetorical discourse which is a preliminary condition for argumentation. In this paper, I introduce the concept of these “encounter rhetorics” and discuss their nature.

Dressed arguments in legal speeches: the use of style formulas, maxims and Latinisms
Serena Tomasi¹, Maurizio Manzin², Federico Puppo³
¹University of Trento, Italy; ²University of Trento, Italy; ³University of Trento, Italy
The aim of this paper is to provide an analysis of communication in forensic situations, drawing on expertise from forensic linguistics. The authors will focus attention on the frequent use of courtesy formulas (style clauses) and legal maxims (brocardi). They will highlight the role played by these technical formulas in forensic practice, whose use seems functional to the progressive construction of a common argumentative ground, to which the parties cooperate in the complex dynamic of practical judgment. Style formulas and brocardi are rhetorical presentational means but also dressed arguments: in this sense, their use is not neutral but deceiving for what they do not say.

Rhetoric of effective translations: Looking for audience demand
Tatyana Petrovna Tretyakova
St.Petersburg University, Russian Federation
The paper concerns incorporating rhetorical dimension in translation studies. It is argued that the conception of pragmatic equivalence is connected with the anticipation of audience demand for text perception as a part of <Strategic Maneuvering> (van Eemeren & Houtlosser). The material used for the analysis are three pillar Russian translations of the US Constitution and the Declaration of Independence that appeared in crucial periods for Russian history (1862 - abandoning of serfdom; 1935 – totalitarian...
Stalin rule; 1993 – Russian Perestroika). The original texts provide a system of interactive major concepts covering the domain of <Democracy> (people, union, equality, liberty, freedom, etc.) and other general axiological concepts (happiness, safety, tyranny etc.). Rhetorical shifts in perception of translated texts lie in discourse practices of the audience and its cultural/ideological expectation.

**Nanobots, nanorockets, and other nanomachines: Verbal and visual metaphors in arguing about nanotechnology**

**Assimakis Tseronis**  
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

In this presentation, I study the ways in which metaphors with the source domain “machine”, conveyed verbally or visually, are employed by scientists and science journalists when arguing about nanotechnology. Such metaphors are used not only to describe nanostructures at the scale of one billionth of a meter, which are invisible as such to the human eye, but also to argue about benefits and risks related to the development and applications of nanotechnology. First, I discuss the parallels that exist between interpreting and reconstructing the argumentative relevance of metaphors and of visuals. Then, I explore the different effects that the verbal and visual realizations of the machine-metaphor have for the argumentation process, based on a sample analysis of articles written by scientists and science journalists in printed and electronic media.

**Chlorinated chicken: Evidence and inference**

**Giovanni Tuzet, Damiano Canale**  
Bocconi University, Italy

In the 1990s a controversy arose between the US and the EU about chlorine-washed chicken: the US treated chicken that way for health-protection purposes, while, ironically, for health-protection purposes the EU banned the import of it. The controversy has recently popped up again after the Brexit vote: the question is whether the UK, after leaving the EU, is going to import such chicken, as free-trade supporters hope and environmental campaigners fear. Now, what are the main arguments advanced in this controversy? What is the evidence presented? What are the legal and economic reasons that come into play? The paper aims at reconstructing the debate on that issue and present an inferentialist account of it, centered on discursive entitlements and commitments involved in the relevant arguments.

**The fallacy of semantic deference**

**Michele Ubertone**  
University of Bologna, Italy

Experts in subjects other than law are taking on an increasingly important role in contemporary legal systems. Traditionally, their task has been understood as confined to that of solving questions of fact. It is normal for a judge to rely on expert opinions to decide whether a certain event has taken place, but it would seem rather odd for a judge to rely on such opinions to decide whether that event has been brought about illegally, or whether it is otherwise legally relevant. The thesis I advance is that, in fact, due to what Hilary Putnam has called “the division of linguistic labor,” experts are often left to decide on important questions of law, as well.
Reception and rejection of complex argumentation: When one’s business practices are contested

Mehmet Ali Üzelgün¹, Önder Küçükural²
¹Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal; ²Ibn Haldun University, Turkey

This study focuses on interviews designed to elicit argumentation with the use of a video-elicitation technique: a complex argument comprising an acceptability criticism concerning the usefulness of carbon offsets is presented via a video-excerpt in the course of (N=42) in-depth interviews to corporate actors pioneering the transition to a low-carbon economy. The goal is to examine how these actors respond to criticism that disputes their own business practices. We examine the responses with regard to their focus, force, level, and the norms they appeal to, as well as how they exploit the topical potential and redefine the disagreement.

Exploring argumentative patterns in a commercial context

Sandra Clemencia Valencia
University of Santiago of Compostela, Spain

This paper takes the pragma-dialectical perspective on argumentation to explore an argumentative pattern with a fortiori argument as the main argument which is prototypical of the argumentative discourse of selling life insurance policies. This commercial practice is first analyzed as a communicative activity type. An argumentative characterization of such activity type demonstrates how a commercial agent maneuvers strategically using comparative arguments to convince a potential client of getting said insurance.

Convergent structures in argument: Theoretical-linguistic description

Lev Vasilev
Kaluga State University, Russian Federation

Convergency in argument is viewed as a phenomenon of semiotic complication/extension of the elementary two-component (‘standpoint-plus-premise’) argument. The rule of thumb for differentiating between multiple and co-ordinate structures is establishing (a) differentiation between causation and non-causation; (b) differentiation between non-causation and correlation. To be co-ordinate, premises in convergent arguments must contain correlation, i.e. have homogeneous parts. In general, premise homogeneity results in semantic-syntactic agreement in an argument. The paper analyses six homogeneity-based linguistic criteria for establishing co-ordination in arguments – teleological, coherent, semantic, contextual, grammatical, and lexical. Absolute homogeneity and the complete co-ordination exist when all the six criteria are met. If only some are present, there can be: (a) incomplete co-ordination with the various trajectories of support; (b) non-coordinate support (still to be distinguished from multiple grounding).

Notes on the structure of valid defeasible arguments

Bart Verheij
University of Groningen, The Netherlands

The structure of arguments is a long-standing theme in argumentation theory. In the paper, the structure of arguments is investigated using a recent proposal to evaluate the validity of defeasible arguments in terms of cases and their preferential ordering. We focus on structure related to argumentative support, and on structure related to argumentative attack. Concretely, support by multiple, subordinated and
coordinated reasons is discussed. As kinds of argument attack, attack by rebutting, undercutting and undermining reasons is treated. It is studied how these six kinds of argumentative structure can be distinguished using cases and their preferential ordering. A connection is made to Toulmin's argument model by addressing whether and to what extent it can be analyzed in terms of the presented approach.

**Analogical argumentation and developing critical reflection**

Ana María Vicuna⁠¹, Celso Lopez⁠²
⁠¹Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile; ⁠²Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Chile

The ability to reflect on the ideas implicit in our standpoints is fundamental for critical thinking. To question principles by which we interpret our experience requires breaking the circle of our prejudices. We must go beyond our experience. Some examples of philosophical argumentation are shown to help in this endeavor. We discuss a question that arises in a philosophical novel for children (Lipman, 1981) about which of two stories concerning our origins is more unbelievable: that in the beginning we were as tall as mountains, or that we were really small and grew to become just as we are now. We show that philosophers like Plato, Descartes and many others have used similes or myths that work in the same way and discuss some examples.

**An annotated corpus of argument schemes in US election debates**

Jacky Visser⁠¹, John Lawrence⁠¹, Jean H.M. Wagemans⁠², Chris Reed⁠¹³
⁠¹University of Dundee, United Kingdom; ⁠²University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ⁠³Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

The US2016-SCHEMES corpus comprises transcripts of television debates leading up to the 2016 US presidential elections, combined with associated reactions on the Reddit social media platform. The full corpus (97,999 words) is annotated with the argumentative relations of inference, conflict and rephrase, and their illocutionary anchoring in the discourse. A sub-corpus containing the first general election debate between Clinton and Trump (17,190 words) is annotated with argument schemes on the basis of a factorial approach to argument classification called the ‘Periodic Table of Arguments’. This classification is based on three discriminating properties of arguments: first-/second-order; predicate/subject; fact/value/policy propositions. The US2016-SCHEMES corpus serves as an open resource of empirical data on argument schemes – e.g. for the development of argument mining techniques (the automated reconstruction of argumentation).

**On argumentation in cognition-based therapies and cognition models in argumentation**

Randee G. Voss
Pierce College, USA

Cognitive behavioral therapy, schema therapy, and other cognitive therapies maintain that maladaptive thoughts cause emotional problems. Therapist and patient work together to reconfigure cognitive structures and processes to achieve healthy beliefs, logical thinking, and happier feelings. Destructive core beliefs, or negative schemata, are conceived as false propositions about self and world that in turn lead to “cognitive distortions.” So argumentation constitutes a model of cognition in which dysfunctional thought is characterized as faulty internal argument. Treatment is likewise based on argumentation and argument analysis. Argumentation studies might further offer to these therapies richer models of agency, situation, and discourse ethics, while the cognitive therapies’ dynamic and layered model of cognition can give us, in turn, a vision of how belief structures work and change.
Resistance to violence metaphors for cancer

Dunja Wackers, Gerard Steen, José Plug
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

In discourse about cancer, violence metaphors are commonplace. Society has ‘waged war’ on cancer to find a cure for the disease; cancer researchers are designing ‘magic bullets’ and ‘smart bombs’ that should ‘destroy’ ‘enemy’ cells. Yet, violence metaphors for cancer are also resisted. While the (potential) shortcomings of these metaphors have received attention in a variety of research fields, a detailed account of resistance is still lacking. The present paper aims to fill part of this gap through examining the argumentative properties of resistance to said metaphors. More specifically, it will make use of insights from pragma-dialectical argumentation theory in order to distinguish between different types of arguments that relate to different aspects of the contested metaphors.

Incommensurability, argumentation scheme and rhetorical invention: Fact as disputable space in cross-cultural argumentation

Jianfeng Wang
Fujian Normal University, China

Among presuppositions firmly entrenched in the tradition and practice of Chinese discourse are the discursive axioms that “fact speaks louder than eloquence,” which means “facts” exist independently of a specific context and audience. In the West, however, one of the long-cherished assumptive principles in speaking is that “fact” and “eloquence” are not in an oppositional relation, but rather in a relation of Siamese twins. In the current discursive field of intercultural argumentation, what counts as “fact” or “data” for point of departure, has become a “stasis” from which arguers from both sides make great efforts to redirect or readjust their discourse production.

Perceptions of reasonableness and effectiveness in responses to fallacious arguments in public argument

Harry Weger¹, Chad Collins²
¹University of Central Florida, USA; ²University of Central Florida, USA

Until recently (e.g., Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2006; Jacobs & Jackson, 2006), comparatively less work examines arguers’ responses to fallacious arguments than work on describing and analyzing fallacies themselves. The purpose of this study is to more closely examine audience perceptions of responses to fallacious arguments. First, we exam two variations of meta-dialogue (Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2006) which involve simply calling out a move as fallacious and direct refutation that explains why the opponent’s argument fails to support her standpoint. The third strategy we assess is the counter fallacy. Participants will evaluate the effectiveness, reasonableness, and credibility of arguers’ responses to fallacious arguments. Multiple instantiations of fallacies and responses presented as Twitter threads will be used to increase the generalizability of our results.

Why a theory of warrant strength is a necessity for argument assessment

Mark L. Weinstein
Montclair State University, USA

Whether argument is seen as a vehicle for persuasion, as striving towards epistemological adequacy or as a contest with winners and losers, more than a recitation of the reasons given is required if the adequacy of an argument is to be assessed. I will argue that the strength of the warrants, whether offered or tacitly
available underlies the adequacy of arguments of all sorts. I will argue that this is obvious for arguments whose merit is epistemological and will then focus on the role on warrant strength in persuasion dialogues using the analysis of bias in arguments about educational policy to support the centrality of warrant strength. Recent work in cognitive science shows the psychological basis for the role of warrants that serve as cognitive networks that support commitments.

**Lying in real world argumentative dialogue systems**

**Simon Wells**¹, **Al Baker**²

¹Edinburgh Napier University, United Kingdom; ²University of Leeds, United Kingdom

Argumentative dialogue systems promise a human-oriented interaction mechanism between people and the new generation of artificially intelligent machines acting in everyday life. However, thorny questions remain in relation to how our ideal, normative systems of argument and dialogue fair when exposed to the real-world. Whilst it's often assumed that the truth should, or will, always be told, this can be easier said than done, and even when achievable, can be counterproductive. In this paper we attempt to shed light on some gray areas concerning truth telling, or lack thereof, in relation to human dialogical interaction with AI systems. From this investigation, we make recommendations for the design of future, real world, applied, dialectical argumentation systems.

**A retrospective analysis of Russian “democracy”: An historical case study of definitional argumentation**

**David Cratis Williams**¹, **Marilyn J. Young**², **Michael K. Launer**³

¹Florida Atlantic University, USA; ²Florida State University; ³RussTech Language Services, Inc.

This presentation traces changes in definitional arguments for Russian “democracy” from the creation of the Russian Federation to the present. We identify three broad phases, each a distinctive blend of argumentative posture and definitional strategies. When Boris Yeltsin declared Russia to be a “democracy,” the meaning was “not Soviet” with aspirational associations with freedom and prosperity; the definitional strategy was oppositional, and the posture was reactive. Following Yeltin’s re-election, strategy shifts toward arguments of becoming, becoming a Western-style democracy or, under Putin, “managed” then “sovereign.” The posture was largely reactive. As Russia moved into Crimea in 2014, definitional arguments proclaiming Russia a “democratic” nation dropped from Presidential discourse, replaced by hardened nationalism – anti-Ukrainian, anti-American, and anti-democratic. Russia ceased re-defining itself as “democratic” and began to redefine “democracy” in western opinion.

**The three levels of argument**

**Harald R. Wohlbrapp**

Universität Hamburg, Germany

The task of this paper is the clarification of the relations between everyday argumentation and other forms or types like juridical, political, rhetorical etc. argument. Usually these various forms are understood as different species sharing some structural qualities which allow us to recognize them all as “arguments”. Against this view it is here proposed to emphasize argumentation’s inherent potential of self-enhancement. It can be represented in three different reflective levels, called here: “natural”-, “scientific”-, and “philosophical” argumentation.
**Epicheireme in American political memory**

Jaime Lane Wright  
St. John's University, USA

The central part of informal argumentation studies engages a structural analysis of what works as “good” argument. In this paper, I challenge the notion that “good” argument works only enthymematically, arguing instead that more complex and multi-layered epicheireme may be more effective in persuading multiple audiences. For the purposes of this paper, I use Church and Catheart’s definition of the epicheireme: that its purpose is “to order and adorn the speaker’s proof” and that it includes “considerable disagreement over the degree of embellishment… that was necessary to … generate audience acceptance.” The major element of the epicheireme at issue is the element of different layers of proof.

**Justifying particular reasoning in constructive dialogue**

Jingjing Wu  
Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Constructive dialogue is a monitoring procedure between international human rights treaty bodies and member states. Particular reasoning is to argue because some particular circumstances, the subject is entitled to deviate from the universal rules, which is an argument commonly made by member states in constructive dialogue. In this paper, I first state that for an argument to be good in constructive dialogue, it must be legally justifiable and dialogically constructive. I then bring out the conditions for a particular reasoning to be justifiable in constructive dialogue, by drawing inspiration from Neil MacComick’s universalisable particular thesis and Scott Brewer's reasoning by analogy. The key for justifying particular reasoning, in this case, is to identify the ‘salient’ feature that makes the subject particular and to decide the validity of its universalisability.

**Confrontational maneuvering by dissociation in the spokespersons’ argumentative replies at Chinese diplomatic press conferences: A pragma-dialectical approach**

Peng Wu  
Jiangsu University, China; ILIAS International Learned Institute for Argumentation Studies

Taken the institutional preconditions of the press conferences held by Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Chinese MoFA) into account, a likely way for the spokespersons to achieve a redefinition of the difference of opinion in the confrontation stage is making use of one of the subtypes or variants of the mode of strategic maneuvering known as dissociation. In this paper, within the framework of Pragma-Dialectics, I will distinguish and explain different subtypes and various variants of dissociation as a mode of confrontational maneuvering that can be identified empirically in the spokespersons’ argumentative replies at Chinese MoFA’s press conferences. Based on these findings, I will further analyze how the spokespersons exploit the topical potential, adapt to audience demands and make use of presentational devices in the strategic design of their use of dissociation.

**The epistemic and social function of reasoning**

Xiaojing Wu  
Southwestern University of Finance & Economics, China

In formal logic, reasoning and argument are both taken as a sequence of propositions, as they share similar formal structures, i.e. premises and conclusion. In everyday life, although reasoning activities frequently manifest in argumentative activities, such as debating, negotiation and persuasion; reasoning is distinguished from argumentation not only in conception and evaluation, but also in their cognitive and
social functions. In this paper, I discuss the above issues; and I argue that the epistemic function of reasoning is to generate thinking products, while the social function is to resolve problems.
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On the logical reconstruction of conductive argument

Yun Xie
Sun Yat-sen University, China

This paper aims to discuss two main approaches for the logical reconstruction of conductive argument. The first one is the supplementation-of-on-balance-premise approach (Govier 2011, Hansen 2011, Blair 2017), and the second is the warrant-reformulation-approach (Freeman 2011, Bermejo-Luque 2017). It is argued that neither of them are satisfactory (at least in their versions developed till now), because (1) reconstructing conductive argument by adding an on-balance premise is problematic, for it would result in a violation of the principle of charity; and (2) integrating counter-considerations into the warrant of a conductive argument would make things unnecessarily complicated, hence might not be preferred when compared with another much simpler approach in which the mechanism of weighing is conceived as just an interaction between arguments for opposite conclusions.

The pattern of reasoning in Mongolian clinical therapy

Minghui Xiong1,2, Sigen Tuo1,3
1Institute of Logic & Cognition, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China; 2Institute for Reasoning, Argumentation & Communication, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, Chengdu, China; 3Inner Mongolia Medical University, Huhhot, China

The Mongolian Clinical Reasoning (MCR) is the rational foundation of Mongolian medicine. MCR refers to such a kind of reasoning, by which traditional Mongolian clinicians could grasp their patients’ symptoms by means of "three diagnostic methods", ascertain the pathogenesis based on the Mongolian pathology, implement treatment programs in the light of Mongolian medicine, and finally be able to verify whether the symptoms have been eliminated. In this paper, we will reconstruct some patterns of reasoning in the MCR We found that MCR seems to be closer to conductive reasoning developed by Carl Wellman in 1971. For this reasoning, in this paper we will try to reconstruct the pattern of MCR by means of the pattern of conductive reasoning.

- Y -

Mencius’s argumentation on human nature

Linqiong Yan1, Minghui Xiong2
1Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China / Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China; 2Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, China / Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, Chengdu, China

Mencius, the second sage after Confucius, is well-known as a master of argumentation in the pre-Qin period of ancient China. One of his influential arguments is that human nature is good. His thought of human nature is expressed in the works Mencius as critical discussion. By reconstructing and analyzing Mencius’s argumentative discourse under the framework of pragma-dialectics, it is revealed that what Mencius really wants to convey is the tendency to goodness inherent in human nature. We also find that Mencius maneuvers strategically in his argumentation by effectively and reasonably employing strategies
like dissociation, *reductio ad absurdum,* “spear-and-shield” strategy, Tuilei, appeal to authority and two-
way arguments. Besides, the coordinate argumentation structure makes his argumentation comprehensive
and tenable as a whole.

**Contemporary Journalism study from the perspective of argumentation theory: A pragma-dialectical
approach**

**Ying Yang**
Tsinghua University, China

As a rational social activity of sharing information, observing the world and finding out the truth among
human beings, journalistic activity is closely connected with argumentative thinking and practice, this is
especially the case in present network society. Adopting the approach of pragma-dialectics in
argumentation studies, the paper points out that in current journalistic environment, to take the
journalistic activity as a critical discussion between journalistic subjects can be considered as a good
choice to meet the unavoidable challenges brought by social media. By taking the current situation of
online journalism in China as an example and pointing out the problems it is faced with, the paper argues
that the final realization of news authenticity in network society benefits from critical discussions among
journalistic subjects.

**Editing in arguments in television news**

**Ying Yang1, Paul van den Hoven2**
1Tsinghua University, China; 2Utrecht University, the Netherlands

In modern journalism, complex forms of video editing are commonly employed. This paper investigates
the question to what extend and how the visual elements contribute to the argumentation conveyed by the
report. We analytically distinguish between images that merely illustrate what is verbally conveyed and
images that have another argumentatively relevant function, framing in particular. Such functions can be
considered forms of strategic maneuvering that deserve further investigation. Materials are taken from
global channels such as CGTN.

**Some critical thoughts on critical thinking: If ‘ands’ or ‘buts’ should be indicators**

**Michael Andrew Yong-Set, Curtis Kenneth Julian Hyra**
University of Windsor, Canada

In this paper, we argue that accounts of ‘indicator language' found in the critical thinking pedagogy can
be enriched by a philosophically-robust Argumentation Theory. By exploring how words can function as
indicators to begin with, we develop a framework that better describes the nature of ‘indicator language.’
On this new model inspired by Aristotelian and Vanadic methods, we reconceptualize indicator language
as an “Apparent Signal Expression Search Heuristic.” But to be a useful technique in argument analysis,
a critical thinker must understand how to be mindful of the ways heuristics can derail despite being
largely reliable. Argumentation Theory has much to offer in developing this background understanding.
From these considerations, we can consider 'and' and 'but' among the words that function as signal
expressions for premises in natural language arguments.
Argument schemes, critical questions, and complete argument evaluation
Shiyang Yu¹, Frank Zenker²
¹Department of Philosophy, Sun Yat-sen University, China; ²Department of Philosophy & Cognitive Science, Lund University, Sweden

The ability to evaluate any instance of an argument scheme requires a complete list of critical questions (CQs). To identify the elements on this list, one approach is to abstract from the CQs’ linguistic content and focus on their functional roles instead. For the Toulmin model, Verheij (2006) has proposed five functional roles for rebutters. Insofar as rebutters are functionally equivalent to CQs, these roles can guide the formulation of CQs. As groundwork for future research, we offer a systematization, and a minor amendment, of Verheij’s functional roles. We treat the CQ referring to the applicability of a warrant (fifth role) as a subtype of an undercutting defeater (fourth role). In like vein, we distinguish further subtypes of defeaters, and illustrate the implicational order in which CQs apply.
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From verbal to non-verbal: How far can we go?
Igor Ž. Žagar
Educational Research Institute, Slovenia

In this paper, I would like to explore how far we can argumentation theory go. Can we widen the scope even more and try to include taste, smell, and touch? If words and visuals are shared by the participants in the (argumentative) discussion, smells, tastes and touches present a problem. We have to report about them (verbally), which takes their distinctive (ontological) features away: they become simple words and phrases of descriptive kind, and cease to be distinctive entities, the entities we perceived non-verbally, with different senses. Can taste, smell and touch and therefore be(come) arguments (play argumentative roles, assume argumentative functions)? And how wide can the scope of what is an argument be? Should we nevertheless consider drawing a line between argumentation and persuasion?

“What kind of story can we build around him?” An argumentative analysis of how journalists frame stories
Marta Zampa
Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

News items – both in the journalists’ perception and in the majority of scholarly understanding – are structured according to a (at least partial) narrative structure. What story exactly should be told – in other words, how an event should be framed – is a key issue for newsmakers, as it indirectly expresses the medium’s position on a given issue. Therefore, the choice of narrative frame can be controversial and has to be argued for. This paper focuses on this choice within argumentative discussions in editorial conferences. Narrative frames are considered endoxa shared by the newsmakers and their audience. The journalists’ collective framing of two events in the newsroom of the German-language Swiss news magazine 10vor10 is presented as a case study.

Beneficial violation of the language use rule: The case of Lyndon Johnson, 50 years later
David Zarefsky
Northwestern University, USA

Many theories of argumentation regard ambiguity as a fallacy of language. But it may sometimes be appropriate -- especially when the audience is large, heterogeneous, and deeply divided. The goal may be
not to resolve a difference of opinion but to reach agreement without resolving it. I will illuminate the value of strategic ambiguity in such situations by examining an event from 50 years ago: U.S. President Lyndon Johnson's announcement on March 31, 1968 that he was modifying his Vietnam policy and not standing for re-election. His speech can be read as consistency or change, acknowledgment of failure or celebration of success, acceptance or displacement of responsibility. Different listeners could each hear the speech within their own frames of reference yet agree that it was a promising new direction.

*How not to aggregate reasons*

**Frank Zenker**
Lund University, Sweden

Assume an arguer forwards two reasons, R1 and R2, in support of a claim. Abbreviating ‘support’ by ‘P’, as in ‘probability’, we can express “How do reasons aggregate?” as a request to specify the function \( f(P(R1),P(R2)) \). There is no shortage of candidates to meet the request. We briefly review—yet reject—approaches that define \( f(P(R1),P(R2)) \) solely according to structural features of argument such as the linked vs. convergent distinction. We also show why extant candidates nevertheless (rightly) apply to some instance of natural language argument. Decisive criteria favoring this or that candidate, however, not only cite, but pivot on semantic rather than structural information.

*Reconstructing metaphor in argumentation*

**Chuanrui Zhang, Cihua Xu**
Zhejiang University, China

In argumentation studies, there are varied proposals about how to reconstruct metaphor used in argumentative discourse but none of them is fully satisfactory. The present paper corporates insights from relevance theory into argumentation studies to solve existing problems about the use of metaphor in argumentation and tentatively proposes a paradigm for reconstructing metaphor from the perspective of pragma-dialectics. It is argued that a metaphor used in argumentation forms a combination of a systematic abductive reasoning and a deduction, instead of an argument by analogy. To explain the viewpoint and method, this study will demonstrate how a metaphor A IS B used in argumentation constitutes a new non-figurative proposition and builds the optimal relevance in argumentation reconstruction by lexical broadening, narrowing or both by analyzing several metaphorical examples.

*Rhetorical issues in education: How rhetorical is teacher’s authority?*

**Janja Žmavc**
Educational Research Institute, Slovenia

In the paper, we explore common points between the concept of a teacher's authority and rhetoric as an interpersonal persuasive process between the speaker and the audience. After a short analysis of different notions of a teacher's authority, we point out that there is an aspect of the process of successful maintaining of the teacher's authority, which is connected to some of the fundamental principles of the art of public persuasion. Focusing on the Aristotelian concept of the means of persuasion and the possibilities of its application to the educational context, we present a model of rhetorical construction of the teacher’s authority. Through some practical examples we remind of the critical aspects of the use of rhetorical principles in contemporary teaching.
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