

ARGUPOLIS COURSE
12 - 15 OCTOBER
LUGANO

STRATEGIC MANEUVERING AND FALLACIES

Frans H. van Eemeren (f.h.vaneemeren@uva.nl)
Bart Garssen (b.j.garssen@uva.nl)

Course description

Fallacies are studied since antiquity and have been a central theme in argumentation theory ever since. Nowadays they are viewed as deficient moves in argumentative discourse. Why exactly are fallacies fallacious? Which fallacies must be distinguished? How can they be identified? The course offers a historical and conceptual overview of the main approaches to the fallacies.

In order to create a solid theoretical background for the study of fallacies, recent developments in the study of strategic manoeuvring will be discussed. In this endeavour the extension of the standard pragma-dialectical theory with a rhetorical dimension is studied. The focus will be on the connection between strategic manoeuvring and the fallacies.

Special attention is paid to the empirical study of the fallacies, focusing on how argumentative discourse is evaluated by ordinary arguers. To what extent do the judgments of ordinary arguers conform to the critical norms for reasonable argumentation? How can the judgments of ordinary arguers be tested in experimental research?

PROGRAM

Monday 12 Oct.	Afternoon:	The standard treatment of the fallacies; from Aristotle to Copi (1, 9, 11, 15). Empirical research and pilot study
Tuesday 13 Oct.	Morning:	Pragma-dialectics and strategic maneuvering (5, 6, 7)
	Afternoon:	Constructive alternatives to the standard treatment I (formal and dialectical approaches; 14, 17) Empirical research and pilot study
Wednesday 14 Oct.	Morning:	Constructive alternatives to the standard treatment II (informal logic and epistemological approaches; 2, 8, 10, 12)
	Afternoon:	Empirical research and pilot study
Thursday 15 Oct.	Morning:	Constructive alternatives to the standard treatment III (rhetorical approaches; 3, 4, 13, 16)
	Afternoon:	Empirical research and pilot study

READINGS

- 1) Aristotle (1995). On Sophistical Refutations. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 19–38). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 2) Biro, J. & H. Siegel (1992). Normativity, argumentation and an epistemic theory of fallacies. In Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, J. Anthony Blair & Charles A. Willard (eds.), *Argumentation Illuminated* (pp. 85-103). Amsterdam: Sic Sat.
- 3) Brinton, A. (1995). The *ad hominem*. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp.213-222). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 4) Crosswhite, James (1993). Being unreasonable: Perelman and the problem of fallacies. In *Argumentation* 7, 385-402.
- 5) Eemeren, F.H. van (to be published in 2010). *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse*.
- 6) Eemeren, F.H., van & R. Grootendorst (2004). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation. The Pragma-Dialectical Approach* (pp. 123-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 7) Eemeren, F.H. van, Garssen, B.J., & Meuffels H.L.M. (2009) *Fallacies and Judgments of Reasonableness. Empirical Research Concerning the Pragma-Dialectical Discussion Rules*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- 8) Govier, T. (1995). Reply to Massey. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 172-180). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 9) Hamblin, C.L. (1970). *Fallacies*. London: Methuen. Reprint 1998, Newport News VA: Vale Press. Ch. 1 (pp. 9-49).
- 10) Johnson, R.H. (1995). The Blaze of her Splendors: Suggestions about Revitalizing Fallacy Theory. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 107-129). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 11) Locke, J. (1995). Four sorts of Arguments. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 55-56). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 12) Massey, G.J. (1995) The Fallacy Behind Fallacies. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 159-171). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 13) Tindale, Christopher (1999). *Acts of arguing. A rhetorical model of argument*. Chapter 6. Albany, NY: SUNY Press. (pp. 157-182).
- 14) Walton, D.N. (1992). ‘Types of dialogue, dialectical shifts and fallacies’. In: Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, J. Anthony Blair & Charles A. Willard (eds.), *Argumentation illuminated*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (pp. 133-147).
- 15) Whately, R. (1995) Of Fallacies. In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 67-94). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- 16) Willard Ch. A. (1995). Failures of Relevance: A Rhetorical View. Lock, J. (1995). In H.V. Hansen & R.C. Pinto (eds.), *Fallacies: Classical Background and Contemporary Developments* (pp. 145-158). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

17) Woods, J. & Walton, D.N. (1989). Ad Hominem. In *Fallacies: Selected papers, 1972-1982*. Dordrecht/ Providence: Foris Publications, PDA 9. Chapter 5 (pp. 55-73).

TAKEN AS READ:

Eemeren, F.H., van & R. Grootendorst (1992). *Argumentation, Communication and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective* (pp. 93-217). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Walton, D.N. (1992). 'Types of dialogue, dialectical shifts and fallacies'. In: Frans H. van Eemeren, Rob Grootendorst, J. Anthony Blair & Charles A. Willard (eds.), *Argumentation illuminated*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (pp. 133-147).