

G. Thomas Goodnight
Argumentation
Spring 2016

ARGUMENTATION & ADVOCACY

This is a course in argumentation that unfolds in three sub-units. The first unit examines communicative argument as a form of engagement with others. The idea of the section is to acquaint you with key moves in thinking and language where you can engage others productively whose views may coincide, be indifferent, or opposed to your own. The second section of the course examines basic forms and tests of productive reasoning that are used in producing arguments that are subjected to testing, review, and judgment. The final section of the class examines argumentation as a practice. We begin with political argument, attend to visual strategies of influence, and move to advocacy, particularly how the legacy of academic debate can be deployed to fashion your own start up or to join and spread NGO activities you think are useful. Business and organizational practices are identified. We end with inquiry into ethical practices directed toward happiness and leading the good life.

The course requires that you (1) *participate in a teaching exercise (in class time)*, (2) *take a mid-term*, (3) *a take home final (4 pages)*, and (4) *produce a class report that leads to a final paper (5-7 pages)*. The mid-term is drawn from key terms defined in notes and referenced in the text. The report requires each person to isolate a topic of interest to urban communities, explain a preferred NGO intervention, define its qualities and advocate that your choice is great or at least better than your peer presenter. Teaching exercise 20%; mid term 30%; final examination 25%; final paper 25%. The class report will constitute an instance of advocacy argument for a particular blogger or group who is working-intervention on state, private, or personal concerns for a local community or some mix. The final paper should constitute a case briefing that presents a good and bad example of a social or policy intervention into community. The final examination will be a take home. The examination requests synthesis and application, limited to 6 pages. Final examination is a take home examination; final paper can be sent by email. Both are due by December 12, close of the day. Class attendance is expected. More than 4 absences will result in a partial grade adjustment.

The Text for the class is Thomas A. Hollihan and Kevin T. Baaske, Arguments & Arguing: The Products and Process of Human Decision Making. The readings are not long, but I do request that students come prepared for class. A student who is absent a significant amount of time will have the grade reduced. I subscribe to standards of integrity and participation outlined by the University on its website and student handbooks.

Office hours are from 2:30-5:00 on Mondays, in ASC 206A. Phone 213-821-5384. On September 19th and 20th I will hold special office hours to discuss with students individually the case of civic engagement which they intend to present to the class. The presentation date will be

fixed early in the semester and scheduled. Students may trade dates, if there are problems. From November 1st forward, we will have two presentations per sessions. Students should coordinate presentations as a debate or discussion between which civic blogger or NGO to support—on the grounds of feasibility, impact, desirability, consequences or meaningfulness of the affiliation. Students should advocate participation as carving out time, commitment, resources and energy while identifying costs, limits, and evaluating alternatives

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Conduct

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in *SCampus* in Part B, Section 11, “Behavior Violating University Standards” <https://policy.usc.edu/student/scampus/part-b>. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in *SCampus* and university policies on scientific misconduct, <http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct>.

Discrimination, sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and harassment are prohibited by the university. You are encouraged to report all incidents to the *Office of Equity and Diversity/Title IX Office* <http://equity.usc.edu> and/or to the *Department of Public Safety* <http://dps.usc.edu>. This is important for the health and safety of the whole USC community. Faculty and staff must report any information regarding an incident to the Title IX Coordinator who will provide outreach and information to the affected party. The sexual assault resource center webpage <http://sarc.usc.edu> fully describes reporting options. Relationship and Sexual Violence Services <https://engemannshc.usc.edu/rsvp> provides 24/7 confidential support.

Support Systems

A number of USC’s schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the *American Language Institute* <http://ali.usc.edu>, which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students. *The Office of Disability Services and Programs* <http://dsp.usc.edu> provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations. If an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible, *USC Emergency Information* <http://emergency.usc.edu> will provide safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued by means of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technology.

UNIT ONE: ARGUMENTATION & CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

1. August 22 ARGUMENTATION AS A HUMAN SYMBOLIC ACTIVITY—PART I **3-9**

ARGUMENT AS PRODUCT (discourse), **PROCESS** (institutional), or **POINT OF VIEW** (an act attributed to be making one or more claims).

ARGUMENT 1 “the claims that people make when they are asserting their opinions and supporting their beliefs.”

CLAIM: a claim is an assertion is a discursive sentence, a statement.

OPINION: an opinion is uttered about something upon which there are different points of view

BELIEF: a belief is a personal commitment that makes sense of experiences of things, events, or others.

ARGUING 2: “the process of resolving differences of opinion through communication.”

THE MARKET PLACE OF IDEAS: The worth of an idea is tested in the process of open exchange and debate. Good ideas win in the long run (Whig theory); bad ideas are winnowed out. A public is constituted by a variety of exchanges where citizens take pro and con positions.

PRO POSITION: Evidence and claims that are offered in support of an idea. Affirmative.

CON POSITION: Evidence and claims that are offered in opposition to an idea. Negative.

DECORUM: The harmony between speaker, audience, message, and occasion.

ACCEPTABLE ARGUING: there are occasions where the expression of disagreement is appropriate.

UNACCEPTABLE ARGUING: there are occasions where the expression of disagreement is inappropriate.

ARGUMENTATION REMAINS STABLE: when there is a consensus about the rules, topics, procedures of making arguments and reaching resolution.

ARGUMENTATION BECOMES VOLATILE: where the consensus as to what includes reasonable rules, topics, and procedures are themselves questioned and judgment is attributed to be suspect.

ARGUMENT CULTURE: An argument culture is an assembly of agents who engage in practices of informing, persuading and playing drawing upon the resources of authority, emotion, and logos over time. Argument cultures thrive with commitments to communicative work. Argument cultures decline when interests in listening to the views of others decline and differences are remain concealed or expressed and punished.

HEALTHY CIVIC ENGAGEMENT: There are relationships, groups, parties where a range of disagreement creates a constructive dynamic. Argument functions as a way of testing which beliefs and opinions should be brought into play, tested, and inform judgment. A healthy argument culture creates a virtuous spiral that is ever more inclusive of its stakeholders.

UNHEALTHY SOCIAL CONTROL: There are relationships, groups, parties where disagreement becomes a strategic instrument of accumulating power over factions. Argument flares into disputes where the importance of who wins outweighs the merits of the case to be

decided. An unhealthy argument culture creates a neurotic cycles of dependency among members who cannot leave but must endure the discourse. The resulting withdrawal sets conditions of factionalization. Exitology: skeptical reasoning that cultivate suspicion, indifference, or a sense of incapacitation—to the threshold of withdrawing, backlashing, or exiting a personal, technical, or public context of argument.

2. August 24 ARGUMENTATION AND DECISION MAKING—PART II 9-17

INDIVIDUAL DECISION-MAKING: Individual decision-making is strengthened by participating in an open-minded inquiry into a search for the better argument.

1. A decision-maker does not want to be duped by false information.
2. A decision-maker wants to make the best decision she can under the circumstances.
3. A decision-maker needs to know what went wrong if things turn out badly
4. A decision-maker must be accountable to her investors of power and resources.
5. A decision-maker must be prepared to justify choice to stakeholders.
6. A decision-maker will be called on to legitimate decision process.

CONTINGENCY: Argumentation concerns those instances where choice matters, decision is urgent, there are good and bad precedents that arguably inform the present, and outcomes will have advantages and disadvantages for oneself and for others.

DOGMATISM: Dogmatism is an attitude that asserts one’s own experiences or beliefs as providing ruling principles for making a decision in each particular case. A dogmatist may have a preference for applying authority to uncertain situations. Dogmatists take the risk that a situation is misjudged, incorrectly defined. Dogmatists also take the risk that a given situation offers distinct elements, that it presents the exception to the rule.

SKEPTICISM: Skeptics resist authority. Skeptics doubt that informed choice can make a real difference to situated decisions. Skeptics are vulnerable to authority because they doubt their own ability to judge better from worse decisions—so either trust others or try to avoid decisions altogether.

JUDGMENT: Judgment takes seriously the need to work through argumentation from an independent point of view as one whose personal life is at stake, whose professional identity is implicated, and whose public duties as a citizen are called into performance. In pluralistic society, judgment is an individual and a collaborative exercise. Individuals do not judge alone; rather, everyone works with other stakeholders; judgments are accountable as outcomes of particular performances.

MORAL ARGUMENT: Choosing and doing what is a *common good* for US. Moral argument depends upon values. Values are sticky reasons because they identify us as a group with certain qualities and goals. Values are positive—expressions of freedoms and responsibilities, preferences for which our community is noted. **MORAL ARGUMENT** in a pluralistic society includes a domain for others—people who have a different values in many areas. The idea of “reasonable difference” acknowledges in the particular case these values for us are crucial. Those values for others are a matter of choice.

ETHICAL ARGUMENT: Choosing and doing what is right for EVERYONE. Ethical norms are deontological in principle; in practice, they are shared as sayings, aphorisms, short statements. Just as what is right to do in a case is true to one's self; so what it must be right for all. The notion of JUSTICE is important to a democratic public. Practices, procedures, rules and situations that are not RIGHT demand exposure, prosecution, and sentencing. The RIGHT provides a counterfactual norm for any argument that claims a moral preference or reasonable difference. A value may be good without serving a broader principle of Justice.

STANDPOINT & OCCASION: If you think something is untrue, wrong, or untrustworthy, imagine the standpoint of another who is asserting a claim. What questions need to be asked to flush out the reasons for supporting a claim? If you think something is true, right, and trustworthy, imagine the standpoint of skeptical regard. What appears to be unsupported, out of the ordinary, or generated by self-interest? In everyday life, the standpoint of belief is ordinary. In professional life, the standpoint of skepticism enables competent work. Personal and professional judgments are called out by occasions. An occasion is a moment where argument has an urgency. We are all in training for a choice—to agree, to disagree, to withhold judgment.

3. August 29 THE FOUNDATIONS OF ARGUMENT: 38-50.

RHETORIC: Propositions are a matter of uncertainty. Goal. Prudential.

Rhetorical argument are those arguments that address a public on the matte of a resolution.

A resolution is a proposed claim that invites agreement and disagreement.

DIALECTIC: Propositions are a matter of conventional thinking. Goal. True.

Dialogue is the discussion of ideas through definition that moves from unexamined knowledge to consistent, thoughtful, reflective principles.

A debate in a safe-space where participants are able to pursue an argument to wherever it leads.

APODICTIC Propositions are a matter of classifying general and particulars. Goal. Certain.

The process of logical classification of the natural world into genus, species relationship.

RHETORICAL CANONS

1. **INVENTION**—Discovery of the reasons for and against a resolution.
2. **ARRANGEMENTS**—The grouping of topics and selection of arguments to make.
3. **STYLE**—The framing of prose into a meaningful sequence of statements.
4. **MEMORY**—A commitment to a range of basic evidence, stories, and norms.
5. **ACTION**—The enactment of an argument as outcome and as anticipation.

GENRES OF ARGUMENT: In principle, pure features serving a single end. In practice, mixed discourse of a public sphere. Epideictic is an element where values are amplified, diminished or reversed. Greek arguments cultivate excellence, the virtue (arête) of independent thinking. The public is the place of doing too much or too little. Common ground depends upon rhetoric.

DELIBERATIVE ARGUMENT: Deliberation is the presentation of a resolution to add to or cease from a course of common action. Deliberation moves to establish future fact, the likelihood of something coming about if a resolution is adopted or if it is not. Deliberation is associated with democracy. Citizens express opinions about leaders, policies, and acts—then vote. The end of deliberation is strong means to good ends. Justice is a secondary end.

FORENSIC ARGUMENT: Forensic argument debates how to deal with past-fact. Forensic argument moves from an autopsies—discussion of the facts under scrutiny—to a conjecture—what can be said about those facts. For Aristotle, forensic argument is to be found in courts of law. Forensic practice involves probable determination of past fact. Its aim is justice.

EPIDEICTIC ARGUMENT: This is an argument of praise and blame. The genre comes closest to “value” argumentation. The speaker is trying to establish the goodness, worthiness, desirability or reputation of a person, practice, object, or event. Epideictic argument occurs when values are uncertain, contested, discounted (in a gap between word and deed), or ritually celebrated. Epideictic attaches to forensic or deliberative questions to amplify or dampen motivation.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF ARGUMENT—THE CLASSICAL SYSTEM, ROMAN

THE METROPOLE AND THE COLONY: Epideictic argument is important in Roman times. Those who are not at the center persuade those who are in power and at the center to look upon them with kindness, responsibility, tolerance, and seriousness. Rhetorical argument is diplomatic, a matter of credible overstatement and ingratiating understatement.

THE PLEBIAN AND ELITE CLASSES: The Roman Republic consisted of two houses. The plebian house was where representatives of the common people talked out issues concerning their livelihoods, security, and issues of livelihood. Questions of justice were sorted out through vernacular discussions. Arguments are crude, but effective due to reputation, common sense, and demonstrated good will (signatures of ethos or authority). The upper house was constituted of elites. The discourse was refined, formal, and textually legal. Debates occurred among ruling families with resources to translate services to the state into wealth, privilege and power.

PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL ADVOCACY: Systems of Empire require administrators and an elite class who handle the day to day routines of informed argumentation. Roman law was codified. Courts established. Trial procedures put into place. So, too, personal defense was “out-sourced” to attorneys who had the time, training, and experience to perform in the courts. The rhetorical tradition is an ongoing discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of various experience with argument.

4. August 31 ARGUMENT AND THE NARRATIVE PARADIGN 60-73

THE NARRATIVE PARADIGM: Walter R. Fisher “(1) Human are---storytellers. (2) The paradigmatic mode of human decision making and communication is ‘good reasons,’ which vary in form among situations, genres, and media of communication. (3) The production and practice of good reasons are ruled by matters of history, biography, culture and character... (4) Rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings—and their inherent awareness of **narrative probability**, what constitutes a **coherent** story, and constant habit of testing **narrative fidelity**, whether nor not the stories they experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives... (5) the world as we know it is a set of stories that must be chosen among in order for us to live life in a process of continual recreation.” p. 26

INCARNATE NARRATIVES: There is an incarnate value that entered the world at a time of beginning. The person, institution, way of life grew, prospered, achieved, and now is under threat. The value is at risk. Things can be lost. Ways of life can end, unjustifiably. The world is a pageant (a coherent unfolding story) where we must remain faithful (fidelity) to the past, in order to avoid (probability) the threat of disorder in the present.
CONSTITUTIONALISTS, ORIGINAL INTENT, SECOND AMENDMENT—PROBLEM OF ORIGINAL SIN BRINGS EVIL INTO THE WORLD, MUST BE CONFRONTED.

TRANSCENDENT NARRATIVES: There are examples gathering together in a trajectory. Each example is unique. Together they constitute a trend. The examples occasion resources for action or obstacles to be overcome. Smart, timely, informed intervention is a duty.

Our story is made coherent by the strength of commitments to pursue over time things we know to be of value, however imperfect the world. PROGRESSIVES, CONSTITUTION AS A LIVING DOCUMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH—PROBLEM OF ENVIRONMENT LIMITS ACTION, LEARN FROM INTERVENTION.

STORIES THAT ARE TREATED AS PARADIGM CASES Deductive

1. What was the event that brought a value into being? Was it good or evil?
2. What is the story of conflict between heroes and villains?
3. Why does the event need to be remembered now? Who forgets it and why?
4. How do we assure that the incarnate value is protected?
5. How does our commitment to a basic value make us secure and happy?
6. How do we contain or expel the groups who violate our values?

STORIES THAT ARE TREATED AS EXAMPLE TRAJECTORIES Inductive

1. What event brought a topic of concern to notice.
2. Does the event require intervention to stop its harms?
3. What would be the consequences of not dealing with the event immediately?
4. Is the single event a sign of gathering examples over time?
5. Are those things that bring about examples self-cancelling or growing?
6. How do we turn the event into a working problem to approximate ideal goals?
7. How do we measure the historical costs of an event against the future benefits of change?

OPPOSING ARGUMENTS FROM PARADIGMS Refuting deduction

1. We do not know exactly what happened. We only have representations.
2. The event was not as significant or unique as it is characterized.
3. The event happened as a matter of accident rather than necessity.
4. The event was telling for one era but the times now are changing.
5. Paradigmatic thinking is dogmatic. It keeps us from appreciation of difference.

REFUTING ARGUMENTS FROM HISTORICAL EXAMPLE TRAJECTORIES

1. If all examples are different, then there is no principle or paradigm that demands Commitment. There is no way to test success. There is redundancy in treatment.
2. The small examples are interesting. There is one preeminent one that has most if not all at least most of the characteristics of each.
3. A string of examples may appear to produce a linear trajectory, but it may reach A point where it finds a limit. Fear appeals are nonmonotonic.
4. The call to particular cases is simply a way of advancing power through unsettling Principle with nuisance considerations.
5. Paradigms are presupposed in the frameworks of identity that recognizes examples As a group or class of things.

5. September 5 ARGUMENTATION: LABOR DAY, NO CLASS

6. September 7, ACTION: INFORM, PERSUADE, AND ENTERTAIN

THREE PURPOSES OF ARGUMENT: INFORM, ENTERTAIN AND PERSUADE.
 PRESENCE: PRESENCE IS REPETITION. WE LEARN CULTURAL FORMS. WE
 DEVELOP HABITS AS AUDIENCES. WE CREATE BY IMITATING FORMS WE HAVE
 EXPERIENCED. NEW VERSIONS OF OLD FORMS EVOKE NOVELTY.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN PRESENCE IS SIMULATED ON THE INTERNET?

INFORM—MEANS TO PROVIDE INFORMATION & A CONTEXT WHERE
 INFORMATION IS USEFUL, TRUSTWORTHY, CLEAR, AND ROBUST.

An informing argument draws an inference from what is known to what is unknown.

The Continuum of Cogency.

Speculation. Small Amount of Evidence. Possible. Go either way. Likely, Probable. Certain.

An argument that genuinely informs will hold to account the amount, reliability, and strength of the evidence gathered in relation to the status of trust, belief or faith called for by the claim.

Audience choice: The more overwhelming the evidence, the less exciting the claim.

The more speculative the evidence, the more interesting the claim.

Reasonability. An informing argument is reasonable to the extent that it presents the appropriate amount of evidence given the uncertainty, reversibility and gravity of the claim.

Information is a check upon audience desires, prejudices, beliefs.

Scientific argument conjectures: What information produced by a test will be

Disconfirming of intuitions, conventions, and authorizing theories?

We PARTICIPATE information by accepting and refining field categories.

PERSUADE A persuasive argument asks the audience to collaborate in making an inference from what they know, value, or hope to what an advocate desires then to understand, prize, or realize. Persuasive argument moves from certain facts to infer that an action is to be consummated. Persuasive argument manipulates approach (pleasure) and avoidance (pain) into an economy of desire.

In late-capitalism, persuasion fuses life-style conditions and a politics of interest to produce characteristic issues—pertaining to age, gender, race, orientation, and class. Advertising is a pre-political array of arguments—that can be turned into social movement and campaign issues through controversy. PERSUASION is a help to conflict resolution, market purchasing, and rallying to social norms.

We PARTICIPATE in persuasion through the enthymeme. A persuader overcomes resistance by inviting US to think with him or her and come to OUR OWN CONCLUSION.

ENTERTAIN: Arguments entertain through play in provoking the HOSPITALITY of a performance. Reason's performances fall into 4 distinctive cultural types.

- “**Agon**, or competition. E.g. **Chess** is an almost purely agonistic game.”
- **Debate is an example of agon. Fair contest between two sides, with judgment the outcome.**
- “**Alea**, or chance. E.g. Playing a **slot machine** is an almost purely aleatory game.”
- Scientific experiments is an example of Alea. A thing is put into play with outcomes determined by chance. Chance is leveraged to test a proposition as to how things are caused.
- “**Mimicry**, or mimesis, or role playing.”
- The game of mimicry is where one performs a role, distinguishing personal beliefs from professional conduct. As POLICE OFFICER, TAX ACCOUNTANT, INSTRUCTOR
- “**Ilinx** (Greek for "whirlpool"), or **vertigo**, in the sense of altering perception. E.g. taking **hallucinogens**, riding **roller coasters**, children spinning until they fall down Games and play combine these elements in various ways.”

Arguers use polemics, fallacies, aggressive presentation to unsettle the other, over and understating claims to throw opponents expectations, calculations, and strategies off. Also, arguers transcend particulars into ecstasies of belief, experience, or fulfilment.

PLAY CAN BE REFINED, DEVELOPED PERFECTED INTO A PARTICULAR STYLE.

PLAY CAN BE HYBRIDIZED SO THAT FORMS OF GAME CONNECT AND TRANSITION.

WE ENTERTAIN AN IDEA WHEN WE COULD THINK DIFFERENTLY.

- “**Poker** features both *alea*, the random shuffling of cards, and *agon*, the strategic decisions of discarding cards and betting. **Collectible card games** combine *alea* (the random shuffling of decks and the distribution of cards in booster packs), *agon*(competition with rules and strategies) and *mimesis* (cards refer to imaginary beings the player controls in a fictional world).**Dancing** is an *ilinx* activity, which can be combined with *mimesis* to portray characters, or with *agon* in competitive dance.”

7. September 12 TRANSACTION, DIALOGUE, CONVERSATION,

PERSONAL ARGUMENT: The personal sphere of argument is a space for exchange where the RELATIONSHIP between two or more people are as much at issue as the content of what is being disagreed about.

DISAGREEMENT SPACE: Individuals, groups, and institutions project formal and informal rules on when it is permissible to argument, how argument takes place, with whom one may argue and about what, where argument occurs, and why certain procedures are followed (or stand to be corrected).

PERSONAL SPACES are intersubjectively shared arrangements that are tested by encounters. People are raised in families with different norms of expression, conflict and authority. Personal relationships sometimes re-enforce and at other times are in opposition to the norms of institutional authority.

DISAGREEMENT SPACES & CHANGE: Disagreement spaces are tightly controlled, narrowly structured, and routinely policed in authority invested individuals, groups, and institutions. Disagreement spaces are more open, developed associatively, and policed through the force of the better argument in idea invested individuals, groups, and institutions. Should disagreement space be too supervised, it narrows, turns rigid, and is corrupted. Should the disagreement space be too open, it may come to lack force, solidarity and purpose.

POLITENESS CONDITIONS: Politeness conditions places the burden of proof upon the person who puts forward a request to believe, know, or act. PRESUMPTION is that a person is entitled to their own space, beliefs, and actions—unless there are reasonable grounds to change.

RELATIONS WITH STRANGERS: Routine habits in urban settings assures that we encounter many strangers. Arguments with strangers are a TRANSACTION. A transaction is routine when price is set, objects are available, services legal, and a basket is constructed to assemble purchase. TRANSACTIONS are pragmatic. The features of providing reasons are often implicit. Variations occur when there are policies on discounts, returns, financing, and replacement. On-line arrangements

DIALOGUE—PERSONAL ARGUMENTS AMONG INTIMATES

Dialogue creates a duration through interaction. Shared time makes argument meaningful as character becomes tested. Dialogue characterizes talks among old friends, who share and understand a wealth of experiences. Dialogue is associated with openness, feelings, and character. Dialogue features argument and risk to the self in the interests of growth.

CONVERSATION—PERSONAL ARGUMENTS AMONG ACQUAINTANCES

Conversation is a way to pass time through topical switching in associative moments. A party. A ball game. An olympics. See van Eemeren and Grootendorst

DISCUSSION—PERSONAL ARGUMENT AMONG ELITES, AD HOC GROUPS, & PEERS—Argument among peers bring to the question what should WE do on this OCCASION to MATCH RESOURCES TO PROBLEMS.

1. **IDENTITY ANNOUNCEMENT: WHO ARE WE? WHAT BROUGHT US HERE? WHAT ARE WE ABOUT?** Ad Hoc group: work. Elite group: Ritual Agengas are a way of organizing argument into subunits. A meeting heavy with reports NARROWS disagreement space, so no one item takes up time. The process is efficient because it raises the cost of disagreement.
2. **WHAT ARE THE OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH.** Changes external to the group can call for response. Reports By subcommittees may set questions—for formal confirmation. Changes may Be announced to get a horizon of discussion going. Ad hoc group: data. Elite group: near and distant belonging rituals.

PROBLEMS: What are the concerns or cares of the group? How do these become Expressed? Who are the stakeholders?

RESOURCES: What are the knowledge resources that can be brought to bear on a problem. How can resources be built by contributions, grants, agencies of intervention?

PEOPLE. Who can be contacted and how to build with the interest of a group? What groups have gone through similar experience? How can these resources be contacted?

STATE OF THE ART. What are the sources of legitimacy to which the decision of a group must attend? How do decisions work within structures of authority?

3. **DISSENSUS:** The participation as a peer risks support, people who are with you, people who are against you, and people who are indifferent—looking to protect privilege and stay out of disputes. Ad hoc groups: difference on issues. Elite groups: differences internal, unity external. Peers form a politics.

INTERVENTION: Too much agreement and one is viewed suspiciously as either gullible or pandering OR both. Too much disagreement and one is discounted as quarrelsome, egotistical, or powerless. The **KEY** to disagreement is to pose it in the form of a modified agreement that advances the cause more slowly, quickly, or in an altogether different direction

4. **MEMORY:** There is a tendency to attribute good outcomes to the energy of the Individual or group. Bad outcomes are attributed to circumstances, if remembered at all. Those who set the agenda are aware of the issues in context, those who merely participate issue by issue are manipulated into compliance. **RITUALS** are important to constitute the group as a meaningful arena of participation.

8. September 14 CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND CRITICAL THINKING 75-95.

CRITICAL THINKING is sometimes associated with Informal Logic. Informal logic is the study of how people think about prudential questions. Prudence: What is the best choice for me and for us in a situation where knowledge is uncertain? Prudential argument is strong to the extent that : The strength of solid, the step from evidence to claim is valid, and the claim specifies precisely a well-defined thing to belief, value or do. Prudential argument is unwarranted when decisions are made out of habit. Habits work. As agents and environments change, social habits falter, with facts falling out that need to be addressed. The habit of good argument cultivates prudence: we look at and account for facts, rather than ignore them and continue habits.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT are groups who engage in personal relations, conversations, dialogues and discussions over WHAT constitutes the FACTS about us that inspire or require common effort. CIVIC ENGAGEMENT is a product of living together. In urban society, the complex needs of living together require groups that assemble talented, interested, resourceful people to defend, maintain, or advance the lifeworld. A lifeworld is a space where practices of living together in sustainable prosperity are secured.

TOPICS: The routines of life are demanding. Civic engagement takes time. Likewise, argumentation takes time away from the efficient routines of communication. Transactions are easy, routine, secure—when things go well. There are problems in urban living that show up and become TOPICS for discussion. A TOPIC is an argument commonplace. A TOPIC signals subject matter, stake holder, a range of differences in relation to who bears risks and rewards, a story of its development, and a range of constraints—urgencies for actions, resources for intervention, and uncertainties about outcomes.

URBAN TOPICS: DISCUSSIONS OF SECURITY. Empathy: Trust

URBAN TOPICS: DISCUSSIONS OF VULNERABILITY. Empathy: Identity

URBAN TOPICS: DISCUSSIONS OF DEVELOPMENT Empathy: Hope

DISCUSSING PROPOSITIONS OF FACT, VALUE, POLICY, NETWORKS A civic argument will be vibrant and productive to the extent people can agree as to what is the central point of contention in a disagreement over a question of fact (things in existence), value (the direction and weight of a person, place or thing), or policy (a proposed trajectory of actions that bundle a way of doing or not doing activities).

Discussing Propositions of Facts: Residents and transients bring to the table experiences from different standpoints. Individual concerns become translated into common

knowledge by inviting people to express what matters to themselves, family and friends. The anecdotal is a beginning place. **Question of Future Fact:** What facts are needed? How can they be gathered? What facts are not called into attention by the media? What are facts that are hopeful? **Question of Past Fact** What are facts surrounding events that impact people in the community. Fact gathering may also require discussion of how to set in place monitoring, reporting, accumulating, and validating processes.

Discussing Propositions of Values: Questions of value are those that circle around praise or blame. Questions of value are comparative: what is worthy of greater or less veneration. Questions of value are identified by naming, mis-naming, and leaving unnamed. Questions of value vary from the formal, ritual and material to the informal, vernacular and ephemeral. Questions of value call attention to acts of identification—support, affiliation, tribute (positive); exception, denunciation, disgust (negative). Propositions of value may be speculative (are hot days worse than cold ones), timely (is this store better than that one), or definitive (how are values protected in this or that particular case).

Discussing Propositions of Policy: Resolved: we should do x. Resolved: x should no longer be done. Resolved: under alternative condition y, x should be triggered automatically. Propositions of policy raise the question of what should be done. Strong policy debate is useful to a citizenry that is able to vote on candidates, ballot propositions, or recall of elected officials. The secret ballot assures independent judgment. Parties organize associated policies. A proposition of policy works best when sides reach an agreement as to WHAT is to be debated.

FORENSIC STASES are created through anticipating disagreement space as competitive. EMPATHETIC STASES, disagreement space as cooperative. Team play.

FORENSIC STASES: DEBATE-ORIENTED is the “place where you choose to differ with the arguments developed by your opponent.” P.82 (The model is competitive, analytics, reductive). Either/or

ESTABLISHING A FACT: What is it that happened or took place?.

CONJECTURING ABOUT THE FACT: What was its cause? How defined?

QUALITY: What was the motive? Does it add weight to the case? Exculpate?

PLACE: Is this a fitting time and place to render judgment. Procedural exclusion. Ripeness exclusion.

EMPATHY STASES: DISCUSSION ORIENTED (The model is collaborative, synthetic, and generative.) Both/and

**WHAT BODY OF FACTS CAN WE DISCOVER FROM SHARING?
WHAT PROBLEMS DO THE DISCLOSURE OF FACTS IDENTIFY?
HOW DO WE EXPERIENCE DIFFERENTLY BENEFITS AND HARMS?
WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE CONNECTION AMONG STEAKHOLDERS
(PRESENT & ABSENT)?**

9. September 19 ARGUING POLICY: STOCK ISSUES AND SYSTEMS THINKING (84-95.)

THE RELATION OF ARGUMENTATION TO PROBLEM SOLVING?
Public Institutions. Private Organizations. Hybridization.

STOCK ISSUES AND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN GROUNDS

SYSTEMS THINKING: How do describe a system? Components, goals, relationship, events. Potentia and Energeia

EVENTS AND SYSTEMS CONTAINMENT: Narratives of anticipation & safety.

EVENTS AND SYSTEMS CRISIS: Narratives of disaster, emergency, and intervention.

EVENTS AND SYSTEMS CATASTROPHE: Breakdown, spread, recovery.

SYSTEMS, POLITICS AND LEGITIMATION STRUGGLES

UNIT TWO ARGUMENT AND THE PRODUCTION OF REASONS

10. September 21 ARGUMENTS FROM ANALOGY— 99-100

What is the difference among root metaphors—deep root and rhizome.

ROOT METAPHORS: MECHANISM, FORMISM, CONTEXT, ORGANIC (DEEP ROOTS). RHIZOME—NOMAD, DRIFT, TRANSGRESSION.

How does a metaphor fuse an analogy into a language game that
Spreads through repetition and variation?
How does a metaphor get played and counterplayed?

What accounts for the lifespan of language games based on analogy?

11. September 26 CAUSAL ARGUMENTS—Epistemic Risk and Uncertainty.

What is the is/ought dilemma? What is pure induction?

Identify Mills laws of induction for causal argument Type I.

Identify Mills laws of induction for causal argument Type II

What are the limits of causal claims? What are criteria for good cause?

12. September 28 SIGN ARGUMENTS—Building up identification from reading signs. 103-104

What are the relations of reference, word, and object?

How do sign systems work to constitute roles in professional activities?

How are sign systems put into discourse matrixes that constitute representation or value.

How can one do critical discourse analysis as a way of questioning representation/

13. October 3 DEDUCTIVE REASONING—Modes of classification 107-108

What is deductive reasoning? What is formal validity? What is informal validity?

How does deductive reasoning work through argument from definition?

What are the uses of classification for knowledge design practices?

What are the distinctions between the Categorical, Conditional, and Disjunctive syl.

14. October 5 THE TOULMIN MODEL OF ARGUMENT 109-114.

Define and identify the primary triad of terms. Data, Warrant, Claim

Define and identify the secondary triad of terms. Qualifier, rebuttal, backing.

How does the Toulmin model convert induction and deduction to practical reasoning?

15. October 10 PRESUMPTION, PREMISES ,BELIEFS, & AUTHORITIES 115-124, 129-135

What are beliefs? What role do beliefs play in argumentation? Assumed premise?

What beliefs are necessary for critical discussion (conversation, dialogue) about the Process of communication?

How does a pluralistic system encourage and protect the holding and practice of Different beliefs about values, goals, and constraints?

How are beliefs disciplined, that is regulated, constrained, punished? How are the social conventions about beliefs changed over time?

18. October 12 EXAMPLES AND STATISTICS 125-129

Identify the uses of Type I and Type II error. How ideally would One set standards of empirical proof in the interests of trust & efficacy?

What is the difference between a paradigmatic example and an inductive example?

What are the tests of reasoning by example?

What are typically fallacies in the use of statistics?

17. October 17 MID-TERM EXAMINATION

18. October 19 PENNY-HARVEST DAY WORK IN DEVELOPING CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Meet with Penny Harvest Leadership Academy.

Conduct a brain storming group to discuss issues of concern extending from their Schools into local neighborhood.

Ask kids to draw a picture of a neighborhood NEED or a neighborhood RESOURCE

The TOPICS for discussion include unsettling events or things seen that

Bring into question SAFETY (topic of security) BELONGING (topics of Good places to go or bad ones to avoid) and DEVELOPMENT (what is Changing in the neighborhood for good or bad).

Each student should be encouraged to VOICE or DRAW a fact, value, or action That he or she sees as important to students, families, the school—community.

ARGUMENT AND ACTION

19. October 24 Argumentation in Politics: Campaigns and Debates 233-251

What is a democratic public sphere? How do elections constitute a ‘peaceful transfer of power.’

What is the role of political debate? How do these function? Who are the participants, how are the outcomes used, and how do debates develop over time.

What arguments disappear during this election; which are featured? How is civility stressed; character tested, temperament assessed, and mandate imagined?

How does argument work to keep people from voting, energize the faithful, and appeal to the unmade up mind?

20. October 26, VISUAL ARGUMENT 177-192

Do pictures argue? How do visual arguments create stasis?

How do visual arguments set a tone through style?

What is the relation of illustrative capacity of visual argument?

What is the iconic capacity of visual argument to represent?

What is the evocative power of visual argument to elicit emotion?

How do objects individually or in collection become unifying symbols?

How do aesthetics stretch the conventions of perception to make an argument?

21. October 31 Pro & Con Thinking Argument and Debate: Security Issues 193-214 Transforming academic debate into NGO position evaluation.

21. November 2 COGNITIVE BIASES IN ARGUMENT: Daniel Kahneman Thinking, Fast and Slow Reading selections.

What is System 1 Thinking? What kind of biases does it produce?

What is System 2 Thinking? What kind of biases does it produce?

What are cognitive shortcomings that we daily confront?

What are typical work-arounds to cognitive issues such as over-confidence, halo effect?
Reports 1 & 2

23. November 7 ARGUMENT FALLACIES AND REFUTATION Part II 165-175.

Identify the fallacies of irrelevant reasoning, miscasting, and misdirecting the issue?

What constitutes effective refutation?

Reports 3 & 4.

24. November 9 Review and write one page of comments on debates. What was the most noteworthy moment? Why?

UNIT THREE THE PRACTICES OF ARGUMENT

25. November 14 ARGUMENT FALLACIES AND REFUTATION PART I 157-175

What factors effective critical listening?

Distinguish between equivocation, euphism, obfuscation, and ambiguity?

Identify exclusionary strategies that remove accountability of judgment from arguers?

Reports 5 & 6

26. November 16 CITIZENSHIP & THE COMMON GOOD

Discussion of virtue ethics, deliberation, civic republicanism, & democracy.

Read William James, On Certain Blindspots John Dewey On Democracy

Robert Asen, Citizenship as Performance

Reports 7 & 8

27. November 21 ARGUMENT & BUSINESS, 273-286

Reports 9 * & 10

28. November 23 ARGUMENT AND JUSTICE, 253-272

Reports 11 & 12

29. November 28 ARGUMENT AND INTEPRESONAL RELATIONS 289-300

Conflict Management Basics Personal Risk. Brockriede. Argument as Love

Reports 13 & 14

30. November 30 ARGUMENT, HAPPINESS, AND THE GOOD LIFE

Dissensus, third way thinking and emancipation. Arguing toward higher ends.

Reports 15 & 16 Charles Willard Dissensus