

Editorial

Argumentation's Conferences

Although forming a *sui generis* class, the olympic ISSA and the biennial (every two years) OSSA witness face increasing competence! Each year, universities in several countries undertake further efforts at achieving organized fruitfulness among philosophers, lawyers, linguists, rhetoricians, psychologists, logicians, discourse analysts, and others who work in argumentation theory, the psychology of reasoning, legal argumentation, rhetoric, informal logic, critical thinking, computational argumentation, as well as related domains.

To give an incomplete list of events which have been or currently are on our agendas:

2012:

- 4th Tokyo Conference on Argumentation, Japan Debate Association, Tokyo, Japan.
- Between Scientists & Citizens: Assessing Expertise in Policy Controversies, Iowa State University, United States.

2011:

- AILACT @ the APA Eastern Division, Washington, DC., United States.
- JURIX 2011, The 24th International Conference on Legal Knowledge and Information Systems, Vienna, Austria.
- Argumentation in Political Deliberation, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal.
- Reasoned Argument and Social Change, 17th Biennial Conference on Argumentation, National Communication Association and American Forensic Association, Alta, Utah, United States.
- First International Workshop on the Theory and Applications of Formal Argumentation, Barcelona, Spain.
- Argumentation: Cognition and Community, Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation, University of Windsor, Canada.

- ARGMAS 2011: Eighth International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems, Taipei, Taiwan.

2010:

- 1st Workshop on Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence and Philosophy: Computational and Philosophical Perspectives, Part of the 11th Symposium of the Italian Association for the Artificial Intelligence, Brescia, Italy.
- Thinking and Speaking a Better World, Third International Conference on Argumentation, Rhetoric, Debate and the Pedagogy of Empowerment, Department of Philosophy, University of Maribor, Slovenia.
- Second International Conference on Logic, Argumentation, and Critical Thinking, Centre for the Study of Argumentation and Reasoning, Faculty of Psychology, Diego Portales University, Santiago, Chile.
- Persuasion and Argumentation, Centre de Recherches sur les Arts et le Langage (CRAL), Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris, France.
- 7th Conference on Argumentation, International Society for the Study of Argumentation, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Communication and Argumentation in the Public Sphere 4, Departments of French and Applied Modern Languages, University of Galati, Romania.
- Where's Your Argument? Informal Logic, Critical Thinking and Argumentation, Manchester Metropolitan University, England.
- Thirteenth Biennial Wake Forest University Argumentation Conference, Wake Forest University, United States.

2009:

- The Uses of Computational Argumentation, AAAI Fall Symposium Series, Washington, United States.
- Argument Cultures, Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation, University of Windsor, Canada.
- ArgMAS 2009: Sixth International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems, Budapest, Hungary.

2008:

- The Psychology of Argumentation and Inductive Reasoning, Centre for Logic and Philosophy of Science, University of Tilburg, The Netherlands.
- Argumentation, the Law and Justice, Third Tokyo Conference on Argu-

mentation, Japan Debate Association (JDA), Department of English, Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan.

- Strategies in Argumentation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Logic, Argumentation and Critical Thinking, Centre for the Study of Argumentation, School of Human Sciences and Education, Universidad Diego Portales, Santiago, Chile.

2007:

- Engaging Argument in Society, 15th Alta Conference on Argumentation, American Forensic Association and National Communication Association, University of Utah, United States.
- Dissensus and the Search for Common Ground, OSSA, University of Windsor, Canada.
- Fourth International Workshop on Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems (ArgMAS 2007), Honolulu, Hawaii, United States.

2006:

- First International Conference on Computational Models of Argument, University of Liverpool, England.
- Sixth Conference, International Society of the Study of Argumentation, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Annual Meeting, Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking (AILACT), Chicago, United States.

2005:

- Engaging Argument, 14th ALTA Conference on Argumentation, American Forensic Association, National Communication Association and University of Utah, United States.
- The Uses of Argument, Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation, McMaster University, Canada.

2004:

- Argument and Social Cognition, Second Tokyo Conference on Argumentation, Japan Debate Association (JDA), Department of English, Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan.
- Critical Thinking Symposium, University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad y Tobago.

2003:

- Critical Problems in Argumentation, 13th Alta Conference on Argumentation, American Forensic Association, National Communication Association and University of Utah, United States.
- IL@25, OSSA, University of Windsor, Canada.

2000:

- Arguing, Communication and Culture, 12th Alta Conference on Argumentation, American Forensic Association, National Communication Association and University of Utah, United States.
- Argumentation and its Applications, OSSA, University of Windsor, Canada.

Can we reasonably complain about a lack of opportunities for exchange? As always, of course, using opportunities depends also on the university's travel policy, as well as the organizers' capacity in communicating achievements, plans, and agreements, so as to encourage participation in subsequent events.

Certainly, all events normally come with a special emphasis. Sometimes, a very busy event is wanted; others prefer a "low profile" to maintain another sort of academic atmosphere; others still focus on rather specific themes, a few deliberately invite scholars from intersecting subjects.

Irrespective of these particularities, the communication of results is a task that *Cogency* welcomes. Alongside five submitted manuscripts and one book review, this issue of *Cogency* makes accessible three papers delivered at Wake Forest University's argumentation conference (March 2010, North Carolina, USA). A selection of further contributions to this conference—which was organized by Alessandra Beasley von Burg— has earlier this year appeared in the journal *Controversia*.

In "Argumentation as Contextual Logic: An Appreciation of Backing in Toulmin's Model," Lenore Langsdorf revisits the well-entrenched Toulmin schema. She proposes "to expand the function of [the] Backing [element of Toulmin's original model] to include the cultural basis that influences our selection and articulation of Data". Appreciating Toulmin's broadly evolutionary account, her proposal also constitutes an attempt to come to terms

with the observation that—perhaps especially in argumentation—Data do normally not qualify as objectively given, but also depend on “selection and deflection by means of which we constitute entities.” Consequently, Langsdorf modifies the Toulmin schema by introducing a Basis element (connected to the Data element), and in turn connects this to the Backing element (see her Fig. 3).

In “The Moral Normativity of Argumentation,” J. Anthony Blair treats the question whether there can be an ethics of argumentation. Refraining from a straightforwardly negative one, Blair’s answer takes the following conditional form: *If* some moral norms apply to argumentation, then they apply *pro tanto* (i.e., can be outweighed by other considerations). Blair discusses three such *pro tanto* norms, understood as specifications of general moral norms (e.g., “It is unethical to use in an argument grounds one believes to be false”). He finds “[t]he moral salience and gravity of the issue under argumentative discussion and the context in which the argumentation occurs [to] make a difference to whether or when these moral injunctions may be overridden.” In contrast, obligations exclusive to argumentation (e.g., the burden of proof obligation) are treated analogously to the rules of a game.

In “*Genera causarum* and the burden of proof,” Michael J. Hoppmann proposes a new systematization of the three classical rhetorical genres (*genus deliberativum*, *genus iudiciale* and *genus demonstrativum*). *Vis-à-vis* the genres’ “systematical, pedagogical, evaluative and heuristic purposes,” their extant definitions are found wanting. Particularly, the six standard criteria currently in use (audience, time, place, rhetorical telos, oratorical activity, and certainty of the case) fail to always provide the same application-result, which is demonstrated by comparing paradigmatic cases. Led by the evaluative purpose, Hoppmann proposes the ‘burden of proof’—divided into a *qualitative*, a *simple* and a *relative* one—as the superior criterion, thus focusing on “circumstances [under which] a speaker fulfills his or her oratorical and probative duties” (see his table 2).

As the editor of the Wake Forest papers, Frank Zenker thanks three anonymous reviewers for providing constructive criticism, and the authors for their work and patience in the revision process which, amongst others, entailed their commenting on each other.

In its regular section, *Cogency* offers a balance of new approaches with traditional angles upon the rhetorical perspective on argumentation; further topics are the relationship between bias, fallacies and argumentation; the argumentative exchanges between individuals in close relationships (such as friendship or romance); the characterization of practical reasoning; and, finally, the link between deliberation and the fallacies.

Frank Zenker

Cristián Santibáñez Yáñez

Lund and Santiago, August 2011