The teaching of writing in Composition programs in colleges and universities is generally aimed at preparing students for success in higher education, by teaching writing as inquiry, and for successful citizenship (of all kinds), by teaching writing as a kind of deliberative reasoning. These efforts are grounded in conceptions of argumentation as the core of reasoning, and so in concepts and theories of argumentation. These theories of reasoning and argumentation are supposed to be universal enough—culturally “neutral” enough—to be able to explain how controversies can be resolved through argumentation in a fair and just way, a way that does justice to the participants in the controversy. This is, of course, a great challenge. It was, historically, one of the challenges taken up by rhetorical theory and by philosophy, especially in the development of theories of democracy, and it has drawn renewed attention from contemporary philosophers and rhetorical theorists.

In this seminar, participants will gain knowledge of a few of the most promising theories of argumentation of our time. With this knowledge, they will be able to examine the claim that argumentation can do justice, and they will be able to ask in informed ways about the implications of these theories for the teaching of writing in colleges and universities. Students will also gain an understanding of some of the cultural challenges faced by these theories, and they will better be able to judge the extent to which they can rise to these challenges.

Texts
Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Justice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing.*
Douglas Walton: *The New Dialectic: Conversational Contexts of Argument.* (TND)
Additional readings available through Canvas.

Requirements: Regular attendance. Reading all assigned work before class. Informed and respectful participation in seminar discussions. Three written substantive questions for discussion brought to each seminar meeting. One in-class presentation. One short (300-500 word) proposal for final paper. One 12-15 page final paper.
Schedule

Introductions


2. October 6  Universality and Dialogue

Universality
1. TNR - Review pp. 26-34.
2. TNR 63-114
3. “Audiences and Arguments.” (Chapter 5 of Crosswhite: The Rhetoric of Reason, 135-64). This is a kind of commentary on and further development of the notions of audience and universality in The New Rhetoric.
4. “Universalities.” (Crosswhite. A social-political interpretation of rhetorical universality as a process)

Dialogue
6. “Introduction” to The New Dialectic (Chapter One, 3-36).

Optional Suggested Readings on Universality.
8. “Rhetoric and Ideology.” (From Deep Rhetoric 65-82.) This chapter explains the way in which argumentation exerts a counter-ideological force.
9. “Argument and Ideology.” (Chapter 7 of The Rhetoric of Reason.) This chapter describes some of the limits of argumentation.
3. October 13  Forms of Reasoning and Inquiry

Forms of Reasoning
   TNR General Remarks 187-92
   TNR Causal Arguments 261-92
   TNR Person/Act Arguments 293-349

Inquiry
   TND 69-99

4. October 20  Forms of Reasoning, Deliberation, Eristics

Forms of Reasoning
   The Behaviors of Binaries
   TNR “The Dissociation of Concepts” 411-59

Deliberation
   TND 151-77

Eristics
   TND 178-197

5. October 27  Culture and Shifting Ground
Manfred Kraus: “Culture Sensitive Arguments”
Yun Xie, Dale Hample, Shuying Shi, Sarah Evans: “Exploring the meaning of argument in China.” (Commentary: James Crosswhite)

6. November 3  Gender, Feminism, Argumentation
Khameiel Al-Tamimi: “Feminist Alternatives to Traditional Argumentation”
(Commentary: Phyllis Rooney)
Michael Gilbert: “Emotion as permeative: Attempting to model the unidentifiable.” (Commentary: Jean Goodwin)
Phyllis Rooney: “Feminism and Argumentation: A Response to Govier”
Miranda Frickers: Introduction and chapter one of Epistemic Injustice.

7. November 10  Epistemic Injustice
Miranda Frickers: Epistemic Injustice

8. November 17  Class discussion of paper proposals
9. November 24   Thanksgiving

10. December 1   Deep Disagreements and Equity
    Manfred Kraus: “Cognitive Communities and Argument Communities”
    Chris Campolo: “Argumentative Virtues and Deep Disagreement”
    (Commentary: David Godden)