Dear Friends,

Again, Roosmaryn Pilgram and Lotte van Poppel have managed to offer all who like to be kept informed about what is going on in pragma-dialectics an interesting issue of the Amsterdam Argumentation Chronicle. An important innovation is that the Chronicle has expanded the scope of its reporting beyond the Department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric of the University of Amsterdam to the much broader international community of pragma-dialectical argumentation researchers. This innovation was made possible by the recent foundation of the International Learned Institute for Argumentation Studies (ILIAS) – whose acronym links its academic ambition with a shining example of ancient culture and wisdom. I hope that ILIAS will not only strengthen the intellectual bonds between pragma-dialecticians but also stimulate regular exchanges between pragma-dialecticians and other argumentation scholars and argumentative cultures.

With kind regards,
Frans H. van Eemeren

International Learned Institute for Argumentation Studies (ILIAS)
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Xiaojing (Jenny) Wu is a PhD student in the institute of Logic and Cognition at Sun Yat-sen University, China. Her research interests are correctional reasoning and argumentation theory. Currently, she is a visiting scholar at the Department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric of the University of Amsterdam.

Tell us a bit about yourself. Where are you from? What did you study? What are you currently working on?

I am a PhD student at Sun Yat-sen University in China, and my major is logic. I study informal logic and legal logic at the Institute of Logic and Cognition in the department of philosophy at my university. And I am now in Amsterdam working on my dissertation on correctional reasoning. If everything goes well, I hope I can defend my thesis by the end of 2011.

Your research is focused on argumentation, why did you choose this focus?

Argumentation is an interesting area in that there are a number of different disciplines focusing on it. Logic is one of those disciplines and for a long time it was the only formal way to study argument. Since the 1970s, people started to be unsatisfied with the mathematical treatments only, more and more scholars realized that it is necessary for us to see that the study of argument could be expanded to a whole process, and argumentation is by no means static. To the real human mind, people’s intelligent behaviors are multiple, flexible and adaptable. To regard argumentation as a dynamic process is what I really see in prospect. And I do believe that argumentation theory still has a lot of space for which we could offer a contribution.

At present, you are a guest researcher at the department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric of the University of Amsterdam. How did you end up at this department?

Well, it was in 2008 that Professor Frans van Eemeren visited my institute in China and I was asked to meet him at the airport. We spent several days later traveling and having good dinners together. It was a nice experience and he left me a very kind impression. During his stay in China, I attended his presentation in our institute. Although before he came, I already read the Chinese version of Frans’ book Argumentation: A Guide to Critical Thinking translated by my Chinese supervisor Minghui Xiong. Pragma-dialectics gave me a good impression in that it is systematic and combines normative and descriptive perspectives on argumentation well. And this really attracted me. After I talked with Frans, I conveyed my intention to visit his department, the department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric, he agreed and looked very happy. Then I decided to apply for a scholarship from China Scholarship Council in 2009. However, the competition was quite fierce that year and I failed. Then after the encouragement of my Chinese supervisor and Frans’ email, I set up the preparation for another try in 2010. And this time, I finally succeeded in applying for the scholarship and came all the way here to extend my further study of pragma-dialectics. It was a hard process, but now that I am here, when I look back at the experience, it feels deserved. And I really want to thank Frans for his continuous support and all the nice people here in this department in Amsterdam. It’s so nice to meet you guys!

Is it very different for you to conduct your research here, at the University of Amsterdam, than back home?
As a matter of fact, yes it is. Here, scholars are more independent and responsible for their own research. And people organize their time efficiently. At the same time, I also found Dutch scholars have built a close-connected academic net and researchers have developed very good cooperative relationships with each other. And I see that’s why European scholars can always stay competitive in international academic activities. Compared to scholars at the University of Amsterdam, Chinese researchers are more isolated in conducting their study and we should learn from western scholars on this point.

What is it like for you to live in Amsterdam?

Actually, there are lots of things I like here in Amsterdam. I do not only like the pleasant scenery, but also the amazing culture. But the best thing I like is the fact that, here, people are free to talk about anything they like, the freedom of speech. Dutch people are open-minded and are always happy to accept new things and the latest information. Plus, people are very good at arranging their time and make good use of their schedule. I think I am learning a lot from my experience abroad.

Are there things that surprised you about Amsterdam – or the Netherlands in general? If so, what was your biggest surprise so far?

I have to admit that before I came here, I kind of worried that European people might discriminate against Asian people. However, when I came here, I found people are unbelievably friendly and nice! Even strangers in the street are very kind in explaining the way and warm-heartedly tell me how I should get to the place I wanted to go to. Dutch people are really international and friendly to foreigners.

What do you miss about China?

There are lots of things I miss about my country. The first two things I miss about China are our famous Chinese food and Chinese language. I have never been staying out of China as long as this time and, for a long time, I have not had a chance to speak my mother tongue. I also missed a lot of traditional festivals that I should have celebrated with my family. The spring festival is the most important part in my culture, in our daily life. But this year I couldn’t get together with my family members and I couldn’t have dinner with friends because I lived thousands of miles away from my country. I really miss them.

Are you planning to return to China after finishing your work as a guest researcher in Amsterdam? If so, what would you like to take with you from your time working here?

Yes, I am going to return to China in September 2011. It was part of the contract that I got financial support from the China Scholarship Council. Then, after that, I have to serve in China for at least five years by way of working in China. So, I have to go back. But, when I leave, I think the most important thing I learned here is that I should always remain curious in my research and always stay independent in my career. A free mind is also of top importance as well as a systematic organization of my study. Those are the most valuable treasures that I got here, at the University of Amsterdam. Being a scholar means a lot, and I really appreciate the Dutch scholars’ academic spirit. And I decided to take this spirit with me, wherever I go.

By the way, I also like the flowers here, so I am going to bring some flower seeds to China. I wish the beautiful Dutch flowers to be there all the time! Plus, if a cheese is not too heavy, it will definitely be one of my gifts!

Where do you see yourself in five years?

I think I am going to keep on doing my research work, maybe in a university in China. In that case, I am going to get an occupation at a university. And I want to make more progress with my research area. And I hope more researchers could join my work and together we can attain achievements.
One last question, not-research related at all:
If you could choose to be anyone in the world, dead or alive, who would you like to be for one day?

This is a very interesting question! I think I would like to be the famous Chinese writer Xiaobo Wang. I always like his work and I have to admit I am quite influenced by him. Plus, I like writing.

THESIS SUMMARY

Considering defeasibility in relation to the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation
By Lester van der Pluijm

A widely acknowledged starting point in argumentation theory is that the reasoning underlying argumentation can be appropriate even if it is not deductively valid. The idea is then that premises do not need to entail the conclusion in a strict sense: they can also justify the conclusion in the face of the information available. In this latter case – of what can be called defeasible reasoning – the conclusion is true if the premises are true and if no exceptions apply.

In light of the starting point that deductive validity can be too strong to deal with everyday reasoning, it is awkward that the pragma-dialectical method for reconstructing partly implicit argumentation is based on deductive validity. The reason that this does not directly result in serious problems is that the evaluation is conducted pragmatically by means of argument schemes. Such a pragmatic evaluation implies that reasoning should minimally meet a defeasible standard. Putting aside the issue whether this solves the underlying theoretical problem, my claim has been that more intuitive results are achieved in the analysis of partly implicit argumentation if defeasibility is explicitly taken into account.

Consider the following example: Claus likes to yodel, because he comes from Tyrol.
Without further contextual evidence, it is unintuitive to commit an arguer uttering these words to the impossibility that there are exceptional Tyrolers that do not like to yodel. Even though it is possible to give a deductive analysis that allows implicitly for Claus to be an exception, a more intuitive analysis allows explicitly for the possibility that there are Tyrolers that do not like to yodel. Such a defeasible analysis, which is presented below, is more in line with the commitments of the arguer. The main difference is that the linking premise is reconstructed by means of a defeasible arrow, signifying that the premises are only presumptively sufficient to infer the conclusion.

1 Liking to yodel is true of Claus (R1)
1.1 Coming from Tyrol is true of Claus (R1)
(1.1') Coming from Tyrol for Rx ⇒ Liking to yodel for Rx

This example demonstrates that there are examples that can better be analysed in terms of a defeasible consequence. It is hence desirable that the pragma-dialectical method for reconstructing partly implicit argumentation allows for dealing with this set of examples in a defeasible fashion, especially since the issue to what an arguer can be committed is at the core of the justification of the method. As a bonus, the explicit incorporation of defeasibility makes it possible to discern the sufficiency of the reasoning from the acceptability of the linking premise, which is particularly helpful for clarifying the structural possibilities for defeating the reasoning. Apart from the desirability, my
thesis has pointed out that there is conceptual room in the pragma-dialectical theory to make an explicit incorporation of defeasibility possible. In my view, protagonists of the theory should embrace this possibility to acknowledge that reasoning can be appropriate even if it is not deductively valid.

WORK IN PROGRESS

Lotte van Poppel

Can you tell us a bit more about your PhD-research? What is it about?

In my research, I try to determine how choices for particular modes of pragmatic argumentation in health promotion materials can be explained in terms of strategic maneuvering. Pragmatic argumentation is used to support a standpoint about the (un)desirability of an action by showing that the action automatically leads to an (un)desirable situation. The material I use consists of advisory health brochures with advice on, for example, how to improve or change your lifestyle or advice to get a particular vaccination. I focus on pragmatic argumentation because this type of argumentation seems particularly suitable in this context to convince the readers to do as advised. Brochures should enable readers to form a well-founded opinion and at the same time, brochure writers will obviously prefer that the readers accept the given piece of advice. In my research, I examine what choices in the presentation of pragmatic argumentation can be made to realize both of these objectives. For the readers it is crucial how desirable or undesirable the effect of the advocated or discouraged action is, and how probable it is that the effect actually occurs. One of the aspects of strategic maneuvering with pragmatic argumentation I analyze is how writers, by choosing a particular formulation of the pragmatic argument, emphasize the likelihood or the (un)desirability of actions.

Why did you choose to focus on argumentation in the field of health communication?

Health communication is a relatively new field of research that has not been dealt with much from an argumentation theoretical perspective,
Despite the argumentative nature of many types of discourse within this context. Argumentation in health communication is usually only dealt with in persuasion research, which lacks the normative perspective, or in framing effects research, which usually does not start from a theoretically based distinction between types of arguments. That is why it was compelling for me to investigate how a pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation can shed more light on the argumentative features of health communication.

**Do you think there are differences between working on argumentation in the medical context from a health communication perspective (e.g., in a health department) and working on argumentation in the medical context from an argumentation theory perspective (e.g., in an argumentation department)? What differences?**

Well, that is hard for me to say, because I’ve never worked at a health department, but the main difference that I noticed at the health communication department of the University of Lugano, with which our department has contacts, and at the conferences on health communication that I have attended, such as COMET 2009 and EACH 2010, is that the research in that field starts from more practice-oriented research questions and usually involves quantitative research, while an argumentation department such as ours is more theory-oriented.

Before you became a PhD-student, you successfully completed the research master programme Rhetoric, argumentation theory and philosophy at the University of Amsterdam and a bachelor and master programme in Languages and Cultures of Latin America at Leiden University. These seem quite distinct study programmes. Why did you choose to follow them?

This story actually starts when I was 11 years old. I was looking for another hobby - I had to stop playing volleyball for a while due to knee problems - and I started a course in Spanish which I continued to follow all through high school. My teacher, who was studying Languages and Cultures of Latin America, got me excited for this study. She eventually supervised me when I wrote my thesis that was about the interplay of genres in columns by Ana Pacheco in the Mexican newspaper *La Jornada*. I have been interested all along in how people use language and how they apply specific strategies to influence their audience. For example, I once wrote a paper on a speech by Fidel Castro in which he strategically mistranslated parts of a speech by George W. Bush into Spanish to put Bush in a bad light. I just had not been aware yet there was something like argumentation theory. After graduating in Leiden, I wanted to follow a research master programme and because the master programme in Leiden overlapped too much with what I had already done, I contacted the University of Amsterdam. Someone suggested the RAP programme and I immediately knew this was what I wanted to do.

**Do you feel that your studies have prepared you for conducting PhD-research? In what ways?**

My studies in literature have taught me to analyze texts carefully, by paying attention to details, variations in grammar, style. The RAP programme provided me the theoretical background I need now for conducting my research, but more importantly it taught me to be critical. And to write academic papers in English, because in Leiden I only wrote in Spanish.

**Next to your PhD-research, you are also teaching undergraduate courses in argumentation. What are the most important things that you would like convey to your students in these courses?**

Obviously there are things I would like to teach them about argumentation theory, but even more I hope to teach them how to have an open mind,
teach them not to be afraid to express themselves and to be critical towards what they read and write.

**You intend to defend your dissertation in 2012. What would you like to do after that?**

Go on vacation to Brazil!

**One last question, not-research related at all:**
If you could choose to be anyone in the world, dead or alive, who would you like to be for one day?

Hmmmm, at the moment I’m reading *The Children’s Book* by A.S. Byatt, which describes the lives of several British families in the beginning of the 1900s, a period of great political and social turmoil. The novel gives an interesting look into the rise of the suffrage movement and female characters’ struggle with the limited possibilities for women to make use of their intellectual or artistic capabilities. I have always been intrigued by pioneering women, such as the Dutch Aletta Jacobs who became the first female physician and who fought for women’s right to vote, because they had to fight for the things that I now take for granted. So, I would really like to be one of those women for one day, to feel their strong will and determination in a time when going to university, working, or even walking on the street alone was not acceptable for women.

---

**STUDENTS ABOUT THEIR STUDY PROGRAMME**

*To one that asketh...*

By Eugen Octav Popa

I still find myself in a slight hesitation each time I have to explain what it is that I study in Amsterdam. Before I arrived, while I was still preparing for admission, I had somehow managed to escape this sensitive question. After the first few months, inevitably, friends and family urged me to disclose, at long last, the undisclosed: “So, tell us now then: what is it all about?!” Argumentation theory? Not only. Philosophy? Too vague, beclouded and intimidating. Linguistics? Not quite. Surely, one might reason – as my father readily did – since you have now reached this level, you must at least know what you are doing, isn’t that the case? It most certainly is. But, as Saint Augustine ruminated about the concept of time in one of his confessions, “If no one asks me, I know: if I wish to explain it to one that asketh, I know not.”

I had written my Bachelor’s thesis on humor, on some of the many ways in which a stand-up comedy discourse allows for argumentative twists and angles. This brought me to pragma-dialectics. I had already covered some basic speech-act theory and some even more basic logic, so I decided to apply, to “get to the source” of what seemed to me a particularly tidy theoretical account. Back then, however, I was merely scraping the surface of what proved to be a methodical, highly-developed apparatus for the study of argumentation. I am currently interested in the connections between some of the areas of pragma-dialectics and what is known as the study of “generics” within natural language semantics.

At the University of Amsterdam, I found out how academic life and scholarship can be contagious. I did not even imagine that a two hours colloquium can be end-to-end exciting, or that a fifteen minutes talk with one of the professors can be more inspiring than any of the books or articles that certain professors wrote. For that matter, I did not even imagine that
studying can get so gripping. But it did, and it still does. I may not be completely certain of what I am about to do after I finish this M.A., but if I choose to follow an academic career, I know what standards it must reach. So, what is it all about, then? It is about Rhetoric, Argumentation Theory and Philosophy, as the title tells, but it is so very much more!

At that time I was interested in understanding the family of manuscripts of Cicero’s texts, and in attending classes of modern dance and playing Chopin on my piano. During my second year at the University, I fell in love with the mind of my professor of Latin, and decided that I should become like him: he was really enjoying research, he was a great teacher and he had a real curiosity for understanding how the world works. I am not sure if I have actually succeeded in my imitatio, but for sure I tried to grow research and teaching skills while maintaining the fascination for the world around me.

VOICE FROM WITHOUT

Sara Rubinelli

Why did you decide to do a PhD in Leeds (UK)?

Because I went to study with Dr. Hans Gottschalk - one of the best scholars in classical philosophy and, moreover, the person from whom I learned what it means to be a real scholar.

What was it like for you as an Italian bella to conduct your PhD-research in Leeds?

It was absolutely great! I enjoyed every single day I spent in England. I adapted very easily to the British style of life. It took me a few years to speak English fluently, but the language was never a barrier. Moreover, the Department of Classics at Leeds University was the hosting institute of spectacular academics. At the time I was there, there was a lot of passion for classical studies, and very little politics. I will never forget the atmosphere there, similar to that in the movie “Dead Poets Society”.

After your PhD, you started as a post-doc at the University of Lugano in Switzerland and worked on projects in health communication and internet technology. What drew you to these fields that are so different from the areas you were working on thus far?

The desire to apply my classical approach to the new field of health communication. I am very Aristotelian in my approach to the world and I have always been fascinated by Aristotle’s idea that certain assumptions and methods remain the same across the different fields. Although, during my postdoctoral years, I have learned many other research methods from the social sciences, my background in classical rhetoric and argumentation theory is always the basic approach of all my research in health.

You studied classical languages in Milan. How would you describe yourself as a student?

The first day at the University of Milan, in the Department of Classics, I was shocked: my colleagues had the attitude of real philologists!
How did you end up at the University of Luzern?

Luzern offers me the ideal context for my research. I am, indeed, in a real healthcare setting (Swiss Paraplegic Research) and my colleagues come from the hard health sciences. Working in this environment forces me ‘to make sense’ of my research in terms of its relevance and applicability. When I saw the call for a position in the Department of Health Sciences and Health Policy, I realized that it was an ideal step for my development. I owe a lot to Lugano, a place where I have learned a lot. But learning also comes out of different experiences. The world has so many experiences to offer, but it is up to us whether we take them or continue living in our small garden!

Could you tell us something about the project(s) you are working on right now?

At the moment I am working on two main areas: on the relationship between health and well-being from a conceptual and methodological point of view, and on patient-centeredness, on the communication strategies to best enhance it. In addition to this, I am involved in the development of the educational program of my Department. Since I find teaching a most rewarding activity, I spend considerable time on courses on academic and professional communication at the University of Lucerne, the University of Lugano and, in Italy, at the Polytechnic of Milan.

You recently gave a lecture at the University of Amsterdam on the importance for argumentation theorists to enter into the field of health communication. What do you think argumentation theory has to offer to the relatively new discipline of health communication, and vice versa?

Argumentation theory offers conceptual tools to analyze and evaluate the quality of health communication for patients and consumers. Also, it offers educational instruments to enhance the communication skills of the various stakeholders of the healthcare setting. Health offers a real context of application, where health and disease are not fictional constructs, but targets to achieve or to fight. Health communication can improve through argumentation theory. Argumentation theory can advance by addressing conceptual challenges originating from its application in the field of health.

In your research you have used the Toulmin model, the New Rhetoric as well as the pragma-dialectical theory as your theoretical framework. What are, in your opinion, the advantages of using such different theoretical approaches? Do you also see any disadvantages in it?

Toulmin’s model of argument schemes focuses primarily on argumentation as a product, but it would be interesting to look into theories that also shed light on argumentation as a process, taking place between two discussion parties. Some research in AI proposes to use Perelman’s theory. But Perelman, although he focused on the ‘audience’ dimension and offered a rich list of argument schemes, did not conceptualize the different stages of a critical discussion and the nature and quality of the moves that can occur there. Such an idea of discussion stages could be useful for argumentation systems, as it involves the process of defining the starting points that two opposing discussants have in common, and the way argumentation is based upon these shared starting points. This provides an insight in the way an arguer can select content which has personal relevance for the person he would like to convince. This is, of course, the added value of adopting pragma-dialectics. At this stage, I do not see any disadvantage. We must perform additional research and explore real values and limitations.

You have studied and worked in several countries. What have you learned from these experiences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sara’s choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t mind me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One main thing: be a serious scholar. We do a job that often empowers our egocentrism. But the greatest academics have inside what Aristotle would call ‘the curiosity of wisdom’. What matters, at the end of the day, is what we leave when we go off the stage: we can decide to build a kingdom of clouds, or to leave a little seed that will grow.

I have heard that you are working on a special personal project. Would you reveal what it is about?

Here I must smile! I love writing books for the general public. Communication is one of our most important skills and people would benefit in many senses from improving their communication skills. So, I just completed a manuscript entitled: “Love affairs are bad for your cholesterol. Reasoning and Communication in relationship”. It is a book that suggests the use of critical thinking strategies and persuasion and argumentation theories in dealing with partners. Why mentioning the cholesterol? Read the book! It should come out in the summer.

What are your plans for the following years?

To continue enjoying my work as I do now. To invest time in teaching. To make sure that what I do is not just for my own benefit.

NEWS FROM THE DEPARTMENT

The 7th ISSA conference on argumentation, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

From 29 June till 2 July 2010, the 7th conference on argumentation took place in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Frans van Eemeren and BartGarsen were members of the planning committee for this conference. At the conference, Bilal Amjarso presented the paper “The effectiveness of mentioning and refuting anticipated counterarguments”, Corina Andone the paper “The reasonableness of retracting a standpoint in a political interview”, Merel Boers the paper “Pragma-dialectics in action: analysis of international historical Holocaust controversy”, Eveline Feteris the paper “Strategic manoeuvring in the case of the Unworthy Spouse”, Bart Garsen the paper “The extended pragma-dialectical argumentation theory; an empirical interpretation” (co-authored with Frans van Eemeren and Bert Meuffels), Janne Maaike Gerlofs the paper “Hidden premises, hidden treasures?”, Constanza Ihnen Jory the paper ‘Stock issues’ and pragmatic argumentation in policy discussions”, Marcin Lewiński the paper “The collective antagonist – multiple criticisms in informal online deliberation”, Dima Mohammed the papers “The reasonableness of responding to criticism with accusations of inconsistency” and “Argumentative insights for the analysis of direct-to-consumer advertising” (the latter co-authored with Peter Schulz (University of Lugano, Switzerland)), Maria Navarro the paper “Elements for an argumentative method of interpretation”, Roosmaryn Pilgram the paper “Reconstructing a doctor’s argument by authority in medical consultation”, José Plug the paper “Parrying fallacies in parliamentary debates”, Lotte van Poppel the paper “Solving potential disputes in health brochures with pragmatic argumentation”, Francisca Snoeck Henkemans the paper “Strategic maneuvering by physicians in a shared decision making process”, Yvon Tonnard the paper “Presenting polarised standpoints in Dutch parliament” and Jean Wagemans the paper “Topoi, laws of logic, and argumentation schemes”.

Xiaojing (Jenny) Wu guest researcher at the Department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric

From September 2010 till September 2011, Xiaojing (Jenny) Wu is a guest researcher at the Department of Speech Communication, Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric of the University of Amsterdam. Jenny is a PhD student in the institute of Logic and Cognition at Sun Yat-sen University, China. Her research interests are correctional reasoning and argumentation theory.

Colloque international “Persuasion et argumentation”, Paris, France

From 7 till 10 September 2010, the international colloquium on Persuasion and Argumentation was held at the École des Hautes Études en
At this colloquium, Frans van Eemeren gave an invited presentation, titled “Strategic maneuvering and persuasion in argumentative discourse”. Bart Garssen presented the paper “Judgments on fallacies: Systematic empirical research of the conventional validity of the pragma-dialectical discussion rules” (paper co-authored with Frans van Eemeren and Bert Meuffels).

**International conference on communication in healthcare 2010, Verona, Italy**

From 5 till 8 September 2010, the international conference on communication and healthcare was held at the University of Verona, Italy. At this conference, Roosmaryn Pilgram presented the poster “A pragma-dialectical analysis of a doctor’s argumentation in medical consultation” and Lotte van Poppel the poster “A pragma-dialectical approach to pragmatic argumentation in health brochures”.

**Würzburg international symposium on dialogue in politics, Würzburg, Germany**

On 13, 14 and 15 September 2010, the Würzburg international symposium on dialogue in politics was held at the University of Würzburg, Germany. At this symposium, Corina Andone presented the paper “Confrontational strategic manoeuvres in a political interview”, Frans van Eemeren and Bart Garssen the paper “Strategic maneuvering in the European Parliament”, Dima Mohammed the paper “Strategic manoeuvring with accusations of inconsistency in Prime Minister’s Question Time”, and José Plug the paper “The strategic use of argumentation from example in plenary legislative debates in the European parliament”.

**Conference of the doctoral school SDLIC, Bucharest, Romania**

On 23 September 2010, the doctoral school SDLIC organised a conference at the University of Bucharest, Romania. At this conference, Frans van Eemeren gave an invited plenary presentation, titled “Effectiveness through reasonableness: Argumentative discourse viewed from a pragma-dialectical perspective”.

**ASCA summit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands**

On 30 September 2010, the ASCA summit was held at the University of Amsterdam. At this summit, Frans van Eemeren, Eveline Feteris, Bart Garssen, Bert Meuffels, José Plug Francisca Snoeck Henkemans and Jean Wagemans presented their research projects in the constellation “Argumentation in Discourse”.

**Frans van Eemeren and Bart Garssen lecture at the University of Lugano, Switzerland**

From 4 till 8 October 2010, Frans van Eemeren and Bart Garssen gave a series of lectures, titled “Standard and extended pragma-dialectics in relation to other approaches to argumentation”, at the University of Lugano, Switzerland. This lecture series is part of the doctoral programme “Argumentation Practices in Context” (Argupolis).

**International conference “Logic, Argumentation and Critical Thinking II”, Santiago, Chile**

On 7, 8 and 9 October 2010, the International Conference “Logic, Argumentation and Critical Thinking II” was held at the Diego Portales University, Santiago, Chile. At this conference, Eveline Feteris delivered the keynote speech “The role of the judge in legal proceedings as argumentative activity”.

**International workshop “Political Speech – Il Parlato Politico”, Rome, Italy**

On 10 October 2010, the workshop “Political Speech – Il Parlato Politico” was held at the University of Rome 3, Italy. At this workshop, Frans van Eemeren held the invited talk “Argumentative discourse in institutionalized contexts. Preconditions for strategic maneuvering in the European Parliament”.

**Colloque rationalités des activités dialogiques, Nancy, France**

On 22 October 2010, the colloque rationalités des activités dialogiques was held at the University of Nancy 2, France. At this colloquium, Frans van Eemeren delivered the keynote speech “Strategic maneuvering in
argumentative dialogues. Reconciling aiming simultaneously for rationality and effectiveness”.

**Bilal Amjarso gives guest lecture at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands**

On 5 November 2010, Bilal Amjarso gave the guest lecture “De overtuigingskracht van het bij voorbaat noemen en weerleggen van een tegenargument” at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

**Corina Andone gives guest lecture at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands**

On 12 November 2010, Corina Andone gave the guest lecture “Strategisch manoeuvreren in een politiek interview” at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

**96th annual NCA convention “Building Bridges”, San Francisco, USA**

From 14 till 17 November 2010, the 96th annual NCA convention “Building Bridges” was held in San Francisco, USA. At this conference, Frans van Eemeren presented “A response to C. Tindale, H. Hansen, and F. Kauffeld concerning argumentation at the interface between rhetoric and dialectic”.

**Frans van Eemeren lectures at the University of Lugano, Switzerland**

From 23 November till 3 December 2010, Frans van Eemeren gave a series of eight lectures, titled “Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse”, at the University of Lugano, Switzerland. This lecture series is part of the doctoral programme “Argumentation Practices in Context” (Argupolis).

**Frans van Eemeren gives guest lectures at the University of Trento, Italy**

On 3 December 2010, Frans van Eemeren gave two guest lectures at the University of Trento, Italy: “The pragma-dialectical method of analyzing and evaluating argumentative discourse” and “Context-dependent criteria for identifying derailments of strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse”.

**Bilal Amjarso defends PhD dissertation**

On 16 December 2010, Bilal Amjarso successfully defended his PhD dissertation titled “Mentioning and then refuting an anticipated counterargument. A conceptual and empirical study of the persuasiveness of a mode of strategic manoeuvring”. Frans van Eemeren was Bilal’s promotor and Bert Meuffels was his co-promotor together with Eveline Feteris. Bilal’s study examines theoretically and empirically whether mentioning and then refuting an anticipated counterargument is more persuasive than mentioning only supporting arguments.

**Corina Andone defends PhD dissertation**

On 16 December 2010, Corina Andone successfully defended her PhD dissertation titled “Maneuvring strategically in a political interview. Analyzing and evaluating responses to an accusation of inconsistency”. Frans van Eemeren was Corina’s promotor, Peter Houtlosser started as her co-promotor and, after his untimely death, Francisca Snoeck Henkemans acted as Corina’s co-promotor. Corina’s study provides a pragma-dialectical analysis and evaluation of the way in which politicians maneuver strategically in response to an interviewer’s accusation in a political interview that their position is inconsistent with another position they have advanced before.

**XI Amsterdam-Lugano colloquium, Lugano, Switzerland**

On 14 and 15 January 2011, the XI Amsterdam-Lugano colloquium was organised by the doctoral school Argupolis at the University of Lugano, Switzerland. At this colloquium, Corina Andone presented the paper “Maneuvering strategically in a political interview”, Frans van Eemeren the paper “Towards an encyclopedic handbook of argumentation theory”, Eveline Feteris the paper “The role of the judge in legal proceedings”, Roosmaryn Pilgram the paper “Strategic manoeuvring in medical consultation. A doctor’s argument by authority as adaptation to audience demand”, José Plug the paper “Responding to *ad hominem* arguments in parliamentary debates”, Lotte van Poppel the paper “Analyzing pragmatic argumentation in health brochures”, Jean Wagemans the paper...
“Characteristics of academic communication”, and Renske Wierda the paper “Direct-to-consumer medical advertisements as an argumentative activity type”.

Newspaper article on PhD research Corina Andone in Het Parool

On 15 January 2011, Joost Zonneveld wrote the article “Draaiende politici” in the Dutch newspaper Het Parool.

Frans van Eemeren gives guest lecture at the University of Duisburg, Germany

On 19 January 2011, Frans van Eemeren gave the guest lecture “Fallacies as derailments of strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse” at the University of Duisburg in Essen, Germany.

International conference “Communication and Cognition 2011 – Manipulation, Persuasion and Deception in Language”, Neuchâtel, Switzerland

On 26, 27 and 28 January 2011, the international conference “Communication and Cognition 2011 – Manipulation, Persuasion and Deception in Language” was held at the University of Neuchâtel (in cooperation with the University of Fribourg) in Neuchâtel, Switzerland. At this conference, Frans van Eemeren delivered the keynote speech “Fallacies as derailments of argumentative discourse. Acceptance based on understanding and critical assessment”.

AAAi spring symposia, Palo Alto, USA

On 21, 22 and 23 March 2011, the AAAI Spring Symposium on AI and Health Communication was held at Stanford University, Palo Alto, USA. At this symposium, Renske Wierda presented the paper “The problem of premissary relevance” (co-authored with Sara Rubinelli (University of Lucerne and Swiss Paraplegic Research, Switzerland), Nanon Labrie (University of Lugano, Switzerland) and Daniel O’Keefe (Northwestern University, USA)).

International colloquium “Inside Arguments – Logic vs. Argumentation Theory”, Coimbra, Portugal

On 24, 25 and 26 March 2011, the international conference “Inside Arguments – Logic vs. Argumentation Theory” was held at the University of Coimbra, Portugal. Frans van Eemeren was a member of the Scientific Committee of this conference and gave the invited plenary presentation “The role of logic in analyzing and evaluating argumentation”. Bart Garssen presented the paper “Charges of inconsistency and the tu quoque fallacy”.

International interdisciplinary conference “Ethics and Discourse in Historical Perspective: Practice and Theory”, Montpellier, France

On 15 and 16 April 2011, the international conference “Ethics and Discourse in Historical Perspective: Practice and Theory” was held at the Paul Valéry-Montpellier III University in Montpellier, France. At this conference, Frans van Eemeren was a guest speaker, presenting the paper “A code of conduct for reasonable discussants: The pragma-dialectical rules for critical discussion”.

Seminar “Modelli e Prospettive per la Teoria e la Prassi del Diritto”, Verona, Italy

On 19 April 2011, the Facoltà di Giurisprudenza of the University of Verona in cooperation with the CERMEG and the Dipartimento di Scienze Giuridiche of the University of Padova, Italy, organised an international seminar on legal philosophy, entitled “Modelli e Prospettive per la Teoria e la Prassi del Diritto”. At this seminar, Eveline Feteris gave an invited plenary presentation called “Analisi e valutazione dell’argomentazione giuridica: approcci della teoria del diritto della teoria dell’argomentazione” (“Analysis and evaluation of legal argumentation: approaches in legal theory and argumentation theory”).

Weekly column Jean Wagemans on www.nu.nl

From 19 April 2011 onwards, every Tuesday, Jean Wagemans will publish a column about argumentation on the Dutch news-website www.nu.nl (go to http://www.nu.nl/column-dinsdag/). Please note that the column is in Dutch.
NEWS FROM ILIAS

Simona Cosoreci Mazilu defends PhD dissertation

On 24 September 2010, Simona Cosoreci Mazilu (University of Bucharest, Romania) successfully defended her PhD dissertation titled “Dissociation and persuasive definitions as argumentative strategies in ethical argumentation on abortion” (“Disocierea si definitiile persuasive ca strategii argumentative in argumentarea etica pe problema avortului”).

Daniela Muraru defends PhD dissertation

On 24 September 2010, Daniela Muraru (University of Bucharest, Romania) successfully defended her PhD dissertation titled “Mediation and diplomatic discourse: The strategic use of dissociation and definitions”. (“Medierea si discursul diplomat folosirea strategica a disocierii si a definitiilor”).

Rudi Palmieri defends PhD dissertation

On 3 December 2010, Rudi Palmieri (University of Lugano, Switzerland) successfully defended his PhD dissertation titled “The arguments of corporate directors in takeover bids. Comparing argumentative strategies in the context of friendly and hostile offers in the UK market”.

Laura Vincze defends PhD dissertation

On 16 December 2010, Laura Vincze (University of Pisa, Italy) successfully defended her PhD dissertation titled “La persuasione nelle parole e nel corpo. Comunicazione multiromale e argumentazione ragionevole e fallace nel discorso politico e nel linguaggio quotidiano”.
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