OSSA Summer Institute – Changing Actions

**Schedule:**

**Opening Reception:** Sunday May 26, 6:00 p.m.

255 Villaire Avenue, Windsor (Home of Chris & Kathy Tindale)

Come and meet fellow participants in the Summer Institute.

Room for all sessions: Dillon Hall 265

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | May 27 | May 28 | May 29 | May 30 | May 31 |
|  | **Monday** | **Tuesday** | **Wednesday** | **Thursday** | **Friday** |
| **9-12** | **Instructor:** Everyone | **Instructor:** Fábio Shecaira | **Instructor:** Constanza Inhen | **Instructor:** Andrew Aberdein | Student Presentations |
| **Topic:** Introductions | **Topic:** Legal Argumentation | **Topic:** Pragmatic argumentation in public policy debates | **Topic:** Virtuous Decision- making |
| **1-4** | **Instructor:** Michael Baumtrog | **Instructor:** Sarah Partlow- Lefevre | **Instructor:** Andreea Mihali | Student Prep | Student Presentations |
| **Topic:** Theoretical Approaches to Practical Reasoning and Argumentation | **Topic:** Debating vs.Deliberating Toward Action | **Topic:** Multimodal arguments |

**Closing Dinner:** Friday May 31, 6:00 p.m.

255 Villaire Avenue, Windsor.

**Session Overviews:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Michael Baumtrog** | Broadly compare and contrast a) theoretical and practical, b) reasoning and argumentation from both argumentation and philosophy. Review differing approaches to and contemporary problems within research on practical reasoning and argumentation from within philosophy and argumentation studies. |
| **Fábio Shecaira** | Discuss how legal argumentation differs from ordinary practical argumentation. How do judges and other legal actors attempt to fulfill their duty to argue for their decisions? What do they think is a good argument in the legal domain? What do they think is a persuasive argument in the legal domain? How do their standards of argument quality and persuasiveness differ from the standards that prevail outside the legal context? |
| **Constanza Inhen** | Public policies are often justified by claiming that the policy proposed will solve some problem or achieve a certain goal of social significance. Argumentation theorists sometimes refer to this type of argumentation as “pragmatic argumentation”. In this lecture, we will revise and discuss: a) models to analyse pragmatic argumentation in policy-making contexts; b) criteria to evaluate the merits of a pragmatic argument; and c) pending challenges concerning the process of balancing the weight of opposing pragmatic arguments. |
| **Andreea Mihali** | In this session we will examine multimodal arguments and their use in promoting action and effecting action change. By means of a close analysis of examples we will investigate the differences between: a) non-arguments and arguments; b) arguments as products, arguments as procedures and arguments as processes; c) arguments accompanied by music and musical arguments. We will also inquire into what these examples tell us about the limits of rational persuasion, solving disagreement and changing actions via rational means. |
| **Sarah Partlow- Lefevre** | In this session, we will discuss the importance of metaphors to understanding and theorizing argument. Close attention will be paid to the differences between metaphors of debate vs. metaphors of deliberation and how they might relate to using argumentation as impetus to action. The possibility of a developing a theory of positive deliberation will be discussed. If time allows, some attention will be paid to reverse engineering argumentation to deepen the inquiry into the relationship between argumentation and action or inaction. |
| **Andrew Aberdein** | Virtue theorists of argumentation have paid surprisingly little attention to practical reasoning. This may reflect a closer affinity to virtue epistemology than to virtue ethics or virtue jurisprudence, since scholars in the latter areas have addressed the role of intellectual virtues in making good decisions. In this session, we will investigate what these approaches to practical reasoning have in common with each other and what virtue argumentation theory might contribute to a unified account of virtuous decision making. |