

Preface

During the last decade we have been working, together with colleagues interested in this endeavor, on an extension of the “standard” pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation developed by van Eemeren and Grootendorst by integrating insights from classical and modern rhetoric. This integration of rhetorical insight in a dialectical theoretical framework was motivated by our wish to improve the quality of a pragma-dialectical analysis and evaluation of argumentative discourse. The integration was brought about with the help of the introduction of the notion of “strategic maneuvering,” which designates the balancing act of reconciling the simultaneous pursuit of dialectical and rhetorical objectives that arguers have to perform in the conduct of argumentative discourse. Even if they are in the first place out to fulfill their dialectical obligations in the explicit or implicit exchange, they may still be expected to be aiming at realizing the rhetorical aspirations that go with entering an argument; and if they are in the first place led by their rhetorical aspirations, they still cannot ignore the dialectical obligations that they have to meet when entering an argument. These considerations concerning the “double” concern that arguers may be assumed to have are at the heart of our efforts to develop an extended pragma-dialectical theory. They are also the starting point for this special issue of the journal *Argumentation* in which authors from various theoretical backgrounds – which may be quite different from our pragma-dialectical position – offer, from their specific vantage points, their “Perspectives on Strategic Maneuvering.”

The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, NWO, granted us a substantial subsidy to further develop our ideas concerning strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse, in particular by examining the strategic function of maneuvering that consists in pointing out an inconsistency in the other party’s position and formulating the soundness conditions applying to that way of maneuvering (research program no. 360-80-030). Apart from involving four excellent PhD students and a post-doctoral researcher in the project, this subsidy allowed us also, just as we intended, to organize a series of small-scale and clearly focused conferences dedicated to specific aspects of strategic maneuvering. At these conferences scholars of argumentation interested in any of these specific aspects could discuss their views with other interested parties and contribute in this way to the progress of our project, not in the last place by criticizing some of our points of departure and offering constructive alternatives. The first

conference, which was held in Amsterdam in October 2006, was devoted to a general discussion of *perspectives on strategic maneuvering* and served as a preliminary to the more specialized conferences that were to be held later on empirical evidence of strategic maneuvering, conventional constraints with regard to strategic maneuvering resulting from institutional demands, and stylistic and other presentational devices for strategic maneuvering. The contributions to the first conference are published in this special issue, albeit that they appear in an amended form, taking the results of the discussions at the conference into account, but also, and firstly, the remarks that were made at the conference by the commentators who responded to the presentations. These comment are, again in an amended version, included in this issue.

'Strategic maneuvering,' the first contribution, co-authored by Frans H. van Eemeren and Peter Houtlosser (University of Amsterdam), gives a synthetic recapitulation of the various steps that have been taken in developing the pragma-dialectical theory of strategic maneuvering. This article is meant to serve as an introduction to this special issue by describing the state of the art in the theory that was the starting point for the reflections on strategic maneuvering from various perspectives reported about in the other articles. Sara Greco Morasso of the University of Lugano is the commentator.

Through examining the dynamics of persuasive definition in various cases, David Zarefsky (Northwestern University) explores in 'Strategic maneuvering through persuasive definitions', both from a dialectical perspective and from a rhetorical perspective, the similarities and differences between the role of strategic maneuvering in normative ideal arguments and in arguments that are actually put forward. In so doing he aims to avoid in comparing dialectic and rhetoric the use of mixed standards that takes place if one starts from ideal standards in the case of dialectic and from empirical standards in the case of rhetoric or vice versa. Bilal Amjarso (University of Amsterdam) is his commentator.

In 'Non-fallacious rhetorical strategies,' Scott Jacobs (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) explores the notion of strategy by examining the relationship between rhetoric, dialectic and logic. Strategy is basically an organization of means to accomplish an end and using this notion poses, according to Jacobs, problems for all three disciplines. Normative pragmatics provides a perspective in which these problems can be resolved by showing that rhetorical strategies can be seen to have the potential for constructive contributions to argumentation and that fallacies are not simply violations of ideals. Jacobs illustrates this potential by means of a case study of a TV

campaign commercial. Dima Mohammed (University of Amsterdam) comments on this contribution by Jacobs.

Christopher W. Tindale (University of Windsor) discusses in 'Constrained maneuvering' some of the ways in which recent models for argumentation have brought rhetoric into the theory of argumentation. He compares in particular the strategic maneuvering project within pragma-dialectics with his own implementation of rhetoric in argumentation theory, in which the notion of "audience" is crucial. According to Tindale, rhetoric is fundamental to argumentation and has its own reasonableness. His paper is commented upon by Peter J. Schulz (University of Lugano).

In 'Strategic maneuvering with dissociation,' M.A. van Rees (University of Amsterdam) uses her study of dissociation to draw some general conclusions for research that aims at understanding the strategic potential of this argumentative technique. She explores the possibilities dissociation has for enhancing critical reasonableness and rhetorical effectiveness if dissociation is conceived as a way of strategic maneuvering. For each stage of a critical discussion, she specifies the dialectical moves in which dissociation can be employed and the specific ways in which dissociation contributes to fulfilling the dialectical tasks associated with the moves concerned. Starting from this background, she discusses the rhetorical gain that dissociation can bring about in each particular case. Sara Rubinelli (University of Lugano) subjects the efforts made by van Rees to a constructive critical scrutiny.

In 'Don't say that!' Jan Albert van Laar (University of Amsterdam and University of Groningen) attempts to establish the boundaries between sound applications and fallacious applications of the way of maneuvering that consists in pointing out the supposedly unfavorable consequences of advancing a particular standpoint. For this purpose, he provides a contextual analysis in which this way of maneuvering is sound in the one situation but not in the other. Andrea Rocci (University of Lugano) gives his commentary.

In 'Relevance of context-bound *loci* to topical potential in the argumentation stage,' the last contribution to this special issue, Eddo Rigotti (University of Lugano) examines one typical aspect of strategic maneuvering: choosing from the "topical potential" that is available at the point at which the maneuvering occurs. He concentrates in this endeavor on those parts of an argumentative exchange that are to be reconstructed as the argumentation stage of a critical discussion and proposes a modern topical system that is inspired by the traditional doctrine of topics. Having brought to light the relevance of the communicative context to the topical potential, Rigotti discusses the 'synergy' of the topical and the endoxical components of argument

construction, the use of topics in the analysis and evaluation of argument and also the heuristic function of topics in the production of arguments. Corina Andone (University of Amsterdam) gives her comments on Rigotti's contribution.

FRANS H. VAN EEMEREN and PETER HOUTLOSSER

Department of Speech Communication,

Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric

Universiteit van Amsterdam, Spuistraat 134

Amsterdam 1012 VB

The Netherlands

E-mails: F.H.vanEemeren@uva.nl; P.Houtlosser@uva.nl