University of Windsor
Scholarship at UWindsor

OSSA Conference Archive

OSSA 3

May 15th, 9:00 AM - May 17th, 5:00 PM

Commentary on F S Nielsen

Douglas Walton

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive

Part of the Philosophy Commons

Douglas Walton, "Commentary on F S Nielsen" (May 15, 1999). *OSSA Conference Archive.* Paper 96.
http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA3/papersandcommentaries/96

Author: Douglas Walton

In Response To: FS Nielsen's *Alfred Sidgwick's 'rogative' approach to argumentation*

(c)2000 Douglas Walton

Nielsen's paper has shown how Sidgwick was a man ahead of his time, whose concerns are familiar and resonant to those of us now working in argumentation and informal logic. Nielsen's explanation of Sidgwick's work in practical logic shows how Sidgwick's ideas were not only ahead of their time, but out of step with developments in logic during and after his lifetime. The explosion of work in mathematical (formal) logic around the beginning of the twentieth century eclipsed the pragmatic concerns of Sidgwick and the few contemporaries of his, like FCS Schiller (1912), who were interested in the uses of argumentation, as opposed to its formal representation, abstracted from contexts of use. We can see now why Sidgwick's work was ignored by most of his contemporaries, and then fell into obscurity. I thought for quite a while I was the only person on the planet interested in Sidgwick and his work. Now it is extremely welcome to find someone who has gone into much more depth than I could ever hope to do, in studying Sidgwick's life and his contributions to argumentation theory. I look forward to a continuation of this research on Sidgwick's life and philosophical contributions. And I agree with Nielsen that it will reveal to everyone that Sidgwick was a highly important precursor to the recent work in argumentation and informal logic studies. There is much I could say about many aspects of Nielsen's paper, but I will confine my comments to the two basic points I think are of key importance - the principle of access and the rogative approach.

The Principle of Access

Sidgwick's principle of access tells us that when we attempt to criticize another person's argumentation, the only evidence we have access to are the natural language formulations of that person. The problem, as Nielsen points out, is that the corpus of this person's natural language formulations in any given case can be complex, and difficult to make sense of. What the person has said may be unclear, ambiguous, evasive, and incomplete. In some cases, an arguer may be purposefully trying to deceive us by using tricky tactics called fallacies. The problem, as Sidgwick clearly saw, is not so much one of formalization, but one of interpreting a natural language text of discourse in some supposed context of use. Thus Sidgwick was right to warn, as shown by Nielsen, that the real problems to be concerned about are those of unfair interpretation, and faulty criticism based on that unfair or unwarranted interpretation. But then the problem is - how do you, in some objective manner, interpret a natural language text of discourse in a given case? This is the famous problem of how to "deconstruct" a person's text of discourse in a real case of argumentation.

Nielsen shows that Sidgwick's answer to this fundamental question lies in his rogative logic, which is based on the necessity of a dialogical approach to

argument criticism. According to the rogative approach, pinning down a fallacy or criticism in a given case is not a matter of exact calculation, but a matter of guesswork. Immediately, many people, especially formal logicians and analytical philosophers will throw up their hands and say, "See, I told you so. There's no exact method of calculation whereby you can prove that the argument is this thing or that thing." Guesswork is taken to be opposed to logic, because guesswork is not exact. While there is something to be said for this objection, the problem is that it misses the most important point. Intelligent guesswork, of the kind we are talking about, can be based on verifiable evidence. In some cases, the evidence can be definitive, even though in other cases, the evidence is inconclusive, or there is not enough of it to arrive at other than a conditional judgment (hypothesis).

It is natural for me to see Sidgwick as anticipating the dialectical approach to argument criticism advocated in (Walton and Krabbe, 1995), which takes commitment in dialogue as the central concept needed in criticizing any actual case of an argument. What we need to do, in evaluating the argumentation in any specific case, is to assemble the textual evidence in the case, and interpret what the arguer is supposedly saying in light of a normative model of dialogue. The normative model represents the supposed context of use of the argument. Using such a normative model, we can then look at the text of discourse (critically but fairly), and use that textual and contextual evidence as a basis for constructing hypotheses or intelligent guesses about what the arguer's commitments are, as expressed by the arguments, or other moves in the dialogues she has put forth in the case. Sometimes the evidence is quite clear and definitive. If the arguer asserts "Bill Clinton is President of the USA.", and does not subsequently retract that commitment, then we can quite definitely say that this arguer is committed to the proposition that Bill Clinton is President of the USA. But notoriously, in other cases, it can be very hard to tell what a person's commitments are, or may be fairly said to be, based on the evidence of what she said in the text of discourse we have as evidence.

The important thing however is that in all such cases, there is evidence that can be used to support or refute claims about what an arguer can fairly be said to be committed to, as a definite set of propositions in a given case. It is no longer just a matter of my word against yours, in the new dialectical theory of argumentation. It's not that there aren't borderline cases, and exquisitely difficult cases, demanding a high level of natural language skills to sort out. The point is that there are objective criteria for collecting and evaluating the evidence in a given case. Sidgwick saw this possibility already, and the need of it to have any kind of practical logic. His principle of access pointed the way to the dialectical approach that has now become the structural tool for evaluating arguments in modern argumentation theory.

The Rogative Approach

Nielsen shows how the problem of the application of logic confronted by Sidgwick led to his distinctive rogative approach, an approach that is a

forerunner to the commitment-based structures of dialogue constructed by Hamblin (1970) and others. Nielsen shows how the rogative approach has five distinctive characteristics.

1. Arguments or assertions are clarified through critical questioning.

2. The use of an expression is "recommended", not "insisted on".

3. Criticisms have the form of objections rather than refutations.

4. There is an openness to "further clarifications".

5. The assertor has final say on what he "actually meant to assert".

These five characteristics of the rogative approach foreshadow Hamblin's use of commitment and the device of critical questions used by Arthur Hastings (1963), the Amsterdam School (Van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992), Kienpointner (1992) and other proponents of the new approach to argumentation theory and informal logic. The notion of commitment is rogative. An arguer's commitments are the propositions that she has gone on record as having accepted, as far as can be determined form the text and context of what she actually said. But commitments can be retracted. They can be clarified. They can be revised. Such retractions and clarifications can be made by continuing a dialogue, if it is possible to do so. The notion of critical questioning is also rogative. The goal of practical logic is (generally speaking) not to decisively refute an arguer, but to find the weakest points in her argument that are open to critical questioning. The aim is to pose objections or criticisms of a kind that can be answered in a continuation of dialogue. The aim is "critical" in the positive sense. It is not to embarrass or humiliate an opponent, by making him look foolish. It is to find the weakest points in his argument by asking the appropriate critical questions. Then by discussing these critical questions, the original arguer can not only improve his argument and make it stronger, but can gain insight into aspects of it that might not have occurred to him before.

References

Charles L. Hamblin, Fallacies, London, Methuen, 1970.

Arthur C. Hastings, *A Reformulation of the Modes of Reasoning in Argumentation*, Evanston, Illinois, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1963.

Manfred Kienpointner, *Alltagslogik : Struktur und Funktion von Argumentationsmustern*, Stuttgart, Fromman-Holzboog, 1992.

F. C. S. Schiller, Formal Logic, London, Macmillan and Co., 1912.

Frans H. van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst, *Argumentation, Communication and Fallacies*, Hillsdale, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates,

1992.

Douglas N. Walton and Erik C. W. Krabbe, *Commitment in Dialogue*, Albany, New York, SUNY Press, 1995.