

C228 Argumentation and Public Advocacy

Professor John Louis Lucaites
800 E Third St., Rm. 245
Lectures: MW 12:20-1:10, BH 013
Discussion Section: F 11:15-12:05, HU 108 (Sect. 9763)
Office Hours:
M 10:30-11:30; F 10:00-11:00
lucaites@indiana.edu

Associate Instructor Christopher Gilbert
800 E Third St., Rm. 275
F 10:10-11:00, SY 004 (Sect. 9764)
12:20-1:10, HU 111 (Sect. 10569)
Office Hours: M 1:30-2:30; F 9-10, BA
chrgilbe@indiana.edu

Associate Instructor Cortney Smith
800 E. Third St., Rm. 275
F 11:15-12:05, ED 1255 (Sect. 10568)
F 12:20-1:10, ED 1250 (Sect. 9765)
Office Hours: MW 1:30-2:30
colasmit@indiana.edu

Course Website:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~c228/index.html>

“Violence is the last resort of the incompetent ...”

– Salvo Hardin in
Isaac Asimov’s *Foundation Trilogy*

“... for every argument there is an equal and weighty counter argument.”

– Protagoras of Abdera

C228 Argumentation and Public Advocacy is an intensive introductory level course on the theory, practice, and criticism of public advocacy – the use of propositions, evidence, practical reason, and the general rhetorical strategies of symbolic action to promote and advance one’s public or civic interests. The course operates with the assumption that liberal-democratic polity relies on the ability of its citizens to be active and critical producers and consumers of public arguments as part of a reasoned process of collective decision-making. This is *not* to suggest that public or political decision making in a

liberal-democratic society is always rational or reasonable—or even that reason and rationality are the only ways to effect social and political change—but it is to suggest that we would all be better off if we were to master the fundamental skills of rhetoric and argumentation as a primary means to represent and protect our own best interests and the best interests of the polity. The course also operates with the assumption that one can best learn the skills of public advocacy through a rigorous combination of theory and practice. Accordingly, the course will be divided between lectures designed to identify and elaborate the theoretical precepts of public advocacy—the norms and assumptions that tend to guide successful public argumentation—and exercises (both formal and informal) designed to allow students to practice the fundamental skills of public argumentation. C228 carries IU A&H General Education Credit and College (CASE) A&H Breadth of Inquiry Credit.

*Note: The lectures in this class are the intellectual property of Professor Lucaites and may not be recorded or distributed without prior written consent. © 2007

TEXTS

There is no textbook for this class. There is a .pdf of the *C228 Student Workbook* as well as other readings available at the C228 Oncourse site.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Course Reading: The required, common, daily reading assignments for this course are very light because we want you to dedicate your energy first and foremost to absorbing lecture materials and to integrating them with your everyday understanding of public advocacy as it is occurring at the present moment. Reading assignments are as follows:

(a) The *C228 Student Workbook* includes a page dedicated to each lecture. Each page includes several quotations that serve to frame and organize the lecture, a list of key terms that will be central to the lecture, and specific reading assignments. *The quotations are designed as epigraphs and their purpose is to be somewhat provocative in getting you to begin to think about implications of the lecture you are about to hear.* Needless to say, it is important that you read and think about these *prior* to class. You should also attend closely to the keywords as they appear in lectures.

(b) For each lecture (listed both in your workbook and on the syllabus) there are assigned readings. These are all brief articles and book chapters (available as .pdfs at Oncourse) that provide supplementary information to the lectures and/or are designed to provoke critical thinking and reflection on your part. In most instances we will not discuss such readings directly in the lectures, though the readings might become important topics of consideration in your discussion sections. If a reading is *required* for either lectures or discussions it will be marked in the workbook and on the syllabus with an asterisk (*). If a reading is required you are responsible for that material on midterm and final exams. Please

note that readings and assignments for the discussion sections are listed on the syllabus but *not* included in the workbook.

(c) You are to read and learn the thirty-four informal fallacies described and illustrated on the handout “Recognizing Microstructural Fallacies in Argumentation” (available both at Ocourse and on the course website). We will consider the topic of fallacies in abbreviated fashion in class lectures and discussions, *but you will need to know the fallacies in detail for the midterm examination* where you will be required to identify them by name, define them, and recognize them in practice. You are encouraged *in the strongest terms possible* to begin to learn these fallacies from the very first day of class. Learning several a week will make a significant portion of the midterm examination a breeze. Waiting to study them until just before the midterm examination ... well, let’s just say it won’t be a breeze.

(d) You need to read the *New York Times* – online or in hard copy – on a fairly regular basis. The *NYT* is not the only important newspaper, to be sure, but it is considered “the paper of record” and provides an almost essential resource for staying on top of national and international public controversies—the sites of much public advocacy. We will draw from the newspaper in lectures and discussions, and occasionally we will ask you to locate and bring to class examples (or counterexamples) of the concepts, rules, and norms of public advocacy being considered. *You should focus in particular on editorials and opinion pieces where we will see many of the argumentative practices we discuss in lectures enacted.*

2. Examinations. There will be an in-class midterm examination on Wednesday, October 21st and a final examination on Wednesday, December 14th (2:45-4:45 PM) in BH 013. The midterm examination will consist of multiple choice and short answer questions from class readings (75%) and lectures (25%). The final examination will consist of several essay questions that ask you to analyze and evaluate specific instances of public advocacy. Each examination will count as 15% of your final grade for the course.

3. Essays. You will craft three argumentative essays establishing and defending a proposition of fact, a proposition of value, and a proposition of policy. Due dates are listed on the course calendar. We will provide detailed descriptions of each assignment at the appropriate time. *All three essays will be on the same topic*, developing the argument you advance in the context of relevant facts, values, and policies. In your first essay you will advance a claim to fact (e.g., “Unemployment rates have risen 5% in the state of Indiana in the past two years.”). In your second essay you will advance a value claim (e.g., “Unemployment violates the ‘right to work’.”). In your third essay you will advance a policy claim (e.g., “The Indiana Legislature should develop and fund a works project bill to employ unemployed citizens.”). Your second essay will require you to engage in “oppositional research” and to develop the argument *in opposition* to the position that you actually hold. So, for example, if your intention is ultimately to argue

that unemployment violates the right to work, in your second essay you will make *the best oppositional argument you can* to mitigate the claim that there is a “right to work.” Each of the essays will be 6-8 pages in length (1,500 to 2,000 words), typed, double-spaced, and formatted with appropriate references according to the conventions of the *MLA Handbook*, 7th Ed. All essays will be submitted as hardcopies on the designated date as well as being submitted as electronic files to turnitin.com. Essays #1 (15% of your final grade) and 2 (20% of your final grade) will each draw upon at least seven different sources of information; essay #3 (25% of your final grade) will have no specific bibliographical requirements in terms of the number of sources you cite though you will be evaluated on whether or not you have a sufficient number of credible sources to establish your authority on the topic. Each essay will be graded for both argumentative form and style (including the standard conventions of English composition and grammar, so, yes, spelling counts!). In-class writing workshops for the all three essays are a *required* step of the process.

ATTENDANCE

Regular attendance in this course is *essential* given that *the* primary source of theoretical materials will be provided in class lectures and *the* primary site for practicing the norms and conventions of public argumentation will be the discussion sections. *Accordingly, attendance is required at all class sessions (there are no excused absences for medical or other reasons) and will count as 10% of your final grade for the course. There will be no penalty for missing classes, but obviously we cannot give you credit for a class that you did not attend.* If you do miss class it is your responsibility to get class notes from a classmate. Once you have reviewed such materials you are welcome to consult with your discussion leader over specific problems you may be having with the material. Attendance will be graded according to the following scale: 0-3 absences = A; 4 = B+; 5 = B; 6 = B-; 7 = C+; 8 = C; 9 = C-; 10 or more = F.

GRADING

All grading will be conducted on the standard A to F scale. A specific rubric for grading argumentative essays can be found on the course website. In general, however, a grade in the “A” range indicates work that is “outstanding” relative to basic course requirements; work in the “B” range is significantly above basic course requirements, though it may not be outstanding in any or every regard; *work in the “C” range meets the basic course requirements in every respect*; work in the “D” range fails to meet one or more of the basic requirements but demonstrates a minimal understanding of core concepts and is minimally deserving of credit; “F” work indicates a failure to meet the basic requirements of an assignment, oftentimes by indicating no understanding of core concepts or by failing to complete an assignment in a timely fashion.

Plagiarism consists of the use of the work of others as if it were your own without properly acknowledging such contributions through the use of quotations (where appropriate) or citations in footnotes and endnotes. Ignorance of the rules and regulations regarding plagiarism and student conduct *is not* considered a defense against

indiscretions. Be sure to read the *IU Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct* (1998), Part III, Student Misconduct, Section A, Academic Misconduct, 3 (available at <http://www.iu.edu/~code/code/responsibilities/academic/index.shtml>). At a minimum, students guilty of plagiarism will receive a “0” for the assignment and, depending on the severity of the indiscretion, will receive an automatic “F” for the course. All acts of plagiarism will be reported to the Dean for Academic Affairs. If you have any questions about whether or not your work is appropriately documented be sure to consult with your discussion leader.

Your final grade for the course will be a calculation based on the following percentages:

Attendance	10%
Essay #1	15%
Essay #2	20%
Essay #3	25%
Mid-term Exam	15%
Final Exam	15%

Discussion leaders, who will be primarily responsible for grading, retain the privilege of raising your final grade for the course by a 1/3 increment (e.g., from C to C+ or from B+ to A-) on the basis of his/her assessment of the quantity and quality of your participation in the Friday discussion sections. Students who miss more than three Friday discussion sections are not eligible to have their grades raised in this manner (although they could be lowered).

CONFERENCES

All three of your instructors are available for individual and group conferences. Their office hours appear on the first page of the syllabus as well as on the course website, *and all course instructors are also available by appointment*. If you need (or desire) an appointment please do not be shy about asking for one, but note that Professor Lucaites is typically *not* on campus on Tuesday and Thursday. In general, you should reserve meetings with Professor Lucaites to discuss lecture materials (or general education and advising concerns) and you should reserve meetings with your discussion leader to consult on examinations, course assignments, and evaluations.

Course Calendar

NOTE: Readings marked with an asterisk (*) are required. All readings are available as .pdfs at the C228 Oncourse site.

Part I: On the Relationship Between Argument and Public Advocacy

- 08/29** Lecture: Introduction to Argumentation and Public Advocacy
- 08/31** Lecture: The Grammar of Argumentation – Questions vs. Propositions
Read: Christopher J. Gilbert and John L. Lucaites, “A Defense of the Civic Art of Argumentation,” in *C228 Workbook*, 12-17.*
- 09/02** Discussion Section
Read: Douglas Ehninger, “Argument as Method: Its Nature, Its Limitations and Its Uses,” *Speech Monographs* 37. (1970): 101-110.*
- 09/05** Labor Day – No Class
- 09/07** Lecture: The “V Model” of Public Advocacy
Read: Kenneth T. Broda-Bahm, Daniela Kempf, and William J. Driscoll, “Crafting Propositions,” in *Argument and Audience: Presenting Debates in Public Settings*. New York, NY: International Debate Education Association, 2004, 109-129.
- 09/09** Discussion Section: Directed Research
Read: John L. Lucaites and Isaac West, “Research Strategies.”*

Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, “Engaging Sources” in *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2008, 84-101.*

** Turn in your topic for WA#1 organized as a “V Model” written in propositional form.

Part II: In Defense of the Proposition of Fact

- 09/12** Lecture: What is a Fact?
Read: Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee, “Just the Facts, Please,” in *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*, 5th Ed. New York, NY: Pearson, 2009, 9-15.*
- 09/14** Lecture: Argumentative *Stases* and the Problem of Definition
Read: Edward Schiappa, “Definitions Matter,” in *Defining Reality: Definitions and the Politics of Meaning*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 2003, 3-10.

- 09/16** Discussion Section: Consideration of the Problem of Definition: Transsexuals and the Law (“Transsexual Marriage and Definitions”*)
 Read: (Fausto-Sterling, “Two Sexes Are Not Enough,” online at <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/gender/fs.html>.*
 Grossman, “In a Decision Rejecting ...” online at <http://writ.news.findlaw.com/grossman/20020326.html>.*
 Link, “Same-Sex Marriage with a Twist,” online at http://www.salon.com/mwt/feature/2002/03/22/kansas_ruling/print.html
- ** Turn in the proposition of fact for WA#1.
- 09/19** Lecture: *Topoi* of Fact: Location, Quantity, State
 Read: Jason Del Gandio, “Explaining the Creation of Reality: A Five-Step Process,” from *Rhetoric for Radicals*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society, 2008, 18-23.
- 09/21** Lecture: Forms of Evidence
 Read: Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams, “Assembling Reasons and Evidence,” in *The Craft of Research* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008, 130-138.
- 09/23** Discussion Section
- 09/26** Lecture: Structuring the Argument
 Read: Jack Selzer and Lester Faigley, “Documenting an Argument” in *A Little Argument*. New York: Longman, 2010, 147-154.*
 Anthony Weston, “Composing an Argumentative Essay,” in *A Rule-book for Arguments*, 3rd Ed. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000, 53-69.
- 09/28** Lecture: Sample Analysis of a Fact Proposition
 Read: TBA
- 09/30** Discussion Section – Writing Workshop (Bring *two* full draft copies of your “fact” paper to class)

Part III: In Defense of the Proposition of Value

- 10/03** Lecture: The Reasoning Process
 Read: Jason Del Gandio, “Argumentation,” in *Rhetoric for Radicals*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society, 2008, 76-81.

*** Essay #1 Due In Class

- 10/05** Lecture: Analogical Reasoning
 Read: John Lucaites, et al., “Inductive Reasoning, An Overview”*

 Kenneth T. Broda-Bahm, Daniela Kempf, and William J. Driscoll,
 “Inductive Reasoning,” in *Argument and Audience: Presenting
 Debates in Public Settings*. New York, NY: International Debate
 Education Association, 2004, 209-217.
- 10/07** Discussion Section
- 10/10** Lecture: Signal Reasoning
- 10/12** Lecture: Cause-Effect Reasoning
- 10/14** Discussion Section
- 10/17** Lecture: Fallacies of Reasoning
 Read: McGee, Lucaites, et al., “Recognizing Microstructural Fallacies in
 Argumentation and Public Advocacy”*
- 10/19** Lecture: Midterm Examination
- 10/21** Discussion Section
- 10/24** Lecture: Value Propositions; or Spanning the “Is-Ought” Gap
 Read: Chaim Perelman, “How Do We Apply Reason to Values?” *The
 Journal of Philosophy* 52.26 (1955): 797-802.
- 10/26** Lecture: Conducting Opposition Research, and the Concept of *Dissoi Logoi*
 Read: “An Introduction to the Dissoi Logoi,” from Department of
 English at Northern Illinois University,
<http://www.engl.niu.edu/wac/dissoi.html>.*
- Richard A. Lanham, “Dissoi logoi,” *A Handlist of Rhetorical
 Terms*, 2nd Ed. Berkeley: Uof California P, 1991, 57-59.*
- 10/28** Discussion Section
- 10/31** Lecture: *Topoi* of Value Judgments I
 Read: Chaïm Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, “Values,” and “Abstract
 Values and Concrete Values,” in *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on
 Argumentation*. South Bend, IN: U of Notre Dame P, 1958. 74-79.
- 11/02** Lecture: *Topoi* of Value Judgments II

- 11/04 Discussion Section
 ** Turn in Value proposition and value t-chart.
- 11/07 Lecture: *Topoi* of Value Judgments III
- 11/09 Lecture: Analysis of a Value Claim
 Read: TBA
- 11/11 Discussion Section – Writing Workshop (Bring two full draft copies of your “value” paper to class.)

Part IV: In Defense of a Proposition of Policy

- 11/14 Lecture: The Political Dimensions of Social Change
 Read: Sharon Crowley and Debra Hawhee, “Language as Power,” “Power Dynamics in a Rhetorical Situation,” and “A Web of Related Issues,” in *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. New York, NY: Pearson, 2009, 22-27, 60-62, 62-63.
 *** Essay #2 Due In Class
- 11/16 Lecture: The Social-Psychological Dimensions of Social Change
 Read: David Zarefsky, “Strategic Maneuvering in Political Argumentation,” *Argumentation* 22.3 (2008): 317-330.
- 11/18 Discussion: No Class
- 11/21 Lecture: *Topoi* of Policy Arguments – The *Prima Facie* Case
 Read: Robert Asen, “Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13.1 (2010): 121-143.
 ** Turn in proposition of policy for WA# 3 via e-mail.
- 11/24 Thanksgiving Break
 11/26 Thanksgiving Break
- 11/28 Lecture: The Doctrine of Opposites
 Read: Aristotle, “Four Classes of Opposites,” in *Categories*, E. M. Edghill, trans.,
<http://www.classicallibrary.org/aristotle/categories/3.htm#10>.
- 11/30 Lecture: Analysis of a Policy Claim
 Read: TBA

- 12/02** Discussion: Writing Workshop (Bring two full draft copies of your “policy” paper to class.)
- 12/06** Lecture: Public Controversy and Democratic Public Culture
Read: Fareed Zakaria, “Why political polarization has gone wild in America (and what to do about it),” *CNN*, July 24, 2011, <http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2011/07/24/why-political-polarization-has-gone-wild>.

Benjamin R. Barber, “America’s Knowledge Deficit,” *The Nation*, November 10, 2010, <http://www.thenation.com/article/156389/americas-knowledge-deficit>.
- *** Essay #3 Due In Class
- 12/08** Lecture: Course Conclusions and Review for Final Examination
- 12/10** Discussion Section
- 12/14** Final Exam, 2:45-4:45