

# announcements

edited by A.W. Chickering and Associates (Jossey-Bass, 1981), pp. 76-116.

2. What is most useful about Perry's scheme is his account of the transitions from position to position. The scheme helps not only to identify "where students are coming from" but also in stimulating thought about ways to help them progress.

3. **Understanding Arguments**, p. 38.

4. Professor Fogelin made this suggestion in a letter to me and I do not know whether he would still abide by it. That this is not his published view should be borne in mind throughout.

5. I am reminded of this point by my colleague, Al Hayward, who also uses Fogelin's text and who has made many helpful suggestions to me about its use.

6. See, for example, the papers by Donnelin and Kripke in **Contemporary Perspectives in the Philosophy of Language**, edited by Peter A French et al (The University of Minnesota, 1979). ●

**Professor G. A. Spangler, Department of Philosophy, California State University, Long Beach, California 90840.**

## abstract

### The Speech Acts of Arguing and Convincing in Externalized Discussions

*Journal of Pragmatics* 6 (1982) 1-24  
North-Holland Publishing Company

F.H. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst

In discussions directed towards solving a conflict of opinion the participants try to convince one another of the acceptability or unacceptability of the opinion that is under discussion. If the participants are co-operative, this means that they are prepared to externalize their position with regard to the opinion and to advance argumentation for or against it. In this article, which is a condensed translation of an article originally published in Dutch (Eemeren and Grootendorst 1980), the authors try to indicate, by reference to the speech act theory, what this entails.

In the way in which it was originally conceived, the speech act theory is inadequate to characterize argumentation. In the author's view this objection can be met by regarding argumentation as an illocutionary act complex at a textual level. They formulate the conditions obtaining for a happy performance of this act complex and explain that for the speaker the performance is linked by convention to the perlocutionary act of convincing. In the case of an externalized discussion this means that with his argumentation the speaker tries to make the listener, in turn, perform an illocutionary act in which he expresses his acceptance or non-acceptance of the opinion.

### Second International Symposium On Informal Logic

**University of Windsor  
Windsor, Ontario**

**June 20-23, 1983**

The First International Symposium on Informal Logic was held in Windsor in 1978. The Second will assess the results of the past five years' work in informal logic, see what definition the field has achieved, take stock of the present battery of problems and methods, and chart the course for future development.

#### Program

Monday, June 20 1:30 p.m. Opening Session

"Informal Logic: The Last Five Years"

J. Anthony Blair & Ralph H. Johnson (Windsor)

3:15 p.m. Plenary Session

"Needed: A Better Theory of Argument"

Trudy Govier (General Studies, Calgary)

8:00 p.m. Address

"The Logic of Deep Disagreements"

Robert Fogelin (Dartmouth)

Tuesday, June 21 9:00 a.m. Concurrent Sessions

A. Missing Premises

"'Missing' or 'Hidden' Premises?"

James Gough (Waterloo) & Christopher Tindale  
(Wilfrid Laurier)

"Filling Premise-Gaps in Arguments"

David Hitchcock (McMaster)

B. Formal vs. Informal Logic?

"Typing"

John Hoaglund (Christopher Newport College)

"Possible Worlds and Imagination in Informal Logic"

John Nolt (Tennessee)

11:15 a.m. Plenary Session

"Background Logic: Its Significance in Informal Logic"

Richard Paul (Sonoma State)