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1. **Corina Andone**

**Political account-giving in Europe: maneuvering with the burden of proof**

It is nowadays common practice for politicians to justify their decisions, actions and policies to the citizens. They realize that their performances need to be assessed for their adequacy and that this is only possible if they give an account of their actions by providing arguments. In line with current theorizing about account-giving, it is assumed in this paper that politicians have a fundamental obligation to respond to criticisms regarding the acceptability of their performances. When their account-giving is examined from the perspective of argumentation theory, it is therefore important to start by delineating precisely the burden of proof underlying the probative obligations politicians have to justify their actions at issue.

Although they are institutionally imposed on them, more often than not politicians try to minimize their responsibilities because this makes it easier to give their account. The question that arises therefore is: how do politicians try to reach an expedient demarcation of their burden of proof? In this paper, I will examine the strategic maneuvering with the burden of proof carried out by Members of the European Commission when they give an account in political interviews. I will do so by means of a systematic empirical analysis which shows how Commissioners manage to manipulate their probative obligations in discussions with journalists when faced with critical questioning of the acceptability of their decisions.

**Explicaţii şi justificǎri politice în Europa: manipularea obligaţiilor probative**

Este o practicǎ comunǎ pentru politicienii din zilele noastre sa justifice cetǎţenilor deciziile, acţiunile şi planurile. Îşi dau seama cǎ faptele lor vor fi judecate dupǎ calitate şi cǎ acest lucru este posibil numai dacǎ ei îşi explicǎ şi îşi justificǎ acţiunile aducând argumente. Conform teoriilor actuale, în aceastǎ lucrare se presupune cǎ politicienii au obligaţia fundamentalǎ de a rǎspunde criticilor privind acceptabilitatea acţiunilor lor. Când acest aspect este analizat din perspectiva teoriei argumentǎrii, este important sa începem prin a delimita precis obligaţiile probative pe care le au politicienii.

Deşi sunt instituţional impuse, deseori politicienii încearcǎ sǎ îşi minimalizeze responsabilitǎţile pentru ca în felul acesta îşi pot justifica acţiunile mai uşor. De aceea, întrebarea care se ridicǎ este: cum încearcǎ politicienii sǎ defineascǎ în favoarea lor obligaţiile probative? În aceastǎ lucrare, voi examina acest tip de manipulare strategicǎ de cǎtre Membrii Comisiei Europene în interviuri politice. Voi face aceasta printr-o analizǎ empirica sistematicǎ prin care se aratǎ cum Comisarii europeni reuşesc sa îşi manipuleze obligaţiile probative faţǎ de jurnalişti atunci când deciziile lor sunt criticate.

1. **Frans H. van Eemeren and Bart J. Garssen (University of Amsterdam)**

**Argumentative patterns in the European Parliament**

Since the pragma-dialectical approach to argumentation has moven on from the abstract level of the ideal model of a critical discussion in idealized circumstances to the concrete level of argumentative discourse in actual argumentative practices, the time is ripe to examine the ways in which argumentative discourse prototypically manifests itself in argumentative reality in various communicative activity types. This paper concentrates on the specific patterns of argument schemes and argumentation structures that can be found in particular communicative activity types. Using parliamentary debate in the European Parliament as a case in point, these institutionally-based specific patterns are distinguished from the argumentative patterns that can be found more generally when a certain type of standpoint is defended.

**Argumentatieve patronen in het Europees Parlement**

Na de ontwikkeling van een ideaalmodel van kritische discussie dat op abstract niveau de normen voor redelijke argumentatie verschaft, is de tijd rijp om de manieren te bestuderen waarop argumentatief taalgebruik zich prototypisch manifesteert in de argumentatieve realiteit van verschillende communicatieve activiteitstypen. In dit artikel concentreren we ons op de specifieke patronen van argumentatieschema’s en argumentatiestructuren die in communicatieve activiteitstypen voorkomen bij de verdediging van bepaalde typen standpunten. We nemen de argumentatiepatronen in het plenaire debat van het Europees parlement als voorbeeld.

1. **A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans** (University of Amsterdam)

**Strategic maneuvering with hyperbole in political debate**

In this paper I investigate what role the stylistic device of *hyperbole* can play in European political debates in politician’s strategic maneuvering, that is, in their attempts to reconcile their rhetorical with their dialectical aims. In the paper I shall first present an analysis of the general effects the use of *hyperbole* may have in argumentative discourse. Next, I shall give a specification of the ways in which hyperbole may contribute to politicians’ dialectical and rhetorical aims in a political debate. Finally, I will analyse a number of cases to illustrate what contribution hyperbole may make to politicians’ strategic maneuvering in various stages of an argumentative discussion.

**Strategisch manoeuvreren met de hyperbool in politieke debatten**

In dit artikel ga ik na welke rol het stijlmiddel *hyperbool* kan spelen bij het strategisch manoeuvreren van politici in Europese politieke debatten. Daartoe zal ik eerst een analyse geven van de algemene effecten die het gebruik van de hyperbool in argumentatief taalgebruik kan hebben. Vervolgens zal ik specificeren op welke wijze de hyperbool kan bijdragen aan het bereiken van de dialectische en retorische doelen van politici in een politiek debat. Ten slotte zal ik ter illustratie van de bijdrage die de hyperbool in verschillende fasen van een argumentatieve discussie kan leveren aan de strategische manoeuvres van politici een aantal voorbeelden analyseren.

**5. Assimakis Tseronis** (University of Amsterdam, Media Studies)

**Visual rhetoric on the European economic crisis: an argumentative analysis of news magazine covers**

Covers of news magazines combine visuals and text in a creative way that attracts the readers’ attention, informing them about the main story while simultaneously asserting the magazine’s stance with respect to it. Although it is generally assumed that the use of a word, phrase or sentence serves to anchor the meaning of the visual, it is also true that visuals (drawings, images and photos) with their symbolic and iconic properties make available a much richer network of meanings and connotations to the reader/viewer. It is up to the reader/viewer to process the meanings conveyed by the verbal-visual interaction in the light of contextual and background knowledge in order to reach a certain interpretation. In this paper, I analyse a series of news magazine covers that have appeared in the last couple of years on the issue of the European economic crisis. In particular, I am interested in systematically studying the ways in which the interaction of visuals and text can help the analyst reconstruct the position that the magazine appears to assume on the debate regarding the causes and consequences of the current European economic crisis. To this end, insights from visual rhetoric and multimodal analysis are combined in order to propose an argumentative analysis within the pragma-dialectical approach to the study of argumentation.

**Ρητορική της εικόνας στην ευρωπαϊκή οικονομική κρίση: επιχειρηματολογική ανάλυση των εξωφύλλων ενημερωτικών περιοδικών**
*Δρ. Ασημάκης Τσερώνης (Πανεπιστήμιο του Άμστερνταμ, Μέσα Μαζικής Επικοινωνίας)*
Τα εξώφυλλα ενημερωτικών περιοδικών συνδυάζουν εικόνες και κείμενο με έναν τρόπο δημιουργικό που προσελκύει την προσοχή των αναγνωστών, τους ενημερώνει για το κύριο θέμα που καλύπτεται στις σελίδες του ενώ ταυτόχρονα αφήνει να διαφανεί η στάση που παίρνει το περιοδικό σε σχέση με το συγκεριμένο θέμα. Αν και είναι γενικά παραδεκτό ότι μιας λέξη, φράση ή πρόταση μπορεί να χρησιμεύσει για να συγκεκριμενοποιήσει τη σημασία της εικόνας, είναι επίσης αλήθεια ότι η εικόνα (σχέδια, εικόνες και φωτογραφίες) με τις συμβολικές και εικονικές ιδιότητές τους παρέχουν στον αναγνώστη ένα πολύ πλουσιότερο δίκτυο νοημάτων και υπονοημάτων. Εναπόκειται λοιπόν στον αναγνώστη να επεξεργαστεί τα νοήματα που η αλληλεπίδραση του γλωσσικού με το εικονικό στοιχείο μεταφέρει, υπό το πρίσμα των συμφραζομένων και της προϋπάρχουσας γενικότερης γνώσης του, προκειμένου να καταλήξει σε μια συγκεκριμένη ερμηνεία. Σε αυτή την παρουσίαση αναλύω μια σειρά από εξώφυλλα ενημερωτικών περιοδικών που έχουν εμφανιστεί τα τελευταία χρόνια γύρω από το θέμα της ευρωπαϊκής οικονομικής κρίσης. Συγκεκριμένα ενδιαφέρομαι για τη συστηματική μελέτη της αλληλεπίδρασης γλώσσας και εικόνας ως εργαλείου ικανού να βοηθήσει τον αναλυτή ώστε να ανακατασκευάσει τη θέση που οι συντάκτες του περιοδικού φαίνεται να λαμβάνουν σχετικά με τα αίτια και τις συνέπειες της τρέχουσας ευρωπαϊκής οικονομικής κρίσης. Προς την κατεύθυνση αυτή προτείνω τον συνδυασμό της ρητορικής των εικόνων και της ανάλυσης πολυτροπικών κειμένων μέσα στα πλαίσια του πραγματοδιαλεκτικού μοντέλου ανάλυσης επιχειρηματολογικού λόγου.

1. **Jean Wagemans (University of Amsterdam)**

**Rhetorical qualities of argumentation based on abduction**

Abduction is a form of reasoning that proceeds from a certain unexpected or anomalous observation to its possible cause. It is frequently used in daily life, for instance when we abduce from the effect that the streets are wet that it must have been raining. But abduction is also frequently used in institutionalized contexts, for instance in medicine, when doctors abduce from the symptoms of a patient that he must have a certain illness, or in the practice of science, where it plays a crucial role in what is called the “logic of discovery.”

Although abduction is a widely used and accepted form of reasoning, it has not been studied much from a rhetorical perspective. As Bybee (1991, p. 197) remarks, abduction “is not peripheral to rhetoric, a concern on the fringe of our discipline, but instead is (or ought to be) a central concern, for abduction's inferential and persuasive patterns pervade discourse as thoroughly as deduction (the enthymeme) and induction (the paradigm).”

In this contribution I shall first give a pragma-dialectical account of abduction as an argumentative pattern. Then I shall focus on the rhetorical aspects of argumentation based on abduction and explore the conditions for the perceived persuasiveness of this type of argumentation by providing an analysis of two examples taken from the European scientific and philosophical tradition. The first example is the abduction (before its actual observation) of the existence of an eighth planet within the solar system by the British astronomer Adams and the French astronomer Le Verrier; the second one the specific use of abduction in the transcendental arguments of the German philosopher Kant.

**Retorische kwaliteiten van argumentatie gebaseerd op abductie**

Abductie is een vorm van redeneren die vanuit een bepaalde onverwachte of abnormale observatie tot een mogelijke oorzaak concludeert. Zij wordt vaak gebruikt in het dagelijkse leven, bijvoorbeeld wanneer wij uit het effect dat de straten nat zijn, abduceren dat het moet hebben geregend. Maar abductie wordt ook vaak gebruikt in geïnstitutionaliseerde contexten, bijvoorbeeld in geneeskunde, wanneer artsen uit de symptomen van een patiënt abduceren dat deze een bepaalde ziekte moet hebben, of in de wetenschap, waar het een essentiële rol speelt in wat de “logica van ontdekking” wordt genoemd.

Hoewel abductie een wijd verbreide en geaccepteerde vorm van redeneren is, is deze niet veel vanuit een retorisch perspectief bestudeerd. Zoals Bybee (1991, p. 197) opmerkt, is abductie “niet perifeer aan de retorica, een onderwerp aan de rand van onze discipline, maar is (of zou moeten zijn) in plaats daarvan een centraal onderwerp, omdat abductie de inferentiële en persuasieve patronen van ons discours even grondig doordringt als deductie (het enthymeem) en inductie (het paradigma).”

In deze bijdrage zal ik eerst een pragma-dialectische beschrijving geven van abductie als een argumentatief patroon. Dan zal ik me richten op de retorische aspecten van argumentatie gebaseerd op abductie en de voorwaarden verkennen van de gepercipieerde overredingskracht van dit type argumentatie door een analyse te geven van twee voorbeelden uit de Europese wetenschappelijke en filosofische traditie. Het eerste voorbeeld is de abductie (vóór het daadwerkelijk waarnemen) van het bestaan van een achtste planeet binnen het zonnestelsel door de Britse astronoom Adams en de Franse astronoom Le Verrier, ten tweede het specifieke gebruik van abductie in de transcendentale argumenten van de Duitse filosoof Kant.

1. **Renske Wierda (**University of Amsterdam)

**Authority argumentation in direct-to-consumer prescription drug advertisements**

In direct-to-consumer (DTC) prescription drug advertisements, pharmaceutical companies try to convince consumers to ask their doctors for a particular drug. Using the pragma-dialectical argumentation theory, developed at the University of Amsterdam (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, 2004), as a theoretical framework, this paper will focus on a kind of argumentation that is often used in these advertisements: the authority argument.

Direct-to-consumer prescription drug advertisements are currently only allowed in the United States and New Zealand, but discussions on whether to allow them in the European Union have recently emerged in European politics. Insights into the possible deceptiveness of the argumentation that is used in these advertisements can provide a useful contribution to these discussions.

In this light, this paper will make clear that while authority arguments *can* be misleading, they do not always have to be: an authority argument can deceive a consumer into using a drug that is not right for him, but it can also reasonably enable a consumer to come to a well-founded decision about using or not using the advertised drug. This will be shown by means of the pragma-dialectical notion of “strategic maneuvering” (Van Eemeren, 2010). By considering unreasonable authority arguments as derailments of strategic maneuvering, we can see that authority arguments can be both sound and fallacious.

**Autoriteitsargumentatie in publieksadvertenties voor receptmedicijnen**

In publieksadvertenties voor receptmedicijnen proberen farmaceutische bedrijven consumenten te overtuigen hun artsen te vragen hen een bepaald geneesmiddel voor te schrijven. Met behulp van de pragma-dialectische argumentatietheorie, ontwikkeld aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam (Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1984, 2004), als theoretisch kader, zal dit paper zich richten op een type argumentatie dat vaak wordt gebruikt in deze advertenties: het autoriteitsargument.

Publieksadvertenties voor receptmedicijnen zijn momenteel alleen toegestaan ​​in de Verenigde Staten en Nieuw-Zeeland, maar in de Europese politiek zijn discussies gaande over het al dan niet toestaan van deze advertenties in de Europese Unie. Inzichten in de mogelijke bedrieglijkheid van de argumentatie die wordt gebruikt in deze advertenties kunnen een nuttige bijdrage vormen aan deze discussies.

In dit kader zal dit paper duidelijk maken dat autoriteitsargumenten weliswaar misleidend kúnnen zijn, maar dat niet altijd zijn: een autoriteitsargument in een advertentie kan een consument op bedrieglijke wijze overhalen om een geneesmiddel te gebruiken dat niet goed voor hem is, maar het kan een consument ook op een redelijke manier in staat stellen tot een gefundeerd besluit te komen over het al dan niet gebruiken van het geneesmiddel. Dit zal worden aangetoond met behulp van het pragma-dialectische begrip ‘strategisch manoeuvreren’ (Van Eemeren, 2010). Door onredelijke autoriteitsargumenten te beschouwen als ontsporingen van strategische manoeuvres, kunnen we zien dat autoriteitsargumenten zowel redelijk al onredelijk kunnen zijn.
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**Workshop Jugend debattiert – ein dialogischer Weg zur politischen Rede**

**Kemmann Ansgar**

**Workshop: Jugend debattiert – ein dialogischer Weg zur politischen Rede**

„Jugend debattiert“ heißt das größte privat-öffentlich finanzierte Projekt zur sprachlich-politischen Bildung in Deutschland.

Im Schuljahr 2012/13 haben über 150.000 Schülerinnen und Schüler daran teilgenommen.

Das Projekt wendet sich an weiterführende Schulen jeder Schulart und umfasst Lehrerfortbildungen, Unterrichtsreihen und einen bundesweiten Wettbewerb ab Klasse 8.

Das pädagogische Konzept folgt den Grundsätzen klassischer Rhetorik und aktualisiert sie für die Bedürfnisse eines demokratischen Gemeinwesens von heute.

An die Stelle der antiken *controversia* tritt die moderne Gesprächsform Debatte als rhetorische Modellsituation.

Der Workshop zeigt, wie eine Debatte nach Regeln von Jugend debattiert funktioniert und nach welchen Kriterien im Wettbewerb bewertet wird.

Vor allem aber wird ein Einblick in das Übungsprogramm gegeben, das am Beispiel der Debatte auf dialogische Weise zur politischen Rede führt.

Kurzvita:

Ansgar Kemmann hat Rechtswissenschaft und Rhetorik studiert. 1991 gründete an der Universität Tübingen den ersten Debattierclub an einer deutschen Hochschule. Von 1992 bis 2002 freiberuflich tätig, u. a. als Lehrbeauftragter für Rhetorik an den Universitäten Tübingen und München (LMU).

1999 konzipierte er das Format „Jugend debattiert“, seit 2003 ist er bei der Gemeinnützigen Hertie-Stiftung, Frankfurt a. M.,  Leiter des gleichnamigen, bundesweit größten Debattierwettbewerbs für Schülerinnen und Schüler.