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Appendices

A De procedurele regels voor een kritische discussie


I CONFRONTATION STAGE

Rule 1
a. Special conditions apply neither to the propositional content of the assertives by which a standpoint is expressed, nor to the propositional content of the negation of the commissive by means of which a standpoint is called into question.
b. In the performance of these assertives and negative commissives, no special preparatory conditions apply to the position or status of the speaker or writer and listener or reader.

II OPENING STAGE

Rule 2
The discussant who has called the standpoint of the other discussant into question in the confrontation stage is always entitled to challenge this discussant to defend his standpoint.

Rule 3
The discussant who is challenged by the other discussant to defend the standpoint that he has put forward in the confrontation stage is always obliged to accept this
challenge, unless the other discussant is not prepared to accept any shared premises and discussion rules; the discussant remains obliged to defend the standpoint as long as he does not retract it and as long as he has not successfully [or conclusively – see rule 9, JW] defended it against the other discussant on the basis of the agreed premises and discussion rules.

**Rule 4**
The discussant who in the opening stage has accepted the other discussant’s challenge to defend his standpoint will fulfill the role of protagonist in the argumentation stage, and the other discussant will fulfill the role of antagonist, unless they agree otherwise; the distribution of roles is maintained until the end of the discussion.

**Rule 5**
The discussants who will fulfill the roles of protagonist and antagonist in the argumentation stage agree before the start of the argumentation stage on the rules for the following: how the protagonist is to defend the initial standpoint and how the antagonist is to attack it, and in which case the protagonist has successfully [or conclusively – see rule 9, JW] defended the standpoint and in which case the antagonist has successfully [or conclusively – see rule 9, JW] attacked it. These rules apply throughout the duration of the discussion, and may not be called into question during the discussion itself by either of the parties.

**III ARGUMENTATION STAGE**

**Rule 6**
a. The protagonist may always defend the standpoint that he adopts in the initial difference of opinion or in a sub-difference of opinion by performing a complex speech act of argumentation, which then counts as a provisional defense of this standpoint.

b. The antagonist may always attack a standpoint by calling into question the propositional content or the justificatory or refutatory force of the argumentation [as far as it is not yet defended successfully – see rule 10, JW].

c. The protagonist and the antagonist may not defend or attack standpoints in any other way.

**Rule 7**
a. The protagonist has successfully defended the propositional content of a complex speech act of argumentation against an attack by the antagonist if the application of the intersubjective identification procedure yields a positive
result or if the propositional content is in the second instance accepted by both parties as a result of a sub-discussion in which the protagonist has successfully defended a positive sub-standpoint with regard to this propositional content.

b. The antagonist has successfully attacked the propositional content of the complex speech act of argumentation if the application of the intersubjective identification procedure yields a negative result and the protagonist has not successfully defended a positive sub-standpoint with regard to this propositional content in a sub-discussion.

Rule 8

a. The protagonist has successfully defended a complex speech act of argumentation against an attack by the antagonist with regard to its force of justification or refutation of the argumentation if the application of the intersubjective inference procedure or (after application of the intersubjective explicitization procedure) the application of the intersubjective testing procedure yields a positive result.

b. The antagonist has successfully attacked the force of justification or refutation of the argumentation if the application of the intersubjective inference procedure or (after application of the intersubjective explicitization procedure) the application of the intersubjective testing procedure yields a negative result.

Rule 9

a. The protagonist has conclusively defended an initial standpoint or sub-standpoint by means of a complex speech act of argumentation if he has successfully defended both the propositional content called into question by the antagonist and its force of justification or refutation called into question by the antagonist.

b. The antagonist has conclusively attacked the standpoint of the protagonist if he has successfully attacked either the propositional content or the force of justification or refutation of the complex speech act of argumentation.

Rule 10

The antagonist retains throughout the entire discussion the right to call into question both the propositional content and the force of justification or refutation of every complex speech act of argumentation of the protagonist that the latter has not yet successfully defended.

Rule 11

The protagonist retains throughout the entire discussion the right to defend both the propositional content and the force of justification or refutation of every complex speech act of argumentation that he has performed and not yet successfully defended against every attack by the antagonist.
Rule 12
The protagonist retains throughout the entire discussion the right to retract any complex speech act of argumentation that he has performed, and thereby to remove the obligation to defend it.

Rule 13
a. The protagonist and the antagonist may perform the same speech act or the same complex speech act with the same role in the discussion only once.
b. The protagonist and the antagonist must in turn make a move of (complex) speech acts with a particular role in the discussion.
c. The protagonist and the antagonist may not perform more than one move of (complex) speech acts at one time.

IV CONCLUDING STAGE

Rule 14
a. The protagonist is obliged to retract the initial standpoint if the antagonist has conclusively attacked it (in the manner prescribed in rule 9) in the argumentation stage (and has also observed the other discussion rules).
b. The antagonist is obliged to retract the calling into question of the initial standpoint if the protagonist has conclusively defended it (in the manner prescribed in rule 9) in the argumentation stage (and has also observed the other discussion rules).
c. In all other cases, the protagonist is not obliged to retract the initial standpoint, nor is the antagonist obliged to withdraw his calling into question the initial standpoint.

ALL STAGES

Rule 15
a. The discussants have the right at every stage of the discussion to request the other discussant to perform a usage declarative and to perform one themselves.
b. The discussant who is requested to perform a usage declarative by the other discussant is obliged to act accordingly.
B De pragma-dialectische gedragscode voor redelijke discussianten

Onderstaande gedragscode voor redelijke discussianten is opgenomen in de formulering van Van Eemeren en Grootendorst (2004: H8).

1 Freedom rule
Discussants may not prevent each other from advancing standpoints or from calling standpoints into question.

2 Obligation-to-defend rule
Discussants who advance a standpoint may not refuse to defend this standpoint when requested to do so.

3 Standpoint rule
Attacks on standpoints may not bear on a standpoint that has not actually been put forward by the other party.

4 Relevance rule
Standpoints may not be defended by non-argumentation or argumentation that is not relevant to the standpoint.

5 Unexpressed-premise rule
Discussants may not falsely attribute unexpressed premises to the other party, nor disown responsibility for their own unexpressed premises.

6 Starting-point rule
Discussants may not falsely present something as an accepted starting point or falsely deny that something is an accepted starting point.

7 Validity rule
Reasoning that in an argumentation is presented as formally conclusive may not be invalid in a logical sense.

8 Argument scheme rule
Standpoints may not be regarded as conclusively defended by argumentation that is not presented as based on formally conclusive reasoning if the defense does not take place by means of appropriate argument schemes that are applied correctly.
9 Concluding rule
Inconclusive defenses of standpoints may not lead to maintaining these standpoints, and conclusive defenses of standpoints may not lead to maintaining expressions of doubt concerning these standpoints.

10 Language use rule
Discussants may not use any formulations that are insufficiently clear or confusingly ambiguous, and they may not deliberately misinterpret the other party’s formulations.