

Fall 2012: Feminism and Argumentation
01-34-530: Topics in Gender or Sexuality
University of Windsor
Tuesdays 2:30-5:20 CHN 2183

Professor: Dr. C. E. Hundleby
Chrysler Hall North 2185
Email: hundleby@uwindsor.ca
519-253-3000 x 3947
Office Hours: Thursdays 2-3pm and by appointment

Calendar Description: The course will focus on the philosophical implications of the impact gender and sexuality have on major epistemological, scientific, normative, and political problems. The specific focus of each year's class will be determined by the instructor. (May be repeated for credit if content changes and with permission of the instructor.)

Course Objectives:

1. Explain and analyze the various feminist philosophical positions on argumentation
2. Lead discussion among peers of scholarly work.
3. Prepare and present an original philosophical essay
4. Prepare and present a commentary on a peer's philosophical essay.
5. Revise one's own work in light of peer commentary

Course Delivery:

Student should make every effort to attend the CRRAR meeting on September 8 at which Dr. Hundleby will review her summary of feminist philosophical work on argumentation. Students must familiarize themselves with the assigned readings before class and come prepared for discussion led by the professor or other students. Each student will lead a seminar discussion twice on an article or set of articles, and prepare a term paper. The term papers will be modeled after conference papers and will also be accompanied by conference-style commentaries from classmates. Students will revise their work in response to the peer discussion before submitting the final version.

Course readings (tentative and subject to change)

All references can be found in Hundleby's (draft) overview of feminism and argumentation distributed along with this outline. If no source is indicated then pdf will be available through the CLEW site.

1. Course introduction
 - a. Course outline
 - b. Hundleby's overview (MS)
 - c. *Sign up for seminars*
2. The Politics and Epistemology of Argumentation
 - a. Govier Chs., 1, 14
 - b. Gilbert 2007 (Hansen and Pinto at Leddy)
 - c. Lang 2010 (*Reasoning for Change*)

3. Adversaries and Alternatives
 - a. Moulton 1983 (Harding and Hintikka on reserve at Leddy)
 - b. Gilbert 1994
 - c. Govier Ch. 4
 - d. Optional:
 - i. Miller 1995
 - ii. Godden 2003
4. Language and Identity:
 - a. Ayim 1988 (Govier (Ed.)at Leddy/Dept.)
 - b. Ayim 1995 on-line
 - c. Bruner 1996 (A&A on reserve)
 - d. Film: "Science & Gender"
5. Gender & Pluralism:
 - a. Orr 1989 online
 - b. Warren 1988 on-line
 - c. Cohen 1995 on-line
 - d. Optional:
 - i. Menssen 1989
 - ii. Orr 1995
 - iii. Fulkerson 1996 (A&A on reserve)
6. Reason and Rationality:
 - a. Verbiest 1995 on-line
 - b. Rooney 2011 (*Reasoning for Change*)
 - c. *Paper proposal due*
7. Rhetoric: Testimony & Pedagogy:
 - a. Govier (Ch. 3)
 - b. Burrow 2010 (*Reasoning for Change*)
 - c. Hundleby 2010 (*Reasoning for Change*)
8. Androcentrism:
 - a. Crenshaw 1996 (A&A on reserve)
 - b. Hundleby 2011 (MS to be provided)
 - c. *Drafts of papers due to your commentators and to Dr. Hundleby*
9. Fallacies:
 - a. Janack & Adams 1999 on-line
 - b. Crouch 1991 on-line & 1993 on-line
10. Strategies for Improvement
 - a. Linker 2011 on-line
 - b. Bondy 2010 (*Reasoning for Change*)
 - c. Optional: Govier, Ch. 2
11. Mini-conference:
 - a. *Paper 1 & commentary*
 - b. *Paper 2 & commentary*
 - c. *Paper 3 & commentary*
 - d. *Paper 4 & commentary*
12. Mini-conference:
 - a. *Paper 5 & commentary*

- b. *Paper 6 & commentary*
- c. *Paper 7 & commentary*
- d. *Paper 8 & commentary*

Materials:

1. For sale at the University of Windsor Bookstore:
Govier, Trudy. 1999. *The philosophy of argument*. Newport News, VA: Vale Press.
2. Optional, for sale on-line through UWindsor Software Depot: Adobe Professional – to make notes on your pdfs. Price approx. \$30 for graduate students.
3. Available free from Dr. Hundleby:
Rooney, Phyllis, and Hundleby, Catherine E., eds. 2010. *Reasoning for change*, a special issue of *Informal logic* 30(3).
4. All other required readings are linked through CLEW or on reserve in the Leddy Library, as indicated.
5. Optional readings are in the Leddy Library but not on reserve.

Course Evaluation:

Seminars (write-up) 2 x /15	30%
One commentary on another student's paper (700-1000 words)	10%
Paper proposal: under 300 words plus bibliography	5%
Professionalism:	
In-class participation, preparedness, politeness and promptness = 10	
Seminar presentation: 2 x /5 = 10	
Completion of paper draft the week before presentation = 5	25%
Final paper (2500-3000 words)	30%

Essay :

Purposes:

1. To give students an opportunity to develop an extended line of reasoning in the topic of this course, and to receive input from the professor.
2. To give students practice composing and presenting a paper appropriate for an academic conference.

Requirements:

1. Length: 2500-3000 words
2. Due:

- a. For presentation on scheduled date
 - b. Final hardcopy to Dr. Hundleby during a scheduled period in her office TBA.
3. Topic:
- a. Beyond the required readings, but soundly resting within the (cross-disciplinary) intersection of feminist scholarship and argumentation theory.
 - b. There is a great deal of disagreement and there are many divergent points of view in our readings, so you should have an easy time finding a controversy to write on. However, here are some suggestions that would be appropriate.
 - i. How does Burrow's analysis of politeness bear on Govier's defense of minimal adversariality? Can politeness prevent a culture of hostility? You might enhance your analysis by considering Moulton, digging up Genevieve Lloyd or Rooney on rationality, or even Douglas Walton on politeness (here and there).
 - ii. How does Godden's defense of coalescent argumentation help address the objections made by Miller to its feminist potential? (First: explain CA and Gilbert's argument that it serves feminist purposes, then Miller's critique of this claim.)
 - iii. Do Sandra Menssen's criticisms of Deborah Orr's position depend on the Adversary Paradigm described by Moulton? Or are they a case of argumentative injustice described by Bondy? Can the empathy described by Linker or the nonagonistic playfulness described by Lange aid the feminist perspectives?
 - iv. Provide a feminist analysis of a standardly recognized fallacy of argumentation, e.g. poisoning the well, ad baculum, ad misericordiam.
 - v. Assess the warrant of Margarita Levin's charge that feminist philosophy of science begs the question. (Levin, Margarita, "Caring New World: Feminism and Science," The American Scholar 57 (1988), pp. 100-106).
 - vi. EXTRA TOUGH: If minimal adversariality is necessary for the pedagogically useful fallacies approach to argument evaluation (Hundleby 2010) and for epistemically productive controversy (Govier 1999), how are we to avoid participating in the tradition of embattled reason (Rooney 2010)?