

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS FOR DR. YOUNG

Munazara scholars assumed a wide acceptance of the Quran, Sunna, and Ijma' as sources of knowledge and validity, and epistemic authority. Such an assumption, however, cannot be relied upon in contemporary pluralistic contexts. Focusing primarily on practical-political debates that deal with "what we should *do*?" (normative domain) rather than "what we should *believe*?"() we are particularly interested in the key considerations that need to be accounted for when designing a Munazara-inspired argumentation procedure for an international audience in diverse societies.

1. Do you think Munazara's goal of *izhar al-haqq* and *ghalabat al-zann* should be preserved, abandoned, or reformulated? Why? And, how?
2. Have any Munazara scholars suggested procedural changes, adjustments, or alternative interpretations of notions such as *izhar al-haqq* as a result of, or by way of accounting for, changes in the social-political-historical context? How could such changes, adjustments, or interpretations inform the contemporary efforts to transform Munazara into a debate protocol and software in use?
3. Keeping in mind our goals between the Munazara procedure and argumentative virtues, what would, for instance, be the relevance of *taqrir/tahrir* (as stated in Samarqandi's *Qistas*) and *fahm/tafhim* (as stated in his *Risala*): Tevcih? Tertip?
4. Focusing specifically on the munazara procedure, what adjustments would be necessary, useful, or worthy of consideration? For instance, (a) should disagreement be the only criteria for marking the beginning of a munazara engagement? If not, then what could mark the beginning of Munazara?, and (b) Should reaching incontrovertible propositions be the only criteria that marks the conclusion of a munazara engagement? If not, then what marks the end of Munazara?