

**PRELIMINARY WHITE PAPER EXPERT CONSULTATION SERIES QUESTIONS FOR
PROF. RAHMAN**

Drawing from the later *ādāb al-baḥth wa-l munāzara* tradition the ADAB project aims to intervene in contemporary debating culture and specifically design a new alternative model for university debating formats. A rough characterization of contemporary debating formats can be delivered as games where parties act strategically to win. Interestingly, this seems to be the very idea of dialogic logic. And you define dialogue as “specific interactions between agents within an adequate game structure, and in which the logical validity is then defined in terms of winning strategies” (*translation*). Notwithstanding its ingenuity, we fear that the dialogical logic might overshadow another equally important component of argumentation, the virtuous conduct (*ādāb*). *Ādāb* refers to epistemic and practical virtues one must develop to be counted as a proper arguer, and in their absence the agent will be named a “quarreller”.

Taking into account ADAB project’s aspiration for analytical competence and virtue:

1. What is the role of virtue and virtuous conduct in dialogic logic, and how our new debating format can benefit from dialogical logic?

You summarize your theoretical approach as follows: “The fundamental philosophical idea underlying my research is that of pragmatic semantics, based on argumentative practices. From this perspective the dialogic approach provides a theory of meaning that differs from more well-known formal frameworks such as model theory and proof theory” (*translation*).

2. Does pragmatic-semantics also differ from classical logic, and where is the point of entry for the pragmatic-semantic approach when it comes to designing a new university debate tournament procedure?

We also had the chance to benefit from Dr. Young’s expertise. The questions we asked him tackled the issue of truth and whether there was a need to readjust/reformulate the Munazara procedure. We want to ask you about a concern that was brought by Dr. Young. In his response, he reminded us of the development of new logics, for instance, paraconsistent logic. Although this remainder is more than welcome, we fear over-complication. Eventually, the new Munazara Model will take university students as its participants:

3. How should we account for the non-classical logic(s) in our procedure?
4. Would it be an oversimplification to remain loyal to Aristotelian principles of reasoning (identity, non-contradiction, excluded middle)?
5. Do these principles ensure some sort of rightness/justice in issues concerning practical wisdom?