Wisner, Harold E. (1951). "Judging the Negative Counterplan." *Communication Studies*, 2: 11-14.

CONTEMPORARY ARGUMENTATION AND DEBATE 17
(1996) 67-84

BOOK REVIEWS

T. C. Winebrenner, Editor

Maps As Argument

Don Brownlee

One of the most popular children's books in 1992 was *Dinotopia*, the fictional story of a lost island where dinosaurs and humanity live together in a mutually beneficial relationship. Before children read the first page about the discovery of this land by a shipwrecked Boston scientist and his son, they see a map of Dinotopia with a green colored rainy basin, a tan colored Great Desert, a dark brown Ancient Gorge, all surrounded by a light blue colored ocean. They understand something of the nature of this world whether or not they can read a word of the text. The maps that mark the worlds of *The Hobbit*, *Winnie-the-Pooh*, and *Treasure Island* are familiar substance to America's school children.

We grow up with maps and they often fascinate us. Joseph Conrad, in what may be an autobiographical passage from *The Heart of Darkness*, has one of the characters say, "Now when I was just a little chap I had a passion for maps. I would look for hours at South America, or Africa, or Australia, and lose myself in all the glories of exploration" (10). I, too, recall staring at an early 20th Century map of Asia wondering of the life in a far off territory called Tannu Tuva.

We learn of maps, but we learn little of their power as arguments. We may learn something about how to get from point A to point B or learn that the crossed shovel and pick on the map of Death Valley indicates the site of a mine, but we never realize how these maps and their accompanying signs make claims about the world. It is more than likely that we are oblivious as to how maps are "weapons of persuasion and deception" (Monmonier, *Cartocontroversy*, 1996).

Two authors, Denis Wood in *The Power of Maps* and Mark Monmonier in *Drawing the Line*, attempt to remove from maps and mapmakers the mask of ultimate authority. Wood, a museum curator, and Monmonier, a Professor of Geography at Syracuse University, take different paths to lead the reader to the same, inescapable conclusion: maps are powerful arguments. They are the substance of controversy, as emphasized by Monmonier, and the rhetorical tools of those who participate in public discourse, according to Wood.

Don Brownlee is Professor of Speech Communication, California State University, Northridge.

At their most fundamental level, these two books demonstrate that maps are far from being factual descriptions of our world. Rather, maps can be complex and subtle arguments that create unique views of reality or fantasy, that shape our perspective on issues of local and global importance, and that are a form of discourse with their readers.

Every child or adult that studies a map tends to share a view on what a map should be. It is a window to the world that is not immediately visible. As Brian Harley, a source frequently cited by Wood, explains, historically maps were viewed as the products of a scientific effort: "In our own Western culture, at least since the Enlightenment, cartography has been defined as a factual science. The premise is that a map should offer a transparent window on the world" (Harley, 1990, p. 4).

This transparency meant that the mapmaker was invisible in the process of conveying the real world into the world of the map. Wood leads the reader through a step-by-step exposition of the many ways in which decisions of the cartographer create not a map, but a set of claims about the world. This conviction about the rhetorical nature of mapmaking is shared by Monmonier. In his review of *Drawing the Line*, David Woodward explains,

We habitually regard maps as uncontroversial statements of fact that we can either ignore or take for granted. Mark Monmonier has skillfully and stylishly shown that they are far from uncontroversial - that they can be persuasively used to argue for our personal viewpoints. Not only are maps the grist of argument, or the support for arguments, they are arguments.

Maps may not be reality, but they create our reality. A map determines who represents you on your city council or in the United States House of Representatives. A map determines your rates of automobile or home insurance. A map determines how your mail is routed and, potentially, how quickly this journal reached your mail box.

The recent film "The Englishman Who Went Up a Hill, But Came Down a Mountain," illustrates the power of the mapmaker to reshape the life of a small Welsh town. Assigned in 1917 to produce maps for the military, two English mapmakers discover that the town's local mountain, Ffynnon Gawr, is 20 feet short of the height necessary for designation on maps as a mountain. The peak that has helped protect countless generations of local residents from waves of invading Romans, Saxons, and Vikings will soon be erased from the maps of the land. The promontory that stopped conquering legions will itself be conquered by the mapmakers' measurements. The heritage and pride of the local community is subject to the judgments of this pair of cartographers. They, and they alone, determine whether future generations know of Ffynnon Gawr.

Across the Atlantic, maps repeatedly are at the center of local controversies regarding the distribution of power in the American political system. Most readers have heard of gerrymandering. Named for the Republican governor of Massachusetts in 1812,

gerrymandering "calls to mind the prototypical caricature of an outrageously curved district with vicious clawlike appendages" (Monmonier, p. 196). Monmonier devotes a chapter to exploring this political use of maps in redistricting efforts from Massachusetts, North Carolina, and New York.

The 12th Congressional District in North Carolina is by almost all accounts an "unusually shaped" voting district. It winds some 150 miles through North Carolina connecting Charlotte and Gastonia in the south to Durham in the north. This 150 mile long district is in some places no wider than the lanes on the interstate highway that travels north through the state. In the words of Justice John Paul dissenting in *Shaw v. Reno*, District 12 maintains a "bizarre and uncouth" set of boundaries (*New York Times* "Excerpts," p. A12).

More so than the majority opinion of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor comparing the District to "the most egregious racial gerrymandering of the past" (p. A12), it is the map itself that makes the strongest argument. Monmonier observes, "As the map testifies, District 12, if not ugly, is anything but compact" (p. 204). It is the map that makes the point. Even the strongest supporters of the shape of District 12, such as Justice Stevens, must admit that the map "is powerful evidence of an ulterior purpose behind the shaping of those boundaries" (Excerpts, p. A12).

Why is the map such compelling evidence? Why does yet another dissenter, Justice David Souter, use the phrase "bizarrely shaped" to describe District 12 (p. A12)? As much as anything, it is past maps that have set a different standard for the shape readers expect. If you compare the shape of District 12 to the contours of Durham, Orange, Alamance, Guilford or any of the other seven counties through which District 12 passes, they stand in sharp contrast to each other. The counties are political entities frequently boundaried by straight lines, forming squares and rectangles, instead of the clawed salamander that is District 12. Repeating the words of Monmonier, "the map testifies."

It is also by omission that maps create a sense of reality. Any map of your own neighborhood might show a variety of features, from streets and creeks to the ethnic background of residents and the incidence of AIDS. In Chapter Four, "The Interest the Map Serves is Masked," Wood illustrates how, again, the mapmaker is like an arguer. Each must ultimately select among the claims that are available. The cartographer decides which features will be used to describe the territory and which will be excluded from consideration.

These decisions are telling and often are made to serve specific interests of the mapmaker. Pick up a map of Kansas from your local American Automobile Association office. Is there a railroad line between Hays and Salina? You'd never know. It doesn't serve the objectives of the AAA to show that connection, though it is quite visible on the Official Kansas Transportation Map for 1995-96. The Kansas government mapmakers, however, want you to

know that Bill Graves is Governor of the state and include his image prominently on the map, along with the necessary sunflower. I doubt AAA cartographers ever considered sharing Graves' image with the world. While few might wish to ride the rails from Hays to Salina, the bus riders of the world are also deprived of information on either map about the location of bus stops or bus terminals. Bicyclists learn nothing about the existence of any bike paths. One means of transportation is promoted, others discouraged. It is the mapmaker's choice.

It is Wood, most of all, that speaks of maps as public discourse. Wood, citing another passage from Brian Harley, leads us to this rather post-modernist viewpoint:

> Maps are never value-free images; except in the narrowest Euclidian sense they are not in themselves either true or false. Both in the selectivity of their content and in their signs and styles of representation, maps are a way of conceiving, articulating and structuring the human world which is biased towards, promoted by, and exerts influence upon particular sets of social relations. By accepting such premises it becomes easier to see how appropriate they are to manipulation by the powerful in society (p. 278).

Wood finds this process occurring from the simplest of circumstances, that color-coded map located near the entrance to every shopping mall, to the most complex products of the United States Geological Survey. To Wood the size, shape or context of the map makes no difference:

> In presentation the map attains . . . the level of discourse (italics in original). Its discursive form may be as simple as a single map image rendered comprehensible by the presence of title, legend, and scale; or as complex as those in The New State of the World Atlas, hurling multiple map images, diagrams, graphs, tables and texts at their audience in a raging polemic. It may be as diverse as vacation triptiks, rotating cardboard star finders, perspex-slabbed shopping center guides, chatty supermarket video displays, or place mats for formica diner tables. Presentation is more than placing the map image in the context of other signs; it's placing the map in the context of its audience (pp. 140-1).

To Wood, maps "speak about the world rather than simply of it" (p. 141).

Monmonier, on the other hand, leads the reader through a series of controversies surrounding, engulfing and employing maps. From the forged Vinland map's attack on Italian pride in Columbus, to the highly political role of the Peters Projection in reshaping perspectives

on the relative importance of Africa, Monmonier documents repeated instances of what he labels "cartocontroversy." His goal is to make readers aware of the need to critically examine maps as we would any other argument. Monmonier writes in the epilogue:

> Most viewers willingly accept maps as factual and objective, but as we have seen, challenging only those maps that blatantly threaten your wallet or beliefs is naive and risky. Subtle cartographic propaganda is common in many contexts and frequently misleads citizens who are unaware that maps are highly selective and necessarily biased. Moreover, a stylish or intriguing map becomes a flag to rally around and parade behind. ... Therein lies much of the power of maps - enchanting displays divert attention from their authors' motives (p. 297).

Just as educational institutions are moving to emphasize media literacy, Monmonier would have us adopt standards for cartographic literacy.

While it seems unlikely that maps will be the centerpiece of many academic debates, understanding the power of maps can attune the debater to the subtlest forms of argument. Maps succeed by stealth, not by coercion. As such, maps' argumentative powers far exceed more overt forms of persuasion. Generally unchallenged by any opposition, maps shape our views about the world more than they represent a view of the world. As the "map-immersed people" described by Wood (p. 143), we must become a map literate people, as well. Both The *Power of Maps* and *Drawing the Line* are persuasive arguments to accept maps as arguments.

BOOKS REVIEWED

Drawing the Line: Tales of Maps and Cartocontroversy. By Mark Monmonier. New York: Henry Holt, 1995. 368 pages. Paper $14.95. ISBN 0-8050-2581-2.

The Power of Maps. By Dennis Wood. New York: Guilford Press, 1992. 248 pages. $39.95. ISBN 0-89862-492-4.

ADDITIONAL WORKS CITED

Conrad, Joseph. (1969). *The Heart of Darkness.* Norwalk, CT: Heritage Press.

"Excerpts from High Court's Opinions on Racial Gerrymandering." *New York Times* 29 June 1993: A12.

Gurney, James. (1992). *Dinotopia.* Atlanta: Turner Publishing.

Harley, J. B. (1988). "Maps, Knowledge, and Power." *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments.* Eds. Dennis Cosgrove & Stephen Daniels. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.

Harley, J. B. (1990). "Texts and Contexts in the Interpretation of Early Maps." *From Sea Charts to Satellite Images: Interpreting North American History Through Maps.* Ed. David Buisseret. Chicago: U. of Chicago.

Monmonier, Mark. (1996). "Cartocontroversy." *Mercator's World,* 1: n. pag. Online. WWW. Available: http://www.mercatormag.com/contro.htm.

Warranting Assent: Case Studies in Argument Evaluation. Edited by Edward Schiappa. Albany: State University of New York, 1995. 330 pages. Paper $19.95. ISBN 0-7914-2364-6.

Theories of argument are often designed for the purpose of explaining and improving argumentation practice. These theories typically embrace the premise that argumentative competence is a valuable critical thinking skill, one which is necessary for the responsible exercise of free speech and participation in democratic forms of governance. Thus, in argumentation studies, theory and practice are equally central pursuits. In the collection *Warranting Assent: Case Studies in Argument Evaluation*, editor Edward Schiappa takes this premise a step further, suggesting that the *evaulation* of argument practice deserves greater recognition as important scholarship. Schiappa defines argument evaluation as "rendering an explicit judgment that an argument is valid or invalid, sound or unsound, good or bad, strong or weak, ethical or unethical" (ix). Exercising this ability to recognize the difference between good and bad arguments should be considered scholarly work for it serves as a means of testing argument theory and assists our pedagogy through expert example. According to Schiappa, argument evaluation is a "valid end in itself" because it is at least as valuable as other sorts of criticism (rhetorical) which tend to lower standards for evaluation by adhering to a criterion of "effectiveness" (ix).

The centrality of argument evaluation is the organizing principle of this collection, which includes argument case studies addressing a wide variety of topics, ranging from an analysis of the KAL flight 007 crash to an evaluation of the Meese Commission's report on pornography. The collection is divided into four parts. The first, "Epistemological Approaches to Argument Evaluation," contains three strong essays concerning conspiracy arguments surrounding the KAL 007 crash, George Bush's Gulf War discourse, and arguments about the ill-fated Challenger launch. The authors in this segment address a diverse set of issues. Marilyn Young and Michael Launer critique conspiracy arguments based on an assessment of logic, evidentiary strength, and audience concerns, contrasting their evaluation with a narrative-based explanation of conspiracy discourse. Carol Winkler investigates the quality of arguments within a particular war narrative, and suggests that George Bush's "terrorist narrative" reframed the terms of the public debate over the Gulf War in a way that redefined acceptable reasons for going to war. In the third essay, Dennis Gouran identifies the failures of the arguments concerning the Challenger launch, and accounts for some of the reasons why the arguments failed to meet standards for reasoned judgment and persuasion. Each of these essays is an

attempt to account for how argument produces knowledge claims and how these knowledge claims should be evaluated.

In "Axiological Approaches to Argument Evaluation," three essays apply ethical standards to diversity arguments by the Committee on Lutheran Unity, to Reagan's rationale for the Grenada invasion, and to Justice O'Connor's dissent in *Metro Broadcasting, Inc.* Kathryn Olson grapples with the alleged tension between ethical and effectiveness standards for assessing arguments. She proposes an alignment of deontological ethicality and effectiveness, and illustrates how such a standard can function in argument evaluation by applying her hybrid standard to arguments over inclusive participation on the Commission for a New Lutheran Church. Ralph Dowling and Gabrielle Ginder derive ethical communication standards from Day's and Nilsen's ideas about democratic values, and apply these standards to Ronald Reagan's justification for the Grenada invasion. In the final essay, Jeffry Courtright illustrates how Johnstone's "Ethics of Rhetoric" can be used as an interpretive tool in argument analysis, and proposes an ethical standard for judging Supreme Court dissenting opinions. Collectively, these essays suggest the importance of evaluating the ethics of particular arguments.

A section on "Ideological Approaches to Argument Evaluation" includes ideological assessments of the arguments in the 1985 *Aguilar* trial of sanctuary activists, the Supreme Court fetal protection policy case, *Johnson Controls*, and post-cold war justifications for ballistic missile defense systems. Kathryn Olson and Clark Olson examine the clash of competing ideologies in the sanctuary trial and reveal how each side indicted the other's position based on the values inherent in ideological assumptions. They also expose how ideological stances taken by the judge and defense attorney influenced the jury. In her examination of arguments surrounding the fetal protection policy case, Mary Keehner observes that ideologies based upon patriarchal, liberal legal philosophy and capitalist assumptions functioned to obscure important gender and class interests. Finally, Rebecca Bjork develops a theoretical basis for and illustrates a post-colonial critique of public policy argument. She argues that post-cold war discourse about proliferation reinforces United States domination and hegemony of Third World nations. Taken together, these essays illustrate how argument critics can and should examine the ideological underpinnings of public argumentation, as well as further their own explicit ideological commitments through such criticism.

The final segment of the book collects three essays concerning the same text, the Meese Commission's Report on Pornography. In the first essay, Ian Fielding examines the causal arguments in the report. In the second essay, Cate Palczewski explores the notion of survivor testimony in the pornography controversy. In the final essay, Gerard Hauser locates the report as an instrument of legitimation in the public sphere controversy over who should speak and be heard in the pornography debate. Disparate as these topics may seem, they are located sensibly

in relation to the first three sections of the collection -- argument is epistemic, argument is axiological, and argument is ideological. This section rounds out the collection by demonstrating a variety of approaches to evaluating the same text.

Warranting Assent should be useful to anyone interested in the specific topics addressed in each of the essays. However, it is especially useful to argumentation instructors who are seeking, in the words of the editor, something between abstract theory monographs and debate textbooks. Each essay demonstrates how one can apply argumentation theory to evaluate specific cases of public argument. The collection would complement a course designed around a basic argument text or one designed around one or more theoretical works. Students who read the essays will see how well-executed argument criticism applies the theoretical premises to which they are exposed.

The theoretical contributions of some of the essays is an additional strength of the collection. For example, Palczewski's discussion about the use of survivor testimony makes a strong argument grounded in feminist theory that personal testimony is a legitimate and powerful form of evidence in public policy controversies. Palczewski questions fundamental theoretical assumptions about "objective" evidence, noting the power relations that inhere in decisions to relegate "subjective" evidence to the realm of the powerless. While the quality of the theoretical contributions of the essays do vary, there are several that advance argumentation theory.

This may seem an odd comment to make about a text designed by the editor to promote argument evaluation *qua* argument evaluation. Schiappa argues that there are few examples of argumentation studies that represent argument evaluation as scholarship in and of itself. Referring to his 1991 analysis of papers presented at the fifth and sixth annual SCA/AFA argumentation conferences, Schiappa concludes that argument evaluation is "the least popular *modus operandi* of the publishing scholar" (p. 40). However, that analysis depended upon a categorizing scheme that accepted essays as examples of argument evaluation only if their *primary* purpose was to render an evaluative judgment. Scholars whose work embraces a symbiosis of criticism and theory may not fall into this category.

Schiappa does make a persuasive case for valuing argument evaluation, but it is also important to recognize the large body of scholarship that intertwines argument evaluation with argumentation theory, using evaluation as a means to contribute to our theoretical conversations. Some of the essays in *Warranting Assent* are excellent illustrations of this practice. It would be a mistake to ignore the theoretical contributions of good argument criticism in the effort to promote argument evaluation as an independent scholarly practice. Valuing argument evaluation, or the rendering of judgments about particular arguments, does not require us to bifurcate criticism and theory, nor does it require us to limit our conception of good criticism

to the application of previously developed theory. Instead, we should value pluralistic approaches to argument criticism which include argument evaluation and celebrate the fact that acts of argument evaluation add to the body of argumentation theory.

Carrie Crenshaw
University of Alabama

With Good Reason: An Introduction to Informal Fallacies 5th ed. By S. Morris Engel. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994. 288 pages. Paper $15.00. ISBN 0-312-08479-X.

Teachers in argumentation and debate often need to balance the two objectives of sound thinking and sound communication. The more time students spend gathering material and preparing themselves for oral advocacy, the less time it seems is available for a thorough examination of reasoning. Argumentation texts originating in the speech communication discipline have tended to address this dual focus by emphasizing the triumvirate of research, organization, and presentation -- and then throwing in a crash course in critical thinking. To balance out the emphases, instructors may seek a supplemental text in informal logic. The challenge is to find a text with sufficient clarity to stand on its own, and sufficient focus to avoid introducing too many extraneous issues.

With Good Reason: An Introduction to Informal Fallacies may fit this mold. The text, now in its fifth edition, is one of an increasing number to approach informal logic as a practical and accessible skill. The book is a comprehensive introduction to the subject, yet it remains an entertaining read. It is written from the author's experience teaching an introductory course in logic, yet it is sensitive to language and the variables of communication. It is filled with understandable and applicable illustrations and exercises which make reading an interactive experience.

Seeing this text, as its subtitle would suggest, as a work solely devoted to informal fallacies, would be a mistake. Fully one third of the material is contained in a preparatory section designed to acquaint the reader with basic concepts in argument and communication. The initial two chapters, on reasoning and language respectively, are designed to provide a positive model of clear and effective reasoning prior to an analysis of common mistakes.

The opening chapter provides a solid overview of the meaning and analysis of arguments. True to his field, Engel defines "argument" in a traditional sense as a logical process

of reasoning from premises (one or more) to a conclusion. Rather than relying on this perfunctory definition, however, Engel devotes the major part of the chapter to a *functional* analysis of the meaning of argument: separating argument from other communication acts such as questions, announcements, complaints, and explanations. At the end of this discussion, Engel's view of argument appears wholly consistent with the social view of "reason giving" that has dominated the field of argumentation. In this chapter Engel also includes diagnostic exercises for recognizing arguments by identifying premises and conclusions, eliminating verbiage, and identifying argument components which are missing or suspect.

While the text is based in logic, its communication emphasis is clear in the equal weighting it gives language and logic in the introductory section. Chapter Two "undertakes to sensitize the reader to the capacity that words have to enrich, distort, specify, obscure, sharpen, or confuse our thinking" (p. 2). Language is presented as a construct which is integral to thought and also as a skill which is essential to clear thinking and expression. Ironically, this focus on the importance of language is not paralleled in most of the texts on argumentation and critical thinking produced by speech communication professionals.

The discussion of language is clear and accessible, but it may be considered a bit too basic, taking pains to distinguish between the word and the thing, and to point out that words have no natural connection to what they represent. While these points are important, they are likely to have been covered in a student's basic communication course. In addition, the material on language is not always connected to the rest of the material in the text. It is left to the instructor, for example, to draw the connection between language ambiguity and the identification of argumentative function. "I really wish John wouldn't yell -- it hurts my ears" would, according to Engel, be considered a complaint rather than an argument. An understanding of the utterance's illocutionary force, however, would allow us to see it as an argument providing a reason why John should stop yelling. A consideration of argument as a specific type of speech act would compliment Engel's analysis and draw a closer parallel between the concerns of logic and communication.

The second section on fallacies comprises the main focus of the text, and two-thirds of its overall content. Engel groups fallacies according to the categories of ambiguity (equivocation, division/composition, amphibole, etc.) presumption (hasty generalization, begging the question, false analogy, etc.) and relevance (ad hominem, appeal to pity, etc.). Thirty distinct fallacies are covered, including most of those traditionally known, as well as a few apparent creations (e.g., "appeal to the authority of the select few"). Fallacies which require advanced knowledge of argument structure (e.g., the fallacy of the undistributed middle term) are not included. Surprisingly, the discussion in this section does not draw a working distinction between arguments which are fallacious and those which are merely untrue. Defining the fallacy

as "an argument that is unsound" (p. 84), Engel groups invalid arguments with those that simply carry a false premise. An avoidance of fallacies of presumption, for example, requires that critics ask, "Are the facts in the argument correctly represented?" (p. 85). Some may feel that adding fallacy categories such as "distorting the facts" risks broadening the concept beyond recognition so that fallacies simply come to mean "bad arguments." In general, however, this risk is unrealized in the text as most examples relate to problems of validity or form rather than to problems regarding the truth value of premises.

At the end of the text there is a short basic writing guide covering the logical, grammatical, and rhetorical considerations involved in creating an essay. This section better serves as a refresher for the student who has already taken a college writing course than as a substitute for the student who has not. The section is not focused on writing in general, but on the development of a traditional argumentative essay: a short paper that supports, rejects, or modifies a given thesis using analysis rather than research. A useful running example of an essay on the death of Socrates punctuates this discussion.

By far, the greatest advantage of *With Good Reasons* is its wealth of examples and exercises. Balancing both classical and contemporary illustrations, the text moves between Shakespeare, the Platonic dialogues, newspapers, novels, textbooks and advertising. Chapter One alone contains seventy-seven numbered exercises, as well as many more examples within the text. Along with summaries, these exercises are not simply tucked away at the end of chapters, but are introduced at the point where they will be most useful -- the point at which a difficult concept needs to be reinforced or explored. At that level, the text promotes a high level of engagement with the reader. Roughly half of the exercise questions are answered at the end of each chapter (the remainder are answered in a section attached to the back of the teacher's edition). Given the imprecise nature of some of the categories of informal logic, it is likely that many instructors and students will quarrel with some of the conclusions that Engel draws from his examples. The subjectivity of some of the designations, however, should not detract from the ability of these examples to generate discussion.

A second unique aspect of the text is its relative simplicity. In keeping with its status as an introductory text, Engel's book is scrupulously free of any mention of the advanced concepts in logic: we hear nothing of distinctions among types of logic, we use no diagrams or tables, and we see no symbols. We receive only the most basic description of the syllogism, straying no further than the familiar proof of the mortality of Socrates. Very consciously, Engel maintains a focus on everyday reasoning in everyday language. An effort is made to designate the fallacies in understandable language, for example preferring "false cause" to *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. Lists of all kinds are carefully avoided. One will not find in Engel the series of questions for testing the appropriateness of an analogy, guidelines for avoiding hasty

generalization, or canons for gauging the adequacy of a causal relationship--tests which are familiar to anyone who has used more traditional logic textbooks. An emphasis on accessibility keeps the reading unfettered and allows students to focus on the main conceptual distinctions, but that same accessibility may not provide the rigor or the focus on fallacy avoidance that some instructors might expect.

Taken together, *With Good Reason* presents readers with an engaging introduction to the basic habits of good thinking. The book's broad focus on the logical fallacies may make it impractical for the performance-based argumentation and debate course which can only afford a week's attention to that subject. Instructors of such courses may wish to assign the first section alone, or to assign specific selections from the section on fallacies. Even if it is not used in an argumentation and debate course, the text is definitely a useful addition to any argument instructor's personal library. Engel's primary emphasis on clear explanation and plentiful illustration will provide the instructor with an arsenal of ideas for in-class exercises and discussion.

Kenneth T. Broda-Bahm
Towson State University

Lines of Argument: Core Volume. By Carol Winkler, William Newnam, and David Birdsell. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark, 1993. 240 pages. ISBN 0-6971-3242-0.

Lines of Argument for Policy Debate. By Carol Winkler, William Newnam, and David Birdsell. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark, 1993. 224 pages. ISBN 0-6971-3240-4.

Lines of Argument for Value Debate. By Carol Winkler, William Newnam, and David Birdsell. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark, 1993. 192 pages. ISBN 0-6971-3241-2.

It is an idea of such startling simplicity and obvious good sense that one wonders why no one thought of it before. The development of an argumentation and debate text that is, in fact, three separate texts -- one core volume, a volume devoted to policy debate, and a volume

devoted to value debate -- is a splendid response to a difficult problem often encountered by instructors in both basic argumentation and more advanced debate classes. These soft bound volumes, designed to be adopted in pairs (the core volume plus either the policy or value volume), are an economical and pedagogically sound solution to the difficult problem of finding a text which accommodates an instructor's desire to focus on value or policy debate while maintaining a strong emphasis on argumentation.

The authors are strong advocates of the connectedness of training in debate with the theoretical substance of argumentation. Unfortunately, they note that "jargon, format, and technique too often overwhelm students whose attention should be directed toward more substantive concerns. Debate then becomes a distracting formalism obscuring the practice of argumentation, rather than a lively forum characterized by rigor, creativity, and communicative experimentation" (*Core Volume*, p. xi). These texts are a response to that formalism and are an excellent example of how theory and practice can be blended into a solid offering. The core text is concerned with the discovery, recognition, and evaluation of arguments. It includes a thorough discussion of debate resolutions, the process of research, evaluating evidence, reasoning, delivery, flowcharting, cross-examination, and ethics. The ethics chapter is particularly strong, using four case studies to illustrate the sometimes difficult ethical choices in argumentation. The authors ground their treatment of argumentation theory in Aristotle's inventional system of general and specific topics, the lines of argument. They are further informed by contemporary developments including the Toulmin model and argument fields. The core volume constitutes a brief, but informed introduction to basic elements of argumentation that will prepare students operating in any contemporary debate forum -- CEDA, NDT, Parliamentary, or Lincoln-Douglas.

The policy volume begins with separate chapters on significance, inherency, solvency, and topicality. Importantly, in addition to extended examples in the text, these concepts are illustrated with excerpts from transcripts of final rounds of the National Debate Tournament. So, for instance, after a discussion of structural inherency, there is a box set off from the rest of text in which a portion of the 1985 NDT Final Round between Iowa and Harvard is reprinted to illustrate how real debaters make the argument. A portion of the 1AC and the corresponding part of the 1NC are included to give students a sense of how the argument is developed and then answered. Similarly, the concept of significance is explained in the text and then illustrated by extensive portions of the 1979 NDT Final Round between Northwestern and Harvard. In that round, the key case issue was the harm of unemployment and the (in)famous Brenner studies. Rarely do students get treated to such excellent examples of actual in-round argumentation. At best, previous texts have reprinted an entire final round with little commentary or application. These authors have chosen their excerpts well and provide an appropriate showcase for some

of our best students. Chapters on counterplans, refutation, speaker responsibilities and evaluation conclude the policy volume. The speaker responsibility chapter is particularly noteworthy for its integration and reinforcement of the lessons of flowcharting discussed alongside the duties of each speaker.

The volume on value debate is prepared in a similar fashion. There are excellent chapters on topicality, criteria, and justification. Again, the authors have chosen actual portions of the final rounds from CEDA Nationals to illustrate value objections, criteria arguments, and topicality objections. The 1989 CEDA Nationals Final Round between Gonzaga and Southern Illinois is used to illustrate the nuances of debating criteria arguments, while value objections and disadvantages are showcased using the 1991 CEDA Final Round between UCLA and Kansas State. Chapters on refutation, speaker duties, and evaluation conclude this volume.

There is much to recommend this fine set of texts. The writing is clear, informative, and appropriate for beginners or more advanced students. The flexibility inherent in the design of this project allows an instructor to tailor a class to either value or policy debate without including large amounts of material that would have to be skipped over or ignored. Perhaps most important, each of these authors were active intercollegiate debaters and coaches who have remained connected to an activity for which they continue to show enthusiasm and respect. I sometimes wonder whether the authors of some of the competing texts on the market have even ventured into an academic debate in the last twenty years.

Having said that, it must also be admitted that these texts are three years old now and the separation between value and policy debate at the intercollegiate level may be disintegrating. As CEDA and NDT move ever closer to an institutional and intellectual rapproachment, the separation of policy and value debate may be a pedagogical choice made by instructors rather than a sociological description of intercollegiate debate practice. Finally, the sole substantive concern I have with these texts is their relatively brief discussion of disadvantages and value objections. Given contemporary practice, that may be a sizable concern if the object of instruction is preparing students for competition. By treating disadvantages as a subset of significance (certainly a defensible choice in presenting stock issues), the authors may have understated the importance or the immense strategic importance of value objections and disadvantage arguments initiated by negative teams. Certainly instructors choosing these texts solely for the preparation of students for competition will want to supplement the information provided here. For classroom debates, these texts offer a solid, if brief, introduction to this particular argument type.

Nonetheless, instructors looking for a rigorous introduction to argumentation and debate would do well to consider these texts. Students will benefit from the quality of examples,

the clarity with which concepts are discussed, and the flexibility this set of texts offers an instructor for customizing materials for her class.

Nicholas F. Burnett
California State University, Sacramento

Statistics as Principled Argument. By Robert P. Abelson. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995. 221 pages. Paper $22.00. ISBN 0-8050-0528-1.

Robert P. Abelson's *Statistics As Principled Argument* combines statistics and argumentation to provide a comprehensive review of techniques that readers can use to understand and critique the use of statistical evidence. Although statistics are typically regarded as mundane and incomprehensible, this book presents the subject in a format that is interesting and easy to read.

Similar to many introductory statistics textbooks, *Statistics As Principled Argument* includes most of the basic statistical information required to understand the methods used by empirical researchers. The text has nine chapters including: the types of claims made with statistical data, hypothesis testing, effect sizes, the use of the significance test, meta-analysis, and the generality of effect sizes. As a whole, the text provides a detailed and fairly clear discussion of these statistical principles.

In contrast to most traditional statistics textbooks, this text is relatively unconcerned with regurgitating statistical formulas. Instead, it is focuses on explaining how to *interpret* statistical findings. As such, while it is valuable in understanding rudimentary theoretical assumptions of simple statistical data, the text provides little assistance to students eager to conduct empirical research.

The primary strengths of this book are in the variety of examples used, the discussion of the shortcomings of the statistical significance test, and the role of chance in research findings. While attention is usually paid to making the material in statistical textbooks more understandable, the examples are usually academically dense or lack a clear and understandable context for many students. Abelson deviates from this norm by providing clear examples from a variety of topic areas, including the orchestra, major league baseball, extrasensory perception, and the greenhouse effect. Clearly, readers are likely to find examples that are familiar and interesting. At the very minimum, the use of "real world" and "commonplace" examples are sure to keep students engaged in the topics covered. One example of Abelson's effort to make

the material understandable is his discussion of how statistical data can be misleading at face value. Here, he examines the research claiming that the average life expectancy of an orchestral conductor is about five years more than the life expectancy of the average person. Abelson contends that before readers rush out to seek a career as an orchestral conductor, they should take a closer look at the statistical comparison that is used to make the orchestra conductor longevity claim. In his discussion of the orchestra conductor data he maintains that the comparison is made between the *average* life expectancy of orchestra conductors and the *general* life expectancy of individuals in the population. When the effect of mortality rates of individuals who are younger than 30, e.g., infant mortality rates are controlled for, orchestral conductors do not have longer life expectancies. Hence, the point clearly illustrates that one should look beyond merely comparing numbers between groups and understand the methods used to collect and analyze data.

A second strength of this book is its discussion of statistical significance. Abelson reviews the primary arguments advanced for rejecting traditional tests of statistical significance. For instance, statistical significance often is a function of sample size. When sample size is small, significance tests require that the mean differences between groups be extremely large before a researcher can reject the null hypothesis. Alternatively, with extremely large sample sizes, small mean differences, even those seemingly trivial, may be statistically significant. This section of the book is especially important in that this view of statistical significance is continuing to gain support among statisticians. If the trend toward rejecting statistical significance tests continues, textbooks failing to address the issue will be less valuable teaching tools than books containing the discussion.

A final strength of this book is the chapter on statistics as argument. Crossing the domains of argumentation and statistics is useful in that it provides insight into techniques that people can use to test claims based on statistical evidence. One specific technique applies logical syllogisms to empirical claims. Abelson provides examples aimed at helping readers understand how research data are used to generate a stream of logical premises resulting in an empirical claim. Through several examples, readers become quickly familiarized with how to use argumentation skills as a means of evaluating the validity of a research claim.

Abelson has an impressive ability to maintain reader interest, but the text has several limitations. While *Statistics As Principled Argument* would be valuable in a post-introductory statistics class for upper division undergraduate or beginning graduate students, it is limited in its application. In particular, there is both an upper and lower level of statistical knowledge that the reader must have for this text to be of value. At the lower end, the text assumes that readers are familiar with statistical procedures such as the F test and the t-test. At the upper end, it provides little instruction to students interested in designing and conducting empirical research.

A secondary limitation is that the text assumes that the reader is already familiar with some of the research topics being presented. For example, in an attempt to illustrate how research can create surprise, the author uses an example from Milgram's classic study of obedience. However, no particular details of the study are provided. Although this study is regarded as a classic, readers may be unfamiliar with the Milgram's methods and specific findings. Anyone unfamiliar with the specifics of the Milgram study will miss both the subtle nuances and the primary point the Abelson attempts to make.

A final limitation regards the critique of the significance test. Most research is conducted at the individual study level. With aggregate studies, researchers can use a meta-analytic approach to minimize the toll that sampling error exerts on a study. While Abelson aptly points out that meta-analysis is a valuable tool and provides a comprehensive review of this topic, he spends a very small portion of his book outlining the use of the confidence interval, which is the alternative to the statistical significance test at the individual study level. Consequently, readers are left with little understanding of the steps that should be taken at the level of the individual study if they choose to reject the statistical significance test.

In closing, *Statistics as Principled Argument* would be most useful in a course designed to broaden statistical understanding of those readers with previous exposure to statistical research. If this book were used in an introductory statistics course, it would be necessary to use a second text providing relevant statistical formulas and a more rigorous review of research relevant to the discipline in which the text is being employed.

Kimo Ah Yun
Michigan State University

CALL FOR PAPERS

Editorial Policy

Contemporary Argumentation and Debate: The Journal of the Cross Examination Debate Association is a refereed journal, dedicated to publishing quality scholarship related to the theory and practice of CEDA Debate, forensic tournament administration, public argumentation and debate, and other areas of interest to CEDA members. In addition, the editorial staff will consider publication of book reviews, scholarly exchanges, and other features.

Of particular interest to the editor are articles relating to diversity and cultural pluralism in forensics, as well as work pertaining to unleashing the power of the new information highway for researching and evidencing argument in debate.

Submission Guidelines

Manuscripts should be typed, double spaced, and prepared in accordance with most recent MLA guidelines. Please include a detachable cover page identifying the author(s) and the institution with which the author is affiliated. As the *Journal* employs a system of blind review, the manuscript itself should contain no reference to the author(s) or the institution.

Manuscripts may not be returned, so the author(s) is encouraged to keep the original copy. The first author will receive notification of receipt of the manuscript and all subsequent correspondence related to the manuscript.

Four copies of the manuscript should be sent to:

Joseph Tuman
Editor, Contemporary Argumentation and Debate
Department of Speech and Communication Studies
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway
San Francisco, CA 94132

If accepted, the author(s) will be required to submit the manuscript on disk.