How to have difficult conversations?

Philosophical Precedents

from Aristotle's "On Sophistical Refutations"

the art of the sophist is the semblance of wisdom without the reality, and the sophist is one who makes money from an apparent but unreal wisdom

- 1. Equivocation using a word with two different meanings
- 2. Amphibology ambiguous sentence structure
- 3. Composition assuming a feature of a part is posessed of the whole
- 4. Division assuming a feature of the whole is posessed by a part
- 5. Accent equivocation by change of accent or stress
- 6. Figure of speech or form of expression rhetorical equivocation
- 7. Accident destroying the exception
- 8. Secundum quid confusing a rule of thumb with an abolsute generalisation
- 9.Irrelevant conclusion proving the wrong thing
- 10. Begging the question assuming the conclusion
- 11. False cause use of falsely alleged causal relationship
- 12. Affirming the consequent knowing only B if A, infer A from B.
- 13. Fallacy of many questions raising a question with doubtful presuppositions

Sources and Purposes

- Book by James Lindsay & Peter Boghossian: "How to have Impossible Conversations"
 - Countless conversations with zealots, criminals, religious fanatics, and extremists of all stripes.
 - Doctoral research in Prison System conversing with offenders.
 - Then thousands of hours of conversations with religious hardliners.
 - Conversations with people who hold radically different views about politics, morality, and religion.
 - Research and experience in conversing with people who profess to be unshakable in their beliefs.

Thirty-six techniques drawn from the best, most effective research on:

- applied epistemology
- hostage and professional negotiations
- cult exiting
- subdisciplines of psychology, and more.
- Talk by Boghossian: "The Way Forward" from critical social justice

Our Special Circumstances and Needs

- Two areas of concern:
 - 1. Our philosophy discussions
 - 2. Healthy democratic institutions
- Few of the special considerations which motivated and informed Lindsay and Boghossian are relevant to (1).
- The concern with logical fallacies remains, heightened by the aftermath of postmodernism.
 - Do we need updated analyses focussing on main contemporary fallacies?
- Ground rules of "Rational Discourse" no longer universally accepted,
 - Should these be re-affirmed?

The Way Forward - ten points from Boghossian's talk

- 1. Listen and be seen to be listening echo back, re-express
- 2. Enquire about grounds for belief ask how they know it
- 3. Check confidence on scale before and after conversation
- 4. Disconfirmation what evidence would change belief?
- 5. Facilitate doubt e.g. if gender studies and biology disagree, who would you be likely to believe more?
- 6. Don't provoke defensiveness don't say "but", say "Yes and ..."
- 7. Build bridges make golden bridges to save face
- 8. Don't apologise unless you are actually sorry. Not if someone is offended.
- 9. Be sincere demonstrate parahesia, don't equivocate or sugarcoat
- 10. Be willing to revise your beliefs be willing to say "I don't know"

A Way Forward? - for philosophical discussions

- Make honest attempt to understand topic and convey that understanding.
- That presumes a rational endeavour to find objective truth rather than political narrative?
- Listen and seek understanding of failure to convey, responding to clarify or modify.
- Invite and seek understanding of alternative views.
- Seek to understand and be understood, to compare not to persuade.
- Avoid "argumentum ad hominem" (fallacious and/or off-topic)

A Way Forward? - for philosophy in the Western, analytic tradition

- Revisit epistemology
 - Examine the rationality of scepticism in a nuanced way
 - Reconsider the scope, limits and degrees of objectivity
 - Re-affirm the logical/empirical/evaluative trichotomy
- Scientific method
 - Address the social and institutional supports and constraints on scientific objectivity
- Ethics and Politics

•