**11AP**

**Rogerian Arguments**

We’ve already discussed concession and refutation as a way to acknowledge a counterargument, and we want to re-emphasize the usefulness of that approach. Viewing anyone who disagrees with you as an adversary makes it very likely that the conversation will escalate into an emotional clash, and treating opposing ideas disrespectfully rarely results in mutual understanding. Twentieth-century psychologist Carl Rogers stressed the importance of replacing confrontational argument tactics with ones that promote negotiation, compromise, and cooperation. **Rogerian arguments** are based on the assumption that having a full understanding of an opposing position is essential to responding to it persuasively and refuting it in a way that is accommodating rather than alienating. Ultimately, the goal of a Rogerian argument is not to destroy your opponents or dismantle their viewpoints but rather to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

So what does a civil argument look like? Let’s examine a short article that appeared in *Ode Magazine* in 2009 entitled “Why Investing in Fast Food May Be a Good Thing.” In this piece Amy Domini, a financial advisor and leading voice for socially responsible investing, argues the counterintuitive position that investing in the fast-food industry can be an ethically responsible choice.

Directions: Read the article and answer the following questions:

1. Where/How does Domini develop ethos in the beginning of the piece?

2. What is her position on the subject?

3. What evidence does she provide to support her claim (logos)?

4. Identify at least two points in Domini’s article where she might have might have given way to accusation or blame or where she might have dismissed the Slow Food movement as being shortsighted or elitist. Discuss how, instead, she finds common ground and promotes dialogue with her audience through civil discourse.