

Rogerian Argument

Logos - Appeal to Reason

Pathos - Appeal to Emotion

Ethos - Appeal to Ethics

All of these must be used in every paper you write in order to make a well-rounded paper; however, you will focus on one or two more at times than the others.

In the last paper, you wrote a logical argument that made a claim and was supported by reasons. You backed up your argument and you bashed all of your opponent's viewpoints with your strict logical look at your topic. You even refuted the opposition's argument, tearing it down as best you could. In this paper, rather than use such strict appeals to logic and your reader's sense of reason, you will be required to appeal to their emotional and ethical side also and avoid refutations.

Using ethos particularly in this assignment presents the author as a fair-minded and open-minded individual who treats the opposition with great courtesy and listens to others' opinions. You are not trying to start an argument here or to convince someone that you are the only one who is right, but to look objectively at the problem and possible solutions to the problem and choose the best compromise.

This approach encourages people to listen to each other rather than to try to shout each other down. Because it focuses on building bridges between the writer and audience, and places considerable weight on the values, beliefs, and opinions the two share, a Rogerian argument doesn't emphasize an "I win - you lose" outcome as much as classical or Toulmin arguments do. Rather it emphasizes a "You win and I win too" solution, one where negotiation and mutual respect are valued and an agreement can be made. Thus, it is particularly useful in psychological and emotional arguments where pathos and ethos rather than logos and strict logic predominate.

Conditions and Compromise

To really find a solution to the problems we face in the world today, we must understand that we can not have everything our way. If no one were willing to compromise, then nothing would ever be accomplished. A Rogerian argument forces us to understand that to solve problems we have to change our way of thinking from "All or Nothing" to "Give and Take."

To accomplish this compromise, we must strive for a non-confrontational, understanding tone that views the opposition as a person of goodwill who is just trying to change the world for the better in a different way from your own. Our tone in this paper should be described as

Understanding

Collegial friendliness

Nonconfrontational

Respectful

Compromising (giving up something in order to gain something)

Essentially, you should try to understand that those who do not share your beliefs are not evil and out to get you or your argument. They believe that they are right just as you believe you are right. Both of you want to change and improve our world in some way, but the way you choose to go about it is different. For example, both smokers and non-smokers want to preserve rights in some way. They just view those rights differently. When writing your paper, you want to step into the shoes of the opposition and try to understand where they are coming from and what value you can see in their argument.

The conditions section of your paper (III) is where you can see the value in the opposition's argument. Do they have a point from their point of view? Can you concede that in some way not allowing smoker's to smoke would violate some of their