

Argument Protocol

Noon Silk

June 16, 2012

Below I describe the Argument Protocol. It is a strategy that can be used whenever you would like to have a clear and useful argument on a topic of some importance with some friends or colleagues. To be used properly, all parties will need to be aware of the protocol.

The Protocol

There are 5 steps. In summary, they are:

1. Consideration of argument importance,
2. Statement of conflicting positions,
3. Statement of conditions for loss,
4. Argument,
5. Review.

Consideration of argument importance

Goals: Establish potential rationality of argument.

The first step, before proposing to use the protocol, is for both of them to silently evaluate how important the particular argument would be, to each other. Essentially the idea is to decide whether or not it is worth investing time in the remainder of the protocol, and in particular it is appropriate to decide if the outcome of this application of the protocol is likely to be useful and good.

Statement of conflicting positions

Goals: Objective argument positions, disassociation of argument from person.

This step is perhaps obvious, but is often not done explicitly. Here we would like a clear and *objective* definition of the respective positions of both parties. In particular, all subjective claims should be resolved.

In the resolution of subjective terms, it should also be that the argument becomes as de-personalised as possible. The hope is that by the end of this, two completely objective positions are found, and that neither party feels emotionally attached to them.

State conditions for loss

Goals: Ensure useful argument outcome, promote direct consideration of each others views.

Each party should state the criteria under which they will accept defeat. If a given party can't come up with a condition then they do not get to participate. It may be that the condition is essentially the negation of their conflicting position; but explicit consideration of this step may also allow either party to realise that their position is perhaps still subjective or irrational. At the very least, it forces each party to consider the contradictory view to their own, and perhaps gain some insight into the others position.

Argument

Goals: Logically explore the topic and resolve conflicting positions.

Finally the typical argument should take place, and of course typical approaches should be followed.

Review

Goals: Ensure the process was useful.

Upon successful arguing on either party, the loss conditions will be reviewed, and the learnings on some party can be noted. At this stage, it is guaranteed that one person has changed their mind, and I think that is what is really important in any argument; otherwise it is useless. It is appropriate to recall that just because a mind has been changed, doesn't mean either party should feel bad. Indeed, both parties should feel *good* that the matter has been truly resolved.