From past to present, the argument is the way that can bring people with different viewpoints at the discussion table and sometimes resolve the conflicts between oppositions. The writer of the issue claims that the best evaluation of an argument is its ability to persuade people with contrasting ideas because he thinks that putting an idea on the debate is the best way to explore its values. I agree with neither the claim and nor the reason as they are as I find them both unconvincing.

First of all, people with different viewpoints in the arguments may have some intention about their actions and beliefs. For instance, they might benefit from opposing to someone even if they are sincerely wrong. In these situations, the argument is pointless and cannot resolve any conflict since there are parties who act partially towards their sakes. As an example, talking about the manner, robbery is a severe action and considered as a crime in society. The people who are robbed of could be harmed in many ways, including losing their money or even, in deteriorating condition like armed robbery, their life. So, in this case, having an argument regarding robbery’s ramifications with, for example, a bank robber, does not mediate any dispute because one side of the dissent is persistent on their profit, whether it is the wrong action or not.

Second, some people are persistent in their viewpoints, and they are always reluctant to change their perspective. Because there is intrinsic fear that if you put aside your ideas, you will end up in harsh situations, this belief makes people intransigent and also insular. An obvious example is about extremely devout people. People who decide and act only based on the book and the religion in which they believe. These people think that if they act and behave against the book, they will expect severe punishment from the god, and they will end up in hell. However, some people have an opposing point of view as they refute any constraint in their life since they think the more religious they are, the more limited they will be. As a result, this situation could lead to a bone of contention between these two groups, even though the latter might be right, the first one rebuff any efforts in order to convince them that they are wrong. Therefore, the argument will be meaningless.

Finally, people can observe and evaluate the value of an idea without any effort since they have apparent effects in society. For instance, there are people who are affluent and also generous, and they try to fight poverty in order to put indigents and destitute on welfare. People will perceive these actions as moral values.

To put the debate in a nutshell, arguments are unable to convince opposing viewpoints because there are other factors behind the conflicting ideas like beneficial incentives or rock-ribbed beliefs. Also, people can observe and evaluate the value of an idea without any effort since they have apparent effects in society.