

Thinking Straight Critical Reasoning Workshop 3-2 (April 18, 2008)

Revised Thinking Straight Schedule Week 4 -5

WEEK	TUESDAY	FRIDAY
WK 4 Apr 22 Apr 25	Am CR: <i>Evaluating Arguments 2</i> (Read C&P Ch 5 to p. 133) Pm ER: <i>Kantian Ethics</i> , (Read: R&R, Ch. 8 & 9):	Am CR: <i>Fallacies</i> (Read C&P Ch 6, 7 to p. 186) Pm ER: <i>Ethics: Contractarianism</i> , (Read : R&R Ch 10 and handout) 5 Portfolio entries due
WK 5 Apr 29 May 2	Am <i>Review of fallacies and preparation for CR Exam</i> No New Reading Review C&P Chapters 1-6 Pm <i>Conceptual Theories</i> (Read C&P Ch. 7 Remainder) Bring both CR and Ethics Texts	Am Critical Reasoning Exam Most Important Change ← Pm Video and Discussion

- I A. (Individually)** review the answers for the assignment given on the last two pages.
Indicate the number correct for the first 3 at the top of the page plus a separate listing for how many of the last three more difficult exercises were close to and how many were questionable.
- B. (In small group)** discuss any items that you found difficult be sure to review the last three .
- C. Plenary** discussion of any remaining problems.

II Showing invalidity.

A. Plenary comments on showing invalidity

Sample: *Anyone who lives with a smoker has an above-average risk of heart disease. Sarah doesn't live with a smoker. So Sarah doesn't have an above-average risk of heart disease.*

B. In small groups put each into standard form and show that it is invalid using either the counterexample or possible situation method. .

1. If dinner guests are coming, then we need more food. If we need more food, then we need to go to the store. Dinner guests aren't coming. Therefore, we don't need to go to the store.
2. No great singer has a weak voice. Kim is not a great singer. It follows that Kim has a weak voice.
3. If the American people feel overtaxed, then they put more Republicans in office. The American people don't feel overtaxed, so they won't put more Republicans in office.
4. All compassionate people are honest people. This is so because all good friends are compassionate people, and all good friends are honest people.
5. Anyone who is good at science is good at math. Anyone who is good at math is intelligent. So, anyone who is intelligent is good at science.

C. Plenary discussion of these examples.

- III A.** Comments on criticizing premises. Each of the following statements might occur as a premise in an argument For each statement, think about what you might say to persuade someone that the claim being made is not true—or at least that it is doubtful.

Some Ways to Cast Doubt on Premises

1. Counterexample for a universal generalization
2. Finding a clear case in which antecedent is true, consequent false for an if-then premise
3. For any premise, point out further implications that are doubtful

Sample A: *If capital punishment is abolished, then the homicide rate will increase more rapidly.*

Sample B: *Any activity that makes people aggressive should be discouraged.*

B. In small groups criticize the following by casting doubt on the premises. Each of the following statements might occur as a premise in an argument. For each statement, think about what you might say to persuade someone that the claim being made is not true—or at least that it is doubtful. Try to apply one of the three ways suggested above. If you find yourself initially inclined to agree with a statement, try to imagine what an intelligent critic on the other side of the issue might say to cast doubt on it.

1. Any activity that poses a risk to the health of bystanders violates their rights.
2. No person should pay taxes to support parts of government that that person doesn't use.
3. If Asian countries are becoming more technologically advanced than the United States, then the United States should adopt their educational methods..

C. Plenary discussion of any problems or issues

IV Terminology

A. Small group. Chapter Four in the Critical Reasoning text provides a discussion of validity for deductive arguments. In the light of this discussion and the use of terms in the chapter address the following tasks .

1. Devise an argument that is (a) valid but obviously unsound.
and (b) another that is invalid and has at least one false premise.
2. Determine which of the following statements make sensible use of the terms:
(a) *The argument you just gave is true,* (b) *Your conclusion is false,* (c) *Your statement is invalid.*
3. Consider which, if either, of these two statements are consistent—that is, for which of them can the two parts both be true together? (a). *Your argument is sound, but not valid* and (b). *Your argument is valid, but not sound.*

B. Plenary discussion

V. A. In small groups for passages 1-3 below: first, set out the argument. (you might find it useful to sketch a version of the argument in standard form to help you determine its structure and whether it has any missing premises.); Second, indicate whether the conclusion follows and third, see if you can cast doubt on any of the premises. Use the methods discussed above and be prepared to put your reconstructed argument on the board.

1. We shouldn't allow doctors to determine the gender of a fetus whenever parents request it. This is so because if we allow such testing, then some parents will abort a fetus simply because of its gender.
2. People should pay taxes to support only parts of government they use. It stands to reason that people without children shouldn't be required to pay for schools.

B. Plenary discussion

3.

Religion and cloning

State Sen. Adrian Smith, in his effort to ban all types of human cloning in Nebraska, clearly is attempting to insert his religious dogma — that an embryo and a person are morally equivalent — into the law. There are compelling legal, scientific and religious reasons to disagree.

Science shows us that only a portion of the cells resulting from a fertilized human egg will, in a normal pregnancy, become a baby. Others are destined to become a placenta. In therapeutic cloning there is no intent of a baby forming, and thus no person whose rights should be protected. Religious teachings on the beginning of life vary greatly, and the Supreme Court has ruled that law must be neutral with respect to religion.

When elected officials enact theology into criminal law, it's not only scientific research that comes under threat. Religious freedom is at stake as well.

Clay Farris Nail, *Lincoln*
Executive director, Center for the
Advancement of Rational Solutions

Omaha World Herald 1-17-04

4.

Make the separation official

It is time to separate the legality of civil unions from marriage. Marriage is a religious rite and institution performed by religious persons such as priests or ministers.

To maintain the separation of church and state, the government should not grant legal standing to this religious rite or any other religious rite. Priests and ministers would still be allowed to perform the religious rite of marriage, but such marriages would not have legal standing.

If couples want to obtain legal standing as "married," they should have to go through a separate civil-union ceremony. Such unions are legal matters and should require legal services. After all, when a couple wants to divorce, they go to their lawyers, not to their minister.

The result of all this would relegate the responsibility of upholding the sanctity of marriage to the church. Individual churches would control whom they allow to marry.

Government should not be in the position to decide what constitutes a good marriage:

— **Gene Ma, Everett**

Seattle Times, 4-16-05

5.

Aught is enough

The opponents of gay marriage are missing an important fact: overpopulation. The Catholic Church used to stipulate that marriage was primarily *for* procreation. The present position says that marriage is primarily for marital harmony.

Those against gay marriage say that marriage is mainly for procreation and thereby limited to heterosexuals. With 6.5 *bilLion* people on this planet, I would think any institution that emphasizes more people is a recipe for self-destruction.

This emphasis on procreation is at the heart of most of the world's problems from sprawl, resource shortages, species loss, to global warming.

A reasonable person could argue that gay marriage is actually more environmentally sustainable than the present form. The main reason for marriage, spiritually and rationally, should be for couple harmony.

— **Jack Pedigo, Seattle**

Seattle Times, 4-16-05



Assignment for Tuesday April 22 Review: Ch 4 pp. 103-107 Read: Ch. 5 pp 112-133.

Ch. 6, p. 141-155 **Submit:** Exercise 4.1, #6, #8, #10; Exercise 4.2 #2, #4, #6;

Exercise 4.3 #1 b,d, #3(i) b,d, #3(ii) b,d; Exercise 4.4 #1b and (#1h or #1j)

as well as a **reconstruction and evaluation** of two (2) Arguments picked from (3, 4 or 5 above).

Exercise 3.2 #4 (either #8 or #10);

Your paraphrases may have other wording

4. Politicians need to advertise what they really do for their constituents. Or, politicians need to communicate to get elected.

8. Culture and the thought it requires shape language; language does not shape culture

OR

10. *General Paraphrase of Central Topic:*

Top U.S. national security officials do *not* lie to preserve personal power, but rather they lie with the honest but misguided intention of protecting the country from its enemies.

For your information: This passage, by the way contains an argument with an implicit Conclusion

- (1) A policy of lying by top U.S. national security officials is defensible only if the United States needs to mislead the enemies and the end of national security justifies most means that can achieve it.
 - (2) Enemies are not misled.
 - (3) The end of national security does not (morally and philosophically) justify most means that can achieve it.
- ∴ A policy of lying by top U.S. national security officials is not defensible. (IMPLICIT)

Exercise 3.3 #1b,d, f, #2c

- 1b. (1) Human life has a moral claim to protection from the moment of conception.
 - (2) If (1), then we shouldn't permit anything that does not protect life from the moment of conception.
 - (3) The harvesting of stem cells by either of the two currently proposed methods does not protect life from the moment of conception.
- ∴ We shouldn't permit harvesting of stem cells by either by the two currently proposed methods (IMPLICIT)

- 1d. (1) There is a continuity of development from conception on.
 - (2) If (1), then no stage of development is radically different. (IMPLICIT)
- ∴ No stage of development is radically different. (SUBORDINATE CONCLUSION)
- (3) If so, then there is no stage after conception at which the fetus becomes human. (IMPLICIT)

- ∴ There is no stage after conception at which the fetus becomes human. (SUBORDINATE CONCLUSION)
 - (4) Either the fetus becomes human at the moment of conception or it becomes human at some stage after conception. (IMPLICIT)
- ∴ The fetus becomes human at the moment of conception.

- 1f (1) If women continue to bear the children of men who don't marry them, then men will continue to be absent fathers.
 - (2) If men continue to be absent fathers, then inner-city crime and violence and family deterioration will continue. (IMPLICIT)
 - (3) Inner-city crime and violence and family deterioration should not continue. (IMPLICIT)
- ∴ Women should not continue to bear the children of men who don't marry them. (SUBORDINATE CONCLUSION)
- (4) If women should not continue to bear the children of men who don't marry them, then our efforts should be aimed at persuading women not to tolerate this behavior in men. (IMPLICIT)
- ∴ Our efforts should be aimed at persuading women not to tolerate this behavior in men.

2c. The title of the editorial and the seventh paragraph suggests the following argument:

- (1) If denial of funds to the Brooklyn Museum of Arts is contrary to first Amendments rights, then it involves legal suppression—banning, burning, barring access. (IMPLICIT)
 - (2) Denial of funds to the Brooklyn Museum of Art does not involve legal suppression—banning, burning, or barring access.
-
- ∴ Denial of funds to the Brooklyn Museum of Art is not contrary to first Amendment rights. (SUBORDINATE CONCLUSION)
 - (3) If denial of funds to the Brooklyn Museum of Art is not contrary to the First Amendment rights, lawyers for the museum have unworthily used (misrepresented) the first Amendment.
-
- ∴ Lawyers for the museum have unworthily used (misrepresented) the first Amendment.