

Thinking Straight Critical Reasoning Workshop 5-1 (April 26, 2011)

I. A. (Individually) follow the powerpoint review/mini-lecture about the answers for today's assignment. Put a check ✓ against largely correct answers, an X against largely wrong answers and a question mark ? if you aren't sure

II. Discussion of the Exam Friday, April 29,

The exam will be **closed book** and consist of a series of short answer questions. For example,

- Picking out the main conclusion and supporting premises as in Chapter 1;
- Circling conclusion and premises in a fully articulated argument that contains indicator words or putting them in standard form as in Chapter 2;
- Writing out the patterns for arguments as in Chapter 2 and 3;
- Providing the form of an argument pattern from the list on p. 34-35 and distinguishing *modus ponens* and *modus tollens* from related fallacies as in the self-administered quizzes.
- Adding missing(implicit) premises or conclusion as in Chapter 3;
- Finding a pattern for an argument that is not an explicit version of the 7 in our list of basic argument patterns but may be an extended version of them ;
- Reconstructing arguments in longer passages as in Chapter three;
- Showing familiarity with the Principle of Charitable interpretation **including the addition of appropriate IMPLICIT premises or conclusion,**
- Applying the concept of deductive validity and the concept of soundness;
- Showing that an argument is invalid using the method of counterexample or producing an invalidating alternative as in Chapter 4;
- Casting doubt on premises as in Chapter 4,
- Showing invalidity using the truth-table method,
- Identifying fallacies in short passages and indicating why they might be persuasive.

Critical
Reasoning
Portion

Shorter
Ethical
Reasoning
Portion

- Presenting and criticizing some of the ethical theories we have covered—to be discussed this afternoon

III Review and discussion of some Sample Questions:

- S1 According to your text, if someone appeals to your emotions by describing how badly you will be affected by some action you are considering, this person is
- a. making a fallacious appeal to pity.
 - b. confusing emotion with reason.
 - c. committing the straw man fallacy.
 - d. making a legitimate appeal to emotion.

S2 The following arguments commits a fallacy.

I favor abortion, but there are some who apparently cannot see that it is justified. These opponents must think that an unwanted pregnancy is the result of sexual indiscretion, and that a woman should be punished for this indiscretion by being forced to bear a child.

- a. State the name of the fallacy committed
- b. Explain why it is a bad argument
- c. Why might it still be persuasive

S3 (In small group)

Reconstruct the main argument in the following passage, write it in standard form and indicate the pattern. Is the argument valid? and (b) list any claims the author makes that support this point. Set aside for the moment

The abortion issue seems to be in the news practically every week. There are rallies and political speeches. Various candidates are jockeying for political advantage by embracing one side or the other on this controversial issue. Abortion raises some fundamental issues that bring into conflict our very conception of humanity and our ideals of liberty. In spite of the importance of the topic, abortion should not be made the central issue in political campaigns. Candidates for public office differ in a variety of ways, some of which are more important to the fate of the country than abortion policy is.

If we do not adequately deal with the deficit and terrorism, both our ideals of humanity and our liberty will be threatened. There should be no "litmus test," no single criterion, in judging people for public life in our complex and increasingly vulnerable world.

S4 (Individually) Read the following OpEd piece

(In Small Group) discuss whether it commit any fallacies? If so, which ones.

Bordering on Idiocy, Michelle Malkin, The Wall Street Journal 3/25/02

What does combating illegal immigration have to do with combating Middle Eastern terrorists in America? Well, duh.

Let's review: Three of the 19 Sept. 11 hijackers were illegal visa overstayers. Seven of the 19 obtained fraudulent ID cards with the help of illegal alien day laborers in Virginia. Two of the 1993 World Trade Center bombers were illegal aliens. At least two bin Laden-linked bomb plotters attempted to cross illegally through our land borders. More than 115,000 people from Middle Eastern countries are here illegally. More than 1,000 of them were smuggled through Mexico by convicted global crime ring leader George Tajirian. And some 6,000 Middle Eastern men who have defied deportation orders remain on the loose.

The connection between illegal immigration reform and homeland security is now fantastically obvious to most Americans, but the loose-and-open borders crowd is as blind and dumb as ever. Leading the senseless is the Wall Street Journal editorial page, which I admired in the past for its stalwart promotion of the rule of law and abhorrence of race-card demagoguery. On March 18, the paper betrayed both principles with disturbing flippancy.

"So Atta got his visa. That's no reason to kick out Mexican workers," pooh-poohed an online summary of an editorial titled "Immigrants and Terrorists." In it, the Journal's unrepentant open borders proponents approve of bipartisan efforts -- foolishly embraced by President Bush and favored by Mexican president Vicente Fox -- to extend partial amnesty to hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens who have been in the country since 1998.

The so-called 245(i) provision of federal immigration law will allow illegal aliens who have found employer or family sponsors to obtain visas in the U.S. for a \$1,000 fee, instead of being forced to return home - where consular offices would thoroughly scrutinize their native criminal records before approving applications. The 245(i) program would also allow these applicants to bypass a 1996 federal law barring illegal aliens from re-entering the U.S. for up to 10 years.

The manner in which the Bush administration initially attempted to ram this proposal through - by a stealth "cloaked" vote - was cravenly Clintonesque. But not a peep of complaint was heard from the Journal on that. Instead, the editorial board lambasted principled conservative critics of 245(i) such as Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-Colorado) for "scapegoating" Mexicans who "bus tables." Drop the Jesse Jackson imitation, guys. This isn't just about innocent Mexican bus boys. The amnesty would be extended to any law-breaking alien from any country who can hustle up an American employer or "spouse" and pay a good immigration lawyer to cook up an eligibility claim.

Section 245(i) is not a family values plan. It is a law-enforcement evasion plan.

The Journal says it doesn't want to overburden consular offices abroad. But what about the dangerous bureaucratic onslaught this program is causing here at home? As we have seen in the past, amnesty is an open invitation for marriage fraud, document fraud, endless litigation, and swamped adjudications offices. It is also a known loophole for terrorists. At least one al Qaeda-linked operative, convicted in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing plot, obtained amnesty through a program intended for farm workers. Who knows how many more are now lurking among us as amnestied American citizens?

The Journal editorial board and its ilk perpetuate a perilous myth -- that we can continue to reward "good" illegal immigrants streaming across the borders while keeping the "bad" illegal immigrants out. "There's always a chance that terrorist cells lie dormant among these folks," the Journal concedes. But even after the heinous murder of 3,000 people in its backyard at the hands of these sleepers who slipped through, the New York-based paper is far more concerned about not wanting to "upend the lives of Mexican nannies in San Diego."

This takes the cake. While the Wall Street Journal editors and their border-crashing allies remain obsessed with protecting illegal Mexican workers from the slightest inconvenience, the lives of countless American soldiers and their families across the country have been "upended" in the war on terror to ensure that we remain a safe and sovereign nation. Which side are our friends at the Journal on, anyway?

IV Q &A

V Opportunity for those that want more review to talk individually or in small groups with David

 **Friday April 29 Exam. 9:00-9:30 Pre exam Last minute Q&A. 9:30-12:30 Exam**

Assignment for Tuesday May 3. Class Session will review the exam answers, before class **Review Ch. 7, Read Ch. 8 to p.219 Submit Exercise 7.1 A6, A10; Exercise 7.2 #6,#8, #10; Exercise 7.3 A10; B6,B10; Exercise 7.4 A7, A10; B6 Extra Credit B8**