

Session 23 (12-5-17)

Previous file lost

Expected topics for ITP: Logic, fallacies, damning evidence, implicit premises

With deductive reasoning, we deduce from the premises that the conclusion should be believed.

Fogelin, Ch. 8: Inductive Reasoning: may generalize from observations to an entire population of something

Strength of deductive VS. inductive arguments

Generalizations based on a sample of the population

Crucial assumption: the world will remain basically as it is in the present moment

Practice Quiz 4: High scores will receive a fabulous prize (please don't share with your neighbor this time, but it's still "open book"/open notes)

Fri. session: Review game

Session 24 (12-8-17): Final Review Game

Return & Correct/Discuss Practice Quiz 4 (Hi= 28, Lo= 5)

Invitation to Persepolis screening tonight at 7pm

Lunch Party 10am?

If you have time before the ITP, start revising Assignment 1 (Editorial Assessment) using the tools gained in this course (at least try putting the author's argument into the standard format.)

REVIEW GAME: Divide into 10 teams

GAME CATEGORIES: 1. Give an example, contradictions; 2. Valid or Invalid?; 3. Rhyme Battle Royale; 4. Loophole, Exception, or Neither?; 5. Guess the Word (Vocabulary Game); 6. Provide a Loophole; (6.5

Optional Word Scramble); 7. Group Answer; 8. Dictation (5vs.5, may be done while other teams are doing 5. "Guess the Word")

Prizes for top 3 teams: CD, Mix CD, English Song Video CD, U.S. quarter, or candy

RUNIN Fall 2017, Critical Thinking, Prof. Buechner. ASSIGNMENT 1:
Critical Analysis of an Editorial

For this assignment, find an editorial, *not* a news article, which is fairly long and detailed, in English, and not from a source published in the PRC. This assignment may work better if you find an editorial whose main idea(s) you disagree with. The list below suggests several sources to search from across the political spectrum.

Once you've found an interesting editorial, write a 4-page paper including two pages of critical evaluation (i.e. what are the strongest and weakest points in it, do you agree or disagree overall, and why?) and two pages explaining the methods you used in making the critical evaluation (i.e. how did you come to your critical conclusions?).

Note that you do not need to have any special critical thinking skills to do this assignment, and you will get a 100-point, perfect score just for completing it. Its purpose is to serve as a benchmark for work you do throughout the semester, to show how and whether your thoughts and analytical skills change and improve.

In December, we will return to this editorial, write a new critical evaluation of it, and compare the two versions. So, again, make sure the editorial is interesting enough to you that you'll want to read it carefully, many times! If it's too short or too simple, you won't have very much to analyze, but if its details are too minute and esoteric, you might lose interest (and we won't enjoy reading your work as much either!).

REQUIREMENTS: (SEE ABOVE) Also, somewhere in your analysis, give the author's name and the date it was written. Include a link to the editorial and a bibliographic entry for it, as if it were in a research paper. If you use any outside sources in your analysis, cite them as well.

This assignment will be due in our next session of class on Tues., Sept. 12th, 2017.

Recommended websites/publications with editorials not requiring a VPN:

Al Jazeera (www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/)

The Atlantic (www.theatlantic.com)

Common Dreams (www.commondreams.org) (See “Views” section on right side of page)

MoveOn.org (www.moveon.org)

The National Review (www.nationalreview.com)

The Washington Post (www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/)

Washington Times (www.washingtontimes.com/opinion/)

Taipei Times (www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials)

Recommended websites/publications with editorials requiring a VPN:

The Economist (www.economist.com)

New York Times (www.nytimes.com)

Wall Street Journal (www.wsj.com)

The Weekly Standard (www.weeklystandard.com)

(and many more! If you find an editorial in another source not listed here, great! But you may want to have us check to make sure it works for the assignment.)

Grading explanation for Assignment 1 (Editorial)

All requirements met = 100

Missing elements from "REQUIREMENTS" resulted in point deductions. (I.E. Link only to source or no link at all, no author or date, insufficient or no methods section. Bibliographic entry/Works Cited section)

Choosing a descriptive news article rather than a persuasive editorial resulted in a point deduction.

Revision of Editorial Assignment... (Due Mon., Jan. 1st) Include a printed copy of the editorial when you turn in your analysis.

Read & reread the editorial several times until you can isolate the author's main argument. How is it structured?

Diagram the argument, using the notation given in class/in the textbook (especially BPs, NBPs, circled Subarguments, OC, using + ↓).

Consider loopholes (for each sub-argument). Describe one of them. Don't worry about the truth of the premises or confuse such disputes with actual loopholes.

More requirements TBA (to be announced). The revision should contain all the elements outlined in the instructions for Assignment 1 (Critical Analysis of an Editorial) plus the additional requirements listed above.

Julian has returned Assignment 1...if you haven't collected it, see him ASAP! Fri. Session (29th): Rm 100 in RUNIN bldg. (not in FL bldg.)
Return to FL bldg. Sat.

12-26

The meaning of "is": identity VS. "having the property of..."

"The Magical Wine" Puzzle: When is the optimal time to drink it?

What is the level of support (on the scale from 0 to 1) for the "Humans are not cel phones" argument?

Damning Evidence: fact(s) which completely undermines an arg.

Necessary VS. Sufficient Conditions

Correlations & Pseudo-Correlations (Pseudo-Sufficient Conditions)

Is a person in a coma (with a living brain/living body, but non-functional brain) still a person? Is a fetus a person?

What is it to be "Chinese"? Are there necessary & sufficient conditions?

For such conditions, defining a concept, look in a dictionary!

*Living in China for a certain # of years? No! *Genetics ("*jus sanguinis*")? No! *Food? No! *Everybody* loves Chinese food!

*Birth ("*jus soli*") No! *Beliefs (i.e. "I believe I am Chinese.")?

*ID Card? (What about stolen & fake cards?) = sufficient but not necessary? Still not sufficient: i.e. able to ascertain/prove but feeling insufficient as in empty or superficial?

Loophole "Gristle/Toothbrushing" Exercise Results: Hi= 31, 30. Low= 7-12

Paradox VS. Contradiction. Given a paradox, we can reach a contradiction. Paradoxes yield contradictions.

Examples of Paradoxes: "I will like all and only those people who do not like themselves." If restricted to 3 people...

"This sentence is false." "Not all of my beliefs are true. (If all of my other beliefs *are* true)"

If A, then not A. If not A, then A.

A "theory of truth" would have to deal with these paradoxes.

Is there another number than zero which functions like zero ($n+0=n$)? We don't think so, but how could we prove it?

"Monster" proof: 14-3 exercises #15 solved by Vivian, Frank very close

Wed.-Sat.: Logic Textbook Assignment= Ch. 1 & 2.

Sat.: First Order Logic (“piggybacking” on top of sentence logic) 7pm in Julian’s apartment: Choice of three top movies of 2017: “Baby Driver,” “A Ghost Story,” or “Mother!”

Sun.: Weakening & Strengthening actual arguments: When conclusions are too specific, how to present arguments to “laymen” who haven’t taken this course.

Weakening & Strengthening arguments: your support *cannot* be reduced by strengthening premises or weakening the conclusion. Adding information to conclusions, by contrast, opens them up to loopholes.

Do “as much as you can” to find information to put in the premises. However, the search for relevant information cannot be infinite (i.e. the “Magic Wine” Puzzle).

Fallacies of reasoning.

Mon. (8am!): Happy new year! Collect “Critical Analysis of an Editorial” revisions: Turn in to Prof. Buechner personally. Team Challenges: SCM argument & comments on editorial revisions

Watch your email inbox for this file, Prof. Buechner’s Quiz 3 on fallacies of reasoning, and others.

Develop an argument (a “product” written on paper!) in 60 min.: Imagine you are working as the executive supply chain manager at a corporation. The corporation produces goods from inputs from various sources. Should the company continue to contract out to a vendor for this part? One group will argue that it should be produced in-house (creating new staff for a new department & facilities within the company), not to renew the contract to have another manufacturer supply the part. The other group will argue that the contract should be renewed, paying another company to supply the essential part.

You may imagine your own corporation and what it produces.

In your teams, find loopholes for the opposing team’s argument.