

PHIL 101: Logic and critical thinking

Dennis Earl (dearl@coastal.edu)
January 21, 2009

First, quiz #1... (and today is the 21th of January)

True or false?

1. Metaphysics is the study of the nature of knowledge.
2. "The number 63 is just an idea" is a metaphysical claim.
3. "Knowledge is impossible" is an epistemological claim.
4. Clarifying a claim is just to state the meaning of that claim.
5. An argument is the same thing as a piece of reasoning's conclusion.

Two central tasks in doing philosophy: Clarification and justification

Clarification

Question: What is it to clarify a claim?

Answer: It's just to make that claim's meaning clear.

Two central tasks in doing philosophy: Clarification and justification

Some examples: For these, what does he/she mean by that?

"The unexamined life is not worth living"—Socrates

"All humans by nature desire to know"—Aristotle

"Money can't buy happiness"

"God is love"

"Studying philosophy is valuable"

Justification

Question: What is it to justify a claim?

Answer: It's to give a reason in favor of the truth of that claim.

Another question: But what does that mean?

Answer: It's to give an argument in favor of that claim.

Arguments

An **argument** is a set of premises intended to support, or justify, a conclusion.

Every argument makes two basic claims:

- (1) A **factual claim**—that the premises are true, as well as the conclusion
- (2) An **inferential claim**—that the premises support the conclusion

Example #1

- (1) It is wrong to kill a person.
- (2) A human fetus is a person.
- (3) An abortion is an act of killing a fetus.

- (4) Abortion is wrong.

Example #2

- (1) Knowledge requires certainty.
- (2) It's impossible to be certain of anything.

- (3) No one knows anything.

Example #3

- (1) God is just.
- (2) Justice is blind.
- (3) Ray Charles is blind.

- (4) Ray Charles is God.

Types of arguments: Deductive and inductive

In a **deductive** argument, the premises are claimed to guarantee that the conclusion is true.

In an **inductive** argument, the premises are claimed to support, but not guarantee, that the conclusion is true.

Question: Which is deductive, and which is inductive?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| (1) Smoking causes cancer. | (1) Everyone who smokes will get cancer. |
| (2) Dr. Earl smokes. | (2) Dr. Earl smokes. |
| (3) Dr. Earl will get cancer. | (3) Dr. Earl will get cancer. |

Valid vs. invalid arguments

A **valid argument** is an argument where the truth of the premises would guarantee that the conclusion is true too.

An **invalid argument** is an argument where the truth of the premises wouldn't guarantee that the conclusion is true too.

Valid vs. invalid arguments

Is this argument valid or invalid?

- (1) South Carolina is a state.
- (2) Obama is President.
- (3) Dinosaurs are extinct.

Valid vs. invalid arguments

Another one: Is this argument valid or invalid?

- (1) Everyone who smokes will get cancer.
- (2) Dr. Earl has cancer.
- (3) Dr. Earl smokes.

What we're doing next time: Plato's *Apology*

Reading: Plato, *Apology*