Lecture One: Homework

1.	few words as possible, give reasons for your answer.
2.	What is the difference between a theoretical judgement and a practical one?
3.	What is a normative discipline and why is such a discipline normative? Is ethics a normative discipline?
4.	Why is it essential to be rational in order to be irrational?
5.	Why is the 'Law of Least Effort' interesting to people who want students to engage in critical reasoning?
6.	What is the definition of 'argument'?
7.	Is 'If she can reach top A then she is a soprano' an argument YES/NO. Please give a reason for your answer

Lecture Three: Homework

- 1. Why is it important to analyse arguments?
- 2. Please analyse this argument and say whether it is inductive or deductive:

There were remarkable likenesses between Beethoven's facial features and those of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Samuel Taylor Coleridge was mixed race and, when in the segregated USA in 1907, he was refused admission to hotels in many American cities on the basis of this. Beethoven, therefore, was mixed race

3. Please analyse this argument, adding any supressed premises, and say whether it is inductive or deductive:

Beethoven's anniversary year was in 2020 was to be celebrated by many live performances of his work. But Beethoven's work is very well known and little would have been learned from such performances. If, instead, we imposed a moratorium on live performances of Beethoven's work, inviting unknown composers to write new pieces inspired by Beethoven we would learn far more. I believe that Beethoven's anniversary should be celebrated by commissioning nine new symphonies, five new piano concertos, 16 new string quartets and 32 sonatas from as diverse a range of composers as possible.

- 4. Are these arguments deductive or inductive (delete the appropriate letter)?
 - a. Killing is wrong. Therapeutic cloning involves killing. Therefore therapeutic cloning is wrong. I/D
 - b. Tom is a banker. Most bankers are rich. Therefore Tom is rich. I/D
 - c. All dogs are mortal. Lucy is mortal. Therefore Lucy is a dog. I/D
 - d. Sue and Tom lead similar lives but Sue smokes and Tom doesn't. Therefore Sue is more likely to die from heart disease than Tom. I/D
 - e. Every person with Huntington's Disease who has been examined, has had the HD gene on chromosome 4. Therefore everyone with HD has the HD gene on chromosome 4. I/D

Lecture Five: Homework

- 1. Why can't inductive arguments be systematised like deductive arguments?
- 2. There are lots of different types of inductive argument can you name three?
- 3. Evaluate these inductive generalisations:
 - a) Those on the third generation pill have a huge risk of a blood clot: taking the third generation pill doubles the risk.
 - b) About 1,755,637 square kilometers (677,855 square miles) of Greenland are covered in ice throughout the year, therefore Tasilaq (which is a city of 6,000 people in Greenland) is ice bound.
 - c) Met Office figures show that between 1997 to 2012 there was no discernible rise in global temperature. This means that human-induced climate change is a myth.
 - d) Nearly every time I have rung my bank I have been put on hold and forced to listen to irritating music for ages. I bet no-one ever gets through to their bank without this problem.
- 4. Explain what is wrong with the following causal generalisations:
 - a. Sleeping with your shoes on gives you headaches.
 - b. Zebra crossings cause accidents.
 - c. I must wear my lucky red jumper to the exam, it has always worked in the past.
 - d. Since the 1950s, the atmospheric CO2 level and the crime level have both increased sharply, maybe this correlation shows there is a causal relationship?

5. Evaluate this analogy:

- a) Leaders should run the economy as if they were running a household budget. After all the former, like the latter, directly affects the lives of individuals
- 6. Answer this question about this Argument from Authority:
 - a) In his book The Grand Design Stephen Hawking claims that philosophy is dead. Hawking is a great physicist....has Hawking given us reason to turn our backs on philosophy?

7. Evaluate this abduction:

a) My bank rang to say that my card has been 'cloned'. They asked for my security details. I asked if I could ring them back to check they were my bank and they said yes. I rang the number he gave me and the same chap answered immediately (it hardly even rang!). So it had to be the bank and I gave them my details.

Should there be other hypotheses in play?