I. Administrative

A. Please let me know if you have any trouble with enrollment.

B. Books? Does everyone have a copy of the 9th edition?

C. Don’t forget the email assignment. (Review schedule.)

D. Questions?

II. General Introduction to Critical Thinking

A. The goal is to put you in a position to think for yourself.
   1. Autonomy/heteronomy distinction (Kant)
   2. This is a distinction in ethics, but it is really what this class is about: deciding how you want to live your life.
   3. There is a subject matter here, but the methods and procedures we employ are also important: they give you insight into a way of life that gives a certain prominence to criticism and to rationality
   4. The “BS Detector” deliverable…


III. The Nature of Arguments

A. Monty Python’s “Argument Clinic”:
   http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kQFKtI6gn9Y
B. **Definition:** “An argument is a connected series of sentences, statements, or propositions (called “premises”) that are intended to give reasons of some kind for a sentence, statement, or proposition (called the “conclusion”)” (p. 3).

1. Consider the elements of this definition: 
   *sentences/statements/propositions, premises, intention, reasons, conclusion.*

2. **Questions:**
   a. Must the elements of an argument be explicit?
   b. Must the elements of an argument be verbal (i.e., delivered in words)?
   c. Must arguments be vehicles of persuasion?

(CNN) When the U.S. Congress signed on to the elaborate Iranian nuclear deal oversight structure negotiated principally by Sens. Bob Corker (R-Tennessee), Robert Menendez (D-New Jersey) and Ben Cardin (D-Maryland), it turned its collective back on the Framers of the Constitution and their express direction that significant undertakings with foreign powers would be of no lasting, binding effect on future Congresses unless two-thirds of the then-sitting senators ratified the treaty proposed by a president.

Indeed, the Corker-Menendez-Cardin framework turned the Constitution on its head, in essence providing that any "neo-treaty" with Iran could be "quasi-ratified" by a mere 34 senators, barely more than one-third of one house of the Congress. A minority of senators have thus been empowered to not only give tacit approval to the deal but also to in effect alter the Constitution.

That the Iran "deal" -- desperately negotiated, improvidently agreed to and still quite likely concealed in key parts from the legislators being asked to vote it up and down -- is moving forward without a vocal bipartisan objection to having to vote without full disclosure is clear evidence of a disaster too awful in its particulars to allow full disclosure and debate.

The "self-inspection" provisions to which Iran has agreed with the IAEA concerning its military facility at Parchin are a very bad joke. And the supermajority opposition to the deal in the polls demonstrates that the public knows Iran shows zero signs of moderating its state support of terror, its mayhem-creating proxies in Syria, Lebanon, Yemen and around the globe, or even its most public "death to America and Israel" rhetoric at home.
C. Detail about the Main Elements

1. Reasons

   a. They come in all shapes and sizes
   b. They can be explicitly delivered or implicit in what is delivered
   c. They can have a variety of rhetorical roles, e.g., persuasion, illustration, illumination, reinforcement
   d. Different people often have different reasons for the same conclusion
   e. Reasons are connected somehow to the conclusion they support—they are related by intention in their production; they can be normatively related, or perhaps just descriptively related
   f. They can be served up in response to “Why?” questions, and also “How?” questions.

2. Conclusions

   a. Like reasons, they come in all shapes and sizes, can be explicit or implicit, and can play different rhetorical roles
   b. Different people can have different conclusions for the same reasons – consider a hot-button social issue, e.g., gay marriage
   c. Conclusions are connected to the premises that support them
   d. A given proposition can serve in one place as a reason and in another as a conclusion

IV. The Variety of Arguments

A. Explicitly propositional / Implicitly propositional

   1. The former are typically delivered verbally in language, with the propositions contributed by sentences or statements
2. But arguments don’t need to be delivered entirely verbally: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=axSnW-ygU5g

3. “Reading between the lines”: what is put forward and what is contextual

4. Question: Is there a common thread that binds these together?

B. Justificatory / Explanatory

1. Some arguments justify, which is to say that their reasons supply “normative justification” for their conclusions
   a. These can be personal or impersonal
   b. These can be persuasive, but need not be
   c. They can stand in different relationships to the intentions of the arguer
   d. They are often adduced to shore up a disputed claim by highlighting why one should believe it
   e. Question: are all justifications arguments?

2. Other arguments explain, which is to say that their reasons “make sense of things” (p. 7)
   a. They are typically intended to “remove bewilderment or surprise” (p. 8)
   b. These can be persuasive, but need not be
   c. These correspond to both “why” and “how” questions
   d. Question: are all explanations arguments?

3. Examples: think of a trial (e.g., the difference between proving guilt and establishing motive); think of a lecture or a speech