

Student Name

Response Paper 1. Part 1.

The Philosopher Credo asserts: Logic, and its applications have accomplished more than any single intellectual tool for the advancement of human knowledge *and* well-being, hence it deserves a place in all High School Curriculums as a *mandatory* subject, and should be the basis for all decisions, not only in regards to scientific knowledge and gaining insights to nature, but as the source for moral decisions and religious ones as well! Those who argue contrary to this view are people of little or no education - probably because they believe education is evil or they always got bad grades, which is an indication that they are stupid, hence their views can be safely ignored.

Let us suppose that the premises which support Credo's argument are indeed true, in other words that logic and its applications have accomplished more than any single intellectual tool for the advancement of human knowledge and well-being. I will argue that even if these premises are true, it does not mean that it should necessarily be taught in all high school Curriculums as a mandatory subject nor that it should be the basis for both moral decisions and religious ones as well. Credo's argument is invalid, and I will state some real possibilities that might occur that would make his conclusion false.

First, it could be that Logic requires a more mature student than what is found in the typical High school. If that is the case, it would be a better idea to teach Logic in college. Even if high school students are ready for logic, it may be that it should be just part of a Math class or even Writing course, rather than a course all on its own. Also it does not follow that logic should be the basis for moral decisions and religious ones as well – especially if Credo means to say it should be the *only* factor in making those decision. For example, suppose you marry someone of a different faith, and the question finally comes to head as to which faith the children will be raised. Suppose that logically it makes more sense to raise them in your husband's faith, since the church is closer, there are more educational and social opportunities for the children their and your husband's parents are still alive, but your own parent's have passed away. But, in spite of all of these logical reasons, you just feel, given your children's personalities, that they will be more happy in your church. Surely, this "emotional" insight should be taken into consideration – even though it is not logical.

Finally, the last part of Credo's argument is just an *ad hominem* fallacy, and does not support or weaken the argument's conclusion, but rather, if anything, raises the question of Credo's knowledge of logical fallacies and reasoning abilities.

Student Name/date/time sent/

INSTRUCTOR NOTES: The above is just one of many possible answers. Please follow your own thoughts and reasoning when composing your response. However, let us go through the grading rubrics so I can point out how the above complies with those rubrics.

Rubrics:

Part 1 responses will be graded on the following criteria:

Paper shows clearly in writing that the author has read and considered Credo's argument and considered arguments both for and against Credo's position (remember, I can't judge what you have considered if you do not put it down in writing, Philosophy instructors are not mind readers!)

The given response shows this by clearly explaining why the author disagrees with part of what Credo states. Notice the author does not say Credo is all wrong, but rather there are possibilities, if true, which might weaken Credo's argument, hence suggesting that Credo has argued for a stronger conclusion than warranted.

Your response shows a good-faith attempt to incorporate vocabulary, terms and concepts learned in class.

In class and the assigned reading we learned what an argument is, what premises are, and how to detect the conclusion of an argument. This is shown by the way the author analyzed the argument. We also learned about valid (a.k.a. deductive) arguments and also invalid arguments. In this case, the author of the response focused on this point by noting that even if all the premises to Credo's argument were true, the conclusion could still be false – the author correctly used the adjective "invalid" to refer to the nature of Credo's argument.

Your response is proof read, checked for grammar and spelling errors, and not hastily written at the last moment.

I have purposely left spelling errors, punctuation errors and at least one word which is commonly misused along with other errors in the above, (check, "there" versus "their", "persons" versus "person's", and when to capitalize academic subjects). Make sure your paper does not have any of these common errors!