

Title: 나의 정체성 : Argument

- ✓ **Instructor:** 박승배
- ✓ **Institution:** 울산과학기술대학교
- ✓ **Dictated:** 유영현, 김지은, 김현주, 신동규, 정희빈

[00:00]

If you want to say something, please use this microphone.

Ok, I'll put it over here

Ok, this is the first announcement that I wanted to make.

The other important announcement to make is that this Friday class is replaced with an on-line class.

I made relevant announcement on black board, right?

Just watch this video clip and find an answer to my question and submit your answer over here, 'Quiz and exam'

Then you'll be count as being present to the Friday's class.

So, don't come to TMB 112, physical class room.

Don't come to that class room this Friday.

Ok, any question about the announcements?

No question.

Ok, before we move on today's material, well let me check the attendance.

I want to memorize your names.

I guess it will take a few weeks to memorize all of your names.

But ultimately I will memorize all of your names.

Your name is not here? Oh what is your name?

I don't see your name here. I printed out this list yesterday.

(Student talking)

Today or yesterday? Oh you changed your sections today?

(Student talking)

Maybe my student list is not updated

Did you changed your name? No I guess.

Anyway I'm moving to todays material

Ok this is what we will do today

Last week, I briefly clarified the concept of argument, I explained what argument is

Today I'll say more about the argument

Second, we will go over several fallacies

Those are Ad Hominem, Straw man, Appeal to ignorance and Begging the Question

These are the fallacies that we often commit when we are engaged with debate.

And this course is a debate oriented course, I hope none of you commit these fallacies, when we have active discussions.

Ok, these are what we are up to today

Excited? I hope you're excited

Last week, I defined an argument as follows

An argument is a collection of statements some of which are intended as promises and one of which is intended as the conclusion

(For)example, All humans are mortal, Socrated is a human. Therefore Socrates is mortal

These 2 statements are promises and the last statement is the conclusion

A promise is a statement provided to support the conclusion

Promises, for this example, are the evidence

These 2 statements are the evidence for the conclusion

They are the reasons of thinking that conclusion is true

This example, the last statement is the conclusion and rest of them are the promises

The last statement, we must reject that penalty, is the conclusion and rest of them are the promises

Ok, that is what we discussed last week

Today I want to distinguish between argument and claim

Claim is the same thing as an assessment, position, view, an opinion.

So, I want to distinguish between argument and mere opinion

[05:00]

Let's compare 2 positions

Situation 1 and situation 2

Situation 1: A says The death penalty should be abolished

Abolish means getting rid of.

The death penalty should gotten rid of.

B says The death penalty should be retained.

Retain means maintain or keep... we should keep the penalty

Situation 2: A says The death penalty should be abolished because some innocent people are executed

Executed means put to death, killed

B says The death penalty should be retained.

Ok, tell me what the difference is between situation 1 and situation 2.

If you know the answer please raise your hand

Pick up the microphone and raise your hand

Whenever you say something I'm going to right down your name

And your performance will be reflected in your final grade.

Please say your name before expressing your opinion so that I can memorize your names.

I forgot your name, what is your name?

박명곤이요

Ok, 박명곤 go ahead

In case of situation 2, A claims his opinion based on an adequate promise

Good point

That's it?

In situation 2, A provided an adequate promise to justify his conclusion

Ok, that's good. Other comments?

Ok, whose position looks better in situation 2?

A's position looks better than B's position

And an A provided an argument whereas B provided merely a claim

He merely expressed his opinion, he stated his position, "This is my position."

And that's it. He did not attempted to justify his position

Now, in a situation like this, B, if he's a rational person, has to give up his position and accept A's position.

A provided an argument and B did not provided an argument, than B has to give up his position and follow A

That is what nice about an argument

A good argument has a persuasive power

If your opponent provides a good evidence, than you should be persuaded of his position if you are a rational person.

Ok, so we can say an argument is means to persuade others of your position

If your position is that the death penalty should be abolished and if you provide an argument than you can persuade others of your position.

Now in situation 1, A merely made a claim and B also merely made a claim, they merely made their positions

And they did not attempt to justify their positions

In a situation like this we cannot determine who we should follow

We don't know which position is reasonable or not

In other words we cannot adjudicate between the 2 rival positions

Ok let's move on to the next examples.

In situation 1, A says Continents move around

And B says Continents don't move around

Situation 2 A says Continents move around because the coastline of eastern South America is similar to that of western Africa

[10:00]

B: continents don't move around

Again in situation 2, A provided an argument

The coastline of South America is similar to that of western Africa, this is a premise

Continents don't move around, this is the conclusion

But B, did not provide an argument, he merely stated his opinion

Now, in situation 1. In a situation like this we cannot adjudicate between competing positions

These 2 positions compete each other and we cannot adjudicate between them

In other words we cannot determine which position is true and which position is false

Now suppose this argument is good

Continents move on because the coastline of eastern South America is similar to that of western Africa

Suppose this argument is good

Then the hypothesis that continents move around is likely to be true

A good argument shows that a particular claim or hypothesis is likely to be true

So, an argument is a means to discover truth.

One of the aims of science is to discover truth about the world

We want to know what the world looks like, what the physical universe looks like

And the way to discover truth about the world is to provide an argument

Moral. An argument is a means to adjudicate between the rival positions, it is a means to discover truths and it is a means to persuade others.

And this course, please try to present an argument, not merely a claim

There will be a lot of discussions in this course

Please try to present an argument, try to justify your position whatever it is

Later we will discuss the issue of the death penalty

You are welcome to justify whatever position you like

You may justify the position that the death penalty is wrong

You may justify the position that the death penalty is right

I don't care which position you'd take, as long as you are trying to provide a good argument, try to justify your position you will get a good grade.

I guess a lot of you are science majors

If you want to be a successful scientist than you would have to publish papers in associated journals and in a paper there should be an argument, a good argument.

If there's a merely a claim or hypothesis in your paper than editors of associated journals will not accept your paper

Also, suppose you are a prosecutors in court

Than you have to provide an argument to proof that the defendant is guilty

If you merely state your position that the defendatnt is guilty

,than the judge will set the defendant free

Your job as prosecutor is to provide an argument, to proof that the defendant is guilty

Okay

Before I move on to next topic, let me take a questions about argument.

Does anybody have a question about argument?

No question. Okay.

Then I move on to the next topic.

As I said earlier, we will go on several fallacies.

The first one was AD Hominem.

Before I define AD Hominem. Let's investigate this example.

Before that let me define what the fallacy is.

Fallacy is an error in reasoning or bad argument

We should avoid a fallacy when we are engaged in a debate.

[15:00]

By the way, this definition of fallacy is not a rigorous one.

It's not precisely definition of fallacy.

It is a rough definition of fallacy

It's extremely difficult to precisely define fallacy

Okay. Let's think about this example.

Plato argued that mathematical objects like circles and triangles are more real than physical objects like cups and trees.

B: His theory is repugnant because he was a homosexual.

Repugnant means disgusting. Objectionable, Disagreeable

I reject Plato's theory because he was homosexual.

Is B's response to A be a good or bad?

Bad, raise your hand

Good, raise your hand

Nobody raise his hand. Okay.

Second example.

Einstein says, space-time is curved near a massive object. After all light bends near the sun.

Nazi says I reject your theory because you are a Jew.

Is the Nazi's response to Einstein is adequate or inadequate?

Another example.

A: I believe that heat is molecular motion because if two pieces of cold metal are rubbed at high speed, they get hot.

B: Your theory is objectionable because you have the greed to achieve fame with your new theory. You have the selfish motive so I reject you. Your theory is false.

Is this response to a proper or improper?

Improper.

Then what is wrong with B' response to A in this example?

What is wrong with this kinds of criticism?

Raise your hands

They said there are premise and he extracted premise to conclusion.

But B didn't attack A's premise if B wants to attack A's conclusion, he must attack A's premise first.

Okay. That's quite precise.

But you are on the right track.

As a stance, B didn't present a premise for his position that mathematical, objection, he nearly stated his position. He didn't provide an argument.

Anyway, I guess you are on the right track.

B didn't attack play roles, positions, rather he attacked player. The human-being.

He attacked the human being, not human beings' idea.

Okay. Other comments?

Let's move on to second example.

Space time is curved near a massive object. After all, all lights bends near massive object.

We have an argument.

Which statement is premise and which statement is conclusion?

Space time is curved near the massive object. That is premise.

[20:00]

After all, light bends near the sun that is the conclusion.

Does anybody have different thoughts?

I think no matter what is Einstein's conclusion, the nazi decide Einstein is a Jew.

So it is improper

Okay. The fact that Einstein is a Jew is not relevant to whether Einstein's theory is true or false.

I guess you have what have in mind.

Good. Now, we have an argument here.

Which statement is conclusion and which statement is premise?

Please hand the microphone.

Because we can observe only light bends so Einstein observes light bends and he concludes the space time is curved near the massive so the first sentence is conclusion, I think.

This is the conclusion. Space-time is curved near a massive object.

Then light bends near the sun. This is premise.

After all, english expression, means because. Right?

Computer is not working very well.

We'll take some time.

Space time is curved near a massive object. Because light bends near the sun.

So this is the premise and this is the conclusion.

We have the argument.

Nazi responded by saying I reject your theory because you are a Jew.

Okay. In effect, nazi attacked not the theory but Einstein.

The author of theory or relativity.

Does anybody disagree with what I just said?

In this example, also B attacked not the theory of heat and argument for it but the author of the theory he attacked human being not the argument.

All these 3 examples involve a fallacy of Ad Hominem.

Ad Hominem is Latin, not English.

In plain English, Ad hominem means person attack.

Ad means 'to' go to school, that to. Preposition to. Hominem means human.

So 'to human'.

Ad hominem occurs when an attack is directed not at an argument but at an arguer who put forward argument.

Okay. Does anybody have an idea what would be the proper response to ad hominem?

Suppose your opponent commits Ad Hominem in intellectual discussion, in intellectual conversation.

[25:00]

What would you do?

What would be the proper response to a person who commits ad hominem?

How would you refute ad hominem?

Think about this example.

Einstein: Space-time is curved near a massive object.

Your theory is false because you are a Jew.

Suppose you are in Einstein's situation, Einstein's position, what would you suppose to say to Nazi?

I would you say, wow you are right I give up my theory.

Please hand over the microphone.

If I would say that you are wrong because you don't have any evidence about my theory.

So I would say like that, I have, observe many experiments and I did many experiments, and according to this I say this conclusion and you don't have any evidence about my theory so you are wrong, I would say like that..

Okay. Perfect.

The theory relative is justified by good evidence.

So I'll stick to my theory.

Other comments?

What if Einstein says to Nazi, I reject your response to my theory because you are Nazi?

Einstein can play same game against Nazi.

That's a fair game, I guess.

Okay. That is not quite nice response to Nazi.

Nice response to Nazi is to point out that morally bad person might have a true belief.

For example, a serial killer, 유명철 is notorious serial killer in this country, a serial killer may believe that the Earth is round.

And his belief is true.

horrily bad person may have a true belief

so even if we grant for the sake of an argument 아인슈타인 is a bad person

plato is a bad person and so on

their positions might be true, right?

even if I have the selfish motive to become famous, my theory may be true

it is one thing that a scientist has selfish motive it is another that his theory is false

in other words, from the fact that a scientist has s selfish motive

it does not follow that his theory is false

I guess this is a probable response at harmful

nice response to add harmful

?

I reflect your theory because you also have the selfish motive from famous and so on

okay, moral

we should separate an idea from a person in an intellectual debate.

it is legitimate to criticize an idea, but not a person

and this course separate idea from the person who initiated the idea

you are allowed to attack the idea but not the person, the author of the idea

okay, I hope none of you ask a personal question during the course of a debate

[30:00]

because asking a personal question runs the risk of committing at harmful

you are taking a first step toward at harmful if you are asking a personal question when we have a debate

not let me give you an example

I guess you guys know who 김부선 is

김부선 is a famous actress in this country

she advocates the legalization of 마리화나 in this country, a kind of drug, right?

legalization of drugs is a big issue and

many respectable and decent people claimed at their states that some forms of drugs , soft drugs should be illegalized

okay and suppose we have a debate on legalize drugs or not in this course

student asks, another student asks 'have you ever done drugs before?'

asking that kind of personal question runs the risk of committing at harmful

so don't ask a personal question

okay, before I move on to the next fallacy, I like to take a question about at harmful.

no question? Okay

let's think about this example.

jill : "we should clean out the closets. They are getting a bit messy."

Bill : "Why? We went through those closets last year. Do we have to clean them out everyday?"

Jill : "I never said anything about cleaning them out everyday"

Bill's response to Jill is not appropriate in this context, right?

He committed a certain fallacy I'll give you the name of the fallacy later, anyway

let's move on to the second example

species, darwin says, species have evolved by natural selection. All terrestrial organisms have descended from a common ancestor

Critic says your theory is false because humans have not evolved from monkeys

also, the critic's response to darwin is inappropriate

He committed a certain fallacy

okay, let's think about this example

what do you think wrong with bill's response to jill?

what's wrong with bill's position?

jill said the closets are getting messy

but bill response,, attack . . . We clean them out everyday

that after all, I mean bill said another premise

okay claim

how his that claim, another claim related to jill's position?

do they coincide each other or there is a gap between the two?

okay, other comments?

what is wrong with bill's response to jill?

did bill correctly understand jill's position?

no. bill misunderstood jill's position

and then criticized him

so there is a gap between jill's position and what bill takes to be jill's position

right? Jill, in other words, jill did not say that they should clean out the closets everyday

but bill claims that jill said that they should clean out the closets everyday

[35:00]

bill distorted jill's position. Exaggerated jill's position and then attacked the misrepresented sentence of jill's position

also, this example, the critic misunderstood darwin's position

and then criticized him

darwin never said that humans have evolved from monkeys

he rather said that humans and monkeys have evolved from the same ancestor

and the ancestor is different from humans, the ancestor is different from monkeys

okay, the ancestor is a different species

okay, all these examples involve the fallacy called straw man

the fallacy of straw man occurs when we attribute a problematic claim to a person which he did not make

in the first example, bill attributed a problematic claim to jill.

the problematic claim in that case is that they should clean out the closets everyday

and jill did not say that they should clean out the closets everyday

we distorted, exaggerated, stretched, or misunderstood our opponent's position and then

criticized

we attacked not a real man but a straw man

okay does anybody know what a straw man is ?

where can you see a straw man?

what does it do? What does it look like?

<student saying>

protect farm, okay, a straw man protects crops from birds like sparrows

farmers erect a straw man on the field a straw man scares the birds away, right?

a straw man looks like a human being but not a human being

a straw man is made out of straw, not flesh

okay, uh, which is easier to attack

straw man or real man? Straw man it is easy to destroy straw man

but it is not easy to beat a real man because if you try to beat a real man

he or she will fight back against you, right?

there is a gap between jill's real position and what bill takes to be jill's position

it is easy to attack what bill takes to be jill's position but it is not easy to attack jill's real position

so if you distort somebody's position and attack it, you commit the fallacy of straw man

people often commit straw man when they are angry

if people are angry, they are prone to distort their opponent's positions and criticized that

okay, when you commit straw man you only wasted your time

because your opponent would say well, I didn't say that?

[40:00]

why would I say just different claim? I'm smarter than you think I will not make an unreasonable claim. I'm a rational human being

I make a reasonable human being so I only make a dispensable claim I don't make a foolish claim

okay, so try not to commit straw man

now, why should we do to avoid straw man?

we should analyze our opponent's position "correctly" and "carefully" before criticizing it.

analyze means understand. We should understand our opponent's position correctly before criticizing it

that is the idea, understanding comes before criticizing

everybody loves criticizing his opponent's

but try to understand before you criticize him or her , that's the idea

okay, if our opponent's position is not clear, we should ask for a clarification

questions like "what do you mean by this, what do you mean by that, please explain. Please clarify what you have in mind

ask that kind of questions to your opponents before criticizing his position

always assume our opponents are more reasonable and intelligent than we think

If you have this kind of attitude, then you will not commit straw man

Let me take questions about the strawman.

OK. No questions.

Let's consider these examples.

There is no evidence that God does not exist.

Therefore, God exists.

We don't know whether God exists or not.

Therefore, I'll believe that God exists.

Another example: There is no evidence that you are not a communist.

Therefore, you are a communist.

Is this argument good or bad?

Bad. This argument is bad.

It involves a certain fallacy to be defined later.

OK. Does anybody have a thought about this example?

What is wrong with this argument?

Park Myeong-gon.

I think it's an extreme attitude because, that's right, there is no evidence that you are not a communist,

but there is no evidence that you are a communist.

There is no evidence either that you are a communist.

OK. Good.

So there is no evidence that you are a communist.

There is no evidence that you are not a communist.

In such a situation, what should we do?

Should we conclude that you are a communist?

Or should we conclude that you are not a communist?

No, we should not draw any conclusion. Right?

We should suspend our judgment.

We should withhold our judgment.

Don't make any judgment at all.

That's what we should do.

If you jump to a conclusion after you state that there is no evidence, then you commit a fallacy called "appeal to ignorance."

You are appealing to ignorance to draw a certain conclusion.

We don't know.

Ignorance means having no information, having no evidence, or having no knowledge.

After you stated that there is no evidence, you jump to a conclusion.

Then you commit this fallacy, appeal to ignorance.

The premise: In appeal to ignorance, the premise states that there is no evidence, or we don't know,

[45:00]

but the conclusion makes a definite claim.

In this example, the premise states that there is no evidence,
but the conclusion is drawn from this premise.

There is no evidence that you are not a communist.

OK. Also in this example, the premise states that there is no evidence,
but the conclusion makes a definite claim.

The conclusion makes a claim one way or the other.

So the argument is an appeal to ignorance.

Also in this example, the premise states that there is no evidence, or we don't know that it
exists or not,

but the conclusion makes a definite claim, one way or the other.

So the argument is an appeal to ignorance.

Is the concept of appeal to ignorance clear? OK.

Suppose, in an intellectual discussion, your opponent is appealing to ignorance.

Now, what would be an adequate response to your opponent?

Suppose, your opponent says, we will discuss the issue of the death penalty.

Somebody says, we don't know whether the death penalty is right or wrong.

Therefore, we should get rid of the death penalty.

What would you say?

Wow, you are right. Your arms are thick.

Would you say that to him or her?

Park Myeong-gon.

The microphone. Use them.

OK. Suppose somebody says, we don't know whether the death penalty is right or wrong.

Therefore, we should get rid of the death penalty.

We have an argument.

The premise says, we don't know whether the death penalty is right or wrong.

Conclusion: We should get rid of the death penalty.

If retaining the death penalty is right, it's adequate that we maintain that law, but in this state, we didn't decide whether the law was right or not.

I think the condition we get rid of the law is "the law is not right", but the evidence is never related to that conclusion.

OK. In order to get rid of the death penalty, it should be proven that the death penalty is wrong.

OK. Good.

Other comments?

I guess a proper response to an appeal to ignorance is to point out that nothing follows from our ignorance.

If we don't have information, then we should withhold our judgments.

We should be silent.

We should not draw a conclusion.

If you stated that there is no evidence, you should suspend your judgment.

As opposed to making a judgment one way or the other.

Be skeptical, in other words.

Be skeptical if you don't have information.

If you don't have evidence, or if you have stated that there is no evidence, then the proper thing to do is to be silent or to say "I don't know."

Moral: A person who believes something bears the burden of proof.

What do I mean by this?

Suppose you are a prosecutor in the court, and you believe that the defendant is guilty.

You accuse him as guilty. He committed a crime.

[50:00]

If you believe so as a prosecutor, then you have the burden to prove that the defendant is guilty.

You cannot ask the lawyer to prove otherwise.

You cannot ask the lawyer to prove that the defendant is innocent.

If you believe that the defendant is guilty, you have to prove that the defendant committed a crime.

We will believe that the defendant is guilty until the lawyer, you, prove that the defendant is innocent.

This is a bad attitude.

Not a good attitude because you appeal to ignorance.

We don't know whether the defendant is guilty or not.

Therefore, I believe that the defendant is guilty.

You made an appeal to ignorance.

Also, theists.

Suppose a theist says, "I'll believe that God exists until you prove that God does not exist."

I'll believe that God exists until you prove that God does not exist.

If you have that kind of an attitude, then you are appealing to ignorance.

You are admitting that you don't have evidence that God does not exist.

Despite that, you are believing that God exists.

If you do so, then you made an appeal to ignorance.

You implicitly stated that there is no evidence that God exists, and you believed that God exists.

OK. Any question about the appeal to ignorance?

Let's do some exercises.

See if this is an appeal to ignorance or not.

There are hostile aliens.

Therefore, we should be prepared for an attack by the aliens.

Is this argument an appeal to ignorance or not?

This is a controversial claim.

There are hostile aliens.

This is a controversial claim.

There is no sufficient evidence for the premise.

This is a debatable claim.

There is... OK.

Is this argument an appeal to ignorance or not?

[Student speaking]

This is an appeal to ignorance?

[Student speaking]

OK.

There is no good evidence that the aliens will attack us.

OK. Other comments?

OK. Let's go back to the definition of the appeal to ignorance.

A premise states that there is no evidence, or that we don't know, but the conclusion makes a definite claim.

The premise states that there is no evidence.

Does the premise state here that there is no evidence or we don't know?

The answer is no.

So this is not an appeal to ignorance.

Of course, this premise is merely an assumption.

There is no evidence for the premise.

Even so, this is not an appeal to ignorance, because the argument is not appealing to ignorance.

The premise does not say that there is no evidence or we don't know.

You see, in this argument, the premise states there is no evidence.

We don't know.

But in this example, the premise does not say that there is no evidence.

So this is not an appeal to ignorance.

Another exercise.

God exists. Therefore, we should go to church.

There is no good evidence for the premise.

This is a controversial claim.

Some people agree to it.

Other people disagree to it.

Is this argument an appeal to ignorance or not?

No. The answer is no.

This is not an appeal to ignorance.

[55:00]

We can only say about this argument that the premise is not justified, that's all I can say, we can say.

Okay, is the concept of an appeal ignorance clear?

Okay, before I move on to the next fallacy let me take questions.

No question? Uh, your name please.

Okay. Let's think about this example.

Uh, Theist. Theist is a person who believes God exists.

Athiest is a person who believes God does not exist.

Theist says "Whatever the bible says is true."

Athiest "Why do you think so?"

Theist "Because the bible says whatever it says is true."

Stupid. Okay, Another example.

So forth, 2 thieves stole 3 gold rings and one of them takes 2 gold rings and the other thief is angry and says "Why do you take 2 gold rings?"

Because I am your boss.

But why are you my boss?

Because I have 2 gold rings.

Okay, another example.

How can he afford that nice car?

Because he is rich.

Well, Why is he rich?

Because he can afford that nice car.

Okay, whatever the bible says is true, why? Because the bible says whatever it says is true.

Many people endorse, are attracted to this argument.

Anyway, Let's think about this example.

Why do you take 2 gold rings? Because I am your boss. But why are you my boss? Because I have 2 gold rings.

What is wrong with Thief 2's response to Thief 1?

Your name, name please. 황재휘

They repeat their evidence to support their words so they think that their premise and conclusion is same thing.

Excellent, Okay.

Thief 2 is repeating the same claim. Premise and conclusion are actually the same claim. Okay, I like that comment.

Other comments? Now how about this example?

Women shouldn't fight bulls because a bullfighter should be a man.

Looks like we have an argument, right? Because bullfighter should be a man.

Is this a premise? Women shouldn't fight bulls.

This is conclusion. Do you like this argument or bad, uh, do you reject this argument?

Good or bad?

Bad. Why bad?

As 황재휘 said, the premise and the conclusion are the same claim.

So the author of this argument is repeating the same point, P because P.

P, why P? Because P.

Okay. All these examples involve the fallacy called "Begging the Question".

Begging the question is sometimes called settler argument.

Why P? Because Q. Why Q? Because P.

I take 2 gold rings, because I am your boss.

[60:00]

Why am I your boss? Because I have 2 gold rings slicing I have 2 gold rings because I have 2 gold rings.

P, why P? Because P, repeating the same point, right?

Okay, to beg the question is to assume that the truth of the claim disputes in attempt to prove it.

Here in this example, P is a claim in dispute, is a controversial claim.

Some people agree to it, other people disagree to it.

And in an attempt to prove that P is true, the author of this argument assumed that P is true.

Provided P to justify a P.

Okay. Also in this example, okay, I will move on.

I guess I don't have to look at the same point.

In real life, however, the circle is so large that the circularity may go unnoticed.

Why P? Because Q. Why Q? Because R, Why R? Because S, Why S? Because P.

Now, if you go back to P, you are saying P because P.

So you should not go back to P.

But even great thinkers, even professors, scientists sometimes commit begging the question.

Moral. Don't take for granted the point under dispute.

Instead, try to justify it with a different claim.

If you do this, then you will not commit the fallacy of begging the question.

Okay, any question about begging the question? Ah okay.

Your name was, I forgot, 이수진.

Yeah, my name is 이수진.

Go ahead.

In large circle, if I can prove that P is Q, and P is right. If P is right then the large circle is true?

That it is true that large circle is true?

Uh, suppose you have a good evidence for Q.

Q is not a controversial claim, and this is true.

Then, your argument is good.

Your argument, you did not commit begging the question.

After all Q justifies P.

But suppose, your opponents take issue with Q.

Why Q? I don't agree with Q.

Then, you have to provide another piece of evidence to justify Q.

You have to provide R.

Hopefully your opponents agree to R.

Then the discussion ends right there, you won the debate.

But, uh, but there might be die-hard critics and they disagree to R.

Then you have to provide S and the point is you don't have to go back to P.

If you go back to P and you are begging the question and your argument is bad.

Your position does not look good.

Okay. Other questions?

김건희 is a student from another section and he raised an interesting question, in the end of the class, yesterday.

Why should we avoid fallacies?

And I said we should avoid fallacies and he is taking issue with my position.

He is trying to, He's challenging my position.

Why should we avoid fallacies?

People commit fallacies all the time in our real life.

Look at what politicians do, they commit at harmony all the time.

They launch a personal attack on their political opponents and perhaps there is an effective means to shoot your political opponents down.

Why should we avoid fallacies?

Another example like Kim Jong-il. Kim Jong-il, the North Korean leader commits, may commit fallacies and may have committed fallacies and he is still in power.

[65:00]

So why should avoid fallacies?

That was 김건희's question and that was an interesting question to me.

How would you respond to 김건희?

Would you say, "Ah, 김건희, your arms are thick, yeah, you are right.".

What would you say to him?

박명곤.

In our real life, we often have to persuade someone. It's the life.

But if we, if we continuously say the fallacies, anyone can't believe me.

Okay, But we have to say some claims based on educated evidences, logically.

First, I have a question.

Okay, this is 박명곤's one.

You will become famous 박명곤.

I like the your response for 김건희.

If you commit fallacies often in your real life, you will be asked to reside from others, yeah.

Others will shun you. You will be isolated from others.

Nobody will trust you. Okay.

You have a question? Go ahead.

Ah, why did 김건희? I don't know.

I don't know why he asked this question, I thought that this question is interesting.

Other response to 김건희?

I don't have a good reponse to 김건희. All I can say is as long as you are in this course, please don't commit these fallacies that would be went over today.

When you are in this course, when you are writing a paper or when you are in the classroom, please don't commit the fallacies and it is up to you whether you commit those fallacies or not outside of this course.

I live that issue, entirely to you, okay.

I guess uh, if you want to become a successful scientist and you will have to publish papers and if you commit fallacies in your paper then your paper will not be accepted, will not be published.

Okay, any question about what we discussed today before we call it a day?

Okay, then this is all I've got for today's class. I hope you have a great lunch.