

Example of first argument critical thinking

[Experience](#), [Belief](#)



In the first argument between Jim and Roger, Roger's response adequately meets the challenge of the argument presented by Jim. Jim argues that during mediations, the mediator should remain neutral so that the parties over which he is mediating can feel comfortable. He therefore concludes that since the United States is the only super power in the world, it cannot act as a mediator between Palestine and Israel. Roger's response meets the challenge of the argument because apart from providing his opinion, he explains why his opinion differs from Jim's argument. He explains and substantiates why the United States is the best mediator because it is the only country that has enough muscle to bring pressure onto the two countries.

Second argument

Peter's response to Steve's argument in the second conversation does not meet the challenge of the argument presented by Steve. Steve believes that hypnosis is bad because it allows another person to control you. It opens the mind to outside influence according to Steve. Peter is supposed to agree or differ with the Steve's opinion and present enough support as to why.

Instead, his response is very vague. He begins his response by saying: " I can see what you mean but I don't know." This is very vague.

Third argument:

Kaitlyn's response to Nicholas' argument in the third conversation is the best of the three responses. It meets the challenge of the argument very satisfactorily. Nicholas says that the recent regulation that requires children to wear helmets while cycling has greatly helped to reduce the number of

hospital admissions caused by cycling accidents. He gives figures that support his argument very well. However, Kaitlyn does not agree with the argument. She disagrees by explaining that other factors like careful cycling by the people may have reduced the accidents not the legislation. He further explains that cycling activities may have decreased with time therefore leading to lesser accidents. In her response she has also considered Nichols' understanding on the issue. This has made her response really good and up to the challenge presented by the argument.