

Discussion 5

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Critical Thinking Below are sets of three terms. Use one of the sets to construct a valid syllogism. Explain how you decided on the statements for your syllogism.

F. Endangered species, animals needing protection, spotted owls

Answer:

Major Premise: All animals needing protection are endangered species.

Minor Premise: Some spotted owl species are animals needing protection.

Conclusion: Therefore, some spotted owl species are endangered species.

The first step involved analysis of the given terms for meaning, and identification of the middle term which would indicate some relationship between the major and minor terms. Then, statements for major and minor premises were decided, while also keeping in view the subject and predicate for the conclusion. The truth of the premises was checked. Then, all the statements were rephrased several times to reach logical coherence and converted to a standard form. The syllogism was also checked for validity using a Venn diagram test (Moore & Parker, 2015).

2 A sound argument is valid (correctly formed) and has all true premises.

Your book Chapters 8 and 9 discuss several ways to test the soundness of an argument. Now it is your turn to apply the tests. Go to a website that provides political opinion, such as the Huffington Post. Find a brief article that contains a clear argument. Evaluate the argument for its soundness. Link the article at the end of your response by copying its Web address.

Answer: The author highlights the point that congress needs a pay raise so people who arent wealthy can serve by referring to a series of arguments by Rep. Alcee Hasting, such as “ the current system doesnt offer enough incentives for less-affluent citizens to enter public service”. The

<https://assignbuster.com/discussion-5-essay-samples-4/>

aforementioned argument with unstated premises can be converted into the following syllogism:

All less-affluent citizens need sufficient incentives.

No current public service offers sufficient incentives.

No current public service is suitable for less affluent citizens.

Testing the statements for validity by Venn diagram and rules method indicates that the argument is logically valid. However, the evidence presented in support of the premises is rather vague and ambiguous. The annual salary of Congress members is much higher than the median household income in United States. The truth in the prediction that, “ 20 years out, the only people that will be able to serve in this institution will be people who are wealthy”, is untestable and probably fallacious. In support of the claim, only three staff members had left and that too ‘ suspiciously’. The argument is valid logically, but it lacks soundness because of weak and vague evidence in support of the claims (Valencia, 2015; Moore & Parker, 2015).

References

Moore, B. N. & Parker, R. (2015). Critical thinking (11th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Valencia, J. (2015, May 19). Rep. Alcee Hastings: Congress needs a pay raise so people who arent wealthy can serve. The Huffington Post. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/05/19/congressional-pay_n_7337282.html?utm_hp_ref=huffpolitics-blog