

Logic and thought



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Step. 2: There are 5 lines of argument line A: Astrology has been practised for over six thousand years, and millions of people have based their lives and life choices on it. B: Until the eighteenth century, diagnoses and prescriptions of astrology were considered more reliable and efficacious than those of the medical practitioners. • Astrology needs to be taken more seriously as an art and science that can contribute to human well-being. The premise does not support its conclusion because there is a genetic fallacy—there is no evidence. The sources of the idea do not come from believable sources such as an official document or any ancient remains. Astrologers try to justify their beliefs by claiming that their work is based on science, but science is based on fact while astrology is not. Statistical studies can give support to the claims of astrology, but this is impossible in this case because astrology cannot be measured. 2 line A: Since the middle of the twentieth century, countless scientific studies that have ultimately supported the basic principles of astrology have been conducted. B: Michel Gauquelin, a noted French statistician, spent much of his life using statistical methods to investigate astrology; he established the truth of a number of claims, including the Mars effect, which proved a relationship between the planet Mars and outstanding athletes. • Astrology needs to be taken more seriously as an art and science that can contribute to human well-being. This argument is incorrect because it cannot be proven 100 percent that scientific studies support the views of astrology. The fallacy for this argument is a genetic fallacy. For the French statistician, he cannot prove his theory of the Mars effect because other factors may have influenced the results. Astrology is linked with destiny, personality, human affairs, and natural events. Astrology is such a serious and sensitive issue that the arguer needs to

provide more sources to back up their claims. This is also known as a hasty generalization. Additionally, this argument also shows faulty appeal to authority because a noted French statistician just happened to make the claim. Even though he has authority, it does not mean that what he says is true. The arguer needs to back up their argument with sources rather than relying on a position in society.

3 line A: Every New Year, astrologers make predictions about what will happen in the coming twelve months. These predictions have a high rate of success. B: Jeanne Dizon, a noted astrologer, even predicted the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, demonstrating that those who claim that astrological predictions are vague are wrong.

- Astrology needs to be taken more seriously as an art and science that can contribute to human well-being.

In this argument, the arguer of the claim commits the fallacy of a hasty generalization. The arguer only provides one example, and from this they make the claim that astrologers can predict any event that will occur in the future. This is not a strong argument because this success could have just been coincidence. For the example of Jeanne Dizon, she needs to make several more predictions to test if her theory is correct. If I predicted that it would rain tomorrow, and it happened to rain, this does not mean that I correctly predicted the rain. The rain would have come whether or not I predicted it and thus I have no control over it.

4 line A: Probably most important, astrologers make analyses of individual personality traits based on the twelve-sign system of astrology. B: In one study, ninety-six percent of those surveyed reported that such analyses of personality were “incredibly accurate.” If nothing else proves the truth of astrology, this does.

- Astrology needs to be taken more seriously as an art and science that can contribute to human well-being.

this argument, the arguer commits the genetic fallacy because they do not note the source of their conclusions. We cannot be sure where these numbers came from and thus must dismiss the information based on this fact alone. The twelve-sign system of astrology has not been proven as true by any scientists or experts. In order to make this argument stronger, the arguer needs to provide more information to support their claims. 5 line A: Some psychologists have taken to using astrology as means of diagnosing and treating their clients. B: Studies of the clients show that many claim that such treatment has been incredible effective. Again, this supports the basic claims of astrology. •Astrology needs to be taken more seriously as an art and science that can contribute to human well-being. Once again, this argument can be proven false because of the genetic fallacy. Medicine is something that has been proven true through thousands of experiments over hundreds of years. The premises do not provide any information about where the source came from. These clients could have gotten better solely due to the medical care that was provided and not because of the means of astrology. Just because astrology happened to be done in conjunction with medicine does not mean that it had any effect on patients. The patients may believe that they were healed because of astrology but there is no proof of this.