DOWNLOAD PDF THE LIMITS OF ARGUMENT : ARGUMENT AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Chapter 1 : Rule Oral Argument | LII / Legal Information Institute

The Limits of Argument: Argument and Autobiography Created Date: Z.

Etymology[edit] The Latin root arguere to make bright, enlighten, make known, prove, etc. Informal logic and Formal logic Informal arguments as studied in informal logic, are presented in ordinary language and are intended for everyday discourse. Conversely, formal arguments are studied in formal logic historically called symbolic logic, more commonly referred to as mathematical logic today and are expressed in a formal language. Informal logic may be said to emphasize the study of argumentation , whereas formal logic emphasizes implication and inference. Informal arguments are sometimes implicit. That is, the rational structure â€" the relationship of claims, premises, warrants, relations of implication, and conclusion â€" is not always spelled out and immediately visible and must sometimes be made explicit by analysis. Standard types[edit] Argument terminology There are several kinds of arguments in logic, the best-known of which are "deductive" and "inductive. Each premise and the conclusion are truth bearers or "truth-candidates", each capable of being either true or false but not both. These truth values bear on the terminology used with arguments. Deductive arguments[edit] A deductive argument asserts that the truth of the conclusion is a logical consequence of the premises. Based on the premises, the conclusion follows necessarily with certainty. Deductive arguments are sometimes referred to as "truth-preserving" arguments. A deductive argument is said to be valid or invalid. If one assumes the premises to be true ignoring their actual truth values , would the conclusion follow with certainty? If yes, the argument is valid. Otherwise, it is invalid. In determining validity, the structure of the argument is essential to the determination, not the actual truth values. If we assume the premises are true, the conclusion follows necessarily, and thus it is a valid argument. If a deductive argument is valid and its premises are all true, then it is also referred to as sound. Otherwise, it is unsound, as in the "bats are birds" example. Inductive arguments[edit] An inductive argument , on the other hand, asserts that the truth of the conclusion is supported to some degree of probability by the premises. For example, given that the U. Arguments that involve predictions are inductive, as the future is uncertain. An inductive argument is said to be strong or weak. If the premises of an inductive argument are assumed true, is it probable the conclusion is also true? If so, the argument is strong. Otherwise, it is weak. A strong argument is said to be cogent if it has all true premises. Otherwise, the argument is uncogent. The military budget argument example above is a strong, cogent argument. Deductive argument A deductive argument is one that, if valid, has a conclusion that is entailed by its premises. In other words, the truth of the conclusion is a logical consequence of the premisesâ€"if the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true. It would be self-contradictory to assert the premises and deny the conclusion, because the negation of the conclusion is contradictory to the truth of the premises. Validity logic Deductive arguments may be either valid or invalid. If an argument is valid, it is a valid deduction, and if its premises are true, the conclusion must be true: An argument is formally valid if and only if the denial of the conclusion is incompatible with accepting all the premises. The validity of an argument depends, however, not on the actual truth or falsity of its premises and conclusion, but solely on whether or not the argument has a valid logical form. The validity of an argument is not a guarantee of the truth of its conclusion. Under a given interpretation, a valid argument may have false premises that render it inconclusive: Logic seeks to discover the valid forms, the forms that make arguments valid. A form of argument is valid if and only if the conclusion is true under all interpretations of that argument in which the premises are true. Since the validity of an argument depends solely on its form, an argument can be shown to be invalid by showing that its form is invalid. This can be done by giving a counter example of the same form of argument with premises that are true under a given interpretation, but a conclusion that is false under that interpretation. In informal logic this is called a counter argument. The form of argument can be shown by the use of symbols. For each argument form, there is a corresponding statement form, called a corresponding conditional , and an argument form is valid if and only if its corresponding conditional is a logical truth. A

statement form which is logically true is also said to be a valid statement form. A statement form is a logical truth if it is true under all interpretations. A statement form can be shown to be a logical truth by either a showing that it is a tautology or b by means of a proof procedure. The corresponding conditional of a valid argument is a necessary truth true in all possible worlds and so the conclusion necessarily follows from the premises, or follows of logical necessity. The conclusion of a valid argument is not necessarily true, it depends on whether the premises are true. If the conclusion, itself, just so happens to be a necessary truth, it is so without regard to the premises. All Greeks are human and all humans are mortal; therefore, all Greeks are mortal. Valid argument; if the premises are true the conclusion must be true. Some Greeks are logicians and some logicians are tiresome; therefore, some Greeks are tiresome. Either we are all doomed or we are all saved; we are not all saved; therefore, we are all doomed. Valid argument; the premises entail the conclusion. This does not mean the conclusion has to be true; it is only true if the premises are true, which they may not be! Some men are hawkers. Some hawkers are rich. Therefore, some men are rich. This can be easier seen by giving a counter-example with the same argument form: Some people are herbivores. Some herbivores are zebras. Therefore, some people are zebras. Invalid argument, as it is possible that the premises be true and the conclusion false. In the above second to last case Some men are hawkers See also, existential import. The forms of argument that render deductions valid are well-established, however some invalid arguments can also be persuasive depending on their construction inductive arguments , for example. See also, formal fallacy and informal fallacy. Inductive argument Non-deductive logic is reasoning using arguments in which the premises support the conclusion but do not entail it. Forms of non-deductive logic include the statistical syllogism , which argues from generalizations true for the most part, and induction , a form of reasoning that makes generalizations based on individual instances. The lack of deductive validity is known as the problem of induction. Defeasible arguments and argumentation schemes[edit] In modern argumentation theories, arguments are regarded as defeasible passages from premises to a conclusion. Defeasibility means that when additional information new evidence or contrary arguments is provided, the premises may be no longer lead to the conclusion non-monotonic reasoning. This type of reasoning is referred to as defeasible reasoning. For instance we consider the famous Tweedy example: Tweedy is a bird. Therefore, Tweedy probably flies. This argument is reasonable and the premises support the conclusion unless additional information indicating that the case is an exception comes in. If Tweedy is a penguin, the inference is no longer justified by the premise. Defeasible arguments are based on generalizations that hold only in the majority of cases, but are subject to exceptions and defaults. In order to represent and assess defeasible reasoning, it is necessary to combine the logical rules governing the acceptance of a conclusion based on the acceptance of its premises with rules of material inference, governing how a premise can support a given conclusion whether it is reasonable or not to draw a specific conclusion from a specific description of a state of affairs. Argumentation schemes have been developed to describe and assess the acceptability or the fallaciousness of defeasible arguments. Argumentation schemes are stereotypical patterns of inference, combining semantic-ontological relations with types of reasoning and logical axioms and representing the abstract structure of the most common types of natural arguments. However, the two levels of abstraction are not distinguished. A typical example is the argument from expert opinion, which has two premises and a conclusion. Source E is an expert in subject domain S containing proposition A. E asserts that proposition A is true false. A is true false. Each scheme is associated to a set of critical questions, namely criteria for assessing dialectically the reasonableness and acceptability of an argument. The matching critical questions are the standard ways of casting the argument into doubt. How credible is E as an expert source? Is E an expert in the field that A is in? What did E assert that implies A? Is E personally reliable as a source? Is A consistent with what other experts assert? If an expert says that a proposition is true, this provides a reason for tentatively accepting it, in the absence of stronger reasons to doubt it. But suppose that evidence of financial gain suggests that the expert is biased, for example by evidence showing that he will gain financially from his claim.

Chapter 2 : SW Counterpoint: What are the limits of your argument?

A deductive argument is one that, if valid, has a conclusion that is entailed by its premises. In other words, the truth of the conclusion is a logical consequence of the premisesâ€"if the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true.

MOL 3 Katherine Falconer Hume realized that David was uncommonly precocious, so when his older brother went up to Edinburgh University, Hume went with him, although he was only 10 or There he studied Latin and Greek, read widely in history and literature, ancient and modern philosophy, and also did some mathematics and natural philosophyâ€"what we now call natural science. The education David received, both at home and at the university, aimed at training pupils to a life of virtue regulated by stern Scottish Calvinist strictures. Prayers and sermons were prominent aspects of his home and university life. At some point, Hume read The Whole Duty of Man, a widely circulated Anglican devotional tract that details our duties to God, our fellow human beings, and ourselves. The intensity of developing his philosophical vision precipitated a psychological crisis in the isolated scholar. Here he read French and other continental authors, especially Malebranche, Dubos, and Bayle, and occasionally baited the Jesuits with arguments attacking their beliefs. By this time, Hume had not only rejected the religious beliefs with which he was raised, but was also opposed to organized religion in general, an opposition that remained constant throughout his life. In , when he was only 23, he began writing A Treatise of Human Nature. Hume returned to England in to ready the Treatise for the press. Six years later, he stood for the Chair of Logic at Glasgow, only to be turned down again. Hume never held an academic post. A year later he became secretary to his cousin, Lieutenant General James St Clair, eventually accompanying him on an extended diplomatic mission in Austria and Italy. He also included material he had excised from the Treatise. Published in six volumes between and , his History was a bestseller well into the next century, finally giving him the financial independence he had long sought. Friends and publishers persuaded him to suppress some of his more controversial writings on religion during his lifetime. In , Hume accepted a position as private secretary to the British Ambassador to France. He became the rage of the Parisian salons, enjoying the conversation and company of famous European intellectuals. He was known for his love of good food and wine, as well as his enjoyment of the attentions and affections of women. Hume returned to Edinburgh in He spent considerable time revising his works for new editions of his Essays and Treatises, which contained his collected Essays, the two Enquiries, A Dissertation on the Passions, and The Natural History of Religion, but â€"significantlyâ€"not A Treatise of Human Nature. In , Hume was diagnosed with intestinal cancer. He summarizes his project in its subtitle: The ancient philosophers, on whom he had been concentrating, replicated the errors their natural philosophers made. He was convinced that the only way to improve philosophy was to make the investigation of human nature centralâ€"and empirical HL 3. The problem with ancient philosophy was its reliance on hypothesesâ€"claims based on speculation and invention rather than experience and observation. By the time Hume began to write the Treatise three years later, he had immersed himself in the works of the modern philosophers, but he found them disturbing, not least because they made the same mistakes the ancients did, while professing to avoid them. Their theories were too speculative, relying on a priori assumptions, and paying too little attention to what human nature is actually like. These systems, covering a wide range of entrenched and influential metaphysical and theological views, purport to have discovered principles that give us a deeper and more certain knowledge of ultimate reality. Metaphysics aids and abets these and other superstitious doctrines. His critique of metaphysics clears the way for the constructive phase of his projectâ€"the development of an empirical science of human natureâ€"and Hume is not at all skeptical about its prospects. The new foundation is the scientific study of human nature. They are all human activities, so what we are able to accomplish in them depends on understanding what kinds of questions we are able to handle and what sorts we must leave alone. If we have a better grasp of the scope and limits of our understanding, the nature of our ideas, and the operations we perform in reasoning about them, there is no telling what improvements we might make in these sciences. We

should expect even more improvement in the sciences that are more closely connected to the study of human nature: Although Hume does not mention him by name, Newton â€" is his hero. Any laws we discover must be established by observation and experiment. Hume is proposing an empiricist alternative to traditional a priori metaphysics. His empiricism is naturalistic in that it refuses to countenance any appeal to the supernatural in the explanation of human nature. As a naturalist, he aims to account for the way our minds work in a manner that is consistent with a Newtonian picture of the world. Hume portrays his scientific study of human nature as a kind of mental geography or anatomy of the mind EHU 1. In the first section of the first Enquiry, he says that it has two principal tasks, one purely descriptive, the other explanatory. Hume, however, wants to go much further. But he emphasizes that while he will try to find the most general principles, rendering them as universal as possible, all of his explanations must be based completely on experience. Although philosophy, as an empirical enterprise, is itself bound by experience, this is not a defect in the science of human nature. The same is true for all the sciences: Explanations must come to an end somewhere. Hume is Newtonian in much more than method. He sees that Newton is significantly different from John Locke â€" and the other Royal Society natural philosophers, because he rejects their mechanist picture of the world. By appealing to these same principles throughout, Hume gives an explanation of these diverse phenomena that enable him to provide a unified and economical account of the mind. Each piece is warranted by experience. The early modern period was the heyday of the investigation of the ideas of causation, moral good and evil, and many other philosophically contested ideas. Hume holds an empiricist version of the theory, because he thinks that everything we believe is ultimately traceable to experience. He begins with an account of perceptions, because he believes that any intelligible philosophical question must be asked and answered in those terms. He uses perception to designate any mental content whatsoever, and divides perceptions into two categories, impressions and ideas. Impressions include sensations as well as desires, passions, and emotions. He thinks everyone will recognize his distinction, since everyone is aware of the difference between feeling and thinking. Hume distinguishes two kinds of impressions: He calls them original because trying to determine their ultimate causes would take us beyond anything we can experience. Any intelligible investigation must stop with them. Impressions of reflection include desires, emotions, passions, and sentiments. They are essentially reactions or responses to ideas, which is why he calls them secondary. Perceptionsâ€"both impressions and ideasâ€"may be either simple or complex. Complex impressions are made up of a group of simple impressions. My impression of the violet I just picked is complex. Among the ways it affects my senses are its brilliant purple color and its sweet smell. I can separate and distinguish its color and smell from the rest of my impressions of the violet. Hume initially distinguishes impressions and ideas in terms of their degree of force and vivacity. Impressions are more forceful and vivacious than ideas. At various times, Hume tries other ways of characterizing the difference between impressions and ideas, but he was never completely satisfied with them. Still, what he says works well enough to give us a handle on the felt differences between impressions and ideas. When Hume distinguishes impressions and ideas in terms of their relative force and vivacity, he is pointing out something that is generally true of them as a matter of fact. On occasion, in dreams or a high fever, ideas may approach the force and vivacity of impressions, but these are exceptions that prove theâ€"empiricalâ€"rule. In general, impressions and ideas are so different that no one can deny the distinction. He argues first that there is a oneâ€"toâ€"one correspondence between simple ideas and simple impressions. But he is so confident the correspondence holds that he challenges anyone who doubts it to produce an example of a simple impression without a corresponding simple idea, or a simple idea without a corresponding simple impression. Since he is certain they will fail, he concludes that there is a constant conjunction between simple impressions and simple ideas. There must be a causal connection between them, but do ideas cause impressions or do impressions cause ideas? Finally, he argues that experience tells us that simple impressions always precede and thus cause their corresponding ideas. To support this claim, he appeals to two sorts of cases. First, if you want to give a child an idea of the taste of pineapple, you give her a piece of pineapple to eat. You never go the other way round. He imagines someone

who has had the same sorts of experiences of colors most of us have had, but has never experienced a certain shade of blue. Hume thinks that if he orders all the shades of blue he has experienced from the darkest to the lightest, he will see immediately that there is a gap where the missing shade should be. While scholars have wondered exactly how the person might supply the missing shade, he seems unconcerned with the details. For Hume, once again the exception proves theâ€"empiricalâ€"rule. As his diagnosis of traditional metaphysics reveals, Hume believes that the chief obstacle â€¦ to our improvement in the moral or metaphysical sciences is the obscurity of the ideas, and ambiguity of the terms. Getting clear about the content of the ideas and the meanings of the terms we are investigating requires something else. He believes he has found a way to accurately determine their contentâ€"his account of definition. Begin with a term. Ask what idea is annexed to it. If there is no such idea, then the term has no cognitive content, however prominently it figures in philosophy or theology. If there is an idea annexed to the term, and it is complex, break it down into the simple ideas that compose it, and trace them back to their original impressions. If the process fails at any point, the idea in question lacks cognitive content. Hume uses his account of definition in his critical phase to show that many of the central concepts of traditional metaphysics lack intelligible content. He also uses it in his constructive phase to determine the exact meaning of our terms and ideas. This suggests that There is a secret tie or union among particular ideas, which causes the mind to conjoin them more frequently, and makes the one, upon its appearance, introduce the other. Hume identifies three principles of association: When someone shows you a picture of your best friend, you naturally think of her because the picture resembles her.

Chapter 3 : Argumentative | Define Argumentative at calendrierdelascience.com

Gilmore's argument hinges on the notion that representing a traumatized identity is in some sense a nearly impossible act, given the evidentiary demands that govern both autobiography and the law.

References and Further Reading 1. I do not expect to see anything like it again. Mill established this rule over English thought through his writings in logic, epistemology, economics, social and political philosophy, ethics, metaphysics, religion, and current affairs. One can say with relative security, looking at the breadth and complexity of his work, that Mill was the greatest nineteenth century British philosopher. This rule did not come about accidentally. James Mill was born in Scotland in to a family of modest means. Through the patronage of Sir John and Lady Jane Stuart, he was able to attend the University of Edinburgh, which at the time was one of the finest universities in Europe. After a brief and generally unsuccessful stint as a minister, James Mill moved to London, where he began his career in letters. This was a difficult path for a man of very modest resources to take; he and his wife Harriet married lived without financial security for well over a decade. It was only with the publication of his The History of British India in â€"a work that took twelve years to writeâ€"that Mill was able to land a stable, well paying job at the East India Company that enabled him to support his large family ultimately consisting of his wife and nine children. Throughout the years of relative poverty, James Mill received assistance from friends including the great legal theorist and utilitarian reformer Jeremy Bentham, whom he met in This philosophically inspired radicalism of the early nineteenth century positioned itself against the Whigs and Tories. Moreover, one aspect of their political temperament that distinguished them from Whigs and Tories was their rationalismâ€"their willingness to recommend re-structuring social and political institutions under the explicit guidance of principles of reason e. While Whig intellectuals and Radicals tended to align with each other on economic issues, both tending towards pro-urban, pro-industrial, laissez-faire policies, Tory intellectuals focused on defending traditional British social structures and ways of life associated with aristocratic agrarianism. These alliances can be seen in disputes over the Tory-supported Corn Laws, legislation meant to protect domestic agriculture by taxing imported grains. James Mill saw the Whigs as too imbued with aristocratic interests to be a true organ of democratic reform. Only the Radicals could properly advocate for the middle and working classes. Moreover, unlike the Radicals, who possessed a systematic politics guided by the principle of utility the principle that set the promotion of aggregate happiness as the standard for legislation and action , the Whigs lacked a systematic politics. The Whigs depended instead on a loose empiricism, which the senior Mill took as an invitation to complacency. The younger Mill was seen as the crown prince of the Philosophic Radical movement and his famous education reflected the hopes of his father and Bentham. Under the dominating gaze of his father, he was taught Greek beginning at age three and Latin at eight. He read histories, many of the Greek and Roman classics, and Newton by eleven. He studied logic and math, moving to political economy and legal philosophy in his early teens, and then went on to metaphysics. His training facilitated active command of the material through the requirement that he teach his younger siblings and through evening walks with his father when the precocious pupil would have to tell his father what he had learned that day. His year in France in led to a fluency in French and initiated his life-long interest in French thought and politics. As he matured, his father and Bentham both employed him as an editor. In addition, he founded a number of intellectual societies and study groups and began to contribute to periodicals, including the Westminster Review. Mill claims that he began to come out of his depression with the help of poetry specifically Wordsworth. This contributed to his sense that while his education had fostered his analytic abilities, it had left his capacity for feeling underdeveloped. This realization made him re-think the attachment to the radical, rationalistic strands of Enlightenment thought that his education was meant to promote. In response to this crisis, Mill began exploring Romanticism and a variety of other European intellectual movements that rejected secular, naturalistic, worldly conceptions of human nature. He also became interested in criticisms of urbanization and

industrialization. These explorations were furthered by the writings of and frequent correspondence with thinkers from a wide sampling of intellectual traditions, including Thomas Carlyle, Auguste Comte, Alexis de Tocqueville, John Ruskin, M. Molesworth quickly bought out the old Westminster Review in , to leave the new London and Westminster Review as the unopposed voice of the radicals. Collected Works [CW], I. Mill would spend his career attempting to carry that out. Harriet Taylor, friend, advisor, and eventual wife, helped him with this project. Unfortunately for Mill, Taylor was married. Her death in left him inconsolable. Beyond question is that Mill found in her a partner, friend, critic, and someone who encouraged him. Mill was probably most swayed by her in the realms of political, ethical, and social thought, but less so in the areas of logic and political economy with the possible exception of his views on socialism. On his retirement and after the death of his wife, Mill was recruited to stand for a Parliamentary seat. Though he was not particularly effective during his one term as an MP, he participated in three dramatic events. Second, he headed the Jamaica Committee, which pushed unsuccessfully for the prosecution of Governor Eyre of Jamaica, who had imposed brutal martial law after an uprising by black farmers protesting poverty and disenfranchisement. Third, Mill used his influence with the leaders of the laboring classes to defuse a potentially dangerous confrontation between government troops and workers who were protesting the defeat of the Reform Bill. Many of his textsâ€"particularly On Liberty, Utilitarianism, The Subjection of Women, and his Autobiographyâ€"continue to be reprinted and taught in universities throughout the world. Works Mill wrote on a startling number of topics. All his major texts, however, play a role in defending his new philosophic radicalism and the intellectual, moral, political, and social agendas associated with it. He is committed to the idea that our best methods of explaining the world are those employed by the natural sciences. Anything that we can know about human minds and wills comes from treating them as part of the causal order investigated by the sciences, rather than as special entities that lie outside it. The intuitionist doctrine conceives of nature as being largely or wholly constituted by the mind rather than more or less imperfectly observed by it. If the mind constitutes the world that we experience, then we can understand the world by understanding the mind. It was this freedom from appeal to nature and the lack of independent i. For Mill, the problems with intuitionism extend far beyond the metaphysical and epistemological to the moral and political. The notion that truths external to the mind may be known by intuition or consciousness, independently of observation and experience, is, I am persuaded, in these times, the great intellectual support of false doctrines and bad institutions. By the aid of this theory, every inveterate belief and every intense feeling, of which the origin is not remembered, is enabled to dispense with the obligation of justifying itself by reason, and is erected into its own all-sufficient voucher and justification. There never was such an instrument devised for consecrating all deep-seated prejudices. And the chief strength of this false philosophy in morals, politics, and religion, lies in the appeal which it is accustomed to make to the evidence of mathematics and of the cognate branches of physical science. To expel it from these, is to drive it from its stronghold. We find Bentham, in his An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, attacking non-utilitarian moral systems for just this reason: Intuitionism, however, is often taken to be on much firmer ground than empiricism when it comes to accounting for our knowledge of mathematics and logic. But this leaves Mill with the problem of accounting for the apparent necessity of such truthsâ€"a necessity which seems to rule out their origin in experience. It should be noted that logic goes beyond formal logic for Mill and into the conditions of truth more generally. The text has the following basic structure. Book I addresses names and propositions. Book IV discusses a variety of operations of the mind, including observation, abstraction and naming, which are presupposed in all induction or instrumental to more complicated forms of induction. Book V reveals fallacies of reasoning. In fact, the human sciences can be understood as themselves natural sciences with human objects of study. The point of the distinction between verbal and real propositions is, first, to stress that all real propositions are a posteriori. Second, the distinction emphasizes that verbal propositions are empty of content; they tell us about language i. In Kantian terms, Mill wants to deny the possibility of synthetic a priori propositions, while contending that we can still make sense of our knowledge of subjects like logic and mathematics. Mill divides

names into general and singular names. All names, except proper names e. Ringo, Buckley, etc and names that signify an attribute only e. That is, they both connote or imply some attribute s and denote or pick out individuals that fall under that description. Instead, it operates like a proper name in that its meaning derives entirely from what it denotes. The meaning of a typical proposition is that the thing s denoted by the subject has the attribute s connoted by the predicate. But this appears untenable because the statement seems informative. Verbal propositions assert something about the meaning of names rather than about matters of fact. As such, verbal propositions are empty of content and they are the only things we know a priori, independently of checking the correspondence of the proposition to the world. Such propositions convey information that is not already included in the names or terms employed, and their truth or falsity depends on whether or not they correspond to relevant features of the world. He claims, for example, that the law of contradiction i. They are, like the axioms of geometry, experimental truths, not truths known a priori. They represent generalizations or inductions from observationâ€”very well-justified inductions, to be sure, but inductions nonetheless. This leads Mill to say that the necessity typically ascribed to the truths of mathematics and logic by his intuitionist opponents is an illusion, thereby undermining intuitionist argumentative fortifications at their strongest point. A System of Logic thus represents the most thorough attempt to argue for empiricism in epistemology, logic, and mathematics before the twentieth century for the best discussion of this point, see Skorupski Other Topics of Interest There are some other topics covered in the System of Logic that are of interest. His discussion is driven by one basic concern: How can it be informative? Mill discounts two common views about the syllogism, namely, that it is useless because it tells us what we already know and that it is the correct analysis of what the mind actually does when it discovers truths. To understand why Mill discounts these ways of thinking about deduction, we need to understand his views on inference. The key point here is that all inference is from particular to particular. What the mind does in making a deductive inference is not to move from a universal truth to a particular one. Rather, it moves from truths about a number of particulars to a smaller number or one. Though general propositions are not necessary for reasoning, they are heuristically useful as are the syllogisms that employ them. They aid us in memory and comprehension. He focuses on four different methods of experimental inquiry that attempt to single out from the circumstances that precede or follow a phenomenon the ones that are linked to the phenomenon by an invariable law. That is, we test to see if a purported causal connection exists by observing the relevant phenomena under an assortment of situations. If we wish, for example, to know whether a virus causes a disease, how can we prove it?

Chapter 4 : Mill, John Stuart | Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

The position I wish to suggest might be called philosophical rhetoric, which presupposes the other two. I attempted to explain this in my essay in Philosophy and Rhetoric, "The Limits of Argument: Argument and Autobiography" () and in my book, Philosophy and the Return to Self-Knowledge ().

Locke grew up and lived through one of the most extraordinary centuries of English political and intellectual history. It was a century in which conflicts between Crown and Parliament and the overlapping conflicts between Protestants, Anglicans and Catholics swirled into civil war in the s. This period lasted from to It was marked by continued conflicts between King and Parliament and debates over religious toleration for Protestant dissenters and Catholics. His father was a country lawyer who served in a cavalry company on the Puritan side in the early stages of the English Civil War. In Locke went to Westminster School in London. From Westminster school he went to Christ Church, Oxford, in the autumn of at the age of twenty. As Westminster school was the most important English school, so Christ Church was the most important Oxford college. Education at Oxford was medieval. Locke, like Hobbes before him, found the Aristotelian philosophy he was taught at Oxford of little use. There was, however, more at Oxford than Aristotle. The new experimental philosophy had arrived. The group around Wilkins was the nucleus of what was to become the English Royal Society. The Society grew out of informal meetings and discussion groups and moved to London after the Restoration and became a formal institution in the s with charters from Charles II. The program was to study nature rather than books. Locke received his B. His career at Oxford, however, continued beyond his undergraduate days. The rank was equivalent to a Fellow at any of the other colleges, but was not permanent. Locke had yet to determine what his career was to be. At this point, Locke needed to make a decision. The statutes of Christ Church laid it down that fifty five of the senior studentships should be reserved for men in orders or reading for orders. Only five could be held by others, two in medicine, two in law and one in moral philosophy. Thus, there was good reason for Locke to become a clergyman. Locke decided to become a doctor. The new leader of the Oxford scientific group was Robert Boyle. Boyle was, however, most influential as a theorist. He was a mechanical philosopher who treated the world as reducible to matter in motion. Locke read Boyle before he read Descartes. When he did read Descartes, he saw the great French philosopher as providing a viable alternative to the sterile Aristotelianism he had been taught at Oxford. In the Epistle to the Reader at the beginning of the Essay Locke remarks: The commonwealth of learning is not at this time without master-builders, whose mighty designs, in advancing the sciences, will leave lasting monuments to the admiration of posterity: Newton, with some others of that strain, it is ambition enough to be employed as an under-labourer in clearing the ground a little, and removing some of the rubbish that lies in the way to knowledge â€¦. Sydenham was an English physician and Locke did medical research with him. Presumably this will reveal the degree of certainty of the knowledge based on such ideas. David Thomas was his friend and collaborator. Locke and Thomas had a laboratory in Oxford which was very likely, in effect, a pharmacy. In Lord Ashley, one of the richest men in England, came to Oxford in order to drink some medicinal waters there. He had asked Dr. Thomas to provide them. Thomas had to be out of town and asked Locke to see that the water was delivered. As a result of this encounter, Ashley invited Locke to come to London as his personal physician. Living with him Locke found himself at the very heart of English politics in the s and s. Lord Ashley was one of the advocates of the view that England would prosper through trade and that colonies could play an important role in promoting trade. Ashley persuaded Charles II to create a Board of Trade and Plantations to collect information about trade and colonies, and Locke became its secretary. In his capacity as the secretary of the Board of Trade Locke was the collection point for information from around the globe about trade and colonies for the English government. In his capacity as the secretary to the Lords Proprietors, Locke was involved in the writing of the fundamental constitution of the Carolinas. There was a monetary crisis in England involving the value of money, and the clipping of coins. Locke wrote papers for

Lord Ashley on economic matters, including the coinage crisis. While living in London at Exeter House, Locke continued to be involved in philosophical discussions. He tells us that: Were it fit to trouble thee with the history of this Essay, I should tell thee, that five or six friends meeting at my chamber, and discoursing on a subject very remote from this, found themselves quickly at a stand, by the difficulties that rose on every side. After we had awhile puzzled ourselves, without coming any nearer a resolution of those doubts which perplexed us, it came into my thoughts that we took a wrong course; and that before we set ourselves upon inquiries of that nature, it was necessary to examine our own abilities, and see what objects our understandings were, or were not, fitted to deal with. This I proposed to the company, who all readily assented; and thereupon it was agreed that this should be our first inquiry. Some hasty and undigested thoughts, on a subject I had never before considered, which I set down against our next meeting, gave the first entrance into this Discourse; which having been thus begun by chance, was continued by intreaty; written by incoherent parcels; and after long intervals of neglect, resumed again, as my humour or occasions permitted; and at last, in a retirement where an attendance on my health gave me leisure, it was brought into that order thou now seest it. Epistle to the Reader, N: He recalls the discussion being about the principles of morality and revealed religion Cranston Thus the Oxford scholar and medical researcher came to begin the work which was to occupy him off and on over the next twenty years. In after Shaftesbury had left the government, Locke went back to Oxford, where he acquired the degree Bachelor of medicine, and a license to practice medicine, and then went to France Cranston The Edict of Nantes promulgated by Henry IV in was in force, and so there was a degree of religious toleration in France. Louis XIV was to revoke the edict in and French Protestants were then killed while some , went into exile. In Shaftesbury was imprisoned in the tower. His imprisonment lasted for a year. In , after the mysterious murder of a London judge, informers most notably Titus Oates started coming forward to reveal a supposed Catholic conspiracy to assassinate the King and put his brother on the throne. This whipped up public anti-Catholic frenzy. Though Shaftesbury had not fabricated the conspiracy story, nor did he prompt Oates to come forward, he did exploit the situation to the advantage of his party. In the public chaos surrounding the sensational revelations, Shaftesbury organized an extensive party network, exercised great control over elections, and built up a large parliamentary majority. As the panic over the Popish plot receded, Shaftesbury was left without a following or a cause. Shaftesbury was seized on July 21, and again put in the tower. He was tried on trumped-up charges of treason but acquitted by a London grand jury filled with his supporters in November. At this point some of the Country Party leaders began plotting an armed insurrection which, had it come off, would have begun with the assassination of Charles and his brother on their way back to London from the races at Newmarket. The chances of such a rising occurring were not as good as the plotters supposed. Memories of the turmoil of the civil war were still relatively fresh. Eventually Shaftesbury, who was moving from safe house to safe house, gave up and fled to Holland in November He died there in January Locke stayed in England until the Rye House Plot named after the house from which the plotters were to fire upon the King and his brother was discovered in June of Locke left for the West country to put his affairs in order the very week the plot was revealed to the government and by September he was in exile in Holland. He also wrote and published his Epistola de Tolerentia in Latin. The English government was much concerned with this group. They tried to get a number of them, including Locke, extradited to England. In the meanwhile, the English intelligence service infiltrated the rebel group in Holland and effectively thwarted their effortsâ€”at least for a while. The revolt was crushed, Monmouth captured and executed Ashcraft Ultimately, however, the rebels were successful. This became known as the Glorious Revolution of It is a watershed in English history. For it marks the point at which the balance of power in the English government passed from the King to the Parliament. Locke returned to England in on board the royal yacht, accompanying Princess Mary on her voyage to join her husband. It is worth noting that the Two Treatises and the Letter Concerning Toleration were published anonymously. Locke had met Damaris Cudworth in and became involved intellectually and romantically with her. She was the daughter of Ralph Cudworth, the Cambridge Platonist, and a philosopher in her own right. During the remaining years of his life

Locke oversaw four more editions of the Essay and engaged in controversies over the Essay most notably in a series of published letters with Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester. In a similar way, Locke defended the Letter Concerning Toleration against a series of attacks. Nor was Locke finished with public affairs. In the Board of Trade was revived. Locke played an important part in its revival and served as the most influential member on it until The new Board of Trade had administrative powers and was, in fact, concerned with a wide range of issues, from the Irish wool trade and the suppression of piracy, to the treatment of the poor in England and the governance of the colonies. During these last eight years of his life, Locke was asthmatic, and he suffered so much from it that he could only bear the smoke of London during the four warmer months of the year. Locke plainly engaged in the activities of the Board out of a strong sense of patriotic duty. After his retirement from the Board of Trade in , Locke remained in retirement at Oates until his death on Sunday 28 October The Limits of Human Understanding Locke is often classified as the first of the great English empiricists ignoring the claims of Bacon and Hobbes.

Chapter 5 : What are the limits of argument? : askphilosophy

tives: "By unlinking argument from persuasion we can focus attention on the need to teach argumentative writing as part of an education that foregrounds respect and consideration of the ideas of others" (5).

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Philosophical Rhetoric Donald Phillip Verene I knew Henry Johnstone as a colleague and friend for nearly three decades, one of which was the decade â€”87 during which I served as editor of Philosophy and Rhetoric. Johnstone introduced me to the importance of rhetoric while we were colleagues at Penn State. Johnstone was from beginning to end a logician. He made his initial reputation in philosophy as the author of a logic textbook. Because he took logic seriously, as the heart of philosophy, he was led to write Philosophy and Argument These works came at a time when many professional philosophers were claiming, to each other and in their classrooms, that to philosophize is to argue, and that the validity of all arguments could be assessed by the application of symbolic logic to what was said. Johnstone, Toulmin, and Passmore showed that more was involved in the evaluation of philosophical arguments than could be gotten from formal logic. This feature of argumentation led Johnstone to publish, just over a decade later, The Problem of the Self , and a little less than a decade after that to recapitulate his own [End Page 27] philosophical development in the collection of his essays, Validity and Rhetoric in Philosophical Argument To what extent is his approach complete, that is, to what extent does it require supplementation and development? It is not my intention to explain his conception of rhetoric and philosophy in its complexity. Philosophers make claims about the nature of things, the nature of knowledge, the nature of human existence, and so forth. These claims must be tested by argument. In argument, philosophers aim at validity. The principles of validity are determined in logic. Philosophy is about controversy; it is a critical activity. When there is disagreement in philosophy, formally valid arguments can be produced by both sides. How are philosophical disputes to be resolved? In disputes occurring in fields of empirical and scientific knowledge there are open avenues for their resolution. Such fields contain methods of experimentation and investigation that allow for the production of evidence and facts that can settle such disputes. But, in philosophical reasoning, what can count as evidence or as a fact is itself in dispute. A fact is a fact only in accord with a specific theory. In philosophical controversy it is the theory that is in dispute. The standards of empirical objectivity in scientific investigation make possible the use of argumentum ad rem to resolve a dispute. The thing to which thought can appeal is not itself in question. In philosophical dispute, as Johnstone claims, argumentum ad rem can go nowhere, because the nature of the thing appealed to is itself at the basis of the dispute. Philosophical argumenta ad rem can all be valid if properly formulated. The standard of objectivity of thought that logic can supply cannot resolve the controversy. This leads Johnstone to You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

DOWNLOAD PDF THE LIMITS OF ARGUMENT : ARGUMENT AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Chapter 6 : Limits of Arguments of Functions | Physics Forums

An argument is a main idea or thesis presented in a text, and for which the author will present evidence throughout the text. Typically, we talk of argument when we talk of persuasive or argumentative writing. In a persuasive essay or speech, the author presents an argument or claim, and then.

His mother was Agnes Keene. Both parents were Puritans. Locke was born on 29 August , in a small thatched cottage by the church in Wrington , Somerset, about 12 miles from Bristol. He was baptised the same day. After completing studies there, he was admitted to Christ Church , Oxford , in the autumn of at the age of twenty. The dean of the college at the time was John Owen , vice-chancellor of the university. Although a capable student, Locke was irritated by the undergraduate curriculum of the time. Through his friend Richard Lower , whom he knew from the Westminster School, Locke was introduced to medicine and the experimental philosophy being pursued at other universities and in the Royal Society , of which he eventually became a member. Cooper was impressed with Locke and persuaded him to become part of his retinue. In London, Locke resumed his medical studies under the tutelage of Thomas Sydenham. Locke coordinated the advice of several physicians and was probably instrumental in persuading Shaftesbury to undergo surgery then life-threatening itself to remove the cyst. Shaftesbury survived and prospered, crediting Locke with saving his life. During this time, Locke served as Secretary of the Board of Trade and Plantations and Secretary to the Lords Proprietor of Carolina, which helped to shape his ideas on international trade and economics. Locke became involved in politics when Shaftesbury became Lord Chancellor in While it was once thought that Locke wrote the Treatises to defend the Glorious Revolution of , recent scholarship has shown that the work was composed well before this date. Although Locke was associated with the influential Whigs, his ideas about natural rights and government are today considered quite revolutionary for that period in English history. Locke fled to the Netherlands in , under strong suspicion of involvement in the Rye House Plot , although there is little evidence to suggest that he was directly involved in the scheme. Locke did not return home until after the Glorious Revolution. Locke accompanied Mary II back to England in Although his time there was marked by variable health from asthma attacks, he nevertheless became an intellectual hero of the Whigs. During this period he discussed matters with such figures as John Dryden and Isaac Newton. He died on 28 October , and is buried in the churchyard of the village of High Laver , [20] east of Harlow in Essex, where he had lived in the household of Sir Francis Masham since Locke never married nor had children. He did not quite see the Act of Union of , though the thrones of England and Scotland were held in personal union throughout his lifetime. However, with the rise of American resistance to British taxation, the Second Treatise gained a new readership; it was frequently cited in the debates in both America and Britain. The first American printing occurred in in Boston. Michael Zuckert has argued that Locke launched liberalism by tempering Hobbesian absolutism and clearly separating the realms of Church and State. He had a strong influence on Voltaire who called him "le sage Locke". His arguments concerning liberty and the social contract later influenced the written works of Alexander Hamilton , James Madison , Thomas Jefferson , and other Founding Fathers of the United States. In fact, one passage from the Second Treatise is reproduced verbatim in the Declaration of Independence, the reference to a "long train of abuses". I consider them as the three greatest men that have ever lived, without any exception, and as having laid the foundation of those superstructures which have been raised in the Physical and Moral sciences". Three arguments are central: His tract The Bloody Tenent of Persecution for Cause of Conscience , which was widely read in the mother country, was a passionate plea for absolute religious freedom and the total separation of church and state. Detractors note that in he was a major investor in the English slave-trade through the Royal African Company. For example, Martin Cohen notes that Locke, as a secretary to the Council of Trade and Plantations â€” and a member of the Board of Trade â€” , was in fact, "one of just half a dozen men who created and supervised both the colonies and their iniquitous systems of servitude". Collectively, these documents are known as the

Grand Model for the Province of Carolina. Theory of value and property Locke uses the word property in both broad and narrow senses. In a broad sense, it covers a wide range of human interests and aspirations; more narrowly, it refers to material goods. He argues that property is a natural right and it is derived from labour. In Chapter V of his Second Treatise , Locke argues that the individual ownership of goods and property is justified by the labour exerted to produce those goods or utilise property to produce goods beneficial to human society. This position can be seen as a labour theory of value. In addition, he believed that property precedes government and government cannot "dispose of the estates of the subjects arbitrarily.

Chapter 7 : Paul K. Alkon, Visual Rhetoric in "The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas" - PhilPapers

Note that this is distinct from bigubau's suggestion as bigubau eventually calls for the natural log of the argument's limit, while Bohrok and I call for the limit of the natural log of the argument's limit.

References and Further Reading 1. He was the first who dared to write a treatise in prose, which has been called traditionally On Nature. This book has been lost, although it probably was available in the library of the Lyceum at the times of Aristotle and his successor Theophrastus. It is said that Apollodorus, in the second century BCE, stumbled upon a copy of it, perhaps in the famous library of Alexandria. Only one fragment of the book has come down to us, quoted by Simplicius after Theophrastus , in the sixth century AD. It is perhaps the most famous and most discussed phrase in the history of philosophy. He is said to have led a mission that founded a colony called Apollonia on the coast of the Black Sea. He also probably introduced the gnomon a perpendicular sun-dial into Greece and erected one in Sparta. So he seems to have been a much-traveled man, which is not astonishing, as the Milesians were known to be audacious sailors. It is also reported that he displayed solemn manners and wore pompous garments. Most of the information on Anaximander comes from Aristotle and his pupil Theophrastus , whose book on the history of philosophy was used, excerpted, and quoted by many other authors, the so-called doxographers, before it was lost. Sometimes, in these texts words or expressions appear that can with some certainty be ascribed to Anaximander himself. Relatively many testimonies, approximately one third of them, have to do with astronomical and cosmological questions. A quotation like "DK 12A17" means: Anaximander is said to have identified it with "the Boundless" or "the Unlimited" Greek: Already in ancient times, it is complained that Anaximander did not explain what he meant by "the Boundless. Some scholars have even defended the meaning "that which is not experienced," by relating the Greek word "apeiron" not to "peras" "boundary," "limit" , but to "perao" "to experience," "to apperceive". The suggestion, however, is almost irresistible that Greek philosophy, by making the Boundless into the principle of all things, has started on a high level of abstraction. On the other hand, some have pointed out that this use of "apeiron" is atypical for Greek thought, which was occupied with limit, symmetry and harmony. The Pythagoreans placed the boundless the "apeiron" on the list of negative things, and for Aristotle , too, perfection became aligned with limit Greek: The Arguments Regarding the Boundless It seems that Anaximander not only put forward the thesis that the Boundless is the principle, but also tried to argue for it. We might say that he was the first who made use of philosophical arguments. Therefore, any reconstruction of the arguments used by the Milesian must remain conjectural. Verbatim reconstruction is of course impossible. Nevertheless, the data, provided they are handled with care, allow us to catch glimpses of what the arguments of Anaximander must have looked like. The important thing is, however, that he did not just utter apodictic statements, but also tried to give arguments. This is what makes him the first philosopher. The Boundless has No Origin Aristotle reports a curious argument, which probably goes back to Anaximander, in which it is argued that the Boundless has no origin, because it is itself the origin. We would say that it looks more like a string of associations and word-plays than like a formal argument. It runs as follows: The Boundless has no origin. For then it would have a limit. Moreover, it is both unborn and immortal, being a kind of origin. For that which has become has also, necessarily, an end, and there is a termination to every process of destruction" Physics b, DK 12A The Greeks were familiar with the idea of the immortal Homeric gods. Anaximander added two distinctive features to the concept of divinity: However, perhaps not Anaximander, but Thales should be credited with this new idea. That which has no origin and no end" DK 11A1 The Origin Must be Boundless Several sources give another argument which is somehow the other way round and answers the question of why the origin should be boundless. In this argument, the Boundless seems to be associated with an inexhaustible source. Obviously, it is taken for granted that "genesis and decay will never stop," and the Boundless has to guarantee the ongoing of the process, like an ever-floating fountain. The "Long Since" Argument A third argument is relatively long and somewhat strange. It turns on one key word in Greek: If any

of them should be boundless, it would long since have destroyed the others; but now there is, they say, something other from which they are all generated" Physics b, DK 12A This is not only virtually the same argument as used by Plato in his Phaedo 72ab5 , but even more interesting is that it was used almost years later by Friedrich Nietzsche in his attempts to prove his thesis of the Eternal Recurrence: If there were for it some unintended final state, this also must have been reached. If it were at all capable of a pausing and becoming fixed, if it were capable of "being," if in the whole course of its becoming it possessed even for a moment this capability of "being," then again all becoming would long since have come to an end. The ancient Greeks did not use quotation marks, so that we cannot be sure where Simplicius, who has handed down the text to us, is still paraphrasing Anaximander and where he begins to quote him. The text is cast in indirect speech, even the part which most authors agree is a real quotation. The Greek original has relative pronouns in the plural here rendered by "whence" and "thence" , which makes it difficult to relate them to the Boundless. Therefore, we offer a translation, in which some poetic features of the original, such as chiasmus and alliteration have been imitated: Whence things have their origin, Thence also their destruction happens, As is the order of things; For they execute the sentence upon one another - The condemnation for the crime - In conformity with the ordinance of Time. In the fourth and fifth line a more fluent translation is given for what is usually rendered rather cryptic by something like "giving justice and reparation to one another for their injustice. The upholders of the horizontal interpretation usually do not deny that Anaximander taught that all things are generated from the Boundless, but they simply hold that this is not what is said in the fragment. They argue that the fragment describes the battle between the elements or of things in general , which accounts for the origin and destruction of things. The most obvious difficulty, however, for this "horizontal" interpretation is that it implies two cycles of becoming and decay: In other words, in the "horizontal" interpretation the Boundless is superfluous. This is the strongest argument in favor of the "vertical" interpretation, which holds that the fragment refers to the Boundless, notwithstanding the plural relative pronouns. There is some sense in this suggestion. On the other hand, we must recognize that we know hardly anything of its original context, as the rest of the book has been lost. The danger exists that we are tempted to use this stray text - beautiful and mysterious as it is - in order to produce all kinds of profound interpretations that are hard to verify. Its eternal movement is said to have caused the origin of the heavens. Elsewhere, it is said that "all the heavens and the worlds within them" have sprung from "some boundless nature. Subsequently, the sphere of fire is said to have fallen apart into several rings, and this event was the origin of sun, moon, and stars. There are authors who have, quite anachronistically, seen here a kind of foreshadowing of the Kant-Laplace theory of the origin of the solar system. But this is presumably a later theory, incorrectly read back into Anaximander. Some authors even think that they are so confused that we should give up trying to offer a satisfying and coherent interpretation. It will appear that many of the features of his universe that look strange at first sight make perfect sense on closer inspection. Speculative Astronomy The astronomy of neighboring peoples, such as the Babylonians and the Egyptians, consists mainly of observations of the rising and disappearance of celestial bodies and of their paths across the celestial vault. These observations were made with the naked eye and with the help of some simple instruments as the gnomon. The Babylonians, in particular, were rather advanced observers. Archeologists have found an abundance of cuneiform texts on astronomical observations. In contrast, there exists only one report of an observation made by Anaximander, which concerns the date on which the Pleiades set in the morning. We may discern three of his astronomical speculations: That the celestial bodies make full circles is not something he could have observed, but a conclusion he must have drawn. We would say that this is a conclusion that lies to hand. We can see - at the northern hemisphere, like Anaximander - the stars around the Polar star making full circles, and we can also observe that the more southerly stars sometimes disappear behind the horizon. We may argue that the stars of which we see only arcs in reality also describe full circles, just like those near the Polar star. As regards the sun and moon, we can observe that the arcs they describe are sometimes bigger and sometimes smaller, and we are able to predict exactly where they will rise the next day. Therefore, it seems not too bold a conjecture

to say that these celestial bodies also describe full circles. Nevertheless, it was a daring conclusion, precisely because it necessarily entailed the concept of the earth hanging free and unsupported in space. The Earth Floats Unsupported in Space Anaximander boldly asserts that the earth floats free in the center of the universe, unsupported by water, pillars, or whatever. This idea means a complete revolution in our understanding of the universe. Obviously, the earth hanging free in space is not something Anaximander could have observed. Apparently, he drew this bold conclusion from his assumption that the celestial bodies make full circles. The shape of the earth, according to Anaximander, is cylindrical, like a column-drum, its diameter being three times its height. We live on top of it. Some scholars have wondered why Anaximander chose this strange shape. The strangeness disappears, however, when we realize that Anaximander thought that the earth was flat and circular, as suggested by the horizon. For one who thinks, as Anaximander did, that the earth floats unsupported in the center of the universe, the cylinder-shape lies at hand. Why the Earth Does Not Fall We may assume that Anaximander somehow had to defend his bold theory of the free-floating, unsupported earth against the obvious question of why the earth does not fall. For that which is situated in the center and at equal distances from the extremes, has no inclination whatsoever to move up rather than down or sideways; and since it is impossible to move in opposite directions at the same time, it necessarily stays where it is. Even more interesting is that the same argument, within a different context, returns with the great protagonist of the principle of sufficient reason, Leibniz. In his second letter to Clarke, he uses an example, which he ascribes to Archimedes but which reminds us strongly of Anaximander: He takes it for granted that if there be a balance in which everything is alike on both sides, and if equal weights are hung on the two ends of that balance, the whole will stay at rest. This is because there is no reason why one side should weigh down, rather than the other". One may doubt, however, whether the argument is not fallacious. Aristotle already thought the argument to be deceiving. He ridicules it by saying that according to the same kind of argument a hair, which was subject to an even pulling power from opposing sides, would not break, and that a man, being just as hungry as thirsty, placed in between food and drink, must necessarily remain where he is and starve.

Chapter 8 : The maximum length of arguments for a new process

selection of such autobiographies to make the argument that, by examining a more complete corpus of spiritual autobiographies, and not just the most polished and successful ones, we get a different and fuller picture of the possibilities and limits of women s self-fashioning through language in the.

Chapter 9 : Argument - Wikipedia

Mill's argument proceeds in five chapters. In his first chapter, Mill provides a brief overview of the meaning of liberty. He also introduces his basic argument in favor of respecting liberty, to the degree it does not harm anybody else.