M20HSS316-ITP/Assignment-1/20171213/CSD

1) The argument raised in the youtube video states that, as people burn witches, and wood is another thing which is burnt, therefore witches must be made up of wood. Again to check if the witch is made up of wood, another property of wood is used. As wood can float in water, and another thing that can float is duck. Therefore the weight of the duck must be equivalent to that of the witch, for a witch to be made up of wood and hence should be burnt.

This whole statement is logically invalid, it's same as saying that if P has some property Q and R also have one of its property as Q, then R must be equivalent to P. Consider an example, let's say P is a dog, and R is a boy and both can walk (that is common property Q) they must be equivalent, if the witch argument is correct. But of course, epistemically dogs can not be equal to a boy. Hence, a contradiction.

Also, consider the last argument " the weight of the duck must be equivalent to that of the witch, for a witch to be made up of wood and hence should be burnt." It's more like using the argument in paragraph-2 twice, if P, Q have something in common (let's say A) and Q, R has something in common (let's say B) then if P, R have something in common (let’s say D) then P is equivalent to Q. Which cannot be true, as a contradiction is shown in paragraph-2.

So, basically, the above argument is somewhat dicey. It requires some rearrangement, that is let the first premise be "Witches are burnt, so is the wood" also "wood can float, so can the duck", now if "duck have the same weight as the girl (have something in common) then the girl is similar to wood", as both "ducks and wood float on water plus girl is similar to ducks" therefore "girl is made up of wood" which states that the "girl can be burnt, as woods can be burnt". Now since the girl can be burnt, and witches are the ones to be burnt. Therefore, that girl is a witch.

---

(2) Firstly, the argument has some premises, first and foremost "P1: Philosophy teaches critical thinking skills that are applicable in every career". Let's see how the conclusion can be drawn from this, if we supply a missing premise "P2 - every student's curriculum must involve courses/subjects which teaches stuff applicable in every career". Then by using premise-1(P1) and premise-2(P2) a conclusion be reached, as philosophy teaches critical thinking skills that are applicable in every career, and such kind of courses/subjects should be there in every student's curriculum hence, "C: Philosophy should be part of every student's curriculum."

Now consider the second sentence in the passage "Coding, on the other hand, should not, since it is a comparatively narrow skill that is only of value to people who intend to pursue careers in the tech industry." Another premise visible here is "P3: Coding is a comparatively narrow skill that is only of value to people who intend to pursue careers in the tech industry or coding skills are not applicable in **every career."** Using premise-2 (P2) and premise-3 (P3), a conclusion can be made that, as coding is a narrow skill and is not applicable in every career, it should not be a part of every student's curriculum.

In the end, it states that people agreeing with educating every student in coding and saying philosophy not to be taught are wrong in some sense. This conclusion is valid because according to our previous premises, philosophy must be there in every student’s curriculum but on the other hand coding must not be.

The premise that coding **should not be** there in every student’s curriculum is **weak**, it’s true that coding is a narrow skill and only useful for people pursuing tech careers but that does not mean it completely crosses out the possibility of it being taught to every student. It can still be taught to students, for them to explore something new and to gain knowledge outside their domain fields. So, the premise should have been that coding is not a necessity for every student but it’s not completely avoidable for it to be strong.
