Introduction to Course
Question: What is Philosophy?
Some philosophers, such as Descartes and Kant, two individuals we will be studying, believed that Philosophy is an autonomous, unbounded field where fundamental truths could be sought out and discovered.
Other more contemporary philosophers see their field as continuous with the natural sciences, dealing with science’s most abstract problems. These are usually cross-trained (in a science) or work with scientists.
Other philosophers believe that Philosophy as a field is by and large **done**.

Various sciences have been extracted from it throughout its history, and **logic** was the last scientific extraction.

Almost all that’s left now is pseudo-problems.
And still other contemporary philosophers accept that Philosophy is a field of inquiry with no standard methodology, which allows for exploration of topics that aren’t being covered by other disciplines.
A standard solution is to use a question-based approach in introductory classes.

In this class, we will pose questions that are traditionally accepted as being *philosophical*, whatever that may mean, and look at the responses of professional philosophers, scientists, mathematicians, and more.
Two or more statements are logically consistent if it is possible that they are all true simultaneously.
Pallis O'Connor Presents

BACK TO THE FUTURE
TRILOGY

THE GREATEST TRILOGY... EVER MADE...
An **argument** is a set of sentences given in support of another sentence, i.e., the conclusion.

A **premise** is a member of the set of sentences that supports the conclusion.

The **conclusion** is the sentence being argued for.
E.g., of an argument

1. All men are mortal.
2. Socrates is a man.
3. Therefore, Socrates is mortal.
Food for thought...
Sometimes, just putting the argument into standard form will help you see if it is “good” or not...
Have you heard this before?

Vegan Dude:

Heeey, did you know that humans are the only animals that drink the milk of other mammals?
1. If an activity is done by humans, but not by other mammals, then that activity is morally wrong.
2. Drinking the milk of other mammals is something only humans do.
3. Therefore, drinking non-human milk is morally wrong.
What about...?
1. If an activity is done by humans, but not by other mammals, then that activity is morally wrong.
2. Drinking the milk of other mammals is something only humans do.
3. Therefore, drinking non-human milk is morally wrong.
A fallacy in error in reasoning, either intended or unintended. These come in two kinds: formal and informal.

Formal fallacies have to do with the structure of one’s argument; informal fallacies have to do with the relationship between the evidence (i.e., premises) and the conclusion.
INFORMAL FALLACY OF THE DAY
Argumentum Ad Hominem

This is a fallacy in which one attacks the arguer rather than the argument itself.
#1 Presents Argument

#2 Rejects

#3 Attacks the person
Standard Form (?)
1. You are annoying.
2. You are cancerous.
3. Therefore, you should vote for Clinton.