Note 3

There were many who did not correctly understand the assignment. The requirement was to apply the analytical tools found in the handout to one of three arguments. This was especially true when the choice was the argument in the Language Primer Second Installment. In brief, there was an argument within an argument. The first level was an argument in the New York Time piece about the separation of children. The thesis was that it was inhuman and amounted to torture. Of course, the issue was: Does this amount to torture? Some of the analysis contained some of the tools at this level

But the deeper level was that this is an example of “facts” supporting “value”. So, the deeper philosophical issue was: Do “facts” (descriptive claims) support “values” (normative claims)? That argument had a counter argument (Hume’s passage) Assurance (Philippa Foot) a warrant (whenever you have descriptive claims they can work as strong and complete reasons for normative theses.

Review of this choice indicated that many only analyzed the New York Times argument. The assignment was to analyze and discuss the deeper issue.