

## ARGUMENTATIVE PASSAGES FOR LOGICAL EVALUATION

You need a bit of courage to criticize reasoning which people present in current publications and in daily conversation. At least you need a bit of boldness. To criticize the reasoning you have to focus attention on the ways people put their claims together to draw conclusions. To pay attention to the forms or patterns with which people make inferences requires interpretation and restructuring of what they actually say. When we interpret and reorganize what people actually say we run the risks of being inaccurate and unfair. It would be nice to be able to criticize others without opening ourselves to criticism. But it seems that we have to put forth our interpretations and reconstructions for critical scrutiny when we criticize others; and that takes a bit of courage.

Most of the passages in this Unit are accompanied by some leading questions about how to analyze them. It is hoped that they are leading as opposed to being misleading questions. In criticizing the reasoning do not think that you need to criticize the entire argument. In many cases you may think that, on the whole, a good case is made for some conclusion, but that certain subarguments in the case are fallacious. It is common that only part of a complex of arguments is defective. The job of logical criticism is frequently to uncover and dismiss the logically weak arguments so that serious attention can be directed towards the truth of the premises of the logically correct arguments.

Do not let this sample of arguments mislead you to a conclusion that most people argue poorly when they try to argue. The material presented here is a biased sample. Much material was read and passages which seemed defective were selected; arguments which seemed strong were systematically rejected for inclusion.

.....

1. Recall the stories from late Dec. 1981 about assassination teams sent from Libya to assassinate U.S. leaders. Some people in our country had doubts about the accuracy of the reports of there being such "hit squads" from Libya. The excerpt from a Jan. 22, 1982 C-J editorial seems to make a wild leap from facts about Ray, Dozier, and a theory about the seriousness of assassination threats from enemies of democracy and capitalism to a conclusion that the speculation about the Libyan hit squads must be taken seriously. There seems to be no structure to their apparently illogical leap. But try using as a target for reconstruction the pattern of confusing 'some one or other' with 'some definite one' on p. 18. Perhaps they think the facts about the assassination of Ray and others give them: Some threats, reports, and rumors of assassination attempts from enemies of democracy etc., must be taken seriously. They have: The rumors of Libyan "hit squads" were some threats, reports, etc.,. By a fallacious form we took note of they can then move to their conclusion. How do you think they got there?

→ **Another terrorist victim**

All Americans must feel frustrated by the recent assassination of a member of a U.S. diplomatic mission.

Lt. Col. Charles Ray, an American military attache in Paris, was the latest of more than 300 diplomats from various countries killed by terrorists since 1968, when the State Department started keeping statistics.

Just a few weeks ago, another member of the U.S. mission in Paris was shot at. After that, U.S. Brig. Gen. James Dozier, a NATO commander, was kidnapped in Italy.

It should be obvious that the terrorist attacks are part of a concerted effort to stir fear, confusion and dissension among the Western allies. It also should be obvious that the terrorist network is being encouraged and financed by enemies of democracy and capitalism.

Perhaps the killing of Ray will end the snickers heard from some quarters about the recent report that a "hit squad" has been dispatched to the United States by Libyan dictator Moammar Khadafy.

2,3. Back on p.33 we referred to a fallacious pattern of inference in which someone moves from a claim that a certain theory or proposal is plausible to a conclusion that it is probable that it is correct or workable. Consider the bright ideas offered in these two C-J letters on the right. Perhaps you may also want to evaluate Mr. Reed's theory from the perspective that his idea is good, in the sense it saves a lot of money, but that it may not be good enough, namely, save enough money to be worthwhile. See the bottom of p. 32. Hewlett's suggestion could also be evaluated from this perspective.

One place to cut C-J 12/25/81

Control of the federal budget has become impossible with entrenched interests pressing for milk, peanut and tobacco supports and the pork-barrel programs for dams, canals and water projects. So we need a new area to cut

The idea of one six-year presidential term seems reasonable. Why not limit Senate and House members to a total of 12 years in Congress? One result would be to reduce the vote-influencing practice of "look what I got from Washington for my district."

To really dream, why not consider electing half as many senators and representatives? When we had 13 states, we needed two senators from each state, but now one should be enough

And if we had half as many representatives, think of the personnel and office space that could be saved. Cuts in the cost of operating Congress could save \$500 million each year. — NELSON REED, Mont Vernon.

12/25/81

4. In one sense of 'teach' you teach regardless of whether or not the pupil learns. In another sense of 'teach' nothing is taught if the pupil learns nothing. In light of this ambiguity, assess the argument implicit in A. Kemppinen's brief letter to Time in reaction to an article reporting that many physicians had not repaid student loans.

3 Getting even C-J 1/21/82

4. Time Jan. 18, 1982

Harvard Medical School obviously does not teach its students professional ethics, since many of its alumni do not repay their student loans.

Auvo I. Kemppinen  
Ballwin, Mo.

Let's really do something about our economy in the car manufacturing business. Here's a simple idea that is fair and would be easy to implement:

Whenever a foreign country charges an import tax on American cars, let's impose the same import rate on their cars.

What could be more fair and helpful to our auto manufacturers, their employees and our nation? — H.D. HEWLETT, Columbus.

C-J 1/21/82

J. Breiner, Cols. Dispatch Nov. 24, 1981

5. LATELY, TAXPAYERS have been looking at the cost of the investigation and saying, "They're crazy. They're going to spend more than \$1.3 million trying to explain what happened to the money."

They wonder if it is worth it.

Well, consider what happens when a policeman catches an 18-year-old carrying a \$400 television set from somebody's home.

The theft amounts to only \$400. But when the creaky wheels of the criminal justice system have finished turning, punishing this kid may cost the taxpayers more than if they had paid to send him to Harvard.

There is the cost of the arrest, the prosecution and, if the youth is indigent, the defense. It costs money to keep him in jail.

The point is that taxpayers routinely pay more for the arrest and punishment of a criminal than is the loss due to the crime.

SO IT IS NOT really out of line to spend \$1.3 million to find \$1.3 million.

5. In the column from which the excerpt on the left was taken Breiner is discussing the controversy over the fact that it is taking the accounting firm of Price-Waterhouse much time and much money to trace what happened to \$1.3 million dollars missing from the Ohio treasury. He offers an analogical argument to defend the expenditure of up to \$1.3 million to uncover what happened to the missing \$1.3 million. Reconstruct this argument in an analogical form and then try to evaluate it without making too many assumptions that are controversial.

6. Recall pp. 31-32 and ask yourself: Limited by what standard? Then reconstruct and appraise an argument in the brief Nov. 11, 1981 Time letter on the right.

6. It is not the possession of weapons that impels countries to fight with one another, but causes, real or fanciful, that motivate nations to acquire the arms for war. Limited weapons did not prevent Hannibal from killing as many Romans in a single battle (Cannae) as the U.S. lost in seven years of Viet Nam fighting, nor did it stop the genocidal acts of Genghis Khan.

History proves that while men with guns kill, those without arms or with inferior weapons die. Common sense dictates that we and our allies stay well armed

William R. Hawkins  
Blacksburg Va

*Dispatch Washington Bureau*

WASHINGTON — It wasn't a good year for 12,000 federal bureaucrats.

The Reagan administration wants to trim the federal workforce, and the latest figures from the government show that it shrunk by that number in 1981.

The report was released by Rep. Michael Barnes, D-Md., who has an interest in these matters because he represents an affluent suburb of Washington where many highly paid federal employees live.

**MANY OF THE 1981** job cuts were done by simply getting rid of agencies, such as the Community Services Administration.

Barnes noted that about one-third of the reductions came through a mechanism called "reduction in force" or RIF. The RIF job cuts came to 3,411 of the total firings.

Naturally, Barnes was quick to criticize the cutbacks, saying they had been done unfairly. His report noted that the government's higher paid workers — above the federal pay grade of GS-12 — made up 44 percent of the RIF. But he also pointed out that the lowest-paid employees — GS grades one through four — accounted for only 11 percent of the RIF.

These developments have not brought many tears to the eyes of people in Washington who don't work for the government and have to live by their wits instead of having civil service protections.

Staffers on Capitol Hill, in private conversations, are showing little compassion for the fired

agency personnel. Of course, a Hill staffer can be fired in a minute if his boss wakes up in a bad mood one morning.

What's lost in all of this uproar is that the government employs more than a million people, and so losing 12,000 of them will hardly bring the federal establishment quaking to its knees.

(On this page: ad hominem circumstantial, ad populum?, Division?, misuse of relative terms.)

7. On the left is an excerpt from a news article from the Jan. 10, 1982 Columbus Dispatch. Perhaps news articles should report the facts and not argue for any conclusion. Nevertheless, this article makes a case for the justification of the Reduction In Force (RIF) of Federal Employees.

Do you detect an ad hominem circumstantial fallacy in dismissing an argument against their view? Would you reconstruct some of the closing remarks as an illegitimate appeal to popular sentiment to justify a claim? Do you find hints of a Division fallacy in their dismissal of Barnes' points? It wouldn't be correct to conclude that the details of an RIF program are justified even if the RIF program is, on the whole, justified.

-----

8. Below are two "target" forms of fallacies: one of a misuse of relative terms and the other an ad hominem circumstantial fallacy.

The cost of doing R in way X is high.

∴ The cost of doing R in way X is higher than doing R in way Y.

Those who do R in way X are going to make a profit from tax monies.

∴ Those who do R in way X are going to overcharge the public for doing it.

Aim at these "target" forms in your efforts to expose fallacies in the letter below which appeared in the Jan. 10, 1982 Columbus Dispatch.

8.

**Fees to house retarded adults in home not told and too high**

A Dec. 30 *Dispatch* story told of a plan for placing eight mentally retarded adults in a home located at 1421 Kenwick Rd.

The story stated that it would be cheaper to house these people in this manner. What it neglected to mention was that Human Services receives \$50 a day per individual.

I certainly don't consider that a bargain. I feel this is high, especially since I know this is taxpayers' money paid to a profit-making organization.

Mrs. Tom Wolfel  
Columbus

## 9. Journal says stingy drug policies force suffering

BOSTON (UPI) — Hospitalized patients endure too much day-to-day pain because doctors and nurses are needlessly stingy with narcotics, an editorial in the prestigious New England Journal of Medicine said Wednesday.

Hospital staffers should get rid of their unrealistic fear that patients will become addicted or suffer harmful side effects from pain-killers and increase doses of pain-killers if necessary, wrote Dr. Marcia Angell, deputy editor of the medical journal.

"Few things a doctor does are more important than relieving pain," she wrote. "Yet the treatment of severe pain in hospitalized patients is regularly and systematically inadequate."

quate."

"Pain is soul-destroying. No patient should have to endure intense pain unnecessarily. The quality of mercy is essential to the practice of medicine; here, of all places, it should not be strained."

Dr. Angell said one study showed that 73 percent of patients undergoing treatment for pain continued to experience moderate to severe discomfort despite medication.

"The desire to protect patients from becoming insidiously drawn into a state of addiction distorts both our sense of priorities and our scientific judgment," she said.

Dr. Angell wrote that addiction is "exceedingly unlikely," and happens

in probably no more than 0.1 percent of the time. Withdrawal is accomplished easily if pain no longer exists, she wrote.

9. The report about Dr. Angell's views on the use of pain-killing drugs appeared in the Jan.

14, 1982 Lantern. Her 2nd. and 5th paragraph justify interpreting her conclusion as: Doctors and nurses should increase the dosages of pain-killing medication for hospital patients until severe and moderate pain is removed regardless of risk of addiction. In so far as she is trying to motivate people to act her appeals to emotions are appropriate. Of course, though, the emotional appeals are irrelevant to our forming a correct opinion on what is likely to happen if we act in the which she wants us to. In particular, the emotional appeals are irrelevant to the issue of whether or not fear that patients will become addicted is realistic. Fortunately for our evaluation of her reasoning, an argument for the unlikelihood of addiction if pain-killer use is increased. is reported in the last paragraph of the above excerpt.

Complete the reconstruction below in the way which you think represents Dr. Angell's reasoning. Pass critical judgment on this reasoning.

Under conditions of present usage of pain-killers in hospitals .1% of the patients administered pain-killers become addicted to them.

∴ (

)

10. Mr. McGee's letter appeared in the C-J on Christmas Day 1961. Would you reconstruct his argument as a hasty generalization from anecdotal experience? Does he use flimsy analogies to support a persuasive definition of 'pusher.' Perhaps he even introduces traces of ad hominem circumstantial in this short letter. Reconstruct it to see whether any inference can be salvaged from it. Perhaps not.

### The worst pushers

It's great that Columbus police are rounding up so many drug pushers.

Unfortunately, the big money-making pushers aren't busted because they are protected by the law. These dealers happen to have MDs after their names.

My mother listened to their advice for years and now is addicted to pills in the worst way. Her habit is very costly, but it helps doctors play golf, take vacations and invest on the stock market.

Young people who see their parents taking pills are more inclined to pop sopors and downers. Then they are thrown in jail. Let's put the burden of guilt where it belongs — DENNIS McGEE, Columbus.

11. →

11. We can sympathize with Lawrence's residents' desire to defend their town. But are strong defenses reported in this excerpt on the right from the Jan. 8, 1982 C-J? Do you detect a composition fallacy to keep Lawrence from last place? Could you reconstruct an illegitimate appeal to the populace as an authority?

12. Is a Supreme Court Justice an authority on economic matters? Consider the excerpt from a mid-Dec. 1981 C-J editorial just below. Aim at the "target" form below to try to uncover an accident fallacy. The C-J is arguing to support Chief Justice Warren Burger's suggestion that U.S. prisons be converted to factories producing standard consumer products. .0

## 12. Factories with fences

Under Burger's concept, prisoners would earn the prevailing local wage, or at least the federal minimum wage, from which they would pay state and federal taxes and possibly room and board.

As for objections from private business, certainly the most voracious consumer society in the world could absorb the production of 100,000 prisoners, as Burger said

X can use more P than X now uses.  
n Ps are more Ps than X now uses. ( n is some number such as 100,000.)  
 ∴ X can use n more P than X now uses.

13.

13. Sometimes it is right to appeal to the populace as the authority on what ought to be done. Still, even when it is right to appeal to the public's opinion, the appeal can be carried out in an incorrect way.

Reconstruct and appraise Reeves' → way of reaching a conclusion on public opinion on care of the elderly.

The bulk of the column, which is left-out, points out the problems the U.S. faces if the governments have to bear the main burden of care for the elderly.

(On this page: ad populum, accident, appeals to authority, poll-taking) composition

DALE McFEATHERS  
Screen-Howard Staff Writer

LAWRENCE, Mass. — This New England factory town, along with its neighboring communities, has just been rated the absolute worst place to live of America's 277 metropolitan areas.

Lawrence R. Smith, executive director of the local Chamber of Commerce, says heatedly as he loads down a visitor with promotional literature, "If anybody came up here or talked to anybody up here, they'd know it was just wrong. Totally false, totally inaccurate. Everybody around here knows better. This is a GOOD place to live"

"Visit us," he urges, "or just write and we'll send you some information that shows this is a pretty good area."

Not, however, according to Rand McNally's just-published \$11.95 "Places Rated Almanac: Your Guide To Finding The Best Places To Live In America" Based on a point system that rated such things as climate, health care and recreation, Lawrence-Haverhill wound up with 1,427 points, 846 behind winner Atlanta, Washington, D.C., finished second. Pittsburgh was fourth.

Local analysts, scouring the ratings for bright spots, note that Lawrence-Haverhill didn't finish last in any one category and that if the town's water had been fluoridated that would have been enough to loft it ahead of Fayetteville-Springdale, Ark., the runner-up worst place.

## Government expected to care for elderly

C-J Dec. 14, 1981 Richard Reeves

WASHINGTON — Traveling the country for the past couple of years I have asked the same question over and over: "Who is responsible for taking care of your parents in their old age?"

The answers — from students in Ithaca, N.Y., and professors in New York City, from autoworkers in Detroit and U.S. senators here — have almost always been "the government."

I cannot recall more than a couple of people who gave a different answer. Many people were uncomfortable when they said it, but they said it. Some bitterly blamed Franklin D. Roosevelt and said that such dependence on government was ruining America, but their answer was the same.

However much we love to talk about rugged individualism and taking care of the family, an American consensus has been reached that taking care of the old is a public function on the same order as educating children. In a working democracy, consensus is the ultimate power, and the decision has been made

14. Discussion of this editorial from the Jan. 14, 1982 C-J could lead to disputes. Disputes could arise over the wisdom of Reagan's administration's decision to stop the IRS from denying tax-exempt status to schools practicing racial discrimination. The decision of Jan. 8 is reported below. Disputes also arise when we reconstruct an argument as an appeal to authority. Disputes arise over whether or not the alleged authorities are truly authorities. What's the dispute about here? It depends upon what we pay attention to. It is clear that the C-J is arguing that Reagan should have continued the IRS denial of tax-exemptions. To support their main conclusion they offer two arguments to rebut Reagan's belief that the Administrative Branch has no legal right to deny tax exemptions. Let us focus attention on those two arguments.

Reconstruct and appraise an argument that there are no significant legal objections to denying tax-exemption; and make this argument an appeal to the authority of Presidents: Nixon, Ford, and Carter.

15 ↓

WASHINGTON (UPI) — Widely criticized for restoring tax-exempt status to private schools that refuse to admit blacks, President Reagan said Tuesday he is "unalterably opposed" to racial discrimination and will submit new legislation to attack the problem.

The decision Friday by the Treasury and Justice departments restored tax exemptions to Bob Jones University of Greenville, S.C., and the Goldsboro Christian Schools of Goldsboro, N.C.

White House spokesman David Gergen said Reagan concurred in the decision by his departmental chiefs, but was "disturbed" by and regretted the perception that his administration was retreating on civil rights.

But the president said there was another issue at stake, which went to the heart of the decision by Treasury and Justice, and it involved "administrative agencies exercising powers that the Constitution assigns to the Congress."

In other words, Gergen said, Reagan still objects to agencies such as the IRS taking such broad actions without benefit of legislation.

"Such agencies," Reagan said, "cannot be allowed to govern by administrative fiat.

"That was the sole basis of the decision" Friday, he said. "I regret that there has been a misunderstanding of the purpose of the decision."

## Tax break mistake

The Reagan administration may have a legal point in dropping an 11-year-old government policy of denying tax-exempt status to private educational institutions that practice racial discrimination. But it is on shaky ground from a moral standpoint.

In justifying the reversal of an Internal Revenue Service policy dating back to the Nixon administration, the Justice and Treasury departments argue that IRS has no clear basis in law for denying tax-exempt status to private schools and colleges that discriminate.

Deputy Treasury Secretary Richard McNamar says it is inappropriate for the executive branch to exercise such a power in areas where Congress has not spoken clearly.

That legal technicality, if indeed it is one, didn't seem to bother the Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations. They denied tax-exempt status to 100 private institutions on the ground that taxpayers should not have to subsidize practices that run contrary to the nation's firm policy against racial discrimination.

We think the Reagan administration made a mistake, especially since the IRS policy was before the courts and its legality would have been decided in due course. The Justice Department plans to ask the Supreme Court to throw out that case in light of the administration's change of policy.

15. How can we use the C-J's observation that "the IRS policy was before the courts and its legality would have been decided in due course" as a premise for a conclusion that there is no significant legal objection to continuing the IRS policy? If the legality of the policy is before the Court and the Court has not yet heard the case, then we are ignorant of whether or not the policy is legal.

Isn't the citation of the fact that the policy is before the Court an indirect assertion that we are ignorant of the legality of the policy? Reconstruct the editorial's appeal to the IRS's policy being before the Court as an appeal to ignorance. If you do not think that it should be reconstructed as an appeal to ignorance how should it be interpreted? Or do you know of some legal principle that can be used to guide us on what course to follow when we are practicing a policy of whose legality we are ignorant?

Appeal to Authority  
Appeal to Ignorance

# Minister believes in 'visualizing'

Hasty generalization  
post hoc  
question begging  
Division?

By GEORGE PLAGENZ

C-T Nov. 21 1981  
scribes-Howard Reiden Writer

SAN DIEGO, Calif. — She could well be the most beautiful minister in the world but the thought has to cross your mind as you watch her and listen to her: Is it the medium or the message which attracts 3,000 people to her Sunday morning services at the California Theater?

I decided to put the Rev. Terry Cole-Whittaker's message to the test.

She had told us, during the meditation part of the service, to picture vividly in our minds whatever it is we desire and that, if we do that, we will discover that the picture will come to life.

Would the technique work on the tennis court?

I found myself an opponent I had beaten in practically every set of tennis we had ever played together. She had also heard Mrs. Cole-Whittaker expound her "visualization" theory at the Sunday service. She was anxious to try it out.

Before each serve — hers or mine — she would close her eyes and picture what she desired the score to be after the next point had been played.

For example, if the score was 40-30 my favor, she would form the picture "40-40" in her mind, which would mean she had won the next point. Then we would play the point.

Believe it our not — and I would not have believed it — she won the set, 6-3.

One set of tennis does not a theory prove, but this visualization technique has been tried on a higher level than tennis and been proved workable.

There is a specialist in cancer therapy in California who combines conventional medical treatment with visualization by the patient.

This doctor — Dr. Carl Simonton — tells his patients they have a mind that is in charge of their body's cells. The body will do what you tell it to do, he says.

One of the techniques Simonton recommends to his patients is to form a picture in the mind of the healing process going on within their bodies. He told a 12-year-old boy to picture his white, healing corpuscles as cowboys attacking his tumor. The boy recovered.

Terry Cole-Whittaker, whose Church of Religious Science here has grown from a membership of 50 to 3,600 in five years, started practicing visualization in her freshman year of college.

"I wanted to be homecoming queen," she says, "but my hair had turned from blond to darker. I was overweight and not even close to being the prettiest in my class.

"So I worked on it. I did visualizations on being homecoming queen. I conjured up all the feelings, the emotions, the joy I would feel if I were picked. I lost 25 pounds and became a blonde again. I didn't understand a whole lot about the principles but they worked. I was chosen as homecoming queen."

At 41, she is still a startling beauty. A couple of years ago she finished third in the national Mrs. America contest.

Her weekly television program, called "With love, Terry," is heard currently in the San Diego and Los Angeles areas, but she has set her sights on a world-wide television ministry.

If people put her preaching into practice, they will "close the gap between potential and performance," she says.

Why does her teaching work? X

"It works," she says, "because what we believe in our minds manifests itself physically, tangibly, in our experience. What you believe, you get. I teach people how to change their negative, limited thinking into a belief in the power within us which can make things exactly as we choose them to be."

16. Does this fallacious pattern occur? ↑ If so, show how. If fallacious, say why.

In a few cases, visualization of a desired outcome is followed by that outcome.

∴ In these few cases visualization causes the desired outcome.

∴ In general, visualization of a desired outcome does (can?) cause the occurrence of the desired outcome.

Who, if anyone, is arguing here? And for what? Assess the attempt to explain how the alleged visualization process works. What's assumed to answer the question about how her teaching works? X

## 17. Plight of the little guy

Small businesses in Ohio are being robbed while large corporations are given the luxury of long-term tax abatements to keep them in the state.

It is incredible that our state leaders would take advantage of the efficiently run small business community by tripling the franchise tax and dunning corporate income below \$25,000 at nearly 5 percent while treating large companies generously.

Small businesses supply endless goods and services. Collectively they employ thousands. Yet whenever taxes are increased, small businesses pay more than others.

As a consequence of that stupid taxing philosophy, small businesses fold or are forced into inflationary price increases. — E. ERIC OSBORN, Amlin. C-T 11/30/81

17. Is it fair to reconstruct this letter on the left as committing

the Division Fallacy: Collectively small businesses are a big business and so small businesses should be taxed as big ones?

19.

### Religion, not the lack of same, was reason America founded

Bernard H. Witsberger's letter to the editor (*Dispatch*, Dec. 27) would have been more understandable if it had come from a political figure in a Communist country. I suggest that he take another look at American history to see why this great country of ours was founded.

Witsberger states in his letter that "when people's religion conflicts with the traditions, interests, and culture of their country, its constitution, and its laws, then those people should quit either their religion or their country."

Maybe Witsberger doesn't realize that our Founding Fathers established America's laws and precepts on the principles recorded in the laws of God, including the Ten Commandments. It is not the people with religion (God) who are in conflict with our nation's traditions, Constitution, laws and so forth, but the people without religion (God). Religion, not the lack of it, was the reason for the founding of this country.

Also, Witsberger apparently does not understand the First Amendment to our Constitution in regard to the separation of church and state. The amendment states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or forbidding the free exercise thereof ..."

The intention of our Founding Fathers was to protect the American people from an established government church which would be controlled by the government and paid for by taxpayers. They wanted to avoid this favoritism by separating church and state in function. This does not mean they intended a government devoid of God or of guidance found in Scripture.

To separate personal religious preference from a forced establishment of religion is far different from separating godliness from government. It is when government gets away from God that problems arise. So I suggest that Witsberger either get religion or move to a country like the Soviet Union where he won't have to be bothered with it. I sincerely hope he will do the former.

Brenda Joyce Clevinger  
Columbus

19. Does her 5th. paragraph bring out the flaw in Witsberger's argument? How?

In the course of exposing Witsberger's fallacy does Clevinger commit, or tend to commit, genetic fallacies and ad hominem abusive fallacies by noting a slight analogy between Witsberger's views and those of some Communists?

18. On Jan. 10, 1982 the rebuttal on the left was printed in the Columbus Dispatch.

Witsberger, who is being criticized, wrote his letter to criticize Columbus Diocese Bishop Herrmann for complaining of inaccurate reporting of clerical activity.

Perhaps the gist of the argument in the part of Witsberger's letter below is:

By our traditions and constitution no religion should influence public policy by virtue of being an official state religion.

•• By our traditions and Constitution no religion should influence public policy in any way.

Witsberger's argument is reconstructed so that it is an obvious misuse of the relative term 'influence by.'

18→

It is ironic that Herrmann seems worried about his and other bishops' image in view of the frightening picture of the Catholic bishops meddling in national and state legislation, not only in the abortion issue but also in the issues of capital punishment, the living will, armaments, illegal aliens, along with attempting to get public money for parochial schools, and all this in flagrant violation of the Constitution.

Religious meddling is causing chaos in Iran; it has brought about the assassination of Anwar Sadat; and it has already disrupted the democratic process in the United States.

The U.S. tradition of separation of church and state demands that no religious leader or group should attempt to influence government in the United States anywhere at anytime.

When people's religion conflicts with the traditions, interests, and culture of their country, its constitution, and its laws, then those people should quit either their religion or their country. Whether they do or do not, they have no right whatsoever by any means or way whatsoever to impose their religion upon others who differ in belief. A so-called religious person does not make a pursuit right by claiming approval of his god. All meddling in government by a person or group in the name of a religion should be declared criminal and liable for prosecution. The U.S. Constitution says, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." Let it be so. And as it is so, then by implication no religion should be permitted to influence lawmakers.

Bernard H. Witsberger  
Delaware, Ohio



### Embattled ERA

20. What a display of twisted legal logic by Federal Judge Marion Callister [Jan. 4]: on the one hand he rules "that states have the constitutional right to change their minds." while, on the other hand, Congress has no constitutional right to its decision to extend the original deadline for passage of ERA.

*Seija A. Hytönen  
Berkeley, Calif.*

21. I am a pro-ERA Mormon who has closely followed the legal maneuverings between NOW and Judge Callister. The outcome of the ERA extension-recision cases was determined by the male Mormon hierarchy from the day the case showed up in Callister's courtroom.

*Susan W. Howard  
Santa Barbara, Calif.*

22. Having Judge Callister, a member of the Mormon Church, rule on the fate of the most significant piece of women's rights legislation since the 19th Amendment 60 years ago is akin to having an executive of the National Rifle Association decide on the constitutionality of gun-control legislation.

*Leslie B. Hardy  
Oklahoma City*

TIME, JANUARY 25, 1982

20. If you regard the U.S. as a whole and the several states as its parts, do you think that a Division Fallacy can be detected in S.A. Hytönen's letter?

21. Wouldn't this be a kind of post hoc reasoning? C is an M, Ms believe P, C believes P. Therefore, C believes P because C is an M? (See pp. 29,32) But even if C believes P because he is an M wouldn't it be an ad hominem circumstantial fallacy to suggest that C's judgment that P is incorrect?

In light of these questions, consider S.W. Howard's letter.

22. Frequently analogies are used to argue in an ad hominem way. It is pointed out that C is analogous to X who is bad, biased, etc., about something similar to what C is talking about. We are implicitly encouraged to transfer our tendency to commit ad hominem fallacies about what X would say to what C did say. Such an approach is subject to criticism on the basis of the analogy and then on the suggestion that we use ad hominem reasoning. Do these rather indirect remarks suggest a pattern for starting to organize the brief remarks of L. Hardy into an argument?

TIME, JANUARY 4, 1982

Letters to Time magazine have to be very short. So, the writers do not have space to develop their arguments in detail so that they appeal to reason. They need to present a readily grasped point which may not be their best point. So, we criticize the letters on the left simply on the basis of what is written. Perhaps with ample space the writers would offer much stronger arguments.

## Death Knell?

### Two rulings hurt ERA

It was a stunning defeat, a double blow to the dwindling prospects for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

In a long-awaited two-part decision, U.S. District Judge Marion J. Callister ruled in Boise, Idaho, last week that states have the constitutional right to change their minds. He declared that the legislatures of Idaho, Tennessee, Kentucky, Nebraska and South Dakota had acted legally when they voted to rescind their initial ratifications of ERA. In an 81-page ruling the judge wrote: "Congress has no power to determine the validity or invalidity of a properly certified ratification or rescision." If that ruling is eventually sustained, it would reduce the number of states that have ratified the proposed 27th amendment from 35 to 30, far short of the 38 required to change the Constitution.

The second part of Judge Callister's opinion, if it is not overturned, means that ERA is already dead. He ruled that Congress had acted unconstitutionally when it decided to extend its original seven-year deadline for states to ratify ERA from March 22, 1979, to June 30, 1982. Declared the judge: "When this time is set, it is binding on Congress and the states and it cannot be changed by Congress thereafter." He noted that both houses had approved the original deadline by two-thirds votes but had allowed the extension by simple majorities.

Angry backers of the amendment announced that they would appeal directly to the Supreme Court. The National Organization for Women had tried to force the former high official of the Mormon Church to remove himself from the case on the ground that his religious beliefs posed a conflict of interest; leaders of his church are strongly opposed to ERA. A

Analogy, *ad hominem* circumstantial, misuse of relative term

## Some Bones of Contention

In the Dec. 21, 1981 issue of Time there was an article in the "Science" section with the above title. The article described a ceremony in which the Yurok Indians of California buried the remains of some of their ancestors which they had recovered from archaeologists by a California State Court order. The article went on to describe the rather successful effort of Native Americans to recover and rebury the remains of Indians and earlier Native Americans which had been collected in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The article went on to report, and to reveal sympathy with, the regret of some scientists over this effort to rebury the remains of these people.

Some excerpts from this article are on the left below. On the right below are two letters arguing on points raised by "Some Bones of Contention." Let's analyze and appraise those two arguments in the "Letters" section of Time Jan. 11, 1982.

For their part, scientists fear that the action in Sacramento is only the first step in a systematic assault against other private and public Indian collections. Many also perceive an antiscientific bias in the Indians' campaign and a broader threat to all free inquiry. U.C.L.A. Archaeologist Clement Meighan, who is the chairman of a recently formed committee seeking to overturn the state's decision in the courts, even invokes the image of China's Cultural Revolution, during which centers of learning were shut down and scholars exiled to the countryside to do menial labor. Says Meighan: "Since many of these bones are over 2,000 years old, it's hard to imagine how any Indian in California can trace lineal descent [from them]."

Unfortunately, much of this archaeological treasure—371 skeletal remains and more than 100,000 artifacts, including jewelry, tools and musical instruments—has barely been studied, especially not with the latest analytical tools for dating, identifying and interpreting ancient fragments. It is hard not to wonder what secrets remain in this rich legacy left by America's first settlers. Curator Riddell hardly seems to be exaggerating when he warns: "In reburying this collection, we are unwittingly assisting the Indians in destroying their past." —By Frederic Golden. Reported by Alessandra Stanley/Patrick's Point

24

23.

A. Plossl is arguing that the bones should be returned.

Do you think she uses an analogy to make ad hominem circumstantial case for her point?

### Burying the Hatchet

The controversy over reburying the remains of California Indians is not simply a dispute between archaeologists and Indians [Dec. 21]. Indeed, some collections of potentially threatened artifacts are in museums owned and operated by the tribes. The disputed materials—and the information they hold—are part of the scientific and cultural heritage of all the people of the state of California. As a window on the lives of ancient native Californians, they help us understand the past and therefore ourselves.

Edwin C. Krupp, Director  
Griffith Observatory  
Los Angeles

23→

In the article "Some Bones of Contention" Curator Francis Riddell says that by allowing California Indians to rebury the bones of their ancestors, "we are unwittingly assisting the Indians in destroying their past." If white men wanted to learn about their own history, would they dig up Arlington National Cemetery?

Anne M. Plossl  
Hanover, N.H.

24. E. Krupp is arguing that the bones ought to be kept in museums. Do you detect in his argument a pattern of inferences such as:

Some Indians have no right to object to keeping the bones in museums.

∴ Indians have no right to object to keeping the bones in museums.

∴ It is right to keep the bones in museums. ?

Do you think that Krupp's argument can be interpreted as containing a portion which can be reconstructed as:

Keeping the bones in museums is good for some purposes.

∴ Keeping the bones in museums is the best use of the bones. ?

25 (This open letter appeared as a full page ad in the Dec. 18, 1981 N.Y. Times.)

Dear Fellow Americans,

The actions of the Polish government in suspending basic rights and liberties of its citizens should cause every American to say a silent thank you for the foresight of the drafters of the U.S. Constitution.

The Associated Press story describing the Polish government's martial law actions is a litany of the precise types of governmental abuses which the Founding Fathers sought to prevent by the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The "Great Writ" of habeas corpus in Article I prevents Americans from being seized and interned indefinitely, as Poles may be, and Lech Walesa and other members of the Polish Solidarity Union apparently have been.

The First Amendment prohibition against "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press" protects Americans from allowing government to require a permit for printing equipment and dissemination of literature, and protects us from the shutting down of all but one government-controlled radio station, one television station, and one newspaper - which has just been ordered in Poland.

The First Amendment's guarantee of the pre-Constitutional "right of the people peaceably to assemble" protects us from an equivalent of the Polish government's edict that "all gatherings, processions and demonstrations are banned."

And the Second Amendment guarantee that the pre-Constitutional "right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed" prohibits a Polish government-type order that "all firearms, ammunition and explosives must be handed in to the police."

Poland has precisely the firearms laws that the NRA has been opposing in the United States. Handguns are allowed only to the privileged few; rifles and shotguns may be kept only with police permission, and every gun is registered. So seizing those guns requires only that the permits be revoked and an order to turn them in or face imprisonment.

As several commentators have noted, the courageous Polish people are willing to continue their active year-long fight against repression by a tyrannical government; they are willing to fight the suspension of the fundamental rights of free men; but the authorities have all the guns."

Fortunately for us, the Founding Fathers had great foresight. They knew that when all intellectual debate has ended, when all appeals for reasonableness have failed, when the only choice remaining is whether to submit or resist, then the overriding question becomes whether the people have the means to resist.

The writers of the Constitution had experienced, and resisted, a tyrannical government; they had both the will and the means to resist. And they wanted to be certain that their descendants also had the means to resist, which is why they wrote the Second Amendment as the ultimate protection for the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment and all the remainder of the Constitution.

And so long as the Second Amendment is not infringed, what is happening in Poland can never happen in these United States.

Thank you, Mr. Jefferson.

Sincerely yours,

25. We present the letter in full because when emotions are to be aroused by words it often takes several words to present the "pictures" and ideas which are to arouse us. Re-read pp. 40 - 41 on illegitimate appeals to emotion. Does the argument of the above letter reduce to what is suggested on p. 41? Also see p. 32 and on the model of fallacy of going from 'good' to: 'good enough to be chosen' invent a fallacious form of going from 'bad' to: 'it's worse than the other alternatives.' The letter reminds us that gun control is bad: It does restrict liberties and does involve risks. But the alternatives are worse ? ? ? ? ?

Neal Knox, Executive Director  
National Rifle Association  
Institute for Legislative Action

# An armed citizenry C-J 1/2/82

26 We may think that the appeal on the previous page is not to be heeded without considerable deliberation. We may even think that use of small arms by Poles

26

The National Rifle Association is trying to get some mileage out of the crisis in Poland.

As part of its crackdown on the Solidarity movement, the Warsaw government ordered that all guns, ammunition and explosives in private hands be turned in to the police.

The NRA was quick to observe that disarming the populace was easy because "Poland has precisely the firearms laws that the NRA has been opposing in the U.S."

"The Polish people are willing to continue their year-long fight against repression by a tyrannical government," says NRA executive

director Neal Knox, "but the authorities have all the guns."

Gee whiz. If it hadn't been for gun-control laws, pistol-packing Poles would have made quick work of those tanks and disciplined troops armed with rifles and machine guns and artillery pieces that suddenly appeared in the streets of every city in the country.

Gee whiz again. Instead of spending billions on MX missiles and B-1 bombers and M-1 tanks and de-mothballed battleships and whatnot, the United States should simply arm its military forces with snub-nosed revolvers.

Then watch the enemies of freedom squirm

would have been totally useless in resisting imposition of martial law. However, should we dismiss the concerns of the NRA about the role of a privately armed citizenry in a last-line defense of basic liberties as absurd concerns because of the "strawman" rebuttal in the Jan. 2, 1982 C-J editorial above? Don't they, the editorial writers, distort the open or ambiguous suggestion of the NRA: Use of small arms by citizens would be effective in resisting tyranny, by reading it as: Use of small arms by citizens would be totally effective in resisting tyranny? Wouldn't there be an accident fallacy in going from 'not totally effective' to 'not effective'?

## We might have been British

27 A recent C-J editorial misused a statement by National Rifle Association Director Neal Knox to deny the truth and promote the newspaper's views on gun control; that did a great disservice to the American people.

The Warsaw government ordered all guns, ammunition and explosives in private hands turned over to the Polish police. The C-J implied they only ordered handguns turned in and that the only guns used by private citizens are snubnosed revolvers.

The armed citizens of Afghanistan have prevented the complete takeover of their country by Russia. Many freedom fighters there are armed with single-shot rifles made in the 1890s. They seem to be gaining in their effort against 90,000 Russian troops who have tanks, machineguns and "yellow rain."

If the right to own firearms had been denied to the citizens of the American colonies, we would be British subjects today. — HIRAM W. THOMPSON, Groveport.



27. Does H.W. Thompson in his Jan. 18, 1982 C-J letter sketch out an effective way of showing that the C-J editorial above provides only a "strawman" refutation of the NRA's views on private uncontrolled ownership of firearms? But what about his last paragraph? Do you sense a hasty generalization or an accident fallacy in the inference below? Why'd he write that paragraph?

Private uncontrolled ownership of firearms by people in the American Colonies in 1776 provided a most effective means of preserving liberties.

•• Private uncontrolled ownership of firearms by people (in the U.S. in 1982) provides a most effective way of preserving liberties.

28 Presumably P.T. Camboni thinks it is 28<sup>2</sup> illogical to reject his analogical reasoning that laws can't stop people from killing with guns. Does he offer an analogical argument? What is it? Do you think he may have reached some premises of his analogy by accident/equivocation fallacies such as: Speeding laws do not not people who do speed from speeding; so, Speeding laws do not stop people from speeding. Certainly gun control laws won't stop people who get guns and kill with guns from killing with guns. But how much does that tell us about stopping people from killing with guns? See p. 25 on ambiguity of general statements.

## Laws won't help C-J 1/21/82

Consider this scenario of a crime: A man decides to rob a store and uses a handgun to carry out his intent. He pulls the trigger and wounds, perhaps kills, someone.

A man, a gun and a bullet are involved in the crime — two inanimate objects and a human being.

All the laws in the world wouldn't prevent that man from obtaining a weapon to carry out his intent. Laws do not stop heroin addicts from obtaining heroin; they do not stop motorists from speeding.

It is illogical and foolish to think that restrictive handgun laws will prevent handgun crimes. We must focus our efforts on the people who commit crimes, instead of on the inanimate objects they abuse while breaking the law.

Millions of law-abiding Americans use these same objects every day for sport and protection. — PATRICK T. CAMBONI, Columbus

## An economics lesson

At a Ford automobile plant at Saarlouis, West Germany, 7,762 workers turn out 1,200 Escort models a day. At an identical plant at Halewood, England, 10,040 workers produce only 800 cars a day.

Each car at Saarlouis requires 21 man hours of labor, at Halewood it takes 40 hours. Although German workers are paid \$4.75 an hour more than their British counterparts, it costs Ford \$1,000 less to build a car in Germany and ship it to England.

One percent of the cars built at Saarlouis fail at a quality control checkpoint; 14 percent fail at Halewood.

Saarlouis has the lowest injury record in Ford's European operations; Halewood workers say the German plant is unsafe.

Another comparison: Halewood had 20 strikes in the first nine months of 1981; Saarlouis never has strikes.

But that's a vast improvement for Halewood, which registered 300 strikes in 1976.

Maybe British workers are beginning to see a connection between their lackluster performance and their country's economic plight.

29. In this Nov. 21, 1981 C-J editorial, England's auto industry is compared unfavorably with that of West Germany. Perhaps we need to know more about the economies of the two countries to make a fuss about comparing only the Saarlouis and Halewood plants. But what lesson about connections should this comparative data show to British workers? Does it show that their "lackluster" performance is a significant factor in England's economic plight? Or is it the other way around?

30. C-J Nov. 21, 1981

The All Savers certificates, hailed as the savings instrument which would bail out savings and loan associations and funnel money back into mortgages, haven't quite live up to expectations.

But Kenneth Elshoff, president and chief executive officer of the Ohio League of Savings Associations, 88 E. Broad St., credits the one-year, tax-free certificates with bringing in some new funds.

Quoting from a report by the Federal Home Loan's Fifth District Bank, Cincinnati's sampling of 18 large associations in the three-state area, he said as of Nov. 10, there were \$474 million in deposits in the area, compared with \$333 million deposits the previous month, so total increase was \$141 million from the October period.

324 R. Reeves: excerpt

But, according to official reports, juvenile crime is decreasing significantly. The 1980 Uniform Crime Reports, issued by the Justice Department in September, indicate that arrests of persons under 18 years of age decreased by more than 6 percent in the last recorded year — and that was the fifth straight year of decline.

In 1980, juvenile automobile theft arrests were down by 18 percent. Juvenile burglary arrests were down 11 percent, and larceny arrests were down 5 percent. And it was not that all arrests were down — adult arrests continued to increase.

The reason for the decline in juvenile crime — or, at least in apprehended juvenile criminals — is quite simple. There are fewer juveniles. Between 1970 and 1980, the number of 5- to 15-year-olds in the United States decreased by 6 million while the overall population increased by 23 million.

31 There is good news reported in the Dec. 29, 1981 C-J article just below. But do you think that the National Safety Council reasoned well to a good explanation for this good news?

31. <sup>12/29/81</sup> *Lowest holiday toll cheers safety group*

United Press International

Adherence to good driving rules and relatively fair weather were the reasons the 1981 Christmas traffic death toll was the lowest Friday-through-Sunday holiday count since records began in 1955, the National Safety Council said Monday.

A final United Press International count showed 355 people were killed on the nation's roadways between 6 p.m. Thursday and midnight Sunday, about 200 deaths lower than the 550 that was the highest estimate by the council.

"What the council has found is that fewer people were killed because of the relatively good weather across the country," said Charlene Moran of the safety council.

"People were also heeding the advice of the council and other organizations to be aware, drive defensively and observe speed limits."

30. From what is presented should we credit offering All Savers certificates with bringing in new funds?

← 32 Richard Reeves presented a longer column in the Jan. 11, 1982 C-J in which he examined the changing character of juvenile crime. But we focus only on his explanation of why there has been a decline in apprehended juvenile criminals. Do you find hints of post hoc, propter hoc reasoning here?

31. That's a "lotta" litter! Really? A lot for a year, for month, for a day? If we reason hastily from ambiguous statistical statements such as that reported in the excerpt on the right from the Dec. 12, 1981 C-J we should talk primarily of ourselves as receivers of data as those committing the fallacy although we can, perhaps, criticize some inference of R.Teater here. Do we have here presentation of data in such a way that a situation which we should expect to occur seems to be an unexpected situation which calls for serious attention, if not action. (See pp. 26-27) Are we tempted here to reason as follows.

There is a substantial litter problem. (But the reading for which this premise is clearly true is: The problem of removing the litter is a problem of removing a large amount of material and this job may be under control.)

∴ There is a substantial unsolved litter problem.

### Survey outlines litter problem in the state

United Press International

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources said Tuesday the state's first comprehensive roadway and recreational litter survey shows there are 200 million pieces of litter weighing 22 million pounds in Ohio.

"This is enough litter to fill 151 boxcars comprising a train 1½ miles in length," said ODNR Director Robert Teater. "This is a substantial litter problem."

• 92 • • • • •

WASHINGTON (UPI) — A congressional study released Tuesday shows that over the next 10 years, only the top 10 percent of American taxpayers will benefit significantly from the personal tax cut enacted this summer.

The study said that the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans, with adjusted gross incomes of more than \$55,850, would save more than \$9,000 in federal taxes in 1990 compared to their 1980 income tax debt.

The next 5 percent — those with adjusted gross incomes of between \$44,540 and \$55,850 — would reduce their 1990 tax bill by \$2,097 compared to what they owed Uncle Sam in 1980, the study said.

But the news was not so bright for the remaining 90 percent of American taxpayers, the report said.

The 40 percent of Americans with income between \$22,610 and \$44,540 would save an average \$58 in 1990 compared to their 1980 tax debt. Taxpayers in the bottom half of the scale — with incomes below \$22,610 — would not receive any tax cut by 1990, paying \$133 more in taxes by the end of the decade than they did in 1980.

The Democratic chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, which conducted the study, used the results to label President Reagan's tax program "trickle-down . . . hocus-pocus." But Republican staff members disagreed, calling the conclusions invalid.

In a letter to the committee members accompanying the report, chairman Henry Reuss, D-Wis., said, "The results confirm the fact that supply-side economics is indeed trickle-down economics," a phrase used to describe tax cuts for the rich that eventually "trickle down" to the poor.

"The result of all this hocus-pocus is that 50 percent of American taxpayers under President Reagan's program will by 1990 be paying more taxes and a greater percentage of total tax revenues while the 10 percent of taxpayers at the top will pay sharply less taxes and a sharply lesser share of total taxes paid," he said.

"If this isn't a Robin Hood-in-reverse scheme, what is?" Reuss asked.

The above article is from the Dec. 30 1981 C-J.

32. If we think carefully about the above report from the bi-partisan Joint Economic Study Committee and combine some of the data we can organize the study's results to reason in the following way.

The top 10% in 1990 will pay significantly less income tax than the top 10% in 1980 paid.

The lower 90% in 1990 will not be paying significantly less taxes than the lower 90% in 1980 paid. (This is put mildly to include 90% of taxpayers.)

∴ It is only the top 10% in 1990 which will pay significantly less income taxes than the top 10% in 1980 paid.

The conclusion is awkward and, perhaps, not too informative. But does it entitle us to go on to infer: It is only the top 10% which will pay significantly less income taxes under the Reagan plan?

Is there a top 10% to resent?

C-J Jan. 19, 1982 34

What happened in Vietnam

Some people apparently believe that when a nation is large it usually is wrong. In the case of a democracy such as the United States they cannot put up with the fact that sometimes we take two steps forward and one step back.

In his recent letter to the C-J, John Quigley saw little or nothing that's right in our attitude toward Vietnam, and little that's wrong with that country.

He seems to have forgotten that during the Vietnam War the North Vietnamese were constantly in the south ruining the countryside and murdering and intimidating the people, while our troops were forbidden to advance into the north.

We may have been wrong to get involved; but we were even more wrong once we were in to limit ourselves to a no-win situation. — F.T. RUDY, Columbus.

C-J Jan. 19, 1982 35

Recognizing the bad guys

In chastising the C-J for its editorial "Hanoi gambit," letter writer John Quigley proved once again that the view from the exalted heights of intelligentsia at Ohio State University is distorted by a lack of oxygen to the brain and not, as he would have us believe, by a lack of facts.

It was Russia which "annexed" the countries around its perimeter. It was North Korea which attacked South Korea. It was North Vietnam which attacked the south, and then its neighbors.

Even if Quigley slept through basic history, he must have read about Russia annexing Afghanistan recently.

It's apparent who the bad guys are, and it ain't us. — J.P. KIRWIN, Columbus.

33 We haven't discussed this issue in our listing of fallacies. But our training in logic tells us that the way to rebut an argument is to know what the argument is, show that the premises do not support the conclusion, or that the premises are false or highly dubious. Reconstruct Quigley's argument and assess whether Rudy (34) and Kirwin (35) attack his argument at all.

36 We can squeeze in here the brief note about some reasoning of J. Falwell reported Jan. 18, 1982 in the C-J. Perhaps you want to assess Falwell's reasoning on the use of a 1924 report and for possible misuse of the relative term 'supporter.' Isn't there a difference between 'support the legal rights of' and 'support the political aims of?' Could such a difference be relevant to Falwell's reasoning? Does Ira Glasser attack Falwell's form of reasoning or his premises?

C-J Jan. 11, 1982 33

The U.S. reneged

The Dec. 31 editorial "Hanoi's Gambit" decried the use "for propaganda purposes" by Vietnam of the four ex-GIs who recently visited that country to explore the MIA and Agent Orange issues. The editorial writers are upset that Vietnam may be trying to utilize such person-to-person contact as a step towards diplomatic relations with the U.S.

In its only reason against opening relations, the editorial parrots the State Department position that relations are out while Vietnam has troops in Kampuchea, but that situation has existed only since 1979. For four years prior to that, the U.S. rejected relations with Vietnam.

During that period, the likely reason for no relations was that the U.S. could not bring itself to deal with a small nation that had driven out our troops. Now the U.S. is nearly allied with China, an enemy of Vietnam. To deal with Vietnam would anger China.

The State Department purports to be outraged over Vietnam's intervention in Kampuchea, but it was the U.S. that led the way in denouncing the brutal government in Kampuchea that was replaced in 1979 by Kampuchean guerrillas and Vietnam's army.

The editorial chides Vietnam for being "heavily dependent on a Soviet subsidy," but Vietnam has been forced into that dependence because its economy is in bad shape.

The editorial obliquely attributes Vietnam's economic woes to its socialist form of government. While the organization of Vietnam's economy has been faulty in some respects, one cannot overlook the fact that half a million U.S. troops defoliated Vietnam's countryside, left land mines and B-52 bomb craters in its rice fields, bombed its industry, and killed and maimed its population.

In the 1973 peace agreement, the U.S. promised reparations for these deprivations, but has reneged.

If the U.S. administration were motivated by the sense of justice it purports to feel over Poland, it would be scrambling to open relations with Vietnam and to send much-needed aid. — JOHN QUIGLEY, Ohio State University, College of Law.

CJ 11/132

36 ↓

Moral Majority blasts ACLU

Moral Majority leader Jerry Falwell is raising funds to attack the American Civil Liberties Union which he calls the "single most destructive threat" to the American way of life. ACLU raised the ire of some church groups for leading the fight against the Arkansas creationism law.

Falwell charges that the ACLU is a Communist front, and as proof he cites the 1924 FBI report calling the ACLU a "supporter of all subversive movements."

ACLU executive director Ira Glasser dismisses it as "paranoid, scuzzy stuff" that "says more about the Moral Majority than it does about us."

37. Cols. Dispatch Jan. 10, 82

14-year-old quotes Genesis as proof God created world

One thing I just can't seem to understand is how all those evolutionists can say that the earth just "evolved." I'm only 14 years of age and I know that that isn't true.

God made the world Himself. It says so in *Genesis 1:1*.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," *Genesis* reads.

How can anyone call God a liar? They'll see when God judges them. They'll be sorry for all eternity that they ever believed that stuff about evolution.

How can the evolutionists say a human just "evolved?" A human being is magnificent. The brain, alone, is complex. How can a brain just "evolve?"

The evolutionists say there was an explosion. What exploded? Where did whatever exploded come from? Why would anyone want to make up something like evolution?

I think this evolution matter is just plain ridiculous. One can just sit and think about evolution and see how stupid it is.

Sherrie Mack  
Columbus

38. Cols. Dispatch Jan. 24, 1982

19-year-old boy discounts view of girl, 14, on evolution theory

Sherrie Mack (letter to the editor, Jan. 10) was at a loss to understand "how all those evolutionists can say that the earth just evolved. I'm only 14 years of age and I know that isn't true."

She also asked, "Why would anyone want to make up something like evolution?"

I think that anyone who read her letter can see that she has been brought up in a totally one-sided atmosphere. I'm only 19 years of age, and in no way do I feel that I, or anyone else my age, is qualified to say "I know that isn't true."

Having been raised in a quite liberal family, I've seen all sides of the evolutionist vs. creationist argument — from my high school science classes to occasionally attending church services. The evolution theory is a result of centuries of scientific study; no one sat down and made it up overnight.

In a way, I feel kind of sorry for Sherrie. Maybe once she completes some of her biology, geology, and anthropology classes in high school, she can see what the evolution theory is based upon. In no way do I want to change her religious beliefs, but I do think that she can't develop any kind of accurate opinion or belief without thoroughly studying each side of the situation.

Brian Long  
Delaware, Ohio

37 Perhaps much of S. Mack's argument can be reconstructed as an appeal to ignorance. Does her Genesis quotation support her reading "God made the world Himself" with the sense that God did not make the world by starting an evolutionary process? Can we uncover some illegitimate appeal to fear in her remarks on eternal damnation?

38 How does Brian Long discount her view on evolutionary theory? Or does he talk only about her and himself?

39. Leave Nancy alone

C-J 11/11/82

Johnny Carson has spent \$20,000 for luxurious bed linens of hand embroidered silk and custom-made pillow cases that cost \$390 each. Liberace has table plates valued at \$1,000 each.

It's time for the nitpickers to get off Nancy Reagan's back.

Do you suppose the free-loaders feel the Reagans should have purchased something cheap and given them the rest of the money?

The truly needy will be taken care of. It is the free-loaders who scream the loudest, when it should be the over-burdened taxpayers. — O.K. WATERS, Newark.

39 Perhaps this is a frivolous issue, but can you rebut Water's analogies better better than S. Allen (40)?

40. Nancy's proper role C-J

C-J letter writer O.K. Waters completely missed the point in his defense of Nancy Reagan. As a working single parent and a taxpaying citizen, I resent being called a free loader and a nitpicker.

Mrs. Reagan lacks any awareness of what is going on in the real world. While the poor and needy go hungry and jobless, she callously flaunts her wealth and position wearing fur coats and buying outrageously priced dinner ware.

References to Johnny Carson's and Liberace's extravagances as private figures are inappropriate. Mrs. Reagan is a public figure who lacks the sensitivity for, or is ignorant of, her public role. — SUSAN E. ALLEN, Columbus. C-J 11/21/82



## 41. Wiretap safeguards

WE REALIZE wiretaps are dangerous to the extent they can be used — illegally — to invade a person's privacy but they also can be an instrument for law enforcement agencies to fight today's organized criminals armed with sophisticated equipment.

The need for this weapon and other electronic weaponry to fight crime was explained a few days ago to members of the Ohio Senate Judiciary Committee which is conducting hearings on Senate Bill 417.

The proposal would allow police to use wiretaps in efforts to gain evidence while investigating organized crime. Very importantly, the bill requires a court-order to use a wiretap.

Lt. Dave Dailey, commander of the Columbus Police Division's organized crime unit, told about the existence of a local gang which is under surveillance for criminal activities in areas of narcotics, prostitution, assaults and even murders.

The officer revealed some background of the gang numbering about 350. In addition to a "boss," the gang includes an attorney, bartenders, auto and petty thieves, drug pushers and what he termed "enforcers." He added these people control 12 bars and also are involved in the sale of pornography.

Dailey and Columbus Police Chief Earl Burden maintain that wiretaps and other electronic surveillance devices are necessary to cope with racketeers, to obtain evidence to put this type of person behind bars.

We feel police should have the proper tools to do their job which is to protect society. Certainly there are no restrictions handicapping the criminal.

The pending legislation is not for Columbus alone but for all law enforcement officers in Ohio. We think most law-abiding citizens would favor Senate Bill 417. We hope the Senate gives it serious consideration.

41. Consider the reasoning implicit in the seventh paragraph of the editorial above from the Jan. 24, 1982 Cols. Dispatch. Do you think that it may go as follows?

- i. If there are no restrictions handicapping the criminal and there is a crime problem, then some restrictions on police action should be removed.
- ii. There are no restrictions handicapping the criminal.
- iii. There is a crime problem.
- ... Some restrictions on the police should be removed.
- iv. Senate Bill 417 removes some restrictions on the police.
- ... Senate Bill 417, on wiretaping, should be passed.

Is there a move from 'some one or other' to some definite one? How should we read 'There are no restrictions handicapping the criminal'? Certainly all criminal activity is against the law. Does it amount to: There are no laws on how to break the law legally?

Do you think that the whole argument can be criticized for making only a case that Bill 417 is good, has some merits, when it should be argued that it is good enough to be chosen.

In any event, this place is good enough to stop the Tenth Unit.