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**CT800 Week 5&6 Assignments**

**4)
The Overall Concept of Intellectual Standards**

Intellectual Standards encompass several criteria by which we can judge the quality of thinking. They are not arbitrarily chosen, but fundamental to reasoning and making sense; that is: to figure something out.

The standards are Clarity, Accuracy, Precision, Relevance, Depth, Breadth, Logicalness, Significance, and – according to the curriculum – Fairness.

These standards are universal across nations and cultures and help us stay on track with our thinking to detect flaws, improve it, and use it to live our best lives.

It is important to note that these Intellectual Standards are so fundamental that you’d use them even if you were to critique them.

**Each Intellectual Standard**

Clarity

1. Clarity means the definitive distinction about what we think about.
2. In other words, it means to understand what the topic at hand is without confusion.
3. For example, Clarity is shown when one thinks about the environmental pollution caused by the usage of combustion engine cars, excluding their production. Further, it would be more clear if one could define whether he or she thinks about carbon or sound pollution.

Accuracy

1. Accuracy means whether something is objectively correct.
2. In other words, it means that a line of thought is not distorted but measures up to an agreed upon scale.
3. For example, it would be more accurate to think of the environmental pollution caused by combustion engine cars under “average” (that needs to be defined as well) real world terms than measuring it under “perfect” conditions in a laboratory.

Precision

1. Precision means the degree to which detail is presented.
2. In other words, it means how granular and pedantic one thinks about a subject.
3. For example one could think of CO2-Emissions caused by combustion engine cars in [kg / 100km] or more precisely in [g / m].

Relevance

1. Relevance means how something relates to the topic at hand.
2. In other words, it means whether something is worth of consideration when thinking about a subject.
3. For example the aspect of politically controlled subsidies for different kinds of cars wouldn’t be relevant to the discussion of pollution caused by combustion engine cars while the distinction between urban (stop-and-go) and highway matters.

Depth

1. Depth means the degree of complexity involved in one’s thinking.
2. In other words, it means how many components and distinct variables of thinking one addresses and how they interrelate with one another; forming something greater than the sum of its parts.
3. For example, the discussion about pollution caused by cars would get more complex if we would include ownership of car (private / public), size of car (for purposes of transporting more people) or type of fuel. The discussion would be more superficially if we’d say that all cars were equal.

Breadth

1. Breadth means the amount of varying viewpoints on a topic included in ones thinking.
2. In other words, it means the degree of neutrality as neutrality (and therefore breadth) can’t exist without opposing viewpoints.
3. For example one can’t judge neutrally about the usage of combustion engine cars without addressing the viewpoints of different interest groups such as families, companies, military, racing, etc.

Logicalness

1. Logicalness means the degree to which a line of thought is coherent.
2. In other words, it means whether something is logically sound in a way that inferences build upon each other without any contradictions.
3. For example one can’t infer that bigger cars cause more environmental pollution and therefore the pollution per capita must decline if we were to prohibit “big” cars. Considering that fully utilized public transport (big cars) would result in much less pollution per capita, this inference is not correct.

Significance

1. Significance means whether or not a topic of thought is worth thinking about in the first place.
2. In other words, it means the degree to which one’s thinking can have real world application.
3. For example, it would be much more significant to think about environmental pollution caused by combustion engine cars in highly populated regions rather than sparsely populated regions as the information is much more nuanced and influential the more data we have.

Fairness

1. Fairness means the degree to which one has tried to consider opposing viewpoints accurately (see the interrelation…).
2. In other words, it means whether or not one has distorted any viewpoint in benefit of the other.
3. For example, it would be unfair to judge the pollution caused by combustion engine cars in third world countries and compare them to first world countries without addressing the situation people in first world countries find themselves in compared to people in third world countries. People in third world countries might have much more pressing priorities (water, food, shelter) than to think about optimizing their carbon footprint.

**5)**

**Think for Yourself 2.7**

Question: Is abortion morally justified

Position 1: Abortion is not morally justifiable

People who hold on to this position claim that life begins at the biological conception which in turn makes abortion murder and therefore morally unjustifiable. The fact that one could argue for or against the birth of a human promotes a culture in which life is disposable. Furthermore, it is well known that most human fetuses develop into sentient beings which, of course, would have had no say about the decision of abortion; but would have the ultimate freedom to commit suicide at any time. Abortion, therefore, implicitly promotes a world in which the decision of others about one’s life may hold more value than one’s own. Moreover, one could make the argument that abortion is an escape from responsibility – especially as access to birth control, health insurance, and sexual education is on the rise. Therefore, the argument of bodily autonomy loses its hold as the consequences of unprotected sex are known to all sentient creatures. If the result of unprotected sex wasn’t hardwired in the stembrain, the very meaning of “Reproduction” should be questioned.

Position 2: Abortion is morally justifiable

People who hold on to this position argue that the bodily autonomy of a woman over her own body is enough to let her abort an unplanned pregnancy. Furthermore, if a child is not taken care of appropriately and causes unnecessary suffering for all parties involved, abortion could be seen as a net positive for the greater good – that is the well-being of all people. Moreover, it is not established whether a fetus is already a person or not until it is born. If we define a person as…

* someone who has certain cognitive abilities, then the fetus is not a person.
* someone with certain biological characteristics, then a fetus may be a person.
* a biological human being who is alive, then abortion is killing a person.

As long as there is no consensus on what a natural person is, one needs to turn to the next obvious which is that the fetus is part of the mother herself. And that, in turn, is covered by the argument that a woman has autonomy over her own body. After all, the fetus would also die if the mother decided to commit suicide which is why one can’t argue for the autonomy of the child.