# DOWNLOAD PDF IMPORTANCE OF LOGIC IN OUR DAILY LIFE

## Chapter 1 : Basic Logical Reasoning

*Assuming the question concerns the practical importance of logic in dealing with all our daily routines and ongoing activities, I would only add that it is actually quite impossible to make any decision without logic.*

Why is logic relevant to everyday life? Of course having too much Logic is the flip side.. Enables clear thought through a rigorous demand for truthfulness;. Because thought processes are clarified, the use of logic enables consideration of all available options for opinion and action, and decreases the persuasive power of popular opinion;. Because available options have been fairly considered, the use of logic increases the likelihood that subsequent opinions and actions will adhere most closely to the truth. Adherence to the truth, while sometimes painful, is the human condition more likely to lead to satisfactory outcomes in most situations. It has been proven that a simple rat has basic logic, Scientists created a machine that would create two types of sounds: They also gave the rat three small levers to pull, Lever 1 and lever 2 and lever 3. When the sceintists played a long sound or short sound, the rat would get fed a large amount of good food if it pulled the correct corosponding lever to the sound played, left lever for long beep, right lever for short beep, if the rat pulled the middle lever, it would get fed some food, but not as much, no matter what sound was played. If the rat pulled the incorect lever, it would not get fed anything for a while. The rat eventually caught on that if it pulled the correct lever it would get much better food, so it started pulling the correct levers. One day, to test the rats logic abilities, the scienctists decided to play many different sounds, long short short long long short, to see what the rat would do. The rat was able to think about his choices, he chose to pull the middle lever, and he took the small amount of food because he knew it was the best choice. The rat would rather not take a chance at missing out on his food. Without logic, everybody would act instantly on their emotions, thus making many many radical choices, without logic there would be more criminals, for example: Imagine if everybody chose option C for all of their choices? Life would be alot worse than it is now. Logic, is a deductive reasoning that results when the human brain calculates the most rational and acceptable outcome of any given situation and recognizes that answer as the most constructive, and consequently the most desirable. When faced with any situation you can divide the reactionary decision into two groups; rational or irrational, instinctual or improv, emotional or logical. Emotional responses tend to be the strongest desire in the moment, when followed outcomes like crimes of passion or moments of extreme passion. I tend to think that acting on an emotional paradigm feels better, and tends to be more rewarding but it also tends to precede more danger. Logical responses happen when the individual looks at a situation from a third party and recognizes the moral obligation or larger demographic of opinion that would rationally decide the correct decision.. Why logic is so relevant to everyday life is a difficult question. I believe it stems from a natural human desire to help support a social group and thus keep everyone content. This instinctual human behavior might originate from tribal hunts in ancient times when a single person would bring back a catch and share it equally with the tribe, thus keeping the tribe alive and healthy. The center of this instinct also shares space with politics, and even our stock market of buying and sharing stock.. For the record people should actually answer the question, rather than just explain what the subject is. Undertanding Logic makes answering the question Rhetorical! What is the importance of logic? If a student just memorizes definitions without understanding why the words are defined as they are and why they are used in a given manner, then the student will only be able to understand those few words, versus the entirety of the language and definitions. The importance of logic? Logic is the catalyst of reason, the foundation of experimentation and the weakness of a lie. Why logic is important? What is the relevance of studying logic as a student? The study of logic allows an individual to understand how things work, and, as this is applied increasingly to their life and to the lives of others to which they are exposedâ€¦ , it allows them to better evaluate situations, making increasingly superior decisions in life. Additionally, logic is the basis of all existance, and is used to comprehend all aspects of reality. Without a basic grasp of this, it is impossible to function, and, although it may appear labourious, it is important for the increased ability of the individual to survive and exist effectively. What is important of logic? Logic link cause to effect, action to reaction and input to output. By finding result, we use logic to analyze. Logic is the basis of

learning methodology and decision making. There are many example of bad logic in this world where fallacy give rise to pseudoscience and false hope in medical world.

## Chapter 2 : Practical Logic and Decision Making in Real Life Â« The Web Site People

*Logic creates a system by which a conscious mind can apply a set of principles to any problem or argument to determine its validity. Some studies that lay the foundation for and continuously interact with modern human societies, including computer science and mathematics among others, are built on.*

This is a broad topic and we only hit on a few items in the previous iteration. Namely, through the application of logic. If your goal is to actually start a business, the worst possible move you can make is this: The person did not have the necessary skills to earn a high income. Easyâ€¦ Does this make sense? So, run the math. It does not make sense. You start it in the States because that is where the network is. Facebook, Twitter, SnapChat, Uber, etc. It is not because the founders are dumb. If you are talented and have options, there are too many opportunities in the states to cause a young 20 year old to pack his bags and leave for no good reason. This is probably the funniest piece of the entire Complain-o-sphere. The claim is that women are not relationship material because they are slutsâ€¦ Thenâ€¦ Claim that women are too hard to sleep with. This does not make any sense. How can you take advice from someone who has this type of logic? This time never existed and never will. It is either hard to get laid or it is not. We do not care which group you are in. It is not a big deal. Which group are you in. Women Abroad are Soooo Different! No they are not. Here is the basic learning curve. Your relative purchasing power is 4x in the foreign country and only 1. Your lifestyle was significantly better on a relative basis so you did better. If you really want to prove this out, you can test run the thesis. You simply decrease your spending all the way down to the median. Then go to your third world country and spend the median income within that cityâ€¦ Hint. While there are always nuances based on personalities, the same thesis applies in foreign countries as they do in the states. The girls you attract will always be a reflection of your total value. On launch day your conversion rate for any product, this is an eBook, real product from a real business or otherwise, is going to be significantly higher than any other day. Of course, holiday season and special days will also sell well, launch day is the real big one and should be ignored. This does not mean page views, this does not mean sessions etc etc. Now here is the equation: This is likely an inflated number. Now that you have the rough math you can quickly figure out if someone is telling the truth or not regardless of claims. We do not care if you sell scammy products or real ones it is your life. Just know the numbers so you can be aware of the world around you. Price ends with the number 7. That is what separates real money from a smaller scale business. Paid traffic converts are where you make a lot of money. The reason why paid traffic is so important is simple. This is exactly why athletes, musicians and celebrities are paid so much to endorse XYZ products and why many affiliate marketers are being sued for impersonating celebs. A great sale is a quick one to a stranger. Spend all of the money you have. Take out loans, liquidate all of your easily sell-able assets and keep spending till it dries up. Once it dries up, turn off the hose and go to the bank. So if you see a business consistently advertising on extremely high traffic website yahoo finance for example that company is doing very, very, very, well. Unless a business is selling aggressively on paid ads in high traffic mega websites, it is not generating a large amount of income. Naturally, we recommend you do the opposite. They will incessantly prod you with how much you actually make so the best way to trap them is as follows: They will usually respond by giving you a little bit of detail about where they live. Assume they live in a 1 bedroom. Take that numberâ€¦ multiply it by 3 after tax money , gross up to the total annual income. Here is the quickest version! Regular people are always insecure and even if they are secure there is no point in testing the waters. A Year Per Month: If you really want to step on the gas with regards to your financial future, start calculating your net worth by years of living expenses saved. If you are young and in the bracket this is likely lowâ€¦ between 0 and 1. Everyone has different levels of risk. Once you get there, you can now spend like mad if you want. Accumulate 12 years and begin doubling down on life experiences. But this is risky! Of course it is. That is going to be successful in their eyes. This can be applied to any field. If someone played division 3 football, they will be impressed by a division 1 athlete. So on and so forth. Knowing this rule of thumb, you can quickly look at audiences to determine if they are groups of people you want to associate with. Some quick ones to go through: What type of person worries

about politics? That is the audience. Do you want to be a part of that audience? Everyone has a weakness. If someone cannot call out a legitimate personal weakness they are untrustworthy individuals. Use logic to recognize weaknesses, limit them and improve upon them. Motivational non-sense will do the reverse. They try to inspire people who are not inspired: Degenerates respond to insults. This is the best word to describe the process. This is evident in the existence of the blog alone. It is better to acknowledge this as a piece of our personality and take the good with the bad. The good is that narcissism leads to solid speaking skills and aggression. The bad is that it leads to arrogance, self importance and lack of empathy. Building off of the previous section, we have very, very, very little empathy. Your girlfriend dumps you. You give us the story in 5 minutes. This is a function of life experience as well. Unless we know the person in real life, we have no interest in reading anything they have to say. The only way to really break through and get us to listen to anything is by providing 1 actionable advice or 2 giving enough detail for us to figure out if the person is legitimate. That is the only way we will ever read or listen. If we do our diligence and realize the person is simply mediocreâ€¦ we ignore them. Lets make this crystal clear. We do not care who other people associate with. If person A has useful information and person B is his friendâ€¦ It does not mean we care about person B. We Get Annoyed Over Investing: We will never do legitimate securities analysis on this blog. That will never happen. Last year we had 10 interactions, this year is two and hopefully next year will be zero.

## Chapter 3 : Application of Logic to Improve Your Life

*Home Essays Importance of Logic in Our Importance of Logic in Our Day to Day Life use various technologies to accomplish specific tasks in our daily life.*

Importance of basic logic 1. The importance of basic logic in learning Hempel proposed the deductive model of explanation. He stated that the occurrence of any event E can be explained deductively from general laws and initial conditions see Figure 1. Given general causal laws and statements describing initial conditions as two premises of deduction, a statement describing the event to be explained not the event itself follows as a logical conclusion drawn from the given premises. They use deductive reasoning to help students to learn the direction of force acting on a moving object. For example, they show these two premises to students: If an object is moving more and more slowly, then the net force acts on that object in the opposite direction to that of its motion. A ball which is thrown vertically upward is moving upward more and more slowly. They then ask what conclusion can be drawn from these premises. Their research shows that using deductive reasoning can help students change their preconceptions. The importance of basic logic in everyday life Deductive reasoning is a basic logic skill and is very useful in our daily life. We make many deductions from what we already know. For example, say you receive a flower as Christmas gift. You need to put it somewhere. You know all plants need sunshine. Your flower is plant. The flower needs sunshine, so you put it beside the window. Research on basic logic JJ Roberge. Logical thinking in college students. Logical thinking in adolescents. Educational Studies in Mathematics, Park, J. International Journal of Science Education. Deductive and inductive modes of preservice physics teacher education.

## Chapter 4 : 7 Active Role of Logic

*Critical thinking, then, enables us to form sound beliefs and judgments, and in doing so, provides us with a basis for a 'rational and reasonable' emotional life. â€" Inquiry: Critical Thinking.*

It tries to discover the nature of truth and knowledge and to find what is of basic value and importance in life. It also examines the relationships between humanity and nature and between the individual and society. Philosophy arises out of wonder, curiosity, and the desire to know and understand. Philosophy is thus a form of inquiry--a process of analysis, criticism, interpretation, and speculation. The term philosophy cannot be defined precisely because the subject is so complex and so controversial. Different philosophers have different views of the nature, methods, and range of philosophy. The term philosophy itself comes from the Greek philosophia, which means love of wisdom. In that sense, wisdom is the active use of intelligence, not something passive that a person simply possesses. These early philosophers tried to discover the basic makeup of things and the nature of the world and of reality. For answers to questions about such subjects, people had largely relied on magic, superstition, religion, tradition, or authority. But the Greek philosophers considered those sources of knowledge unreliable. Instead, they sought answers by thinking and by studying nature. Philosophy has also had a long history in some non-Western cultures, especially in China and India. But until about years ago, there was little interchange between those philosophies and Western philosophy, chiefly because of difficulties of travel and communication. As a result, Western philosophy generally developed independently of Eastern philosophy. The Importance of Philosophy Philosophic thought is an inescapable part of human existence. Almost everyone has been puzzled from time to time by such essentially philosophic questions as "What does life mean? Even a person who claims that considering philosophic questions is a waste of time is expressing what is important, worthwhile, or valuable. A rejection of all philosophy is in itself philosophy. By studying philosophy, people can clarify what they believe, and they can be stimulated to think about ultimate questions. There are people who simply enjoy reading the great philosophers, especially those who were also great writers. Philosophy has had enormous influence on our everyday lives. The very language we speak uses classifications derived from philosophy. For example, the classifications of noun and verb involve the philosophic idea that there is a difference between things and actions. If we ask what the difference is, we are starting a philosophic inquiry. Every institution of society is based on philosophic ideas, whether that institution is the law, government, religion, the family, marriage, industry, business, or education. Philosophic differences have led to the overthrow of governments, drastic changes in laws, and the transformation of entire economic systems. Such changes have occurred because the people involved held certain beliefs about what is important, true, real, and significant and about how life should be ordered. Democratic societies stress that people learn to think and make choices for themselves. Nondemocratic societies discourage such activities and want their citizens to surrender their own interests to those of the state. The Branches of Philosophy Philosophic inquiry can be made into any subject because philosophy deals with everything in the world and all of knowledge. But traditionally, and for purposes of study, philosophy is divided into five branches, each organized around certain distinctive questions. The branches are 1 metaphysics, 2 epistemology, 3 logic, 4 ethics, and 5 aesthetics. Metaphysics is the study of the fundamental nature of reality and existence and of the essences of things. Metaphysics is itself often divided into two areas--ontology and cosmology. Ontology is the study of being. Cosmology is the study of the physical universe, or the cosmos, taken as a whole. Cosmology is also the name of the branch of science that studies the organization, history, and future of the universe. Metaphysics deals with such questions as "What is real? These theories include materialism, idealism, mechanism, and teleology. Materialism maintains that only matter has real existence and that feelings, thoughts, and other mental phenomena are produced by the activity of matter. Idealism states that every material thing is an idea or a form of an idea. In idealism, mental phenomena are what is fundamentally important and real. Mechanism maintains that all happenings result from purely mechanical forces, not from purpose, and that it makes no sense to speak of the universe itself as having a purpose. Teleology, on the other hand, states that the universe and everything in it exists and occurs

for some purpose. Epistemology aims to determine the nature, basis, and extent of knowledge. It explores the various ways of knowing, the nature of truth, and the relationships between knowledge and belief. Epistemology asks such questions as "What are the features of genuine knowledge as distinct from what appears to be knowledge? We arrive at a priori knowledge by thinking, without independent appeal to experience. For example, we know that there are 60 seconds in a minute by learning the meanings of the terms. In the same way, we know that there are 60 minutes in an hour. From these facts, we can deduce that there are 3, seconds in an hour, and we arrive at this conclusion by the operation of thought alone. We acquire empirical knowledge from observation and experience. For example, we know from observation how many keys are on a typewriter and from experience which key will print what letter. The nature of truth has baffled people since ancient times, partly because people so often use the term true for ideas they find congenial and want to believe, and also because people so often disagree about which ideas are true. Philosophers have attempted to define criteria for distinguishing between truth and error. But they disagree about what truth means and how to arrive at true ideas. The correspondence theory holds that an idea is true if it corresponds to the facts or reality. The pragmatic theory maintains that an idea is true if it works or settles the problem it deals with. The coherence theory states that truth is a matter of degree and that an idea is true to the extent to which it coheres fits together with other ideas that one holds. Skepticism claims that knowledge is impossible to attain and that truth is unknowable. Logic is the study of the principles and methods of reasoning. It explores how we distinguish between good or sound reasoning and bad or unsound reasoning. An instance of reasoning is called an argument or an inference. An argument consists of a set of statements called premises together with a statement called the conclusion, which is supposed to be supported by or derived from the premises. A good argument provides support for its conclusion, and a bad argument does not. Two basic types of reasoning are called deductive and inductive. A good deductive argument is said to be valid--that is, the conclusion necessarily follows from the premises. A deductive argument whose conclusion does not follow necessarily from the premises is said to be invalid. The argument "All human beings are mortal, all Greeks are human beings, therefore all Greeks are mortal" is a valid deductive argument. But the argument "All human beings are mortal, all Greeks are mortal, therefore all Greeks are human beings" is invalid, even though the conclusion is true. On that line of reasoning, one could argue that all dogs, which are also mortal, are human beings. Deductive reasoning is used to explore the necessary consequences of certain assumptions. Inductive reasoning is used to establish matters of fact and the laws of nature and does not aim at being deductively valid. One who reasons that all squirrels like nuts, on the basis that all squirrels so far observed like nuts, is reasoning inductively. The conclusion could be false, even though the premise is true. Nevertheless, the premise provides considerable support for the conclusion. Ethics concerns human conduct, character, and values. It studies the nature of right and wrong and the distinction between good and evil. Ethics asks such questions as "What makes right actions right and wrong actions wrong? In many cases, our obligations conflict or are vague. In addition, people often disagree about whether a particular action or principle is morally right or wrong. A view called relativism maintains that what is right or wrong depends on the particular culture concerned. What is right in one society may be wrong in another, this view argues, and so no basic standards exist by which a culture may be judged right or wrong. Objectivism claims that there are objective standards of right and wrong which can be discovered and which apply to everyone. Subjectivism states that all moral standards are subjective matters of taste or opinion. Aesthetics deals with the creation and principles of art and beauty. It also studies our thoughts, feelings, and attitudes when we see, hear, or read something beautiful. Something beautiful may be a work of art, such as a painting, symphony, or poem, or it may be a sunset or other natural phenomenon. In addition, aesthetics investigates the experience of engaging in such activities as painting, dancing, acting, and playing. Aesthetics is sometimes identified with the philosophy of art, which deals with the nature of art, the process of artistic creation, the nature of the aesthetic experience, and the principles of criticism. But aesthetics has wider application. It involves both works of art created by human beings and the beauty found in nature. Aesthetics relates to ethics and political philosophy when we ask questions about what role art and beauty should play in society and in the life of the individual. Some philosophers claim that all philosophic questions arise out of linguistic problems. Others claim that all

philosophic questions are really questions about language. One key question is "What is language? The question has been raised whether there can be a logically perfect language that would reflect in its categories the essential characteristics of the world. This question raises questions about the adequacy of ordinary language as a philosophic tool.

## Chapter 5 : APPLYING LOGIC IN EVERYDAY LIFE by Nicole Stewart on Prezi

*Logic, is a deductive reasoning that results when the human brain calculates the most rational and acceptable outcome of any given situation and recognizes that answer as the most constructive, and consequently the most desirable.*

Translate this page from English Print Page Change Text Size: We have great capacity. But most of it is dormant; most is undeveloped. Improvement in thinking is like improvement in basketball, in ballet, or in playing the saxophone. It is unlikely to take place in the absence of a conscious commitment to learn. Development in thinking requires a gradual process requiring plateaus of learning and just plain hard work. It is not possible to become an excellent thinker simply because one wills it. The essential traits of a critical thinker require an extended period of development. How, then, can we develop as critical thinkers? How can we help ourselves and our students to practice better thinking in everyday life? First, we must understand that there are stages required for development as a critical thinker: The Unreflective Thinker we are unaware of significant problems in our thinking Stage Two: The Challenged Thinker we become aware of problems in our thinking Stage Three: The Beginning Thinker we try to improve but without regular practice Stage Four: The Practicing Thinker we recognize the necessity of regular practice Stage Five: The Advanced Thinker we advance in accordance with our practice Stage Six: In this article, we will explain 9 strategies that any motivated person can use to develop as a thinker. As we explain the strategy, we will describe it as if we were talking directly to such a person. Further details to our descriptions may need to be added for those who know little about critical thinking. Here are the 9: A Problem A Day. Keep An Intellectual Journal. Deal with Your Ego. Redefine the Way You See Things. Get in touch with your emotions. Analyze group influences on your life. There is nothing magical about our ideas. No one of them is essential. Nevertheless, each represents a plausible way to begin to do something concrete to improve thinking in a regular way. All humans waste some time; that is, fail to use all of their time productively or even pleasurably. Sometimes we jump from one diversion to another, without enjoying any of them. Sometimes we become irritated about matters beyond our control. Sometimes we worry unproductively. Sometimes we spend time regretting what is past. Sometimes we just stare off blankly into space. So why not take advantage of the time you normally waste by practicing your critical thinking during that otherwise wasted time? For example, instead of sitting in front of the TV at the end of the day flicking from channel to channel in a vain search for a program worth watching, spend that time, or at least part of it, thinking back over your day and evaluating your strengths and weaknesses. For example, you might ask yourself questions like these: When did I do my worst thinking today? When did I do my best? What in fact did I think about today? Did I figure anything out? Did I allow any negative thinking to frustrate me unnecessarily? If I had to repeat today what would I do differently? Did I do anything today to further my long-term goals? Did I act in accordance with my own expressed values? If I spent every day this way for 10 years, would I at the end have accomplished something worthy of that time? It would be important of course to take a little time with each question. It would also be useful to record your observations so that you are forced to spell out details and be explicit in what you recognize and see. As time passes, you will notice patterns in your thinking. At the beginning of each day perhaps driving to work or going to school choose a problem to work on when you have free moments. Figure out the logic of the problem by identifying its elements. In other words, systematically think through the questions: What exactly is the problem? How can I put it into the form of a question. How does it relate to my goals, purposes, and needs? State the problem as clearly and precisely as you can. Figure out, for example, what sorts of things you are going to have to do to solve it. Distinguish Problems over which you have some control from problems over which you have no control. Set aside the problems over which you have no control, concentrating your efforts on those problems you can potentially solve. What can you do in the short term? In the long term? Distinguish problems under your control from problems beyond your control. Recognize explicitly your limitations as far as money, time, and power. This may involve direct action or a carefully thought-through wait-and-see strategy. Be prepared to shift your strategy or your analysis or statement of the problem, or all three, as more information about the problem becomes available to you. Each week, develop a heightened awareness of one of the universal

intellectual standards clarity, precision, accuracy, relevance, depth, breadth, logicalness, significance. Focus one week on clarity, the next on accuracy, etc. For example, if you are focusing on clarity for the week, try to notice when you are being unclear in communicating with others. Notice when others are unclear in what they are saying. When you are reading, notice whether you are clear about what you are reading. When you orally express or write out your views for whatever reason , ask yourself whether you are clear about what you are trying to say. In doing this, of course, focus on four techniques of clarification: You will regularly ask others to do the same. Each week, write out a certain number of journal entries. Use the following format keeping each numbered stage separate: Describe a situation that is, or was, emotionally significant to you that is, that you deeply care about. Focus on one situation at a time. Describe what you did in response to that situation. Be specific and exact. Then analyze, in the light of what you have written, what precisely was going on in the situation. Dig beneath the surface. Assess the implications of your analysis. What did you learn about yourself? What would you do differently if you could re-live the situation? Choose one intellectual traitintellectual perseverance, autonomy, empathy, courage, humility, etc. For example, concentrating on intellectual humility, begin to notice when you admit you are wrong. Notice when you refuse to admit you are wrong, even in the face of glaring evidence that you are in fact wrong. Notice when you become defensive when another person tries to point out a deficiency in your work, or your thinking. Who does he think he is forcing his opinions on me? Deal with Your Egocentrism. Egocentric thinking is found in the disposition in human nature to think with an automatic subconscious bias in favor of oneself. On a daily basis, you can begin to observe your egocentric thinking in action by contemplating questions like these: Under what circumstances do I think with a bias in favor of myself? Did I ever become irritable over small things? Did I try to impose my will upon others? Did I ever fail to speak my mind when I felt strongly about something, and then later feel resentment? Once you identify egocentric thinking in operation, you can then work to replace it with more rational thought through systematic self-reflection, thinking along the lines of:

## Chapter 6 : Intro to Logic: The Importance of Good Thinking

*Many articles present logic in decision making as an "alternative" to the way decision making is typically done. This article's premise is that upon reflection, logic is everyone's preferred method of decision making - even illogical arguments use logically sounding statements to appear more valid.*

Let us consider each of the three propositions in it. Now, our major premise, being a universal proposition, may be either: If our major premise is a , it is obviously not inferred from the minor premise or the conclusion. If b , it is at best probable, and that probability could only be incrementally improved by the minor premise or conclusion. And if it is c , its reliability depends on the probability of the premises in the preceding argument, which will reclassify it as a or b. Our minor premise, being a singular or particular proposition, may be either: If our minor premise is a , it is obviously not inferred from any other proposition. If b , it is at best probable, and that probability could only be incrementally improved by the conclusion. It follows from this analysis that the putative conclusion was derived from the premises and was not used in constructing them. In case a , the conclusion is as certain as the premises. In case b , the putative conclusion may be viewed as a prediction derived from the inductions involved in the premises. The conclusion is in neither case the basis of either premise, contrary to the said critics. The premises were known temporally before the conclusion was known. The deductive aspect of the argument is that granting the premises, the conclusion would follow. But the inductive aspect is that the conclusion is no more probable than the premises. Since the premises are inductive, the conclusion is so too, even though their relationship is deductive. The purpose of the argument is not to repeat information in the premises, but to verify that the premises are not too broad. The conclusion will be tested empirically; if it is confirmed, it will strengthen the premises, broaden their empirical basis; if it is rejected, it will cause rejection of one or both premise s. Rather, we could assume Caius mortal with some probability â€” a high one in this instance due to the credibility of the premises. When, finally, Caius died and was seen to die, he joined the ranks of people adductively confirming the major premise. He passed from the status of reasoned case to that of empirical case. Syllogism is a deductive procedure all right, but it is usually used in the service of inductive activities. Without our ability to establish deductive relations between propositions, our inductive capabilities would be much reduced. All pursuit of knowledge is induction; deduction is one link in the chain of the inductive process. It should be noted that in addition to the above-mentioned processes involved in syllogism, we have to take into account yet deeper processes that are tacitly assumed in such argumentation. For instance, terms imply classification, which implies comparison, which mostly includes a problematic reliance on memory insofar as past and present cases are compared , as well as perceptual and conceptual powers, and which ontologically raises the issue of universals. Or again, prediction often refers to future cases, and this raises philosophical questions, like the nature of time. The approach adopted above may be categorized as more epistemological than purely logical. It was not sufficiently stressed in my Future Logic. Bortoft argues, in effect, that when science adopted its mathematical approach to the description of nature, as of the 18th Century under Neoplatonistic influences, in its enthusiasm it missed out on a valuable epistemological opportunity which Goethe had presented it. Bortoft explains that this was not meant to be interpreted, as it has been by many, as a search for the commonalties of plant organs and plants â€” but rather, as Rudolph Steiner [17] had done, as an attempt to capture a supposed biological transformation of some original unitary organ or plant into a multiplicity of organs or plants. Propositional forms through which to verbally express change including metamorphosis , and the deductive logic oppositions, syllogism, etc. Aristotle had, in his treatises on logic, crystallized and surpassed the work of his predecessors, and in particular that of his teacher Plato, by formalizing the language of classification and the reasoning processes attending it. This is all well known, no need for more detail. While Aristotle limited his formal treatment to such static relations, essentially the relations between particulars, species and genera, he did in his other works investigate change informally in great detail. He was bound to do so, in view of the interest the issues surrounding it had aroused in Greek philosophy since its beginnings. His approach to change was, by the way, distinguished by his special interest in biology. What concerns us here is the

distinction between being and becoming, which Aristotle so ably discussed. The latter copula can easily be subjected to the same kind of logical analysis as was done for the simpler case. The formal treatment in question may be found, as I said, in my above-mentioned work [20]. What I want to stress here is the significance of the introduction of propositions concerning change into formal logic. Our philosophical view of classification has been distorted simply because Aristotle stopped his logical investigations where he did. Perhaps given more time he would have pursued his research and extended our vision beyond the statics of classification into its dynamics. For, finally, it is very obvious that things do not just fall under classes once and forever, but they also pass over from one class to another. And this is true not just in biology, but in all fields. The baby I was once became an older man. The water used in the hydrolytic process became hydrogen and oxygen. Logicians have no need to invent a special language, and there is nothing artificial in considering changes in subsumption. We all, laymen and scientists, speak the language already and reason with it all the time. No change of paradigm is called for, no metaphysical complexities, note well. The only problem is that philosophers have lagged behind in their awareness of the phenomenon. Nothing said here invalidates the static approach; we merely have to enrich it with awareness of the dynamic side. For, in addition to reawakening us to the dynamic aspects of our world, Goethe is pointing out [22] that the root form, the common historical source of present forms, has a unifying effect, distinct from that of mere similarities in present characteristics. After an X becomes a Y, we can classify that Y under the heading of things that came out of an X though not under things X. The closer study of this more complex predicate, involving both tense and course of change, would constitute an enlargement of class logic. For evidently, a broad consideration of class logic has to recognize a distinct existence and identity to terms which are not only present and attributive is X , but past was X or future will be X in the mutative came out of X, will come out of X or alterative got to be out of X, will get to be out of X senses. For each of these terms is legitimate and oft-used in practice and sure to have its own behavior patterns [23]. The scope of class logic studies has so far been limited so as to simplify the problem; but once the simpler cases are dealt with, we are obliged to dig deeper and try and give an account of all forms of human reasoning. Concept Formation Many philosophers give the impression that a concept is formed simply by pronouncing a clear definition and then considering what referents it applies to. For this reason, it is important to understand more fully how concepts arise in practice [24]. There are in fact two ways concepts are formed: Some concepts indeed start with reference to a selected attribute found to occur in some things or invented, by mental conjunction of separately experienced attributes. The attribute defines the concept once and for all, after which we look around and verify what things it applies to if any, in the case of inventions and what things lack it. Of course, insofar as such concepts depend on experiential input observation of an attribute, or of the attributes imagined conjoined , they are not purely deductive. Note in passing the distinction between deductive concepts based on some observed attribute s , and those based on an imagined conjunction of observed attributes. The former necessarily have some real referents, whereas the latter may or not have referents. The imagined definition may turn out by observation or experiment to have been a good prediction; or nothing may ever be found that matches what it projects. Such fictions may of course have from the start been intended for fun, without expectation of concretization; but sometimes we do seriously look for corresponding entities e. But there are other sorts of concepts, which develop more gradually and by insight. We observe a group of things that seem to have something in common, we know not immediately quite what. We first label the group of things with a distinct name, thus conventionally binding them together for further consideration. This name has certain referents, more or less recognizable by insight, but not yet a definition! Secondly, we look for the common attribute s that may be used as definition, so as to bind the referents together in our minds in a factual not conventional, but natural way. The latter is a trial and error, inductive process. We begin it by more closely observing the specimens under consideration, in a bid to discern some of their attributes. Later, this assumption may be found false, when a previously unnoticed specimen is taken into consideration, which intuitively fits into the group, but does not have the attribute s required to fit into the postulated definition. This may go on and on for quite a while, until we manage to pinpoint the precise attribute or cluster of attributes that can fulfill the role of definition. I would say that the majority of concepts are inductive, rather that deductive. That is, they do not begin with a clear and fixed

definition, but start with a vague notion and gradually tend towards a clearer concept. It is important for philosophers and logicians to remember this fact. Empty Classes The concept of empty or null classes is very much a logical positivist construct. The conceptual vector is divorced from the empirical vector. What happens in practice is that an imaginary entity or a complex of experience, logical insight and imagination is classified without due notice of its imaginary aspect s. A budding concept is prematurely packaged, one could say, or inadequately labeled. Had we paid a little more attention or made a few extra efforts of verification, we would have quickly noted the inadequacies or difficulties in the concept. Though of course in practice the task is rather to reexamine seemingly cut-and-dried concepts. I am not saying that we do not have null classes in our cognitive processes. Quite the contrary, we have throughout history produced classes of imaginary entities later recognized as non-existent. They had an image of a horse with wings, but eventually found it to be a myth. However, as a myth, it survives, as a receptacle for thousands of symbolizations or playful associations, which perhaps have a function in the life of the mind. But in another sense, as the recipient of every time the word Pegasus is used, or the image of a flying horse is mentally referred to, it is not an empty class. Mythical concepts in this sense are discussed by Michel Foucault in his Order of Things. Perhaps one day, as a result of genetic manipulations. Another example interesting to note is that of a born-blind person, who supposedly lacks even imaginary experience of sights, talking of shape or color. Such words are, for that person, purely null-classes, since not based on any idea, inner any more than outer, as to what they are intended to refer to, but on mere hearsay and mimicry. Here again, some surgical operation might conceivably give that person sight, at which time the words would acquire meaning. But of course, there are many concepts in our minds, at all times, which are bound to be out of phase with the world around since we are cognitively limited anyway. It follows that the distinction here suggested, between direct reference and indirect symbolic â€” verbal or pictorial reference, must be viewed as having gradations, with seemingly direct or seemingly indirect in-betweens. Of course, realistic concepts may later be found imaginary and vice-versa; we must remain supple in such categorizations.

## Chapter 7 : What is the importance of logic

*Hey guyz can u tell me: "The Applications of Logic Gates in our daily life ".I want you peepz to comment on it actually it's my quiz and I need lil help..I know abt the Logic Gates,what are they and how they work but dunno abt their applications in depth so if anyone can tell me it wud be a great help!*

Deborah Bennett Good thinking can be hard work, and you have to practice it. But it can also be great fun, and spare you lots of pain and confusion from bad choices. Even some of the finest philosophers do. The best way to learn or relearn something is to teach it, continuously. Probably, most of the people reading this blog have some familiarity with logic. But I think this will be a good review for all of us. For example, there will be individual posts on each informal fallacy, why logic works, how to construct a valid argument, etc. This first part of my basic course in logic is about the crucial importance of good thinking. Who cares about logic? People take many paths to truth. Most people use a combination of personal experience, gut feeling, and testimony from others to discern the truth. These methods might do you well enough to manage some relationships and get you to and from work, but they have a horrible track record when it comes to getting at truth about much of anything else. The fact is that throughout history, nearly all the people who have ever lived have been wrong about damn near everything. Wrong about political theory. Wrong about chemistry and physics. Wrong about the afterlife. Wrong about the opposite sex. Wrong about pretty much everything. The reason is they were using the wrong tools. Several people can experience the same thing and walk away with wildly different impressions. First, because other people are usually as ignorant and biased as you are. For thousands of years humans have passed on wrong information to each other. Somebody may be lying to you, or deceiving themselves and passing on bad information. So, we need some tools that are better designed to discover truth. Here are some benefits of having good tools for discovering truth: You can avoid scams, rip-offs, and con artists. You can focus on what really matters. You can engage with the real world, instead of living a confused fantasy. You can avoid really huge mistakes, like devoting your life or money or emotions to a false religion or a false ideology. You can avoid making the world a worse place when you were trying to make it better. Think of religious crusaders or bloodletting doctors â€” they thought they were making the world better, but they actually made it worse, because they had bad ideas that came from poor thinking skills. You can contribute to our common quest of finding and promoting solutions that actually work. You can properly filter the masses of information that come your way in the information age. You can improve your rhetorical and presentation skills, and your ability to persuade others. Feelings, personal experience, and testimony from others â€” no matter how effective you feel them to be â€” are not good tools for the job. You need to build your truth filter with something better-designed for the task. Logic is the right tool for the job. Master the machinery of [logic], and you have a mental occupation always at handâ€¦ that will be of real use to you in any subject you take up. It will give you clearness of thought â€” the ability to see your way through a puzzle â€” the habit of arranging your ideas in an orderly and get-at-able form â€” and, more valuable than all, the power to detect fallacies, and to tear to pieces the flimsy illogical arguments, which you will so continually encounter in books, in newspapers, in speeches, and even in sermons, and which so easily delude those who have never taken the trouble to master this fascinating Art. That is all I ask of you! Also see the post index to this Intro to Logic series. Feelings are designed only for subjective truth:

## Chapter 8 : Applications of Logic Gates in Daily Life | All About Circuits

*Intro to Logic: The Importance of Good Thinking by Luke Muehlhauser on March 23, in Intro to Logic Believing ourselves to be logical is common, but logic itself is rare.*

Unfortunately, many of us do not use logic consistently for decision making in real life, resulting in many poorly made decisions. Common falacies in decision making: Some decision making can be difficult. In real life, most decision making takes place in the absense of complete information. Often, shortcuts are taken. The average person, who is not necessarily fully versed in the decision making criteria, will make decisions based on unrelated factors, such as: What do other people think? Or would the pedophile be the most reliable source in that group? What if everyone surveyed unanimously agreed? What if this belief was standing for thousands of years? Would that change anything? Perhaps you think it is ridiculous that so many people would be so deluded for such a long time, and hence the question is unrealistic, and therefore pointless. Did that make it true? Up until the 20th century, most of the world was certain that human activity was far too minor to have global effects on the planet, such as ozone depletion or global warming. Does that make it true? Is the fact that the majority of people everywhere and throughout history believe in some deity good enough reason to be certain of the existence of one? Here are some common shortcuts used to determine truth: Advertisers know that repetition works too. But really, does the number of times something is said change its truth? What if you hear something from multiple different independent sources? What if you hear it regularly? What if it is embedded in your culture? If you grew up believing something, does that affect its truth? You may recall being in situations where an argument escalated to raised voices, insistent repetition, off-topic distraction, emotional blackmail, and similar tactics. Now give it some thought: If a statement is made louder, is it any more or less true? What if it is repeated using different words? The influence of such tactics may be subconscious. For example, you might be skeptical about something you heard from a friend. You might be less skeptical after hearing it on the news, and if you read it in a book, well, that might be the clincher. Is what they say about the products or services provided by the company they represent more or less true if you meet them in person? So are you saying that other people are useless for decision making? If you want to know the answer to any question â€” truly â€” then there is no shortcut: Discussing issues with other people is immensly useful for suggesting options you may not have considered, calling attention to logical flaws in your thinking, and providing guidance with collecting relevant information. Finally, no single human being can in a single life-time learn everything there is to learn, do everything there is to do, or even think through everything there is to think through to make the enormous number of decisions each is faced with. To live the lifestyle we are accustomed to, we rely on others to handle at least some portions of our lives eg, research, invention, technology, manufacture, legislation, etc , and by implication, to make reasonable decisions on our behalf. Am I relying on the opinions of others? Could the opinions of others change my mind about this? If the answer to both those questions is again, No! Human beings are born with the capability to think logically, and to see its unchangeable universal truth. The axioms of logic are the basis of the type of decision making described above â€” the kind that no outside forces such as the opinions of others could ever possibly change. Indeed, nothing â€” including what you are now reading, or even your own apprehension, doubt, or rejection of the principles of logic â€” can change it. Unfortunately, humans are also born with the ability to think illogically, so the distinction between logic and non-logic is important. You might think that this is a given, that is, we have defined things that way. To understand why, consider an empty mailbox. Now, insert an envelope into it through the mail slot. Now insert another envelope. But when we open it up, we find 2 envelopes. This exercise is repeated throughout our lives unintentionally and subconsiously whenever we work with multiple objects eg, 2 apples in a basket, 2 cars in a driveway, etc. Must the answers to these questions be axiomatic? Is there really no way to determine the answers empirically? Or is that just short-sighted thinking and a lack of imagination? Up until fairly recently, it was assumed that science would never be able to explain the connection between the mind and the body, the origins of living species, the existence of altruism and morality, or cognition. Scientists are tackling the question of the origins of the universe without fear. Logic,

math, and science, can be seen as 3 different views of the same concept, each focusing on a different area or part of the same thing. It is important to recognize this only in order to understand that when we talk about logic, we are also talking about math and science. Here is an example: Science primarily focuses on inductive reasoning: Logic primarily focuses on deductive reasoning: If all swans are white, and this is a swan, then it must therefore be white. These seem like quite different concepts at first blush. However, logical arguments can get quite complex, and use many abstract concepts. As such, any logical proof is up for scrutiny, and anyone reviewing the proof may find an error in it, and thereby correct it, improve it, or disprove it. Of course, the disproof itself is subject to the same type of review by others! Scientific theorems are equally open to scrutiny. However, this reaction must itself be subject to scrutiny too: It may turn out that the specimen was not a swan, but a very swan-like duck, or it may be the case that the swan suffered from a disease that coated its feathers in black scales, but underneath, the swan is as white as its kin. This process demonstrates the scientific method. Math certainly demonstrates the same properties: If we find, through testing, that prime numbers greater than 2 are odd, then we might propose a theorem that all prime numbers greater than 2 are odd. Then someone might come up with a deductive proof of this, greatly increasing our confidence in the original theorem. However, the proof may be overturned if someone finds a flaw in it, or if a supercomputer finds a number that contradicts expectations. Granted, this is highly unlikely to happen given how simple this particular proof is how few steps removed from the definitions involved , but for much more complex proofs, the chances increase. Proof is incorrectly seen as truth. Some of the differences between logic and non-logic eg, pseudo-science, religion, politics , include: This would be a pointless outcome, and so it is crucially important that contradictions are recognized and resolved. God either exists, or not. So far, many of the predictions made based on the word of God eg, geocentrism, creationism, young Earth, static Earth, infinite resources, historical accuracy, non-determinism, etc have not favoured this theory, making this concept effectively useless for day-to-day decision making. How would logic and science have impacted the change from geocentrism to the relative world view more common today? Even without the scientific method, once evidence such as that gathered by Galileo Galilei became available, the accepted viewpoint began to change. So if this happened anyway, then how would logic and science have improved things? Well, prior to the relative viewpoint becoming dominant, there was a geocentric viewpoint. With the scientific method in mind, we might acknowledge that geocentrism was reasonably consistent with the evidence available at the time. However, it would also be acknowledged that a non-geocentric viewpoint may fit the data just as well. This is a remarkably different approach, with significant consequences. Prior to Galileo, there was already mounting evidence against geocentrism, but it was largely dismissed because geocentrism was not viewed as being up for scrutiny. In the modern approach, with the scientific method more fully developed, scientists would be encouraged to question and look for flaws in existing theories. A scientist suggesting an alternate theory would certainly be reviewed, probably be scrutinized, and perhaps even criticized, but not punished. As such, while the end result is the same â€” we now have a non-geocentric consensus â€” how quickly this type of change comes about has increased enormously. While we value science and technology for how they have improved our standard of living, we rarely think to employ these successful principles to our own day-to-day decision making. What beliefs do you hold that you have no evidence to support? What facts do you take for granted based on external sources of information? What opinions do you express that you have not opened up for scrutiny? What evidence could be presented that would cause you to change your mind? What efforts do you make to fill in these gaps with deductive reasoning and empirical observations? Many people hold strong views about political, economic, moral, and philosphical ideas. How can logic and science help resolve these views? Clearly not everyone can be right, at least some must be wrong. How do we figure out who?

## Chapter 9 : What is the relevance and importance of logic in your life

*Logic is description. The importance of logic in reference to education is that if a student understands the logic and reasoning behind a given aspect of reality, then he/she may be able to adapt.*