# Summer School on Law and Logic
# Session 2.1.1
# 10 July, 2018
# Scott Brewer

## Exercises for the Logocratic Method

(post version 07-09-18)

1. Please read the two projections now posted to the course site for Session 1.1.1

2. Please read *Wright v. Newman* (U.S., Georgia Supreme Court) – posted in link in Session 2.1.1.

3. On the basis of your reading of my two posted materials and the my classroom lecture, in *Wright v. Newman*:

    a. One or more examples of a rule enthymeme.

    b. The try to restate this rule (in a. in a way that makes the logical form of the rule explicit ("rulify" the rule enthymeme)

    c. One or more examples of an argument enthymeme.

    d. The try to restate this argument (in c.) in a way that makes the logical form of the argument explicit ("argufy" the argument enthymeme)

    e. One or more examples of a proposition that is a judgment about what law is.

f. Identify the main rule of law that the court (the majority opinion, not the concurrence or the dissent) offers to resolve the case.

g. What is the source of law – common law (case law), statute, constitution, administrative regulation? A combination of these sources?

h. We have not yet looked in any detail at any of the modes of logical inference (recall that there are four: deduction, induction, abduction, and analogy – defeasible and indefeasible). But at this point, see whether you can identify in the opinion (in any of the three opinions, majority, concurrence, dissent) one of each of the four modes of logical argument.

i. See whether you can identify:

    (i) one argument that is inferentially strong (meaning the same as 'epistemically' and 'internally' strong).

    (ii) one argument that is dialectically strong.

    (iii) one argument that is rhetorically strong -- or at least in an identifiable way reflects an *attempt* by the arguer to persuade a target audience – compare the examples offered from *Monge*

j. See whether you can identify:

    (i) one argument that is defeasible

    (ii) one argument that is indefeasible