

Critical and scientific thinking

Critical & Scientific Thinking

A Short Introduction

Michael Vlerick



This book and all material included in it is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which means that you are free to copy, distribute, and remix this work in any medium or format, granted that you a) give appropriate credit to the author (see above), provide a link to the work, and indicate whether any changes have been made b) do not use the material for commercial purposes.

For more information, see <https://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>.

ISBN 978-9-40-366878-9

DOI 10.26116/IHOX-9K96

Design and Typesetting by Thomas F. K. Jorna

Cover by Mor Lumbroso

Copyediting by Meike Robaard

Coordination by Violet S. Zagt

Publishers of Trial and Error

Published by Open Press Tilburg University,

Tilburg, The Netherlands

<https://www.openpresstiu.org>

info@openpresstiu.org



© 2023 Michael Vlerick.

Contents

	Preface	I
	1 What is this book about?	I
	2 Who is this book for?	I
	3 Why read this book?	II
1	What is Philosophy of Science?	I
	<i>On the importance of philosophy of science</i>	
	1 What is science?	I
	2 What is philosophy?	4
	3 The importance of philosophy of science	5
	4 The structure of this book	6
	5 Summary	7
	6 Further reading	8
2	Predictably Irrational	9
	<i>An overview of common reasoning errors</i>	
	1 What is (and what is not) critical thinking?	9
	2 The goal of critical thinking	10
	3 The usefulness of critical thinking	10
	4 The tenacity of nonsense	12
	5 Three rules of thumb	13
	6 Predictably irrational	15
	7 Problem 1: The 'Linda' problem	15
	8 Problem 2: The base rate fallacy	16
	9 Problem 3: The base rate fallacy	16
	10 Problem 4: The birthday problem	17
	11 Problem 5: Exponential reasoning	17
	12 Problem 6: Exponential reasoning	17
	13 Problem 7: The availability bias	19

14	Problem 8: The availability bias	19
15	Problem 9: The availability bias	19
16	Problem 10: Anchoring	20
17	Problem 11: The framing effect	21
18	Problem 12: The Allais paradox	21
19	Problem 13: The hindsight bias	22
20	Problem 14: The confirmation bias	23
21	Problem 15: Self-overestimation	24
22	Summary	25
3	Why Are We Irrational?	27
	<i>The evolutionary origin of irrationality</i>	
1	The peculiar architect of our thinking	27
2	Evolution by natural selection	27
3	What does this entail for our thinking?	28
4	Truth is an expensive means to an end	29
5	System 1 and system 2	30
6	The fallibility of system 1	31
7	Taking stock	34
8	Other sources of irrationality	35
9	Summary	40
10	Further reading	41
4	Irrationality in Action	43
	<i>How reasoning errors lead to domains of irrationality</i>	
1	Superstition, horoscopes, and palm reading	43
2	Correlation does not imply causation	44
3	Order in randomness and randomness in order	45
4	Chance blindness	45
5	Causal reasoning errors	46
6	Conspiracy theories	47
7	Pseudoscience	49
8	Religion	55

9	The myth of 'Homo economicus'	57
10	Summary	59
11	Further reading	60
5	Mastering Critical Thinking	61
	<i>How we can guard our thinking against reasoning errors</i>	
1	Three sources of reasoning errors	61
2	Intuitive reasoning errors	61
3	Emotions	68
4	How can we curb the confirmation bias?	70
5	Summary	75
6	The Importance of Critical Thinking	77
1	Are there beneficial illusions?	77
2	The impact of irrationality on the world	78
3	What about religion?	80
4	Critical thinking and moral progress	82
5	Critical thinking and progress in general	85
6	The major challenges of today	86
7	A lasting struggle	87
8	Summary	88
7	The Importance and Reliability of Science	89
	<i>On the scientific method and the demarcation criterion</i>	
1	The scientific method	89
2	Human and natural sciences	90
3	A self-correcting process	92
4	How is science protected against the reasoning errors of scientists?	93
5	The importance of scientific progress	95
6	Self-censorship in the human sciences	96
7	The demarcation criterion	97

8	Sokal's hoax	IOI
9	Striking a balance	IO2
10	Summary	IO4
Appendix		IO5
11	List of reasoning errors	IO5
12	Detect the reasoning errors	IO7
13	Answers	II3
Bibliography		II8

Preface

WHAT IS THIS BOOK ABOUT?

This book is about critical and scientific thinking. You will learn what reasoning errors we all tend to make, why we make those reasoning errors, what they lead to, and how we can improve our thinking. Finally, you will learn about the importance of critical and scientific thinking, and what characterizes the sciences, i.e. what makes them distinctive (from pseudoscience and non-scientific domains of inquiry) and reliable.

WHO IS THIS BOOK FOR?

This book is written for students taking a course on philosophy of science or critical thinking. The book provides content for seven lectures (the seven chapters) and one seminar (appendix). It can stand on its own for courses consisting of seven lectures with a study load of 3 ECTS or might be combined with a historical or thematic overview of the philosophy of science (e.g. Dooremalen et al., 2021) for courses consisting of fourteen lectures with a study load of 6 ECTS.

I use this book as part of my teaching of philosophy of science for students at Tilburg University. Hopefully, it will also find its way to other lecturers.

Ultimately, I hope that this book finds its way out of academia to reach a wider audience. Critical thinking concerns everyone. It is of great value on both a personal and societal level. Indeed, as I discuss in Chapter 6, critical thinking is a driver of progress, both with respect to knowledge and innovation as with regards to morality.

WHY READ THIS BOOK?

Critical thinking is one of the biggest hiatuses in our education system. Learning to distinguish sense from nonsense is of great importance in the information age that we live in. In a systematic way, this book helps you to gain insight into, and subsequently eliminate, the most important reasoning errors that we all tend to make. It also helps you to debunk weak and fallacious arguments and unreliable information.

In addition to understanding what critical and scientific thinking entails, you will learn more about what makes science reliable. In times of skepticism regarding science, where (sometimes dangerous) pseudoscientific and conspiracy theories run rampant, this is particularly important.

Critical thinking, as I conclude in Chapter 6, is not a matter of intellectual preference or even self-interest (although one certainly benefits from thinking critically). It is first and foremost a matter of moral and social responsibility. Better thinking leads to a better world. With this book I hope to contribute to that important goal and you, dear student or reader, can do the same!

Enjoy your reading!

What is Philosophy of Science?

On the importance of philosophy of science

WHAT IS SCIENCE?

The central question that philosophers of science ask is: What is science? This question may seem easy to answer at a first glance. The sciences are physics, chemistry, biology, etc., and not music, art and religion. This, of course, is true, but it raises the very same question: What distinguishes those scientific domains and activities from non-scientific domains and activities? What characteristics do the sciences share with each other and not with non-scientific domains? What, in other words, makes science science? (Okasha, 2002).

This question, too, may seem easy to answer. Sciences attempt to explain certain aspects of reality based on observations. But whilst that is certainly not a bad answer, it is not entirely satisfactory. Astrology (horoscopes), too, seeks to explain aspects of reality based on observations, as does religion. So, what is it that demarcates the sciences as science? What is it that distinguishes science from so-called pseudoscience? The latter refers to theories and practices that may appear scientific but are not (such as astrology, creationism, and certain forms of alternative healthcare). Finally, we must also ask what characteristics make science reliable or – in any case – more reliable than pseudoscience. These are the questions we will address and answer in this book.

From the question of what science is, however, follows a series of other questions that philosophers of science ask. What is the relationship between scientific theories and reality? Realists, for example, think that scientific theories represent reality truthfully or, at least that they can represent reality truthfully. Anti-realists disagree. According to

the latter, we can only claim that scientific theories can make accurate predictions, not that they actually represent reality (i.e. that they are faithful depictions of the reality they describe).

Another question often asked by philosophers of science is: How do the sciences evolve? Contemporary scientific theories are often quite different from those of, say, the nineteenth century. How did this change come about? According to the philosopher of science Karl Popper (1963) - who will be discussed later - scientific change happens in a gradual way. New theories are typically revisions of previous theories, and we may therefore assume that, in general, the sciences are improving over time. They represent the world more truthfully than the theories they replaced.

Another prominent philosopher of science, Thomas Kuhn (1970), objects. Sciences undergo 'revolutions', according to Kuhn, discarding just about everything that came before it. This debate, of course, also has important implications for the question of scientific realism. Someone like Kuhn joins the ranks of the anti-realists because he sees science as an intellectual activity within a so-called paradigm. A paradigm is built on basic assumptions for which there is no evidence. In case of a revolution, one simply discards the old paradigm and starts again in a new paradigm. Therefore, according to Kuhn, the sciences do not come closer to the truth over time, they just switch ways of looking at world (and one way is not inherently more truthful than another way).

You may wonder what use all this is to practicing specific sciences. That is a valid point. The discussion between realists and anti-realists changes little to nothing for the way scientific investigation is conducted. But philosophers of science are not just concerned with science in general, they also think about specific sciences. There is a philosophy of physics, a philosophy of biology, a philosophy of psychology, and a philosophy of economics. In the philosophy of economics, for example, philosophers question whether economic models objectively describe economic reality. Perhaps subjective values creep in? For instance, the value that economists place on freedom (and free entrepreneurship) may lead them to be slightly biased towards perceiving (free) market mechanisms as efficient (and perhaps turn a blind eye to shortcomings