



# S.A.P.I.E.N.T. BEING

Society Advancing Personal Intelligence & Enlightenment Now Together

## SAPIENT CONSERVATIVE TEXTBOOKS (SCT)

### SCT PROGRAM HANDBOOK

By Corey Lee Wilson

Version 6-4-21

#### How to Contact the SAPIENT Being

If you have any questions or require additional info starting a SAPIENT Being organization on your campus and/or becoming a member, please contact the SAPIENT Being HQ at (951) 638-5562 or at [sapientbeing@att.net](mailto:sapientbeing@att.net). Please visit the SAPIENT Being website for frequently asked questions (FAQs) at the CONTACT page at [www.sapientbeing.org](http://www.sapientbeing.org).

# Contents

<b>1 – The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2 – Why is a SCT Program Needed?.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Consider These Disturbing Trends .....	5
The New Campus Illiberalism Is More Than Intolerance .....	6
<b>3 – The Proposed 50 “MADNESS” Series of Textbooks.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4 – 2021 MADNESS Textbook Release Schedule .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5 – The SCT’s 50 A - Z MADNESS Textbooks List.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6 – Journalism Code of Ethics, Practical Logic &amp; Sapience Guidelines .....</b>	<b>13</b>
Society of Professional Journalists: Code of Ethics.....	13
Best Practices: .....	14
Minimize Harm:.....	15
Act Independently:.....	15
Be Accountable: .....	16
Practical Logic to the Rescue and Intervention .....	16
Recommendations for Tech Companies .....	20
Avoiding Personal Bias and Faulty Research Methods .....	21
Constructive Disagreement is Good .....	21
Confirmation Bias is Bad and Everywhere .....	22
The Replication Crisis in Science is Real.....	22
<b>7 – Author’s Biography.....</b>	<b>24</b>



# S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being

## 1 – The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program

University life requires that people with diverse viewpoints and perspectives encounter each other in an environment where they feel free to speak up and challenge each other. Countering campus groupthink is part of what led to the creation of this program, because when nearly everyone in a field in academia or throughout the student body shares the same political orientation, certain ideas become orthodoxy, dissent is discouraged, and errors can go unchallenged, and sapience is stunted.

The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program's goals are congruent with the Heterodox Academies and align with many others to find ways of improving the academy by enhancing viewpoint diversity and the conditions that encourage free inquiry. The ethos for every MADNESS textbook is truth without bias and forms the basis for every topic the SCT addresses.

The primary purpose of the 50 MADNESS series of textbooks is to introduce, expose, and touch upon a growing list of “madness” topics that present themselves in the 21st century. By using sapience as the foundation for addressing the most important issues and problems facing America and the world today, together—left, right, and center—we can achieve common sense solutions that support the public trust, promote good will, and serve the common good.

Sapience, also known as wisdom, is the ability to think and act using knowledge, experience, understanding, common sense and insight. Sapience is associated with attributes such as intelligence, enlightenment, and unbiased judgement.

The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program is designed to help return conservative values, viewpoint diversity, and sapience to high school and college students and enlighten them on the many blessings to humankind that are the direct result of American exceptionalism, Western European culture, and Judeo-Christian values.

In order to create deeper intellectual and political diversity, we need an affirmative-action program for the full range of conservative ideas and traditions, because on too many of our campuses they seldom get the sustained, scholarly attention they deserve.



## 2 – Why is a SCT Program Needed?

Our present ideological circumstances and point of views should not prevent us from engaging with a variety of conservative, religious, and libertarian modes of thinking, just as they shouldn't prevent us from engaging with modes of thinking organized under the banner of progressivism or critical theory.

Such engagement might actually lead to greater understanding among those who disagree politically, and it might also allow for more robust critical and creative thinking about our histories, our present and the possibilities for the future.

The Heterodox Academy ratings reveal the good, the bad and the ugly about the intellectual diversity on 150 leading campuses and published a rating of the intellectual diversity and free speech friendliness of 150 of America's more prominent universities and colleges.

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) surveyed the written policies of 466 colleges and universities, evaluating their compliance with First Amendment standards and their college rankings are disturbing

The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) rated colleges and universities as “red light,” “yellow light,” or “green light” institutions based on how much, if any, protected expression their written policies restrict. Of the 466 schools reviewed by the FIRE in 2019, 133, or 28.5%, received a red light rating. 285 schools received a yellow light rating (61.2%), and 42 received a green light rating (9%).

In today's ideologically charged campus climate, the Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program will test the limits educational institutions place on freedom of speech, viewpoint diversity, and intellectual humility—and sapience as well.

K12 schools, community colleges and 4-year universities—and their principals, superintendents, presidents, boards of trustees, faculties, parents, and alumni—must maximize support for free expression, intellectual pluralism, and most of all viewpoint diversity.

A 2016 Gallup survey found that more than one in four college students felt colleges should be able to restrict students from “expressing political views that are upsetting or offensive to certain groups,” while nearly half were open to restricting press access to public events.

## Consider These Disturbing Trends

Given the current undergraduate tendency toward intellectual orthodoxy, one wonders: Would the advances of the feminist movement even have happened, had the campus conformists of a half-century ago had their way?

- A recent study found that 68 percent of college students “largely agree” the campus climate today prevents some of them from speaking their minds for fear of offending someone.
- In a 2016 Gallup survey, one in four college students felt their schools should be able to restrict students from “expressing political views that are upsetting or offensive to certain groups.”
- Shockingly, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE, for short) rated the level of freedom of speech permitted at 466 major universities in America. They found that 28 percent received a “red light” rating, 62 percent a “yellow light” rating, and only 10 percent received a “green light” rating.

Regarding the lack of viewpoint diversity needed to burst the prevailing ideological bubbles on campus, consider these alarming statistics:

- More than 50 percent of students surveyed reported that they do not think their college frequently encourages students to consider a wide variety of viewpoints and perspectives.
- UCLA’s Higher Education Institute shows that the faculty has moved considerably leftward since the late 1980s, especially in the Arts and Humanities. In New England alone, liberal professors outnumber conservative ones by an astonishing ratio of 28:1.
- A large student and faculty sampling by the American Association of Colleges and Universities reported only 18 percent of the faculty and staff strongly agreed that it was “safe to hold unpopular positions on campus.”

And the third major concern is a lack of intellectual humility from students, administrators, and faculty. Consider these examples:

- The first is the rise of Intolerance: Since 2000, the FIRE has recorded 379 instances of disinvitations, with nearly a quarter of those occurring between 2016 to 2018. In those two years, 82 percent of these disinvitations have been because of the Left’s doing.
- The second is the lack of Constructive Disagreement: The concept centers around creating a dynamic where key stakeholders in the faculty and student body are compelled to disagree. The word “constructive” alludes to the need to raise issues, debate, and resolve them reasonably. In the academy, this rarely happens—but it does so in the corporate world—successfully.
- And the third concerns the prevalence of Confirmation Bias: The 2008 paper, “Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science” describes the replication failure rate being as high as one-half to two-thirds of 100 sampled experiments published in 2008 in three high-ranking psychology journals.

## The New Campus Illiberalism Is More Than Intolerance

The 21st century term "illiberalism" is used to describe an attitude that is close-minded, intolerant, and bigoted.

The pursuit of knowledge and the maintenance of a free and democratic society require the cultivation and practice of the virtues of intellectual humility, openness of mind, and, above all, love of truth. These virtues will manifest themselves and be strengthened by one's willingness to listen attentively and respectfully to intelligent people who challenge one's beliefs and who represent causes one disagrees with and points of view one does not share.

That's why all of us should seek respectfully to engage with people who challenge our views. And we should oppose efforts to silence those with whom we disagree—especially on college and university campuses. As John Stuart Mill taught, a recognition of the possibility that we may be in error is a good reason to listen to and honestly consider—and not merely to tolerate grudgingly—points of view that we do not share, and even perspectives that we find shocking or scandalous.

None of us is infallible. Whether you are a person of the left, the right, or the center, there are reasonable people of goodwill who do not share your fundamental convictions. This does not mean that all opinions are equally valid or that all speakers are equally worth listening to. It certainly does not mean that there is no truth to be discovered. Nor does it mean that you are necessarily wrong. But they are not necessarily wrong either.

"The person you are now only exists because the person you were was willing to grow into something new." - John Templeton.

All of us should be willing—even eager—to engage with anyone who is prepared to do business in the currency of truth-seeking discourse by offering reasons, marshaling evidence, and making arguments. The more important the subject under discussion, the more willing we should be to listen and engage—especially if the person with whom we are in conversation will challenge our deeply held—even our most cherished and identity-forming—beliefs.

Intellectual humility is the key to questioning our beliefs, lowering our defense mechanisms, and finding the truth. Consider watching the short "The Joy of Being Wrong" video by the John Templeton Foundation at: <https://youtu.be/mRXNUx4cua0> where this principle is nicely summarized.



S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being

### 3 – The Essential 50 “MADNESS” Series of Textbooks

When it comes to measuring the true quality of a learning institution, conventional measures of academic quality are relatively useless if the intellectual life of the university is skewed in a manner that (intentionally or unintentionally) suppresses unfashionable ideas and alternative points of view.

Social media censorship, cancel culture, and outright threats toward conservatives, libertarians, independents, and sapient beings make it hard for young people to break free of the woke mob and fake news and consider alternate points of view, the truth, and sapient ideals.

The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program counters campus groupthink and the 50 MADNESS textbook titles for are meant to buck the trend of viewpoint orthodoxy in K12 and college textbook selection and extra curriculum reading by being the spark, the starting point, the damning expose on a variety of the hottest issues and controversial topics in America and the world.

Each year throughout the 2021 decade, the textbooks are available in three different format options of Paperback @ \$34.99, PDF @ \$14.99, and ePub @ \$7.99 and can be ordered online at Fratire Publishing at: <https://www.fratirepublishing.com/books>. Special and bulk orders are available upon request.

Because Fratire Publishing is a small but determined independent and self-publisher, it makes the perfect home for the development of the 50 MADNESS textbook titles and its viewpoint diverse topics—and is not restricted by a large publication commitment using traditional publishing houses or dependent on university presses and approvals.



S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being

## 4 – 2021 MADNESS Textbook Release Schedule

The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program can enhance viewpoint diversity and intellectual humility so students, administrators, and professors can make and participate in free speech again on campus in America's high schools, community colleges, and four-year universities and enhance ideological diversity throughout America's academic and educational institutions.

To accomplish these goals and develop sapience, these ground-breaking, anti-politically correct, and thought-provoking books, along with the SAPIENT Being's foundational guide book *The S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being* outlining its mission, vision, and ethos, are at the forefront of fighting illiberalism on campus.

The 5 proposed the SCT Program MADNESS book titles for 2021 publication are as follows with books already published, or soon to be published, shown in parenthesis with month already self-published or month it is going to be published:

- **Fake News Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Spotting Fake News Media & How to Help Fight and Eliminate It (published in January 2021)
- **Crime Rate Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Color of Crime, Antifa, BLM, SPLC & OSF Impacts on Criminal Justice (published in March 2021)
- **Voting Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Election Irregularities, Voter Fraud, Mail-In Ballots, HR1 and More (published in May 2021)
- **Free Speech Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Free Speech Suppression of Sapient Conservative Ideals & Values (projected for July 2021)
- **California Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the State's Recall, Leftist Policies & Downward Progressive Spiral (projected for September 2021)





# S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being

## 5 – The SCT’s 50 A - Z MADNESS Textbooks List

The Sapient Conservative Textbooks (SCT) Program utilizes a variety of current events and content media sources, and all of the ones used must meet the SAPIENT Beings Journalism Code of Ethics. Furthermore, this qualified content of meaningful points, profound messages, and eloquent arguments are assembled into a cohesive whole, told with high school and college students in mind, and that is what the author Corey Lee Wilson does and where his writing strength lies.

The motivation for the listed titles that have presented themselves is based on pressing topics where there seems to be a lack of sapience confined to the 21<sup>st</sup> century perspective—but not prior to that. The goal of the topics is to keep things “current.” There is no set priority and sequence for publishing the five SCTs per year and each title’s relevance varies depending on its relative importance each year.

For some of you these MADNESS textbook tiles will be a revelation, an epiphany, a sapient being moment. For others, they will be a triggering event, denial of truth, and a painful intervention. For this reason, and more, there’s a reason the common denominator for each title is the word “madness” and the madness can be felt and expressed in a variety of ways.

The subtitles are an iterative process and most always change as a result of continuous improvement during the book’s development process so here is latest list as of June 4, 2021:

**American Madness:** A SAPIENT Being’s Guide to Why a Unified Culture With Social Cohesion is Best for Humanity

**Blexit Madness:** A SAPIENT Being’s Guide on Black America’s Potential Greatness, Free of the Democratic Party

**California Madness:** A SAPIENT Being’s Guide to the State’s Recall, Leftist Policies & Downward Progressive Spiral (September 2021)

**China Madness:** A SAPIENT Being’s Guide to Why a Chinese Superpower is Not in the World’s Best Interest

**Climate Madness:** A SAPIENT Being’s Guide to an Accurate and Unbiased Analysis of Climate Change & Causes

**Communism Madness:** A SAPIENT Being’s Guide to Clarifying Humankind’s Horrific Suffering From Communism

**Conservative Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Conservative Values Trump Leftist & Liberal Ones

**Crime Rate Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Color of Crime, Antifa, BLM, SPLC & OSF Impacts on Criminal Justice (March 2021)

**Cultural Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Western European Culture's Uplifting Contribution to Humanity

**Democratic Party Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Progressivism Madness of Democratic Party Policies & Agenda

**Diversity Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Diversity Programs Are Destroying America's Social Cohesion

**Economics Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Reeducating Americans of the Importance of Essential Economics

**Education Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Fixing America's Dysfunctional & Illiberal Educational Systems

**Fake News Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Spotting Fake News Media & How to Help Fight and Eliminate It (January 2021)

**Family Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Left's War on America's Nuclear Family, Values & Institutions

**Feminism Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Understanding Feminism and Why Sapient Women Reject It

**Free Speech Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Cancel Culture of Sapient Conservative Ideals & Values (July 2021)

**Generations X Y Z Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to America's Demise From These 3 Unsapient Generations

**Globalism Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Globalism Undermines America's Exceptionalism & Leadership

**Government Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Our Civic Obligation to Fight Big Government Abuse & Bureaucracy

**Gun Control Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide Understanding Gun Facts and Deaths by All Types of Weapons

**Health Care Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Pros and Cons of Socialized Health Care Programs & Options

**Hollywood Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Seeing How Ridiculous & Hypocritical Celebrities' Opinions Are

**Immigration Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to America's Legal vs. Illegal Immigrants and Assimilation

**Justice Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the DOJ, SpyGate, Government Corruption, and SCOTUS Rulings

**Leftist Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Showing Why Leftism's Ongoing Failures Can Be Righted Rightly

**Liberal Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Reversing the Unsapient State of Liberal Politics, Policies & Agenda

**Mexico Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Mexico & Central America Struggle and Canada Succeeds

**Middle East Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Jewish-Christian Love & Tolerance vs. Islam's Extremism & Hate

**Minority Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide and Non-Racist Assessment and Understanding of Racial Disparities

**New York City Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Analyzing the City's Acute Liberal Madness and Leftist Policies

**Obesity Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Curing America's Obesity, Lack of Fitness, and Sedentary Lifestyles

**Pandemic Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Progressive Overreach & Totalitarian of the Lockdowns

**Pension Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Fixing the Pending Pension Fund Crisis Before it Bankrupts America

**Political Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Constitution's Genius, Power to the People & Convention of States

**Population Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Addressing Overpopulation and Irresponsible Conception

**Progressivism Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Idiocracy and Hypocrisy of the 'Regressivism' Movement

**Racism Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide as to the Idiocracy of CRT, Implicit Bias Training, White Privilege & More

**Religion Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Religious Freedom & Choices Make Better American Citizens

**Republican Party Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Saviors of the Republic and the American Dream

**Russia Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Understanding How American Capitalism Defeated Soviet Communism

**Sexual Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Idiocracy of the New Gender Types and Why They Fail Humanity

**Snowflake Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Generations X Y Z Are Unprepared to Lead America Sapiently

**Socialism Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Generations X Y Z Love of Socialism Will Ruin the America Dream

**Technology Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the Dangers of Big Tech Control & Addiction to Electronics

**Third World Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Understanding Why the Third World Remains Third Rate

**Trump Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Why Fighting Politics & Elitism as Usual Can Help Cure Governing Madness

**Union Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Fighting Public Union's Monopsonistic Political Power & Public Policy

**United Nations Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to the New World Order of Soros, Leftists & Progressives

**Voting Madness:** A SAPIENT Being's Guide to Election Irregularities, Voter Fraud, Mail-In Ballots, HR1 and More (May 2021)



S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being

## 6 – Journalism Code of Ethics, Practical Logic & Sapience Guidelines

The S.A.P.I.E.N.T. Being's Journalism Code of Ethics, Practical Logic & Sapience Guidelines forms the basis for our motto "truth without bias" and forms the basis and foundation for our textbook ethos, media sources, and journalistic content.

Once asked what it takes to be a successful writer, Ernest Hemingway replied, "A good crap-detector." Crude? Perhaps. What he meant was an ability to separate the authentic from the phony, the real from the illusory, the significant from the trivial, the artistic from the artful, the truth from the BS.

It's not only the writer and reader who needs that capacity. Everyone does, and more so these days with hip boots due to fake news, false narratives, and cancel culture. Lacking it, we can do little more than slip and slide from the brainwashing effect of academia, mainstream media, and big tech. Or we can fight back and help eliminate it? One effective way to do that is to master practical logic and the correct rules of argument.

The SAPIENT Being utilizes the Society of Professional Journalists: Code of Ethics (Straubhaar, LaRose & Davenport, pages 478-79) in regard to its journalistic research and reporting standards. The Society of Professional Journalists created a code of ethics that are in effect today and outlined below.

These standards provide the foundation of journalistic ethics and they are supplemented with key practical logic fallacies, confirmation bias, constructive disagreement, replication crisis, along with the mission statement of the SAPIENT Being that promotes the return of free speech, open dialogue and civil discourse and the vision statement of creating a society advancing personal Intelligence and enlightenment now together (S.A.P.I.E.N.T.).

### **Society of Professional Journalists: Code of Ethics**

The Code of Ethics from the Society of Professional Journalists used for the first half of this chapter is powerful list because it reminds oneself how mainstream fake news media flagrantly and continuously violate every item on the list. The Code can be used to critique fake news journalism, unsound research,

fact checking, agendas, sources, stereotyping, and so on. In one item there is one added term (ideology) that is shown in parenthesis.

### Best Practices:

The main mantra of the code is "Seek truth and Report it!" The code also states that: "Journalists should be honest, fair, and courageous in gathering, reporting, and interpreting information. Journalists should:

- Test the accuracy of information from all sources and exercise care to avoid inadvertent error. Deliberate distortion is never permissible.
- Diligently seek out subjects of news stories to give them the opportunity to respond to allegations of wrongdoing.
- Identify sources whenever feasible. The public is entitled to as much information as possible on sources' reliability.
- Always question sources' motives before promising anonymity. Clarify conditions attached to any promise made in exchange for information. Keep promises.
- Make certain that headlines, news teases, and promotional material, photos, video, audio, graphics, sound bites, and quotations do not misrepresent. They should not oversimplify or highlight incidents out of context.
- Never distort the content of news photos or video. Image enhancement for technical clarity is always permissible. Label montages and photo illustrations.
- Avoid misleading reenactments or staged news events. If reenactment is necessary to tell a story, label it as so.
- Avoid undercover or other surreptitious methods of gathering information except when traditional open methods will not yield information vital to the public. Use of such methods should be explained as part of the story.
- Never plagiarize.
- Tell the story of the diversity and magnitude of the human experience boldly, even, when it is unpopular to do so.
- Examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing on those values on others.
- Avoid stereotyping by (ideology), race, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, geography, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, or social status.
- Support the open exchange of views, even views they find repugnant.
- Give voice to the voiceless; official and unofficial sources of information can be equally valid.

- Distinguish between advocacy and news reporting. Analysis and commentary should be labeled and not misrepresent fact or content.
- Distinguish news from advertising and shun hybrids that blur the lines between the two.
- Recognize the special obligation to ensure that the public's business is conducted in the open and that government records are open to inspection.

### Minimize Harm:

Ethical journalists treat sources, subjects, and colleagues as human beings deserving of respect. Journalists should:

- Show compassion for those who may be affected adversely by news coverage. Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects.
- Be sensitive when seeking or using interviews or photographs of those affected by tragedy or guilt.
- Recognize that gathering and reporting information may cause harm or discomfort. Pursuit of the news is not a license for arrogance.
- Recognize that private people have a greater right to control information about themselves than do public officials and others who seek power, influence, or attention. Only an overriding public need can justify intrusion into anyone's privacy.
- Show good taste. Avoid pandering to lurid curiosity.
- Be cautious of identifying juvenile suspects or victims of sex crimes.
- Be judicious about naming criminal suspects before the formal filing of charges.
- Balance a criminal suspect's fair trial rights with the public's right to be informed.

### Act Independently:

Journalists should be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know. Journalists should:

- Avoid conflict of interest, real or perceived.
- Remain free of associations and activities that may compromise integrity or damage credibility.
- Refuse gifts, favors, fees, free travel, and special treatment, and shun secondary employment, political involvement, public office, and service in community organizations if they compromise journalistic integrity.
- Disclose unavoidable conflicts.
- Be vigilant and courageous about holding those with power accountable.

- Deny favored treatment to advertisers and special interests and resist their pressure to influence news coverage.
- Be wary of sources offering information for favors or money; avoid bidding for news."

### Be Accountable:

Journalists are accountable to their readers, listeners, viewers, and each other. Journalists should:

- Clarify and explain news coverage and invite dialogue with the public over journalistic conduct.
- Encourage the public to voice grievances against the news media."
- Admit mistakes and correct them promptly.
- Expose unethical practices of journalists and the news media.
- Abide by the same high standards to which they hold others.

## Practical Logic to the Rescue and Intervention

Per Vincent E. Barry, author of the 1980 timeless classic *Practical Logic*, listed in alphabetical order is a quick and short definition of the essential practical logic terms for your use as needed. There's no better written way of calling out fake news than quoting these:

**Argument from analogy** is an inductive argument in which a known similarity that two things share is used as evidence for concluding that the two things are similar in other respects.

**Argument from ignorance fallacy** is the argument that uses an opponent's inability to disprove a conclusion as proof of the conclusion's correctness.

**Argument** is any group of propositions true or false statements one of which is said to follow from the others.

**Common practice fallacy** is an argument that attempts to justify wrongdoing on the basis of some practice that has become commonly accepted.

**Compatibility** refers to whether or not a hypothesis fits in with a body of knowledge that is already accepted as true.

**Deductive argument** is one whose conclusion is claimed to follow from its premises with logical certainty in logic a deductive argument whose premises necessarily lead to its conclusion is termed a valid argument.

**Fallacies of ambiguity** are those fallacies arising from careless language usage.

**Fallacies of relevance** are those arguments whose premises are logically a relevant to their conclusions.

**Fallacy** is a type of argument that may seem to be correct but is not.



**Fallacy of accent** is an argument whose justification depends on a shift in emphasis on a word or phrase.

**Fallacy of accident** is an argument that applies a general rule to a particular case Whose special circumstances make the rule inapplicable.

**Fallacy of ad hominem** is an argument that attacks the person who makes an assertion rather than the person's argument.

**Fallacy of begging the question** is an argument that assumes as a premise the very conclusion it intends to prove.

**Fallacy of biased question** is an argument based upon the answer to a question that is worded to draw a predetermined reply.

**Fallacy of biased sample** is an argument that contains a sample that is not representative of the population being studied.

**Fallacy of complex question** is an argument that in asking a question assumes the conclusion at issue.

**Fallacy of composition** is an argument that attributes characteristics of the parts to a whole.

**Fallacy of concealed evidence** is an argument that presents only facts that are favorable to its conclusion while suppressing relevant but non-supportive facts.

**Fallacy of division** is an argument that attributes to the parts of a whole the characteristics of the whole itself.

**Fallacy of equivocation** is an argument that uses the word or phrase in such a way that it carries more than a single meaning.

**Fallacy of false analogy** is an argument that makes an erroneous comparison.

**Fallacy of false authority** is an argument that violates any of the criteria for a justifiable appeal to authority.

**Fallacy of false dilemma** is an argument that erroneously reduces the number of possible positions for alternatives on an issue.

**Fallacy of fear or force** is an argument that uses the threat of harm for the acceptance of a conclusion.

**Fallacy of hasty conclusion** is an argument that draws a conclusion based on insufficient evidence.

**Fallacy of invincible ignorance** is an argument that insists on the legitimacy of an idea or principle despite contradictory fact.

**Fallacy of mob appeal** is an argument that attempts to persuade by arousing a group's deepest emotions.

**Fallacy of pity** is an argument uses pity to advance a conclusion.

**Fallacy of popularity** is an argument that tries to justify something strictly by appeal to numbers.

**Fallacy of positioning** is an argument that tries to capitalize on the earned reputation of a leader in a field to sell something.

**Fallacy of provincialism** is an argument that views things exclusively in terms of group loyalty.

**Fallacy of questionable causation** is an argument that asserts that a particular circumstance produces that it causes a particular phenomenon when there is in fact little or no evidence to support set contention.

**Fallacy of questionable classification** is an argument that classifies somebody or something on the basis of insufficient evidence.

**Fallacy of slippery slope** is an argument that objects to a position on the erroneous belief that the position if taken will set off a chain of events that ultimately will lead to undesirable action.

**Fallacy of two wrongs make a right** is an argument that attempts to justify what is considered wrong by appealing to other instances of the same action.

**Fallacy of unknown fact** is an argument that contains premises that are unknowable either in principle or in this particular case.

**Generalization** is a statement that covers many specifics.

**Guilt by association fallacy** is an argument in which people are judged guilty solely on the basis of the company they keep or the places they frequent.

**Hypothesis** must be relevant that is it should explain the problem directly.

**Inductive argument** is one whose conclusion is a generalization.

**Inductive generalization** is an inductive argument whose conclusion is a generalization.

**Informal fallacies** are commonplace errors in reasoning that we fall into because of careless language usage or inattention to the subject matter.

**Intuition** is the direct apprehension of knowledge that is not the result of conscious reasoning or of immediate sense perception.

**Irrelevant reason fallacy** is the argument whose premises are totally irrelevant to the conclusion.

**Justification** refers to the reasonableness of the evidence to support a conclusion.

**Method of agreement** states that if two or more instances of a phenomenon have only one circumstance in common then that circumstance is probably the cause for the effect of the phenomena.

**Method of concomitant variation** states that whenever a phenomenon varies in a particular way as another phenomenon varies in a particular way then a causal relationship probably exists between them.

**Method of difference** states that if an instance where the phenomenon occurs in an instance where it doesn't occur have every circumstance in common except one in that circumstance occurs only in the former than the circumstances probably the cause or the effect of the phenomenon.

**Necessary and sufficient cause** any condition that must be present for the effect to occur in one that will bring about the effect to one and of itself.

**Necessary cause** is a condition that must be present if the effect is to occur.

**Occam's razor** is the problem-solving principle that "entities should not be multiplied without necessity", or more simply, the simplest explanation is usually the right one.

**Objectivity** refers to the quality of viewing ourselves in the world without distortion.

**Persuasive definition** is one that departs from conventional word meaning in order to influence attitudes.

**Post-hoc fallacy** is an argument that asserts that one event is the cause of another from the mere fact that the first occurred earlier than the second.

**Predictability** refers to the explanatory power that a hypothesis has.

**Premises of arguments** are those statements that are claimed to until the conclusion. The conclusion is the statement that supposedly is entailed by the premises.

**Proposition is true** means the proposition describes a state of affairs.

**Public verification** means that almost anyone wanting could verify the claim.

**Reason** is the capacity to draw conclusions from evidence.

**Sampling technique** is the method of procedure used to generate a sample.

**Scientific method** is a way of investigating a phenomenon that's based on the collective analysis and into interpretation of evidence to determine the most probable explanation. The five basic steps in scientific method: 1) statement of the problem, 2) collection of facts, 3) formulating a hypothesis, 4) making further inferences, and 5) verifying the inferences.

**Simplicity** refers to a hypothesis capacity to account for the facts and data in the most economical way of all the alternatives.

**Statistical generalization** is a statement that asserts that something is true of a percentage of a class.

**Stipulative definition** is one that attaches unique or at least unconventional meaning to a term.

**Stratified sample** is a sampling technique in which relevant strata within the group are identified and a random sample from each stratum is selected in proportion to the number of members in each stratum.

**Straw man fallacy** is an argument that alters a position that the result is easier to attack than the original.

**Sufficient cause** is any condition that by itself will bring about the effect.

**Supporting testimony** refers to the observations of other (viewpoint diverse) observers that tend to support the evidence presented.

**Testability** refers to whether or not a hypothesis offers observations that will confirm or disconfirm it.

**True premises** do not of themselves justify and inductive conclusion an argument is sound when in the case of induction, it is Justified; or win in the case of deduction it is both valid and true.

**Universal generalization** is a statement that asserts that something is true of all members of a class.

## Recommendations for Tech Companies

The Media Research Center (MRC) has undertaken an extensive study of the problem at major tech companies' effort to censor the conservative worldview from the public conversation and formulated a guidebook in 2018, titled *CENSORED! How Online Media Companies Are Suppressing Conservative Speech*.

Like it or not, social media is the communication form of the future—not just in the U.S., but worldwide. Facebook and Twitter combined reach 1.8 billion people. More than two-thirds of all Americans (68 percent) use Facebook. YouTube is pushing out TV as the most popular place to watch video. Google is the No. 1 search engine in both the U.S. and the world.

As previously covered, war is being declared on the conservative movement in this space and conservatives are losing—badly. If the right is silenced, billions of people will be cut off from conservative ideas and conservative media. It's the new battleground of media bias. But it's worse. That bias is not a war of ideas. It's a war against ideas. Below is a list of suggestions from MRC to deal with this problem:

### People are Policy:

Tech companies like Google and Facebook are making a nominal effort to hire conservatives, but that doesn't address the core problems within those organizations. Companies need to eliminate policies and biases that discriminate against conservatives. They also need to protect employees' ability to disagree with the pervasive liberal groupthink that dominates the industry.

### Tech Companies Must Provide Transparency:

People and organizations have their posts and videos either restricted or deleted on all major platforms. If those companies expect their users to trust them, they must make this system transparent. They must show at least when posts of organizations and public figures are deleted and when they aren't. That would give users a baseline of what speech is allowed on a platform, not just whatever the companies choose to delete.

### **Expect Regulation at This Pace:**

Tech companies are facing calls for regulation from left and right. The firms should address this by setting rules about how they will treat both conservative and liberal organizations and information fairly. This means clear, published guidelines must be established that support free speech online. Algorithms, content guidelines and ad policies must be designed that don't target political speech. Firms must stop pretending disagreement is equivalent to hate speech. Fairness and transparency are equally essential.

### **Avoid Partnering With Bad Actors:**

Twitter, YouTube and others had tried to establish policies that prevent so-called hate speech on their platforms. But those policies are being enforced by organizations that spew hate against the conservative movement and can't pretend to be neutral players. Groups like the SPLC and ADL label core conservative values as "hate" or "bigotry." Tech companies can't expect conservatives to trust a system that is so blatantly one-sided.

### **Modify Flagging Systems:**

One of the worst problems tech companies grapple with is the abuse of their flagging and reporting systems. YouTube, Twitter and Facebook, in particular, succumb to liberal activists who game their systems and constantly report conservative content. These services must determine a better way to handle alerts that do not allow coordinated campaigns against the right.

### **Use Neutral Fact-Checkers:**

If social media sites are going to attempt to be the arbiters of what is real news, they must rely on fact-checking sources that are neutral and fair toward stories on both sides of the aisle. Relying on sites like Snopes, which has a clear liberal bias, raises concerns over whether the tech giants are trying to promote a liberal political narrative.

## **Avoiding Personal Bias and Faulty Research Methods**

The sections above provide a solid foundation for spotting and fighting fake news in all its forms and uses in an ethical and journalistic manner. The ones below from a sociological and psychological perspective, can also assist in our crusade to improve journalistic, media, and research standards and make them more sapient in the process.

### **Constructive Disagreement is Good**

Constructive disagreement occurs when people who don't see eye-to-eye are committed to exploring an issue together, alive to their own fallibility and the limits of their knowledge—and open to learning something from others who see things differently than they do.

When people lack the skill or the will to disagree constructively, disputes about theories, methods, data, analysis, or solutions can take on the character of zero-sum power struggles rather than opportunities for mutual growth and discovery. People become more polarized and closed-minded. They grow less likely to share and cooperate, and more likely to withhold key information, or engage in bad faith for competitive advantage.

Mistakes and failures are more likely to be weaponized against scholars rather than being understood as an unavoidable part of the iterative process of exploration, trial, error, discovery, and revision that lies at the core of the scientific method. People grow less likely to take risks or tolerate uncertainty. Under these circumstances, increased diversity can become a liability—a source of additional paranoia and strife—rather than an asset.

### Confirmation Bias is Bad and Everywhere

As an example, a *Reason* study by Ronald Bailey in 2011 titled “Climate Change and Confirmation Bias” suggests that your values, not science, determine your views about climate change.

The Pew Research Center conducted a 2009 survey comparing the political ideologies of scientists and the general public. Only 9 percent of scientists identified as conservative, 35 percent as moderate, and 52 percent as liberal, with 14 percent claiming to be very liberal. In contrast, the general public identifies as 37 percent conservative, 38 percent moderate, and 20 percent liberal, and 5 percent very liberal.

Slicing the data another way, the survey finds that 81 percent of scientists lean Democrat whereas 52 percent of the general public does. Another telling division between the beliefs of the general public versus scientists is their responses to this statement: “When something is run by the government, it is usually inefficient and wasteful.” Fifty-eight percent of scientists disagreed, whereas 57 percent of the public agreed with it.

The quest for publication has led some scientists to manipulate data, analysis, and even their original hypotheses. In 2014, John Ioannidis, a Stanford professor conducting research on research (or ‘meta-research’), found that across the scientific field, “many new proposed associations and/or effects are false or grossly exaggerated.” Ioannidis, who estimates that 85 percent of research resources are wasted, claims that the frequency of positive results well exceeds how often one should expect to find them. He pleads with the academic world to put less emphasis on “positive” findings.

Ironically, the scientific method is meant to combat confirmation bias: scientists are encouraged to search primarily for falsifying evidence, then confirmation of their hypothesis. The rigors of science, however, are often outweighed by the realities of getting and keeping a job. With their academic careers and tenure contingent on getting published, scientists have moved from testing “How am I wrong?” to simply asking “How am I right?”

“At present, we mix up exploratory and confirmatory research,” Brian Nosek, a psychologist with the University of Virginia, told Philip Ball. “You can’t generate hypotheses and test them with the same data.”

### The Replication Crisis in Science is Real

Because the reproducibility of experimental results is an essential part of the scientific method, the inability to replicate the studies of others has potentially grave consequences for many fields of science in which significant theories are grounded on unreproducible experimental work. The replication crisis has been particularly widely discussed in the field of psychology and in medicine, where a number of efforts have been made to re-investigate classic results, to determine both the reliability of the results and, if found to be unreliable, the reasons for the failure of replication.

A 2016 poll of 1,500 scientists reported that 70% of them had failed to reproduce at least one other scientist's experiment (50% had failed to reproduce one of their own experiments). In 2009, 2% of scientists admitted to falsifying studies at least once and 14% admitted to personally knowing someone who did. Misconducts were reported more frequently by medical researchers than others.

The replication crisis in the sciences has just begun. It will be big when it's over. After a decade of slow growth beneath public view, the replication crisis in science begins breaking into public view. First psychology and biomedical studies, now spreading to many other fields—overturning what we were told is settled science, the foundations of our personal behavior and public policy.

This crisis emerged a decade ago as problems in a few fields—especially health care and psychology. Slowly similar problems emerged in other fields, usually failures to replicate widely accepted research. Economics, with its high standards for transparency—has been hit and even physics has been affected.



## 7 – Author’s Biography



*Author: Corey Lee Wilson.*

Corey Lee Wilson was raised an atheist by his liberal *Playboy* Bunny mother, has three Anglo-Hispanic siblings, a brother who died of AIDS, baptized a Protestant by his conservative grandparents, attended temple with his Jewish foster parents, baptized again as a Catholic for his first Filipina wife, attends Buddhist ceremonies with his second Thai wife, became an agnostic on his own free will for most of his life, and is a lifetime independent voter.

Corey felt the sting of intellectual humility by repeating the 4th grade and attended eighteen different schools before putting himself through college at Mt. San Antonio College and Cal Poly Pomona University (while on triple secrete probation). Named Who's Who of American College Students in 1984, he received a BS in Economics and won his fraternity's most prestigious undergraduate honor, the Phi Kappa Tau Fraternity's Shideler Award, both in 1985. In 2020, he became a member of the Heterodox Academy and in 2021 a member of the National Association of Scholars and 1776 Unites.



As a satirist and fraternity man, Corey started Fratire Publishing in 2012 and transformed the fiction “fratire” genre to a respectable and viewpoint diverse non-fiction genre promoting practical knowledge and wisdom to help everyday people navigate safely through the many hazards of life. In 2018, he founded the SAPIENT Being to help promote freedom of speech, viewpoint diversity, intellectual humility and most importantly advance sapience in America’s students and campuses.