Lack of Evidences tend to Negate Rationality of the Argument

In their article titled “Why Our Memory Fails Us”, the authors Christopher F. Chabris and Daniel J. Simons have presented an argument with specific emphasis on logos and ethos of the context. While the authors stayed logical and scientific in their arguments and explanation, the use of their context and examples did provoke pathos in readers as well. While the authors were trying to emphasize on the importance of how the memory tend to be manipulated by our personal biases and opinions, the use of President Bush and Mr. Tyson as the examples provoked an emotional concern amongst the readers. This is actively evident in the top three comments of the articles as well, there the commentators are trying to defy or agree to the authors based on their perceptions of personality of President Bush as one commentator stated that “"Dr. Tyson, Mr. Bush and Mrs. Clinton are all intelligent, educated people." - I think your memory of Bush being an intelligent person is faulty” (Chabris & Simons).

The authors of the article are trying to be logical in their approach without provoking personal perceptions and biases as they stated that “A critical concern about eyewitness memory is the sometimes-tenuous relationship between the accuracy of a witness’s memory and his confidence in it” (Chabris & Simons). However, at another instance in the article, the authors presented a conflict to the same argument as they stated that “Overconfidence in memory could emerge from our daily experience: We recall events easily and often, at least if they are important to us, but only rarely do we find our memories contradicted by evidence, much less take the initiative to check if they are right” (Chabris & Simons). With such statements, apparently logical, but with no scientific evidences to cite, the authors tend to lose their credibility in view of the readers. This is probably the reason that the top three comments picked by the Editor were not in favor of the authors. Instead, they criticized on this rationale by making their own logics of the information presented in the article.

While the authors tried to stay on track and precise about their information, but the criticalness of the readers defy their own concept as they stated that “Our lack of appreciation for the fallibility of our own memories can lead to much bigger problems than a misattributed quote” (Chabris & Simons). It was some of the faulty information about President Bush that reduced their credibility and were pointed out by the first commentator with evidence as well. Therefore, this precise instance further reduces the rational capability of the authors amongst the readers because they have themselves stated that “Erroneous witness recollections have become so concerning that the National Academy of Sciences convened an expert panel to review the state of research on the topic” (Chabris & Simons).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the authors did presented the argument in a logical and rational manner. However, the inappropriate use of examples and contexts with lack of evidences led to provoke pathos and ethos for the readers against the authors’ arguments.
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