Exercise 3.1

1. Formal fallacy  
   2. Informal fallacy  
   3. Formal fallacy  
   4. Informal fallacy  
   5. Informal fallacy  
   6. Formal fallacy  
   7. Informal fallacy  
   8. Informal fallacy  
   9. Formal fallacy  
   10. Formal fallacy

Exercise 3.2
Part I

1. Appeal to pity  
2. Argument against the person, circumstantial  
3. Red herring  
4. Accident  
5. Appeal to the people, indirect variety  
6. Argument against the person, abusive  
7. Appeal to force  
8. Straw man  
9. Missing the point  
10. Tu quoque (you too)  
11. No fallacy  
12. Appeal to the people, direct variety  
13. Red herring  
14. Appeal to pity
15. Accident

16. Argument against the person, circumstantial

17. Argument against the person, abusive

18. No fallacy

19. Straw man

20. Appeal to force

21. Red herring

22. Appeal to the people, indirect variety

23. No fallacy (Jones has presented no argument.)

24. Tu quoque

25. Missing the point

Part II

1. False  6. False
2. False  7. True
3. True  8. True
4. True  9. True
5. False 10. True

Part III

The fallacies are noted in brackets throughout the text:

"Thanks for saving us a seat," Jodie says to her friend Frank, as she and Liz sit down with coffee cups in hand in the crowded cafeteria.  
"No problem," Frank says. 
"We were late getting out of Professor Conklin's social problems class," Jodie says disgustedly. "He's such a jerk! He always keeps us late, and he's the most arrogant snob I've ever met." [No fallacy. No argument of Prof. Conklin is being attacked.]
"I've heard that," Frank says. "What's he covering in class now?"
"Sexual harassment in the workplace," Jodie replies. "But that is a real problem these days."
"How so?"
"Well, my friend Amelia is a dispatcher for a trucking company, and she's told me about dozens of times she's been a victim of sexual harassment. The truckers have
Playboy centerfolds tacked up all over the place, they constantly leer at her, they're always asking her for dates. One of them even pats her rear when she leans over at the drinking fountain." [No fallacy]

Frank laughs. "Well, there is such a thing as the First Amendment, which supposedly guarantees freedom of expression. You wouldn't want to deny these guys their freedom of expression, would you?" [Accident]

"Freedom of expression my eye!" explodes Jodie, looking incredulously at Frank. "Patting someone's rear isn't freedom of expression, it's abusive physical contact. So it's not protected by the First Amendment. [No fallacy] Men! The trouble with you, Frank, is you're a typical man. If you were a woman, you'd see these things for what they are," she says, looking at Liz for support. [Ad hominem circumstantial]

Liz nods her head in strong agreement.

"Well, says Frank, "I think your friend is lucky to have a job, what with all the people out of work these days. I've got a friend who's spent half his retirement savings just putting food on the table for his family, after losing his job. He was in the construction business, which is dead right now. And in other parts of the country it's even worse. You should tell Amelia to quit complaining." [Red herring]

"Stop giving me the run-around," demands Jodie, offended. "The trouble with you men is, you always look at women as sex objects. That makes sexual harassment inevitable." [Red herring]

"What do you mean?" protests Frank. "It's you women who treat us men like sex objects. What about all your makeup and perfume? And the tight pants and all the see-through stuff you wear? You think men are just a pack of animals--nothing but instinct--and you think that will make us fall for you. Isn't that how you see us?" [Tu quoque]

"I won't dignify that with a reply," fumes Jodie. "Anyone who isn't blind can see that Amelia's being victimized by those truckers. [Ad hominem abusive] If you can't see it, maybe pouring this hot coffee over your thick head will wake you up!" she threatens. [Appeal to force]

"Calm down," says Frank with a startled look. "Everyone is beginning to stare at us. Okay, suppose I agree that Amelia is a victim. The question is, what do we do about it?"

"To begin with," says Jodie firmly, "the trucking company should transfer Amelia out of dispatch and give her a better job, like executive secretary in the regional office. Her husband ran out on her recently, leaving her with all five kids--and little Tommy needs braces. She could really use the extra money." [Appeal to pity]

"You're joking!" Frank laughs sarcastically. " Didn't you tell me once that Amelia never finished high school and is functionally illiterate? She could never handle a job like that." [No fallacy]

Thinking for a moment, Jodie then replies, "well, maybe you're right. But at least the company should adopt a policy forbidding all forms of sexual harassment. Maybe that would make the truckers see how abusive they are, and then they might stop acting that way. [No fallacy] Practically every company in the country has such a policy, but Amelia's bosses are dragging their feet." [Appeal to the people--indirect]

"Okay. But then how do you define sexual harassment?" Frank asks. "Cause if you can't define it, any policy is useless."

"Well, I don't exactly know," Jodie hesitates. "I'll have to think about that."

"Aha! I knew it!" exclaims Frank, triumphantly. "You can't define it, which means you don't even know if it exists! [Missing the point] If you weren't such a radical feminist, you would see that all these claims of sexual harassment are hooey." [Ad hominem abusive]
"Me, radical?" Jodie explodes. "The truth is you're a radical sexist. [Tu quoque] What you're saying is, women are only chattel, like they were two hundred years ago, and men can use or abuse them any way they please. [Straw man] Liz, that's what he's saying, isn't it?"

"Absolutely," Liz affirms. "What a crazy argument," says Frank scornfully. "What you're saying is, we should abolish all distinctions between men and women and create a unisex society in which everyone acts like a bunch of robots. [Straw man] Isn't that right, Liz?"

"No, not at all," insists Liz. "She's trying to--"

"You're completely insane, Frank" Jodie interrupts, rising determinedly from her chair, "and your arguments are wacko!" [Ad hominem abusive]--and then she throws the remains of her coffee at Frank. [No fallacy] The other students who have been listening to the heated argument rise up shouting, "Right on Jodie!" Some begin chanting, "End sex harassment! End sex harassment!" As more students join the demonstration, they surrounded Frank, gesturing crudely. [Appeal to the people--direct]

Angry and humiliated, he breaks away and dashes out the door.

Exercise 3.3
Part I

1. Hasty generalization (converse accident)
2. Weak analogy
3. Appeal to unqualified authority
4. Slippery slope
5. No fallacy
6. False cause
7. Appeal to ignorance
8. No fallacy
9. Hasty generalization (converse accident)
10. Appeal to unqualified authority. (This was a TV ad; recall that Ray Charles is blind.)
11. No fallacy
12. Slippery slope
13. Weak analogy
14. Appeal to ignorance
15. False cause

Part II

1. False  6. True
2. True  7. True
3. False  8. False
4. False  9. True
5. True  10. True

Part III

1. Hasty generalization
2. Missing the point
3. No fallacy
4. Argument against the person, circumstantial
5. Accident
6. No fallacy
7. False cause (gambler’s fallacy)
8. Appeal to force
9. Appeal to the people, indirect variety
10. Straw man
11. Weak analogy
12. No fallacy
13. Red herring
14. Argument against the person, abusive
15. No fallacy
16. Missing the point

17. Appeal to unqualified authority. (Would the answer be the same if Bush’s statement were a mere slip of the tongue?)
"Hi! Glad you could make it," Ralph says to his friend Claudia, at a Friday night party. "Hey, you just missed a great discussion that Tom, Ruben, and I were having about abduction by extraterrestrials. Ruben just left, but he said he's been reading this book by Whitley Strieber--I think it's called *Transformation*--in which Strieber describes being kidnapped by creatures from outer space."

"Good grief! You don't actually believe that nonsense, do you?" Claudia asks incredulously. [Possible *ad hominem* abusive]

"Well, I don't think Strieber would lie. Also, Ruben told us an amazing personal story. He was out camping a year ago, and after he'd killed off a couple of six packs of Moosehead, he says he saw a UFO. So, I think we have to conclude there really are UFOs." [Appeal to unqualified authority]

"What a joke!" Claudia laughs scornfully. "Ruben was probably hallucinating. [No fallacy] By the way, didn't he fail most of his classes last semester? His parents are spending a fortune for his education, and all he does is party, sleep, and ignore his studies. I think that's immoral. [Red herring] As for Strieber, does he give any evidence?"

"As a matter of fact, he does," Ralph replies smugly. "Apparently, a few years ago, he was driving with his wife on some country road, when both of them experienced an unusual blackout. When they woke up, they were thirty-five miles further down the road,"
and they had no recollection of how they got there. Later, both began having dreams about extraterrestrials performing experiments on them while they were on board their spacecraft. Extraterrestrials must have abducted them, then hypnotized them so they wouldn't remember what had happened." [False cause]

"Oh yeah, now I remember who Strieber is," answers Claudia, caustically. "He's that weirdo who dreams up all kinds of fantastic stories just so he can write books about them and make lots of money. [ad hominem abusive and circumstantial] If you give that sickie one minute of your time, then you're crazier than he is." [Ad hominem abusive]

"I think you're prejudiced," Ralph says. "Why, recent surveys show that sixty-four percent of the American public believe in UFOs, and the number is growing every day. That alone should convince you they're real." [Appeal to the people--indirect]

"You've got to be kidding," Claudia mutters, shaking her head in disbelief.

"Well then, consider this," insists Ralph. "There are hundreds of people out there who've had similar dreams and the same unaccounted for time lapses. They can't all be fantasizing." [No fallacy]

"I know that Strieber is a kook," Claudia persists, "so all the others must be too." [Hasty generalization]

"Now, now, aren't we jumping to conclusions?" her friend asks condescendingly. [No fallacy]

"Not at all. First it was UFOs and little green men. Now those little creatures are abducting people and experimenting on them. Before long they'll be manipulating our genes and trying to infiltrate the human race. In the end, everyone will suspect everyone else of being an alien, mass terror will prevail, and civilization will collapse!" Claudia exclaims in mock horror. [Slippery slope]

"Don't be a fool!" Ralph barks, irritated. "The problem with you is, you're an agnostic. [Ad hominem circumstantial] Obviously, you're saying we should refuse to believe in anything we can't clearly see or touch. So, logically, God doesn't exist, and there is no immortal soul. [Straw man] Tom, that's what she's saying, isn't it?"

"More or less," Tom agrees halfheartedly.

"Again, not at all," Claudia responds. "What I'm saying is, people have to be just a little bit critical about what they believe. Apparently you believe any cockamamie story that comes your way. You're just so gullible. If you keep it up, everyone and their dog will take you for a ride." [Probably no fallacy]

"Oh yeah? If I were you, I'd take a close look at my own beliefs," Ralph gibes. "Didn't I see you reading the astrology column just the other day? [Tu quoque] Nobody in their right mind believes in astrology. [Ad hominem abusive] Maybe I should start screaming 'Claudia believes in astrology! Claudia believes in astrology!' Then everyone will gawk at you, and that sexy physics major you're dying to get a date with will think you're a nut." [Appeal to force]

"Oh, shut up!" says Claudia, blushing. "I may read the astrology column, but I certainly don't believe it. I just read it for fun. But, the fact is, during the past twenty-five years there have been thousands of alleged sightings of UFOs, and not a single one has led to any solid evidence of their existence. [No fallacy] What do you make of that?"

"I think we should look at this situation the other way around," Ralph says. Up until now, nobody has shown that UFOs don't exist, so I think we should give those people who claim they have seen them the benefit of the doubt. We should believe in UFOs and extraterrestrials until the sightings are proven false. [Appeal to ignorance]"
"Well, okay, let's suppose, just for the sake of argument, that I admit the existence of UFOs and their little green drivers. How are we supposed to respond to them? What are we supposed to do?" Claudia asks.

"For starters, we should extend an open invitation to them," answers Ralph. "They may come from a dying planet where millions of their compatriots desperately struggle for survival. Their sun may be burning out, their water supply exhausted, and their soil poisoned with toxic chemicals. Surely they deserve a second chance on a new planet." [Appeal to pity]

"Maybe so," Claudia says in a patronizing tone. "And now that you mention it, we probably have a legal obligation to let them in. Our current immigration laws say that we have to admit at least ten thousand applicants annually, from every major nation. If those aliens would just sign the right papers, we'd have to give them permanent residency. [Accident] However, what worries me is, they may have the wrong intentions. After all, didn't they conduct experiments on those people they abducted?"

"Yes, but don't we experiment on animals? If the animals don't complain, why should we? [Weak analogy] Also, medical experimentation often leads to wonderful new cures. I'm certain we have nothing to worry about," says Ralph, proud of his logic. [Missing the point] "Humph! I hope you're right. Well, I've got to go now--and don't let any green men kidnap you," Claudia says with a barb.

"And you either," Ralph answers.

Exercise 3.4
Part I

1. False dichotomy

2. Composition

3. Equivocation (on "good")

4. Amphiboly

5. Complex question

6. Division

7. Begging the question

8. No fallacy

9. Suppressed evidence (the hidden conditions for getting a free trip prevent most people from ever actually receiving one.)

10. Equivocation (on "ring")
11. Complex question
12. Division
13. Composition
14. No fallacy
15. Amphiboly

16. Suppressed evidence  (The arguer ignores the time value of money. In today's dollars, the $90,000 is worth several times that figure, and, given that the pay-back will be spread out over several years, the present value of the $200,000 is significantly less than that figure.)

17. False dichotomy
18. No fallacy
19. Division
20. Begging the question
21. Composition
22. Complex question
23. Amphiboly
24. Equivocation
25. Begging the question

Part II

1. True  6. False  11. True
2. True  7. True  12. False
5. False  10. True  15. True

Part III

1. Argument against the person, circumstantial
2. Amphiboly
3. Appeal to unqualified authority
4. Equivocation
5. Composition
6. Appeal to the people
7. Begging the question
8. Composition
9. Appeal to ignorance
10. Division
11. Weak analogy
12. Hasty generalization (converse accident)
13. False cause (oversimplified cause)
14. Red herring
15. Complex question
16. Appeal to unqualified authority
17. Argument against the person, abusive and circumstantial
18. Appeal to pity
19. Composition
20. False dichotomy
21. Division
22. Weak analogy
23. Equivocation
24. No fallacy
25. Straw man
26. Amphiboly
27. Begging the question
28. Accident
29. Appeal to force
30. Suppressed evidence
31. Red herring
32. *Tu quoque*
33. Slippery slope
34. Amphiboly
35. Begging the question
36. Appeal to unqualified authority
37. False cause (gambler’s fallacy)
38. Weak analogy
39. Equivocation
40. Begging the question
41. Division
42. No fallacy
43. Missing the point or suppressed evidence.
44. False dichotomy
45. Appeal to ignorance
46. Hasty generalization
47. Missing the point
48. False cause
49. Composition
50. Complex question

Part IV
"Thanks for giving me a lift home," Paul says to his friend Steve, as they head toward the freeway.
"No problem; it's on my way," says Steve.
"Uh oh," warns Paul suddenly, "watch out ahead. Looks like the police have pulled somebody over."
"Thanks," Steve says. "Hope they don't beat the guy up."
"Not a chance," says Paul. "Why would you say that?"
"You're an optimist," answers Steve. "Most cops are animals; they beat up on anybody they want to. You remember Rodney King, don't you? Those cops in LA put King in the hospital for no reason at all. That should prove I'm right." [Hasty generalization]
"I think you're overreacting," Paul says. "Daryl Gates, the LA Police Chief at the time, said the King incident was an aberration. Since he was chief, I think we should take him at his word." [Appeal to unqualified authority]
"But Gates was a lunatic who refused to acknowledge even our most basic rights," Steve persists. "Also, if you recall, he was forced to resign after the King incident. [No fallacy--Gates made no argument] I know we don't live in LA, but our police department is just as bad as theirs. So, you can bet that our friend back there is just as abusive as any of them." [Division]
"Wait a minute," Paul argues, "as far as I know, nobody has ever proved that our police force is the slightest bit violent. You've no right to draw such a conclusion." [Appeal to ignorance]
"Well, listen to this," Steve counters, as he changes lanes and turns onto the freeway. "About a week ago, I was with my friend Casey. When I left him, he was perfectly okay; but he was picked up for going through a stop sign on the way home. I saw him a couple of days later, and he had a big bruise under his right eye. The cop who stopped Casey must have hit him with his baton." [False Cause--post hoc]
"Hold on. Did you ask Casey what happened?"
"No. I didn't have to," says Steve, a bit righteously. "I asked Casey's wife what happened between Casey and the cop, and she said he hit him. Those were her exact words, so that was good enough for me. I bet the cop's a maniac." [Amphiboly--who hit whom?]
"Good grief," answers his friend. "How long will it take you to get over your warped view of things?" [Complex question]
"My way of looking at things isn't warped," Steve insists. "The problem is, you and I are both white. If you were black, you'd see things differently. [ad hominem circumstantial] Police brutality toward African-Americans is way out of hand."
"Well," counters Paul, "a study done recently by an independent agency might interest you. According to that study, for every African-American whom the police use force against, there's a white person they also use force against. That proves the police treat African-Americans no worse than they do whites." [Begging the question: "Doesn't this assume that the number of blacks in the population equals the number of whites?" or possibly, composition]
"I've never heard of that study, but it seems to me there must be something wrong with it," insists Steve.
"Well, the results of that study are born out in my experience," says Paul. "I've been pulled over three or four times in the past couple of years, and the officers have always been extremely courteous. I can only conclude that the vast majority of these allegations
of police brutality are the product of fertile imaginations." [Suppressed evidence or hasty generalization]

"Again, your naiveté amazes me," Steve answers, dumbfounded. "First of all, you forget that you're white and you drive a new Mercedes. Don't you think that makes a difference? [No fallacy] In fact, that's the trouble with all these arguments that downplay police brutality. They're all concocted by white people." [Ad hominem circumstantial]

"Well, the fact remains that we have a major crime problem in this country," Paul argues. "Combating crime requires a few concessions, and you do want to combat crime, don't you?" [Begging the question]

"Sure," Steve replies grudgingly, "but at what expense? Do innocent people have to get their heads bashed in?" [No fallacy]

"Well, the fact remains that we have a major crime problem in this country," Paul argues. "Combating crime requires a few concessions, and you do want to combat crime, don't you?" [Begging the question]

"Sure," Steve replies grudgingly, "but at what expense? Do innocent people have to get their heads bashed in?" [No fallacy]

"Well, I think what it comes down to is this," says Paul. "Either you allow the police to use whatever force they find necessary, or the criminals will take over this country. Now you certainly don't want that to happen, do you?" [False dichotomy]

"No, but that's the crucial question," Steve says, exiting from the freeway. "When and how much force is necessary?" [No fallacy]

"Well, you remember when the police apprehended that serial killer a few weeks ago? When the police made the arrest, the killer attacked them. So, the police can use force when attacked." [No fallacy]

"I agree," responds Steve thoughtfully. "But what about the way the police treated those peaceful right-to-lifers who were demonstrating in front of the abortion clinic the other day? Many of them were elderly and posed no physical threat. But the cops used those contraptions--what do you call them, nimchucks, nomchucks, I don't know--to squeeze the old folks' wrists, causing great pain and injury, and they hit the old people on the head with their batons. Do you think that was necessary?!" [No fallacy]

"Of course it was," answers Paul, agitatedly. "Those people attacked the police--they hurled epithets at them." [Equivocation on "attack"--verbal attack, physical attack]

"Honestly, I don't know how we've managed to stay friends all these years," Steve says with some frustration. "By the way, do you know what it says on the back of all police cars? It says 'To Protect and Serve.' Now if you hired a servant to take care of you, you'd get rid of him if he disobeyed you. Right?"

"Probably."

"Well, isn't it true," Steve asks, "that whenever a police officer disobeys one of us taxpayers, that officer should be fired?" [Weak analogy]

"That may be stretching it a bit," Paul laughs.

"But seriously," continues Steve, "I think what we need is some screening device to keep violent types from ever becoming cops."

"Well, you'll be happy to know that exactly such a device has been used for the past twenty-one years," Paul states. "Before entering the police academy, every applicant goes through a battery of psychological tests that positively eliminates all the macho types and the ones prone to violence. This ensures the individual officers are nonviolent, so we know the entire police force is nonviolent." [Composition]

"Hmm. Maybe your so-called solution is really the problem," Steve suggests, as he pulls up in front of Paul's house. "We've had psychological testing for twenty-one years, and all that time, police violence has been on the rise. Perhaps we should get rid of the testing program." [False cause--non causa pro causa]

"Well, I don't know about the logic of that," Paul muses, stepping out of the car. "But like you said, we've been friends for a long time, so I guess we can disagree. Thanks for the ride and the discussion. See you tomorrow!"

Exercise 3.5
Part I

1. Missing the point, begging the question, or suppressed evidence. (Is any activity justified by the mere fact that it amounts to good business? Also, the arguer ignores the moral question of exporting a product that kills its users.)

2. Appeal to pity

3. Begging the question. (Is it likely that every woman will enlist and that every one of those will be killed?)

4. Composition

5. Missing the point; also, begging the question?

6. _Tu quoque_

7. No fallacy? Weak analogy?

8. Appeal to pity

9. Begging the question. (Does money invested in the stock market actually produce jobs?). Composition? (The fact that some politicians are corrupt and self-serving does not mean that the whole government is). Hasty generalization? (The fact that some programs are wasteful and useless does not mean that all of them are.)

10. Appeal to unqualified authority. The statement "Only a fool . . . ." suggests argument against the person, abusive.

11. Complex question

12. No fallacy? Weak analogy?

13. False cause (oversimplified cause), suppressed evidence, begging the question. (There is little or no evidence of any causal connection between malpractice suits and the decision of some obstetricians to leave the field. An unmentioned factor is the inconvenience of being on call twenty-four hours per day waiting for patients to deliver. There is also little or no evidence of any genuine "lawsuit crisis.")

14. Argument against the person, abusive; argument against the person, circumstantial

15. Slippery slope

16. Begging the question. (The argument appears to run in a circle.)
17. False dichotomy

18. Two cases of weak analogy; also, argument against the person, circumstantial

19. Slippery slope

20. False dichotomy; also, begging the question and/or false cause. (Will a smoking ban in restaurants actually cause smokers to stay away?)

21. Appeal to pity

22. False cause? No fallacy?

23. Missing the point or red herring; also, begging the question?

24. Argument against the person, abusive

25. False cause (post hoc ergo propter hoc)

26. Begging the question. (Just because your emotional reaction was that of losing a baby, does that mean the fetus is really a baby?)

27. Missing the point. (Pledging allegiance to the flag is a symbolic statement of support for the Constitution, which guarantees freedom of expression--including flag burning). Also, weak analogy (between flag burning and libel)


29. No fallacy? Weak analogy?

30. Suppressed evidence? (Men and women usually differ in physical strength.)
   Begging the question? (Is it likely that physical attraction will lead to injury or rape?)
   No fallacy?

31. Appeal to the people (direct variety). Also, appeal to pity? Begging the question?
   (Does the fact that former pets were once loved make any difference?)

32. Tu quoque. Also, red herring

33. False cause (post hoc)

34. Appeal to the people (direct variety)?

35. Appeal to force

36. Hasty generalization
37. False dichotomy? No fallacy?

38. Equivocation. (The advertiser makes it appear that the buyer will save 60% of the entire cost of a vacation instead of merely 60% of the cost of a plane ticket.)

39. Begging the question. (Must we all die prematurely in a nuclear holocaust?)

40. Appeal to unqualified authority; also, slippery slope

41. Begging the question and/or weak analogy. (Is the forced extinction of animal and plant species caused by industrial growth just another form of evolution? Is this forced extinction justified?)

42. Weak analogy and/or red herring; also, begging the question (Is the fetus a child?).

43. Several cases of weak analogy; also, argument against the person, abusive?

44. *Tu quoque*; also, appeal to force?

45. Complex question

46. Begging the question (Is the fetus a child?); also, straw man

47. Hasty generalization

48. Slippery slope

49. Appeal to unqualified authority. Also, the last paragraph suggests a hasty generalization.

50. Appeal to the people, indirect variety. (Whether such roadblocks are reasonable or unreasonable is a question for the courts to decide--not the general public.)

51. Argument against the person, abusive (against the ACLU). Also, missing the point or begging the question. (If the mere possibility of hidden contraband justifies a search, then won't all Fourth Amendment rights be destroyed?)

52. Hasty generalization. Also, argument against the person, abusive? Also, begging the question or red herring?

53. Argument against the person, circumstantial; also, begging the question (Are talk-show participants informed and unbiased spokespersons?)

54. Begging the question or suppressed evidence (Individual tax payers are never consulted as to how tax revenues should be allocated.)

55. Weak analogy
56. Argument against the person, abusive; also, begging the question (Does the possibility that the Japanese would have used the atomic bomb against us justify our use of it against them?)

57. Weak analogy (between being overweight, too tall, or too short—which require special uniforms—and being gay)

58. No fallacy or argument against the person, circumstantial, depending on whether the arguer is attacking Gram's arguments or merely his unsupported statements.

59. Suppressed evidence. (Even though assault rifles might be used in few crimes, when they are used, they often inflict tremendous damage.) Begging the question (Is it likely that we will ever be justified in using assault rifles against government troops?)

60. Weak analogy? No fallacy?

Exercise 4.1

1. Quantifier: some; Subject term: college students; Copula: are; Predicate term: avid devotees of soap operas

2. Quantifier: no; Subject term: persons who live near airports; Copula: are; Predicate term: persons who appreciate the noise of jets

3. Quantifier: all; Subject term: oil-based paints; Copula: are; Predicate term: products that contribute significantly to photochemical smog

4. Quantifier: some; Subject term: preachers who are intolerant of others' beliefs; Copula: are not; Predicate term: television evangelists

5. Quantifier: all; Subject term: trials in which a coerced confession is read to the jury; Copula: are; Predicate term: trials in which a guilty verdict can be reversed

6. Quantifier: some; Subject term: artificial hearts; Copula: are; Predicate term: mechanisms that are prone to failure

7. Quantifier: no; Subject term: sex education courses that are taught competently; Copula: are; Predicate term: programs that are currently eroding public morals

8. Quantifier: some; Subject term: universities that emphasize research; Copula: are not; Predicate term: institutions that neglect undergraduate education

Exercise 4.2

Part I

1. E proposition, universal, negative, subject and predicate terms are distributed.
2. **A** proposition, universal affirmative, subject distributed, predicate undistributed.
3. **I** proposition, particular affirmative, subject and predicate undistributed.
4. **O** proposition, particular negative, subject undistributed, predicate distributed.
5. **A** proposition, universal affirmative, subject distributed, predicate undistributed.
6. **E** proposition, universal negative, subject and predicate distributed.
7. **I** proposition, particular affirmative, subject and predicate undistributed.
8. **O** proposition, particular negative, subject undistributed, predicate distributed.

Part II

1. No drunk drivers are threats to others on the highway.
2. All wildlife refuges are locations suitable for condominium developments.
3. Some slumlords are not persons who eventually wind up in jail.
4. Some CIA operatives are champions of human rights.

Part III.

1. Some owners of pit bull terriers are persons who can expect expensive lawsuits.
2. Some tax proposals that favor the rich are not fair proposals.
3. All grade school administrators are persons who choke the educational process.
4. No residents of Manhattan are people who can afford to live there.

Part IV.

1. Some oil spills are not events catastrophic to the environment.
2. Some alcoholics are persons with a healthy diet.
3. No Mexican vacations are episodes that end with Montezuma's revenge.
4. All corporate lawyers are persons with a social conscience.

Exercise 4.3
Part I
Part II
1. Invalid 6. Invalid 11. Invalid
3. Invalid 8. Valid 13. Invalid
5. Invalid 10. Valid 15. Invalid

Part III
1. No S are B.

All S are B.
Invalid

2. F: Some L are V.

No L are V.
Valid

3. All T are P.

Some T are P.
Invalid
Existential Fallacy

4. All M are C.

\[ \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C} \]

F: Some M are not C.
 Valid

5. F: No J are N.

\[ \text{J} \nleftrightarrow \text{N} \]

Some J are not N.
Invalid

6. Some C are A.

\[ \text{C} \nleftrightarrow \text{A} \]

Some C are not A.
Invalid

7. No F are S.

\[ \text{F} \rightarrow \text{S} \]

F: All F are S
Invalid
Existential Fallacy

8. F: No C are T.

\[ \text{C} \nleftrightarrow \text{T} \]

Some C are T
Valid

9. F: Some S are not C.

\[ \text{S} \rightarrow \text{C} \]

F: Some S are C.
Invalid

10. No V are A.
   
   F: Some V are A.
   Valid

11. No T are A.
    
    Some T are not A.
    Invalid
    Existential fallacy

12. Some C are O.
    
    No C are O.
    Invalid

13. F: Some S are not O.
    
    Some S are O.
    Invalid
    Existential fallacy

14. F: All W are L.
Some W are not L.
Valid

15. F: Some C are D.