

1.

- a. Would taking the citizens of a country hostage be an adequate reason for the use of force to release the hostages? Why or why not?

I would say it depends on the context. If the hostage taker is treating the hostages with brute force (hitting them, injuring, and wounding them), it would make a lot of sense to use force to release them. But if the hostage taker is treating the hostages with respect and is asking the government for food for them then negotiations, in this case, would make a lot more sense than using force. It also depends on the requests of the hostage taker. If his requests are valid and acceptable, then the government might not have to use force. But if the hostage taker is threatening to kill hostages if their requests are not granted, then force is the way to go. It also depends on how long the hostage taker has been holding the hostages and when and if they plan to release them.

- b. How does the example of married women working outside the home at the end of Sec. 8.6.1 in your textbook commit the fallacy of post hoc?

It commits the post hoc fallacy. In post hoc fallacy B occurs after A so B is caused by A. Similarly, in this context, divorce rates increased significantly, therefore, women working away from home caused the significant increase in divorce rates. These 2 events may be totally unrelated, and it was just a coincidence that they occurred together. One thing that might have increased the increased divorce rate is that men started to see more women throughout their day and were bored of their women. Or some infidelity on whichever part that got uncovered. There are a million other reasons than women working outside of home that might have caused the increase in the divorce rates.

- c. How does the second example at the end of Sec. 8.6.2 (that about Kevin and Paula) commit the fallacy of confusing cause and effect?

It commits the fallacy of confusing cause and effect because it is at least as if not more likely that Paula tells Kevin not to drink too much because Kevin always gets really drunk. But in this argument, Kevin drinks too much because Paula says so which might be the case, but it also might be the case that she tells him not to drink too much because he always drinks too much at parties.

- d. How does the example of the two MIT graduates in Sec. 8.3 commit the fallacy of appeals to anecdotal evidence?

I DO NOT HAVE THE NEEDED VERSION OF THE BOOK

- e. How does the second of the three examples at the end of Sec. 8.6.3 (that about poverty and education) commit the fallacy of common cause?

The fallacy of a common cause occurs when 2 events that happen with each other are mistaken for being cause and effect for each other (whether event A caused B or vice versa) when in fact, both might have been caused by a different but common cause. This argument commits the fallacy of common cause because being poor and being uneducated occur together. When in fact they might have a different yet common cause. One of the causes could be the lack of access to life's necessities causing the student to leave school to work for the little money to help his/her family at home keep a roof on their heads and food on their table.

---

2.

- a. Almost all military experts hold that we must have standing armies because of the continuing threat of war. The reality is quite different: the continuing threat of war is caused by the existence of standing armies.

This argument commits the fallacy of confusing cause and effect. This argument argues that the reason there is a threat of war is that we have militaries. It is true that having standing armies and a continuing threat of war go hand in hand. However, it is at least as likely if not more that the reason we have standing militaries is because of the continued threat of war.

one could also argue that this argument commits the fallacy of a common cause. Since these 2 events occur together, they do not have to have a cause-and-effect relationship. One could argue that they have a common cause. One such cause could be the lack of trust between human beings and whether they will stick to their words.

- b. There has been a great deal of criticism recently of the quality of high-school education in Alberta. People seem to think the quality is declining. But the statistics don't bear this out; in fact they show that quality is increasing. The average grades of high-school graduates have increased by at least 10 per cent since 1977.

In this argument, the speaker contradicted his conclusion by saying that there is an increase by 10% increase in the average grades of high-school graduates. In fact, this could be used as evidence to the decline of high school education quality, because if the quality of education decreases then, getting higher grades becomes easier. And if this is not the case, we can have a fallacy of common cause. Maybe with the easy and wide access to the internet the students began sharing answers with each other, or looked up answers online to their question which can definitely result in an increase in the grades of high-school graduates and a decrease in the quality of education.

- c. People who believe they have a duty to help those who are less fortunate than themselves almost always get pleasure from their unselfish actions. This just proves that it is the expectation of pleasure which causes people to act morally or to adopt their moral beliefs.

This argument commits the appeal to ignorance fallacy because an appeal to ignorance is “to think that a position can be accepted simply because the opposite has not been established, that something is the case because there is no evidence against it, or that it is false because there is no evidence for it. In this argument, the opposite argument has not been established.” There is no way we can prove or disprove peoples’ intentions. We can’t collect evidence to prove or disprove someone’s intentions. Therefore, the speaker wants us to accept his/her argument. In this context, the speaker states that people only believe that they have a duty to help those who are less fortunate because they always get pleasure from unselfish actions. Because the opposite point can’t be proven/disproven, the speaker wants us to agree with his/her argument.

- d. Athletes who earn multi-million-dollar salaries deserve them. Those who are so critical of these “astronomical” salaries conveniently overlook two reasons that make such salaries entirely justified. First, these athletes are supremely talented. They are able to perform better than almost everyone else, including most other athletes. Second, they have only a few short years to make their fortune, since in most cases they will have retired from professional sport by their mid-thirties. To compare their salaries with what most people earn you would have to spread athletes’ million-dollar salaries out over 40 years to make the comparison fair.
- e. Ken is the leading scorer on the university hockey team this year. He is averaging one goal per game this year whereas last year he scored only three goals in the entire season. He claims that what made the difference is that he found God last summer; before each game he prays to God to give him the strength and concentration to score at least one goal. Well, maybe he’s right, and we should try to get the rest of the team to get religion. If it works for Ken, who is to say it won’t work for the other players.

It commits the fallacy of appealing to anecdotal evidence. Based on a single story, the speaker wants to turn all the other players religious when in fact Ken might have committed a post hoc fallacy. Yes, he started scoring after he found God. But since these two events are seemingly unrelated, there doesn’t seem to be a cause-and-effect relationship between the two events. It is more logical to say that these two events occurred by sheer coincidence.

- f. The [federal] Liberal government plans to endorse same-sex marriage based on a lower-court ruling in Ontario. Once it does, the well-defined definition of traditional marriage in Canada will be forever altered. The following letter responds to the debate:

If we allow people to marry without regard to their sex, who is to say that we can't discriminate on the basis of number? It is a small step then to legalizing polygamy. Once we open up marriage beyond the boundary of one man and one woman only, there will be no difference based on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms between gay marriage and polygamous marriage (Letter to the editor, *Globe and Mail*, June 19, 2003)

This argument commits the slippery slope fallacy. The structure of the slippery slope fallacy is A likely leads to F. F is bad.  $\rightarrow$  A is bad. Now there likely will be a lot of events between allowing same-sex marriage and polygamy. The probability of allowing polygamy is diminished as the number of steps between allowing same-sex marriages and polygamy increases and with the decrease in the probability of each step between them happening. The fallacy here makes the listeners think that if we take a step along the path of allowing same-sex marriage, nothing will prevent us from allowing polygamy. This will ultimately cause the definition of traditional marriage in Canada to be altered by treating same-sex marriage and polygamy as if they were identical. This course of events is stoppable.