

*Professor Jones says that no one will get an A in his course unless they attend every seminar. Well, I've attended every seminar so I'm expecting an A.*

It commits the fallacy of equivocation because it was interpreted as if you attend every seminar you are guaranteed to get an A. However, the right interpretation is that you can get a 100% on every question, assignment, quiz, etc. but if you do not attend every seminar, you will not get an A.

---

*According to Judge Wapner's ruling, the Country Club cannot build an indoor swimming pool unless the membership agrees. Well, I am a member, and I most certainly do not agree. Therefore, the Club cannot build its new pool.*

It commits the fallacy of equivocation because it was interpreted as if anyone who has a membership (every member) doesn't agree to the indoor swimming pool being built, it will not be built. As if the membership can act as a right to veto. However, a right interpretation could be that if a member of the board of members (representatives) doesn't agree to the indoor swimming pool being built, it won't be built. Not every person who has a membership at the club.

---

*These days students have to choose whether they want to get good grades or whether they want to have fun. Well, Tamsen has decided she wants to have fun at college, so I guess she's not going to get good grades.*

It commits the fallacy of false dichotomy because in this case, we find that we can either have fun or good grades, not both. The speaker makes it sound like the premises are exhaustive when they are not, in fact. Students, like Tamsen, can have fun and get good grades. Therefore, the premises are non-exhaustive.

---

*I'm against giving aid to countries in which people are starving. We will never be able to eradicate starvation completely, so it is a waste of time even trying.*

It commits the fallacy of false dichotomy because in this case, we find that we can either we can or can't eradicate starvation completely and there is no benefit in helping those who can be salvaged with how little that given aid helps. The speaker makes it sound like the premises are exhaustive when in fact, the premises are not exhaustive.

---

*There is no such thing as an unselfish act. If you examine any so-called unselfish act, such as donating money to charity, you will always find that there is a selfish motive. There has to be, for nobody can do anything unless they think it will give them some kind of satisfaction. Seeking self-satisfaction is the only reason why anybody does anything. So every act is selfish.*

This argument is weak because it commits the fallacy of begging the question. In this case, the conclusion is an instance of the premise that there is no such thing as an unselfish act. Another premise that instances the conclusion is that nobody can do anything unless they think it will give them some kind of satisfaction.

---

*Individuals are born, struggle through childhood, grow to maturity, and after a few years decline and finally die. So we should expect all societies, which are mere aggregations of individuals, to do the same.*

This argument is weak because it commits the fallacy of equivocation. The speaker doesn't mention that sometimes societies do not struggle and decline as fast as individuals. And doesn't mention that some individuals of society leave some things for the society after they die that alleviates the societies' struggles which makes them struggle less. Eventually making the society as a whole better and have a better life. Everyone in their respective fields also makes society as a whole function and there are many aspects to society such as how they make a living. Do they hunt or work regular jobs and pay for food? What business do they have? Etc.

---