

Each of the following arguments relies upon a premise that might be regarded as irrelevant. Identify the offending premise and suggest an argument that shows it is irrelevant.

Irrelevant Premises will be highlighted

1. There are no absolute values, i.e., no values that are valid for all times and all places. **To see this you only have to look at the wide variety of values that have been held by other societies and at earlier times in our history.** Pick any value you like: there will be some society somewhere that has rejected it. You simply cannot find a value that has been valid at all times and in all places.
 - a. This commits the appeal to popularity fallacy. The speaker is talking about societies accepting values. The speaker is using societies as proof for his point. What is the percentage of members of society that need to reject a value to be rejected by society? That is a question to ask in this argument.
2. Although there are no strict proofs that God exists, it is still rational to believe that He does exist. **Suppose God does exist: in this case heaven and hell exist and God will send unbelievers to hell for eternity, while believers stand a good chance of going to heaven.** Obviously, it is rational to do whatever is necessary to avoid hell and to get to heaven, so it is rational to believe in God if He actually exists. **On the other hand, suppose God doesn't exist: in this case there is no heaven or hell, so even if we believe He exists, we run no risk of being punished for having a false belief.** It is rational, therefore, to believe in God even if He does not exist. So it is rational to believe God exists, whether He exists or not
 - a. It is an appeal to force. Because the speaker speaks about if God exists, the unbelievers will go to hell, and it is very rational to avoid hell at all costs. The speaker also mentions that if God doesn't exist, we run no risk of being punished for having a false belief. The speaker is trying to get the listeners to believe in God using the fear of being punished in hell. Therefore, even if the listeners have their doubts, they might start believing in God to avoid the painful punishment in hell.
3. The Israeli government should accept the right of Palestinians to a national homeland, **because otherwise, the Palestinians will continue their campaign of terrorism indefinitely.** Israel will never have peace until it recognizes this right.
 - a. It is an Appeal to force. Because what is used here is "terrorism." So, in this case, based on this argument (which is a delusional view of the reality of what is really going on), Palestinians will not stop "terrorizing" the Israeli people until the Palestinians have a national homeland. Palestinians are not getting the Israeli people to agree with them by convincing them. They are using force to compel the Israelis to the acceptance of a view.

P.S This is just an answer to a question and does not represent what I believe when it comes to the validity and recognition of the occupying state.

4. Recently, a number of manufacturers have begun marketing so-called green products, i.e., products that are supposed to be environmentally friendly. The supermarket shelves are now full of them, everything from detergent to peanut butter. These companies seem to think that these products will show their concern for the environment. This is absurd. They have developed these products not because they care about the environment but because they think they can make more money. Sadly, they probably will make more money because the public wants to help preserve the environment and thinks that buying green products will make a difference. But don't be fooled into thinking that these manufacturers care about the environment. It is profit, pure and simple, that motivates them.
 - a. This commits the straw man fallacy. The speaker is distorting the view of the people they are speaking to. The speaker proceeds to attack the manufacturers of green products saying that these products will show the public how the manufacturers are concerned about what is happening to the environment when this is just a show and that the only reason these products were developed was profit. In other words, the speaker is attacking the manufacturers to weaken their view that they might actually care for the environment (which doesn't mean do not care for profit but genuinely care about the environment), making them an easy target.
5. There are a few people who believe that prostitution is morally acceptable, but in fact, it is immoral behavior. It is contrary to the accepted standards of our community as reflected in public opinion and in the legal system. The vast majority of Canadians strongly believe that prostitution is immoral and therefore quite properly reject any proposal to legalize prostitution.
 - a. This is an appeal to popularity. The speaker here uses the community-accepted standards to "manipulate" others psychologically by belonging to a group with shared values and beliefs. If they agree with the speaker, they are part of a community with accepted standards and values. If they do not agree with the speaker, they are a nonconformist, an outcast from society, and they now appear as deviant.
6. Why does the public get so upset when people refuse to render assistance to someone in need? That incident last month where a woman was beaten in a park by her boyfriend while several hundred people looked on and did nothing produced a great outpouring of righteous indignation. But I can't for the life of me see why everyone gets so upset at the bystanders. According to the law, these people did nothing illegal, since the law imposes no duty on ordinary citizens to go to the aid of someone who is in distress. That's what the law says, so I don't see that the bystanders did anything wrong at all.
 - a. This is an appeal to authority because the speaker is using the law's point of view to tell whether the bystanders are wrong. In this case, the argument is about why the public gets upset when people refuse to render assistance to someone in need. Looking at the context of the argument, it is irrelevant to talk about the law in such a matter. There are many other things that are legal that can offend people such as dishonesty.