Q1.

1.

P1: Green Party is the only political party that shows genuine concern for the state of the environment.

P2: State of the environment is the single most important issue facing the world today.

Con: Therefore, you ought to vote for the Green Party.

2.

P1: It is hot in the summer there.

P2: Neither of us reacts well to heat.

P3: Going on a holiday there is too expensive.

Con: Therefore, we should not go on holiday there.

3.

P1: The central mission of a school is education.

P2: A school is only as good as its teachers.

P3: Teachers cannot be attracted without better pay.

P4: First priority of any school is to attract good teachers.

Missing Conc: Schools should increase their pays to teachers.

4. False Dichotomy

False dichotomy arises when the speaker assumes there are no options other than the ones he/she suggests. The speaker is saying the audience is either for the speaker or against the speaker, but an individual might be neutral or have a different opinion on the topic.

5. Inconsistency

The speaker is talking about how significant the freedom of speech is important and he/she also says that the religious fanatics are ought to be allowed to advocate their views in public. The statements of the speaker is inconsistent since they contradict.

8. Appeal to Force.

Appeal to Force arises when the speaker's premise threatens the audience by some kind of force. In this argument the speaker threatens the audience by saying them that it could lead them to lose their job if they report to press.

9. Ad Hominem

Ad Hominem Fallacy is when the speaker is trying to support his/her point by irrelevant personal to attack a persons saying and discredit it. The speaker suggests that the person's saying in the argument should be discredited because his father is has been convicted of fraud.

12. False appeal to authority

The authority who is being referenced should be a person who can be credited in the field. In the argument here the speaker tries to credit his/her psychology professor for a topic in philosophy which would make this appeal to authority fallacious.

15. Appeal to Ignorance

Appeal to Ignorance is when the speaker accepts a case just because the opposite has not been established. In this argument, speaker suggest that they should impeach the attorney general because he has not done anything to demonstrate his innocence.

17.Reconstruction:

If a plane is going to be late, they announce it a half hour before.

Tina's plane is due in 15 minutes (and they have not announced)

Therefore, we don't need to worry about Tina's plane being late.

Symbolizing:

p->q (if p then q)

~q(not q)

C:~p ( then not p)

Validity:

A deductive argument is where the premises are true, then the conclusion must be true as well. In the symbolized form of the argument, we can see that the conclusion (~p) is correct if the premises are correct by modus tollens.

18.Reconstruct:

If you don't work hard throughout the whole term, you cannot get an A average.

Bruce has been working hard throughout the whole term.

Therefore Bruce will get an A average.

Symbolize:

p->q (if p(not working hard) then q(not getting A avg,))

~p(not p(working hard))

C:~q(therefore not q(getting A avg))

Validity:

This argument is not formally valid since the symbolized logic chart shows. The argument suggests that someone can not get A average if they don't work throughout the whole term. But that does not mean that if somebody has worked throughout the whole term they will get an A average.

20. Type: Analogical Reasoning.

Schematize:

If a watch has intricate and interconnected parts, then it must be designed by an intelligent being.

Nature has equally intricate and interconnected as a watch, so it must have been designed by an intelligent being.

The analogical reasoning compares 2 different occasions by the same aspects. This argument suggests that there should be a creator of the nature since there is a creator for a watch. But these two concepts are totally different. We can not use physical objects to prove some meta-physical entity. Even though the logic sounds correct, it wouldn't make sense to use the same logic for proving a god who supposedly created everything you know and you don't even know just with a watch analogy.

21.Type: Statistical Syllogism

Schematize:

10 percent of students at university X will not be able to take their place in residence.

John is a student at university X

John has nothing to worry about since the risk of not finding that space is low.

The logic is correct by inductive reasoning. But it doesn't make sense to conclude that John has nothing to worry about. He has the 10% chance to not finding the space. So there is still a probability of not getting the space.

This generalization is too broad for law. A counter example can be about a law that helps people financially. Law financially helps to people who has children. Those people are not in a position where they are forced to do what they would otherwise choose not to do.

the argument has the form of

q=>p

p

then q

Absurd example could be :

If it is 7 am the sun must be out. The sun is out. So it must be 7 am.

But we know that sun might be out in other times of the day as well. So this shows the weakness of the argument above.

The percentage of alumni who contribute can be used as a criterion for ranking the universities. Alumni are the references for current and future students since they are show the result of studying at the particular university. Also the supports of the alumni generate reputation for the university and they help university's community to get bigger and known better.

27. Persuasive redefinition

The speaker is trying to define "art" which could mean different things to different people and he/she tries to defend that his definition of art is superior to other definitions, so he/she does not recognize the things what some people might call art as art.

25. Red Herring

The speaker is avoiding the criticism to his/her drinking and driving by trying to get the audience's attention to another topic. He/She draws the attention to driving while being on cell phone where the starting of the argument is not about that.

P1: I am sorry for missing the test but it was not my fault.

P2: I did not get back until midnight after the weekend.

P3: I studied until 4 in the morning.

P4: I didn't hear the alarm and missed the midterm.

C: Therefore, it would be unfair to punish me for something that is not my

fault.

The argument would not be sound even all of the premises are true. The premises need to support the conclusion. Even though, all of the premises the student suggests sound like valid reasons to miss a midterm, it is still the student's responsibility to wake up to the test. These premises do not help the audience to conclude that it is not the student's fault missing the midterm. Therefore, the argument is not sound by criterial approach.