

Exercise 11.1

A

1. No. B directly attacks A's conclusion that evolution cannot be true. B should either attack the existence of God, or whether God allows such development of life.
2. Yes. A argues that earth is going to heat up no matter what we do. B provides an undercutting defeater that shows that such the premise A gives is not true.
3. Yes. A argues that a good argument must be strong (though it's a fallacy here). B provides an undercutting defeater that a strong president could also be bad.
4. No. A is arguing about global warming, B directly against A's conclusion without addressing its argument. B just provides his own weak argument.
5. Yes. B is addressing A's argument by arguing that God could not possibly exist (undercutting defeater)
6. No. A argues that that car doesn't worth the price. B just say he has enough money for it, without addressing A's argument.

B

1. B needs to prove that NAFTA has hurt the American Economy since he claims it. It's not A's burden to prove it.
2. A gives his opinion with explanation, B also gives his own opinion with explanation too. they each discharge their own burden of proof.
3. A needs to prove above what he has claimed. B is skeptical about A's claim, and A rejects B's skepticism by saying that he only he belief that good things will come to him will this work. Yet, this at most only reject the single case that B gives. A still need to prove his claim.
4. A and B both need to prove their own claims. It's not others' burden to prove otherwise.
5. A thinks there exists psychic phenomena. B don't think so. Yet they both doesn't prove their claim. A just explains that a skeptical environment might not provide the condition for the people to show their ability, but this a weak proof, and further evidence definitely need to be given between the relationship of skeptical environment and the people's performance.
6. A provide the argument for believing Earth is not flat. B provide an undercutting defeater for A's evidence of the ship. They both provide the argument for their stances.
7. A implies that the evidence that he said so far is good scientific evidence, and denying good scientific evidence is unscientific. However, A needs to prove this very general claim that "denying good scientific evidence is unscientific". B should not take the burden of proof, as he are likely to provide weak proof, which he does. A lot of scientific evidence are observed outside earth using telescope, and they are good evidence even though it's not done in laboratory.

C

The argument gives the statement that most of us will likely to accept (other humans in this room have minds) It points out that the *only* evidence that we decide human have minds is by human's behavior and particularly their ability to engage in conversation. Then it uses parity of reasoning, that if we use this criteria to decide if one has mind or not, then we have to accept that the machine, which we could not distinguish from human by engaging in conversation, must also have mind. But the premise, "the *only* evidence that we decide human have minds is by human's

behavior and particularly their ability to engage in conversation.", it often might not be the case. Some think that only the biological beings have minds. While others might think otherwise. This parity of reason will only work if this could be proved (which is very difficult).

Exercise 11.2

1. Circular Reasoning
2. Unreasonably demanding definitions
3. Initiating a regress of evidence
4. Refusing to allow the claimant to offer testimony
5. Circular Reasoning
6. Seems to be correct. A provides F-making for the mountain bike, B provides F-ruining features, and then provides his own arguments.
7. No-true-Scotsman fallacy (to evade the testimony provided by B)
8. If we don't have context from 7, it seems that B is unreasonably demanding definitions. But since we know that in 7, A changes the definition of 'taste' to 'true taste' to evade the testimony provided by B. In that case, it is impossible for B to continue the conversation without first let A first define the 'taste' and 'true taste', so all the testimony and evidence given later could be useful. B's pressing on definition is valid here.

Exercise 11.3

1. Not a special pleading. A implies that many politicians will be influenced by the oil and gas industries which they take large contributions from. B doesn't directly address A's argument. He just said he is different than other politicians. A here made the argument that this is likely to happen and B is one of the politicians so he will probably do the same thing. (Statistically syllogism). However, A doesn't take his burden of proof, he doesn't show any further evidence that shows his claim is true. B is taking the burden by trying to show that he is not that kind of politician (the argument which turns to be pretty weak). B would have committed a special pleading if A completes his statistical syllogism, since in that case merely saying you are different than others without providing evidence for that is special pleading.
2. B commits tu quoque. A takes money from Wall Street doesn't invalidate his argument. Yet, A doesn't take his burden of proof, he needs to prove that one who is being financed by Wall Street will not do anything to upset Wall Street.
3. It commits false equivalency. The speaker seems to make "political experience" equal to "presidential experience", and they are often not the same.
4. Tu quoque. All major powers engage in similar actions doesn't imply anything that whether our military action is justifiable.
5. This is not tu quoque. Because use parity of thinking, if your government engages in similar military action in the name of peace, and I am doing the same like you are doing, then I could say that I am also doing it in the name of peace, and your claims will be against yourself by parity of thinking.