**“An Unjust Sacrifice”**

Claim: The state or courts should not be able to impose utilitarian decisions surrounding subjects of moral implication.

Warrant: -Assumes reader believes there is no justification for deliberately destroying innocent life

-Assumes reader may or may not be religious

-Assumes people should be able to make own moral decisions without court involvement

-Assumes a country you seek refuge in should protect you

-Assumes reader does not see hypocrisy in protecting one life to end two lives

**“The Case for Torture”**

Claim: There are situations in which torture is not merely permissible but morally mandatory.

Warrant: -Assumes reader believes torture is wrong

-Assumes reader can be scared into believing torture is permissible by giving an absurd “what if… and what if” situation.

-Assumes reader believes in following the Constitution

-Assumes people like to agree with what other people have to say

1. A quantifier modifies the claim. True
2. Backing is evidence that supports the warrant and the claim. True
3. A warrant is always stated. False
4. The act of forming a hypothesis after studying numerous examples is known as an **inductive** leap.
5. Hasty Generalization Fallacy
6. Slippery Slope Fallacy
7. Straw Man Fallacy
8. Two Wrongs Make a Right Fallacy
9. Non Sequitur Fallacy
10. Ad Hominem Fallacy