**Proof by Assertion**

The author repeatedly states that Greenlove’s point of view is wrong without providing actual reasons. As improvement, the author can make use of research findings or statistical reports to substantiate his argument.

**Hasty Generalization**

The author assumed Greenlove to be unethical because of Greenlove’s association with Sea Shepherd. As improvement, the author should support his argument by providing evidence of unethical behavior committed by Greenlove himself.

**Slippery Slope**

The author illustrated a chain of events with negative consequences that snowballed to being cave people. As improvement, the illustration should be of greater relevance and logical such that the chain of events is plausible and shows a cause and effect relationship.

**Attacking the Strawman**

The author misinterpreted Greenlove’s argument that human has the responsibility to act in defense of the environment. As improvement, the author should focus his argument on the responsibility to protect the environment instead of emphasizing the point that human is destroying the environment.

**False Dilemma**

The author limits the options available and excluded other possibilities. As improvement, the author can provide options that are related or have a causation effect to make his argument stronger and avoid limiting the options available.

I agree with the four types of fallacies highlighted by Dax. They are well explained and supported with examples from the passage. However Dax could have put in more suggestions in his response to show how the arguments can be improved such that they become non fallacious.

Ad hominem is a fallacy of relevance; the author should focus his argument on Greenlove’s point that we are responsible for the environmental issues rather than Greenlove as a person. Being an eco activist or radical is not related to the subject of rising sea levels.

Ad populum is a fallacy of insufficient evidence; the author could consider providing greater context to the poll done to support the poll result. If the poll includes a study between change in sea levels and level of support for oil industry, it will increase the reliability of the results.

Another fallacy committed by the author is false dilemma. Although Dax did not mention it explicitly, it is apparent in the passage. The author states “Either we go against Greenlove, or we go back into the caves”. This has limited options which are not substantiated. As improvement the author can provide more options or state a point that is of greater relevance to the subject of rising sea levels.

To conclude, Dax has been clear in his delivery but more content can be added to enrich his response.

I agree with Lionel that “Education and experience do not necessarily guarantee a job”, however it is not entirely true that “People do [guarantee a job]”.

The illustration of organization re-structuring is indeed prevalent and choices are made to the best interest of the organization. Hence it is entirely possible that an organization choose to keep employees that cost less over employees that are educated or experienced. To add on, the relevance of education and experience to the job scope plays a part too.

“People”, often referred to as social network, does not guarantee a job either. I recognize that it has an influence over the job provision to an extent but applicants who do not posses certain qualification and experience are unlikely to get the job too. In my opinion, there are various contributing factors that determine if someone is offered a job. To state that “people” is the determinant factor is an unsupported statement.

There is no right or wrong to a person’s belief. To conclude, I would like to highlight that Lionel’s response is well substantiated real life experience. They way Lionel justify his belief is logical as well. However the response is at risk of committing the slippery slope fallacy. Lionel snowballed the effect of keeping foreigners in the organization during retrenchments to an end result that majority of the employees are foreigners.

“A lie is not only about the absence of truth but a deliberate intention to steer away or cover up the truth.”

I believe many people have heard accusations of people lying or have told a lie before. I used to think that if something is untrue or not real, it is a lie. However, as time pass, I realise that there is something more to lying. I do not have any significant experiences that lead me to my belief, except that I have a keenness to find out for myself why do people lie.

In my opinion, my belief is deductively inferred. By English definition, a lie is “an intentionally false statement”, “deliberately presented as being true”. People lie with an intention, which is also the source of motivation to create a story that deviates from the truth. The absence of truth can simply be information that was not conveyed or the lack of knowledge for a matter. However a lie acknowledges the existence of the truth and purposefully conveys a message otherwise. When faced with someone lying, people often ask “why do you lie?” rather than “what is the truth?” This goes to show that the underlying intention for the lie is as important as the truth behind it.