Exercise 3.4

Part I

1. False dichotomy
2. Composition
3. Equivocation (on "good")
4. Amphiboly
5. Complex question
6. Division
7. Begging the question
8. No fallacy
9. Suppressed evidence. (The trees are much larger today than they were twenty years ago.)
10. Equivocation (on "ring")
11. Complex question
12. Division
13. Composition
14. No fallacy
15. Amphiboly
16. Suppressed evidence (The arguer ignores the time value of money. In today's dollars, the $90,000 is worth several times that figure, and, given that the pay-back will be spread out over several years, the present value of the $200,000 is significantly less than that figure.)
17. False dichotomy
18. No fallacy
19. Division
20. Begging the question
21. Composition
22. Complex question

23. Amphiboly

24. Equivocation

25. Begging the question

Part II

1. True 6. False 11. True
2. True 7. True 12. False
5. False 10. True 15. True

Part III

1. Argument against the person, circumstantial

2. Amphiboly

3. Appeal to unqualified authority

4. Equivocation

5. Composition

6. Appeal to the people (indirect variety)

7. Begging the question

8. Hasty generalization (converse accident)

9. Appeal to ignorance

10. Division

11. Weak analogy

12. Composition

13. False cause (oversimplified cause)

14. Red herring
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15. Complex question
16. Appeal to unqualified authority
17. Argument against the person, abusive and circumstantial
18. Appeal to pity
19. Composition
20. False dichotomy
21. Division
22. Weak analogy
23. Equivocation
24. No fallacy
25. Straw man
26. Amphiboly
27. Begging the question
28. Accident
29. Appeal to force
30. Suppressed evidence
31. Red herring
32. *Tu quoque*
33. Slippery slope
34. Amphiboly
35. Begging the question
36. Appeal to unqualified authority
37. False cause (gambler’s fallacy)
38. Weak analogy
39. Equivocation
40. Begging the question

41. Division

42. No fallacy

43. Missing the point or suppressed evidence.

44. False dichotomy

45. Appeal to ignorance

46. Hasty generalization

47. Missing the point

48. False cause

49. Composition

50. Complex question

Part IV

"Thanks for giving me a lift home," Paul says to his friend Steve, as they head toward the freeway.
"No problem; it's on my way," says Steve.
"Uh oh," warns Paul suddenly, "watch out ahead. Looks like the police have pulled somebody over."
"Thanks," Steve says. "Hope they don't beat the guy up."
"Not a chance," says Paul. "Why would you say that?"
"You're an optimist," answers Steve. "Most cops are animals; they beat up on anybody they want to. You remember Rodney King, don't you? Those cops in LA put King in the hospital for no reason at all. That should prove I'm right." [Hasty generalization]

"I think you're overreacting," Paul says. "Daryl Gates, the LA Police Chief at the time, said the King incident was an aberration. Since he was chief, I think we should take him at his word." [Appeal to unqualified authority]

"But Gates was a lunatic who refused to acknowledge even our most basic rights," Steve persists. "Also, if you recall, he was forced to resign after the King incident. [No fallacy--Gates made no argument] I know we don't live in LA, but our police department is just as bad as theirs. So, you can bet that our friend back there is just as abusive as any of them." [Division]

"Wait a minute," Paul argues, "as far as I know, nobody has ever proved that our police force is the slightest bit violent. You've no right to draw such a conclusion." [Appeal to ignorance]
"Well, listen to this," Steve counters, as he changes lanes and turns onto the freeway. "About a week ago, I was with my friend Casey. When I left him, he was perfectly okay; but he was picked up for going through a stop sign on the way home. I saw him a couple of days later, and he had a big bruise under his right eye. The cop who stopped Casey must have hit him with his baton." [False Cause--post hoc]

"Hold on. Did you ask Casey what happened?"

"No. I didn't have to," says Steve, a bit righteously. "I asked Casey's wife what happened between Casey and the cop, and she said he hit him. Those were her exact words, so that was good enough for me. I bet the cop's a maniac." [Amphiboly--who hit whom?]

"Good grief," answers his friend. "How long will it take you to get over your warped view of things?" [Complex question]

"My way of looking at things isn't warped," Steve insists. "The problem is, you and I are both white. If you were black, you'd see things differently. [ad hominem circumstantial] Police brutality toward African-Americans is way out of hand."

"Well," counters Paul, "a study done recently by an independent agency might interest you. According to that study, for every African-American whom the police use force against, there's a white person they also use force against. That proves the police treat African-Americans no worse than they do whites." [Begging the question: "Doesn't this assume that the number of blacks in the population equals the number of whites?" or possibly, composition]

"I've never heard of that study, but it seems to me there must be something wrong with it," insists Steve.

"Well, the results of that study are born out in my experience," says Paul. "I've been pulled over three or four times in the past couple of years, and the officers have always been extremely courteous. I can only conclude that the vast majority of these allegations of police brutality are the product of fertile imaginations." [Suppressed evidence or hasty generalization]

"Again, your naiveté amazes me," Steve answers, dumbfounded. "First of all, you forget that you're white and you drive a new Mercedes. Don't you think that makes a difference? [No fallacy] In fact, that's the trouble with all these arguments that downplay police brutality. They're all concocted by white people." [Ad hominem circumstantial]

"Well, the fact remains that we have a major crime problem in this country," Paul argues. "Combating crime requires a few concessions, and you do want to combat crime, don't you?" [Begging the question]

"Sure," Steve replies grudgingly, "but at what expense? Do innocent people have to get their heads bashed in?" [No fallacy]

"Well, I think what it comes down to is this," says Paul. "Either you allow the police to use whatever force they find necessary, or the criminals will take over this country. Now you certainly don't want that to happen, do you?" [False dichotomy]

"No, but that's the crucial question," Steve says, exiting from the freeway. "When and how much force is necessary?" [No fallacy]

"Well, you remember when the police apprehended that serial killer a few weeks ago? When the police made the arrest, the killer attacked them. So, the police can use force when attacked." [No fallacy]

"I agree," responds Steve thoughtfully. "But what about the way the police treated those peaceful right-to-lifers who were demonstrating in front of the abortion clinic the other day? Many of them were elderly and posed no physical threat. But the cops used those contraptions--what do you call them, nimchucks, nomchucks, I don't know--to
squeeze the old folks' wrists, causing great pain and injury, and they hit the old people on
the head with their batons. Do you think that was necessary?" [No fallacy]
"Of course it was," answers Paul, agitatedly. "Those people attacked the police--they
hurled epithets at them." [Equivocation on "attack"--verbal attack, physical attack]
"Honestly, I don't know how we've managed to stay friends all these years," Steve
says with some frustration. "By the way, do you know what it says on the back of all
police cars? It says 'To Protect and Serve.' Now if you hired a servant to take care of
you, you'd get rid of him if he disobeyed you. Right?"
"Probably."
"Well, isn't it true," Steve asks, "that whenever a police officer disobeys one of us
taxpayers, that officer should be fired?" [Weak analogy]
"That may be stretching it a bit," Paul laughs.
"But seriously," continues Steve, "I think what we need is some screening device to
keep violent types from ever becoming cops."
"Well, you'll be happy to know that exactly such a device has been used for the past
twenty-one years," Paul states. "Before entering the police academy, every applicant
goes through a battery of psychological tests that positively eliminates all the macho
types and the ones prone to violence. This ensures the individual officers are nonviolent,
so we know the entire police force is nonviolent." [Composition]
"Hmm. Maybe your so-called solution is really the problem," Steve suggests, as he
pulls up in front of Paul's house. We've had psychological testing for twenty-one years,
and all that time, police violence has been on the rise. Perhaps we should get rid of the
testing program." [False cause--non causa pro causa]
"Well, I don't know about the logic of that," Paul muses, stepping out of the car. "But
like you said, we've been friends for a long time, so I guess we can disagree. Thanks for
the ride and the discussion. See you tomorrow!"

Exercise 3.5
Part I
1. Missing the point, begging the question, or suppressed evidence. (Is any activity
   justified by the mere fact that it amounts to good business? Also, the arguer ignores
the moral question of exporting a product that kills its users.)

2. Appeal to pity

3. Begging the question. (Is it likely that every woman will enlist and that every one of
   those will be killed?) Also possible straw man.

4. Composition

5. Missing the point; red herring; also, begging the question?

6. Tu quoque

7. No fallacy? Weak analogy?