

## CS 100 - Homework 6

### Deadline:

Due by 11:59 pm on Friday, October 5

### How to submit:

- Go to the course Moodle site.
  - (either log into myHumboldt and click the Moodle button in the upper right corner,
  - or get to it via [learn.humboldt.edu](http://learn.humboldt.edu),
    - ...and then click the "my moodle" button in the upper right under the big yellow moodle logo to get your list Moodle course sites,
    - or follow the link from the public course web site, [users.humboldt.edu/smtuttle/f12cs100](http://users.humboldt.edu/smtuttle/f12cs100))
- Once you are at the course Moodle site, find the section titled "Submit your HOMEWORK FILES here",
  - and click on the link "Click HERE to submit Homework 6".
- You should see, in the middle of the page, a place where you can upload your homework file.
  - Note that I believe I set this up to permit multiple submissions. I couldn't set it to "unlimited", because the largest number available was 20, but that seems like it should be ample.
  - Also note that I will grade the latest file submitted before the deadline unless you e-mail and tell me otherwise.

### Purpose:

To consider deductive validity, invalidity, soundness, and unsoundness, to consider inductive strength, weakness, cogency and uncogency, to consider positive relevance, negative relevance, and irrelevance, and to begin practicing identifying logical fallacies in arguments (starting with 4 classic fallacies of relevance).

### Important notes:

- Type:
  - your name, then
  - the problem number and your answer for each of the following questions,
  - into a file named `cs100hw6` (optionally followed by your name, including only letters and underscores -- NO blanks or other unusual characters)
  - Its format may be `.txt`, `.odt`, `.pdf`, `.doc`, `.docx`, or `.jpg`. (Please ask me before

submitting files of other formats -- for example, please do not submit .pages documents, because our grader cannot read them.)

## The Problems:

### **Problem 1:**

Consider Exercise 3.5, part I., in the course textbook, on pp. 81-82. All of the arguments in this exercise are **deductive**. For each argument specified below, put the Problem 1 part number, and then whether it is **valid** or **invalid**.

- 1-1. Exercise 3.5, Part I, Argument 2 ("If anything is a trout...")
- 1-2. Exercise 3.5, Part I, Argument 3 ("If we're at the North Pole...")
- 1-3. Exercise 3.5, Part I, Argument 5 ("Some people like...")
- 1-4. Exercise 3.5, Part I, Argument 6 ("Simba is a lion...")
- 1-5. Exercise 3.5, Part I, Argument 8 ("*Science student*:...")
- 1-6. Exercise 3.5, Part I, Argument 9 ("*Bill*:...")

### **Problem 2:**

Consider Exercise 3.5, part II., in the course textbook, on p. 82. All of the arguments in this exercise are **deductive**. For each argument specified below, put the Problem 2 part number, and then:

- whether it is **valid** or **invalid**, AND
- whether it is **sound** or **unsound**.

- 2-1. Exercise 3.5, Part II, Argument 2 ("Either dogs...")
- 2-2. Exercise 3.5, Part II, Argument 3 ("If Rome...")
- 2-3. Exercise 3.5, Part II, Argument 5 ("No cars...")
- 2-4. Exercise 3.5, Part II, Argument 6 ("California has...")
- 2-5. Exercise 3.5, Part II, Argument 8 ("Some apples...")
- 2-6. Exercise 3.5, Part II, Argument 9 ("Los Angeles is...")

### **Problem 3:**

Consider Exercise 3.5, part III., in the course textbook, on pp. 82-83. All of the arguments in this exercise are **inductive**. For each argument specified below, put the Problem 3 part number, and then:

- whether it is **strong** or **weak**, AND
- whether it is **cogent** or **uncogent**.

- 3-1. Exercise 3.5, Part III, Argument 2 ("Cigarette smoking...")
- 3-2. Exercise 3.5, Part III, Argument 3 ("The vast majority...")

- 3-3. Exercise 3.5, Part III, Argument 5 ("Billions of men...")
- 3-4. Exercise 3.5, Part III, Argument 6 ("Shakespeare was...")
- 3-5. Exercise 3.5, Part III, Argument 8 ("Ninety percent...")
- 3-6. Exercise 3.5, Part III, Argument 9 ("Very few people...")

### **Problem 4:**

Consider Exercise 3.5, part IV., in the course textbook, on pp. 83-84. For each argument specified below, put the Problem 4 part number, and then:

- whether it is **deductive** or **inductive**
- IF it is **deductive**, ALSO put if it is **valid** or **invalid**
- IF it is **inductive**, ALSO put if it is **strong** or **weak**

- 4-1. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 2 ("All birds...")
- 4-2. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 3 ("Most college students...")
- 4-3. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 5 ("John's home address...")
- 4-4. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 6 ("It is totally dark...")
- 4-5. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 8 ("If it rained...")
- 4-6. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 9 ("This bathwater...")
- 4-7. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 11 ("There are more than...")
- 4-8. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 12 ("In a recent...")
- 4-9. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 14 ("Smedley ran...")
- 4-10. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 15 ("Some Native Americans...")
- 4-11. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 17 ("The Empire State...")
- 4-12. Exercise 3.5, Part IV, Argument 18 ("Do most Americans...")

### **Problem 5:**

Consider Exercise 5.1 in the course textbook, on p. 121. For each argument specified below, put the Problem 5 part number, and then whether it is **positively relevant**, **negatively relevant**, or **irrelevant** to the conclusion.

- 5-1. Exercise 5.1, Argument 2 ("Marcos lives...")
- 5-2. Exercise 5.1, Argument 3 ("The sky is blue...")
- 5-3. Exercise 5.1, Argument 5 ("Thousands of...")
- 5-4. Exercise 5.1, Argument 6 ("Emily is...")
- 5-5. Exercise 5.1, Argument 8 ("Sue lives...")
- 5-6. Exercise 5.1, Argument 9 ("The last three...")

- 5-7. Exercise 5.1, Argument 11 ("Peter and...")
- 5-8. Exercise 5.1, Argument 12 ("Hmm, the wiper blades...")
- 5-9. Halle is seven years-old. So, Halle is a senior in high school.
- 5-10. Pete is an accountant. So, Pete was born in January.
- 5-11. Figure X is a triangle. So, figure X is a square.
- 5-12. Felix is a parrot. So Felix has feathers.

**Problem 6:**

Each of the arguments specified below contains one of the following fallacies of relevance:

- personal attack (*ad hominem*)
- attacking the motive
- look who's talking (*tu quoque*)
- two wrongs make a right

For each argument specified below, put the Problem 6 part number, and then which of the above fallacies of relevance it contains. (Choose the most appropriate for each argument.)

- 6-1. In a recent issue of Stogey magazine, Julio Fumar argues that Honduran cigars are better than Cuban cigars. But Fumar's argument isn't worth the paper it's printed on. Fumar is biased against Cuba because the Castro regime imprisoned his parents.
- 6-2. Sneaker City has accused our company of exploitative labor practices. But Sneaker City's labor practices are much more exploitative than ours are. I happen to know they regularly employ children as young as nine in their overseas factories. Clearly, these accusations are groundless.
- 6-3. Sandy Beach has argued for bilingual education. But who is Sandy Beach? Is she a trained educator? No, she's a high-school dropout who once served time for drug possession. Her argument, therefore, is worthless.
- 6-4. Dipsy O'Neill has recently argued that drinking a little red wine with dinner is good for one's health. But no one should accept O'Neill's argument. O'Neill, as you know, is the owner of O'Neill's Wines and Spirits. Naturally she'd love to see people buy more wine.
- 6-5. *Mom*: Annie, did you break your brother's model airplane?  
*Annie*: Well, he put chewing gum in my dolly's hair.
- 6-6. Dad, I can't believe you won't let me get "I Love Spike" tattooed on my left buttocks. After all, I'm sixteen years old, and you told me you and Mom both got your first tattoo when you were sixteen.
- 6-7. *Ferdie*: You shouldn't step in the bucket when you swing that baseball bat. You lose all your power that way.  
*Casey*: What would you know about baseball, squirt? A scrawny geek like you couldn't hit a baseball if it was sitting on a tee. Why don't you go play with your pocket calculator or something?