

CS 100 - Homework 9

Deadline:

Due by 11:59 pm on Friday, November 2

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,
 - ...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)
- 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 9".
- 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 practice identifying some of the logical fallacies of insufficient evidence in arguments, now also including weak analogy and inconsistency, and to practice diagramming arguments.

Important notes:

- Type:
 - your name, then
 - the problem number and your answer for each of the following questions,
 - into a file named `cs100hw9` (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.)

- Remember that, for homework purposes when diagramming arguments:
 - UNDERLINE the indicator words that you find within an argument (rather than circle them).
 - in numbering the statements within an argument, you may EITHER circle the statement numbers OR write the statement numbers in parentheses

The Problems:

Problem 1

Consider all nine fallacies of insufficient evidence we have discussed in class, now also including weak analogy and inconsistency:

- inappropriate appeal to authority
- appeal to ignorance
- false alternatives
- loaded question
- questionable cause
- hasty generalization
- slippery slope
- weak analogy
- inconsistency

All of the arguments below contain at least one of these fallacies of insufficient evidence. (While weak analogy and inconsistency will definitely be well-represented below, they are not the ONLY fallacies of insufficient argument included, for better distinguishing-practice.)

For each argument specified below, put the problem number, and then give the name of the most evident fallacy of insufficient evidence that it contains.

1. Nasrudin was throwing handfuls of crumbs around the house. "What are you doing?" someone asked him. "Keeping the tigers away." "But there are no tigers in these parts." "That's right. Effective, isn't it?" (Idries Shah)
2. I've long been convinced that nothing exists outside of my own mind. Indeed, the argument for this seem so obvious to me that I can't understand why everybody else doesn't believe it, too.
3. If a proposed amendment to the Pennsylvania state constitution to grant residents of Pennsylvania the right to hunt is passed, the floodgates will be opened for other groups to follow. What's next? An amendment allowing the right to play golf or go shopping?
4. Why all the fuss about preserving old-growth redwood forests? Redwood trees are like Motel 6's. Once you've seen one, you've seen them all.
5. *Police Detective:* Did you get a good look at the bank robber?
Witness: Yes, I saw his face clearly. It was Willy, the night watchman.

Police Detective: And were you also able to recognize his voice?

Witness: No, I couldn't really hear what he said very well. His voice was muffled by the full ski mask he wore.

6. *From a student e-mail:* Dear Professor Lott: I can't believe you took off points from my paper because it contained numerous spelling errors. You see, I always spell-check whatever I write, so I know my writings contain no spelling errors.
7. Rich Kowalski is a young, successful CEO of an Internet start-up company, and his parents came from Poland. Kelly Yablonski is a young, successful CEO of an Internet start-up company, and her parents came from Poland. Matt Golembeski is a young, successful CEO of an Internet start-up company, and his parents came from Poland. Miguel Gonzalez is a young, successful CEO of an Internet start-up company. So, his parents probably came from Poland, too.
8. *Herbie:* Are you still reading that wacky New Age magazine?
Alice: Yes.
Herbie: Well, at least you admit it's wacky.
9. *Sign in New Jersey parking lot:* Free shuttle transportation to and from airport. Fuel surcharge of \$4 per car.
10. I don't understand why you have to wear a helmet to play football. Soccer is a dangerous sport, and they don't make soccer players wear helmets.

Problem 2

Consider the following arguments from Exercise 7.1, on pp. 171-172. Diagram each of these arguments, including BOTH:

- the "marked up" argument (including underlined indicator words and including parenthesized or circled numbers before each statement)
- the numbers arranged with premise-numbers above conclusion-numbers, and arrows leading from the premises to the conclusions, as described in the chapter and in class.

With regard to those arrows, remember:

- for independent premises, the premise arrow goes from the premise number to the conclusion number it supports
- for linked premises, you put a + between the linked premise numbers, underline the linked premise numbers, and draw a line from the underline to the conclusion number being supported.
- (they don't have to be any prettier than the posted in-class examples... 8 -)).

1. Exercise 7.1, Problem 2 ("No members of...")
2. Exercise 7.1, Problem 3 ("Don't copy off...")
3. Exercise 7.1, Problem 5 ("This is either...")
4. Exercise 7.1, Problem 6 ("Wexford College is...")
5. Exercise 7.1, Problem 8 ("Something is a...")

6. Exercise 7.1, Problem 9 ("Lasse speaks...")
7. Exercise 7.1, Problem 12 ("It's foolish to...")
8. Oh me, oh my! Just follow me on this. Jeremiah is a bullfrog. Since all bullfrogs are amphibians, it follows that Jeremiah is an amphibian. All amphibians can drink wine. So Jeremiah can help me drink my wine.
9. Meg detests Joe Biden and Al Gore. She loves conservative talk-show host Rush Limbaugh. She is a fervent member of the National Rifle Association. She's also a big baseball fan. Therefore, Meg probably is not a Democrat.
10. The 49ers will make the playoffs only if the Cowboys win. If the 49ers make the playoffs, then they will play the Redskins. If the Redskins win, they will be in the Super Bowl. But the Cowboys won't win. Their top two quarterbacks are hurt, and their defense has been decimated by injuries. Therefore, the 49ers will not make the playoffs.