

**Philosophy 150
Critical Thinking
Assignment #1 Key
Summer 2017**

Chapter 1

Exercise 1.7: 5

Yes an argument is present. The tricky thing about this one is that you seem to have a choice of conclusions. Indeed you could find that this one has 2 conclusions supported by all of the premises.

Conclusion(s): It is a boldface lie that in Canada we tax the wealthy more than the poor
OR Canada's tax system is a regressive one.

Premises: 1. Low-income families . . . than do higher-income families. 2. There are many tax loopholes . . . tax rate.

Chapter 2

Exercise 2.2:

11: A fairly clear example of self interested thinking or a high likelihood of it, for the speaker appeals to his upbringing, what is unique to him, to justify his view on pornography. Now, if students made a case for some occurrence of group pressure this could get them partial marks.

Exercise 2.3: 5, 7

5. The best answer is d. This independent report replicates the findings of the recent report. While this proposition asserts that the independent 3rd party report does not support ACME's ability to supply to the same extent, this qualifying factor is not terrible important.

7. If true, assuming it is true, letter b is a good reason to accept the conclusion.

Exercise 2.4: 6

Group pressure. Negative consequences include a loss of personal integrity and trust of the electorate.

Exercise 2.5: 5

This seems to be an instance of **face-saving**. The important part of the passage seems to be when Max quotes fictitious research findings. This is done in part to save the reputation and image his friends have of him.

If they said only self-interested thinking, only partial marks were available, .5 to be sure.

Negative consequences include more lying from Max and doing other dishonest things to get the approval of his peer group and attempt to look good in their eyes.

Integrative Exercises p. 60: 17, 18

17: An argument is present. The conclusion is “ You must reject the proposition . . . Registry.” The first premise is “there’s no documented . . . guns.” And the second premise is “if you accept . . . Westerners.” The second premise is an instance of group pressure, but not peer pressure, for this region of westerners is too large to constitute a peer group.

18: Many students got this wrong. It constitutes an argument and likely a poor or even fallacious one. The conclusion is that teens should be arrested for trying to get into bars and pubs with fake identification. The premise is that doing so is a bad idea. When one thinks about this case, we could easily switch the premise and conclusion around and still have an argument. Again it is a poor argument.

Chapter 3

Exercise 3.2: (avoid using the step method. Use pattern recognition)

16: This one has no evidence of a deductive pattern. Hence it is inductive. The premise is: “From Infancy, almost, the average girl is told that marriage is her ultimate goal.” The other statement is the conclusion. As such, the argument is rather weak, though the existing step method will not help you here. To evaluate this one, which you might do without deduction of mark, you would need to examine the implied premise and determine whether an opposite conclusion follows. The implied premise is that whatever a girl is told is her ultimate goal should be supported by her training and education. This is a terribly contentious premise to say the least. Students do not need to engage in a full evaluation of this argument. Indeed a very different conclusion is possible. It would read something like, “therefore girls should ignore what they are told is their ultimate goal.”

17: This is a simple deductive conditional argument utilizing the pattern of Modus Ponens and is such valid. What might be tricky is how the antecedent contains two propositions. Yet, each is affirmed in the second premise.

Exercise 3.3: 7

This argument is a disjunctive syllogism. Either p or q, not p, therefore q. It is valid due to its form, regardless of whether the word “or” is used inclusively or not.

Exercise 3.5:

7: This is an invalid argument because the second premise affirms the consequent and the conclusion then affirms the antecedent. We know this pattern is invalid. Given some thought, students could see that just because we have an effect of something, it does not follow that this one possible cause actually caused it. The effect could have been brought about by another cause.

11: This is affirming the consequent and it is invalid.

12: This is a pure hypothetical syllogism and it is always valid.

Exercise 3.6:

3:

Modus Ponens: Premise 1: If China adopts North American patterns of consumption, then the environment is doomed.

Premise 2: China does adopt such patterns.

Conclusion: China is doomed.

Modus Tollens:

add these statements:

Second premise: The environment is not doomed.

Conclusion: China does not adopt these patterns.