

**Exercise 33.7** In each case, which of Mill's methods is being used?

1. To test the quality of a new transmission additive, a company buys two identical cars, one red, the other blue. The red car gets the new additive and the blue car gets no additive. At the end of the test, they take apart the transmissions and measure the wear and tear. The red car has significantly less wear. The mechanics conclude that the additive reduced wear and tear on the transmission.
2. A Martian lands, sees a car for the first time, and wants to figure out what makes the car speed up and slow down. He gets in, manages to start the engine, and then starts pushing buttons and turning the steering wheel. Finally, because he is on a level street, he notices a perfect correlation between the position of the gas pedal and the speed of the car: The closer the pedal is to the floor, the faster the car goes; the further the pedal is from the floor, the slower the car's speed. The Martian concludes that pushing on the gas pedal causes the car to speed up and slow down.
3. Six pupils are extremely poor readers. The teacher investigates the background of each student and finds that each comes from a different family, each has a different socioeconomic background, and each had attended a different previous school. However, all six lacked phonics instruction. The teacher concludes that phonics instruction causes good reading.
4. Many XYZ computers keep getting returned for repairs. The company looks into the matter and finds that the computers that are returned were produced in different years and were sold in different areas. Finally, it is found that all were sold in areas with very high humidity. The company concludes that highly humid air damages something in the computers.
5. A department store manager notices a statistical relationship between the local employment rate and the shoplifting rate in her store. As the employment rate increased, the theft rate decreased, and vice versa. The manager concludes that unemployment is part of the cause of shoplifting.
6. A patient developed an allergic reaction. When she eliminated foods x, y, and z from her diet, the reaction ended. She then added the foods back one at a time. When she began eating food y, milk products, the reaction reappeared. She concluded that the reaction was caused by milk products.
7. A doctor is treating five cancer patients. The only common factor is that all five were employed by the XYZ chemical company in a division producing a chemical defoliant. The doctor concludes that the defoliant caused the cancer.
8. The Smith family moves from city A to city B and discovers that their clothes are cleaner. Yet they are using the same soap and the same washing machine. They conclude the change must be due to the water.

witness—in order to avoid perjury charges—will confess that he was coached to lie by the district attorney's office. And if that sort of thing were made public, then juries would stop believing prosecution witnesses, and we would find it almost impossible to convict anyone.

7. *Jury nullification* is the decision by jury members not to convict a defendant who is guilty under the law, because the jury members believe the law is unjust or because the application of the law in this particular case would be wrong. Jury nullification is a very dangerous thing. If jury members can ignore the law in their deliberations, then next they may decide to ignore the law when they are no longer jurors: They may ignore laws against filing fraudulent income tax returns, and they may decide to ignore laws regulating how they dispose of hazardous wastes, and they may even ignore laws forbidding theft and violent assault. And once some people start ignoring laws, others are likely to follow their lead. Then before you know it, we are living in an anarchistic and lawless society, where all laws are ignored and no one is safe in either property or person. So we must stop this jury nullification movement, and avoid the terrible harms to which it may lead.
8. In truth, a few cigarettes are not likely to do you any real harm. But the problem is, after you smoke a few cigarettes, it becomes very appealing to smoke a few more. And before long, you have started smoking as part of a social habit, and then you want cigarettes a bit more often—with your morning coffee, after lunch, while you're driving, a couple in the evening. Soon smoking becomes a deeply ingrained habit, and then it swiftly becomes an addiction: Nicotine, after all, is a powerfully addictive drug. So you wind up with a very expensive smoking habit that makes you smell awful, leaves you more vulnerable to colds and other infections, significantly increases your risk for cancer and strokes and respiratory problems, and eventually puts your children at risk from secondhand smoke. Then you will probably want to quit smoking, and you will find that it's a difficult or impossible job to break the smoking habit and the nicotine addiction. So the best way to avoid those problems is to avoid smoking those first innocent-looking cigarettes.
9. In the following argument, St. John of Chrysostom warns believers of the dangers of laughter:

To laugh, to speak jocosely, does not seem an acknowledged sin, but it leads to acknowledged sin. Thus laughter often gives birth to foul discourse, and foul discourse to actions still more foul. Often from words and laughter proceed railing and insult; and from railing and insult, blows and wounds, and from blows and wounds, slaughter and murder. If then, thou wouldst take good counsel for thyself, avoid not merely foul words, and foul deeds, or blows, and wounds, and murders, but unseasonable laughter itself.<sup>5</sup>

10. In 1989, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional state laws that make it a crime to burn the U.S. flag as part of a protest or demonstration. The court ruled that since burning the flag is an expression of political protest, it is protected under the First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech. Justice William Brennan wrote the majority opinion, and one of his key arguments was the following:

To conclude that the Government may permit designated symbols [such as the flag] to be used to communicate only a limited set of messages would be to enter territory having no discernible or defensible boundaries. Could the Government, on this theory, prohibit the burning of state flags? Of copies of the Presidential seal? Of the Constitution? In evaluating these choices under the First Amendment, how would we decide which symbols were sufficiently special to warrant this unique status? To do so, we would be forced to consult our own political preferences, and impose them on the citizenry, in the very way that the First Amendment forbids us to do.<sup>6</sup>

11. J. Gay-Williams offers the following slippery slope argument against active euthanasia (against active intervention to purposefully hasten the death of one who is suffering during the course of a terminal disease and voluntarily requests a speedier death). (This is the toughest of the examples, and there is probably room for legitimate disagreement in analyzing it.)

Finally, euthanasia as a policy is a slippery slope. A person apparently hopelessly ill may be allowed to take his own life. Then he may be permitted to deputize others to do it for him should he no longer be able to act. The judgment of others then becomes the ruling factor. Already at this point euthanasia is not personal and voluntary, for others are acting "on behalf of" the patients as they see fit. This may well incline them to act on behalf of other patients who have not authorized them to exercise their judgment. It is only a short step, then, from voluntary euthanasia (self-inflicted or authorized), to directed euthanasia administered to a patient who has given no authorization, to involuntary