

sound fallacies

by Liz Murugi

Submission date: 25-Apr-2021 12:54PM (UTC-0700)

Submission ID: 1569331564

File name: Fallacy_of_soundness.edited.docx (21.02K)

Word count: 438

Character count: 2209

Fallacy of soundness

Institutional affiliation

Name of lecturer

Name of student

Submission date

Fallacy of soundness

These are fallacies where the premise cannot support the conclusions made from it. They are characterized by the premise, minor term, and major term. A premise in sound fallacy is unable to support the deduction because the premise is false. Another fallacy is the fallacy of circularity. In this fallacy, the premise cannot support the conclusion even if they are true or false. This is because the conclusion forms a shadow that blocks the premise and thus making it unable to support the conclusion (Woods & Walton 2019).

Considering the above definitions of sound fallacy and the fallacy of circularity, the arguments cannot be sound fallacies. The first fallacy, "All humans are mortal. Max is human. Therefore, Max is mortal," is disqualified from sound fallacy because of its main premise (all human beings are mortal). All human beings are indeed subject to death, and true human beings are mortal disqualifies it from being a sound fallacy. The second argument is that the cafeteria will not serve steak because it was on a Friday, not a sound fallacy. The premise is ambiguous, leaving room for debate about the validity of the cafeteria not serving steak on Fridays. As such, this is the fallacy of ambiguity as it requires some consideration of the truth of the major premise.

In the third argument, where geckos are reptiles, and reptiles are cold-blooded, this argument's major premise is that all reptiles are cold-blooded, which is true. Reptiles body temperature depends on the temperature of the environment they are in. as such, the argument cannot be classified as a fallacy of sound. This fallacy requires the major premise to be false for it to be a sound fallacy. As such, it is a fallacy of circularity. Just like the third argument, the

fourth argument is circularity because it has a true major fallacy that cannot support the conclusion. As such, all four arguments are not sound.

Part 2

Drug driving should be legalized, and the actions of drug drivers criminalized. Criminalizing drug driving violates the driver's civil rights as he/she has not committed any crime. When a drug driver causes an accident, the law should focus on the actions and not the driver's drunkenness. As such, the government should avoid basing the law on the probability of the driver causing accidents, but the activities of the drug drivers are the ones that cause harm to society. Thus they are the ones that should be criminalized.

References

Woods, J., & Walton, D. (2019). Fallacies. In *Fallacies*. De Gruyter Mouton.

sound fallacies

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography Off

Exclude matches Off