

*Critical Thinking Skills Tutorial:*

# **Logical Fallacies**

**Writing Center**

**English 800 Center**

**YOU DO NOT NEED TO PRINT THIS  
TUTORIAL!**

**All notes and exercises should be done  
on separate sheets of paper, which you  
will bring to an Instructional Aide in the  
Writing Center.**

**As you work through the tutorial, make  
sure to see an instructor in the  
Writing Center or English 800 Center  
if you have any questions or difficulties.**

## Introduction

When we argue, we can be wrong for lots of reasons. We might have our facts wrong; or we might be right about our facts, but wrong about what we've inferred from them.

Often, we come out with statements that sound persuasive, but that don't really hold together for lots of reasons. We use words carelessly, we make assumptions that we don't investigate, and sometimes--let's be honest--we just want to win and are willing to play a little dirty. We try to bully our listeners, or sneak an idea by them, or try to make it hard for them to answer back.

And sometimes, people use all these tricks on us. We call these deceptive arguments "logical fallacies."

**Definition:** **Fallacies** are arguments that sound convincing but are essentially flawed; they usually stem from careless thinking, or more often, from an attempt to persuade through non-logical means.

Here are some examples of fallacies, most gleaned from discussions over the election of November 2000:

- Mayor Willie Brown wants to use all of your tax dollars to fund his cronies and laugh at the taxpayers of San Francisco.
- You can support Proposition L, or you can hand San Francisco over to rich, greedy landowners who will stop at nothing until all the artists and working people are evicted.
- No way I'm voting for Diane Feinstein as senator. Years ago, when she took over as Mayor of San Francisco, the City had plenty of money. When she left a few years later, the City was in debt.
- This law is unwise because it isn't a good idea.
- No real New Yorker will vote for Hilary Clinton as New York senator.
- Do you think that Gore's pathetic incompetence will present a problem if he is elected?
- If Bush overturns Roe v. Wade, it'll just be a matter of time before women will be oppressed in other ways: no access to health care, or education, or work--it'll be like the 19th century.
- Senator Lieberman's arguments are convincing because he's a good man.
- Don't be fooled by Proposition M (more permits for taxicabs). My uncle, who runs a restaurant, says it's a terrible idea.
- We don't want prerequisites at College of San Mateo. Prerequisites prevent students gaining access to courses, and our whole mission is to give students access to education.
- If the state has the right to decide who may or may not own a car, it ought to have the right to decide who may have a baby--and issue licenses to people who are fit parents.

Did any of those statements sound familiar? You might not remember the election or have cared about it. They are often provocative and bullying, the kind of argument that makes you say "But....!!!" yet leaves you a bit uncertain as to how to argue against it.

These are specific patterns of deceptively convincing but false reasoning, called fallacies. By looking precisely at the logic implied in the argument, you can often identify precisely what is wrong with it.

**IN YOUR NOTES** (keep these to submit with exit quiz):

1. What is a logical fallacy?
2. Where do logical fallacies come from?
3. How do you identify what is wrong with a fallacious argument?

## **Definitions**

There are a number of well-known patterns of fallacious argument. Here are twelve of them.

**NOTE:** While this module presents a list of fallacies including definitions and explanations, please note that the name of the fallacy is less important than your ability to recognize what's wrong with the argument. Don't forget to study the examples as you take your notes.

1. The “**Straw Man**” fallacy involves making a caricature of your opponent’s views, and then scoring points by opposing this caricature.

*Willie Brown wants to use all of your tax dollars to fund his cronies and laugh at the taxpayers of San Francisco.*

Whether or not you like or trust Willie Brown, the Mayor of San Francisco, he doesn't literally plan to use all of our tax dollars to laugh at the City residents. This statement creates an unfair and exaggerated target for the speaker to aim at.

*My opponent is a milkshake hating extremist. But not me. I have a Golden Retriever.*  
[Courtesy of a Jack-in-the-Box parody!]

*Well, no doubt you like to live like a pig in a sty. But perhaps I can explain why it's worth doing essential repairs on this house.*

2. The “**False Dilemma**” fallacy pretends that what may be a very complex situation can be resolved into two alternatives, then forces you to choose.

*You can support Proposition L, or you can hand San Francisco over to rich, greedy landowners who will stop at nothing until all the artists and working people are evicted.*

Surely there's another alternative? Perhaps you don't support Prop L, the no-growth proposition which bans development in certain districts in the City, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you want to hand over the City to greedy landowners. This assertion pretends that there are only two alternatives, thus putting any opponent into the position of having to choose one or the other.

*We will have to cut back social services or go completely bankrupt.*

*You can either dedicate yourself to karate, or just live on your couch eating chips.*

3. The “**False Cause**” fallacy assumes, without proof, that because two things happen together, one must have caused the other.

*No way I'm voting for Diane Feinstein. Years ago, when she took over as Mayor of San Francisco, the City had plenty of money. When she left a few years later, the City was in debt.*

Diane Feinstein may have been the mayor during a period in which the City lost money. But that doesn't mean that she caused the loss of money. It's not enough to say that two things happened at the same time if you want to prove that one caused the other; you must also show actual cause.

*Since you entered the room half an hour ago, two light bulbs have blown out! What is it with you?*

*Since divorce was made legal, marriages have been breaking up at an alarming rate-- what's more, teen pregnancies, drug use and delinquency have increased. Divorce is clearly a bad thing.*

4. The "**Begging the Question**" fallacy looks like a reason is being offered for a position, when in fact the position is merely restated.

*This law is unwise because it isn't a good idea.*

The word "because" implies that the speaker is about to give some reasons for why the law is unwise: examples of badly written sentences, for instance, or illustrations of how the law might backfire. But instead the speaker just says again that it's unwise, this time in slightly different words. It's bad because it's bad because it's bad.

*The music is really enjoyable because it's pleasant to listen to.*

*He is obnoxious because he's really annoying.*

5. The "**Poisoning the Well**" fallacy sidetracks an argument by putting potential opponents personally on the defensive.

*No real New Yorker will vote for Hilary Clinton.*

It's almost silly to call this a logical fallacy, because there's nothing logical about this at all. It's a very familiar bullying tactic. The speaker here makes an assertion about people who don't agree with him that puts any prospective disagreements on the defensive. Now, instead of explaining why he is voting for Clinton, anyone with a different view must first prove that he's a real New Yorker.

*Any person with reasonably educated tastes can see that Hemingway is a great novelist.*

*Only sexist pigs enjoy movies with Arnold Schwarzenegger.*

6. The "**Loaded Question**" fallacy sidetracks an argument by presenting someone with a question whose premises he may not accept, and which are probably damaging his position.

*Do you think that Gore's pathetic incompetence will present a problem if he is elected?*

Closely related to "poisoning the well," this fallacy involves another, slightly subtler bullying tactic. Again, the opponent is put on the defensive, but this time the accusation is embedded indirectly in a question. The speaker can't answer the question without accepting a premise he may want to reject (that Gore is pathetically incompetent). At the same time, if he challenges the question, he looks evasive. You've seen this tactic used many times in arguments!

*When did you stop beating your wife?*

*How soon do you expect to implement your plans to destroy the economy?*

7. The "**Slippery Slope**" fallacy infers extreme and dramatic consequences from a single cause, usually by skipping over details of how the mountain will grow from the molehill.

*If Bush overturns Roe v. Wade, it'll just be a matter of time before women will be oppressed in all kinds of ways: no access to healthcare, or education, or work--it'll be like the 19th century.*

Well... hold on a moment! It's too easy to extrapolate dramatic consequences from a single event. We tend to exaggerate how far we can see consequences, and we shouldn't.

*If we let this person shoplift without administering a severe punishment, the next thing you know, everyone will shoplift; stores will be forced to close down; there will be panic buying and total economic collapse.*

*Today, marijuana is outlawed. Tomorrow it will be alcohol and cigarettes; eventually, you and I will not be allowed legally to buy a cup of coffee without being arrested.*

8. The "**Ad Hominem**" or "**Personal Attack**" fallacy rebuts a person's opinions with a statement (usually irrelevant) about the person himself.

*Senator Lieberman's arguments are convincing because he's a good man.*

That doesn't sound so bad. But look at the "because." Here, the speaker seems again to be about to give the reasons why Lieberman's arguments are convincing. But he doesn't; instead, he tells us why he likes Lieberman. If the sentence had read, "Lieberman is believable because he's a good man," that would be fine. After all, good people do tend to be credible; honesty is one of the commonly accepted criteria of goodness. But Lieberman's goodness doesn't give us a reason to be convinced by his arguments. Good people can be wrong. This fallacy is also known as the "**personal attack**" fallacy, but as you can see, the key point is not that it's rude--this example is actually a compliment! --the key point is that the speaker tries to respond to a person's arguments with a statement about the person himself. "**Ad hominem**" is Latin meaning "to the man," and that is where the logic slips up: it speaks to the person, not to his opinions.

*Bush's economic arguments make no sense because he is completely insincere and is just after our votes.*

*Halevy's great history of the English people is fundamentally flawed because he is a Frenchman, not an Englishman.*

9. The "**Appeal to Authority**" fallacy cites an inappropriate authority to support a point.

*Don't be fooled by Proposition M (more permits for taxicabs). My uncle, who runs a restaurant, says it's a terrible idea.*

Of course there's nothing wrong with citing an authority to back up your views. None of us knows much about most things, so it's a good thing to consult someone who does, and to refer to that person. However, it's important to make sure that the "authority" we cite is actually someone who has some knowledge or expertise in the appropriate area. Now, perhaps this speaker's uncle knows a lot about Prop M, but all we know about him is that he runs a restaurant. This makes him an authority on how to make good crispy ginger chicken, but not necessarily on the taxicab business.

*You shouldn't invest in dotcom stocks right now--that's what my doctor says.*

*According to a prominent civil litigation lawyer, OJ's criminal trial was "fundamentally flawed."* [Note the different specialty of the lawyer--litigation lawyers don't handle criminal trials.]

10. The "**Equivocation**" fallacy tries to make a point by pretending that because the same word is used, it means the same thing.

*We don't want prerequisites at College of San Mateo. Prerequisites prevent students gaining access to classes, and our whole mission is to give students access to education.*

Equivocation is one of the sneakiest fallacies, and we're often guilty of it by mistake because we're confused. Here, for instance, the speaker has presented us with an apparent contradiction: if CSM is all about giving students "access" to education, then how can this be compatible with preventing students from gaining "access" to the classrooms?

Of course, there is no real contradiction. It only sounds contradictory because the same word, "access," is used in both cases. But in fact, "access" means different things in each case. "Access" to education means putting students in a position to succeed in their academic goals--to enable them to get the skills to transfer to college or get a different job. "Access" to the classroom, however, means making sure the door is open so that students can physically get in! You can give people "access" to the room without helping them get "access" to education, by letting them walk into rooms where they won't get the skills they need.

*Mark says that he opposes discrimination. He says that employers and landlords should not discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and so on. But when I tried to rent an apartment from him, he discriminated against me just because I have bad credit. That's hypocrisy!*

[No, it's not. See how the speaker misses the point: what matters is the grounds on which people are selected for housing and work. No one has ever objected to reasonable selection criteria.]



11. The "**False Analogy**" fallacy compares two very different things, but draws conclusions about one based on the other.

*If the state has the right to decide who may or may not own a car, it ought to have the right to decide who may or may not have a baby--and issue licenses to people who are fit parents.*

This is often an easy fallacy to identify when other people do it--it's harder to stop ourselves from doing it, though! Here, the speaker decides that what applies to one situation (cars) must apply to another (babies). The trouble is that the two situations may superficially look similar, but they are fundamentally different. You can't reliably draw conclusions from one based on the other.

Drawing conclusions about one thing based on another is called drawing an analogy, and it's a very useful and clever device. It often helps us make better sense of abstract concepts because it links them to more familiar concrete ideas. But you need to be careful that the two things you're comparing really are comparable.

*Mountaineering may be dangerous, but so is driving a car.*

*Capital punishment may indeed kill innocent people, but then, so do inoculations and traffic accidents--for that matter, fighting Hitler cost innocent lives too. So there's no objection to capital punishment's occasional mistake.*

12. The "**Appeal to Emotion**" fallacy tries to persuade by playing on our fears, pity, or other feelings, instead of giving us reasons.

*Immigration cannot continue unchecked. How long before our country crumbles, with no one even speaking a common language, and blood running in the streets?*

Like its cousin, the slippery slope, appeals to fear are attempts to scare us into agreeing. The slippery slope makes a vague attempt to show that one small thing will lead to huge consequences. Appeals to fear are more basic; simply, they try to scare us into submission. The other most frequent appeal is the appeal to pity.

Both are useful tactics, and they can work--and not only on your mother. Public safety announcements draw freely on appeals to fear (think of safe sex campaigns, anti-drug campaigns etc.) Charity ads try to appeal to our pity with pictures of wide-eyed children and warm music. But emotional appeals are only as good as the point they try to make; and unless they are very relevant and cogent, they can backfire.

*The defendant is guilty of murder, because the victim was a young, kind, beautiful woman with her whole life ahead of her--she did not deserve this terrible fate!*

*We must protest the presence of nuclear weapons because if we don't, we will all die horribly.*

**NOTE:** Before continuing with the exercises, make sure you have understood the definitions by responding to the following questions. If you like, refer back to the definitions to help you. (Remember you have already answered three questions.)

**IN YOUR NOTES** (keep these to submit with your exit quiz):

4. What is a straw man fallacy?
5. What is a false dilemma fallacy?
6. What is a false cause fallacy?
7. What is a begging the question fallacy?
8. What is a poisoning the well fallacy?
9. What is a loaded question fallacy?
10. What is a slippery slope fallacy?
11. What is an ad hominem fallacy?
12. What is an appeal to authority fallacy?
13. What is an equivocation fallacy?
14. What is a false analogy fallacy?
15. What is an appeal to feelings fallacy?

## Exercise 1

**Instructions:** Decide which fallacy each statement contains, and what is wrong with it. Check your answers against the Answer Key at the end.

---

1. Do actors lead immoral lives because of their ridiculously high earnings?
2. Of course we shouldn't give condoms to teenagers; we wouldn't give them alcohol or drugs, which are also dangerous, so it would be equally irresponsible to hand out condoms.
3. We are told not to take drugs like heroin and LSD because they are bad for us. But caffeine is a drug, and no one objects to that; on the contrary, you can buy it anywhere. And what about the many drugs that save lives? Shouldn't these be illegal too?
4. According to the actor George Clooney, who plays pediatric surgeon Doug Ross on the popular TV show E.R., the new breakthroughs in gene therapy offer very exciting possibilities for treating congenital diseases in children.
5. What the Democrats want is to raise taxes on everyone's income to bail out people who can't be bothered to get a job. And here's why I think this isn't a good idea.
6. Pollution is slowly killing our planet, and unless you want to watch your grandchildren drown in melting ice-caps or die slowly of diseases caused by a thinning ozone layer, you had better start thinking about how to prevent it.
7. If you don't trust me with a choice, how can you trust me with a child?
8. Capital punishment is clearly an effective deterrent. Look at Saudi Arabia: they behead people there, and their crime rate is very low.
9. This movie is dull because it's got nothing interesting in it.
10. Don't listen to the doctor's arguments against smoking--they're worthless, because what he doesn't tell you is that he himself is a smoker!
11. My son says I should let him go to the Eminem concert on Friday night. But if I start letting him go to concerts and staying out late, he'll start to cut school in the morning; next thing you know, he'll be a dropout, pushed into hanging with the wrong crowd, probably taking drugs with the rest of his buddies. I don't think a concert is worth throwing the rest of his future away for.
12. All patriotic Americans will put a flag in their window.

## Answer Key

1. *Do actors lead immoral lives because of their ridiculously high earnings?*

Loaded Question. The questioner buries two assumptions in the question: first, actors do lead immoral lives; second, actors' earnings are ridiculously high. You can't answer the question (whether the earnings cause immorality) without accepting these assumptions.

2. *Of course we shouldn't give condoms to teenagers; we wouldn't give them alcohol or drugs, which are also dangerous, so it would be equally irresponsible to hand out condoms.*

False analogy. Condoms are not like alcohol and drugs, and what may be true for one is not necessarily true for the other. Condoms are supposed to protect people from the consequences of their actions. Alcohol and drugs do not offer any protection at all.

You might have thought this was equivocation, because the speaker is pretending that all three things (alcohol, drugs and condoms) are comparable. But equivocation would involve the speaker playing on the associations of a single word, and pretending that because two different things share a word, they must be the same thing. There isn't a single word here; the speaker is saying that what is true for alcohol and drugs is also true for condoms. However, equivocation would have been a reasonable answer, and you probably would have seen the essential logical flaw.

3. *We are told not to take drugs like heroin and LSD because they are bad for us. But caffeine is a drug, and no one objects to that; on the contrary, you can buy it anywhere. And what about the many drugs that save lives? Shouldn't these be illegal too?*

Equivocation. Just because we can use the same word for LSD, caffeine and aspirin doesn't mean that these are actually the same things. The speaker is playing on the use of the word "drug" to pretend that very different things are the same, and should be treated the same.

You might have thought this was a false analogy. But the speaker isn't saying that caffeine is like LSD; he's saying that caffeine and LSD are both the same kind of thing--"drugs"--so it's not an analogy. However, this would have been a reasonable answer. False analogy is very similar, and you probably picked up on the nub of the problem.

4. *According to the actor George Clooney, who plays pediatric surgeon Doug Ross on the popular TV show E.R., the new breakthroughs in gene therapy offer very exciting possibilities for treating congenital diseases in children.*

Appeal to authority. George Clooney played a doctor on television, but he isn't a doctor. So he's not a useful authority to cite when discussing new treatments for children. And by the way--we made this up. Clooney has never, to our knowledge, offered an opinion about pediatric care!

5. *What the Democrats want is to raise taxes on everyone's income to bail out people who can't be bothered to get a job. And here's why I think this isn't a good idea.*

Straw man. Perhaps the speaker feels that this is the Democrat agenda, but this is not how the Democrats have described their policies. And this is a policy that virtually no one would support. While most of us are sympathetic to those who can't find work, few of us would be very sympathetic to those who can't be bothered to work. So this speaker has picked an easy target, and will now have a very easy time defeating an enemy of his or her own creation.

6. *Pollution is slowly killing our planet, and unless you want to watch your grandchildren drown in melting ice-caps or die slowly of cancers caused by a thinning ozone layer, you had better start thinking about how to prevent it.*

Appeal to fear. The speaker uses an image of drowning children to motivate the listeners.

You might also have thought this was a slippery slope. In a way, it is; a slippery slope version of this might go something like "If you don't think about the ozone layer, the next thing you know we will all be drowning in melting ice-caps." It's really a difference of phrasing. In both cases, the speaker is drawing a dramatic conclusion from the present.

Another possible choice is false dilemma. The speaker does seem to suggest that we have only two options here: to care, or to watch the inevitable destruction.

7. *If you don't trust me with a choice, how can you trust me with a child?*

False dilemma. This familiar bumper sticker prompted one person to remark, "Who says I trust you with either?" The question implies that we must trust the questioner with one or the other. But there is a third alternative.

You might also have seen this as a loaded question. That would be a reasonable guess, because this is certainly a question. It isn't quite the same kind of form as a typical loaded question; there are no loaded terms, like "immoral lives" or "ridiculously high earnings" in the opening example. But it is a question based on an assumption.

8. *Capital punishment is clearly an effective deterrent. Look at Saudi Arabia: they behead people there, and their crime rate is very low.*

False cause. Saudi Arabia does occasionally behead people, and they also have a much lower crime rate than we do. However, the speaker offers nothing to suggest that the beheading causes the low crime rate. Just because they happen in the same place doesn't mean that one causes the other. Indeed, we can point to the reverse just as easily: European countries don't execute people, yet their crime rates are typically lower than those of the U.S.

You might have thought this was appeal to authority, since the speaker refers to Saudi Arabia as an example of successful deterrence. But an appeal to authority usually involves quoting someone's opinion, rather than pointing to an example.

You might also have thought this was a false analogy because the speaker compares the U.S. to Saudi Arabia. That is not a bad choice, since the problem with the logic does lie partly in the comparison. However, it's reasonable to compare one country to another; and if it were true that capital punishment did deter crime, then it would be true everywhere in the world.

9. *This movie is dull because it's got nothing interesting in it.*

Begging the question. The definition of a "dull" thing is that it lacks interest. The speaker doesn't tell us why the movie is dull, but instead just rephrases the adjective.

10. *Don't listen to the doctor's arguments against smoking--they're worthless, because what he doesn't tell you is that he himself is a smoker!*

Personal attack (ad hominem). The speaker tells us that this doctor's anti-smoking arguments are worthless, because the doctor is a smoker. But that doesn't discredit his evidence. It only tells us that he hasn't managed to take his own findings seriously enough to quit, or that he isn't strong-willed enough. In short, it tells us about the doctor himself, not his findings.

You might have thought this was begging the question, because the speaker looks, as though he is going to give a reason but doesn't. However, this speaker doesn't avoid giving reasons by restating his opening comments. Instead, he deflects the argument to the person.

11. *My son says I should let him go to the Eminem concert on Friday night. But if I start letting him go to concerts and staying out late, he'll start to cut school in the morning; next thing you know, he'll be a dropout, hanging with the wrong crowd, probably taking drugs with the rest of his buddies. I don't think a concert is worth throwing the rest of his future away for.*

Slippery slope. The speaker speculates on the consequences of her poor son going to a concert, moving effortlessly from a night out to a vision of his ruined life.

You might also have seen this as an appeal to fear. This is a reasonable guess, since the speaker is certainly frightening herself, and preparing to frighten her son into staying home.

12. *All patriotic Americans will put a flag in their window.*

Poisoning the well. The speaker has already decided that anyone who doesn't agree with him about putting a flag in the window is not patriotic. So anyone arguing with this person would have to first defend herself before explaining why she doesn't have a flag in the window. It's a bullying tactic that puts the opponent on the defensive and is make him or her look evasive.

## **You are now ready to take the Exit Quiz.**

- You can get a printed version of the quiz at the Written Center, OR
- You can print the quiz at the end of this tutorial.

YOUR NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
G# \_\_\_\_\_ Course# \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

**FALLACIES: Exit Quiz -- Directions**

- Print this page, and your notes from the tutorial if you have kept them online. (If not, make sure you have your notes with you.) Complete the quiz .
  - Take the completed quiz, **and your notes with answers to all questions**, to the Writing Center to be checked. NO appointment is needed for this. However, if you **do not** pass the quiz, you must make a conference appointment for feedback and credit.
  - **REMEMBER:**
    - However well you do on the quiz, the instructional aide **cannot** give you credit unless he or she can clearly see that you have responded to all questions.
- 

**Name that fallacy! Write the name of the appropriate fallacy beneath each argument.**

1. Echinacea cured my cold! Since I started taking it, my symptoms have gone away.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Hitler is considered a monster because he authorized concentration camps. But Roosevelt authorized concentration camps too, for Japanese Americans in World War II--so he was really just another Hitler.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

3. For an analysis of the O.J. Simpson criminal trial, we turned to Sam Waterston, the actor who plays the District Attorney on NBC's "Law and Order."

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

4. You must either get a college degree, or lead a miserable life.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

5. I ignored what the nutritionist told me about healthy eating, because she was overweight.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

6. The victim's death was caused by cessation of bodily function.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

7. If you let this student hand in work late, the next thing you know, all students will hand in work late; the failure rate will rise dramatically; the school will lose its accreditation; and all of us will be out of a job.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

8. The meal tasted good because it was delicious.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

9. Do you think athletes behave like hooligans because they are thrust into the public eye too young?

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

10. All decent people believe in God.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

11. If we don't act now to defeat crime, we will never walk down the street in safety again. Do you want to have to look over your shoulder for the rest of your life, never knowing if your loved ones will be safe waiting at home for you?

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

12. We should permit people to smoke cigarettes in bars. Sure, smoking is bad for you. But bacon and saturated fats are bad for you too, yet no one has tried to close down McDonalds.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

13. Gun control advocates want to leave all of us defenseless, at the mercy of armed criminals. They don't care about the rights of individuals. But these rights are important.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_



14. While Clinton was in office, the economy improved dramatically. The dot-com boom created thousands of jobs and spurred growth on an unprecedented level. Clearly, Clinton must have been doing a great job.

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Why not let us decide for ourselves the truth about evolution? After all, we shop for clothes, CDs, cars, and food that suits our tastes and lifestyles. Why not let us choose a scientific theory that suits our tastes and lifestyles, too?

Fallacy: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**TO BE COMPLETED BY THE INSTRUCTIONAL AIDE:**

\_\_\_\_\_ (initials) \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

1. Tutorial notes are COMPLETE / INCOMPLETE (\_\_\_\_/15 questions)

2. Score on exit quiz: \_\_\_\_/15

3. Conference with instructor required for credit? YES / NO

# ATTENTION!

## STOP!

Now that you are at the end of this tutorial and have taken the Exit Quiz, please bring it, with your tutorial notes and exercise answers, to the Writing Center in 18-104 or the English 800 Center in 18-102 and ask the Instructional Aide to correct your quiz.

If you pass the quiz, the Instructional Aide will give you credit for this tutorial.

If you did not pass the quiz, you will need to make an appointment with a lab instructor. During this appointment, you will review your incorrect answers and ask any questions you may have about this tutorial. You will receive credit for the tutorial after this appointment.

Remember that you may go to the Writing Center or English 800 Center at any time in this process to ask questions and seek help.