

Free essay on argument

[Countries](#), [United States](#)



\n[[toc title="Table of Contents"](#)]\n

\n \t

1. [Dictionary](#) \n \t
2. [∴ killing the perpetrator of mass murder was right.](#) \n \t
3. [Symbolic argument](#) \n

\n[/toc]\n \n

The President Obama said that anyone who would question that the perpetrator of mass murder on American soil didn't deserve what he got needs to have their head examined. If President Obama said that anyone who would question that the perpetrator of mass murder on American soil didn't deserve what he got needs to have their head examined, then killing the perpetrator of mass murder was right. So, killing the perpetrator of mass murder was right.

Dictionary

T = The President Obama said that anyone who would question that the perpetrator of mass murder on American soil didn't deserve what he got needs to have their head examined.

I = If President Obama

T= said that anyone who would question that the perpetrator of mass murder on American soil didn't deserve what he got

N = Needs to have their head examined

K = then killing the perpetrator of mass murder was right.

∴ killing the perpetrator of mass murder was right.

- T

- I ∧ T ∧ N

- ∴ N ⊢ I

- N ⊢ I K

- ∴ K

- ⊨ ∴ K

The president is an authority on matters of governance, therefore if he condemns a critic of the killing of mass murderers, his argument is considered authoritative. So if he says the killing of mass murderers is correct, he has authority in saying so. However, if he says anyone commenting on the killing of mass murderers needs a mental examination, and thus the killing of mass murderers is correct, he confers to himself authority on matters of mental health, making a conclusion therefore out of a fallacious premise.

Symbolic argument

$\exists(x) N$

$\exists(x) N \wedge \text{If } K,$

$\sim \text{If } (N \text{ If } I K)$

$\therefore I K \text{ If } \perp$

$\rightarrow \sim I \rightarrow K$

The argument does not hold, as not all paths close off, and is therefore fallacious.