

# Exam 3



Argument E which states that 'the city cannot afford to build both a new town hall and the highway that would be needed to get there. But neither of the projects is worth completing without the other. Since the city will not undertake projects that are not worthwhile, the new town hall building will not be built anytime soon' is the most syllogistically parallel to the given statement, 'Columbus and Akron cannot both be included in Carly Simon's tour route. The singer will make a stop in Columbus unless River Glen is included in the tour route. Unfortunately, a stop in River Glen is not possible. Clearly, then, a stop in Akron will not occur' due to their similarly valid conclusions which spring from their correctly-stated premises. The given statement signifies that 'Simon cannot be in Columbus and Akron,' while the choice statement indicates that 'the city cannot afford to build a new town hall and a highway.' Both are very direct in their assumptions, and nonetheless were coincided with their likewise direct and logical conclusions that 'Akron will not be toured by Simon' and 'a new town hall will not be built anytime soon', respectively. Both arguments can be regarded as valid because their conclusions follow what their premises indicate; both also are logically true as claims are accurate and materially consistent with facts (Surhone, Timplendon, & Marseken, 2010). It should be noted, moreover, that the concluding sentences of the two arguments are congruous to their major and minor premises, which are needless to say, imperative in deciphering whether or not validity is present. Both categorical propositions, ultimately, are logically acceptable and sound as their construction or arrangement is more precise than the rest of the choice at hand. Reference Surhone, L. M., Timplendon, M. T. & Marseken, S. F. (2010). Syllogism. Saarbrücken: Betascript.