## **CHAPTER 17**

## Solutions to the Even-Numbered Questions in the Text

## 17.5

- 2. No evidence is given that the magazines offered are worth subscribing to, or are cheaper to subscribe to than ordering directly. Instead, a prize is offered. This violates Rule 1.
- 4. The salesclerk is pulling a bait-and-switch: the ad offered an Apple at a low price, but the salesperson is trying to switch the customer to a different system, violating Rule 2.
- 6. No evidence is given that the jobs are high-paying or worth having. Violates Rule 1.
- 8. The ad assumes you've promised yourself a new car, and repeatedly says without proof that their prices are low. This violates Rule 1.
- 10. This pitch assumes the customer will buy the decanter set without giving any evidence he should. This violates Rule 1.
- 12. The ad gives no evidence that the investment letter is worth subscribing to. This violates Rule 1.
- 14. The ad compares its minimum only with Ford and Chevy SUVs, which are a different type of vehicle (namely, ones capable of driving off-road). This faulty dilemma violates Rule 3.
- 16. The ad tells us how popular the necklace is, and this may be a tiny bit of evidence that it is worth buying, but not much. This mainly irrelevant appeal to identity violates Rule 3
- 18. The ad implies that the organization helps animals, but doesn't explain how, so it is a violation of Rule 3.

1