Parallel Flaw Challenge Explanation   15.2.4

First, translate.

> *So a study measured the blood pressure of people petting animals in a lab, and some of the people's blood pressure went down while petting. Therefore, if those people adopted a pet, they would have lower average blood pressure.*

If only owning a pet were as stress-free as petting puppies in a lab. So these study participants are seriously living the dream. They're probably being paid to pet puppies and kittens. But then the author *massively* overgeneralizes from the effect of one experience petting animals to the effect of owning a pet. There's a huge difference between the blood pressure reduction associated with petting cute animals one time and then dealing with 4:00 AM emergency visits to the vet. There are a lot of possibly stressful responsibility associated with ownership that aren't being taken into account in this lab test.

LOOPHOLE What if we shouldn't overgeneralize from one experience to ownership?

Now we see it's Parallel Flaw, which is great because it means we just have to match our Loophole in the answer choices. Let's go find our Loophole match.

A) *So a single drug dose cures a disease; therefore, a healthy person can prevent the disease by taking regular single doses. Eh, I'm not feeling* **A**, *but it is a bit tricky to eliminate. Let's see why. First off, they aren't really overgeneralizing because the effect changes between the premises and the conclusion (cure a disease vs. prevent a disease). In the stimulus, we truly overgeneralize because we say that the low blood pressure will carry over between the lab and ownership. Plus, taking multiple single doses would be more analogous to regularly visiting the lab and petting animals, not owning animals.* **A** *isn't a provable match.*

B) *So buying a car is expensive; therefore, you should try and get the car you have to last as long as possible.* **B** *isn't even close to overgeneralization; it's way easier to eliminate than* **A** *was. There aren't even two situations to overgeneralize between.* **B** *isn't a provable match.*

C) *So since pruning plants is enjoyable for some, those people should abandon plants that don't need pruning. There's no overgeneralization between two situations here either.* **C** *isn't a provable match.*

D) *So riding in a boat for a couple minutes is relaxing for some; therefore, those people would be more relaxed if they owned boats. It's overgeneralization!* **D** *reads the same the way the stimulus did. We've got the effect of a shallow encounter with a boat generalized out to boat ownership.* **D** *is a perfect provable match.*

Did this exact emergency vet scenario happen to me last month? Yes, and I will tell you that my blood pressure was not lowered.

Also, my impression is that owning a boat is crazy amounts of stress. Why do people own boats?

E) *So since painting a fence white once will make the fence white, painting the fence white twice will make it even whiter. Notice how there's no comparative between the premises and conclusion in the stimulus: It doesn't say owning pets will make your blood pressure even lower than it was in the lab. It just says the lowering effect will continue, not intensify. This "even whiter" comparative is one of the fatal flaws in* **E**, *but notice how* **E** *stacks individual instances in much the same way* **A** *does (painting twice, taking single doses regularly); this isn't what happened in the stimulus or in* **D**. *They generalize between a single instance and ownership.* **E** *isn't a provable match.*

D is the correct answer. It's the only answer choices that matches the stimulus' Loophole.