

1. apple.com
2. The NRA
3. Dr. Andrew Wakefield

1. Your great-grandmother herself, ancestry.com, government records
2. Local news paper, trip advisor (watch out for ads)
3. Anthony Kalashnikov a history professor at the Nation University Higher School of Economics, britannica.com

1. This argument does a pretty good job of citing the source. We know the name of the researcher and where he works, so we could probably find the study, but it would be easier if they gave the name of the study or the year it was published. The argument uses an informed source, and we have no reason to think that he is biased (rather the fact that he would also die if he were wrong is reason to think he is a good impartial source). This argument could do a better job of cross-checking the source. There are probably not a lot of other people who study this area, but just knowing what other astrophysicists and weapons experts think of this study would further help support the conclusion.
2. The source of this argument is the more than 2,400 law professors that signed the open letter in the *New York Times*. The letter in the paper should be pretty easy to track down from how it was cited in this argument, but it would be much harder to find information about the law professors. These professors are informed about the legal system and how it works, but because of their relative anonymity it is impossible to tell if they are impartial. This argument would be stronger if they mentioned the political views of the law professors. That is, whether it was a balanced survey or if they all leaned towards one political view.
3. This argument cites two unnamed tour guide companies to argue that the only way to visit the glaciers is by helicopter. Since these sources work in that region, and presumably have for a while these sources seem to be informed about the terrain around the glaciers. However, the argument would be better if it named the tour companies so we could make sure that these are impartial companies. For all we know they are the only companies that offer helicopter rides, and they are just trying to up-sell their tours to make more money. This argument would be better if we knew what kinds of tours other companies in the area offer.

1. Philosophy attracts people who are good at verbal reasoning and analytic writing. Or Philosophy makes people better at verbal reasoning and analytic writing.
2. The trees turn color means that the vegetation is dying and so the geese have less to eat. Or the cold weather causes both the plants to die and the geese to fly south.
3. When the stock market goes up more people go on vacation where women are more likely to wear shorter dresses and skirts. Or when the stock market goes up it gives fashion houses more financial security and so they take more risks with shorter hemlines.

1. This is a pretty weak argument. Although it does a good job establishing the correlation between family dinners and teenager's emotional well-being, the argument jumps to the conclusions without considering alternative explanations, or ever that this specific causal

explanation is the best explanation of this correlation. For instance, maybe their overall well-being increases because they were eating more well balanced meals. Or maybe well-adjusted teenagers are the ones who like to eat dinner with their families. At least the argument does not underestimate the complexity of the argument by claiming that it was the only way to improve the well-being of teenagers.

2. This is a pretty strong argument that preemptively considers other explanations through the set up of the experiment, whether clean hands or rubber gloves cause mold to grow on bread. Given that these alternative explanations did not result in moldy bread the experiment established a strong correlation between the moldy bread and the germs on the kids hands. This argument could have been more convincing if they had done the experiment multiple times to make sure that the germs came from the students hands instead of from a contaminated bag or piece of bread. Although the argument does a good job considering alternative explanations, it could have accounted for more complexity by putting the bread in more different kinds of environments to see how this effected the bread. Maybe the germs only grew on the bread because it was in the plastic bag.
3. This is a pretty good argument that offers a few clear examples that establish a correlation between the word for 'tea' in a language and how tea first arrived in that country. This argument seems to work towards the most likely explanations, but it fails to consider any alternative explanations. Maybe the languages that have similar words for tea have a common ancestral language. Or maybe these cultures were unified in some other way such that they had a similar use and practice with tea and that gave them a common word. This argument does not claim that this is the only reason that these cultures share a word for tea, but it could expect more complexity by considering other factors that might influence the word for tea in a culture.