

Rule

Custom Formal Fallacy Naming Rules :

- Neg Ant Method : If P , then Q . Not P , erroneously concludes Not Q .
- Aff Cons Method : If P , then Q . Q is true, erroneously concludes P .
- Cond Swap Method : If P then Q , erroneously believes that if Q then P .
- Incorr Neg Method : If P then Q , erroneously concludes that if Not P then Not Q .
- Disj Syl Method : Either P or Q . Knowing Q , erroneously concludes Not P .
- Quant Switch Method : $\forall x, y, R(x, y)$, therefore, $\forall y, x, R(x, y)$. Erroneously changes the order of quantifiers, leading to an invalid conclusion.
- Ill Trans Method : $\forall x (Sx \rightarrow Px)$, therefore, $\forall x (Px \rightarrow Sx)$. It is erroneous to infer "all P are S " from "all S are P ". Similarly, from $\forall x (Sx \wedge Px)$, it is erroneous to infer $\forall x (Px \wedge Sx)$. Erroneously converts the terms in the proposition, leading to an invalid conclusion.
- Incorr Inf Method : From $\forall x (Sx \wedge Px)$ infer $\forall x (Sx \wedge Px)$, and from $\forall x (Sx \wedge Px)$ infer $\forall x (Sx \wedge Px)$. It is erroneous to infer "some S are not P " from "some S are P " and vice versa. An invalid inference is made about propositions with existential quantifiers.
- Inv Sub Error Method : $\text{`K}(x, y)\text{'}$ indicates that individual x knows that y is true. $\text{`R}(x, y, z)\text{'}$ indicates that x has a relationship z with y . $\text{`Sub Error}(x, y, z)\text{'}$ indicates a substitution error when incorrectly applying knowledge or attributes about y to z .
- Let Clause Shift Method : When the structure of a statement is incorrectly adjusted or interpreted, causing the original intent or logical relationship to be misrepresented. For example, a shift in the structure of a let clause leads to an invalid inference.

Question

Considering the domain of individuals as natural numbers and R representing the "less than" relationship, $\forall x \exists y R(x, y)$ states that for any natural number, you can find another natural number greater than it, meaning there is no largest natural number. However, $\exists y \forall x R(x, y)$ suggests that there is a natural number greater than any other natural number, implying the existence of a largest natural number. Here, the premise is true, but the conclusion is false,

making the reasoning invalid.

What type of formal fallacy is this?

- A. NegAnt Method
- B. AffCons Method
- C. CondSwap Method
- D. IncorrNeg Method
- E. DisjSyl Method
- F. QuantSwitch Method
- G. IllTrans Method
- H. IncorrInf Method
- I. InvSubError Method
- J. LetClauseShift Method

Please give your answer in the format [[A/B/C/D/E/F/G/H/I/J]].

Answer

[[F]]

Response

[[F]]