

## **History 150C6**

### **Introduction to Political History**

## **Arguments**

- Opinion without reasons is not an argument.
- All arguments have at least two statements.

### **Basic Information on Arguments:**

1. An argument draws a conclusion and, crucially it gives reasons for that conclusion.
2. All arguments have at least two statements: A conclusion and one or more premises. The premise or premises are the parts that give reasons that argue why the conclusion is correct.
3. For an argument to exist, premises must lead to the conclusion. If this is not the case, and more than two statements are present, then what we have is a series of statements, not an argument.
4. Any statement that has only one statement cannot be an argument.
5. An argument may or may not be valid according to the rules of logic. It is perfectly possible to make an argument, with both premises and conclusion, that nevertheless violates the rules of logic. This is what is meant by an invalid argument.

## Premises --- Conclusion

### Types of Arguments

**Deductive Reasoning** – The conclusion follows with absolute certainty from the premises

Gandhi opposed all violence.

Any future war against Iraq would involve violence

∴ Gandhi, if he were alive, would certainly oppose war against Iraq.

**Inductive Reasoning** - The conclusion probably follows from the premises\*

[Usually has statistics]

African Americans have voted for the Democrats in the vast majority of recent elections.

There is nothing special about the upcoming Congressional races in 2016 to think that African-American voting will be any different from what it was in the past.

∴ It is likely\* that a majority of African-Americans will vote Democratic in the next set of Congressional races.

**Hidden Premises** – Not spelled out in an argument but strongly implied.

What is the hidden premise, which is not stated but is nevertheless necessary to reach the conclusion?

Example:

I oppose any warlike actions by governments; - Only one premise here.

US policy is in fact undertaking warlike actions in Iraq. – (Hidden Premise)

∴ I oppose U.S. policy with regard to Iraq.

\*Whether it is considered a strong argument depends on the context of the hidden premise. \*

Cogent Reasoning is not the Same as Being Right

Cogency means that the premise leads to the conclusion. If you accept the premises, the conclusion does follow the premises. The conclusion is valid if the premises is valid.

Example 1:

David Gibbs believes the world is flat. Everything David Gibbs believes must be true.  $\therefore$  The world must be flat.

Example 2:

All forty-three presidents of the US up until now have been males.  $\therefore$  Therefore the next president will probably be a male.

(This is a deductive argument. Predictions based on past history.)

### Recognizing Arguments

For each of the following, tell whether or not it could be seen, without additions, as an argument.

1. The need for a more just system for the prosecution of criminals has led the state of New Hampshire to review its criminal justice system. (Single, factual statement)
2. It's sunny out today. (Statement, observation of the condition)
3. It's sunny out today. The grass is green and healthy. And there's a soft, steady breeze coming out of the southwest. (Series of disconnected statements, no conclusion)
4. If I can't figure out my homework, then you should help me. (Absent to reason why they should help with homework)
5. If I can't figure out my homework, then you should help me. After all, you're my big brother. And big brothers are supposed to give their little brothers a hand at times like that. (Cogent argument)
6. Keiko has a Kilimanjaro Cobra mountain bicycle. So I'm sure that Keiko has a bicycle. (Premise and conclusion almost say the same thing)
7. Professional singers protect their voices by warming up before performing. Sopranos do; altos do; and tenors do also. (Inductive – 3 premises)
8. Smith got "A's" on all her tests. And she got the highest grade in class on her term paper. Not only that, but she's been accepted to Harvard Law School. (No conclusion)
9. Shale is less hard than diamond. And anything that's less hard than diamond can be cut by diamond. Mica is less hard than shale. Therefore, diamond will cut mica. (Deductive)
10. If the students take good notes, they'll do well on the test. (Not certain that they will do well on the test, "If".)
11. I don't feel any need to take notes on this material; nobody here seems to be taking notes. (Argument with a hidden premise)
12. The instructor got out her textbook. As soon as she did, everyone in class got out their textbooks, as well. So, I got out mine, too. (Hidden premises: I should do what everyone is doing) – Valid argument

9/1

Recognizing Arguments and their Components

1. Not an Argument
  - a. I support war against Iraq.
  
2. Invalid Inference (lacks cogency)
  - a. Most people favor war with Iraq.  
∴ You too should favor war with Iraq.

Inference: The way a premises leads to the conclusion.

What is missing? – A hidden premise.

3. Valid Inference, Invalid Argument

Most people favor war with Iraq.

The most popular opinion is the best opinion. You should favor the best opinion.

∴ You too should favor war with Iraq.

What can we do to make this a valid argument?

- *For a valid argument, the premises must be valid and true.*

Argument Structure [Premise / Conclusion]

For each argument find the premise, the hidden premise, and the conclusion:

1. Thomas Szasz

Since there are no mental diseases, there can be no treatments for them.

Hidden premise: You cannot treat an illness that do not exist.

2. Chicago Daily News

If marriages were really falling apart, divorced persons wouldn't be as eager as they are to find another partner as speedily as possible.

Conclusion Marriages are not really falling apart.

3. The Economist

It is difficult to gauge the pain felt by animals because pain is subjective and animals cannot talk.

4. William Shakespeare

Forbear to judge, for we are sinners all.

Hidden premise: People who are sinners themselves should not judge others.

5. Aristotle

The earth has a spherical shape. For the night sky looks different in the northern and southern parts of the earth, and that would be the case if the earth were spherical in shape.

### Fallacy of Appeal to Authority

Sometimes when we make arguments, we justify our premises (or our conclusions) by citing some "expert" authority, someone who is supposed to be knowledgeable on a particular subject. Sometimes this is a good strategy, and sometimes it is not. To incorrectly use authority in your argument, constitutes fallacy of appeal to authority.

The following circumstances would constitute a fallacious appeal to authority:

1. When the person being cited has an obvious bias or conflict of interest. The best type of an authority is someone who is disinterested (i.e. they would have no incentive to lie or to distort the truth);
2. When the person being cited has no real credentials that would justify using them as an authority;
3. When authorities are divided on a particular issue, and you only cite authorities who agree with your point, while you ignore the rest;
4. When the person being cited as an authority has a long track record of being wrong, ill-informed, or dishonest;
5. When the person being cited is simply saying something that is incorrect, based on easily available information.

**[Common with Hollywood stars being cited as sources on real world issues such as war / poverty etc.]**

## **Courtroom Standards of Evidence**

In evaluating whether fallacy of appeal to authority applies, it is important to assess whether the cited authority is biased. In court, there are three levels of evaluating bias:

### **1. Arguments against interest**

"Your honor, I am guilty."

- **This is the strongest type of argument**, because the statement goes against the interests of the person saying it.

### **2. Arguments consistent with interest**

"I am not guilty."

- **This is the weakest type of argument**, because the person saying it has an obvious bias; of course they want to appear not guilty.

### **3. Neutral arguments**

Testimony from someone who does not know the accused party and has no connection to him/her.

- This is a strong argument, given the apparent absence of bias. However, ***it is not quite as strong as 1.***



Appeal to Authority – Valid and Invalid

1. Flying saucers really exist! It said so in a magazine I saw on the checkout line at Safeway.
2. Advocates of the view that the earth is really flat are wrong. All scientists without exception agree that the earth is spherical.
3. From a newspaper: "Today, the United States and Britain bombed Iraq. It is clear that there were no civilian casualties. According to a western diplomatic source, only military targets were hit, and no civilians were killed or injured."
4. From another newspaper: "Today, it was revealed that Turkish government forces committed major atrocities against Kurdish rebels in western Turkey, including such acts as the execution and torture of prisoners. The Foreign Minister of Turkey, in an interview, acknowledged that such atrocities had occurred and expressed regret about the incidents."
5. In a recent controversy, Professor Gibbs admits that he accepted a \$10,000 "gift" from a student, and the next day, he increased the student's grade to an A. Some say that Professor Gibbs was bribed by the student, but this is not true. I asked Professor Gibbs about the incident and he said that the student's gift had no influence on the decision to increase the grade.
6. Several newspaper articles have accused the Central Intelligence Agency of participating in the marketing of heroin, cocaine, and other illegal narcotics. However, such reports are false. The CIA has flatly denied any such involvement. In his memoirs, former CIA director Alexandra Harcourt-Smith states that the CIA never had any involvement, either directly or indirectly, in the narcotics trade.

3/9/2015

## **Four Types of Deductive Arguments**

### **1. Modus Ponens**

All A's are B's This is an A  
Therefore, This is a B

- **Real world example:**

All Americans are rich (compared to people in the rest of the world); George Bush is an American; Therefore, George Bush must be rich.

-----

### **2. Modus Tollens**

All A's are B's; This is not a B;  
Therefore, This is not an A.

- **Real world example:**

All Americans are rich (compared to people in the rest of the world); Jane Doe is not rich;  
Therefore, Jane Doe must not be an American.

-----

### **3. Hypothetical Syllogism**

If A, then B; If B, then C; Therefore If A then, C.

- **Real world example:**

If the people elect their own government, then the political system is democratic; If the political system is democratic, then the economy is prosperous;  
Therefore, If the people elect their own government, the economy must be prosperous.

-----

#### 4. Disjunctive Syllogism:

Either A or B; Not A; Therefore, B

- Real world example:

All humans are either male or female; Jane Doe is not male;  
Therefore, Jane Doe must be female.

-----

### **Deductive Invalidity**

#### 1. Denying the Antecedent

- Fallacy / Invalid inference/ Conclusion does not follow the premises

If A then B Not A  
Therefore, Not B

- Example:

If a Democrat is president, then a war is likely. But a Democrat is not president.  
Therefore, a war is not likely.

-----

#### 2. Affirming the Consequent

If A then B, B is therefore A

- Example:

If Jeb Bush runs for election, a Republican will surely win the presidency. A Republican is sure to win the presidency,

Therefore Bush will run.

## **Inductive Reasoning**

### **1. Induction by Enumeration**

All A's in my sample are B's;  
My sample was large and randomly selected; All A's in the world are probably B's.  
(Larger the sample, greater the validity/ not bias / draws a larger conclusion)

#### **- Real world example:**

All U.S. presidents I have studied are male;  
My sample of presidents was large and randomly selected; All presidents in U.S.  
history have **probably** been male.

-----

### **2. Induction by Analogy**

All A's in my sample are B's.  
My sample was large and randomly selected;  
Therefore, the next A, outside my sample, will probably be a B.

#### **- Real world example:**

All revolutions in my survey have been preceded by economic crises;  
My sample of revolutions was large and randomly selected;  
The next revolution in the future will probably be preceded by an economic crisis.

-----

### **3. Statistical Induction**

Some percentage of A's in my sample have some characteristic B;  
My sample was large and randomly selected;  
Therefore, the larger population of A's will have the same characteristic B, in  
approximately the same proportion as the sample.

#### **- Real world example:**

In a survey, some 60 percent of U.S. senators accepted bribes; My sample was large and  
randomly selected;  
Therefore, approximately 60 percent of U.S. senators accept bribes.

## **Fallacies**

### 1. Inconsistency:

"Intervention in the affairs of other countries is immoral, and the U.S. should never engage in this practice. However, the U.S. should act to overthrow rogue figures like Slobodan Milosevic and Saddam Hussein."

### 2. Straw Man: -

*Arguing with someone else, arguing against what they are saying. You misrepresent what they are saying.*

"People who supported George W. Bush for president were arguing, in essence, that the world's biggest moron is best qualified to be president."

### 3. Either-Or (False Dilemma):

"Demonstrators against globalization of the world economy are adopting an absurd position. If you reject the agenda of globalization, then you must favor a turn to national isolation and xenophobia." (More than two options, and claiming that there are only two options, ignoring all other possible options)

### 4. Begging the Question (or Tautology): ( Premise / Conclusion the same)

Roger has a Kilimanjaro mountain bicycle; Roger has a bicycle.

A slightly more racist version of this fallacy: "The problem with Middle East politics is that it is all based on a fundamental lack of respect for the concept of truth. People in that region simply lack compunctions about the need to be truthful in political debate, newspaper editorials, and government pronouncements. Why is this so? Because Middle Eastern countries have a culture that does not value truth, and in this respect is so different from the United States and other Western countries. The fact that political debate is so completely based on dishonesty in the Middle East proves that the culture must be dishonest."

### 5. Questionable Premise (or False Premise): - Premise is wrong

"Elvis really is alive and well. So, the National Enquirer must be right in some cases."

6. Suppressed Evidence (or the Fallacy of Whitewash):

An example of this fallacy: Discussing the history of the United States during the nineteenth century, arguing that the U. S. has had an honorable history, but leaving out any mention of Indian massacres.

7. Tokenism: - Trying to argue that you take something seriously. Constantly talking about it.

"As a senator I have an excellent record on environmental issues. During the recent campaign, I have mentioned the environment in almost every speech I have given." (Popular during elections.)  
Talk is cheap. / Done any sponsoring on legislation? (Useful)

**More on the Strawman Fallacy**

This comes from a recent controversy in Germany, involving the German Justice Minister, who made the following statements at a campaign rally:

"The Americans have enough oil. Bush wants to distract attention from his domestic problems. This is a popular method. Hitler also used it."

– German Minister of Justice, Herta Daeubler-Gmelin

"President Bush's spokesman yesterday denounced Germany's justice minister for painting Bush as a Nazi by comparing him to Adolf Hitler."

Is the second statement a misrepresentation of the first? Is it a strawman fallacy?

- It is mistranslated.

**Another example of Public Controversy**

Here is a debate between two former CIA officers, regarding the U.S. role in a coup in Indonesia in 1965. Is there anyway one can ferret out the truth from this exchange?

[Ralph] McGehee: ... the CIA prepared a study of the 1965 Indonesian operation that described what the agency did there. I happened to have been custodian of that study for a time, and I know the specific steps the agency took to create the conditions that led to the massacre of at least half a million Indonesians... *(More reliable, argument against interest)*

Hugh Tovar: ... I am rather shattered by these allegations... I was in charge of CIA operations in Jakarta at the time, so I would have been the primary instigator of the massacres that allegedly took place. In fact the CIA served primarily as an intelligence collecting operation in Indonesia, and did not engage heavily in covert action... We certainly did not instigate the 1965 revolt. We had nothing to do with it [emphasis added]. *(Argument consistent with interest)*

**Yet Another example of Declaration against Interest**

Testimony by Maj. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr., US Air Force, Commander, Far Eastern Air Force Bomber Command, Testimony before the US Senate, June 25, 1951

**Gen. O'Donnell:** It was my intention and hope, not having any instructions that we could be able to get out there and to cash in on our psychological advantage in having gotten into the theater and into the war so fast, by putting a very severe blow on the North Koreans, with advance warning perhaps telling them that they had gone too far in what we all recognized as being a case of aggression, and General MacArthur would go top side to make a statement, and we now have at our command a weapon that can really dish out some severe destruction, and let us go to work on burning five major cities in North Korea to the ground, and to destroy completely every one of about 18 major strategic targets. (Proposing nuclear weapon destruction)

**Senator Russell:** ... As I understand it, you intended to give them notice you had better get out of the war or we will burn your cities?

**Gen. O'Donnell:** I thought that would take care of the humane aspects of the problem, We thought we could do it. Tell them to either stop the aggression and get back over the 38parallel or they better have their wives and children and bedrolls to go down with them because there is not going to be anything left up in North Korea to return to.

**Chairman Russell:** What decision was made at that suggestion of yours?

**Gen. O'Donnell:** We were not at that time permitted to do it...

**Senator Stennis:** ... Now as a matter of fact, Northern Korea has been virtually destroyed, hasn't it? Those cities have been virtually destroyed.

**Gen. O'Donnell:** Oh, yes: we did it all later anyhow... I would say that they entire, almost the entire Korean Peninsula is just a terrible mess. Everything is destroyed. There is nothing left standing worthy of the name... Just before the Chinese came in we were grounded. There were no more targets in Korea.

From I. F. Stone, The Hidden History of the Korean War (Boston: Little, Brown, 1989), p. 312.

*\*(Credible testimony from an expert, no evidence of boasting)*



## **Identify by Naming**

- a. Michael Jordan says Air Jordans are the best for basketball. Who knows better? I want Air Jordans. (Argument consistent with interest) (Biased authority)
- b. The Surgeon General says that smoking is hazardous to your health. So, I'd better assume that it is. (Valid argument – good authority)
- c. Pat: We ought to liberalize the laws governing the use of marijuana for medical purposes. Matt: Hey ...no way! Giving people unrestricted access to drugs will weaken the moral fiber of the country, and hamper this country's efforts at efficient production. (Strawman fallacy – misrepresenting)
- d. I think I'll major in philosophy. I like the field, and I've thoroughly researched a number of career opportunities that would favor philosophy majors. (The person is the authority themselves. Research is a moderate authority. This is a valid appeal to authority)
- e. Between the Nikes and the Reeboks, the Reeboks are clearly superior. Therefore, the Reeboks are the better shoes. (Premise says same thing twice / Superior & Better / Begging the Question)
- f. I'm in favor of the right to dissent, but I do not believe it should be exercised. - L.B. Johnson (Fallacy of inconsistency / contradicts himself)
- g. Sure, this is the tastiest flavor of ice cream. The instructor just said so! (The instructor is the authority / not a valid authority on the flavor of ice cream)
- h. We have to have more money for the school. So we have to either raise student fees or cut student services. But it's unlikely that students want their services cut. So, we'd better raise the fees for students. (Either / Or – Raise fees or Cut services / other services: cut professors salary / fundraising etc. – Ignores the fact that there are more than two options)
- i. The professor is right, without question. But we'd better be prepared; she may be wrong. (Inconsistency)
- j. Senator Jones proposes that we should spend less on welfare. So, she must believe that poverty has ended in America, and that there are no more poor or needy. I suggest that the senator take a look outside. (Strawman)
- k. But the professor MUST always be right. He teaches philosophy! (Inconsistency / false authority / fallacy of appeal to authority)
- l. Company president: "Salaries will go up immediately." Company VP: "Salaries will increase, but not for some time." (Organizational consistency)

15/9/2015

## **List of Fallacies II**

### **1. Ad Hominem Fallacy**

*(When you attack someone using their background – person has nothing to say that is relevant)*

“Your arguments that the U.S. should not use military force in Afghanistan are ridiculous. And I notice that you have an Arabic sounding last name.”

How would you rewrite the above to qualify as “guilt by association?”

Note: One can question a person's background in a way that is not fallacious:

“Look, I myself know nothing about military matters and so I am unable to assess your arguments that the U.S. should not use military force. However, you also have no background whatsoever that would qualify you as an expert in these matters and, accordingly, I cannot take your arguments very seriously.”

### **2. The “Two Wrongs Make a Right” Fallacy**

*(Just because other people do something wrong, it is not a logical justification of you doing something wrong) Using a past evil to use your own evil.*

“Terrorists have killed large numbers of innocent Americans in their attacks on September 11. Accordingly, no reasonable person can object if the United States, in retaliating against these attacks kills civilians too.”

How would you rewrite the above to qualify as fallacy of “common practice and traditional wisdom?”

### **3. Non Sequitor (Fallacy of Irrelevant Reason)**

*(The premise gives no evidence to support the conclusion)*

“Most Americans cannot even find Afghanistan on a map. So it is hard to see how the U.S. can intervene in that country and expect to win.

#### 4. Fallacy of Equivocation

*(Use the words of two meanings and play upon those two meanings to draw illogical conclusions.)*

A socialist politician in Germany: "Vote socialist. Remember that the heart beats to the left."  
(Because the heart pumps blood to the left)

#### 5. Fallacy of Appeal to Ignorance

*(When something has been proven false but is said to be true)*

"There is no proof that the CIA funded Osama Bin Laden. So, we can assume that such funding never occurred."

#### 6. Fallacy of Composition

*(Logically moving from the parts to the whole)*

"According to press reports, all the men in the recent terrorist attack were from Arab countries. So all Arabs must be terrorists, and Arab culture must favor terrorism."

#### 7. Fallacy of Division

*(Illogical proceeding from the whole to the parts)*

"Afghanistan is ruled by an anti-democratic government. So, therefore, the people of Afghanistan must be anti-democratic."

#### 8. Fallacy of the Slippery Slope

*(Small thing will turn to a much larger thing automatically)*

"Any U.S. military action in Afghanistan is bound to lead to a Vietnam style ground war, detrimental to U.S. interests."

How could you reconstruct the above to be valid?

### **Fallacy of the Beard**

- Takes vague words and thus it means nothing.
  
- All humans (including women) have some amount of hairs on their faces.  
There is no fixed number of hairs you need to have in order to qualify as having a beard.  
Therefore, there is no difference at all between having a beard and not having a beard.
  
- There is no clear standard as to what constitutes a “good” human rights record.  
Both Sweden and Iraq can be said to have human rights records that, by any standard, are less than perfect.  
Therefore, there is no difference at all between the human rights conditions in Sweden and Iraq.

**Criticizing the Person Who Makes an Argument: When is It Justified? When is it Fallacy Ad Hominem?****Example 1:**

John Doe: "I think that it is immoral to use nuclear weapons. To use them certainly would kill a huge number of innocent civilians, and any weapons system that kills innocent parties is automatically immoral."

Response: "I can't take this argument seriously. John Doe is a communist and a sexual pervert! And he is a drug user! I would not trust anything he says"

**Example 2: – Argument is appeal to authority**

John Doe: "You can take it from me: Nuclear weapons should be banned. I know about these things, since I have a PhD in physics and have extensively studied nuclear weapons. I also once was an air force officer and worked with nuclear weapons."

Response: "John Doe is a communist, and his ideology is so different from mine that I doubt there is much political common ground between us. Accordingly, I cannot accept the authority of his argument in this case."

**Example 3:**

John Doe: "Nuclear weapons are very unreliable weapons systems. Study after study have conclusively shown that nuclear weapons often fail to detonate when they are supposed to, they miss their targets, or their explosive impacts are unpredictable. I know about these things, since I have a PhD in physics and have extensively studied nuclear weapons. I also once was an air force officer and worked with nuclear weapons."

Response: "It is true that John Doe is an expert in nuclear weapons, based on his credentials. He has a good track record as a commentator on these issues, and has never been known to distort or falsify information to the best of my knowledge. However, he is also a communist, and accordingly I cannot accept his arguments."

17/9/2015

### **Fallacies II: Identify by Naming**

- a. I like your aunt. She seems to be a wonderful person.
  - Valid argument (person making statement is their own authority)
  - Hidden premise: "I like people who are wonderful".
  
- b. I have the right to gamble and drink. So, when I gamble and drink, I'm right to do so.
  - Fallacy of Equivocation – the word "right" used twice.
  - First "right" – restrictive, second "right" – endorsement, correct thing to do.
  
- c. I appreciate your offer of financial assistance for our Children's Fund. We'll now be able to provide many more services for children than we would have otherwise.
  - Valid argument. Appeal to authority "I appreciate"
  - Premise 1: Your offer will enable to provide financial services
  - Hidden Premise: We appreciate people who provide financial assistance
  - Conclusion: I appreciate your offer of financial assistance
  
- d. Now look who's for this "widening-the-roads" proposal: A senator from a rural state, where they barely use highways, and another senator whose driving record is so bad that he shouldn't be on any highway, no matter HOW wide. This is a bad proposal.
  - Ad Hominem – Not looking at the argument, rather it looks at the arguer.
  - Their bad driving record is not an authority on the argument of widening the roads.
  
- e. Honor is worth having because it is had by truly honorable persons.
  - Begging the question. Premise and Conclusion means almost the exact same thing / meaning

- f. Between the Nike running shoe and the Reebok running shoe, the Nike is clearly superior. Therefore, the Nike is the better running shoe.
- Begging the question / premise is essentially the same as conclusion / “superior and better”.
- g. Every attempt to disprove the existence of higher beings has failed. So it doesn't take a rocket scientist to see that we can believe in them.
- Fallacy of Ignorance
- h. Nothing is better than eternal happiness. And an old, dirty nickel is better than nothing. So, an old, dirty nickel is better than eternal happiness.
- Fallacy of Equivocation
  - 1<sup>st</sup> “Nothing” – everything in the universe
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> “Nothing” – better than not having any money at all
- i. This is clearly a very wealthy organization. So we can reasonably conclude that all of its members must be wealthy.
- Fallacy of Division (Illogical proceeding from the whole to the parts)
  - Doesn't mean everyone's rich
- j. Sen. Jenkins is one of those ultraconservative reactionaries the kind who believe in business before people. So, don't waste your time on her proposal regarding health care for the aged; instead, review some from more mainstream representatives.
- Invalid argument
  - Ad Hominem
- k. You say you want to know whether the professor is right or not? Well, you're standing on my left, and she's on my other side. So she looks right to me.
- Fallacy of Equivocation
  - 1<sup>st</sup> right “Right vs Wrong”
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> right “Right vs Left”

- l. But the instructor MUST be right. He's so darned good looking!
  - Fallacy of Irrelevant Reason (Non-Sequitur)
  - Disconnect, to be good looking and to be right has no connection or correlation.
  
- m. Do you realize who originated this proposal? He's never even graduated from high school AND he's an ex-convict. Forget it!
  - Ad Hominem
  - You should read the propose
  - What matters is the proposal
  
- n. I like watching a good comedy. It helps me to relax.
  - Valid Argument. He's an authority that helps him relax
  - Hidden Premise: I like watching good comedy



**Fallacy of Composition in Economics**

Wisconsin weakened labor unions and lowered wages, which caused businesses to relocate to Wisconsin, away from states that had stronger labor unions and higher wages. So it would seem that lowering wages is an excellent strategy for attracting investment. If every state in the US were to do this, then they all would see an influx of investment and improved economics conditions.

When countries devalue their currency, they make their exported products cheaper, which therefore augments the level of exports and increases employment levels. This is obviously a good thing, especially during a recession when there is significant unemployment. Therefore all countries should adopt this strategy of devaluing their currencies, and they will enjoy augmented employment levels as a result.

When countries adopt austerity measures, which lower their living standards, they attract liquid capital investment from overseas, which strengthens their economic position and lays the groundwork for improved economic conditions. Therefore all countries should implement austerity, in order to achieve this influx of capital.

**[Illogical proceeding from the whole to the parts]**

**22/9/2015**

**The Monty Python Syllogism**

If the woman weighs the same as a duck, then she must be made of wood. If she is made of wood, then she must be a witch.

The woman does in fact weigh the same as a duck.

Therefore, the woman is a witch (Burn Her!)

**Logical Argument from The Donald**

"Look at that face! Would anyone vote for that?" - Donald Trump, commenting on Carly Fiorina

*How would you represent the above as a syllogism?*

- Carly Fiorina has an ugly face. You shouldn't vote for people with ugly faces. Therefore, you should not vote Fiorina.

Such arguments are an Ad Hominem as it is a personal attack.

**Fallacy of Suppressed Evidence, or Whitewash**

Logical arguments must contain all relevant and important evidence. To key relevant and important evidence, is both manipulative and illogical; the fallacy of whitewash.

Example:

"The Patriot missile is an excellent weapon. Tests show that in 98 percent of firings, the missile successfully left the launch pad."

Technically true. However, this omits information that after leaving the launch pad successfully, a majority of the missiles either blew up in mid-air or failed to hit the targets.

**Fallacies III** [Premise / Conclusion]**1. Hasty Conclusion**

- Premise gives some evidence but not enough. It is relevant and does support the conclusion but is insufficient.

"Clearly Saddam Hussein must have been behind the September 11 terrorist attacks. What is the evidence? Well Hussein clearly has no moral scruples, he believes in the use of violence to achieve his objectives, and he has a sizable military and intelligence apparatus. For heaven sake, he is a man who used poison gas against his own people! And furthermore, he clearly has a motive to attack the United States."

**2. Small Sample Size**

"I spoke to two officials in the Bush administration, and both stated that the United States will go to war against Iraq. So, there must be widespread agreement among most U.S. government officials on the need for war with Iraq."

**3. Unrepresentative Sample**

"Nearly all of the students that I have talked to are opposed to war. So, the sentiment in favor of war in this country must be very small."

**4. Questionable Cause (Post Hoc, Ergo Propter Hoc)**

"Doctors don't know anything and seeing one can shorten your life. Consider my Aunt Bertha. She went to see a doctor for the first time when she was 112 years old and the next year - poof! - she was dead."

"George Bush was in office for eight months at the time of the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the attacks were Bush's fault and that his flawed foreign policies must have caused these attacks."

**More on Questionable Use of Public Opinion Polls**

In 1991, the federation of Yugoslavia was facing a breakup, as two of its constituent parts, Croatia and Slovenia, were attempting to secede from the federation. At the time, a polling organization asked people in twelve European countries whether they supported Croatia and Slovenia's attempts to secede. They asked respondents to state which of the following two options they favored (they were also allowed to answer "Don't Know"). The two options were:

**Option I:**

- Preserve Yugoslavia's Territorial Integrity

**Option II:**

- Respect Democracy and Self Determination (Including Possible Independence for Slovenia and Croatia)

**What is the problem with this poll?**

- Badly worded.
- The person revealing the questions portrays how they feel.

**List of Fallacies:**

Appeal to Authority

- Using a cited authority that is not a valid authority for a topic. (e.g. look at bias and their credentials [Hollywood actors talking about Africa]).

Strawman

- You recast someone else's argument to make their argument look weaker or ridiculous.

Inconsistency

- Contradiction – someone says one thing and another person says another (Common in Govt. Depts)

Either-Or (also known as Fallacy of False Dilemma)

- Only two options are provided. Other aspects / options are not considered even though they may be available.

Suppressed Evidence (or Fallacy of Whitewash)

- Leaving out vital information, purposely or accidentally. [Forgot to do homework]

Begging the Question (or Tautology)

- Conclusion restates the premise often using different words

Tokenism

- Talking about an issue like you care but don't really do much [e.g. a Senator]

Hasty Conclusion

- Premise gives some evidence for the conclusion but not enough.

Questionable Cause (or Post Hoc, Ergo Propter Hoc)

- One thing happened then another thing happened. So you say the first must have caused the second. But there are many other factors that could have caused the second.

Ad Hominem

- When you attack someone using their background – person has nothing to say that is relevant. It would only be valid to criticise an arguer when they are being presented as an authority.

Non Sequitur (or Fallacy of Irrelevant Reason)

- Using irrelevant evidence – premise has no support at all for the conclusion.

Composition

- Word almost gives away what the decision is. Illogical proceeding from the parts to the whole. [If one country has a good economic policy, thus all countries should have that economic policy, what is good for one is not necessarily good for the whole]

Division

- Illogical proceeding from the whole to the parts.

Small Sample Size

- When your trying to sample a large population but it is too small and you draw a statistical conclusion from it.

Unrepresentative Sample

- A valid statistical sample must be representative. Not an accurate a reflection of the sample, i.e. over or under representing. [Sample for which President is in lead, but only asking students].

Questionable Premise (or False Premise)

- When the premise is either wrong or probably wrong. There is no evidence that it is true.

*Two Wrongs Make a Right*

- Just because other people do something wrong, it is not a logical justification of you doing something wrong) Using a past evil to use your own evil.

*Ignorance*

- When something has been proven false but is said to be true

*Slippery Slope*

- A small thing will turn to a much larger thing automatically [Legalize all drugs for all purposes]

*Beard*

- If a word is vague [Beard is a vague idea, not clearly defined].

*Equivocation*

- Using words with double meanings to create an argument.

*Questionable Analogy*

- Making an analogy based on two sets of events. [Just like WW2, Just like 1939]

## Comparison of Fallacies

### 1. Questionable/False Premise **versus** Hasty Conclusion **versus** Non Sequitur.

- a. In **Questionable Premise**, the premise of an argument is probably (or in some cases certainly) untrue; or alternatively, the premise is insufficiently supported. The conclusion may follow the premise but the premise is wrong.
- b. In **Hasty Conclusion**, the factual accuracy of the premise is not questioned, and the premise provides some support for the conclusion; but by itself, the premise (or premises) is insufficient to justify the conclusion. More evidence is needed in such cases.
- c. Finally, in **non sequitur**, there is no relationship at all between the premise and conclusion. The premise provides no significant evidence to justify the conclusion.

*If you find an argument that contains **Hasty Conclusion** and another fallacy, choose the other fallacy as the correct answer. Only use Hasty Conclusion if there is no other fallacy present.*

*Note: I will not give you an example that contains both Hasty Conclusion and Questionable Premise.*

### 2. Either-Or versus Strawman.

- a. **Often Strawman arguments also contain the Either-Or Fallacy as well.** It is a classic Strawman to make your opponent look ridiculous by misrepresenting their arguments as being Either-Or when their arguments are not in fact Either-Or.
- b. **To tell the difference:** If the argument contains an explicit claim to restate someone else's argument, but does so falsely, then select Strawman (and not Either-Or). If there is no explicit effort to represent someone else's argument, then Either-Or may be selected.

### 3. Fallacy of Composition versus Small Sample Size.

- a) Both of these fallacies generalize from the parts to the whole, in a fallacious way. The difference: In Composition, it does not matter whether there is a small sample size. Even if the sample size were large (and representative) the generalization would be wrong.
- b) **Example:** Because the large majority of British people are orderly, therefore a demonstration by 100,000 British people will be orderly. The fact that British people are individually orderly does not mean they act that way in a group.



4. **Small Sample Size** versus **Unrepresentative Sample Size**

- Small sample size means that too few people are in the sample; the small sample size means that one cannot generalize about a larger group. The small sample increases the possibility of measurement error. In cases of Unrepresentative Sample, the sample is not randomly selected.

5. **Appeal to Authority** versus **Suppressed Evidence**.

- a) One type of Fallacy by Appeal to Authority involves a situation where authorities are divided. You cite some authorities who happen to agree with your point, and do not mention that there are other authorities who disagree with your point.
- b) Technically, this involves both Fallacy of Appeal to Authority and also Fallacy of Suppressed Evidence (Whitewash); you are after all suppressing the authorities who disagree with you. In cases like this, select Fallacy of Appeal to Authority.
- c) Only select Fallacy of Suppressed Evidence in cases where there is no use of Appeal to Authority

## **Manipulative Uses of Language** **[Included in Mid Term Exam]**

### 1. Euphemism

An expression that substitutes for another expression, because the original is discomforting, offensive, or unpleasant. [i.e. in the 50's, they did not say pregnant on TV]

#### Example:

"Military campaigns against American Indian tribes during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries did unfortunately cause some degree of discomfort for the Indians."

-----

### 2. Orwellism

A specialized form of euphemism that is actually the opposite of the real meaning.

#### Examples from George Orwell's 1984:

- The Ministry of Peace was the government agency that concerned itself with war; the Ministry of Plenty was the agency that concerned itself with starvation; and the Ministry of Love concerned itself with torture.
- 

### 3. Doublespeak (or Obfuscation)

Deliberately ambiguous or evasive language that seeks to hide something discomforting, offensive, or unpleasant. Somewhat like euphemism, except that euphemisms are short phrases or words, while doublespeak consists of at least one full sentence, or several sentences.

"Unfortunately, civilians were killed in the air strikes over Iraq." Compare this sentence to the following: "U.S. Air Force planes killed civilians while conducting strikes over Iraq. Note: The first sentence omits who is responsible for the deaths, and seeks to hide this fact."

#### Example of academic doublespeak: "

- The Correlation between Oral and Somatic Motor Habits." [Note this actually means "Facts and Words."]
-

#### 4. Slanting (or Innuendo)

Presenting information in such a way that implies something beyond what is explicitly stated.

##### Examples:

"President Clinton was a rather amoral president, even though there is no proof that he actually accepted a bribe."

Neutral: Negative: Positive:

"It is six thirty." "It is already six thirty." "It is only six thirty."

-----

#### 5. Blending value claims into factual statements.

A special form of slanting that uses emotively charged words to make its point. This is commonly used in newspapers.

##### Example:

"The U.S. government has opposed the hardline government of Slobodan Milosevic."

-----

#### 6. Weasel Words

Words that qualify a statement in such a way that it undercuts the meaning of the statement.

##### Example:

"The U. S. case against Osama Bin Laden is surely a strong one, as it was partially confirmed by statements that Bin Laden himself has made in recent days."

-----

## 7. Fine Print Disclaimers

A statement in fine print (or in a footnote, or buried deep in the narrative) that undercuts the significance of statements made in the main body of the narrative. [Negative information that you have which goes against your argument].

### Example:

"The missile attack was an astounding success, as 98 percent of the missiles were launched successfully." In a footnote: "The fact that the missiles were launched successfully does not mean that they reached their targets, in fact only 3 percent of the missiles actually did reach their targets."

-----

## 8. Sexist Language

Language that shows a bias in favor of men and against women by presupposing that certain activities are undertaken exclusively by men.

Examples: Congressmen, Firemen, Businessmen etc.

-----

## 9. Glittering Generalities

Statements that contain words or phrases with a positive sound, but which are extremely vague in their actual meaning.

Examples of such words and phrases: "freedom," "liberty," "family," "our way of life."

-----

### 10. Bandwagon

Statements suggesting that because something is popular it is therefore good, and that you too should support it.

#### Example:

"Your views about the possibility of war with Iraq are completely out of line with what the vast majority believe. Polls show overwhelming support for the president's position. What's the matter with you?"

-----

### 11. Plain Folks

This technique makes an argument with a populist slant, suggesting that the person making the argument has much in common with the common man or women; and because of this, we should accept their arguments.

#### Example:

"My views on communism – that it is dire threat to American security – are not those of the striped pants diplomats who use big words. My views are those of the American people."

-----

### 12. Fear

This technique presents information in a sensationalized and often with violent overtones to instill a sense fear and anger into the audience; often the targets of the argument are claimed to be foreign or domestic "enemies." This is a classic propaganda technique.

#### Example:

"Saddam Hussein is an evil leader who poses a dire threat to the United States, and we must destroy him before he destroys us. This is a leader who tortures children in front of their parents."

-----

1. The Department of Peace used enhanced interrogation techniques and information extraction during their military campaigns in around the world.

- **Doublespeak, Euphemism**

---

2. 90% of the dogs at the dog park have not bitten anyone. Thus, it would be safe to pet the dog approaching us now.

- **Whitewash**

---

3. According to my dance instructor, the strange sound coming from my car is a loose bolt. Therefore, my car has a loose bolt.

- **Appeal to Authority**

---

4. In the upcoming elections you can only vote for either the Democratic or Republican candidate.

- **Either Or**

---

5. John: We should relax the laws on beer. Jane: No way! A society with weak alcohol laws loses its work ethic and family values.

- **Strawman – rearranging John's argument to make it look weaker and what was meant to be said**

---

6. The presidential nominee recently watched the movie "An Inconvenient Truth" therefore he claims to have a strong global warning platform

- **Tokenism**

---

7. There is no evil in this world. Though evil exists in some parts of the world, we will overcome it sooner or later.

- **Inconsistency**

- **First premise, no evil but second premise says there is some evil.**
- 

8. The rights of the minority are every bit as sacred as the rights of the majority, for the majority rights have no greater value than those of the minority

a. **Begging the Question / Tautology**

b. **Premise conclusion saying exactly same thing / changing a few words**