

Logical Fallacies

Excerpted from "Stephen's Guide to the Logical Fallacies" at <http://www.datanation.com/fallacies/index.html>

Fallacies of Distraction

- False Dilemma: two choices are given when in fact there are three options
- From Ignorance: because something is not known to be true, it is assumed to be false
- Slippery Slope: a series of increasingly unacceptable consequences is drawn
- Complex Question: two unrelated points are conjoined as a single proposition

Appeals to Motives in Place of Support

- Appeal to Force: the reader is persuaded to agree by force
- Appeal to Pity: the reader is persuaded to agree by sympathy
- Consequences: the reader is warned of unacceptable consequences
- Prejudicial Language: value or moral goodness is attached to believing the author
- Popularity: a proposition is argued to be true because it is widely held to be true

Changing the Subject

- Attacking the Person:
 - (1) the person's character is attacked
 - (2) the person's circumstances are noted
 - (3) the person does not practice what is preached
- Appeal to Authority:
 - (1) the authority is not an expert in the field
 - (2) experts in the field disagree
 - (3) the authority was joking, drunk, or in some other way not being serious
- Anonymous Authority: the authority in question is not named
- Style Over Substance: the manner in which an argument (or arguer) is presented is felt to affect the truth of the conclusion

Inductive Fallacies

- Hasty Generalization: the sample is too small to support an inductive generalization about a population
- Unrepresentative Sample: the sample is unrepresentative of the sample as a whole
- False Analogy: the two objects or events being compared are relevantly dissimilar
- Slothful Induction: the conclusion of a strong inductive argument is denied despite the evidence to the contrary
- Fallacy of Exclusion: evidence which would change the outcome of an inductive argument is excluded from consideration

Fallacies Involving Statistical Syllogisms

- Accident: a generalization is applied when circumstances suggest that there should be an exception
- Converse Accident: an exception is applied in circumstances where a generalization should apply

Causal Fallacies

- Post Hoc: because one thing follows another, it is held to cause the other
- Joint effect: one thing is held to cause another when in fact they are both the joint effects of an underlying cause
- Insignificant: one thing is held to cause another, and it does, but it is insignificant compared to other causes of the effect
- Wrong Direction: the direction between cause and effect is reversed
- Complex Cause: the cause identified is only a part of the entire cause of the effect

Missing the [Point](#)

- [Begging the Question](#): the truth of the conclusion is assumed by the premises
- [Irrelevant Conclusion](#): an argument in defense of one conclusion instead proves a different conclusion
- [Straw Man](#): the author attacks an argument different from (and weaker than) the opposition's best argument

Fallacies of [Ambiguity](#)

- [Equivocation](#): the same term is used with two different meanings
- [Amphiboly](#): the structure of a sentence allows two different interpretations
- [Accent](#): the emphasis on a word or phrase suggests a meaning contrary to what the sentence actually says

[Category](#) Errors

- [Composition](#): because the attributes of the parts of a whole have a certain property, it is argued that the whole has that property
- [Division](#): because the whole has a certain property, it is argued that the parts have that property

[Non Sequitur](#)

- [Affirming the Consequent](#): any argument of the form: If A then B, B, therefore A
- [Denying the Antecedent](#): any argument of the form: If A then B, Not A, thus Not B
- [Inconsistency](#): asserting that contrary or contradictory statements are both true

[Syllogistic](#) Errors

- [Fallacy of Four Terms](#): a syllogism has four terms
- [Undistributed Middle](#): two separate categories are said to be connected because they share a common property
- [Illicit Major](#): the predicate of the conclusion talks about all of something, but the premises only mention some cases of the term in the predicate
- [Illicit Minor](#): the subject of the conclusion talks about all of something, but the premises only mention some cases of the term in the subject
- [Fallacy of Exclusive Premises](#): a syllogism has two negative premises
- [Fallacy of Drawing an Affirmative Conclusion From a Negative Premise](#): as the name implies
- [Existential Fallacy](#): a particular conclusion is drawn from universal premises

[Fallacies of Explanation](#)

- [Subverted Support](#) (The phenomenon being explained doesn't exist)
- [Non-support](#) (Evidence for the phenomenon being explained is biased)
- [Untestability](#) (The theory which explains cannot be tested)
- [Limited Scope](#) (The theory which explains can only explain one thing)
- [Limited Depth](#) (The theory which explains does not appeal to underlying causes)

[Fallacies of Definition](#)

- [Too Broad](#) (The definition includes items which should not be included)
- [Too Narrow](#) (The definition does not include all the items which should be included)
- [Failure to Elucidate](#) (The definition is more difficult to understand than the word or concept being defined)
- [Circular Definition](#) (The definition includes the term being defined as a part of the definition)
- [Conflicting Conditions](#) (The definition is self-contradictory)