Fallacy: A defect in an argument that arises from a mistake in reasoning or the creation of an illusion that makes a bad argument appear good.

There are two kinds of fallacy:

• Formal fallacy: Detectable by analyzing the form of an argument

• Informal fallacy: Detectable only by analyzing the content of an argument

Fallacies of Relevance: The premises are not relevant to the conclusion:

• **Appeal to force:** Arguer threatens the reader/ listener.

• **Appeal to pity**: Arguer elicits pity from the reader/ listener.

• **Appeal to the people (Ad Populum)**: Arguer incites a mob mentality (direct form) or appeals to our desire for security, love, or respect (indirect form). This fallacy includes appeal to fear, the bandwagon argument, appeal to vanity, appeal to snobbery, and appeal to tradition.

• **Argument against the person (Ad hominems)**:
    -Arguer personally attacks an opposing arguer by verbally abusing the opponent (ad hominem abusive)
    – Presenting the opponent as predisposed to argue as he or she does (ad hominen circumstantial), or by
    – Presenting the opponent as a hypocrite (tu quoque).
 For ad hominem to occur, there must be two arguers.

• **Accident**: A general rule is applied to a specific case it was not intended to cover.

• **Straw man**: Arguer distorts an opponent's argument and then attacks the distorted argument. N ote: For this fallacy to occur, there must be two arguers.

• **Missing the point**: Arguer draws a conclusion different from the one supported by the premises. N ote: Do not cite this fallacy if another fallacy fits.

• **Red herring**: Arguer leads the reader/ listener off the track.

Fallacies of Weak Induction: The premises may be relevant to the conclusion, but they supply insufficient support for the conclusion:

• **Appeal to unqualified authority**: Arguer cites an untrustworthy authority.

• **Appeal to ignorance**: Premises report that nothing is known or proved about some subject, and then a conclusion is drawn about that subject.

• **Hasty generalization**: A general conclusion is drawn from an atypical sample.

• **False cause**: Conclusion depends on a nonexistent or minor causal connection. This fal-lacy has four

forms: post hoc ergo propter hoc, non causa pro causa, oversimplified cause, and the gambler's fallacy.

• **Slippery slope**: Conclusion depends on an unlikely chain reaction of causes.

• **Weak analogy**: Conclusion depends on a defective analogy (similarity).

Fallacies of Presumption: The premises presume what they purport to prove:

• **Begging the question**: Arguer creates the illusion that inadequate premises are adequate by leaving out a key premise, restating the conclusion as a premise, or reasoning in a circle.

• **Complex question**: Multiple questions are concealed in a single question.

• **False dichotomy (dilemma)**: An " either . . . or . . . " premise hides additional alternatives.

• **Suppressed evidence**: Arguer ignores important evidence that requires a different conclusion.

 Fallacies of Ambiguity: The conclusion depends on some kind of linguistic ambiguity:

• **Equivocation**: Conclusion depends on a shift in meaning of a word or phrase.

• **Amphiboly**: Conclusion depends on an incorrect interpretation of an ambiguous statement made by someone other than the arguer.

Fallacies of Illicit Transference: An attribute is incorrectly transferred from the parts of something onto the whole or from the whole onto the parts:

• **Composition**: An attribute is incorrectly transferred from the parts to the whole.

• **Division**: An attribute is incorrectly transferred from the whole to the parts.