Recap of procedure for judging arguments (p. 75)

(1) What is the argument’s main conclusion and its premises?

(2) (a) Is the argument deductively valid? If not, skip to (3).
   (b) If yes, is it deductively sound? If yes, stop. If no go to (4)

(3) (a) Is the argument inductively strong? If no, skip to (4).
   (b) If yes, is it inductively cogent? If yes, stop.

(4) Though the argument falls short of both, which sort of argument is intended: deductively valid or inductively strong?

To answer (2.b) or (3.b), you must ask whether the premises are true.

**Deductively sound**  
deductively valid + premises are true  
At (2.b) you have already determined argument is deductively valid.

**Inductively cogent**  
inductively strong + premises are true  
At (3.b) you have already determined argument is inductively strong.

So at (2.b) or (3.b), the part that remains is to see whether premises are true.

Chapter 4: guidelines for evaluating claims for which no argument is presented

These claims may be supported elsewhere, but no support is given here.  
These claims may be asserted on their own, but they may also be used as premises.  
All premises are unsupported claims, so the guidelines in Chapter 4 can help us decide whether it is reasonable for us to accept the premises in an argument -- that is, to accept them as true.

Chapter 4  guidance based largely on the source of a claim and how it is presented

**Chapter 5  Faulty reasoning**

**Two major categories of fallacies** – kinds of faulty reasoning

1. **irrelevant premises** (make argument inductively weak) (p. 187)
2. **unacceptable premises**
   
   Chapter 4: reasons not to accept premises, based on
   a. how claims are presented (manipulative, one-sided, biased)
   b. who is providing information: reasons not to trust source
   c. limits of 1st-person experience – ways we know we are apt to be misled, make mistakes

   Chapter 5: unacceptable because of content
**IRRELEVANT PREMISES**

**Genetic fallacy**
Suggesting a claim should be rejected because of its origin (who believes or defends it), without citing features of origin relevant to likelihood of its truth.

**Ad hominem**
Appeal to the person
Arguing that a claim is false or should be rejected by criticizing its advocate; attacking the person rather than his claims, positions, or qualifications (not a fallacy if the criticism is that the person lacks relevant information or expertise).

**Tu quoque**
X is hypocritical in claiming P. So P is false, or you shouldn't believe P.

**Poisoning the well**
Arguing against a position by trying attacking the credibility of the person who advocates it.

**Guilt by association**

**Fallacy of composition**
Parts have a characteristic, therefore the whole of which they are parts has that characteristic.
(or members of a group / group as a whole)
Ex: Each part of the car is lightweight. Therefore the car is lightweight.

**Fallacy of division**
From premise saying that a group or whole has a characteristic, concluding member or part has it (or from average for a group to individual in the group)
Ex: The average test score for students who do all homework is higher than the class average. Ralph did all the homework. So Ralph’s test score is higher than the class average.
Ex: California is densely populated. So the quad on campus is densely populated.

**Equivocation**
Argument depends upon switching meanings of an expression partway through the argument (p. 179)

**Appeal to popularity**
(appeal to the masses)
Lots of people believe this, therefore it is true.

**Appeal to tradition**
This is traditionally believed. Therefore it is true.

**Appeal to ignorance**
I don’t know (you can’t prove) this is false. Therefore it is true. (p. 181)

**Appeal to emotion**
Attempting to get someone to believe or do something by trying to get them to feel a certain way about it
Ex: Ralph will lose his scholarship if he fails this class, so you should give him a passing grade.
Red herring  An irrelevant point introduced to distract the hearer or reader from the issue.

Straw man  Describing a position in a way that makes it appear weaker than it really is, to make it easier to refute (often by oversimplifying, exaggerating, or distorting)

Ex:  They [the Screenwriter's Guild] said "Oh, no. We're not interested in doing something intelligent. We'll just throw darts in the dark and let the chips fall where they may."

Quote from Nick Counter, President of the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers, re Screenwriters' Guild response to the Alliance's suggestion for study of future business prospects as the basis of contract negotiations

"Hollywood Screenwriters' Strike Looms" by Kim Masters

UNACCEPTABLE PREMISES

begging the question  circular argument; assuming the point one is trying to defend
(different from use of this expression to mean raising or prompting the question)

false dilemma  saying or assuming there are just 2 alternatives when there are really more
Ex:  Either you support me or you support terrorists.
Ex:  Either you pass this economic reform plan this week or the US economy will fall apart.

slippery slope  If A is true, so is B, and then so is C .... which is unacceptable. So A must not be true.
Ex:  If a man with no hair is bald, so is a man with just one hair. In that case a men with 2 hairs is bald,, and so on. Then every man would be bald. So a man with no hair can't be bald.
If we accept or do A, that will lead to B, which will lead to C, .... which is unacceptable. So we should reject A.
Ex:  If we allow gay marriage, we'll have to allow adults to marry minors. If we llow that, we'll have to let adults marry small children, and then we'll have to allow them to marry animals.
There is no significant difference between A and B, and no significant difference between B and C, .... which is unacceptable. So we should reject A.

**hasty generalization**

Basing a general claim on too few cases

**faulty analogy**

A is similar to B in one respect. So A is like B in another (unrelated) respect.

Argument by analogy is legitimate where the first similarity is appropriately related to the second

Ex1: legitimate argument by analogy

Agnes found her philosophy class last semester interesting. She'll probably find this philosophy class interesting, too.

Ex 2: faulty analogy

Agnes took an 11 AM class last semester and found it interesting. This class meets at 11 AM. So she'll probably find this one interesting too.

Ex 3: faulty analogy

Some people think vanilla ice cream is bad, and others don't. Each opinion is equally legitimate. Similarly, some people think the theory of evolution is true, and others don't. Each opinion is equally legitimate.
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