

Fallacies

Ad Hominem Argument – An attack on the opponent rather than the opponent's argument.

Faulty Analogy – A misuse of an argument by analogy, which is an argument two things that are alike in some respects must be alike in other respects.

Questionable Authority – Supporting a conclusion by depending on the judgement of someone who is not a reliable authority on the subject at hand.

Appeal – Force, threat of force, or intimidation is used to coerce an opponent into accepting the conclusion.

Abusive – Attack the opponent's character rather than address his or her conclusion.

Popular appeal – The opinion of the majority is used as support for a conclusion.

Hand Waving – Claiming something is so (or not so) because every one knows it's so.

Begging the Question – The premise and conclusion are different workings of the same position.

Equivocation – A key term shifts meaning during the conversation.

Hasty Generalization – Using a few instances to form universals or all reaching conclusions.

Appeal to Ignorance – Arguing that a claim is true (or false) because we have no evidence proving otherwise.

Post Hoc, Ergo Proptec - Claiming that one thing is cause by another because it follows the other.

Red Herring – An irrelevant issue introduced to distract attention from the issue at hand.

Slippery Slope – Assuming that an action will lead to an unwanted outcome as the result of many small stapes that will inevitably follow.

Straw Man – A distortion of an opponent’s actual postion.

Appeal to tradition – To argue that something is moral because it is traditional, “It’s the way it has been handed down to use.”

Naturalistic Arguments – To argue from what is natural to what *ought* to be the case.

Circumstantial – To argue that ones opponent should accept a particular position because of his or her lifestyle or membership in a particular group.