Informal Fallacies
‘Fallacy’: A defect in an argument (*other than a false premise*) that causes an unjustified inference

(*non sequitur* - “it does not follow”).

*Formal Fallacy*: A defect in the *form* (or *structure*) of a *deductive* argument.

*Informal Fallacy*: A defect in the *evidence* of an *inductive* argument.
Informal Fallacy: A defect in the evidential content of an inductive argument.

1. Fallacy of Relevance: The wrong kind of evidence

You should get an iPhone. It’s the phone that popular and smart people use.
Informal Fallacy: A defect in the evidential content of an inductive argument.

1. Fallacy of Relevance: The wrong kind of evidence
2. Fallacy of Sufficiency: Insufficient amount of evidence

Every woman I’ve date turned out to be a liar. Women are untrustworthy.
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**Informal Fallacy:** A defect in the *evidential content* of an inductive argument.

1. **Fallacy of Relevance:** The wrong *kind* of evidence
2. **Fallacy of Sufficiency:** Insufficient *amount* of evidence
3. **Fallacy of Presumption:** Confusion about what the evidence *supports*

You can either get an iPhone, or a Galaxy 7. Android phones are difficult to use. You should get an iPhone.
In the document, there is an example of an informal fallacy: the argument that "Men are created with unalienable rights. Women aren’t men, so they don’t have unalienable rights." This example illustrates the fallacy of relevance, where the conclusion does not follow from the premises because the evidence is not relevant to the conclusion.
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I. Fallacies of Relevance - wrong *kind* of evidence

A. **Appeal to Force** (*ad baculum*) - direct or indirect threat to the audience

B. **Appeal to Pity** (*ad misericordiam*) - using pity to sway the audience

C. **Appeal to the People** (*ad populum*) - using popularity to sway the audience -

1. **Bandwagon** - “everyone else is doing it ...”
2. **Vanity** - “*X* is special, and they ...”
3. **Snobbery** - “If you do it, you’ll be special like...”
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I. Fallacies of Relevance - wrong *kind* of evidence

A. Appeal to Force (*ad baculum*) - direct or indirect threat to the audience

B. Appeal to Pity (*ad misericordiam*) - using pity to sway the audience

C. Appeal to the People (*ad populum*) - using popularity to sway the audience

D. Attacking the Person (*ad hominem*) - focusing on the opponent, not the argument

   1. Abusive - personal criticism
   2. Circumstantial - guilt by association
   3. *Tu Quoque* ("you too") - you do it too!
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I. Fallacies of Relevance - wrong *kind* of evidence

A. Appeal to Force (*ad baculum*) - direct or indirect threat to the audience

B. Appeal to Pity (*ad misericordiam*) - using pity to sway the audience

C. Appeal to the People (*ad populum*) - using popularity to sway the audience

D. Attacking the Person (*ad hominem*) - focusing on the opponent, not the argument -

E. Straw Man - oversimplifying your opponent’s argument in order to knock it down
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F. Red Herring - changing the subject to distract the audience

G. Accident - misapplication of a general rule to a specific case

H. Missing the Point (ignoratio elenchi) - drawing the wrong conclusion from legitimate premises
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II. Fallacies of Sufficiency - insufficient evidence

A. Appeal to Authority (*ad verecundiam*) - unqualified authority

B. Appeal to Ignorance (*ad ignorantiam*) - the lack of evidence is evidence for ...

C. Hasty Generalization - insufficient cases to warrant the conclusion

D. False Cause - unsupported correlation of events
   1. *Post Hoc (ergo propter hoc)*
   2. Oversimplification - ignoring complicating factors

E. Slippery Slope - bad consequences are sure to follow ...

F. Weak Analogy -
III. **Fallacies of Presumption** - *never assume*

A. **Begging the Question** *(petitio principii)* - assuming what needs to be proven

B. **Complex Question** *(ad ignorantiam)* - a question *within* a question

C. **False Dichotomy** *(absolute disjunction)* - assuming only two options when more are possible
IV. **Fallacies of Ambiguity** - confusion over *meaning*

A. **Equivocation** - applying multiple meanings to a single term

B. **Division** - What’s true of the whole, is not necessarily true of the parts

C. **Composition** - What’s true of the parts, is not necessarily true of the whole

D. **Amphiboly** - deliberate misinterpretation of ambiguity