

FALLACIES RULES

Ad hominem abusive: attack a person's age, character, family, gender, ethnicity, social or economic status, personality, appearance, dress, behavior, or professional, political, or religious affiliations.

Ad hominem "you too" (tu quoque): the attempt to refute a claim by attacking its proponent on the grounds that he or she is a hypocrite, upholds a double standard of conduct, or is selective and therefore inconsistent in enforcing a principle.

Ad hominem vested interest: attempt to refute a claim by arguing that its proponents are motivated by the desire to gain something (or avoid losing something).

Straw man: attempt to refute a claim by confusing it with a less plausible claim (the straw man) and then attacking that less plausible claim instead of addressing the original issue.

Appeal to force (ad baculum): the attempt to establish a conclusion by threat or intimidation.

Appeal to authority (ad verecundiam): we accept (or reject) a claim merely because of the prestige, status, or respect we accord its proponents (or opponents).

Appeal to the masses (ad populum): we infer a conclusion merely on the grounds that most people accept it.

Appeal to pity (ad misericordiam): we are asked to excuse or forgive an action on the grounds of extenuating circumstances.

Appeal to ignorance (ad ignorantiam): X has not been proved, therefore x is false.

Red herring (changing the subject): an extraneous or tangential matter used purely to divert attention away from the issue posed by the argument.

Irrelevant conclusion (missing the point; ignoratio elenchi): the premises of an argument warrant a different conclusion from the one that the arguer draws

Circular reasoning (begging the question and petition principia): assuming what we are trying to prove (assumes its own conclusion).

Question-begging epithet: phrases that prejudice discussion and assume the very point at issue.

Complex question (loaded question): presupposing an answer to a logically prior question.

Equivocation (ambiguity): the meaning of an expression shifts during the course of an argument.

Amphiboly: arguments whose meanings are indeterminate because of loose or awkward sentence construction.

Accent: emphases that generate multiple and often misleading interpretations.

Accident (destroying the exception): ignoring exceptions to a rule. Fallaciously moves from a general statement to a particular.

Hasty generalizations (converse-accident): fallaciously inferring a conclusion about an entire class of things from inadequate knowledge of some of its members. Fallaciously moves from particular statements to a general statement

False analogy: comparing things in an analogy that are too dissimilar.

Gambler's fallacy: the gambler falsely assumes that the history of outcomes will affect future outcomes.

False Cause (post hoc ergo propter hoc – "after this, therefore because of this"): confusing a cause with an effect; inferring a causal connection based on mere correlation.

Suppressed evidence (cherry picking the evidence): intentionally failing to use information suspected of being relevant and significant.

Denying the antecedent (fallacious modus tollens): denying the antecedent of an if-then statement, and then inferring that the consequent must also be denied.

Affirming the consequent (fallacious modus ponens): affirming the consequent in an if-then statement, and then inferring that the antecedent is true.

Composition: invalidly imputing characteristics of one or more parts of a thing to the whole of which they are parts.

Division: invalidly imputing characteristics of the parts to the whole to the parts.

Excluded middle (false dichotomy, misuse of "or"): making a false assumption that only one of a number of alternatives holds.

Slippery slope (misuse of "if-then"): the conclusion of an argument rests upon an alleged chain reaction, suggesting that a single step will result in an undesirable outcome.