

Logical Fallacies

personal attack (ad hominem)

an argument directed at a person, not the person's point

attacking the motive

attacking the person's motivation rather than his or her point

look who's talking (tu quoque)

argument is rejected because the person does not practice what he or she preaches

two wrongs make a right

attempting to justify argument because something else is worse

scare tactics

using fear to persuade

appeal to pity

attempting to evoke pity or compassion

bandwagon argument

an appeal toward being accepted or popular

straw man

distorting a point to make it easier to attack

red herring

using an irrelevant point to sidetrack audience

equivocation

using two or more meanings in same argument

begging the question

assuming as a premise the very thing trying to be proved

inappropriate appeal to authority

appeal to an unreliable, biased or unusual authority

incorrect or inaccurate citation

appeal to ignorance

assertion that something must be true because it has not been proven false (or vice versa)

false alternatives

creating a false either/or choice

loaded question

question contains an assumption

post hoc

assuming that two events are connected simply because one followed the other

mere correlation

assuming events are cause-and-effect simply because they occur together

oversimplified cause

assuming that an event has one particular cause when it actually has several

hasty generalization

drawing a conclusion from a biased and/or small sample size

slippery slope

concluding that a seemingly harmless action will lead to disaster

weak analogy

comparing things that are really not comparable

inconsistency

arguer uses contradictory claims

Many of these assume that there is otherwise insufficient evidence.

For Socratic seminar *arguer* could be *asserter* and an argument could be called a claim or assertion.

adapted from *Critical Thinking: A Student's Introduction 3rd edition*
by Bassham, Irwin, Nardone, and Wallace