

PHI 103 - Inductive Logic
Lecture 2

Informal Fallacies

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - 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.

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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.

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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.

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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.

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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*
4. **Fallacy of Ambiguity:** Confusion about what the evidence *means*

Men are created with unalienable rights. Women aren't men, so they don't have unalienable rights.

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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...”

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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!

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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** -

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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

Inductive Logic

Part 2 - Informal Fallacies

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