



## PRIMER CHART 1\_LOGICAL FALLACIES

### Some Important Rules to Remember<sup>1</sup>

#### THE FOUR PRIMARY LAWS/PRINCIPLES OF LOGIC

- a. **THE LAW OF (NON-) CONTRADICTION:** is the first of the primary principles of logic. It states “A is not non-A,” in other words, no statement, proposition, assertion, etc. can be both true and false at the same time and in the same sense.
- i. This is important because its usage signals to the hearer that there’s a falsehood. There are those who deny such a law (e.g., Hindus, New Ager, etc.), but the very law they try to refute, they employ. The reason for this is that it is a first principle of thought or *epistemology* (i.e., how we know what we know). Remember, whenever this law is violated, there is a falsehood.
  - ii. Example: “I believe Jesus rose from the dead, I do not believe He rose from the dead” is a violation of the law of contradiction.
    1. Again, “That cylinder on my desk has the shape of a square”. Square circles don’t exist!
- b. **THE LAW OF EXCLUDED MIDDLE:** is the second primary law of logic. It states “A, or non-A,” in other words, a proposition or statement is *either* true or false. It must be one or the other.
- i. This law is important because it helps us understand whether *or* not a state of affairs obtains.
  - ii. Example: Say I tell my wife Trish “It is raining outside” and it actually is raining outside, then it is true that it is raining outside, and the opposite is false (i.e., that it is not raining outside).
- c. **THE LAW OF IDENTITY:** is the third primary law of logic. It states “A is A,”

<sup>1</sup> Sources used for chart: Angeles, Peter A., *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Philosophy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, (1992 by Peter A. Angeles); Geisler & Brooks, *Come Let Us Reason: An Introduction to Logical Thinking*, (1990 by Baker Books); and Hurley, Patrick J., *A Concise Introduction to Logic*, (7<sup>th</sup> Edition, 2000 by Wadsworth)

in other words, if any statement is true, then it is true.

- i. This law is important because, among other things, it helps us distinguish *who* or *what* for example, committed a certain crime.
  - ii. That is, “*Joe* is the one that killed the dog, *Sally* did not.” To blame *Sally* for the death of the dog, for whom *Joe* is responsible, among other things, violates the law of identity. Namely, the killer of the dog is identical to *Joe*, not identical to *Sally*, because *Joe* is the killer of the dog, and *Sally* is not identical to the killer.
- d. **THE LAW OF LOGICAL OR RATIONAL INFERENCE:** is the fourth primary law of logic. It states “if  $A=B$ , and  $B=C$ , then  $A=C$ .”
- i. This is important epistemologically (i.e., the study of how we know what we know) for it helps us get at all discursive or non-axiomatic knowledge.
  - ii. Example: “If *Trish* is my wife, and my wife is the mother of *Alexandra*, then the mother of *Alexandra* is *Trish*”

These four laws are not only the essence of logic, but they are also crucial to all coherent or intelligible discussions or arguments. These laws are part of the furniture of the universe, one cannot, not use them, for to even **dispute** them, is to **employ** them.

### **FIVE ASPECTS OF REASONS REGARDING THE NATURE AND NECESSITY OF LOGIC**

***a. FIRST, THE PRIMARY PRINCIPLES/LAWS OF LOGIC/REASON ARE FIRST PRINCIPLES OF EPISTEMOLOGY***

- i. First principles are, “Statements that are self-evident and/or fundamental to the explanation of a system and upon which the system depends for consistency and coherence.”
- ii. These principles are axiomatic (i.e., self-evident propositions)
- iii. Which cannot not be used, there’s no “getting around them”

***b. SECOND, DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN TRUE AND FALSE OR WHAT IS APPLICABLE AND NOT APPLICABLE IS MEANINGFUL ONLY IF LOGIC IS TRUE AND APPLICABLE***

- i. If there were no law of contradiction, the concept of true or false could not obtain.
- ii. That is, no topic could obtain a true/false application, for we could

not call something false, without first assuming that there is a state of affairs that is true (non-contradiction).

- iii. In other words, the law of (non-) contradiction states that “A is not on-A,” in other words, no statement, proposition, assertion, etc. can be both true and false at the same time and in the same sense. This law **draws the lines** between what is false and true.

**c. THIRD, A STATEMENTS MEANINGFULNESS OR SIGNIFICANCE OR TRUTHFULNESS DEPENDS ON LOGIC**

- i. For example, if logic is not true, nor can it be applied to the topic we are covering, it then follows that the statement is meaningless. The fact however, is that a statement has meaning specifically because logic is true and applicable.
- ii. In other words, logic must obtain if statements or significance has meaning.

**d. FOURTH, TO DENY OR TRY TO DISPROVE THE NEED, NECESSITY, AND TRUTH OF LOGIC A PERSON MUST USE IT**

- i. By saying, “logic is not true”, they affirm it is true, namely that it is the true state of affairs that logic is not true.
- ii. By doing this they disprove their original assertion “logic is not true”
- iii. In other words, if one uses logic in order to refute it, it is self-evidently not true, for they use it in order to deny it. Example: “No puedo escribir ni una palabra en Espanol (I.e., I cannot write not even one word in Spanish) is obviously false, for I just did.

**e. FIFTH, ONE CANNOT NOT USE LOGIC IN THE REAL WORLD**

- i. Life without logic is like jumping in the water without getting wet. It cannot, not be the case.
- ii. Example: “Let’s go to the beach” does not make sense if logic is not true. Which beach do we go to? Manhattan, Newport, Torrance, Zuma, etc. What state or country are we referring too? If logic were not true, we couldn’t even begin going to say Manhattan Beach in California, for there is no *distinction* to make from some other Manhattan.
- iii. If logic is not true, how is it that your creditors call *your* phone and *not* your neighbors? Logic is part of the furniture of the universe, that is why you get the call, and your neighbor does not.

FALLACY	DESCRIPTION & EXAMPLE
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Three False Cause Fallacies</b></p> <p><b>False Cause fallacies</b> come under the heading of <b>weak induction</b>. This weak induction occurs not when the premises are logically irrelevant to the conclusion, but rather because the connection between the premises and the conclusion is not strong enough to support the conclusion.</p> <p><b>False Cause</b> occurs when the link between the premises and the conclusion depends on some imagined causal connection that probably does not exist.</p> <p>Whenever an argument is suspected of committing this fallacy, the reader should be able to say that the conclusion depends on the supposition that X causes Y, whereas X probably does not cause Y at all.</p>	<p><b>Post hoc ergo propter hoc</b> (“after this, therefore on account of this”). This variety of the fallacy presupposes that just because one event precedes another event, the first event then causes the second. Mere temporal succession is not sufficient to establish a causal connection. Yet, this is the kind of reasoning that’s behind most forms of superstition.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “A black cat crossed my path and later I tripped and sprained my ankle. Black cats really are bad luck”</p> <hr/> <p><b>Non causa pro causa</b> (“not the cause for the cause”) is a variety of this fallacy that is committed when what is taken to be the cause of something is really not the cause at all, and the mistake is based on something other than mere temporal succession.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Suzy, I know why Church attendance was down this week...because brother Joe was preaching.” When in fact a flue epidemic was sweeping across the country and happened to take its effect at the time brother Joe was preaching.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Oversimplified cause</b> is the variety of fallacy that occurs when a multitude of causes is responsible for a certain effect but the arguer selects just one of these causes and represents it as if it were the sole cause.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Suzy, I know why church attendance is down this weekend, because it rained today” When in fact, it was not only the rain but also that brother Joe was preaching. For every time he preaches, and beforehand the congregation knows it’s his turn to preach, they do not show up.</p>

<p><b>Three Prestige Jargon Fallacies</b></p> <p><b>Prestige Jargon Fallacy</b> is another type of logical snobbery where one expresses things in such a complex way that people dare not question the claims truthfulness. Another way of saying it is “fancy talk.” It confuses complexity with authenticity. It may also be likened to the scene in the Three Stooges “Disorder in the Court” where Curly asks the defense attorney if he’s giving Curly the “double talk” [see Movie]</p>	<p><b>Blinding/Blinded by Science</b> using very high scientific language without using understandable terms to the common folk. When a claim or product is made to look stronger than it actually is. Again one may use technically sounding language but it does not then follow that it is a good argument. At the expense of giving accurate descriptions, a technical term is used to hide the truth of a matter.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> a <i>domestic engineer</i> is used in the place of a <i>house wife</i></p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Euphemisms</b> are the substitution of an agreeable or less inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant. This is done, by using the good sounding word or phrase instead of an offensive sounding word.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> Someone might ask, “Did you <i>lie</i>?” No, I only <i>embellished</i> the issue,” Or: “Did you <i>steal</i> that...? No I was simply <i>overseeing</i> it for my client in his absence”.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Titles</b> are the deliberate deception employed when one twists the meaning of a job’s description.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> Instead of Joe telling his neighbor that he is a ditch digger for the city of Torrance, he conceals it by giving it the title of “excavating engineer”</p>
<p><b>The Straw Man, Red Herring, and Missing the Point (Ignoratio Elenchi) Fallacies</b></p>	<p><b>Straw Man</b> is a fallacy committed when an arguer distorts an opponent’s argument for the purpose of more easily attacking it, demolishes the distorted argument, and then concludes that the opponent’s real argument has been demolished.</p> <p><b>Red Herring</b> is a fallacy committed when the arguer diverts the attention of the reader/listener by changing the subject to a different but sometimes subtly related one.</p>

	<p>This fallacy gets its name from a procedure used to train hunting dogs to follow a scent.</p> <p>The red herring fallacy can be confused for being a straw man because both have the effect of drawing the reader off track. The difference is that the <b>straw man</b> <i>distorts</i> the opponents argument and concludes by knocking it down. The <b>red herring</b> <i>ignores</i> the arguer's argument and subtly changes the subject.</p> <p><b>Missing the Point (Ignoratio Elenchi)</b> illustrates a special form of irrelevance when the premises of an argument support one particular conclusion, but then a different conclusion often vaguely related to the correct conclusion is drawn. <b>Ignoratio Elenchi</b> means "ignorance of the proof." Thus, the arguer is ignorant of the logical implications of his premises, and it results in drawing the wrong conclusion that misses the point entirely.</p>
<p><b>The Psychogenetic Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Psychogenetic Fallacy</b> holds that because you were conditioned to believe in God, your views can be reduced to a psychological state. This fallacy reduces one's beliefs to a <i>mere</i> mental state:</p> <p><b>Example:</b> "You are mentally ill if you <i>do</i> believe in God" OR "You are mentally ill if you <i>do not</i> believe in God"</p>
<p><b>Special Pleading / Suppressed Evidence Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Suppressed Evidence</b> obtains if an inductive argument ignores important evidence. A cogent argument is an inductive argument with good reasoning and true premises. The requirement of true premises includes the stipulation/proviso that the premises not ignore some important piece of evidence that outweighs the presented evidence, and entails a very different conclusion.</p> <p>If an inductive argument does indeed ignore such evidence, then the argument commits the fallacy of <i>suppressed evidence</i>.</p> <p><i>Suppressed evidence</i> fallacy is similar to begging the question. The difference is that <i>suppressed evidence</i> leaves out a premise that requires a <i>different</i> conclusion. <i>Begging</i></p>

	<p><i>the question</i> leaves out a premise that is needed to support the <i>stated</i> conclusion. Because both of these fallacies proceed by leaving a premise out of the argument, there are cases where the two overlap.</p> <p>In other words, <i>suppressed evidence</i> only cites the evidence that appears to support one's position, rather than evidence that is detrimental to one's case.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> While soliciting a pre-owned car, the sales person only answers the questions raised by the customer, "Is the engine in good running condition?" "Yes it runs very well!" But the salesman fails to tell the potential customer that the transmission needs to be overhauled.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Special pleading</b> is a fallacy that is committed when only the evidence that supports one view is cited, and the rest is not reported. That is, this fallacy is committed when one applies a universally applicable principle to the opposition, but fails to apply the same principle to oneself.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> "Do as I say, not as I do" OR Postmodernist's commit this often when they view because in both instances the arguer leaves out a or state: "There are no positions that are true, except ours"</p>
<p><b>The Fallacy of Division and Composition</b></p>	<p><b>Composition</b> is the fallacy that when the conclusion of an argument depends on the erroneous transference of an attribute from the parts of something onto the whole. The fallacy occurs when it is argued that because the parts have a certain attribute, then it follows that that the whole has that attribute too and the situation is such that the attribute in question cannot be legitimately transferred from parts to whole.</p> <p>These fallacies are <i>informal</i> because they cannot be discovered by mere inspection of the form of the argument. Moreover, detecting this fallacy requires general knowledge of the situation and of the nature of the attribute being transferred.</p>

	<p><b>Example:</b> “Trish likes Reese’s Peanut Butter cups. She also likes pepperoni pizza. Therefore, Trish would like a pepperoni pizza topped with Reese’s Peanut Butter Cups”</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>Division</b> is the opposite of composition. As composition goes from parts to whole, <i>division</i> goes from whole to parts. The fallacy occurs when the conclusion of an argument depends on the erroneous transference of an attribute from a whole (class) onto its parts (members).</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “The jig-saw puzzle, when it is assembled is square. Therefore, all the pieces are square”</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>The <i>Is-Ought</i> (Naturalistic) Fallacy</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>and</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>The <i>Ought-Is</i> (Wishful Thinking) Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b><i>Is/Ought Fallacy</i></b> holds that whatever is the case, descriptively speaking, morally ought to be the case. This confuses what is (descriptive) to what ought (prescriptive) to be the case.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Abortion is the law, therefore it ought to be obeyed.” Because it is the law, does not make abortion right. What would have occurred had Abraham Lincoln committed this fallacy with the issue of Black people and slavery?</p> <p>Perhaps a civil war would not have broken out when it did. Lincoln did not descriptively argue, but rather prescriptively. That is, he already knew that blacks were slaves, but Lincoln argued that it was wrong to treat them as slaves.</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b><i>Ought /Is Fallacy</i></b> is committed when one holds that because something ought to be the case, it is the case.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Christians will be kind to me because they belong to God’s kingdom”. They may belong to God’s kingdom, but that does not then mean that they will be kind, they may very well be angry irritable people whom God must discipline in order that they may bear the fruit of the Spirit of kindness.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Two Forms of the <i>Tu Quoque</i> (You too or Your another) Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b><i>Tu Quoque</i></b>: (“you too”) fallacy begins the same way as the <i>ad hominem abusive and circumstantial</i>, except that the second arguer attempts to make the first arguer appear to be hypocritical or arguing in bad faith</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “How dare you argue that I should stop smoking because it is bad for my health, why you smoke yourself”</p> <p>.....</p> <p><i>Tu Quoque</i> is presenting evidence that a person’s <u>actions</u> are not consistent with that for which he is arguing</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “Christians always talk about loving each other, good Lord they are always fighting among themselves.”</p> <p>.....</p> <p><i>Tu Quoque</i> is also presented in the form of showing that a person’s views are <u>inconsistent</u> with what he <u>previously</u> believed and therefore that person cannot be trusted and/or that person’s new view is to be rejected.</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “Joe used to hold to a post-millennial eschatological position, but now he holds to the pre-tribulation eschatological position. How can you listen to someone who at one time held a view, but now holds the contrary view? Joes present position is inconsistent with his prior view, and therefore he should not be trusted”</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b><i>Tu Quoque</i></b> sometimes is related to the <i>fallacy of two wrongs make a right</i>.</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “David cheated on his exams to get through college, so also you shouldn’t condemn Billy for cheating on his exams to get through college”</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Dicto Simpliciter</i> (Fallacy of Accident or The General rule)</b></p>	<p><b><i>Dicto Simpliciter</i></b> occurs when the fallacy applies a general rule to a particular case that has significant differences from the general cases to which the rule properly applies.</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “A wise son accepts his father’s discipline”</p>

	<p>(Prov.13: 1) does not apply to the son whose father comes home drunk and beats him. OR “You should never kill a human being” does not apply to the one whose life is being threatened. There is “justifiable homicide” where one kills another to defend his life.</p>
<p><b>Reductive Fallacies</b></p> <p><i>Reductive fallacies</i> attempt to make a complex issue simple by considering only one aspect of it. These fallacies reduce a many-faceted question to a single point. They assume that descriptions on one level, excludes or invalidates descriptions on another level</p>	<p><b>Genetic Fallacy</b> is a type of reductive fallacy in which the single issue focused on is the <i>source</i> or <i>origin</i> of the argument. That is, a product is wrong because of its origin.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Logic was invented by Aristotle therefore its bad because he was not a Christian.” Just because Aristotle <i>codified</i> logic, not invented logic, does not mean that it is bad. This is an attempt to belittle a position by its source, it does not deal with the argument itself.</p> <p><b>Nothing-Buttery fallacy</b> is a reductive fallacy that argues that something is nothing but some aspect of it.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “The mind is nothing but the brain. We are nothing but matter in motion. Humans are nothing but their bodies” How could I know that I was nothing but my body, and/or brain unless I was <i>more</i> than my body/brain.</p>
<p><b>The Fallacy of Continuum (The Beard)</b></p>	<p><b>Fallacy of the Beard/Continual Fallacy</b> is the fallacy of presuming that there’s no real difference between the extremes on a continuum because the differences between adjacent positions along the continuum are almost imperceptible.</p> <p>Because there is such variety of spectrum between two extremes, there’s no real difference. But, just because its difficult to determine doesn’t mean its impossible to determine.</p> <p>“Since we are not sure when a person passes from life to death, there then is not much difference between life and death.” Just because its difficult to tell when life begins does not mean there is not a definitive point when life does begin.</p> <p>Moreover, just because differences are slight and subtle, it doesn’t follow that they are not important</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Since people are more or less good and evil, and</p>

	everyone is a sinner before God, then we should not call Mother Theresa good, and Hitler evil”
<b>The Circumstantial <i>ad hominem</i></b>	<p><b><i>Ad Hominem</i></b> involves two arguers: one advances the argument (direct/indirect). The other responds by directing his attention not to the first person’s argument, but to the <i>person himself</i>. The <i>purpose</i> of the ad hominem argument is to discredit another person’s argument by placing its author in a bad light. Thus, for the fallacy to be committed, there must be at least two arguers (at least implicitly)</p> <p>Arguments against the person have three different forms, but our focus is on the <i>circumstantial</i> aspect of the fallacy.</p> <p><b><i>Ad hominem circumstantial</i></b>: begins by heaping verbal abuse on the opponent. This is where the respondent attempts to discredit the opponent’s argument by alluding to certain circumstances that affect the opponent. Used often in political debate</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “Of course Dr. Jones argues for the rights of women to have an abortion, the majority of his income comes from performing such heinous acts against the unborn.”</p>
<b>Poisoning The well fallacy</b>	<p><b><i>Poisoning the Well Fallacy</i></b> alleges that if one argues a specific way, they will be poisoned (insights ridicule). That is, instead of a direct insult, one is labeled a fool if they argue in a certain manner. This is closely related to loaded language.</p> <p><b>Example</b>: “Only an idiot would believe that we can know anything about...” OR “If you are against me, you’re a terrorist”</p>
<b>Two forms of the false dichotomy or dilemma (black or white) fallacy</b>	<p><b><i>False Dichotomy</i></b> is also called “false bifurcation” and the “either-or fallacy.” This is committed when one premise of an argument is an “either...or...” (disjunctive) statement, that presents two alternatives as if they were jointly exhaustive (as if no third alternative were possible). A false dichotomy is classified as a fallacy of presumption because</p>

	<p>the soundness of the argument depends on the presumption that the two alternatives presented are the only ones that exist.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Either get me that bike for Christmas Daddy, or the kids on the block will make fun of me. I know you don’t want me to be made fun of, so I know that you will get me that bike for Christmas”</p> <p>.....</p> <p><b>False Dilemma (Black or White)</b> says that something is either A or B, A is false, therefore, it must be B. This is only a fallacy if there are more than two options. One can also be given many options, without the whole spectrum of options disclosed.</p> <p><b>E.g.,</b> “Rabbi who sinned, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind? (Jn.9:2-3) Neither, ...this was so the works of God may manifest in him...</p> <p><b>Black-and-White-fallacy</b> stated differently is arguing a) with the use of sharp distinctions despite any factual or theoretical support for them, or b) by classifying any middle point between extremes as one of the extremes.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “If he is not a Christian, then he is a decent person,” OR “If he empathizes with Fidel Castro, then he is a communist,” OR “If he is an Arminian, he does not do all things for God’s glory.”</p>
<p><b>Two forms of the appeal to ignorance (<i>argumentum ad ignorantiam</i>) fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Appeal to Ignorance (<i>Argumentum ad Ignorantiam</i>)</b> occurs when the premises of an argument state that nothing has been proved one way or the other about something, and the conclusion then makes a definite assertion about that thing.</p> <p>Usually, the issue involves something that is incapable of being proved or something that has not yet been proved.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “Nobody has proved that X is true. Therefore X is false.” OR conversely “Nobody has proved that X is false, therefore X is true”</p> <p>.....</p>

	<p><b>Argument from ignorance</b> argues that something is true because no one has proved it to be false, or arguing that something is false because no one has proved it to be true.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> Atheist: “God can’t exist because I have never seen any evidence for Him” Christian: “God must exist because no one can prove his non-existence.” Both views should be rejected because the appeal is based on ignorance. Aquinas stated, “The contrary of a truth can never be demonstrated”</p>
<p><b>The Equivocation Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Equivocation Fallacy</b> is the fallacy that occurs when the conclusion of an argument depends upon the fact that a word or phrase is used, either explicitly or implicitly, in two different senses in the argument. Such arguments are either invalid or have a false premise and in either case they are unsound arguments.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “God is no respecter of persons” KJV does not mean that God does not respect people, but that he plays no favorites</p>
<p><b>The Argumentum ad Spiritum Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Argumentum ad Spiritum</b> is committed when a person argues to the Spirit as the source of any said action. That is, someone claims that the Holy Spirit said something (x) but it cannot be because it contradicts Scripture.</p> <p><b>Example:</b> “God told me to divorce my wife because she was not the one He chose for me” OR “God told me to go rob a bank and give 40% to missions, 10% to my church, and 50% I can keep because He cares about my happiness.”</p>
<p><b>The Argumentum ad Lapidum (argument to the stone) Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Argumentum ad Lapidum</b> is committed when the “irresistible force meets the immovable object.” In other words, good arguments do not always convince people. Aquinas held that knowledge does not compel belief, and while it is necessary, it is not sufficient for belief.</p> <p>There’s a line between notitia/assensus and fiducia. That’s why some cardiologists smoke, even though they understand the side effects of said habit.</p>

	<p><b>Example:</b> “You can lead a horse to water, but you can’t force him to drink” OR “I am required to provide you with an argument, but not with an understanding”</p>
<p><b>The <i>Almighty Will</i> Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>Examples:</b>          “If you can will it, you can do it”          “Word-Faith Movement”          “Motivational Speaking”          “Where there’s a will, there’s a way”          “If you want it enough, you can do it”          “Human Potential Movement (“Believe in Yourself”)”          “Occult”</p>
<p><b>The <i>Trivial Objection</i> Fallacy</b></p>	<p><b>The <i>Trivial Objection</i> Fallacy</b> is committed when someone supposes or asserts that any objection to a view/argument is sufficient to overthrow it. The fact is that some arguments are better than others; some are too weak to be considered effectively.</p> <p><b>Example:</b>          “You mispronounced “Nietzsche”, so you don’t know what you’re talking about”</p>

<p><b>Time Fallacies</b></p> <p>Age is irrelevant to truth but the arguer uses it to mask their arrogance</p>	<p><b><i>Argumentum ab annis (argument because of age)</i></b></p> <p>This is where it is believed that new ideas are better than old ones simply because they are newer. Advertisers are notorious for this fallacy.</p> <p><i>Explicitly</i> the old is bad; <i>implicitly</i> the new is good          “You believe <i>that</i>?! That’s primitive. It’s medieval. Come join the rest of us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century” C. S. Lewis called this “Chronological snobbery.”</p> <p><b><i>Argumentum ad novitam (argument from new) – the fallacy of novelty</i></b></p> <p><i>Explicitly</i> the new is good; <i>implicitly</i> the new is good.          This is manifest in the Western idea to follow fads (Eastern = tradition). This is an appeal to “different-ness”</p> <p>Bultmann: “Paul: had a primitive world view; the enlightened man of the 20<sup>th</sup> century can’t possibly believe in miracles.”</p> <p><b><i>Argumentum ad antiquitam (argument from antiquity) – appeal to tradition</i></b></p> <p>The past is good. <b>People say</b>, “We’ve always done it this way.” Church boards can be guilty of this. <b>Response</b>: “Why should we continue to do it this way?”</p> <p>“My father, and my father’s father did it this way.”          “Hinduism is much older than Christianity, therefore, it must be better.”</p>
---	---