

Basics

Reasoning/logic- Aims at Persuading us by showing that a claim is true/reasonable

Rhetoric Aims at persuading us by relying on our non logical physiological traits

→ Use

→ Mention

Mention vs Use

Mention using the word **not mentioning** the **definition**

Example CIA started to use waterboarding to refer to induced suffocation in the late 70s

Use using the word to **refer** to the **act**

Example I don't see anything wrong with waterboarding

→ Non Rhetorical

→ Rhetorical

Non Rhetorical VS Rhetorical

Non Rhetorical Wants a direct answer

Rhetorical trying to make a point rather than get an answer

Three types of Rhetorical Strategies

→ Content Directed

→ Subject Directed

Non Rhetorical VS Rhetorical (cont)

→ Rhetorical Fallacies

Premise examples

what is the unstated premise ? Anyone who has seen the movie knows that it's terrible. So, you should know that it's terrible.

You have seen the movie

unstated premise 1. ? 2. Mark is a human being 3. Therefore mark is mortal ? = all human beings are mortal

Argument tips and hints

what is the unstated premise ? Anyone who has seen the movie knows that it's terrible. So, you should know that it's terrible.

You have seen the movie

Argument tips and hints (cont)

unstated premise 1. ? 2. Mark is a human being 3. Therefore mark is mortal

? = all human beings are mortal

example of an invalid argument 1. Some Wisconsinites are rich 2. Some Wisconsinites are republicans Therefore, some republicans are rich

Can we conclude from the fact that an argument is not sound that it is not deductively valid? No, from the fact that the argument is not sound we can conclude that either it is not valid or one of the premises is false.

Argument tips and hints (cont)

Is it possible to have a sound argument and a false conclusion? Why or why not? No. This is not possible. For an argument to be sound it must be (1) valid (if the premises are true then the conclusion must be true) and (2) it must have all true premises. (1) and (2) necessitate that a sound argument has a true conclusion.

difference between inductive and deductive While the conclusion of an inductive argument can only be likely, a conclusion of a deductive argument is certain.



By emmaadams

Published 23rd February, 2023.
Last updated 23rd February, 2023.
Page 1 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**
Measure your website readability!
<https://readable.com>

Argument tips and hints (cont)

Can we conclude from the fact that an argument is not sound that it is not deductively valid?

No, from the fact that the argument is not sound we can conclude that either it is not valid or one of the premises is false.

Example of a Valid deductive argument that contains a false conclusion.

P1: If I go to the store, I will learn how to fly. P2: I went to the store. C: So I learned how to fly.

Example of a Sound argument

If a city is in Germany then it is in Europe. Cologne is in Germany. Therefore, it is in Europe. This argument is sound because: i) it is valid and ii) it's premises are true.

you can have multiple conclusions for something

A valid Argument can have a false conclusion AND a false premise

(North America example)

Things that are not arguments

List of Claims

We are fifteen years into this new century. Fifteen years that dawned with terror touching our shores; that unfolded with a new generation fighting two long and costly wars; that saw a vicious recession spread across our nation and the world. It has been, and still is, a hard time for many. But tonight, we turn the page.

Conditionals An argument in which the premises, if true, demonstrate or establish the conclusion.

Things that are not arguments (cont)

Statement ♣If you drink more, you'll have a hangover tomorrow. ♣If he has been stealing, then he deserves to be fired

Casual Claims Causal claims identify the cause of something. They explain why something is the case or happens.

Argument John must love kale because he eats it a lot. **Casual Claim** Because John loves kale he eats it a lot.

Things that are not arguments (cont)

Step 1. Find the two events, states or facts that are related in the claim. Step 2. Determine which one of the events, states or facts is typically the cause and which one is typically the effect of the other one. Step 3. Find the premise indicator. Step4. If what comes after the premise indicator is the effect, the statement is an argument. If what comes after the premise indicator is the cause then the statement is a causal claim



By emmaadams

cheatography.com/emmaadams/

Published 23rd February, 2023.

Last updated 23rd February, 2023.

Page 2 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**

Measure your website readability!

<https://readable.com>

words I don't know		words I don't know (cont)		Content Directed Strategies	Indirect Content Based Strategies (cont)
Mixed rhetorical strategies	Rhetorical strategies that can be used both directly and indirectly. Examples of such strategies include hyperbole and rhetorical Analogy.	Aristotle's three modes of persuasion	Ethos: Persuasion by the speaker's personal attributes (reputation, accomplishments, expertise, looks, charisma) Pathos: Persuasion by arousing emotions with a skillful use of rhetoric. Logos: Persuasion by rational arguments and reasoning.	Aims at supporting or undermining an idea by presenting its content in a smart way that makes it more likely that we will accept or reject it.	Loaded Question Asking a question to make you believe it is true (humans are more likely to believe something when it is implied)
Parsimony Principles	Principles according to which views that are simpler and posit fewer entities should be preferred to more complex views.	Rhetorical Force	The rhetorical force of an expression is its ability or power to express and elicit emotional and other psychological responses in the audience. Expressions can have almost identical literal meanings but different rhetorical forces.	Indirect Content Based Strategies Weaseling use words to help: (A) Protect a statement from criticism by weakening it. While (B) hoping the audience will still believe the stronger version *common terms: up to, some, perhaps, possibly Ex: loose up to 37 pounds in 28 days Downplaying speaker tells you something is the case but cleverly uses language to implicitly undermine its significance ex; Ex: mary has a mere high school diploma Ex: karl is a "professor" of mathematics	ex Why does the president hate immigrants? Explicitly asks: why does the president hate immigrants? Implies: the president hates immigrants Indirect Hyperbole make an exaggerated or non exaggerated claim which gives it persuasive force



By emmaadams

Published 23rd February, 2023.
 Last updated 23rd February, 2023.
 Page 3 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**
 Measure your website readability!
<https://readable.com>

Indirect Content Based Strategies (cont)

ex Ex: **I would kill myself before i eat at this restaurant again.** You are saying something directly but you **want people to believe what you are indirectly saying** (I Don't want you to believe i want to kms I want you to believe that the food is bad.) OR She cooked so much food for her party; there was enough for an army!

Innuendo says something explicitly but they also want you to believe something else that is NOT weaseling, downplaying, indirect hyperbole or preposition (more indirect - stressing certain words)

Indirect Content Based Strategies (cont)

Example 1 What do you think is being implied by the innuendo in this dialogue? In other words, how are things going for B?
A: "How's it going?"
B: "...it's going."
(Answer things are not going well)

Example 2 What do you think is being implied by the innuendo in this dialogue? Cicero: "[Marc Antony] is here now, in your hands. I am merely stating facts; I am not suggesting any particular course of action..." Brutus: "I will not take the course of action you're not suggesting." (answer killing Marc antony)

Direct Content Based Strategies

Euphemisms Positive expression used in place of a negative expression with the same literal meaning in order to persuade the audience of a claim

Example The fear that the new administration might reintroduce **enhanced interrogation** techniques is unjustified.

Dysphemism negative expression used in place of a positive expression with the same literal meaning in order to persuade the audience of a claim

Example Its wrong to give tax breaks to the **obscenely** rich

Direct Content Based Strategies (cont)

Direct Hyperbole one exaggerates a claim hoping that the audience will be more likely to accept the exaggerated claim saying something explicitly is what you want them to believe

Example Cable news has gone round the bend: the only thing you hear on Fox News is right-wing rant, and the only thing you hear on MSNBC are left-wing rants.



By emmaadams

cheatography.com/emmaadams/

Published 23rd February, 2023.
Last updated 23rd February, 2023.
Page 4 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**
Measure your website readability!
<https://readable.com>

Direct Content Based Strategies (cont)		Arguments and Main components		Arguments and Main components (cont)		Stereotype (cont)	
Proof Surrogates	support a claim by suggesting that there is agreement about it or that there is agreement about it or that there is strong support for it when there is not much agreement and existence of support is in dispute	Series of statements that aim at proving rational reasons for believing in a claim		Validity:	argument is valid when it is impossible for the premises to be true and the conclusions false	Examples	new yorkers are rude, Jews are successful in business, Illegal immigrants are criminals, Only tree huggers believe in climate change.
		claim	any sentence that is true or false	ex			
		Rational Reasons:	Reasons that show that a claim is true or more likely to be true	Soundness:	argument is valid if premises are true	→ Rhetorical	Supporting a claim about individuals by placing them within a stereotyped group to make a conclusion
		Non-Ra-tional Reasons:	Reasons that are causes, Reasons that do not indicate the truth	ex			
Example common phrases: widely accepted, recognized, it's obvious that, as we all know studies show	The Great Depression of the 1930s was needlessly prolonged by government policies now recognized in retrospect as foolish and irresponsible. OR Obamacare is a disaster; you know it; I know it; they know it.	Premises: statements that are given in support of the conclusion		Inductive:	new information is in the conclusion If premise is true conclusion might not		
		indicators : come before the premise Since, For, In view of, Because		Subject Directed Strategies			
		Conclusion Claim that the argument supports		aim at supporting/undermining an idea by supporting/undermining the proponents of the idea or the group that the idea is about			
		Indicators: Thus, Therefore, Consequently, Hence, So, This implies that		Stereotype			
Reasoning							
Deductive reasoning:		no new info in the conclusion premise = true -> conclusion true		→ Non Rhetorical	assenting to a stereotype (i agree w the generalizati-on/just commenting on the stereotype)		
ex							

Stereotype (cont)	Ad Hominem (cont)	Ad Hominem (cont)	Ad Hominem notes (cont)
<p>Examples I'm sure John's mom will be waiting outside she's a helicopter mom, Better hide the bottle before John arrives. He's Irish! April is a study freak so I bet she got an A on the test</p> <p>Not all generalizations are stereotypes</p> <p>Some rules</p> <p>Often have socio-political implications</p> <p>these are part of the explanation for why stereotypes exist</p> <p>Most scientific generalizations are not stereotypes</p> <p>Often essentialize feature that they attribute to a group</p> <p>You don't have to have knowledge on whether something is false - but if it looks like a scientific claim it is less likely to be a stereotype.</p> <p>EXAMPLE: THE JAPANESE ARE MORE PRONE TO HAVE BOWEL CANCER</p>	<p>You tell me it's dangerous to text when I'm driving but I have seen you doing it! (inconsistency between claim and behavior)</p> <p>You tell me that it's dangerous to text while driving but just last week you were saying it isn't! (inconsistency between claim and behavior)</p> <p>→ Questioning one's motivation</p> <p>li: What do you think about Betsy DeVos' idea that replacing public schools with charter schools and the voucher system will help improve education?</p> <p>Kyle: Of course it's a terrible idea! Didn't you know that the DeVos family has made a lot of money by investing in K12, a company that manages charter schools?</p> <p>→ Personal Attack</p> <p>Mary: Dad says it's dangerous to stay out after 11pm?</p> <p>Jack: It's not.</p> <p>Dad's just a control freak!</p> <p>→ Refuting By Association</p> <p>Using stereotype to disprove/refute claim</p>	<p>Bob: You think banning guns will reduce gun violence? That sounds like what those left-wing university professors would say. Banning guns would actually make us less safe.</p> <p>*Do not confuse a personal attack with an ad hominem attack that uses a personal attack.</p> <p>Just a personal attack: Mark is a liar! Personal attack ad hominem Jasmine: Mark says he didn't steal the car. Peter: He's a liar! Of course, he did.</p> <p>Ad Hominem notes</p> <p>What Makes It an Ad Hominem?</p> <p>When are motivations, inconsistencies, personal attributes or associations completely irrelevant to the evaluation of a claim and when are these factors relevant? Provide an example to explain your reasoning.</p>	<p>Motivations, inconsistencies, personal attributes or associations are relevant/irrelevant depending on the conclusion we are supposed to draw. When motivations, inconsistencies, personal attributes or associations are reasons to doubt the source of the claim or the claim itself, the ad hominem attack can be considered a reason to be cautious about accepting the claim.</p> <p>Diagramming Arguments</p> <p>Diagramming represents the logical structure of an argument (what supports what)</p> <p>Step 1: find and label components of argument Use numbers (components are premises and conclusion)</p> <p>Step 2: using arrows represent the rational components</p>
<p>Ad Hominem</p> <p>rejecting a person's claim or position by attacking them</p> <p>→ Accusation of Inconsistency</p>			



Diagramming Arguments (cont)

example Does Blank get support from the previous statements and does it provide support for any of the arguments

connecting what premises give support to the previous statements and what statements provide the conclusions in the argument

Points on Diagramming

Structure vs. shape The structure of the diagram matters not the shape (straight line vs weird pentagon - same thing)

Embedded arguments Some complex arguments are embedded in other arguments

One conclusion many arguments A complex argument can have multiple different arguments for a single conclusion

One premise many conclusions One premise can be a reason for multiple conclusions

co - operation Premises can work together

Points on Diagramming (cont)

Ambiguous structures Arguments can have ambiguous structures more than one way to get to a conclusion) diff arguments are divided by a line)

Opposing reasons Some components can be reasons against other components Some things don't support anything in the argument (these are hashed out)

Lines are only used for + when using two arguments for a conclusion - not a deep meaning

Rhetorical Fallacies

Strawman claim is false by misrepresenting/distorting it to make it vulnerable to attack/easy to refute

Rhetorical Fallacies (cont)

ex **Alex:** "I believe that some of the money for the defense budget should be reallocated to education spending."

Becca: "I can't believe that you want to cut the paycheck of the brave men and women who fight to defend our country!"

Line Drawing since there is no one way to define a concept or line between concept & opposite it should not be used

ex It's not clear how many people the planet can support. We should stop worrying about overpopulation."

Perfectionist assumes only available option is ideal or perfect

Rhetorical Fallacies (cont)

ex "I don't think we should sign him up for football. The odds of him getting into the NFL are slim to none."

False Dilemma assumes you only have two options

ex You can either be straight edge or an addict, so you better not try any drugs or alcohol.

Misplacing the burden of proof there is no proof for claim -> we should reject the claim



By emmaadams

cheatography.com/emmaadams/

Published 23rd February, 2023.

Last updated 23rd February, 2023.

Page 7 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**

Measure your website readability!

<https://readable.com>

Rhetorical Fallacies (cont)		Rhetorical Fallacies (cont)		Demagoguery (cont)		Demagoguery (cont)	
ex	Obviously, Clinton was lying about her emails. Can you prove she wasn't? •Since there is no proof that she wasn't lying, she was lying. •Since there is no proof that guns shouldn't be outlawed they should be outlawed •Since there is no proof that ghosts don't exist, they do exist.	ex	The superiority of the Aryan race is proved by the inferiority of the other races, That God exists is proved by scripture because scripture is the word of God and thus cannot be fa	Otherising	Dividing people into in-groups and out-groups and viewing or treating the members of the out-group as inherently different from the members of the in group	Fear Mongering	Invoking intense fear of the members of the out-group in the audience
who has burden of proof	legal principles, change, inherent credibility, parsimony principles (in cases of controversy both parties have burden of proof)	THIS IS NOTHING (it j kept showing up) "I refuse to draw a line between your side of the room and mine. We should just respect each other's stuff!"		ex	Nazis otherized jews, the Roma and homosexuals	Other Rhetorical strategies of demagogues	
begging the question	offers a reason that is repacking the claim into a question	Rhetoric by Omission Persuading someone to believe something by omitting necessary information sometimes information can change bc of definition changes, think aids example; more people weren't getting aids than before the definition was more inclusive to all types of aids		Demonizing	Representing someone or members of a group as inherently evil or wicked in character.	Personal insult and Ridicule:	often personally insult or ridicule those who disagree with them as an alternative to deliberation and reasoning
		Demagoguery A figure who exploits prejudice, fear and ignorance among the public in order to achieve and further his/her goals		ex	Nazi's demonized jews	Empty Promises:	making a promise just for the sake of their effect on the audience and without any regard for the practical possibility of what is promised or sometimes without the intention to deliver it.
		CORE Rhetorical Strategies		Scapegoating	Blaming the members of the out group for the problems from which members of the in group suffer	Repetition:	making the same point over and over in order to convince the audience to believe it
				ex	nazis scapegoat jews as responsible for economic hardship and as the reason germany lost ww1		



By emmaadams

Published 23rd February, 2023.
Last updated 23rd February, 2023.
Page 8 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**
Measure your website readability!
<https://readable.com>

Demagoguery (cont)

suspending belief: avoidance of critical thinking or logic in examining something unreal or impossible in reality, such as a work of speculative fiction, in order to believe it for the sake of enjoyment

Suspending your belief on something because you have some type of bias, you suspend your belief bc you can't make a full judgment

Charitable

When possible, assume the best interpretation

Example **What the speaker says:** Glen Beck said President Obama's foreign policy is weak? But Glen Beck is an idiot! President Obama's foreign policy is fine.
What the speaker has in mind: Glen Beck said President Obama's foreign policy is weak? But Glen Beck is an idiot! So, don't give much weight to his opinion.

Charitable (cont)

Sometimes we do not fully articulate what we mean to say: If possible, assume the interpretation that does not attribute a fallacy to them.

Be constructive

When possible show how a problem can be fixed or avoided or give others a chance to explain or improve their reasons

Help speaker Avoid ad hominem by offering a different conclusion

Avoid non-constructive response: This is just an ad hominem!!
Glen Beck said President Obama's foreign policy is weak? But Glen Beck is an idiot! President Obama's foreign policy is fine.

Constructive response: I think that since John is known to be paranoid we shouldn't believe on the basis of his report that Mary is having an affair. But we can't conclude that Mary is not having an affair, can we?

Be Informative

When possible, make the problematic assumptions explicit and focus the discussion on those

Be Informative (cont)

Identify the problematic assumptions, Discuss the problematic assumptions, Discuss the premises of the valid deductive argument



By emmaadams

Published 23rd February, 2023.
Last updated 23rd February, 2023.
Page 9 of 9.

Sponsored by **Readable.com**
Measure your website readability!
<https://readable.com>