

Additional LEA titles in Argumentation include

van Eemeren et al. • *Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory: A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments*

Johnson • *Manifest Rationality: A Pragmatic Theory of Argument*

van Eemeren and Grootendorst • *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*

For additional information, contact Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., or view the online catalog at www.erlbaum.com.

Argumentation

Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation



Frans H. van Eemeren
Rob Grootendorst
A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans



LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS
2002 Mahwah, New Jersey London

Overview of Rules For Critical Discussion and Fallacies



RULES FOR CRITICAL DISCUSSION

1. Freedom rule
Parties must not prevent each other from putting forward standpoints or casting doubt on standpoints.
2. Burden-of-proof rule
A party who puts forward a standpoint is obliged to defend it if asked to do so.
3. Standpoint rule
A party's attack on a standpoint must relate to the standpoint that has indeed been advanced by the other party.
4. Relevance rule
A party may defend his or her standpoint only by advancing argumentation related to that standpoint.
5. Unexpressed premise rule
A party may not falsely present something as a premise that has been left unexpressed by the other party or deny a premise that he or she has left implicit.

6. Starting point rule
No party may falsely present a premise as an accepted starting point, or deny a premise representing an accepted starting point.
7. Argument scheme rule
A standpoint may not be regarded as conclusively defended if the defense does not take place by means of an appropriate argument scheme that is correctly applied.
8. Validity rule
The reasoning in the argumentation must be logically valid or must be capable of being made valid by making explicit one or more unexpressed premises.
9. Closure rule
A failed defense of a standpoint must result in the protagonist retracting the standpoint, and a successful defense of a standpoint must result in the antagonist retracting his or her doubts.
10. Usage rule
Parties must not use any formulations that are insufficiently clear or confusingly ambiguous, and they must interpret the formulations of the other party as carefully and accurately as possible.

FALLACIES

Violations of rule 1 (freedom rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at the confrontation stage

- 1 *Placing limits on standpoints or doubts*
 - fallacy of declaring standpoints sacrosanct
 - fallacy of declaring standpoints taboo
- 2 *Restricting the other party's freedom of action*
 - * putting the other party under pressure
 - fallacy of the stick (= argumentum ad baculum)
 - fallacy of appeal to pity (= argumentum ad misericordiam)
 - * attacking the other party's person
(= argumentum ad hominem)
 - fallacy of depicting the other party as stupid, bad, unreliable, etcetera (= direct personal attack/"abusive" variant)
 - fallacy of casting suspicion on the other party's motives
(= indirect personal attack/"circumstantial" variant)
 - fallacy of pointing out a contradiction in the other party's words or deeds (= "tu quoque" variant)

Violations of rule 2 (burden-of-proof rule) by the protagonist at the opening stage

- 1 *Charging the burden of proof to the other party*
 - * in a nonmixed difference of opinion, instead of defending his or her own standpoint the protagonist forces the antagonist to show that the protagonist's standpoint is wrong
 - fallacy of shifting the burden of proof
 - * in a mixed difference of opinion the one party does not attempt to defend his or her standpoint but forces the other party to defend its standpoint
 - fallacy of shifting the burden of proof
- 2 *Escaping from the burden of proof*
 - * presenting the standpoint as self-evident
 - fallacy of evading the burden of proof
 - * giving a personal guarantee of the rightness of the standpoint
 - fallacy of evading the burden of proof
 - * immunizing the standpoint against criticism
 - fallacy of evading the burden of proof

Violations of rule 3 (standpoint rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at all the discussion stages

- 1 *Attributing a fictitious standpoint to the other party*
 - * emphatically putting forward the opposite standpoint
 - fallacy of the straw man
 - * referring to the views of the group to which the opponent belongs
 - fallacy of the straw man
 - * creating a fictitious opponent
 - fallacy of the straw man
- 2 *Misrepresenting the other party's standpoint*
 - * taking utterances out of context
 - fallacy of the straw man
 - * oversimplifying or exaggerating
 - fallacy of the straw man

Violations of rule 4 (relevance rule) by the protagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *The argumentation has no relation to the standpoint under discus-*

- fallacy of irrelevant argumentation (= ignoratio elenchi)
- 2 *The standpoint is defended by means other than argumentation*
 - * non-argumentation
 - fallacy of playing on the sentiments of the audience (= pathetic fallacy)
 - fallacy of parading one's own qualities (= ethical fallacy/abuse of authority)

Violations of rule 5 (unexpressed premise rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Adding an unexpressed premise that goes beyond what is warranted*
 - fallacy of magnifying an unexpressed premise
- 2 *Refusing to accept commitment to an unexpressed premise implied by one's defense*
 - fallacy of denying an unexpressed premise

Violations of rule 6 (starting point rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Meddling with the starting points by the protagonist by falsely denying that something is an accepted starting point*
 - fallacy of falsely denying an accepted starting point
- 2 *Meddling with the starting points by the antagonist by falsely presenting something as an accepted starting point*
 - fallacy of making unfair use of presuppositions in making assertions
 - fallacy of making unfair use of presuppositions in asking questions (= fallacy of many questions)
 - fallacy of using an argument that amounts to the same thing as the standpoint (= fallacy of circular reasoning/petitio principii/begging the question)

Violations of rule 7 (argument scheme rule) by the protagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Using an inappropriate argument scheme*
 - populist fallacy (symptomatic relation) (= argumentum ad populum)
 - fallacy of confusing facts with value judgments (causal relation) (= argumentum ad consequentiam)

Violations of rule 2 (burden-of-proof rule) by the protagonist at the opening stage

- 1 *Charging the burden of proof to the other party*
 - * in a nonmixed difference of opinion, instead of defending his or her own standpoint the protagonist forces the antagonist to show that the protagonist's standpoint is wrong
 - fallacy of shifting the burden of proof
 - * in a mixed difference of opinion the one party does not attempt to defend his or her standpoint but forces the other party to defend its standpoint
 - fallacy of shifting the burden of proof
- 2 *Escaping from the burden of proof*
 - * presenting the standpoint as self-evident
 - fallacy of evading the burden of proof
 - * giving a personal guarantee of the rightness of the standpoint
 - fallacy of evading the burden of proof
 - * immunizing the standpoint against criticism
 - fallacy of evading the burden of proof

Violations of rule 3 (standpoint rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at all the discussion stages

- 1 *Attributing a fictitious standpoint to the other party*
 - * emphatically putting forward the opposite standpoint
 - fallacy of the straw man
 - * referring to the views of the group to which the opponent belongs
 - fallacy of the straw man
 - * creating a fictitious opponent
 - fallacy of the straw man
- 2 *Misrepresenting the other party's standpoint*
 - * taking utterances out of context
 - fallacy of the straw man
 - * oversimplifying or exaggerating
 - fallacy of the straw man

Violations of rule 4 (relevance rule) by the protagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *The argumentation has no relation to the standpoint under discussion*

- fallacy of irrelevant argumentation (= ignoratio elenchi)
- 2 *The standpoint is defended by means other than argumentation*
 - * non-argumentation
 - fallacy of playing on the sentiments of the audience (= pathetic fallacy)
 - fallacy of parading one's own qualities (= ethical fallacy/abuse of authority)

Violations of rule 5 (unexpressed premise rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Adding an unexpressed premise that goes beyond what is warranted*
 - fallacy of magnifying an unexpressed premise
- 2 *Refusing to accept commitment to an unexpressed premise implied by one's defense*
 - fallacy of denying an unexpressed premise

Violations of rule 6 (starting point rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Meddling with the starting points by the protagonist by falsely denying that something is an accepted starting point*
 - fallacy of falsely denying an accepted starting point
- 2 *Meddling with the starting points by the antagonist by falsely presenting something as an accepted starting point*
 - fallacy of making unfair use of presuppositions in making assertions
 - fallacy of making unfair use of presuppositions in asking questions (= fallacy of many questions)
 - fallacy of using an argument that amounts to the same thing as the standpoint (= fallacy of circular reasoning/petitio principii/begging the question)

Violations of rule 7 (argument scheme rule) by the protagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Using an inappropriate argument scheme*
 - populist fallacy (symptomatic relation) (= argumentum ad populum)
 - fallacy of confusing facts with value judgments (causal relation) (= argumentum ad consequentiam)
- 2 *Incorrectly applying an argument scheme*

- fallacy of authority (symptomatic relation) (= argumentum ad verecundiam)
- fallacy of hasty generalization (symptomatic relation) (= secundum quid)
- fallacy of false analogy (relation of analogy)
- fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc (causal relation)
- fallacy of the slippery slope (causal relation)

Violations of rule 8 (validity rule) by the protagonist at the argumentation stage

- 1 *Reasoning that treats a sufficient condition as a necessary condition*
 - fallacy of denying the antecedent
 - fallacy of affirming the consequent
- 2 *Reasoning that confuses the properties of parts and wholes*
 - fallacy of division
 - fallacy of composition

Violations of rule 9 (closure rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at the concluding stage

- 1 *Meddling with the conclusion by the protagonist*
 - fallacy of refusing to retract a standpoint that has not been successfully defended
 - fallacy of concluding that a standpoint is true because it has been defended successfully
- 2 *Meddling with the conclusion by the antagonist*
 - fallacy of refusing to retract criticism of a standpoint that has been successfully defended
 - fallacy of concluding that a standpoint is true because the opposite has not been successfully defended (= argumentum ad ignorantiam)

Violations of rule 10 (usage rule) by the protagonist or the antagonist at all the discussion stages

- 1 *Misusing unclarity*
 - fallacy of unclarity (implicitness, indefiniteness, unfamiliarity, vagueness)
- 2 *Misusing ambiguity*
 - fallacy of ambiguity

General References



SURVEY OF ARGUMENTATION STUDIES

- van Eemeren, F. H. (Ed.). (2001). *Crucial Concepts in Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Snoeck Henkemans, A. F., Blair, J. A., Johnson, R. H., Krabbe, E. C. W., Plantin, Ch., Walton, D. N., Willard, Ch. A., Woods, J., & Zarefsky, D. (1996). *Fundamentals of Argumentation: Theory. A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

PRAGMA-DIALECTICAL THEORY OF ARGUMENTATION

- van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions. A Theoretical Model for the Analysis of Discussions Directed Towards Solving Conflicts of Opinion*. Dordrecht/Berlin: Foris/De Gruyter.
- van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies. A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1993). *Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse*. Tuscaloosa-London: The University of Alabama Press.
- van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (Eds.). (1994). *Studies in Pragma-Dialectics*. Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

