

#### Informal Logic

Informal Logic is an introductory guidebook to the basic principles of constructing sound arguments and criticizing bad ones. Non-technical in approach, it is based on 186 examples, which Douglas Walton, a leading authority in the field of informal logic, discusses and evaluates in clear, illustrative detail. Walton explains how errors, fallacies, and other key failures of argument occur. He shows how correct uses of argument are based on sound strategies for reasoned persuasion and critical responses. Among the many subjects covered are: forms of valid argument, defeasible arguments, relevance, appeals to emotion, personal attack, straw man argument, jumping to a conclusion, uses and abuses of expert opinion, problems in drawing conclusions from polls and statistics, loaded terms, equivocation, arguments from analogy, and techniques of posing, replying to, and criticizing questions.

This edition takes into account many new developments in the field of argumentation study that have occurred since 1989, many created by the author. Drawing on these developments, Walton includes and analyzes thirty-six new topical examples and also brings in recent work on argumentation schemes.

Ideally suited for use in courses in informal logic and introduction to philosophy, this book will also be valuable to students of pragmatics, rhetoric, and speech communication.

Douglas Walton is Distinguished Research Fellow of CRRAR (Centre for Research in Reasoning, Argumentation and Rhetoric) at the University of Windsor, and Assumption University Chair in Argumentation Studies (University of Windsor). The author of more than thirty books, he has received major research grants from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Isaak Walton Killam Memorial Foundation. He was awarded the ISSA Prize by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation for his contributions to research on fallacies, argumentation, and informal logic, among many honors he has received for his achievements.



## Informal Logic

# A PRAGMATIC APPROACH Second Edition

Douglas Walton
University of Winnipeg





#### CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521713801

© Douglas Walton 1989, 2008

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1989 Second edition published 2008

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Walton, Douglas N.

Informal logic : a pragmatic approach / Douglas Walton. – 2nd ed.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-0-521-88617-8 (hardback) – ISBN 978-0-521-71380-1 (pbk.)

1. Logic. 2. Reasoning I. Title. BC177.W324 2008 168-dc22 2007042373

ISBN 978-0-521-88617-8 hardback ISBN 978-0-521-71380-1 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



For Karen, with love.



### Contents

Preface  Asknowledgments		page xi	
Acknowledgments		XV	
1	Argument as reasoned dialogue		1
	1.1	Types of argumentative dialogue	3
	1.2	Components of argumentative dialogue	8
	1.3	Persuasion dialogue (critical discussion)	10
	1.4	Negative rules of persuasion dialogue	15
	1.5	Some major informal fallacies	18
	1.6	The straw man fallacy	22
	1.7	Argument from consequences	24
	1.8	The critical perspective	34
2	Que	38	
	2.1	Presuppositions of questions	39
	2.2	Complex questions	42
	2.3	Have you stopped abusing your spouse?	46
	2.4	Disjunctive questions	50
	2.5	Arguments from ignorance	56
	2.6	Replying to a question with a question	61
	2.7	Begging the question	64
	2.8	Questions in polls	67
	2.9	Advocacy and push polling	71
	2.10	Question-answer rules in dialogue	73
3	Criticisms of irrelevance		78
	3.1	Allegations of irrelevance	79
	3.2	Global irrelevance	82
	3.3	Question-answer relevance	85
	3.4	Setting an agenda for a discussion	88
	3.5	Red herring versus wrong conclusion	92
	3.6	Varieties of criticisms of irrelevance	99
	3.7	Summary	102
4	Appeals to emotion		106
	4.1	Argumentum ad populum	107

vii



	4.2	The argument from popularity	111
	4.3	Problems with appeals to popularity	114
	4.4	Threatening appeals to force	117
	4.5	Further ad baculum problems	124
	4.6	Appeals to pity	128
	4.7	Overt, pictorial appeals to pity	130
	4.8	Summary	133
5	Valid	arguments	136
	5.1	Deductive validity	137
	5.2	Identifying arguments	138
	5.3	Validity as a semantic concept	142
	5.4	Valid forms of argument	144
	5.5	Invalid arguments	149
	5.6	Inconsistency	152
	5.7	Composition and division	156
	5.8	Defeasible reasoning	159
	5.9	Jumping to a conclusion	162
	5.10	Summary	166
6	Perso	onal attack in argumentation	170
	6.1	The abusive ad hominem argument	171
	6.2	The circumstantial ad hominem argument	177
	6.3	The attack on an arguer's impartiality	185
	6.4	Non-fallacious ad hominem arguments	190
	6.5	Replying to a personal attack	194
	6.6	Critical questions for an ad hominem argument	198
	6.7	Important types of error to check	201
	6.8	Some cases for further discussion	203
7	Appe	eals to authority	209
	7.1	Reasonable appeals to authority	211
	7.2	Argumentation scheme for appeal to expert	
		opinion	215
	7.3	Critical questions for the appeal to expert opinion	217
	7.4	Three common errors in citing expert opinions	223
	7.5	Evaluating appeals to expert opinion in written	
		sources	225
	7.6	Expert testimony in legal argumentation	229
	7.7	How expert is the authority?	232
	7.8	Interpreting what the expert said	237
	7.9	A balanced view of argument from expert opinion	241



8	Inductive errors, bias, and fallacies		246
	8.1	Meaningless and unknowable statistics	247
	8.2	Sampling procedures	251
	8.3	Insufficient and biased statistics	254
	8.4	Questionable questions and definitions	256
	8.5	The post hoc argument	259
	8.6	Six kinds of <i>post hoc</i> errors	263
	8.7	Bias due to defining variables	270
	8.8	Post hoc criticisms as raising critical questions in an	
		inquiry	272
	8.9	Strengthening causal arguments by answering	
		critical questions	275
	8.10	Examples of drawing causal conclusions from	
		scientific studies	279
	8.11	Summary	285
9	Natural language argumentation		289
	9.1	Ambiguity and vagueness	290
	9.2	Loaded terms and question-begging language	294
	9.3	Equivocation and amphiboly	300
	9.4	Arguments based on analogy	305
	9.5	Argumentative use of analogy	308
	9.6	Criticizing arguments from analogy	312
	9.7	Slippery slope arguments	315
	9.8	Subtle equivocations	321
	9.9	Variability of strictness of standards	325
	9.10	Conclusions	328
Bił	Bibliography		
Inc	Index		



## Preface

The purpose of this handbook is to furnish the reader with the basic methods of critical analysis of arguments, as they occur in natural language in the real marketplace of persuasion on controversial issues in politics, law, science, and all aspects of daily life. This is very much a practical (applied) subject, because each individual argument is, to some extent, unique. The technique of applying the general guidelines of criticism for each type of argumentation scheme to each individual case requires practical skills of good judgment and judicious interpretation in identifying the argument, and sorting out the main thread of the argument from the discourse it is contained in. These are pragmatic skills requiring prior identification of the type of dialogue in which an argument occurs.

Logical semantics is an important subject in its own right. It is the construction of consistent and complete theories based on semantical constants and the use of variables. Chapter 5 is about semantics, but the remaining eight chapters are mainly about the pragmatics of argumentation. For the most part, applying critical rules of good argument to argumentative discourse on controversial issues in natural language is an essentially pragmatic endeavor. It is a job requiring many of the traditional skills associated with the humanities: empathy, a critical perspective, careful attention to language, the ability to deal with vagueness and ambiguity, balanced recognition of the stronger and weaker points of an argument that is less than perfectly good or perfectly bad, a careful look at the evidence behind a claim, the skill of identifying conclusions, sorting out the main line of argument from a mass of verbiage, and the critical acumen needed to question claims based on expert knowledge in specialized claims or arguments.

A basic requirement of critical argumentation is that any argument that a critic attempts to evaluate must be set out and sympathetically appreciated in the context of dialogue in which the argument occurs. This means that we must sometimes contend with lengthy and complex arguments, and we must sometimes probe in depth into the unstated parts of an argument, into the arguer's position and commitments as indicated by the evidence of the text, and into the question that the argument was supposed to



answer. This requirement means that if a criticism is to be made of an argument, or if the argument is to be called weak, erroneous, or even fallacious, substantial justification for the reasonableness of the criticism must be given in the form of documented evidence from the actual wording and context of the given argument. This dialectical type of approach to the study of arguments means that the question-answer context of an argument is crucially important to bring out in all reasoned criticism and analysis of arguments. Thus every argument is conceived along the lines of a challenge-response model of interactive dialogue, where two people "reason together." Some of the most important types of contexts of argumentation will be profiles of sequences of question-answer dialogue on disputed subjects. Thus generally the theory of informal logic must be based on the concept of question-reply dialogue as a form of interaction between two participants, each representing one side of an argument, on a disputed question.

As Erik Krabbe (1985) has indicated, the concept of critical argument analysis as a dialogue logic deserves to be the cornerstone of the emerging theories of argumentation now the subject of so much interest. In recent times, the attention to the classical logic of propositions and its extensions has begun to shift, through the need for a practical approach to the study of arguments, towards a pragmatic conception of reasonable dialogue as a normative structure for argument. This shift has been signalled by the appearance of many new practically oriented textbooks but also by scholarly work in this emerging field. Two new important journals have recently begun publication – *Informal Logic* and *Argumentation* – and the Association for Informal Logic and Critical Thinking, as well as the International Society for the Study of Argumentation, have been founded. On June 26-28, 1978, the First International Symposium on Informal Logic was held at the University of Windsor. In more recent years, the development of argumentation systems has become an increasingly important research topic in computing, especially in the area of artificial intelligence. The first international conference on computational models of argument (COMMA) was held in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Liverpool in September 2006. Topics studied included systems for learning through argument, tools for supporting argumentation, dialogue-based argument systems, and computational properties of argumentation (Dunne and Bench-Capon 2006). These trends point to a welcome shift towards the practical in logic, accompanied by a growing use of argumentation theory in computing, and a resurgence of interest in the study of argumentation generally.



> At this point in the history of the subject, it is timely to raise the terminological question of whether it should still be called 'informal logic' or something else, such as 'argumentation'. It is good that the term 'logic' should be retained, but it is a problem that for the purposes of computing, an exact science, any useful system of analyzing and evaluating arguments needs to be at least partly formal. Standardized forms of argument that represent common species of arguments encountered in everyday conversational argumentation need to have a precise, partly formal structure. However, these forms of argument also have a pragmatic factor. As a result, the practice is arising in artificial intelligence of calling these forms of argument semi-formal. Verheij (2003, 172) has described them as "semiformal rules of inference" or "semi-formal argument templates". What is happening now could be described as a movement from informal logic to semi-formal logic. By these lights, a more suitable title for this book might be Semi-formal Logic, but the title Informal Logic has been retained (but with the new subtitle, A Pragmatic Approach), to preserve continuity with the first edition.

> Whatever happens in the next few years in the theory of argumentation study, it is clear that a new approach to logic and argument study has already begun to be taught in logic classes around the world, and has been taken up not only in philosophy but in fields like computing, linguistics, and speech communication. While that new logic is based on new theoretical foundations, including abstract structures of formal dialogues and pragmatic structures of discourse analysis, at the same time it is a subject that has moved much closer to many of the traditional aims of the humanities through a more practical approach to the study of particular arguments in natural language.



## Acknowledgments

The work in the first edition was supported by a Killam Research Fellowship, a Fellowship from the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences, and a research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. The techniques used were much refined and improved by discussions with Frans van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst during workshops and discussions at the University of Amsterdam, and also by many discussions with Erik Krabbe during a five-month period of joint research on a related project at NIAS in 1987–1988.

Another important stimulus in writing the first edition was the International Conference on Argumentation in Amsterdam in June 1986. Among other colleagues whose papers, conversations, or correspondences were particularly helpful in shaping ideas in the present work, I would like to thank Francisca Snoeck Henkemans, Tjark Kruiger, Johan Kaufmann, John Woods, Bob Binkley, Jim Mackenzie, William Mann, Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., Dick Epstein, Max Cresswell, Michael Wreen, Christoph Lumer, Tony Blair, John Haugland, Ralph Johnson, Michael Schmitt, Trudy Govier, John Biro, Ed Damer, Maurice Finocchiaro, Alan Brinton, and Michel Meyer. Terry Moore, the editor of the first edition, suggested writing a second edition. I respected his judgment and enjoyed his company. I miss Terry, and after he died in 2004, I kept his advice in mind, and it was what led to my writing the second edition.

There were some influences on my thinking about the subjects in the second edition of this book that should be acknowledged. A discussion forum that shaped my views on some pragmatic aspects of relevance was the conference Relevance in Argumentation, held in June 1991, at McMaster University. Among the participants with whom I discussed the problem of relevance at the conference, I would especially like to thank Frans van Eemeren and Rob Grootendorst again, as well as Scott Jacobs and Sally Jackson, Chris Tindale, John Woods, Tony Blair, Jim Freeman, David Hitchcock, and Erik Krabbe. For support in the form of a Research Grant in 1994–1997, and another one in 1999, I would like to thank the



Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I would also like to thank the Canada—U.S. Fulbright Foundation for a Senior Fulbright Fellowship in 1999, and the Department of Communication Studies of Northwestern University for hosting me as Visiting Professor during that period. While I was at Northwestern, discussions with Jean Goodwin and Michael Leff were instrumental in refining many of my views on relevance, and other pragmatic features of argumentation.

I learned a lot about new developments in computing that turned out to be central to my changing views on argumentation theory at the Symposium on Argument and Computation at Bonskeid House in Perthshire, Scotland, in June and July 2000. I would especially like to thank Tim Norman and Chris Reed for organizing the conference, and for what they taught me during the tutorials and discussions at the conference. The following conference participants also deserve thanks for informing me about the state of the art of AI and clarifying many questions related to defeasible reasoning: Trevor Bench-Capon, Daniela Carbogim, Jim Crosswhite, Aspassia Daskalopulu, John Fox, Jim Freeman, Janne Maaike Gerlofs, Michael Gilbert, Rod Girle, Floriana Grasso, Leo Groarke, Corin Gurr, David Hitchcock, Hanns Hohmann, Erik Krabbe, Peter McBurney, Henry Prakken, Theodore Scaltsas, Simone Stumpf, and Bart Verheij.

Finally, I would like to give special thanks to Tom Gordon, Henry Prakken, Chris Reed, and Bart Verheij, for many discussions over the period of 1997–2007 that helped to sharpen my grasp of how crucial questions should be used as tools for analyzing and evaluating argumentation. My thanks as well to Rita Campbell for creating the index, and to Anahid Melikian for help with proofreading.



Informal Logic