**ENL213 Revision**

**Argument:**

1. Explicit Argument: straight forward; direct (example: essay or speech).

Implicit Argument: may not look like an argument at all (example: poster, photograph, cartoon, and poem).

2. An argument is both a process (two people seek a solution to a problem) and a product (any person’s contribution to the conversation at a given moment).

3. A discussion could be either formal (long and carefully prepared such as a PPT presentation or a speech) or informal (short such as a discussion among friends)

**Making a Claim:**

Consider:

1. The claim type you want to use.

2. What’s at stake?

3. List the criteria as to what is considered as good/bad or \*something\* in evaluation and definition claims.

4. Reasons.

**Seven Claim Types:**

1. Definition: usually includes either comparison (like/similar to/different from) or is \*something\*.

2. Evaluation: good/bad.

3. \*Casual: cause/effect; hard to identify and differentiate from definition so pay attention.

4. Narrative: usually includes “I”.

5. Rebuttal: Although, however. Refute.
*Note:*
Rebut 🡺 you completely don’t agree with the opponent’s argument.
Counter 🡺 you agree with the claim but you either don’t agree with the solution or you believe the claim does not go far enough.

6. Proposal: includes “should” or “should not”. Be careful though, it could also include an effect which makes it half causal.

7. Hybrid: a hybrid claim is one that has two or more (a mix) of the above claim types.

**Nineteen Fallacies:**

1. Fallacies of Logic:

 1. Begging the question: when the reason simply restates the claim in different words: “abortion is murder.”

2. Either/or: two choices appear possible but one of them is unacceptable so the remaining one is the better choice: “either we allow embryonic stem cell research or we condemn people with diabetes to a life without a cure.”

3. False analogies: comparing two subjects which are more different than alike: “banning guns on the basis that guns accidently kill people is like banning cars on the basis that cars accidently kill people.”

4. Hasty generalization: a generalization made on the basis of too little evidence: “don’t buy cheese from Mr. Smith, last week I got sick after eating it.”

5. Non sequitur: a claim supported by irrelevant premises: “genetically modified foods should be outlawed because they are not natural.”

6. Oversimplification: may be true, but the argument would be unacceptable because the solution is clearly more complex: “to pass your driving test, you just need to know the rules.”

7. Post hoc (cause/effect): when a sequential relationship is mistaken for a causal relationship: “cramming for a test really helps because last week I crammed for my psychology test and I got an A.”

8. Rationalization: excuses that avoid actual causes: “I could have finished my paper on time if my printer had been working.”

9. Slippery slope: assuming that if we allow x, then y and z will definitely happen: “if you miss classes tomorrow, then you will ruin your future because you will continue to miss classes, fail out of college, and end up working at a gas station.”

10. Stereotyping: making assumptions of people, regarding religion, nationality, ethnicity, or gender based on little information: “Italians are thieves. Last summer when I went to Italy my wallet was stolen.”

11. Part for the whole: picking out a part of the whole and arguing that what is true of this part is the same for the whole: “we should get rid of the DAE organization because many of their events have not been benefiting the community.”

12. Loaded labels: creating a definition: “people who oppose the “estate tax” have relabeled it the “death tax” in order to give it a negative connotation.”

13. Red herring: throwing an audience off track by using an unrelated or irrelevant point: “debating a gas tax increase is valuable, but I really think there should be an extra tax on SUV’s.”

14. False authority: when the person in question is not a legitimate authority on or is not qualified for the subject: “buy the new baby formula because Eva Longoria says it is the only food she gives to her baby.”

2. Fallacies of Emotion:

 1. Bandwagon: claims that you should do/believe something because everyone else does: “you should support gun control law, because the rest of the neighborhood does.”

2. Name calling: referring to the character of the opponent, and not their reasoning: “Senator Smith’s views on gas tax should be discounted because her husband works for a huge oil company.”

3. Polarization: exaggerates positions and groups by representing them as extreme and disruptive: “republicans are all rich.”

4. Strawman: oversimplifying an opponent’s argument to make it easier to refute: “so basically, you are saying that we should not fund inner-city schools because then the poor would have an equal education with the rest of society.”
 5. Poisoning the well: discrediting the opponent or opposing their view in advance: “before I give the floor to the next speaker, I must remind you that those who oppose my plan do not have the best interest of the working people in their hearts.”

**Aristotle’s Appeals:**

1. Ethos: the source’s credibility; the author’s authority.

2. Logos: the logic used to support a claim: facts, examples, statistics, or reasoning used to help support the argument.

3. Pathos: emotion: vivid language, imageries, etc.

**Audience Analysis:**

1. Who is the audience?

2. Is the argument geared towards this audience? \*Refer to Aristotle’s appeals\*.

**Eight Types of Evidence:**

1. Data from personal experience.

2. Data from observation and field study.

3. Data from interviews, questionnaires, or surveys.

4. Data from library internet research.

5. Testimony.

6. Statistical data.

7. Hypothetical examples.

8. Reasoned sequence of ideas.

**Rhetorical Context \*(should be in a paragraph form):**

1. What genre of argument is this?

 1. Newspaper Editorial.

 A. Short.
 B. Written in response to political events or social problems.

 2. Articles in scholarly journals.

 A. Published by non-profit academic journals funded by universities.

 3. Articles in public affairs or niche magazines.

A. Often reflects the political point of view of the magazine (informal); includes narratives rather than explicit thesis and reason organization.

2. Who is the author?

 1. What are their credentials?

 2. What is his or her interest in the issue?

3. What audience is s/he writing for?

4. What motivated the writer?

 1. Current event.
 2. Crisis.
 3. Pending legislation.
 4. Recently published alternative view.
 5. Another ongoing problem.

5. Purpose?

 1. Strong advocacy: they want you to take a side: persuade.
 2. Truth seeking: they want to find the truth: inform.

6. What information about where it was published will help explain their perspective or structure and style of the argument?

 1. Perspective:
 A. Broad.
 B. Narrow.

 2. Structure:
 A. Organized.
 B. Unorganized.

7. What is their angle of vision?

What is left out in the argument: could be the counter, emotion, credibility, or valid reasoning and logic.

**Visual: Evaluating Photographs:**

1. Who created the image or video? What bias might they have?

2. Who published the image or vide? What bias might they have?

3. Who is the intended audience?

4. What is being shown? \*discuss color, texture, expressions, wording, and style\*

5. Who is being represented and who is not being represented?