A claim is the assertion that authors would like to prove to their audience. It is, in other words, the main argument.

The grounds of an argument are the evidence and facts that help support the claim. The warrant, which is either implied or stated explicitly, is the assumption that links the grounds to the claim. Identify the claim, the grounds, and the warrant in the following <sentence>.

A **contradiction** occurs when a [proposition](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proposition) conflicts either with itself or established [fact](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fact).

Identify the claim, the grounds, and the warrant of the following <sentence>, try to find a logical contradiction within these components.

What is the logical fallacy in the following <sentence>?

<sentence>: You should give me a promotion. I have a lot of debt and am behind on my rent.

What are the well-established facts in this <sentence>?

<sentence>: Students should not be allowed to park in lots now reserved for faculty because those lots should be for faculty only.

An opinion article in a campus newspaper states that in an all-campus survey 95% of students think that tuition should be lowered and therefore tuition should be lowered immediately.

Premise: tuition should be lowered immediately.

Facts:

1. Opinion article in the campus newspaper have some credibility
2. All campus survey mentions that 95% of students think that tuition should be lowered

Contradiction:

Argument: If we ban Hummers because they are bad for the environment, eventually the government will ban all cars, so we should not ban Hummers.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fact bank | Agreement bank |
| Governments have the authority to enact bans on certain products or activities. | Governments have the authority to enact bans on certain products or activities. |
| Hummers have been perceived by some people as bad for the environment. | Hummers have been perceived by some people as bad for the environment. |
| Banning Hummers due to their negative environmental impact is a possible action. | Banning Hummers due to their negative environmental impact is a possible action. |
| Banning one product or activity may lead to broader regulatory actions in the future, though this is not necessarily a direct consequence. | * Banning hummers leads to a ban on all cars because they are all bad for the environment |
| Not all cars are bad for the environment | * Not all cars are bad for the environment |
|  |  |

Contradiction: Banning Hummers due to their negative environmental impact does not lead to ban on all cars.

Argument: Students should not be allowed to park in lots now reserved for faculty because those lots should be for faculty only.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fact bank | Agreement bank |
| Lots are reserved for faculty | Lots are reserved for faculty |
| Students can park in any lot |  |
|  |  |

Argument: Your€™re a vegetarian? You do realize that Hitler was a vegetarian, too?

Premise: you are morally bad because you are a vegetarian like Hitler

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fact bank | Agreement bank |
| You are a vegeterian | You are a vegeterian |
| Hitler was a vegeterian | Hitler was a vegeterian |
| Hitler was morally bad | Anyone who is vegetarian can be morally bad, since you are no different from any other vegetarian. |

Mayor Blake wants to create more bicycle lanes in Lowell. Why is he forcing us to give up our cars and bike everywhere?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fact bank | Agreement bank |
| Mayor Blake wants to create more bicycle lanes in Lowell | Mayor Blake wants to create more bicycle lanes in Lowell |
| There are not many bicycle lanes in lowell | There are not many bicycle lanes in lowell |
| More bicycle lanes means there will be fewer car lanes | More bicycle lanes means there will be fewer car lanes |
| There are car lanes in Lowell | We can still travel with cars |
|  | Mayor Blake is forcing us to give up on cars altogether |

For fallacy of extension: we can derive new facts based on the given facts in the original argument, and proceed to establish contradictions between the layman’s argument and the derived facts.

For fallacy of relevance (red herring): we can point out that the premise is not related to the evidence.

For

TEACHER: It's great that you're reading Borges! However, it's important to clarify that while Borges wrote in Spanish, being from Argentina doesn't necessarily mean he was Spanish. Spanish refers to things from Spain. Borges was Argentine. Does that make sense?

STUDENT: Yes, I understand that Borges was Argentine and not from Spain, but he still wrote in Spanish, right? So, technically, reading his work means I am reading Spanish. The language is the same, even if the country is different.

TEACHER: Absolutely, you're correct that you're reading in the Spanish language. It's just important to distinguish between the language and nationality to avoid confusion. Reading Borges indeed means you are reading Spanish language literature, but not literature from Spain. It's a subtle but significant distinction. How are you finding reading in Spanish? Is it challenging?

STUDENT: Oh, I see what you mean about the nationality versus the language. But still, reading Borges means I'm effectively reading Spanish, right? His works are complex, but I'm really enjoying the depth and the unique themes he explores. It's quite a challenge, but it's very rewarding!

TEACHER: Exactly, you are reading in the Spanish language, and it's fantastic that you're tackling such complex material and enjoying it! Borges is indeed known for his intricate themes and unique storytelling. Keep up the great work, and you'll find that your understanding of the language and its nuances will continue to grow. Is there a particular work by Borges that you found especially intriguing?