

2) “Case closed  $\Rightarrow$  Ambassador Sondland just testified under oath that he NEVER heard the president say there were conditions on aid to Ukraine. Democrats' smear campaign is falling apart.”<sup>1</sup>

3) I believe that this Tweet commits the logical fallacy of appeal to ignorance.

4) An appeal to ignorance is when the lack of evidence to support a conclusion is itself used as evidence to demonstrate that the conclusion is false. In this example, the lack of evidence about what the president said is being used to assert that the president never said there were conditions on aid to Ukraine.

5) Appeal to ignorance is a fallacy because the lack of evidence to support a conclusion doesn't disprove it; it tells you precisely nothing about whether the conclusion is true or not. Assuming we accept the ambassador's statement as true, only a lack of evidence has been proven. Just because the ambassador never heard the president say that there were conditions on aid to Ukraine doesn't necessarily mean that the president never said such a thing (maybe he said it to someone else; Sondland isn't constantly following the president around). It certainly doesn't mean that the “case [is] closed.” If we accept the ambassador's statement as true, then we can't prove or disprove anything about the president's innocence or guilt since we have only established that Sondland didn't hear anything about conditions of aid to Ukraine.

6) “Ambassador Sondland just testified under oath that he never heard the president say there were conditions on aid to Ukraine. Unless other evidence of what the president said surfaces, the case against him will have to be dropped since there is no evidence.”

<sup>1</sup>McCarthy, Kevin (@GOPLeader). “Case closed  $\Rightarrow$  Ambassador Sondland just testified under oath that he NEVER heard the president say there were conditions on aid to Ukraine. Democrats' smear campaign is falling apart.” 20 Nov 2019, 8:47 AM. Tweet.