

Learning Critical Thinking Through Astronomy:  
Logical Fallacies and Distraction Techniques

Joe Heafner  
[heafnerj@gmail.com](mailto:heafnerj@gmail.com)

2017-09-13

**STUDENT NOTE**

PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE THIS DOCUMENT.

## Contents

Questions	1
Materials Needed	1
Points To Remember	1
<b>1 Fallacies and Distractions</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Lying	1
1.2 Shifting The Burden	2
1.3 Appeal To Emotion	3
1.4 Appeal To The Past	4
1.5 Appeal To Novelty	5
1.6 Appeal To The People (Appeal To The Masses, Appeal To Popularity)	6
1.7 Appeal To Logic	7
1.8 Appeal To Ignorance	8
1.9 Argument By Repetition	10
1.10 Attacking The Person	11
1.11 Confirmation Bias	12
1.12 Strawman Argument or Changing The Subject	13
1.13 False Premise	14
1.14 Hasty Generalization	15
1.15 Loaded Question	16
1.16 Feigning Offense	17
1.17 False Dilemma	17
1.18 Appeal To Authority	18
<b>2 A Reasoning Template</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1 A Strategy For Thinking	19
2.2 Using The Template	19
<b>3 Inquiry</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 Evidence	20
3.2 Responding To Fallacies	20
<b>4 Feedback</b>	<b>23</b>

## Questions

How do you recognize a faulty or erroneous argument? How do you rebut such an argument? What constitutes evidence?

## Materials Needed

For this activity, you will need the following materials:

- familiarity with the glossary
- a pencil (do not use ink)
- the ability to read and follow directions

## Points To Remember

Unless otherwise explicitly instructed, your responses must not contain personal opinions. All of your responses must be in the form of complete sentences; the fewer sentences the better. Spelling and grammar must be correct. Effective communication is essential for both learning and doing science.

Don't ask instructors for answers to questions posed in activities; you won't get them. You may ask questions regarding the clarity of the instructions or the soundness of your reasoning. If you encounter a word you are not familiar with, don't ask the instructor about it. Look it up first in your glossary and then a dictionary or some other source if necessary. Ensure that all definitions are unanimously agreed upon before proceeding. There are, of course, sound reasons for these policies. See the instructor if you have questions, but do not complain about these policies. They are not negotiable.

## 1 Fallacies and Distractions

The names of persons in the following pages are all fictitious. Any similarities to name of students in this class are purely coincidental. Feel free to change them.

### 1.1 Lying

Tobacco industry: Smoking does not cause cancer.

Non-scientist: There is considerable disagreement among scientists as to the correctness of evolution.

These are examples of the most frequently used distraction technique in all of propaganda: lying. They are also two of the best examples of its use. It is now well documented that the tobacco industry hired scientists to lie on its behalf about the safety of smoking. The industry clung to this lie well into the end of the twentieth century. Regarding evolution, the only people who say it is incorrect are non-scientists whose religious worldview is contradicted by it.

When someone says something that contradicts what we currently know, there are two possible reasons. One is that the person isn't knowingly passing along incorrect information and is probably just parroting what he/she has heard elsewhere. The other is that the person is indeed *knowingly* passing along incorrect information with the intent of deceiving the audience. In the first case, no lying is done. In the second case,

however, the person is lying. When confronted with evidence to the contrary, many people will continue to lie because their goal is to perpetuate the lie and have it accepted as truth, sometimes for financial reasons. Unfortunately, this tactic works, especially in modern American society. They also continue to lie because they know they will likely not be accused of lying. They know that calling someone a liar is frowned upon in “polite” society, which is also why many people are afraid to point out lies.

What if the person doesn’t know he/she is passing along incorrect information? Well, the person isn’t guilty of lying but is indeed at fault for not checking the veracity of the information he/she is passing along. If, after being educated on the topic, the person still passes along incorrect information, then he/she becomes guilty of lying and is doing so for deviously propagandistic reasons or is profoundly stupid. (*Stupid* is a perfectly legitimate word in this context, so don’t be offended by its use here.)

#### STUDENT NOTE

Lying happens when you knowingly pass along incorrect information.

## 1.2 Shifting The Burden

Steve: I was abducted by aliens and taken aboard one of their spacecraft.

Sarah: Wow! I don’t believe you though.

Steve: Can you prove I wasn’t abducted?

Sarah: Nope.

Steve: If you can’t prove me wrong, I must be telling the truth!

1. What evidence did Steve attempt to provide to back up his claim?

Steve provided no evidence at all. In place of evidence, he put Sara in the position of having to provide evidence to support HIS claim. The owner of an outrageous claim is the ONLY person obligated to provide supporting evidence. However, ANYONE can provide evidence to refute any claim.

In science, there is an unwritten rule requiring the person making a claim responsible for producing evidence backing up that claim. The persons hearing the claim, call them *listeners*, have no such responsibility. The listeners usually do not have the background knowledge or other sufficient information to reliably judge the claim. Steve knows in advance that Sarah doesn’t know anything about aliens, so instead of backing up his own claim, he shifts the burden of backing it up onto Sarah. Steve asserts that her inability to back up his claim means it must be true and unquestionable. Steve is using the fallacy of **shifting the burden** to win the argument.

#### STUDENT NOTE

Shifting the burden happens when you make someone else responsible for providing evidence support your claim. The more outrageous the claim, the more supporting evidence is required.

### 1.3 Appeal To Emotion

Jane: Did you see that concert to raise money for the earthquake victims?

Jack: Yeah I did. Did you donate any money?

Jane: Yeah. I gave fifty dollars.

Jack: I don't have that kind of money.

Jane: You should contribute something! Didn't you see the photos? Those people looked so sad! The photos pushed me over the edge.

Jack: Oh I saw the photos, but it takes more than sad photos to make me part with fifty dollars.

2. What evidence did Jane attempt to provide to justify her monetary contribution?
3. Should Jane's evidence be trusted? Explain briefly.
4. Does Jack have a point or is he just being mean? Explain briefly.
5. By being skeptical, is Jack implying that charities in general are not worthy of financial contributions?

Emotions should never be used as evidence in science. Emotions can be manipulated by someone who knows how effective our responses to them can be. Jane is using the fallacy of **appeal to emotion** to justify her charitable contribution.

**STUDENT NOTE**

Appeal to emotion involves manipulating emotions to make someone behave a certain way or to do something they normally would not do.

6. What evidence, not based on emotion, could Jane have used to convince Jack to donate some money?

#### 1.4 Appeal To The Past

Barry: Basic physics hasn't changed in over a hundred years. I see no reason to change the way it's taught.

Becky: Haven't you heard of new pedagogical techniques?

Barry: Yeah, but it's been done the same for generations so we shouldn't change that.

7. What evidence did Barry attempt to provide to back up his claim?

8. Should Barry's evidence be trusted?

Just because something, in this case teaching physics, has been done a certain way for a long time does not mean that way is good. It also does not mean that way is bad either. Barry is using the fallacy of **appeal to the past** to justify not changing the way physics is taught.

**STUDENT NOTE**

Appeal to the past is a justification based only on the way something has been done in the past.

9. What evidence could Barry have cited to convince Becky his claim is true?

### 1.5 Appeal To Novelty

Lisa: Teaching science by inquiry is a relatively new pedagogical strategy. It's better than existing methods.

Liam: So, what are you suggesting?

Lisa: I'm suggesting that we should adopt inquiry-based instruction. After all, it's the newest thing.

Liam: Change isn't a bad thing. Let's do it!

10. What evidence did Lisa provide to back up her claim?

11. Should Lisa's evidence be trusted?

Just because something, in this case a teaching method, is new does not mean it is good. It also does not mean it is bad either. Lisa is using the fallacy of **appeal to novelty** to justify adopting a new teaching method.

**STUDENT NOTE**

Appeal to novelty is a justification that something is good only because it is new.

12. What evidence could Lisa cite to convince Liam her claim is true?

### 1.6 Appeal To The People (Appeal To The Masses, Appeal To Popularity)

David: As a creationist, I can tell you that a recent poll shows that approximately half of all Americans think evolution is wrong. That's approximately one hundred-fifty million people! That many people can't be wrong. Therefore, evolution is wrong and should be replaced by something with which more people agree.

13. What evidence did David attempt to provide to back up his argument?

14. Should David's evidence be trusted?



A claim or argument may be wrong regardless of how many people agree or disagree with it. Science is not determined purely by popular consensus. David is using the fallacy of **appeal to the people or appeal to the masses** to justify evolution's correctness. Note that in this context, **popular** can refer to the population's approval or disapproval of an opinion. A science book is called **popular** if its intended audience is the general population; it has nothing to do with sales volumes. Be careful when you encounter this word.

**STUDENT NOTE**

Appeal to the people means justifying a claim or argument based on popular consensus.

15. What evidence could David cite that his conclusion is true?

**1.7 Appeal To Logic**

Karen: How can I prove that sixty-four divided by sixteen is equal to four?

Karle: That's simple. Write  $64/16$  and cancel out the 6. You're left with  $4/1$ , which is just equal to 4.

Karen: Makes sense to me!

16. What evidence did Karle attempt to provide to back up his argument?

17. Should Karle's evidence be trusted?

One might think that logic always leads to correct conclusions, but this is not true! Although one step may follow logically from another, all steps must be correct for the conclusion to be correct. In other words, in a long “chain” of reasoning, every individual “link” must be correct for the conclusion to be correct. No intermediate step can violate an existing or established framework (frameworks are discussed in a previous activity). Every premise must be true. With a false premise, anything, no matter how outrageous, can be logically “proven.” Karle is using the fallacy of **appeal to logic** to justify his conclusion.

**STUDENT NOTE**

Appeal to logic is using a seemingly logically connected series of steps to justify a claim or argument, but one or more of the steps or premises is wrong or violates an existing framework.

18. How should Karen respond to Karle?

**STUDENT NOTE**

Note that this answer is provided for you. Don't get used to this!

## 1.8 Appeal To Ignorance

Johnny: Do we have any evidence at all that vaccines cause autism?

Lonnie: I've researched the literature extensively and there is no such evidence.

Johnny: So that means we don't know for sure?

Lonnie: It just means there is no evidence that vaccines cause autism.

Johnny: That suggests that vaccines must cause autism then if we can't establish that they don't.

19. What evidence did Johnny attempt to provide to back up his argument?

**STUDENT NOTE**

You may find your answer difficult to articulate. Think carefully about it.

The lack of evidence for something is not equivalent to the presence of evidence for neither that something nor an alternative to that something. This can be tricky to think about, so read that last sentence again slowly and carefully. Johnny is using the fallacy of **appeal to ignorance** to justify his conclusion. The words *ignorance* or *ignorant* should never be taken as an insult (although they are frequently intended to be taken that way by people who are ignorant of the words' actual meanings). It simply implies a lack of knowledge. Everyone is ignorant of something; no one knows everything there is to know. Ignorance, lack of knowledge, is never a substitute for knowledge. Here, Johnny is using the fallacy of **appeal to ignorance** to justify his conclusion.

There is one case in which absence of evidence **may** indeed be evidence for the the alternative to something. Suppose you carry out a test of a prediction that says X must exist, and your test gives negative results, meaning that you find no evidence that X exists. Now suppose you carry out this same test multiple times, and each time the test gives negative results. It is entirely possible that your repeatedly negative results indicate that the assumption that X exists is incorrect that X may not actually exist. This perfectly reasonable conclusion may be accepted only after you have accounted for all other sources of experimental errors. Is your process correct? Is your equipment or apparatus operating correctly? Are you making numerical or computational errors? If everything else has been accounted for, then accepting the lack of evidence for X's existence **may** indicate that X does not exist. There is at least one instance of this happening in science, specifically around the turn of the twentieth century.

**STUDENT NOTE**

**Appeal to ignorance means using the lack of evidence for something as the presence of evidence for that something or an alternative to that something.**

20. How should Lonnie respond to Johnny?

21. Has Lonnie established conclusively whether or not vaccines cause autism? Explain briefly.

## 1.9 Argument By Repetition

Joe: Two plus two equals five.

Steve: You're crazy! Two plus two is four, not five.

Joe: Two plus two equals five. Two plus two equals five. Two plus two equals five. Two plus two equals five.

Steve: Idiot!

Weeks later on a test, Joe asked, "What is two plus two?"

Steve wrote, "Two plus two equals five."

Joe says in class, "Steve has learned that two plus two equals five. I'm a great teacher!"

22. What evidence did Joe attempt to provide to back up his "teaching?" (note the quotes)

This was a rather silly example, but many times in real life people use repetition, rather than evidence, as a way to get their point across and to make other people agree with them. Politicians are especially well trained in this tactic and regularly exploit it. Much of your previous education was probably based almost entirely upon repetition rather than evidence-based explanations, especially if you attended ineffective schools.

In this example, Joe incorrectly assumed that Steve had *learned* simple addition based on a correct answer on a test. More likely, though, Steve knew that to get the credit, he had to give an expected answer rather than a correct and reasoned answer. Sometimes repetition is needed to master certain skills. It is used in this very activity! By itself, repetition is never a good replacement for evidence in arguing one's point. Joe is using the fallacy of *argument by repetition* to justify his conclusion.

### STUDENT NOTE

**Argument by repetition means using repetition as a substitute for evidence. If the thing being repeated is incorrect and that is known by the speaker, then the speaker is also guilty of lying.**

23. How should Steve respond to Joe's claim in class?

### 1.10 Attacking The Person

Senator Snort: This science bill is just another part of the liberal agenda and must be defeated!

24. What evidence did Sen. Snort attempt to provide to back up his claim that the science bill must be defeated?

When arguing against a claim, a common strategy is to associate a negative label to the claim. This establishes a mental connection between the label and the claim and has nothing to do with the claim at all. The negative association is all that matters, and many people will be persuaded to reject the claim based entirely on the label. This is nothing more than an adult version of childhood **name calling**. One would think that adults could argue their points without resorting to such tactics, but name calling is used all the time. Almost all political campaigns rely on it. At this level, we call name calling **attacking the person** or an **ad hominem** attack. It is really nothing more than name calling used in place of evidence.

#### STUDENT NOTE

Attacking the person means resorting to name calling, however subtle, as a substitute for evidence in arguing one's point.

25. How should the bill's supporters respond to Sen. Snort's comment?

### 1.11 Confirmation Bias

Roberta: I get my news from multiple sources.

Bob: I only get my news from Fox News.

Roberta: Why is that?

Bob: It's the only source that I consistently agree with.

Roberta: Are you serious?

Bob: Yep. I always agree with everything I hear there and it's the only source I trust.

26. What evidence did Bob attempt to provide for his choice of Fox News as his only source for news?

As humans, we tend to trust sources with which we agree. We all have done so in the past, and doing so is not necessarily a bad thing. It is a genuine psychological tendency. However, just because we agree with someone does not mean that that someone is using correct reasoning or has reached a correct conclusion. Your instructor can make a good case for saying that one plus one is eleven rather than two. The argument is perfectly reasonable, but of course it does not give the correct result within the accepted framework of arithmetic. When Bob treats Fox News as reliable solely because he agrees with what he hears there, he is committing a *confirmation bias*. This means he uses only sources with which he agrees and thus his sources are biased towards his own beliefs and opinions. He never experiences contrary beliefs and opinions. He biases his sources toward those that reinforce his own personal worldview.

#### STUDENT NOTE

**Confirmation bias means consulting only sources that agree with one's personal worldview rather than a variety of sources that contradict one's worldview, that may be more reliable, or may be a better reflection of reality.**

Some of you may think this example of confirmation bias is a subversive attempt to indoctrinate you against Fox News. It is nothing of the sort. Some of you may also think this example is an attempt to inject the instructor's personal worldview into the course. Understand that it is not. This example came from actual conversations overheard by your instructor. If you do indeed think these things, or similar things, you need to critically think about your own biases and how they shape your personal worldview. Remember, you are the easiest person to fool. You are also the person most likely to fool you. (That is a paraphrase of a quote by Richard Feynman, a well known physicist.)

Everyone, including you and your instructor, has biases. It is not the case that all biases are bad. It is not the case that all biases are good. You need to be aware of your own biases and try very hard not to let them contradict objective evidence.

In this particular example, note that many people get belligerent when they are accused of using confirmation bias or when Fox News is contradicted. This shows their ignorance of the meaning of *bias* and

ignorance of the fact that being biased is not necessarily harmful. By the way, you could just as well replace every mention of “Fox News” and replace it with “NPR” and still have a valid example of confirmation bias. Think about that very carefully. Experiment with it.

27. How should Roberta respond to Bob?

### 1.12 Strawman Argument or Changing The Subject

Chana: We discussed the Big Bang model in cosmology class today. Do you know how much of our Universe it correctly explains?

Carol: Hah! It's wrong!

Chana: Why? How do you know?

Carol: The Universe had to have come from something. You can't get something from nothing. You can only get something from something.

Chana: What does this have to do with the Universe?

Carol: Well, it means the Big Bang model must be wrong because it says the Universe, which is something, came from nothing.

28. What evidence did Carol attempt to provide for her claim that the Big Bang model must be wrong?

This is a frequently heard argument against the Big Bang model's content. Carol is subtly, and maybe even unknowingly, changing the subject away from the Big Bang model to another claim entirely, the subject of getting something from nothing. These are two very different claims. After changing the subject, Carol then attacks the **new subject** rather than the original claim that the Big Bang model is incorrect. That way, Carol never has to actually address that claim. Brilliant! This tactic is called establishing a **strawman argument**. It is basically nothing more than changing the subject and then attacking the new subject rather than the old subject.

#### STUDENT NOTE

A strawman argument results from changing from one subject to a new subject, and then attacking the new subject while never actually addressing the old subject.

29. How should Chana respond to Carol?

### 1.13 False Premise

Clark: Everything that happens and that we observe must have a cause. If the Big Bang really happened, then it too must have had a cause. Cosmologists can't tell us what caused the Big Bang. Therefore, the Big Bang model must be wrong.

Rusty: That doesn't make sense.

Clark: Why?

30. What evidence did Clark attempt to provide for his conclusion that the Big Bang model must be wrong?

Sometimes we try to establish a conclusion by logical argument. When any step in the argument is incorrect, we have the fallacy of **appeal to logic** which is described in a previous example. When the very first premise is incorrect, we call this fallacy **false premise**. It is one thing to commit an error within a series of logical steps, but it is quite another to begin with a false premise. If you begin with a false premise, there is no limit to the things which can be incorrectly established.

#### STUDENT NOTE

False premise means beginning a logical argument with a premise that is not true.

31. How should Rusty respond to Clark?



A tactic frequently used by those who rely on this fallacy to support their own conclusion is to forbid others to use this fallacy against them. Consider the false premise in the argument above, namely that everything must have a cause. The people who most often use this fallacy use it to conclude that a supernatural being created and oversees our Universe. However, they refuse to address what caused this being to exist. They answer that this being has just “always been” and thus violate their own premise. They are selectively calling a fallacy on other people’s arguments but not allowing it on their own, which is a common strategy.

### 1.14 Hasty Generalization

Dana: The last science course I took at a community college was a joke. Astronomy will be just as easy.

Dani: Are you sure about that.

Dana: Yep. Why shouldn’t I be?

Dani: Astronomy may be different.

Dana: Nah. All community college science courses are the same.

32. What evidence did Dana cite to back up the conclusion that all community college science courses are the same?

It is easy to let past experiences cloud our judgement of the present, and we tend to do just that. However, a bad experience with one thing in no way means that all such things will also give a bad experience. The same is true of good experiences. We hastily jump to such assumptions in the absence of evidence. Dana uses the fallacy of *hasty generalization* to justify her conclusion.

#### STUDENT NOTE

Hasty generalization means assuming that a good or bad experience with a particular thing will be the same for all such things without any evidence to support that assumption.

#### STUDENT NOTE

Note that this fallacy goes from the specific to the general, and this is the key to recognizing this fallacy in someone’s reasoning.

33. How should Dani respond to Dana?

### 1.15 Loaded Question

TV host: Good evening. On tonight's show we take up the topic of evolution and why it should not be taught.

Shawn (watching at home): Just how long are we going to allow science teachers to get away with this fraud that is evolution?

Sharon (watching at home): Well ...

34. What two issues does Shawn's question address?

Now, something interesting happened here. Consider the possible answers to Shawn's question. Shawn asserts that teaching evolution constitutes fraud, and that should be the main issue here. It isn't though, because Shawn has cleverly (perhaps unknowingly) made the issue one of how long the fraud is to be perpetuated. One week? One month? One year? There is no good answer. Fraud is bad no matter how long it endures. In other words, this question has no satisfactory answer. No answer will appease Shawn because the conclusion has already been established. This is an example of a **loaded question**.

#### STUDENT NOTE

A loaded question is one for which there is no satisfactory answer to a discreetly implied foregone conclusion.

35. How should Sharon respond to Shawn?

Here are more examples of this fallacy: "Do you support the troops protecting your freedom?" "Why are you angry at God?" "Why are you so angry?" "Why do you hate America?" "Are you still an alcoholic?"

### 1.16 Feigning Offense

TV host: You mean to tell me that your work on extraterrestrial life has never been peer reviewed?

Guest: I'm outraged that you would bring that up! You've offended me and this interview is over!

People sometimes resort to desperate tactics when backed into a corner. Here, the host asked a legitimate question that the guest should be able to calmly answer. Instead, the guest ends the discussion with the claim of being offended. Words can evoke anger, melancholy, rage, happiness, or even comfort. Offense, you must understand, is nothing more than a way of immediately shutting down all discussion. It is frequently used to avoid having to justify claims or arguments or to avoid answering questions. It is the one fallacy for which there is no recovery or rebuttal. It is final, and the person claiming offense always wins, at least in his or her mind. The guest is using the distraction of **feigning offense** to shut down the discussion.

#### STUDENT NOTE

Feigning offense is claiming to be offended for the purpose of shutting down otherwise legitimate debate or discussion.

36. How should the host respond to the guest?

### 1.17 False Dilemma

Tom: Well, I'll either get an A or an F in astronomy.

Ray: Hmm. I think you're wrong about that.

Tom: How so?

Sometimes when presented with a choice, we forget that there may be more than two options. When we do this, we commit a **false dilemma**. It's false because there really are more than two options.

#### STUDENT NOTE

False dilemma means presenting only two options for a choice when there are really more than two options.

Be careful! If there really are only two options, then presenting them does not constitute a fallacy.

37. How should Ray respond to Tom?

38. Rephrase Tom's first comment so that is not fallacious. (HINT: Assume that incompletes are not allowed at Tom's college.)

### 1.18 Appeal To Authority

Professor: Most stars in our galaxy are not like Sun at all.

Student: I'm not sure I believe that.

Professor: I have a degree in astronomy, so you can trust what I say.

The professor (and note that we don't know what discipline this professor practices) is using his/her academic credentials as evidence that what he/she says must be correct. This is the equivalent of saying "It's true because I say so." in place of actual evidence. Rather than give actual evidence, the professor uses the fallacy of **appeal to authority** to justify his/her conclusion.

#### STUDENT NOTE

Appeal to authority means using one's position of authority or one's credentials, or some other potentially authoritative source of information (a book perhaps) in the absence of evidence to justify a conclusion.

39. What evidence could the professor provide to justify his/her claim?

**WARNING:** You must be careful when deciding if this fallacy is being used. In science, there comes a point at which you must accept the validity of the work of other scientists. At that point, however, the person, book, or otherwise source of authority must be able to provide more evidence than credentials or merely the written word. This evidence may come in many forms. Providing this evidence is usually a sign that the authority is trustworthy.

## 2 A Reasoning Template

### 2.1 A Strategy For Thinking

To help you learn to recognize and deal with fallacies and distraction techniques, use the following template to train yourself how to think through a situation. Read through the template, filling in the blanks as you go for your particular situation.

This person is trying to convince me that \_\_\_\_\_. Instead of using evidence, this person is using \_\_\_\_\_ to convince me. Using \_\_\_\_\_ to convince me instead of evidence constitutes the fallacy of \_\_\_\_\_. Instead of using \_\_\_\_\_ to convince me, this person should have, or could have, used \_\_\_\_\_ to convince me.

Note that the blanks are merely place holders and not necessarily proportional to what goes in the blank. It is important to **not** omit any part of the template when using it to reason through a situation. It is important to think completely and thoroughly in order to train yourself to think rationally and correctly.

### 2.2 Using The Template

Consider the following exchange:

Joe: You can't trust that guy's work. He's an alcoholic.

Celeste: He's published his work in all the right journals.

Joe: Yeah, but he's still an alcoholic and alcoholics usually don't think rationally. Therefore, you shouldn't trust anything he's published or anything he says.

40. Use the reasoning template to detect whether or not a fallacy has being used. Write out the entire template, filling in the blanks as you go.

### 3 Inquiry

#### 3.1 Evidence

You have been asked a lot about *evidence* in this activity, but you have not been explicitly asked to define *evidence*. One reason is that evidence is rather difficult to define. Take some time now to discuss this in your groups.

41. In the space provided, make an attempt to operationally define *evidence* in terms of what things (for lack of a better word) do and do not constitute valid evidence. For example, would you consider a person's memory of an event to be valid evidence that the event really happened? Would you consider a photograph to be valid evidence? Would you consider a mathematical equation to be valid evidence?

#### 3.2 Responding To Fallacies

In general, a fallacy is an error in reasoning that may or may not lead to an erroneous conclusion. Some fallacies are better classified as distraction techniques or strategies. There are literally hundreds of classified fallacies and you have only seen a small number of them here.

42. For each example you saw, you were asked for a response to the person committing the fallacy. Take a few minutes to compare your responses with those from other groups. Make any notes in the space provided.

Generally, the best way to respond to a fallacy is to point it out. With distraction techniques such as taking offense this is usually all that can be done. In situations where there is evidence to counter a fallacious claim or argument, that evidence should be presented immediately. Some people use fallacies to lure you into discussion or "debate" (note the quotes) to make you look foolish. This is especially true with people addressing the fictitious overlap of religion and science.

43. Take a few minutes to think of some situations where fallacies are used this way and list them here.

44. How do you recognize a faulty or erroneous argument? How do you rebut such an argument? What constitutes evidence?

CHECKPOINT

45. Map this activity into as many of the elements of thought as you can.

46. Every activity will have at least one standard associated with it.

**STANDARD**

I can recognize the fallacies and distraction techniques described in this activity and I can properly point them out to the person or source using them.



## 4 Feedback

What could be done to make this activity more interesting? Please be honest.

Sample Student Activity Version