Logical fallacies worksheet

What logical fallacy is being committed in each of the following examples?

Directions: Identify the conclusion and premise on the argument itself. Then write down the assumption and logical fallacy being committed.

1. The Golden Rule is a sound moral principle. It is basic to every system of ethics in every culture.

   Conclusion: The Golden Rule is a sound moral principle
   Premise: It is basic to every system of ethics in every culture
   Assumption: It is sound because it is common in many cultures. Its popularity is evidence of its soundness
   Flaw: Appeal to majority

2. Foreign imports are wrecking our economy and savaging our workers, the backbone of this country. Buy American! Before you put your money on that Honda, think of the guy in Detroit whose kids may not eat tomorrow.

   Conclusion: Buy American!
   Premise: Some guys kids won’t eat tomorrow
   Assumption: I should make my decisions on what to buy based on someone starving
   Flaw: Appeal to emotion

3. I think America should be more careful about the international organizations we join and the treaties we sign. After all, wasn’t it George Washington himself who warned against foreign entanglements?

   Conclusion: America should be more careful about the international organizations we join and the treaties we sign
   Premise: George Washington himself who warned against foreign entanglements
   Assumption: Because George Washington said it it must be true or hold value.
   Flaw: Appeal to authority.
4. My opponent wants to take your guns away and make it so that you can’t defend your family. They want criminals to ravage your neighborhoods. I believe in the Constitution and freedom and I want to protect your right to look out for your loved ones.

This one doesn’t need to be broken down the same way.
Flaw: Strawman

5. How can we end starvation in this world? People should eat more.

Conclusion: People should eat more to solve starvation.
Premise: People should eat more to solve starvation
Assumption:
Flaw: Circular argument, begging the question.

6. TV commentators are always attacking big businesses for making “obscene profits,” but the companies they work for have higher profits than almost any other industry.

Conclusion: TV commentators shouldn’t attack big businesses for making obscene profits
Premise: Because they make obscene profits
Assumption: If you are guilty of something you cannot call it out in someone else
Flaw: Ad hominem, poisoning the well

7. Every time Kentucky wins the NCAA men’s title, the Yankees win the World Series. Since Kentucky just won, I think you should make a bet on the Yankees. You can’t lose!

Conclusion: The Yankees will win the world series, you should bet on them
Premise: In the past, whenever Kentucky won the Yankees won
Assumption: If it happened in the past then it will happen again the future,
Flaw: False cause, correlation does not mean causation

8. You should never, ever listen to him because I like to eat pizza on Fridays.

Conclusion: Don’t listen to him
I like to eat pizza on Fridays
Assumption: That the two things are linked in some way
Flaw: Non sequitur.

9. When he was elected President, the economy went on to grow at a record pace. He absolutely deserves credit for it.

Conclusion: He deserves credit for the economy
Premise: The economy was doing well when he was President
Assumption: He caused the thing to happen
Flaw: False cause. Just because the two things happened at the same time one caused the other.

10. Why would you ever listen to him? He voted for Jill Stein in the last election.

Conclusion: Don’t listen to him
Premise: He voted for Jill Stein
Assumption: His voting for Jill Stein impacts the quality of his opinions
Flaw: Ad hominem

11. Why are you complaining about the name of the Washington Redskins? You only care because the people on the TV told you to.

Conclusion: You shouldn’t complain about the name, Redskins
Premise: The only reason you care about this is because of the TV
Assumption: That the cause of your care has any impact on the value of your opinion.
Flaw: Ad hominem

12. Of course Jane is going to be successful. Everyone says so.

Conclusion: Jane will be successful
Premise: Everyone says so
Assumption: That a lot of people believe something is important and relevant.
Flaw: Appeal to majority

13. Why should Congress consult the Joint Chiefs of Staff about military funding? They are military men so obviously they will want as much money as they can get.

Conclusion: Don’t listen to the Joint Chiefs
Premise: They are military men and they are self interested
Assumption: Who they are should have an impact on whether you believe their opinions
Flaw: Ad hominem

14. The faster a windmill turns, the more wind there is. Therefore, windmills create wind.

Conclusion: Windmills create wind
Premise: These two things are observed together
Assumption: Because the two are associated with each other they have a causal relationship
Flaw: False cause

15. There are only two kinds of people in this world: makers and takers. Which one are you?

Conclusion:
Premise:
Assumption: These are the only two choices available
Flaw: Black or white.