

CHAPTER EIGHT

ARGUMENTATION

Just about everyone has had an argument. Some arguments deteriorate to physical violence. Other confrontations are less violent; they are just intense verbal disagreements, foot stomping, and yelling. There is another way to argue. In this handbook its focus is on what most academic settings aim to teach regarding argumentation—in verbal or written form, an intellectual form of persuasion.

This chapter contains argumentation themes. They should provide clear examples of how you can develop this writing style. First, you will find a color-coded recommended set up for the body paragraphs of an argumentation theme. Next, there is Sample One. It contains a full outline and one body paragraph and the Works Cited Page that follow the outline that precedes these items. Then, there are two argumentation themes: Sample Two and Sample Three. The first argumentation theme is against the death penalty. The second argumentation theme is for animal testing. These themes contain color coding in their body paragraphs to show how they follow the recommended set up that is at the early part of this chapter. If you follow this format, you should have no difficulty writing a well-developed argumentation theme. Yes, there are different ways to set up an argumentation theme. For the purposes of this handbook, only one method will be demonstrated.

Then, toward the end of this chapter, there is a section that will discuss the fallacies (lack of logic and falsities) in an argument. To become a really sustained sophisticated citizen of the world and a discerning reader and writer, you need to be able to identify the fallacies in an argument. Also, you need to know how to refute illogical reasoning in a calm, non-violent manner that clearly indicates you are an intelligent person in control rather than an illogical individual who demonstrates a lack of clear thinking!

It is important that you understand that it is not the position you take but how well you present the position. Most instructors are objective and reasonable. They are able to put aside their personal feelings if they do not agree with your position. However, no instructor or any other reasonable individual can agree with your argument if it is not a well-thought out, researched, and organized presentation. When you take your advanced writing courses or work with a tutor, you should go into more detail about this challenging form of discourse.

SET UP FOR ARGUMENTATION BODY PARAGRAPH

There are several ways of setting up the body paragraphs for an argumentative theme. One way which is quite effective is:

- 1. topic sentence**
- 2. 1st example of support of the topic sentence**
- 3. opposing viewpoint**
- 4. 2nd example of support and refutation of the opposing viewpoint**
- 5. 3rd example of support**
- 6. concluding sentence**

For the purpose of this handbook, this is the method encouraged. Each body paragraph will follow this format. Before you continue reading, study the cursory outline (this only serves as a guide, not anything expected of you to submit to an instructor; however, if you feel it will help you organize your body paragraphs, use it for your personal purposes) at each body paragraph of Sample One. You will see how the author implements this format.

The importance of developing opposing viewpoints will be demonstrated, too. Furthermore, Sample One provides an outline noting where the opposing viewpoint should be placed, following the color-coded format above stated. Next, Sample Two will actually use this color-coded format for all three body

paragraphs. Also, there is color-coding used in the Works Cited. The reason is explained on page 168. Then, Sample Three will develop a different topic using this same method of development. Also, its body paragraphs will be color-coded. So, in this chapter you have two different completed argumentation themes and one partial one. Each demonstrates in different ways how you can write a strong argumentative work. It is crucial that, no matter the argumentative topic, the paper MUST acknowledge quality opposing viewpoints. If a paper does not do this, no matter how strongly a writer presents his/her argument, not to express the opponent's views and NOT try to refute those views, the paper will be weak! OK, now, take your time to read the various samples in this chapter. Later on in this handbook in Appendix A, there will be two more samples to help you write strong argumentation papers!

SAMPLE ONE

OUTLINE & PARTIAL ARGUMENTATION THEME

You will see in one body paragraph how the writer follows her outline (B1. to B2.). The author of this handbook shows how Ms. Driskell has presented the opponent's viewpoint. Dr. Hayes-Scott has utilized color-coding to point out how the format should be implemented. And if the whole theme had been posted, then, EVERY body paragraph would have needed to follow this pattern. The green illustrates how you should handle the presentation of an opponent's ideas and the method for refutation. Yes, you must mention and show your awareness of your critics' ideas (see the sentences in red). Also, you must demonstrate that you have a rational reply (green). If not, your body paragraphs are weak.

This author is not saying that you have to use this outline format; that will be up to you and your instructor. However, this is a set up you may wish to use personally to get your ideas or-

ganized and to make certain you are definitely addressing the opponent's issues and you are effectively refuting his/her views.

Outline

Step I. Thesis Sentence: The government should abolish capital punishment because of the chance of error, the failure to deter crime, and the degrading of human life.

Step II. Body Paragraphs:

A1. Topic Sentence: The possibility of error makes capital punishment unacceptable.

1. **Death is irreversible**
2. **Opposing viewpoint**
3. **Rebuttal—74 cases of errors**
4. **No safeguards can prevent convicting an innocent person.**

A2. Concluding Sentence: The danger of a mistake justifies abolishing capital punishment because death is irreversible, errors are documented, and no safeguards can prevent an error.

B1. Topic Sentence: Capital punishment is not an effective deterrent to murder.

1. **Person does not expect to be caught**
2. **Opposing viewpoint**
3. **Rebuttal—Homicides lower in cap. states**
4. **Life imprisonment is just as effective**

B2. Concluding Sentence: Deterrence is ineffective because a murderer does not expect to be caught, capital punishment states are not free from murder, and life imprisonment is sufficient.

C1. Topic Sentence: Capital punishment destroys belief in the inherent worth of human life.

1. **Cruel and unusual punishment**
2. **Opposing viewpoint**
3. **Cannot bring life back**
4. **Decay of the condemned man**

C2. Concluding Sentence: Cruel and unusual punishment, inability to restore victim's life, and the indecent decay of the condemned are dehumanizing effects of the death penalty.

Step III. Concluding Paragraph—Topic Sentence: The number one reason why society should abolish capital punishment is it is wrong for anyone to kill.

1. **An innocent person wrongfully executed is intolerable.**
2. **Death is no more a deterrent to the commission of crimes than are other alternate, more acceptable punishments.**
3. **The ultimate result of the death penalty is a total disregard for human life and dignity.**

Concluding Sentence (Soul): To be a truly civil society, the US must ban capital punishment.

ARGUMENTATION—EXCERPT—SAMPLE ONE
Body Paragraph 2 (B1 to B2):

Capital punishment is not an effective deterrent to murder. The fear of the punishment is least likely to be present during the crime of murder. The murder committed in a fit of passion or anger is over and done with before the person realizes what s/he did. In the same sense, a carefully and premeditated crime of murder is not deterred by capital punishment because the murderer does not expect the legal community to discover or punish him/her (McClellan 20). Proponents of capital punishment share a different view.

The death penalty is a warning, just like a lighthouse throwing its beams out to sea. We hear about shipwrecks, but we do not hear about the ships the lighthouse guides safely on their way. We do not have proof of the number of ships it saves, but we do not tear the lighthouse down. (Carrington 13)

OPPONENTS CLAIM, HOWEVER, THAT IF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT WERE A REAL DETERRENT TO CRIME, THEN, THE STATES WITH CAPITAL PUNISHMENT WOULD BE RELATIVELY FREE FROM MURDER. Actually, the opposite is true. The homicide rate is lower in the states without the death penalty (Reid 487). Also, the death penalty is unnecessary because punishment sufficient to deter is just and no more. A life sentence in prison will serve the deterrent purpose at least as well as capital punishment (Van Den Haag & Conrad 293). Deterrence is ineffective because a murderer does not expect to be caught, capital punishment states are not free from murder, and life imprisonment is just as sufficient.

Works Cited

- Carrington, Frank. **"The Case for Capital Punishment."** *Capital Punishment: Criminal Justice Issues.* Citizens Research Council of Michigan, 1978. pp. 9-20.
- Horwitz, Elinor Lander. *Capital Punishment, U.S.A.* J.B. Lippincott Co., 1973.
- McClellan, Grant S. *Capital Punishment.* H.W. Wilson Co., 1961.
- Reid, Sue Titus. *Crime and Criminology.* Dryden Press, 1976.
- Van Den Haag, Ernest, & John P. Conrad. *The Death Penalty: A Debate.* Plenum Press, 1983.

—Karen Driskell, English 101

[Parenthetical citations and Works Cited entries are following the 8th edition MLA format.]

ARGUMENTATION THEME—SAMPLE TWO

NOTE: Body Paragraph Two of this paper will be color-coded to demonstrate explicitly the set up of body paragraphs for this assignment. The colors will correspond with those on page 158.

SAMPLE TWO

Barry Rusk

Dr. Fairy

Argumentation Theme

English 102

22 May 2013

Why Congress Should Abolish the Death Penalty

The death penalty has been an engrained part of American culture from the very beginning. The first execution in America occurred in 1608, just one year after the founding of the first English colony. The death penalty was proscribed for everything from stealing grapes or striking one's mother or father to murder or treason ("Introduction to the Death Penalty"). As America grew and prospered, the death penalty was repealed and reinstated many times by many states. From 1972 to 1976, the United States as a whole suspended the death penalty. Congress should take a stand once and for all against the death penalty because it is a waste of taxpayer money, it is not an effective deterrent, and it is not in the best interest of the victim or

his/her family.

The government should abolish the death penalty because it is a waste of taxpayer money. The waste starts with the trial itself. “...Studies have uniformly and conservatively shown that a death-penalty trial costs \$1 million more than one in which prosecutors seek life without parole” (Barnes). The extra cost is incurred even if the jury does not come back with a death penalty conviction. Opponents would say that the increased cost is because of the legal maneuvering and delay tactics used by death penalty opponents. Furthermore, advocates of the death penalty state that “if the multiple layers of appeal are pursued in an ethical, and fiscally responsible manner, execution is less costly than warehousing a murderer for life” (Beatty). The idea of an expedient trial is ideal; however, the duty of the defense attorney is not to be expedient. Justice White describes the defense attorney’s job in *U.S. v. Wade*, 388 U.S. 218, 256-258(1967):

"Defense counsel has no obligation to ascertain or present the truth. Our system assigns him a different mission. He must be and is interested in preventing the conviction of the innocent, but, absent a voluntary plea of guilty, we also insist that he defend [sic] his client whether he is innocent or guilty.” (Lenhardt)

Then, there is the appeals process. It is sacrosanct and protected by law as a means of preventing innocent deaths. The process begins after conviction with an automatic review by the State Supreme Court and continues through six layers of appeals (Office of Victims' Services) This is additional cost. In 2009, Cali-

ifornia budgeted \$58,563,000 solely for appeals in capital cases (Alarcon and Mitchell). The government should ban the death penalty because it wastes taxpayers' money due to the increased cost of the trial, increased cost of housing, and increased cost of appeals.

Next, Congress should abolish the death penalty because it is not an effective deterrent. It is prohibitively difficult to prove that the existence of the death penalty is the causation for an individual not committing a crime. Proving a single reason as the cause for why someone did not do something is nearly impossible (Ichinose). While it is possible to prove that an individual was speeding because he/she had an accelerator pedal that was stuck, it is nearly impossible to prove that an individual did not speed because he/she did not have an accelerator pedal that was not stuck. There is a myriad of reasons why the individual might not be speeding, from safety concerns to fear of being ticketed, but it is fairly easy to show causation with a stuck accelerator pedal and speeding. Opponents would argue that just because causation cannot be proven does not mean that it does not have an effect. They would point to the study that counts an average of eighteen less murders committed for each execution carried out (Muhlhausen). They would further point out the number of murders that could have been prevented had murderers not had their sentences changed to life without parole. The murder rates in states with the death penalty versus the murder rates in states without the death penalty do not support such a claim. From 2008 to 2011, the murder rates in states without the

death penalty were consistently lower than states with the death penalty by more than thirty percent (“Murder Rates Nationally and by State”). This substantial correlation is undeniable. Furthermore, individuals that do not consider the consequences are not deterred by the severity of them. In a web post on April 7 of 2009, the American Civil Liberties Union said:

People commit murders largely in the heat of passion, under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or because they are mentally ill, giving little or no thought to the possible consequences of their acts. The few murderers who plan their crimes beforehand—for example, professional executioners—intend and expect to avoid punishment altogether by not getting caught. (“Death Penalty: Questions and Answers, The”)

These persons do not consider whether they would rather spend life in prison or be put to death. The death penalty is not an effective deterrent because it cannot be proven that its existence is a deterrent factor in the absence of a crime being committed, the murder rate in states with the death penalty are still higher than the murder rate of states without the death penalty, and many murders are committed without thought to consequence.

Finally, Congress should abolish the death penalty because it does not bring closure to the victim’s family. When someone sentenced to death is executed, the pain and suffering family members feel from the loss of their loved one does not go away. The grief process must still be navigated. Only 2.5% of

families found closure from the execution of the assailant (Shaw). Proponents of the death penalty would point to the execution as the embodiment of justice. Abolishing the death penalty would mandate injustice by not allowing the accused to be killed for killing another (Brauchler). The concept of an-eye-for-an-eye is true justice. However, can the continued pain and suffering of the victims' families be justice? Sandra Place, the daughter of a murder victim said:

Nearly eight years since the jury delivered the verdict of death, I am still forced to focus on my mother's killer. If the killer were given life without parole, and I mean a true life sentence, I would not be here. I would not be forced to discuss the killer and the verdict and the ways in which my life has been affected. Each court date, each appeal, each write-up in the newspaper, revisiting and revisiting the pain, each event keeping me that much further from the curative process I and my family so greatly deserve. ("Quotes by Families of Homicide Victims")

The pursuit and execution of the death sentence is a long and drawn out process, and it was designed as such to protect against the conviction of someone that is innocent. Forcing the victims' families to relive a terrible part of their lives over and over for more than thirteen years, the average stay on death row, is not justice (Liptak). It is the cruel and unusual punishment of the families of the victims. attempting the death penalty. The death

penalty does not provide closure for families of the victims because the execution does not heal the pain, the long trial prolongs the suffering, and differing views can tear grieving families apart.

Congress has the opportunity to change fundamentally the way America deals with crime. The uncertain benefits of the death penalty are far outweighed by the drawbacks, the wastefulness of taxpayers' money, the ineffectiveness of capital punishment as a deterrent, and the lack of closure that is provided by the death penalty. The projected cost savings of abolishing the death penalty alone in California will be significant. The government should stop wasting this money on criminals and spend it instead on victim counseling and child education, thereby reducing future criminal behavior (Moretti).

The 8th edition of the MLA has changed a lot from the 7th edition regarding the set up of works cited entries. Now, it has nine (9) core elements. If an element is missing from a source, you are to skip to the next. Below are listed the nine elements. To make it easier for you to see how they are positioned and implemented, you will see they will follow the colors of the items listed in the actual works cited of this argumentation theme. Also, this is noted on the works cited page on page 162.

Nine Core Elements:

- 1) Author
- 2) Title of Source
- 3) Title of Container (*italicized*)
- 4) Other Contributors
- 5) Version
- 6) Number
- 7) Publisher
- 8) Publication date
- 9) Location

Works Cited

- Alarcon, Judge Arthur L., and Paula M. Mitchell. "Executing the Will of the Voters?: A Roadmap to Mend or End the California Legislature's Multi-billion Dollar Death Penalty Debacle." *Loyola of Los Angeles Law Review*, 2011, <https://www.google.com/search?q=Alarcon%2C+Judge+Arthur+L.+and+Paula+M.Mitchel.+%22Executing+the+%09Will+of+the+Voters%3F%3A+A+Roadmap+to+Mend+or+End+the+Cal=%09ifornia+Legislature%27s+Multi-billion+Dollar+Death+Penalty+%09%09%09Debacle.%22+Loyala+of+Los+Angeles+Law+Review+2011&ie=utf-8&ee=utf-8>. Accessed 1 Apr. 2016.**
- Beatty, Gary D. "The Next Time Someone Says the Death Penalty Costs More Than Life in Prison, Show Them This Article." *The Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies*, 1 December 1997, <http://www.fed-soc.org/publications/details/the-next-time-someone-says-the-death-penalty-costs-more-than-life-in-prison-show-them-this-article>. Accessed 10 Apr. 2016.**
- Brauchler, George. "Death Penalty is a Tool of Justice." *Denver Post*, Denver Post, 31 March 2013, <http://www.denverpost.com/2013/03/28/death-penalty-is-a-tool-of-justice/>. Accessed 24 Apr. 2016.**
- "Death Penalty: Questions and Answers, The." *American Civil Liberties Union*. American Civil Liberties**

- Union, 9 Apr. 2007, <https://www.aclu.org/death-penalty-questions-and-answers>. Accessed 24 Apr. 2016.
- Ichinose, Masaki. "Ethics for the Future of life." *Oxford Uehiro Center for Practical Ethics*, Oxford University, June 2013, <http://philpapers.org/rec/UEHEFT>. Accessed 29 Apr. 2016.
- "Introduction to the Death Penalty." *Death Penalty Information Center*, <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/part-i-history-death-penalty>. Accessed 16 Apr. 2016.
- Lenhardt, Robert. "The Duty of a Defense Attorney." *Avvo*, 2 Mar. 2011, <https://www.avvo.com/legal-guides/ugc/the-duty-of-a-defense-attorney>. Accessed 5 Apr. 2016.
- Liptak, Adam. "Lifelong Death Sentences." *New York Times*, New York Times, 31 October 2011, http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/01/us/death-row-inmates-wait-years-before-execution.html?_r=0. Accessed 17 Apr. 2016.
- Moretti, Enrico. "Does Education Reduce Participation in Criminal Activities?" *Teachers College Columbia University*, Columbia University, 2005, <https://www.tc.columbia.edu/centers/EquitySymposium/symposium/resourceDetails.asp?PresId=6>. Accessed 17 Apr. 2016.
- Muhlhausen, David. "The Death Penalty Deters Crime and Saves Lives." 28 Aug. 2007, <http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/the-death-penalty-deters-crime-and-saves-lives>. Accessed 13 May 2016.
- "Murder Rates Nationally and by State." *Death Penalty Information Center*, 2013, <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/>

murder-rates-nationally-and-state. Accessed 19 June 2013.

California Attorney General's Office. *A Victim's Guide to the Capital Case Process, Office of Victims' Services*, <http://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/publications/deathpen.pdf>. Accessed 12 May 2016.

"Quotes by Families of Homicide Victims." *Equal Justice USA*, https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=sal#q-quotes%20by%20families%20of%20homicide%20victims. Accessed 17 Apr. 2016.

Reinhart, Christopher. "Prison Conditions for Death Row and Life Without Parole Inmates." *Connecticut General Assembly*, 4 April 2011, <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2011/rpt/2011-R-0178.htm>. Accessed 28 Apr. 2016.

Shaw, Renee. "KY Study: Executions Fail to Deliver Closure for Victims' Families." April 2011, <http://mvfhr.blogspot.com/2011/04/executions-fail-to-deliver-closure.html>. Accessed 17 Apr. 2016.

NOTE: Normally, the Works Cited page is on a page separate from the theme/essay. However, to save a few trees, the author decided to begin the works cited on the same page. However, whenever you write a research piece, place the Works Cited page on a SEPARATE page!

These works cited entries are following the 8th edition MLA format. There is an option to add the date when you accessed the information. This is what these works cited entries are showing. Still, this is not imperative. If your instructor requests this, then, these are examples of how the access date should be noted in each entry. Finally, if you choose to place the access date, you must be consistent and place an access date for every entry.

SAMPLE THREE**Jacob Steinhauser****Dr. Fairy****Argumentation Theme****English 102****18 April 2017**

Everyday people die from different diseases. If there were a way to learn to treat different diseases more effectively, that didn't harm people, most people would jump on board. But as soon as a mouse is given cancer to test different ways to treat it, people suddenly no longer want to fund research for possible solutions to diseases like cancer. If it meant the life or death of a child for some lab mice to die, people can take sides, and the side of saving a child's life seems better. Congress should support animal testing because it leads to medical breakthroughs, it provides safety for people, and it is better to test on animals than humans.

Animal testing has led to many medical breakthroughs. Frankie Trull is the president of the Foundation for Biomedical Research. She informs that animal testing has helped make immunizations against polio, diphtheria, mumps, rubella, and hepatitis (Trull). Many of these diseases can be lethal and without animal testing doctors may not have any other way to treat them. The other side that is against animal testing says that minor differences in genes between animals and humans make inaccurate results even in animals similar to humans like primates ("Failure of the Animal Model"). Animals and humans are not a 100% match. However, the polio vaccine that was only found through animal testing has saved millions of lives alone (Festing). Even though animals and humans have differences, some great medical advancements have been found from animals. The first blood transfusion ever done was on a dog in 1666. It was, then, perfected on dogs in 1907 ("Medical Benefits"). If it weren't for the tests done on these dogs, blood transfusions may not have

been successful in the treatment of people. The amount of medical advancements found due to animal testing has played a huge role in modern medicine.

Also, animal testing provides safety to humans. Cosmetic testing on animals is mostly used to test a product's effects on skin and in eyes ("Fact Sheet: Cosmetic Testing"). It makes sure that the product is safe for when it is sold to people. The other side states that animals are killed and treated inhumanely. They also state that the animals are being borderline tortured (Murnaghan-B). However, many governments have regulations and laws for the treatment of animals being tested. The UK introduced a law that makes companies that are doing animal testing give a detailed report of what must happen. Then, it is weighed against the potential benefits of the project. If the cost doesn't outweigh the benefits, the testing is not allowed (Festing). Also, animals can be used to test the toxicity of a product. When products are made, it may not be possible to know how toxic it is for a human. Since animals and people are so alike, testing it on animals can make sure that when humans use it they don't have the possible negative effects that can harm them ("FDA Basics"). If it meant a lab rat getting sick from a product to protect a child from getting harmed, it is worth the testing.

Finally, it is better to test on animals than humans. Humans and mice share 95% of DNA. Animals often suffer from the same types of diseases people do ("Forty Reasons Why We"). This makes animals a good replacement for humans in studies. The other side thinks that it is inhumane to use animals such as dogs and cats as test subjects because they are used as pets. That it is unfair because those animals don't deserve to be tested on (Murnaghan-A). However, 93% of all animals used for tests are rats, mice, birds, and fish that are specifically bred for testing. These animals were never kept as pets and are born only to be tested on ("US Statistics"). First a test is conducted on tissue and organs. Then, it has to be tested on a suitable animal because it would be unethical to test on humans. People are viewed to be above animals so harming humans is out of the question ("Why

Animals Are Used”). So animals make the best substitute for medical tests.

Animals and people can share a bond. However, animals can be used to teach people so much. Animal testing should be allowed by the government because it greatly improves people’s lives. It, also, allows people to understand so much about medicine. Animals are the best substitute for people when it comes to test. The life of one million lab rats isn’t worth as much as the life of one child.

[Again, the author wants to emphasize that the Works Cited Page should be on a SEPARATE page from the content of any research piece. However, to save some trees, this is why it is on the same page of the content. Still, remember: The MLA format and the APA format require that its Works Cited Page and Reference Page be on a page/s separate from the content of the research theme/paper. Also, note that the font size and style should be the same as the rest of the research piece.]

Works Cited

“Fact Sheet: Cosmetic Testing.” Humane Society, www.

**humanesociety.org/issues/cosmetic_testing/qa/questions
_answers.html?referrer=https://www.google.com. Ac-
cessed 9 Apr. 2017.**

**“Failure of the Animal Model.” National Anti-Vivisection So-
ciety, www.navs.org/the-issues/failure-of-the-animal-
model/#, WO66QdlyuUI. Accesses 9 Apr. 2017.**

“FDA Basics—Why Are Animals Used for Testing Medical Products?” U S Food and Drug Administration Home Page, Office of the Commissioner, 20 Mar. 2017, www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/Transparency/Basics/ucm194932.htm. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

Festing, Simon. “Animal Research Saves Lives.” *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 28 May 2008, www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2008/may/28/animalresearchsaveslives. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

“Forty Reasons Why We Need Animals in Research | Understanding Animal Research.” 11 Sept. 2014, www.understandinganimalresearch.org.uk/about-us/science-action-network/forty-reasons-why-we-need-animals-in-research/. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

“Medical Benefits.” *Speaking of Research*, 6 Apr. 2016, speakingofresearch.com/facts/medical-benefits/. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

Trull, Frankie L. “Animal-Test Research Has Saved Many Hu-

man Lives.” Animal Research Saves Lives, 7 Apr. 2002, www.mofed.org/Animal_Research.htm. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

“US Statistics.” Speaking of Research, 10 Feb. 2017, speakingofresearch.com/facts/statistics/. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

“Why Animals Are Used.” Four Main Reasons Why Animals Are Used in Medical Research, www.animalresearch.info/en/designing-research/why-animals-are-used/. Accessed 9 Apr. 2017.

There is a key element that you need to know, no matter the pattern you use to develop an effective argumentation paper. You need to make certain your arguments are not based on fallacies. Also, it is crucial that you are able to determine any fallacies in the opponent's argument and be able to point out and refute them as well as refute even the quality arguments of the opponent as the argumentation themes in this chapter demonstrate.

FALLACIES

Now, you want to make certain you do not use a fallacy to serve as a basis for supporting an argument. What is a fallacy? It is a flaw in the logic of the argument. There are different types:

1) Ad Hominem—this fallacy works at assailing the reputation of a person rather than focusing on the incompetency of an opponent. Generally, when a person implements this fallacy, his/her opponent is probably competent, or the user of this fallacy has no facts to substantiate the alleged incompetency.

2) Appeal to Emotion—this fallacy really goes to the emotional "jugular." During this decade and before, terrorist activity has been perpetrated by some individuals of a certain ethnicity. So, it is common, unfortunately, for some people of authority or power to say: "Beware of this ethnic group because its members may do harm to you or this country." And the fear based on ignorance, never having interacted in a positive situation with individuals of this group, is manipulated and used to heighten this fear so to get people to support actions against these individuals which is like what was done in the 1930s and 1940s to Jewish citizens during the reign of Nazism. And how did that occur? People did not think and realize their financial problems were not caused by Jewish citizens but by the economic challenges caused by several factors, not attributed to Jewish citizens who owned small businesses.

3) Bandwagon—a common example of this occurs when people base their decisions on the results of polls; yes, polls do give a microcosm of what a group of people may or may not think; however, it is very important that one asks:

- a) How many people were included in the poll results?
- b) Who was polled? Were all from the same geographical area or of the same economic class or of the same ethnic group?
- c) And even if many feel a social policy should be pushed or not, is that social policy really morally and ethically correct?

For example, prior to 1920, there were many polls that strongly showed people were against women getting the vote. And, unfortunately, many women, before then, were ridiculed for pushing for the right of women to vote. For a long time, these suffragettes were in the minority. For many years those in Congress did not vote for women to have the right to vote because they based their stand on polls, what their constituents, who talked to them said, and their own personal feelings. So, the fallacy of bandwagon must be recognized and must be questioned and refuted when discovered.

4) Begging the Question—just because a person says something, that does NOT make it true. S/he must show documented facts to support the assertion. In other words, the question should be: What proof do you have to support your assertion? The answer “because I said so” is not proof. And if that person cannot give facts to answer, s/he has used this very powerful fallacy. A key example of this fallacy is the following: “Ms. Fallarpal is a bad teacher.” Unless the person who has stated this does not provide any facts that clearly support this, this is a fallacious statement. First, one should request that the critic defines what s/he means by a “bad teacher.” Then, s/he should provide clear examples that are actually facts that support his/her assertion. So, it is important that the way to refute is to ask: “I have a question: What proof do you have to support this statement?” If the person does

not have an answer that provides facts, then, the assertion should not be believed.

5) **Either/Or**—this fallacy purports that there are only two choices. In most cases, there are always more than two choices. Sometimes, the third, fourth, or fifth choices may be more difficult initially to perceive or may be very taxing for one to choose. For example, if a significant other says to his/her partner, “You either follow my rules or get out,” one may offer a third choice: “We can consider discussing which rules are acceptable and come to an agreement so that we both can live in this abode peacefully.” Of course, if that third choice is not acceptable, there may be a fourth choice, that individual who stated his/her partner must leave may need to consider a fifth choice—s/he be the one to move out of the abode.

6) **False Dichotomy**—this fallacy is shown when people give very easy answers to very complex situations. Some want to say there would not be a drug problem in America if the person using drugs would just “say no.” With all due respect to the former first lady, Nancy Reagan, this was her key slogan, “Just Say No to Drugs.” Yes, this works for individuals who do not have an addiction to drugs or the ability to find a different way of coping with their life challenges. However, for those who have an addiction to drugs, a simple slogan did not and does not work.

7) **Flattery**—sometimes, persons who use this fallacy tell people that they are wonderful folks, even when they know that the actions they are perpetrating are morally and ethically wrong; they continue to tell folks they are so right. And, unfortunately, there are people who do not want to hear what they need to hear but what they want to hear. For many years citizens in the US were arrested, intimidated, and killed if they tried to vote. And those that perpetrated these ghastly acts were told by their ministers, teachers, and municipal leaders that they were doing the right thing to preserve the status quo—of bigotry. Actually, they were used to abuse the civil rights of citizens.

8) Guilt by Association—just because a person associates with a certain group or individual or supports a group's cause does not mean that person is the same as that person or a member of that group. Just because Mother Teresa associated and cared for people who may have been considered to be unsavory, it would be inaccurate to presume she was, also, unsavory. To avoid using this fallacy, a writer or speaker should focus on only the person and what s/he has or has not done, not on with whom s/he is around. And if that person is, indeed, unsavory, only the actions of that person should be mentioned if those actions are relevant to the discussion.

9) Name Calling—this is the opposite of flattery. This fallacy implements the technique of using insults about the opponent rather than discussing the actual issue of disagreement, for example, "You are a liar" or "You are a mean son-of-a ----" or "Roger, is a low-down thug" or "Mary is a weak-kneed Congresswoman!" Even if these insults are true, this is not the proper manner to add support to your argument. Generally, when a person resorts to name calling, this indicates s/he has no facts to support his/her argument. And the best way for one to refute such a fallacy is not to respond. Instead, the person having been insulted should just stay focused on the subject at hand.

10) Post Hoc Doubtful Cause—Having been a professor of a wide range of students, the author has had women students, whose significant others would abuse them, share with her that their partners would say to them: "I would not hit you if you would not irritate me. I love you, but it is your fault." And the sad fact is that some of her female students believed that they were the cause of their own abuse. And many have stayed believing, if they just did not cause the guy to become angry, things would be better. Yes, one has to be able to determine what is the REAL cause; in many cases there is not just one answer; that answer, generally, has nothing to do with the actions of the victim of the abuse. Or any other situation, it is important to study the actual cause. No, one cannot just conclude that the cause is that the abuser is a

dirty S.O.B. The actions may be considered terrible, but that is not the cause; using that as an explanation is just another fallacy—name calling. The cause/s of such actions, the primary causes, probably are deep-seated issues that began during his childhood, before the victim ever knew the abuser. In many cases the primary cause/s need to be addressed by the abuser with the help of a professional therapist, psychologist, or psychiatrist.

11) **Red Herring**—whenever one is in the heat of an argument, the opponent may bring up a subject that has **NOTHING** to do with the issue. And if one is not careful, s/he will become distracted from the real subject and start discussing the irrelevant topic. For example, if a husband and wife are having an argument about the fact that one of them has written overdrafts, the spouse who has written the bad checks may say: "You always want to blame me for everything!" If the responding spouse begins to defend himself/herself by saying, "No, I don't! I always support you." Instead, the responding spouse, who is not the one who has written bad checks, should respond: "Now, Sweetheart, I do not always blame you for everything. What I am talking about is one thing—this issue of the overdrafts of our banking account. I want us to focus on how this can be avoided. Do you have any suggestions, Sweetheart?"

There are other fallacies. However, these are the most common that are used by speakers and writers. It is very important that as listeners, you are not "sucked in" by these illogical statements. And as writers and speakers, it is paramount that you do not implement any of these fallacies in order to prove a point. Indeed, all you will have proven is your ignorance about the subject matter. Thus, you lose credibility and weaken your argument!

QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW FOR CHAPTER EIGHT

- 1. What do you see is the difference between a narrative and argumentative paper?**
- 2. An argumentative paper must persuade the reader to see and understand a particular point of view. Do you have to acknowledge the opposing viewpoints?**
- 3. What is the opposing viewpoint for the 2nd body paragraph of Argumentation Theme—Sample One?**
- 4. What is the writer’s refutation of that opponent’s viewpoint?**
- 5. What is the opposing viewpoint for the 2nd body paragraph of Argumentation Theme—Sample Two?**
- 6. What is the writer’s refutation of that opponent’s viewpoint?**
- 7. Is this refutation well-developed?**
- 8. What is the recommended set up for every body paragraph (158)?**
- 9. What punctuation must end every works cited entry?**
- 10. In Argumentation Theme—Sample Three, what is the opposing viewpoint for 1st body paragraph?**
- 11. What is the refutation to that argument?**
- 12. What are three reasons why this writer is not in favor of the death penalty?**
- 13. The writer of Sample Theme Two uses various types of**

sources. Identify the 1st source that he uses that is from a scholarly journal.

14. Identify the 1st source in the content of Sample Two that refers to material from a printed newspaper agency.

Review of Pattern for Argumentative Theme

Introductory Paragraph

Body Paragraph One

Topic Sentence

Example 1 supporting topic sentence

Opposing example of topic sentence

**Example 2 supporting topic sentence & refuting
opposing example of topic sentence**

Example 3 supporting topic sentence

Concluding Sentence

Body Paragraph Two

Topic Sentence

Example 1 supporting topic sentence

Opposing example of topic sentence

**Example 2 supporting topic sentence & refuting
opposing example of topic sentence**

Example 3 supporting topic sentence

Concluding Sentence

Body Paragraph Three

Topic Sentence

Example 1 supporting topic sentence

Opposing example of topic sentence

**Example 2 supporting topic sentence & refuting
opposing example of topic sentence**

Example 3 supporting topic sentence

Concluding Sentence

Concluding Paragraph