Ethical communication and fallacies

Tuesday, 4 April 2017 4:36 PM

•	Key concern in all elements of the rhetorical canons		
•	-	nitions	
	0	Arguers who act to undermine their audiences or weaken community bonds and	
		structures are generally considered unethical	
		■ Ethical	
		□ Strengthens community structures	
		□ Works in the best interests of the audience	
	0	 Inch and Warnick, Critical Thinking and Communication, 2010 Ethical (and persuasive) characters seek to be wise, trustworthy, fair and honest 	
	0	Aristotle	
	0	The ability to meet their obligations to others	
		 Balancing respect for the writer's audience with the complexity of the issue being 	
		discussed	
		 I.e. For a complex issue, not using language that is too simple and vice versa 	
		 Ensures obligations to the audience is met because they are ensuring the 	
		reader has an accurate understanding of the topic	
		 Willingly put ourselves in the place of our readers 	
		□ Experience what they do as they read what we've written	
		 Seek understanding of the ways that our writing affects the people we write about Write in ways that help achieve the best interests of those communities 	
		☐ Being aware of community expectations about respectful language	
		◆ Inclusive language according to Monash	
		♦ Avoids marginalising people	
		♦ Accessible and meaningful to a wide audience	
	0	Professional ethics according to Anne Surma (Public and Professional Writing 34)	
		 Professional communicator might have different cultural backgrounds, goals and 	
		responsibilities to various parties	
		 Complicating the rhetorical situation 	
		□ E.g. Family and company	
		Oriented towards (rather than at) others Imaging and asknowledging:	
		☐ Imaging and acknowledging:◆ Their positions	
		 Rights to respond to our missives in a challenging manner which may 	
		encourage us to re-evaluate our aims, ideas or beliefs	
		 Aim is to achieve a close as possible correspondence between intended meanings 	
		and the interpretations others make of them	
•		e-Segolene Royal's use of rhetoric was viewed as deceptive when used "tactfully, perhaps	
	even	tactically"	
	0		
		Richardson (2008) Introduction: What is rhetoric?	
•		orical fallacies Definition	
	O	Collins Australian Dictionary	
		☐ An incorrect or misleading notion or opinion	
		□ Invalid reasoning	
		☐ Rendering an argument logically invalid	
	0	Rhetorical fallacy	

a) Speech is presented in a rhetorical situation

□ Rather than considering formal logic and universal validity, because:

Use of unfair tactics of argument in a particular situation

i) See below

- b) The study of rhetoric considers text in relation to these factors (contextualisation), so texts cannot be faulty in a universal sense
- c) Only in the situation in which it was presented
 - ♦ E.g. Fallacy can exist in one situation but not in another

Examples

- □ Appeal to fear
 - Made by increasing fear and prejudice towards the opposing side
 - Pathos
- □ Slippery slope
 - Unjustified claim that a chain reaction, ending in dire consequences, will take place if one 'step' is made
 - ◆ Pathos
- □ Appeal to ridicule
 - Presenting an opponent's argument as if it is absurd
 - ◆ Logos
- ☐ Hasty (or biased) generalizing
 - Making assumptions to a broader case/group based on an inadequate sample size
 - ♦ E.g. Stereotypes
 - ◆ Logos
- □ False dilemma (or false dichotomy)
 - Arguer sets it up as if there are only two choices, then eliminates one to leave the choice that they are pushing for
 - ◆ Logos
 - ♦ Logical option left
 - ◆ Pathos
 - ♦ Audience feeling cornered
- □ False analogy
 - Arguments sometimes rely on analogies being made to compare objects/ideas/situations
 - Doing so falsely is to compare things that aren't alike in the aspects relevant to the argument
 - ♦ E.g. Hammers and guns are used to kill (but guns can be used to commit mass-murder)
 - ◆ Logos
- □ Post hoc ergo propter hoc
 - Claimed that one event was caused by another, solely based up their chronology
 - ◆ Logos
- □ Ad hominem
 - Bypassing an argument by launching an attack on the character presenting it (usually irrelevant one) and not their claim
 - ◆ Ethos
- □ Guilt by association
 - Discrediting an argument by associating it with an undesirable person or group
 - **♦** Ethos
 - ♦ Attaching negative characteristics to the new argument
 - ◆ Logos
 - "You don't want that, so you don't want this"
- □ Straw man
 - Anticipating an argument of the opponent and attacking it according
 - The arguer knocks down a distorted/weaker, watered-down version of the opponent's position, but this is less powerful than rebuking the principle points of it
 - ♦ Logos