

Falsehood and Fallacy Index

Page numbers in italics represent examples/diagrams/screenshots.

- abstractions, 108–10
- abstracts, 88
- abusive *ad hominem*, 129–30, 143–7
- academic texts, 75–81, 137–8
- Ad Fontes Media, 65
- AdChoices, 25
- aesthetic fallacies, 56, 58, 133
- algorithms, 17, 47
- AllSides.com, 65, 66
- ambiguity fallacies, 138–41
- American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), 5, 6
- amphiboly fallacies, 139
- anachronisms, 111, 121–2, 126, 136
- analysis mode of writing, 161–2
- anecdotal fallacies, 119–20, 160
- appeal to authority, 54, 112, 125–7, 140, 143–9
- appeal to emotion, 61, 131, 143–7
- appeal to fear, 131–2, 143–7
- appeal to guilt, 131
- appeal to irrelevant authority, 112, 125–6
- appeal to nature, 139–40
- appeal to past authorities, 126
- appeal to pity, 131
- appeal to progress, 112–3
- appeal to the people, 134
- appeal to tradition, 112–3, 121–2, 134–5, 143–9
- apples and oranges fallacies, 141–3
- argument from fear, 131–2, 143–7
- argument from the rod (baculum)*, 132
- arguments, 99–100, 158–62. *See also* fallacies
- argumentum ad antiquitatem*, 134–5
- argumentum ad baculum*, 132
- argumentum ad metum*, 131–2, 143–7
- argumentum ad misericordiam*, 131
- argumentum ad populum*, 134
- Arnold, John, 35–6
- attacking the alternative, 128
- audience, 154
- authors of sources, 52–7, 62–4, 70–1, 73

- bandwagon fallacies, 18, 134, 143–7
- bias
 - being aware of, 29
 - confirmation bias, 18–9, 29
 - and emotions, 61–2
 - interpretations, 34, 36
 - in media, 66
 - purpose, 62–70, 71, 73–4
- black-and-white fallacies, 117–8

- Blair, Christopher, 1
 - book conclusion, 163–4
 - book overview, 6–8
 - books
 - and aesthetic fallacies, 133–4
 - and editorial review, 41
 - for research, 4, 12
- Borowitz, Andy, 57
- bots, 56–7
- Break Your Own News (website), 55
- bubbles, 18–9

- Carr, E.H., 36
- category confusion, 141–3
- Caulfield, Michael, 59
- causation, types of, 103–9
- change, 112
- cherry picking, 126, 160
- Chesterton, G.K., 134
- choice fallacies, 117–8
- circumstantial *ad hominem*, 130
- citations, 58
- Clayton, Victoria, 137
- clickbait, 19, 55, 131
- coercion, 132
- comedy, 1, 55, 57, 64, 90
- common characteristics fallacies, 114–5, 121–2
- communication, 11, 12
- composition fallacies, 114, 148–9
- conclusions, 99–100, 161
- conclusions in monographs, 77–9
- conditional necessary causes, 103–7
- confirmation bias, 18–9, 29
- conspiracy theories, 115–6
- content of arguments, 100
- contributing causes, 103, 104–7
- correlation, 107–8
- COVID-19, 2
- CRAAP test
 - overview, 47–8
 - accuracy, 48, 57–62, 71, 73
 - with appeals to irrelevant authority, 126
 - authority, 48, 52–7, 62–4, 70–1, 73
 - currency, 48, 49–51, 70, 71
 - purpose, 48, 62–70, 71, 73–4
 - relevance, 48, 51–2, 70, 71
 - using, 70–1
- critical reading
 - See* information literacy; monographs, reading
- critical thinking, 6–7, 75
- cum hoc, ergo propter hoc*, 107, 109–10

- dates of sources, 49–51

Falsehood and Fallacy Index

- definitions of words, 136–7
- democracy and disinformation, 23
- dense writing, 137–8
- Denver Guardian (fake news site), 55
- diversion fallacies, 123–36
- division fallacies, 114
- domains, 65–7, 74

- echo chambers, 18–9
- education, 4–5, 6, 12
- either-or fallacies, 117
- emotions
 - appeals to, 61, 131, 143–7
 - and bias, 61–2
 - vs. logic, 7
 - and spread of fake news, 20
- enthymemes, 159
- equivocation, 141, 143–7
- etymological fallacies, 136, 143–7
- evidence, 32–4, 80, 81, 158–62
- evidence fallacies, 118–20
- exercises
 - causation, 106–7
 - CRAAP test, 72–3
 - critical reading exercise #1, 91–2
 - critical reading exercise #2, 93–5
 - essay scavenger hunt, 148–50
 - fact-checking, 59–60
 - factual statements vs. opinion, 29–30
 - logical fallacies, 109–10, 121–2, 143–7
 - opinion vs. interpretation, 34–5
 - primary or secondary sources, 43–5
 - Tweet authenticity, 26, 26
 - website content, 23–4
- explanations, 32

- Facebook, 15, 17, 56. *See also* social media
- fact checking, 59–60
- fact vs. opinion, 28–31
- FactCheck.org, 59
- factual statements, 28–33, 35
- fake news
 - defined, 3, 16
 - as deliberate, 15, 16
 - Facebook engagement, 17
 - legitimate media labeled as, 21, 23
 - and Macedonia teens, 17
 - and satire, 1, 64
 - sites of, 55–6
 - spread of, 19–20
- fallacies
 - as bad arguments, 3, 99
 - defined, 99
 - of diversion, 123–36
 - of evidence, 118–20
 - formal, 100–3
 - of generalization, 113–8
 - informal, 100, 108–9, 123–4, 140, 142
 - and legitimate sources, 7
 - of linguistic diversions, 136–42
 - of narration, 111–2
 - fallacies attacking the arguer, 130–2
 - fallacious arguments, 7. *See also* arguments
 - fallacy fallacies, 142
 - false dilemmas, 117, 121–2
 - falsehoods
 - bubbles, 18–9
 - discerning truth, 21–3
 - dodging, 27
 - fact vs. opinion, 28–31
 - as filtered out, 14
 - interpretation vs. opinion, 31–5
 - objectivity vs. neutrality, 35–8
 - proving, 28
 - See also* CRAAP test; fake news; monographs, reading
 - Fischer, David Hackett, 7
 - free speech, 3

 - Gaddis, John Lewis, 115
 - gambler’s fallacies, 101–3, 109–10
 - gatekeepers, 14
 - generalization fallacies, 113–8
 - generalizations, 113–8
 - Generation Z, 1–2
 - genetic fallacies, 125
 - goals of monographs, 83, 84, 89, 91–5
 - Google and news research, 15–6, 47, 68–9
 - grammatical errors, 61
 - guilt by association, 130, 143–7

 - Harris, Robert, 59, 62
 - hasty generalizations, 113–6
 - historical method, 37
 - Histories and Fallacies* (Trueman), 36–7
 - historiography, 86–7
 - hot hand fallacies, 102–3, 109–10
 - hypocrisy, 124–5

 - impersonations, 55
 - information literacy, 6, 7, 75. *See also* monographs, reading
 - internet
 - and aesthetic fallacies, 133–4
 - amount of material, 15
 - fake websites, 55–6

Falsehood and Fallacy Index

- as filterless, 14
- news research with Google, 15–6, 47, 68–9
- for research, 4, 13
- See also* CRAAP test; social media; technology
- Internet Archive (website), 51, 67–8, 68–9
- interpretation vs. opinion, 31–5
- interpretations, 35–8, 39
- introduction writing, 155–8
- introductions in monographs, 77–8
- intrusion fallacies, 123
- irrelevant proof fallacies, 119

- journal articles, 75

- Kelly, T. Mills, 68–9

- language and purpose, 69–70
- legitimate media
 - biases, 66
 - as fake news, 21, 23
 - and fallacies, 7
 - newspapers vs. social media, 16
 - and wide range of readers, 76
- LGBTQ+ people, 3
- liberal arts, 5–6
- liberal educations, 5–6
- libraries, 12
- linguistic diversions fallacies, 136–42
- listening, 132
- logic, 99–101. *See also* exercises; fallacies
- lonely fact fallacies, 113

- metadata, 69
- methodology in monographs, 85–7, 89, 91–5
- microfilm readers, 12
- Momo hoax, 20
- monographs, reading
 - overview of how to read, 76–7
 - overview of aspects to identify, 84, 89
 - as conversations with authors, 81–2
 - critiquing, 87, 88, 89
 - and different disciplines, 81
 - goals, 83, 84, 89, 91–5
 - historiography, 86–7
 - and important facts, 79–80
 - introduction and conclusion, 77–9
 - methodology, 85–7, 89, 91–5
 - subjects, 82–3
 - taking notes, 79, 87
 - thesis, 83–5, 89, 91–5
- Multiple Death Syndrome, 50

- narration fallacies, 111–2

- necessary causes, 103–7
- negative proof fallacies, 118–9, 121–2
- neutrality, 35–8, 40
- newspapers, 16, 76
- 9/11 events, 2
- nirvana fallacies, 112, 148–9
- non sequiturs, 101–3, 109–10, 143–7

- objectivity
 - and bias, 34–5
 - defined, 28
 - and factual statements, 28, 29–30
 - vs. neutrality, 35–8
 - and verification, 37
- opinion vs. fact, 28–31
- opinion vs. interpretation, 31–5
- Otero, Vanessa, 65
- outrage, 20
- oversimplification, 115–6, 121–2, 148–9

- Pariser, Eli, 18
- Pasquerella, Lynn, 6
- Passmore, Kevin, 32, 36
- peer reviews, 40–1, 42, 61, 75
- “Pizzagate,” 21
- poisoning the well, 130
- politics and polarization, 3, 7
- post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, 107, 109–10, 148
- Postman, Neil, 13–4
- Post-Millennial Generation, 1–2
- précis, 88–9, 90
- premises, 99–100
- primary agent causes, 103–5
- primary sources
 - overview, 38–40
 - and credibility, 58
 - defined, 158
 - vs. secondary, 42–5
 - and textbooks, 41
- pseudo-profundity fallacies, 137–8, 143–7, 163

- quotations, 126
- quote mining, 140–1, 160

- Raab, Nigel, 6
- reading
 - See* information literacy; monographs, reading
- red herring fallacies, 124
- reductive fallacies, 115
- reification, 108–10
- research, 4, 12
- Richardson, Heather Cox, 77, 78, 80

- sacred cow, 127, 143–7
- satire, 1, 55, 57, 64, 90
- scapegoating, 128–9, 143–7
- scientific method, 37
- search engine optimization, 69
- secondary sources
 overview, 39–43
 and date of publications, 49
 defined, 158
 hierarchy of, 42
 and monographs, 75–6
 and primary sources, 58
 when writing, 160–1
- “shifting the blame” fallacies, 125, 129
- Silverman, Craig, 16–7, 20
- single cause fallacies, 115
- slippery slope generalizations, 114, 121–2
- social media
 Break Your Own News (website), 55
 and bubbles, 18–9
 vs. print newspapers, 16
 reach of, 15
 verified users, 56–7
 See also internet
- Sokal, Alan, 138
- sources
 and aesthetics, 133
 authors of, 52–7, 62–4, 70–1, 73
 and content, 100
 dates of, 49–51
 evaluating (*see* CRAAP test)
 interpretations of, 35–8
 legitimate sources and fallacies, 7
 primary, 38–40, 41, 42–5, 58, 158
 reading critically, 75–6 (*see also* monographs, reading)
 secondary, 39–43, 42, 49, 58, 75–6, 158, 160–1
 tertiary, 41
 for writing, 158–9
 See also various sources
- SourceWatch (website), 63
- special pleading, 123, 143–7
- speculations, 119
- sponsored content, 22, 25
- statistics, 119–20
- stereotyping, 114, 116, 121–2
- straw man fallacies, 127–8, 143–7
- students, 2, 21–3
- style in writing, 162–3
- subjectivity, 28, 30–1, 34–5
- subjects in monographs, 82–3
- summaries, 90
- sunk-cost fallacies, 135–6
- sweeping generalizations, 116–7
- technology, 1–2, 14. *See also* internet
- Technopoly* (Postman), 13–4
- textbooks, 41
- Thamus, 13
- TheLastLineOfDefense.org, 1
- thesis, 83–5, 89, 91–5, 155–8
- tokenisms, 113–4
- Tromble, Rebekah, 20
- Trueman, Carl, 36–7
- Trump, Donald, 16, 17, 21, 26
- truth
 absolute, 32
 and arguments, 99–100
 and democracy, 23
 and listening, 132
 and novelty, 20
 and number of believers, 18
 post-truth politics, 21
 proving, 28
 and reputability, 15
 on Twitter, 19–20
 young people discerning, 21–3
- tu quoque* fallacies, 124–5, 143–7
- 2016 US elections, 16, 17
- Twitter, 19–20, 26, 26, 56–7. *See also* social media
- “two wrongs don’t make a right” fallacies, 124–5, 143–7
- university websites, 66–7
- unknowable fact fallacies, 119, 121–2
- URLs, 55–6, 65–8
- vague appeal to authority, 126–7, 143–7
- vagueness, 138–40, 143–7, 148–9
- Vosoughi, Soroush, 19–20
- War on Terror, 2–3
- Wayback Machine, 51, 67–8, 68–9
- website domains, 65–7, 74
- websites, 54–6, 65–8
- Whitman, Walt, 14
- Wineburg, Sam, 21–2, 23
- word concept fallacies, 136–7, 143–7
- writers, 8
- writing
 overview, 153–4, 162
 abstracts, 88
 arguments, 158–62
 and audience, 154
 concluding sentences, 160
 conclusions, 161
 evidence, 158–62

- and forgetfulness, 13
 - hazards to avoid, 155
 - as important skill, 11
 - introductions, 155–8
 - précis, 88–9
 - and professor's comments, 40
 - and questions, 154–5
 - sources, 158–9
 - spoilers, 156
 - style, 162–3
 - summaries, 90
 - thesis, 155–8
 - using analysis mode, 161–2
- young people, 21–3