

Difference and Analogy: The Five Types of Argument in Law and Common Sense

Introduction

In the realm of law and jurisprudence, the art of argumentation stands as a cornerstone, a linchpin that binds together the intricate tapestry of legal discourse. Through the skillful weaving of words and the marshalling of evidence, advocates seek to persuade judges and juries, to sway their opinions and shape the course of justice. At the heart of this persuasive endeavor lies the concept of legal argument, a structured and reasoned presentation of evidence and logic aimed at supporting a particular legal position.

This book delves into the fascinating world of legal argumentation, exploring the various types of

arguments that lawyers and judges employ to build their cases and advance their positions. Drawing upon real-world examples and case studies, it provides a comprehensive and accessible guide to the art of legal reasoning and persuasion.

The book is divided into ten chapters, each focusing on a specific type of legal argument. These chapters delve into the intricacies of textual arguments, intentional arguments, precedent arguments, traditional arguments, policy arguments, and analogical arguments. Each chapter examines the structure, elements, and strengths of each type of argument, providing readers with a deep understanding of how they are constructed and deployed in legal settings.

Beyond the exploration of individual argument types, the book also delves into the broader principles of argumentation theory. It examines the criteria for evaluating arguments, the techniques for attacking and

defending arguments, and the strategies for constructing powerful and persuasive arguments.

Whether you are a law student seeking to master the art of legal argumentation, a practicing lawyer seeking to enhance your persuasive skills, or simply a curious individual seeking to understand the inner workings of the legal system, this book offers a wealth of insights and practical guidance. With its clear and engaging writing style, it makes the complex world of legal argumentation accessible to readers of all backgrounds.

Book Description

Difference and Analogy: The Five Types of Argument in Law and Common Sense provides a comprehensive and accessible guide to the art of legal argumentation. Drawing upon real-world examples and case studies, this book delves into the intricacies of textual arguments, intentional arguments, precedent arguments, traditional arguments, policy arguments, and analogical arguments.

With its clear and engaging writing style, **Difference and Analogy** makes the complex world of legal argumentation accessible to readers of all backgrounds. Whether you are a law student seeking to master the art of legal argumentation, a practicing lawyer seeking to enhance your persuasive skills, or simply a curious individual seeking to understand the inner workings of the legal system, this book offers a wealth of insights and practical guidance.

Inside, you will discover:

- The six essential elements of a sound legal argument
- How to identify and avoid common fallacies
- The art of constructing persuasive arguments
- How to use evidence effectively to support your case
- Strategies for attacking and defending arguments

Difference and Analogy is more than just a book about legal argumentation. It is also a valuable resource for anyone who wants to improve their critical thinking and persuasion skills. The principles of argumentation that are explored in this book can be applied to a wide range of settings, from the courtroom to the boardroom to the dinner table.

With this book, you will learn how to:

- Analyze arguments more effectively

- Identify weaknesses in your own arguments and the arguments of others
- Develop more persuasive arguments
- Communicate your ideas more clearly and effectively

Difference and Analogy is the essential guide to legal argumentation for anyone who wants to understand and participate in the legal process.

Chapter 1: Reasoning and Argumentation

The Nature of Reasoning

Reasoning is a fundamental cognitive process that allows humans to make sense of the world around them and to form judgments and beliefs. It is the process of using logic and evidence to draw conclusions from premises. Reasoning is essential for all aspects of human life, from making everyday decisions to solving complex problems.

There are many different types of reasoning, each with its own strengths and weaknesses. Some of the most common types of reasoning include:

- **Deductive reasoning:** Deductive reasoning is a type of reasoning in which the conclusion is necessarily true if the premises are true. For example, if we know that all dogs are mammals

and that all mammals have fur, then we can conclude that all dogs have fur.

- **Inductive reasoning:** Inductive reasoning is a type of reasoning in which the conclusion is probably true, but not necessarily true. For example, if we observe that the sun has risen every day for the past several thousand years, we can conclude that the sun will probably rise tomorrow.
- **Abductive reasoning:** Abductive reasoning is a type of reasoning in which the conclusion is the best explanation for the evidence. For example, if we find a watch in the woods, we might conclude that someone was there recently.

Reasoning is a complex and multifaceted process that is essential for human cognition. It allows us to make sense of the world around us, to solve problems, and to make decisions.

Reasoning is also essential for legal argumentation. Lawyers use reasoning to construct arguments that support their clients' positions. They use evidence and logic to persuade judges and juries to adopt their viewpoints.

The study of reasoning is called logic. Logic is the formal study of the principles of reasoning. It provides a framework for analyzing and evaluating arguments.

Logic can be divided into two main branches: deductive logic and inductive logic. Deductive logic is the study of the principles of reasoning that guarantee that the conclusion is true if the premises are true. Inductive logic is the study of the principles of reasoning that allow us to draw probable conclusions from evidence.

Reasoning is a powerful tool that can be used to achieve a variety of goals. It can be used to solve problems, to make decisions, and to persuade others. By understanding the principles of reasoning, we can

improve our ability to think critically and to make sound judgments.

Chapter 1: Reasoning and Argumentation

The Structure of Arguments

Every legal argument, regardless of its type, shares a common structure that consists of three essential elements: a claim, evidence, and reasoning.

1. **Claim:** The claim is the central assertion that the arguer is trying to prove. It is the proposition that the arguer wants the audience to accept. For example, in a criminal trial, the prosecutor's claim might be that the defendant is guilty of murder.
2. **Evidence:** The evidence is the information that the arguer uses to support the claim. Evidence can take many forms, such as testimony from witnesses, documents, physical evidence, and expert testimony. In the murder trial example, the prosecutor might present evidence such as

eyewitness testimony, forensic evidence, and the defendant's confession.

3. **Reasoning:** The reasoning is the logical connection between the evidence and the claim. It is the explanation of how the evidence supports the claim. In the murder trial example, the prosecutor might argue that the eyewitness testimony, forensic evidence, and the defendant's confession all point to the conclusion that the defendant is guilty of murder.

These three elements are essential for any legal argument to be persuasive. Without a clear claim, evidence, and reasoning, the argument will be weak and unconvincing.

In addition to these essential elements, legal arguments may also include other elements, such as:

- **Introduction:** The introduction sets the stage for the argument by providing background

information and explaining the significance of the issue.

- **Conclusion:** The conclusion summarizes the argument and restates the claim.
- **Rebuttal:** The rebuttal addresses any counterarguments that the opposing party might raise.

The structure of a legal argument can vary depending on the type of argument and the context in which it is being made. However, the essential elements of claim, evidence, and reasoning are always present.

By understanding the structure of legal arguments, you can become a more effective advocate for your clients. You will be able to construct stronger arguments that are more likely to persuade judges and juries.

Chapter 1: Reasoning and Argumentation

Deductive and Inductive Arguments

Deductive and inductive arguments are two fundamental types of logical reasoning that play a crucial role in legal argumentation. Deductive arguments proceed from general premises to specific conclusions, while inductive arguments proceed from specific observations to general conclusions.

Deductive Arguments

Deductive arguments are based on the principle of syllogism, which states that if two premises are true, then the conclusion must also be true. For example:

- All men are mortal (premise 1)
- Socrates is a man (premise 2)
- Therefore, Socrates is mortal (conclusion)

In a deductive argument, the conclusion is necessarily true if the premises are true. However, the truth of the premises does not guarantee the truth of the conclusion. For example:

- All swans are white (premise 1)
- This bird is a swan (premise 2)
- Therefore, this bird is white (conclusion)

This argument is deductively valid, but it is not sound because the first premise is false. There are black swans, so the conclusion does not necessarily follow from the premises.

Inductive Arguments

Inductive arguments are based on the principle of generalization, which states that if a pattern is observed in a number of cases, then it is likely to hold true in other cases. For example:

- I have seen several black crows (observation 1)

- I have seen several more black crows (observation 2)
- Therefore, all crows are black (conclusion)

This argument is inductively strong because the conclusion is supported by a large number of observations. However, the conclusion is not necessarily true. It is possible that there are white crows that we have not yet observed.

Deductive vs. Inductive Arguments in Law

Deductive and inductive arguments are both used in legal argumentation, but they serve different purposes. Deductive arguments are often used to prove a legal principle or rule, while inductive arguments are often used to prove a factual issue.

For example, a prosecutor might use a deductive argument to prove that the defendant is guilty of murder:

- Murder is a crime (premise 1)

- The defendant killed the victim (premise 2)
- Therefore, the defendant is guilty of murder (conclusion)

On the other hand, a defense attorney might use an inductive argument to prove that the defendant did not commit the crime:

- The defendant has no history of violence (observation 1)
- The defendant was not seen near the crime scene (observation 2)
- The defendant has an alibi for the time of the crime (observation 3)
- Therefore, it is unlikely that the defendant committed the crime (conclusion)

The strength of a deductive or inductive argument depends on the truth of the premises and the validity of the reasoning. In legal argumentation, it is important to carefully evaluate the evidence and the reasoning used

in both deductive and inductive arguments in order to determine their validity and persuasiveness.

This extract presents the opening three sections of the first chapter.

Discover the complete 10 chapters and 50 sections by purchasing the book, now available in various formats.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Reasoning and Argumentation * The Nature of Reasoning * The Structure of Arguments * Deductive and Inductive Arguments * Formal and Informal Fallacies * The Role of Evidence in Argumentation

Chapter 2: Textual Arguments * The Plain Meaning Rule * The Rule of Lenity * The Parol Evidence Rule * The Doctrine of Stare Decisis * Legislative History

Chapter 3: Intentional Arguments * The Subjective Intent of the Parties * The Objective Intent of the Parties * The Reasonable Person Standard * The Custom and Usage Rule * The Course of Dealing Rule

Chapter 4: Precedent Arguments * The Doctrine of Stare Decisis * The Rule of Precedent * The Doctrine of Distinguishability * The Doctrine of Overruling * The Prospective Overruling Doctrine

Chapter 5: Traditional Arguments * The Common Law * The Canons of Statutory Construction * The Maxims of Equity * The Rules of Professional Conduct * The Restatements of the Law

Chapter 6: Policy Arguments * The Public Policy Doctrine * The Balancing of Interests Test * The Cost-Benefit Analysis * The Risk-Benefit Analysis * The Precautionary Principle

Chapter 7: Analogical Arguments * The Nature of Analogical Reasoning * The Similarity Requirement * The Dissimilarity Requirement * The Materiality Requirement * The Policy Requirement

Chapter 8: Evaluating Arguments * The Criteria for Evaluating Arguments * The Weight of Evidence * The Burden of Proof * The Standard of Proof * The Role of Persuasion

Chapter 9: Attacking Arguments * Identifying the Fallacies * Exposing the Weaknesses * Undermining the

Evidence * Shifting the Burden of Proof * Appealing to the Emotions

Chapter 10: Constructing Arguments * Choosing the Right Type of Argument * Gathering the Evidence * Organizing the Argument * Presenting the Argument * Responding to Objections

This extract presents the opening three sections of the first chapter.

Discover the complete 10 chapters and 50 sections by purchasing the book, now available in various formats.