



I'm not robot



Continue

Reductio ad hitlerum explained

DEFINITIONS OF ADACIA GROUP 6: REFUTATION BASED ON FALLACIES TEST #6 A CORRECT ANSWER IS To Explain the reductio ad absurdum.. Fallacy. Reductio ad absurdum is also known as reducing to an absurdity. It involves characterizing an opposite argument in such a way that it seems ridiculous, or the consequences of the position seem ridiculous. It may be ridiculous in the sense that the argument seems silly, or ridiculous in the sense that no reasonable person would take such a stand. An example of reductio ad absurdum would be an anti-Equal Rights advocate claiming that anyone in favor of an Equal Rights Amendment should be in favor of killing babies. The fallacy reductio ad absurdum is similar to the fallacy of the straw person. Someone who makes a fallacy reductio ad absurdum does not attack the other position, however, because it is so absurd that the public can dismiss it without counterargument. Someone committing the fallacy of the straw person goes ahead one to refute the other argument to seem to have a strong argument of their own. Click here to go to the next question. For the general concept, see Nazi analogies. Reductio ad Hitlerum (/ˈhʊtlərəm/; The Latin for reduction to Hitler), also known as playing the Nazi card.[1][2] is an attempt to invalidate another person's position based on the same view it was maintained by Adolf Hitler or the Nazi Party. [3] One example would be that since Hitler was against smoking, this implies that someone who is against smoking is a Nazi. [4] Coined by Leo Strauss in 1953, reductio ad Hitlerum lends its name from the term used in logic called reductio ad absurdum (reduction to absurdity). [5] According to Strauss, reductio ad Hitlerum is a form of ad hominem, ad misericordiam, or a fallacy of irrelevance. The suggested logic is guilt by association. It is a tactic often used to derail arguments because such comparisons tend to distract and annoy the opponent. [6] Fallacious nature Reductio ad Hitlerum is a form of fallacy association. [7] The argument is that a policy takes - or is the same as - one defended or implemented by Adolf Hitler or the Third Reich and thus proves that the original policy is undesirable. Another example of reductio ad Hitlerum is asking a question about how Do you know who else...? with the deliberate intention of impregnating a certain idea or action, implying that Hitler held this idea or carried out such an action. [8] An invocation of Hitler or Nazism is not an ad Hitlerum reductive when it illuminates the argument rather than causing distraction from it. [9] History The phrase reductio ad Hitlerum is first known to have been used in an article written by University of Chicago professor Leo Strauss for Measure: A Critical Journal in the spring of 1951,[10] although it was famous in a book by the same author published in 1953[3] Natural Right and History, Chapter II: In this movement towards its end will inevitably reach a point beyond which the scene is darkened by Hitler's shadow. Unfortunately, it should not be said that in our examination we must avoid the fallacy that in recent decades has often been used as a substitute for reductio ad absurdum: the reductio ad Hitlerum. A view is not refuted by the fact that it happens to have been shared by Hitler. The phrase was derived from the logical argument called reductio ad absurdum. The argumentum variant takes its form from the names of many classical fallacies, such as argumentum ad hominem. The variant of ad Nazium can be even more humorous derived from argumentum ad nauseam. Limits to classification as a fallacy Historian Daniel Goldhagen, who had written about the Holocaust, argues that not all comparisons with Hitler and Nazism are logical fallacies, since if they were all, there would be nothing to learn from the events that led to the Holocaust. He argues in his book Hitler's Willing Executioners that many people who were accomplices or active participants in the Holocaust and later in fascist and neo-Nazi movements manipulated the historical narrative to escape guilt or deny aspects of the Holocaust. [12] Allegations that allegations of antisemitism are reductio ad Hitlerum were also employed by David Irving, a British Holocaust denier. [13] The claim of reductio ad Hitlerum has been employed in recent years widely online to end criticism of anti-Semitic and fascist statements and the defense of the use of the ad Hitlerum stronghold to silence criticism has also been used more widely on social media by companies such as Facebook, Twitter and YouTube. Allegations of reductio ad Hitlerum are also employed as a technique with which to make general statements about political opponents as making absurd claims if they actually made these allegations in fact. In 2000, Thomas Fleming claimed that reductio ad Hitlerum was being used by his opponents against his values: Leo Strauss called it reductio ad Hitlerum. If Hitler liked neoclassical art, it means that classicism in all forms is Nazi; if Hitler wanted to strengthen the German family, which makes the traditional family (and its defenders) Nazi; if Hitler spoke of the nation or the people, then any invocation of nationality, ethnicity or even folklore is Nazi [...]. [14] Antecedents Although named and formalized around Hitler, the logical fallacy existed before World War II. There were other individuals in history who were used as substitutes for pure evil. [15] In the 18th, 19th and EARLY 20th centuries, the Pharaoh of the Book of Exodus was commonly seen as the vilest person in history. [15] In the years prior to the American Civil War, abolitionists to slave owners as modern pharaohs. After VE Day, Pharaoh Pharaoh to appear in the speeches of social reformers such as Martin Luther King Jr.[15] Judas Iscariot and Pontius Pilate were also commonly held as pure evil. However, there was no universal person similar to Hitler and different regions and sometimes used different stand-ins. [15] In the years after the American Revolution, King George III was often vilified in the United States. Andrew Jackson was also called King Andrew the First. During the American Civil War, some Confederates called Lincoln a modern pharaoh. In 1991, Michael André Bernstein claimed reductio ad Hitlerum over a full-page ad placed in The New York Times by the Lubavitch community after the Crown Heights riot under the title This year Kristallnacht took place on August 19, right here in Crown Heights. Henry Schwarzschild, who had witnessed Kristallnacht, wrote to The New York Times that no matter how ugly the anti-Semitic slogans and the aggressive behavior of people on the streets [during the Crown Heights riots] [...] one thing that clearly did not occur was a Kristallnacht. [16] The American conservative accused Jonah Goldberg's book, liberal fascism, of employing reductio fallacy: that Nazism and contemporary liberalism promote healthy living is as meaningless a discovery as that bloody marys and martinis can be made with gin. Repeatedly, Goldberg does not recognize a reductio ad absurdum. [...] In no case does Goldberg discover anything more sinister than a coincidence. [17] See also Godwin's Law List of red-baiting fallacies (reductio ad Stalinum) References ^ Godwin's Law, or Playing the Nazi Charter. Jewish Telegraph Agency. Retrieved April 21, 2020. ^ Playing the Nazi Charter. Fair. March 1, 2010. Retrieved April 21, 2020. ^ a b Natural Law and History. University of Oklahoma. 2008. Retrieved 2008-08-11. ^ Schneider, N. K; Glantz, S.A. (October 1, 2008). Nicotine Nazis attack again: a brief analysis of the use of Nazi rhetoric in attacking the defense of tobacco control. Tobacco control. 17 (5): 291–296. doi:10.1136/tc.2007.024653. PMC 2736555. PMID 18818222. ^ Leo Strauss, Natural Law and History. Chicago: University of Chicago Press ,1965 [1953], p. 42. ^ a b Curtis, Gary N. (2004). Logical Fallacy: Hitler's Letter. Fallacy Archives. Retrieved 2007-10-08. ^ Curtis, Gary N. (2004). Logical Fallacy: Guilt by Association. Fallacy Archives. Retrieved 2007-10-08. Do you know who else ___? Origin? - catchphrase meme. Ask MetaFilter. Retrieved 2013-01-10. ^ Gabriel H. Teninbaum, Reduction ad Hitlerum: Trumping the Judicial Nazi Card. Michigan State Law Review, Vol. 2009, p. 541-578, 2009 ^ Hutchins, Robert Maynard (1951). Measure: A Critical Journal. Company H. Regnery. Retrieved February 5, 2014. ^ Hitler Willing Executioners: Common and the Holocaust, Daniel Jonah Goldhagen 1997 ^ Eichmann was Scandalously Stupid. Hannah Hannah The Last Interview: And Other Conversations. November 9, 1964. ^ Broomfield, Matt (May 7, 2017). Disguised in a secret 'neo-Nazi' meeting with Holocaust denier David Irving. Independent. Independent news. Retrieved November 22, 2019. ^ Thomas Fleming, Editor, Chronicles (Rockford, Illinois), May 2000, p. 11. ^ a b c d and Brian Palmer (October 4, 2011). Before Hitler, who was the substitute for pure evil?. Slate. Retrieved November 27, 2014. ^ Foregone Conclusions. Escholarship.org. Recovered 2011-07-07. The Lubavitcher community itself, in the form of the Crown Heights Emergency Fund, placed a full-page ad in The New York Times on September 20, 1991, under the title This year Kristallnacht took place on August 19 right here in Crown Heights... His version of Leo Strauss's reductive ad Hitlerum was rightly perceived by those who were in Germany in Kristallnacht (November 9, 1938) as an outrageous comparison. ^ Austin Bramwell (January 28, 2008). Goldberg's Trivial Pursuit. The American Conservative. Retrieved January 30, 2014. External links Is it okay to call someone a Nazi?. BBC News. July 14, 2010. Playing with Hitler and History – slideshow of Mike Huckabee's Der Spiegel reductio ad Hitlerum. Lincoln Mitchell, April 7, 2013 Harris, Adam J. L.; Hsu, Anne S.; Madsen, Jens K. (June 11, 2012). Because Hitler did it! Quantitative tests of Bayesian argumentation using ad hominem (PDF). Thinking and Thinking. London, United Kingdom: Psychology Press. 18 (3): 311–343. doi:10.1080/13546783.2012.670753. 15921519 S2CID. Retrieved January 14, 2015. Scialabrinio, Frank (2018). Reductio ad Hitlerum. Bad arguments. John Wiley & Sons: 212-214. doi:10.1002/9781119165811.ch44. 9781119165811 ISBN. Recovered from

