The classic example of fallacy is a scene in a British court of law. As the attorney for the defense takes the floor, his partner hands him a note: "No case. Abuse the plaintiff's attorney."

If you can't shake the argument, abuse the person who advances it, and so discredit it through the back door. Go from facing the issue, which jurists call ad rem, to the man, ad hominem.

A story is told about Lincoln as a young lawyer. In one of his first jury cases, he showed his political shrewdness by an adroit and quite non-malicious use of ad hominem. His opponent was an experienced trial lawyer, who also had most of the fine legal points on his side. The day was warm and Lincoln slumped in his chair as the case went against him. When the orator took off his coat and vest, however, Lincoln sat up with a gleam in his eye. His opponent was wearing one of the new city-slicker shirts of the 1840's, which buttoned up the back.

Lincoln knew the reaction of frontiersmen, who made up the jury. When his turn came, his plea was brief: "Gentlemen of the jury, because I have justice on my side, I am sure you will not be influenced by this gentleman's pretended knowledge of the law. Why, he doesn't even know which side of his shirt ought to be in front!"

Lincoln's ad hominem is said to have won the case.

This fallacy, like over-generalizing, has been around for a long time. The Sophists must have used it freely, and I suspect it goes back to the dawn of the race.

The health of President Eisenhower was an important consideration in the nominations of 1956. Was he well enough to serve out another four years in the toughest job in the world? Similarly with Franklin Roosevelt in 1944. But when the enemies of Roosevelt charged that a given government policy was wrong because it originated with "that cripple in the White House," they were practicing a particularly vicious kind of ad hominem.

QUESTIONS:

Q1. After reading this selection, do you have a clear idea of what 'ad hominem' means?

Q4. What risk did Lincoln take by using ad hominem? If you had been an opposing lawyer, how might you have countered Lincoln's move?

Q5. Write the meanings of the following words: a) fallacy b) gleam c) plaintiff d) cripple e) vicious.

O3. How was Lincoln tactic 'non-malicious'? In view of the result, does it matter whether the tactic was malicious or not?

Q2. How did Lincoln succeed in convincing the jury?

Scanned with CamScanner

COMPREHENSION-73821-3999

(2)

Ad Hominem is a technique used by
lewyers in which they actack their
opposition lawyers personally bather
than using facts to defend abguments
against them It is a clever tactic
to pressurize opponents and to deviate
the focus of juby from facts.

Lincoln succeeded in convincing the juby by using Ad Hominem. It's opponent was a seasoned lawyer who had prepared case strongly. Lincoln feiled to find a squiments to defend himself but he noticed that his opponent was wearing shirt wrongly. On his turn to speak, he argued that the feets of his opponents shall not be believed by the juby as his opponent does not even know how to wear shirt correctly. Thus he succeeded in convincing juby.

Lincoln tactic was non-maticious because
he just wanted to win the case and
to cover up his lack of asguments the
had no pessonal bad intentions for his
opponent. In view of result, it doesnot
matter whether tactic was malicious
of not. The only thing that matter is
opositive result which lincoln got, by
using non-malicious tactics.

ate:
(4)
Lincoln took the bisk of provoking his
opponent by takgetting himpersonally.
about his outfit. His opponent could
have got in vage and target him
petsonally as well leading to chaos. If
I was a lowyer, I would have
convinced jusy that weating shift
woongly doesnot weaken my asguments.
The judy should take décision based
upon facets bather than basing their
deasion on my attible.
(5)
a-Fallacy: Ebbob, Mistake
b- Gleam: Hope, Courbage, Shine
c- Plaintiff: Opponent
d-Csipple: Cback which reads to downfall
e-vicious: Toapping, unescapable.
satisfactory sentence structurer and basic grammar is satisfactor

sentence structurer ang basic grammar is satisfactory ans are well composed and relevant 9.20