List of Fallacies:

Subjectivism: using the fact that you believe or accept or want a statement to be true as a basis for concluding that the statement is true.

Appeal to Majority: using the fact that a sizable number of people (or other entities, including countries or groups or organizations, etc.) believe, accept or want a statement to be true as a basis for concluding that the statement is true.

Appeal to Force (argumentum ad baculum): trying to get someone to accept a statement, position, course of action, etc., by threatening his/her safety, finances, social standing, etc.

Appeal to (unreliable) Authority (argumentum ad verecundiam): using the fact that an unreliable authority accepts or advocates a proposition as a basis for concluding that the proposition is true.

Ad hominem (argument against the person): citing irrelevant traits, facts or properties of a speaker as a basis for rejecting his/her argument or statements

a) abusive AH (name calling): using terms of derision against a speaker, including 'liar', 'communist', 'liberal', 'conservative', etc.;

b) tu quoque: attempting to justify rejecting another’s advice, criticism, recommendation, etc., by citing the fact that the person who gave the advice etc., doesn't adhere to it; (in short, the arguer accuses another of being a hypocrite).

c) circumstantial AH: attempting to undermine another's argument or claim by citing facts about him/her that suggest, but do not establish, that the person's argument or claim is to be rejected.

False Alternative (Black and white thinking): An argument that relies on alternatives that seem to be exhaustive but are not; typically involves an either-or statement that makes use of contrary terms that seem to be contradictory terms; e.g., black/white, smart/stupid, friend/enemy, hot/cold, etc.
**Hasty Generalization:** drawing a general conclusion based on insufficient evidence, usually one or two instances are cited when many more are needed to properly support the general claim.

**Appeal to Ignorance** (argumentum ad ignorantiam): using a premise (or premises) that there is no proof or evidence against (for) a particular statement as a basis for concluding that the statement is true (false).

**Post Hoc (ergo propter hoc):** citing the fact that one event (A) happened after another (B) as a basis for concluding that the prior event (B) caused the latter (A); trying to justify a causal claim by appeal to the fact that the alleged cause occurred before the alleged effect.

**Diversion/Red Herring:** arguing for a conclusion that is not really at issue but which seems to be; drawing a conclusion about intentions by citing premises which say nothing about intentions.

**Straw Man:** arguing or responding to another person’s claim or argument by distorting it so as to make it easily refutable or easy to reject.

**Begging the Question/Circular Argument:** trying to argue for a statement by using that statement (or something that is effectively identical to it) as a premise, or by presupposing the truth of that statement in another argument. Other forms of this fallacy include **complex question**, which involves asking someone a question which presupposes the truth of something that has yet to be established; e.g., "Have you stopped beating your wife yet?", and **question-begging definition**, which involves defining a term so as to make a statement in question true.

**Division:** this fallacy is committed when one illegitimately supposes that what is true (or false) of a whole is true (or false) of its parts as well (or what is true or false of a group is true or false of its members).

**Composition:** This is the reverse of DIVISION. This fallacy is committed when one illegitimately supposes that what is true (or false) of the parts of a whole is also true (or false) of the whole composed out of
those parts (or what is true or false of the members of the group is
ture or false of the group as whole).

Equivocation: This fallacy results from an illegitimate shift of meaning
in an argument. Usually, a single term or short phrase is used in two
different senses, or with two different meanings, in the course of the
argument.

Amphiboly: This fallacy results from faulty or problematic formal
structure in a statement. (Newspaper headlines and advertisements
are a wonderful source of amphibolies). Amphiboly typically results
from someone misinterpreting an ambiguous statement.

"TO BE" fallacy: In this fallacy, one confuses the "is" of identity with
the "is" of predication. The "is" of identity occurs most often in
mathematical contexts, e.g., "2 X 3 is 6". But when we say: "The sky is
blue", we are not saying that the sky is identical with the color blue
but rather we are predicating the property blue to the sky. When
these two senses of "is" are confused, the result is ambiguity and
fallacy.