

1.3 – ARGUMENTATION STANCES

The following are ways to nuance an argument.

- **Scope** (time & place; developing vs developed).
- **Degree** (how serious is it for different stakeholders?).
- **Long-term & Short-term.**
- **Alternatives are not any better.**
- **“Necessary evil”** (e.g. surveillance, censorship, capital punishment).
- Rebuttals for “necessary evil”:
 - Slippery slope.
 - “Road to hell is paved with good intentions.”
 - It becomes so “necessary” that only “evil” remains.
- **Slippery slope.**
- **Either-or fallacy** (not mutually exclusive).
- **Zero-sum game vs win-win game** (e.g. democratic vs republic).
- **Counter-arguing stats & trends:**
 - Definition (in different context) (e.g. domestic abuse in Sweden).
 - Detection (e.g. for terrorism, is it detected/reported?).
- Sampling (choice of samples).
- **“Do not throw the baby out with the bath water”.**
 - Rebuttal will be “do not keep taking half-measure”.
- **“Trying to fit a square peg into a round hole”.**
- **“Putting the cart before the horse”.**
- **“Swatting a fly with a sledgehammer”** (over-reaction).
- **“Hindsight is 20/20”.**
- **There is more harm than good.**
- **VUCA** (volatile, uncertain, complex, ambiguous).
- **Lack of political will/enlightened leadership.**
- **Tokenism/lip-service.**
- **“The jury is out”** (e.g. genetic engineering).
- **“A victim of its own success”.**