

The Universal Fallacy Map

Classical and Contemporary Fallacies Mapped to Five Structural Error Types

Companion Document to Paper II: The Universal Fallacy Architecture

Brent Alan Seeley · WellFlow Labs · April 2026, revised July–August 2026; Second Edition, August 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21880635> (Second Edition; First Edition: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21766167>)

How to Read This Map

This is a companion to Paper II, but it is written to be readable on its own. Each entry names a fallacy, gives a brief description, and records which AOML constraint it violates.

The six semantic axes (the kinds of truth a claim can be about):

Axis	Tracks	Settled by
VER	Veridical truth: is it so, in the world?	observation, measurement, experiment
AUTH	Authenticity: is it the genuine item?	provenance, chain of custody
SINC	Sincerity: is the speaker's inner state as presented?	behavioral consistency, testimony
NORM	Normative correctness: is it right, proper, just?	principle, consequence, consensus
ESS	Essence: what is it by definition or nature?	formal logic, definition, proof
VERIF	Verification: has it been established or tested?	experiment, statistics, formal proof

The four meta-axes modify a claim on a host axis without being that axis: **DEG** (degree or intensity), **TEMP** (temporal position), **LIKE** (resemblance to the host property without being it), **EVID** (source-marking: reported, inferred, firsthand). Treating a meta-axis modification as if it established the underlying claim is the substitution family $M[A]$ does not yield A , formalized as rules R5, R6, R8, and R9 in Paper II.

Numbering. Entry numbers are stable identifiers, not a running tally. When an entry is reclassified its original number travels with it (so #23 Equivocation and #93 Red Herring sit in Type 5, #72 and #73 in Type 2), which is why the numbers are not contiguous within a section. Later additions are appended rather than interleaved. A fallacy analyzed two ways appears twice and is counted once (Appeal to Tradition at #49 and #94). Where one name covers two structurally distinct errors, both are listed and both are counted: Appeal to Emotion at #2 and #99, Appeal to Authority at #48 and #100, Bandwagon/Argumentum ad Populum at #47 and #101. Where two entries prove to be one fallacy, they merge onto a single row that retains both numbers and is counted once (Argument to Moderation / Middle Ground at #82/#88). Entries #102 and #103

were added in the Second Edition, unbundled from #67 and #71 respectively. The document therefore has 102 entry rows carrying 103 numbered identifiers and describing 101 distinct fallacies.

Reading an entry. The AOML Violation column names the constraint breached and, in parentheses, which AOML component it belongs to (Axis, Operator, Method, Level, or Contrast). An arrow marks a substitution, source to target. So entry 1, Ad Hominem, reads SINC → VER (Axis): evidence about a speaker's sincerity is substituted for evidence about the veridical truth of a claim, and the component violated is the Axis condition. Named rules (R1, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9) are the structural rules defined in Paper II and AOML v2.2.

Root and locus. Where an entry involves two AOML components, the Second Edition distinguishes their contributions. A component is the **root** if repairing its side condition, with the judgment held fixed, licenses the inference; it is the **locus** if removing it does not repair anything but destroys the judgment under examination, leaving nothing to evaluate. A compound whose two violations are each independently reparative (each survives repair of the other) is marked **co-roots**; a compound where one component carries the violation the other causes is marked **root/locus**.

Second Edition Revision Note

The Second Edition applies a classification criterion, frozen before the pass, to every entry of the July–August 2026 edition:

- 1. **Judgment form vs. side condition.** Write the entry's judgment form (the shape of the inferential claim) and list its licensing side conditions separately.
- 2. **Three-outcome intervention.** Repair each side condition with the judgment held fixed: if the inference becomes licensed, that condition is the root; if the failure persists, it is not the root; if the judgment itself disappears, the component is the locus, not the root.
- 3. **Regimentation stability.** Classify only when the verdict is stable across admissible regimentations (those preserving inferential content). Genuine instability is a finding: the traditional label covers more than one structural error and splits.
- 4. **Type 4 root reserved for unassignability.** A Type 4 root requires that no legal stratification assignment can make the judgment form well-formed, not merely that a level boundary is crossed.
- 5. **Method identity.** A Type 3 classification requires a method that is independently specifiable apart from the inference under audit, with an established warrant it is being used outside of.
- 6. **Dual intervention for compounds.** Where two candidate violations are present, repair each while holding the other fixed; violations that each survive repair of the other are co-roots.

The principal results: Type 3 contracts to nine entries, each an identifiable epistemic practice used outside its warrant (#56 moves to a new 1+2 compound row, #57 and #59 to Type 5, #58 to Type 2). The former Type 4 roster moves to the compound sections: eight entries to 2+4, uniformly Type 2 root with Type 4 locus, and #74 to 5+4, contrast root with level locus. No numbered entry survives as a Type 4 root, and the type's exhibited cases are three unnumbered witnesses (paradoxes, not fallacies). #82 and #88 merge as one fallacy. Two bundled errors receive their own entries: #102 Aggregation Reversal (from #67) and #103 Confusion of the Inverse (from #71). Several of these moves had been made independently in the July–August revision before the criterion was applied; the convergence of the two passes is itself evidence that the classification is tracking structure rather than editorial taste. The Second Edition also renames the type: Stratification Failure (First Edition: Stratification Misalignment), with unassignability as its primary form, since misalignment names precisely the reparable class that now sits in the 2+4 section as locus.

Type 1: Axis Transfer Error (Category Condition)

One kind of truth substituted for another. The pattern holds across domains, but the axis of the claim changes without justification.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
1	Ad Hominem	Attacking the person instead of the argument	SINC → VER (Axis)	Character/intent as empirical disproof
2	Appeal to Emotion (affective substitution)	An emotional consideration is offered where the claim's own axis requires evidence	SINC → VER (Axis)	The classic axis transfer: sympathy, fear, or indignation supplied in place of veridical support. Distinguish from #99, where it is the <i>intensity</i> of feeling rather than its content that is treated as probative
3	Appeal to Pity	Sympathy to persuade	SINC → VER (Axis)	Emotional vulnerability replaces proof
4	Appeal to Fear	Fear to persuade	SINC → VER (Axis)	Emotional → Veridical
5	Appeal to Flattery	Praise to persuade	SINC → VER (Axis)	Affective → Veridical
6	Appeal to Spite	Resentment to persuade	SINC → VER (Axis)	Emotional → Veridical
7	Appeal to Ridicule	Mockery as refutation	SINC → VER (Axis)	Social performance → Veridical
8	Tu Quoque	Dismissing due to hypocrisy	SINC → VER (Axis)	Sincerity as veridical evidence
9	Wishful Thinking	Desire as evidence	SINC/PREFERENCE → VER (Axis)	Preference → Veridical
10	Poisoning the Well	Preemptively discrediting a source	SINC → VER (Axis)	Preemptive sincerity attack; anticipatory, not reactive
11	Argument from Incredulity	Can't imagine, so false	SINC/personal belief → VER (Axis)	Personal epistemic state → veridical evidence
12	Genetic Fallacy	Judging something based on its origin	AUTH → VER (Axis)	Provenance as truth-value
13	Guilt by Association	Invalid because associated with despised group	AUTH → VER (Axis)	Association treated as truth-value
14	Naturalistic Fallacy	Deriving "ought" from "is"	VER → NORM (Axis)	Descriptive → Normative
15	Appeal to Nature	Natural, so good	VER → NORM (Axis)	Descriptive → Normative
16	Is-Ought Gap	Descriptive implies prescriptive	VER → NORM (Axis)	Factual → Normative
17	Appeal to Consequences	Claim must be false because of its	NORM → VER (Axis)	Normative desirability substituted for

		consequences		truth
18	Moralistic Fallacy	Ought, so is	NORM → VER (Axis)	Normative → Descriptive
19	Appeal to Ideal	Using a normative ideal as evidence for veridical truth	NORM → VER (Axis)	Distinct from Nirvana (#74, contrast frame with level locus); this is axis transfer
20	Divine Fallacy	Amazing, so divine	VER → ESS (Axis)	Phenomenal → Supernatural/essential
21	False Analogy	Poor analogy	Various axes mismatch (Axis)	Axis mismatch in analogical transfer
22	Masked-Man Fallacy	Identity substitution error	ESS confusion (Axis)	Identity axis confusion
24	Category Error	Misapplying concepts across categories	Multiple axes (Axis)	Pure category/axis violation (prototypical)

Type 1 count: 23

Type 2: Operator Overextension (Composition Licensing Condition)

A compositional operator is applied beyond its licensed semantic scope. Includes meta-axis substitution subtypes (R5, R6, R8, R9) and polarity conditioning (R3, R7).

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
25	Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc	Assuming correlation implies causation	CAUSE misapplied (Operator)	Illegitimate CAUSE from sequence
26	Slippery Slope	One event leads to extreme consequences	BECOME misapplied (Operator)	Unsupported BECOME chain
27	Begging the Question	Assuming conclusion in premises	RESULT misused (Operator)	Illicit RESULT as premise
28	Circular Reasoning	Premise as conclusion	IDENTITY misused as inference (Operator)	Identity treated as derivation
29	Affirming the Consequent	If P then Q; Q therefore P	CONDITIONAL converse assumed (Operator)	Converse assumed for a conditional; licensed only under the stronger biconditional ($P \leftrightarrow Q$). The conditional need not be causal

30	Denying the Antecedent	If P then Q; not P therefore not Q	CONDITIONAL inverse assumed (Operator)	Inverse assumed for a conditional; licensed only under the biconditional ($P \leftrightarrow Q$)
31	Non Sequitur	Conclusion doesn't follow	INFERENCE invalid (Operator)	Illicit inferential connection
32	Argument from Fallacy	Fallacious argument means false conclusion	STRUCTURE $\rightarrow$ CONTENT (Operator)	Illicit RESULT from structure
33	Affirming a Disjunct	A or B; A, so not B	DISJUNCTION misused (Operator)	Exclusive disjunction assumed
34	Appeal to Probability	Likely, so true	DEG meta-axis substitution (R5)	Probability treated as veridical certainty
35	Appeal to Novelty	Better because new	TEMP meta-axis substitution (R6)	Recency treated as normative validity
36	Modal Fallacy	Necessity/sufficiency confusion	MODAL misused (Operator)	Modal operator misuse
37	Modal Scope Fallacy	Misplaced necessity	SCOPE violated (Operator)	Modal scope violation
38	Undistributed Middle	Middle term undistributed	DISTRIBUTION violated (Operator)	Classic syllogistic error
39	Existential Fallacy	Universal to particular	QUANTIFICATION misused (Operator)	Universal $\rightarrow$ Existential jump under modern first-order semantics; licensed with an existence premise. Traditional treatments with existential import declare a different habitat, so the licensing is habitat-relative
40	Affirmative from Negative	Positive conclusion from negative premises	POLARITY misused (Operator)	Polarity operator mismatch
41	Exclusive Premises	Both premises negative	PREMISE combination (Operator)	Invalid premise operator
42	Four Terms	Syllogism with four terms	TERM overextended (Operator)	Term count violation
43	Illicit Major / Illicit Minor	Major/minor term undistributed	DISTRIBUTION violated (Operator)	Distribution boundary error
44	Negative from Affirmative	Negative from positive premises	POLARITY misused (Operator)	Polarity operator error
45	Amphiboly	Grammatical ambiguity leads to false conclusion	STRUCTURE ambiguity (Operator)	Syntactic scope; distinct from Equivocation (lexical)
46	Kafkatrap	Denial of accusation as evidence of	CAUSE/RESULT reversed (Operator)	Self-sealing argument structure

		guilt		
58	Proof by Assertion	Repetition as proof	Iterated EVID[A] $\rightarrow$ A (R9 family)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 3: repetition is not an independently specifiable method with an established warrant; the error is evidential substitution, iterated
99	Appeal to Emotion (intensity substitution)	Strength of feeling treated as establishing the claim	DEG[A] $\rightarrow$ A (R5)	Meta-axis substitution: the degree of conviction or affect is substituted for the truth of what is felt. The reading Paper II lists under R5; distinguish from #2, the axis-transfer reading
100	Appeal to Authority (evidential substitution)	The fact that a claim is authoritatively asserted treated as establishing it	EVID[A] $\rightarrow$ A (R9)	Meta-axis substitution: the source-marking of a claim (authoritatively asserted, reported) treated as itself establishing it. The reading Paper II lists under R9; distinguish from #48, the habitat-mismatch reading
101	Argumentum ad Populum (intensity substitution)	Widespread or intense belief treated as establishing truth	DEG[VER] $\rightarrow$ VER (R5)	Meta-axis substitution: the prevalence or intensity of belief treated as constituting truth. The reading Paper II lists under R5; distinguish from #47, the consensus-as-method reading
72	Conjunction Fallacy	Specific more probable than general	Inclusion-order direction error (Operator)	The composition violates $P(A \wedge B) \leq P(A)$: adding a conjunct moves downward in the inclusion order, and probability preserves that order. LIKE[VER] $\rightarrow$ VER (R8, representativeness) names the mechanism that makes the error attractive. Reclassified from Type 4; column harmonized with #103 in the Second Edition (structural condition in the column, mechanism in the notes)
73	Double Counting	Overcounting probability	Unlicensed composition (Operator)	Non-independent evidence composed as though independent.

				Reclassified from Type 4
103	Confusion of the Inverse	P(E given H) read as P(H given E)	Inverse-conditional substitution (Operator)	New in the Second Edition, unbundled from #71: the direction error in conditionalization (the prosecutor's fallacy); the reverse conditional can be derived only when the requisite prior and base-rate terms are supplied through Bayes' theorem; it cannot be obtained by simply reversing the conditional. Distinguish #71, the suppressed-prior shortcut

Type 2 count: 29 (includes #72 Conjunction Fallacy and #73 Double Counting, reclassified from Type 4 under the operator-licensing reading; the meta-axis substitution readings #99, #100, and #101; #58 Proof by Assertion, reclassified from Type 3 in the Second Edition; and #103 Confusion of the Inverse, added in the Second Edition; original sequence IDs are retained)

Type 3: Verification Habitat Mismatch (Validation Condition)

The axis is correctly identified, but the validation method is inappropriate. Wrong kind of evidence for the kind of claim being made. Second Edition: every entry here names an independently specifiable epistemic practice (polling, testimony, continuity assessment, search, sampling) with an established warrant, used outside it; entries that failed that method-identity test moved out (#56 to the 1+2 compound, #57 and #59 to Type 5, #58 to Type 2).

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
47	Bandwagon (consensus as method)	The agreement of many offered as verification of a claim	CONSENSUS → VER (Method)	Consensus polling has an established warrant for conventional-level facts; here it is offered for a claim whose axis requires observation. Distinguish from #101, where the sheer prevalence or intensity of belief is treated as itself establishing truth
48	Appeal to Authority (habitat mismatch)	Expert testimony used outside the expert's axis of competence	AUTH/TESTIMONY misapplied (Method)	Expertise misapplied across domains. Distinguish from #100, where the mere fact of authoritative assertion is treated as establishing the claim
49	Appeal to Tradition	Right because traditional	AUTH → NORM (Method)	Continuity-of-practice assessment warrants claims about custom, not

				normative validity
50	Argument from Silence	Absence of evidence as evidence	NULL → VER (Method)	A search or detection procedure warrants a null conclusion only with a detection-expectation premise (if it existed, this search would have found it); without that premise the null carries no weight
51	Appeal to Ignorance	Truth from absence of disproof	NULL → VER (Method)	Absence of counter-evidence as validation; distinct from Arg. from Silence. Second Edition: also absorbs the evidential reading of Burden of Proof (#57), where absence of disproof is offered as proof
52	Confirmation Bias	Seeking only supporting evidence	SELECTIVE method (Method)	The warrant of an evidence search assumes an unbiased search; the selective search violates it. Second Edition: the earlier possible-compound hedge is retired; the warrant violation is the whole analysis
53	Cherry Picking	Selective supporting data	SELECTIVE method (Method)	As #52, at the presentation stage; hedge retired in the Second Edition
54	Nut-Picking	Selective negative data	SELECTIVE method (Method)	As #52, negative selection; hedge retired in the Second Edition
55	Survivorship Bias	Ignoring failures	SELECTIVE method (Method)	Sampling warrant violated where the sampling frame excludes the failures; the frame is the locus of the error, the sampling warrant its root

Type 3 count: 9

Type 1+2 Compound

Axis transfer combined with operator overextension.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
---	---------	-------------------	----------------	-------

56	Appeal to Purity	Purer form is better	ESS → NORM (Axis) + DEG[ESS] → ESS (Operator, R5 family)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 3 by dual intervention: supplying genuine essential status independently leaves the degree substitution standing; repairing the substitution leaves the axis transfer standing. Co-roots
----	------------------	----------------------	--	--

Type 1+2 count: 1

Type 2+3 Compound

Operator overextension combined with method mismatch.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
60	Texas Sharpshooter	Retrofitting patterns	SELECTIVE/POST-HOC method + CAUSE/PATTERN (Operator)	Composite: selective method + illicit pattern imposition. Co-roots (each violation survives repair of the other)

Type 2+3 count: 1

Type 2+4 Compound

Operator overextension combined with stratification misalignment. Second Edition: uniformly Type 2 root with Type 4 locus. The level transition is where the inference operates; the failed operator license is why it is illicit. Repairing the license (with the level transition intact) licenses the inference; deleting the transition leaves nothing to evaluate.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
61	Chronological Snobbery	Old, so wrong	TEMP meta-axis + TEMPORAL levels (Operator + Level)	Temporal position misused across levels
62	Gambler's Fallacy	Independent events as dependent	INDEPENDENCE violated + statistical levels (Operator + Level)	Illicit causal connection across probability levels
63	Hot Hand Fallacy	Random streaks as meaningful	PATTERN overextended + statistical levels (Operator + Level)	Pattern overinterpretation across levels
64	Regression Fallacy	Mistaking regression to mean	STATISTICAL CAUSE + levels	Statistical CAUSE error across levels

			(Operator + Level)	
65	Sunk Cost Fallacy	Continuing due to prior investment	TEMP meta-axis + PAST → FUTURE (Operator + Level)	Past level misaligned with future (R6)
95	Fallacy of Accident	A general rule applied to an exceptional case outside its licensing conditions	RULE overextension + contextual levels (Operator + Level)	Rule overextension across contextual levels; classical mirror of hasty generalization (instance→rule vs. rule→exception)
66	Hasty Generalization	Broad conclusions from small samples	ABSTR/inductive license (Operator) + INSTANCE → CATEGORY (Level)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 4: repairing the inductive license (an adequate sampling warrant) licenses the inference with the instance-to-category judgment intact
67	Ecological Fallacy	Inferring individual traits from group statistics	Down-projection without distributional license (Operator) + GROUP → INDIVIDUAL (Level)	Narrowed in the Second Edition: the Simpson-type association reversal formerly bundled here is a structurally distinct error, now #102
68	Composition Fallacy	Whole assumed to have parts' properties	Predicate not established as preserved under composition (Operator) + PARTS → WHOLE (Level)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 4: the failed condition is preservation of the predicate under the composition operation, not the level transition itself. Not the mirror image of #69: for threshold predicates over additive quantities, exactly one of the two directions fails. The classical universal premise is also misdrawn: for up-closed predicates a single qualifying part suffices, and for down-closed predicates no quantifier strength rescues the composition
69	Division Fallacy	Parts assumed to have whole's properties	Predicate not established as preserved under division (Operator) + WHOLE → PARTS (Level)	Dual of #68; same Second Edition analysis
70	Argument from Anecdote	Anecdote as general evidence	ABSTR/inductive license (Operator) + INSTANCE → GENERAL (Level)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 4; companion to #66. Where the anecdote is also report-status

				evidence, an R9 compound reading applies
71	Base Rate Fallacy	Ignoring base rates	Suppressed class-level premise (Operator) + INDIVIDUAL vs GROUP probabilities (Level)	Narrowed in the Second Edition: the licensed composition requires the prior, and the shortcut omits it. The inverse-conditional confusion formerly bundled here is a structurally distinct error, now #103
75	Historian's Fallacy	Anachronistic judgment	R6/TEMP scope (Operator) + TEMPORAL levels (Level)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 4; joins #61 and #65 in the R6 family
76	Presentism	Current standards on past	R6/TEMP scope (Operator) + TEMPORAL levels (Level)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 4: a consistently applied temporal scope licenses evaluation, so the root is the operator's scope, not the levels
102	Aggregation Reversal	A per-stratum association asserted of the aggregate, or conversely	Aggregation homomorphism not established (Operator) + STRATA vs AGGREGATE (Level)	New in the Second Edition, unbundled from #67: the Simpson-type reversal. The preservation conditions in Simpson's own analysis are precisely the missing license

Type 2+4 count: 15

Type 2+5 Compound

Operator overextension combined with contrast frame collapse.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
96	Fallacy of Relative Privation	A problem dismissed because a worse problem exists	DEG[A] < DEG[B] → ¬NORM[attend(A)] (Operator, R5 family) + exclusive-admissibility frame (Contrast)	Meta-axis substitution (M[A] → A family): priority ordering collapsed into exclusive admissibility. Co-roots. Distinct from whataboutism (no counter-accusation) and the Nirvana fallacy (real-vs-real, not real-vs-ideal)
97	Fallacy of the Single Cause	A contributing cause presented as the exhaustive explanation of a	CAUSE scope amplification (Operator) + causal-field foreclosure	Partial causal license inflated to exhaustive scope. Co-roots. Distinct

		multicausal outcome	(Contrast)	from post hoc: the causal link may be genuine; the exhaustiveness is not
--	--	---------------------	------------	--

Type 2+5 count: 2

Type 4: Stratification Failure (Stratification Condition)

Second Edition: a Type 4 root violation occurs when no legal stratification assignment can make the judgment form well-formed. Stratification unassignability, not incidental level-crossing. Level-crossing whose license can be repaired is Type 2 root with Type 4 locus and sits in the 2+4 section above.

No numbered entry survives as a Type 4 root under the revision criterion. This is not a gap but a finding about what the type is. A fallacy presupposes a well-formed judgment whose license can fail; a pure Type 4 violation destroys the possibility of the required judgment itself. The type's exhibited cases are therefore paradoxes, listed as unnumbered witnesses: they resist every side-condition repair, and they do not enter the fallacy count.

Witness	Case	Structure	Status
W1	Liar cycle	Self-referential truth predication: under the declared well-founded object/meta stratification, no legal level assignment exists (Tarski)	Type 4 root: unassignability
W2	Yablo regress	An infinite sequence with no self-reference; no well-founded assignment satisfying the declared dependency-order constraints exists	Type 4 root: unassignability
W3	Two-Truth Collapse	The conventional/ultimate stratification erased; restoration requires habitat revision, not premise repair	Type 4 root: unassignability

The stratification condition's everyday work is done as the locus of the fifteen 2+4 entries; its root violations are exhibited by the configurations the scholastic, Mādhyamaka, Kantian, and Tarskian traditions each converged on. These structure-level configurations are violations of the existing conditions read globally over an argument's dependency structure, not a sixth type (Paper III §6).

Type 4 count: 0 numbered entries; 3 exhibited witnesses

Type 5: Contrast Frame Collapse (Opposition Topology, the Precondition)

False or inverted opposition imposed. A multidimensional space is forced into a binary, or contrast boundaries are manipulated. Also includes relevance failures (off-question diversion), identity-persistence failures (meaning drift), and temporal frame failures (boundaries shifted over a discourse), which mis-specify or fail to maintain the opposition frame; see Paper III §6.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
77	False Dilemma	Limited options as exhaustive	BINARY imposed (Contrast)	False binary opposition
78	False Equivalence	Treating unequal things as equal	SIMILARITY → IDENTITY (Contrast)	Superficial similarity as identity. Second Edition adversarial check against the R8 reading (LIKE → identity): the dual intervention shows the two candidate violations are one condition. Supplying genuine equivalence does not repair a separate similarity inference; it redraws the equivalence partition itself, since equivalence classes are frame structure, and the canonical instances assert positional sameness rather than a host-axis property, leaving no host axis for an R8 substitution. Type 5 stands
79	Straw Man	Misrepresenting argument to refute it	OPPOSITION distorted (Contrast)	False opposition via distortion
80	No True Scotsman	Redefining to exclude counterexamples	BOUNDARY moved (Contrast)	Inverted opposition boundary
81	Loaded Question	Question assuming unproven premise	BINARY imposed (Contrast)	Imposes false binary choice
82/88	Argument to Moderation / Middle Ground Fallacy	The middle position selected merely because it lies between opposed positions	MIDDLE assumed (Contrast)	Second Edition merge: two First-Edition entries (#82, #88) describe one fallacy; both numbers are retained on this row and it is counted once
83	Continuum Fallacy	Rejecting imprecise claims	DISCRETE imposed (Contrast)	Imposes discrete opposition on graded structure. Second Edition annotation: where the argument

				trades on oscillation between essential and veridical readings of the vague predicate, a Type 1 root is also present (Paper IV)
84	Suppressed Correlative	Redefining to exclude	OPPOSITION collapsed (Contrast)	Collapses natural opposition
85	Perfect Solution Fallacy	Imperfect, so reject	PERFECTION binary (Contrast)	The acceptance boundary is set at accept-only-if-perfect: no ideal is represented in the comparison at all, and a real proposal is rejected merely for having a flaw. Distinguish #74, where an unattainable ideal is admitted into the comparison set
86	Special Pleading	Exception without justification	BOUNDARY ad hoc (Contrast)	Ad hoc boundary manipulation
87	Moving the Goalposts	Changing success criteria	CRITERIA dynamic (Contrast)	Dynamic opposition frame (temporal)
89	Incomplete Comparison	Comparison without basis	COMPARISON incomplete (Contrast)	Incomplete opposition frame
90	Thought-Terminating Cliché	Cliché ends discussion	CLOSURE artificial (Contrast)	Artificial discussion closure (temporal frame)
91	Motte and Bailey	Defending strong claim by retreating to weaker one	BOUNDARY dynamic (Contrast)	Two claims of different strength treated as equivalent; kinship with #23
23	Equivocation	Ambiguous terms to mislead	FRAME drift over occurrences (temporal)	A term's distinction drifts mid-argument, an identity-persistence failure = maintenance of the opposition frame over time (Paper III §6)
93	Red Herring	Irrelevant distraction	FRAME, off-question claim (Contrast)	Presents an off-question claim as occupying the position at issue; a same-axis diversion is a pure FRAME failure (Paper III §6). +Type 1 only when an axis-shift is also present
57	Burden of Proof	Shifting evidential responsibility	FRAME obligation boundary shifted (temporal)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 3: the procedural reading. The obligation boundary is part of the opposition frame, and shifting it over a discourse is a temporal frame

				failure (Paper III §6). The evidential reading (absence of disproof offered as proof) is #51
59	Gish Gallop	Overwhelming with quantity of weak arguments	FRAME evaluation capacity attack (temporal)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 3: quantity is not a method with an established warrant; the attack prevents the opposition frame from being evaluated at all (Paper III §6)

Type 5 count: 18 (includes #23 Equivocation and #93 Red Herring, reclassified under the FRAME / opposition-topology reading of Paper III §6; #57 Burden of Proof and #59 Gish Gallop, reclassified from Type 3 in the Second Edition; and the merged #82/#88, counted once; original sequence IDs are retained)

Type 1+5 Compound

Axis transfer combined with contrast frame corruption.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
92	Whataboutism	Diverting with counter-accusations	SINC → VER (Axis) + CONTRAST	Axis diversion + false equivalence. Co-roots (each violation survives repair of the other)

Type 1+5 count: 1

Type 3+4 Compound

Verification habitat mismatch combined with stratification misalignment.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
94	Appeal to Tradition (compound analysis)	Right because traditional	AUTH → NORM (Method) + TEMP levels (Level)	Custom as evidence + temporal level crossing. Root/locus: the method-warrant violation is the root; the temporal levels carry it

Note: Appeal to Tradition appears at #49 as a primary Type 3 violation and here as a compound analysis showing its Type 4 component. It is counted once in the total.

Type 5+4 Compound

Contrast frame collapse combined with stratification misalignment.

#	Fallacy	Brief Description	AOML Violation	Notes
98	Package-Deal Fallacy	Separable claims or commitments fused into one indivisible object of acceptance or rejection	False fusion of the option space (Contrast) + component/package evaluation transfer (Level)	The inverse topology of false dilemma. Root/locus: the fusion is the root; the component/package levels carry it. Distinct from guilt by association (relational transfer) and composition (property inference after fusion, #68)
74	Nirvana Fallacy	Rejecting the actual because an unattainable ideal is admitted into the comparison	Candidate-set corruption (Contrast) + IDEAL vs ACTUAL levels (Level)	Second Edition reclassification from Type 4: the root is the corrupted option space, an unattainable ideal admitted into the comparison set as though available; the ideal/actual levels carry the violation (root/locus). Distinguish #85, where no ideal is represented and the acceptance boundary itself is corrupted

Type 5+4 count: 2

Summary Statistics

UFA Type	Name	Condition Violated	Count	Description
Type 1	Axis Transfer Error	Category	23	One kind of truth substituted for another
Type 2	Operator Overextension	Composition licensing	29	Illicit compositional rule applied (includes R3, R5, R6, R7, R8, R9 subtypes)
Type 3	Verification Habitat Mismatch	Validation	9	An identifiable epistemic practice used outside its established warrant
Type 1+2	Axis + Operator compound	Category + Composition	1	Axis transfer combined with operator overextension (co-roots)

Type 2+3	Operator + Method compound	Composition + Validation	1	Operator overextension combined with method mismatch
Type 2+4	Operator + Level compound	Composition + Stratification	15	Type 2 root with Type 4 locus: a level transition whose operator license failed
Type 4	Stratification Failure	Stratification	0 numbered (3 witnesses)	Stratification unassignability; exhibited by paradoxes, populated as locus throughout 2+4
Type 5	Contrast Frame Collapse	Opposition topology (<i>precondition</i>)	18	False or inverted opposition (includes relevance, identity-persistence, and temporal frame failures, Paper III §6)
Type 1+5	Axis + Contrast compound	Category + Opposition topology	1	Axis transfer combined with contrast frame corruption
Type 2+5	Operator + Contrast compound	Composition + Opposition topology	2	Operator overextension combined with contrast frame collapse
Type 5+4	Contrast + Level compound	Opposition topology + Stratification	2	Contrast frame collapse with level locus
Type 3+4	Method + Level compound	Validation + Stratification	(counted at #49)	Dual analysis of Appeal to Tradition
	Total distinct fallacies		101	

Note: Appeal to Tradition (#49/#94) is counted once, as is the merged Argument to Moderation / Middle Ground (#82/#88). Entries #95–#98 were added in the July 2026 revision. Entries #99–#101 split names that each cover two structurally distinct errors (Appeal to Emotion #2/#99; Appeal to Authority #48/#100; Bandwagon/Argumentum ad Populum #47/#101). Entries #102–#103 were added in the Second Edition, unbundled from #67 and #71. The document has 102 entry rows carrying 103 numbered identifiers and describing 101 distinct fallacies.

Key Structural Properties

- 1. **Empirical completeness:** Every classical and contemporary fallacy tested reduces to one of five boundary violation patterns, with compound violations decomposing into identified components. No sixth primitive type was required, including under the Second Edition's frozen revision criterion.
- 2. **Compound transparency:** Fallacies that combine multiple violation types are analyzed as compounds rather than forced into single categories. The compound nature explains why certain fallacies are more rhetorically effective: they exploit multiple failure modes simultaneously.

- **3. Root/locus discipline** (Second Edition): where an entry involves two components, the classification records which condition's repair licenses the inference (the root) and which merely situates it (the locus); compounds with two independently reparative violations are co-roots. This prevents a level transition that carries an error from being mistaken for the condition that caused it.
- **4. AOML component mapping**: Each entry explicitly identifies which AOML component is violated (Axis, Operator, Method, Level, Contrast), connecting the fallacy map directly to the constraint geometry and the argument from distinction (Paper III).
- **5. Extensibility without negation**: If a sixth type were discovered, it would mean a fifth condition for coherent distinction-making exists beyond category, composition, validation, stratification, and opposition topology. The five existing types would remain valid.
- **6. Cross-substrate applicability**: The same five violation types appear in human language (CLCA), engineering systems (oAOML), and 2,400 years of independent philosophical investigation, supporting the structural argument that these are conditions for coherent distinction-making rather than artifacts of any particular analytical tradition.

Connection to AOML v2.2 and the Argument from Distinction

Each fallacy type corresponds to a violation of one condition for coherent distinction-making (Paper III):

- **Type 1 (Axis)** → Category condition: the system must track what kind of distinction it is making
- **Type 2 (Operator)** → Composition licensing condition: compositions must be licensed (includes R1–R4 and R7 structural rules; R5, R6, R8, R9 meta-axis substitution: the $M[A] \rightarrow A$ family)
- **Type 3 (Method)** → Validation condition: evidence must match the claim type
- **Type 4 (Level)** → Stratification condition: level boundaries must be assignable, and preserved across inference; the root violation is unassignability
- **Type 5 (Contrast)** → Opposition topology precondition: the space of possible distinctions must be correctly configured

The first four conditions correspond to the four AOML tuple components (A, O, M, L). Type 5 corresponds to the opposition-topology precondition (tokened the FRAME in the AOML v2.2 reference) that makes the other four possible. Four independent philosophical traditions each identified one of these conditions independently over 2,400 years.

Related Documents

This map is one artifact in a series; several questions it raises are answered elsewhere.

- **Paper II, The Universal Fallacy Architecture**. Defines the AOML tuple, the structural rules R1 through R9 including the meta-axis substitution family $M[A]$ does not yield A, and the derivation of the five types. The place to go for anything this map references but does not define.
- **Paper III, Given Distinction**. The closure argument: why there are exactly five types, why the opposition topology is a precondition rather than a fifth coordinate condition, and the historical convergence across independent traditions.
- **Terminology Correspondence** (companion, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21781768>). Maps every term used here to its nearest counterpart in linguistics, philosophy and epistemology, formal logic, and computer science, including a section that places the five violation types against argumentation theory, philosophy of logic, cognitive science, and AI vocabulary.
- **Paper I, Cross-Linguistic Compositional Analysis**. The cross-linguistic evidence the axes rest on. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21709636>

On the exhaustiveness claim specifically: Paper II section 6.7 reports a pre-registered inter-rater study in which independent raters (three heterogeneous frontier language models in the executed first phase; a human-rater second phase is pre-declared) classified this inventory using only the five type definitions, with a *fallacy but fits no type* option available on every item and salted distractor items included. That study, not this map, is where the claim that no sixth type is required is put at risk. The study's agreement statistics were computed against the First Edition classification key (94 entries as of the study); the Second Edition's reclassifications do not retroactively alter those statistics, which stand as a First Edition result, and the exhaustiveness finding is unaffected: no entry left the five-type space in either edition. Any replication runs against the Second Edition definitions and key, since the Type 4 definition changed intensionally, not only in its assignments.

Companion document to: Seeley, B.A. (2026). The Universal Fallacy Architecture. Paper II, Foundations of the Convergent Semantic Architecture. Structural foundation: Seeley, B.A. (2026). Given Distinction. Paper III, Foundations of the Convergent Semantic Architecture. Empirical foundation: Seeley, B.A. (2026). Cross-Linguistic Compositional Analysis (CLCA). Paper I, Foundations of the Convergent Semantic Architecture. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21709636>