

























# KNOWLEDGE SHIELDS

25 strategies people use to defend their mental models and reasoning

<b>Illegitimate Subsumption</b>	makes new material special case of old		<b>Reductio-Ad Absurdum</b>	this new thing implies a consequence that conflicts with this other thing that I KNOW is right	
<b>Partly Legitimate Subsumption</b>	old knowledge accounts in part for right information		<b>Theoretical-Reality Dichotomy</b>	that may be true in theory, but it isn't like that in reality	
<b>Argument from Authority</b>	new material is wrong because X told me differently		<b>Extirpation of Effects</b>	if true, would lead to destruction	
<b>Demean Effect</b>	that might be right but it's insignificant		<b>Fallacious Alternative</b>	disagrees because has mistaken alternative explanation	
<b>Add Appendage</b>	that might be right, but it's just an add-on to what I believe (when it actually controverts it)		<b>Prior Knowledge Clash</b>	that is simply incongruent with what I know to be true	
<b>Resort to Bad Analogy</b>	that can't be right because of something I know (but doesn't know right)		<b>Impertinent Complexification</b>	yes, but there's more to it than that	
<b>Decoupling of Effects</b>	causally related processes/things that are treated as separate		<b>Argument from Equation/Formalism</b>	that's not right because of this equation I know (inappropriate equation, erroneous application, etc.)	
<b>Correlation as Causation</b>	x must cause y because they are correlated		<b>Argument from Reduced Dimensions</b>	argues using only one or few of the pertinent dimensions of a situation	
<b>Argument from Faulty Causal Reasoning</b>	agrees/disagrees because of cooked up causal argument that is flawed		<b>Restricted Applicability of Principle</b>	that might be right, but it only applies in special circumstances	
<b>Ignoring of Secondary Effects</b>	x doesn't cause y, only z does		<b>Argument from Static Representation of Dynamic</b>	argument assumes unit equals change over time	
<b>Argument from Extremes</b>	it could be true but only if x (something extreme) happens		<b>Argument from Salient Example Subsumption</b>	that can't be true because of this example I know	
<b>Argument from Special Case</b>	it could be true if special boundary conditions hold		<b>Argument from Unrelated Alternative</b>	that's not right because this other thing I know is	
<b>Counter-intuition</b>	just seems like that CAN'T be right	