

DETAILED CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
§ 1. Issues	3
I. Definitions	3
II. Creation of Issues	6
III. Resolution of Issues	7
A. Frame the Issue in the Dispute.....	7
B. Find the Facts That Pertain to the Issue.....	9
C. Identify and Interpret, or if Necessary Create, the Authority That Governs the Issue.....	10
D. Apply Law to Fact (i.e. use the authority to determine the legal consequences of the facts of the dispute)	11
IV. Identifying Issues	11
A. Identifying Issues in Documents	12
<i>The College Daily</i>	12

	<i>When Is an Offer Accepted?</i>	14
	B. Identifying Issues in Facts.....	16
	<i>The Coconut Cases</i>	17
V.	Review.....	19
	<i>Sally's Case</i>	20
	<i>The Case of the Research Papers</i>	21
VI.	References.....	21
§ 2.	Identifying the Governing Rule of Law	22
	I. Definition of a Rule of Law.....	23
	II. Identifying an Existing Rule of Law.....	24
	<i>The Refusal to Bargain Case</i>	25
	A. Identifying the Governing Rule of Law	
	Using Precedents.....	28
	B. Identifying the Governing Rule of Law Using	
	Authoritative Texts.....	30
	<i>Two Cases of Second Thoughts</i>	30
	<i>Diallo's Case</i>	31
	<i>Niner's Case</i>	32
	<i>Packard Motor Car Company</i>	32
	III. Review.....	33
	IV. References.....	34
§ 3.	Levels of Abstraction	35
	I. Levels of Abstraction: The Basic Idea.....	35
	II. The Definition of "Level of Abstraction".....	40
	A. Unrelated Issues and Levels of Abstraction.....	43
	B. Related Issues and Levels of Abstraction.....	44
	<i>Ben and Gerrie's Case</i>	46
	III. Why the Level of Abstraction Matters.....	48
	<i>Guenevere v. Arthur</i>	53
	IV. Review.....	59
	<i>Mary's Case</i>	61
	<i>Wimp v. Bully</i>	63
	<i>The Spat</i>	64
	V. References.....	64

§ 4. Deduction.....	65
I. In General.....	65
A. Syllogisms	67
B. Enthymemes.....	67
II. Categorical Syllogisms and Quasi Syllogisms	68
A. The Major and Minor Premises Are Affirmative	70
1. The Valid Form.....	70
2. The Fallacy of the Undistributed Middle.....	70
B. The Major Premise Is Affirmative and the Minor Premise Is Negative	72
1. The Valid Form.....	72
2. The Fallacy of the Illicit Major	73
III. Hypothetical Syllogisms.....	74
A. Modus Ponens.....	74
1. The Valid Form.....	74
2. The Fallacy of Denying the Antecedent.....	75
B. Modus Tollens.....	76
1. The Valid Form.....	76
2. The Fallacy of Affirming the Consequent.....	77
IV. The Soundness of Syllogisms.....	77
V. Moral Syllogisms and Legal Syllogisms.....	80
A. Moral Syllogisms.....	80
B. Legal Syllogisms	82
<i>Willie Sutton's Case</i>	82
VI. The Value of Syllogisms	83
VII. Review.....	85
 § 5. Induction	 88
I. Inductive Generalizations.....	88
A. The Nature of Induction	88
B. Probability of Conclusions	89
C. Analysis of Arguments in the Form of Inductive Generalization.....	90
D. Some Errors Associated with Inductive Generalization.....	90
1. Hasty Generalization	91

2. Unrepresentative Sample.....	91
3. Vivid Counterexample.....	91
4. Argument Ad Hominem	92
5. Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc	93
6. Failure to Falsify Alternative Hypotheses.....	93
Excerpt from the <i>Phaedo</i> by Plato.....	94
II. Statistical Syllogisms	98
A. The Nature of a Statistical Syllogism.....	98
B. The Force of a Statistical Syllogism	100
C. Statistical Syllogisms in Ordinary Speech	101
III. Practical Syllogisms.....	102
IV. Review	103
V. References.....	104
§ 6. Arguments in General	105
I. Definition of an Argument	105
II. Elements of an Argument.....	106
<i>Should Use of Marijuana Be Legal?</i>	107
<i>Katzenjammer for Congress</i>	109
III. Recognizing Arguments	110
IV. Incomplete Arguments	111
V. Issues, Arguments, and Rhetoric	112
VI. Review	113
§ 7. Arguments Classified by Function.....	114
I. Arguments as to the Issue in a Case	114
<i>Clinics v. Hospitals</i>	115
II. Arguments as to the Facts	115
III. Arguments as to the Law	116
A. Arguments as to Which Authority Governs the Case	116
<i>Here v. There</i>	116
<i>Round v. About</i>	116
B. Arguments as to How to Interpret the Governing Authority	116
<i>Scarpia v. Sky</i>	117
<i>Puss v. Boots</i>	117

IV.	Arguments Applying Law to Fact	118
	<i>Don Juan in Hell</i>	118
V.	Review.....	119
	<i>Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Company</i>	119
VI.	References.....	121
§ 8.	Arguments Based on Evidence	122
I.	Varieties of Evidence	122
II.	Uses of Evidence	123
§ 9.	Policy Arguments.....	124
I.	The Nature of Policy Arguments.....	125
	A. Normative Claims.....	125
	1. Values.....	125
	2. Varieties of Arguments about Values	127
	3. Sources of Values.....	128
	B. Assertions of Fact.....	128
	1. Retrospective and Prospective Facts.....	129
	2. Sources of Assertions of Fact	131
II.	Uses of Policy Arguments.....	131
	<i>Lockouts</i>	131
	<i>Employees or Independent Contractors?</i>	132
III.	Evaluating Policy Arguments	133
	<i>The Case of the Bargaining Order</i>	133
IV.	Review.....	137
V.	References.....	138
§ 10.	Doctrinal Arguments	139
I.	Varieties of Authority.....	139
	A. Binding Authorities	139
	B. Advisory Authorities	141
II.	Uses of Authority.....	141
	<i>People v. Ledfoot</i>	144
III.	Varieties of Doctrinal Argument	146
IV.	Review.....	146
	<i>Sure-Tan v. National Labor Relations Board</i>	147
V.	References.....	149

§ 11. Analogies and Precedents: The Structure and Criteria for Evaluation of Legal Analogies.....	150
I. Analogies, Similes, and Metaphors	150
A. The Nature of Analogies	150
B. The Danger of Analogies.....	153
<i>Aspasia</i>	153
II. The Legal Analogy	154
A. Differences between an Ordinary Analogy and a Legal Analogy	154
B. The Structure of a Legal Analogy	156
<i>The Captain's Analogy</i>	157
C. Truncated Analogies.....	158
1. Failure to Demonstrate That the Facts of the Precedent Are Similar to the Facts of the Case at Bar	159
<i>The Case of Illegal Questions</i>	159
<i>The "Phantom Analogy"</i>	161
<i>The Seat Belt Cases</i>	161
2. Failure to Demonstrate That the Rationale of the Precedent Applies to the Case at Bar.....	163
<i>Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States</i> ...	163
<i>The Case of Gay Marriage</i>	164
3. Legal Citations as Truncated Analogies	165
<i>The Case of the Second Bite</i>	166
D. The Uses of Analogies	169
1. Using an Analogy to Identify the Issue.....	169
<i>Ford Motor Company v. National Labor Relations Board</i>	169
2. Using an Analogy to Find the Facts	170
3. Using an Analogy to Identify and Interpret the Governing Rule of Law	171
<i>The Taggers' Cases</i>	171
4. Using an Analogy to Apply Law to Fact	172
<i>Ford Motor Company v. National Labor Relations Board (continued)</i>	172
E. Four Criteria for Evaluating Analogies.....	173
1. The Precedent Must Be Authoritative; If the Precedent Can Be Vitiating, the Analogy Fails	173

2. The Legally Significant Facts of the Precedent and the Case at Bar Must Be Analogous in the Important Ways; If the Case at Bar Can Be Distinguished from the Precedent (that is, if the legally significant facts of the case at bar and the precedent differ), the Analogy Fails	173
3. The Analogy Must Be Relevant to the Issue at Hand	174
4. No Other Analogy May Be More Convincing	174
<i>Thomas the Mover</i>	175
III. Review	177
<i>The Fine Print Cases</i>	177
IV. References.....	179

§ 12. Distinctions: Distinguishing Precedents, Disanalogies, and Precedents and Levels of Abstraction	180
<i>The Musician's Case</i>	180
I. The Elements of a Distinction	182
A. Difference(s) of Fact between the Precedent and the Case at Bar	183
B. The Importance of the Difference(s) of Fact	183
1. Some Differences Do Not Matter	183
<i>Seth's Case: An Unsuccessful Distinction</i>	184
2. Merely Identifying Difference(s) of Fact Does Not Distinguish a Precedent from a Case at Bar: The Importance of the Difference(s) of Fact Must Be Explained	187
<i>A Brick and a Rose Petal</i>	187
<i>Daniela's Case: A Successful Distinction</i>	188
<i>Seymour's Case</i>	191
C. The Conclusion	194
II. The Uses of Distinctions	195
III. Disanalogies.....	198
IV. Distinctions and Levels of Abstraction.....	199
V. <i>Seymour's Case</i> Expanded.....	201
<i>Shady Sam v. Esme</i>	201
<i>Seymour v. Hard Luck Hank</i>	202

VI. Review.....	205
<i>The War between the Unions</i>	205
<i>The Case of the Supervisor's Questions</i>	206
<i>Young Tom's Case</i>	207
<i>The Fine Print Cases</i>	208
§ 13. Holding and Dictum	209
I. Definitions	209
II. Effect of a Holding	209
III. The Scope or Meaning of a Holding	210
<i>Union Access to Company Property</i>	210
IV. References.....	212
§ 14. Reductio ad Absurdum.....	213
I. The Elements of a Reductio ad Absurdum	213
<i>The Paradox of the Arrow</i>	214
<i>The Paradox of Achilles and the Tortoise</i>	216
<i>The Paradox of the Minimum Wage</i>	217
II. The Criteria of a Sound Reductio ad Absurdum	218
III. Reductio ad Absurdum in Law	218
A. Reductio and Precedents	218
B. Reductio and Fact Finding.....	219
<i>The Philosopher's Reductio</i>	219
C. Reductio and Policy Arguments	220
IV. Review.....	221
V. References.....	222
§ 15. Subjective and Objective Standards.....	223
I. Standards.....	223
II. Subjective Standards	225
III. Objective Standards	226
IV. Mixed Standards and Evidence	227
V. Subjective versus Objective Standards.....	228
<i>The One-Year Misunderstanding</i>	229
VI. Review.....	230
<i>The House of Tantalus</i>	230

§ 16. Interpreting Statutes.....	232
I. Sources	232
A. Text of the Statute	233
B. Purpose of the Statute	234
C. Legislative History of the Statute.....	235
D. Scholarly Publications	235
E. Public Policy.....	236
<i>Cannery Row</i>	236
F. Administrative Interpretations.....	237
G. Precedent.....	237
1. Analogous Statutes	237
2. Other Tribunals' Interpretations	238
II. Principles	238
A. The Principle of Meaningfulness	238
<i>Duplex v. Deering</i>	239
B. The Principle of Wholeness	240
1. Within One Statute.....	240
2. Between Statutes.....	242
III. The Effect of Precedents on the Meaning of Statutes.....	242
IV. References.....	244
§ 17. Prima Facie Case, Affirmative Defense, Burden of Proof.....	245
I. Prima Facie Case.....	246
A. The Basic Idea	246
B. Two Meanings of "Prima Facie Case"	247
<i>Proving Battery</i>	248
II. Defenses.....	249
A. Destruction of the Plaintiff's Prima Facie Case	249
B. Affirmative Defense.....	250
<i>A Pinch at Pong</i>	251
III. Burden of Proof	252
A. Burden of Persuasion.....	253
1. Who Carries the Burden of Persuasion?.....	253
2. How Heavy Is the Burden of Persuasion?	253
3. What Happens If a Party Fails to Carry the Burden of Persuasion?	253

	B. Burden of Production	254
IV.	Prima Facie Case + Affirmative Defense = Rule of Law	256
V.	Review	256
	<i>Battery on a Barstool</i>	257
	<i>The Two-Timer</i>	258
VI.	References.....	258
§ 18.	Application of Law to Fact	259
I.	Application of Law to Fact Operates Issue by Issue	260
	<i>The Raid</i>	260
II.	Direct Application of Law to Fact.....	261
	A. Direct Application of Law to Fact by Force of Logic.....	261
	<i>Caroline's Case</i>	261
	<i>Tommy's Case</i>	263
	B. Direct Application of Law to Fact by Use of Judgment	263
	<i>The Coach</i>	263
	<i>Adora's Case</i>	264
	<i>Amanda's Case</i>	269
	<i>Ben-El's Case</i>	270
III.	Application of Law to Fact Using Precedent	274
	A. Application of Law to Fact Using Binding Precedents	275
	<i>The Honor Society Cases</i>	275
	<i>Harry the Harrier</i>	275
	B. Application of Law to Fact Using Guiding Precedents	280
	<i>The Battle of the Sexes</i>	280
IV.	Review	282
	<i>Dipaboli's Case</i>	282
V.	References.....	283
§ 19.	A Model of Legal Argument	285
I.	Neither a Quasi Syllogism nor a Statistical Syllogism Can Capture a Legal Argument	285
	<i>Shimul's Case</i>	285

- II. A Model of Legal Argument 288
 - A. Toulmin's Model 288
 - B. Our Revision of Toulmin's Model 290
 - 1. Issues as to the Issue 292
 - Janus v. American Federation of State,
County, and Municipal Employees*..... 292
 - 2. Issues of Fact 294
 - 3. Issues of Law 296
 - 4. Issues of Application of Law to Fact..... 300
- III. The Value of the Model 302
- IV. Review 303
- V. References..... 304

- Answers 305