

1.

Put the following arguments in standard form. You may find that the argument forms we have named so far do not suffice to capture all the steps in the argument. If that happens, flag it and make some suggestions for possible argument patterns that could be used to fill the gap.

- a. If Sally has taken logic or has taken calculus, she has satisfied Pomona's area 5 requirements. She has taken calculus. So she has satisfied the area 5 requirements.
- b. Only the butler or the gardener could have killed the old man. The gardener did not do it. So the butler killed the old man.
- c. Only the butler or the gardener could have killed the old man. So if the butler didn't do it, the gardener must have done it.

2.

Put each of the following into a valid argument in standard form. Be creative (i.e., add unstated premises, extra steps, etc. as necessary).

- a. The new movie, which is directed by Christopher McQuarrie, runs for two hours and forty-three minutes, and its full title is "Mission: Impossible—Dead Reckoning Part One," which takes about half an hour to say. If Part Two, which is due to be released next June, is of similar dimensions, we'll be landed with a tale that is more than five hours in the telling. Concision junkies will have to look elsewhere.
- b. *Background: In 1839, Lin Zexu, a high official of China, published an open letter to Queen Victoria of England calling for the cessation of the sales of opium in China by British merchants. (The letter went nowhere, China confiscated the opium stored by traders, and the British Empire responded by going to war with China in the name of defending the right to free trade—the disgrace known as the Opium War.)*

Put the reasoning in the following snippet into standard form:

We have heard that in your own country opium is prohibited with the utmost strictness and severity; this is a strong proof that you know full

well how hurtful it is to mankind. Since then you do not permit it to injure your own country, you ought not to have the injurious drug transferred to another country.

- c. *The idea that prohibiting the sales of opium is a serious infringement of liberty was a respectable idea back then. The following are the thoughts of John Stuart Mill, one of the most important and respected British philosophers of the 19th century, writing in 1859.*

Put Mill's reasoning in standard form:

These interferences [like the prohibition of the sales of opium] are objectionable, not as infringements on the liberty of the producer or seller, but on that of the buyer. ... If poisons [like opium] were never bought or used for any purpose except the commission of murder, it would be right to prohibit their manufacture and sale. They may, however, be wanted not only for innocent but for useful purposes, and restrictions cannot be imposed in the one case without operating in the other. ... [W]hen there is not a certainty, but only a danger of mischief, no one but the person himself can judge of the sufficiency of the motive which may prompt him to incur the risk: in this case, therefore, he ought, I conceive, to be only warned of the danger; not forcibly prevented from exposing himself to it.