## Sufficient Assumption Challenge Explanation 18.4.12

First, translate.

> *Most nondomestic mammals in Australia are marsupials, but there are some placentals too. The placentals aren't native to the Australian continent though. We know this because all the nonhuman placentals (except the dingo that humans brought) had ancestors who could swim, fly, or float.*

We've got a classic dangling variable SA stimulus here.

"not native" ≠ "able to swim, fly, float"

So we've got these rogue placentals in Australia. The conclusion is claiming that they couldn't have been native to Australia because their ancestors could swim, fly, or float there. But just because these ancestors *could* have gotten to Australia from somewhere else doesn't meant they actually did. They could have the ability to swim, fly, or float and not actually do so. They could still be native to Australia and have ancestors who like to chill on driftwood.

**LOOPHOLE** What if ancestors who could swim, fly, or float could also be native to Australia?

Now that we see it's SA, we have to knock our Loophole out of contention. We have to prove our conclusion, building a bridge between the premises and the conclusion.

**SA** If your ancestors could swim, fly, or float, then you must not be native to Australia.

Awesome! Let's see if we can find our SA in the answer choices.

**A)** *So some marsupials might not be native to Australia, but got there some other way. Wow, this is like the opposite of a powerful answer. First off, we need to plug the gap about placentals; marsupials don't really matter for the conclusion. Marsupials being native doesn't affect whether placentals are native. Plus, the "some" and "might" make* **A** *a super provable, misdirected answer. Not the powerful answer we're looking for on SA.*

**B)** *So humans probably introduced most of the placentals. Our conclusion is about* ***all*** *of the placentals, so an answer addressing* ***most*** *of them isn't going to prove the conclusion Also, that "probably" is way too weak to prove that all the placentals are not native to Australia.* **B** *just isn't powerful enough for SA.*

**C)** *So the only placentals who could be native have ancestors who couldn't have gotten to Australia any other way.* **C** *is kinda wordy, so let's think about what it means for a sec. It says if my ancestors could travel to Australia, I must not be native. The only placentals who get to be native are the ones whose ancestors couldn't travel. Sounds a lot like our sufficient assumption, right? If my ancestors could swim, fly, or float, that means they could have reached Australia by other means. If* **C** *is true, the placentals with mobile ancestors can't be native; our conclusion must be true.* **C** *proves our conclusion; it's a powerful choice.*

**D)** *So no current marsupial can swim, fly, or float. We don't care about what the marsupials can do, and we definitely don't care if the marsupials in Australia today can swim, fly, or float. This doesn't prove anything about how the placentals started in Australia.* **D** *is talking about the wrong group.*

**E)** *So seals, bats, and mice are usually found in places without marsupials. Who cares?* **E** *doesn't tell us anything about whether placentals can be native. These placentals can keep to themselves and also be native to Australia or not.* **E** *doesn't affect the conclusion, meaning it's not a suitable sufficient assumption.*

**C** is the correct answer. It's the only answer the bridges the gap between the premises and the conclusion.