



## Principle Conform Challenge Explanation 23.2.13

---

First, translate.

*So we shouldn't put someone at the top who has a history of excessive drinking that wouldn't let them command a missile, bomber, or fighter jets. Leadership goes from the top down.*

My first thought here is why do we care if the candidate can do all these middle management positions? Why does that mean that they can't do the higher level stuff? There's a big disconnect between the relevancy of the premises and the judgment in the conclusion.

### LOOPHOLE

What if being barred from doing all the middle management commands doesn't matter for being at the top?

Our Loophole is exposing the gap our Principle will bridge, but it has to underpin the example's reasoning exactly. It will be specific to exactly what occurred in the example.

### PRINCIPLE

Being at the top requires not being barred from doing the middle management jobs.

Let's go find our principle in the answer choices.

- A)** *So if you're barred from doing important jobs, you shouldn't be the leader. This sounds a lot like our principle, right? The difference is how they characterize the missiles, bombers, and fighter jets as "important jobs." I don't love A since "important" is never established in the stimulus. Besides the problem with "important," A has a lot going for it: It specifically mentions being barred and leading an organization, two key points from the stimulus. Let's keep A open and see what else we have to work with.*
- B)** *So if you're the leader, you have to have served at every level. Well, that wasn't in the stimulus. The problem for the candidate isn't that they didn't serve; it's that they would be specifically barred from jobs due to excessive drinking. Being precluded is the issue, not whether the service occurred at all. B isn't provable.*
- C)** *So if you're the leader, you have to be qualified to hold every important job. "Qualified" is the problem here. The candidate could be totally qualified, but then their history of drinking would bar them anyway. Then we have that "important job" problem again. If every possible correct answer necessitates that I make this "important" leap, I'm going to have to be OK making it. C is farther from the stimulus than A though. It's not provable.*
- D)** *So if you're an excessive drinker, you shouldn't have any leadership position along the chain of command. The stimulus isn't making a claim about "anywhere along the chain of command." It's making a claim about the top of the chain only. This principle is going way beyond the example it's supposed to support. It's also speaking to present-day drinking when we only know that the candidate has a history of excessive drinking. Maybe he recovered? We can't infer from past to present. D isn't provable.*



**E)** *So if you can't command a missile wing, you can't be at the top of the chain. Being barred from commanding a missile wing is not the same thing as being unable to command a missile wing, which means **E** is straying pretty far from the provable realm of the stimulus. We don't know whether the barred person can or cannot command a missile wing in theory. **E** doesn't conform to the reasoning in the stimulus; it isn't provable.*

**A** is the correct answer. It is the only answer choice that conforms to the stimulus' reasoning: If you're barred, you can't be at the top. Characterizing missiles, bombers, and fighter jets as "important jobs" ends up not being a problem because there's nothing more provable in the answer choices. We have to take the "important" characterization as a commonsense shorthand.