

Philosophy Lab I Report

Aleksandr Lobanov

Exercise I

What is the conclusion in this argument?

There can't be weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. If there were, then the military forces would have found them by now, or some radicalized group of insurgents would have used them. But the military forces haven't found them and no insurgent groups have used any.

Answer:

There can't be weapons of mass destruction in Iraq

Why?

We can reconstruct the sentence to emphasize the conclusion:

If there were, then the military forces would have found them by now, or some radicalized group of insurgents would have used them. But the military forces haven't found them and no insurgent groups have used any. So, **therefore there can't be weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.**

Exercise II

Exercise III

Individuate the implicit premise in this argument

“Positive thinking cannot help you win the lottery. If it could, then lots of people would win.”

The starter must be broken. If the car won't start, then it's either the starter, the alternator, or the battery that's the problem. It won't start. And we've ruled out the alternator since we just put a new one in, and it can't be the battery because it's fully charged.