Parallel Reasoning Challenge Explanation 18.2.13

First, translate.

> *So because students violently protested the Imperialist Society president's speech, he has been banned from speaking on politics by the dean. But if we deny anyone's free speech rights, everyone's rights to free expression are in danger. Therefore, the dean threatened everyone's right to free expression.*

So these protests led to this offensive dude getting banned from talking about politics on campus. The question is whether this action actually denied the president his unrestricted freedom to speak. Usually, rights like free speech are only guaranteed by the government, not by private institutions like universities. This leads us straight to our Loophole.

LOOPHOLE What if the dean's actions aren't denying the president his right to unrestricted free speech?

Now we see it's Parallel Reasoning, so we have to design a skeleton. Our Loophole forced us to see how the argument parts are fitting together, so we already have a head start. It seems like we have a specific example (first sentence), then a principle that's applied to the example (second sentence), then a conclusion about the example using the principle. Let's see how this looks as a skeleton:

SKELETON Thing 1 happened to person 1. Whenever thing 1 happens to anyone, there's a consequence. Therefore, this consequence happened with person 1.

Let's see if any of these answers fit the skeleton.

A) *So Dr. Pacheco saved a child with emergency surgery, but surgery rarely has risk for the surgeon. Therefore, if an action isn't heroic unless the agent takes some risk, Dr. Pacheco wasn't heroic. Does* **A** *match our skeleton? No, it doesn't match because Dr. Pacheco's example doesn't necessarily fit the principle. Notice how it says surgery "rarely" entails risk for the surgeon. For all we know, Dr. Pacheco could have fallen into the minority and the surgery he performed did entail risk for him. That would mean the principle didn't apply to him and the conclusion wouldn't follow. Our example has to activate the principle definitively in order for the skeleton to match, so* **A** *isn't a match.*

B) *So anyone who performs a heroic act is acting altruistically instead of selfishly; therefore, if a society rewards heroism it is encouraging altruism over self interest. Does* **B** *match our skeleton? Nope, and it's not even as close as* **A**. **B** *doesn't have a specific example for the principle to apply to, so it's not a provable match.*

C) *So Isabel rescued a drowning child from a freezing river; these heroic acts performed to save a life enrich everyone's lives. Therefore, Isabel's action enriched everyone's lives. Does* **C** *match our skeleton? Yes! We have an example (Isabel saving the child), a principle that applies to the example (acts to save another enrich everyone's lives), and then a characterization of the example according to the principle (Isabel enriched everyone's lives).* **C** *is just like the stimulus. It's a provable match.*

D) *So firefighters are often expected to act heroically, but no one is required to act heroically. Therefore, firefighters are often expected to act in a way they are not required to. Does* **D** *match our skeleton? It doesn't. There's no example; there's just a general observation about how firefighters are often expected to act. Without a specific example for the principle in the second sentence to apply to,* **D** *can't be a provable match.*

E) *So extremely generous acts usually go above and beyond, and all actions that go above and beyond are heroic. Therefore, most extremely generous acts are heroic. Does* **D** *match our skeleton? No!* **D** *is just a* **MOST** *chain, read straight from the first to the last term. That's not the same thing as an example and a principle that's applied.* **E** *isn't a provable match.*

C is the correct answer. It's the only answer choice that matches our skeleton.

Parallel Reasoning Challenge Explanation 20.4.15

Wordy Parallel here we come! Instead of a translation, we'll number the stimulus to understand what's going on:

First Premise Translation	If Rhonda sees the movie tomorrow afternoon **(1)**, then Paul goes to the concert in the afternoon **(2)**.	Write in the numbers on the text and then the **1 ⟶ 2** on the side. Now we can translate the next statement.
Second Premise Translation	If Paul goes to the concert **(2)**, then Ted agrees to go **(3)**.	Write in a **⟶ 3** on the end of your chain from the first premise. The chain should read **1 ⟶ 2 ⟶ 3**.
Conclusion Translation	Ted isn't going to the concert **(~3)**, so Rhonda isn't seeing the movie **(~1)**.	So it looks like our conclusion is taking the three-part chain from the premises and activating the contrapositive. It then reads the contrapositive correctly from the last to the first variable in the chain. Awesome.

PREMISE 1 **1 ⟶ 2**

PREMISE 2 **2 ⟶ 3**

CONCLUSION **~3 ⟶ ~1**

That's our pattern of reasoning: three-part premise chain and a conclusion that reads the contrapositive from the last to the first term. That's the pattern we want to find in the answer choices.

A)

First Premise Translation	**Janice visit (1) ⟶ NOT Mary bills (~2)**
Second Premise Translation	**Janice visit (1) ⟶ babysitter (3)**

The premises aren't even chaining! Without chaining premises, there's no point in numbering the conclusion. **A** *is definitely not a provable match.*

B)

First Premise Translation | **Gary laundry (1) ⟶ Peter work (2)**

Second Premise Translation | **Peter work (2) ⟶ Cathy ill (3)**

The premises are chaining! We've got our nice three-part chain. **B** *is matching the stimulus so far. Let's see if the conclusion can hold it together.*

Conclusion Translation | **NOT Cathy ill (~3) ⟶ NOT Gary laundry (~1)**

The conclusion read the contrapositive of our premise chain! The numbers match; everything is glorious. Awesome! **B** *is a provable match.*

C)

First Premise Translation | **NOT rain (~1) + trout (2) ⟶ Kelly fish (3)**

Then wait a second... the next premise is pretend activating the conditional supplied in the first premise! There's no chaining in **C**'s *premises. The forecast not calling for rain doesn't even activate* **NOT rain**. *Posers. We don't need to number anything else; it's clear that* **C** *isn't a match.*

D)

First Premise Translation | **Lisa attend (1) ⟶ Jared (2) or Karl (3)**

Now we're seeing the same problem we say in **C**. *The next premises are just poorly reading our conditional from the first premise. There's no chain going on, so there's no point in continuing to number when we already know the answer is wrong. Without a three-part chain,* **D** *has no shot at being a provable match.*

E)

First Premise Translation	**George museum (1) ⟶ Mark agrees (2)**
Second Premise Translation	**Mark agrees (2) ⟶ postpone most appt (3)**

We have another three-part chain! It's a match so far. Now we'll see if the conclusion pulls through.

Conclusion Translation	**postpone some appt (4) ⟶ Mark agrees (2)**

Dang, the conclusion totally blew it. First, we have the bad **SOME/MOST** *match between the conclusion and the second premise, which is trying to fool us into activating the contrapositive at the end of our chain. Then the conclusion isn't even interacting with the first part of the chain. It's just reading within the second premise.* **E** *isn't a provable match.*

B is the correct answer. It is the only provable match for the stimulus.