

**Philosophy 103**  
**Professor Guerrero**  
**Paper #1**

**Due by 9am on Monday, October 24, 2016**

**Please email your paper to me as a .doc or .docx file with the subject “Phil 103: Paper #1”**  
**750 to 1000 words (roughly 2-3 pgs)**

This paper is an argument analysis. Please read the passage below carefully. It contains at least one argument. Your job in this paper will be to clearly state the main argument in your words and to raise a question/objection with at least one of the premises of the argument you have presented.

**Step One: Reconstructing the Argument**

- PRESENT THE ARGUMENT AS A LOGICALLY VALID ARGUMENT.

Two forms of short, valid arguments (these might form the basis or subparts of your reconstructed arguments):

Modus ponens:

- (1) If  $p$ , then  $q$ .
- (2)  $p$ .
- (3) Therefore,  $q$ .

Modus tollens:

- (1) If  $p$ , then  $q$ .
- (2) Not  $q$ .
- (3) Therefore, not  $p$ .

- Number the premises and the conclusion. Articulate each premise and the conclusion in no more than one sentence. STATE THE PREMISES AND THE CONCLUSION IN YOUR OWN WORDS, NOT IN THE AUTHOR’S WORDS.
- Include both explicit and implicit premises. In other words, you may need to supply premises that are not explicitly stated in the text.
- When presenting the argument, present it charitably and as convincingly as possible. You are trying to make it seem like a strong, compelling argument.

**Step Two: Engaging with the Argument**

- After stating the argument, briefly explain it in your own words.
- After explaining the argument, identify one premise that you think is most plausibly objected to, the “weakest link,” so to speak, and then write at least one paragraph explaining the basis of an objection to this premise. This objection can be of your own invention, or it can draw on the other readings for the course.
- Now return to Cajete’s side: present one plausible counter-response that might be made to the objection that you’ve just raised. Write at least one paragraph presenting and explaining this counter-response and how it is a response.

- You should read the surrounding material in the article from which the passage is taken, but do not discuss arguments the author makes elsewhere in the article. Discuss only the argument in the quoted passage.

The Passage:

Gregory Cajete:

“Native American philosophy of science has always been a broad-based ecological philosophy, based not on rational thought alone, but also incorporating to the highest degree all aspects of interactions of “man in and of nature,” i.e. the knowledge and truth gained from interaction of body, mind, soul, and spirit with all aspects of Nature. As all knowledge originates in a people’s culture, its roots lie in cosmology, that contextual foundation for philosophy, a grand guiding story, by nature speculative, in that it tries to explain the universe, its origin, characteristics, and essential nature. Any attempt to explain the story of the cosmos is also metaphysical as the method of research always stems from a cultural orientation, a paradigm of thinking that has a history in some particular tradition. Therefore, there can be no such thing as a fully objective story of the universe.”