Argument 1:

1. *Either I will have Chinese for dinner or Italian.*
2. *I did not have Chinese for dinner.*
3. *Therefore, I had Italian.*

Symbolization:

Let C= I will have Chinese for dinner

Let I= I will have Italian for dinner

1. C or I

2. not I

3. Therefore, C

Form:

1. p ∨ q

2. ~q

3. P

Regardless of what declarative sentence (which may be either true or false) you substitute in for p and q, the argument will always come out valid.

Argument 2:

1. If Bill Clinton was president in 1993, then Al Gore was Vice-President in 1993.

2. Al Gore was Vice-President in 1993.

3. Therefore, Bill Clinton was president in 1993.

Symbolization:

Let B=Clinton was president in 1993.

Let A=Al Gore was Vice-President in 1993

1. If B then A

2. A

3. Therefore, B

Form:

1. $p \supset q$
2. q
3. p

In this instance, it is possible for the form of the argument to have all true premises and a false conclusion and is invalid.

Example 3:

1. If Ontario is the 51st state, then Mike Harris was Premier of Ontario.

2. Mike Harris was Premier of Ontario.

3. Therefore, Ontario is the 51st state.

Symbolization

1. *If O then H (true)*
2. *H (true)*
3. *Therefore, O (false)*

Modus Moron

Notice that this argument has the exact same form as the Clinton/Gore example.

1. If C then A (true)

2. A (true)

3. Therefore, C (true)

-This counterexample demonstrates that the form "If p then q" "q" therefore "p" is not truth preserving.