

Mini Paper 6

Instructions: this assignment should be **printed out** and turned in **in class** on **October 8**. This paper would ideally be under a page and should definitely be under a page and a half. I like to grade as anonymously as possible, so please **do not put your name on the top of the paper, but instead put it on the opposite side of the page (or on a second page, if you can't print double-sided)**. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

1. In Steven L. Davis's paper, "The Least Harm Principle May Require that Humans Consume a Diet Containing Large Herbivores, Not a Vegan Diet," Davis discusses an argument by Tom Regan that concludes "... humans are morally obligated to consume a vegan or vegetarian diet." The argument occurs on page 387. I would like you to reconstruct it with numbered premises.
2. The paper you've read reveals that Davis would say that this argument is unsound. Would he say that it is invalid, or that one of its premises is false, or both? And if he would think that one of its premises is false, which one? And why would he say this?

Here are some reminders of things to pay attention to:

- Sometimes you need to fill in premises that the author hasn't explicitly stated in order to reconstruct their argument. It may require some creativity on your part to figure out the missing premises.
- Sometimes a passage will contain a sub-conclusion on the way to the main conclusion.
- Sometimes the text will contain a bunch of extraneous information, or keep using different words. Try to get rid of the extraneous information, and to rephrase so the wording is consistent.
- Try to avoid having a number of premises that are all basically repeating the same point.

- If you have the word “because” in your conclusion, the stuff that comes after the “because” probably belongs in the premises.
- Write as clearly as possible. Pretend you are tutoring a high school student, and they have asked you this question. You’re best off writing as simply and directly as you can; using unnecessary big words or convoluted sentences will only confuse them. (An exception – you can assume they’ve been taught words like “valid” and “sound.”)
- Philosophers like it when you state things as precisely as possible. Try not to state things vaguely or incorrectly, even if you think I will know what you mean.
- To complete this assignment, you will have to write concisely; if something is irrelevant you should remove it and if you can say something just as clearly in fewer words, then do so.