


Sulmasy et al, Argument A (248).
**The argument under 1.1 is that
of Sulmasy's envisioned *opponent*;
Sulmasy argues by raising an
objection to this argument.

PAS: Physician-
Assisted Suicide



Note that I added 3.2;
Sulmasy doesn't say it
explicitly, it's just implied. Can
you see what the reasoning
co-premise to 3.3 is? (The
argument has a 'modus
tollens' structure.)

It seems to me that
Sulmasy's arguments
don't seem to work if 2.1
is merely that "Our
fundamental obligation
is to *advance*
individuals' interests.
What do you think?

Note: Sulmasy doesn't say
this specifically, I'm
inferring this from his
argument.