

Assignment One Questions

Brian Weatherson

First Prompt

Do you think your local butcher will reduce the amount of meat she orders from the slaughterhouse if you become a vegetarian? Of course not! The supply chain for meat just isn't sensitive to the quantities that a single person consumes. So, by becoming a vegetarian, you'll never save a single animal's life! But by becoming a vegetarian, you'll deprive yourself of the pleasure of eating meat, and you should only do that if the benefits would outweigh the losses. Therefore, you should only become a vegetarian if doing so would save some animals' lives.

Question 1

What is the conclusion of this argument?

1. There is no benefit to becoming a vegetarian.
2. You shouldn't become a vegetarian.
3. Becoming vegetarian will not save any animals' lives.
4. You should only become vegetarian if doing so would save animals' lives.
5. The supply chain for meat isn't sensitive to the quantities that a single person consumes.

Answer: You shouldn't become a vegetarian.

Question 2

What reason is given for the claim that by becoming a vegetarian you will not be saving any animals' lives?

1. Your local butcher will not reduce the amount of meat she orders from the slaughterhouse if you become a vegetarian, which is the only way you could save animals' lives by becoming a vegetarian.
2. The supply chain is not sensitive to consumption.

3. The only relevant benefit of becoming vegetarian would be saving animals' lives, and becoming a vegetarian will not help save animals' lives.
4. The supply chain is not sensitive to the quantities of meat that a single person consumes.
5. You becoming a vegetarian and animals' lives being saved do not have a cause-effect relationship.

Answer: The supply chain is not sensitive to the quantities of meat that a single person consumes.

Question 3

What is assumed in the inference from the claim that the supply chain is not sensitive to the quantities of meat that a single person consumes, to the conclusion that by becoming a vegetarian you will not be saving any animals' lives?

1. You shouldn't become a vegetarian.
2. The only way to save animals' lives by becoming a vegetarian is by influencing the supply chain.
3. Animals' lives should be saved.
4. The supply chain is not sensitive to the quantities of meat that a single person consumes.
5. The only relevant benefit of becoming vegetarian would be saving animals' lives.

Answer: The only way to save animals' lives by becoming a vegetarian is by influencing the supply chain.

Question 4

What reason is given for the claim that you should only become a vegetarian if doing so would save animals' lives?

1. By becoming a vegetarian you will lose the pleasure of eating meat, and you should only deprive yourself of pleasure if the benefits outweigh the losses. Furthermore, the only relevant benefit of becoming vegetarian would be saving animals' lives.
2. By becoming a vegetarian you will lose the pleasure of eating meat, and you should only deprive yourself of pleasure if the benefits outweigh the losses.
3. Saving animals' lives is very important and is worth depriving yourself of the pleasure of eating meat.
4. If the supply chain for meat is sensitive to the quantities that a single person consumes, then you are obligated to deprive yourself of the pleasure of eating meat.
5. You should only deprive yourself of pleasure if the benefits outweigh the losses.

Answer: By becoming a vegetarian you will lose the pleasure of eating meat, and you should only deprive yourself of pleasure if the benefits outweigh the losses.

Question 5

What is assumed in the inference from the claim “by becoming a vegetarian you will lose the pleasure of eating meat, and you should deprive yourself of pleasure if the benefits outweigh the losses” to the conclusion that you should only become a vegetarian if doing so would save animals’ lives?

1. Our actions need to influence others to be relevant.
2. Your local butcher will not reduce the amount of meat she orders from the slaughterhouse if you become a vegetarian.
3. The pleasure of eating meat is more important than saving animals’ lives.
4. Animals’ lives do not need to be saved.
5. The only relevant benefit of becoming vegetarian would be saving animals’ lives.

Answer: The only relevant benefit of becoming vegetarian would be saving animals’ lives.

Second Prompt

I don’t think that humans should become biologically immortal. Due to natural selection and the process of evolution, each new generation of humans is slightly better adapted to survive than the one before it. If an entire generation were to become biologically immortal, this process would basically stagnate. Any future generations would have to be very small (or even nonexistent), because if there were a much lower death rate, we would have to limit the number of people born in order to preserve resources. Biological immortality would essentially stunt the evolutionary development of the entire human race.

Question 6

What does this argument conclude?

1. Humans should not become biologically immortal.
2. Biological immortality would force us to preserve resources.
3. If we were biologically immortal, any future generations would have to be very small or nonexistent.
4. Biological immortality would force us to limit the number of people born.
5. Biological immortality would stunt the evolutionary development of the entire human race.

Answer: Humans should not become biologically immortal.

Question 7

Which of the following is used to directly support the claim “humans should not become biologically immortal”?

1. If humans were biologically immortal, any future generations would have to be very small or nonexistent.
2. Biological immortality would stunt the evolutionary development of the entire human race.
3. Due to natural selection and the process of evolution, each new generation of humans is better adapted to survive than the one before it.
4. If there were a much lower death rate, we would have to limit the number of people born in order to preserve resources.
5. We should not limit the number of people that can be born in order to preserve resources.

Answer: Biological immortality would stunt the evolutionary development of the entire human race.

Question 8

Which of the following is used to directly support the claim “biological immortality would stunt the evolutionary development of the entire human race”?

1. Humans should not threaten the evolutionary development of the entire human race.
2. Humans should not become biologically immortal when it would stunt our evolutionary development.
3. If there is a much lower death rate, we would have to limit the number of people born in order to preserve resources.
4. If humans became biologically immortal, future generations would have to be very small or even nonexistent.
5. If an entire generation were to become biologically immortal, the evolutionary process would stagnate.

Answer: If humans became biologically immortal, future generations would have to be very small or even nonexistent.

Question 9

Which of the following is used to directly support the claim “if humans became biologically immortal, future generations would have to be very small or even nonexistent”?

1. It would be a bad thing for future generations to be very small or even nonexistent.

2. If there were a much lower death rate, in order to preserve resources we would have to limit the number of people born.
3. Preservation of resources is necessary for the evolutionary development of the human race.
4. If humans became biologically immortal, the evolutionary process would stagnate.
5. We should prevent future generations from being small or nonexistent.

Answer: If there were a much lower death rate, in order to preserve resources we would have to limit the number of people born.

Question 10

What is assumed when the claim “if there is a much lower death rate, we would have to limit the number of people born in order to preserve resources” is used to support the claim that if humans became biologically immortal, future generations would have to be very small or even nonexistent?

1. We should not allow a much lower death rate if it requires limiting births.
2. If humans became biologically immortal, we would have to preserve resources.
3. We should not limit the number of people born in order to preserve resources.
4. Biological immortality would result in overpopulation unless we limit births.
5. If humans became biologically immortal, there would be a much lower death rate.

Answer: If humans became biologically immortal, there would be a much lower death rate.

Third Prompt

As nice as free college for everyone sounds, we shouldn't let the state fund college education. First of all, that would be expensive for the state, and expensive state-funded programs often result in resources being thinly spread. So, with resources spread so thin, the quality of education offered would definitely suffer. More importantly, we don't want the state to be in control of what we learn! If that were the case, then they could stop any criticism of the government and only promote their own ideas. That goes against the very essence of democracy!

Question 11

What does this argument conclude?

1. State-funded college for everyone would diminish the quality of education.
2. State-funded education goes against the very essence of democracy.

3. We don't want the state to be in control of what we learn.
4. It is too expensive for the state to fund college education.
5. We should not let the state fund college education.

Answer: We should not let the state fund college education.

Question 12

Of the following claims, which are used to directly support the claim “we should not let the state fund college education”? 1. It is too expensive for the state to fund college education. 2. State-education would have fewer resources. 3. State-funded education suffers in quality. 4. If the state funded college education, it could control the curriculum.

1. 1, 4
2. 1, 3
3. 1, 2
4. 3, 4
5. 2, 4

Answer: 3, 4

Question 13

What is assumed when the claim “state-funded education suffers in quality” is used to support the claim that we should not let the state fund college education?

1. The quality of education is the state's top priority.
2. The state should not be in control of the curriculum.
3. Lack of resources leads to lower quality education.
4. State-funded education would have fewer resources.
5. We should not lower the quality of education.

Answer: We should not lower the quality of education.

Question 14

Which of the following is used to directly support the claim “we should not let the state control the curriculum”?

1. A high priority of the state's is to gain public support of its policies.
2. We should not let the state promote its own ideas and censor criticism of the government.
3. If the state funded college education, it could control the curriculum.

4. A state that controls the curriculum could promote its own ideas and stop criticism of the government, which would be anti-democratic.
5. There is no reason given.

Answer: A state that controls the curriculum could promote its own ideas and stop criticism of the government, which would be anti-democratic.

Question 15

What is assumed when the claim “a state that controls the curriculum could do things that go against democracy” is used to support the claim that we should not let the state control the curriculum?

1. We should not allow the state to do anything that is anti-democratic.
2. The state would stop any criticism of the government and only promote their own ideas.
3. Letting the state control the curriculum would cause them to do things that are anti-democratic.
4. A high priority of the state’s is to gain public support of its policies.
5. None of the above.

Answer: We should not allow the state to do anything that is anti-democratic.

Fourth Prompt

Raising the drinking age to 21 has done more than just save lives. At age 21, deaths, hospitalizations, and arrests all jump sharply as a result of increased alcohol consumption. Thus, if we made the drinking age earlier, we would just provide an earlier start for these destructive behaviors. Plus, lowering the drinking age would lower the perceived risk involved in consuming alcohol. When people perceive the risk from alcohol consumption as lower as it really is, they cannot accurately evaluate the risk involved in an action and make good decisions.

Question 16

What does this argument conclude?

1. Raising the drinking age to 21 has done more than just save lives.
2. We should not provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.
3. An earlier drinking age would provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.
4. A lower drinking age would make people perceive the risk from alcohol consumption as lower than it really is.
5. We should not lower the drinking age.

Answer: We should not lower the drinking age.

Question 17

Which of the following is used to directly support the conclusion “we should not lower the drinking age”?

1. People consume more alcohol when they reach drinking age.
2. Increased alcohol consumption results in an increased risk for death, arrests, and hospitalizations.
3. We should not limit people’s ability to make good decisions.
4. An earlier drinking age would provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.
5. When people fail to accurately evaluate risks, they cannot make good decisions.

Answer: An earlier drinking age would provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.

Question 18

What is assumed when the claim “an earlier drinking age would provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors” is used to support the claim that we should not lower the drinking age?

1. People consume more alcohol when they reach drinking age.
2. Increased alcohol consumption results in an increased risk for death, arrests, and hospitalizations.
3. We should not provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.
4. We should not establish an earlier drinking age.
5. People should not start destructive behaviors earlier.

Answer: We should not provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.

Question 19

Which of the following is used to directly support the claim “an earlier drinking age would provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors”?

1. Increased alcohol consumption results in an increased risk for death, arrests, and hospitalizations.
2. Raising the drinking age to 21 has done more than just save lives.
3. A lower drinking age would make people perceive the risk from alcohol consumption as lower than it really is.

4. Young people do not have fully developed minds and are more prone to destructive behaviors if they drink.
5. When people perceive the risk from alcohol consumption as lower as it really is, they cannot accurately evaluate the risk involved in an action and make good decisions.

Answer: Increased alcohol consumption results in an increased risk for death, arrests, and hospitalizations.

Question 20

What is assumed when the claim “increased alcohol consumption results in an increased risk for death, arrests, and hospitalizations” is used to support the claim that an earlier drinking age would provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors?

1. A lower drinking age would make people perceive the risk from alcohol consumption as lower than it really is.
2. We should not provide an earlier start for destructive behaviors.
3. People consume more alcohol when they reach drinking age.
4. Death, arrests, and hospitalizations will result from an earlier drinking age.
5. We should not allow people to have an increased risk for death, arrests, and hospitalizations.

Answer: People consume more alcohol when they reach drinking age.