

# HUM2570: Argument 4

Grant Butler | [gbutler2020@my.fit.edu](mailto:gbutler2020@my.fit.edu)

## Is genetic enhancement morally permissible?

1. According to utilitarianism, it is morally good to do anything that maximizes the good of all.
2. Genetic enhancement will benefit all of humanity, by expanding their ability to survive and thrive on Earth by reducing disease, and increasing longevity. This can propel the success of all of humanity, providing good for all humans.
3. Therefore, it is morally good and permissible to enhance the genetics of humans.

In a peer-review session, a reviewer reads what a writer has written and gives the writer feedback on that written work. The reviewer should identify the writing's strengths and weaknesses, and then suggest strategies for revising it. As the writer, think of peer review as a way to test and improve your written work. Keep an open mind and be prepared for constructive criticism. As the reviewer, you will have an opportunity to practice your critical reading and thinking skills. Accordingly, both the writer and the reviewer have something to gain. The writer profits from the feedback the reviewer provides, whereas the reviewer profits from practicing critical reading and thinking skills.

**Writer's name:** Grant Butler

**Reviewer's name:** Nikki Katz

Using the decision procedure for evaluating arguments outlined in the next page, please answer the following questions after reading your classmate's argument:

	Question	Reviewer's Response
1	Are there any terms and/or phrases in the argument that need to be defined and/or clarified? If so, please list them.	None.
2	Are there any ambiguous and/or vague terms (and/or phrases) in the argument? If so, please list them.	Nope!
3	Are there any rhetorical questions in the argument? If so, please list them and ask the writer to rephrase them as statements.	None.
4	Is the argument deductively valid? If so, is it sound?	The argument is both valid and sound!
5	If not valid, is the argument invalid? Does it commit any obvious fallacies (e.g., circular reasoning)?	N/A
6	If not deductive, is the argument inductively strong? If so, it is cogent?	N/A
7	If not inductively strong, is the argument weak?	N/A
8	If the argument is invalid or weak, unsound or non-cogent, what revisions do you suggest the writer should make in order to fix the argument?	N/A

