Argument 3

HUM2570 | Dr. Mizrahi
Grant Butler | gbutler2020@my.fit.edu

But even if we can clone humans, should we? Or should human cloning (both reproductive and therapeutic/research cloning) be banned?

1. In Kantian ethics, human beings have inherent dignity and moral worth that must be protected.
2. Cloning human beings creates people with identical genetic makeup to an existing person.
3. Copying ones genetic makeup removes the uniqueness of individuals, reducing them to copies, and does not respect their intrinsic value.
4. Therefore, cloning human beings is morally impermissible because it violates a human being's inherent dignity and moral worth.

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.	Nope!
2	Are there any ambiguous and/or vague terms (and/or phrases) in the argument? If so, please list them.	None.
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

Premises & Conclusion

Is *evidence* (*reasons*) presented in support of a *statement*?

Type of Argument

Are the premises supposed to provide *conclusive* or *probable* support for the conclusion?

Logical Form

Does the truth of the premises *guarantee* or *make more likely* the truth of the conclusion?

Content of Premises

Are all the premises actually *true*?

argument

deductive

inductive

valid

invalid

strong

weak

sound

unsound

cogent

non-cogent