

A basic argument for vegan(ish)ism

Part 1: Wrongness of system

- (1) It is generally wrong to inflict suffering and death on animals without very strong competing ethical considerations
- (2) Animal agriculture inflicts massive suffering and death on animals
- (3) There are no strong competing ethical considerations
- (4) Therefore, animal agriculture is wrong

Adapted from McPherson (2015)

Part 2: Wrongness of personal participation

- Causal contribution?
- Complicity in a wrongful practice?

Logic of the larder

‘The pig has a stronger interest than anyone in the demand for bacon. If all the world were Jewish, there would be no pigs at all.’ (Leslie Stephen 1896)

- (1) It is good for nonhuman animals to be born
- (2) If we didn’t eat them, they wouldn’t be born
- (3) Therefore, we should eat them

Conditions for LL to succeed

- C1. Bringing that animal into existence could be a benefit to that animal
- C2. The animal has/had a life worth living
- C3. The animal would not exist/have existed if not for the consumption of its meat, eggs, or milk
- C4. The animal will/would be replaced after her slaughter by another animal
- C5. The rearing of that animal does not prevent a greater number of animals with lives worth living from existing (or, more precisely, does not prevent a greater amount of moral value among other animals from existing)
- C6. The purchase of that animal’s meat, eggs, or milk must produce more moral value than any alternative use of money

Matheny and Chan (2005)

Humane Omnivorism/Benign Carnivorism

-A practice in which animals are bred and raised in humane conditions with overall good lives before being painlessly killed and eaten. McMahan (2008)

Better and worse are comparative terms – they compare the condition of an individual in two different states of the world. Good and bad are (often?) non-comparative terms. It can’t be better or worse to be created, though it can be good or bad.