

# Argument Analysis #4

PHI 370/SPM 370

Due February 12th, 2014

Please write approximately 2 pages stating, in your own words, the argument contained in the following passage and critically analyzing it.

But what, exactly, is this "accidental" quality that we perceive in the grocer's doing of the right thing? It is not simply the fact—if it is a fact—that the profit motive does not reliably produce moral actions. We can, with some difficulty, imagine a world in which some invisible hand or other makes it true that the profit motive reliably produces morally right actions, and we can place Kant's grocer in that world, and still we shall not free ourselves from the sense that there is something accidental in the fact that he does the right thing... Kant's grocer is attracted to fair pricing for reasons that are of no interest to the ethicist. The salient feature of Kant's case, I would like to suggest, is that the grocer's morally right action does not stem from any responsiveness on his part to moral reasons. In pricing fairly, the grocer acts for a reason that has nothing to do with morality or with the features of his action that make morally right... His *reasons for action* do not correspond with to the action's *right making features*. *Arpaly, pg. 72*

You should first reconstruct the argument in the passage. Make clear what you take the conclusion of the argument to be, and what you take the premises to be, both explicit and suppressed, by setting them off from surrounding text and labeling each premise and the conclusion. Premises and conclusions should not be quotes; they should be stated in your own words. They should not be questions. It is best to do this both in prose and in standard form. Below is an example of an argument in standard form (but you needn't have only two premises).

Premise 1: Every claim with a truth-value is either analytic or empirically verifiable.

Premise 2: No moral claim is either analytic or empirically verifiable.

Conclusion: No moral claim has a truth-value.

Explicit premises are premises the author explicitly states; suppressed premises are premises that he or she is assuming to be true without explicitly stating.

Next, critically analyze the argument. What is the best objection to the argument? Is it to one of the premises? Is the argument valid? Ultimately, can the argument be successfully defended against the objection?