

### The Argument from Pain and Suffering

P1. It is wrong to inflict a great deal of pain and suffering on others for the sake of relatively minor benefits.

P2. The meat industry inflicts a great deal of pain and suffering on animals for the sake of relatively minor benefits.

C. Therefore, the meat industry is acting wrongly.

### The Paying-Other-People Argument

P1. If it's wrong to do something, then it's also wrong to pay other people to do it.

P2. It's wrong for the meat industry to raise animals for meat in the way way that they do.

C. Therefore, it's wrong to pay the meat industry to raise animals for meat in the way that they do.

### Potential Problems:

(a) buyers of meat aren't telling the industry to cause the animals to suffer greatly

(b) the industry didn't respond directly to your purchase; the meat you buy was already dead

Both appear to be alleged exceptions to P1.

Responses: The case of Killian

(c) maybe none of our decisions whether to buy meat ever makes a difference to animal suffering

This is a Utilitarian objection.

Utilitarianism: an act is morally permissible if and only if it leads to the greatest balance of happiness over misery as compared with the alternatives.

So on Utilitarianism, all that ultimately matters to right and wrong is promoting happiness and diminishing misery.

So it's a consequence of Utilitarianism that if two acts have identical effects on happiness and misery, neither is morally worse than the other.

Responses to objection ...