

# NTT

Flash

18/08/2021

## Name The Trait

### Main Argument

#### Definitions

W = Moral Worth

N = Non-exploitation

x is variable

a = animal

t = trait

Anm = n is a trait Absent from m

#### Symbolic Syllogism

1.  $\forall x(Wx \implies Nx)$
2.  $\neg Wa \implies \exists t(Ata \implies (Ath \implies \neg Wh))$
3.  $\neg \exists t(Ata \implies (Ath \implies \neg Wh))$
4. Wa (2,3 MT)
5. Na (1,4 MP)

#### English Translation

1. For all things, if something has moral worth we should not exploit it
2. If animals don't have moral worth, then there exists a trait that is absent in animals such that if it were absent in humans, humans wouldn't have moral worth
3. There doesn't exist a trait that is absent in animals such that if it were absent in humans, humans wouldn't have moral worth.
4. Animals have moral worth (2,3 MT)
5. We should not exploit animals (1,4 MP)

Now how do you justify premise 3? Well first I'd argue you should be open to someone giving you that trait. But most traits can be falsified by the following logic.

## Trait Falsification

### Definitions

G = moral worth Giving trait

Hab = b Has a

i = intelligence

d = disabled person

x and y are variable

### Symbolic Syllogism

1.  $G_i \implies \forall x(Wx \implies Hix)$
2.  $\neg H_{id}$
3.  $W_d$
4.  $\exists y(Wy \wedge \neg H_{iy})$  (2,3)
5.  $\exists y(\neg(\neg Wy \vee H_{iy}))$  (4, DM)
6.  $\exists y(\neg(Wy \implies H_{iy}))$  (5)
7.  $\neg \forall y(Wy \implies H_{iy})$  (6, DM)
8.  $\neg G_i$  (1,7 MT)

### English Translation

1. If intelligence is the value giving trait, then for all things, if they have moral worth, they have the value giving trait
2. Some disabled people aren't intelligent
3. Disabled people have moral worth
4. There exists something that has moral worth and doesn't have intelligence
5. This one I cannot rephrase into english
6. There exists something such that it's not the case that them having moral worth implies they have intelligence
7. It's not the case that for all things, if they have moral worth, they have intelligence
8. Intelligence isn't the value giving trait (1,7 MT)

This works for any other trait so long as you can come up with a similar counter example where a human has moral worth but not that value giving trait.

The argument gets more complicated if your interlocutor says that there a *set* of traits such that if you have atleast 1 of them you have moral value. In that case, your counterexample would need to be an example of someone who has *none* of those traits.