

The Thot-Queen Paradox

Analytic Birb¹

1 Setting up the problem

There are two apparently contradictory sentences that are often taken as axiomatic. Namely, ‘if she breathes, she’s a thot’ and the common retort to this assertion, ‘all women are queens’. Whether either of these is really an axiom, or even true, is not the subject of this discussion. The fundamental problem is, if these are axioms, as it is often assumed, is there a contradiction (or an antinomy, to use the nomenclature of Tarski and Quine)? At the root of the problem is the assumption that thots cannot be queens, and *vice versa*. This can be easily expressed using the law of the excluded middle. Let ‘ a ’ be an arbitrary individual woman of the set of all women ‘ W ’, and let the predicates ‘ $Th()$ ’ and ‘ $Q()$ ’ be ‘is a thot’ and ‘is a queen’, respectively. We then formalize the problem:

$$(1) \forall a \in W, Th(a) \vee Q(a)$$

$$(2) Th(a) \rightarrow \neg Q(a)$$

2 Solution

The motivation for this discussion is the two more general statements that apply these predicates to the class of all women, ‘ $\forall a \in W Th(a)$ ’ and ‘ $\forall a \in W, Q(a)$ ’. But we do not need to prove or disprove either of these. In order to solve the paradox, all we need to show is the following:

$$(3) \exists a \in W \text{ such that } Th(a) \wedge Q(a)$$

This would show that the predicates ‘ $Th()$ ’ and ‘ $Q()$ ’ are not mutually exclusive, and since we know that (2) is true if and only if (3) is false, we would have a solution to the problem. Let us, then, discuss the meaning of ‘ $Th()$ ’ and ‘ $Q()$ ’, or to put it another way, what are the properties of objects which satisfy sentences with these predicates. The predicate ‘is a queen’, used in this sense, does not refer to being a monarch, though it does share some properties with its original acceptation. Its usage suggests that a queen is a strong woman who commands respect and admiration. This, no doubt, is in line with the fact that monarchs should have those properties. A clear example, someone to whom the predicate is very often applied, is Beyoncé.

Now the next step is defining the properties of someone to whom the predicate ‘is a thot’ is applied. If we look at concepts like ‘e-thot’, ‘instagram thot’ or the slogan ‘begone thot’, we see that they are applied to generally attractive women who use their sexuality or physical beauty to attract attention to get ahead, further their goals, or for mere personal satisfaction. Could these properties apply to queens? The answer is yes. We can easily show that these properties apply to

¹ analytic.birb@gmail.com

Beyoncé as well. Of course, she relies on more than her physical attributes to further her goals, like her singing talent and marketing acumen. That, however, does not make someone a non-thot. It is fair to say that Beyoncé is *also* a thot. We can even use a historical example which should be immediately obvious as one that satisfies both predicates now that we have discussed their properties, namely, Queen Cleopatra (who, incidentally, was also a monarch). We have thus shown that (3) is true because both Beyoncé and Cleopatra satisfy both predicates. Therefore, (2) cannot be true. There is no antinomy.

3 Implications

None of this shows whether ‘all women are queens’ and ‘if she breathes, she’s a thot’ are universal truths. What it does show, however, is that they both *can* be, and if they were to be, the logical implication is that all thots are queens. Formally:

$$(4) \forall a \text{ such that } Th(a), Q(a)$$