

Refutation of relativity on absolute moralism

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with Tautology as the designated *proof* value, **F** as contradiction, N as truthity (non-contingency), and C as falsity (contingency). Results are a 16-valued truth table in row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables for more variables.

LET p, q, r, s: Alice, Bob, killing, morality
 ~ Not; + Or; - Not Or; & And; = Equivalent; > Imply; < Not Imply;
 % possibility, for any one or some, ∃ # necessity, for every or all, ∀.
 (s=s) T tautology, good; (s@s) **F** contradiction, bad.

From: Tooker, J.W. (2018). On relativity of absolutism in morality. vixra.org/pdf/1806.0194v2.pdf
 [claimed email addresses bounced at gatech.edu]

Remark: We quote relevant portions of the argument because it is ill-framed without numbered equations.

Bob wants to know if it is moral to kill Alice. (1.0)

We rewrite Eq. 1.0 as: "If Bob kills Alice, then is Bob killing Alice good?" (1.1)

$((q \& r) \& p) > (((q \& r) \& p) > (s = (s = s)))$; TTTT TTTT TTT**F** TTTT (1.2)

An absolute moral proposition of relevance would be that murder is wrong. (2.0)

We rewrite Eq. 2.0 as:
 "If morality is good as a tautology, then murder is a bad as a contradiction." (2.1)

$(s = > (s = s)) > (r > (s > s @ s))$; TTTT TTTT TTTT **FFFF** (2.2)

"Is Alice on a machine gun rampage such that [Bob] will save lives by killing her?" (3.0)

"If Alice killing is bad, then if Bob kills Alice, then is Bob killing Alice good?" (3.1)

$((p \& r) = (s @ s)) > (((q \& r) \& p) > (((q \& r) \& p) > (s = (s = s))))$; TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (3.2)

Remark: We ignore the subsequent injection of irrelevant contingencies from other worlds, such as implication of Bob killing from alien killing as a result of Alice killing.

Eq. 3.2 as rendered is tautologous, hence refuting relativity of moral absolutism.