

argument from marginal cases

The Argument from Marginal Cases: Ebook Description

The Argument from Marginal Cases is a philosophical approach used to challenge distinctions between groups of beings, typically focusing on the moral status of animals and humans. It argues that if we grant moral consideration to certain individuals within a group (e.g., healthy, cognitively advanced humans), then, based on the lack of a clear, morally relevant difference, we should extend that same consideration to others who share crucial characteristics, even if they fall on the "margins" of that group (e.g., infants, severely disabled humans, or highly intelligent animals). This approach aims to expose inconsistencies in our moral reasoning and advocate for a more inclusive and consistent ethical framework. The ebook explores the complexities of this argument, examining the criteria used to justify moral consideration and analyzing the implications for our treatment of various beings. It is relevant to anyone interested in ethics, animal rights, disability rights, and the development of a more just and compassionate world.

Ebook Title & Outline: "The Moral Maze: Navigating the Argument from Marginal Cases"

Contents:

Introduction: Defining the Argument from Marginal Cases; its historical context and philosophical underpinnings.

Chapter 1: Defining Moral Status: Exploring different conceptions of moral status (e.g., sentience, rationality, personhood) and their limitations.

Chapter 2: The Cases Themselves: Detailed examination of marginal cases in humans (infants, individuals with cognitive impairments, the severely ill) and animals (great apes, cetaceans, other highly intelligent species).

Chapter 3: The Problem of Gradualism: Addressing the challenge of drawing sharp lines when capacities for moral consideration exist on a spectrum.

Chapter 4: Objections and Replies: Analyzing common objections to the argument (e.g., the slippery slope argument, the speciesism objection) and developing robust counter-arguments.

Chapter 5: Implications and Applications: Exploring the practical implications of accepting the argument, including its relevance to animal rights, disability rights, and environmental ethics.

Conclusion: Summarizing the key arguments and reflecting on the broader significance of the Argument from Marginal Cases for ethical theory and practice.

Article: The Moral Maze: Navigating the

Argument from Marginal Cases

Introduction: Defining the Argument from Marginal Cases

The Argument from Marginal Cases (AMC) is a powerful philosophical tool used to challenge our moral intuitions and expose inconsistencies in our ethical frameworks, particularly concerning the moral status of animals and humans. It operates on the principle that if we grant moral consideration—rights, protections, or concern—to certain individuals within a group based on particular characteristics, then we ought to extend that same consideration to others who possess those characteristics to a significant degree, even if they fall at the margins of that group. The argument doesn't necessarily dictate what moral status should be granted, but rather that the criteria we use should be applied consistently. Its historical roots can be traced back to discussions on animal rights, but its implications reach far beyond the animal-human divide, impacting discussions on disability rights and environmental ethics.

Chapter 1: Defining Moral Status: A Spectrum of Considerations

The AMC hinges on the definition of "moral status." What characteristics make an individual deserving of moral consideration? Common candidates include:

Sentience: The capacity to feel pleasure and pain. This is a relatively straightforward criterion, allowing for a broad inclusion of many animals. However, the degree of sentience can vary greatly, complicating the line-drawing problem.

Rationality: The ability to reason, make choices, and understand consequences. This criterion often excludes many humans (infants, the severely cognitively impaired) and animals. Its reliance on higher-level cognitive abilities is a significant drawback.

Personhood: A more complex concept often incorporating rationality, self-awareness, autonomy, and the capacity for moral agency. This standard is even more restrictive than rationality, often excluding infants and individuals with severe cognitive disabilities.

Relationship: The capacity to form meaningful relationships. This criterion shifts the focus from individual characteristics to the individual's role in a larger social fabric.

The problem is that none of these criteria provides a clear and universally accepted line separating those who deserve moral consideration from those who don't. The AMC exploits this ambiguity.

Chapter 2: The Cases Themselves: Humans and Animals at the Margins

The strength of the AMC lies in its concrete examples. Consider:

Human Marginal Cases: Infants, individuals with severe cognitive disabilities, those in a persistent vegetative state—all lack some or all of the characteristics usually considered necessary for full moral status according to traditional views. Yet, we generally grant them significant moral protection.

Animal Marginal Cases: Great apes, dolphins, elephants, and other highly intelligent species possess many of the same characteristics (sentience, complex social structures, problem-

solving abilities) as many human marginal cases. If we grant protection to human marginal cases, how can we justify denying similar protection to these animals?

The AMC challenges us to justify this seemingly arbitrary distinction.

Chapter 3: The Problem of Gradualism: Blurring the Lines

Many characteristics relevant to moral status exist on a spectrum. Sentience, rationality, and even personhood are not binary states but rather degrees. This poses a significant challenge to drawing clear lines and establishing firm criteria for moral consideration. The AMC highlights this problem, forcing us to confront the difficulty of justifying an arbitrary cutoff point on a spectrum.

Chapter 4: Objections and Replies: Addressing the Challenges

Several objections are frequently raised against the AMC:

The Slippery Slope Argument: This argument claims that accepting the AMC will lead to untenable consequences, such as granting moral rights to plants or inanimate objects. However, the AMC doesn't advocate for such radical conclusions. It simply urges a consistent application of our moral criteria, wherever those criteria lead.

The Speciesism Objection: The AMC is often used to challenge speciesism—the unjustified bias toward members of one's own species. Critics argue that speciesism is a perfectly justifiable bias. However, proponents of the AMC counter that species membership is not, in itself, a morally relevant characteristic.

Chapter 5: Implications and Applications: A More Inclusive Ethics

Accepting the AMC has profound implications:

Animal Rights: The AMC provides a strong argument for extending significant moral consideration to animals, especially those with high levels of sentience and cognitive abilities.

Disability Rights: It challenges discriminatory practices based on cognitive or physical abilities, advocating for greater inclusivity and respect for individuals with disabilities.

Environmental Ethics: By expanding our ethical circle, the AMC can inform our approach to environmental issues, emphasizing the intrinsic value of non-human life and ecosystems.

Conclusion: Toward a Consistent and Compassionate Ethics

The Argument from Marginal Cases is not a simple formula for solving all ethical dilemmas. However, it serves as a crucial tool for critically evaluating our existing moral beliefs and practices. By exposing inconsistencies and challenging us to justify our ethical distinctions, it encourages us to move towards a more consistent, inclusive, and ultimately, more compassionate ethical framework.

FAQs

1. What is the central claim of the Argument from Marginal Cases? That if we grant moral consideration to some individuals based on certain characteristics, we should consistently apply those criteria to others who possess those characteristics, regardless of species or other arbitrary distinctions.
1. What are some examples of marginal cases? Human infants, individuals with severe cognitive impairments, and highly intelligent animals like great apes and dolphins.
1. What are the main objections to the Argument from Marginal Cases? The slippery slope argument and the claim that species membership is a morally relevant factor.
1. How does the Argument from Marginal Cases relate to speciesism? It directly challenges speciesism by arguing that species membership is not a morally relevant criterion for determining moral status.
1. What are the practical implications of accepting the Argument from Marginal Cases? Changes to animal welfare laws, greater inclusion of individuals with disabilities, and revised approaches to environmental ethics.
1. Does the Argument from Marginal Cases dictate a specific moral theory? No, it doesn't prescribe specific moral conclusions, but rather highlights inconsistencies in our existing moral reasoning.
1. What is the role of sentience in the Argument from Marginal Cases? Sentience is often considered a crucial characteristic for moral consideration, but the AMC highlights the difficulties in precisely defining and measuring it.
1. How does the Argument from Marginal Cases deal with the problem of gradualism? It highlights the difficulty of drawing sharp lines when capacities for moral consideration

exist on a spectrum.

1. Is the Argument from Marginal Cases primarily focused on animals or humans? While frequently used in animal rights debates, the AMC has broader implications, including ethical considerations for humans with cognitive impairments.

Related Articles

1. The Ethics of Animal Experimentation and the Argument from Marginal Cases: Explores the application of the AMC to the ethical debate surrounding animal research.
1. Sentience and Moral Status: A Comparative Analysis: Examines different conceptions of sentience and their relevance to determining moral status.
1. The Slippery Slope Argument and its Implications for Animal Rights: A detailed critique of the slippery slope argument as it pertains to animal rights.
1. Disability Rights and the Challenge of Defining Personhood: Focuses on the implications of the AMC for individuals with disabilities.
1. The Moral Status of Infants and the Argument from Marginal Cases: Examines the moral status of human infants in light of the AMC.
1. Comparing Cognitive Abilities in Humans and Animals: A comparative study of cognitive abilities across species, relevant to the AMC.
1. Speciesism and its Role in Ethical Decision-Making: A critical examination of speciesism and its impact on ethical frameworks.

1. Environmental Ethics and the Expanding Circle of Moral Consideration: Discusses the broader implications of the AMC for environmental protection.

1. The Argument from Marginal Cases and the Future of Ethical Theory: Explores the ongoing impact and future development of the Argument from Marginal Cases within ethical theory and practice.

Additional Resources

[parameter vs argument - Stack Overflow](#)

Argument vs Parameter - Stack Overflow
Argument vs Parameter - Formal ...

What's the difference between an argument and a parameter?

Oct 1, 2008 · But a parameter accepts an argument, so it is an argument that is accepted, not a parameter. And if anything, an argument is given in a call to a parameter (or at least, some ...

[Difference between terms: "option", "argument", and "parameter"?](#)

Apr 8, 2016 · What are the differences between these terms: "option", "argument", and "parameter"? In many pages these terms often seem to be used interchangeably.

[orthography - Why is it "argument" instead of "argument"?](#)

Mar 13, 2018 · It wasn't formed within English at all. According to the OED, this is the etymology of the word: French argument (13th cent.), < Latin argūmentum , < arguĕre (or refashioning, ...

typescript - Argument of type '...' is not assignable to parameter of ...

Jan 21, 2019 · Argument of type '...' is not assignable to parameter of type '...' TS 2345
Asked 6 years, 5 months ago Modified 2 years, 1 month ago Viewed 133k times

[path to a directory as argparse argument - Stack Overflow](#)

add_argument does not take a option parameter. Is this path name supposed to come from the command line? Is it ok to change path after parsing?

Python -How to solve OSError: [Errno 22] Invalid argument

Jul 31, 2020 · Python -How to solve OSError: [Errno 22] Invalid argument [duplicate] Asked 4 years, 11 months ago Modified 3 years, 2 months ago Viewed 108k times

Why am I getting this unexpected keyword argument TypeError?

Aug 15, 2019 · TypeError: second_test() got an unexpected keyword argument 'Name' I've googled "unexpected keyword argument", but I can never find a definition; only other Stack

...

c++ - error: passing 'const ...' as 'this' argument of '...' discards ...

Nov 17, 2014 · error: passing 'const A' as 'this' argument of 'void A::hi ()' discards qualifiers [-fpermissive] I don't understand why I'm getting this error, I'm not returning anything just

...

How can I pass an argument to a PowerShell script?

In my particular use-case, I wanted to access the arguments from the profile which ignored the params, and simply checked for the existence of an argument (essentially a switch).

parameter argument -

Argument Parameter Argument Actual Argument Parameter Formal ...

What's the difference between an argument and a parameter?

Oct 1, 2008 · But a parameter accepts an argument, so it is an argument that is accepted, not a parameter. And if anything, an argument is given in a call to a parameter (or at least, some ...

Difference between terms: "option", "argument", and "parameter"?

Apr 8, 2016 · What are the differences between these terms: "option", "argument", and "parameter"? In many pages these terms often seem to be used interchangeably.

orthography - Why is it "argument" instead of "argument"?

Mar 13, 2018 · It wasn't formed within English at all. According to the OED, this is the etymology of the word: French argument (13th cent.), < Latin argūmentum, < arguere (or refashioning, ...

typescript - Argument of type '...' is not assignable to parameter of ...

Jan 21, 2019 · Argument of type '...' is not assignable to parameter of type '...' TS 2345
Asked 6 years, 5 months ago Modified 2 years, 1 month ago Viewed 133k times

path to a directory as argparse argument - Stack Overflow

add_argument does not take an option parameter. Is this path name supposed to come from the command line? Is it ok to change path after parsing?

Python -How to solve OSError: [Errno 22] Invalid argument

Jul 31, 2020 · Python -How to solve OSError: [Errno 22] Invalid argument [duplicate] Asked 4 years, 11 months ago Modified 3 years, 2 months ago Viewed 108k times

Why am I getting this unexpected keyword argument TypeError?

Aug 15, 2019 · TypeError: second_test() got an unexpected keyword argument 'Name' I've googled "unexpected keyword argument", but I can never find a definition; only other Stack

...

c++ - error: passing 'const ...' as 'this' argument of '...' discards ...

Nov 17, 2014 · error: passing 'const A' as 'this' argument of 'void A::hi ()' discards qualifiers [-fpermissive] I don't understand why I'm getting this error, I'm not returning anything just

...

How can I pass an argument to a PowerShell script?

In my particular use-case, I wanted to access the arguments from the profile which ignored the params, and simply checked for the existence of an argument (essentially a switch).

Argument From Marginal Cases

Argument From Marginal Cases

Related Articles

- [arcturus in the bible](#)
- [architectural styles a visual guide](#)
- [are there snakes in belize](#)

[Back to Home](#)