## Shell

**Interpretation: If the affirmative defends a consequentialist framework, they must explicitly delineate which theory of the good they defend in the form of a text in the 1ac.**

**Each nuance of the ethic entails different obligations and would exclude different offense – there are 7 different versions.**

**Mastin,** [Luke Mastin, Consequentialism, The basics of philosophy <http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch_consequentialism.html>]

Some **consequentialist theories include**: Utilitarianism, which holds that an action is right if it leads to the most happiness for the greatest number of people ("happiness" here is defined as the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain). **Hedonism**, **which** is the philosophy **[holds] that pleasure** **is** the **most important** pursuit of mankind, **and** that **individuals** **should** strive to **maximise** **their own total** **pleasure** (net of any pain or suffering). **Epicureanism** is a more moderate approach (which still seeks to maximize happiness, but which **defines happiness** more **as a** **state of tranquillity** than pleasure). **Egoism, which holds that an action is right if it maximizes good for the self.** Thus, Egoism may license actions which are good for an individual even if detrimental to the general welfare. **Asceticism**, in some ways, **the opposite of Egoism in that it describes a life characterized by abstinence from egoistic pleasures** especially **to achieve a spiritual goal. Altruism**, which **prescribes that an individual take actions that have the best consequences for everyone except for himself**, according to Auguste Comte's dictum, "Live for others". Thus, individuals have a moral obligation to help, serve or benefit others, if necessary at the sacrifice of self-interest. **Rule Consequentialism**, which is a theory (sometimes seen as an attempt to reconcile Consequentialism and Deontology), **[holds] that moral behaviour involves following certain rules**, but that those rules should be **chosen** based **on** the **consequences that** the selection of **those rules have**. Some theorists holds that a certain set of minimal rules are necessary to ensure appropriate actions, while some hold that the rules are not absolute and may be violated if strict adherence to the rule would lead to much more undesirable consequences. **Negative Consequentialism**, which **focuses on minimizing bad consequences rather than promoting good consequences**. This may actually require active intervention (to prevent harm from being done), or may only require passive avoidance of bad outcomes.

**B. Violation: They don’t and maximizing expected well-being doesn’t cut it.**

**Crisp**, Roger, "Well-Being", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Fall **2017** Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/well-being/>.

Well-being is most commonly used in philosophy to describe what is non-instrumentally or ultimately good *for* a person. **The question of what well-being consists in is of independent interest**, but it is of great importance in moral philosophy, especially **in the case of utilitarianism**, according to which the only moral requirement is that well-being be maximized. Significant challenges to the very notion have been mounted, in particular by G.E. Moore and T.M. Scanlon. **It has become standard to distinguish theories of well-being as either hedonist theories, desire theories, or objective list theories**. According to the view known as welfarism, well-being is the only value. Also important in ethics is the question of how a person’s moral character and actions relate to their well-being.

**C. Standards:**

**1. Shiftiness – They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard. Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of consequentialism as coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1ar which gives them access to multiple contingent standards.**

**2. Strat – I lose 6 minutes of time during the AC to generate a strategy because I don't know what turns or strategy I can go for during the 1N absent which proves CX doesn’t check since it would occur after the skew.**

**3. Resolvability – Makes the round irresolvable since we can’t weigh different mechanisms for the good – Benatar would probably link harder under a hedonistic conception of util – weighing ground is key since it ensures we can compare arguments that clash to access the ballot.**

**Voters –**

## NC

**Permissibility Negates –**

**[1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[1]](#footnote-1) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics o/w – a) it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res and b) it’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.**

**[2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.**

**[3] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.**

**Skepticism is true and it negates –**

**1. Moral Skep: Justice requires us to act immediately since waiting in the face of injustice is itself an injustice. However, we need to be fully informed to avoid formulating a rule incorrectly and unjustly, so obligations are internally contradictory. Jacques Derrida 92 - Derrida, Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice, October 10, 1992** “The Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” Accessed 3/11/19

But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It is that which **must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule.**

**And, any account of morality is regressive since it predicates one universal rule on the existence of another moral rule. Since every human chain of reasoning must be finite according to our finite nature, such a reasoning process must terminate in a rule for which no reason can be given.**

**2. External World Skep: No amount of subjective evidence can ever prove objective knowledge.**

**Searle 98 - John R Searle, Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy In The Real World, December 15, 1998** Accessed 3/11/19

**[Y]ou could have the best possible evidence about some domain and** still be radically **mistaken**. You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states. You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence aboutyour own perceptualexperiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so **because you could be dreaming, having hallucinations**, be a brain in a vat, **or** be **deceieved** systematically by an evil demon.Strange situations, yes, but **it is impossible to disprove the potentiality for** any of **these scenarios.**

**That negates since providing an obligation requires that a. the one assigning the obligation has some externally reliable source of authority and b. it assumes we know the facts about a situation and can make a case for an obligation which is impossible.**

**3. Truth properties – linguistic properties are indeterminate since every claim requires a factual definition and empirical verification, which is impossible given the arbitrariness of meaning.**

**Kripke 02 - Kripke, Rule-Following and Meaning, April 8, 2002** “Truth Rules, Hoverflies, & the Kripke-Wittgenstein Paradox” Accessed 03/11/19 PG

The simplest, most basic idea of the Tractatus can hardly be dismissed: **a declarative sentence gets its meaning by virtue of** its truth conditions, by virtue of [and] **its correspondence to facts that must obtain if it is true. For example, [the sentence] ‘the cat is on the mat’** is understood by those speakers who realize that it **is true if and only if a certain cat is on a certain mat; it is false otherwise.** The presence of the cat on the mat is a fact or condition-in-the-world that would make the sentence true (express a truth) if it obtained.

**Thus, it is impossible to verify the truth property of a statement, even if it is a question of the desirability of the statement since a. linguistic interpretation is indeterminate, as each property can be expressed in multiple ways and b. empirical conditions do not verify the results of a claim since you cannot verify the external world.**

**4. Paradoxes – a. Meno’s – in order to discover something, it must not be known, but in order to know to discover something, it must already be known – this makes the quest for knowledge incomprehensible and thus impossible b. Good Samaritan – in order to say I want to fic x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes an moral attempt inherently immoral c. Induction – either it’s the case we can predict the outcome of a situation, or we cannot. We cannot, insofar as no situation is ever replicated exactly, and even if it can, there’s no guarantee the outcome will be the same. If we can predict situations, that means everyone can, which means we will always predict each other, making a paradox of action insofar as we always attempt to predict the outcomes of each other’s actions, and will cancel out the obligations.**

## ROB

**The role of the ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it:**

**1] Text – five dictionaries[[2]](#footnote-2) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[3]](#footnote-3) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden. Text first – Text comes first – a) Controls the internal link to fairness since it’s the basis of things like predictability and prep b) Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden c) Even if another role of the ballot is better for debate, that is not a reason it ought to be the role of the ballot, just a reason we ought to discuss it.**

**Aprioris and paradoxes negate under comparative worlds – in order to make comparisons those worlds need to be coherent, which we have proven are not**

**Now Negate –**

**1] member[[4]](#footnote-4) is “**a part or organ of the body, especially a limb**” but an organ can’t have obligations**

**2] of[[5]](#footnote-5) is to** “expressing an age” **but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time**

**3] the[[6]](#footnote-6) is “**denoting a disease or affliction**” but the WTO isn’t a disease**

**4] to[[7]](#footnote-7) is to** “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” **but the rez doesn’t have a location**

**5] reduce[[8]](#footnote-8) is to** “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” **but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.**

**6] for[[9]](#footnote-9) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.**

**7] medicine[[10]](#footnote-10) is** “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” **but you can’t have IP for a spell.**

## K

**Justifying util is an independent voter –**

**1. Util justifies atrocities since it justifies allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others – even if they spew some pain quantifiability argument that doesn’t solve since there are still instances some get great benefit from others harm.**

**2. Util can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until we’ve evaluated the states of affairs they’ve produced since it’s based on the outcome of the action. Probability doesn’t solve because that just allows for moral error and freezes action while attempting to calculate the perfect decision.**

**3. Util justifies death good – the absence of pleasure is not bad since there is no life to calculate its lossed value and experience its absence but the lack of pain is actively good even if that good cannot be enjoyed by anyone because it would still have net value.**

**Two Impacts:**

**[1] It triggers permissibility since they can’t generate a correct moral obligation that justifies affirming. That affirms: Since Ought means having sufficient reason because all instances of ought are just indexed to sufficient reason in particular contexts (i.e. moral, legal, logical, etc). That affirms since if every reason is equally invalid, that means any reason is a sufficient reason to justify an action.**

**[2] They read morally repugnant arguments. Thus the alternative is to drop the debater, to ensure that debate remains a space safe for all – the judge has a proximal obligation to ensure inaccessible practices don’t proliferate. Accessibility is a voting issue since all aff arguments presuppose that people feel safe in this space to respond to them.**

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=member+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=member+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l3.1863j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for#:~:text=English%20Language%20Learners%20Definition%20of,meant%20to%20be%20used%20with [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)