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## 1

#### Yes Act-Omission Distinction

#### 1] Infinite obligations – no act-omission means you’re culpable for every possible omission implying they’re immoral for debating instead of curing cancer which is untenable. Answering this means you negate – (a) The 1AC is suboptimal compared to some alternative (b) State action would be frozen b/c they wouldn’t be able to decide b/t alternatives so the plan wouldn’t pass and you vote on presumption.

#### 2] Trolley Problem – Omissions allow us to escape culpability in otherwise unavoidable situations like when someone pulls the lever to kill 1 instead of 2 – otherwise we’re always categorically wrong which makes morality inaccessible, only the distinction solves. O/ws on Bindingness, if an agent is permanently violating their ethical standard, they can’t take moral action.

#### Negate

#### Not recognizing a right to strike is a legitimate moral action to avoid infinite culpability

## 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Most educational since otherwise we wouldn’t use math or logic to approach topics. Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional, that outweighs since it’s a procedural question of arguments that they can evaluate

#### 1] a[[3]](#footnote-3) “used when expressing rates or ratios; in, to, or for each; per” but there are no numbers in the rez

#### 2] just[[4]](#footnote-4) describes what is “(of treatment) deserved or appropriate in the circumstances” but the rez is aspatial

#### 3] government[[5]](#footnote-5) is “direction; control; management; rule” but a direction can’t perform an action

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] recognize[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person presiding at a meeting or debate) call on (someone) to speak” but a right can’t speak

#### 6] an[[8]](#footnote-8) “forming names of organic compounds, chiefly polysaccharides” but a right isn’t an organic compound

#### 7] of[[9]](#footnote-9) “expressing an age” but the rez is atemporal

#### 8] a worker[[10]](#footnote-10) “a person who produces or achieves a specified thing” but the rez doesn’t spec

#### 9] strike[[11]](#footnote-11) is to “cause (someone) to be in a specified state” but the rez doesn’t spec

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa

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**

## 3

#### Framing –

#### The standard is consistency with epistemic and experiential authenticity.

#### Experience Machine: Pleasures are intrinsically worthless without authentic experience.

Nozick 74 [Nozick, Robert. Anarchy, State and Utopia. 1974, rintintin.colorado.edu/~vancecd/phil3160/Nozick1.pdf.] //Massa recut Lex VM \*\*Brackets for gendered language

What matters other than how people's experiences feel "from the inside"? **Suppose there were an experience machine that would give you any experience that you desired.** Superduper neuropsychologists could **stimulate your brain so that you would think and feel you were writing a great novel, or making a friend, or reading an interesting book. All the time you would be floating in a tank, with electrodes attached to your brain**. Should you plug into this machine for life, preprogramming your life's experiences? If you are worried about missing out on desirable experiences, we can suppose that business enterprises have researched thoroughly the lives of many others. **You can pick and choose** from their large library or smorgasbord of **such experiences, selecting** your life's experiences **for, say, the next two years.** **After two years have passed, you will have ten minutes or ten hours out of the tank, to select the experiences of your next two years.** Of course, **while in the tank you won't know that you're there**; you'll think it's all actually happening. Others can also plug in to have the experiences they want, so there's no need to stay unplugged to serve them. (Ignore problems such as who will service the machines if everyone plugs in.) Would you plug in? **What else can matter to us, other than how our lives feel from the inside?** Nor should you refrain because of the few moments of distress between the moment you've decided and the moment you're plugged. **What's a few moments of distress compared to a lifetime of bliss** (if that's what you choose), and why feel any distress at all if your decision is the best one? **What does matter to us in addition to our experiences? First, we want to do certain things, and not just have the experience of doing them**. In the case of certain experiences, **it is only because first we want to do the actions that we want the experiences of doing them or thinking we've done them.** (But why do we want to do the activities rather than merely to experience them?) **A second reason for not plugging in is that we want to be a certain way, to be a certain sort of person. Someone floating in a tank is an indeterminate blob. There is no answer to the question of what a person is like who has been long in the tank. Is he courageous, kind, intelligent, witty, loving?** It's not merely that it's difficult to tell; there's no way he is. Plugging into the machine is a kind of suicide. **It will seem to some, trapped by a picture, that nothing about what we are like can matter except as it gets reflected in our experiences.** But should it be surprising that what we are is important to us? Why should we be concerned only with how our time is filled, but not with what we are? **Thirdly, plugging into an experience machine limits us to a [hu]man-made reality, to a world no deeper or more important than that which people can construct.** There is no actual contact with any deeper reality, though the experience of it can be simulated. **Many persons desire to leave themselves open to such contact and to a plumbing of deeper significance.** This clarifies the intensity of the conflict over psychoactive drugs, which some view as mere local experience machines, and others view as avenues to a deeper reality; what some view as equivalent to surrender to the experience machine, others view as following one of the reasons not to surrender!

#### That negates –

#### Value theories must make sense of the experiences we have and give us reasons why certain experiences are better than others.

#### Consider two worlds In world 1, you are in love with a person A, and A loves you genuinely. In world 2, you are in love with A, but A only pretends to love you they actually hate you, hedonistic experiences are identical but clearly, world 1 is better than world 2.

#### Negate – objective knowledge of the external world is epistemically nonsensical.

Neta 14 [Neta, Ram. “External World Skepticism.” The Problem of The External World, 2014, philosophy.unc.edu/files/2014/06/The-Problem-of-the-External-World.pdf.] //Massa

You take yourself to know that you have hands. But notice that, **if you do have hands, then you are not merely a brain floating in a vat of nutrient fluid and being electrochemically stimulated to have the sensory experiences** that you have now: such a brain does not have hands, but you do. So if you know that you do have hands, then you must also be in a position to know that you are not such a brain. **But how could you know that you are not such a brain? If you were such a brain, everything would seem exactly as it does now**; **you would** (by hypothesis) **have all the same sensory experiences that you’re having right now.** Since your **empirical knowledge of the world** around you **must somehow be based upon your sensory experiences, how could these experiences**—the very same experiences that you would have if you were a brain in a vat—**furnish you with knowledge that you’re not such a brain? And if you don’t know that you’re not such a brain, then you cannot know that you have hands.**

## 4

#### A. 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>] //Massa

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 **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), **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 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/>. //Massa

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.

## 5

Interpretation: The affirmative can’t justify new 2ar responses and 1ar theory

Vio you do

Inf abuse
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