# Glenbrooks R3 v Lexington AK

## 1N

### NC

#### Permissibility Negates –

#### 1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation 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.

#### 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.

#### 4] Shiftiness – Permissibility ground encourages the aff to load up with triggers and the 1ar controls the direction of the round which means they can moot all my offense, I need permissibility in the 2n to compensate.

#### Presume neg- A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. The lack of a reason something is false does not me it is assumed to be true. B. Statements are more often false then true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true in one way by demonstrating that it is indeed red, where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.

#### Ethics is based in language –

#### 1] It creates out ability to think and makes us agents – life outside language is deterministic and without morality. Pettit 09,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

This picture of the mental life with which nature furnishes human beings, according to Hobbes, has two striking features. The first is that every process that takes place within the mind, cognitive or appetitive, is entirely particularistic. People will see and remember, represent and desire, only concrete things and situations. They will have no capacity to hold by general claims about how things are, or by general policies or principles for the direction of action. They will be prisoners of the imagined particular. Presented with a triangle, they will register just the individual figure contemplated, not any general aspect of the triangle (DCr 6.11; L 4.9). They will see the triangle before them, but will not register it as a triangle, a closed figure, or a drawing; not having access to such classes, they will not have the capacity to register it as anything more general than this particular thing: they will not be able, however implicitly, to classify it. The second aspect of Hobbes’s picture is that all that happens in the natural mind does precisely that: it happens. The succession of conceptions in which mental life consists is a form of vital motion, not of animal or voluntary motion; “one conception followeth not another, according to our election, and the need we have of them, but as it chanceth us to hear or see such things as shall bring them to our mind” (EL 5.1). The process does not evolve under the prompting or guidance of the agent’s desire to have those conceptions assume a certain pattern—say, constitute correct and consistent representations—but only as a by-product of a desire to act in one or another concrete fashion. If the subject is well constructed, then the succession of conceptions will lead rationally to action; the action will satisfy the subject’s desires according to evidentially sensitive representations. But no matter how rational the process or result, this succession of conceptions will not be prompted or guided by the agent’s desires in the manner of an active, intentional performance. The natural agent, animal or human, may be rational, instantiating a certain model of homo rationalis. Yet no one in this natural state will exemplify homo ratiocinans. No one will display the sort of active reflection that we naturally ascribe to Auguste Rodin’s sculpture of the thinker, bent over in concentrated thought. But while the natural mind is particularistic and passive in Hobbes’s portrait, he had no doubt that is not how our minds are. We adult, articulate human beings have words and concepts, not just for particular things, but for classes and categories of things, and we use them to classify, cross-check, and pursue interconnections. More specifically, we do this actively or intentionally, asking ourselves questions about how the words and concepts go together, and seeking to determine the answers. We may do this publicly in speaking with one another, but we may also do it silently, as in reflecting and taking counsel with ourselves. In these two respects, then, we reveal a mind that is decidedly different from the natural mind that Hobbes finds in the animal kingdom. The Linguistic Way Beyond How do human beings escape the constraints of the natural mind? How do they achieve the capacity to represent and desire things under general aspects, and think about them in an active, voluntary way? Hobbes’s answer is the most startling and original claim that he makes in the whole of his philosophy. The claim is that language or speech is a historical invention, and that it is language that makes possible the general, active form of thinking that we human beings display; it enables us to classify as well as register particulars, and seek out the implications of those classifications in a voluntary or active manner. Language, in Hobbes’s story, provides the magic that enables us to jump the limitations of the natural, animal mind. The claim is most vividly expressed in Leviathan. Having reviewed the capacities of the natural mind that human beings share with animals, Hobbes directs us to other human capacities or faculties that “proceed all from the invention of words, and speech. For besides sense, and thoughts, and the train of thoughts, the mind of man has no other motion; though by the help of speech, and method, the same faculties may be improved to such a height, as to distinguish men from all other living creatures.”(L 3.11).

#### 2] It’s inescapable – even if moral theorization could occur absent language it can only be communicated within it when getting others to act on it to create goodness

#### And language causes infinite violence –

#### 1] Language gives rise to comparison which results in endless competition and violence. Pettit 2,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

Lacking the capacity to think in a classificatory way, other animals are insensitive to the ways in which they differ from or resemble their fellows, and so they live in the private as well as the present. But human beings can transcend the boundary of private concern as they can transcend the boundary of concern for the present. And transcend it they certainly will. It will be important for their welfare that they know how they compare with others and that they achieve a high relative standing.5 According to the Hobbesian picture, people’s concern with returns to themselves—their own pleasure, or their avoidance of pain—will naturally lead them to want access to the resources or powers whereby such returns can be produced. If they are to satisfy their wants, they will need the “natural” resources represented by “the faculties of body and mind” as well as “instrumental” resources such as “riches, place of authority, friendship or favour, and good fortune” (EL 8.4). Bent on the pursuit of their own self-interest, then, they will seek the means of conducting that pursuit; moved by the love of self, they will look for a way of consummating that love. In this they will be no different from other animals, though they may be more adept at spotting the means whereby their ends can be realized. But there is one aspect of the resources sought by human beings and other animals that only becomes clear on reflection and reasoning. This is that in a competitive world where the objects of desire are scarce, what will really matter to any creature is not the absolute level of its resources but their level relative to the resources of others. Where there is competition for resources, or competition in the use of resources, the important thing for each will be not the absolute quantity of resources commanded but the extent to which those resources enable the creature to outdo its competitors; “what all have equally is nothing” (DH 11.6). Letting the word power serve for resource, Hobbes finds a nicely turned way of putting the point. “And because the power of one man resisteth and hindereth the effects of the power of another: power simply is no more, but the excess of the power of one above that of another. For equal powers opposed, destroy one another”. These observations are true in some measure of all animals, but given their longer time horizons, it is particularly true of human beings. And it is only human beings, of course, who can become aware of the observations, since only they will be able to compare themselves with others for the resources they each command, and only they will be able to see that the important thing for each will be to have more resources than others—greater power. Under the pressure of this perceived need, the human being becomes a creature “whose joy consisteth in comparing himself with other men”

#### 2] Language is structurally negative and doesn’t refer to reality – if I say a saw an oak tree you know I didn’t see a car or person but you can’t visualize what I did see – since our rationality is based in language truth is created by individuals rather than extrinsically found but that creates infinite violence over meaning creation.

#### Thus, morality requires an authority to enforce a universal moral theory and resolve conflict. Only an absolute sovereign can do this. Parrish 2:

Derrida`s Economy of Violence in Hobbes` Social Contract, Richard Parrish

“All of the foregoing pints to the conclusion that in the commonwealth the sovereign’sfirst and most fundamental **job is to be the ultimate definer.**Several other commentators have also reached this conclusion. By way of elaborating upon the importance of the moderation of individuality in Hobbes’ theory of government, Richard Flathman claims that **peace “is possible only if** the **ambiguity and disagreement** that pervade general thinking and acting **are eliminated** by the stipulations of a sovereign.” Pursuant to debunking the perennial misinterpretation of Hobbes’ mention of people as wolves, Paul Johnson argues that“one of the primary functions of **the sovereign is to provide** the necessary **unity of meaning** and reference **for the**‘ primary **terms in which [people]** men try to **conduct their** social **lives.” “The** whole **[purpose]** raison d’entre of sovereign helmsmanship lies squarely in the chronic**[is to] defus[e]**ing of **interpretive clashes,”without which humans would**“fly off in all directions” and **fall** inevitably **into the violence of the natural condition.”**

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Prefer it for motivation – morality lacks authority over agents. Even if the aff defines the good it gives no way to obligate agents to actually be good. That hijacks the aff since defining good and denying the ability to enforce it the sovereign creates is contradictory.

#### That negates –

#### 1] The aff creates post-fiat obligations for the state – this is incoherent because it implies an authority higher than the state to constrain the sovereign. Only sovereign entities can create moral obligations, so the state can’t have an obligation to act

#### 2] The aff gives employees, specifically public sector ones, the right to strike against the state which is definitionally a violation of the sovereign’s will

## Case

### Hedge

#### 1ar theory is illegitimate –

#### A] 1ar theory time skews the rest of the round since they have the 1ar and 2ar, which is 7 minutes compared to my 2nr, which is 6 minutes. This gives them a whole minute advantage on the theory debate, that’s a lot in such a time crunched event and outweighs their strat stuff since I need time to execute strat and get ground.

#### Drop the arg on 1ar theory

#### A] the 1ar will always be incentivized to go for theory because they get a ballot implication, destroying substance engagement

#### B] You shouldn’t stake the round on incomplete 1ar blips that become 3 minute 2ars – that wrecks neg win percentage because it means the 2nr has to overcover 1 second arguments

### TT

**1] Constitutive: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) 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 its intrinsic to the nature of the activity**

#### 2] Bindingness: a) all arguments pre-assume that they are true as judges don’t vote an arguments proven false b) in order to win that your ROB is superior to TT you must prove true the claim that your ROB is better than TT.

### Hijacks

#### Hobbes hijacks –

#### 1] Humanity’s ability to think about the future leads to perpetual pain created by fear of the future – only a sovereign that can protect future wellbeing solves. Pettit 09,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

This capacity to focus on the future may look like a release, freeing human beings from what Hobbes calls “the short vehemence of any carnal pleasure” (L 6.35). But the liberation has another side to it as well, since the ability to reason about how things may be in the future enables people to worry about what may yet transpire, and be paralyzed by fear and anxiety. This is the side of things that Hobbes emphasizes. He thinks concern for future evil is absolutely inevitable among human beings: “it is impossible for a man, who continually endeavoureth to secure himself against the evil he fears, and procure the good he desireth, not to be in a perpetual solicitude of the time to come” (L 12.5). And so whereas “wolves, bears and snakes” are not “rapacious unless hungry,” “man is famished even by future hunger” (DH 10. 3). As he puts it in Leviathan, the “object of man’s desire is not to enjoy once only, and for one instant of time, but to assure forever the way of his future desire” (L 11.1). Thus he posits as “a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death”; man “cannot assure the power and means to live well, which he hath present, without the acquisition of more.”

#### This explains the real implication of pleasure being intrinsically good to humans – the relationship doesn’t just end there.

#### 2] Non-descriptive words necessary for ethics don’t have a stable meaning so there is infinite conflict over how to interpret them making peace impossible. Pettit 09,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

But what sort of reasoning or ratiocination does the expression of passion allow? The words that are paradigmatically associated with passion, as we saw in the second chapter, are thin evaluative terms like good or bad. Hobbes’s view is that we use positive terms for anything that we desire, and corresponding negative terms for anything to which we are averse. If we are attracted to something we call it good, and call it good only on that account; if we are averse to something we call it bad, and call it bad only on that account. As Hobbes says, “Whatsoever is the object of any man’s appetite or desire, that is it which he for his part calleth good: and the object of his hate and aversion, evil” (L 6.7). Hobbes thinks that where there is desire for something, there is pleasure in the presence or at least the immediate prospect of the object desired, and where there is aversion, there is pain or displeasure; the attractive is the pleasant, and the aversive the unpleasant. He can take the pleasure to be “the appearance, or sense, of good; and molestation or displeasure, the appearance, or sense, of evil” (L 6.11). Thus, he can say that everyone “calleth that which pleaseth, and is delightful to himself, good; and that evil which displeaseth him” (EL 7.3). As we learn to use words like rough, red, or round on the basis of the effects that things have on our senses, so we learn to use good and bad on the basis of the effects they have in giving or promising us pleasure or displeasure. The question, then, is how words introduced on that sort of basis can be recruited to a process of reasoning. And the question is troublesome, of course (L 6.7). We naturally use words that name what Hobbes regards as real properties of bodies according to how things “simply and absolutely” are; an example might be a word like round. We naturally use words that do not name real properties of bodies but are guided by the common effects that bodies happen to have on us—words like red and rough—according to “a common rule”; the rule will be common insofar as bodies affect us in more or less the same ways. But what are we to do with evaluative terms? There are two problems with these words, as we already know. First of all, words like good and bad are used by different people to pick out different things, since people vary in the things they find pleasant or unpleasant; “while every man differeth from other in constitution, they differ also one from another concerning the common distinction of good and evil” (EL 7.3). Words like good and bad “are ever used with relation to the person that useth them, there being nothing simply and absolutely so, nor any common rule of good and evil to be taken from the nature of the objects themselves” (L 6.7). They are used by me to pick out those things I find pleasing or displeasing, and by you to pick out those things that you find pleasing or displeasing. This makes for a problem, because differences in our judgments of good and evil are likely to lead us into strife with one another; our “controversy must either come to blows or be undecided” (L 5.3). As we saw in chapter 3, that problem may stem from the fact that we each mistakenly take ourselves to be making conflicting, nonindexical judgments, or just from the fact that the judgments, even understood as indexical, support conflicting practical dispositions. The second problem that arises with evaluative terms, however, is that not only are we each disposed to use them for different things but we are also each liable to use them differently at different times. We are subject to intertemporal as well as interpersonal inconstancy. This arises “because the constitution of a man’s body is in continual mutation,” so that “it is impossible that all the same things should always cause in him the same appetites and aversions” (L 6.5). What Hobbes has in mind here can hardly be the way we are each likely to change our views about what is attractive and good, or aversive and bad; after all, such a change of mind is likely with any beliefs whatsoever. He seems rather to be thinking of the ways in which things may engage our desires differently, depending on which of their elements or aspects is currently salient, and whether our desire is still alive or satiated. These problems are both reflections of the indexicality of the terms good and bad, according to Hobbes’s analysis. The terms are used differently, depending on the personal and indeed temporal index given by the speaker. And yet they are used across persons and times to shape what is done, whether done by one person or many, so that they raise a possibility of controversy and strife. We cannot expect any person at different times, or different people at the same time, to “consent in the desire of almost any one and the same object” (L 6.5).

#### Only a sovereign can absolve conflict over the meaning of pleasure to providing a starting point for its maximization. Pettit 09,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

But right reason will not be in place with words like good and bad, “for want of a right reason constituted by nature.” Therefore, Hobbes says, “The parties must by their own accord set up for right reason the reason of some arbitrator or judge to whose sentence they will both stand” (L 5.3; see also D 26). The picture he has is that just as a common measure is needed to establish shared meanings for purely conventional terms of measurement like pint or quart, foot or yard, so a measure is needed to establish shared meanings for evaluative terms, at least when they are used of matters that engage everyone in the society. It “was necessary that there should be a common measure of all things that might fall in controversy; as for example: of what is to be called right, what good, what virtue, what much, what little, what meum and tuum, what a pound, what a quart, etc.” (EL 29.8). No one can cease to regard their own death as evil, according to Hobbes, insofar as a natural necessity will lead them each to seek their own good (EL 14.6; DC 1.7; L 27.8). Yet there is no reason, he thinks, why people should not be able to give up many of their self-indexed uses of evaluative terminology in favor of a usage that is tied to someone who speaks for them all equally—someone who relates to them as the agent over time relates to the agent at different times. In envisaging that possibility, of course, he is looking to the possibility of a sovereign who will speak for the commonwealth, fixing the meaning of good or bad so that it refers to what is attractive or aversive by the sovereign’s judgment. More on this in the next chapter

#### 3] Collapses – whenever a sovereign is removed, each person becomes their own sovereign and must attempt to force others under their will until someone prevails and becomes the sovereign. Parrish :

Derrida`s Economy of Violence in Hobbes` Social Contract, Richard Parrish

“But even more significantly for his relationship with Derrida, Hobbes argues that **in the state of nature persons must** not only try to control as many objects as possible -- they must also try to **control as many** persons **as possible**. "There is no way for any man to secure himself so reasonable as anticipation, that is, **by force** or wiles to master the persons of all men he can, so long till he see no other power great enough to endanger him. And this is no more than his own conservation requireth, and is generally allowed."37 While it is often assumed that by this Hobbes means a person will try to control others with physical force alone, when one approaches Hobbesian persons as meaning creators this control takes on a more discursive, arche-violent character. First," says Hobbes, "among [persons in the state of nature] there is a contestation of honour and preferment,"38 a discursive struggle not over what physical objects each person will possess, but over who or what will be considered valuable. **Persons,**as rationally self-interested beings **who**"measure, not only other men, but all other things, by themselves,"39 and **value themselves above all** others, attempt to **force that valuation on others**."The **human desire** for 'glory', which in today's language translates not simply as the desire for prestige, but also the desire to acquire power over others," **is** therefore primarily **about subsuming others beneath one**'s own personhood, **as** direct **objects** or merely phenomenal substances. As above, the inevitability of this situation is given by the fact that the primarily egoistic nature of all experience renders the other in a "state of empirical alter-ego"41 to oneself. Those who prefer a more directly materialistic reading of Hobbes may attempt to bolster their position by pointing to his comment that "the most frequent reason why men desire to hurt each other, ariseth hence, that many men at the same time have an appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy in common, nor yet divide it; whence it follows that the strongest must have it, and who is strongest must be decided by the sword."42 This quote also supports my reading of Hobbes, because quite simply the primary thing all persons want but can never have in common is the status of the ultimate creator of meaning, the primary personhood, from which all other goods flow. Everyone, by their natures as creators of meaning whose "desire of power after power . . . ceaseth only in death,"43 tries to subsume others beneath their personhood in order to control these others and glorify themselves. As Piotr Hoffman puts it, "every individual acting under the right of nature views himself as the center of the universe; his aim is, quite simply and quite closely, to become a small "god among men," to use Plato's phrase."Hobbes argues that **this discursive struggle** rapidly **becomes physical** by writing that "every man thinking well of himself, and hating to see the same in others, they must needs provoke one another by words, and other signs of contempt and hatred, which are incident to all comparison, till at last they must determine the pre-eminence by strength and force of body."45 **The ultimate violence**, the surest and most complete way **of removing a person's ability to create meaning, is to kill that person**, and the escalating contentiousness of the state of nature makes life short in the war of all against all. But this does not render the fundamental reason for this violence any less discursive, any less based on "one's sense of self-importance in comparison with others"46 or human nature as a creator of meaning.”

### Overview

#### 1] Util triggers permissibility – a] cascading b] induction c] culpability d] weigh ability

#### 2] Pain and pleasure are subjective

#### 3] Concept Skep – there are 2 forms of knowledge – deductive, knowledge from logical proofs, and empirical, knowledge from experience. However, all knowledge is grouped into two concepts – universals or particulars. The concept “I am Prateek” is particular because there is only one me, but “bears are white” is universal because it applies to all theoretical bears. Universal knowledge is epistemically inaccessible because you must prove a negative existential which requires omniscience to prove. For the concept, “bears are white” to be true, I must be certain there are no brown bears, as that would disprove my claim.

1. <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-1)
2. *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-2)