# Hobbes NC

#### To negate means “to deny the truth of” (Merriam Webster) so presumption and permissibility semantically negate. (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate)

#### The metaethic is constructivism – truth is not absolute but rather created by individuals based on their own individual perspective. Prefer it

#### [1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand how someone else thinks. Every truth I create cannot be universalized because I can’t guarantee that they will create the same truth because they do what they want

#### [2] Linguistics – Truth is constructed by language, which is completely arbitrary. Nothing tells me that a chair is a chair; I only assign it that name arbitrarily because I want to. Meaning can’t be contained within language if we make it up ourselves, and truth doesn’t exist absent language.

#### But, the state of nature leads to infinite violence – competing truth claims means conflicts cannot be resolved. Two warrants:

#### [1] Ambiguity – everyone can assert their own claims to be true and refuse contestation – this means we always fight over who is correct. This is irresolvable because there is no mediator to adjudicate the dispute and tell who is correct – we just fight forever

#### [2] Self-Interest – everyone wants their truth claims to be true because it benefits them – this leads to conflict because we can’t divide limited resources and have to compete with each other – terminates in death because neither of us want to concede to the other

#### This state of nature is brutish and has no conception of morality because we don’t have any unified truth to guide us, and thus outweighs on magnitude. The solution is the creation of the sovereign to mediate what is true and enforce the law; she is the ultimate ruler and arbitrator. It must eliminate all conflicts to bring peace to our violent natures.

#### Therefore, the standard is adhering to the state’s perspective.

#### Impact Calculus: Only evaluate impacts to structural purpose –what you justify through doing the action. We can control what we justify but we can’t control what we cause.

#### Reject consequentialism: A) Normativity, moral theories that hold agents responsible for all consequences of their actions destroy motivation to be ethical because moral intentions can still lead to immoral consequences

#### Prefer my standard additionally

#### 1. Moral Discourse- outside of the state there is no regulative authority to ensure that individuals are capable of engaging in the same moral language. For example, one party can think good means x and another thinks that good means y. The state clarifies this dispute by being an ultimate arbiter and declaring what is good and bad. This means that absent my standard, moral language makes no sense.

#### 2. Infinite Regress- other moral theories inevitably fail because individuals can question why they follow them, but state basedmorality escapes this because individuals consent to the state by virtue of engaging in it.

#### 3. Constitutivism– other moral theories might matter in the abstract but obligations differ based on the nature of agency. For example, a janitor has different obligations than teachers, in the same vein the state has unique obligations that might be inconsistent with morality in general.

#### 4. TJFs – morality’s a definition of the word ‘ought’ which means it can be evaluated as a topicality issue

#### [a] Resolvability – other debates create a mess of weighing and link turns, but using Hobbes is easily resolvable because it becomes a question of what the sovereign believes. Independently indicts their framework, we can’t act on it if every action required endless consideration

#### [b] Political Education – politicians have to understand the social contract in order to know what powers they have and what they have to provide citizens, and debating about Hobbes helps us learn about that.

#### Now negate –

#### 1: the state’s perspective determines what is just so if the state decides not to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines then that’s what the state has decided is just.