## Off 1

### 1nc – nc

#### The meta-ethic is constructivism – morality is constructed through social interactions and does not exist a priori. Prefer –

a] Rule-following paradox—rules are infinitely regressive because they rely on more rules to explain them that are based in social understanding.

b] Epistemology—the way we interpret the natural world is necessarily framed by social constructs—we don’t call trees trees because of some natural fact about trees, rather the interpretation an individual subject places on them.

c] Externalism fails—even if a priori normative facts exist, they’re epistemically inaccessible because humans are products of their molecular biology—the mind can’t derive facts independent of material, external forces like gravity.

d] Bindingness – language and social norms are inescapable, because the only way you can pursue ends is through others. Even if one refuses to engage in a particular enterprise, they could not escape the social context that enterprise is situated in. One could choose not to play chess, but this necessitates a social understanding of what chess is in the first place.

#### The state of nature necessitates infinite violence between conflicting world views –

a] Pre-emption—if there’s no basis to condemn actions, then everyone acts solely in their own self-interest—that means the most rational strategy is to take people out before they can hurt you

b] Resource Wars—a finite amount of material resources creates conflict between different people who want it

c] Action Theory—the imposition of your world view through action necessitates violence against the other since it de-legitimizes their perspective.

#### There is no objective solution to this conflict, because truth is relative. Instead, conflict requires the creation of the sovereign, to resolve disputes. In exchange for their safety, subjects agree to give up their claims to meaning to the sovereign.

Parrish 04 [Parrish, Rick, (Rick Parrish teaches at Loyola University New Orleans. His current research is focused on the play of violence and respect within justice.) "Derrida’S Economy Of Violence In Hobbes’ Social Contract" Theory &amp; Event, Vol. 7 No. 4, 2005, 2005, http://muse.jhu.edu/article/244119#back, DOA:6-30-2018 // WWBW]

All of the foregoing points to the conclusion that in the commonwealth **the sovereign's** first 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."57 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 men try to conduct their social lives."58 "The whole raison d'être of sovereign helmsmanship **lies** squarely **in the chronic defusing of interpretive clashes**,"59 **without which** **humans would** "fly off in all directions"60 and **fall inevitably into the violence of the natural condition.** 26. It is not surprising that so many noted students of Hobbes have reached this conclusion, given how prominently he himself makes this claim. According to Hobbes, "in the state of nature, where every man is his own judge, and differeth from others concerning the names and appellations of things, and from those differences arise quarrels and breach of peace, it was necessary there should be a common measure of all things, that might fall in controversy."61 The main categories of the sovereign's tasks are "to make and abrogate laws, to determine war and peace, [and] to know and judge of all controversies,"62 but each of these duties is a subspecies of its ultimate duty to be the sole and ultimate definer in matters of public importance. **It is only through the sovereign's effective continued accomplishment of this duty that the people of a commonwealth avoid the definitional problems that typify the state of nature.** 27. Judging controversies, which Hobbes lists as the third main task of the sovereign, is the duty most obviously about being the ultimate definer. In fact, Hobbes declares it a law of nature that "in every controversy, the parties thereto ought mutually to agree upon an arbitrator, whom they both trust; and mutually to covenant to stand to the sentence he shall give therein."63 As I repeatedly alluded to above, this agreement to abide by the decision of a third party arbitrator, **a sovereign** in the commonwealth, **is necessary because of the fundamentally perspectival and relative nature of persons' imputations of meaning and value into the situations they construct.** Hobbes understands this problem, as evidenced by his claim that "seeing right reason is not existent, the reason of some man or men must supply the place thereof; and that man or men, is he or they, that have the sovereign power"64 to dictate meanings that will be followed by all. The sovereign is even protected from potential democratic impulses, by which a 'true' meaning would be that agreed upon by the greatest number of people. Because "no one man's reason, nor the reason of any one number of men, makes the certainty," they will still "come to blows . . . for want of a right reason constituted by nature"65 unless both the majority and the minority agree to abide by the meanings promulgated by the sovereign. 28. These meanings are usually created and promulgated by the sovereign in the form of laws, another of the tasks with which Hobbes charges it. In one of his clearest explanations of the law, Hobbes writes that "it belongs to the same chief power to make some common rules for all men, and to declare them publicly, by which every man may know what may be called his, what another's, what just, what unjust, what honest, what dishonest, what good, what evil; that is summarily, what is to be done, what to be avoided in our common course of life."66 The civil law is the set of the sovereign's definitions for ownership, justice, good, evil, and all other concepts that are important for the maintenance of peace in the commonwealth. When everyone follows the law (that is, when everyone follows the sovereign's definitions) there are far fewer conflicts among persons because everyone appeals to the same meanings. This means that people know what meanings others will use to evaluate the actions of themselves and others, so the state of nature's security dilemmas and attempts to force one's own meanings upon others are overcome. 29. **There is to be no question of the truth or falsity of the sovereign's definitions because "there are no authentical doctrines concerning right and wrong**, good and evil, **besides the constituted laws in each realm and government."**67 In fact, Hobbes specifically says that one of the "diseases of a commonwealth" is that "every private man is judge of good and evil actions."68 **Only when individual persons agree to follow the meanings promulgated by the sovereign, which of course includes refraining from trying to impose their own meanings on others, can persons live together in peace -- when they take it upon themselves to impose meaning on situations of public import, they descend into violence again.**

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign.

#### Vote neg –

#### 1] states can’t have obligations to external standards like international law since their only obligation is to avoid the state of nature –the state can’t restrict its own power since it exists outside the law which means the res is impossible – vote neg on presumption

#### 2] the res implies an unchanging normative claim but this is impossible as truth is constructed through socialization and there’s no guarantee that all subjects would come to the same truth claims.

#### 3] Imposing normative obligations on the sovereign is incoherent as the sovereign is the creator of normative obligations, and it’s actively bad because ethically constraining the sovereign prevents them from using all means available to prevent the state of nature

#### 4] The sovereign hasn’t granted the unconditional right to strike in the squo - proves that it doesn’t want it. Passing the res blocks the sovereign’s will.

#### 5] The right to strike grants normative power to strikers, allowing them to make their own truth claims which inherently pulls towards the state of nature as it decentralizes authority and undermines the sovreign

#### The metaethic takes out all paradoxes and a prioris – they attempt to construct transcendental principles of logic but that’s impossible as truth is socially constructed. And, this functions on the highest layer of the substance debate – it’s a fundamental epistemological and metaphysical question that frames all other forms of reasoning and linguistics.

## Off 2

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the aff must prove it true and the neg must prove it false.

**Prefer: [A] Text: 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 the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. This outweighs on common usage – it is abundantly clear that our roles are verified. Any other role of the ballot enforces an external norm on debate, but only truth testing is intrinsic to the process of debate i.e. proving statements true or false through argumentation. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test – if a chess player says you should break the rules for a more fun game, the proper response is to ignore them as a practice only makes sense based on its intrinsic rules. Jurisdiction is also an independent voter and a meta constraint on anything else since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary – otherwise they could just hack against or for you which means it also controls the internal link to fairness since that’s definitionally unfair. [B] Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent. It also means their ROB warrants aren’t mutually exclusive with mine. If the aff is true the res ought to be implemented, but the res ought to only be implemented if its not already being implemented, so it ought to be that the res is not implemented. [C] Inclusion: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for inclusive debates because people without every technical skill or comprehensive debate knowledge are shut out of your scholarship which turns your ROB- truth testing solves because you can do what you’re good at and so can I. This is also better for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone. o/w since it is a real-world implication in round rather than a thought experiment that doesn’t do anything**

#### Permissibility negates:

1) negate means “to deny the truth of,” so the neg can disprove an obligation through permissibility since the 1ac must defend an active obligation to act

#### 2) there is a trichotomy between obligation, prohibition and permissibility; proving one

#### disproves the other two.

#### 3) Ought implies proactive justification since we don’t take actions unless we have a reason to take the action.

**Presumption negates:**

1) 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 to believe something is false does not mean it is assumed to be true. The black swan disproved the statement “all swans are white.”

2) 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

3) “To negate,” means “to deny the truth of,” which means any argument that renders affirming false is sufficient to negate. If an assumption the AC makes is false, the resolution is also false. I.e. if my parents don’t exist, then it’s impossible to say that they want me to do my homework because that statement presupposes my parents exist in the first place.

4) Even under a comparing worlds it negates since it requires them to prove the statement that “the aff world is more desirable than the neg world” true. However, my args deny their ability to prove statements true under util, at neither debate has any offense, so you presume which negates since 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.

## Off 3

#### 1] DTA – A] they can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it B] proves terminal defense to 1AR shells since the 1NC is directly engaging under the aff’s framework of choice, with the most predictable advocacy C] Time skew doesn’t exist – we both have 13 minutes and you can do drills and spread faster

#### 2] Reasonability – 1AR theory is super aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to which means either A] the 2AR always wins since they just need a single response to each argument which flips infinite abuse or B] means it’s irresolvable because the judge has to intervene to determine whether or not it’s warranted enough to vote on which collapses to reasonability – reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing super abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### 3] No 2ar weighing because I don’t have a 3nr to respond to all your arguments so I always lose theory. Neg gets an RVI on 1AR theory if the neg didn’t read a shell – [a] 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – outweighs on quantifiability [b] Otherwise the 1AR will always uplayer to give themselves an out that I can’t access offense on—the RVI is key to deter frivolous theory [c] Otherwise they can spread out the 2NR and collapse to whatever I undercover—there’s no 3NR so the 2AR can always shift to avoid my arguments [d] Norming—if I’m abusive, they should stake the round on that—that gives us the most time to debate and allows us to find the best norms.

#### 4] No new 1ar paradigm issues – A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms. C] anything else screws over NC strategy because your lack of justification determines my 1nc strat D] Infinite abuse is solved by preemptive shells empirically proven by reading ACC

#### 5] Reject 1AR Theory: a] Resolvability: Either you auto accept all responses to 2NR standards and they auto win since I can't respond, or you intervene to give 2AR credence b] flips infinite abuse - 2ar can always line by line every 2nr standard and we lose every time so eval theory debate after the 2nr so we both get one speech and also outweighs since 1ar can respond to the 1nc c] No infinite abuse: 1NC is 7 minutes and 1AC spikes check

#### 4] Life is on balance filled with more pain than pleasure --- laundry list.

Benatar 17 brackets in original David Benatar, philosopher at U of Cape Town / Monty Python fan, The Human Predicament, Oxford UP 2017, p. 71-83 //WWDH

Most people recognize that human lives can sometimes be of an appallingly low quality. The tendency, however, is to think that this is true of other people's lives, not one's own. When people do think their own lives are of low quality, this is typically because their lives are in fact unusually bad. However, if we look dispassionately at human life and control for our biases, we find that all human life is permeated by badness. Even in good health, much of every day is spent in discomfort. Within hours, we become thirsty and hungry. Many millions of people are chronically hungry. When we can access food and beverage and thus succeed in warding off hunger and thirst for a while, we then come to feel the discomfort of distended bladders and bowels. Sometimes, relief can be obtained relatively easily, but on other occasions, the opportunity for (dignified") relief is not as forthcoming as we would like. We also spend much of our time in thermal discomfort—feeling either too hot or too cold. Unless one naps at the first sign of weariness, one spends quite a bit of the day feeling tired. Indeed, many people wake up tired and spend the day in that state. With the exception of chronic hunger among the world's poor, these discomforts all tend to be dismissed as minor matters. While they are minor relative to the other bad things that befall people, they are not inconsequential. A blessed species that never experienced these discomforts would rightly note that if we take discomfort to be bad, then we should take the daily discomforts that humans experience more seriously than we do. Other negative states are experienced regularly even if not daily or by everybody. Itches and allergies are common. Minor illnesses like colds are suffered by almost everybody. For some people, this happens multiple times a year. For others, it occurs annually or every few years. Many women of reproductive years suffer regular menstrual pains and menopausal women suffer hot flashes.15 Conditions such as nausea, hypoglycemia, seizures, and chronic pain are widespread. The negative features of life are not just restricted to unpleasant physical sensations. For example, we frequently encounter frustrations and irritations. We have to wait in traffic or stand in lines. We encounter inefficiency, stupidity, evil, Byzantine bureaucracies, and other obstacles that can take thousands of hours to overcome—if they can be overcome at all. Many important aspirations are unfulfilled. Millions of people seek jobs but remain unemployed. Of those who have jobs, many are dissatisfied with them, or even loathe them. Even those who enjoy their work may have professional aspirations that remain unfulfilled. Most people yearn for close and rewarding personal relationships, not least with a lifelong partner or spouse. For some, this desire is never fulfilled. For others, it temporarily is, but then they find that the relationship is trying and stultifying, or their partner betrays them or becomes exploitative or abusive. Most people are unhappy in some or other way with their appearance—they are too fat, or they are too short, or their ears are too big. People want to be, look, and feel younger, and yet they age relentlessly. They have high hopes for their children and these are often thwarted when, for example, the children prove to be a disappointment in some way or other. When those close to us suffer, we suffer at the sight of it. When they die, we are bereft. We are vulnerable to innumerable appalling fates. Although each fate does not befall every one of us, our very existence puts us at risk for these outcomes, and the cumulative risk of something horrific occurring to each one of us is simply enormous. If we include death, as I argue in the next chapter that we ought to do, then the risk is in fact a certainty. Burn victims, for example, suffer excruciating pain, not only in the moment but also for years thereafter. The wound itself is obviously painful, but the treatment intensifies and protracts the pain. One such victim describes his daily "bath" in a disinfectant that would sting intact skin but causes unspeakable pain where there is little or no skin. The bandages stick to the flesh and removing them, which can take an hour or more if the bums are extensive, causes indescribable pain.16 Repeated surgery can be required, but even with the best treatment, the victim is left with lifelong disfigurement and the social and psychological difficulties associated with it. Consider next those who are quadriplegic or, worse still, suffer from locked-in syndrome. This is sheer mental torture. One eloquent amyotrophic lateral sclerosis sufferer describes this disease as "progressive imprisonment without parole"17 because of the advancing and irreversible paralysis. Dictating an essay at the point when he had become quadriplegic, and before losing the ability to speak, he describes his torments, which are most acute at night. When he is put to bed, he has to have his limbs placed in exactly the position he wants them for the night. He says that if he allows "a stray limb to be misplaced" or "fail to insist on having [his] midriff carefully aligned with legs and head," he will "suffer the agonies of the damned later in the night."18 He invites us to consider how often we shift and move during the course of a night, and he says that "enforced stillness for hours on end is not only physically uncomfortable but psychologically close to intolerable."' He lies on his back in a semi-upright position, attached to a breathing device and left alone with his thoughts. Unable to move, any itch must go unscratched. His condition, he says, is one of "humiliating helplessness."2° Cancer's reputation as a dreaded disease is well deserved. There is much suffering in dying from this disease, but at least as much in the treatments that are usually necessary to cure the patient of the malignancy. In the worst scenarios, the patient suffers from both the treatment and its failure. When symptoms have not precipitated the diagnosis, the first blow is the diagnosis itself. Arthur Frank says that on receiving the news that he had a malignancy, he felt as though his "body had become a quicksand" in which he was sinking.21 But that is only the beginning. For example, radiation treatment for esophageal cancel left Christopher Hitchens desperately attempting to avoid the inevitable need to swallow. Every time he did swallow, "a hellish tide of pain would flow up [his] throat?2` culminating in what felt like a mule kick in the small of [his] back. "Ruth Rakoff, after receiving chemotherapy for breast cancer, described her "insides as raw."23 Treatment can result in nausea, vomiting, constipation, diarrhea, and gum and dental soreness. Food tastes bad and appetite is lost. Unsurprisingly, all this results in weight loss and fatigue. Neuropathy is another common side effect, as is hair loss. Many of the same symptoms can be experienced even in the absence of treatment or after treatment has been ended. Moreover, tumors pressing on brains, bowels, and bones can cause excruciating pain. When the pain can be controlled, it is sometimes at the expense of consciousness or at least lucidity. Cancer is an appalling fate, but it is also a common one (in those countries where people do not typically die earlier of infectious diseases). In the United States, it has been estimated that one in two men and one in three women will develop cancer, and one in four men and one in five women will die from it.24 It has recently been suggested that estimates of lifetime risk of developing cancer may be exaggerated by the fact that some people develop cancer more than once. However, even if we opt for the more conservative estimate of lifetime risk of first primary, we find that 40% of men and 37% of women in the United Kingdom will develop cancer.25 Those who do not get cancer are still at risk for hundreds of other possible causes of suffering. It is, of course, more commonly, older people who get cancer.26 However, although it is, all things being equal, generally worse to die when one is younger than when one is older,27 the physical and psychological symptoms of life with cancer and dying from cancer are no less appalling at older ages. Pain accompanies many conditions, but we should remember that much of it is not attendant upon visible conditions. It is often hidden from those not experiencing it. One sufferer from chronic pain describes it as "debilitating" and observes that it "can take over one's life, sap one's energy, and negate or neutralize joy and well-being."28 Not all suffering is physical, although psychological ailments can certainly have bodily symptoms. William Styron, describing his depression, said that ultimately, "the body is affected and feels sapped, drained." 2' He wrote of his "slowed-down responses, near paralysis, psychic energy throttled back close to zero."38 Sleep is disrupted, with the sufferer staring "up into yawning darkness, wondering and writhing at the devastation"31 of his mind. The sufferer from depression, we are told, is "like a walking casualty of war."32 In addition, there is an atrociously diverse range of harms that people suffer at the hands of other humans, including being betrayed, humiliated, shamed, denigrated, maligned, beaten, assaulted, raped, kidnapped, abducted, tortured, and murdered.33 The horrors of each could be enumerated but consider those of rape as an example. Rape34 can instill terror in the victim before and while she or he is violated. Physical injury, including bruising and laceration, is not an uncommon consequence of the assault. There can be lifelong psychological repercussions, including rage, shame, feelings of worthlessness, and difficulties with intimacy. A pregnancy can result if the victim is a fertile female. Even when abortions are freely available, there can be psychic trauma in terminating the pregnancy. Carrying the fetus to term can be even more psychologically distressing. Rape victims can also contract sexually transmitted diseases from their assailants. These in turn have many harmful physical effects and can cause great mental trauma as well. Optimists will very likely suggest that this is a one-sided picture—that lives typically contain not only bad but also good. However, although it is true that lives are not usually unadulteratedly bad, there is much more bad than good even for the luckiest humans. Things are worse still for unluckier people, many of whom have almost nothing going in their favor. Our lives contain so much more bad than good in part because of a series of empirical differences between bad things and good things. For example, the most intense pleasures are short-lived, whereas the worst pains can be much more enduring. Orgasms, for example, pass quickly. Gastronomic pleasures last a bit longer, but even if the pleasure of good food isprotracted, it lasts no more than a few hours. Severe pains can endure for days, months, and years. Indeed, pleasures in general—not just the most sublime of them—tend to be shorter-lived than pains. Chronic pain is rampant, but there is no such thing as chronic pleasure. There are people who have an enduring sense of contentment or satisfaction, but that is not the same as chronic pleasure. Moreover, discontent and dissatisfaction can be as enduring as contentment and satisfaction; this means that the positive states are not advantaged in this realm. Indeed, the positive states are less stable because it is much easier for things to go wrong than to go right. The worst pains are also worse than the best pleasures are good. Those who deny this should consider whether they would accept an hour of the most delightful pleasures in exchange for an hour of the worst tortures. Arthur Schopenhauer makes a similar point when he asks us to "compare the respective feelings of two animals, one of which is engaged in eating the other." 35 The animal being eaten suffers and loses vastly more than the animal that is eating gains from this one meal. Consider too the temporal dimensions of injury or illness and recovery. One can be injured in seconds: One is hit by a bullet or projectile, or is knocked over or falls, or suffers a stroke or heart attack. In these and other ways, one can instantly lose one's sight or hearing or the use of a limb or years of learning. The path to recovery is slow. In many cases, full recovery is never attained. Injury comes in an instant, but the resultant suffering can last a lifetime. Even lesser injuries and illnesses are typically incurred much more quickly than one recovers from them. For example, the common cold strikes quickly and is defeated much more slowly by one's immune system. The symptoms manifest with increasing intensity within hours, but they take at least days, if not weeks, to disappear entirely. There are, of course, conditions in which one declines gradually rather than suddenly, but the great majority of these—including age-related physical decline, dementia, neuromuscular degenerative diseases, and the deterioration from advancing cancers—are conditions from which there is no recovery. Where there are treatments, some are merely palliative. When treatments are potentially curative, the decline is the default against which one has to battle, sometimes successfully but other times not. Moreover, billions of people simply have no access to either curative or palliative treatments. We should not think that gradual declines are restricted to diseases. Gradual decline is actually a feature that characterizes most of normal human life. After the growth of infancy and childhood,36 the normal human flowers in very young adulthood. (In some ways, the peak is just before adolescence, which wreaks all kinds of havoc.) Thereafter, from one's early twenties and on, one begins the long, slow decline. Some of the mental decline is masked and counteracted by hard work or by increasing wisdom. Thus, at least in some areas of pursuit (but not others), people do not reach their professional or overall mental peaks until later in life. However, there is an underlying decline, at least physically and to some extent also mentally: Hair turns gray or begins to fall out; wrinkles begin to appear and various body parts sag; muscle gives way to fat, as strength does to weakness; and eyesight and hearing begin to fail 37 This long decline characterizes the majority of one's life. At first, the decline is imperceptible, but then it becomes all too evident. If, for example, one views photographs of a person taken over the course of his or her life, one cannot but be struck by the deterioration. The strong, vibrant youth gradually makes way for the weak, decrepit ancient. It is not an uplifting series of images. Some might suggest that the decline is not so bad in the earlier stages. They are obviously right that it is not as bad as it gets later, but that does not mean that the decline is absent. Moreover, it dearly bothers many people—and not only those who resort to various cosmetic interventions such as dyeing their hair, injecting Botox, and surgery. Things are also stacked against us in the fulfillment of our desires and the satisfaction of our preferences.38 Many of our desires are never fulfilled. There are thus more unfulfilled than fulfilled desires. Even when desires are fulfilled, they are not fulfilled immediately. Thus, there is a period during which those desires remain unfulfilled. Sometimes, that is a relatively short period (such as between thirst and, in ordinary circumstances, its quenching), but in the case of more ambitious desires, they can take months, years, or decades to fulfill. Some desires that are fulfilled prove less satisfying than we had imagined. One wants a specific job or to marry a particular person, but upon attaining one's goal, one learns that the job is less interesting or the spouse is more irritating than one thought. Even when fulfilled desires are everything that they were expected to be, the satisfaction is typically transitory, as the fulfilled desires yield to new desires. Sometimes, the new desires are more of the same. For example, one eats to satiety but then hunger gradually sets in again and one desires more food. The "treadmill of desires" works in another way too. When one can regularly satisfy one's lower-level desires, a new and more demanding level of desires emerges. Thus, those who cannot provide for their own basic needs spend their time striving to fulfill these. Those who can satisfy the recurring basic needs develop what Abraham Maslow calls a "higher discontent"39 that they seek to satisfy. When that level of desires can be satisfied, the aspirations shift to a yet higher level. Life is thus a constant state of striving. There are sometimes reprieves, but the striving ends only with the end of life. Moreover, as should be obvious, the striving is to ward off bad things and attain good things. Indeed, some of the good things amount merely to the temporary relief from the bad things. For example, one satisfies one's hunger or quenches one's thirst. Notice too that while the bad things come without any effort, one has to strive to ward them off and attain the good things. Ignorance, for example, is effortless, but knowledge usually requires hard work. Even the extent to which our desires and goals are fulfilled creates a misleadingly optimistic impression of how well our lives are going. This is because there is actually a form of self "censorship" in the formulation of our desires and goals. While many of them are never fulfilled, there are many more potential desires and goals that we do not even formulate because we know that they are unattainable. For example, we know that we cannot live for a few hundred years and that we cannot gain expertise in all the subjects in which we are interested. Thus, we set goals that are less unrealistic (even if many of them are nonetheless somewhat optimistic). Thus, one hopes to live a life that is, by human standards, a long life, and we hope to gain expertise in some, perhaps very focused, area. What this means is that, even if all our desires and goals were fulfilled, our lives are not going as well as they would be going if the formulation of our desires had not been artificially restricted. Further insight into the poor quality of human life can be gained from considering various traits that are often thought to be components of a good life and by noting what limited quantities of these characterize even the best human lives. For example, knowledge and understanding are widely thought to be goods, and people are often in awe of how much knowledge and understanding (some) humans have. The sad truth, however, is that, on the spectrum from no knowledge and understanding to omniscience, even the cleverest, best-educated humans are much closer to the unfortunate end of the spectrum.40 There are billions more things we do not know or understand than we do know and understand. If knowledge really is a good thing and we have so little of it, our lives are not going very well in this regard. Similarly, we consider longevity to be a good thing (at least if the life is above a minimum quality threshold °1). Yet even the longest human lives are ultimately fleeting. If we think that longevity is a good thing, then a life of a thousand years (in full vigor) would be much better than a life of eighty or ninety years (especially when the last few decades are years of decline and decrepitude). Ninety years are much closer to one year than to a thousand years. It is even more distant from two thousand or three thousand or more. If, all things being equal, longer lives are better than shorter ones, human lives do not fare well at all 42 It is not surprising that we fail to notice this heavy preponderance of bad in human life. The facts I have described are deep and intractable features of human (and other) life. Most humans have accommodated to the human condition and thus fail to notice just how bad it is. Their expectations and evaluations are rooted in this unfortunate baseline. Longevity, for example, is judged relative to the longest actual human lifespans and not relative to an ideal standard. The same is true of knowledge, understanding, moral goodness, and aesthetic appreciation. Similarly, we expect recovery to take longer than injury, and thus we judge the quality of human life off that baseline, even though it is an appalling fact of life that the odds are stacked against us in this and other ways. The psychological trait of comparison is obviously also a factor. Because the negative features I have described are common to all lives, they play very little role in how people assess the quality of their lives. It is true for everybody that the worst pains are worse than the best pleasures are good, and that pains can and often do last much longer than pleasures. Everybody must work hard to ward off unpleasantness and seek the good things. Thus, when people judge the quality of their own lives and do so by comparing them to the lives of others, they tend to overlook these and other such features. All this occurs against the backdrop of an optimism bias, under which we are already inclined to focus on the good more than the bad. The fact that we fail to notice how bad human life is does not detract from the arguments I have given that there is much more bad than good. Human life would be vastly better if pain were fleeting and pleasure protrasscted; if the pleasures were much better than the pains were bad; if it were really difficult to be injured or get sick; if recovery were swift when injury or illness did befall us; and if our desires were fulfilled instantly and if they did not give way to new desires. Human life would also be immensely better if we lived for many thousands of years in good health and if we were much wiser, cleverer, and morally better than we are.

#### 5] Pleasure its good but its absence isn’t bad—you have no offense under util.

Benatar 97 bracketed for language Benatar, David (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa). “Why It is Better Never to Come Into Existence.” American Philosophical Quarterly, Volume 34, Number 3, July 1997.

Having rejected alternative evaluations, I return to my original diagram. To determine the relative advantages and disadvantages of coming into existence and never coming to be, we need to compare 1) with 3), and 2) with 4). In the first comparison we see that non-existence is preferable to existence. The advantage is a real one. In the second comparison, however, **the** pleasures **of the existent**, although good,are not a[n] realadvantage over nonexistence, because the absence of pleasures is not bad. **For the good to be a real advantage over non-existence,** [the absence of pleasure] it would have to be the case that its absence were bad**.** To illustrate this, **consider an analogy** which, because it involves the comparison of two existent people is unlike the comparison between existence and non-existence in this way, but which nonetheless may be instructive**.** S is prone to regular bouts ofillness**.** Fortunately for him, **he** is also so constituted that he recovers quickly**. H lacks the capacity for quick recovery, but he never gets sick. It is bad for S that he gets sick and it is good** for him **that he recovers quickly.** It is good that H never gets sick**, but it is not bad that he [doesn’t]** lacks the capacity to **heal speedily. The capacity for quick recovery, although a good for** S, is not a[n] real advantage over H. This is because the absence of that capacity is not bad for H (and H is not worse off than he would have been had he had the recuperative powers of S). S is not better off than H in any way, even though S is better off than he himself would have been had he lacked the capacity for rapid recovery

### Extinction weighing

#### 1] Saying extinction comes lexically prior to other offense is a voting issue –

A] strat skew – it forces the 2nr to beat back util and extinction precludes to access my offense but they can collapse to either – normally framework debate is comparative but they’ve functionally read multiple frameworks so it forces the 2nr to do twice as much comparison to win – it also makes the AC functionally unturnable since the 1nc doesn’t have time to read a disad and do sufficient work on the framework page

B] phil ed – collapses fw debate which means there’s no incentive to learn abt philosophy – extinction scenarios aren’t portable bc they’re not evaluated in everyday policymaking

#### 2] presumes consequentialism –

The sov can’t make predictions abt the future – cross apply the calc indictss

#### 3] no impact to human existence –

the NC says morality exists as a result of humans so lack of human existence is definitionally a morally neutral state

#### 4] can’t say sov has an external obligation

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)