# SPOILER WARNING FOR NO WAY HOME

# 1AC – Spidey

### Advocacy:

#### In a democracy in Earth-199999, the Daily Bugle should prioritize objectivity over advocacy.

To clarify, its in the MCU.

### Offense – Spiderman is a Hero!

#### The Daily Bugle prioritizes advocacy over objectivity

Jameson ’24 (John Jonah Jameson is Editor in Chief of the Daily Bugle in the Marvel Cinematic Universe, “https://screenrant.com/spiderman-no-way-home-daily-bugle-identity-read/” ) // 11/2024 // accessed 2/18/2022 // egg

Maniac. Menace. Mystery? No more! That's right, true Buglers! Ever since the masked marauder masquerading as Spider-Man dangled with impunity above our city streets – without a permit, might I add – and took the law into his own web-covered hands, yours truly worked tirelessly to de-mask the myth and reveal the truth. And now we have. Peter Parker. Just a boy. And now that the coward has been unmasked, will he do his civic duty and answer for his egregious crimes? Will he use his great power to join the police force? The fire department? Fat chance! Will Peter Parker take responsibility for the vandalism and destruction of property those powers have left smoking in his wake? Ha! Don't make me laugh! Parker wore a mask because he refuses to answer for his actions. He kept his identity hidden because he views himself as above the law. But if the Constitution doesn't allow citizens to vote until they've reached the age of 18, why would we continue to let a child decide who is saved and who is guilty? We know he's made mistakes before. Just ask Quentin Beck. Oh, wait, you can't! 'Cause Spidey killed him! So if you don't want to be next, dear reader, join me in this call to the unmasked red-tight-wearing monster: Peter Parker, we are the public, and we will be YOUR judge and YOUR jury. Call the tip line, folks. Let Parker know you're watching.

#### The events of No Way Home causes the Multiverse of Madness

Williams ‘21 (Dec. 17, 2021, Hannah Shaw-Williams has been covering the world of film, TV and video games for over a decade. She began her career writing for Bleeding Cool before joining the news team at Screen Rant, and then working her way up to editorial roles. Hannah now leads /Film's weekend coverage of all the latest releases (and some of the old classics). Before moving to writing full-time she worked as a sound recordist and boom operator, with credits on a number of shorts and indie films, as well as the BBC series "Merlin." <https://www.slashfilm.com/710203/spider-man-no-way-home-ending-explained-it-takes-a-multiverse/> // accessed 2/21/2022 // egg

It's not easy being Spider-Man. It's even less easy to be Spider-Man when the entire world knows your secret identity and also thinks you're a murderer, thanks to some deathbed slander from Mysterio and a smear campaign by the Daily Bugle. In "Spider-Man: No Way Home," Peter Parker draws the line when his superhero infamy begins to negatively impact his friends' futures, and turns to Doctor Strange to plead for a spell that will make the world forget he's Spider-Man again. As is usually the case with magic, this ends up causing far more problems than it fixes. Director Jon Watts returns to helm "No Way Home" following the success of "Spider-Man: Homecoming" and "Spider-Man: Far From Home," and a massive amount of credit is due to screenwriters Chris McKenna and Erik Sommers for wrangling the chaotic raw material of the story into a surprisingly coherent script. Against all odds, "No Way Home" taking three different movie franchises and throwing them into a big mixer actually works. And despite all the multiverse shenanigans, the movie's ending manages to wrap things up in a quiet and poignant way. Needless to say, from here on out there will be major spoilers for "Spider-Man: No Way Home." If you have arrived here by accident and would like to avoid spoilers, kindly follow Sorcerer Supreme Wong through the exit to your left. Sony Is everyone else still with me? Sony Okay, let's go! With Great Power... Sony Since the fellas in "Spider-Man: No Way Home" came up with a pretty good system for avoiding confusion (even if it took them a couple of tries to get it right), I shall henceforth use their system and refer to the Spider-Men as follows: Peter 1 — Marvel Cinematic Universe Spider-Man (Tom Holland) Peter 2 — "Spider-Man" Spider-Man (Tobey Maguire) Peter 3 — "Amazing Spider-Man" Spider-Man (Andrew Garfield) Intriguingly, "Spider-Man: No Way Home" reveals that Peters 2 and 3 have something in common that Peter 1 doesn't have: an Uncle Ben. When Peter 1 made his debut in "Captain America: Civil War," he appeared to make an oblique reference to the death of Uncle Ben as he explained his reasons for wanting to be a superhero to Tony Stark: "When you can do the things that I can, but you don't, and then the bad things happen? They happen because of you." At the time, this was simply read as a way to fast-forward through Spider-Man's origin story, since the spider bite and the death of Uncle Ben had already gotten the big-screen treatment twice since the turn of the millennium. But "Spider-Man: No Way Home" quietly retcons that hint of a haunted past in order to give Peter 1 his own "death of Uncle Ben" scene after all. Only this time, it's not Uncle Ben who tells Peter that "with great power comes great responsibility." And it's not Uncle Ben who dies and leaves Peter guilt-ridden and rageful. Sadly, it's time to say goodbye to Marisa Tomei's Aunt May, who gets side-swiped by Green Goblin's glider and then hit while she's down with the blast from one of the Goblin's grenades. There's a "she's okay!" fake-out (a rare cousin to the death fake-out) that lasts just long enough to make you think this movie won't have a major character body count, but then May succumbs to her injuries shortly after delivering the old "great power/great responsibility" chestnut. The context is not the same; whereas Peters 2 and 3 lost their Uncle Bens as a direct result of letting a thief go free, Peter 1 genuinely was trying to the heroic thing by protecting Green Goblin and the other lost supervillains. Had he simply allowed Doctor Strange to send them back and die, Aunt May would have lived — but at the cost of Peter's principles. It's a tough lesson that sometimes even trying your hardest to do the right thing isn't enough to guarantee a happy ending. There's a quote often misattributed to the philosopher Edmund Burke: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." It goes hand-in-hand with the idea that with great power comes great responsibility, but while it fits with the death of Uncle Ben in the two previous iterations of Spider-Man's origin story, it doesn't quite tally with the death of Aunt May in "No Way Home." There is an actual Edmund Burke quote, however, that feels a lot more appropriate: "When bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall, one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle." The pain of losing Aunt May is more than Peter can cope with alone. But between MJ and Ned rallying to his side and Spider-Men from other universes commiserating about their own personal tragedies, he's not alone. And that's just as well, because the bad men are combining. Let's Cure Some Ass! Sony From his very first appearance in "Captain America: Civil War," Peter 1's arc has been about taking the character from a place where he is safe and supported to a place where he is completely alone, with no one to rely upon but himself. "Spider-Man: Homecoming" laid out the roadmap for the rest of the trilogy when Peter started out with a shiny, high-tech Stark Industries suit, only to have it taken away from him, leaving him to head into the final battle wearing his ropey homemade costume, with no Avengers to back him up. "Spider-Man: Far From Home" continued to build upon the relationship between Tony Stark and Peter Parker even in the aftermath of Tony's death. Through the execution of his final wishes, we see that Tony, in lieu of being able to put a suit of armor around the world, tried to at least leave his young protégé with his own personal suit of armor. Unfortunately, Tony's background as an arms manufacturer meant that his idea of "armor" was an army of lethal drones. "Far From Home" demonstrated that while Mysterio wasn't the right person to wield that kind of firepower, neither is Peter Parker. Not yet, and maybe not ever. That brings us to "Spider-Man: No Way Home." It might seem an odd choice, given that Iron Man has been Peter's de facto father figure, to stage the movie's final battle on top of a giant replica of Captain America's shield, rather than a giant arc reactor or at the top of the building formerly known as Stark Tower. After all, aside from some mild bonding over their shared hometown, Peter and Cap never had a chance to get particularly close. But the fallen shield represents something bigger than Captain America: it represents all the lost leaders and fallen heroes of the MCU. Iron Man is dead, Black Widow is dead, Vision is dead, Captain America is gone, Nick Fury is off in space somewhere doing Top Secret Nick Fury Things, Mysterio turned out to be a fraud, and the remaining Avengers are once again scattered to the four winds. Aunt May was the last domino to fall: the cornerstone of support in Peter's life, who had been there for him long before he ever met Tony Stark or Nick Fury. There's no one left to mentor Peter, or to be his moral guide as he grapples with his powers, or to pull him back when he starts punching a little too hard, and persuade him it's better to cure than to kill. Well. Almost no one. Redemption for the Original Spider-Man Sony "Spider-Man: No Way Home" has a lot of villains in it, but whether by design or by accident, Green Goblin feels like the most full-realized (all credit to Willem Dafoe for coming back after 20 years without missing a single beat). It's easy to forget, after two decades brimming over with superhero movies, just how pivotal Peter Parker's final confrontation with the Green Goblin at the end of Sam Raimi's "Spider-Man" felt. It created a clear roadmap for compelling villains that the very best of the MCU movies made since have followed. First, and crucially: Norman Osborn wasn't a stranger, but the father of Peter's childhood best friend. With their masks off, the two of them got on very well; Peter saw Dr. Osborn as a role model and mentor, while Norman was impressed by Peter's love of science — to the point that Harry Osborn became jealous that his father liked Peter more than his own son. Throughout the MCU, a similar pattern emerges where the most interesting villains are those whom the hero cannot hurt without hurting themselves, or knowing that they are causing harm to their loved ones: Loki (Thor's adopted brother), Killmonger (Black Panther's cousin), Thanos (Gamora's adoptive father) — and, of course, Adrian Toomes, AKA the Vulture. As "Spider-Man: Homecoming" approached its final act, it greatly complicated things by revealing that the villain was none other than the father of Peter Parker's prom date. Then there's the tragedy. As entertaining as Dafoe is when he lets his villain grin loose, Norman Osborn is actually a rather tragic character. "No Way Home" draws parallels between him and Doctor Otto Octavius, another scientist whose experiments led to him losing part of his mind and surrendering control to a darker half. In "Spider-Man," the scene where Norman's unravelling mind causes him to behave rudely at a dinner is arguably even more unsettling than scenes where he's whizzing around on a glider in a green costume. And at the end of the movie, Spider-Man still believes that Norman can be saved — right up until the Green Goblin is violently impaled on his own glider in a last-ditch effort to kill Spider-Man. Apparently not content with wrapping up one "Spider-Man" movie trilogy, "Spider-Man: No Way Home" also takes care to wrap up the unfinished business of the two previous iterations of the franchise. (Come on, that's just showing off.) As the Spider-Men are delegating the development of cures for their various supervillains, Peter 2 quietly reveals that he knows exactly how to cure Green Goblin because he's given it a great deal of thought over the two decades since Norman's death. When Peter 2 intercedes to stop Peter 1 from murdering Norman with the glider, he not only manages to save the very first enemy whom he ever watched die — he also figuratively returns to the night of Uncle Ben's death, and prevents his younger self from giving in to rage and killing for the sake of revenge. Redemption for the Amazing Spider-Man Sony One of the most interesting elements of Spider-Man Group Therapy is getting to find out what happened to Peter 2 and Peter 3 in the years since their respective "Spider-Man" movie franchises got the "Etch A Sketch" treatment (shake to erase, and start over). Tobey Maguire's "youth pastor fashion icon" Peter Parker 2 is the more well-adjusted of the two; he's had longer to mature as a person, and he has Mary Jane Watson by his side to keep his life as Peter Parker anchored. Yes, "Spider-Man: No Way Home" confirms that Maguire's Peter and Kirsten Dunst's MJ got their happy ending, even if it did take them a while to get there. Garfield's Spider-Man didn't get so lucky. Apparently the MJ of the "Amazing Spider-Man" universe never emerged (Shailene Woodley did film scenes as the character for "The Amazing Spider-Man 2," but they were left on the cutting room floor), and despite Peter 3 seeming to shake himself out of his depression at the end of the movie in order to fight Rhino, his grief wasn't magically cured. Whereas Peter 2 managed to find a balance between the two halves of his personality, Garfield's version of the character responds in the negative when asked if he has a significant other, telling Peter 2 that he simply doesn't have time for "Peter Parker stuff." In truth, he probably could make time for Peter Parker stuff, but chooses not to. Peter 3 confesses to Peter 1 that after Gwen's death he became angry and bitter, and after a while he stopped pulling his punches when beating up the bad guys. He embraced his identity as Spider-Man entirely and left Peter Parker to wither on the vine — fearful of getting close to anyone in case they ended up the same way as Gwen. For Peter 3, meeting Peter 1 allows him to reconnect with his own, younger self. And like Peter 2 and Green Goblin, Peter 3's trip through the multiverse offers him a chance for redemption. "Spider-Man: No Way Home" comes close to realizing another adaptation of the "Night Gwen Stacy Died" arc from the comics, only this time with MJ falling to her death instead of Gwen. Peter 1 is waylaid by the Green Goblin before he can catch her, but Peter 3 steps in and manages to successfully do what he failed to do years ago in his own universe: save Spider-Man's girlfriend from the jaws of death. It's a powerful moment for Garfield's character, whose eyes are full of tears as he checks to make sure that MJ is OK. When Peter 3 heads back home at the end of the movie, there's a strong sense that his encounter with the other Spider-Men has been healing for him, and perhaps he'll start to make a little more time for "Peter Parker stuff." The People in the Rifts Marvel Comics Thanks to some accidental intervention from Ned and his borrowed sling ring, Doctor Strange returns from the Mirror Dimension in time for the final battle of "Spider-Man: No Way Home." Unfortunately, before he can press the button on his magic spell box that will put everything back to normal, Green Goblin blows up the box with one of his grenades and unleashes the spell. The sky cracks open as the spell tears rifts in the multiverse, and more people start to come through. The shapes of the people are hard to make out, but there's a moment where the camera lingers on the emerging shape of a guy with a spear, who could very well be Kraven the Hunter. Aaron Taylor-Johnson is set to play the trophy hunter, who is one of Spider-Man's greatest enemies in the comics, in an upcoming movie, so this could be Sony's way of laying the groundwork for his arrival. The appearance of the rifts in the sky effectively gives both Sony and Marvel Studios a blanket excuse for introducing just about any character into the MCU: "Oh, they came through the multiverse rift and didn't get sent back with everyone else." The other person in the rift who gets special attention is a broad and hulking shape that could be the Thing, given the upcoming MCU-based "Fantastic Four" reboot, but could also be Paul Giamatti's Rhino from "The Amazing Spider-Man 2." Like Maybe-Kraven, this figure is left just vague enough that it's not certain who it actually is — leaving us to speculate about the possibilities over the next few years. What Will Happen to the 'Visitors'? Sony "Spider-Man: No Way Home" wisely doesn't get into the weeds of time manipulation on top of everything else, but it does establish that not all of the multiverse visitors came from the same time in their own universes. Villains like Doc Ock, Green Goblin, and Electro are transported into the MCU from the moment just before they died, whereas Peter 2 and Peter 3 were plucked from their own versions of the present day (which, in the MCU, is 2023). After being reunited with his former enemy, Doc Ock observes that Peter 2 is now "grown up" compared to the last time he saw him. By curing the supervillains rather than killing them, it's strongly implied that Peter 1 has saved them — and, in so doing, has changed the timelines of their respective universes. It's unclear whether (for example) Peter 2 and the newly cured Norman Osborn will now return to the same universe, or whether Norman being cured will kick off a whole new timeline and give birth to a new universe. "Spider-Man: No Way Home" avoids tangling with this question (again, a wise decision), and instead simply settles for implying that all of the supervillains now have a second chance to be better people. Peter Who? Sony Saving the multiverse from total collapse comes at a price. Since the original spell was designed to make the whole world forget that Peter Parker is Spider-Man, the only way to repair the damage from it is to cast a spell that makes the world forget Peter Parker ever existed at all. This time around, Peter can't beg for exceptions for his girlfriend or his best friend, so instead he simply plans to find MJ and Ned in the aftermath and explain everything to them. Peter falters, however, when he sees MJ and Ned making plans for the next chapter of their lives: studying at MIT. And Peter comes to a full stop when MJ brushes back a strand of hair and reveals the band aid covering the cut over her eye that she got in the final battle. The injury is a reminder to Peter that being Spider-Man's girlfriend puts MJ in harm's way, and he decides he can't bear to see the people he loves put in danger like that again. With that decision, there's a danger of Peter 1 going down the same path that Peter 3 did: pouring all of his energy into being Spider-Man, and neglecting his life as Peter Parker. But the final (pre-credits) scene of "Spider-Man: No Way Home" has an optimistic tone. As Peter gets settled into his new apartment, he unpacks items of significance: the Lego Emperor Palpatine from the Death Star model that he was working on with Ned (which gets destroyed again in "No Way Home"), and a coffee cup from MJ's workplace that says "we are happy to serve you." Rather than being a painful memory that only he can remember, Peter's connection to MJ and Ned — even from afar — will inspire him to be the best, most friendliest friendly neighborhood Spider-Man he can be. The Consequences for Doctor Strange Sony While Doctor Strange's final spell of erasing Peter Parker from the entire world's memories appeared to have fixed the multiverse, it was less of a "fix" and more like, well... Sony Yes, as the post-credits stinger for "Spider-Man: No Way Home" indicates, the multiverse is still pretty f\*\*\*\* up. In Doctor Strange's defense, he's not the only person who's been a bit irresponsible with the boundaries of reality this year. Wanda Maximoff is currently trying to lead a new life in isolation after accidentally enslaving the minds of an entire town into her bizarre sitcom reality in "WandaVision." Meanwhile, the events of "Loki" cracked open the "Sacred Timeline" into infinite timelines, and Jonathan Majors' Kang the Conqueror will be making a comeback in "Ant-Man and the Wasp: Quantumania." It's going to take more than superglue and a few throw pillows to fix this mess Read More: <https://www.slashfilm.com/710203/spider-man-no-way-home-ending-explained-it-takes-a-multiverse/?utm_campaign=clip>

#### No Way Home didn’t fix the multiverse – it directly leads to Multiverse of Madness

Dumaraog 21 (BY ANA DUMARAOG PUBLISHED DEC 23, 2021, Spider-Man: No Way Home Caused Doctor Strange 2, Confirmed, ScreenRant, <https://screenrant.com/spiderman-no-way-home-doctor-strange-cause-multiverse/)//ww> pbj

The events of Spider-Man: No Way Home directly lead to Doctor Strange's problem in Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness. Peter Parker's (Tom Holland) latest adventure involved Benedict Cumberbatch's sorcerer who attempted to undo Mysterio's (Jake Gyllenhaal) revelation about Spider-Man's true identity using sorcery. But after helping the young Avenger with his problem, Doctor Strange is set for his own mission in Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness, which is apparently caused by his attempt to resolve the wall-crawler's identity dilemma. Originally set to be directed by Scott Derrickson, who helmed the first Doctor Strange movie, Sam Raimi took over the job after the original filmmaker exited the sequel due to creative differences with Marvel Studios. Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness is expected to fully tackle the multiverse which was previously hinted at in a few projects in Phase 3 like in Ant-Man, Avengers: Endgame, and more recently in WandaVision. Elizabeth Olsen's Wanda Maximoff/Scarlet Witch is confirmed to join Doctor Strange's next adventure. Meanwhile, Wong (Benedict Wong), Baron Mordo (Chiwetel Ejiofor), and Christine Palmer (Rachel McAdams) all return in the sequel, as well. Finally, the blockbuster will also debut Xochitl Gomez's latest MCU hero, America Chavez. Marvel Studios has been impressively able to keep Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness's production tightly under wraps, with no set image leaking — at least thus far. Plot specifics are also scant at the moment, but the movie’s first teaser confirms that it's directly caused by the events of Spider-Man: No Way Home. For context, Doctor Strange's decision to cast the dangerous spell to make everyone forget that Peter Parker is Spider-Man went awry and resulted in various interdimensional beings descending to MCU's main universe. Ultimately, Doctor Strange was able to resolve the problem by casting a more powerful spell that essentially prevented the multiverse from collapsing in exchange for a bigger sacrifice from Peter. But, there seems to still be unknown ramifications from the pair's actions which will materialize in Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness. Despite the franchise’s interconnected storytelling, clear set-ups like this are actually rare. Projects are mainly tied through MCU post-credits scenes, but in this instance, Spider-Man: No Way Home's story directly results in the events of the Doctor Strange sequel.Doctor Strange casting a spell in No Way Home. Doctor Strange and the Multiverse of Madness' teaser also features Doctor Strange traveling to a parallel universe that is in the middle of chaos and destruction. It's uncertain what or who caused its destruction, but it's reminiscent of the Void in Loki, although it's unlikely that it's the same setting. Instead, it could be another dimension in the multiverse that has been negatively impacted by Shuma-Gorath's rampage — Doctor Strange and the Multiverse of Madness' rumored villain. It could establish just how dangerous the villain is, upping the stakes for Doctor Strange and his allies to protect the Sacred Timeline. This could also reaffirm Baron Mordo's belief that Doctor Strange isn't fit to be the next Sorcerer Supreme — something that he fully believes in when he said that the "wizard" is the world's biggest threat. Perhaps even Wong, who's been a loyal ally for a while, is finally convinced of the idea, especially since he explicitly warned him of casting the dangerous spell in Spider-Man: No Way Home. Given Doctor Strange's involvement in Spider-Man: No Way Home, the question now is whether or not Spider-Man will come to help the sorcerer in his own fight in Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness. While it's Doctor Strange who cast the spell, Peter's repeated meddling was what caused it to go awry. Even if Doctor Strange doesn't have any recollection of his personal ties to the wall-crawler, Spider-Man could take the initiative to lend a helping hand to the only other MCU hero who assisted him during his biggest personal fight thus far.

#### Multiverse of Madness ends the multiverse – Kang, Timeline Changes, Shuma-Gorath, Multiverse Collapse, Mordo, and Evil Strange

Curtice 22 (CLAYTON CURTICE PUBLISHED JAN 15, 2022, MCU: 10 Biggest Reveals About Dr. Strange in the Multiverse of Madness (So Far), Collider, <https://collider.com/reveals-about-dr-strange-multiverse-madness/)//ww> pbj

Possible TVA Crossover There is a brief scene in the Multiverse of Madness trailer where we see Wanda’s hand fill with a magic red orb and behind her is a pillar of golden light in a similar shape to a time door from the Disney+ show Loki. It’s possible because the timeline has been shifted, we will see a member of the TVA within The Multiverse of Madness. There is already a season 2 of Loki in the works, so it may not be Loki himself, but one of the many Time-Variant cops or employees may make a cameo. This may be highly speculative, but it’s possible Kang the Conqueror has contributed to the collapse of the Multiverse. Time Plays a Different Role In the opening shot of the trailer, we see Steven Strange’s broken watch from the first movie. He has kept it all these years most likely to indicate that time now has shifted. We can fully expect that time is going to be altered and changed in The Multiverse of Madness and most likely it will be permanent. However, we don’t know exactly what that entails, but the effects may be visible in future Marvel projects. Christine is Getting Married There is a moment in the trailer where we see Christine (Rachel McAdams) walking down the aisle in a wedding dress. She is not walking toward Steven, but past him, which indicates she may be getting married to a different person. How this plays into the plot of the film is still not known, but it could be an alternate universe that Dr. Strange is witnessing. It could also be that Christine has moved on, because Steven has been off saving the world, and inadvertently destroying it. Wanda Has Answers In the end credit scene of WandaVision on Disney+, we see Wanda using her powers to search alternate dimensions for her children. This may be a hint as to why Strange needs her help in understanding the Multiverse. Wanda knows something deeper about the multiverse and Dr. Strange has probably seen it as well. Wanda will most likely play an important role in why time has been altered. A Cosmic Being Will Appear One of the most powerful beings in the universe, Shuma-Gorath can be spotted throwing a bus at Dr. Strange in the trailer. The creature is a giant, one-eyed tentacle monster from another dimension, most likely coming to terrorize New York in search of a way to control the multiverse. These rumors are not yet confirmed, and the tentacle monster could possibly be a different terror that Marvel is using to wreak havoc on the people of New York. Even so, it seems Dr. Strange will be battling many villains in this film. America Chavez Will Debut We get a quick glimpse of America Chavez, who will be played by Xochitl Gomez, in the trailer, and it’s only of her back as she walks into a dilapidated room. However, it’s highly likely to be America Chavez based on her classic denim jacket with a large white star on the back. In the comics, America Chavez is hunted down by Shuma-Gorath for her time shifting abilities, and may be why the two of them are revealed in the trailer. America Chavez is originally part of the Young Avengers and has the ability to break open holes in reality. We have been introduced to other Young Avengers from Marvel's Disney+ shows, Loki with Kid Loki, and Hawkeye with Kate Bishop. Marvel definitely has a plan to unite all these characters at some point. Wong Is Sorcerer Supreme It’s revealed in Spider-Man: No Way Home that Wong has become the Sorcerer Supreme after half the population, including Strange, was snapped out of existence. We will most likely see him in this role in the Multiverse of Madness. He is wearing a new costume with a unique red and gold trim, which may indicate his higher status, but may also be Sam Raimi's was of indicating that he has just learned more and is a more powerful sorcerer. He has also been seen wielding a new sword, which may be an important piece to his new position as Sorcerer Supreme. The Universe is Falling Apart There is a scene at the beginning of the trailer where Steven Strange walks out of an alleyway to reveal that the city is collapsing. We will most likely be seeing multiple versions of New York in this film, but the original one may be in serious trouble. From the events of No Way Home when Peter Parker asked Strange to wipe everyone’s memory, we may be seeing the effects of that spell in this scene. Mordo returns Baron Mordo makes his return, and he also dawns a new look. He seems to have gained some power and knowledge and is ready to come back fighting. Mordo’s new style may indicate that he plays a larger role among the wizards in the sanctum. In the trailer, he seems to have learned a few new moves and is more confident in his abilities. It will be interesting to see how his character arc has progressed in this new movie. Evil Dr. Strange The biggest reveal so far has been the appearance of evil Dr. Strange. There is so much intrigue as to who he is and why he seems so dark and sinister. In an episode of the animated series What If…? on Disney+, we are introduced to an eviler, malevolent Dr. Strange, and fans are speculating that this might allude to the Strange we see in the trailer of Multiverse of Madness.

#### Wanda Maximoff destroys the multiverse in MoM – she’s a Nexus Being

Hood 21 (WandaVision: How Scarlet Witch Could Destroy The Multiverse, BY COOPER HOOD PUBLISHED APR 03, 2021, ScreenRant, <https://screenrant.com/wandavision-scarlet-witch-multiverse-destroy/)//ww> pbj

WandaVision proved Wanda Maximoff is one of the Marvel Cinematic Universe's strongest beings, and her power could lead to the destruction of the multiverse. Elizabeth Olsen's MCU hero has gradually become more powerful as her story has continued. After nearly defeating Thanos by herself, WandaVision showed her truly become the Scarlet Witch. This came after altering reality to the point where she controlled all of Westview. Wanda officially becoming Scarlet Witch is a moment Marvel fans have been waiting to see for years, but WandaVision also included another tease of how powerful and important she is. Episode 7's fake commercial teased the existence of Nexus Beings in the MCU. Each universe has its own Nexus Being who can draw immense power from the multiverse. WandaVision sets up the potential for Scarlet Witch to be a Nexus Being in the main MCU timeline. But with the show's ending also teasing a potentially dark path ahead as she tries to understand her abilities, Scarlet Witch could destroy the multiverse instead. If Scarlet Witch is a Nexus Being in the MCU, her ties to the multiverse could be how she is so powerful. This has proven to be both a blessing and a curse already for Wanda, as she's hurt and helped people with these abilities. Now that she is studying the Darkhold (potentially at Wundagore Mountain), there is the potential that the evil influence of Chthon could affect Wanda. It is possible Chthon will possess Scarlet Witch and use her powers to fracture the multiverse, allowing him to regain power over multiple universes instead of a single one. The destruction of the multiverse could actually be what Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness is really about. Marvel Studios already confirmed Scarlet Witch has a significant role in the movie. While many hope that is because Doctor Strange will mentor the young witch, it is just as likely that the future Sorcerer Supreme will be tasked with fighting Scarlet Witch instead. After all, Doctor Strange 2's title indicates that the multiverse will be in chaos during the movie. We do not yet know why that is, but it stands to reason that Scarlet Witch has something to do with it - especially since WandaVision was said to set up the movie's events. Scarlet Witch destroying the multiverse after WandaVision opens the door for the MCU to go in several different exciting directions. Many had hoped the Disney+ series would directly bring mutants to the shared universe, but a shattered multiverse down the road could be how it happens. Perhaps this even provides a narrative way for Ryan Reynolds' Deadpool (and his supporting cast) to join the MCU. The multiverse collapsing could also provide a path for Sony and Marvel to continue sharing Tom Holland's Spider-Man, either by having him constantly go between universes, join the Sony universe exclusively for a few years, or fold Venom and other titles into the MCU.

#### Put away your defense – she’s the strongest sorcerer in the MCU

Mithaiwala 21 MANSOOR MITHAIWALA PUBLISHED MAR 06, 2021, How Scarlet Witch Is More Powerful Than Doctor Strange, ScreenRant https://screenrant.com/wandavision-scarlet-witch-doctor-strange-more-powerful/

In the WandaVision series finale, Agatha Harkness subtly confirms Scarlet Witch is the strongest sorcerer in the Marvel Cinematic Universe, saying that she could beat the Sorcerer Supreme - and there's good evidence to prove why that's true and not an exaggeration. One of the many mysteries going into the final episode was the identity of Agatha's magic book, which was confirmed to be the Darkhold - the book of the damned - and its chapter on the Scarlet Witch explained how powerful the character's magic is. Viewers have seen Wanda Maximoff take on a number of people - superheroes and supervillains - and come out on top. Her power was put on full display in Avengers: Infinity War when she defeated a swarm of Outriders in Wakanda; then shortly thereafter, she managed to hold back Thanos - a villain Iron Man could only hurt enough to produce a drop of blood, and who was wielding five of the six Infinity Stones by that point - while seemingly using only half of her power; the other half being used to destroy the Mind Stone. Then in Avengers: Endgame, Wanda came close to killing Thanos - that is, until he forced his ship to execute an aerial bombardment on the Avengers compound. All of that proved Wanda was a powerful superhero, but WandaVision has now explained just how powerful. Although specific details haven't been revealed about Scarlet Witch's powers, the implications are the same as they were in the comics. In both versions, Wanda uses Chaos Magic, a primordial form of magic that dates back to the Earth's formation, and it's a type of magic that was harnessed by Chthon, an Elder God. With the Mind Stone augmenting her abilities, Wanda doesn't need to perform any incantations or learn any spells to use her powers. She's not like Doctor Strange or Agatha Harkness - their powers are learned and can be classified primarily as either Eldritch Magic or Darkhold Magic. Instead, all she has to do is rely on herself, and her emotions, to intensify her powers. WandaVision Scarlet Witch Darkhold In addition to showcasing Wanda's powers in Infinity War and Endgame, WandaVision has highlighted Wanda's magic in such a way that it can be easily compared to other sorcerers, particularly Agatha Harkness and Doctor Strange. As Agatha so curiously noted, Wanda can warp reality on a massive scale without giving it much thought; she didn't even know what she was doing at the time when her sitcom-esque Westview was created. Scarlet Witch was able to take on Agatha directly and best her in battle, and, interestingly, she's been shown to outmatch Doctor Strange's projection trick. In 2016's Doctor Strange, the hero used projection to learn more about sorcerery while he slept; in WandaVision's post-credits scene, Scarlet Witch does that while awake. Comparing one form of magic to another isn't a direct science; there's nuance to each type and each character who utilizes them. Both Agatha Harkness and the Ancient One used dark magic to prolong their lives, and the Masters of the Mystic Arts use all sorts of spells to defend themselves and the world. But then there's Scarlet Witch, who can easily do everything. By comparison, it would be like Hawkeye mastering archery through dedication versus someone whose skill amplifies their natural ability to hit any target without looking. Of course, while WandaVision name-drops the Sorcerer Supreme, it's unclear if Doctor Strange is at that level yet. If he's not, he will be soon - and even then, Wanda is still more powerful than the Ancient One ever was.

#### No, she’s not the hero – her MCU trajectory proves she’ll destroy the multiverse to find her children

Sara Salamat, Is Wanda Maximoff the real villain in Doctor Strange 2?, 2022, Fansided, <https://bamsmackpow.com/2022/02/13/doctor-strange-2-in-the-multiverse-of-madness-is-wanda-maximoff-evil-villain/)//ww> pbj

With the latest Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness trailer, we can’t help but wonder if Wanda Maximoff is the true villain of the movie? Marvel has released the second official trailer for Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness. The Marvel Cinematic Universe movie is set to release on May 6th of this year and the trailer was packed with shocks, cameos and plot hints, but the real spotlight falls on Doctor Strange and Wanda Maximoff, a.k.a. the Scarlet Witch. It’s safe to say that Wanda Maximoff had a lot to think about at the end of WandaVision last year. From her internalized grief, to trapping the citizens of Westview, to unlocking her abilities as the Scarlet Witch — our beloved Wanda has been through a lot. Is Elizabeth Olsen’s Scarlet Witch the villain of Doctor Strange 2? “You break the rules, and you become a hero,” Wanda says to Strange, “I do it and I become the enemy. That doesn’t seem fair.” After the first Doctor Strange in the Multiverse of Madness teaser, which came in place of the end credits of Spider-Man: No Way Home, fans had suspicions that Wanda would be key to assisting Strange in exploring the multiverse, and to reverse any and all damage — but after the most recent trailer, it seems that Wanda might be taking up more of a villain role, suggesting that those rumors about her being the film’s antagonist just might be true. Wanda Maximoff, (played by Elizabeth Olsen), seems to still be in a fragile state, still recovering from everything that happened to her, Vision and the world in the past five years. But is that proof that she’s going down a dark path? Making Wanda a villain is logically the next step in her arc Given the context of all she has endured: tremendous loss with little support from her friends, (the Avengers), this is the perfect recipe for villain origin story. Even in the comics, Wanda has been teetering on the fence about being a villain vs hero for ages — experiencing this much heartache and death. All in all, Wanda was already a force to be reckoned with, and after tapping into her Chaos Magic and becoming the Scarlet Witch, it’s safe to say the multiverse better watch out.

#### Independently, Shuma-Gorath ends the multiverse

Marvel Fandom (Shuma-Gorath, Marvel Fandom, no date, <https://marvel.fandom.com/wiki/Shuma-Gorath_(Multiverse)#:~:text=The%20power%20of%20Shuma%2DGorath,he%20fires%20at%20the%20reality.)//egg>

Powers Shuma-Gorath was a powerful, sometimes stated to be omnipotent,[20] and ancient demon that possesses vast supernatural powers, and is stated to be the "archetypal Class Three demon".[52] He is considered to be one of the primal power of Chaos.[9] He was stated to be the greatest of the Old Ones.[6] In his native dimension he is virtually unstoppable.[citation needed] Given his past reformations, it is unknown if he can ever truly be killed. Among his many mystical powers is the ability to communicate with and control others both within his vicinity and across dimensional barriers. He can create and direct powerful blasts of mystical energy (usually from his eye and/or tentacles) and affect transmutations on a planetary scale.[53] His skin is rubbery and armored, making him difficult to damage except by the most powerful magics. Though he often appears as a scaly being with six to eight tentacles and a great, central eye, during the Hyborean Age he was also seen to have numerous pincers, claws, and insectoid limbs, in addition to a large, fanged maw. Similarly, he has been depicted as either greenish or purple in color. It is stated by The Vision that Shuma-Gorath exists on many planes and thus his true form cannot be seen by humans. Presumably, he can alter the form people see him as to his will. According to Shuma-Gorath himself, he is nothing except his power and his form is merely a shell that contains it.[53] His size seems to be related to his power, as he is truly gigantic in his home dimension. On Earth he has always appeared substantially smaller, though it is confirmed that only the smallest part of Shuma-Gorath's essence manifests on Earth when he is invoked, thus he has only been seen at full power within his home dimension. The power of Shuma-Gorath is such that he can destroy multiple galaxies solely through his aura-pressure.[54] Shuma-Gorath also has the ability to destroy realities by using all of his tentacles to create a ball of energy which he fires at the reality.[42][43] Shuma-Gorath's name is often invoked across many dimensions by beings seeking dark power. Physical Strength Superhuman with an unknown upper limit.

### Framing

**Standard is maximizing expected well being**

**Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue**

**Blum et al. 18**
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**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

**Actor Spec— States must use util. Any other standard dooms the moral theory**

**Goodin 90.** Robert Goodin 90, [professor of philosophy at the Australian National University college of arts and social sciences], “The Utilitarian Response,” pgs 141-142 //RS

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules or conduct.

**There are an infinite number of things that negate so its impossible to affirm under all of them – just proving that we affirm under our index is sufficient to win.**

### Underview

#### Objective reality is inconclusive – the future is based off of different perceptions of the world, so our reading is best.

MIT Technology Review ’19 (Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page; Covers latest ideas from blog post about arXiv; 03/12/2019; “Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page”; <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/12/136684/a-quantum-experiment-suggests-theres-no-such-thing-as-objective-reality/>; *MIT Technology Review*; accessed: 11/19/2020; MohulA)

Back in 1961, the Nobel Prize–winning physicist Eugene Wigner outlined a thought experiment that demonstrated one of the lesser-known paradoxes of quantum mechanics. The experiment shows how the strange nature of the universe allows two observers—say, Wigner and Wigner’s friend—to experience different realities. Since then, physicists have used the “Wigner’s Friend” thought experiment to explore the nature of measurement and to argue over whether objective facts can exist. That’s important because scientists carry out experiments to establish objective facts. But if they experience different realities, the argument goes, how can they agree on what these facts might be? That’s provided some entertaining fodder for after-dinner conversation, but Wigner’s thought experiment has never been more than that—just a thought experiment. Last year, however, physicists noticed that recent advances in quantum technologies have made it possible to reproduce the Wigner’s Friend test in a real experiment. In other words, it ought to be possible to create different realities and compare them in the lab to find out whether they can be reconciled. And today, Massimiliano Proietti at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and a few colleagues say they have performed this experiment for the first time: they have created different realities and compared them. Their conclusion is that Wigner was correct—these realities can be made irreconcilable so that it is impossible to agree on objective facts about an experiment. Wigner’s original thought experiment is straightforward in principle. It begins with a single polarized photon that, when measured, can have either a horizontal polarization or a vertical polarization. But before the measurement, according to the laws of quantum mechanics, the photon exists in both polarization states at the same time—a so-called superposition. Wigner imagined a friend in a different lab measuring the state of this photon and storing the result, while Wigner observed from afar. Wigner has no information about his friend’s measurement and so is forced to assume that the photon and the measurement of it are in a superposition of all possible outcomes of the experiment. Wigner can even perform an experiment to determine whether this superposition exists or not. This is a kind of interference experiment showing that the photon and the measurement are indeed in a superposition. From Wigner’s point of view, this is a “fact”—the superposition exists. And this fact suggests that a measurement cannot have taken place. But this is in stark contrast to the point of view of the friend, who has indeed measured the photon’s polarization and recorded it. The friend can even call Wigner and say the measurement has been done (provided the outcome is not revealed). So the two realities are at odds with each other. “This calls into question the objective status of the facts established by the two observers,” say Proietti and co. That’s the theory, but last year Caslav Brukner, at the University of Vienna in Austria, came up with a way to re-create the Wigner’s Friend experiment in the lab by means of techniques involving the entanglement of many particles at the same time. The breakthrough that Proietti and co have made is to carry this out. “In a state-of-the-art 6-photon experiment, we realize this extended Wigner’s friend scenario,” they say. They use these six entangled photons to create two alternate realities—one representing Wigner and one representing Wigner’s friend. Wigner’s friend measures the polarization of a photon and stores the result. Wigner then performs an interference measurement to determine if the measurement and the photon are in a superposition. The experiment produces an unambiguous result. It turns out that both realities can coexist even though they produce irreconcilable outcomes, just as Wigner predicted. That raises some fascinating questions that are forcing physicists to reconsider the nature of reality. The idea that observers can ultimately reconcile their measurements of some kind of fundamental reality is based on several assumptions. The first is that universal facts actually exist and that observers can agree on them. But there are other assumptions too. One is that observers have the freedom to make whatever observations they want. And another is that the choices one observer makes do not influence the choices other observers make—an assumption that physicists call locality. If there is an objective reality that everyone can agree on, then these assumptions all hold. But Proietti and co’s result suggests that objective reality does not exist. In other words, the experiment suggests that one or more of the assumptions—the idea that there is a reality we can agree on, the idea that we have freedom of choice, or the idea of locality—must be wrong. Of course, there is another way out for those hanging on to the conventional view of reality. This is that there is some other loophole that the experimenters have overlooked. Indeed, physicists have tried to close loopholes in similar experiments for years, although they concede that it may never be possible to close them all. Nevertheless, the work has important implications for the work of scientists. “The scientific method relies on facts, established through repeated measurements and agreed upon universally, independently of who observed them,” say Proietti and co. And yet in the same paper, they undermine this idea, perhaps fatally. The next step is to go further: to construct experiments creating increasingly bizarre alternate realities that cannot be reconciled. Where this will take us is anybody’s guess. But Wigner, and his friend, would surely not be surprised.