# AT Util NC

## 1AR Restart

### AFC (0:18)

#### Interpretation and violation: The neg must not contest the aff framework absent providing a substantive reason they can’t engage in the 1NC.

#### The standard is time skew – If the neg wins their framework, I only have 4 minutes to generate turns, so I’ll always be behind on the substantive debate, and winning my framework isn’t viable either because I’m split between answering framework and substance objections.

#### And, fairness outweighs education:

#### [1] Constitutivism – it’s key to the activity because we presuppose sticking to speech times, whereas education is only a pragmatic benefit

#### [2] Controls internal link – we wouldn’t get any education from rounds if people were constantly spamming tricks since there’d be no substantive engagement

### Spec Util (0:20)

#### Interpretation and violation: If the negative reads a utilitarian framework, they must specify which type of util they defend in the 1NC.

**Crisp**, Roger, "Well-Being", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Fall **2017** Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/well-being/>. //Massa

Well-being is most commonly used in philosophy to describe what is non-instrumentally or ultimately good *for* a person. **The question of what well-being consists in is of independent interest**, but it is of great importance in moral philosophy, especially **in the case of utilitarianism**, according to which the only moral requirement is that well-being be maximized. Significant challenges to the very notion have been mounted, in particular by G.E. Moore and T.M. Scanlon. **It has become standard to distinguish theories of well-being as either hedonist theories, desire theories, or objective list theories**. According to the view known as welfarism, well-being is the only value. Also important in ethics is the question of how a person’s moral character and actions relate to their well-being.

#### [1] Shiftiness – They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard.

#### [2] Strat – I lose 6 minutes of time during the AC to generate a strategy because I don't know what turns or strategy I can go for during the 1N absent which proves CX doesn’t check since it would occur after the skew.

#### [3] Resolvability – Makes the round irresolvable since we can’t weigh different mechanisms for the good – Benatar would probably link harder under a hedonistic conception of util – weighing ground is key since it ensures we can compare arguments that clash to access the ballot.

### Epistemic Modesty Bad (0:10)

#### Interpretation and violation: The neg must not read epistemic modesty and an extinction level impact.

#### The standard is reciprocity – the aff only needs to win their offense to win the round since it always outweighs under epistemic modesty, but I have to win a high likelihood of my framework being true AND my offense, since there are no violations of infinite magnitude under my framework, imposing a 2:1 burden on me.

### TJFs Bad (0:18)

#### Interpretation and violation: The neg must not read theoretical reasons to prefer their framework.

#### [1] Ground – It moots 6 minutes of the AC because I can’t leverage substantive justifications since you assert theory comes first, which means I have to 1AR restart.

#### [2] Phil ed – It prevents us from talking about actual philosophy which kills ed and disincentivizes people from reading new and unique frameworks. And o/w b/c it’s constitutive to LD.

#### [3] Impact turn accessibility – even if the substance is hard to learn that is A. Constitutive to debate because it has a learning curve and B. Incentivizes people to get better at more forms of debate rather than defaulting to TJFs which is better for education. C. Just win the framework debate proper and you get access to your offense.

### Contracts Hijack (0:30)

#### Utilitarianism collapses to contracts:

#### [1] Pleasure and pain are only motivational to the individual who senses them, which means only a system of mutual self-restraint can enter agents into binding agreements to respect each others’ pleasure and pain.

#### [2] Even if there is an external source of the good, pain and pleasure are only examples of things that agents might find motivational, its not a wholistic account of everyone’s self-interest which means only contracts can ensure agents follow ethical principles.

#### [3] Nagel proves individuals experience pain and pleasure and strives towards those things, but what counts as pain and pleasure are subject to disagreement between different agents which requires a contract that binds their conceptions of the good together.

#### That affirms:

#### [1] LAWs put those with more advanced weaponry at a stronger bargaining position and are used to coercion other countries into forming illegitimate contracts which o/w since it is a procedural violation of the framework

#### [2] LAWs can’t consent to being placed into contracts which means a) their development is bad because they are put into war without consent and b) they are bad to use since their targets can’t interact with them

#### [3] They violate the Martens clause

Docherty ’20 Senior Researcher for the Arms Division for Human Rights Watch [Docherty, Bonnie. “The Need for and Elements of a New Treaty on Fully Autonomous Weapons.” *Human Rights Watch*, June 1st, 2020. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/06/01/need-and-elements-new-treaty-fully-autonomous-weapons>] NM

Finally, fully **autonomous weapons contravene the Martens Clause**, a provision that appears in numerous international humanitarian law treaties.[5] **The clause states that if there is no specific law on a topic, civilians are still protected by the principles of humanity and dictates of public conscience.[**6] Fully **autonomous weapons** would **undermine** the **principles of humanity because of their inability to show compassion or respect** human **dignity.**[7] **Widespread opposition to** fully **autonomous weapons among faith leaders, scientists, tech workers, civil** society **organizations, the public, and more indicate that this** emerging **technology** also **runs counter to** the dictates of **public conscience.[**8]

### Pacifism Hijack (0:30)

#### Act-util collapses to rules:

#### [1] Aggregation – policymakers make decisions under uncertainty, which renders act-util impossible b/c they lack the time and capacity to quantify exact happiness levels.

#### [2] Butterfly effect – Every effect has an effect, which cycles infinitely. Only by adopting a general policy can you create disposition effects that counteract singular unfortunate situations.

#### [3] Rules are more intuitive. Hooker 08.

[Hooker ’08 (Brad, phil prof @ University of Reading, “Rule Consequentialism,” SEP, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/consequentialism-rule/>) OS] SHS ZS

We have seen that rule-consequentialism evaluates rules on the basis of the expected value of their acceptance by the overwhelming majority. What rules will such an approach endorse? It will endorse rules prohibiting physically attacking innocent people or their property, taking the property of others, breaking one's promises, and lying. It will also endorse rules requiring one to pay special attention to the needs of one's family and friends, but more generally to be willing to help others with their (morally permissible) projects. Why? The crude answer is that a society where such rules are widely accepted would be likely to have more good in it than one lacking such rules. The fact that these rules are endorsed by rule-consequentialism makes rule-consequentialism attractive. For, intuitively, these rules seem right. However, other moral theories endorse these rules as well. Most obviously, a familiar kind of moral pluralism contends that these intuitively attractive rules constitute the most basic level of morality, i.e., that there is no deeper moral principle underlying and unifying these rules. Call this view Rossian pluralism (in honor of its champion W. D. Ross (1930; 1939)). Rule-consequentialism may agree with Rossian pluralism in endorsing rules against physically attacking the innocent, stealing, promise breaking, and rules requiring various kinds of loyalty and more generally doing good for others. But rule-consequentialism goes beyond Rossian pluralism by specifying an underlying unifying principle that provides impartial justification for such rules. Other moral theories try to do this too. Such theories include some forms of Kantianism (Audi 2001; 2004), some forms of contractualism (Scanlon 1998), and some forms of virtue ethics (Hursthouse 1999; 2002; Foot 2000). In any case, the first way of arguing for rule-consequentialism is to argue that it specifies an underlying principle that provides impartial justification for intuitively plausible moral rules, and that no rival theory does this as well (Urmson 1953; Brandt 1967; Hospers 1972; Hooker 2000).

#### Rule-util justifies pacifism.

Fiala 18, Andrew, chair and prof of phil @ Fresno State, director of Fresno Statute’s Ethics Center, columnist for Fresno Bee. "Pacifism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/pacifism/>.

**Consequentialist pacifism is usually grounded in** some sort of **rule-utilitarianism**. A utilitarian pacifist may argue that **a rule against war or other sorts of violence will tend to promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number.** A broader prohibition against violence other than war can extend the “greatest happiness” concept to take into account the happiness of sentient beings other than humans.Utilitarian pacifists must appeal to empirical and historical data to support this rule. A utilitarian argument for pacifism could be grounded in the claim that **history shows us that wars tend to produce more harm than good.** As Bentham put it, “The happiest of mankind are sufferers by war; and the wisest, nay, even the least wise, are wise enough to ascribe the chief of their sufferings to that cause” (Bentham 1789, Fourth Essay) One of the problems for consequentialist arguments against war is that judgments vary about whether war always causes more suffering than it prevents. Utilitarian defenders of the just war theory will argue that some wars help alleviate suffering, as for example, in the case of humanitarian wars in defense of human rights.Utilitarian pacifists may **articulate a rule-based argument** that **holds that a general rule against war will, in the long run, produce more happiness. A utilitarian might support such an argument by also arguing that economic and other resources that are spent on war and preparation for war could produce more happiness if spent on peaceful goods such as education, hunger relief, and so on.** And a rule-utilitarian might argue that **a rule against humanitarian intervention would produce more happiness in the long run by protecting international stability and preserving important values like national sovereignty**.

#### That affirms – banning LAWs is consistent with a pacifist methodology of rejecting weaponry and war.

### Polls Hijack

#### Util collapses to polls:

#### [1] Aggregation – The only way for governments to determine if a policy will cause most pain or pleasure is by taking a poll of their citizens to see if it is desirable for them. Death body counts don’t solve b/c governments are responsible for far more than simply preventing death.

#### [2] Universality – Util just says to value our own pain and pleasure, but we have no reason to care about other people’s pain or pleasure absent a poll that shows other people also value pleasure.

#### Polls affirm. Campaign.

[Campaign to Stop Killer Robots. “Global poll shows 61% oppose Killer Robots.” Published 22 January 2019] SHS ZS

**The survey of 26 countries** was conducted in December 2018 by the market research company Ipsos and commissioned by the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots. It **found that** more than **three in** every **five people** responding to the new poll **oppose the development of weapons systems that would select and attack targets without human intervention**. This poll also asked those opposed to killer robots what concerned them the most. Two-thirds **(**66%) answered that lethal autonomous weapons systems would “cross a moral line because machines should not be allowed to kill.” More than half (54%) said the weapons would be “unaccountable.”

### Util

#### [1] Utilitarianism fails and triggers permissibility.

#### [A] Induction fails –

#### [B] Aggregation fails –

#### [C] Butterfly effect –

#### [D] Culpability fails –

#### [E] Infinite universe –

#### [2] Utilitarianism is morally repugnant.

#### [A] Util justifies atrocities since it justifies allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others – even if they spew some pain quantifiability argument that doesn’t solve since there are still instances some get great benefit from others harm.

#### [B] Util can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until we’ve evaluated the states of affairs they’ve produced since it’s based on the outcome of the action. For Example if asked the question “is rape okay?” a utilitarian would not be able to say yes because there are situations in which it would be morally obligatory to do so if it maximized pleasure.

#### [C] Util justifies death good – the absence of pleasure is not bad since there is no life to calculate its lossed value and experience its absence but the lack of pain is actively good even if that good cannot be enjoyed by anyone because it would still have net value. This puts them in a double bind: Either A) we intuitively know killing people is wrong in which case you reject util or B) they condone death as good in which case their advantage affirms.

#### They should be dropped for reading abhorrent arguments in the debate space to not proliferate dangerous practices.