# ND21 Hobbes NC

## NC

#### Permissibility negates:

#### [1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation\* which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

\*Merriam Webster, ND (no date, 9-25-2021, No Publication, Definition of OUGHT, [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought)//phs](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought%29//phs) st

: moral obligation : DUTY

#### [2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### [3] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### This state of nature is brutish and has no conception of morality because we don’t have any unified truth to guide us, and thus outweighs on magnitude. The solution is the creation of the sovereign to mediate what is true and enforce the law; they are the ultimate ruler and arbitrator. It must eliminate all conflicts to bring peace to our violent natures. Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Prefer it because it outweighs on bindingness: Only the sovereign can get everyone to follow their rule and enforce the law, it creates motivations for any moral rules we create. Otherwise, the framework collapses and truth becomes impossible.

## Offense

#### Negate –

#### [1] The sovereign has absolute authority; strikes contest the rule of the authority of the sovereign which leads to infinite regress and freezes action.

Lloyd and Sreedhar (Sharon A. Lloyd and Susanne Sreedhar, Sharon Lloyd is Professor of Philosophy, Law, and Political Science at the University of Southern California. She co-founded the USC Center for Law and Philosophy, and directs the USC Levan Institute's Conversations in Practical Ethics Program., Susanne Sreedhar is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Boston University. Sreedhar's work on social contract theory has been influential, and has mostly been aimed at the nature and scope of obligation within political systems, and the possibility of ethical civil disobedience within a Hobbesian system., 2-12-2002, accessed on 6-29-2021, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2020 Edition), "Hobbes’s Moral and Political Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)", [https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/)//st](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/%29//st)

Although Hobbes offered some mild pragmatic grounds for preferring monarchy to other forms of government, his main concern was to argue that **effective government—whatever its form—must have absolute authority.** Its powers must be neither divided nor limited. **The powers of legislation, adjudication, enforcement, taxation, war-making (and the less familiar right of control of normative doctrine) are connected in such a way that a loss of one may thwart effective exercise of the rest;** for example, **legislation without interpretation and enforcement will not serve to regulate conduct. Only a government that possesses all of what Hobbes terms the “essential rights of sovereignty” can be reliably effective**, since **where partial sets of these rights are held by different bodies that disagree** in their judgments as to what is to be done, **paralysis of effective government, or degeneration into a civil war to settle their dispute, may occur.** Similarly, **to impose limitation on the authority of the government is to invite irresoluble disputes over whether it has overstepped those limits. If each person is to decide for herself whether the government should be obeyed**, factional disagreement—**and war to settle the issue, or at least paralysis of effective government—are [is] quite possible**. **To refer resolution of the question to some further authority, itself also limited and so open to challenge for overstepping its bounds, would be to initiate an infinite regress of non-authoritative ‘authorities’** (where the buck never stops). To refer it to a further authority itself unlimited, would be just to relocate the seat of absolute sovereignty, a position entirely consistent with Hobbes’s insistence on absolutism. **To avoid the horrible prospect of governmental collapse and return to the state of nature, people should treat their sovereign as having absolute authority.**

#### [2] 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.