# Hobbes NC – Analytic

#### 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 have to compete with each other – terminates in death because neither of us want to concede to the other

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

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

#### Prefer it on bindingness: Only the sovereign is able to get everyone to follow her rule and enforce the law, it creates motivations for any moral rules we create. Otherwise, the framework collapses and truth becomes impossible.

#### I unconditionally defend the advocacy that states ought to ban voting. Negate:

#### [1] Power – The aff removes power from the sovereign by dividing decisions up among the population – this prevents a sovereign from being able to enact its will because it lacks the ability to enforce it onto others. That’s bad – the sovereign needs complete and absolute control to determine truth.

#### [2] Polarization – Compulsory voting prevents proper truth creation from the sovereign and leads to disagreements and a polarized public – this causes regress into the state of nature as there is no more unified truth because people feel entitled to their own ideas.

#### [3] There is an act-omission distinction – A. Otherwise there would be an infinite amount of obligations for a moral agent which would render action impossible B. It’s consequentialist and assumes we would know what happens when an agent doesn’t take an action, since there is nothing inherent to not acting. C. Incoherent – you wouldn’t blame someone for drowning baby in their pool equally as somebody who didn’t risk their life to save a drowning baby. That negates: the aff is a critique on the effects of not voting, but we cannot hold entities responsible for omissions of actions, which means the only offense can be derived from negating.

# Extensions/Frontlines

## A2 Fiat

#### [1] Fiat is a mechanism in the debate round to evaluate simulated consequences. Even if Hobbes is permissible in a fiatted world, the negative does not assume a notion of fiat – we are evaluating the morality in the real world in which all states were suddenly obligated to eliminate their nukes.

#### [2] Fiat does not entail roleplaying the state a) it’s impossible “become the state” and know exactly how its internal mechanisms operate – the best we can do is predict their reaction to the res being forced upon them b) unrealistic – you could fiat the state doing something absurd and assume the world would react normally, it’s more realistic to see how the state would respond like in real life

## A2 Hobbes Justifies Atrocities

#### [1] The sovereign solves – atrocities like slavery are the state of nature – Lincoln passing the Emancipation Proclamation is an example of the sovereign asserting its authority to decrease the state of nature and eliminate slavery – proves that the sovereign asserting itself is how we resolve atrocities

#### [2] One is not bound to the Hobbesian Commonwealth – if people really do desire, they can leave the social contract and enter the state of nature – the sovereign isn’t permanent

#### [3] State of Nature o/w – even if some sovereigns have caused atrocities, it’s a question of comparativity – the state of nature is infinitely worse, as there are literally no restraints to prevent these atrocities unlike the sovereign’s world – this means the sovereign still decreases this violence

#### [4] Hobbes says that you revolt against the sovereign if the sovereign has taken away someone’s capacity for self-defense – this resolves oppression because it is impermissible under the framework