# Contracts NC

## NC

### Framework

#### Permissibility and Presumption flow neg: A) If I know nothing about P, under a world where presumption flowed aff, I would presume both P and not P true without positive justification causing a contradiction B) Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. C) the resolution is an ought not statement, so proving permissibility would deny it.

#### The purpose of ethics is not only to identify what is good, but also to motivate agents to achieve it. Thus, absent being motivated, agents have no reason to do what is right and philosophy collapses to skepticism.

#### However, when confronted with a moral obligation, individuals can always just infinitely ask “why should I be moral” or “why should I do this”, making it impossible to force them to act. This has two implications: First, Obligations from external sources fail because their source of authority is infinitely questionable (IE the legitimacy of the government). And second, it is insufficient for an internal will to just establish something as a bad action, since the subject can just choose to be bad without consequence (Ie people murder all the time even though it’s not universizable).

#### Thus the only way for ethics to be motivational is for agents to internally want to follow the rules. This solves the “why should I” question, since agents themselves to desire to be moral.

#### But this creates another problem for ethics: if agents can only be motivated by their own desires and each agent has a different desire, this creates an state of unlimited permissibility where each acts only on what is right for them and creates their own ethical truth.

#### Since we cannot control how other individuals act, the only solution to this is a system of contracts, where individuals agree to mutually restrain themselves from not taking certain actions. This solves the problem of self-interest, since by desiring to act on my own system of morality, I presuppose my ability to take that action, meaning it is in my interest to prevent other people from stopping me

#### Thus the standard is consistency with a system of mutual self restraint: This entails that individuals achieve morality by creating contracts, in order to ensure mutual noninterference. Under the standard its illogical to violate a contract since it A) it’s the only stable system of morality and B) the only thing stopping an agent from infringing on your ends. Prefer the standard:

#### [1] There is no universal moral truth every agent can access: A) Epistemology we don’t have a concrete way to detect or verify values, this empirically proven by disagreement B) Logic: if good meant X, then X things are good would be equivalent to X things are X producing a tautology C) Justification only operates within a conceptual framework, but that framework contextualizes what counts as justification, so it’s impossible to compare between competing options.

#### [2] Contracts are valid independent of their moral value. Since there is no objective way to determine what a good or bad contract is, this entails that either all contracts are binding or none are.

### Offense

#### I contend that contracts negate:

#### [1] The agreement to provide military aid functions as a contract between the United States an authoritarian regimes, where we give them goods in exchange for particular functions. Abolishing military aid constitutes a violation of that contract as they have geopolitically oriented themselves in a particular way for us, and we have failed to fulfill our end of the bargain.

#### [2]
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### Extension