# 1AR – AT Util NC

### 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.”