First off – framework

The role of the ballot is to evaluate the **desirability** of a topical affirmative advocacy, not to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution.

**First**, Offense/defense is most fair because it gives reciprocal burdens to both sides instead of allowing the aff to moot the NC by denying the many assumptions it is grounded on, such as the existence of morality.

**Second**, Offense/defense is most educational because it deals with how philosophy is actually applied to the real world, i.e. as a guide for action instead of a pointless thought experiment.

**Third,** “Resolved” means “firmly determined to do something.” Thus, he needs to defend a topical action. Simply proving the truth of the statement **following** “Resolved” is not sufficient because it does not show resolve to take that action. Textuality comes first because consistency with the text of the resolution is the only non-arbitrary basis for determining the better debater. Also, textuality link turns other theory standards because it is the basis for claims to predictability and ground.

Fairness comes first because it is a gateway issue to determining the better debater.

Next off – the ethical framework

The **value** is **morality**. Only util gives all people equal respect.

Professor Eric **Rakowski** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

On one side, it presses toward the consequentialist view that individuals' status as moral equals requires that the number of people kept alive [life] be maximized. Only in this way, the thought runs, can we give due weight to the fundamental equality of persons; to **allow more deaths when we can ensure fewer is to treat some** people **as less valuable than others.** Further, **killing some to save others**, or letting some die for that purpose, **does not entail that those who are killed** or left to their fate **are** being **used merely as means** to the well-being of others, as would be true if they were slain or left to drown merely to please people who would live anyway. They do, of course, in some cases serve as means. But they do not act merely as means. Those who die are no less ends than those who live. **It is because they are** also **no more ends than others** whose lives are in the balance **that [one]** an impartial decision-maker **must** choose to **save the more numerous group, even if she must kill to do so.**

Therefore the **standard** is **maximizing happiness**. My standard controls the link to any practical reason or contract frameworks because rational agents would consent to a universal law to maximize utility to increase the chance of their own interests being satisfied.

Finally, no act-omission distinction means side-constraints reduce to util.



Alan **Gewirth 82** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**To be responsible for inflicting** lethal **harms, a person need not intend or desire to produce such harms**, either as an end or a means. **It is sufficient if the harms come about as an unintended but foreseeable** and controllable **effect of what he does. For since he knows** or has good reasons to believe **what** **actions** or policies under his control **will lead to the harms in question he can control whether the harms will occur**, so that it is within his power to prevent or at least lessen the probability of their occurrence by ceasing to engage in these actions. Thus, just as all persons have the right to informed control, so far as possible, over the conditions relevant to their incurring cancer and other serious harms, so the causal and moral responsibility for inflicting cancer can be attributed to persons who have informed control over other persons’ suffering the lethal harms of cancer.

Next off – the counterplan

The counterplan is this collage.

Resolved:



The counter-plan depicts a victim of domestic violence killing her abuser.

The counter-plan is competitive because the neg does not advocate the words used in the resolution but instead uses pictures to describe the same action. Any permutation still links to the net benefit.

The counter-plan solves 100% of the aff because it depicts the same action the affirmative advocates while avoiding the rhetoric used.

The net benefit is the **Environment**

Reliance on the alphabet for communication suppresses right-brain thought.

Neurosurgeon Leonard **Shlain 98** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

Aside from the obvious benefits that derived from their ease of use, alphabets produced a subtle change in cognition that redirected human thinking. For sophisticated neurolinguistic reasons the early practitioners could not have known, alphabets reinforced only half of the dual strategy that humans had evolved to survive. As we have seen, this strategy had three components: left brain/right brain, cone/rod, and right hand/left hand. Each tripartite half of this duality perceived and reacted to the world in a different way; a unified response emerged only when both complementary halves were used. **All forms of writing increase the left brain's dominance over the right.** As civilization progressed from image-based communication, such as pictographs and hieroglyphs, to non-iconic forms, such as cuneiform, written communication became more left-brain oriented. **An alphabet, being the most abstract form of writing, enhances left-brain values the most.** Each letter stands only for a singular sound; meaning emerges only when letters are strung together in a row. Unlike icons, which often evolved from images of things, an alphabetic word bears no resemblance to the object or action it symbolizes. Nowhere in the word dog can we discern a dog. There remain some trace correlations, as with the word water, which begins with the letter w. The ancient Egyptians created a hieroglyph for water that resembles our letter w and to indicate water on a map, or in a cartoon, we still use a series of wavy lines. This iconic symbol for water became the alphabetic letter w and is a component of many words associated with the liquid state of matter (e.g., wet, wave, wash, wade, wallow, winnow, womb, and woman). However, we no longer connect the letter w with water directly. When we see w in print as part of a word, the brain issues complex directions that instruct the lips to purse so that we can pronounce the phonetic sound of w. **Alphabets have long divorced themselves from the images of concrete things.** They have washed out of the written language iconic patterns that were apparent in earlier forms of writing. All that remains are letters that stand starkly like rows of pier posts at ebb tide. The versatility of letters becomes evident when they are placed in regular, linear, consensually agreed upon arrangements. Aligning three letters to spell d-o-g results in the English reader instantly seeing a dog in the mind's eye. Yet the mental image of a dog was once attached only to a real dog, or to the invisible spoken word, dog. The induction of any member of society (usually a young child) into alphabet arcana numbs her to the fact that she supplants all-at-once gestalt perception with a new, unnatural, highly abstract one-at-a-time cognition. **In this fashion, alphabets subliminally elevated**, within each alphabet user, **the influence of the left hemisphere at the expense of the right.**

Right-brain thought is key to preserve the ecosystem. Left-brain dominance must be challenged to avoid extinction. **Reuther 89** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

The notion of dominating the universe from a position of autonomy is an illusion of alienated consciousness. **We have only two** real **options:** either to learn to use our intelligence to **become servants of** the survival and cultivation of **nature or** to **lose our own life-support system in a**n increasingly **poisoned earth.** This conversion of our intelligence to the earth will demand a new form of human intelligence. **The dominant** white western **male rationality has been based on** linear, **dichotomized** thought **patterns** that divide reality into dualism: **one is good and the other bad,** one superior and the other inferior, **one should dominate and the other should be** eliminated or **suppressed. The biological base of these patterns is specialization in left-brain, rational functions in a way that suppresses the right-brain, relational sense.** This one-sided brain development seems more dominant in males than in females, possibly because of later verbal development in males. This biological tendency has been exaggerated by socialization into dominant and subordinate social roles. Dominant social roles exaggerate linear, dichotomized thinking and prevent the development of culture that would correct this bias by integrating the relational side. Women and other subordinate groups, moreover, have had their rational capacities suppressed through denial of education and leadership experience and so tend to be perceived as having primarily intuitive and affective patterns of thought. Thus socialization in power and powerlessness distorts integration further and creates what appears to be dichotomized personality cultures of men and women, that is, masculinity and femininity. What we must now realize is that the patterns of rationality of **left-brain specialization** are, in many ways, ecologically dysfunctional. Far from this rationality being the mental counterpart of "natural law," it **screens out much of reality as "irrelevant" to science** and reduces scientific knowledge to a narrow spectrum fitted to dominance and control. **But the systems it sets up are ecologically dysfunctional because they fail to see** the **larger relational patterns** within which particular "facts" stand. This rationality tends toward monolithic systems of use of nature. Linear thinking, for example, directs agriculture, or even decorative planting, toward long rows of the same plant. This magnifies the plants' vulnerability to disease. Humans then compensate with chemical sprays, which in turn send a ripple effect of poisons through the whole ecological system. Nature, by contrast, diffuses and intersperses plants, so that each balances and corrects the vulnerabilities of the other. The inability to see the forest for the trees is typical of linear thinking. Linear thinking simplifies, dichotomizes, focuses on parts, and fails to see the larger relationality and interdependence. Ecological thinking demands a different kind of rationality, one that integrates left-brain linear thought and right-brain spatial and relational thought. **One has to disrupt the linear concept** of order **to create a different** kind of **order** that is truly **the way nature "orders,"** that is, balances and harmonizes, but that appears very "disorderly" to the linear, rational mind.

Any risk of extinction comes first. Nick **Bostrom 11**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Even if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we find that **the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of 1018 human lives.  This implies that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives.  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or **1052 lives** of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  **Even if we give this** allegedly **lower bound** on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization **a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percent**age point **is worth a hundred billion times** as much as **a billion human lives.**

Next off – prison disad

Women who kill their abusers go to prison for a long time. **Lowry 11**[[6]](#footnote-6)

But while I might cheer on the fictional Janice Soprano as she murders the fictional Richie Aprile, I would never advocate for women who have been abused to take such action in real life. There are obvious moral reasons for this, but there are practical reasons as well. After shooting Richie, Janice called her mob boss brother Tony Soprano to take care of cleaning up the mess and disposing of the body. And so Janice experienced no consequences from the murder except for her own grief. Not so for real-life victims of domestic violence who murder their abusers. The **[a] study** "Convicted Survivors: The Imprisonment of Battered Women Who Kill" by Elizabeth Ann Dermody Leonard **demonstrates that 95.4 percent of battered women who kill their abusers are convicted of either first or second-degree murder and sentenced to lengthy prison terms.** Nearly all abused inmates will be released back into their communities without needed support.

Prison outweighs domestic violence for two reasons:

1. **Magnitude** – women in prison have fewer liberties and are confined for a longer amount of time.

2. **Reversibility** – abuse victims can rectify abuse through alternate means later on, but there is no way to solve a life sentence in prison.

Prison turns the case. Women are abused worse in prison and have no recourse.

**Lind 2k**[[7]](#footnote-7)

As Owen notes, **Human Rights Watch** recently **focused on the sexual abuse of women in prison.** Reviewing the evidence in an array of states, the organization **[It] reported that** "our findings indicate that being a woman in U.S. state prisons can be a terrifying experience." **For all too many women in US prisons**, Human Rights Watch concluded, **there is *no* escape from one's abuser. There are ineffectual grievance procedures,** there is **a lack of employee accountability, and** there is **little to no public concern about the problem.**

**AT AC**

Self-defense justifies murder as excusable, not permissible. The death is still a moral harm. We merely blame the abuser for the death and *excuse* the victim for the role he plays.

Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oregon Cheney **Ryan** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

This case helps us put the self-defense situation in perspective, since Victim’s position seems to be analogous to the mayor’s. **When Aggressor threatens Victim, his actions have created a situation in which someone’s life will be lost** (he hopes Victim’s) Victim is not responsible for this situation, it is merely presented to him. But given it, Victim can determine whose life is lost, and in choosing to defend himself Victim determines that it will be Aggressor’s life. In this sense the **true responsibility for the taking of life rests not with Victim, for Aggressor’s actions have made this inevitable.** In pointing this out, **the appeal to self-defense shows that the real blame for Aggressor’s losing his life rests with Aggressor himself.** We must still explain why Victim is justified in choosing to save his own life over Aggressor’s, but first let me consider some respects in which this approach to self-defense is illuminating. It reveals, I think, the true asymmetry of the self-defense situation. Victim decides which life is lost, and while he may decide incorrectly, his crime in doing so is infinitely less than the malicious Aggressor’s. Interestingly enough, **it is a mistake** on this view **to speak of a right to self-defense, for if the appeal to self-defense serves to absolve one of** the **responsibility for taking** hum**a**n **life**, as I have suggested, **it cannot at the same time give one the right to take another’s life** (except, perhaps, in the weaker Hohfeldian sense of liberty). This approach also reconfirms earlier intuitions about the relevance, or rather irrelevance, of Aggressor’s right to life. Think of it this way: when the mayor is asked to account for the killing of the resistance fighter he chose to kill, must he show that that person forfeited his right to life? Perhaps his choice would be easier if this could be shown, but the propriety of his action does not rest on it. In this same sense, the propriety of Victim’s actions need not presume any forfeit on Aggressor’s part.

The most comprehensive and recent studies conclude that domestic violence is mutual.

**Straus 2012** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

Graham-Kevan’s paper fully documents overwhelming evidence that the “patriarchal dominance” theory of partner violence (PV from here on) explains only a small part of PV. Moreover, more such evidence is rapidly emerging. To take just one recent example, **analyses of data from 32 nations** in the International Dating Violence Study (Straus, 2007) Straus and International Dating Violence Research Consortium 2004) **found** about **equal perpetration rates and a predominance of mutual violence in all 32 samples, including non-western nations.**

Studies prove that women do not act on the motive of self-defense. The studies that conclude aff actually have data that concludes neg. They just mis-interpret their results because of ideological bias.

**Straus 2012** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

The widely acclaimed and influential World Health Organization report on domestic violence (Krug et al. 2002) reports that “Where violence by women occurs it is more likely to be in the form of self defense. (32, 37, 38).” This is selective citation because almost **all studies that have compared men and women find about equal rates of self-defense.** Perhaps even worse, **none of the three [widely acclaimed] studies** cited **provide evidence supporting [self-defense]** the quoted sentence. Study #32 (**Saunders** 1986) **shows that** 31% of minor violence and **39% of severe [violence] was in self defense, i.e., about two-thirds of female** perpetrated PV **[violence] was not in self defense.** Study #37 (**DeKeseredy** et al. 1997) **found that only 7% of women said their violence was in self defense.** Study #38 (Johnson and Ferraro 2000) is a review paper that has no original data. It cites #32 and #37, neither of which supports the claim.

1. Rakowski, Eric. “Taking and Saving Lives,” Columbia Law Review, Vol. 93, No. 5, (Jun., 1993), pp. 1063-1156. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1122960> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Gewirth (Department of Philosophy, Univ. of Chicago) 82 Alan, Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications pg 183 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Dr. Leonard Shlain is a neurosurgeon at California-Pacific Medical Center and contributor to The Encyclopedia of Creativity, The Alphabet Versus The Goddess: The Conflict Between Word and Image, 1998, pg. 66-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Rosemary Radford Reuther, Professor of Feminist Theology at Pacific School of Religion, 1989, “Toward an Ecological-Feminist Theology of Nature” in Healing the Wounds: the Promise of Ecofeminism ed. Judith Plant p. 147-150 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Nick Bostrom (Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School & Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford), “THE CONCEPT OF EXISTENTIAL RISK”, 2011

   <http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Hit Her Once, She'll Shoot You Dead: Did Janice Soprano Have It Right? Mary Pauline Lowry Posted: 09/19/11 11:42 AM ET [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. From Bad to Worse Review of Harsh Punishment: International Experiences of Women's Imprisonment by Meda Chesney-Lind The Women's Review of Books, Vol. 17, No. 5 (Feb., 2000), p. 7 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Ryan, Cheney C. [Prof. of Philosophy, University of Oregon], “Self-Defense, Pacifism, and the possibility of Killing,” *Ethics*, Vol. 93, (Apr., 1983), pp. 508-524, 515-516 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Straus, Murray. Professor of Sociology and Co-Director Family Research Laboratory University of New Hampshire. “How feminists corrupt DV research.” feb 4 2012. <http://www.avoiceformen.com/feminism/how-feminists-corrupt-dv-research/> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Straus, Murray. Professor of Sociology and Co-Director Family Research Laboratory University of New Hampshire. “How feminists corrupt DV research.” feb 4 2012. <http://www.avoiceformen.com/feminism/how-feminists-corrupt-dv-research/> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)