#### The standard is maximizing expected well being. Prefer:

#### [1] State obligations – governments can only act on aggregates. Goodin 90.

Robert Goodin 90, [professor of philosophy at the Australian National University college of arts and social sciences], “The Utilitarian Response,” pgs 141-142, SHS ZS

My larger argument turns on the proposition that **there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable** for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and **their situations** that **make it** both more **necessary** and more desirable **for them to adopt** a more credible form of **utilitarianism**. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. **Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty**, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. **Public officials**, in contrast, **are relatively** poorly **informed as to the effects** that **their choices will have on individuals**, one by one. What **they typically** do **know** are generalities: **averages and aggregates**. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. **That is enough to allow** public **policy-makers to use** the **util**itarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules or conduct.

#### [2] Reductionism is true – Science proves no personal identity exists. That means there aren’t individual moral agents, so all we can focus on is the state of affairs – maximizing net pleasure. Parfit 84

[Derek Parfit, cool hair. “Reasons and Persons” 1984.] SHS ZS

Some recent medical cases provide striking evidence in favour of the Reductionist View. **Human beings have a lower brain and two upper hemispheres**, which are **connected by a bundle of fibres**. In treating a few people with severe epilepsy, **surgeons have cut these fibres**. The aim was to reduce the severity of epileptic fits, by confining their causes to a single hemisphere. This aim was achieved. But the operations had another unintended consequence. **The effect**, in the words of one surgeon, **was the creation of ‘two separate** spheres of **consciousness.**’ **This effect was revealed by** various **psychological tests**. These made use of two facts. We control our right arms with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. And what is in the right halves of our visual fields we see with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. When someone’s hemispheres have been disconnected, **psychologists can** thus **present to this person two different written questions** in the two halves of his visual field, **and can receive two different answers** written by this person’s two hands.

#### [3] Degrees of wrongness – only util can explain why certain actions are intrinsically worse than others, for example skipping a lunch date with your friend vs skipping taking your dying friend to the hospital. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### [4] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, util comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their own framework

#### [5] Desires are the only basis for ethics since good is only coherent in relation to what we desire—we couldn’t obtain evidence of goodness without desire.

McCord 1 [Geoffrey Sayre-McCord, (Philosophy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) "Mill's “Proof” Of The Principle of Utility: A More Than Half-Hearted Defense" Social Philosophy and Policy, 18(2), 330-360., 2001, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/mills-proof-of-the-principle-of-utility-a-more-than-halfhearted-defense/FDBE07CBE08D4E17523930BF8C7BBC32, DOA:9-5-2018 // WWBW] SHS ZS

How is the argument supposed to go, if not by way of these multiple fallacies? Let us start with the principle of evidence an d the analo g y Mill draws between visibility and desirability. W hat is the analogy supposed to be if not one that co m mits Mill to interpretin g "desirable" as "capable of bein g desired"? W hen it co mes to visibility, no less than desirability, Mill ex plicitly denies that a "proof" in the "ordinary acceptation of the term" can be offered.25 As he notes, "To be i ncapable of proof by reasoning is com mon to all first pri nciples; to t he first premises of our knowledge, as well as to those of our conduct."26 Nonet heless, support -- t hat is, evi dence, though not proof -- for **the first premises of our knowledge is provided by "our senses**, and our i nternal consciousness." Mill's suggestion is that, when it comes to the first principles of conduct, **desire play the same epistemic role that the senses play**, when it comes to t he first pri nciples of knowledge. To understand this role, it is i mportant to distinguish t he fact t hat someone is sensing something from what is sensed, which is a distinction mirrored i n t he contrast bet ween t he fact t hat someone is desiring something and what is desired. In the case of our senses, **the evidence we have for our judgments** concerning sensible qualities traces back to what **is sensed**, to the content of our sense-experience. Likewise, Mill is suggesting, in the case of value, **the evidence we have for our judgments** concerning value **traces back to what is desired**, to the content of our desires. Ultimately, **the grounds** we have **for holding the principles** we do **must**, he thinks, **be traced back to** our experience, to **our senses** and desires. Yet the evidence we have is not that we are sensing or desiring something but what it is t hat is sensed or desired.27 When we are having sensations of red, when what we are looking at appears red to us, we have evidence (al beit overrideable and defeasi ble evi dence) that the thing is red. Moreover, if things never looked red to us, we could never get evidence that things were red, and would indeed never have developed the concept of redness. Si milarl y, **when we are desiring things**, when what we are consi dering appears good to us, **we have evidence** (al beit overrideable and defeasi ble evi dence) **that the thing is good**. Moreover, if we never desired things, we could never get evidence that things were good, and would indeed never have developed the concept of value. 28 Recall that desire, for Mill, like taste, to uch, sig ht, an d smell, is a "passive sensibility." All of these, he holds, provide us with both the co ntent that makes thought possible and t he evi dence we have for t he concl usions t hat thought leads us to embrace. "**Desiring a thing" and "thinking of it as desirable** (u nless for the sake of its co nseq uences)" **are** treated b y Mill as **o ne an d the same**, just as seeing a thing as red and t hinking of it as red are one and t he same.29 Accordingl y, a person who desires x is a person who ipso facto sees x as desirable.30 Desiring something, for Mill, is a matter of seeing it under the guise of t he good.31 This means that it is important, in the co ntext of Mill's arg u ment, that one not think of desires as mere preferences or as just any sort of motive. They constitute, according to Mill, a distinctive subclass of our motivational states, and are distinguished (at least i n part) by t heir evaluative content.32 Thus, **Mill is neither assuming** nor arguing **that something is good because we desire it; rather, he is depen din g o n o ur desirin g it as establishin g that we see it as good**. Mill's aim is to take what people already, an d he thin ks inevitably, see as desirable and argue t hat those views co m mit them to the value of the general happiness (whet her or not t heir desires follow t he deliverances of t heir reason). Those who, like Mill, desire the general hap piness already hold the view that **the general happiness is desirable**. They accept the claim that Mill is trying to defend. As Mill knows, however, there are many who do not have this desire -- many who desire onl y t heir own happiness, and some who even desire t hat others suffer. These are t he people he sets out to persuade, along with others who are more generous and benevolent, but who nonet heless do not see hap piness as desirable, an d the o nly thin g desirable, as an en d. Mill's arg u ment is directed at convincing t hem all -- whether t heir desires follow or not -- t hat they have grounds for, and are in fact already com mitted to, regarding the happiness of others as val uable as an end. At the same time, while desirin g so methin g is a matter of seein g it as good, one could, on Mill's view, believe that something is good without desiring it, just as one can believe something is red without seeing it as red. W hile desire is supposed to be t he fundamental source of our concept of, and evi dence for, desirability, once the concept is in place there are contexts in which we will have reason to t hink it applies even when t he corresponding sensi ble experience is lackin g. In deed, in Chapter IV, Mill is co ncerned not with generatin g a desire but with justifying t he belief t hat happiness is desirable, and t he onl y thing desirable, as an end, and so concerned with defending t he standard for determining what should be desired.33 Mill recognizes that whatever argument he might hope to offer will need to appeal to evaluative claims people already accept (since he takes to heart Hume's caution concerning i nferring an 'ought' from an 'is').34 The claim Mill thinks he can appeal to -- t hat one's own happiness is a good (i.e. desirable) -- is something licensed as available by people desiring t heir own happiness. Yet he is not supposing here t hat t he fact t hat t hey desire t heir own happiness, or anything else, is proof t hat it is desirable, just as he would not suppose that the fact that so meone sees so methin g as red is proof that it is. Rather, he is supposing t hat if people desire t heir own happiness, or see something as red, one can rel y on t hem having available, as a premise for further argument, the claim that their own happiness is desirable or t hat t he t hing is red (at least absent contrary evidence).35 As he puts it in t he t hird paragraph, "If t he end which t he utilitarian doctrine proposes to itself were not, in theory and in practice, acknowledged to be an end nothing could ever convince any person t hat it was so." Thus, in appealing to t he analogy bet ween judgments of sensi ble qualities and judgments of value, Mill is not trading on an ambiguity, nor does his argument here involve i dentifying being desirable with being desired or assu min g that "desirable" means "desired." He is instead relyin g co nsistently on an empiricist account of concepts and their application -- on a view according to which we have the concepts, evidence, and knowledge we do only thanks to our having experiences of a certain sort. **In the absence of the relevant experiences**, he holds (with other empiricists), **we would** not only **lack the required evidence for our judgments**, we would lack the capacity to make the judgments in the first place. In the presence of the relevant experiences, though, we have both the concepts and the required evidence -- "not onl y all t he proof which the case ad mits of, b ut all which it is possible to req uire."36

#### [6] Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority. Bostrom 12 [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)] SHS ZS These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### [7] No act omission distinction---choosing to omit is an act itself – people psychologically decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### [8] Ground & Clash- every argument has a weighable util impact if you explain why it causes pain or pleasure – other frameworks are narrowly designed to exclude offense.

#### [9] Research skills and real world – allows us to cut cards on the most recent events and use cost benefit analysis – this is proven since most phil cases are analytics and the contentions are a couple cards.