Moral theories must judge action as a unified whole.  If they did not, the separate steps in the chain of action would not be justified.  In the process of doing a whole action, the steps are not disconnected, but rather so connected that one interruption would disrupt the entire action. **Rodl 1,** Rodl I (Rödl, Sebastian. Self-Consciousness, Harvard University Press, 2000)

**Suppose** I walked from a to c, via b.  It may be that **I decided to walk from a to b, and, having got there, [then] decided to walk from b to c.  Or I decided to walk from a to c, and did**.  In the former case, I was walking from a to b, and then I was walking from b to c.  But **only in the latter case**, not in the former, **was I walking from a to c.  As a movement, an action is not an aggregate, but a unity of phases.**

**This understanding is necessary for action formation and makes judgements based on desire incoherent that requires atemporal judgements.**

**Rodl[[1]](#footnote-1) 2,**

**Calculations from desire does not yield a premise for instrumental reasoning because its conclusion represents a changeable state**, while an instrumental reasoning proceeds from a thought that represents something with the temporality of a movement. But the instrumental syllogism is a necessary form of practical reasoning, for practical reasoning arrives at a thought on which a movement may rest. And if a movement rests on thought, then the unity of its phases, which constitutes it as a movement, must rest on thought. So it does if I reason from the same thought now, “I want to do B. So let me do [X]”, and then, “I want to do B. So let me do [Y]”, and so on. As “I want to do B” expresses the same thought all the while that I am doing B and until I have done it, the unity of the phases of my doing B consists in the fact that they all hang on that thought. By contrast, if “I want to do B” represented a changeable state I would not reason from the same thought, now to doing A1, and then to doing A2. In consequence, my doing A1 and my doing A2 would bear no unity. These would not be phases of a movement, and I would not, in doing A1 and A2, be doing B.[…]**The ground of an intention is a judgment that** desires, all in all, **speak[s] in favor of doing A. As desires come and go, that judgment contains a reference to a time. It is a judgment that desires now present** all in all speak **in favor of doing A. Such a judgment made at T1  bears no logical connection with the judgment expressed by the same words at T2, no matter whether the same thingsare present at T1 and T2, no matter whether it was probably or even necessary that the same things would be present.**

**Action theory comes first under your ROB –**

**1. States of affairs only care about ethical decision making insofar as there is an entity and an action that is coherent enough to achieve that normative end. Every decision made is an action, even inaction which means the NC is inescapable.**

**2. The AC framework collapses: a] Even if we were to compare worlds it would require the AC to defend a world in which an obligation is produced to create that state of affairs which means if I win the NC any world that is not the aff is a better one since we can create obligations b] To conceive yourself as the cause of your actions, an analysis of how one acts is a priori – otherwise we would never hold agents accountable.**

**3. A priori knowledge o/w under any fwk – a) a priori conditions are inescapable which means ignoring them for the sake of some end is cruel optimism b) comparing worlds means if you like one world better than the next you adopt it but if my world always exists it functions as a side-constraint**

**Now Negate – The resolution is not a unified action.**

**1. Oxford Dictionary defines state as “the particular condition that someone or something is in at a specific time.” A condition can’t possess nuclear weapons, so the actor cannot take the action.**

**2. Oxford Dictionary defines eliminate as “murder”, and it’s impossible to murder something that isn’t alive, so the action is impossible.**

**3. States cannot be an ethical agent – a) They are multiple different states with different policy implementations which means the action isn’t unified b) Aggregation fails since agential qualities are not additive – two circles combined do not make something more circular c) It’s impossible to verify the eliminate of nukes by other nations which means that it disincentivizes every agents, causing no action.**

**4. Unity of action in the resolution is impossible since a) It cannot create an atemporal obligation since it’s a finite action that can only be taken once and b) An infinite end cannot be generated from a maxim contingent upon particular circumstances.**

1. (Rödl, Sebastian. Self-Consciousness, Harvard University Press, 2000) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)