All ethical knowledge must be a priori since rational freedom can only be exercised non-observationally. Kant:  
*Immanuel Kant, the only philosopher the common man ever recognizes, “Critique of Pure Reason”*

**Because** this **empirical character** itself **must be drawn from appearances as effect**, and from the rule which experience provides, **all the actions of the human being in appearance are determined** in accord with the order of nature **by his empirical character** and the other cooperating causes; **and if we could investigate** all **the appearances of his power of choice down to their basis, then there would be no human action that we could not predict with certainty, and recognize as necessary given its preceding conditions. Thus[,] in regard to this empirical character[,] there is no freedom**, and according to this character we can consider the human being solely by observing, and, as happens in anthropology, by trying to investigate the moving causes of his actions physiologically.

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:  
**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, 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.**

Calculations from desire do not account for the unity of action, as I should do X because the end state at a certain time speaks in favor of doing it. This means changeable end states are morally irrelevant as reasons to act. Rodl 2:  
**Rodl II** (Rödl, Sebastian. Self-Consciousness, Harvard University Press, 2000)

**Calculations from desire does not yield a premise for instrumental reasoning because its conclusion represents a changeable state**, while an instrumental reasoning proceeds from athought 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.**

Calculations from desires that reference time cannot account for the unity of action because there is no constant intention linking the parts of an action together. Rodl 3:  
**Rodl II** (Rödl, Sebastian. Self-Consciousness, Harvard University Press, 2000)

**An intention to do A2 cannot rest on a judgment that desires earlier were best served by doing B. It can rest only on a judgment that doing B is best given all desires now**. If appetite unified by a calculation is the order of practical reason, then she who conforms to it forms two intentions to do B: one is the ground of her intention to take the first step and do A1, another the ground of her intention to take the second step and do A2. One might think that there are not two intentions, but one that remains, if the desires on which the intention is based remains. But this is wrong. The ground of an intention is a judgment that desires, all in all, speak 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 things are present at t1 and t2, no matter whether it was probably or even necessary that the same things would be present. On Davidson;s account, the same holds true of all-out judgments, or intentions, as their basis is an all-things considered judgment: **judging all out at t1 to do B and judging all out at t2 to do B are different judgments, regardless of whether the desires changed in the meantime,** whether it was unlikely or even impossible that they would change.

Any conception of action that relies on time as a concept would be irrational. Folger:

Folger (Time Folger, “Time May Not Exist,” Discover, June 2007)

**[Below] the Planck scale**, where even attoseconds drag by like eons. It marks the edge of known physics, a region where distances and intervals are so short that the very **concepts of time** and space start to **break down**. Planck time—the smallest unit of time that has any physical meaning—is 10-43 second, less than a trillionth of a trillionth of an attosecond. Beyond that? Tempus incognito. At least for now. Efforts to understand time below the Planck scale have led to an exceedingly strange juncture in physics. The problem, in brief, is that Time may not exist at the most fundamental level of physical reality. If so, then what is time? And why is it so obviously and tyrannically omnipresent in our own experience? “The meaning of time has become terribly problematic in contemporary physics,” says Simon Saunders, a philosopher of physics at the University of Oxford. “The situation is so uncomfortable that by far the best thing to do is declare oneself an agnostic.” The trouble with time started a century ago, when **Einstein’s special and general theories of relativity demolished the idea of time as a universal constant**. One consequence is that **the past, present, and future are not absolutes**. Einstein’s theories also opened a rift in physics because the rules of general relativity (which describe gravity and the large-scale structure of the cosmos) seem incompatible with those of quantum physics (which govern the realm of the tiny). Some four decades ago, the renowned physicist John Wheeler, then at Princeton, and the late Bryce DeWitt, then at the University of North Carolina, developed an extraordinary equation that provides a possible framework for unifying relativity and quantum mechanics. But the Wheeler-­DeWitt equation has always been controversial, in part because it adds yet another, even more baffling twist to our understanding of time. “One finds **[for example] time just disappears from the Wheeler-DeWitt equation [a fundamental equation of quantum physics]** ,” says Carlo Rovelli, a physicist at the University of the Mediterranean in Marseille, France. “It is an issue that many theorists have puzzled about. It may be that the best way to think about quantum reality is to give up the notion of time—**that [also] the fundamental description of the universe must be timeless.**” No one has yet succeeded in using the Wheeler-DeWitt equation to integrate quantum theory with general relativity. Nevertheless, a sizable minority of physicists, Rovelli included, believe that any successful merger of the two great masterpieces of 20th-century physics will inevitably describe a universe in which, ultimately, there is no time. The possibility that time may not exist is known among physicists as the “problem of time.” It may be the biggest, but it is far from the only temporal conundrum. Vying for second place is this strange fact: The laws of physics don’t explain why time always points to the future. All the laws—whether Newton’s, Einstein’s, or the quirky quantum rules—would work equally well if time ran backward. As far as we can tell, though, time is a one-way process; it never reverses, even though no laws restrict it. “It’s quite mysterious why we have such an obvious arrow of time,” says Seth Lloyd, a quantum mechanical engineer at MIT. (When I ask him what time it is, he answers, “Beats me. Are we done?”) “The usual explanation of this is that in order to specify what happens to a system, you not only have to specify the physical laws, but you have to specify some initial or final condition.” The mother of all initial conditions, Lloyd says, was the Big Bang. Physicists believe that the universe started as a very simple, extremely compact ball of energy. Although the laws of physics themselves don’t provide for an arrow of time, the ongoing expansion of the universe does. As the universe expands, it becomes ever more complex and disorderly. The growing disorder—physicists call it an increase in entropy—is driven by the expansion of the universe, which may be the origin of what we think of as the ceaseless forward march of time. **[as] time**, in this view, **is not something that exists apart from the universe**. There is no clock ticking outside the cosmos. Most of us tend to think of time the way Newton did: “Absolute, true and mathematical time, of itself, and from its own nature, flows equably, without regard to anything external.” But as Einstein proved, time is part of the fabric of the universe. Contrary to what Newton believed, our ordinary clocks don’t measure something that’s independent of the universe. In fact, says Lloyd, clocks don’t really measure time at all. “I recently went to the National Institute of Standards and Technology in Boulder,” says Lloyd. (NIST is the government lab that houses the atomic clock that standardizes time for the nation.) “I said something like, ‘Your clocks measure time very accurately.’ They told me, ‘Our clocks do not measure time.’ I thought, Wow, that’s very humble of these guys. But they said, ‘No, time is defined to be what our clocks measure.’ Which is true. They define the time standards for the globe: **[but] is defined by the number of clicks of [a] clocks [and is not an independently functioning variable**].” Rovelli, the advocate of a timeless universe, says the NIST timekeepers have it right. Moreover, their point of view is consistent with the Wheeler-DeWitt equation. “We never really see time,” he says. “We see only clocks. If you say this object moves, what you really mean is that this object is here when the hand of your clock is here, and so on. We say we measure time with clocks, but we see only the hands of the clocks, not time itself. And the hands of a clock are a physical variable like any other. So in a sense we cheat because what we really observe are physical variables as a function of other physical variables, but we represent that as if everything is evolving in time. “What happens with the Wheeler-DeWitt equation is that we have to stop playing this game. Instead of introducing this fictitious variable—time, which itself is not observable—we should just describe how the variables are related to one another. The question is, Is time a fundamental property of reality or just the macroscopic appearance of things? I would say **it’s only a macroscopic effect**. It’s something **that emerges only for big things.”**

Thus, I contend that the use of deadly force is predicated on a conception of time.

1. You can only carry out the action of deadly force for a finite amount of time, meaning the ends of deadly force are not infinite ends. Something like agency would come prior since agency can always be acted on indefinitely since it is the end state-independent determination of reason.

2. The topic says the deadly force is used only as a response to repeated domestic violence. Ends that are only responsive to certain states of affairs are predicated on time since those states of affairs are able to change.

3. The act of using lethal force is finite in nature, as once the victim is dead the act has ended. Self-defense would not be an infinite end because it only exists as long as there is an abuser.