To negate means “**to deny the truth of**” which implies **a)** that you presume neg since negating has no positive connotation and permissibility negates and **b)** that indicting assumptions negates since it denies the fact that the resolution can be true by making it logically incoherent*.*

The **standard** is **rejecting totalization**. Moral systems must start with a pre-reflexive engagement with the other. My experience of the world demonstrates the limits to my own cognition, so claiming to speak for the other cannot be justified, even conceptually. **Blum[[1]](#footnote-1)**

The experience of transcendence is, at bottom, the experience of having my interiority brought into question ontologically, epistemologically, and morally. Ontologically, I find that I am not the only possible source of reality. Although I am capable of creating, I experience a presence within the world that so overflows and escapes from my experience that I could not have created it. Epistemologically, I find that my perspective on the world is not the only possible [one] perspective. There is a point of view that I can never occupy, because the only way of defining it relative to my point of view is that it is not mine. Because the Other so radically escapes my cognition, it simultaneously threatens my freedom (to such a degree that I am inclined to murder) and awakens my desire (to such a degree that I am inclined to awe, and even to worship). The Other is at once the mysterium tremendum and the mysterium fascinans. If morality is understood as arising in the context of sociation, then the insight that the limits of my understanding become apparent precisely in this context would seem necessarily to have moral implications. Inasmuch as the Other fundamentally escapes my understanding, the forced totalization of the Other murder, in the extreme case is an imposition of my will for which a justification is, in principle, unavailable. As Levinas puts it, murder is impossible- not physically speaking, of course, but morally speaking (Levinas 1961/1969, 198-99). If I kill someone, it is fundamentally because I wish to be rid of the limits that are imposed by his or her presence. The cognitive and moral limits that are illuminated by the face, however, are not eliminated by removing the face from the purview of sensibility. The infinite distance between myself and the Other, once opened in my experience by the Other's epiphany, will remain open. My responsibility, once illuminated, is seen as a part of what I am. The commandment that was initially inscribed on the face of the Other is now inscribed on the heart of the same.19 "To be an I means . . . not to be able to escape responsibility. . . . The uniqueness of the I is the fact that no one can answer for me"(97).

And, outweighs other framework warrants: I deny the empirical supposition that the other is like yourself, so they can’t justify the generalization of particular reasons in an ethical context. I contest a critical presupposition of their framework link chain.

And, the NC precludes: moral cognition is a mental process, but ideas don’t directly refer directly to anything in external world. Totalization severs the link between your idea and an external person, so it could not be endorsed by an ethical theory. **Beavers[[2]](#footnote-2)**

If we can accept this notion that ideas are inventions of the mind, that ideas are, when it comes down to it, only interpretations of something, and if ethics, in fact, is taken to refer to real other persons who exist apart from my interpretations, then we are up against a problem: there is no way in which ideas, on the current model, refer to independently existing other persons, and as such, ideas cannot be used to found an ethics. There can be no pure practical reason until after contact with the other is established. Given this view towards ideas, then, anytime I take the person in my idea to be the real person, I have closed off contact with the real person; I have cut off the connection with the other that is necessary if ethics is to refer to real other people. This is a central violence to the other that denies the other his/her own autonomy. Levinas calls this violence "totalization" and it occurs whenever I limit the other to a set of rational categories, be they racial, sexual, or otherwise. Indeed, it occurs whenever I already know what the other is about before the other has spoken. That is, it is the inscription of the other in the same. If ethics presupposes the real other person, then such totalization will, in itself, be unethical.

Also means it’s a presupposition of the AC framework, so I don’t need to win that the AC ethical theory is false to preclude, I just need to extend an framework warrant, since their framework is not competitive with mine.

1. The establishment of any threshold of “necessity” by a living wage violates the standard – defines necessity, security and comfort for the other universally. **Rorem[[3]](#footnote-3)**
   1. The definition of “living wage” is difficult to nail down. In 2012, members of the University of Virginia community issued a living wage demand of $13.00 per hour for University employees, to be adjusted yearly. Amy Glasmeier, the researcher behind the MIT Living Wage Calculator, defines living wage as “just enough to pay bills for the necessities of life and not fall behind”. The Economic Policy Institute built its Family Budget Calculator to determine “the income a family needs in order to attain a secure yet modest living standard,” while the Center for Women’s Welfare Self-Sufficiency Standard calculates “the amount of income necessary to meet basic needs (including taxes) without public assistance…and without private/informal assistance”. What is a “living wage”? Though they may appear under different names, each of the above represents an attempt to define an hourly wage or yearly income that will allow households to meet basic needs. The effort to establish a “living wage” is made difficult because security and comfort are both subjectively, and relatively, defined. In the US and other developed countries, living wage calculations tend to reflect households’ needs for shelter, food, clothing, transportation, health care, and taxes, as well as some small budget for “other”. While there are good sources of consumer data to use, researchers must make some decisions about what constitutes “just enough” or a “secure but modest” lifestyle. Even when setting explicit income minimums, as in the case of the Self-Sufficiency Standard, researchers must begin with certain assumptions.
2. LW enforces concept of good life - i.e. one in which you possess such a wage. The idea that there is one such “good life” makes it impossible for people to self actualize and come to their own understanding of what is good for them.
3. Living Wage mandates the conditions of fair contract between two parties. Free contract is free to correct self actualization- or deciding what is good for oneself because it allows us to leverage our own resources to obtain what we see as “good” or “better”. Limiting of free contract reinforces the ideals of the government as a guide to what people ought to value and limits the possibility of coming to these conclusions independently; and the government should not control and totalize all notions of the what people should be looking for in a contract.

1. Blum, Peter C. "Overcoming Relativism? Levinas's Return to Platonism." Journal of Religious Ethics 28.1 (2000): 91-117. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Beavers, Anthony. "Introducing Levinas to undergraduate philosophers." Colloquy paper, Undergraduate Philosophy Association, University of Texas. Austin (1990). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Annie Rorem [Policy Associate for the Demographics Research Group at the University of Virginia Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service. She has a background in both theoretical mathematics and public policy, and conducts research on education and labor force participation with a particular interest in gender], “Modest, secure, or self-sufficient? Living wage in Virginia.” (December 2, 2014) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)