**Very allowing of forbidding victimless acts [for paternalistic reasons]**

**Very restrictive of forbidding victimless acts**

It is morally permissible for the law to forbid victimless acts when the act causes severe, permanent mental and physical damage (such as paralysis, CTE, or other debilitating damages) to the consenting party. Otherwise it is morally wrong.

It is morally permissible for the state to forbid victimless acts when the act is sufficiently harmful for the person committing it – otherwise, it is morally impermissible for the state to forbid victimless acts.

It is always morally wrong for the law to prohibit victimless acts. x6

It is morally permissible for the law to forbid victimless acts when it would be likely enough to ensue in current society and very consequential for a majority of people to commit said victimless act. Otherwise, it is morally wrong.

It is morally permissible for the law to forbid victimless acts if the act has destructive effects that undermine human rights/standards of living when committed by large amounts of the people. Otherwise it is morally wrong to forbid victimless acts.

It is morally wrong for the law to forbid victimless acts when [the enforcing the law causes too much of a financial burden on society]. Otherwise it is morally permissible.

It is morally permissible for the law to forbid victimless acts when the adverse effects of the act would lead to long-term degradation of society and its environment, or when the victimless act leads to a deterioration of societal moral standards. Otherwise it is morally wrong.

It is always morally permissible for the law to forbid victimless acts.

**Very allowing of forbidding victimless crimes**

**[for social benefits]**

*Types of Democratic Constitutionalism*

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the constitution when they are doing so to reflect the modern general public's viewpoint on how the constitution ought to look in modern society; otherwise, it is morally wrong.

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the Constitution when the judge applies modern contemporary values, as unbiased as possible, yet still allows their decision to be based upon the advancements and progress in society. Otherwise it is morally wrong.

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the Constitution when their interpretation aligns with contemporary values and the language is vague enough to have multiple meanings; otherwise, it is morally wrong.

*Types of Natural Law*

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret or change the ambiguous parts of the Constitution using the “natural law constitutionalism” perspective; otherwise it is morally wrong. x2

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the Constitution when the judge uses the Constitution and the precedent it sets only as a point of reference while accounting for modern values and present-day American realities of living, but ultimately striving to do what is morally obligatory even if is contrary to the literal words of the Constitution and/or unpopular and not in keeping with current sentiments; otherwise it is morally wrong.

*Types of Originalism*

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the Constitution when their interpretation [attempts to stay as true to the original meaning of the Constitution when the matter is explicitly or implicitly within the realms of the Constitution, and has done extensive research to ensure that the interpretation is historically accurate,] or [when the matter at hand is not addressed by or within the scope of the Constitution and the judge works to discover the best moral truth for the issue.] Otherwise, it is not morally permissible.

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the Constitution when the judge attempts to stick to the original meaning of the text and has done substantial research to determine what that meaning is; otherwise it is morally wrong.

It is morally permissible for a judge, in their official capacity, to interpret the Constitution when their interpretation attempts to conform to what the writers of the Constitution would have thought if they were aware of current advanced in science. Otherwise it is not morally permissible.

**Don’t forget the following possible considerations**

* Autonomy and rights
* Doing what leads to the best outcomes (“the ends justify the means”)
* Moral obligations to play one’s social role (special obligations)
* Concerns about discretion, transparency, and abuse of power