# Structure

## The Three-step technique – Omissions question

Activity Objective

### Step 1: Examples

The non-voter, the non-contributor, To get material that will illustrate

and the non-petitioner. similarities and differences

Step 2: Analyse

1. No direct causal connection To form the hypothesis: the

2. No effective opportunity to influence prototype concept

events

3. No intention

Step 3: Testing

1. Borderline cases

In the case of the girl who drowned in The opportunity to influence events

the lake as others looked on from the effectively is not absent in all

shore without helping, omissions did omissions at the responsible end of

seem to count. the spectrum.

2. Contrasting cases

If I decide to check the oil in my car Intentions include foreseen con-

once a year, it’s my intention to accept sequences and causes represent

the consequence that my car will seize deviations from normal expect-

up and I have caused this to happen. ations.

3. Doubtful cases

In all cases there is a clear difference Yet this may be a psychological

between deliberately killing someone, rather than a moral problem: that

say a terminally ill patient in great pain, we feel guilty may not be evidence

and merely allowing them to die by that we are in fact guilty. Feelings

omitting to treat them. are not always a reliable indicator.