# 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.