## 1

#### A: Interpretation – Debaters must must not read impact justified frameworks. To clarify, frameworks that make ethical claims based off a certain impact without a starting justificatory point are bad.

#### B: Violation – there’s no starting point and justification of why we should care about the impacts you reference, like the imperialism, violence, and biolgical impacts caused by cybernetics – even if they’re bad u didn’t normatively prove it

#### 

#### C: Standards –

#### [1] Strat skew – Reading an impact justified framework destroys my strategy: A) Turn ground – it artificially exclude impacts from a larger framework that would justify your impact being bad which means you can cherry pick any impact that flows one direction

#### B) Limits – it makes it impossible for me to answer your framework because you can choose any impact that is always bad like racism which leaves me no ground and grants you an infinite number of impacts to defend that aren’t justified by a broader philosophy.

#### [2] Logic - you should reject impact justified frameworks because they fail to derive a moral imperative to act since they unjustifiably assume something is bad – logic outweighs because it’s a metaconstraint on what counts as an argument and this takes out the aff framing anyway.

## 2

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than “Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.” then they must provide a linked counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. Violation: its not whole res – they only defend the nonhuman and defend full elimination Standards:

#### Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair – a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides. b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things. Also means the aff has no solvency because we can’t clearly conceptualize it’s demands in the first place.

## 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a. the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation b. Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false. C. we don’t presume everything true, that’s why we don’t believe in conspiracy theories

#### The neg burden is to prove that the aff won’t logically happen in the status quo, and the aff burden is to prove that it will. The aff and the role of the judge operates under the assumption of an ethical ought and since ought operates under a logical consequence the burden takes out the aff - we reframe what affirming or negating under the res means

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Text –

#### A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### 2] Debatability – A] it focuses debates on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years – Resolvability is an independent voter cuz otherwise the judge can’t make a decision which means it’s a constraint on any burden because otherwise the round is impossible B] moral framework debate is impossible.

Joyce 02 Joyce, Richard. Myth of Morality. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p 45-47.

This distinction between what is accepted from within an institution, and “stepping out” of that institution and appraising it from an exterior perspective, is close to Carnap’s distinction between internal and external questions. 15 Certain **“linguistic frameworks”** (as Carnap calls them) **bring** with them **new** terms and **ways of talking: accepting the language of “things” licenses making assertions** like “The shirt is in the cupboard”; **accepting mathematics allows one to say “There is a prime number greater than one hundred”;** accepting the language of propositions permits saying “Chicago is large is a true proposition,” etc. Internal to the framework in question, confirming or disconfirming the truth of these propositions is a trivial matter. But traditionally **philosophers have interest**ed themselves **in** the external question – **the issue of the adequacy of the framework itself:** “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “**Are there numbers?”,** “Are the propositions?”, etc. Carnap’s argument is that **the** external **question,** as it has been typically construed, **does not make sense. From a perspective that accepts mathematics, the answer to the question “Do numbers exist?” is just** trivially **“Yes.”** From a perspective which has not accepted mathematics, Carnap thinks, the only sensible way of construing the question is not as a theoretical question, but as a practical one: “Shall I accept the framework of mathematics?”, and this pragmatic question is to be answered by consideration of the efficiency, the fruitfulness, the usefulness,etc., of the adoption. But the (traditional) **philosopher’s questions** – “But is mathematics true?”, “Are there really numbers?” – **are pseudo-questions.** By turning traditional philosophical questions into practical questions of the form “Shall I adopt...?”, Carnap is offering a noncognitive analysis of metaphysics. Since I am claiming that we can critically inspect morality from an external perspective – that we can ask whether there are any non-institutional reasons accompanying moral injunctions – and that such questioning would not amount to a “Shall we adopt...?” query, Carnap’s position represents a threat. What arguments does Carnap offer to his conclusion? He starts with the example of the “thing language,” which involves reference to objects that exist in time and space. **To** step out of the thing language and **ask “But does the world exist?” is a mistake,** Carnap thinks, **because the very notion of “existence” is a term which belongs to the thing language, and can be understood only within that framework, “hence this concept cannot be meaningfully applied to the system itself.”** 16 Moving on to the external question “Do numbers exist?” Carnap cannot use the same argument – he cannot say that “existence” is internal to the number language and thus cannot be applied to the system as a whole. Instead he says that philosophers who ask the question do not mean material existence, but have no clear understanding of what other kind of existence might be involved, thus such questions have no cognitive content. It appears that this is the form of argument which he is willing to generalize to all further cases: **persons who dispute** whether propositions exist, **whether properties exist,** etc., do not know what they are arguing over, thus they **are not arguing over the truth of a proposition,** but over the practical value of their respective positions. Carnap adds that this is so because there is nothing that both parties would possibly count as evidence that would sway the debate one way or the other.

#### 3] Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Now negate:

#### 1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t going to happen since there are structural barriers that preclude. Also you don’t get to say in the 1ar that the aff is non inherent because you took a stance in the aff that it was which is an academic integrity issue.

**2] Motion is impossible –**

**[a] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance, and half of the remaining distance, and so forth to infinity – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in a finite amount of time.**

**[b] Imagine an arrow in flight. At any given instant, the arrow is motionless because motion requires time and there is no time surpassing in one instant. Time is composed of a bunch of instants, which means the arrow never moves – this applies to any situation and thus motion is impossible.**