## 1

Shoutout to jack for the shell love you home boy

#### A. Interpretation: The aff may not defend implementation.

#### Ought statements entail an ideal without an action or imperative.

Robinson 71 Richard Robinson, “Ought and Ought Not,” Philosophy, Vol. 46, No. 177 (Jul., 1971), pp. 193-202 // Massa

Many ought-sentences are not prescriptive at all, either prudentially or morally, but express valuations. Such as "Everybody ought to be happy". This is **[**are] not a prescription or command to anybody to act or to refrain. There is no possible act that would count as the fulfillment of the command, if it were a command. Neither individually nor collectively can we make everybody happy. But the state of universal happiness **[**it] is an ideal that we cherish; and the sentence expresses this ideal. It is thus a valuation. A valuation is something distinct from a prescription, though they share the negative property of not being descriptions. Even when there is a possible act, the ought may be more ideal than prudential. The question "Do you think the hem of this dress ought to be higher?" suggests the practical possibility of raising the hem; but what the speaker has in mind is rather the question of beauty, of better- ness, of the ideal dress-length. "A clock ought to keep good time" is obviously not an imperative to clocks. Nor is it, except indirectly, a prescription to clockmakers and clockminders. It is a platitudinous restatement of the obvious ideal of a clock. (I take this example from Mellor's discussion of knowledge in Mind, 1967.) "You ought to feel ashamed" might be a moral ought if the speaker believed that we can feel what we will when we will; but usually it is the ideal ought. A man who feels shame after doing such an act is, in the speaker's opinion, a less bad man than one who does such an act and feels no shame. "Feel ashamed" does not refer to an action, a doing. Wherever ought is followed by a nondoing infinitive, as "to feel ashamed", it is likely to be the ideal ought. An outstanding case of the nondoing infinitive is "'to be"; and "ought to be" usually belongs to a sentence that expresses an ideal, not a command. "Everyone ought to be happy." "There ought to be a chicken in every pot." "Ought to have" is nearly the same. "Everyone ought to have a motor-car." "Everyone ought to have equal opportunity." "There ought to be a minimum wage" can perhaps be interpreted as a command to Parliament, and hence as the moral ought. Still more so the common phrase "There ought to be a law against it". But probably those who use such phrases rarely think of themselves as prescribing to Parliament; and what they say ought to exist is often something that cannot be brought into existence by the passage of a law. They are expressing an ideal.

#### B. Violation: They do.

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Precision –

#### 2. Limits and Ground –

#### 3. Resolvability –

#### D. Voters:

#### Fairness is a voter –Drop the debater –No RVIs – Use competing interps

## 2

#### Use a truth testing paradigm a) Logic –– b) Fiat is illusory –– c) ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense– d) Inclusion –– e) Permissibility trigger –f) Constitutivism –– g) Inescapability –

## 3

#### Presumption and permissibility negates -

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It **is that which must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule**

#### Affirming negates.

**Paraphrasing Mcnamara ‘06**, Paul, 2-7-2006, "Deontic Logic (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-deontic/index.html#4.3> //Massa

#### Premise 1—

#### Premise 2—

#### Thus, premise 3—

#### External world skep is true.

**Neta**, Ram. “External World Skepticism.” The Problem of The External World, **2014**, philosophy.unc.edu/files/2014/06/The-Problem-of-the-External-World.pdf. //Massa

You take yourself to know that you have hands. But notice that, **if you do have hands, then you are not merely a brain floating in a vat of nutrient fluid and being electrochemically stimulated to have the sensory experiences** that you have now: such a brain does not have hands, but you do. So if you know that you do have hands, then you must also be in a position to know that you are not such a brain. **But how could you know that you are not such a brain? If you were such a brain, everything would seem exactly as it does now**; **you would** (by hypothesis) **have all the same sensory experiences that you’re having right now.** Since your **empirical knowledge of the world** around you **must somehow be based upon your sensory experiences, how could these experiences**—the very same experiences that you would have if you were a brain in a vat—**furnish you with knowledge that you’re not such a brain? And if you don’t know that you’re not such a brain, then you cannot know that you have hands.**
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#### Their use of the term women instead of womxn reinforces hierarchies.

Caira Blignaut, OPINION: Womxn vs Women, March 24, 2018, <https://www.matiemedia.org/opinion-womxn-vs-women/> ///AHS PB

It has been a decades long debate of the fight for feminists to have their voices truly heard. One part of this is by taking autonomy over the very word that describes them as an independent and self-directed group within society. The spelling of the word ‘women’ as ‘womxn’ has surfaced over the last few years. The spelling comes from the fact that individuals and groups are choosing to spell the word this way because they feel the need to not be an extension to the word man. It is a form of self-reinvention. The idea behind the spelling of the word in this way is womxn being their own separate entity from that of a man. In its spelling, it indicates that the womxn is fully capable of operating as a single entity without the relief of a man. The word is also intersectional, “as it is meant to include transgender womxn, womxn of color, womxn from third world countries, and every other self-identifying womxn out there,” says Natalia Emmanual, from Washington University, who has also chosen to identify as a womxn. It can and most probably will be said that this minor change in the spelling of the word is unnecessary. That it holds no distinguished sanctions in the way society is set up in its patriarchal roots of misogyny and misrepresentation but I do feel like this micro- change is essential. It is vital in the depiction of the notoriously known ‘weaker sex’ in terms of representation and voice. This new spelling can lead to endless conversations and discourse that can be created not only for awareness but inclusion as well. Social media has slowly started adopting the spelling of the word in its new form. By doing this fellow womxn are perpetuating a space for education against dominant narratives to take place. By making others more aware of the spelling, it creates a space for another to be better informed on why some choose to spell womxn with an x.

#### Drop them to deter further sexist rhetoric in the debate space- they could have said womxn instead.

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

**Teehan** Ryan Teehan [NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School] – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014. //Massa

Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. **All** of the **arguments that talk about how debate is** a **unique** space for questioning assumptions **make an assumption of safety**. They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. **That is not true** for everyone. **When we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape**, lynching, etc., **we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is** the definition of **privilege**, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. **People who face the actual effects** of the aforementioned things **cannot question those assumptions, and making debate** a space **built around the idea that they can is hostile**. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the wrongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyone, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate unsafe has actual repercussions. On "**debate is not the real world**". **Only for people who can separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate.** That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim when some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. **At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone** involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people**. If you care at all about the people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments**. If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competitors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or judge. The pay can't be that good. I don't believe that you're just in it for the money, which is why I ask you to ask yourselves whether you can justify making debate unsafe for certain people.

# Accessible Formatting

#### Ought statements entail an ideal without an action or imperative.

Ought sentences are not a prescription to act there is no act that would count as the fulfillment of the command it is an ideal valuation is distinct from a prescription there ought to be a chicken in every pot is something that cannot be brought into existence by law

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

Justice must not wait a decision is required immediately it cannot furnish itself with unlimited knowledge of conditions even if it did the moment of decision remains a moment of urgency deliberation that precedes it

#### External world skep is true.

If you have hands then you are not a brain floating in a vat but how could you know you are not everything would seem exactly as it does now you would have the same sensory experiences that you’re having now empirical knowledge of the world must be based upon sensory experiences

#### Their use of the term women instead of womxn reinforces hierarchies.

Womxn comes from the fact that the word need to not be an extension to the word man it indicates that the womxn is fully capable of operating as a single entity without the relief of a man. The word is also intersectional, “as it is meant to include transgender womxn, womxn of color, womxn from third world countries, and every other self-identifying womxn out there this micro change is vital in terms of representation and discourse

#### The safety of the space is prima facie – we don’t know who’s winning if people can’t engage. Anything that doesn’t immediately denounce atrocities excludes people who have and can experience them.

Debate is an assumption of safety when we allow arguments that question the wrongness of racism we make debate unsafe for certain people people who face effects cannot question those assumptions making debate hostile If you care at all about people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments