## 1

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a. the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation b. Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false so negate because the aff is probably false

#### The aff burden is to prove that the resolutional statement is logical, and the reciprocal neg burden is to prove that the resolutional statement is illogical.

#### Prefer:

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

[https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought //](https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought%20//)Massa

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

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

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action.

**Gray,** Grey, JW. "The Is/Ought Gap: How Do We Get "Ought" from "Is?"" *Ethical Realism*. N.p., 19 July 2011. Web. 28 Oct. 2015. //Massa

**The is/ought gap is a problem in moral philosophy where what is the case and what ought to be the case seem quite different, and it presents itself as the following question** to David Hume: **How do we *know* what morally ought to be the case from what is the case?** Hume posed the question in A Treatise of Human Nature Book III Part I Section I: In **every system of morality**, which I have hitherto met with, I have always remark’d that the author proceeds for some time in the ordinary way of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs, when of a sudden I am surpriz’d to find, that instead of the usual copulations of propositions, is and is not, I meet with no proposition that is not connected with an ought, or an ought not. This change **is imperceptible**; but is, however, of the last consequence. **For as this ought**, or ought not, **expresses some new relation** or affirmation, ‘tis necessary that it shou’d be observ’d and explain’d; and at the same time that a reason shou’d be given, **for what seems altogether inconceivable**, how this new relation can be a deduction from others, which are entirely different from it. It is here that Hume points out that **philosophers argue about** various **nonmoral facts, then somehow conclude what ought to be the case** (or what people ought to do) **based on** those facts (about **what is the case**). **For example, we might find out that arsenic is poisonous and conclude that we ought not consume it. But we need to know how nonmoral facts can lead to moral conclusions. These two things seem unrelated. The is/ought gap [isn’t]** doesn’t seem like **a problem for nonmoral oughts**—what we ought to do to accomplish our goals, fulfill our desires, or maintain our commitments. For example, we could say, “If you want to be healthy, you ought not consume arsenic.” However, it might be morally wrong to consume arsenic. If it is, we have some more explaining to do.

#### 4. Neg definition choice – The aff should have defined ought in the 1ac as their value, 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.

#### [1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### [2] Intellectual is defined as “possessing or showing intellect or mental compacity” (Dictionary.com) but property cant possess intellect so the resolutions incoherent

#### [4] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral.

#### [5] member means “a body part or organ” (Marriam Webster) but a nation cannot have bodily organs so the resolutions incoherent

#### [6] you can’t be sure anything besides yourself exists – we could be deceived by a demon, dreaming, or in a simulation so the whole world could be nonexistent

#### [7] one third times three is one and point nine repeating as per point three repeating times three, so one equals point nine repeating, and the difference of the infinitely smallest vale makes it the same, therefore, infinite subtraction or addition of that value means any value can be achieved and is equivalent to one and zero. This means values are all equivalent in measure, therefore time and space are impossible and do not exist through change – negate on presumption as the aff has no solvency.

#### 8] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means the aff is logically impossible

#### **9] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

## 2

#### Interp:Precluding a future increase is not a reduction

Melinda **Harmon 12**, Judge, United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division, 3/6/12, Zieche v. Burlington Res., Inc., 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 30134, p. lexis

Zieche contends that the Court erred when it concluded that "there was no reduction in Zieche's salary or bonus percentage" that would constitute "good reason" for his resignation. Doc. 70 at 8, 9. The Court relied on the fact that Zieche received "his full 2006 performance bonus" after he began working at ConocoPhillips and that the bonus percentage increased from 30% in 2005 to 40% in 2006 as proof that Zieche did not suffer a reduction in salary.

Zieche contends that an increase in his bonus is irrelevant to a determination of whether his salary was reduced because a "bonus is not part of the salary," but is instead [\*12] "something in addition to what is expected or strictly due." Doc. 72 at 4. Additionally, Zieche alleges that "the [C]ourt's analysis ignores the specific provisions of the retention agreement," which defines "good reason" to include "any reduction from your annual rate of base salary." Id.

Initially, although Zieche alleges that ConocoPhillips reduced his salary, he introduced no summary judgment **ev**idence to support this contention. In his Response to ConocoPhillip's Motion for Summary Judgment, Zeiche repeatedly asserts that, in his new position at ConocoPhillips, he would "**not be eligible for annual merit salary *increases***" as he had previously received at Burlington. Doc. 54 at 4 (emph. added). The summary judgment evidence before the Court included Zieche's deposition, in which he admitted that his salary "remained the same . . . up to the time [he] resigned from ConocoPhillips." Doc. 48-1 at 50 (emph. added). Nevertheless, Zieche argues that the Court unnaturally should read the word "reduce" in the retention agreement to mean "**not increase**," rather than interpreting the word according to its plain meaning. **The Court does not agree with this reasoning**, and Zieche has introduced [\*13] no evidence to convince

#### Violation: the one and done method still allows patents but prevents future increases on that

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits and ground– their model allows affs to defend anything from evergreening to preventing patents in 100 years— there's no universal DA since it’s impossible to know the timeframe when there won’t be IP— that explodes neg prep and leads to random timeframe of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible — limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep

#### 2] Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 3] TVA – defend the advantage to a whole rez timeframe. We don’t prevent new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – our model allows you to specify countries and medicines.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 3

#### Interp: The aff debater cant read that reject neg fairness concerns and no neg theory on spikes and if I win one layer vote aff

#### Violation -they did

#### Standard-Infinite abuse

#### This combination of spikes makes it impossible to negate. They get to read any amount of spikes they want in the 1AC and I cant check since I don’t get theory on spikes. Since these could count as their own independent layer even if they don’t have any implication you can make that a reason to auto affirm. No theory on spikes intensifies the abuse since I cant check back against any sort of abusive spikes. Reject neg fairness concerns takes away my ability to check them substantivly since I cant generate reasons that your spikes are unfair

#### And they cant leverage their spikes against the shell-I question their abbility to make them in the first place

#### And I get Meta Theory-otherwise you can read abusive thery and I have no way to check agaisnt this-2ar and judge gut check against bad shells

## Case

#### I Their strategy of quick, blippy arguments excludes people with learning disabilities which not only deters them from the activity but also makes debate uneducational.

Thompson 15 Terrence Lonam April 21, 2015 “Miscellaneous Thoughts from the Disorganized Mind of Marshall Thompson” http://nsdupdate.com/2015/04/21/miscellaneous-thoughts-from-the-disorganized-mind-of-marshall-thompson/

First, I think that evaluating who is the better debater via who dropped spikes excludes lots of specific individuals, especially those with learning disabilities. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia. Despite debating for four years with a lot of success I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time. I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that if spikes had had anywhere near the same prevalence when I started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that the values that debate cares about and should be assessing are not questions of handwriting or notation. We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that as long as I can flow well enough to easily follow a non-tricky aff it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.)

#### Vote them down – inclusion is a tangible out-of-round impact distinct from the procedural aspects of debate – it’s key to minority participation.