## 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

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not read 1ar theory is the highest layer, 1ar theory has no rvis, 1ar theory is legit, all neg interps are counterinterps, new 2ar arguments, and no 2n theory or I meets

#### The standard is infinite abuse –

- infinite abuse - lets the aff win 1ar theory every time bc its the highes tlayer, the 2n cant use paradigm issues outweigh it since and they also get new 2ar weighing, also irreciprocal bc no rvi - also link turns norming bc the aff is always structurally ahead on the theory debate which kills ability to determine what norms are actually good

#### Framing Issue:

#### Don’t evaluate anything but the counterinterpretation to the shell: allowing them cross apps or deflationary strats feeds back into the abuse story because they can use abusive arguments to deflate theory – that’s circular, but contradictions negate since I indicted their argument first.

#### Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Education is a voter—it’s intrinsic to debate. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted – also to deter future abuse and set better norms. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear brightline.

#### No RVIs—a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect and b) ) illogical – you don’t win because you’re fair or educational

#### Meta-theory outweighs -

## 3

#### 1ar theory hedge:

#### [1] DTA – A] they can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it B] proves terminal defense to 1AR shells since the 1NC is directly engaging under the aff’s framework of choice, with the most predictable advocacy C] Time skew doesn’t exist – we both have 13 minutes and you can do drills and spread faster

#### [2] Reasonability – 1AR theory is super aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to which means either A] the 2AR always wins since they just need a single response to each argument which flips infinite abuse or B] means it’s irresolvable because the judge has to intervene to determine whether or not it’s warranted enough to vote on which collapses to reasonability – reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing super abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### [3] No 2ar weighing because I don’t have a 3nr to respond to all your arguments so I always lose theory. We get RVIs –1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – outweighs on quantifiaiblity

#### [4] No new 1ar paradigm issues - A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms. C] anything else screws over NC strategy because your lack of justification determines my 1nc strat D] Infinite abuse is solved by preemptive shells empirically proven by reading ACC

#### [5] Reject 1AR Theory: a] Resolvability: Either you auto accept all responses to 2NR standards and they auto win since I can't respond, or you intervene to give 2AR credence b] flips infinite abuse - 2ar can always line by line every 2nr standard and we lose every time so eval theory debate after the 2nr so we both get one speech and also outweighs since 1ar can respond to the 1nc c] No infinite abuse: 1NC is 7 minutes and 1AC spikes check