**Argument for Originalism #1**

1. If a theory of Constitutional interpretation reduces the moral errors a judge makes when adjudicating on some topic, then it is a good theory of Constitutional interpretation for that judge to employ when adjudicating on that topic.
2. For every topic, the original meaning of the Constitution is more likely to be correct about moral facts than every judge.
3. Thus, Originalism is a good theory of Constitutional interpretation for every judge to use in every case.
4. Are there specific topics, or specific types of topics, where the Constitution is likely to be mistaken about morally important stuff, given its original meaning and/or the ideas of the Founding Fathers? Think about not only topics that the Constitution talks about, but what it does not talk about.
5. Could there be specific judges who are (to some extent) more likely to be morally correct than the Constitution, given its original meaning? Why or why not?

**Argument for Originalism #2**

1. Adhering to the original meaning of the Constitution will prevent every judge from making [certain errors].
2. [Preventing those errors] is more important than allowing [any good thing ruled out by the Constitution’s original meaning].
3. Thus, Originalism is a good theory of Constitutional interpretation for every judge to use in every case.

**Argument for Originalism #3**

1. Overall, fewer errors will be made by judges if [we] publicly advocate Originalism
2. Thus, [we] are morally obligated to publicly advocate Originalism whether or not it is the best theory of Constitutional interpretation for all judges in all cases.