## 1

#### Our Interpretation is the affirmative should instrumentally defend the resolution – hold the line, CX and the 1AC prove there’s no I-meet – anything new in the 1AR is either extra-T since it includes the non-topical parts of the Aff or effects-T since it’s a future result of the advocacy which both link to our offense.

#### “Resolved” means to enact by law.

Words & Phrases ’64

(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature (<https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

**Resolution**

**A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies**, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution **uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### Two Standards to Prefer:

#### First - Fairness – radically re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method tangentially related to the topic exploding Limits, which erases neg ground via perms and renders research burdens untenable by eviscerating predictable limits.

#### Second - Clash – picking any grounds for debate precludes the only common point of engagement, which obviates preround research and incentivizes retreat from controversy by eliminating any effective clash. Only the process of negation distinguishes debate and discussion by necessitating iterative testing and effective engagement, but an absence of constant refinement dooms revolutionary potential.

#### TVA – [Affirm an unconditional RTS that creates Asian led unions that build grassroots movements]

Marlene **Kim, ND** [Marlene Kim, (Recipient of the first Rhonda Williams Prize, 2002, from the International Association for Feminist Economics, “for work that best reflects Rhonda William's legacy of scholarship and activism.” Awarded for past work and for “Has the Race Penalty for Black Women Disappeared in the United States?” Feminist Economics, 8:2: 115-124.)]. " Organizing Asians into Labor Unions " Accessed 12-4-2021. [http://www.aasc.ucla.edu/resources/policyreports/Trajectory\_Civic\_Political\_Engagement/Trajectory\_Ch11.pdf //](http://www.aasc.ucla.edu/resources/policyreports/Trajectory_Civic_Political_Engagement/Trajectory_Ch11.pdf%20//) duongie

Historically, few Asians belonged to unions, reflecting a society that excluded, or at best, ignored, Asian workers. But with changes in attitudes about race, and with APALA and unions reaching out to organize Asian Pacific Americans, race is no longer a barrier. Instead, today, the barriers to unionizing Asian workers- employer resistance and weak national laws - are those that confront all workers. Thus Asians hold a common agenda with other workers, and civic participation across racial lines will further the cause of Asians, as well as all workers. Today, Asians are organizing Asian workers into labor unions. The very activity of organizing into unions often transforms and ernpowers workers when they experience that by working together they can change the conditions of their lives. Consequently, unionized workers use their newfound tools of collective action to participate broadly in their local community and in the larger society, and in doing so, improve their schools, neighborhoods, and nation.

#### The TVA is terminal defense – proves compatibility of our Models AND Solvency Deficits proves ground for engagement.

#### SSD solves – it preaches self-reflexive ideologies that are key to check back dogmatism – arbitrarily bracketing off topics of discussion creates a groupthink mentality that dooms Social Movements.

#### Procedural fairness is a voter and outweighs a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is a game and equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews, c] internal link turns every impact – a limited debate promotes research and engagement d] All your arguments concede fairness since you assume they will be esvaluated fairly.

#### Prefer Competing Interpretations – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom. This means reject Aff Impact Turns predicated on their theory since we weren’t able to adequately prepare for it.

#### No RVIs – A – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly B – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments

#### DTD – it’s key to norm set and deter future abuse

#### No impact turns

#### 1] T is just an argument for why the aff is a bad idea, which is what every single negative position says—there’s nothing unique about T that causes violence but the cap k or case turns don’t

#### 2] we’re not imposing a norm or forcing you to do anything—our norm is open to contestation because you can just win that a counter-interpretation is a better norm

## 2

#### PIC: We endorse the aff besides reading it against another Asian debater in debate

#### Solves all of your offense—allows you to engage in modes of transpacifism against other debaters besides Asians

#### DAs:

#### 1] Negation---if your aff is true, you force us to negate our own identity by defending the model minority as good or that there is no impact etc which is psychologically violent. Two impacts:

#### A] That fractures collectivity for your movement and destroys coalitions by pitting Asians against each other which is a tool of the white man.

#### B] Causes psychological violence for Asian debaters which outweighs by making the debate space non-inclusive

#### PICs anything greenlights totalization of Asian identity that skimps over the nuanced differences between things like Vietnamese and Koreans

## 3

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly have a role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC

#### Violation: they don’t – I will spec here only post fiat offense matters

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing what counts as offense is a prerequisite to making arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us a standard. Especially true since there is no norm on what “performative engagement” like there is for util offense

#### Few impacts:

#### a) Education – When two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything - This also guts novice inclusion because now they can never learn arguments in round.

#### b) Turns the aff – Your impacts are premised on engaging with issues of oppression, but no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with

#### c) Strategy Skew – You can recontextualize your ROTB to make up reasons why my offense doesn’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your ROTB. My method is your ROTB with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory. If they go for the Aff first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

## 4

#### Role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 6 min AC and it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins.

#### Reject their framing on inclusion – a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.

#### The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.

#### Negate –

#### 1) Darwinian dilemma—if moral facts were objective realities, species who believed them would’ve died out since they’re dominated by beliefs that are more evolutionarily advantageous. Since we believe there are moral facts, they’re merely beliefs that help us reproduce with no independent normative force

#### 2) Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable; for it to be more understandable it must be less complete and therefore less accurate. Therefore no philosophical or political model can be useful.

#### 3) Linguistics – words are indeterminate since every claim requires a empirical verification, which is impossible given the arbitrariness of meaning. If I say, “The man is on the table”, that statement is true if and only if a certain man is on a certain table. This takes out any definition based a prioris because they can’t be based on a definition.

## Case

#### Vote Negative on Presumption:

#### 1] This aff has been read many time before and won which proves– D/B – either transpacific interrogating has already collapsed debate making the Aff non-inherent OR it’s a form of cruel hope.

#### 2] No ability to solve their impacts – what does affirming in this round change to structural antagonisms – you can only change the mindset of you and us.

#### 3] No need for a Negative to transpacific reimagining means Debate isn’t key so only a risk their performance is co-opted/causes Neg Coercion.

#### Presumption is a sequencing question to evaluating solvency – they shouldn’t get to weigh their aff – they has to win how they resolves it or else it’s non-unique.

#### Their forwarding of the resolution solely to evidence its violent qualities is an affective investment in the violent norms of debate that they’ve critiqued---turning the case.

Lundberg 12 – Dr. Christian Lundberg, Co-Director of the University Program in Cultural Studies and Professor of Rhetoric at the University of North Carolina, PhD in Communication Studies from Northwestern University, MA in Divinity from Emory University, BA from the University of Redlands, Lacan in Public: Psychoanalysis and the Science of Rhetoric, p. 174-177

Thus, "as hysterics you demand a new master: you will get it!" At the register of manifest content, demands are claims for action and seemingly powerful, but at the level of the rhetorical form of the demand or in the register of enjoyment, demand is a kind of surrender. As a *relation of address* the hysterical demand is more a demand for recognition and love from an ostensibly repressive order than a claim for change. The limitation of the students' call on Lacan does not lie in the end they sought but in the fact that the hysterical address never quite breaks free from its framing of the master. The fundamental problem of democracy is not articulating resistance over and against hegemony but rather the practices of enjoyment that sustain an addiction to mastery and a deferral of desire.

Hysteria is a politically effective subject position in some ways, but it is politically constraining from the perspective of organized political dissent. If not a unidirectional practice of resistance, hysteria is at best a politics of interruption. Imagine a world where the state was the perfect and complete embodiment of a hegemonic order, without interruption or remainder, and the discursive system was hermetically closed. Politics would be an impossibility: with no site for contest or reappropriation, politics would simply be the automatic extension of structure. Hysteria is a site of interruption, in that hysteria represents a challenge to our hypothetical system, refusing straightforward incorporation by its symbolic logic. But, stepping outside this hypothetical non-polity, on balance, hysteria is politically constraining because the form of the demand, as a way of organizing the field of political enjoyment, requires that the system continue to act in certain ways to sustain its logic. Though on the surface it is an act of symbolic dissent, hysteria represents an affirmation of a hegemonic order and is therefore a particularly fraught form of political subjectivization.

The case of the hysteric produces an additional problem in defining jouissance as equivalent with hegemony. One way of defining hysteria is to say that it is a form of enjoyment that is defined by its very disorganization. As Gerard Wajcman frames it, the fundamental analytical problem in defining hysteria is precisely that it is a paradoxical refusal of organized enjoyment by a constant act of deferral. This deferral functions by asserting a form of agency over the Other while simultaneously demanding that the Other provide an organizing principle for hysterical enjoyment, something the Other cannot provide. Hysteria never moves beyond the question or the riddle, as Wajcman argues: the "hysteric ... cannot be mastered by knowledge and therefore remains outside of history, even outside its own .... [I]f hysteria is a set of statements about the hysteric, then the hysteric is what eludes those statements, escapes this knowledge .... [T]he history of hysteria bears witness to something fundamental in the human condition-being put under pressure to answer a question.T'" Thus, a difficulty for a relatively formal/ structural account of hegemony as a substitute for jouissance without reduction: where is the place for a practice of enjoyment that by its nature eludes nanling in the order of knowledge? This account of hysteria provides a significant test case for the equation betweenjouissance and hegemony, for the political promise and peril of demands and ultimately for the efficacy of a hysterical politics. But the results of such a test can only be born out in the realm of everyday politics.

*On Resistance: The Dangers of Enjoying One's Demands*

The demands of student revolutionaries and antiglobalization protestors provide a set of opportunities for interrogating hysteria as a political practice. For the antiglobalization protestors cited earlier, demands to be added to a list of dangerous globophobes uncannily condense a dynamic inherent to all demands for recognition. But the demands of the Mexico Solidarity Network and the Seattle Independent Media project demand more than recognition: they also demand danger as a specific mode of representation. "Danger" functions as a sign of something more than inclusion, a way of reaffirming the protestors' imaginary agency over processes of globalization. If danger represents an assertion of agency, and the assertion of agency is proportional to the deferral of desire to the master upon whom the demand is placed, then demands to be recognized as dangerous are doubly hysterical. Such demands are also demands for a certain kind of love, namely, the state might extend its love by recognizing the dangerousness of the one who makes the demand. At the level the demand's rhetorical function, dangerousness is metonymically connected with the idea that average citizens can effect change in the prevailing order, or that they might be recognized as agents who, in the instance of the list of globalophobic leaders, can command the Mexican state to reaffirm their agency by recognizing their dangerousness. The rhetorical structure of danger implies the continuing existence of the state or governing apparatus's interests, and these interests become a nodal point at which the hysterical demand is discharged. This structure generates enjoyment of the existence of oppressive state policies as a point for the articulation of identity. The addiction to the state and the demands for the state's love is also bound up with a fundamental dependency on the oppression of the state: otherwise the identity would collapse. Such demands constitute a reaffirmation of a hysterical subject position: they reaffirm not only the subject's marginality in the global system but the danger that protestors present to the global system. There are three practical implications for this formation.

First, for the hysteric the simple discharge of the demand is both the beginning and satisfaction of the political project. Although there is always a nascent political potential in performance, in this case the performance of demand comes to fully eclipse the desires that animate content of the demand. Second, demand allows institutions that stand in for the global order to dictate the direction of politics. This is not to say that engaging such institutions is a bad thing; rather, it is to say that when antagonistic engagement with certain institutions is read as the end point of politics, the field of political options is relatively constrained. Demands to be recognized as dangerous by the Mexican government or as a powerful antiglobalization force by the WTO often function at the cost of addressing how practices of globalization are reaffirmed at the level of consumption, of identity, and so on or in thinking through alternative political strategies for engaging globalization that do not hinge on the state and the state's actions.

Paradoxically, the third danger is that an addiction to the refusal of demands creates a paralyzing disposition toward institutional politics. Grossberg has identified a tendency in left politics to retreat from the "politics of policy and public debate.":" Although Grossberg identifies the problem as a specific coordination of "theory" and its relation to left politics, perhaps a hysterical commitment to marginality informs the impulse in some sectors to eschew engagements with institutions and institutional debate. An addiction to the state's refusal often makes the perfect the enemy of the good, implying a stifling commitment to political purity as a pretext for sustaining a structure of enjoyment dependent on refusal, dependent on a kind of paternal "no." Instead of seeing institutions and policy making as one part of the political field that might be pressured for contingent or relative goods, a hysterical politics is in the incredibly difficult position of taking an addressee (such as the state) that it assumes represents the totality of the political field; simultaneously it understands its addressee as constitutively and necessarily only a locus of prohibition.

These paradoxes become nearly insufferable when one makes an analytical cut between the content of a demand and its rhetorical functionality. At the level of the content of the demand, the state or institutions that represent globalization are figured as illegitimate, as morally and politically compromised because of their misdeeds, Here there is an assertion of agency, but because the assertion of agency is simultaneously a deferral of desire, the identity produced in the hysterical demand is not only intimately tied to but is ultimately dependent on the continuing existence of the state, hegemonic order, or institution. At the level of affective investment, the state or institution is automatically figured as the legitimate authority over its domain. As Lacan puts it: "demand in itself ... is demand of a presence or of an absence ... pregnant with that Other to be situated within the needs that it can satisfy. Demand constitutes the Other as already possessing the 'privilege' of satisfying needs, that it is to say, the power of depriving them of that alone by which they are satisfied."46

#### Embedding hope for liberation to an object like a ballot enacts cruel optimism that the 1AC’s rhetoric sustains.

Berlant 06 Lauren, professor of Literature at the University of Chicago. “Cruel Optimism” in Differences, 17.3. 2006.

When we talk about an object of desire, we are really talking about a cluster of promises we want someone or something to make to us and make possible for us. This cluster of promises could be embedded in a person, a thing, an institution, a text, a norm, a bunch of cells, smells, a good idea—whatever. To phrase “the object of desire” as a cluster of promises is to allow us to encounter what is incoherent or enigmatic in our attachments, not as confirmation of our irrationality, but as an explanation for our sense of our endurance in the object, insofar as prox- imity to the object means proximity to the cluster of things that the object promises, some of which may be clear to us while others not so much. In other words, all attachments are optimistic. That does not mean that they all feel optimistic: one might dread, for example, returning to a scene of hunger or longing or the slapstick reiteration of a lover or parent’s typi- cal misrecognition. But the surrender to the return to the scene where the object hovers in its potentialities is the operation of optimism as an affective form (see Ghent). “Cruel optimism” names a relation of attachment to compromised conditions of possibility. What is cruel about these attachments, and not merely inconvenient or tragic, is that the subjects who have x in their lives might not well endure the loss of their object or scene of desire, even though its presence threatens their well-being, because whatever the content of the attachment, the continuity of the form of it provides something of the continuity of the subject’s sense of what it means to keep on living on and to look forward to being in the world. This phrase points to a condition different than that of melancholia, which is enacted in the subject’s desire to temporize an experience of the loss of an object/scene with which she has identified her ego continuity. Cruel optimism is the condition of maintaining an attachment to a problematic object in advance of its loss.¶ One might point out that all objects/scenes of desire are prob- lematic, in that investments in them and projections onto them are less about them than about the cluster of desires and affects we manage to keep magnetized to them. I have indeed wondered whether all optimism is cruel, because the experience of loss of the conditions of its reproduction can be so breathtakingly bad. But some scenes of optimism are crueler than others: where cruel optimism operates, the very vitalizing or ani- mating potency of an object/scene of desire contributes to the attrition of the very thriving that is supposed to be made possible in the work of attachment in the first place. This might point to something as banal as a scouring love, but it also opens out to obsessive appetites, patriotism, a career, all kinds of things. One makes affective bargains about the costliness of one’s attachments, usually unconscious ones, most of which keep one in proximity to the scene of desire/attrition.¶ To understand cruel optimism as an aesthetic of attachment requires embarking on an analysis of the modes of rhetorical indirection that manage the strange activity of projection into an enabling object that is also disabling. I learned how to do this from reading Barbara Johnson’s work on apostrophe and free indirect discourse. In her poetics of indi- rection, each of these rhetorical modes is shaped by the ways a writing subjectivity conjures other ones so that, in a performance of phantasmatic intersubjectivity, the writer gains superhuman observational authority, enabling a performance of being made possible by the proximity of the object. Because the dynamics of this scene are something like what I am describing in the optimism of attachment, I will describe the shape of my transference with her thought

#### Micropolitical action such as what happens in this debate must be supplemented with calls for legal reform – that is key for Asian Americans to actually institute political change in any meaningful fashion. It proves that the aff can be T

McCann 12 (Michael McCann, "Inclusion, Exclusion, and the Politics of Rights Mobilization: Reflections on the Asian American Experience," Seattle Journal for Social Justice: Vol. 11: Iss. 1, Article 9. Available at: http://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol11/iss1/9\*\*)

IV. T HE P OLITICS OF RIGHTS : L EARNING FROM THE ASIAN AMERICAN EXPERIENCE It is tempting to draw from my comments so far a fairly cynical view of law and rights. In short, law and rights simply reflect contests over power, at any moment just registering the ongoing trench war over who gets what and, specifically, who is included and excluded from full protection by the legal agents of dominant groups. I think there is much truth in such a skeptical view, but I also think it is simplistic. Framing struggles over power, position, and interest as claims of rights can impart a historically grounded ethical dimension to struggle. This framework can then open the possibility for changing relationships of power, in part by mobilizing the official legal establishment, but even more by potentially mobilizing citizens and organizations in civil society who stand up to challenge either the abuses of rights or the uses of rights to justify abuse, as in these two hist orical cases. Rights are words, often written on paper, but they become materially powerful when people, ordinary and extraordinary, invest in them meaning and faith through action to challenge the unjust and often arb itrary practices of dominant groups through and beyond states. And that is just the message preached and exemplified by Gordon Hirabayashi: rights must be mobilized and demanded routinely for them to matter in guiding governmental and social power. “As fine a document as the Constitution is,” Gordon Hirabayashi famously told a reporter, “it is nothing but a scrap of paper if citizens are not willing to defend it.” 23 Such mobilization of rights in the cause of justice is hardly easy or natural, however, and Gordon’s legacy exemplifies what the struggle takes. For one thing, rights mobilization requires personal virtues of courage and willingness to make personal sacrifices . Gordon displayed such selfless bravery in his refusal to accept the or der of internment, a defiant challenge to the illegitimate government denial of basic rights to him and other Japanese Americans. In waging hi s campaigns against criminalizing subjugation, he also had to resist the pressures of others in his community who discouraged “rocking the boat” and making a bad situation worse by challenging government injustice. Gordon made a “lonely stand” in his initial resistance. 24 Young Filipino American activists in the 1970s, including Silme Domingo and Gene Viernes, displayed that same type of independent courage and persistence in the face of many obstacles and dangers. Indeed, they not only challenged powerful corporations and the American legal establishment that protected their unjust practices, but the young activists boldly opposed a dictator (who declared martial law) as well as his elite supporters in the American government. 25 The young reformers also persisted when other workers, especially senior manongs , 26 were wary about defiant challenges to the status quo. Gordon was willing to go to prison; Gene and Silme lost their liv es to assassins. Defiant action to demand rights can be risky business, and often requires such commitment and willingness to make sacrifices for larger causes.Personal courage and persistence alone are rarely sufficient. Struggles for rights also require organizational support, financial resources, and allied experts, usually including cause-oriented lawyers . Indeed, struggles for rights typically require movements that enlist many forms of organized support. The struggle for the ruling on coram nobis and legislated reparations during the 1980s, in particular, illustrates the important role of committed lawyers, community mobilization, and organizational alliance, both within and beyond the Japanese American communities. The Filipino Americans workers who initially foug ht for citizenship and workplace organizing rights, and later for work place justice and democracy in the Philippines, likewise understood the political imperative to build a movement within the union, as well as within the broader Filipino community and beyond, including among diverse progressive organizations. Finally, each of these legacies illustrates that struggles for rights must be willing to go beyond exclusive reliance on litigation to produce change . In each campaign, efforts to mobilize media support, to influence public opinion, and to lobby members of government, the business community, and the academy were critical to success. Struggles over rights are most productive when they can convince dominant groups that it is both a matter of public principle and in the political interest of the majority, including the dominant group, to do the right thing. 27 As Gordon put it, “I never look at my case as just my own, or just as a Japanese American case. It is an American case, with principles that affect the fundamental human rights of all Americans,” and, I might add, all peoples. 28

#### Asian American scholarship is compatible and stronger when connected to politics-their K is overly essentializing

Lien 10  
(Pei-te – Professor of Political Science, UC – Santa Barbara – Making of Asian America: Through Political Participation, p. xii-xiii)

One thesis of the project is that, contrary to a triangulated group image of cultural docility, socioeconomic success, and political complacency, peoples of Asian descent have always been able to interact with a transpacific system of multiple forms of repression to bargain for their best possible space in American society and polity. Rather than being passive objects of social forces, Asian American men and women have been pragmatic and calculating actors who have adopted a multifaceted style of politics to maximize their chances of survival and their interests. Prior to the eras of modern civil rights and electoral politics, they manifested a variety of political strategies ranging from active resistance to accommodation, of tactics ranging from protest to litigation, and of styles encompassing both the left and the right ends of the political spectrum. Their explicit forms of political expression reflected the confluence of a complex dynamic between internal community structure and external legal, social, political, and international context. Their participation not only earned them a rightful place to survive and thrive in America but helped transform the identity of both the foreign- and the U.S.-born generations into one that is both ethnic and American.¶ Based primarily on theories of racial formation and panethnicization, I argue in Chapter 2 that it takes a strand of coalition-building movements for liberation, justice, and empowerment at the organizational level in the post-1965 era to transform the ethnic-specific group identity into one that is panethnic in nature. The chapter depicts the onerous birth and growth of the pas-Asian American community and identity into one that is panethnic in nature. The chapter depicts the onerous birth and growth of the pan-Asian American community and identity after 1965, in arenas moving from the margins to the mainstreams of American politics as well as from ethnic-specific group politics to panethnic and transnational politics. These transformations were made possible by the drastic expansion of the community population base since the passage of the 1965 U.S. Immigration Act, but they were also made more difficult by the subsequent rise in the diversification and fragmentation of the population. Nevertheless, concurrent changes in the domestic sociopolitical and global economic context threatening the primary identity and interests of the localized community created organizing momentum for a more coherent community, which demography alone does not predict.

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)