#### **1st off is T**

### **1NC – Proper**

#### **Our interpretation is that the resolution should exclusively define the division of affirmative and negative ground**

#### **“Resolved” before a colon reflects a legislative forum.**

#### **USAWOCC 04**

#### **USAWOCC, functions as Training and Doctrine Command's executive agent for all warrant officer training and education in the U.S. Army, “# 12, Punctuation -- The Colon and Semicolon”, United States Army Warrant Officer Career College, 12 May 2004, accessed: 21 January 2021, https://web.archive.org/web/20051109001422/http://usawocc.army.mil/IMI/wg12.htm, R.S.**

#### **The colon introduces the following:**

#### **a. A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive:**

#### **Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag.**

#### **The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis.**

#### **b. A long quotation (one or more paragraphs):**

#### **In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon)**

#### **They may find it a different story from the one they learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War].**

#### **(The quote continues for two more paragraphs.)**

#### **c. A formal quotation or question:**

#### **The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."**

#### **The question is: (colon) what can we do about it?**

#### **d. A second independent clause which explains the first:**

#### **Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment.**

#### **e. After the introduction of a business letter:**

#### **Dear Sirs: (colon)**

#### **Dear Madam: (colon)**

#### **f. The details following an announcement**

#### **For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock**

#### **g. A formal resolution, after the word "resolved:"**

#### **Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.**

#### **h. The words of a speaker in a play:**

#### **Macbeth: (colon) She should have died hereafter.**

#### **Resolved means a policy**

#### **Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.**

#### **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”.**

#### **The WTO is a trade organization**

#### **WTO No Date (**[**https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\_e/whatis\_e/whatis\_e.htm**](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm)**) EE**

#### **What is the WTO?**

#### **The World Trade Organization (WTO) is the only global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations. At its heart are the WTO agreements, negotiated and signed by the bulk of the world’s trading nations and ratified in their parliaments. The goal is to help producers of goods and services, exporters, and importers conduct their business**

#### **Reduce means to diminish**

#### **Idaho State Court of Appeals 03**

#### **(State v. Knutsen, 71 P. 3d 1065 - Idaho: Court of Appeals 2003) EE**

#### **By its plain language, Rule 35 grants a district court the authority within a limited period of time to reduce or modify a defendant's sentence after relinquishing jurisdiction. To "reduce" means to diminish in size, amount, extent or number, or to make smaller, lessen or shrink. WEBSTER'S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY 1905 (1993). To "modify" means to make more temperate and less extreme, or to lessen the severity of something. Id. at 1452. Thus, under the plain meaning of its language, Rule 35 authorizes a district court to diminish, lessen the severity of, or make more temperate a defendant's sentence. An order placing a defendant on probation lessens the severity of a defendant's sentence and thus falls within the district court's authority granted by Rule 35. Other state jurisdictions have held likewise in interpreting similar rules for reduction of sentence. See** [**State v. Knapp, 739 P.2d 1229, 1231-32 (Wy.1987)**](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=1318610396541051353&q=%22the+term+reduce%22+OR+%22the+word+reduce%22+OR+%22the+phrase+reduce%22+OR+%22reduce+means%22&hl=en&as_sdt=2006) **(similar rule of criminal procedure authorizes reduction of a sentence of incarceration to probation);** [**People v. Santana, 961 P.2d 498, 499 (Co.Ct.App.1997)**](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=17890892396701062585&q=%22the+term+reduce%22+OR+%22the+word+reduce%22+OR+%22the+phrase+reduce%22+OR+%22reduce+means%22&hl=en&as_sdt=2006) **(grant of probation is a "reduction" under Colorado Cr. R. 35(b))**

#### **Nation means a community with a defined territory and government**

#### **Merriam Webster no date (**[**https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nation**](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/nation)**) EE**

#### **b: a community of people composed of one or more nationalities and possessing a more or less defined territory and government**

#### **Canada is a nation with a written constitution**

#### **— B. K. Sandwell**

#### 

#### **Violation: they defend their method. Independently, garnering offense from form implies their speech act is an advocacy. CX proves and hold the line – at best, they’re Extra-T which still links to our predictability offense.**

#### 

#### **Vote neg –**

#### **1.** **Predictable limits - post-facto topic adjustment manipulates the balance of prep which is anchored around the resolution. The resolution is the only official and public stasis point for pre-round prep.**

#### **Two impacts**

#### **1.** **Clash – the resolution as a stasis point is key for thorough examining of both sides of topic – that deconstructs dogma through self-reflection and consideration of multiple viewpoints AND is a prerequisite for third- and fourth-level iteration that develops advocacy skills which turn all their out-of-round impacts.**

#### 

#### 

#### **2.** **Procedural Fairness – speech times, speaker positions, and wins and losses prove debate is a game structured around competition. Procedural equity is necessary for the sustainability and value of that game otherwise no one will play – any interpretation that upsets it should lose. Independently, its assessment is inevitable because it’s the logical evaluative structure that undergirds their arguments.**

#### 

3. Tva- they can just read their aff as a full rez or part of the rez that talks about how IP is exclusionary to black/brown people or the developing world or how IP perpetuates cycles of violence

#### **1NC theory is DTD – a) T indicts the whole aff so DTA is DTD b) abuse is supercharged with the 7-6 rebutal time skew c) norm setting d) future abuse**

#### **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 c] Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat which outweighs on urgency**

**Falsifiability NC**

**All statements and moral theories are regulated by the falsifiability theory of meaning which prioritizes falsity over positive observation. This renders future knowledge in a state of indeterminacy and holds negative observations sufficient to disprove a theorem.**

**Nickles**, Thomas. "Falsifiability." New Dictionary of the History of Ideas. **2005**. ,<https://elearning.shisu.edu.cn/pluginfile.php/35320/mod_resource/content/1/Falsifiability%20%28Introduction%29.pdf> ///AHS PB

**Falsifiable contrasts with verifiable. A claim is empirically verifiable if possible observation statements logically imply the truth of the claim. If actual observation statements do imply the claim, then it is verified. "This raven is black" verifies "There are black ravens."** During the 1930s the logical empiricists of the Vienna Circle proposed verifiability both as a criterion of demarcation of science from nonscience and a criterion of meaning. Their idea was that a statement is meaningful if and only if it is verifiable in principle, and its meaning is given by its method of verification. For the logical empiricists, only empirically verifiable claims make genuine assertions about the world and are, in this broad sense, scientific. All other claims (metaphysical, religious, ethical, etc.) are cognitively meaningless. In his Logik der Forschung (1934; Logic of Scientific Discovery), Popper replied by rejecting the logical empiricists' concern with language and meaning and by noting that **verifiability as a criterion** of demarcation **excludes** scientific **law** claims and thus the core of science **itself. For** since **a law claim** is universal in scope (in simplest form, "All A's everywhere and everywhen are B's"), it **cannot possibly be verified: there are always actual or potential instances beyond those so far observed. Yet a** universal claim **can be falsified by a single negative instance. The first observed black swan refuted the claim "All swans are white."** (Law claims of statisticalprobabilistic forms are more problematic.) Based on this logical asymmetry of verification and falsification, Popper proposed falsifiability as a criterion of demarcation of science from nonscience, although not as a criterion of meaning. According to Popper, nonscience includes pseudoscience (e.g., Freudian psychology and Marxism) and metaphysics, the one fraudulent, the other sometimes providing a valuable heuristic for science. Many deep scientific problems have their roots in metaphysics, but to be scientific, a claim must take an empirical risk. Moreover, **falsifiability**, as the ongoing risk of falsification in our world, **is a permanent status** for Popper. **No amount of successful testing can establish a hypothesis as absolutely true or even probable: it forever remains conjectural. That all** scientific **theories remain falsifiable entails** fallibilism, the view that **our best epistemic efforts remain open to future revision. There can be no certain foundations to knowledge.**

**Thus the reasonable aff burden is to deny the falsifiability of the resolution two warrants:**

**[1] Deontic Logic: a single falsity negates the entire truth principle.**

**Luca**, Luca, Andrei. “LogicWarrior Demand Reason.” LogicWarrior, 9 Oct. **2017**, [www.logicwarrior.net/tag/law-of-non-contradiction/](http://www.logicwarrior.net/tag/law-of-non-contradiction/).

This law is another seemingly obvious point but in practice the Law of Non-Contradiction is the foundation of argumentative validity. The Law of Non-Contradiction makes logic truth preserving so that **you’ll never go from a true point and arrive at a false point. Contradiction negates logic**, and while true paradox may be something fun which to reflect unless you’re attempting to unite with the godhead by reaching nirvana, contradiction simply has no place in logic. This is not to say that something can’t appear to be self-contradictory and this idea is the basis of a lot of statements of reflection. In the course of debate another definition may become useful: **Both a claim and not that claim can’t be true. So, if a statement holds even a teensy weensy bit of falseness, it must be entirely false.**

**[2] Semantics - In debate, we either affirm or negate- Merriam Webster defines negate as “to deny the existence or truth of”[1] affirm as to “maintain as true” [2] so it’s intrinsic to our roles as debaters**

[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>

[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*

**And Permissibility and presumption flow neg: [A] Probability, there is one way for a statement to be true and an infinite amount of ways for it to be false [B] If I knew nothing about P I would presume both P and not P true, a contradiction [C] if every action is permissible then ought not statements like the resolution are incoherent [D] All moral truths require absolute certainty [1] Absent certainty we can always ask why should I, making our obligation unconstitutive [2] Uncertain truth statements are illogical**

**Unger**, Peter (**1975**): Ignorance (Oxford: Oxford University Press). ///AHS PB

The very particular idea that knowing entails its being all right to be certain is suggested, further, by the fact that **knowing entails**, at least, **that one is certain**. As we saw in section 9 of the preceding chapter, that **this** is a fact **is made quite plain by the inconsistency expressed by sentences like 'He really knew that it was raining, but he wasn't absolutely certain it was.' Such a sentence can express no truth: if he wasn't certain, then he didn't know.**