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## Conditionality Bad

*Offense*

1. Not reciprocal- we cant run multiple plans to find the best example of the resolution
2. Time and strat skew: They could read 14 CP texts and we’d have to at least cover them all so they don’t develop one in the block.
3. Moving Target bad- Hurts fairness as well as education, we don’t know what the issues in the debate are until the 2NR.
4. Most real world- Policy makers cant propose competing pieces of legislation and I’ve never seen a senator unroll a list of 30 bills he/she might advocate that day
5. Makes for sloppy debate- Instead of creating effective strategies, negs can just guess and check
6. Voter for fairness and education

*Defense:*

1. Who says neg flexibility is good, the already have a thousand kritiks and disads, random T violations, and whatever CP they run as long as its dispo.
2. Perm doesn’t check abuse: It’s just a test of competitiveness, advocated perms justify intrinsicness.

## Dispositionality Bad

*Offense*

1. Just conditionality in disguise- the neg knows we cant strategically straight turn it.
2. Kills in depth education- We don’t analyze 2 competing policies.
3. Reciprocity- The aff will only have one advocacy, the neg gets an infinite number of combinations. Justifies affirmatie conditionality, severance and intrinsic perms
4. Infinitly regressive- Neg can run an infinite number of CP’s and defend the squo, they’ll just force us to perm
5. Moving target- We cant test their advocacy if we don’t know what position they take, kills predictability and fairness
6. Race to the bottom- If you want a debate where its just who reads the most impact turns v. net benefits than accept dispo, forcing straight turns is bad.
7. Voter for fairness

*Defense*

1. Straight turns don’t check abuse- Its suicide not to perm the CP, we have not lit. base for offense
2. Perms don’t check abuse- It’s a test of competitiveness not an advocacy, this justifies severance and intrinsic perms

## Consult CP’s Bad

1. Infinitely regressive- The aff cant predict an infinite number of consultable actors and plan modifications
2. Time and strat skew- They moot every second of the 1AC, we only get one constructive to generate offense
3. Multiple actor fiat illegit –The aff is stuck with only the USFG. This gives the negative one more advantage.
4. Future fiat is illegit- This proves the CP is delay and magnifies why consult CP’s are bad --the Neg can non-unique DA’s to the CP because its passed later after consultation
5. Conditional fiat creates a double bind—if we argue that they’ll say no, the negative can concede the CP and use our evidence as a relations DA. Forces us to debate against ourselves
6. Modifications bad- Unpredictable standard for competition and no one has literature for solvency- killing clash and educational debate.
7. Education- Consult CP’s void the round of topic specific education to debate non germane net benefits from thousands of potential actors.

## 2NC CP’s Bad

First is Offense

1. Kills aff strategy- We cant read new add ons or arguments to leverage against the CP in the 1AR
2. Time Skew- We have to answer a brand new off case argument along with everything else from the 1NC
3. Bad for education- They throw out 33 minutes of this debate we could spend developing comparisons between the policies- You cant develop analysis well in the 1AR
4. Moots our entire 2AC, they could just change their CP to get out of our DA’s and solve better.
5. Not reciprocal- It’d be like us changing our plan text in the 2AC.
6. Voter For fairness

And the Defense

1. Sandbagging hurts the aff, we cant develop our advantage for the judge
2. Not key to finding the best policy- They could’ve read the CP in the 1NC and we’d have more time to analyze it.
3. Fairness outweighs education- if debate had no rules education would be about nonsense, and debates still a game, you know you want to win.
4. Not justified by 2AC add-ons, a new impact to their CP is justified, not a new advocacy.
5. Give the 1AR leeway

## Agent CP’s Bad

1. The CP is topical, they’re affirming the resolution and taking out topical ground
2. Bad for education- kills critical thinking, and we argue courts v. congress every year instead of the resolution.
3. Steals aff ground and forces us to debate against ourselves.
4. There are 140 agencies just under the USFG they can choose- unfair neg bias.
5. Justifies stupid arguments as time sucks- The FDA wouldn’t pass the plan get over it.
6. Voter for fairness and education

## PIC’s Bad

1. Infinite regression: You can PIC out of my friend Ben, the aff has no reason that doesn’t solve case and they get a linear risk of a disad to coercian
2. Time Skew: Moots the 1AC speech time
3. Education: Gets to the point where Depth is ridiculous, focuses on a trivial detail.
4. Strategy skew: We get no offense off of 90% of our case. Forces us to Debate ourselves.
5. Voter for Fairness and education

## AT: ASPEC

Counter-interpretation: normal means solves issues stemming from agent specification

* 1. Solves offense, the negative can read evidence that says the plan will be done in certain way and then link to it
  2. Normal means solves the Elmore evidence, under normal means policies don’t lack direction or implementation.

*Offense*

1. Forcing specification gives the negative the right to agent and process counterplans. This creates bad, un-educational debate- there is never any discussion of the aff we just talk about their narrow net benefit and whether or not the perm solves.
2. Infinitely regressive- There is no reason why specifying funding or personnel is less relevant than ASPEC
3. Encourages over specifying- This kills limits and predictability because there are thousands of case combinations.

*Defense*

1. No Resolution mandate- The resolution says the USFG, it doesn’t mandate that we have to specify a single branch.
2. No in round abuse- If you were to run a specific DA link to one agent, we would not no link your disad.
3. Cross-x checks- You could’ve asked us but you just wanted to run ASPEC
4. Disclosure checks abuse- They had our plan text before the round to root it out for DA links and CP’s
5. Wrong remedy- This is an argument why the negative should get their ground- its never a reason to reject the aff

## Conditionality Good

First- offense

1. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech

1. Testing entire aff key to search for best policy option
2. Increases strategic thinking- 2ACs have to prioritize
3. Most real world- multiple choices for policy makers
4. Reciprocity- they can kick out of 2AC arguments or advantages
5. Perms are worse- they’re conditional and you can run more than one

Next- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. 2NR solves abuse the 1AC is 9 minutes of offense against the status quo- they also get the 2AR after
3. Perms solve all of their warrants
4. Time and strategy skews are inevitable- speed difference, bigger teams, short T shells
5. Don’t vote on potential abuse- allows judge intervention

## Dispo Good

First- offense

1. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
2. Testing entire aff key to search for best policy option
3. Increases strategic thinking- 2ACs have to prioritize
4. Perms are worse and they get more than one
5. Dispo is better for the aff- gives them the choice to straight turn the net benefit
6. Kicking it repairs the damage- 1AC is 9 minutes of offense vs. the status quo

Next- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions

1. 2NR solves abuse the 1AC is 9 minutes of offense against the status quo- they also get the 2AR after
2. Perms solve all of their warrants
3. Time and strategy skews are inevitable- speed difference, bigger teams, short T shells

Don’t vote on potential abuse- allows judge intervention

## Agent CPs Good

First- offense

1. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
2. Testing entire aff key to search for best policy option
3. Aff gets DAs to the CP

Second- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. Lit checks - proves it’s not infinitely regressive
3. It’s predictable and tied to the USFG wording in the resolution

*Counterinterpretation:* Neg gets agent CPs based on one of the three USFG agents

## PICs Good

First- offense:

1. Makes the aff defend the entire plan- causes better plan righting and in depth debate
2. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
3. PICs check extra-topical plan planks
4. Education- it’s the most real world and germane to the topic
5. Vital to search for best policy option

Second- Defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. Nearly inevitable- almost all CPs are PICs
3. Net benefits check abuse
4. Aff chooses the plan- proves not infinitely regressive

## International Fiat Good

First- offense

* 1. Vital to the search for the best policy option
  2. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
  3. Most real world- policy makers can enact policies from multiple countries
  4. Increases education on international issues and policies- uniquely germane on an international nuclear issue
  5. Increases aff ground- can read DAs to international action

Next- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. Predictable- the entire topic is built around the question of whether the federal government should act
3. Not object fiat- we don’t fiat the object of the advantage
4. Literature check abuse
5. Not outside of jurisdiction of the judge- the theory of opportunity cost proves the US can’t or shouldn’t do it if another country already will

## AT: No Solvency Advocate

First- offense

1. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
2. Testing entire aff key to search for best policy option
3. Encourages creativity- debate would get stale

Second- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. Either it’s tied to literature or you can win the CP doesn’t solve- proves no abuse
3. Permutations check
4. No brightline- how explicit does an article have to be to be a solvency advocate

## AT: No Neg Fiat

First- offense

1. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
2. Testing entire aff key to search for best policy option
3. Forces better aff plan writing- need to defend against CPs
4. Reciprocity- aff gets fiat, so should we
5. Increases education about alternate policies

Next- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. Permutations check
3. Debate rules are just constructions to preserve fairness- neg fiat should be constructed to preserve fair debate

## 2NC CPs Good

First- offense

1. Key to stop 2ac sandbagging which delays indepth and educational debate
2. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech
3. Vital to search for best policy option
4. Neg need recourse against 2ac add ons which are inherently unpredictable and not disclosed
5. Forces better 2AC strategy- they should anticipate these contingencies

Second- defense

1. Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions
2. 2NC is a constructive- we get new arguments
3. No offense- their arguments about underdevelopment would rule out new impact scenarios or kicking DAs
4. Cross-ex checks

## 2NC Amendments Good

1. More real world. Policy-makers make minor changes and amendments to bills all the time.

2. Increases education - it makes the 2AC choose offense wisely and forces better strategic choice

3. It's a constructive - the 2NC should be able to make modifications to arguments.

4. Negs negate - our stable position is always "don't do the plan", which the aff should be able to defend against.