Theory File

[Condo Bad 2](#_Toc266471769)

[AT: Reject Arg Not Team 3](#_Toc266471770)

[AT: All Args Conditional 4](#_Toc266471771)

[Condo Good 5](#_Toc266471772)

[Dispo Bad 6](#_Toc266471773)

[Dispo Good 7](#_Toc266471774)

[Uncondo Bad 8](#_Toc266471775)

[Uncondo Good 9](#_Toc266471776)

[Consult Bad 10](#_Toc266471777)

[Consult Good 11](#_Toc266471778)

[Conditions Bad 12](#_Toc266471779)

[Conditions Good 13](#_Toc266471780)

[Agent CP Bad 14](#_Toc266471781)

[Agent CP Good 15](#_Toc266471782)

[PICs Bad 16](#_Toc266471783)

[PICs Good 17](#_Toc266471784)

[Intrinsicness Bad 18](#_Toc266471785)

[Intrinsicness Good 19](#_Toc266471786)

[Yes Neg Fiat 20](#_Toc266471787)

[No Neg Fiat 21](#_Toc266471788)

[Textual Competition Good 22](#_Toc266471789)

[Textual Competition Bad 23](#_Toc266471790)

Condo Bad

Offense –

1. Strat Skew – Conditionality moots 2AC strat, they can kick out of our best offense.
2. Education – Condo disincentives in depth research because the neg won’t be held to an advocacy.
3. Switch Side Debate – Condo kills switch side debate because the neg can kick out of any flow without any answers to our offense.

Defense –

1. Depth is better than breath – In depth analysis provides better education than that of who can speak faster.
2. Unpredictable – Conditional advocacies can be kicked in any speech, impossible to be aff without a coherent path the debate will take.

Interpretation –

The neg’s positions should be dispositional–

* 1. Fairness – The aff should be able to stick the neg to something in their strat.
  2. Education - Forces the neg to fully research both sides of the argument before entering the debate.

AT: Reject Arg Not Team

1. **It’s not what you do, it’s what you justify, the neg is justifying ridiculous amounts of conditional args.**
2. **Punishment paradigm rewards abusive teams - gives teams an incentive to run abusive strategies preventing good cost-benefit analysis.**
3. **Make them win condo first – This arg is just as conditional as kicking out of the advocacy.**

AT: All Args Conditional

1. **Conditional policy alternatives uniquely bad—kills 2ac offense—can’t kick out of a DA and make all of our offense irrelevant**
2. **All arguments are functionally dispositional—neg can’t kick a straight turned DA**

Condo Good

Offense –

1. Education –
   1. Allows for creative new args to be read in round, prevents topic and debate stagnation.
   2. Forces the aff to read only their best offense on each flow.
2. Aff Abuse – Conditional arguments check unpredictable aff addons.
3. Perms Justify – The aff can say three words and get out of any of our counterplans, condo gets back to equal grounds.
4. Uncondo Bad – Stagnates debate and eliminates strategic fun of debate by limiting the neg to one choice.

Defense –

1. 2AR checks abuse – The aff speaks last which allows them to answer which strat we pick.
2. Solves Switch Side Debate – Forces the aff to cross apply arguments and encourages argument diversity
3. Reject the arg not the team.
4. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Interpretation –

Neg gets \_\_\_\_\_ Conditional CP’s and \_\_\_\_\_ Conditional K’s.

* 1. Prefer our interp – The neg should be able to test the aff in multiple scenarios.
  2. Their interp is worse – All args are condo, no one goes for all of them.

Dispo Bad

Offense –

1. Education – Dispo forces the aff to make certain args to stick the neg with the advocacy instead of actually answering it.
2. Strat Skew – Our best 2AC args can be kicked out of. 2AC strategy is key to fairness – that’s how we gain any adv over the block.
3. Research – Dispo positions don’t require the neg to research the advocacy fully because they don’t have to defend it.

Defense –

1. Depth over Breath – Prefer in depth debate on one advocacy than shallow debate on many different options. Incentives speed over education.
2. Moving Target – No predictable definition for what dispo is.

Interpretation –

Unconditional Good –

1. Most Real World – Policy makers have to defend the notions of plans proposed.
2. Education - Forces the neg to fully research both sides of the argument before entering the debate.

Dispo Good

Offense –

1. Education –
   1. Forces aff strategic thinking – creates the conditions for the most educational debate.
   2. Checks abusive perms
2. Dispo key to check the unpredictability of new aff addons
3. Uncondo Bad – Stagnates debate and eliminates strategic fun of debate by limiting the neg to one choice.

Defense –

1. 2AR Checks abuse - The aff speaks last which allows them to answer which strat we pick.
2. Reject the arg not the team
3. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Interpretation –

Neg gets \_\_\_\_\_ Dispositional CP’s and \_\_\_\_\_ Dispositional K’s.

1. Prefer our interp – The neg should be able to test the aff in multiple scenarios.
2. Their interp is worse – All args are condo, no one goes for all of them.

Uncondo Bad

Offense –

1. Education -
2. Breath is better than depth – The more arguments presented the easier it is to achieve education on a variety of flows.
3. Strategic Thinking – Strategically choosing a 2NR strategy is part of the education gained in debate.
4. Diversity – Debate will stagnate if strategic block choices are limited to unconditional advocacies.

Defense –

1. Real World Education – Policy makers don’t stick to one plan of action, they change to improve conditions.
2. Limits – The neg over limits debate by forcing negatives to choose only one option.

Interpretation –

Dispositionality good –

1. Solves diverse strategies by allowing negative choice.
2. Sets the best limits because the neg can strategically pick dispositional advocacies with the ability to kick from them.

Uncondo Good

Offense –

1. Fairness –
   1. It is easier to predict
   2. Aff can pick best 2AC strat without risk of skewing.
2. Education - Forces the neg to fully research both sides of the argument before entering the debate.
3. Most Real World – Policy makers have to defend the notions of plans proposed.

Defense –

1. Depth is better than breath – Education is not gained through number of arguments but through in depth analysis on few.
2. Reject the arg not the team.
3. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Interpretation –

The neg gets \_\_\_\_ Unconditional advocacies.

* 1. Creates coherent strats that can be prepared outside of the round
  2. Disincentives shady strategies

Consult Bad

Offense –

1. Unpredictable – Infinite number of actors that can be consulted. Creates a race to the bottom where negs are always trying to find the most obscure actor to consult. Predictability is key to fairness.
2. Timeframe CP’s Bad – Forces us to debate not IF the plan should pass but WHEN and under WHAT conditions, shifts focus and purpose of debate which is key to education.

Defense –

1. Aff Focus – The neg shifts the debate from a question of the aff to a question to the international agency they choose – This is the root of any education claims.
2. Aff Ground – Forces the aff to debate itself because any DA’s we read against the CP would be DA’s to the Aff.

Interpretation –

CP’s should compete textually and functionally

1. Functional competition is key to fairness in the debate, its how the aff gets to square one when the neg reads a CP
2. Textual competition is also key to fairness as it checks abusive CP’s.

Consult Good

Offense –

1. Education – THIS IS AN INTERNATIONAL TOPIC Running consult counterplans better allows us to understand political implications of the plan on an international scale.
2. Lit checks abuse – The neg can’t run obscure consultations without a stable lit base. Forces the aff to also research possible actors.
3. Research – Consultation provides opportunity to research in depth on international actors response to plan action.

Defense –

1. **Not Timeframe CP –** 
   1. **We garner no NB’s off WHEN the CP is passed, only HOW it is passed.**
   2. **Reject their interp of Timeframe CP’s – Over limits debates and doesn’t allow for questions of HOW like politics.**
2. Reject the arg not the team
3. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Interpretation –

Counterplans must compete textually and functionally except for changes that allow consultation.

1. Their interp over limits -
2. No CP competes both textually and functionally.
3. Consultation is a regular process in the international policy making framework
4. Solves their offense because only a few actors can be consulted.

Conditions Bad

Offense –

1. Unpredictable – Infinite number of conditions the CP could be predicated off of. Predictability is key to fairness.
2. Conditional Fiat Bad – The neg only passes the CP if a condition is met. Stable confirmation of FIAT is the only way for the aff to garner offense and test competition.
3. Utopian fiat bad –
   1. Neg fiats international co-operation on an issue
   2. Kills fairness – allows the neg to fiat any ridiculous CP mooting the offense the aff gains from the 1AC.

Defense –

1. Aff Focus – Conditional CP’s shift focus of the debate to a question of a specific condition instead of the aff action itself. Key to in round education.
2. Aff ground – Conditional CP’s force the aff to debate against itself, moots the 1ac ground gained.

Interpretation –

CP’s should compete textually and functionally

Conditions Good

Offense –

1. Lit checks abuse – The neg can’t run obscure consultations without a stable lit base. Forces the aff to also research possible actors.
2. Research – Consultation provides opportunity to research in depth on international actors response to plan action.

Defense –

1. Not Utopian- The plan fiats that all branches of the government will pass the plan
2. Conditional fiat good –
3. Most real world – International actors often add different conditions to agreements.
4. Competition is not premised around whether there is actual stable FIAT.
5. Reject the arg not the team
6. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Interpretation -

Counterplans must compete textually and functionally except for changes that allow for conditions.

Agent CP Bad

Offense –

1. Unpredictable – Infinite number of agents that can do the plan.
2. Topic specific education - generic process CPs encourage generic debates. Topic education prevents stale debate.
3. Kills aff ground - it’s not an effective test of our whole plan which allows the negative to neutralize our best offense. Kills argument development.

Defense –

1. Aff Focus – Shifts the debate to a question of WHO not If we should do the plan.
2. Limits – The neg sets the best limits by keeping CP’s confined to agency presented by the 1AC.

Interpretation -

Reject CPs that do not include the whole action of the plan

Agent CP Good

Offense –

1. Forces 2ac strategic thinking – affs will have to defend their agent and read addons that the CP can’t solve.
2. Education - debates over the agent of action are equally important as the mandates of the plan.
3. Topic specific education – Agent CP’s are key to understanding different agencies relationships to

Defense –

1. Framers intent – The resolution doesn’t specify an agent, meaning any agency within the USfg could potentially be involved in the plan.
2. Reject the arg not the team
3. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

PICs Bad

Offense –

1. **Aff Ground – The PIC uses 1AC ground to weigh versus the aff itself, we lose all 1AC offense.**
2. **Education - Re-using aff ground destroys clash and switch side debate.**
3. **Abuse – We lose all pre-round prep and impact ground.**
4. **Infinitely regressive – Inevitably leads to worse and worse PIC out of obscure objects. Makes the aff impossible speech.**

Defense –

1. **Competition – PIC doesn’t compete, means the aff is best option.**
2. **Justifies intrinsicness - PIC justifies affirmative making intrinsic perms.**

PICs Good

Offense –

1. Reciprocal: permutation includes all of the plan and part of the counter-plan is legit even though it’s partially inclusive of the counter-plan
2. Leads to better plantexts: prevents affs from reading plantexts that have negative implications based on the rhetoric or implementation of the plan.
3. Plan focus neg’s job is to attack the 1AC on the whole – increases topic specific education

Defense –

1. Every counter-plan is a PIC - they must include all or part of the plan.
2. Reject the arg not the team
3. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Intrinsicness Bad

Offense –

1. Neg Ground - destroys links to 1NC strategy, we lose 8 minutes of offense
2. Education - the perm shifts focus from the plan which destroys education,
3. Utopian fiat – Intrinsicness justifies illegitimate claims from the 1AC.

Defense –

1. Competition - The texts are mutually exclusive, rendering the perm illegit.
2. Infinitely regressive - the perm will justify new and multiple 2NC counter-plans to generate offense against the 1AR.

Intrinsicness Good

Offense –

1. Competition - Intrisicness proves competition of plan and counter-plan is possible.

Defense –

1. Neg Ground - they can run disads that link to the new portion, justifies new offense in the block.
2. Proves plan is a good idea - perms in addition to the 1AC means that the plan is true.
3. Reject the arg not the team
4. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

Yes Neg Fiat

Offense –

1. Best policy option - if we win counterplan is a preferable advocacy you vote neg.
2. Cost Benefit analysis is good –
   1. Real World Education – Policy makers change and change plans to improve it. This education carries outside round.
   2. Fairness – It’s fair that the neg should be able to not only point out flaws in the aff but fix them too.

Defense –

1. Aff bias - the persuasive value of the 2ar outweighs the strategic benefit of the block - we should be able to use counterplans to prove an advocacy is better than the affirmative
2. Reject the arg not the team
3. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff

No Neg Fiat

Offense –

1. Predictability – There are an infinite number of things the neg can fiat, makes it impossible to be aff.
2. Skews 2AC strat – The job of the neg is not to propose alts to the aff but to prove why the plan itself is bad. Key to fairness.
3. Hurts aff stability – The neg focuses on cp instead of the plan which is key to in round education.

Defense –

* + - 1. Aff focus – Neg fiat shifts the focus of the debate from the plan to the CP. Plan focus is key to topic specific education.

2. The CP steals aff ground, makes the aff debate itself.

Textual Competition Good

Offense –

1. **Objective - sets a better brightline for when a counterplan is competitive by limiting it to textual precision.**
2. **Predictable - we can't predict every policy that could theoretically solve our aff. there is nothing to restrain counterplans without text comp**
3. **Competition – Competition can’t be weighed without seeing what plan allows and precludes through text.**

Defense –

1. **Justifies delay counter-plans which are bad because they allow the negative to steal affirmative ground and change when the plan gets implemented.**
2. **Predictability – Aff predictability is limited by the wording of the plan text. Some CPs may have “advantages” theoretically but not meet the need to make those CPs topical.**

**Interpretation -**

**All** counterplans must be textually and functionally competitive - Solves any reason why functional competition is good.

Textual Competition Bad

Offense –

1. Infinitely regressive – forces aff to write obscure plan texts to avoid PICS.
2. Education – forces the neg to the confides of the plan text, discourages creative CP’s.

Defense –

1. Limits - No cp fully competes textually, the aff limits out literally all CP’s.
2. Only functional competition matters the cp will inevitably contain part of the aff. Functional competition good -
3. Real World – Policy makers care about the substantive benefits of bills and policies, not the exact text.
4. Best Policy Option – Functional competition allows the search for the best policy option by allowing a true comparison of net benefits.
5. Reject the arg not the team
6. Err Neg: Theory is a zero sum game for the aff