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## 2AC CONDITIONALITY BAD

Conditionality is illegitimate and a voting issue:

A. Advocacy skills – encourages the neg to kick a shallowly-researched advocacy without defending it. Decentivises comparison of advocacy skills and complex decision making. Complex policy decision making is key to being good policy analysts and decision-makers in all aspects of life.

B. Guts 2AC offense – The neg can kick the cp if the aff puts offense on it, mooting 2AC coverage. The 2AC is the only place we can get offense against the off-case positions – choices for the 2AR have to be made in the 2AC.

C. Our interpretation – one unconditional counterplan – mitigates most of their offense.

## 2NC Conditionality Good

Counter interpretation – the judge should consider any germane opportunity cost to the plan

1. They destroy optimal policy making deliberation – Limiting the negative to one advocacy artificially insulates the aff against competitive policy options – kills neg flexibility
2. Advocacy construction – makes the aff consider all opportunity costs when choosing a proposal - preventing the evaluation of opportunity costs props up bad affs – destroys effective policy consideration
3. Tactical choices – we force the 2ac to recognize and respond to strategic interactions – this is a critical skill for practical advocacy defense, because of the inevitability of strategic opponents
4. Aff side bias - First and last speech, aff picks the focus of the debate, infinite prep, the topic is huge
5. Condo not a voter – Forces substance crowd out, incentivizes cheap shot theory arguments

## **2AC INTERNATIONAL FIAT BAD**

**INTERNATIONAL FIAT IS A VOTING ISSUE –**

**A - SETS MODEL FOR POOR DECISION MAKING - the judge can’t be an agent of both the US Congress and the world. A lawmaker has the opportunity to accept or reject plans in his/her jurisdiction. Individual decision-making is also only about choice of action – we don’t have jurisdiction over other actors. It also allows for the international actor CP to fiat away some of the Affirmative case harms, like counterplan to have India not counterstrike over a mis-identified asteroid.**

**B. UNPREDICTABLE – there are around 200 countries that the Negative could fiat – the Negative also has the ability to fiat those 200 countries factorial in all possible combinations – makes it impossible for the Affirmative to generate offense against all of those actors.**

**C. SKEWS TOPIC EDUCATION – the topic should be about US space policy, not debates about the intricacies of various international actors. It also guts “foreign policy” education, which is about how the US responds to other international actors, not about the action the international actor takes.**

**D. AFF INTERPRETATION – the Negative is allowed one domestic counterplan, which includes counterplans that has the US request the action from an international actor.**

## 2NC – INTERNATIONAL FIAT GOOD

**INTERNATIONAL FIAT IS LEGITIMATE – GROUP THE DEBATE**

**OUR COUNTER-INTERPRETATION IS THAT NEGATIVES ARE ALLOWED ONE INTERNATIONAL ACTOR COUNTERPLAN IN WHICH THE ACTOR ALREADY HAS AN EXISTING SPACE PROGRAM AND THAT COUNTERPLAN DOES NOT FIAT THE OBJECT OF THE HARMS.**

***OFFENSE –***

**FIRST, RECIPROCITY – THE AFF GETS ONE ACTOR. THE NEGATIVE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO COUNTER WITH A SEPARATE ACTOR. IT IS NOT ABOUT EACH TEAM GETTING ONE ACTOR OR THE SAME ACTOR – IT IS ABOUT EACH TEAM GETTING A FAIR SHOT AT CHOOSING THE BEST POLICY OPTION FOR AN ACTOR. LIMITING US TO THE USFG MEANS WE, AT BEST, GET THE SECOND BEST POLICY OPTION THE USFG CAN TAKE.**

**SECOND, FOREIGN POLICY INFORMATION PROCESSING – INTERNATIONAL ACTOR COUNTERPLANS ARE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE UNIQUE EDUCATION ON THE MECHANISMS OF HOW OTHER COUNTRIES AND THEIR SPACE PROGRAMS OPERATE. DISADS DON’T PROVIDE THIS SAME LEVEL OF EDUCATION. INTERNATIONAL INQUIRY IS ESSENTIAL ON A SPACE TOPIC.**

**THIRD, NEGATIVE STRATEGY – UNIQUELY ON THE SPACE TOPIC, THE AFFIRMATIVE IMPACTS ARE GOING TO BE SO LARGE THAT A DISAD/CASE STRATEGY IS NOT VIABLE. THE NEGATIVE HAS TO HAVE THE ABILITY TO ATTEMPT TO SOLVE FOR MOST OF THAT IMPACT – THE STATES CP IS NOT A PLAYER ON THIS TOPIC. NEG LOSS PERCENTAGE WILL SKYROCKET WITHOUT AN ATTEMPT TO EVEN THE IMPACT PLAYING FIELD.**

***DEFENSE –***

**FOURTH, RESOLUTION CHECKS BACK YOUR PREDICTABILITY CLAIMS – IF THE TOPIC AUTHORS DID NOT WANT INTERNATIONAL ACTORS BEING DEBATED, THE RESOLUTION WOULD HAVE JUST STATED “WE SHOULD INCREASE SPACE EXPLORATION”. SPECIFYING THE USFG IN THE RESOLUTION MAKES THE ACTOR A PREDICTABLE SUBJECT OF THE DEBATE.**

**FIFTH, YOUR DECISION-MAKING ARGUMENTS ARE FALSE – LAWMAKERS AND INDIVIDUALS DO MAKE DECISIONS TO NOT TAKE AN ACTION IF THEY THINK ANOTHER ACTOR SHOULD TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY. A LAWMAKER CAN SAY THE US SHOULD NOT DO X ACTION AND VOTE AGAINST THE BILL IF THEY THINK IT IS ANOTHER ACTOR’S RESPONSIBILITY.**

**SIXTH, OUR COUNTER-INTERPRETATION CHECKS BACK YOUR LIMITS – ANY CLAIMS ABOUT TOO MANY ACTORS TO PREDICT ARE ANSWERED BY THE FACT WE ONLY ALLOW ACTORS WITH EXISTING SPACE PROGRAMS.**

**SEVENTH, ERR NEG – AFF SIDE BIAS – THE AFF GETS TO SPEAK FIRST AND LAST AND THEY GET INFINITE PREPARATION TIME.**

## 2AC – Framework – Policymaking/Plan good

**Our interpretation – the Affirmative should be able to weigh the advantages of the Affirmative against the kritik alternative. The alternative must be one that is enacted by the United States Federal Government.**

**Prefer our interpretation for several reasons:**

**A. DECISION-MAKING - DEBATE IS NOT THE SITE FOR ACTUAL CHANGE, BUT A FORUM THAT TEACHES THE SKILLS NECESSARY TO FOSTER CHANGE. WEIGHING THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF A SPACE POLICY IS KEY TO OUR FUTURE DECISION-MAKING.**

**B. JUDGE CHOICE – THERE’S NO REASON THAT THE REPRESENTATIONS THAT THEY CRITIQUE ARE INTRINSIC TO THE AFF. THE JUDGE CAN VOTE AFF SEPARATELY FROM OUR REPRESENTATIONS. THE JUSTIFICATIONS OF THE PLAN ARE NOT NECESSARY OR INEVITABLE OUTCOMES OF THE PLAN.**

**C. THEIR FRAMEWORK CEDES THE POLITICAL – THE NEG WITHDRAWS FROM ENGAGING THE STATE AND ALLOWS A CONSERVATIVE TAKEOVER – URGENT PROBLEMS WILL GO UNSOLVED --THIS IS A DISAD TO THEIR FRAMEWORK.**

**D. GUTS AFFIRMATIVE GROUND – THERE ARE INFINITE NUMBER OF POTENTIAL KRITIK FRAMEWORKS, WHICH MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE TO BE ABLE TO PREPARE OFFENSE AGAINST THOSE INFINITE OPTIONS. ALSO, ALLOWING THE NEGATIVE TO CHOOSE THE FRAMEWORK WILL MEAN THE AFFIRMATIVE’S FIRST EIGHT MINUTES WILL ALWAYS BE EXCLUDED FROM THE DEBATE.**

**AND, The role of the ballot should be to determine the best space policy proposal - Learning about space policy is key to becoming an effective space advocate**

**Livingston 2** (Dr. David M., Professor at the University of North Dakota School of Space Studies, and founder of “The Space Show, “The Prospects for Space Commerce in the Aftermath of 9-11” Paper to the Mars Society, Aug 2002, <http://www.spacefuture.com/archive/the_prospects_for_space_commerce_in_the_aftermath_of_9_11.shtml>) rory

A second recommendation is to realize that political activity on the part of space advocates and commercial space promoters is important. Our nation thrives on political activity and effectively communicating with our elected representatives and policy makers is an important part of our political, social, and economic way of life. Even if the immediate response is tepid, we must push forward with our goals and our focus in the political arena. By doing so we can accomplish much over a shorter time frame than if we did not advocate in the political arena. The key is to make sure that our efforts are productive and that we understand how specific barriers in the form of policies, regulations, and laws actually interfere with space business opportunities, and how these can be changed. Many of the existing space advocate organizations have very effective political action components in their organizations so learning how to do this does not mean reinventing the wheel.

## 2NC – Framework - Reps First

### Our interpretation is: Discussions of representations precede discussions of policy. The negative framework is the best way to evaluate the round, because representations shape the way we perceive the world. Understanding the underlying representations is a necessary pretext to effective policy making. Only through an effective evaluation of the affirmative’s representations can we arrive at the best policy option.

### A. Judge is an academic, not a policy maker – This approach is more logical and predictable – No one in the room has the ability to implement the plan. Representations affect our lives on a daily basis, and an effective discussion of representations will apply more than discussion of simulated policies.

B. Abdicating personal responsibility - By pretending the judge is the USFG we ignore our personal responsibility – fiat doesn’t actually exist, so the idea that we can solve all these problems and magically enact the plan makes us ignore other complexities. Leads to individual decision-making paralysis.

### C. We don’t need to win an alternative – if a student writes a bad paper, the teacher doesn’t have to rewrite the paper in order to give the student an F. If their 1AC is grounded in faulty representations it should be rejected, we don’t need an alternative. Permutations are therefore meaningless, because without an alternative there are no permutations.