Alright folks, this argument is totally sweet—it's a delay counterplan. There are two different variations; the first is the November Election counterplan that waits until the day after the election to pass the plan, obviously the net benefit will be an elections disad. The second version is the Stealth Friday counterplan, the argument here is that we should delay the plan until Friday afternoon because there is no public perception then. The net benefit to the Stealth counterplan would probably be a Bush good story. I think until the election you shouldn't even touch the Friday CP as the November CP will make a lot more sense. The blocks are pretty comprehensive for the theory debate, just be ready for a big theory throw down so if you don't like that sort of round don't run this file. Good Luck!
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**NOVEMBER ELECTION DELAY COUNTERPLAN PAGE 1 OF 1**


A. IT’S LEGIT—
CROSS-X IS BINDING AND THEY DEFEND IMMEDIATE ADOPTION—THEY CAN’T SEVER THAT OR IT CRUSHES ALL NEGATIVE GROUND—AND SEVERING IMMEDIACY CRUSHES OUR CONSULT GROUND AND VIOLATES THE WORD ‘RESOLVED’.

B. IT COMPETES—
PASSING THE PLAN AFTER THE ELECTION PREVENTS THE PLAN FROM HAVING ANY EFFECT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE ELECTION

C. IT SOLVES—
CONGRESS CAN DELAY POLITICALLY CONTROVERSIAL VOTES UNTIL AFTER THE NOVEMBER ELECTION TO STOP PARTISAN DEBATE FROM TURNING INTO A CAMPAIGN ISSUE

Alan Fram (Associated Press Writer) Seattle Post Intelligencer; June 4, 2004; l/n //nick

Congress may be able to postpone politically difficult votes on boosting the government’s debt limit until after the November elections, two top congressional aides said Friday.

Treasury Department officials have told congressional staff in recent weeks that by shifting federal funds among different accounts, they may find enough cash to avoid the need for new borrowing authority until mid-November, said the aides, who spoke on condition of anonymity.

With a spate of huge federal deficits over the past three years, Congress has already boosted the borrowing limit twice since President Bush took office. The need to raise the current $7.4 trillion ceiling is certain, with the only question being one of timing.

By delaying a vote until after the elections, Republicans could prevent Democrats from using the debate to train a campaign-season spotlight on the massive deficits of Bush’s term, his tax cuts and what they say has been his mishandling of the economy.
STEALTH FRIDAY DELAY COUNTERPLAN

STEALTH FRIDAY DELAY COUNTERPLAN PAGE 1 OF 4

COUNTERPLAN: THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD PASS ______ (insert the plan) ______ ON FRIDAY AFTERNOON, ____________

A. IT’S LEGIT—
CROSS-X IS BINDING AND THEY DEFEND IMMEDIATE ADOPTION—THEY CAN’T SEVER THAT OR IT CRUSHES ALL NEGATIVE GROUND—and severing immediacy crushes our consult ground and violates the word ‘resolved’.

B. IT COMPETES—

1. PASSING THE PLAN ON FRIDAY AFTERNOON AVOIDS THE NEWS CYCLE THAT MAGNIFIES PUBLIC PERCEPTION—MEANS WE’LL UNIQUELY DODGE THE POLITICS LINK

Judy Keen and Haya El Nasser, USA TODAY, September 22, 2003, “It’s TGIF for the White House when it has bad news,” Monday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 18A

The Bush administration seems to be following an axiom that guided many of its predecessors: To keep negative headlines to a minimum, release bad news on a Friday.

For at least 15 years, the Census Bureau has released its annual reports on the nation’s income and poverty statistics on a Tuesday or a Thursday. This year, when indicators suggest that the reports will document downward trends, they will be released Friday.

Census spokesman Lawrence Neal says the agency “picked a date out of the air.” But the Bush administration has a pattern of announcing controversial or unfavorable news as the weekend begins.

To attract little attention, the strategy makes sense. Friday night’s network news broadcasts are the least-watched of the workweek. Saturday newspapers are the week’s least-read editions.

Robert Lichter, director of STATS or Statistical Assessment Service, a group that monitors the use of numbers by the news media, says Fridays are ideal for “throwing the news into a black hole.”
2. IT'S EMPIRICALLY PROVEN THAT BUSH AND CONGRESS HAVE SUCCESSFULLY USED STEALTH FRIDAYS TO DODGE PUBLIC PERCEPTION MANY TIMES—IT'S ESPECIALLY TRUE FOR THE PLAN, WHICH IS A ONE-DAY STORY.
Judy Keen and Haya El Nasser, USA TODAY, September 22, 2003, “It's TGIF for the White House when it has bad news,” Monday, FINAL EDITION, Pg. 18A

This administration isn't the first to try to bury bad news.

On a Friday in 1996, for example, the Clinton White House released long-sought records from Hillary Rodham Clinton's former law firm, saying the files had just been found. In 1989, the first President Bush lifted trade sanctions against two Chinese companies on a Friday soon after China's crackdown on protesters in Tiananmen Square.

This Bush administration has had many bad-news Fridays:

* On a Friday last November, the Environmental Protection Administration said it would relax enforcement of the Clean Air Act so older coal-fired power plants could renovate without having to install anti-pollution equipment.

* On a Friday in January, the administration said it would consider removing Clean Water Act protections from up to one-fifth of the nation's streams, ponds, lakes, mudflats and wetlands.

* The resignations of Army Secretary Thomas White and Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill were announced on Fridays.

* Last December, Census officials admitted on a Friday that the 2000 Census undercounted the nation by 3.3 million people.

Politicians on Capitol Hill know about stealth Fridays, too. When Sen. Trent Lott, R-Miss., announced in December that he would resign as majority leader because of controversy over racial comments he had made, he did it on a Friday.

The week between Christmas and New Year's and the day before national holidays also are popular times to try to slip controversial news under the radar. Last year, the administration said on the eve of Thanksgiving that it would give managers of national forests more authority to approve logging with less study of potential environmental problems.

Neal says he had planned to release the poverty and income reports Tuesday, but they are more complex this year.

"We just moved it to the 26th," he says. Asked if that indicates the numbers will not be very positive, he says: "They weren't positive last year, either," and the numbers were released on a Tuesday.

Last year's reports showed that median household income in 2001 registered the first significant decline since 1991 and the percentage of Americans living in poverty rose from 11.3% to 11.7%, the first increase in five years.

The Friday strategy works best if the story is a "one-day wonder," and isn't dramatic enough to dominate Sunday's widely read newspapers and popular TV news talk shows, Lichter says. "You want that one-day wonder to be the day that nobody wonders about the news."
3. WHITE HOUSE CAN USE FRIDAY ANNOUNCEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY TO CONTROL MEDIA SPIN.
OnEarth, March 22, 2003 No. 1, Vol. 25; Pg. 47

For most of America's overburdened workforce, Friday at five o'clock is a time to exhale—but for journalists covering the Bush administration, Friday at five o'clock means trouble. More than fifty times over the last two years, the Bush administration has chosen the hour to break bad environmental news to the public. (Senator Patrick Leahy [D-VT] has even remarked that for the environment, "every Friday is Friday the 13th ") There is, of course, a reason for the strategy; it helps keep unpopular policy changes out of the press. Networks don't have time to pull together a story for the nightly news, and journalists have little time to call environmental experts--NRDC, for example--who can counter the White House spin. The pattern has become so predictable that environmentalists have taken to calling this White House tactic the "five o'clock follies' Below, a few examples of what the Bush administration was saying while you were heading home to enjoy your weekend.
4. STEALTH FRIDAY AVOIDS PUBLIC AND PRESS SCRUTINY AND PASSES
THE PLAN QUICKLY AND QUIETLY.
John J. Monahan, Sunday Telegram (Massachusetts), March 09, 2003 Sunday, ALL
EDITIONS, ENVIRONMENT; Pg. A5

In newsrooms around the country, reporters and editors are all too familiar with one of the oldest tricks in
the PR book, designed to limit public scrutiny of unpopular issues and known as "the Friday afternoon
press release."

Want to read bad news about the environment? Read the Saturday papers, recommends the Sierra Club,
which is getting fed up with the tactic.

"Thank George it's Friday" is the slogan the Sierra Club has adopted to describe the Bush
Administration's preweekend media plans.

The group has gotten used to grimacing in the hours before the weekend, when many government reporters
have wrapped up their workweeks, editors have already planned news coverage for the weekend, and
public officials are hard to track down.

When Friday rolls around, the White House has taken to announcing bad news for the environment, "safe in
the knowledge that it will attract the minimum amount of scrutiny from the press and the public," said
Carl Pope, executive director of the Sierra Club.

Recently it was the decision to pave the way for logging in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. The U.S.
Forest Service released an environmental impact decision that denied wilderness designation for any of the
9 million acres of road-free natural forest land.

"By slipping controversial proposals in under the radar, the administration seeks to accomplish their goals
quickly and quietly, without full public knowledge, public debate or public consent," said Mr. Pope.

Who would have thought?

Of course you don't have to be in the White House to play the game.

State officials have been using the Friday fast one for years. In one infamous case, the governor caved in to legislative pressure to
grant lawmakers a controversial pay hike he had said he would not approve, then flew off with some legislative leaders to Ireland to
talk about Irish-American relations for the weekend.

State environmental officials for the last four years have also held up releases of environmental impact decisions on major projects
until late Friday afternoon.

Here in our newsroom, meanwhile, one editor recalled it was the Sierra Club that announced it would file suit against the state to
block more ski trails at Wachusett Mountain very late one Friday afternoon a couple of years ago.

Still, Mr. Pope makes a point.
Looking back, it was Friday, Jan. 10, when the administration announced its decision to authorize the 39,000 new oil and gas wells on
"public land" in the Powder River basin of Wyoming and Montana. The same day, the EPA announced it was issuing new policies to
restrict the Clean Water Act.

A week later, on Friday, Jan. 17, the administration released its plans to expand drilling in 23.5 million acres of Alaska's North Slope.

It was Friday, Nov. 22, last year when the EPA proposed rules to weaken the Clean Air Act. Of course that notice had to also appear
in the widely available Federal Register at a later date. And it did— in the New Year's Eve edition.

The technique will work on any Friday. But the most effective ones are those Fridays followed by a
Monday holiday.
EMPIRCAL EXAMPLES

HERE ARE FOUR EXAMPLES OF STEALTH FRIDAY ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES.
OnEarth, March 22, 2003 No. 1, Vol. 25; Pg. 47

FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 2003 Isolated wetlands such as desert springs, vernal pools, and seasonal streams contain up to 20 percent of America’s water. But on this day the Bush administration argued that these important water sources for migratory birds aren’t covered by the Clean Water Act—even though they have been for thirty years. Instead, protecting them could become the job of states and local governments (many of which think it’s just fine to let developers fill in the wetlands and get to building).

FRIDAY, JANUARY 3, 2003 It’s your right to have a say in how and how much federal land gets logged. It’s your right to know how logging might affect fish and other animals. Or it has been your right. Today the Forest Service laid out a plan to exclude you from reviewing timber-cutting projects of less than 250 acres. And, no, you won’t be able to challenge any government decisions to sell off these small tracts to timber companies. The proposed rules forbid appeals in court.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22, 2002 May as well rename Padre Island National Seashore in Texas the “Padre Island Private Gas Wells.” The Bush administration announced the 69-mile-long island will get fresh wells courtesy of BNP Petroleum. To build them, tractor-trailers will drive up to forty trips a day along a 14-mile stretch of beach that is the main nesting ground for the world’s most endangered sea turtle, the Kemp’s ridley.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2002 Talk about an unlucky day for the endangered desert tortoise. The Bureau of Land Management announced it wants to reduce the animal’s protected habitat in California’s Sonoran Desert by 150,000 acres—a move that will open up the area to off-road vehicles.
ROVE USES THEM

ROVE USES STEALTH FRIDAYS
Paul Harris, The Observer, October 5, 2003, Observer News Pages, Pg. 14

Critics accuse Rove of bringing such tactics into the White House. Certainly he has made the Bush administration one of the most leak-proof ever to take power. Unlike the more open - and leaky - Clinton era, speaking to reporters is seen as a punishable offence for many officials. Many announcements of bad news - such as last week’s poverty increase - are released late on Friday ahead of the weekend newspapers, which are not widely read in America.
WHITE HOUSE USES

WHITE HOUSE MANAGES ENVIRONMENTAL NEWS BY BURYING BAD NEWS ON FRIDAYS.
Anderson Cooper (Host) CNN 360 Degrees 19:00, September 26, 2003 Friday,
Transcript # 092600CN.V98

More now on politics and a question. If news breaks on a Friday when no one is watching, did it ever really break?

We're talking about the Friday burial, when politicians release news when they know no one is watching. Today brought accusations of just such a Friday burial. A report showing an increase in poverty. Democrats complained it got a Friday burial instead of coming out on the usual release days, which is Tuesday or Thursday. The Census Bureau strongly denies it. But fair to say politicians on both sides of the aisle have proven in the past that they have impeccable timing when it comes to releasing news they'd rather you ignore. Take a look.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

COOPER (voice-over): Friday nights are the least watched newscast of the work week. And Saturday morning's papers have the lowest circulation, which means fewer people see news that happens on Fridays than on any other day.

The White House benefited from that when the first President Bush lists some Chinese trade sanctions on a Friday in 1989, not long after the massacre in Tianamen Square.

President Clinton's team benefited on the Friday in 1996 when they released the first lady's supposedly missing law firm records.

And this Bush White House benefits as well. Environmentalists are so used to getting bad news on Fridays, like easing restrictions in the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, that they call it the 5:00 follies. The EPA has said it releases information when it gets it. But former White House Spokesman Ari Fleischer has acknowledged managing the timing of some environmental news. Otherwise, Fleischer says, chances are more of the story will be about reaction to the president's environmental announcement than the substantive reasons why the president did it.
2NR BLOCKS

STEALTH FRIDAY 2NR OVERVIEW

THE COUNTERPLAN SOLVES 100% OF THE CASE. THEY CAN NEVER WIN AN IMPACT TO A COUPLE DAYS OF DELAY, BUT OUR ON-POINT EVIDENCE GUARANTEES A SUBSTANTIAL LINK TO THE NET BENEFIT. ANY RISK OF A LINK DIFFERENTIAL MEAN WE WIN—

THEY WON’T BEAT US ON THEIR WEAK THEORY ARGUS—IT’S ALL ANSWERED IN THE 2NC OVERVIEW—THE LITERATURE STANDARD CHECKS EVERY SINGLE EXAMPLE OF ABUSE THEY CAN COME UP WITH. THERE ARE LOTS OF ARTICLES ABOUT STEALTH FRIDAYS—AND THEY HANDED US THE COMPETITION IN CROSS-X. AND, OUR DEPLOYMENT OF ESOTERIC TOPIC RESEARCH TO CONTROL GROUND IS 100% RECIPROCAL WITH THE WAY THEY RESEARCH THEIR AFFS. AND, THERE’S NO WARRANT FOR ANY OF THEIR THEORY ARGUS BEING VOTING ISSUES.
NOVEMBER ELECTION 2NR OVERVIEW

THE COUNTERPLAN SOLVES 100% OF THE CASE. OUR FRAM EVIDENCE SAYS CONGRESS CAN AND WILL DELAY POLITICALLY CONTROVERSIAL VOTES UNTIL AFTER THE ELECTION TO AVOID A LEGISLATIVE IMPACT ON CAMPAIGNING. THEY CAN NEVER WIN AN IMPACT TO THE SHORT TIMEFRAME OF THE DELAY, BUT OUR ON-POINT EVIDENCE GUARANTEES A SUBSTANTIAL LINK TO THE NET BENEFIT. ANY RISK OF A LINK DIFFERENTIAL MEAN WE WIN—
2NR DELAY GOOD

DELAY COUNTERPLANS ARE SWEET FOR LOTS OF REASONS—FIRST THEY MAKE DEBATE MORE LIKE THE REAL WORLD WHICH INCREASES POLICY REALISM AND IMPROVES EDUCATION—THAT’S 2NC 3—AND—THEY UNIQUELY INCREASE EDUCATION BY HIGHLIGHTING TIME-SENSITIVE ISSUES—THAT’S 2NC 5—AND—DELAY IS KEY TO ALL NEGATIVE GROUND, BECAUSE IF AFF CAN SEVER IMMEDIACY OR CERTAINTY THEY CAN ALWAYS CLARIFY OUT OF EVERY DISAD LINK AND COUNTERPLAN COMPETITION CLAIM, WHICH MEANS NEG COULD NEVER WIN, A WORSE SCENARIO THAN ANY OF THEIR ABUSE CLAIMS—THAT’S THE 2NC #8. AND THERE’S STILL PLENTY OF GROUND—EXTEND ALL THE EXAMPLES OF REAL ARGS THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN MAKING INSTEAD OF WHINING ABOUT THEORY.
2NR PICS GOOD

PICS ARE CRUCIAL TO NEGATIVE GROUND—AFFS SPEAK FIRST AND LAST AND CHOOSE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE DEBATE. PICS ARE THE ONLY THING SHORT OF GENERIC, UTOPIAN COUNTERPLANS AND CRITIQUES THAT CAN STRATEGICALLY SHIFT GROUND AND LEVEL THE PLAYING FIELD—AND—THEY SHOULD HAVE TO DEFEND ALL OF THEIR PLAN AND CROSS-X CLARIFICATIONS. THEY HAD INFINITE PREP TO DETERMINE EXACTLY WHAT TO INCLUDE IN THEIR ADVOCACY AND BE READY TO DEFEND IT—AND—THEIR GROUND IS WHAT THEY MAKE IT. IF OUR PIC IS JUST TOO SWEET THEN THEY SHOULD LOSE THIS DEBATE AND ADD A STEALTH FRIDAY TO THEIR PLAN NEXT TIME.
TOPICAL COUNTERPLANS ARE MONEY—DEBATE IS A SEARCH FOR THE BEST POLICY OPTION, IGNORING RELEVANT OPTIONS JUST BECAUSE THEY'RE TOPICAL IS IRRATIONAL—AND—COMPETITION CHECKS ALL OF THEIR EXAMPLES OF ABUSE—AND—WE’LL WIN A TURN—A WORLD OF EXCLUSIVELY NONTOPICAL COUNTERPLANS UNDERMINES TOPIC EDUCATION AND SKews GROUND TO BACKFILE CHECKS AND BORING GENERIC ARGS LIKE SOCIALISM AND ANARCHY—AND—THERE'S NO REASON THIS IS A VOTING ISSUE.
2NC THEORY BLOCKS

STEALTH FRIDAY 2NC OVERVIEW

THE COUNTERPLAN SOLVES THE ENTIRETY OF THE CASE—THERE IS ZERO IMPACT TO A COUPLE DAYS OF SOLVENCY DEFICIT—AND IT DODGES NEARLY THE ENTIRETY OF THE POLITICS LINK—OUR EVIDENCE IS FANTASTIC THAT FRIDAY AFTERNOON RELEASE DODGES THE MEDIA SPIN CYCLE ENTIRELY AND MEANS ZERO PUBLIC PERCEPTION—AND ANY RISK OF A LINK DIFFERENTIAL MEAN WE WIN—

THEIR LONE HOPE IS THEORY AND WE’LL WORK THEM ON IT—A FEW KEY POINTS:

1. RECIPROCITY—THEIR GAME IS TO DO LEXIS SEARCHES FOR OBSCURE CORNERS OF THE TOPIC AND BUILD CASES AROUND THEM TO DODGE CLASH AND SHIFT GROUND IN THEIR FAVOR. WE’RE DOING EXACTLY THE SAME THING—WE DID SEARCHES ON THE PROCESS OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY AND FOUND A WAY TO SHIFT GROUND IN THE DEBATE.

2. LITERATURE—OUR STANDARD CHECKS BACK EVERY ABUSE EXAMPLE THEY CAN EVER COME UP WITH. A LEGITIMATE COUNTERPLAN MUST BE GROUNDED IN THE RELEVANT ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY LITERATURE—OURS CLEARLY IS—THAT GUARANTEES PREDICTABILITY AND FAIRNESS.

3. GROUND—THEY GOT PLENTY. THERE ARE LOTS OF SUBSTANTIVE ARGUMENTS THEY COULD HAVE MADE AGAINST POLITICAL MANAGEMENT OF THE MEDIA SPIN CYCLE.
NOVEMBER ELECTION 2NC OVERVIEW


THEIR LONE HOPE IS THEORY BUT THE FRAM EVIDENCE FROM THE 1NC PROVES A DELAY IS A STANDARD MECHANISM EMPLOYED BY CONGRESS AROUND ELECTION TIME AND WE’LL WORK THEM ON THEORY ON THE LINE BY LINE....
DELAY CP GOOD 2NC THEORY PAGE 1 OF 2

1. IT'S FUNDAMENTALLY A DEFENSE OF STATUS QUO
   It fulfills the only neg burden of disproving that the plan should be done in the present policy environment. It's uniquely less abusive than any other counterplan.

2. IT DEJUSTIFIES THE RESOLUTION.
   The "should" claim in the resolution is time-bound—it assume desirability relative to the status quo—any delay would make the plan not topical and dejustify the resolution. In today's debate negate the resolution because it shouldn't be affirmed until later.

3. IT'S REAL WORLD
   "Now is not the time" is a crucial argument against policy action in the real world. Debate should mirror the real world to teach skills that transfer to other contexts. Our injection of policy realism is an independent voter for education.

4. THERE'S AFF GROUND
   Just argue that the plan needs to be done now and you have substantive ground to win a solvency deficit—we think we can win that debate, but there's no reason to whine about theory when you could be making real args.

5. UNIQUELY INCREASES EDUCATION
   Delay counterplans are key to fully evaluating truly pressing issues like war and economic crisis that would otherwise be crowded out by highly speculative advantage scenarios that lack immediate relevance to our lives—the counterplan provides qualitatively better education than the case.

6. CONGRESS PUTS OFF LEGISLATION TO ADDRESS OTHER LEGISLATION
   Tom Doggett “House delays vote on Bush's Alaska oil drilling plan” Reuters News Service 14/4/2003 //nick

WASHINGTON - The Republican-led House of Representatives has delayed until Friday a final vote on a broad energy bill that critics said would turn over an Alaskan wildlife refuge to oil companies instead of focusing on ways to stretch the nation's energy supplies by increasing vehicle mileage requirements. Although the bill contained $18.7 billion in tax incentives for U.S. coal, natural gas, nuclear and alternative energy, and conservation, most attention has focused on its endorsement of a Bush administration plan to open part of the sprawling Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR, to oil drilling. Most House Democrats oppose drilling in the refuge and said the legislation primarily benefits the oil industry. Democrat Jim McDermott of Washington called the bill a "dream plan" for big oil companies, with less money for energy conservation and alternative fuels. "This is an oil company bill. It's oil, oil oil - it has a greasy feeling to it," he said on Thursday during debate on the bill.

Lawmakers had hoped to vote out the energy bill by late Thursday evening, but delayed action to take up separate budget legislation.

7. FUTURE FIAT IS OK
   Neg can be nontopical and lit checks abuse. Any counterplan flatted far in the future should lose to case outweighs, so options are grounded in predictable current events.
8. KEY TO NEG GROUND
If aff can sever the immediacy and certainty of their policy action it crushes critical
negative counterplan ground—we lose all consult and process counterplans, which are key
ground equalizers and are necessary to properly evaluate plan desirability.

9. NET BENEFITS CHECK ABUSE
There really is a reason to do the plan later as opposed to now. There’s no reason the aff
shouldn’t be held accountable for it.

10. NO RIGHT TO DODGE GENERICS
The fact that it applies universally doesn’t mean it’s not legitimate. That just makes it
good strategy.

11. TIMING IS KEY TO ADVOCACY, SO WE SHOULD DEBATE ABOUT IT
Thomas G. Nelson, Ninth Circuit Court Judge, N.A.A.C.P. Western Region V. City Of
Richmond, May 16, 1984, 743 F.2d 1346, p. 1356.

A spontaneous parade expressing a viewpoint on a topical issue will almost inevitably attract more
participants and more press attention, and generate more emotion, than the "same" parade 20 days later.
The later parade can never be the same. Where spontaneity is part of the message, dissemination delayed is
dissemination denied.

12. REWARD TIMELY AFFIRMATIVES
Delay counterplans give incentives to research cases that have the most immediate
relevance to policy-making. That’s key to education and avoiding repetition

13. DELAYS SERVE THE INTERESTS OF LEGISLATORS AND CAN RESULT IN
MORE EFFECTIVE POLICY MAKING
Daniel B. Rodriguez (Acting Professor of Law, Boalt Hall School of Law, University of

The ways legislators calculate how their regulatory preferences may change over time raises a final
difficulty: Congress may actually benefit from some degree of regulatory ossification. Delays and barriers
to the making and remaking of regulatory policy can frequently serve legislative goals. Although efforts to
refine regulation often presuppose that legislators would profit from a reconfigured system in which regulatory
policy is made more efficiently, inefficiencies in the system—inefficiencies that several of the NPR recommendations are designed
to counteract—may actually serve the interests of legislators. For example, administrative procedures that provide notice
and a considerable delay between the announcement of a proposed policy and its implementation may generate legislative attention,
enabling legislators concerned with this policy proposal to express their views to the appropriate agency officials.

14. NO VOTING ISSUE
If the counterplan's not legit then it's like a disad with no link—but the plan might still be
a bad idea.
AT: PERM "PASS NOW IMPLEMENT LATER"

1. STILL LINKS--
The initial action of deciding to pass the plan immediately would be magnified by the news cycle and perceived by the public.

2. IT'S AN ADVOCACY SHIFT--
Their plan fiats immediate policy action per the 1AC and cross-x clarification--delaying even the implementation of that is a shift of 1AC advocacy that justifies 2AC severence and plan spikes that destroy all ground--that's a voter.
AT: PERM "DO BOTH"

1. THIS IS STUPID--
There is no offensive reason to pass the plan twice. If we win a risk of the disad the counterplan alone is always a better option.
AT: PERM "DO THE CP"

1. IT SEVERS--
If they delay the plan action it severs the immediacy and certainty of the plan, makes the
aff nontopical on the word "should" which is an auxiliary used in the present and under
"resolved" a definite course of action. Severence takes out all disad links and justifies
"do the CP" perms to all counterplans which mean neg can never win—that's a voter.

2. THIS JACKS OUR DELAY COUNTERPLAN GROUND--
That's a voting issue for all of the reasons delay is good--cross-apply from above.

3. TEXTUAL COMPETITION IS BAD--
Allowing them to permute in the delay language of the CP to radically alter plan
mandates justifies permuting in agents or banning language from counterplans--
eliminating the most relevant counterplans, trivializing debate, and jacking our ground.
INTRINSIC PERMS BAD

1. ABUSIVE MOVING TARGETS
The neg cannot present any argument against intrinsicness perms ans therefore never has an opportunity to win against case because they will consistently add sections to their case that spikes the link to DA or solvency attacks

2. CAN LEAD TO VIOLATIONS OF T AND EXTRA-T
At this point in the round a violation would be dismissed as abusive so they are allowed to abandon the resolution by adding non or extra topical parts to the plan; this violates limits on Aff ground

3. DESTROYS RECIPROCITY
Reciprocity in this situation could only be achieved by allowing the Neg to run new DA’s and counterplans every speech to counter the perm; the Aff should restrict themselves to one plan and provide a good debate

4. INFINITELY REGRESSIVE
Allowing these perms allows a simple case to mutate into a ludicrous monstrosity that solves multiple nuclear wars, disease, while making your teeth whiter and waxing you car; the Neg never wins

5. IT’S AN ADVOCACY SHIFT
The perm must be advocated since it doesn’t test whether the CP competes with the plan, but whether the CP competes with the plan plus something else. This advocacy shift is abusive, since it justifies severing any part of the plan to avoid disad links, or adding to the plan to spike disad impacts. Since allowing shifting effectively destroys all neg ground, it’s a voting issue.

6. DESTROYS EDUCATION
The plan is the focus of the debate; we need a stable focus in order to have a grounded discussion about social policy. If permutations can add to the plan, then plan focus is no longer a coherent model of argument.

7. DESTROY NEG GROUND
Intrinsic perms make all our counterplans go away and disads disappear as long as we advocate any action as good cuz they can fiat that action in the perm
SEVERANCE PERMS BAD

1. ABUSIVE MOVING TARGET
The Aff can constantly just continue to sever out of any part of the plan that is a link to a Neg argument or solvency attack; this destroys the neg opportunity to win the round

2. DESTROYS AFF LIMITS
They can get out of topicality as well as takes their case in limitless directions in the round; they no longer affirm their stance by breaking these limits as they go out of the restriction for available Aff cases

3. INFINITE REGRESSIVE
They can continue to duck out of more and more of their case up to the point of abandonment; every time this occurs they concede that the negative position is better than the resolution bettering the reason to vote Neg

4. DESTROYS ALL CP GROUND
If the aff can sever then they can always permute to sever the whole plan and do the CP. No CP competes with that permutation.

5. DESTROYS EDUCATION
The plan is the focus of the debate; we need a stable focus in order to have a grounded discussion about social policy. If permutations can sever part of the plan, then plan focus is no longer a coherent model of argument.

6. ADVOCACY SHIFT
Since this arg isn't a link test, they have to advocate it but advocated perms are abusive cuz it gives the aff multiple advocacies or at least shifting ones makes them a moving target destroys neg ground, its a voter for ground and clash

7. ALL OUR INTRINSICNESS ARG'S APPLY
Severance is an additional advocacy in that it is a shift supposedly predicated by the counterplan
AT: INFINITE REGRESSION

1. **LIT CHECKS**—
   Our cards are just too good—requiring a literature-based distinction checks all of their trivial examples and proves that our counterplan is legitimate.

2. **DON’T VOTE ON POTENTIAL ABUSE**—
   If we were delaying until after a disad brink or making an arbitrary delay they could beat us on actual theory, but we’ll win there’s no specific abuse in this debate so there’s no voting issue.
AT: TRADES OFF WITH CASE DEBATE

1. NONUNIQUE—
All off-case arguments trade-off with the case debate. Generic critiques have made case debates rare already—and we have tons of them, so cut us some slack if we roll with a generic strat for once.

2. THEY DODGE CASE DEBATE—
They chose to run this aff at the periphery of the topic to intentionally *dodge* case debate—they forced us to go generic.

3. NO IMPACT—
If we win that the CP is the best policy option we should win—it’s the only predictable, non-arbitrary standard for judging debate.
AT: SHOULD IN RESOLUTION NOT TIME SPECIFIC

1. SHOULD IS TIMEBOUND.
Whether he should do something depends entirely on when the question is asked. In this debate today the USFG should not establish an ocean policy—we’ll win the resolution shouldn’t be affirmed until Friday.

2. AFF’S PLAN IS STILL TIMEBOUND
Even if the resolution doesn’t require it, they specified in cross-x that the plan is done immediately—cross-x has to be binding or they just lie to us and we lose.

3. JUSTIFIES DODGING ALL LINKS
If aff can clarify a delay into the plan they can always dodge the links to every disad, crushing all negative ground.
AT: JUSTIFIES INTRINSICNESS ARGS

1. BEST POLICY DOESN’T MEAN ANYTHING GOES—
If it did the aff could replan with a totally different case in 2AC or even 1AR and
we’d never have a chance.

2. PLAN FOCUS IS THE BEST FRAMEWORK FOR DEBATE—
It’s the only nonarbitrary, predictable way to judge—if the plan is better than any
competitive alternative the aff wins, otherwise they lose. This gives both teams a
fixed object of debate to link arguments to while still allowing the aff to choose the
focus of the debate by writing the plan.
AT: KILLS AFF GROUND (FRIDAY COUNTERPLAN ONLY)

1. AFF Chooses THEIR OWN GROUND—
   You could have written your plan text to be enacted on a Friday if you wanted to—
   you made a strategic choice that we’re punishing you for.

2. THERE ARE LOTS OF SWEET SUBSTANTIVE ARGS YOU COULD HAVE RUN—
   Secrecy Bad—a calculated storing of info until its release.
   Public Participation Good—excludes the public from the policy making process
   Grassroots Movements—stops movement mobilization
   Mainstream Environmentalism—prevents NRDC and Sierra Club influence
   Bennett Critique—elite manipulation of the news crisis cycle
   Edelman Critique—talk about manufacture of political spectacle
   Rove Credibility DA—this sort of thing would really tank it

3. YOUR GROUND IS THE ROAD TO THE LEXIS TERMINAL—
   There are tons of cards about Stealth Friday—all of our cards are links to arguments
   that can run in the other direction—cut the articles and make the args.

4. MAKE YOUR OWN GROUND—
   It’s not our job to tell you how to beat our sweet counterplan—if you can’t find any
   ground, that means you lose, not that you win.
AT: DELAY KILLS EDUCATION

1. LEARNING ABOUT THE POLITICAL PROCESS IS EDUCATIONAL
   Why is learning about the election less educational than case. There is a reason
   political science is one of the undergraduate majors, right along with communication.

2. READING THE 1AC CHECKS
   We don’t make you mute. You still read the 1AC and we still learn about your case.
   And we will get more education out of additionally considering the political
   ramifications of it.

3. THE CASELIST CHECKS
   Even if you were somehow mute the caselist allows for both learning about other
   peoples cases and doing research on them.

4. NO REASON TO REJECT
   Just because something might not be educational its not a reason to reject it.
   Topicality is not educational by your definition but its still so important to debate.
AT: IMMEDIACY NOT IN RESOLUTION

1. SHOULD IS TIME BOUND—
   If the USFG shouldn't enact an energy policy today that means you negate today.

2. RESOLVED IS A DEFINITE COURSE OF ACTION—
   They aren't resolved if they want to delay action into the future.

3. RESOLUTIONAL BASIS IS IRRELEVANT—
   They still have to defend their plan and their binding cross-x clarification—even if the counterplan is topical, it's still the best policy option and competition checks abuse. A world of no topical counterplans would crush neg ground and force negs to rely on nontopical, utopian counterplans which hurt education quality.
AT: ENCOURAGES VAGUE PLANS

1. **NO IMPACT**—
   If it leads to people refusing to specify when the plan passes that’s fine—it takes out all their other theory arguments why delay is bad—still doesn’t change that they *chose* to specify immediacy in this debate and they have to defend it.

2. **NONUNIQUE**—
   People exclude acronyms, spelling errors, quotation marks, and single words all the time. People already need to write concise plans that they can defend.
AT: ENCOURAGES DODGING CROSS-X QUESTIONS

1. DODGING HAS ITS OWN PENALTY—
   It makes you look stupid, zaps your ethos, and gives the neg leeway on lots of other arguments.

2. NO IT DOESN’T—
   If you want to say “normal means” then say it and be ready to defend it. If you say something other than normal means, like immediacy, then defend that. It’s easy to avoid this counterplan without dodging anything in cross-x. Try it next time.
AT: FUTURE FIAT BAD

1. NOT FUTURE FIAT
The plan should be done later on. We don’t have the judge sign their ballot a week or month from now.

2. FUTURE FIAT IS GREAT—
It encourages critical thinking about timing of policy decisions and announcements, which is another dimension of real world policy analysis that increases the nuance of debate and its educational value.

3. LITERATURE CHECKS—
Specific literature distinguishing between present and future action makes it a relevant and predictable policy option that the aff should be ready for.

4. NONUNIQUE—
All of debate is predictive—yes the world is chaotic and changing but we can still debate likely future events and inevitably do.

5. ITS NEGATIVE GROUND
The Affirmative gets their time-frame, anything that’s the not affirmative time-frame is negative ground.

6. FUTURE FIAT REALISTIC
We sometimes do endorse the enactment of policies at some point in the future. For example, politicians often defer consideration of controversial policies until after elections.

7. DOESN’T JUSTIFY TIME-FRAME OR INTRINSIC PERMUTATIONS
Just because we potentially fiat the future it doesn’t mean the affirmative can. We stay on one time line throughout this round. Advocating the permutation would be advocating the plan on multiple timelines which is impossible and extremely abusive.

8. NO IN ROUND ABUSE
They should be researching politics scenarios, that’s what this is, don’t let them whine their way into an affirmative ballot.
AT: WE ARE THE COUNTERPLAN BECAUSE NORMAL MEANS

1. YOU’RE NOT THE COUNTERPLAN—
   Look, face the facts, we got you to commit to when the plan passes in the cross-
   examination. Own up to it and defend it.

2. LOTS OF THINGS ARE NORMAL—
   Our evidence proves the CP is a normal means option predictable in the literature, but
   it’s also common and normal for policies to be passed early in the week. Since both
   are normal the only way to determine what the plan does is to ask them.
AT: CAN'T TELL THE FUTURE POLITICAL CLIMATE

1. NOT TRUE—THERE ARE AUTHORS WHO DEFEND TIMEFRAME
   There is plenty of literature on who the plan should be done now or why later is bad. However any argument you make we will outweigh.

2. IF THIS ARGUMENT IS TRUE YOU HAVE NO CASE SOLVENCY
   The authors in your case don’t assume the current political climate. Our link cards are more specific then your case cards.

3. DON'T HAVE EVIDENCE SAYING YOU AVOID THE NET BENEFIT
   The authors in your case don’t assume the current political climate at all. They just say that the plan is a good idea. Our net benefit tells a more holistic political story.

4. NEGATION THEORY JUSTIFIES
   Our job is to present a reason to reject the affirmative in the present situation. Delaying to prevent Bush re-election is a great reason to vote negative.

5. NO AFF GROUND LOSS
   The counterplan is still beatable. It is not my job to teach you how to debate me on delay. Find a way to straight turn the net benefit or justify immediate action and you're all good.
AT: HUGE SOLVENCY DEFICIT

1. TIMEFRAME IS TOO SHORT
Look, face the facts, your evidence does not say we need action right now, and even if it did there wouldn’t be a big impact to such a short term solvency deficit.

2. THE NET BENEFIT OUTWEIGHS
The disad impacts are huge and would outweigh the case even if we didn’t counterplan—you default to a consequential calculus and prefer a solvency deficit that avoids the disad impact.

3. DELAYING THE IMPLEMENTATION UNTIL SOLID ANSWERS ARE SPECIFIED WILL NOT HURT THE ENVIRONMENT
William F. O’KEEFE (Executive Vice President of the American Petroleum Institute)
“Global Warming Opposing Viewpoints”; 1997 pg. 118 //nick

To expect the citizens of this nation, or any nation, to implement actions that disrupt their economies without solid answers to the most pressing questions ignores the limits of what is at best a forced consensus among a well-organized and vocal minority. Especially when there will not be a serious penalty for waiting until we know more. The U.S. Congress’s Office of Technology Assessment concludes that “initial delays of ten or 20 years in implementing emission stabilization will have little effect on ultimate atmospheric carbon concentrations.”

Industry has often been accused of wanting to delay all action until the scientific questions are answered, but that’s not true. The prestigious Marshall Institute recently released a report unambiguously stating that “no scientific justification now exists for economically punishing policies aimed at global reductions in the emission of carbon dioxide.” The report went on to state that “There is time for climatological research in coming years to provide a firmer basis for the consideration of global strategies.” These conclusions mirror those of leading academics at institutions like MIT who have been pursuing the climate issue in a rigorous and scholarly manner. The irony is that emerging scientific information has so far reduced the magnitude of the threat, although considerable uncertainties remain.
AT: ITS MORALLY REPUGNANT TO PROLONG SUFFERING

1. TIMEFRAME IS TOO SHORT
Look, face the facts, none of your morality evidence does says we need action right now, and even if it did there wouldn’t be a big impact to such a short term solvency deficit.

2. SO IS LETTING THE PEOPLE DIE FROM WAR
There is no warrant as to why the people that would die as a result of the elections disad are any less important. The counterplan still takes a moral action.

3. THE NET BENEFIT OUTWEIGHS
The disad impacts are huge and would outweigh the case even if we didn’t counterplan—you default to a consequential calculus and prefer a solvency deficit that avoids the disad impact.

4. CONSEQUENTIALISM IS THE FRAMEWORK FOR THIS DEBATE—THE ENDS JUSTIFY THE MEANS
Charles Fried (Professor of Law @ Harvard University) Right and Wrong; 1978; p. 8

On what basis, the consequentialist asks, can one admit the independence of moral categories competing with the category of the good? It is states of the world, including states of mind, which we care about, choose, and therefore value. And so it is states of the world which must determine utterly the contents of morality. Surely we must be able to say whether one states of the world is better than another and which one is best of all. Whatever the conception of that end state, the consequentialist asserts that it cannot be rational to be concerned with how the end state comes about, except as that concern bears upon the very production of that end state. In short, it is ends not means which determine morality. Moreover, consequentialism is driven to hold that there is some one single end state, or type of end state, or characteristic of end states which is morally significant, for then this characteristic provides a criterion for choosing between end states, a criterion which is itself consequential.
AT: FIAT TAKES OUT, SHOULD/WOULD

1. THIS IS A SHOULD ARGUMENT—
   We’re arguing the USFG *should* not pass the plan today. The plan is specifically
timebound by their cross-x clarification.

2. IT WAS THEIR CHOICE—
   They could have said that their conception of fiat is non-time bound and then
defended it from the start of the debate. Allowing them to reconceptualize fiat mid-
debate would kill predictability and all our ground.
AT: TOPICAL COUNTERPLANS BAD

ARE YOU KIDDING? TOPICAL COUNTERPLANS ARE SWEET:

1. DEBATE IS A SEARCH FOR THE BEST POLICY OPTION
   Excluding topical counterplans would wreck policy analysis by making it impossible
to consider relevant policy options that happen to be topical.

2. COMPETITION CHECKS ABUSE
   The net benefits prove the aff should be prepared to debate us and permutations check
any abusive counterplans.

3. NONTOPICAL COUNTERPLANS ARE UNIQUELY WORSE
   Socialism, anarchy, and WOMP would be the staples in a world without topical
counterplans—those debates are generic, skew ground, and qualitatively hurt
education.

4. TOPICAL COUNTERPLANS INCREASE TOPIC EDUCATION
   You learn more about the topic because comparisons of topical policies are made
possible. And our counterplan in particular is drawn from a largely neglected part of
the environmental literature.
AT: FUNCTIONAL COMPETITION BAD

1. FUNCTIONAL COMPETITION IS EDUCATIONAL
Forces focus on details of policymaking - how the government functions increase education and activism.

2. TEXTUAL COMPETITION IS UN-EDUCATIONAL
Reduces debate to argument over grammar and phrasing that has no educational value. Focus on how policies interact is preferable over ways to change one or two words of a plan.

3. UNFAIR TO THE NEGATIVE
It impossible for the negative to strategize, since the plan text isn’t revealed until the debate begins. Functional competition rewards innovative pre-round strategizing and research.

4. MOST REAL WORLD
By focusing on the effect of the wording—how the plan and the counterplan are functionally different—we most closely model real world policy-making.

5. FUNCTIONALLY COMPETITIVE COUNTERPLANS ARE PREDICTABLE
The affirmative has the choice of specifying the fashion in which the plan is implemented. The affirmative should be prepared to answer the counterplan.
AT: NO NEGATIVE FIAT

1. OPPORTUNITY COST THEORY JUSTIFIES IT
The counterplan should do done, and having done the CP, the plan shouldn’t be done. Fiat derives from that "should" claim: the benefits of an action are weighed against the best available alternative—that's just sound decision making.

2. ITS RECIPROCAL
If they get to advocate a plan we need to get a counterplan for a fair debate

3. COUNTERPLAN IS REAL WORLD
In Congress, policy makers consider the timing of the passage of the bill, even for issues as trivial as the maximization of political capital. They also could delay the passage of the bill in favor of more study, or to maximize the benefits of the policy enactment.

4. CRUSHES GROUND
Counterplans are the critical negative ground in debate. Without CPs, affs would always win—we can’t win on rape good or racism good.

5. THE STATUS QUO IS A POLICY TOO
We have as much right to say “you should pass our counterplan” as we do to say “you should maintain the status quo.”

6. OUR ONLY JOB IS TO NEGATE THE AFFIRMATIVE
The counterplan is another way to do

7. INCREASES EDUCATION
We learn more about the aff plan when we compare it to other policies, and we gain the added benefit of learning about a different policy

8. INCREASES COMPETITIVENESS
There are cases where the plan is always a better option than doing nothing. Counterplans are key to equalizing ground between the aff and neg

9. AFF ADVANTAGE JUSTIFIES NEG FIAT
They get first and last speech infinite prep, and a higher win percentage we should get fiat.
AT: PERF / CON WITH KRITIK

1. STILL DOESN’T JUSTIFY THE PLAN.
At least the negative is making the attempt to question and criticize the inherent assumptions of plan

2. IT’S AND IF THEN STATEMENT,
The kritik is a gateway argument to test the affirmative. We can only debate the policy level once their assumptions have been justified on the kritik level

3. NO REASON WHY WERE WORSE THAN THE AFF,
Worst case you vote on the kritik which means you vote neg or we both link and you vote neg on presumption or ignore the kritik

4. IT’S INTELLECTUAL HUBRIS FOR THE NEG TO MAKE ONLY ONE ARGUMENT.
It presumes we know everything about the aff plan before we debate it, that would force us to close our ears to other possibilities which would destroy clash debatability and education

5. NOTHING TO CONCEDE,
The way to deal with a contradiction is to grant one link and extend the other impact, that’s a built in check to potential abuse, its their fault they didn’t do it.

6. PERFORMATIVE CONTRACTION GOOD
2NC PICS BLOCKS

AT: EXCLUSIONARY COUNTERPLANS BAD

1. FAIR DIVISION OF GROUND
Neg needs to be able to provide a counterplan that’s competitive and with a resolution with such a specific scope of advantages available, the neg will often require a portion of the plan in order to solve; this allows the neg an adequate chance in the round

2. ALMOST ALL COUNTERPLANS ARE PLAN-INCLUSIVE
They either use an alternate agent to enact the same mandates or the same agent to enact different mandates. If both are allowed, the negative will have almost no counterplan ground.

3. KEY TO BEST POLICY
The affirmative has unlimited time to devise the best plan that it can. If it’s proven not to be the best, it should be rejected. Not allowing plan-inclusive counterplans risks accepting sup-optimal policies. If the negative can’t argue for refinements in the affirmative approach, the truly best policy may never be found.

4. INCREASES EDUCATION
We can learn more about specific tenets of the plan by showing how the plan is different in some but not all aspects, thus we learn more about the policy by examining difference in a dynamic setting. This increases education and legitimizes the CP.

5. RECIPROCITY JUSTIFIES PICS
We cannot be expected to exclude some counterplan actions just because they stated it first, after all, they speak first. In order to give both sides an adequate chance, the neg should not be restricted from some positions otherwise debate is unequal.

6. MOST REAL WORLD
Policies always have a myriad exceptions for context, location, date, or other factors just cuz they didnt make the exceptions in their plan doesnt mean they dont matter.

7. IMPROVES CLASH
Previously, we wouldn’t have debated the small issues of the aff case. We’re drawing attention to them and letting them be debated.

8. NET BENEFIT CHECKS
If its a dumb net benefit they shouldnt have a problem answering our CP

9. REJECT THEORY NOT TEAM
Even if they win this, just throw out the counterplan, don’t make us lose; the punishment does not fit the crime. Its not a reason to reject us outright
AT: PICS → VAGUE PLAN WRITING

1. JUST REQUIRES RESPONSIBLE PLAN TEXTS
They wrote the plan they have to defend it, the encourage responsibility

2. NOT TRUE
They wouldn't be able to say the PIC is the same as the plan if they were vague any more
than they can now, make them give a specific plan text they would rewrite to

3. THEY SAID THEY'D CLARIFY INTENT
In cross ex they clarified their plan to include what we aren't including its not an issue of
plan text

4. NO IMPACT TO VAGUE PLAN WRITING
Its checked by vagueness violations and

5. PICS ONLY → VAGUE PLANS IF THE AFF HAS THE RIGHT TO IGNORE OUR
CPS BUT THEY DON'T
Cuz our CPs focus the debate on important and otherwise neglected issues
AT: PICS JUSTIFY SEVERANCE PERMS

1. NO WARRANT, SEVERANCE GETS RID OF PARTS OF THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN
   That erodes their advocacy and means they can retreat from any ground they gave us for links or counterplans

2. ITS NEGATION THEORY
   Were like Dennis Rodman, we can be as bad as we wanna be, but the aff has to keep their plan to let us even have the round

3. THE IAC IS THE BASIS FOR ENTIRE ROUND AND SEVERANCE PERMS MAKE DISCLOSURE MORE THAN USELESS
   They lied about their plan that abrogates neg strat and wastes our time and destroys education cuz we never actually debate anything
AT: PICS JUSTIFY INTRINSIC PERMS

1. NOPE, THAT ASSUMES THAT ITS A NEGATIVE BURDEN TO ADVOCATE THE PLAN BACK AT THE AFF
   But we can advocate anything, they chose a plan, we chose a counterplan

2. THE PLAN IS AN EXCLUSIONARY COUNTERPLAN AGAINST THE REZ
   It only deals with part of it (at best, since they aren't topical)

3. NOTHING CAN JUSTIFY THIS KIND OF ABUSE
   Being affirmative has different responsibilities than going negative
AT: PICS STEAL AFF GROUND

1. ITS NOT AFF GROUND
Just because the plan makes certain demands doesn't mean that no one else is allowed to make demands with anything in common.

2. NO IMPACT TO THIS
They don't have to debate their own case, just the part of it we exclude i.e. their timeframe.

3. ITS RECIPROCAL
They use their plan to capture disads or kritiks, we use the counterplan to get parts of the case.

4. AFF HAS INFINITE PREP TIME FOR 1AC
They should have been able to write the plan so that they could maintain ground to win against any PIC. This deep preparation will result in better understanding of the topic.

5. COMPETITION CHECKS ABUSE
The counterplan provides a reason to reject the plan. That means there is automatic ground for them to argue against the net benefit.

6. TURN- AFF HAS TOO MUCH GROUND TO START WITH
The aff chooses what the focus of the debate is, the plan. The aff gets to speak first and last. These two procedural realities give the aff an overwhelming advantage in ground, which is why the aff wins up to 70% of debate rounds. If PICs decrease aff ground, then that's a good thing.

7. THIS IS A WHINE- THEIR GROUND IS THE ROAD TO THE LIBRARY.
There's lots of literature about the net benefits. And if they can't find enough evidence to support the plan as written, then they should have run the CP as the plan to begin with. Not our fault.
AT: PICS = PLAGIARISM

1. NO LINK
The whole reason to vote negative is based on our citation of the affirmative team

2. PLAGIARISM IS A COLONIALIST WESTERN CONCEPT TO RESTRICT ACCESS
Mark DAvis Australian nonfiction author 1998

Yet, with painting as it is carried out by the Warrpiri people at Yuendumu, in Central Australia, the tradition is quite different. As the anthropologist Eric Michaels points out, 'The modes and relations of production from which many aboriginal forms arise do not emphasise original creative individuals or assign them responsibility as authors. Instead of an ideology of creative authority, there is an ideology of reproduction...the art masks inventiveness and authorial intent.' Rather than being seen as the result of individual creativity, the right to reproduce certain designs from a predetermined tribal body of work is assigned through a complex system of age, gender, rank and familial association. Entitlement to paint has nothing to do with notions of individual skill or talent, but flows 'as a result of certain negotiated positions within systems of inherited rights and obligations.' Clearly this raises problems for Western art dealers, who append value to a given work on the basis of signature. If x's cousin did the painting, and not x, then is it worth the same as if it were done by x alone, or is this plagiarism? As Michaels points out, plagiarism is impossible in Western Desert Painting; the problem is one of theft of designs from the tribe. Other basic Western concepts pertaining to authorship are similarly irrelevant. For example, the temporal succession of works is unimportant, given that designs are drawn from a collective tribal past, and 'project toward an infinite, impersonal future.'

Over the past century, as colonial empires have receded, once-were-colonies have started 'writing back'. They have sent, at the same time, uncomfortable messages for the systems of Western meaning—such as the author system for validating works—that everyone used to think were universal. Yet most complainers about postmodernism like to pretend it might be possible to turn back the clock, or put their heads in the sand, and the whole damn thing will go away. Will it? I don't think so. Rather, the problem will be exacerbated. Most anti-postmodern rhetoric tends to a certain xenophobia, and tries to re-ratify western values on the grounds that all 'we' need to do to get things back to 'normal' is to reinvigorate the collective moral fibre and reinscribe 'our' Western histories. The problem is, of course, that for every 'we' there is a 'they', and that in the late Twentieth century the 'theys' of this postcolonial world aren't so easily denied.

3. NOT A VOTER
At worst you'd reject the counterplan not the team
**AT: PICS = INFINITELY REGRESSIVE / JUSTIFIES PLAN MINUS A PENNY**

1. NO EVIDENCE
   There's no evidence for net benefit to tiny exclusions of a single person or a penny of funding, believe me, i've looked

2. ITS RECIPROCAL
   The plan can make an infinite number of exceptions or can be clarified in all its particulars

3. ITS NOT REGRESSIVE
   Sure their might be an infinite number of exclusionary counterplans, but there are an equal number of agent counterplans or totally unrelated coutnerplans but we need some counterplans for neg ground, thats the slavery arg, and at least exclusionary counterplans are predictable cuz theyre limited by the boundaries of the plan

4. THERE IS A DIFFERENCE
   Their prophecy is empirically denied since precedent hasnt resulted in penny saved counterplans. Judges would consider those counterplans more abusive
AT: PICS OVERINFLATE TRIVIAL NET BENEFITS

1. THIS ARGUMENT TRIVIALIZES OUR NET BENEFIT
   The whole point of our counterplan is to focus the debate on something that the aff marginalizes and is wrong on

2. MARGINALIZING THE SAME FOLKS IS BAD, EVEN UNINTENTIONALLY
   David J. Dwyer Anthropology, MSU August 21, 1999
   http://www.msu.edu/~dwyer/Marginal.htm
   When talking of non-mainstream groups including blacks, women, gays, etc., there is a tendency to trivialize, marginalize and delegitimize their activities and institutions. Up until recently, we were told on TV that black athletes are talented, whereas white athletes were hard working, and by contrast over achieving through diligence, not genetics. Whether this activity is intentional or so wholly institutionalized in the mainstream culture that it is done unconsciously does not effect the damage that such characterizations can do.

3. THERE'S NO IMPACT TO THEIR ARGUMENT
   Even if we did focus on a particular part of the plan, they only focus on one part of the resolution, and only one possible policy action besides
AT: PICS TRIVIALIZ DEBATE

1. NO REAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN TRIVIAL AND IMPORTANT PARTS
   No part of a policy is really trivial. The goal of a policy maker should be to adopt the best policy option, regardless of how close other options come. Debating minor details is critical to an understanding of the importance of seemingly minor aspects of any endeavor.

2. COMPETITION PROVES THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PLAN AND THE COUNTERPLAN IS NONTRIVIAL
   Our net benefit authors obviously think that the difference between the plan and the counterplan is very significant. If it were a triviality, it couldn't generate a reason to reject the plan.

3. THIS ARGUMENT ENCOURAGES SLOPPY THINKING
   The aff wants us to gloss over the details and just debate the gestalt of the plan. This weakens critical thinking skills and is basically an anti-intellectual plea to avoid defending a shaky aspect of the plan.

4. TURN- THE AFF TRIVIALIZES DEBATE
   By arbitrarily excluding competitive options, the aff makes a mockery of the debate process. They would allow affirmatives to advocate two page long plans featuring everything on the topic, so they would always have something in there to turn the disads that the neg couldn't get to in 1NC. PICs prevent that from happening.
AT: PICS JUSTIFY SEVERANCE

1. NOPE, ITS NOT A RACE TO THE LEAST POSSIBLE ADVOCACY
The plan advocated part of the resolved, we advocate a part of the plan, they dont get to keep going down its just reciprocal, otherwise the aff would always win cuz the 2ar would get the last advocacy

2. ONLY TRUE IF PICS ARE BAD FOR OTHER REASONS
But well win that just aint so

3. THERES NO WARRANT IN THEIR ARGUMENT
But counterplans are key to negative ground so that we dont have to advocate a flawed status quo every round.
AT: PICS DESTROY CLASH

1. NOPE, JUST MAKE CLASH MORE SPECIFIC MEANS ITS BEST FOR DEBATE
   If they aren't prepared it's their fault, they advocated something bad,

2. ITS JUST A MORE FOCUSED VERSION OF A CASE DEBATE
   We say something they advocate is bad, why can't they debate that

3. BETTER THAN ANY OTHER STRATEGY
   If we weren't running this it'd be a random counterplan they had nothing to say against
   with some irrelevant net benefit or else a disad debate with maybe some generic case
   args, but never as germane as this
AT: PICS CONCEDE PLAN IS A GOOD IDEA

1. NO IT DOESN'T
   The counterplan says that the plan is a bad idea because of the net benefits.

2. AFF SHOULD DEFEND EVERY PART OF THE PLAN
   They have infinite prep to write the plan correctly. If they lose to this counterplan, they'll go do some research to defend to plan as is, or they'll run the counterplan as their plan in the future. Either way, they'll have learned something.

3. NO IMPACT
   Yes, maybe the plan is a good idea, but the counterplan is a better idea. We shouldn't pass every policy that's a good idea, when some are better than others.
AT: CONGRESSMEN WOULD COMPROMISE, WE CANT

1. CONGRESSMEN WOULDN'T NECESSARILY COMPROMISE
There could be party bickering or any number of other reason for Congressmen not to compromise on even very similar bills. The net benefits prove that there would be a basis for such disagreement.

2. WE SHOULDN'T BE PUNISHED FOR THE STRUCTURE OF DEBATE
Yes, the structure of debate makes the judge choose between the plan and the counterplan. We are prepared to defend that the counterplan is the best option. We shouldn't lose just because the aff thinks there might be some middle ground; they should have made that their plan to start with.

3. REAL WORLD MODELS ARE IRRELEVANT
Allowing PICs is best for debate because it enhances preparation and makes us consider the details of policy implementation more carefully. If that means deviation from a correspondence to the way things happen in the Congress, that's OK; Student Congress is in the other building, after all...

4. THERE'S NO IMPACT TO THEIR ARGUMENT
This is not a reason to reject the counterplan on theoretical grounds. At most, it's an argument in favor of an intrinsicess permutation, which is abusive because it would allow the affirmative to advocate anything in the 2AC, effectively mooting the entire 1NC and making it impossible for the neg to win.
AT: PICS ARE GENERIC/REDUNDANT

1. SO WHAT-- SO IS BUSH.
   There are lotsa generic arguments that can be run nearly every debate. If they link, in this case compete, then being generic does not make them illegitimate. If anything, it means that the aff should be prepared.

2. THIS PIC IS NOT GENERIC.
   The on-point net benefit evidence proves that this counterplan is tailored to the topic and the aff's strategic choices.

3. TURN-- PICS REDUCE GENERIC DEBATE.
   By focusing the debate on a less frequently examined portion of the plan, the counterplan allows us to escape the monotony of the same topic generics that are heard over and over.

4. COMPETITION PREVENTS IT FROM BEING TOO GENERIC.
   No counterplan competes with every case, or even close to every case. The aff mechanisms are too disparate for that; no PIC could compete with a carbon tax and with military procurement of solar cells.

5. NO IMPACT.
   You shouldn't vote for a plan just because the reason not to do it is generic. The absurdity of this is clear; for instance, we would spend trillions of dollars for microscopic advantages.
**PROCEDURAL**

**WHEN-SPEC PROCEDURAL**

A. THEY REFUSED TO SPECIFY WHEN THE PLAN SHOULD BE PASSED.

B. THAT'S REALLY BAD--

1. JACKS DISAD GROUND
   They can always clarify the plan is done after the brink.

2. MAKES THEM NONTOPICAL
   The "should" in the resolution is time-bound—it assume desirability relative to the status quo—any delay would make the plan not topical and dejustify the resolution. In today's debate negate the resolution because it shouldn't be affirmed until later.

3. KEY TO OUR DELAY CP GROUND
   Delay counterplans are key to fully evaluating truly pressing issues like war and economic crisis that would otherwise be crowded out by highly speculative advantage scenarios that lack immediate relevance to our lives—the counterplan would provide qualitatively better education than the case.

4. 2AC IS TOO LATE.
   They already forced us out of our delay strategy by not specifying—that radically changed the rest of the debate.

C. VOTER
   They should lose for not playing fair.
CROSS-X QUESTIONS

YOU: SO WHEN DOES PLAN GET PASSED?

THEM (MOST LIKELY): WHEN THE JUDGE SIGNS THE BALLOT

YOU: WELL IT'S A WEEKEND SO CONGRESS ISN'T IN SESSION DOES THAT MEAN IT GETS PASSED MONDAY MORNING?

.....IF THEY SAY YES YOU ARE GOOD TO GO, IF THEY SAY NO PUSH THE QUESTION