Counterplans simplified

1. Role of “should”—
   1. Assigns the affirmative with the burden to prove that their plan is **necessary** to achieve the advantage.
   2. Creates fiat “ability to imagine what the world would like if the plan were adopted”
      1. Other words establish the parameters of fiat
      2. Agents--USFG
      3. Actions—increase
      4. Objects—Engagement/Infrastructure
      5. And Modifiers
         1. Economic/Transportation
         2. Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela/in the United States
2. Purposes of the counterplan—to force the affirmative to prove all parts of the resolution/their plan are necessary
3. to solve some or all of the affirmative advantage
4. to make disadvantages unique
5. Types of Counterplans (Representative examples/not an exhaustive list)
6. Agent Counterplans

1. International Organizations

1. Other Governments
2. States
3. Alternative branches
   1. Executive Orders
   2. Courts
   3. Congress
   4. Departments/Agencies
4. Exemptions—do some of the mandates of the plan but not all of them
5. Solve some of the affirmative advantage while running disadvantages to certain parts of the plan

e.g. Cuba and sugar

1. Condition Counterplans

Solve at least some of the affirmative advantage if the other country says “yes”

e.g. US will lift embargo if and only if Cuba does x

1. Consult counterplans

US will consult with other countries/organizations, someone else before they adopt the plan--they need to say yes.

E.g. US will consult with the OAS before they lift the embargo

E. Advantage counterplans

1. Benefits of running the counterplan
   * + 1. Solves the Affirmative Advantage
       2. Avoids disadvantages that only result from the aff plan.

C. Shifts the grounds of the debate

1. Uniqueness of Uniqueness Counterplan
2. Doesn’t solve the Affirmative Advantage
3. Make disads that are not unique, unique
4. Still shift ground of the debate
5. Burdens of the Counterplan
6. Solvency
7. Avoids disadvantages to the affirmative plan
8. Competitive—the notion of **forced choice:** that the judge has to choose between the plan and the counterplan
   1. Mutually exclusive—impossible to do both
   2. Net Benefit—should not do both-it would be bad to do both
9. Arguments for answering the counterplan
10. Not competitive: there is **not a forced choice**
    1. Prove that both are possible
    2. Disprove the net benefit
    3. PERMUTATION
       1. Some combination of the plan and part or all of the counterplan (do not sever the original plan)
       2. Easy way to illustrate that the counterplan is plan plus
       3. “Perm do both”
       4. Warning about “perm do the counterplan”
11. Does not solve
    1. Not solve the affirmative advantage
       1. Allows you to leverage the affirmative advantage against the advantage of the counterplan
       2. Not absolute/a matter of degree
    2. Not solve the net benefit
12. Disads to the counterplan
    1. Must make sure the counterplan is not conditional
    2. “Straight turn” them if they are dispositional
13. Theoretical Objections—first c-x question “what is the status of the counterplan?”
    1. Conditional/Dispositional Counterplans
    2. Multiple Counterplans Bad
       1. Moving targets
       2. No stable advocacy
       3. Unfair advantage b/c aff only gets one
       4. Time limits
       5. Unpredictable
       6. Breadth v. Depth

(impacting theory arguments)

* 1. **P**lan **I**nclusive **C**ounterplans (exemptions)
     1. Force affirmative to argue against selves
  2. Range of fiat—what is fair to both sides has to be determined by theory because the affirmative range of fiat is inherently restricted by the resolution and without theoretical restrictions what the negative does is boundless
     1. International Organizations
     2. Other Countries
     3. States
  3. Does Negative fiat exist?

1. What does the perm mean?
   * 1. Test of Competition
     2. Can the affirmative advocate the perm?
     3. Can the aff sever part of the plan to create a perm?
2. Back to should