# 1AR---Herb---Round 6

## Foreign Service

### 1AR---Latin America

#### Latin American bioterror causes extinction. State-supplied bioweapons skirt all their defense and encourage use that creates global pandemics. That’s Hiebert and Beres.

All of their Russia defense proves it---they don’t want to get directly involved in a war with the US, but also want to bog down the US in Venezuela which means they’ll empower non-state actors with bioweapons to groups that have the motive to use

## Buddhism K

### 1AR---Condo

Condo is bad because straight turns are good:

1. Research. Rewards 2A time investment in cutting straight turns AND forces 2Ns to robustly research counterplans

2. Fairness. Only balancing strategic options ensures an equal playing field given infinite neg fiat –2AC determines the entire debate because it’s our last chance for offense but they get another constructive to recover.

Reject the team for deterrence and counterplan’s status is something they can’t kick

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Block Skew

They cause more skew since the more positions they introduce, the more likely we have to contradict ourselves to answer them

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Neg Flex

1. Condo isn’t key. Concede [X THEORY ARG], which they said solves.

2. Research turns neg flex. They reward shallow 1NCs and contradictions BUT aff’s will always try to balance it out, breaking debate.

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Arbitrariness

Arbitrariness wrong. They link because their interp is functionally infinite condo.

Defining dispo proves no shifting goal post or ‘condo in disguise’ and all the reasons their interp’s bad for debate proves a difference between models.

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Logic

No logic. It’s circular and condo doesn’t solve. What they did is MORE illogical.

Proving the plan bad doesn’t mean the status quo is good

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Innovation/Risk Averse

Dispo solves. Forces teams to write the least straight-turn-able version of their counterplans.

Only our model solves because teams need to be forced to take risks. Dispo rewards strategic risks while condo rewards cowardice.

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Skew/Research Inev

Some research is inevitable, but quality outweighs quantity

Not going for skew---irrelevant

1AR---Conditionality---AT: Dispo = Condo

No. We defined it in the 2AC. You can kick an advocacy if we read perms or theory.

### 1AR---FW

#### Framework---the ballot is a referendum on the plan’s desirability

#### 1. Procedural fairness: anything that avoids questions of the plan sideline 1AC offense and make us start over from the 2AC---it outweighs: it’s the only impact intrinsic to the ballot so it outweighs any of their arguments because they don’t require the ballot to remedy

## EU Dip Cap DA

### 1AR---NUQ

EU policy is already oriented towards autonomy from Trump’s hostility. Overriding NATO, Grenada, Greenland, etc. all send Europe away from the US and ensures they pursue autonomy. That’s the 2AC card.

Uniqueness shapes the direction of the link.

#### All of the dipcap will be spent only on Venezuela

Rubin & Vujica 1-11 [James P. Rubin, served as special envoy and coordinator for the US Department of State’s Global Engagement Center. Mr. Rubin has more than 35 years of experience in foreign policy. Prior to his appointment, Mr. Rubin served as a diplomat, political advisor, commentator, professor, and broadcaster. Before joining the State Department, Mr. Rubin served as the diplomatic counsellor to the secretary-general of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris, advising Secretary-General Mathias Cormann on global affairs. Prior to that, he served as chair for International Policy and Strategy at Ballard Partners, based in Washington, DC., Darjan **Vujica**, served as a senior official at the State Department, working at the nexus of technology and foreign policy, 1-11-2026, "How the Donald Trump Corollary Takes on a Chinese Reality in South America", National Interest, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-the-donald-trump-corollary-takes-on-a-chinese-reality-in-south-america]

As the cliché goes, only time will tell whether US policy in Venezuela will be successful. In the meantime, other events are taking place that demonstrate why Venezuela should not be the overwhelming focus of American diplomacy in the region. The administration risks becoming consumed by the mechanics of a post-Maduro Venezuela—managing transition councils, securing oil fields, and navigating the unpredictable fallout. All of this will demand extraordinary time and resources. While Washington is bogged down in Caracas, Beijing is quietly taking over the rest of the continent, unchallenged.

At the same time, the Trump administration risks not only alienating the rest of Latin America with modern gunboat diplomacy (which China has already seized upon) but also undercutting its own National Security Strategy (NSS) by losing sight of the South American forest for a single Venezuelan tree.

### 1AR---No I/L