

claim to go unchallenged; with such a standard in place, the affirmative team could quite obviously outweigh the negative disadvantages, no matter what they might be.

*Second Affirmative Constructive Speech:* The affirmative speaker must respond to whatever the first negative speaker had to say. If the negative speaker presented a topicality attack, that argument must be answered. If disadvantage shells were presented, disadvantage answers must be offered. If the affirmative case is attacked, there must be responses to those attacks. If any arguments are made in the first negative speech that go unanswered in the second affirmative constructive, the negative team will claim that their argument has been *dropped*. Further, they will say that any answer from the affirmative made in rebuttal speeches would be a new argument in rebuttal. The quickest and most decisive way for the affirmative team to lose the debate is to neglect to answer a major argument made by the negative in the first negative constructive speech.

*Second Negative Constructive Speech:* In the traditional approach, the second negative speaker typically originates the disadvantage attack on the affirmative plan. In modern practice, however, the disadvantages are first presented in the first negative speech. This means the second negative speaker can focus on winning disadvantages by completely answering the attacks on those disadvantages made by the second affirmative constructive speaker. In the typical debate, a second affirmative speaker might make five or six answers to a disadvantage. The second negative speaker might decide to spend all eight minutes of the constructive speech giving extensive answers to each of those five or six responses.

One of the most important strategic concepts for the negative strategy in the second affirmative constructive is called *division of labor*. The second affirmative constructive speaker should work in conjunction with the first negative rebuttalist to properly divide up the second affirmative constructive arguments. The two negative speeches are back-to-back, so no purpose is served by repeating the same arguments in the two speeches. The second negative constructive speaker should communicate with her partner to decide how the arguments will be divided. Suppose, for example, the debate going into the second affirmative constructive contains a topicality argument, some case attacks, and three disadvantages. The second negative constructive speaker might take two of the disadvantages, leaving the remainder of the responses for the first negative rebuttalist.

*First Negative Rebuttal Speech:* The first negative rebuttalist should deal with any of the arguments from the first negative constructive speech that were not covered in the second negative constructive speech. Successful negative teams learn to make this decision (concerning who will cover what) before the beginning of the second negative constructive speech. This procedure allows the first rebuttalist to use the whole of the final constructive speech as preparation time for the rebuttal.