

affirmative. The negative team might reach into its backfiles to find its own strange arguments such as a kritik of reason or de-development good.

*Predictability:* Does an affirmative case allow you to anticipate the negative attack? This criterion is actually the opposite of surprise. Consider the chess analogy: The best chess players are those who can think several moves into the future. Thinking into the future requires an ability to predict what the other player will do when you make your move. Suppose the affirmative team plans to use a geothermal energy case. A predictable negative response to a geothermal energy case is that drilling holes in the earth will increase the potential for earthquakes. An affirmative team might actually hope for this response because it has evidence that geothermal drilling relieves pressure within the upper earth crust, making earthquakes less likely. This argument is what a debater calls a *turnaround*—or just *turn*. A turn takes an argument made by the other team (increased likelihood of earthquakes) and makes it into another reason to support the affirmative case (decreased likelihood of earthquakes).

*Something in reserve:* A good affirmative case has advantages on the surface, but even more below the surface. Consider a wind power affirmative case. The first affirmative speech might have based the wind advantage primarily on the need for energy independence—the need to be free from reliance on Middle Eastern oil. Yet numerous other advantages can be called upon to turn various negative disadvantage arguments. The negative might argue that wind power harms wildlife by killing birds that fly into turbines. This argument can be turned by arguing that wind power cuts down air pollution from coal-fired plants, saving far more birds (and other wildlife) than would be killed in turbine accidents. The negative might also argue that wind power undermines the environment by requiring large tracts of land. This argument can be turned by arguing that wind power limits global warming which causes sea-rise, destroying much more land than would be required for wind farms. Or the negative may argue that wind power will increase the price of energy, risking a serious economic recession. This argument can be turned by showing that wind power is actually less expensive than continued reliance on fossil fuels.

*Topical:* Does the affirmative plan do what the resolution says it should do? Negative teams commonly challenge topicality because they know they can win the debate on this argument alone. Often even obviously topical cases are subjected to topicality challenges. Consider the 2007-2008 national policy topic: “Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its public health assistance to sub-Saharan Africa.” You must be prepared to show how your affirmative plan meets every one of the words in the resolution—even seemingly simple terms such as *substantially* or *to*. You might want to propose that the United States take military action to stop the killing in Darfur. Before selecting such a case, however, you must be