

government subsidization of energy industries. As a negative team, you are advocating this free enterprise approach as a proper choice. The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria is an existing international program to provide public health assistance in sub-Saharan Africa (and elsewhere). As a negative team, you can advocate this international approach as superior to the U.S. federal government's solution to Africa's problems.

2. *Minimize and then outweigh.* This recommendation means that direct clash with the affirmative case should play a part in your strategy. Many negative teams make the mistake of focusing entirely on their own arguments while ignoring the claims made in the affirmative case. Consider an affirmative contention that millions of persons in Africa are dying from AIDS. The problem of AIDS seems so undeniable that the negative team won't even try to minimize the affirmative case. Instead, the negative focuses on its own deficit disadvantage claim that spending more money on AIDS would cause economic recession or depression. Why put the judge in a position of having to weigh millions of deaths in Africa against an economic depression in the United States? Reduce the size of the affirmative advantage to an amount the disadvantage can more easily outweigh.

Direct clash with the affirmative case does not always take the form of denying the affirmative harm. The negative could offer an inherency argument showing that the problem of AIDS is being properly addressed by international actors (the World Health Organization and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria). Solvency arguments could show that additional U.S. funding for AIDS would not solve the harm (because of a shortage of health workers in Africa, for example).

In many instances it is possible to show that the affirmative harm itself is exaggerated. If the harm is global warming, the negative might be able to show that the rate of warming is slow enough to allow natural ecosystems to adjust. If the harm is that people lack health insurance, the negative might be able to show that emergency rooms in the United States provide critical care for the uninsured.

The recommendation to offer direct clash with the affirmative case seems difficult because of the wide range of affirmative options. In reality, this is less difficult than it seems. Consider a resolution that calls on the affirmative to fund energy alternatives. An affirmative team can choose from a wide variety of energy approaches it will advocate. Nevertheless, the potential harm arguments are all very similar. Why would anyone say we must develop energy alternatives? There are really only three potential harm areas: the need for energy independence (security harms), the need to save the environment (environmental