

Uniqueness arguments explain why the disadvantage will not happen in the present system. If the disadvantage will happen inevitably (with or without the affirmative plan), the argument gives no reason to reject the plan. Negative teams can defend the uniqueness of the disadvantages in a variety of ways. The best way is to provide evidence showing that the maintenance of the present course of action will prevent the disadvantage.

The final element of the disadvantage is the impact. The impact shows why the disadvantage is significantly harmful. It is not enough to show that the federal budget deficit will be increased, that trade relations with Europe will be strained, that pollution of the environment will be increased, or that civil liberties will be infringed. A properly designed impact argument goes one step further to show why these outcomes are significantly harmful. What bad things will happen to the United States or world economies if the federal budget deficit worsens? Why do we care about straining trade relations with Europe? So what if already high levels of environmental pollution are increased? How important are civil liberties? How big does the impact need to be? If the negative team is to win the debate, the impact must be bigger than the harm claim in the affirmative case.

Negative teams should always be aware that the affirmative team might attempt to turn around either the link or impact to the disadvantage. A *turn* argument attempts to remake the disadvantage into another advantage of adopting the affirmative case. The affirmative team might try to turn the link of a deficit disadvantage by showing that the plan would actually save money, lightening the burden on the federal budget.

An impact turn to the disadvantage would claim that an economic recession would actually be a good thing rather than the calamity envisioned by the negative team. In some debates the affirmative team chooses to defend the position of extreme environmental groups who welcome a recession as a means of cutting resource use throughout the world to preserve rain forests and prevent species extinction. Impact turn arguments are rare because they represent such a high-risk strategy; an impact turn brings the debate wholly to the argumentative ground chosen by the negative team. Many impact turn claims also attempt to defend counterculture positions that some judges would find repugnant.

There are three basic types of defenses against a link turn argument. The first (and best) defense is to link the disadvantage from something the case claims to do. If, for example, the case calls for an increase in the use of DDT to prevent malaria, the affirmative team cannot reverse the link. It has now foreclosed the option of arguing that the plan would actually decrease the use of DDT.

The second line of defense against a link turn is a good supply of negative evidence supporting the original link. If the affirmative team has proposed national health