insurance, for example, the negative team might use a federal deficit disadvantage. Undoubtedly, the affirmative team will attempt to turn the link, claiming its national health insurance proposal will end up saving money. If the negative team decides to use a deficit disadvantage, it must have confidence in the strength of its evidence showing that national health insurance will be more expensive than the current system.

The third and final defense against a link turn is a strong uniqueness position, which serves to disprove the inherency for any affirmative link turn. If the negative uniqueness evidence is true, the disadvantage would be avoided in the present system. This means the link turn can never be an additional advantage for plan adoption because plan adoption is unnecessary to prevent the disadvantage. On the deficit disadvantage, for example, the negative uniqueness argument would show that no recession will occur so long as the federal budget deficit stays at or below current levels. Thus, there is no impact to a link turn. If the affirmative team proves that its national health insurance proposal would save money, the disadvantage just goes away.

FURTHER READING

Carlin, Diana, and Walter Ulrich. *Developing and Defending the Negative Position.* Indianapolis, IN: National Federation of High Schools, 1991.

Ulrich, Walter. *Developing and Defending Disadvantages.* Indianapolis, IN: National Federation of High Schools, 1990.