

DISADVANTAGE LECTURE

- A. PARTS OF A DA
1. Uniqueness - SQUO is fine or predictive of future SQUO (X will pass bc Y)
 2. Link - Plan triggers something BAD
 3. Internal Link - X event that plan triggers
 4. Impact
- * uniqueness is important, because if it is proven wrong, the impact is proven to be unlikely in the SQUO. Predictive evidence is much better here.
- B. UNIQUENESS TRICKS
1. Use predictive ev over descriptive ev, bc even if conditions aren't in your view now, you can argue it will be soon.
 2. Inevitability - you can lose descriptive ev about the SQUO bc your ev indicates that your view will happen eventually.
 3. Goldilocks - currently, everything is okay, but the plan pushes it too far. (SQUO is "just right," plan is "too hot") SQUO promotes slow change, plan changes too fast.
- C. LINK
1. Read several links in the block that lead to the same I/L
 2. Remember, they can only say no link or link turns not.
- D. INTERNAL LINK
1. Question the I/L. It's undermining the DA. (If they're pushing to pass another policy that the plan prevents, question if the policy being prevented is even good.)
- E. IMPACT
1. Don't read new impacts in the block bc the MAF can turn them right before the last neg speech.
 2. Read impacts that don't align w/ their aff. If they have an econ adv & you read an econ DA, aff can win on other impacts.
 3. Read impacts that turn the case. (say this in every ZNC.)
 4. Impacts need UQ too.
 5. calc - Magnitude, Timeframe, Probability. (choose 1 & explain why you win this one & why it's the only thing that matters).

DRUGS & SUSTAINABILITY

6. Anthony likes timeframe bc of intervening actors. EX: Global warming is so slow; others will have enough time to plan. Step in & attempt to solve, whereas my fast impact... won't have enough time.
7. Rational actors make a good arg for probability. My terrorism impact is more probable than countries going to war.
- A. Intervening Actors: NO guarantee that they will be able to solve. You make warming SO BAD, it doesn't even matter!
8. Brink - close enough that the plan will trigger it, but far enough that only the plan can trigger the DA.
- F. Link Uniqueness (Neg says x bill will pass, plan drains PC, while Aff says Obama has no PC → NO link)
- G. Intrinsicness - opportunity costs → the plan & DA are not so mutually exclusive. The judge can pass both. You argue that the flat is bad bc it's not "fair" to single out the US.

H. Topic Discs

1. Politics - lot of ev from the right wing. However a lot of ev is in the context of international surveillance (so it always looks at the linker closely). The aff should be well-prepped

2. Terrorism - lot of ev from the right wing. However a lot of ev is in the context of international surveillance (so it always looks at the linker closely). The aff should be well-prepped

3. Flexibility / Presidential Powers - gives president unilateral action powers. The link is: Congress is able to curtail the president's power → people perceive pres as weak (Syria) → DOD

4. Relations / Cooperation - DA - The US won't look as hypocritical

when they tell other countries to not spy. Read links.

→ much ev w/ foreign contexts. DOD looks like DOD is doing a lot of work.

→ DOD is doing a lot of work. DOD is doing a lot of work.

→ DOD is doing a lot of work. DOD is doing a lot of work.

→ DOD is doing a lot of work. DOD is doing a lot of work.

I. KICKING DAs

1. WHEN THE AFF HAS READ OFFENSE, IF YOU KICK THE DA WRONG, THEY GET A NEW ADV. CONCEDED A DEFENSIVE ARG.
2. IF THE AFF STRAIGHT TURNS, YOU HAVE TO WIN UP & LINK.

J. AFF STRAT

1. EITHER LINK TURN OR IMPACT TURN, NOT BOTH.
2. ALWAYS READ IMPACT DEFENSE.
3. REASONS WHY THE CASE O/W (FINE, WE TRIGGER YOUR IMPACT, BUT OUR IMPACTS ARE BIGGER.)
4. I/L TAKE-OUTS
5. YOU NEED A VARIETY OF ARGS.
6. IAR SHOULD ALWAYS READ CARDS. IT'S A CONSTRUCTIVE, BC IT COMES AFTER THE BLOCK'S NEW ARGS.
7. USE CX TO POINT OUT HOW BAD THEIR CARDS ARE.
8. READ ADD-ONS THAT ANSWER THE DA. THEY'RE BASICALLY 2 CARD ADVS. IF THEY READ AN ECON ^{DA} DEF, AND YOU READ AN ADD-ON THAT SAYS THE PLAN SOLVES ECON, THEN THE CASE TURNS THE DA BECAUSE THE DA IS TRYING TO PREVENT THE PLAN FROM HAPPENING.