

## Negative Case Attacks

A **negative case attack** (or an “**on-case argument**”) is an argument the negative makes which directly correlates with something from the first affirmative constructive. That is, the negative team is responding directly to something said by the 1AC.

Since a negative case attack would correspond to one of the main contentions or observations in the 1AC, and since the 1AC contentions normally correspond with a stock issue, on-case arguments are normally negative attacks against one of the stock issues in the debate. For example, a negative team could attack an affirmative’s **Inherency**, its **Harms** (or Advantages), or its **Solvency**. While Topicality, as mentioned, is also a stock issue, normally an affirmative is assumed to be topical unless challenged by the negative team, and therefore it is unusual for an affirmative to topicality in the 1AC. Therefore, though it corresponds to a stock issue, Topicality arguments by the negative are generally an **off-case argument**, which we discuss in greater detail in greater detail next week.

Generally, a case attack falls into one of two categories: a **take-out** or a **turn**. A take-out is fairly simple: it is basically an argument that the affirmative is wrong. For example, a negative argument that the affirmative’s harms are not a big problem would be a significance take-out. Saying they don’t exist would be a harms take-out. Saying an affirmative’s plan doesn’t solve the harm is a solvency take-out. While useful, take-outs are entirely **defensive arguments**, which serve only to mitigate the possibility of what the affirmative says – since the affirmative will (or should) always argue that what they say is right, a negative team is highly unlikely to win on take-outs alone, since without other, “**offensive,**” **arguments** there is always the possibility that an affirmative may have some benefit and thus should be voted for.

A turn (along with off-case arguments) provides some offense for the negative team. A turn says that not only are you wrong, but in fact what you say is the opposite of what right. This is better understood with some meta-examples. A negative who says not only is your harm not a problem, but in fact your “harm” is a good thing is *turning* the harm (likewise they could turn your advantage by saying your advantage isn’t actually good, it’s bad). Similarly, a negative could claim that an affirmative not only doesn’t solve a harm, it in fact makes the harm worse by passing plan, thereby *turning* the solvency.

Suggestions for reading/viewing: (esp. vets)

Code of the Debater, Part 2: Basic Knowledge, Section 2: Attacking the affirmative case

Novice Policy Debate Videos: Part 13 “Attacking the Case”

**Key terms from this training are in bold; you should strive to know what all of them mean before the next training session.**