**GENERIC AFFIRMATIVE ANSWERS TO TOPICALITY**

This is a quick guide to 2As for topicality violations you hear that you do not have prepared answers to.

Topicality- The Aff. can take several approaches to defeating a T argument: 1) prove they meet the negative interpretation; 2) provide an Aff. interpretation, prove they meet it and prove it is better than the Neg. interpretation; 3) prove T is not a voting issue.

The following are some answers directed toward the second and third approaches.

1) The Aff. is reasonably topical, we are within the general area of the topic and that is sufficient

2) The Neg. interpretation is overlimiting - it would not allow any Aff. cases to be topical

3) Other words in the resolution provide a check against abuse - the other words in the resolution serve to limit the number of cases which may be run

4) The Neg. interpretation is unreasonable - they can’t name any cases which meet their standard

5) Broader definitions are better, they allow for greater numbers of cases which allow for greater education

6) Clash checks abuse - the purpose of T is to provide common ground for the Aff. and the Neg., to the extent that the Neg. has run DAs and case arguments, there is sufficient clash in the round.

7) 100% sure, since topicality is an absolute issue for the Aff., you must be 100% sure that we are non-topical to vote Aff.

8) Literature checks abuse - the Aff. cites evidence in the 1AC indicating a relationship between the plan and the topic. Since there is literature available, the Neg. could get evidence on the case which shows that the Aff. case is not abusive