

right is now denied; people are sick or dying; the environment is polluted; national security is threatened; or animal rights are ignored. For the affirmative team to win, it must show that something is other than it should be.

Inherency is the stock issue that focuses on the causes of the harm cited by the affirmative. The affirmative team has a responsibility to show why the present system cannot or will not resolve the problems cited in the affirmative case. If the present system is fully capable of solving the problem on its own, there is no reason to enact the affirmative plan.

The two types of inherency are *structural* and *attitudinal*. The strongest inherency arguments focus on some structural defects written into current laws. An affirmative case proposing immigration reform might, for example, point to current legislation mandating the construction of a border fence as an inherent barrier to an effective solution. An affirmative case attempting to preserve the ocean environment might point to current legislation allowing the leasing of the continental shelf for oil drilling. Other inherency arguments might focus on attitudes and show why decision-makers in the present system are improperly motivated to solve the problem. A case dealing with environmental protection might, for example, claim that the Environmental Protection Agency has been captured by corporate interests.

The *solvency* stock issue asks whether the affirmative team has authoritative evidence to show that the affirmative plan will reduce the harm shown in the case. The judge is unlikely to vote for a change if it offers no better solution than can be found in the present system.

Desirability is the final stock issue in policy debate. The affirmative team must be able to show that the disadvantages of adopting the affirmative plan are outweighed by the advantages of doing so. The negative team often argues that the affirmative plan would create problems that would outweigh any slight advantages the plan could offer—such arguments are called *disadvantages*. Suppose the affirmative plan proposes to send more fertilizer to Africa so African farmers can grow more food. The negative team might present evidence showing that more intensive agricultural production in Africa would destroy fragile ecosystems. The affirmative team would, therefore, have to prove that the advantage of feeding hungry people in Africa would outweigh the risk of destroying the environment.

WHAT HAPPENS IN EACH SPEECH IN POLICY DEBATE?

First Affirmative Constructive Speech: In this speech the affirmative team should present its plan, the reasons this plan is necessary or desirable, and authoritative