

*States with legal visas. “Enforcement alone is not the solution.... We can build fences, but people will come around them,” he said.*

Counter-causality is another type of solvency attack. Most public policy problems have multiple causes. The affirmative plan might remove one of these causes, leaving all the others still in place. Consider the problem of global warming. The affirmative plan might impose a carbon tax designed to reduce carbon-dioxide emissions. Yet such a plan would leave more significant causes of global warming untouched:

*Richard Hill (Staff Writer), The Oregonian, November 2, 1989, p. E1. Methane, however, is particularly worrisome because it is increasing at twice the rate as CO<sub>2</sub> and can trap 20 times more heat than carbon dioxide. “That’s the remarkable thing,” [Oregon Research Institute professor, Reinhold A.] Rasmussen said. “Carbon dioxide has only increased maybe 20 percent in the last 100 or so years, but the amount of methane in the atmosphere has more than doubled—gone from 700 parts per billion to almost 1,750, so it’s a very large increase proportionately.”*

Workability questions offer another way to attack affirmative solvency claims. Consider an affirmative plan that proposes to increase funding to purchase more antiretroviral drugs for HIV/ AIDS sufferers in sub-Saharan Africa. The negative team could argue that providing more drugs will have little effect given numerous workability problems: corrupt governments will prevent the drugs from reaching those who need them, shortages of health clinics and health workers mean that no one will be able to dispense or monitor the drugs, and extensive water and food shortages mean that drugs will not be taken with food as recommended.

## **CONSTRUCTING DISADVANTAGES**

A properly constructed disadvantage has a link, uniqueness, and impact. The link answers the question “Why will the plan cause the disadvantage?” Uniqueness arguments answer the question “How does the present system keep this disadvantage from happening?” Impact arguments answer the question “How serious would be the harm that will result if this disadvantage happens?”

The link argument in the disadvantage must start from something the plan does. The link then attempts to make a logical connection between the plan and the impact of the disadvantage. If the plan substantially doubles the spending for foreign aid to Africa, such spending provides the link for a deficit disadvantage. If the plan funds the use of DDT in indoor residential spraying, increased DDT use provides the link to the DDT-bad disadvantage.