

other because an attempt to take people out of society (imprisoning them) through law enforcement strategies is exactly the opposite of considering them as an integral part of society that needs protection from the harms of drug addiction. A second argument might be that imprisoning people creates a criminal subculture preventing a former prisoner from reintegrating into society once released from prison. This kind of thinking helps the affirmative debater see how the features of these two policy options (harms reduction and law enforcement) clash with each other.

3. **How can some feature of the affirmative plan be used to replace some feature of the negative policy?** Having decided that socialization is central to harms reduction and that criminalization is central to law enforcement, the question now becomes how can socialization be used as a replacement for criminalization? One approach is to think of socialization processes, such as education and rehabilitation, as alternatives to imprisonment.

Having thought about the proposition by answering these three questions, the affirmative is now in a position to begin constructing its plan.

CONSTRUCTING THE AFFIRMATIVE PLAN

Developing answers to the three questions (or questions like them) helps debaters to think about what needs to be included in their plan. By answering these questions, debaters focus on the features of the negative policy that need to be avoided and features of the affirmative policy that need to be included and highlighted in the affirmative plan. As harms reduction policies are actually implemented in some countries, debaters could model their plan based on those plans (remember, the affirmative is not required to oppose the status quo). The plan proposed by the affirmative can also be an absolutely new one developed for the sake of the debate. The affirmative plan should follow the same requirements as discussed in the sections on simple policy propositions: it should identify the agent of action and specify the action itself (with necessary details). One significant difference between an affirmative plan in comparative policy propositions and one in simple policy propositions is that the comparative policy plan should account for the interaction of the features of the affirmative and negative plans.

Thus, the affirmative must think in terms of what needs to be excluded and what needs to be included in its plan. The following list may be helpful in this process:

1. Features of the negative policy to be excluded from the affirmative plan
2. An expanded list of categories and subcategories of these policies to be excluded from the affirmative plan
3. Features of the affirmative to be included in the affirmative plan
4. An expanded list of categories and subcategories of these policies to be included in the affirmative plan