

II. The affirmative is a superior method of reducing the problems associated with sales of drugs that are now illegal.

A. Law enforcement strategies allow sales of illegal drugs to be controlled by dangerous criminal elements.

As the sale of drugs not prescribed by a doctor is illegal, drug dealers are criminals. Thus, the only people who can sell illegal drugs are criminals.

B. Placing sales of illegal drugs into the hands of criminals creates drug wars.

In their efforts to enforce laws against drug selling, law enforcement agents must engage the drug sellers—sometimes violently. These violent confrontations expose not only the drug sellers but also the law enforcement agents to substantial risks.

Criminalization of drug sales is also dangerous to law-abiding citizens. Because the risk of dealing in an illegal trade is so great, the price of drugs and the potential profit are high. When criminal elements find themselves in situations where they are able to make great profits on drugs, they start turf battles that lead to drug wars in which innocent bystanders are killed and wounded.

C. The affirmative plan takes criminals out of the drug business.

Under the affirmative plan, the sale of drugs is no longer illegal. Therefore the sale of drugs will be controlled by the marketplace and regulated by the government, rather than be in the hands of criminals.

D. Taking criminals out of the drug business reduces the problems associated with drug wars.

By making drug sales legal, the dangers to both law enforcement officers and ordinary citizens would be substantially reduced. Just as running a legal liquor store is much less dangerous than being an illegal drug dealer, legalizing currently proscribed street drugs would substantially reduce the violence associated with drug sales.

Of course, the two examples provided above are simply illustrations of how advantages can be described on the basis of the earlier conceptualization of the case. In both of these cases, debaters will have to add more explanation, and, even more important, they will need to research and add evidence to their presentations.

The two examples above offer another pattern that will work most of the time when describing comparative advantages:

A. Describe a condition associated with the negative policy. This point requires returning to the conceptualization of the case and describing an inherent feature of the policy assigned to the negative team.

B. Relate that condition to some effect. By drawing a cause-and-effect relationship between the negative policy and some unwanted effect, the affirmative case proves that the negative policy is undesirable.

C. Describe an opposing condition associated with the affirmative policy.