

of each and emphasize the benefits of criminalization when addressing the problem of drug abuse.

After conceptualizing the case, the negative would construct a plan. In our example, the negative plan would encompass the main features of law enforcement strategy. The negative could model their plan on an actual law enforcement policy, or construct an original one. The plan should have a clearly identified actor and action, as well as a set of features setting it apart from the affirmative's.

Finally, the negative could outline the major advantages of the law enforcement strategy in the following way:

- I. Law enforcement is superior to harms reduction in eliminating the availability of drugs.
 - a. Law enforcement policy defines drug sellers and drug users as criminals.
 - b. Defining drug sellers as criminals allows for law enforcement officials to keep tighter control over the selling of drugs. Declaring drugs and drug-selling practices illegal helps to eliminate the availability of drugs. In this way, law enforcement policy allows police to deal with drug abuse at the very source of the problem.
 - c. Harms reduction policy tolerates selling drugs as well as drug use.
 - d. Harms reduction allows drugs to be available and sends a message to the society that drug use is acceptable. Thus, rather than deterring drug use and eliminating the availability of drugs, harms reduction policies fail to effectively fight drug abuse, whereas law enforcement fights the problem at its source.

Similar to the way the affirmative team constructs its case, the negative structures its arguments by first describing a feature of the negative's plan, and by demonstrating how that particular feature leads to the advantage; by describing a feature of the affirmative plan, and by demonstrating how that particular feature leads to the disadvantage in the affirmative plan.

No matter how the negative team decides to structure its case, the most important parts should be a clear presentation of the plan and its comparative advantages. The negative cannot merely present reasons why its plan is good; the team must explain why it is superior to the affirmative one. A good debate on propositions of comparative policy relies heavily on the critical examination of how the features of two plans interact and on the comparative analysis demonstrating which plan is more effective in achieving the goal outlined in the resolution.