2017-2018 Chicago Debate League Core Files
English Language Learners Aff

<u>**Vocabulary**</u>
<u>**ELL 1AC**</u>

>>> **First, our <u>PLAN</u>: The United States Federal Government should mandate that any state receiving grant funding under the Every Student Succeed Act will use the funds for Dual Language Immersion classes in elementary and secondary education classrooms.**

<u>**Contention One: Inherency**</u>

>> **American schools continue to focus on English-only instruction without true bilingual education, which dooms us to a society and a workforce that only speaks English**

>> **<u>The</u> <u>current</u> <u>law,</u> <u>the</u> <u>Every</u> <u>Student</u> <u>Succeeds</u> <u>Act,</u> <u>provides</u> <u>resources</u> <u>for</u> <u>English</u> <u>learners</u> <u>but</u> <u>fails</u> <u>to</u> <u>provide</u> <u>the</u> <u>federal</u> <u>direction</u> <u>needed</u> <u>for</u> <u>accountability</u>**

<u>**Contention Two: Harms to the American Economy**</u>

>> **Demand for bilingual employees is growing in the United States**

>> **Increasing the number bilinguals in the workforce through education expands America's global economic reach and makes our workers competitive**

>> **The US economy will be dragged down by having low labor force participation from fewer workers**

>> **Economic crisis leads to nuclear war**

<u>**Contention Three: Harms of American Racism**</u>

>> **Historically, English only programs are rooted in racism and cause harassment and discrimination**

>> **We have a moral obligation to fight racism wherever we can see its impact**

<u>**Contention Four: Solvency**</u>

>> **A recent Stanford study shows that students learning dual languages outperform students in English-only programs by middle school**

English Language Learners 2AC

<u>**2AC AT: Harms (Economy) #1 = "Job Market Strong"**</u>

> **1.** **They say the job market is strong now, but**

>> **2. <u>Many</u> <u>industries</u> <u>are</u> <u>seeking</u> <u>bilingual</u> <u>employees</u> <u>–</u> <u>without</u> <u>fully</u> <u>employed</u> <u>immigrants,</u> <u>our</u> <u>workforce</u> <u>population</u> <u>would</u> <u>fall</u> <u>in</u> <u>years</u> <u>to</u> <u>come</u>**

<u>**2AC AT: Harms (Economy) #2 = "Latinos Already Bilingual"**</u>

> 1.   They say   Latinos are already bilingual
, but

> **2.** **The U.S. produces less bilinguals than other countries**

>> **3. Their evidence only speaks to Latino immigrants – our 1AC Gandara and Acevedo evidence says there's also a need for dual language immersion in Chinese and Arabic as well.**

<u>**2AC AT: Harms (Economy) #3 = "No Impact"**</u>

> 1.   They say   , but

>> **2. Statistics show that economic growth decreases the risk of war**

>> **3. Having a bilingual workforce can increase a countries GDP**

<u>**2AC AT: Harms (Racism) #1-2 – "Gentrification Turn"**</u>

1. <u>They say   dual language programs lead to gentrification,</u>
<u>, but</u>

> **2. No Impact: Every public school with English Language Learners would have dual-language programs, so affluent families will not have to move to different school districts**
> **3. Mixed income schools are better than homogenous schools**

2AC AT: Solvency #1 – "English-only works"

1. <u>They say   , but</u>
2. **<u>Prop 227 did not help English Language Learners</u>**

2AC AT: Solvency #2 – "Bilingual costly and fails"

1. <u>They say   , but</u>

> **2. Bilinguals earn more than monolinguals**

English Language Learners Neg

1NC Harms (Economy) Frontline

> **1. The job market is strong now and labor force participation is stabilizing**
> **2. Status quo solves: Most Latinos already either speak English or are bilingual, especially younger Latinos**
> **3. No Impact: Economic decline does not lead to war**

2NC/1NR Economy #1 Extension – "Job Market Strong"

> 1. They say that the <u>job market has a shortage of bilingual workers</u>, but
> **2. Even if there is a high need for bilingual workers, it is not a big enough portion of the job market to trigger the impact**
> **3. Alt Causes: The job market needs more skilled workers**

2NC/1NR Economy #2 Extension – "Latinos Already Bilingual"

> **1. They say _____ , but**
> **2. Their own evidence admits that most Hispanics will still be able to speak Spanish by the time they reach the workforce.**
> **3. The number of people who are bilingual in the United States is increasing**

2NC/1NR Economy #3 Extension – "No impact"

> **1. They say _____ , but**
> **2. No Impact: Economic Decline leading to war is empirically denied**
> **3. No internal link to the economy: People who are bilingual only make 2% more than those who are not bilingual**

1NC Harms (Racism) Frontline

> **1. Turn: Dual language programs are a magnet for gentrification – privileged non-immigrant families will take spots meant for English language learners**
> **2. Gentrification leads to a laundry list of social impacts for marginalized communities**

2NC/1NR Harms (Racism) #1-2 Extension – Gentrification Turn

> **1. They say _____ , but**
> **2. Affluent families are drawn to dual language programs**
> **3. Gentrification is a form of systematic violence**

1NC Solvency Frontline

> **1. SOLVENCY TURN: English-only programs are more effective**
> **2. Bilingual programs cost way more money and don't work**

2NC/1NR Solvency #1 Extension – "English-only works"

> **1. They say _____ , but**

2. English Only Immersion programs work

2NC/1NR Solvency #2 Extension – "Bilingual fails"

1. They say _____ , but

2. **Turn: Bilinguals make less than monolinguals in the same position**

Charters Aff

Vocabulary

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) was signed into law by President George W. Bush on Jan. 8, 2002. It significantly increased the federal role in holding schools responsible for the academic progress of all students. And it put a special focus on ensuring that states and schools boost the performance of certain groups of students, such as English-language learners, students in special education, and poor and minority children, whose achievement, on average, trails their peers. States did not have to comply with the new requirements, but if they didn't, they risked losing federal Title I money.

Advantage 1: Neoliberalism

Corrupt charter schools have siphoned off funds from CPS and created a false crisis to close down schools. They don't care about our city and they want to profit off students like a real life *Hunger Games*

This is national--DeVos and her charter policies are the face of modern neoliberalism turning the public good of education into a commodified product benefitting the rich elite

Charter schools create a discriminatory culture of racism, classism, and ableism which causes students to fail

The charter system reinforces white supremacy—they misuse billions of dollars, increase educational inequality, and segregate

White neoliberalism necessitates constant purification of itself by exterminating those that are different--this makes genocide and global war inevitable.

Charter school neoliberal policies collapse democracy and cause the rise of strong arm dictators

1AC Critical Solvency/Plan

Plan: my partner and I substantially increase the regulation of public high schools by unflinchingly rejecting all charter programs in favor of politicized educational pedagogy within the debate space.

Politicized educational pedagogy encourages students to become agents of change as they understand their role in power structure of neoliberalism—this process guarantees democratic exchange and political reforms

The debate space is a key place of resistance to build democratic citizenship and dismantle neoliberalism

Teachers can link their educational methods to new political struggles challenging neoliberalism

1AC Policy Solvency/Plan

Text: The United States federal government should substantially increase its regulation of elementary and secondary charter schools by implementing the Annenberg Institute regulations.

These regulations would include robust oversight, transparency, equal funding, and a safe school environment

Tying federal funding to substantial reforms solve the worst elements of charter discrimination

Charters Aff 2AC

2AC Inherency Extensions

Trump expands investment in Charters by millions of dollars
Charter growth is on the rise and is meaningfully supported by the government
The Every Student Succeeds Act allows charters to run rampant with no oversight
Charters are expanding dramatically creating an "education bubble"

2AC AT: Neoliberalism #1 "Neoliberalism=Democratic"

1 Extend our Love and Blakely evidence.
2   Charters are reverse Robin Hood—they take wealth from the poorest and give to the richest, rigging elections using their massive wealth
3   Neoliberalism is directly responsible for income inequality and as a result higher violence

2AC AT: Neoliberalism #2 "No Brink"

1 Extend our   evidence.
2   Neoliberalism's horrible impacts are happening now
3   Resource wars and financial meltdowns are happening because of neoliberalism

2AC AT: Neoliberalism #3 "Charter Checks Exist"

1 Extend our   evidence.
2   No transparency
3   Corrupt Contracts

2AC AT: Neoliberalism #4 "Neoliberalism Inevitable"

1 Extend our   evidence.
2   Neoliberalism is unsustainable and will collapse on its own

2AC AT: Critical Solvency #1 "Charters Improve Education"

1 Extend our Annenberg Institute for School Reform evidence.
2   Charters fail students and teachers—their author
3   Charters encourage competition and destroy cohesion

2AC AT: Critical Solvency #2 "Giroux Biased"

2AC AT: Critical Solvency #3 "No Practical Solvency"

1 Extend our   evidence.
2   Teacher connections to the real world facilitate strong democracy
3   Politicized educational pedagogy creates new sites of resistance against neoliberalism and re-engages the political sphere
4   Schools are the essential space for resistance and genuine democratic citizenship

2AC AT: Policy Solvency #1 "Charters Improve Education"

1 Extend our Annenberg Institute for School Reform evidence.
2   Charters fail students and teachers—their author
3   Charters encourage competition and destroy cohesion

2AC AT: Policy Solvency #2 "Loopholes"

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2. Authorizers have no skin the game—students fail at higher rates and schools are left in shambles. Regulating them solves

2AC AT: Policy Solvency #3 "Public Schools Fail"

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   Funding is equalizing slowly and regulating charters would help

3   Charters are comparatively worse—they undermine critical thinking and make educational robots intended to maximize corporate profits

2AC Policy Regulations Solvency Extensions

Transparency Solvency

Authorizer solvency

Charters Neg

1NC Neoliberalism Frontline

1.   Impact turn: neoliberalism increases democracy and overall freedom

2.   **No brink—charter schools have been around for decades and none of their impacts have happened. There should be major wars and no democracy, but our system of checks and balances have prevented their problems.**

3.   No impact--multiple checks exist to make charters accountable to their students, teachers, and parents

4.   No alternatives—neoliberalism has been around for centuries and is grounded in human nature

2NC/1NR Neoliberalism #1 "Neoliberalism Democratic" Extensions

1 Extend our Friedman evidence.

2   Neoliberalism is good for democracy, standard of living, and altruism

2NC/1NR Neoliberalism #2 "No Brink" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   Alternate causes—there are literally hundreds of examples of neoliberalism in the status quo including free trade deals, multinational companies, and Walmart. All of their impacts should have happened already.

3   No specific root cause to violence—multiple reasons the aff can't solve

2NC/1NR Neoliberalism "Charter Checks Exist" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   Federal regulations make sure that charters protect all students

1.   All states have regulations on oversight including student discipline policies

2NC/1NR Neoliberalism #4 "Neoliberalism Inevitable" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   Neoliberalism is sustainable and inevitable—politics and history prove

1NC Critical Solvency Frontline

1.   Solvency Turn: charters improve education and increase student achievement, especially in high-poverty areas

  2. **No credibility: the majority of their solvency evidence is from a socialist philosophy professor. Of course, he's going to say neoliberalism is bad. Their author cannot be trusted and so their argument as a whole is flawed.**

  3. **No solvency: wishing away neoliberalism does nothing—only concrete political action can solve**

2NC/1NR Critical Solvency #1 "Charters Good" Extensions

1 Extend our <u>Claremont Journal</u> evidence.

2 **Charter schools perform comparatively better, especially in cities**

3 **Data across multiple states show charter schools are better on education, attendance, and achievement in cities**

2NC/1NR Critical Solvency #2 "Giroux Biased" Extensions
2NC/1NR Critical Solvency #3 "No Political Solution" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2 **Abandoning politics cedes it to the elites – causes war, slavery, and authoritarianism**

1NC Policy Solvency Frontline

1. **Solvency turn: charters improve education and increase student achievement, especially in high-poverty areas**

2. **No Solvency: states and charters will just find a loophole in the laws. They have previously not been held to the same standards. Also, states may just accept the financial penalty because the federal government does not give a lot of money for education.**

3. **No Solvency: public school systems are on the verge of bankruptcy and do not have adequate funds for students**

2NC/1NR Policy Solvency #1 "Charters Good" Extensions

1 Extend our <u>Claremont Journal</u> evidence.

2 **Charter schools perform comparatively better, especially in cities**

3 **Data across multiple states show charter schools are better on education, attendance, and achievement in cities**

2NC/1NR Policy Solvency #2 "Loopholes" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

The Atlantic '17 [Major news outlet focused on domestic issues, "Betsy DeVos's Accountability Problem", Jan. 13, https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/01/betsy-devoss-accountability-problem/513047/]

2NC/1NR Policy Solvency #3 "Public Schools Fail" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2 **Public schools are packed with students which causes schools to fail and teachers to quit**

Federal Funding Inequality Aff

Vocabulary

Plan Text

Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its regulation of elementary and secondary education schools by creating grant incentives and penalties for states in compliance with the "progressive funding" model.

Advantage One: Racism

6

In our own city, segregation has made equal education impossible. Students in the suburbs get millions of dollars more, smaller class sizes, more experienced teachers, better meals, better classes, better everything.

This unfair funding makes the achievement gap between white and black students enormous—without the plan, it will take 250 years to get equal education for minority students

Racism is not only immoral, but it is makes disposable people and leads to genocide and war

Advantage Two: Poverty

Despite the horrible results, there is no movement now toward funding equality now

Funding for low-income schools is being cut daily—there's less money in school today than there was during the great recession. This creates a vicious cycle of poverty

1AC Solvency

Federal grant incentives with matching state funds would close the achievement gap

As part of the plan, states without "progressive funding" for low income schools will have their funding cut and given to states that meet the standard

More education resolves inequality and boosts the economy

Federal Funding Inequality 2AC

2AC AT: Racism #1 "Police/Justice System is Worse"

1 Extend our NPR and Camera evidence.

2   "School choice" policies are rooted in segregation and racism

2AC AT: Racism #2 "Funding isn't Policies"

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   Funding inequality is devastating urban zones and preventing students from reaching their potential—it's the root of the problem

2AC AT: Racism #3 "Racism on Decline"

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   Racism is rampant: Trump's presidency has surged previously hidden racism

2AC AT: Poverty #1 "Wealth Improving"

1 Extend our Semuels and NPR evidence.

2   Global economic inequality is drastically increasing

2AC AT: Poverty #2 "Education Inequality Myth"

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   States fail in equitable funding—federal government regulation is key to make this work. A minimum of funding would solve the problem.

3   States deny responsibility for funding equality

2AC AT: Poverty #3 "Government Assistance"

2AC AT: Solvency #1 "Poverty Undermines Education"

2.   Education can solve the income gap and improve the local economy in low-income neighborhoods

3. **Education is essential to get a high paying, quality job and it also improves the local economy—low income communities can dramatically improve their quality of life**

2AC AT: Solvency #2 "No Policy Change"
2AC AT: Solvency #3 "Regulation Harms"
Federal Funding Inequality Neg
1NC Racism Frontline

1. **No impact: racism in the justice system and police force are far worse than in the school system**
2. **No internal link: changing funding will not stop the racist policies done by schools. Their evidence argues that students are being discriminated against based on the school-to-prison pipeline and school policies. The plan only changes funding.**
3. **No impact: despite inequality still existing, racism has declined over the past century based on all metrics**

2NC/1NR Racism #1 "Racism in Justice System" Extensions

1 Extend our New York Times evidence.

2   **The US prison system is incredibly racist**

2NC/1NR Racism #2 "Funding won't Fix Discrimination" Extensions
2NC/1NR Racism #3 "Racism Reducing" Extensions

1 Extend our   evidence.

2   **Data and new generation overwhelmingly show decline in racism**

1NC Poverty Frontline

1. **No impact: global inequality is dramatically down and will continue to improve**
2. **No impact and turn: funding is actually greater for minority students today than white students and the plan mismanages federal money**
3. **No impact: Government assistance improves people's lives and prevents destitute poverty**

2NC/1NR Poverty #1 "Poverty Declining" Extensions

1 Extend our Qiu evidence.

2   **Our generation will end extreme poverty by 2030**

2NC/1NR Poverty #2 "Inequality Myth" Extensions

1 Extend our   evidence.

2   **Funding inequality is a myth and there are multiple factors that cause the achievement gap unrelated to funding**

2NC/1NR Poverty "Government Assistance" Extensions

1 Extend our   evidence.

2   **Not only is there a safety net, but employment is at all time highs**

1NC Solvency Frontline

1. **No solvency: other way around, poverty makes proper education almost impossible**
2. **No solvency: the plan only reallocates money based on poverty. That does not necessarily help people of color. Most of the funds will fix poverty in rural areas and do nothing for black and brown folk. This means they don't solve their racism advantage.**
3. **Solvency turn: regulations cause tax increases, more testing, teacher cuts, and are fundamentally unfair**

4.   **No solvency: a college degree is the real possibility for getting a quality job, the plan is not enough**

2NC/1NR Solvency #1 "Poverty Prevents Education" Extensions

1 Extend our American Psychological Association evidence.

2   **Income inequality causes feelings of low self-worth and leaving school**

2NC/1NR Solvency #2 "Rural Poverty" Extensions

1 Extend our _____ evidence.

2   **Rural poverty, especially with children, is far more pronounced than urban areas**

2NC/1NR Solvency #3 "Regulations Hurt Education" Extensions

1. Extend our _____ evidence.

2   **Solvency Turn: increased regulations mean more testing which destroys learning**

3   **Funding increases have not shown any results—other factors make educational efforts fail**

4   **Funding increases have been tremendous and have had no impact**

2NC/1NR Solvency #4 "College Key" Extensions

2.   **No correlation—city high school graduates are at all time highs, but college attendance is way down**

STEM Aff

Vocabulary
Plan Text
Solvency

Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) change how Science is taught in the American education system by addressing major global issues

The Next Generation Science Standards will provide the necessary framework to increase the number of students receiving proper math and science instruction

18 states have adopted NGSS but still need a push

Advantage One: Hegemony

Job market is growing but there are not enough qualified workers to fit those positions- students need to be exposed to STEM education a younger age to close this gap

STEM workers are key to prevent war, terrorism, and economic decline.

Military readiness prevents global war.

Advantage Two: Global Warming

There is a lack of diversity in STEM fields, but there needs to be more diversity if there is ever going to be a solution to Global Warming

Global Warming is real and is caused by CO_2 and other greenhouse gas emissions

Warming is real, anthropogenic, and presents several scenarios for catastrophe

NGSS teaches students that greenhouse emissions will increase global warming and science and engineering is the only way to solve

STEM 2AC

2AC AT: Hegemony #1= "Squo Solves"

    1. They say more students are getting STEM degrees, but

    2. Even if more students are getting STEM degrees it is not enough to meet the million students needed in the field.

    3. The number of STEM jobs is growing faster than the number of students getting STEM degrees

2AC AT: Hegemony #2-3= "Terrorism Turn"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. New STEM technology can solve for terrorism

2AC AT: Hegemony #4= "Heg Sustainable"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. U.S. hegemony is declining

2AC AT: Hegemony #5= "No impact"

    1. They say _____ , but

2AC AT: Global Warming #1= "Squo Solves"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. Not enough is being done to decrease Warming

2AC AT: Global Warming #2= "Timeframe"

    1. They say _____ , but

2AC AT: Global Warming #3= "Tipping Point"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. Warming is reversible

2AC AT: Global Warming #4= "No Impact"

    1. They say _____ , but

2AC AT: Solvency #1= "States don't adopt"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. 26 states were involved with creating the NGSS

2AC AT: Solvency #2= "NGSS =/= Solve"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. Based on the Fordham Institute Report, the NGSS still ranked higher than the programs that 32 states currently have. Even if it's not the best it is way better than what most states have now

2AC AT: Solvency #3= "Not Enough Teachers"

    1. They say _____ , but

    2. NGSS helps teachers become better STEM teachers

STEM Neg

1NC Hegemony Frontline

    1. Status quo Solves- more students are earning STEM degrees

    2. Turn: Terrorism is inevitable as long as U.S. heg is sustained

    3. Impact: A terrorist attack goes nuclear

    4. Status quo Solves: U.S. Heg is sustainable

    5. No Impact: 9/11 proves that deterrence fails against non-state actors like terrorists.

    Record 4(Jeffery former professional staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee "Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation" July 8 The CATO Institute)AQB

1NC Global Warming Frontline

    1. Status quo solves: Actions are being taken now to decrease environmental destruction

        2. The affirmative's impacts will happen before they can get enough STEM workers in the market to solve

        3. We are beyond the tipping point for CO2 emissions

        4. Their impacts are over exaggerated and not backed by peer-reviewed research

1NC Solvency Frontline

        1. No Solvency: Conservative states will not adopt NGSS

        2. NGSS are no better than the standards that exist and are not enough to create change in STEM

        3. There are not enough qualified STEM teachers

2NC/1NR Extensions

2NC/1NR Hegemony#1 Extension

        1. They <u>say that there are not enough students getting STEM degrees</u>, but

        2. Increasing H-1B Visas would increase STEM workers in the U.S.

2NC/1NR Hegemony #2-3 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. U.S. heg motivates terrorism

2NC/1NR Hegemony #4 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. U.S. heg is sustainable

2NC/1NR Hegemony #5 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. No nuclear war between great powers – it's in a country's interest to avoid war

2NC/1NR Global Warming #1 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. The international community is determined to decrease warming

2NC/1NR Global Warming #2 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. It takes over a decade to get through the STEM pipeline from Kindergarten to College, even if we started now the process would take too long. All their evidence calls for immediate solutions for Warming.

2NC/1NR Global Warming #3 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. Too late to reverse the effects of global warming

2NC/1NR Global Warming #4 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. Their impact claims are not valid

        3. Turn: Their exaggerated impacts only lead to inaction or climate change denial

2NC/1NR Solvency #1 Extension

        1. They say   , but

        2. The NGSS focuses a lot on teaching students about anthropogenic global warming and how to stop it. Republican states will not adopt the standards.

        3. Republicans do not believe in Climate Change

2NC/1NR Solvency #2 Extension

        1. They say   , but

2. No Solvency: The standards are flawed and confusing

<u>2NC/1NR Solvency #3 Extension</u>

1. They say   , but

2. NGSS only focuses on education but does not provide a framework to create more STEM teachers.

3. STEM education fails because there are not enough teachers

Topicality

<u>Vocabulary</u>

<u>Limits</u>: The amount of arguments that can be run. This is usually about how many affirmatives are topical under a certain interpretation. If there are many, many affs—think 50+—that would make it super hard to be negative. On the other hand, if there were only 2 affs, then that would make it too hard for the aff. When people talk about limits, this is the discussion.

<u>Ground:</u> Which arguments that can be run depending on the interpretation. Basically, which DA's, CP's, K's, and Case arguments can you read. If you couldn't read ANYTHING in the core files against an aff, that would make it challenging to be negative.

<u>1NC Funding Equality Regulations Topicality</u>

A.   **Interpretation: regulations must be a mandatory requirement**

B.   **Violation: the "progressive funding" model encourages states to give more equal funding through grants and cuts. The plan is not actually a mandatory law.**

C.   **Reasons to vote negative:**

1.   **Mixing burdens: It's impossible to tell if the plan will actually solve the problem directly based on the plan text. Mandatory laws are topical just by looking at the plan text. Having uncertain solving is not only bad for education, but also bad for fairness since we base our strategy off the plan text.**

2.   **Limits: there are many more cases that give incentives or penalties. Any case that just tries to have the states change education would be considered topical. With so many cases, it will be impossible to have predictability and therefore depth of education and fairness will be destroyed.**

<u>2AC AT: Funding Equality Regulations Topicality</u>

1.   **We meet—our Center for American Progress evidence argues that states will be forced to fund more equally by the government. If they do not, huge amounts of funding will be cut and redistributed. These states will also lose out on grants so they will do the plan.**

2.   **Counter interpretation: regulations must be voluntary incentives**

3.   **Counter Standards:**

A.   **Topic Education—regulations on education are almost always incentive based. It's not possible to *make* states do something on education, especially with the 10th amendment balancing power. Our interpretation gives the debaters the best education about the topic itself and mechanisms that the government uses which increases policy education.**

B.   **No case meets—all laws are just penalties and incentives. Even laws that the interpretation is talking about cannot force a person or organization to do something. The threat of jail or fines is exactly the**

same incentive as grants and economic cuts. They limit the topic so much no education or fairness is possible.

C.   Real World—all negotiations between people include give and take. Most interactions and relationships are based on compromise, incentives, and collaboration. Just forcing a school to do something does not teach real negotiation skills that can be used in job situations or life in general.

4.   Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.

2NC/1NR AT #1: "We Meet"

1.   They don't meet—extend our EPA evidence. It states that regulations are mandatory requirements that force individuals, states, or organizations to comply with the government.

2.   Extend the violation—their solvency evidence talks about grant incentives and cuts that will be made for non-compliance. These do not force the states to equalize funding, instead they just give or take away money to encourage states to equalize funding.

2NC/1NR AT #2: "Counter Interpretation"

1.   Extend our EPA interpretation. Our interpretation is preferable for debate because of limits, ground, fairness, and education.

2.   There's a topical version of the Aff—they can just make a law which demands that states comply with funding equalization under the law. It can also be a federal crime to leave funding grossly unequal. With this direct regulation, states will be forcesd to comply.

3.   They've abused us in the debate round because they

_____
_____
_____
_____

2NC/1NR AT #3: "Topic Education"

1.   They explode limits—allowing incentives or penalties means that the plan is not directly topical. The aff is effectually topical which means they may result in change, but not necessarily so. This means that multiple steps can be taken to be topical which makes almost all aff fit. There are also almost an infinite amount of incentives or penalties which could be switched out which also explodes the amount of cases.

2.   We must keep regulations and funding small because there are almost infinite education regulations—loose interpretations destroy neg. ground

3.   Topic too broad already—there are four qualifiers in the resolution already—"elementary", "secondary", "regulation", and "funding". All of these mixes dramatically increase the topic size. The judge must put their foot down and protect negative limits because of the aff bias.

2NC/1NR AT #3: "No Case Meets"

1.   Cross apply the topical version of their own case. They can just make it law punishable as a crime if states do not comply. This also means that the federal and state courts would have to enforce it. This

means that they can have all of the funding equality conversation without exploding limits.

2.   Many cases fit: banning or capping charter schools, any direct funding affs, changing common core standards, implementing curriculum, or banning discriminatory behavior in schools. This is enough cases to fit under our interpretation to give a fair balance of cases.

2NC/1NR AT #3: "Real World"

1.   We're more grounded in policy education—our interpretation is from the Environmental Protection Agency. The interpretation is rooted in one of the largest regulatory organizations in the government. Therefore, we have the most predictable interpretation grounded in the literature which is preferable for fairness and education.

2.   Real world—many things in the world are just laws and people must comply. The government does not give people money for not hurting each other. There are laws against violence with the threat of jail for non-compliance. Pretending that there is always a reward or incentive is unrealistic so we access their real world argument.

3.   Only the round matters—we need good, educational, and fair rounds. It doesn't matter if we can use something outside if everyone quits because the rounds are awful. If there is no debate community, the activity collapses and there are no rounds.

2NC/1NR AT #4: "Reasonability"

1.   Reasonability is subjective—it's impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Like all preferences, each person has different tastes. Because these differ for every person, each round would be unpredictable and based on the judge's choices.

2.   Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it's educational and fair.

3.   Err neg on T—there's an aff bias because the topic is enormous with the four qualifying terms in the resolution. The judge must protect the limits and ground of the Neg.

1NC English Language Learners Substantial Topicality

A.   Interpretation: Substantial is at least 25%

Federal Tax Regulation Code '08 [Government organization responsible for tax codes]

B.   Violation: ELL students make up less than 10% of total students in the U.S.

C.   Reasons to vote negative for education and fairness:

1.   <u>Limits:</u> allowing small affs means that the number of cases would explode. Instead of having 25 affs max, there would be hundreds because any small change with education policy or funding would be considered topical. This prevents teams from getting depth learning and destroys negative fairness.

2.   <u>Ground</u>: a non-substantial change will not be enough for the negative to get DA or case links. We can't get DA links about policies that impact the majority of students. A tiny change will not be in the negative literature either because nobody will have heard about it. This

makes the debate unfair for the neg and prevents generic DA use which is key for learning.

2NC/1NR AT #1: "We Meet"

1. You don't at all—extend our federal tax code interpretation that a substantial increase must be at least 25%. Also, extend our National Center for Education Statistics evidence that proves that ELL students make up less than 10% of the student population. There 15% less than topical at best.
2. Even if ELL students will increase in the future, they aren't topical now. There are no DAs that focus on a future link all ground is based on numbers today that the plan impacts.

2NC/1NR AT #2: "Counter Interpretation"

1. Extend our federal tax code evidence. Our interpretation is preferable for debate because of limits, ground, fairness, and education.
2. There's a topical version of the Aff—they can increase employment through increasing education to ELL students and the broader student population. They could redistribute funding to help all students. This would solve the economy and discrimination while giving fair neg ground.
3. They've abused us in the debate round because they

_____
_____
_____
_____

2NC/1NR AT #3: "Core of the Topic"

4. Your AFF is not core—ELL's make up a small portion of the overall educational system as per our National Center for Education Statistics evidence. This sets an awful precedent where teams can pick smaller and smaller sections of the topic that the neg won't be able to predict. They could have a wheelchair ramp aff, freshman biology aff, or basketball after school aff.
5. We must keep regulations and funding small because there are almost infinite education regulations—loose interpretations destroy neg. ground
6. Topic too broad already—there are four qualifiers in the resolution already—"elementary", "secondary", "regulation", and "funding". All of these mixes dramatically increase the topic size. The judge must put their foot down and protect negative limits because of the aff bias.

2NC/1NR AT #3: Precise

1. Vague—their interpretation allows anything that creates a material or social impact. Those ideas are subjective because some people may interpret those words differently. They allow for hundreds of affs that anyone thinks are "impactful"
2. We're precise—we set a clear brightline for being topical. The aff must increase funding 25% or impact 25% of the student population through regulations. All other versions of substantial force judge intervention where they decide what is "substantial". This is unfair because every judge has a different opinion.

3. **Predictable—Our interpretation comes from the government. It's not directly about education, but it is from a government organization. This makes way more sense when we talk about government policy in comparison to their interpretation from the Oxford dictionary.**

4. **Imprecise definitions destroy solvency and turn the aff case**

2NC/1NR AT #3: Overlimiting

1. **They underlimit—cross apply the limits debate here. They allow almost any aff that is about education to be topical. This destroys negative ground by making the aff impossible to predict. That kills fairness for the neg and prevents depth education on a focused topic.**

2. **Many possible affs—they could read any court case aff about the school system, funding equality, STEM, or charters. There are absolutely enough affs to choose from.**

3. **Better to overlimit—it's preferable to keep the focus small. Even if we only allow 10 affs, that's much better than 200. Also, teams will have to switch sides which makes all of their arguments apply to us next round anyway.**

2NC/1NR AT #4: Reasonability

1. **Reasonability is subjective—it's impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Like all preferences, each person has different tastes. Because these differ for every person, each round would be unpredictable and based on the judge's choices.**

2. **Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it's educational and fair.**

3. **Err neg on T—there's an aff bias because the topic is enormous with the four qualifying terms listed above. The judge must protect the limits and ground of the Neg.**

2AC AT: English Language Learners T Substantial

1. **We meet—ELL are an increasingly growing population. Their own violation evidence indicates that over ten years ELL students have been a huge growing student group.**

2. **Counter interpretation: "Substantial" means "socially important."**

3. **Counter Standards:**

A) **Core of the topic: ELL's are an essential part of the conversation about how to help students. Moreover, our aff interpretation's focus on material and social change is at the core purpose of schools. We are predictable and essential to the topic.**

B) **Precise: Their interpretation is horrible and out of context. It talks about a substantial "reduction" and it's referring to taxes, not students. The interpretation must make sense for students, otherwise it destroys ground and makes the debate completely random.**

C) **Overlimiting: our interpretation only allows for Affs that truly have a social or material impact. Very few policies actually would impact a quarter of all students. There would only be a handful of affs which would make being aff impossible destroying fairness.**

4.   **Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.**

1NC Charters Regulation Topicality

A.   **Interpretation: regulations must have measurable results of the policy**

B.   **Violation: the aff only increases oversight of charter policies to prevent them from being unfair. There is no mechanism to evaluate charters vs. traditional public schools or the impact of the regulation.**

C.   **Reasons to vote negative for education and fairness:**

1.   **Limits: without any follow up or measuring, almost every affirmative becomes topical. Any aff that puts any limits on any school will be considered topical. This opens the flood gates for many affs destroying predictability and therefore education and fairness.**

2.   **Education: Comparing multiple policies is essential for learning. Policy debate is intended to compare possible options for action evaluating pros and cons. If there is no way to measure the efficacy of the regulation, then it is unclear if it has done anything good. This destroys depth of learning and education.**

2NC/1NR AT: #1 "We Meet"

1.   **You don't—while your Annenberg evidence states that the government will hold charters accountable, that's not the same as being measurable. They aren't evaluating: a. if the policy is working; b. the comparative benefits or costs of charter schools; or c. the degree to which charters are complying**

2.   **Measurable means that amounts and quantities must be counted**

2NC/1NR AT: #2 "Counter Interpretation"

1.   **Extend our Consortium for Policy Research in Education evidence. Our interpretation is preferable for debate because of limits, ground, fairness, and education.**

2.   **There's a topical version of the Aff—they can provide a follow up study measuring compliance and effectiveness of the policy through student testing and independent contractors. They can have all of the charters conversation with the measurable results connected.**

3.   **They've abused us in the debate round because they**

_____
_____
_____
_____

2NC/1NR AT: #3 "Common Phrasing"

1.   **Common phrasing is vague: what one person believes is common is different from another. They don't have any evidence supporting that argument of how people traditionally use "regulation" so it's impossible to say which is better.**

2.   **Common definitions bad: prefer our interpretation which comes from an educational consortium. Because our interpretation is grounded in the education literature, debaters will find more negative arguments against it and it will be more predictable.**

3.   **Relying on vague definitions turns solvency. Use qualified and precise definitions.**

2NC/1NR AT: #3 "Mixing Burdens"

1. Real world—when people in real life make a decision, they re-evaluate and measure that decision afterwards. The aff is irresponsible decision making because they don't actually consider the efficacy of their policy. Real world education outweighs because we can use it outside the round.

2. We increase ground—by ensuring measurability, affs would have to include more regulation following the initial action. This means that the neg would get more ground to spending das, federalism, and K's that are hinged on government intervention.

3. No impact: even if we mildly have debaters look at solvency, that doesn't change the main idea of the aff. We only expect another mechanism to measure solvency. The plan text would remain almost the same so pre-round prep and neg strategy would too.

2NC/1NR AT: #3 "Core of the Topic"

1. You all destroy limits: while charters are a conversation happening with Devos, we are criticizing the measurability of the policy. We can still have their charter aff as long as it's measurable. Allowing any case that makes any oversight explodes limits and allows half-baked cases with little to no evidence to back them up.

2. We must keep regulations and funding small because there are almost infinite education regulations—loose interpretations destroy neg. ground

3. Topic too broad already—there are four qualifiers in the resolution already—"elementary", "secondary", "regulation", and "funding". All of these mixes dramatically increase the topic size. The judge must put their foot down and protect negative limits because of the aff bias

4. Better to overlimit—it's preferable to keep the focus small. Even if we only allow 10 affs, that's much better than 200. Also, teams will have to switch sides which makes all of their arguments apply to us next round anyway.

2NC/1NR AT: #4 "Reasonability

4. Reasonability is subjective—it's impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Like all preferences, each person has different tastes. Because these differ for every person, each round would be unpredictable and based on the judge's choices.

5. Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it's educational and fair.

6. Err neg on T—there's an aff bias because the topic is enormous with the four qualifying terms listed above. The judge must protect the limits and ground of the Neg.

2AC AT: Charters Regulation Topicality

1. We meet—the government will follow up with these charter schools to determine if they have actually been following the policies. Our Annenberg evidence states that charter policies will be measured by the government.

2. Counter interpretation: regulation includes oversight, competition controls, and individual guidance

Dill and Beerkens '12 [David and Maarja, Department of Public Policy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Public Administration, Leiden University, Postbus, " Designing the framework conditions for assuring academic standards: lessons learned about professional, market, and government regulation of academic quality"]

3.   **Counter standards:**

A.   **Common Phrasing: our interpretation is how regulations are used by people traditionally—putting a limit on an organization. Most individuals would not include a follow up measuring, just the action itself. This means that our interpretation is most predictable and educational for the debate round.**

B.   **Mixing Burdens: their interpretation would force the judge and debaters to look to solvency instead of the plan text in the vacuum to determine if the aff is topical. All pre-round prep, CPs, and case debate arguments are based on the plan text. They create bad education and unfairness through their vague burden.**

C.   **Core of the Topic: The conversation about charters is the first ten pages of Google hits about the resolution. Devos and Trump have made their platform about student choice. Limiting out our aff destroys the essential conversation in the resolution destroying education.**

4.   **Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.**

1NC STEM Its/USfg Topicality

A.   **Interpretation: Its refers to the federal government of the United States**

The United States federal government refers to the national government of the US

Its connects belonging with the previously mentioned thing

B.   **Violation: Next Generation Science Standards were created by individuals outside of the federal government and so the AFF does not increase federal government regulation**

C.   **Reasons to vote negative:**

1.   **Limits: all regulation and funding must come from the federal government. It is the single largest limit on the topic and makes the number of affs much smaller. Allowing not-for-profits and outside organizations explodes the amount of cases destroying predictability and thus fairness and education.**

2.   **Ground: all of our DAs and case arguments are based on federal government regulation. If outside organizations can be filtered into the process, our arguments specific to the federal government will not apply. They could argue that since the states made the standards, they avoid fed based arguments.**

2NC/1NR AT: #1 "We Meet"

1.   **No, they don't—extend our two definitions from New Oxford American Dictionary and Jumbo Minds. The USfg is the federal government responsible for laws in the U.S. and its refers to that federal government. That means that the regulation or funding must come from the federal government.**

2. **Extend the violation**—their regulatory system was created by experts from across the states. They won't be increasing the federal government regulation, but just having states and this separate organization's standards do it.
3. **Regulations determine legality**

2NC/1NR AT: #2 "Counter Interpretation"

1. **Extend our New Oxford American Dictionary evidence.** The regulation must come from the government itself. Our interpretation is preferable for debate because of limits, ground, fairness, and education.
2. **There's a topical version of the Aff**—they can have the federal government create the standards themselves and then implement. This allows them to have 100% of the conversation about military power and global warming without the vagueness of a different actor.
3. **They've abused us in the debate round because they**

_____
_____
_____
_____

2NC/1NR AT: #3 "Core of the Topic"

1. **They destroy limits:** allowing any outside collaboration or non-governmental regulation explodes the topic. They could have an aff that cooperates with any of the thousands of not-for-profits, any of the 50 states, or any individuals. This makes the quantity of cases over a thousand at least. Have no limits decreases depth of education and fairness.
2. **They destroy ground:** we would lose any of our federal government based DAs. Extend our analysis that we would lose the fed vs. states debate entirely which is the most essential part of the topic. These standards were made my state officials and they could argue they avoid the link to federalism. They could also avoid any fed based DAs and argue that the outside organizations take the heat. Predictable ground and generics are key to any neg fairness.

2NC/1NR AT: #3 "Overlimiting"

1. **There are many topical cases:** any fed funding aff, any federal regulations made by the government, and banning or limiting charters. That would be at least 10-15 affs and a fair balance of aff and neg ground.
2. **We must keep regulations and funding small** because there are almost infinite education regulations—loose interpretations destroy neg. ground
3. **Topic too broad already**—there are four qualifiers in the resolution already—"elementary", "secondary", "regulation", and "funding". All of these mixes dramatically increase the topic size. The judge must put their foot down and protect negative limits because of the aff bias
4. **Better to overlimit**—it's preferable to keep the focus small. Even if we only allow 10 affs, that's much better than 200. Also, teams will have to switch sides which makes all of their arguments apply to us next round anyway.

2NC/1NR AT: #3 "Contextual"

1. Contextual is vague—just because your author is from an education organization doesn't mean that his literature is easily found or more predictable. Your author is from Germany and it seems he's talking about educational regulations in Europe. It's not predictable or good ground.

2. Grammar key to predictability: our reading of the relationship between the "USfg" and "its" is grammatically correct. The resolution is the only thing that we prepare for during the majority of the year. It's also a small, one sentence thing so it's much easier to base our research off of that. This means that the grammar of the resolution is the most important when it comes to predictability.

3. Grammar outweighs: learning basic grammatical skills are key to portable learning. We can use grammar on papers, conversations, and job interviews. This means that our knowledge about how to talk and write outweighs any possible fairness or education in the debate round that we won't use as much in our lives.

2NC/1NR AT #4: Reasonability

1. Reasonability is subjective—it's impossible to tell how fair is fair enough. Like all preferences, each person has different tastes. Because these differ for every person, each round would be unpredictable and based on the judge's choices.

2. Look to the best interpretation—whichever interpretation is best for education and fairness should win. The Aff should have to defend their counter interpretation and win that it's educational and fair.

3. Err neg on T—there's an aff bias because the topic is enormous with the four qualifying terms listed above. The judge must protect the limits and ground of the Neg.

2AC AT: STEM Its/USfg Topicality

1. We meet: the states are part of the federal government territory and so are the citizens that created the standards. That means that a portion of the federal government made the standards.

2. Counter interpretation: regulation includes not-for-profit and private collaboration with the federal government.

3. Counter Standards:

A) Core of the Topic: educational standards are the central discussion that all politicians, teachers, and students are having. Common core standards are one of the central forms of regulation that the government uses in collaboration with states. Learning about this is not only predictable ground, but also important educationally.

B) Overlimiting: the only topical aff would be a regulation that the federal government made in house and then imposed on other organizations. The majority of government projects use outside contractors, experts, or state officials. They limit the topic down so small that the negative will always win and the debates will be stale.

C) Contextual Definition: our definition is from a major department of education head. Our interpretation takes into account the educational structure, new policy changes, and the world as it actually is. Their interpretation is too focused on grammar rather than the contextual use of regulation. This makes our interpretation

more predictable and better for ground because of the literature base.

4.   Reasonability: We are having a fair debate. They have enough things to say against our AFF. Unless the judge is certain we have abused the neg, let's focus on the substance of the debate.

Extra Regulation Definitions

Regulation must include penalties on the private sector
Policies and regulations are intertwined
Regulations are input costs including funding
Base standards

Framework / T-USFG
1NC

Our interpretation is that Aff should only be able to garner offense based off of the implementation of a specific "resolutional" policy
Federal government means action by the federal government
First impact is deliberation – an equal and predictable stasis point of discussion is the lynchpin for problem solving, and effective intellectual exchanges.
And those traits are necessary to resolve problems ranging from climate change to racial relations.
Second impact is that clash is intrinsically good – It's the basis for evidence centered engagement because we find evidence to support our arguments, comprehend them, and refute our opponent's arguments. Furthermore, clash functions as a natural filter that eliminates fallacious arguments through truth testing, and forces opponents to forefront only their strongest points. That logic applies to the resolution by filtering abstract ideologies, and calling for a specific methodology to resolve problems in education.
Third impact is dialogue – the aff's model perpetuates a monologue in that it disavows predictable limits which are pre-requisite to effective argument building and discussion; our model facilitates through fair constraint and acts as the key I/L to adovacy skills.
Fifth impact is fairness – Debate is a game fairness is maximizes the games potential . They make the game unfair by increasing affirmative ground without granting the negative reciprocal reactionary predictable ground. Having ground is a prerequisite to creative thinking because we can only come up with killer strats when we have a stasis for what the aff will be in the first place. Creative thinking that occurs along a reasonable limitation is a prerequisite to coming up with strategies to break down the state.

2NC o/v
AT: State bad

We don't say state good

AT: Exclusion

Debate inevitably involves exclusions and normative constraints---making sure that those exclusions occur along reciprocal lines is necessary to foster democratic habits which solves the case

AT: Reasonability

Competing interpretations is the best framework---

Neutrality---standards of "abuse" and "reasonability" are subjective and allow for judge intervention that benefits neither team – debaters should decide debates

Reasonability is silly---applied in any other debate context this notion is absurd. Nobody would vote for an aff that said "well, we don't quite outweigh your disad but we're really close"

Gut-check---we haven't read "highlighter specification" our interpretation is also reasonable which means you should defer to whose interpretation is the best because the best interpretation determines predictability

AT: Kills agency

We don't kill agency

DEBATE roleplay specifically activates agency

AT: Predictability Bad

1.   Predictability is good – its key to have an effective stasis point where both sides have evidence and can effectively engage other args

2.   They link harder to their own predictability bad args, they probably have 5 2ac blocks and a framework block

3.   We still access creative thinking – New Counterplans and affs and new neg strats get broken all the time.

4.   Deliberation is a pre-req to creative thinking, doesn't matter if you have creative ideas if you don't have the skills to defend it.

5. Fairness exists to ensure participation from both sides – our framework allows for storytelling, they just have to ground it in a topical affirmative

AT: K of citizenry

1.   Their Kritik of citizenry ONLY kritiks the statusquo. Our interpretation allows for marginalized groups to have the deliberation skills to change citizenry

2.   We defend that consensus is possible but also falsifiable

3.   Their aff is worse, by denying ground the 1ac becomes a monologue, this reduces neg teams to passivisity which is a worse form of citizenry.

AT: Role of Ballot

This is just an impact calc argument

Role of the ballot is to vote for the team that did the better debating lmao

AT: Fuels Neolib

1.   no relation to the type of decisionmaking that debate stimulates because debate fosters cost benefit analysis approaches to situations that are based off cognitive skills and formulating your own opinions about issues –

2.   This describes the squo, framework gives the skills necessary to challenge the neoliberal ideologies.

AT: You silence us

1.   T version and do it on the neg

2.   There is a difference between excluding unpredictable arguments and excluding people

3.   By that logic every argument silences them, the cap k would say that challenging cap is more important than the aff

Our argument for limited, topic-focused debate is <u>not</u> violent or oppressive, and <u>neither is voting for it</u>---procedural constraints on debate <u>solve</u> the worst aspects of right-wing politics

T versions of Affs
Definitions

"Resolved" before a colon reflects a legislative forum.
"Should" requires defending federal action
Its means possessive.
Regulations in national policy are prescribed by the USFG.
The Department of Education has empirically done education reform and funding

AFF AT: Framework / T-USFG
Counter-Interpretation

Interp: Our interpretation is that the aff should question the ethics of the resolution, even if doing so requires the abjection of USFG action.

Their definitional starting point of state-centricity makes critical understanding of the world impossible.

A2 Decision Making

1. Non-unique: social movements and non-policy action give use just as good decision making skills, make them prove the distinction of why policy is better not just list why policy decisions are good and not mention K decisions.
2. Specifically, we change the decision of the ballot by challenging the traditional debate structures and b) we critique that knowledge production that excludes people from debate and academia.

A2 Predictability

1. Predictability bad not real world
2. Turn: they use this as a weapon against new arguments- running this against k affs destroys the creativity in this round and it justifies always debating the same topics
3. Education: predictable debate is boring debate, we make it more interesting from round to round, which means you are learning more, and it better for competitive debate
4. Making a predictable argument means you've bought into the bad education we solicit from debate. Bringing that ontology into the debate space causes all the impacts of the 1AC
5. Turn: claims of predictability create a static space which elites control and exclude

A2 Fairness

Debate is always unfair, race, disability, and class determine fairness before anything in a round is read. Fairness claims are not only inherently privileged, but lead to the disavowal of actual unfair parts of debate.
Make them prove round specific abuse

A2 Limits

1. Limits are destructive, especially in the framework of expression. Our arguments are based on our social location in debate and the world. By putting "limits" on our social locations, you effectively remove us from the debate.

2. Innovation is a prerequisite to change – limits on a topic restrict the ability to create new solutions and theories
3. Limits not key – if we prove impacts and solvency for our aff, that proves that our advocacy is important, and outweighs the impact to limits.
4. Education is more important, it's why we are here at debate camp and here as debaters.

Military Trade Off DA
Vocabulary

Skinny Budget is the budget that Trump has suggested. It's called "skinny" because it makes cuts to domestic programs such as social services, foreign aid, and specifically education. This money is redirected to American military operations. The majority of the money and focus is the war against ISIS in Syria. Any investment increase in education would trade off and force Trump to step back on this military funding.
Syria: A country in the Middle East where was has broken out between Assad, ISIS, and opposition groups. There are many different religious and political groups fighting for survival and power in the country. The death tolls are high and it is a serious crisis.
Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS, ISIL)—Sunni Muslim extremist group that believes in the spread of Islam across the world. They are a militant group and spread their power through violence, kidnapping, and torture.
Bashar Al-Assad: (Bah-shar all-awss awd): President of Syria fighting for control of the country. He is described as authoritarian kind of like a dictator. He has used violence against those that oppose him.

1NC Shell

A.   Uniqueness and link: Trump's skinny budget invests in the military and pays for it through education cuts—any funding increases would trade off with the military
B.   Internal Link: military funding increases go toward defeating ISIS
C.   Impact: rogue ISIS will use nuclear weapons

2NC Impact Extensions
2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #1 "Military Spending High"

2.   The increase is huge! It would be a 10% military budget increase
3.   Secretary of Defense Mattis argues that the budget is crucial to defeat ISIS

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #2 "No Link"

2.   Military and education spending are zero sum
3.   Trump plans on cutting funding for schools to strengthen the military
4.   Trump's budget director is paying for the military boost through domestic cuts—any funding would necessitate military cuts
5.   Currently, education cuts are being made to balance the budget

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #3 "Strikes Bad"

2.   Strikes destroy key supply routes, kill terrorists, and destroy leadership
3.   US strikes win physical victories and create psychological fear in ISIS

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #4 "Impact Calculus"

ISIS can get access to nuclear material and cause massive destruction

The Syrian conflict kills 440 people a day—this humanitarian crisis

100% probable and must be stopped

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #5 "Military Investment→China War"

2.   US hegemony solves China war and multiple other conflicts

Military Trade Off DA – Aff Answers

2AC

1.   Uniqueness overwhelms the link: U.S. military spending is so high, the plan would barely trade off

2.   No link: education spending only makes up roughly 1/5 or 20% of the cuts which go to the military. This means that increased federal funding would only partially trade off with military funding.

3.   Impact turn: military strikes in Syria embolden terrorists, are unconstitutional, and risk US-Russia war

4.   Impact Calculus:

5.   Impact turn: Increased US military investment causes major war with China

Federalism DA

Vocabulary

In **Federalism** the power is divided between the national government and other governmental units. In the U.S., this means the power is divided between our federal government and our state and local governments. This was a philosophy stated at the foundation of America that was to prevent tyranny of the federal government. These framers of the constitution were worried that the federal government would grow too large like Britain did in the 1700s.

1NC Shell

A.   Uniqueness: Trump and Devos have rolled back Obama education policies in favor of state rights and local school choice

B.   Link: Federal incentives or penalties both violently interfere with federalism

C.   Federalism is key to preventing global violence, secessions, and rebellions

Regulation Links

Rolling back state decisions on education sends a mixed message and undermines federalism

Federal performance standards are inaccurate, limit state flexibility, and devastate poor, urban cities

Funding Links

Block grants are the primary means for federal expansion into state affairs

Grants let the federal government wield control over all areas of state matters while overcoming concerns of stepping over the boundaries of its power

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #1 "Federalism Low"

2.   Devos champions state rights on education and she decides the agenda

3.   Educational federalism is high now—ESSA devolves power

4.   Trump champions state rights on land ownership and education

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #2 "Plan doesn't' decrease Federalism"

2. [Insert more/specific links to the AFF]

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #3 "No Modeling"

2. US educational policy is modeled globally, especially in developing countries

3. American federalism is the beacon for government internationally

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #4 "Federalism Bad for Schools"

2. State control key to functioning educational system—innovation, funding, local solutions, parents, and federal mismanagement

3. Federalism is key to school functionality—turns the affirmative solvency

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #5 "Impact Calculus"

Empirically federalism bolsters peacemaking and promises to solve future conflicts – numerous examples

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #6 "Federalism Racist"

2. Increased federal regulations create an imbalance of power, destroys state federalism, and ensures racial discrimination

2NC/1NR Hegemony Impact Module

1. Strong federalism is key to military strength

2. Hegemony increases global democracy and solves war

Federalism DA – Aff Answers

2AC Answers

1. Federalism low—Trump has used a massive amount of executive orders to expand the federal government

2. No link: regulation does not undermine federalism and creates a healthy balance between the federal government and states

3. No brink and no internal link: nations across the world don't model US behavior, especially when it comes to democracy. Also, if we violate federalism all the time, the neg impacts should have already happened.

4. Impact Turn: Federal education policy is more efficient—state policies get caught up in red tape

5. Impact Calculus:

6. Impact turn: the historical and current purpose of federalism is to ensure poor people of color are exploited

1AR "Federalism=Racist" Extensions

Impact turn: federalism guarantees racism and unequal treatment

States CP

Vocabulary

In **Federalism** the power is divided between the national government and other governmental units. In the U.S., this means the power is divided between our federal government and our state and local governments. This was a philosophy stated at the foundation of America that was to prevent tyranny of the federal government. These framers of the constitution were worried that the federal government would grow too large like Britain did in the 1700s.

1NC Charters States CP

Text: The United fifty states should substantially increase their regulation of elementary and secondary charter schools by implementing the Annenberg Institute regulations.

States solve: they can control charter schools and return power to local school districts

2NC/1NR Solvency Extensions

Flexibility in state charter regulation improves education

1NC Funding Equality States CP

Text: The United fifty states should substantially increase their regulation of elementary and secondary education schools by complying with the "progressive funding" model.

States solve: they can fund equally by themselves and more efficiently

2NC/1NR Solvency Extensions

States can increase taxes and fund equally to give all students access to quality education

1NC ELLs States CP

2NC/1NR Solvency Extensions

1NC STEM States CP

States are capable and easily implement STEM programs

2NC/1NR Solvency Extensions

States can distribute STEM funds—West Virginia proves

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #1 "50 State Theory"

1.   **50 state fiat is not a voting issue:**

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #2 "States Fail"

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #3 "Double Bind"

1.   **Reciprocal: The CP acts uniformly to do exactly what the plan does. If there is not uniform implementation, the same arguments apply to the federal government.**

2.   **No impact: the minimal differences state to state would actually mean that we solve better. Even if the CP is not done 100% uniformly, there's no impact to being slightly different.**

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #4 "Perm"

1.   **No net-benefit: even if it's possible for the CP and the plan to work together, they still would link to all of our fed based DAs. This means that it makes more sense to only do the CP and avoid the negative impacts of doing the plan.**

2.   **Doesn't solve—all of our arguments in the 1nc and this speech prove that the federal government mismanages resources and the states alone are better. It would make education reform even worse off since the federal government would bring in a heavy hand, lots of bureaucracy, and too many people.**

3.   **Federal intervention crowds out the states entirely destroying solvency**

2NC/1NR AT: 2AC #5 "Spending DA"

1.   **No link: most affirmatives on this topic already force the states to increase spending. Also, almost all federal regulations that happen daily force increased state spending. This means that the spending DA would have already been triggered.**

2. **Non-unique: most states are already making huge cuts and spending like crazy**
3. **Turn: federal spending is comparatively less efficient and causes an economic collapse**

States CP – Aff Answers

2AC Answers

1. **50 state fiat is a reason to reject the CP for fairness and education.**
A) **Interpretation--the negative can fiat any single, uniform organization**
B) **Fair ground—they can read any international actor, private organization, different government branch, or not-for-profits. This is enough ground for the neg.**
C) **Not real world—at no time have the 50 states uniformly and simultaneously done the exact same thing in coordination. It's unrealistic and destroys education about policy change.**
D) **Not reciprocal—there are thousands of people that make up each state legislature and 50 governors. They fiat all of those organizations. We fiat one single actor with one legislative body. It's an overstep of fiat and completely unfair.**
2. **No solvency: states will find loopholes and inherently increase funding inequality especially for non-white students**
3. **Double bind: either states are flexible and that makes them more effective than the federal government because they can tailor their policies OR they act completely uniformly and they will have the same issues they say the federal government will. They can't have their cake and eat it too!**
4. **Perm: the federal government and states should work in collaboration to do the plan. Solves better through flexible state implementation.**
5. **Spending DA:**
A) **States cannot deficit spend and so must make cuts to fund the plan**
B) **Cuts will be made in social services including welfare, education, and domestic violence prevention funding**

1AR Spending DA Extensions

Deep cuts are made to social services which hinders vulnerable populations and collapses state economies
Social Service cuts destroy the economy

Classroom K

Vocabulary

Link: Something the aff has said in a card, cross-ex, or analytic that is flawed. Just like a DA link, it connects the negative argument to something the aff has done. In the case of the K, this is using security language.
Impact: The same as a DA—something very bad that happens because of the Aff's actions. With the K, it's a little different though because it makes a "root cause" argument that the ideas that the Aff has makes their own impacts happen.

Alternative: Think similar to a Counterplan text, but more about what happens in the debate round instead of a government actor doing it. The alternative is what we should do in the debate round to try to fix the problem laid out by the K. These are usually rethinking or rejecting bad ideas.

Pedagogy is just a fancy way of saying education or a way of teaching. Usually people describe pedagogy as an educational philosophy that guides the teacher and the classroom.

Michel Foucault is a 20th C. French philosopher who was interesting in examining power and how the government uses and creates it. He argued that education was only used to better strengthen the government by making workers, soldiers, innovators, and generally citizens who would not question the government abuse of power. He leans heavily on the concept of ideology where people are deceived into giving up their rights and just doing what they are told.

Biopower literally means power over life since bio=life and power=power. This concept was coined and developed by Foucault throughout the majority of his writings. As previously mentioned, this refers to the government power over human lives. This can mean starting a war and forcing people to fight through a draft. It can also be seen in education where people are controlled by the information they are forced to learn.

Paolo Freire Brazilian educator and philosopher. He was very critical of the "banking method" where teachers wrote down information, students memorized it, and then regurgitated it on tests. He thought this was not genuine education. He also did not like the educational system because it was overly complex and tended to exclude regular people.

Problem-posing education was formulated by Freire. It is the alternative for the K. It puts teachers and students on an equal playing field by submitting that all people have something to contribute to the conversation. Instead of pretending like the teacher knows everything, Problem-posing education asks students and teachers to be part of the process of challenging and learning from each other. In this way, students learn critical thinking, individually, authentically, and memorably without the hieararchy of the classroom.

Epistemology: Epiteme=thought, ology=study of→the study of how we think. How do you know what you know? Who told you to think that? Did you come up with that on your own? Generally speaking, this is a reflection on how we think and how we have come by knowledge. We do this all the time! For example, when you think about what study habits are most effective; you're thinking about how you learn best. When you consider the honesty of a news source, you're thinking about how you get your knowledge.

Cede the Political: "Cede" means to leave or give up and "the political" refers to voting and the government. Therefore, to cede the political means to give up on working through the government and trying to change it, but instead to try to work outside this political system.

Permutation (Perm): A Perm is arguing that the CP or Alternative can actually work with the plan together. A perm must include <u>all</u> of the plan and all or part of the CP/Alternative.

Severance: An argument against a perm. Severance is when the AFF does not include part of the plan in the permutation—they sever or remove part of the 1ac.

1NC Shell

    A.   Link: Schools as organizations reinforce biopower through rote learning, obedience, and economic preparation

    B.   Impact: the drive toward national education and utopian goals causes global war and genocide

    C.   Our alternative is problem-posing education. This style of learning equalizes the playing field, makes learning organic, and has students question biopolitical authority

Links--Schools

Schools are sites for students to learn surveillance, control, power, and abuse

The demand of silence and subsequent regulation of students establishes strong teacher control in the classroom and beyond

Links—Economic/Government Regulations

Administration of biopolitical economic order requires threat inflation and subversion—results in greater overall violence

Links–Hegemony

Hegemony is based on a liberal fantasy of US exceptionalism which necessitates <u>permanent war-making</u> – a more peaceful world order fills in to solve their theoretical impacts, while obscure the <u>real consequences</u> of <u>untold suffering</u>

Links-English Language Learners

The aff attempts to absorb ELL's into the education system through disciplinary power for their own benefit and reinforce model minority stereotypes

2NC/1NR: Impacts-War

Biopower justifies genocide, mass destruction, and war

Biopoolitics is the root cause of violence. When we allow the state to calculate lives we have no value in living

Dillon 99- professor of political theory at lancaster

2NC/1NR Impacts: Structural Violence

The impact is a biopolitical protection of life itself, the violent imposition of liberalism that perpetuates structural violence, racism, and global civil war

2NC/1NR Impacts: Turns the AFF/Destroys Education

The biopolitical teacher-student relationship dehumanizes the student and destroys positive education

2NC/1NR AT #1: "Framework"

1.   Counter-Interpretation: The aff must defend their epistemology/education before they can have any of their policy impacts.

2.   Epistemology first—the way that we learn about things influences how we act. Therefore, we must examine the philosophy of the aff before acting foolishly.

3.   Impact turn: their limits education argument is a lie—they're just trying to exclude our conversation to control how people learn just like teachers do in the classroom

4.   Fairness and Education—Kritiks are a common discussion that happens frequently. There's no abuse here and the Aff should be prepared. This is especially true because this K is specific to the China topic.

2NC/1NR AT: "Link Turn"

2.   [Insert specific link or any other links that connect to the AFF]

2NC/1NR AT: "Perm"

1.   The perm is severance—the aff can't just take back their defense of the school system they advocated in the 1ac. They read multiple pieces of evidence which argue that the school system is good. Allowing teams to change their advocacy from speech to speech is incredibly unfair to the negative. Therefore, the perm should be rejected.

2.   Masking DA—the aff's focus on single reform issues hides the structural biopolitics of the school system

3.   Sequencing DA—jumping to include legal reform whitewashes the biopolitical security project and sidelines criticism

2NC/1NR AT: "Impact Calculus"

Government entities fabricate threats to establish their control—their impacts are non-existent

2NC/1NR AT: "Cede the Political"

2.   Our alternative questions authority and creates new ways of engaging the political sphere

3.   There's no "political" only the debate round. We fix the education we can control in the round with "Problem-posing education"

2NC/1NR AT: "No Internal Link"

2.   Schools are fundamentally flawed—they reinforce state control over students and destroy critical thinking

Classroom K – Aff Answers

2AC Answers

1.   **Framework**
Our interpretation is that the impacts of the Aff should be evaluated.
A)   Ground—If we can't weigh the Aff impacts, they will have destroyed the entire 1ac. They will be one speech ahead and we will always lose. Weigh our impacts on fairness.
B)   Policy Education—We should be talking about the policy of the plan. This is the best way to discuss the topic and learn about what we can do to help in the future. If we only talk about representations, then we can't fix schools.
C)   Simulation allows us to more effectively influence state policy AND is key to agency – studies prove
2.   Link turn: extend our solvency evidence. We reform the school system to make it more humane, accessible for all students, and to increase critical thinking. Just because some teachers are bad does not mean that we shouldn't try to improve the system
3.   Perm: the affirmative and the alternative together can create political resistance to end the worst forms of biopower

4. **Impact Calculus:**
5. **Solvency Turn: Abandoning politics cedes it to the elites – causes war, slavery, and authoritarianism**
6. **No internal link: there's no relationship between teachers being biopolitical and war. It's not a logical conclusion. Also, their impacts should already be happening because the school system has existed for hundreds of years in the U.S.**