

**2017-2018 Chicago Middle School Debate League Core Files**

**English Language Learners Aff**

**Vocabulary**

**ELL 1AC**

First, our PLAN: 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.

**Contention One: Harms to the American Economy**

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  
 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

**Contention Two: Harms of American Racism**

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

**Contention Three: Solvency**

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

**English Language Learners 2AC**

**2AC AT: Harms (Economy) #1 = “Job Market Strong”**

1. They say the job market is strong now, but
2. Many industries are seeking bilingual employees – without fully employed immigrants, our workforce population would fall in years to come

**2AC AT: Harms (Economy) #2 = “Latinos Already Bilingual”**

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.

**2AC AT: Harms (Racism) #1-2 – “Gentrification Turn”**

1. They say dual language programs lead to gentrification,  
,but
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. They say \_\_\_\_\_, but
2. Prop 227 did not help English Language Learners

**2AC AT: Solvency #2 – “Bilingual costly and fails”**

1. They say \_\_\_\_\_, but

**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

**2NC/1NR Economy #1 Extension – “Job Market Strong”**

1. They say that the job market has a shortage of bilingual workers, 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

**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

**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.

**Contention One: Harms (Racism)**

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

**Contention Two: Harms (Poverty)**

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**

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 Samuels and NPR evidence.**
1. 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.

**2AC AT: Poverty #3 “Government Assistance”**

1. **Extend our \_\_\_\_\_ evidence.**
- 2 **Trump is going to make monster cuts to social services and job training programs**

**2AC AT: Solvency #1 “Just reallocating money”**

1. **Extend our Center for American Progress and New York Times evidence.**
- 2 Education can solve the income gap and improve the local economy in low-income neighborhoods

**2AC AT: Solvency #3 “Need College Degree”**

1. **Extend our \_\_\_\_\_ evidence.**
- 2 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 “Regulation Harms”**

1. **Extend our \_\_\_\_\_ evidence.**
- 2 **Fair funding would increase overall equality without too much red tape**

**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**

1. Extend our \_\_\_\_\_ evidence.

**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: 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.
2. Solvency turn: regulations cause tax increases, more testing, teacher cuts, and are fundamentally unfair
3. 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 “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 #3 “College Key” Extensions

- 1 Extend our \_\_\_\_\_ evidence.
- 2 No correlation—city high school graduates are at all time highs, but college attendance is way down

STEM Aff

Vocabulary

Plan Text

Contention One: Harms (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.

Contention Two: Harms (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  
Warming is real, anthropogenic, and presents several scenarios for catastrophe

## Contention Three: Solvency

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

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

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

**2NC/1NR Extensions**

**2NC/1NR Hegemony#1 Extension**

1. They say that there are not enough students getting STEM degrees, but
2. Increasing H-1B Visas would increase STEM workers in the U.S.

**2NC/1NR Hegemony #2 Extension**

1. They say \_\_\_\_\_ , but
2. U.S. heg motivates terrorism

**2NC/1NR Hegemony #3 Extension**

1. They say \_\_\_\_\_ , but
2. U.S. heg is sustainable

**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. No Solvency: The standards are flawed and confusing

**2NC/1NR Solvency #2 Extension**

- 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**

**Vocabulary**

**Limits:** 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.

**Ground:** 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.

**1NC Funding Equality Regulations Topicality**

- 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.

**2AC AT: Funding Equality Regulations Topicality**

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 10<sup>th</sup> 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 forced 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. Limits:** 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. Ground:** 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 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 by 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.

Military Trade Off DA  
Vocabulary

**Skippy 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 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