



TOPICS PLUS

UIL District ESC 10 (3A/5A) Research Pack

**– Researched and Written by –
Topics Plus Research Team**

www.topicsplus.com

Contents

Item 1 – Equalize State Hate Crimes Laws	
Affirmative Evidence	6
Affirmative Takeaways	8
Negative Evidence	9
Negative Takeaways	12
Item 2 – End Depleted Uranium Munition Usage by the United States	
Affirmative Evidence	13
Affirmative Takeaways	15
Negative Evidence	16
Negative Takeaways	18
Item 3 – Ban the Use of Handheld Cellphones While Operating a Motor Vehicle	
Affirmative Evidence	19
Affirmative Takeaways	21
Negative Evidence	22
Negative Takeaways	24
Item 4 – Eliminate the Statute of Limitations on Sexual Assault	
Affirmative Evidence	25
Affirmative Takeaways	27
Negative Evidence	28
Negative Takeaways	30
Item 5 – Create a Path to Citizenship for Undocumented Immigrants	
Affirmative Evidence	31
Affirmative Takeaways	35
Negative Evidence	36
Negative Takeaways	38
Item 6 – Legalize an Individual's Right to Buy and Sell Non-vital Organs	
Affirmative Evidence	39
Affirmative Takeaways	41
Negative Evidence	42
Negative Takeaways	44
Item 7 – Apply Standard Legal Protocol to All Illegal Immigrants Regardless	
Affirmative Evidence	45
Affirmative Takeaways	47
Negative Evidence	48
Negative Takeaways	50
Item 8 – Combat the Aftereffects of Natural Disasters and other Emergencies	
Affirmative Evidence	51
Affirmative Takeaways	54
Negative Evidence	55
Negative Takeaways	57
Item 9 – Allow Businesses to Refuse to Serve Customers Based on Their Religion	
Affirmative Evidence	58

Affirmative Takeaways -----	60
Negative Evidence -----	61
Negative Takeaways -----	63
Item 10 – Create a Standardized Public School Dress Code to Promote Learning	
Affirmative Evidence -----	64
Affirmative Takeaways -----	66
Negative Evidence -----	67
Negative Takeaways -----	69
Item 11 – Elect the Red Wolf as the United States National Animal	
Affirmative Evidence -----	70
Affirmative Takeaways -----	72
Negative Evidence -----	73
Negative Takeaways -----	77
Item 12 – Combat the AIDS Epidemic	
Affirmative Evidence -----	78
Affirmative Takeaways -----	80
Negative Evidence -----	81
Negative Takeaways -----	83
Item 13 – Ban Fracking on National Park Premises	
Affirmative Evidence -----	84
Affirmative Takeaways -----	86
Negative Evidence -----	87
Negative Takeaways -----	89
Item 14 – Allow Criminal Offenders the Option of Military Service as an Alternative	
Affirmative Evidence -----	90
Affirmative Takeaways -----	93
Negative Evidence -----	94
Negative Takeaways -----	96
Item 15 – Increase National Education Funding by 10 Billion US Dollars	
Affirmative Evidence -----	97
Affirmative Takeaways -----	98
Negative Evidence -----	99
Negative Takeaways -----	102
Item 16 – Suspend Some of the Authority of the President	
Affirmative Evidence -----	103
Affirmative Takeaways -----	106
Negative Evidence -----	107
Negative Takeaways -----	109
Item 17 – Sanction Zimbabwe to Promote International Law	
Affirmative Evidence -----	110
Affirmative Takeaways -----	112
Negative Evidence -----	113
Negative Takeaways -----	115
Item 18 – Remove Credit Unions Tax Exemption Status	
Affirmative Evidence -----	116

Affirmative Takeaways -----	118
Negative Evidence -----	119
Negative Takeaways -----	122
Item 19 – Amend CAPTA	
Affirmative Evidence -----	123
Affirmative Takeaways -----	125
Negative Evidence -----	126
Negative Takeaways -----	130
Item 20 – Amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act	
Affirmative Evidence -----	131
Affirmative Takeaways -----	134
Negative Evidence -----	135
Negative Takeaways -----	138
Item 21 – Give South Korea 20 Billion Dollars	
Affirmative Evidence -----	139
Affirmative Takeaways -----	141
Negative Evidence -----	142
Negative Takeaways -----	144
Item 22 – End Economic Assistance to Yemen	
Affirmative Evidence -----	145
Affirmative Takeaways -----	148
Negative Evidence -----	149
Negative Takeaways -----	151
Item 23 – Advance Research of Production Methods of Spider Silk	
Affirmative Evidence -----	152
Affirmative Takeaways -----	154
Negative Evidence -----	155
Negative Takeaways -----	157
Item 24 – Provide Funding for Convicted Felons' Children to Improve Their Education	
Affirmative Evidence -----	158
Affirmative Takeaways -----	160
Negative Evidence -----	161
Negative Takeaways -----	164
Item 25 – Require All US Citizens to Register with Selective Service	
Affirmative Evidence -----	165
Affirmative Takeaways -----	167
Negative Evidence -----	168
Negative Takeaways -----	170
Item 26 – Bill to Enforce Presumed Consent Organ Donation And Implement the Opt out System.	
Affirmative Evidence -----	171
Affirmative Takeaways -----	172
Negative Evidence -----	173
Negative Takeaways -----	175
Item 27 – Expand Political Asylum to Syrian Refugees	

Affirmative Evidence -----	176
Affirmative Takeaways -----	181
Negative Evidence -----	182
Negative Takeaways -----	184

Legislation – A Resolution to Equalize State Hate Crime Laws

Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Hate Crime Violence is on the Rise

Al Jazeera America “Violence against U.S. homeless on the rise” Ehab Zahriyeh, March 28, 2014 <<http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/3/28/violent-crimes-againsthomeslessincreases.html>>

“Despite a decrease in the U.S. homeless population, new research by an advocacy group for the homeless indicates an alarming increase in violent crimes targeting those living on the streets.

In 2013, homeless Americans experienced a 23 percent increase in violence compared with the year before, according to preliminary figures by the National Coalition for the Homeless (NCH). The U.S. homeless population declined over the same period, with 610,000 people going without shelter on any given day in 2013 – 20,000 fewer than in 2012.

The homeless “are targeted solely because of their circumstances,” coalition director Jerry Jones told Al Jazeera. “People who are in shelters and marginalized are often preyed upon.”...

In an attempt to curb targeted violence against the homeless, advocates are pushing to have such attacks defined as hate crimes on local and federal levels.

The U.S. Department of Justice defines a hate crime as “violence of intolerance and bigotry, intended to hurt and intimidate someone because of their race, ethnicity, national origin, religious, sexual orientation or disability.”

Brian Levin, director of the Center for the Study of Hate and Extremism at California State University at San Bernardino, said, “It’s important to address these crimes for what they are, as hate crimes.”

“What we are seeing is a shift from fatal racial attacks to homophobic attacks and now attacks against the homeless,” he told Al Jazeera.

“If you look at the characteristics of both offenders and victims traditionally in the hate crime category, the homeless really are a category that fits,” Levin said. “From the motivation of attackers to the types of weapons that are used to the ages and types of offenders, it really is the newest generation in a rather disturbing tradition of attacks on vulnerable oppressed minorities.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how violence against the homeless population of the US is increasing, and a lack of representation keeps these acts of violence from being considered a hate crime. This happens because people are generally afraid of what they perceive homeless people to be. This typically isn’t the case – but the violence persists. This should be considered in passing this legislation, because this kind of violence shouldn’t be acceptable and should be punished just as harshly as other hate crimes. We need to protect our homeless population as well as any other demographics.*

AFF – Many States Still do not Have Hate Crime Laws

Indy Star “Will Indiana remain one of 5 states without hate crime law?” Stephanie Wang, October 19, 2015 < <http://www.indystar.com/story/news/politics/2015/10/19/urban-league-religious-groups-back-democratic-push-hate-crime-law/74229640/>>

“This hasn't changed: Indiana is one of five states without a hate crime law.

For at least 15 years, state Rep. Gregory Porter, D-Indianapolis, has advocated for — and failed to win — legislation to stiffen penalties for crimes motivated by biases.

But he still plans to try again.

This time, he has the backing of the Indianapolis Urban League, a civil rights nonprofit. He has the backing of religious groups, including the Indianapolis Jewish Community Relations Council. He has the backing of Marion County Prosecutor Terry Curry.

"We have a coalition of individuals saying enough is enough," Porter said. "These are issues we need to address."

He added: "This isn't cutting edge. This is really catch-up."

Some community members say it's a timely discussion topic in today's polarizing climate, across the nation as well as in the state and Indianapolis.

They cited the attention on expanding anti-discrimination protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender Hoosiers. They cited the church shooting in Charleston, S.C. And they cited Monday's arrest of an Indiana University student accused of shouting "white power" as he attacked a Muslim woman.

"Now you begin to see a rash of incidents that are seen as acts against society," Porter said. "We need to have some real accountability."

Hate crimes are generally defined as incidents in which someone commits a crime — such as battery or arson — having intentionally targeted a victim because of an actual or perceived personal characteristic, such as race, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity or disability.

Hate crimes are meant to send a message of intimidation to the individual and to the community, said Miriam Zeidman, Midwest civil rights counsel for the Anti-Defamation League.

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how Indiana is one of 5 states that still do not have hate crime laws established. Despite the rise in hate crimes and the recent acts of violence, inspired by hate, these states have still failed to properly protect their people. As the AFF you should argue that by requiring all states to abide by the national standard of hate crime laws, we will ensure the protection of the people in these 5 states that have had no previous protection under hate crime laws. You can further your argument to say that these 5 states are the reason a national standard is required. Beyond that, are should argue that an equal statute on hate crimes should be enacted nationally, because it's a national, social crisis, that the federal government needs to weigh in on.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how violence against the homeless population of the US is increasing, and a lack of representation keeps these acts of violence from being considered a hate crime. This happens because people are generally afraid of what they perceive homeless people to be. This typically isn't the case – but the violence persists. This should be considered in passing this legislation, because this kind of violence shouldn't be acceptable and should be punished just as harshly as other hate crimes. We need to protect our homeless population as well as any other demographics.

This second article explains how Indiana is one of 5 states that still do not have hate crime laws established. Despite the rise in hate crimes and the recent acts of violence, inspired by hate, these states have still failed to properly protect their people. As the AFF you should argue that by requiring all states to abide by the national standard of hate crime laws, we will ensure the protection of the people in these 5 states that have had no previous protection under hate crime laws. You can further your argument to say that these 5 states are the reason a national standard is required. Beyond that, are should argue that an equal statute on hate crimes should be enacted nationally, because it's a national, social crisis, that the federal government needs to weigh in on.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Laws Against Hate Crimes Spreading Fast – May Not Be Effective

Huffington Post “States Classify Attacks Against Homeless As 'Hate Crimes' To Curb Rising Violence” Aleanor Goldberg, August 29, 2014 < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/08/29/homeless-hate-crimes_n_5732660.html>

“Alaska, California, Florida, Maine, Maryland, Rhode Island and Washington have committed to qualifying assaults against the homeless as hate crimes -- which currently protect people who are targeted based on race, ethnicity, national origin, religious, sexual orientation or disability.

"[These laws are] important to make statements that homeless people are not second-class citizens and that violence against them, brutal violence against them, will not be tolerated," Tulin Ozdeger, civil rights director for the National Law Center on Homeless & Poverty, told the Associated Press in 2010.

While advocates continue to press the need for such protections, it may not necessarily compute into less criminal acts.

In 2010, Florida declared attacks against homeless people as hate crimes, which come with heavier sentencing. A second-degree felony, for example, gets bumped to a first-degree felony, with the maximum prison sentence increased from 15 to 30 years, the Sun Sentinel reported.

The issue came to a head in January 2006 when a group of teens beat a homeless man to death with bats in downtown Fort Lauderdale and the assault was caught on security cameras, according to the Sun Sentinel.

But while law has been in place for nearly four years, Florida still had the second highest rate of reported attacks against homeless people last year.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how several states are already adopting variations of this bill, and altering their hate crime laws to fit more demographics. Even still, violence is still occurring. As the negative, you should argue that this kind of legislation is already happening in the status quo. Second, you could argue that though it’s happening in the status quo, it isn’t working. This kind of mandate is on mindset, and if we don’t change our culture, we can never make a lasting change. We might have to take more drastic measures, or find more unique ways to change the culture of hate crimes in America.*

NEG – Experts still Disagree on What Crimes Should be Considered Hate Crimes

Us News “Hate Crime Experts Skeptical of Call for Cops to be Covered by Federal Law” Tierney Sneed January 8, 2015 < <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2015/01/08/hate-crime-experts-skeptical-of-call-for-cops-to-be-covered-by-federal-law>>

“Legal experts and scholars are skeptical of calls from a major police union to include protection for police officers under federal hate crime legislation.

On Tuesday, the Fraternal Order of Police – which represents more than 300,000 officers and claims to be the world’s largest law enforcement organization – sent formal

letters to President Barack Obama and congressional leaders, urging them to expand the law to include targeted crimes against law enforcement officers.

“We feel it’s inappropriate to target people because of the color their skin and it’s inappropriate to target people because of the color of their uniform,” says James Pasco, executive director of the Fraternal Order of the Police.

However, experts in the field wonder whether such protection is necessary, and if it would really change how crimes against police officers are treated.

“There isn’t really any need to add police officers to hate-crime legislation and I don’t think it makes sense. I think it’s contrary to the concept of what a hate crime is,” says Steve Freeman, the director of legal affairs at the Anti-Defamation League.

The last time the federal hate-crime law was expanded was in 2009, when the president signed a law to include sexual orientation, disability, gender and gender identity to the existing categories of race, color, religion and ethnicity, which are also protected by various state laws.

To a certain extent, hate-crime legislation is symbolic.

“Because the hate crime sends a message, we need a law that sends a message back to the perpetrators and to the victim, that we as a society will not tolerate victimization by virtue of race or religion or some other protected category,” says Jack Levin, a criminologist at Northeastern University and author of a number of books about hate crimes, including the upcoming “Hate Crime: A Global Perspective.”

It is not surprising that many cops – whose policing tactics have come under criticism in the wake of the deaths of Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice and other unarmed African-Americans – are feeling under siege. But the push to make police officers a protected group is not a recent development; the union had urged that they be included in the 2009 expansion.

“Obviously it’s not new for us. This is something we have been advocating for for at least the last 10 years,” Pasco says. “Recent events underscore the fact that, unfortunately, there are individuals out there who will target police officers just because they are police officers, which if you think of it is symmetrical with the hate crimes act.”

While assaults against police officers are trending down as a whole, along with the general crime rate, 2014 did see a spike in officers killed in the line of duty, according to a report by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, and the deadly ambush of NYPD officers Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos in December further inflamed the debate over citizen-cop tensions.

“Nothing focuses Congress on a bipartisan effort more than the need to cover butts,” Pasco says. “There are a lot of people who have been perhaps over the top with their criticism in the police. They want to show that actually they don’t really mean that, they really like the police.”

He says members of the union will be lobbying for the expansion in early February, during its annual gathering in Washington.

However, according to experts, hate-crime legislation has reflected longstanding biases against certain people.

“Hate crimes against black Americans have had a long history in this country – we didn't just see a rise of hate offenses against black Americans over a period of a month or two,” Levin says. “Hopefully the ambushing of police officers will turn out to be a short-term clustering and not some kind of long-term form of hate against the police force in general. We just don't know that yet.”

Distinctions will also be need to be made for crimes that are indeed driven by bias, as opposed to those that are just a part of the risk inherent in the job, Levin says. It's the difference between when a criminal assaults an officer in an attempt to escape versus when cops are attacked just for being cops.

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how experts and lawmakers tend to disagree on what crimes should be considered hate crimes. Should it be limiting, or cover the full spectrum? How do we determine what to cover in a national mandate? As the negative, you should argue that this issue is a difficult one to resolve, and we can't equalize hate crimes across the country, because too many people, states, laws, etc. have different ideas on what hate crimes are.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how several states are already adopting variations of this bill, and altering their hate crime laws to fit more demographics. Even still, violence is still occurring. As the negative, you should argue that this kind of legislation is already happening in the status quo. Second, you could argue that though it's happening in the status quo, it isn't working. This kind of mandate is on mindset, and if we don't change our culture, we can never make a lasting change. We might have to take more drastic measures, or find more unique ways to change the culture of hate crimes in America.

This second article talks about how experts and lawmakers tend to disagree on what crimes should be considered hate crimes. Should it be limiting, or cover the full spectrum? How do we determine what to cover in a national mandate? As the negative, you should argue that this issue is a difficult one to resolve, and we can't equalize hate crimes across the country, because too many people, states, laws, etc. have different ideas on what hate crimes are.

Legislation – A Resolution to End Depleted Uranium Munition Usage by the United States Military Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Uranium Causes Cancer and Birth Defects in Iraq

RT “Depleted uranium used by US forces blamed for birth defects and cancer in Iraq” July 23, 2013
<<https://www.rt.com/news/iraq-depleted-uranium-health-394/>>

“The US military’s use of depleted uranium in Iraq has led to a sharp increase in Leukemia and birth defects in the city of Najaf – and panicked residents are fearing for their health. Cancer is now more common than the flu, a local doctor tells RT.

Tags

Children, Health, Military, Scandal, Iraq, War witness, Rory Suchet, Matt Trezza, Lucy Kafanov, War

The city of Najaf saw one of the most severe military actions during the 2003 invasion. RT traveled to the area, quickly learning that every residential street in several neighborhoods has seen multiple cases of families whose children are ill, as well as families who have lost children, and families who have many relatives suffering from cancer...

...“After the start of the Iraq war, rates of cancer, leukemia and birth defects rose dramatically in Najaf. The areas affected by American attacks saw the biggest increases. We believe it’s because of the ‘illegal’ weapons like depleted uranium that were used by the Americans. When you visit the hospital here you see that cancer is more common than the flu,” Nsaif told RT’s Lucy Kafanov.

“The war isn’t over. Yes, the Americans are gone, but we are still suffering from the Consequences,” said Leila Jabar, whose three children died because they were born with congenital deformities. She blames radioactive ammunition used by American forces during the war for the health problems of her children. Her only surviving 8-months-old son Ahmed has a nervous system disorder and doctors don’t expect him to survive his first birthday.

Dr. Chris Busby has researched the effects of depleted uranium (DU) in detail. He says the only source of uranium in Iraq was used by American-led forces.

“We went to Fallujah and we found the levels of cancer. We looked at the parents of children with congenital malformation and we did analysis of their hair to see what was inside their hair that might be genotoxic, that might be the sort of thing that can cause congenital malformation. The only thing that we found was uranium. We found uranium in the mothers of the children with congenital malformations,” he told RT.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that the United States’ use of depleted uranium in the War in Iraq has caused lasting side effects for the citizens of Iraq. Since the violence in particular areas ended, children with birth defects and people with cancer are on the rise. When the mothers of those children were tested, they found uranium as the other abnormality present in their bodies. The United States cannot use these weapons, if they then cause devastation for the areas after the conflict has ended. We must end the use of this terrible weapon. Don’t we have enough ways to kill people?*

AFF – US Guilty of Using Depleted Uranium in Iraq

The Guardian “US fired depleted uranium at civilian areas in 2003 Iraq war, report finds” Rob Edwards, June 19, 2014 <<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jun/19/us-depleted-uranium-weapons-civilian-areas-iraq>>

“US forces fired depleted uranium (DU) weapons at civilian areas and troops in Iraq in breach of official advice meant to prevent unnecessary suffering in conflicts, a report has found.

Coordinates revealing where US jets and tanks fired nearly 10,000 DU rounds in Iraq during the war in 2003 have been obtained by the Dutch peace group Pax. This is the first time that any US DU firing coordinates have been released, despite previous requests by the United Nations Environment Programme and the Iraqi government.

According to PAX's report, which is due to be published this week, the data shows that many of the DU rounds were fired in or near populated areas of Iraq, including As Samawah, Nasiriyah and Basrah. At least 1,500 rounds were also aimed at troops, the group says...

...PAX estimates that there are more than 300 sites in Iraq contaminated by DU, which will cost at least \$30m to clean up. DU is a chemically toxic and radioactive heavy metal attractive to weapons designers because it is extremely hard and can pierce armour.

The author of the PAX report, Wim Zwijnenburg, said the US Air Force knew the harm that could be done by DU weapons and should not have used them in populated areas. "The use of DU against these targets questions the adherence of coalition forces to their own principles and guidelines," he argued. "They should be held accountable for the consequences." ...”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that the United States was guilty of using depleted uranium munition in Iraq, which extends on the argument presented in the first article. As the affirmative, you need to argue whether it was necessary to use this kind of weaponry, and whether the side effects of these weapons are worth it. The United States shouldn't use weapons that will destroy the futures of the people we're fighting – the civilians who have been hurt by DU use is ridiculous, and something needs to be done about it. Didn't we learn anything from dropping the atomic bomb in World War II?*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that the United States' use of depleted uranium in the War in Iraq has caused lasting side effects for the citizens of Iraq. Since the violence in particular areas ended, children with birth defects and people with cancer are on the rise. When the mothers of those children were tested, they found uranium as the other abnormality present in their bodies. The United States cannot use these weapons, if they then cause devastation for the areas after the conflict has ended. We must end the use of this terrible weapon. Don't we have enough ways to kill people?

The second article says that the United States was guilty of using depleted uranium munition in Iraq, which extends on the argument presented in the first article. As the affirmative, you need to argue whether it was necessary to use this kind of weaponry, and whether the side effects of these weapons are worth it. The United States shouldn't use weapons that will destroy the futures of the people we're fighting – the civilians who have been hurt by DU use is ridiculous, and something needs to be done about it. Didn't we learn anything from dropping the atomic bomb in World War II?

Negative Evidence

NEG – Iran Nuclear Deal Poses Threat to US

US News “Obama's Unforgivable Betrayal” Mortimer B. Zuckerman, April 17, 2015

<<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2015/04/17/obamas-iran-nuclear-deal-is-an-unforgivable-betrayal-of-israel>>

“Flash forward to the Obama administration. Now the president is no longer trying to stop Iran from going nuclear. “Never” has been slimmed down to 13 years – at best! The Iranians have secured enough nuclear fuel to make the first generation bomb small enough to be dropped from a transport plane. The former International Atomic Energy Agency inspector, Olli Heinonen, reckons the proposed agreement from the Lausanne talks leaves Iran “a threshold breakout nuclear state for the next 10 years.” But we may have only the mirage of an agreement since Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and his associates are producing tons of ambiguity about what was agreed – and on our side, where unity is essential in dealing with a very slippery adversary, there are troubling discrepancies between the French and U.S. understandings...

...But none of Iran’s nuclear facilities, including the Fordow center will be closed, as The Washington Post noted. Not one of the country’s 19,000 centrifuges will be dismantled. Tehran’s existing pile of enriched uranium will be “reduced” but not necessarily shipped out of the country. In effect, then, Iran’s nuclear infrastructure will remain intact even though some of it will be mothballed for 10 years. But when the accord lapses the Islamic Republic will instantly become a threshold nuclear state.

Most upsetting is that even with much greater restriction the deal would not be permanent but instead one or more sunset clauses whereby all limits would ultimately be lifted.

Congress fears it has no substantive input, which means a deal would be implemented without its consent. The vote and voice of Congress is vital to the credibility and durability of a final deal that would be acceptable to the U.S. and not just to this administration.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the Iran Nuclear Deal and how the United States made a mistake by essentially giving Iran the freedom to create nuclear weapons. As the negative, you should argue that this is not the time for the United States to get rid of any weaponry. While nuclear capabilities and this depleted uranium doesn’t compare to a nuclear weapon, why are we trying to disarm ourselves in times when war could be imminent?*

NEG – DU Used Only in Extreme Circumstances, When Necessary

The Guardian “US fired depleted uranium at civilian areas in 2003 Iraq war, report finds” Rob Edwards, June 19, 2014 <<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jun/19/us-depleted-uranium-weapons-civilian-areas-iraq>>

“This conflicts with legal advice from the US Air Force in 1975 suggesting that DU weapons should only be used against hard targets like tanks and armoured vehicles, the report says. This advice, designed to comply with international law by minimising deaths and injuries to urban populations and troops, was largely ignored by US forces, it argues.

A six-page memo by Major James Miles and Will Carroll from the international law division of USAF's Office of the Judge Advocate General concluded in March 1975 that DU weapons were legal. But it recommended imposing restrictions on how they were used.

"Use of this munition solely against personnel is prohibited if alternative weapons are available," the memo stated. This was for legal reasons "related to the prohibitions against unnecessary suffering and poison".

The memo also pointed out that DU weapons were "incendiary" and could have indiscriminate impacts in urban areas. "They may cause fires which spread thereby causing potential risks of disproportionate injury to civilians or damage to civilian objects," it said. "Precautions to avoid or minimise such risks shall be taken in the use of this weapon or alternate available weapons should be used."

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the restrictions already in place for the use of depleted uranium. As the negative, you should argue that we shouldn't stop using something that is helpful in destroying weaponry like tanks and armored vehicles. The goal in war is to win, with as few casualties as possible on our side. The more effective we are at fighting the enemy, the more likely we are to win. Depleted uranium is something that the United States uses in extreme conditions, and it helps the United States succeed. Beyond that, you should argue that the fact that we only use them in extreme situations should be enough to appease the affirmative.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article discusses the Iran Nuclear Deal and how the United States made a mistake by essentially giving Iran the freedom to create nuclear weapons. As the negative, you should argue that this is not the time for the United States to get rid of any weaponry. While nuclear capabilities and this depleted uranium doesn't compare to a nuclear weapon, why are we trying to disarm ourselves in times when war could be imminent?

The second article discusses the restrictions already in place for the use of depleted uranium. As the negative, you should argue that we shouldn't stop using something that is helpful in destroying weaponry like tanks and armored vehicles. The goal in war is to win, with as few casualties as possible on our side. The more effective we are at fighting the enemy, the more likely we are to win. Depleted uranium is something that the United States uses in extreme conditions, and it helps the United States succeed. Beyond that, you should argue that the fact that we only use them in extreme situations should be enough to appease the affirmative.

Legislation – A Bill to Completely Ban the Usage of Handheld Cellphones
While Operating a Motor Vehicle
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Cell Phone and Driving Statistics Are Staggering

Law Firm, Edgar and Snyder & Associates “Texting & Cell Phone Use While Driving Statistics” 2007-2013
< <http://www.edgarsnyder.com/car-accident/cell-phone/cell-phone-statistics.html> >

“National Cell Phone and Driving Statistics

- About 660,000 drivers use cell phones at any given time during daylight hours in the United States.
- Texting while driving makes a driver 23x more likely to crash.
- Drivers talking on a cell phone are 4x more likely to have a car accident.
- Talking on a cell phone while driving can make a young driver's reaction time as slow as that of a 70 year old.
- Answering a text takes away your attention for about five seconds. That is enough time to travel the length of a football field.
- Studies have found that texting while driving causes a 400% increase in time spent with eyes off the road.
- 94% of drivers support bans on texting while driving.
- 74% of drivers support bans on hand-held cell phone use.

Teen Driver Cell Phone Statistics

- 15 to 19 year olds make up the largest proportion of distracted drivers.
- According to the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, texting while driving kills 11 teens each day.
- In a AAA poll, 94% of teens called texting and driving a serious threat, but 35% admitted to doing it.
- 11% of drivers ages 15 – 19 involved in fatal crashes were reported to be distracted.
- 21% of distracted teen drivers involved in fatal accidents were distracted by cell phones.
- Teen drivers are 4x more likely than adults to get into car crashes or near-crashes when talking or texting on a cell phone.
- A teen driver riding with one other passenger doubles the risk of being involved in a fatal car crash. With two or more passengers, a fatal accident is 5x as likely.
- 46% of drivers under 18 admit to texting while driving.
- Over 60% of American teens admit to risky driving, and nearly half of those admit to texting behind the wheel.

TAKEAWAYS – *This article is really just a list of statistics about how dangerous and life-threatening texting/using a phone will driving can be. The information here is pretty self-explanatory, so you'll want to punch your speech full of these statistics. What we need to focus on as the affirmative is this –Too many people, including teens, are dying as a result of using a cellphone while driving. For some reason, this hasn't sunk in for those that still do it, so we must put a plan in action that will solve this problem.*

AFF-Cell Phones While Driving Is the Same As Drunk Driving

Cell Phone Safety, "Cell Phone Driving Hazards," Accessed October 21, 2015, <
<http://www.cellphonesafety.org/vehicular/> >

"Automobiles and cell phones don't mix. A University of Utah study implies driving while talking on a cell phone reduces a driver's response time to the same levels observed in drunk drivers and "old folks." Even though automakers initially built mobile phones into car systems, and they continue to design successive generations of sophisticated telecommunications bundles, statistics are mounting that suggest distractions from cell phones increase accidents...

Students Against Drunk Driving and Liberty Mutual Insurance conducted a study that revealed 62% of high school-age drivers use their cell phones while driving and of those, 24% believe the practice is perfectly safe."

TAKEAWAYS- *This piece of evidence says that studies show that talking on a cell phone reduces a driver's response time to the same levels observed in drunk drivers. We don't allow drunk driving, because it's dangerous. We shouldn't allow cellphone distracted driving for the same reason. The group that is most at risk for distracted driving via cellphones is teenagers. One study found that 62% of teens use their phones while driving and 24% of them believe that it's totally safe. This is a HUGE problem. We need to pass this legislation to make our teens and roads safer.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article is really just a list of statistics about how dangerous and life-threatening texting/using a phone while driving can be. The information here is pretty self-explanatory, so you'll want to punch your speech full of these statistics. What we need to focus on as the affirmative is this –Too many people, including teens, are dying as a result of using a cellphone while driving. For some reason, this hasn't sunk in for those that still do it, so we must put a plan in action that will solve this problem

The second piece of evidence says that studies show that talking on a cell phone reduces a driver's response time to the same levels observed in drunk drivers. We don't allow drunk driving, because it's dangerous. We shouldn't allow cellphone distracted driving for the same reason. The group that is most at risk for distracted driving via cellphones is teenagers. One study found that 62% of teens use their phones while driving and 24% of them believe that it's totally safe. This is a HUGE problem. We need to pass this legislation to make our teens and roads safer.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Laws Already in Place to Ban Texting and Driving, Promoting Hand-Held Devices

Mother Jones “How Much Does Your State Fine For Texting and Driving?” Benjy-Hansen Bundy, Tasneem Raja, October 25, 2013 <<http://www.motherjones.com/media/2013/10/numbers-texting-and-driving>>

“The good news: fatal car crashes are on the decline. The bad news: fatal car crashes involving cell phone use—anything from texting to talking to reaching for a ringing phone—are on the rise. In fact, the leading cause of death for teenage drivers is now texting, not drinking, with nearly a dozen teens dying each day in a texting-related car crash. Stark figures like this have driven 46 states to pass legislation banning texting and driving...”

TAKEAWAYS – *This article doesn't hide the fact that there are texting-related fatalities. In fact, there are now laws in place in almost all fifty states against it. The number hasn't reached 50 yet, but it will – that's why we shouldn't pass this legislation. This problem is already being solved for in the status-quo. If you argue in negation, you can't argue that cellphone crash related fatalities aren't a problem-because they are. You have to argue that it doesn't require a federal mandate to fix. States are handling the problem.*

NEG – Hands-Free Devices Dangerous

Associated Press “Hands-free not the way to be: Text-by-voice more distracting than talking on a cellphone, says AAA” June 12, 2013 <<http://www.nydailynews.com/autos/text-by-voice-distracting-making-call-aaa-article-1.1370208>>

“Using voice commands to send text messages and emails from behind the wheel, which is marketed as a safer alternative for drivers, actually is more distracting and dangerous than simply talking on a cellphone, a new AAA study found.

Automakers have been trying to excite new-car buyers, especially younger ones, with dashboard infotainment systems that let drivers use voice commands do things like turning on windshield wipers, posting Facebook messages or ordering pizza. The pitch has been that hands-free devices are safer because they enable drivers to keep their hands on the wheel and their eyes on the road.

But talking on a hands-free phone isn't significantly safer for drivers than talking on a hand-held phone, and using hands-free devices that translate speech into text is the most distracting of all, researchers found. Speech-to-text systems that enable drivers to send, scroll through, or delete email and text messages required greater concentration by drivers than other potentially distracting activities examined in the study like talking on the phone, talking to a passenger, listening to a book on tape or listening to the radio...

... The greater the concentration required to perform a task, the more likely a driver is to develop what researchers call "tunnel vision" or "inattention blindness." Drivers will stop scanning the roadway or ignore their side and review mirrors. Instead, they look straight ahead, but fail to see what's in front of them, like red lights and pedestrians.

"People aren't seeing what they need to see to drive. That's the scariest part to me," said Peter Kissinger, president and CEO of the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety, the group's safety research arm. "Police accident investigative reports are filled with comments like the 'looked, but did not see.' That's what drivers tell them. We used to think they were lying, but now we know that's actually true."

There are about 9 million cars and trucks on the road with infotainment systems, and that will jump to about 62 million vehicles by 2018, AAA spokeswoman Yolanda Cade said, citing automotive industry research. At the same time, drivers tell the AAA they believe phones and other devices are safe to use behind the wheel if they are hands-free, she said."

TAKEAWAYS – *This article presents an interesting argument for the negative side. It talks about how hands-free devices can actually be more distracting than any other. It gives the illusion that you're being safe, which means you'll do more on your phone, which will hinder your concentration even further. Plus, it requires more concentration, so while drivers might be looking at the road, they aren't really seeing it – which causes accidents. You should argue that this bill doesn't solve for the harms it hopes to, because it's allowing hands-free devices to remain. You should argue that we shouldn't pass this legislation, because it should ban ALL cellphone devices- Even hands free ones!*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article doesn't hide the fact that there are texting-related fatalities. In fact, there are now laws in place in almost all fifty states against it. The number hasn't reached 50 yet, but it will – that's why we shouldn't pass this legislation. This problem is already being solved for in the status-quo. If you argue in negation, you can't argue that cellphone crash related fatalities aren't a problem-because they are. You have to argue that it doesn't require a federal mandate to fix. States are handling the problem.

The second article presents an interesting argument for the negative side. It talks about how hands-free devices can actually be more distracting than any other. It gives the illusion that you're being safe, which means you'll do more on your phone, which will hinder your concentration even further. Plus, it requires more concentration, so while drivers might be looking at the road, they aren't really seeing it – which causes accidents. You should argue that this bill doesn't solve for the harms it hopes to, because it's allowing hands-free devices to remain. You should argue that we shouldn't pass this legislation, because it should ban ALL cellphone devices- Even hands free ones! a requirement since they're already happening, and forcing people to use hands-free is still just as dangerous as hands-on devices.

Legislation – A Resolution to Eliminate the Statute of Limitations on Sexual Assault Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Colorado Shows the Importance of Changing Statute of Limitation

9 News “Changing the statute of limitations for sexual assault” Victoria Sanchez, September 15, 2015 < <http://www.9news.com/story/news/local/2015/09/15/sexual-assault-state-of-limitations-bill-cosby/72340726/>>

“A new bill could change Colorado's sexual assault statute of limitations to either extend or eliminate the time limit for victims to report the crime.

The bill is in response to the alleged crimes by comedian Bill Cosby.

Colorado's current statute of limitations for sexual assault against an adult is three years from the date the crime occurred.

At meeting at the State Capitol, Rep. Rhonda Fields, the bill's author, met with attorneys and women who claim to be victims of Cosby to talk about possible options to extend or get rid of the statute of limitations.

"We need to start making some changes now. We're not asking for the past. I don't want to go back to '86," said Beth Ferrier, a woman accusing Cosby of sexual assault.

District Attorney George Brauchler said he's in favor of extending the statute of limitations but doesn't know how long it should be. He also thinks the people accused of crimes need to be considered.

"Someone who is ultimately accused of this, whether it's by DNA or other means, I think there's an expectation that they have the ability to fully defend themselves. The longer that we make the statute of limitations, in some cases, that puts them at a disadvantage," Brauchler said.

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how Colorado is trying to eliminate the time frame for statute of limitations on sexual assaults, or at the very least, extend it. The idea is gaining support, but still has a long way to go. As the AFF you should argue that the current limit of 3 years is not nearly long enough. There is will-documented cases of trauma associated with sexual assault cases that prevent many people from taking action against the person who assaulted them.*

AFF – Removing Statute Stops Rapists from Becoming Serial Offenders

Denver Post “Bill Cosby rape allegations spur effort to end Colorado's time limits” Tom McGhee, September 15, 2015 < http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_28817939/bill-cosby-rape-allegations-spur-effort-end-colorados>

“State Rep. Rhonda Fields held a meeting at the Capitol on Tuesday with the Cosby accusers and others who support changing Colorado law, including 18th Judicial District Attorney George Brauchler.

Gloria Allred, an attorney representing many of the more than 50 women who allege Cosby drugged and raped them, spoke to the gathering via Skype. She pointed out New Jersey has no time limitation on prosecuting the crime.

"I have been to New Jersey, and I'm not aware of any down side since they eliminated the statute (of limitations) for rape and sex assault," she said.

Beth Ferrier, 56, of Denver, Heidi Thomas, 56, of Castle Rock, and Helen Hayes, 80, of Marin County, Calif., all said Cosby had assaulted them when they were younger.

Dozens of actresses, waitresses and models have claimed Cosby drugged and sexually assaulted them over the past 50 years. Cosby has denied the allegations. Ferrier, who said Cosby raped her in 1986, isn't seeking vengeance. She said she just wants the statute lengthened to make it easier for victims to get justice and to stop rapists from becoming serial offenders.

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how the statute of limitations has been a serious issue in the recent sexual assault case involving Bill Cosby and numerous women claiming he sexually assaulted them over a number of years ago. As the AFF you should argue that by removing the statute of limitations we can avoid such accounts of sexual assault turning in a serial accounts. Currently, victims feel like their chance to speak up about what has happened has passed them by, so they don't speak up. This allows the person accused to continue these heinous acts while not worrying about the crimes of their past catching up to them. Beyond that, you can argue that the status quo allows people to commit crimes, knowing that if their victims are silent long enough, they can never get in trouble for it. While the statute is short, the damage done to the victim could be life-long.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article explains how Colorado is trying to eliminate the time frame for statute of limitations on sexual assaults, or at the very least, extend it. The idea is gaining support, but still has a long way to go. As the AFF you should argue that the current limit of 3 years is not nearly long enough. There is well-documented cases of trauma associated with sexual assault cases that prevent many people from taking action against the person who assaulted them.

This second article explains how the statute of limitations has been a serious issue in the recent sexual assault case involving Bill Cosby and numerous women claiming he sexually assaulted them over a number of years ago. As the AFF you should argue that by removing the statute of limitations we can avoid such accounts of sexual assault turning in a serial accounts. Currently, victims feel like their chance to speak up about what has happened has passed them by, so they don't speak up. This allows the person accused to continue these heinous acts while not worrying about the crimes of their past catching up to them. Beyond that, you can argue that the status quo allows people to commit crimes, knowing that if their victims are silent long enough, they can never get in trouble for it. While the statute is short, the damage done to the victim could be life-long.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Statute of Limitations Protects Against Abuse of the Legal System

Daily Business Review “Statute of Limitations Applies to Everyone, Even Lenders” Bruce Jacobs, Daily, October 21, 2015 < <http://www.dailybusinessreview.com/id=1202740346660/Statute-of-Limitations-Applies-to-Everyone-Even-Lenders?slreturn=20150921220534>>

“Statutes of limitation exist for good reason: to keep the law predictable and fair, and to preserve order in the court.

That very order is under threat in a high-profile mortgage foreclosure case before the Florida Supreme Court in oral argument on Nov. 4 in *Bartram v. U.S. Bank*.

In general, statutes of limitation are straightforward. In personal injury and oral contract cases, the right to sue expires after four years. In professional malpractice, it's two years. In written contracts, including mortgages, the statute of limitations is five years. Sit on your rights and wait past that point, you are out of luck, whether your claim is for \$5 or \$5 million. The law is the law.

Yet a remarkable attempt to carve out a judicial exception for lenders is about to come to a head in the *Bartram* case.

The root question in *Bartram* is this: When does the clock start ticking to file a mortgage foreclosure action? Does it start with the bank's first foreclosure and end after five years? That was the law in Florida before *Bartram*. That is the law in nearly every other state with a foreclosure statute of limitations. Can a mortgage lender simply declare a new default date indefinitely — even after the statute of limitations has passed since their original acceleration?

Mortgage lenders are asking the Supreme Court to carve out the only judicially enacted exception to the statute of limitations in Florida.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the importance of statutes of limitations. As the NEG, you should argue the importance of keeping the law predictable and fair, and to preserve order in the court. As time passes the ability for a person to recall details and defend themselves is compromised and without a limitation the defendant is put at a grave disadvantage. Memories fade, witnesses die, records are lost and all of these hinder the legal process and prevent the ability for the court to expose the truth.*

NEG – Removing Statute of Limitation Harms Principles of Justice and Fairness

Syracuse “Changing statute of limitations for sex abuse would harm schools, churches” Editor, October 02, 2015 <

http://www.syracuse.com/opinion/index.ssf/2015/10/changing_statute_of_limitations_for_sex_abuse_would_harm_schools_churches_your_1.html>

“We applaud Assemblymember Markey's commitment to helping victims of sexual abuse get justice (“Reform statute of limitations to help sex abuse victims”, Sept.21). However, her proposal to open a one-year period during which plaintiffs could file lawsuits for alleged abuse that happened at any time, raises very serious concerns.

First and foremost, statutes of limitations exist –and have existed for thousands of years – in order to ensure that all people are afforded the opportunity to defend themselves in

a court of law. Memories fade, witnesses die, and records are lost. In many cases, the alleged abuser themselves is no longer alive. When California adopted a similar proposal, 336 of the over 800 claims were against deceased individuals. In these cases, the "deep pocketed" institutions which employed the alleged abuser become the target of the lawsuit.

If the law is changed retroactively, many institutions including schools, nonprofits, and community organizations may discover the hard way that they have no records or witnesses to defend against the emotionally charged claims, let alone insurance to cover decades-old claims. Lacking evidence and resources, many long-serving organizations may be forced to close.

These crimes are so heinous and reprehensible that it is understandable to consider eliminating due process in pursuit of justice. We cannot. The social cost of retroactively eliminating the statute of limitations would be tremendous, borne by schools, churches, community groups, and those they serve. If enacted, this proposal would irreparably harm most basic principles of justice and fairness.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains why some people would be in favor of removing the limitations, but then goes into detail about how this would harm several publically funded organizations. As the NEG, you should read the article to understand where these harms would come from. These crimes are so heinous and reprehensible that it is understandable to consider eliminating due process in pursuit of justice. We cannot. The social cost of retroactively eliminating the statute of limitations would be tremendous.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article explains the importance of statutes of limitations. As the NEG, you should argue the importance of keeping the law predictable and fair, and to preserve order in the court. As time passes the ability for a person to recall details and defend themselves is compromised and without a limitation the defendant is put at a grave disadvantage. Memories fade, witnesses die, records are lost and all of these hinder the legal process and prevent the ability for the court to expose the truth.

This second article explains why some people would be in favor of removing the limitations, but then goes into detail about how this would harm several publically funded organizations. As the NEG, you should read the article to understand where these harms would come from. These crimes are so heinous and reprehensible that it is understandable to consider eliminating due process in pursuit of justice. We cannot. The social cost of retroactively eliminating the statute of limitations would be tremendous.

Legislation – A Resolution to Create a Path to Citizenship for
Undocumented Immigrants and Promote Immigration Reform to Stimulate
Economic Growth
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Immigration Reform Requires More Pathways to Citizenship

About News, “Should the US Adopt a Guest Worker Program?,” Justin Quinn, Accessed October 12, 2015, < http://usconservatives.about.com/od/conservativesimmigration/a/Guest_Worker_Program.htm >

“Each year, more than half a million people enter the US illegally. As of 2009, there were an estimated 11 to 12 million illegals already living in -- and in many cases -- working in the US. The cold, hard reality is that rounding up and deporting every last illegal is logistically and politically impossible.

To deal with the existing element of illegal residents, the idea of a guest worker program has been floated by those on the left and the right...

For true immigration reform to take place, more pathways to citizenship must be available -- not less. A national guest worker program should be adopted.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that illegal immigrants are a huge problem in the U.S. In 2009, there were an estimated 11-12 million illegals living in the US. It is unrealistic to think that we could detain and deport all of them, so we’re left with millions of illegal immigrants who want to live and work in the U.S.- why don’t we let them? Immigration reform requires more pathways to citizenship. It will help address the millions of immigrants already living in the U.S., and will allow the United States to take advantage of the immigrants that have been here for a long time, and allow them to become tax-paying, valuable members of society.*

AFF – Pros for a Allowing Illegal Immigrants to Become Productive Members of US Society

Balanced Politics, “Should America Maintain/Increase the Level of Legal Immigration?” Joe Messerli, January 7, 2012, < <http://www.balancedpolitics.org/immigration.htm> >

1. **“Some of the most intelligent and ambitious individuals, who are unsatisfied with their own countries, bring their skills to America.** Few countries offer the limitless opportunities that the United States offers. You can start your own business, learn a high-tech career, become a movie star, publish a best-selling novel, or be elected to office. People in other countries crave the same things we do: recognition, wealth, fame, and the feeling of making a difference. America offers endless ways for a "nobody" to become great. Many countries of the world limit educational opportunities, stifle entrepreneurship, and prevent individuals from reaping the rewards of their hard work. Consequently, such individuals -- the cream of the crop -- often come to America. In fact, our nation was founded by English and other European citizens that

risked their lives to sail across the ocean to an unknown future. America can't help but become better from the influence of such people.

2. It increases the diversity and expands the culture of the country. No country in the world has the diversity of races, religions, languages, and cultures. America is called the great "melting pot" because we bring together all sorts of people around the world. Diversity brings more tolerance for people that are, on the surface, different than us. It introduces new ideas, new perspectives, new music & food, different customs, new forms of entertainment, diverse strengths & skills, and a host of other advantages.

3. Immigrants often taken the low-paying jobs (like food service & hotel cleaning) that most Americans don't want to do at such low wages. Few Americans like to wash dishes, bust tables, mop floors, pick up garbage, etc. These types of jobs must be done, but employers consistently have trouble finding regular employees to do the work. A wage of \$5-\$7 is usually too low to induce Americans to take and stay at such jobs. However, immigrants who may be lucky to earn \$5 a day in their native countries are more than willing to work these jobs.

4. Decreasing or eliminating *legal* immigration will inevitably create more incentive to come to the country *illegally*, which leads to less assimilation and fewer taxpaying, law-abiding citizens. Many individuals have only one true hope for a better life for themselves or their children -- emigrate to America. The enormous number of immigrants in this country show that they will try to get here whether or not there are laws to stop them. Illegal immigrants must hide their identities. Thus, they aren't going to be attending American schools, filing tax returns, or doing other things that typical Americans do. Plus, if they're already breaking the law by being here, what's to prevent them from breaking other laws we have? Legal immigrants, especially those who plan to stay permanently, must pay taxes and are more likely to attend school to learn history, English, and a marketable skill. Since they don't have to hide, they are more likely to assimilate with other Americans and adopt the culture. Lastly, they can eventually earn the right to vote and participate in our political process, meaning they can develop a decision-making stake in the future of our country.

5. It improves the overall image of America internationally, as it is seen as an open, welcoming country; and immigrants who return home or maintain contact with family back home have a true image of America, not the one propagandized in much of the international media. It's no secret that the United States has a very unfavorable image around the world. Most American citizens are proud of their country and are happy to be here. So why do we have such an unfavorable image abroad? What percentage of the people in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East that have been sampled in these favorability opinion polls do you think have actually been to the United States for any significant amount of time? Think about it, for those that haven't lived here, their opinion of America is based almost entirely on the media. Thus, the socialists, communists, and propagandists that dominate the international news media may be most responsible for America's image. We can help alleviate the problem by allowing more people to enter the country. Real people can see what

it means to have freedom of speech, freedom to worship, freedom to publish and assemble. They can see our diversity and our shunning of those who lack tolerance. They can sample our sports and our entertainment. They can meet for themselves the "evil Americans". As more people return home or communicate with loved ones, people around the world will increasingly learn what a great country we have.

6. Adding an additional group of cheap labor adds to the flexibility of business, leading to cheaper prices, better quality products, and higher profits. Labor is one of a number of costs of doing business. When businesses have trouble filling low skill jobs such as washing dishes or cleaning rooms, they have only two choices: raise the wage rate high enough to fill the jobs or eliminate the positions altogether. While higher wages sounds good, it means businesses must either accept lower profit margins or they must raise prices to make up the difference. A hike in prices means we pay more for restaurants, hotels, factory products, etc. while draining money from other segments of the economy (since we have less to spend). Lower profit margins mean lower stock prices in our 401(k)'s and less investment dollar inflow. The second choice of eliminating jobs is obviously undesirable for a couple of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that a willing worker could be denied a job that a business wants to offer. But also, when a business eliminates these jobs, it means lower quality products and services. For example, your favorite restaurant might want to carry three bus people for the Friday night shift, but because of a labor shortage, it may only be able to hire two bus people. The work will still get done, but is the cleaning of tables going to be as thorough? Do you think it will take the same amount of time to get a table on a busy night? These types of problems can be helped by increasing the labor pool through the increase of legal immigration.

7. It gives struggling people all over the world an opportunity for a better life. This country was built on immigrants who sought opportunity, political & religious freedom, etc. At some point in this debate we need to set aside the question of whether it's good for America and look at the point of view of the immigrant. Imagine you were in a place where you could be stoned to death for practicing your religion. Imagine you got paid the same regardless of how hard you worked. Imagine you were unable to study for a new career or start up your own business. Imagine you were forced to rely on government rationing of food to scratch out a living. Imagine the only access to medical care was physicians with only a few months of training who lacked vaccines and basic medical equipment. Would you want to live the rest of your life like this? Would you want your kids to live their whole lives like this? I'm guessing most people, if given a choice, would take the risk in coming to America to achieve something better. Our country was built and has grown on the backs of such people. “

TAKEAWAY – *This article presents 7 reasons to increase opportunities for legal immigration, and allow people to become citizens who are already here in the United States. All of these reasons could be used as a reason to pass this piece of legislation. No matter their reason for coming to the U.S., they are here and most of them have*

families. It's time that we stop looking at immigrants as enemies and start offering them a clear path to citizenship. If they live here, they're already accustomed to the ways we operate within the United State. In reality, it's best to just provide them a path to citizenship, so they can start paying taxes, voting in our elections, and being overall productive members in our society.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that illegal immigrants are a huge problem in the U.S. In 2009, there were an estimated 11-12 million illegals living in the US. It is unrealistic to think that we could detain and deport all of them, so we're left with millions of illegal immigrants who want to live and work in the U.S.- why don't we let them? Immigration reform requires more pathways to citizenship. It will help address the millions of immigrants already living in the U.S., and will allow the United States to take advantage of the immigrants that have been here for a long time, and allow them to become tax-paying, valuable members of society.

The second article presents 7 reasons to increase opportunities for legal immigration, and allow people to become citizens who are already here in the United States. All of these reasons could be used as a reason to pass this piece of legislation. No matter their reason for coming to the U.S., they are here and most of them have families. It's time that we stop looking at immigrants as enemies and start offering them a clear path to citizenship. If they live here, they're already accustomed to the ways we operate within the United State. In reality, it's best to just provide them a path to citizenship, so they can start paying taxes, voting in our elections, and being overall productive members in our society.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Guest Worker Programs Hurt Unemployed Americans

Huffington Post, “Immigration Reform: Guest Worker Program Considered As Part Of Deal,” Dave Jamieson, January 31, 2013, < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/31/immigration-reform-guest-worker-program_n_2593729.html >

“But if a guest worker overhaul becomes part of the larger proposal, unions may seek a way to limit the number of visas available during times of high U.S. unemployment -- an idea generally opposed by business groups.

Critics of the guest worker program have argued that employers have relied too heavily on cheap foreign labor when millions of Americans are out of work. Given that domestic unemployment remains stubbornly high at 7.8 percent, business groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce may find it more difficult to argue that employers can't find willing and able American workers to do the job.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that domestic unemployment is at 7.8%. If we overhaul and allow more immigrants to become legal citizens, they would be more likely to take American jobs, and would have access to a lot more. This article talks primarily about guest worker programs, but can be used to argue in negation of this bill, because we could have the same effect. This kind of legislation would also encourage people to come to the United States and avoid detection, because they know that there's a loophole in our system. Labor unions are against guest worker programs, because big businesses like to hire cheap workers, and immigrants will typically work for much less than American citizens. If we encourage more immigrants to work in the U.S. more Americans will be without work. This isn't the answer to a growing issue – we should try to get them out of our country, not encourage them to stay or come to our country illegally.*

NEG – We Shouldn't Reward Illegal Immigrants

About News, “Should the US Adopt a Guest Worker Program?,” Justin Quinn, Accessed October 12, 2015, < http://usconservatives.about.com/od/conservativesimmigration/a/Guest_Worker_Program.htm >

“Republican Congressman J.D. Hayworth of Arizona, considers a guest worker program to be a “transparent amnesty reward for illegal aliens” that would undercut wages for US workers thanks to employers who hire migrants at lower rates...

Many conservatives, however, see the concept of a guest worker program as a reward for illegal behavior and transgressing American law.

"We're saying the border is closed, but we turn around and have a bill that says if somebody got past the National Guard, got past the Border Patrol, got around the fence is now going to be put on a guaranteed path to citizenship," Republican Sen. Jeff Sessions of Ala. told ABC News in 2007...

For conservatives, any approach to immigration reform must begin -- and end -- with secure borders. Without border security, any attempts to fix or tweak the American immigration system would be worthless...

The second major approach to conservative immigration reform is removing the economic incentives for illegal immigration both at home and abroad. This means the arrest and prosecution of unscrupulous employers who hire illegal immigrants and prey on them as a cheap source of labor.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that guest worker programs, and giving illegal immigrants a path to citizenship, is rewarding people who came to the U.S. illegally. It’s flawed to reward law breakers. If we reward immigrants who are in the U.S., what message are we sending to the world? “Come on over illegally! No need to follow a process. We’ll let you work and make you citizens if you avoid detection. No problem!” Rewarding illegal immigration is not a solution to our growing problem with illegal immigration. In fact, it could potentially exacerbate our problem. The article further suggests that immigration reform starts with border security and REMOVING economic incentives for illegal immigrants- not adding them.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that domestic unemployment is at 7.8%. If we overhaul and allow more immigrants to become legal citizens, they would be more likely to take American jobs, and would have access to a lot more. This article talks primarily about guest worker programs, but can be used to argue in negation of this bill, because we could have the same effect. This kind of legislation would also encourage people to come to the United States and avoid detection, because they know that there's a loophole in our system. Labor unions are against guest worker programs, because big businesses like to hire cheap workers, and immigrants will typically work for much less than American citizens. If we encourage more immigrants to work in the U.S. more Americans will be without work. This isn't the answer to a growing issue – we should try to get them out of our country, not encourage them to stay or come to our country illegally.

The second piece of evidence says that guest worker programs, and giving illegal immigrants a path to citizenship, is rewarding people who came to the U.S. illegally. It's flawed to reward law breakers. If we reward immigrants who are in the U.S., what message are we sending to the world? "Come on over illegally! No need to follow a process. We'll let you work and make you citizens if you avoid detection. No problem!" Rewarding illegal immigration is not a solution to our growing problem with illegal immigration. In fact, it could potentially exacerbate our problem. The article further suggests that immigration reform starts with border security and REMOVING economic incentives for illegal immigrants- not adding them.

Legislation – A Bill to Legalize an Individual’s Right to Buy and Sell Non-Vital Organs
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – People Are Unnecessarily Dying-Experts Weigh in On Why We Should Allow The Sell Non-Vital Organs

NPR, “Should We Legalize the Market for Human Organs?” May 21, 2008, <
<http://www.npr.org/2008/05/21/90632108/should-we-legalize-the-market-for-human-organs> >

“About 75,000 Americans are on the waiting list for kidney transplants. But in the coming year, just 18,000 will get them. That’s only one in four.

It’s not as though the others will eventually get kidneys if they just wait, sustained in the meantime by dialysis. In the next year, nearly 4,000 of those patients will die waiting. At least 1,200 others will fall off the list because they develop complications that make them too sick to withstand a transplant.

Thousands more transplant candidates might be saved if more Americans signed organ donation cards, if more families consented to donation of their loved ones’ organs, and if medical personnel approached the families of potential donors more often. But the supply of cadaveric organs has been disappointingly flat..

Six experts recently tackled that emotional issue in an Oxford-style debate, the last of this season’s events in the Intelligence Squared U.S. series.

The proposition: “We Should Legalize the Market for Human Organs.”

By the end of the session, many of the “undecideds” were persuaded. Before the debate, 29 percent were uncertain. Afterward, that declined to 9 percent.

Those who favored buying and selling organs went from 44 percent to 60 percent. But those opposed inched up only 4 points, from 27 to 31 percent...

Sally Satel, a psychiatrist and resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute who received a kidney from a friend in 2006, says: “Despite decades and decades of public education about the virtues of organ donation, the waiting list just gets longer, and the time to transplantation just gets longer. ... It’s past time to face the fact that altruism is just not enough. Many people need more of an incentive to give. And that’s why we need to be able to compensate people who are willing to give a kidney to a stranger, to save a life. ... We are not talking about a classic commercial free-for-all, or a free market, or an eBay system. We’re talking about a third-party payer. For example, today you could decide to give a kidney. You’d be called a Good Samaritan donor. ... The only difference in a model that I’m thinking about is where you go and give your organ, and your retirement account is wired \$40,000, end of story.”

Amy Friedman, director of transplantation at SUNY Upstate Medical University and close relative of two transplant recipients and one live organ donor, says: “I agree with our opponents that the black market must be closed. I disagree with asking patients to accept death gracefully, instead of resorting to the black market. My position is that development of a legal, regulated mechanism for donor compensation is the only means of effectively eliminating the demand for this covert activity, closing down the black market and improving safety for donors and

recipients. ... Compensation for the organ donor's time and risks, by providing life insurance, lifelong health insurance and even a direct monetary fee, is more appropriate than for the donation of an egg, the rental of a uterus for a surrogate pregnancy, or the participation in clinical experimentation, all of which are legal."

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that only 1 in 4 people waiting for a kidney will get it this year. Thousands will die waiting. The Intelligence Squared U.S. Series had an Oxford style debate where experts weighed in on live donor sales, and two of those in favor are included in this piece of evidence. Before the debate, 29 percent were uncertain about how they felt. Afterward, that declined to 9 percent. Those who favored buying and selling organs went from 44 percent to 60 percent. These numbers indicate that education would help persuade the public. Their arguments are strong and you should really take the time to read them in their entirety. Their major points were: Altruism isn't enough incentive and if we want to close the black market, we make it safe and legal.*

AFF – We Own Our Bodies- This Model Works in Other Countries

Forbes, "Selling Your Organs: Should it be Legal? Do You Own Yourself?" Marcia Clark, June 13, 2013, <<http://www.forbes.com/sites/marciac Clark/2013/06/13/selling-your-organs-should-it-be-legal-do-you-own-yourself/>>

"If we are to get out ahead of the problem, there has to be an increase in live donations as well. This is where the more libertarian minded argue that if our bodies are ours to manage, it should follow that we are also able to sell our organs. They argue that the financial incentive will increase the supply of live donors so significantly, it will eliminate the market shortage. The libertarians argue that organ sales – not presumed consent, which they claim not only violates personal freedom, but also is ineffectual over the long run – is the answer.

There's a certain logic to their thinking. We don't expect altruism to drive markets in most other aspects of our daily lives. Ralph's Markets, Macy's, BMW dealers, you name it – they'd all go out of business in a New York minute if they had to rely on the altruism of farmers, garment manufacturers, or auto parts manufacturers. The same can be said of the organ market. As long as it relies upon altruism, there will always be a shortage of organ donors.

In fact, there is some evidence that the financial incentive works. Organ sales are permitted in the Philippines as long as the donor recipients are natives. A Filipina organ recipient describes the domestic market: "Nobody in these parts," she said, "would donate a kidney without getting paid." And the market is thriving. This recipient stated that the prices for organs are going up.

Iran uses a hybrid system of free market and government control. There, vendors sell their organs to the government, which acts as an intermediary. It pays them and gives them free health insurance for one year. Donor recipients must be Iranian and they are required to work to pay for the cost of their organs. The system has virtually wiped out the waiting lists for donors."

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that we own the right to our own bodies, so we should be able to sell parts of them if we want to. Beyond that, there is a serious shortage of organs begin donated. Why? Because we depend on altruism, and that's not enough. We have to incentivize. The Philippines and Iran have both incentivized and legalized live organ donation, and in doing so, they have ended their organ shortage. If we want people to stop dying waiting for organs, we must pass this legislation.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that only 1 in 4 people waiting for a kidney will get it this year. Thousands will die waiting. The Intelligence Squared U.S. Series had an Oxford style debate where experts weighed in on live donor sales, and two of those in favor are included in this piece of evidence. Before the debate, 29 percent were uncertain about how they felt. Afterward, that declined to 9 percent. Those who favored buying and selling organs went from 44 percent to 60 percent. These numbers indicate that education would help persuade the public. Their arguments are strong and you should really take the time to read them in their entirety. Their major points were: Altruism isn't enough incentive and if we want to close the black market, we make it safe and legal.

The second article says that we own the right to our own bodies, so we should be able to sell parts of them if we want to. Beyond that, there is a serious shortage of organs being donated. Why? Because we depend on altruism, and that's not enough. We have to incentivize. The Philippines and Iran have both incentivized and legalized live organ donation, and in doing so, they have ended their organ shortage. If we want people to stop dying waiting for organs, we must pass this legislation.

Negative Evidence

NEG – We Should Offer Compensation after Death Because Our Market Affects The World Market

NPR, “Should We Legalize the Market for Human Organs?” May 21, 2008, <
<http://www.npr.org/2008/05/21/90632108/should-we-legalize-the-market-for-human-organs> >

“Lloyd R. Cohen, professor of law at George Mason University, says: “The market I propose is one in which healthy individuals might contract for the sale of their organs and tissue for delivery after their death. If the vendors' organs are retrieved and transplanted, a payment in the range of \$5,000 for each major organ would be made to a person or institution chosen by the donor. ... In an options market, organs would only be acquired from the dead. No one need be induced or even permitted to sacrifice his health or bodily integrity for money. The donation of the organs of the deceased by both rich and poor is currently strongly encouraged, precisely because most of us believe that surrendering the organ represents no sacrifice to the donor.”

Francis Delmonico, professor of surgery at Harvard Medical School and adviser to the World Health Organization on transplantation, says: “What we do here has a profound influence on the rest of the world. Now, I say that because I've been to Manila. And ... it's not a matter of balanced thought when a 14-year-old has to sell a kidney to an American that comes there. It's not a matter of balanced thought in Pakistan, or in Egypt. ... About 20 patients a month go from Israel to Manila because of cheap prices. If there's a market legalized in the United States, in the global context of medical tourism, do you think that the 72-year-old patient on the list would wait for a kidney here, versus going to buy a 20-year-old kidney in Manila?”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence includes quotes from The Intelligence Squared U.S. Series Oxford style debate where experts weighed in on live donor sales. These 2 quotes were from opponents of live donor sales. They both made strong points that you can use in your negative speech. The first speaker said that we should incentivize organ sales, but only after death. So, we pay them now for a contract for their organs later. It's more humane, and it will ultimately help with our organ shortage. As a negative speaker, you could present this idea. We shouldn't do live donations- we should just incentivize our current system. The second speaker said that what we do to our medical market will ultimately affect the rest of the world. If we legalize live donor sales, poorer countries will follow. This will lead to medical tourism for organs. We will encourage unsafe medical practices in other countries. We have a responsibility to not let that happen.*

NEG – Selling of Organs Exploits the Poor and Ruins Medical Standards

Forbes, “Selling Your Organs: Should it be Legal? Do You Own Yourself?” Marcia Clark, June 13, 2013, <
<http://www.forbes.com/sites/marciaclark/2013/06/13/selling-your-organs-should-it-be-legal-do-you-own-yourself/> >

“There are dissenters, some of whom even object to Iran’s hybrid model. One dissenting group says that any market based system will necessarily be exploitative of the poor since they’re the ones who’ll be most tempted to take the risks in order to get the rewards. The poor of Pakistan and China have shown willingness to sell corneas on the black market for money. A market system – black or otherwise – exploits such abject poverty...”

This leads to the second group of dissenters, whose viewpoint is described by the Hastings Center on Bioethics: “In a market—even a regulated one—doctors and nurses still would be

using their skills to help people harm themselves solely for money. The resulting distrust and loss of professional standards is too a high price to pay to gamble on the hope that a market may secure more organs for those in need.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that live donor sales would ultimately exploit the poor. People in poverty would risk their health for money. If we pass this legislation, we are opening the door for the poorest in our country to begin donating their organs. It’s not morally sound. Secondly, live organ donation is blurring medical ethics. Ultimately, doctors will be performing non-necessary surgeries on people for the sake of profit. This will lead to distrust and a decrease in professional standards. You can use either of these to make a strong speech in negation of this legislation.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence includes quotes from The Intelligence Squared U.S. Series Oxford style debate where experts weighed in on live donor sales. These 2 quotes were from opponents of live donor sales. They both made strong points that you can use in your negative speech. The first speaker said that we should incentivize organ sales, but only after death. So, we pay them now for a contract for their organs later. It's more humane, and it will ultimately help with our organ shortage. As a negative speaker, you could present this idea. We shouldn't do live donations- we should just incentivize our current system. The second speaker said that what we do to our medical market will ultimately affect the rest of the world. If we legalize live donor sales, poorer countries will follow. This will lead to medical tourism for organs. We will encourage unsafe medical practices in other countries. We have a responsibility to not let that happen.

The second article says that live donor sales would ultimately exploit the poor. People in poverty would risk their health for money. If we pass this legislation, we are opening the door for the poorest in our country to begin donating their organs. It's not morally sound. Secondly, live organ donation is blurring medical ethics. Ultimately, doctors will be performing non-necessary surgeries on people for the sake of profit. This will lead to distrust and a decrease in professional standards. You can use either of these to make a strong speech in negation of this legislation.

Legislation – A Bill to Apply Standard Legal Protocol to All Illegal
Immigrants Regardless of Confidentiality Clauses
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – The Punishment should Fit the Crime

American Immigration Council, “The Ones They Leave Behind: Deportation of Lawful Permanent Residents Harm U.S. Citizen Children,” April 26, 2010, <
<http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/ones-they-leave-behind-deportation-lawful-permanent-residents-harm-us-citizen-children> >

“Thousands of long-term legal immigrants are deported each year. While some are deported for committing serious crimes, many more are deported for committing minor, nonviolent crimes, and judges have no discretion to allow them to stay in the U.S.—even if they have U.S. citizen children.”

More than 100,000 children were affected by parental deportation between 1997 and 2007.

- At least 88,000 of these children were U.S. citizens.
- 217,000 other immediate family members were affected by the deportation of LPRs.

68% of the LPRs who are deported are deported for minor, non-violent offenses.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how permanent residents are already being deported for crimes. The majority of them are being deported for minor, non-violent crimes. However, their deportations are affecting their children in a real and severe way. This article presents several possible arguments for an affirmative speech. One, clearly permanent residents are already being monitored in the status quo, so there’s no reason to pass this bill. Secondly, we are deporting long term residents without a real trial. They have no right to contest their deportation, and that’s a criminal oversight on the part of our judicial system. You can argue that the bill helps solves for lack of punishment associated with criminal activity. Third, the deportation of permanent residents hurts their children. You can argue one or all of these points in your speech.*

AFF –Deportation and Punishment Programs need Guidance of Legal System

Immigration Defense, “San Francisco and San Jose Criminal Immigration Defense Lawyers Returning Legal Permanent Residents with Prior Crimes: Avoiding Traps and Pitfalls,” Daniel Shanfield, Accessed October 18, 2015, <<http://www.immigration-defense.com/Immigration-Defense/Permanent-Resident-with-Crimes.aspx> >

“HS is subjecting legal permanent residents to an ever-tightening noose, with the goal of identifying, detaining, and removing those non-citizens convicted of, or who are suspected to have committed, crimes in the U.S. or abroad.

In addition to actively investigating certain priority criminal violators, DHS has set up a series of passive "checkpoints" to identify non-citizens with criminal backgrounds. For instance, LPRs are required to submit to biometrics when applying for permanent residency, renewing an expiring I-551 green card, applying for a re-entry permit for extended foreign travel, when applying to remove the condition on permanent residency, or pursuing naturalization. They are also subject to investigation as petitioners for family members under the Adam Walsh Act,

which prohibits citizens and permanent residents convicted of certain sex offenses from petitioning family members for an immigrant visa, but in the course of DHS investigation, may also be found out in connection with other offenses, and thereby subject to possible removal. As federal and state law enforcement agencies have in the last several years effectively linked up their offender databases, these checkpoints have become extremely effective at identifying LPRs with law enforcement records, and at mistakenly sweeping up immigrants who do not.

The most perilous checkpoint however for LPRs is the Customs and Border Protection window at the U.S. airport or port of entry. Now, under US Visit and the DHS Northern Hemisphere Travel Initiative, returning LPRs must present their passports and I-551 green cards to gain entry into the United States, as well as submit a fingerprint scan. Now linked to the massive (and massively inaccurate) federal-state law enforcement database, LPRs who previously came and went in and out of the U.S. are now finding themselves being referred for deferred inspection and even being referred for removal and deportation proceedings, based on long ago arrests and convictions.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence talks about the many ways that the Department of Homeland Security is already controlling permanent residents with criminal records. They have even combined databases in order to track permanent residents with criminal pasts. As the affirmative you can argue that this exposes the need for the legal system to have involvement activities of permanent residence. The Department of Homeland Security is monitoring permanent residents’ activities through several different methods back lacks the legal support to take appropriate action. They’re tacking criminal activity and monitoring crime. But at the end of the day, our only means of punishment does not have the support of our legal system.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how permanent residents are already being deported for crimes. The majority of them are being deported for minor, non-violent crimes. However, their deportations are affecting their children in a real and severe way. This article presents several possible arguments for an affirmative speech. One, clearly permanent residents are already being monitored in the status quo, so there's no reason to pass this bill. Secondly, we are deporting long term residents without a real trial. They have no right to contest their deportation, and that's a criminal oversight on the part of our judicial system. You can argue that the bill helps solves for lack of punishment associated with criminal activity. Third, the deportation of permanent residents hurts their children. You can argue one or all of these points in your speech.

This second piece of evidence talks about the many ways that the Department of Homeland Security is already controlling permanent residents with criminal records. They have even combined databases in order to track permanent residents with criminal pasts. As the affirmative you can argue that this exposes the need for the legal system to have involvement activities of permanent residence. The Department of Homeland Security is monitoring permanent residents' activities through several different methods back lacks the legal support to take appropriate action. They're tacking criminal activity and monitoring crime. But at the end of the day, our only means of punishment does not have the support of our legal system.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Bill Does Not Fix Current Deportation Inconsistencies

The Nation, “Why Has President Obama Deported More Immigrants Than Any President in US History?” Alejandra Marchevsky, Beth Baker, March 31, 2014, <<https://www.thenation.com/article/why-has-president-obama-deported-more-immigrants-any-president-us-history/>>

“In 2012, Obama told the Spanish-language television network Univision that, “We try to focus our enforcement on people who generally pose a threat to our communities, not to hardworking families who are minding their own business and oftentimes have members of their family who are US citizens.”

As proof that it is weeding out the “bad guys,” Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) recently reported that 59 percent of deportations in fiscal year 2013 involved noncitizens with criminal records...

“Smart enforcement” strategies have led to an unprecedented level of cooperation between ICE, the FBI and local police agencies as they seek to target “terrorists” and “criminal aliens.” Not surprisingly, the proportion of criminal to non-criminal deportations has grown steadily over the past decade.

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence talks about how 59% of deportations in 2013 were because of non-citizens criminal records. The proportion of criminal to non-criminal deportations has grown steadily over time. As the negative, you have to argue that the deportation of noncriminal permanent citizens is a gross injustice. We aren’t trying to punish people who are hard-working and passionate about pursuing citizenship, but this Bill does not protect these people. The Bill focuses on punishing the wrong doers while not mentioning the protection of the people in the right. We should not pass this bill until we ensure the protection of non-criminal permanent citizens. We cannot pass this bill for until we can ensure both fairness and public safety.*

NEG – Deportation is a Larger Criminal Deterrent than Incarceration

NYSDA Immigrant Defense Project, “ALERT FOR LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS WITH CRIMINAL RECORDS CONSIDERING APPLYING FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP,” Accessed October 18, 2015, <http://www.sikhcoalition.org/documents/pdf/03_citizensalert.pdf>

“Any lawful permanent resident who has ever been arrested and charged with a crime, no matter how minor or how long ago, should proceed carefully...the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (“BCIS”) may place such a permanent resident in removal proceedings (formerly called deportation proceedings).”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that permanent residents are being deported for crimes no matter how minor or how long ago they were committed (the AFF articles talk a little about this too). In the status quo, The Department of Homeland Security searches the pasts of Permanent Residents to see if they have a criminal past. This is much more effective and direct approach to dealing with immigrants charged with criminal activity. As the NEG, you should argue that forcing permanent residence through the legal process would further*

congest the legal system and not as much of a criminal deterrent as deportation. Many immigrants find a better life for them in the US prison system and maintain the means to support their families to some extent. Instead of support the legal rights of these people, they should be forced out of the country.

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence talks about how 59% of deportations in 2013 were because of non-citizens criminal records. The proportion of criminal to non-criminal deportations has grown steadily over time. As the negative, you have to argue that the deportation of noncriminal permanent citizens is a gross injustice. We aren't trying to punish people who are hard-working and passionate about pursuing citizenship, but this Bill does not protect these people. The Bill focuses on punishing the wrong doers while not mentioning the protection of the people in the right. We should not pass this bill until we ensure the protection of non-criminal permanent citizens. We cannot pass this bill for until we can ensure both fairness and public safety.

This second piece of evidence says that permanent residents are being deported for crimes no matter how minor or how long ago they were committed (the AFF articles talk a little about this too). In the status quo, The Department of Homeland Security searches the pasts of Permanent Residents to see if they have a criminal past. This is much more effective and direct approach to dealing with immigrants charged with criminal activity. As the NEG, you should argue that forcing permanent residence through the legal process would further congest the legal system and not as much of a criminal deterrent as deportation. Many immigrants find a better life for them in the US prison system and maintain the means to support their families to some extent. Instead of support the legal rights of these people, they should be forced out of the country.

Legislation – A Resolution to Combat the After-effects of Natural Disasters
and Other Emergencies
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – We Should Put More Money into FEMA, Not Less

US News “We Should Put More, Not Less, Into FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund” James M. Kendra and Scott Gabriel Knowles, November 1, 2012 < <http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/should-femas-responsibilities-be-handed-over-to-the-states/we-should-put-more-not-less-into-femas-disaster-relief-fund>>

“Suggesting that FEMA's emergency responsibilities be handed over to the states is a dangerous proposition that will interrupt the evolution of a stable emergency management system, and will ultimately place more citizens and more property at risk.

FEMA was founded in 1979, following a policy-advocacy process brought about by the National Governors Association. They needed help shoving aside the futile civil defense bureaucracy in Washington (with its emphasis on surviving all-out nuclear war), and they needed a single agency where they could turn for assistance in coordinating disaster victim relief, temporary housing, business loans, and reconstruction.

In the period through the '80s and early '90s, FEMA was regarded as a haven for political appointments, but it reached a high point of professionalism (and Cabinet status) in the Clinton years under James Lee Witt. It was restructured and reorganized again in the Bush administration after 9/11, when it was placed within the Department of Homeland Security. Then the entire national emergency management strategy was restructured another time after Hurricane Katrina, rightfully considering the failures of the Katrina response.

Management scientists estimate it takes an organization 10 years to institutionalize change, but FEMA has been structurally changed and repurposed much more frequently than that, often with the arrival of a new administration. Casual talk about dismantling FEMA now, or “returning” its responsibilities to the states disregards a key point: This isn't just about FEMA, it's about a commitment to a long and critical process of building our national emergency planning capabilities.

FEMA has never supplanted the responsibilities of states and localities to respond to disasters. Local initiatives are the backbone of disaster management. But by definition a disaster is an event that surpasses those capabilities, and that requires assistance from elsewhere. FEMA's principal role is coordination of government agencies and the disaster-oriented private and nonprofit organizations. If there were no FEMA, something like FEMA would have to be developed, in each disaster.

Rather than putting the weight of disaster response back on the states, it makes far more sense to invest now into infrastructures of protection that will reduce our national exposure to disasters—and we should put more, not less, into FEMA's disaster relief fund. Costlier storms are the new normal in the United States. It makes no sense to pretend we live in a time when states can go it alone.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that FEMA should be able to get things done, but the program has been altered and changed so many times that it hasn't been able to plant roots*

that are necessary for disaster relief. The organization has also received less funding than is necessary, and as a result, disasters have had devastating effects on the United States. We must put full support into FEMA and award them more funding, so they can respond to natural disasters and other emergencies in a timely manner with a plan that works. With more money, FEMA could keep America's emergency response state in high alert, and that's something we need with the increase in natural disasters in recent years.

AFF – FEMA's Global Warming Decision Smart

Philly "FEMA to deny funds to warming deniers" Katherine Bagley, March 22, 2015 <

http://www.philly.com/philly/news/politics/20150322_FEMA_to_deny_funds_to_warming_deniers.html>

"If a state has a climate denier governor that doesn't want to accept a plan, that would risk mitigation work not getting done because of politics," said Becky Hammer, an attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council's water program. "The governor would be increasing the risk to citizens in that state" because of his climate beliefs.

The policy doesn't affect federal money for relief after a hurricane, flood, or other disaster. Specifically, beginning in March 2016, states seeking preparedness money will have to assess how climate change threatens their communities. Governors will have to sign off on hazard-mitigation plans. While some states, including New York, have already started incorporating climate risks in their plans, most haven't because FEMA's 2008 guidelines didn't require it.

"This could potentially become a major conflict for several Republican governors," said Barry Rabe, an expert on the politics of climate change at the University of Michigan. "We aren't just talking about coastal states."

Climate change affects droughts, rainfall, and tornado activity. Fracking is being linked to more earthquakes, he said. "This could affect state leaders across the country." ...

... Environmentalists have been pressing FEMA to include global warming in its hazard-mitigation guidelines for almost three years. FEMA told the Natural Resources Defense Council in early 2014 that it would revise the guidelines. It issued draft rules in October and officially released the new procedures last week as partisan politics around climate change have been intensifying.

... "The challenges posed by climate change, such as more intense storms, frequent heavy precipitation, heat waves, drought, extreme flooding, and higher sea levels, could significantly alter the types and magnitudes of hazards impacting states in the future," FEMA wrote in its new procedures."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the issue of denying states money that they might need in order to make them worry and fix issues related to the intensity of Global Warming. First, as the affirmative, you can argue that this funding does not affect national disaster funding, which would still remain intact, so the protection from hurricanes and other disasters would STILL be included in the funding given by FEMA. It's only in regards to states. Second, you should argue that this is a great decision by the organization, because it's a step to try to limit the amount of disasters actually occur. Global warming contributes to disasters, by forcing states to respond to that, and assess the impacts, will reduce the amount of disasters in the*

country. This is a smart decision that shows that FEMA knows what it's doing, and can be trusted with additional funding.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that FEMA should be able to get things done, but the program has been altered and changed so many times that it hasn't been able to plant roots that are necessary for disaster relief. The organization has also received less funding than is necessary, and as a result, disasters have had devastating effects on the United States. We must put full support into FEMA and award them more funding, so they can respond to natural disasters and other emergencies in a timely manner with a plan that works. With more money, FEMA could keep America's emergency response state in high alert, and that's something we need with the increase in natural disasters in recent years.

The second article talks about the issue of denying states money that they might need in order to make them worry and fix issues related to the intensity of Global Warming. First, as the affirmative, you can argue that this funding does not affect national disaster funding, which would still remain intact, so the protection from hurricanes and other disasters would STILL be included in the funding given by FEMA. It's only in regards to states. Second, you should argue that this is a great decision by the organization, because it's a step to try to limit the amount of disasters actually occur. Global warming contributes to disasters, by forcing states to respond to that, and assess the impacts, will reduce the amount of disasters in the country. This is a smart decision that shows that FEMA knows what it's doing, and can be trusted with additional funding.

Negative Evidence

NEG – FEMA Plays a Political Game

Mother Jones “This Is How the Federal Government Is Going to Force Your State to Prepare for Climate Change” Luke Whelan, April 1, 2015 < <http://www.motherjones.com/environment/2015/03/fema-governors-climate-change>>

“The Federal Emergency Management Agency wants states to do a better job planning for the natural disasters they are likely to face in a warming world. Beginning next year, the agency will require states to evaluate the risks that climate change poses to their communities in order to gain access to millions of dollars of disaster preparedness funding.

Environmentalists are praising the plan. But some on the right are furious, claiming that the Obama administration is seeking to punish states whose governors dispute the overwhelming scientific consensus that humans are warming the planet. “FEMA toys with denying disaster funds for states that doubt global warming,” warned the Drudge Report.

The new requirement won't affect the post-disaster relief that communities receive after being devastated by hurricanes or tornados. Rather, the change comes as part of FEMA's revision to its State Hazard Mitigation Plan guidelines. Under its Hazard Mitigation Assistance program, FEMA allocates disaster preparedness funds to states that submit formal documents outlining the risks their communities face and how they plan to address them. These efforts might include purchasing flood-prone properties to prevent future losses, building air-conditioned refuges for major heat waves, or creating procedures for shutting down or moving equipment in a floodplain...

... But the provision could put many climate-skeptic governors—especially those from the disaster-prone Gulf states—in a tough spot. The new guidelines also require the state's “highest elected official” to formally sign-off on the plan in order to “demonstrate statewide recognition” of...its contents...

... It's perhaps not a surprise then that many of the states doing the least to prepare for climate change have received the most disaster relief money from FEMA. As of 2013, six of the top 10 recipients of National Flood Insurance Program payouts made no mention or minimal mention of climate change in their mitigation plans, according to the Columbia report.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article, while also an interesting read, discusses the political schemes of FEMA, and presents us with a great negative argument against this legislation. FEMA’s job is to protect the United States in terms of natural disasters, not take funds away to push a political agenda centering climate change. We all have seen the lack of response from FEMA, but now they want to withhold funds from states that don’t agree with them? That isn’t an organization that we should openly support, and we shouldn’t give this organization more money that they won’t even give to the states that deserve them.*

NEG – FEMA Needs Reform, Not More Money

The Heritage Foundation “FEMA Reform Needed: Congress Must Act” David Inserra, February 4, 2015 <<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/02/fema-reform-needed-congress-must-act>>

“Throughout most of U.S. history, state and local governments were responsible for responding to nearly all disasters. Under President Ronald Reagan, FEMA averaged 28 federal disasters declarations a year. Following the passage of the Stafford Act in 1988, this number dramatically changed, with federal disaster declarations steadily rising so that under President George W. Bush and President Obama, the U.S. has averaged around 130 federal disaster declarations a year.[1] The result has been that FEMA now responds to a disaster every 2.8 days and has needed more and more money to cover the costs of responding to growing numbers of disasters to which it responds. The Stafford Act has at least two provisions that are to blame. First, the act shifts at least 75 percent of disaster response costs to the federal government.[2] In the event of a disaster, states normally have to pay for the costs of responding, but if the President declares the disaster a major disaster worthy of federal assistance, then 75 percent or more of response costs are covered by the federal government. The result has been that states now request federal help whenever they can, since it will bring federal dollars. This creates a vicious cycle as states respond to increased federalization of disasters by preparing less and setting less funding aside for disasters. As a result, states are less prepared for disasters, they request more government help, and thus the cycle is perpetuated.

The second problematic provision of the Stafford Act makes it far too easy for states to request disaster assistance. The act vaguely requires that a disaster be “of such severity and magnitude that effective response is beyond the capabilities of the State and the affected local governments and that Federal assistance is necessary,”[3] and that storm-related damages top approximately \$1.40 per capita, which for several states is less than \$1 million...

... To stop the over-federalization of disasters and the harm it does to FEMA’s ability to respond, Congress must return more responsibility for smaller disasters to states...

... FEMA is in need of serious reform. Disaster relief and response should be focused on the truly catastrophic, and DHS grants should be focused on those areas of greatest risk. Such reforms will free up DHS resources and funding that can be redirected to underfunded priorities, such as the Coast Guard, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or efforts to counter violent extremism and terrorism. Rather than focusing on developing and implementing executive amnesty as DHS currently is, it is time that Congress gave FEMA the attention, focus, and scrutiny it deserves.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the problems with FEMA in the status quo, and how the organization is in need of serious reform. They don’t do their job well – not because they don’t have enough money – but because they aren’t doing their jobs right. FEMA is a disaster, and we essentially need another FEMA (for government organizations) to come in and fix it, before we ever think about giving it more money. We should stand in negation of this bill until FEMA proves itself worthy of extra funding.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article, while also an interesting read, discusses the political schemes of FEMA, and presents us with a great negative argument against this legislation. FEMA's job is to protect the United States in terms of natural disasters, not take funds away to push a political agenda centering climate change. We all have seen the lack of response from FEMA, but now they want to withhold funds from states that don't agree with them? That isn't an organization that we should openly support, and we shouldn't give this organization more money that they won't even give to the states that deserve them.

The second article discusses the problems with FEMA in the status quo, and how the organization is need serious need of reform. They don't do their job well – not because they don't have enough money – but because they aren't doing their jobs right. FEMA is a disaster, and we essentially need another FEMA (for government organizations) to come in and fix it, before we ever think about giving it more money. We should stand in negation of this bill until FEMA proves itself worthy of extra funding.

Legislation – A Bill to Allow Businesses to Refuse to Serve Customers Based on Their Religion

Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Jeb Bush Believes Denying Service Based on Religion is NOT Discrimination

Huffington Post, “Jeb Bush Says Christian Business Owners Can Refuse To Serve Gay Weddings” May 17, 2015, < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/05/17/jeb-bush-gay-weddings_n_7301728.html >

“Presidential candidate Jeb Bush said that Christian business owners should not have to provide services for gay weddings if it goes against their religious beliefs.

“Yes, absolutely, if it’s based on a religious belief,” he said when asked by the Christian Broadcasting Network in an interview Saturday if businesses should be able to decline services to same-sex weddings.

The former Florida governor justified his position by claiming that not providing a service does not count as discrimination if business owners feel that it violates their religious rights.

“A big country, a tolerant country, ought to be able to figure out the difference between discriminating someone because of their sexual orientation and not forcing someone to participate in a wedding that they find goes against their moral beliefs,” he said. “This should not be that complicated. Gosh, it is right now.”

The blurry distinction has become a controversial topic, as many wedding-related businesses around the country, like florists and bakeries, have turned down gay customers, citing religious freedom. The issue became politically charged in March, when Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R) signed the Religious Freedom Restoration Act into law, which allows businesses to cite religious rights as a reason for refusing service. Many in the GOP presidential field, including Bush, defended the law. “Once the facts are established, people aren’t going to see this as discriminatory at all,” he said in March.

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that presidential candidate Jeb Bush believes Christian business owners should not have to provide services for same-sex weddings if it goes against their religion. He says there’s a difference between discrimination and choosing not to serve someone because of religious beliefs. Many GOP politicians agree and Indiana already signed an act into law allowing business owners to refuse service based on religious reasons. If you argue in affirmation of this bill, you have to articulate that refusal to serve isn’t discrimination. Refusing to allow business owners the right to religion IS discriminatory.*

AFF – Religious Expression is a Freedom of Speech Issue

The Daily Signal, “Kentucky Court Says Printing Business Has Right to Deny Service for Religious Reasons,” Kelsey Harkness, April 27, 2015, < <http://dailysignal.com/2015/04/27/kentucky-court-says-printing-business-has-right-to-deny-service-for-religious-reasons/> >

“A Kentucky court ruled on Monday that a Lexington printing business does not have to print messages that are in conflict with its religious beliefs...

The Kentucky ruling signals that states and local governments are still divided on the question about whether public places have the right to refuse service based on religious objections.

“What this court found in this case is that no one should be forced to promote ideas—or in this case, print ideas—that conflict with their beliefs,” said Jim Campbell, an attorney for Alliance Defending Freedom representing the printing business. “That protection is for everyone. It’s a protection that’s for the atheist just as much as it’s for the person of faith.”

The printing company, Hands On Originals, is a small business located in Fayette County, Ky.

The company prints custom messages on items such as shirts, hats, bags, cups, and mugs.

The issue began on March 18, 2012, when Aaron Baker, representing the Gay and Lesbian Services Organization, alleged that Hands On Originals denied that group “full and equal enjoyment of a service” by refusing to print official t-shirts for the organization’s 2012 Pride Festival.

The Gay and Lesbian Services Organization advocates for the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer community....

After appealing to the state, Adamson, co-owner of Hands On Originals won the case, when a Fayette County Circuit judge ruled he has a “constitutional right of freedom of expression from government coercion.”

“With all due respect to the Hearing Commissioner and the Human Rights Commission [the plaintiffs arguments] are not factually accurate and are in direct contrast to well established precedent from the United States Supreme Court interpreting the Federal Constitution,” wrote Judge James Ishmael.

The Hearing Commissioner agrees that these cases support a finding that when [Hands On Originals] prints a promotional item, it acts as a speaker, and that this act of speaking is constitutionally protected.

Campbell, the lawyer representing the printing business, says the case signifies that the issue of religious expression in the workplace will continue to be debated in the courts.

And in this case, he said, the judge’s ruling “affirms the right of Americans to live out their faith in the workplace.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that a Kentucky court ruled in favor of a business’s right to refuse service based on religion. The judge ruled that business owners have the “constitutional right of freedom of expression free from government coercion.” It is business owners’ constitutional right to express themselves, religiously or otherwise. Businesses shouldn’t be forced to promote ideas that go against their beliefs. This is a bill for religious business owners, but it’s also a bill for everyone who wants to operate free from forced government interference. It’s a slippery slope to allow our government to force people to act outside of their beliefs.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that presidential candidate Jeb Bush believes Christian business owners should not have to provide services for same-sex weddings if it goes against their religion. He says there's a difference between discrimination and choosing not to serve someone because of religious beliefs. Many GOP politicians agree and Indiana already signed an act into law allowing business owners to refuse service based on religious reasons. If you argue in affirmation of this bill, you have to articulate that refusal to serve isn't discrimination. Refusing to allow business owners the right to religion IS discriminatory.

The second article says that a Kentucky court ruled in favor of a business's right to refuse service based on religion. The judge ruled that business owners have the "constitutional right of freedom of expression free from government coercion." It is business owners' constitutional right to express themselves, religiously or otherwise. Businesses shouldn't be forced to promote ideas that go against their beliefs. This is a bill for religious business owners, but it's also a bill for everyone who wants to operate free from forced government interference. It's a slippery slope to allow our government to force people to act outside of their beliefs.

Negative Evidence

NEG – ACLU Says Religion is An Excuse to Discriminate and States Agree

ACLU, “Using Religion to Discriminate,” Accessed October 21, 2015, < <https://www.aclu.org/feature/using-religion-discriminate> >

“While the situations may differ, one thing remains the same: religion is being used as an excuse to discriminate against and harm others.

Instances of institutions and individuals claiming a right to discriminate in the name of religion aren’t new. In the 1960s, we saw institutions object to laws requiring integration in restaurants because of sincerely held beliefs that God wanted the races to be separate. We saw religiously affiliated universities refuse to admit students who engaged in interracial dating. In those cases, we recognized that requiring integration was not about violating religious liberty; it was about ensuring fairness. It is no different today.

Religious freedom in America means that we all have a right to our religious beliefs, but this does not give us the right to use our religion to discriminate against and impose those beliefs on others who do not share them.

Through litigation, advocacy and public education, the ACLU works to defend religious liberty and to ensure that no one is either discriminated against nor denied services because of someone else’s religious beliefs...

In many states, businesses are barred by law from discriminating against customers based on their sexual orientation, as well as based on race, religion, or other legally protected categories. Increasingly, we see business owners claiming that they do not have to follow these laws but can instead refuse to provide services – including lodging, wedding dresses, and photography services – because the owners object to same-sex relationships. In addition, we see social service organizations that receive government funding deny services to same-sex couples. Everyone is entitled to their own religious beliefs, but when you operate a business or run a publicly funded social service agency open to the public, those beliefs do not give you a right to discriminate.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence is from the American Civil Liberties Union. It draws parallels between this bill and segregation in the 1960s (paragraph 2). People have been using religion as an excuse to discriminate for centuries. It is immoral and irrational to allow business owners to discriminate. Everyone is entitled to their religious beliefs, and they can practice them freely. However, if those religious beliefs result in discrimination, you shouldn’t be serving the public. Period.*

NEG – Religious Leaders Agree: We Shouldn’t Let Religion Rule Business

Michigan Live, “Why businesses should, and should not, be able to refuse service to LGBT people,” April 7, 2015, < http://www.mlive.com/opinion/grand-rapids/index.ssf/2015/04/religious_freedom_lgbt_west_mi.html >

“Doug Van Doren, the pastor of Plymouth United Church of Christ, responds:

‘As a clergy, and looking at history, it is clear that sometimes individuals and groups need to be protected from overzealous religion. The Inquisition, the Salem Witch Trials, slavery (largely supported by Christian theology) and discrimination against women are but a few examples. One’s personal beliefs aside, it is simply anarchy if everyone gets to decide whom they judge to

be worthy of being served. The title, "Religious Freedom and Restoration Act" implies that freedoms have been taken away. I can think of none! In the U. S., one's personal religious practice is safe guarded. However, when individuals are serving the public their individual discriminatory behavior, even if it is based on their religious beliefs, should not be supported by the state. Holding fast to one's religious beliefs often is costly. If I cannot uphold my personal religious beliefs and serve the public, it is I, not the public, who should bear the cost.'

Fred Stella, the Pracharak (Outreach Minister) for the West Michigan Hindu Temple, responds:

'Besides discriminating against those in the LGBT community, which is offensive enough, think of this scenario: What if I were to attempt to rent an apartment and the landlord knew I was Hindu. He might be savvy enough to know I would probably have a small meditation area with an altar. That altar might include icons of figures such as Shiva & Krishna. To many people this would be considered idolatry. If the landlord has a religious revulsion toward such activity it sure seems likely that he could use this law to bar me from renting. It doesn't take much imagination to see how far this could all expand.'

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence includes quotes from two different religious leaders who oppose this bill. Neither of them believe that business owners should have the right to refuse service based on religion. Both of their quotes are really well spoken. The second quote by the Pracharak of a Hindu Temple is particularly strong. He really shows how dangerous this bill could become. It also presents a really strong argument outside of the LGBT context, so you could have a really unique argument using his quote as the foundation of the speech.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence is from the American Civil Liberties Union. It draws parallels between this bill and segregation in the 1960s (paragraph 2). People have been using religion as an excuse to discriminate for centuries. It is immoral and irrational to allow business owners to discriminate. Everyone is entitled to their religious beliefs, and they can practice them freely. However, if those religious beliefs result in discrimination, you shouldn't be serving the public. Period.

The second piece of evidence includes quotes from two different religious leaders who oppose this bill. Neither of them believe that business owners should have the right to refuse service based on religion. Both of their quotes are really well spoken. The second quote by the Pracharak of a Hindu Temple is particularly strong. He really shows how dangerous this bill could become. It also presents a really strong argument outside of the LGBT context, so you could have a really unique argument using his quote as the foundation of the speech.

Legislation – A Resolution to Create a Standardized Public School Dress Code Policy to Provide More Comfortable Learning Atmospheres
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Dress Codes in Status Quo Subjugate Women

She Knows “School superintendent under fire for calling girls a nasty name over dress code violations”
Eve Vawter, September 2, 2014 < <http://www.sheknows.com/parenting/articles/1049137/school-superintendent-under-fire-for-calling-girls-skanks-over-dress-code-violations>>

“I’m all for dress codes in schools. I think having standards for what kids wear to class can be conducive to an effective learning environment and help ensure that kids don’t get injured while wearing flips flops or don’t offend others by wearing questionable T-shirts. Dress codes also mean that no one has to see the tops of someone’s underwear if their jeans are all saggy. I personally like uniforms because I believe school is for learning and not a fashion show and kids can learn to express their individuality in ways other than how they dress or on weekends or after school. I have no issue with any of this. But what I do take issue with is how these dress code policies are usually enforced under the guise of protecting male students from viewing female student’s body parts because we all know, boys are incapable of getting their learn on if they see a flash of female thigh. Boys are never called skanks because they wore a sleeveless T-shirt to school.

Dress codes should be the same for both female and male students across the board. Students should be taught that they shouldn’t objectify female students due to what they wear.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how dress codes are necessary, but current dress codes reflect poorly on girls, and are sexist, because they don’t target boys. Boys aren’t called skanks or aren’t forced to wear certain clothes as to not distract the opposite sex. This bill would help with that problem, because it would give everyone equal opportunity to adapt their dress code. Whether you like the rules or not, it doesn’t matter, as long as they aren’t promoting rape culture. School is for learning, and there are other ways to express yourself besides how you dress. We put too much emphasis in high school and middle school on how students dress, and there shouldn’t be different rules for how each gender adapts to their new dress code.*

AFF – Dress Codes Should be Equal

Al Jazeera America “School dress codes unfairly target girls” Jennifer Weiss-Wolf, October 14, 2014 < <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/10/school-dress-codegirlsstudentprotestsmplewoodnewjersey.html>>

“The rules applied across the country, however, go well beyond short shorts. For example, a school in North Dakota recently banned skinny jeans, leggings and yoga pants. What these examples tend to have in common is the targeting of girls — and not just of bare skin but of the female silhouette itself.

The trend has created a new front in the dress code wars. Refusing to be shamed, girls are instead raising their voices. They are demanding to be treated with fairness — as more than the sum of their body parts and more than a classroom distraction to boys. Students at Tottenville High School in Staten Island, New York, and Bingham High

School in South Jordan, Utah, have recently walked out of classes, protesting strict and unfair dress code enforcement...

... But more needs to be done. Our coalition is seeking a change of perspective and focus away from the culture of punishment, blame and shaming and toward one of equality and respect. Our goal is to create a districtwide policy that ensures equal treatment of girls, including fair messaging to and expectations of boys.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how dress codes are targeted towards girls. The issue with dress codes is that they are sexist, and focus more on stopping girls from being girls, and excusing boys being boys. This bill would solve this issue, taking dress codes and updating the standards at which they are held. If dress codes were updated and allowed to evolve, then we wouldn't have these protests and issues. Equality and freedom need to be understood – boys can't harass girls, and girls shouldn't focus on getting boys' attention (if that be the case). School is for learning, and there are better and more productive ways of expressing yourself. Let's make dress codes a non-issue.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how dress codes are necessary, but current dress codes reflect poorly on girls, and are sexist, because they don't target boys. Boys aren't called skanks or aren't forced to wear certain clothes as to not distract the opposite sex. This bill would help with that problem, because it would give everyone equal opportunity to adapt their dress code. Whether you like the rules or not, it doesn't matter, as long as they aren't promoting rape culture. School is for learning, and there are other ways to express yourself besides how you dress. We put too much emphasis in high school and middle school on how students dress, and there shouldn't be different rules for how each gender adapts to their new dress code.

This second article talks about how dress codes are targeted towards girls. The issue with dress codes is that they are sexist, and focus more on stopping girls from being girls, and excusing boys being boys. This bill would solve this issue, taking dress codes and updating the standards at which they are held. If dress codes were updated and allowed to evolve, then we wouldn't have these protests and issues. Equality and freedom need to be understood – boys can't harass girls, and girls shouldn't focus on getting boys' attention (if that be the case). School is for learning, and there are better and more productive ways of expressing yourself. Let's make dress codes a non-issue.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Dress Codes Shouldn't be Enforced

Huffington Post “These Quotes From Students Nail Everything That's Wrong With School Dress Codes” Sara Boboltz, June 25, 2014 < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/06/25/dress-code-problems_n_5420985.html>

“But many students are hitting back at schools with incisive critiques over how their schools are failing them. Here, in the students' words, is what's wrong with their school dress codes.

“Too distracting for boys' is giving us the impression we should be guilty for what guys do.”...

... “It's almost teaching us that if any guys harass us, it's the girl's fault.”...

... “We [female students] have all these restrictions on our clothing while boys didn't have to sit through it at all.”...

... “I've been told that even though my skirts were technically acceptable, they were still too short for me to wear.”...

... When educators use shame as a tool to enforce a system of rules that singles out one group of individuals, they miss an opportunity to encourage positive self-image and equal respect for others. And while there's always room for healthy debate in a learning environment, it seems all the time that goes into squabbling over the dress code could be better spent, you know, actually learning.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article provides several quotes about school dress codes. You should really read the entire article, because there's a lot of valuable information there if you choose to run this attack. This bill addresses the issue an outdated dress codes, but provides the wrong solution. We should not try and update dress codes because we are still limiting the ability for these student to express themselves and be comfortable. This isn't a solution – its taking the same problem and giving it a new updated look.*

NEG – Dress Codes Aren't a Necessity Anymore

Associated Press, Fox News “What should students wear? Who decides? Dress codes can be a real minefield for schools” April 16, 2014 < <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2014/04/16/what-should-students-wear-who-decides-dress-codes-can-be-real-minefield-for/>>

“We were always pro dress code. Now I think, 'Is it really that important?'" says Jamie Renfro. She's the mother of a third-grader Kamryn Renfro, who recently gained national attention when she decided to shave her head to support her 11-year-old friend Delaney Clements, who has cancer and lost her hair after chemotherapy.

After she shaved her head, 9-year-old Kamryn was suspended from her public charter school in Grand Junction, Colo. — though the school's board quickly reversed the decision.

Now, because of her daughter's experience, Renfro says she catches herself paying attention at school events to dress code violations — earrings that might be too big, or a boy's hair that is longer than shoulder length.

"But does the length of the kids' hair doesn't necessarily affect them in the classroom?" she asks. "I really doubt it does."

Haley Bocanegra, a 17-year-old junior from Riverside, Ill., regularly pushes the limits even further at her school, sometimes dressing like a boy, or wearing wigs and goggles for a "Steampunk" outfit, or a Japanese anime costume.

She says teachers usually have a harder time with it than her classmates do.

"I'm paying attention in class. So why are you making a big deal about it?" the honors student asks, showing them the student handbook to prove she's not violating the code.

At least one former teacher who's now an expert in education law advises schools to continue to focus instead on safety — and to ignore students' unusual dress, if it's not disruptive or disrespectful in some way.

Beyond that, Nancy Hablutzel, a professor of education at the Chicago-Kent College of Law, says consistency is important.

"But," she says, "so is common sense."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how dress codes were initially started with good intentions, but they have spiraled out of control. The goal of this Congress should be to eliminate school dress codes altogether, not make them even stricter for some students. While the intentions are good, in this case, it's not the right answer. We live in a time where self-expression means a lot, and if you are performing well in school, why should there be an issue? Putting stricter regulations isn't the answer – putting more relaxed restrictions should be the goal.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article provides several quotes about school dress codes. You should really read the entire article, because there's a lot of valuable information there if you choose to run this attack. This bill addresses the issue an outdated dress codes, but provides the wrong solution. We should not try and update dress codes because we are still limiting the ability for these student to express themselves and be comfortable. This isn't a solution – its taking the same problem and giving it a new updated look.

This second article talks about how dress codes were initially started with good intentions, but they have spiraled out of control. The goal of this Congress should be to eliminate school dress codes altogether, not make them even stricter for some students. While the intentions are good, in this case, it's not the right answer. We live in a time where self-expression means a lot, and if you are performing well in school, why should there be an issue? Putting stricter regulations isn't the answer – putting more relaxed restrictions should be the goal.

Legislation – A Resolution to Elect the Red Wolf as the United States
National Animal
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Benjamin Franklin Hated the Bald Eagle, Bald Eagle Saved from Extinction

The Dodo “13 Things Every American Should Know About Bald Eagles” Stephen Messenger, July 3, 2014
<<https://www.thedodo.com/13-things-every-american-shoul-613959995.html>>

“3. Ol' Benjamin Franklin didn't want Bald Eagles as the National Symbol because he thought they were mean.

There's a lot to like about America's portliest Founding Father, the ever-affable, beer-loving, bi-focal inventing Benjamin Franklin. But if there's one thing to disagree with him about, it's his unfavorable opinion of Bald Eagles. After the birds were selected as the new nation's official emblem in 1787, Franklin was less than thrilled:

I wish that the bald eagle had not been chosen as the representative of our country, he is a bird of bad moral character, he does not get his living honestly, you may have seen him perched on some dead tree, where, too lazy to fish for himself, he watches the labor of the fishing-hawk, and when that diligent bird has at length taken a fish, and is bearing it to its nest for the support of his mate and young ones, the bald eagle pursues him and takes it from him....

13. They were once nearly extinct, but conservation brought them back from the brink.

During the 18th century, there were an estimated 500,000 Bald Eagles soaring in the skies of North America, living symbols of a proud new nation. In the decades that followed, they began to diminish due to habitat loss and because they'd become a frequent target among hunters and trappers.

By 1940, killing the birds became illegal, but their decline continued from another threat -- the widely-used pesticide DDT, the runoff from which poisoned huge portions of their food supply. In the 1950s, only 412 breeding eagle pairs were counted in the whole of the contiguous 48 states.

Faced with the very real possibility that the national bird could be wiped out entirely, in 1967 they were added to the Endangered Species list. Not long after, DDT was banned and the birds began a remarkable recovery. In 1992, Bald Eagle numbers reached over 100,000 and rising.

In 2007, after sufficiently recovering thanks to concerted conservation efforts, Bald Eagles were delisted, though stringent protections still exist to this day.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that Benjamin Franklin actually despised the Bald Eagle, because he thought it was a mean bird that profited off of others. It wasn't exemplary of the country that he wanted the United States of America to be. Beyond that, this article talks about how bald eagles were indeed saved from extinction, most likely a result of being the US national animal. Because it was a symbol for the United States, more people cared about their preservation. That is something that is needed for the Red Wolf now, especially by the Fish and*

Wildlife Service, who recently abandoned a conservation effort to protect and save the Red Wolves.

AFF – FWS is Abandoning Conservation of Red Wolf, Could Cause Eventual Extinction

Nature World News “Fed Halts Red Wolf Recovery in North Carolina” Brian Stallard, July 10, 2015 <<http://www.natureworldnews.com/articles/15503/20150710/fed-halts-red-wolf-recovery-north-carolina.htm>>

“The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has decided to put the brakes on a recovery program for one of the most endangered species of canine in all of North America, the red wolf. And while the Service assures us that this does not spell the end for the program entirely, it has done little to quell the ire of conservation groups...

... "Make no mistake, this is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service abandoning endangered red wolves while they stand at the brink of extinction," Brett Hartl, the endangered species policy director at the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD), said in a recent statement.

As things stand, it is estimated that a little more than 100 red wolves (*Canis rufus*) in North America, with a maximum of 75 located a peninsula in North Carolina - the product of an experimental release in the 1980s. The recent decision made by the FWS was to indefinitely suspend plans to introduce more red wolves to those wilds while the effectiveness and impact of the program is investigated...

... Still, for many conservationists, the FWS' decision reeks of abandonment, especially with no concrete dates set for when the program will be resumed.

"The emphasis and tone have moved far away from the conservation and recovery of an endangered species," Sierra Weaver, an attorney with the Southern Environmental Law Center in Chapel Hill, NC, told The American Association for the Advancement of Science. "[The Service] seems to be preparing the public for its eventual extinction in the wild."

"The agency can dress it up in bureaucrat-speak but there's no avoiding the fact that the recovery program for the red wolf... is being left to wither on the vine," Hartl added. "More study of the red wolf recovery program is not needed - we know how to recover and restore red wolves to the landscape... What is needed right now is for the agency to stop appeasing radical right-wing elements that despise wildlife and want to see the Endangered Species Act repealed.""

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the Fish and Wildlife Service stopped an effort that could have saved the Red Wolf from extinction. While the negative might argue that enough is being done in the status quo to save the Red Wolf, this is proof that all of the efforts they were talking about have been halted due to political tension and a lack of support for saving extinct animals. We must protect these animals, and by declaring them the national animal for the United States, it will raise awareness for the animal, and could potentially save them. Beyond the fact that the wolf is a very majestic animal, and the rarity factor should also play a part – they are a unique animal that deserves American attention, and deserves to be a national symbol.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that Benjamin Franklin actually despised the Bald Eagle, because he thought it was a mean bird that profited off of others. It wasn't exemplary of the country that he wanted the United States of America to be. Beyond that, this article talks about how bald eagles were indeed saved from extinction, most likely a result of being the US national animal. Because it was a symbol for the United States, more people cared about their preservation. That is something that is needed for the Red Wolf now, especially by the Fish and Wildlife Service, who recently abandoned a conservation effort to protect and save the Red Wolves.

The second article talks about how the Fish and Wildlife Service stopped an effort that could have saved the Red Wolf from extinction. While the negative might argue that enough is being done in the status quo to save the Red Wolf, this is proof that all of the efforts they were talking about have been halted due to political tension and a lack of support for saving extinct animals. We must protect these animals, and by declaring them the national animal for the United States, it will raise awareness for the animal, and could potentially save them. Beyond the fact that the wolf is a very majestic animal, and the rarity factor should also play a part – they are a unique animal that deserves American attention, and deserves to be a national symbol.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Bald Eagle is Amazing, Exemplary of the United States in Many Ways

The Dodo “13 Things Every American Should Know About Bald Eagles” Stephen Messenger, July 3, 2014
<<https://www.thedodo.com/13-things-every-american-shoul-613959995.html>>

“Most people already know that the Bald Eagle is the national animal of the U.S.A., but there's much more to them than that alone. Here are 13 things that every American should know about these marvelous birds of prey.

...4. They're surprisingly good swimmers....

5. They live in every state in the Union, except for Hawaii.

Of all 59 species of eagle in the world, two of which are native to U.S., Bald Eagles are the only ones that live exclusively in North America -- which was one of the very good reasons they were selected as our national symbol.

(Yes, Bald Eagles can be found north of the border, too.)

6. Their mating ritual seems ripped straight out of an action movie.

When it comes to making babies, Bald Eagles don't fool around. The birds' mating ritual begins high in the air as a male and female dart and dive towards one another. After a few of those daring maneuvers, the mating pair then lock talons, forming a sort of "cartwheel" as they plummet towards the earth in free-fall, waiting until they're just moments from hitting the ground before separating.

Seriously.

7. They stick with the same partner for life.

I guess when you find that special someone willing to join you in that crazy mating ritual, you hang on to them.

8. Their nests are really, really big. I'm talking HUGE.

For Bald Eagles, no puny home will do. Instead, they construct sprawling, mansion-esque nests that make more run-of-the-mill bird abodes look like unlivable little shanties.

In fact, Bald Eagles hold the record for the largest bird nest ever built. One construction in St. Petersburg, Florida measured 9.6 feet wide, 20 feet deep, and weighed an estimated 4,400 pounds.

9. Bald Eagle chicks are adorable, and slightly intimidating.

...10. They work together when hunting.

Bald Eagles are often thought of as embodying the American tradition of self-reliance, but they actually work quite well with others too. The birds have been observed engaging in cooperative hunts, wherein one or more eagle will distract prey while another swoops in from behind, catching a meal that's then shared among the group.

11. There are probably more images of them out there than of any other animal, ever.

Not only are Bald Eagles a staple on patriotic T-shirts, trucker hats and tattoos, they're also depicted on nearly all official U.S. forms and documents -- making them easily one of, if not the most widely-depicted animal on the planet.

As the centerpiece to the Seal of the Federal Reserve, Bald Eagles appear on every denomination of paper currency printed today, as well as on the reverse of every quarter. That means, on money alone, there are more than 28 billion pictures of Bald Eagles in existence today.

12. Possessing Bald Eagle feathers is against the law.

As tempting as it may be to own a token of our beloved national bird, doing so is actually a federal crime, punishable by a year in jail and fines up to \$200,000.

There are exception to this, however. Native Americans who use feathers in religious ceremonies are exempt from the law, but must attain Bald Eagle feathers from a government repository in Denver where the bodies of dead birds are kept in storage.

13. They were once nearly extinct, but conservation brought them back from the brink.

During the 18th century, there were an estimated 500,000 Bald Eagles soaring in the skies of North America, living symbols of a proud new nation. In the decades that followed, they began to diminish due to habitat loss and because they'd become a frequent target among hunters and trappers.

By 1940, killing the birds became illegal, but their decline continued from another threat -- the widely-used pesticide DDT, the runoff from which poisoned huge portions of their food supply. In the 1950s, only 412 breeding eagle pairs were counted in the whole of the contiguous 48 states.

Faced with the very real possibility that the national bird could be wiped out entirely, in 1967 they were added to the Endangered Species list. Not long after, DDT was banned and the birds began a remarkable recovery. In 1992, Bald Eagle numbers reached over 100,000 and rising.

In 2007, after sufficiently recovering thanks to concerted conservation efforts, Bald Eagles were delisted, though stringent protections still exist to this day.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the amazing things about the bald eagle, and leads to reasons why we should keep it as our national animal here in the United States. One, it was the national animal from the very beginning. Leaving it would be a departure from our principles as a nation. Two, the bald eagle exemplifies the United States in a lot of ways, and is quite the admirable bird. Three, it's also a national symbol, and we should think about how often we see the bald eagle in everyday life. Besides our own household pets, we most likely see the bald*

eagle more than any other animal. They are a huge part of American culture. That's not something that can be, or should be, changed.

NEG – Red Wolves Are Being Saved in the Status Quo

National Wildlife Federation “Coyotes and poaching threaten the only U.S. red wolf population, but NWF and its North Carolina affiliate are helping to save them” Roger Di Silvestro, July 28, 2014 <<https://www.nwf.org/News-and-Magazines/National-Wildlife/Animals/Archives/2014/Red-Wolves.aspx>>

“Once inhabiting the southeastern United States and possibly even north into Pennsylvania, the red wolf is closely related to the coyote and the Algonquin wolf of eastern Canada. Red wolves weigh 50 to 85 pounds—about twice the size of a coyote—and measure about 26 inches tall at the shoulder. They mate for life and live in family packs typically composed of five to eight animals that range across an area of 25 to 50 square miles. In North Carolina they usually feed on deer, raccoons, rabbits and various rodents. Older pups help raise younger siblings and leave the pack when two or three years old, seeking territories and mates.

The red wolf is North America’s rarest wild canine, though not as rare as it was 40 years ago. By the 1970s, predator-control programs and habitat degradation had reduced the species to a remnant population in coastal Texas and Louisiana, where it was facing extinction from interbreeding with coyotes...

... FWS biologists brought the last red wolves into captivity with the intention of reintroducing them into native habitat once a sufficient number had been bred. North Carolina’s Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge became the first release site with the introduction of four male-female pairs in 1987. The species now ranges across three national wildlife refuges, a Department of Defense bombing range, state-administered lands and private property, all in the northeastern part of the state, for a total of 1.7 million acres—an area slightly larger than the state of Delaware and nearly the size of Yellowstone National Park. “Against the longest of odds, the red wolf again roams the wild lands of eastern North Carolina,” says Tim Gestwicki, chief executive officer for the North Carolina Wildlife Federation (NCWF), an NWF affiliate that has aided the reintroduction program since its inception. Private lands serve as an important component because they are home to more than half the wolves. “There are many stewardship-oriented landowners who have been supportive of the red wolf program,” Gestwicki says...

... If their numbers increase, the wolves are likely to have positive impacts on local ecology, preying on crop-damaging species such as raccoons, deer and nutria—large South American rodents, introduced into the United States by the fur trade, that damage wetlands as well as farm crops. “The reality is that we have a huge northeastern North Carolina deer population that is damaging to crops,” Gestwicki says. Deer in the state consume about \$30 million in crops yearly.

Although wolves take some deer, which could benefit local farmers, at present “the dent the wolves put in the deer population is fairly negligible,” he says. “Balancing wildlife and agribusiness is an ongoing matter.” Some farmers have reported that the wolves may be influencing deer behavior by limiting the amount of time deer spend in agricultural fields eating crops, Rabon says. FWS is partnering with the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission to explore predator-prey impacts.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how Red Wolves are already being saved in the status quo, so there isn't a need to upset the natural order within the United States in hopes of preserving this species. If it's already being done, without changing our national animal, then there's no point in moving forward with this legislation.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about the amazing things about the bald eagle, and leads to reasons why we should keep it as our national animal here in the United States. One, it was the national animal from the very beginning. Leaving it would be a departure from our principles as a nation. Two, the bald eagle exemplifies the United States in a lot of ways, and is quite the admirable bird. Three, it's also a national symbol, and we should think about how often we see the bald eagle in everyday life. Besides our own household pets, we most likely see the bald eagle more than any other animal. They are a huge part of American culture. That's not something that can be, or should be, changed.

The second article talks about how Red Wolves are already being saved in the status quo, so there isn't a need to upset the natural order within the United States in hopes of preserving this species. If it's already being done, without changing our national animal, then there's no point in moving forward with this legislation.

Legislation – A Resolution to combat the AIDS Epidemic Affirmative Evidence

AFF – WHO Recommends NSPs

Avert, “Needle and Syringe Programmes (NSPs) for HIV Prevention,” Accessed October 21, 2015, <
<http://www.avert.org/needle-and-syringe-programmes-nsp-hiv-prevention.htm> >

“Needle and syringe programmes (NSPs) are a type of harm reduction initiative that provide clean needles and syringes to people who inject drugs (PWID). The World Health Organisation (WHO) recommends providing 200 sterile needles and syringes per drug injector per year, in order to effectively tackle HIV transmission via this route. 1

Many programmes supply other equipment to prepare and consume drug such as filters, mixing containers and sterile water. The majority of NSPs are run by drug services or pharmacies and operate from a range of fixed, mobile and outreach sites. 2

NSPs aim primarily to reduce the transmission of HIV and other blood-borne viruses caused by the sharing of injecting equipment. Many also work to reduce other harms associated with injecting drug use by providing:

- advice on safer injecting practices Disposal of dirty needles into a sharps box
- Disposal of dirty needles into a sharps box
- advice on minimising the harm done by drugs
- advice on how to avoid and manage an overdose
- information on the safe handling and disposal of injecting equipment
- referrals to HIV testing and treatment services
- help to stop injecting drugs, including access to drug treatment (e.g. opioid substitution therapy (OST) and encouragement to switch to safer drug taking practices
- other health and welfare services (including condom provision) 3

A study by the WHO reported that:

"NSPs substantially and cost effectively reduce the spread of HIV among PWID and do so without evidence of exacerbating injecting drug use at either the individual or societal level". 4

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that the World Health Organization supports NSPs. It also gives examples of other services that NSPs commonly provide (bulleted items). It also says that a WHO study found that NSPs are cost-effective and reduce the spread of AIDS without increasing injecting drug use for individuals or communities at large. As the affirmative you can argue that these programs provide more than just needles, and they're cost effective and they work at curbing the HIV/AIDS epidemic.*

AFF – Statistics on NEPs

ACLU, “Needle Exchange Programs Promote Public Safety,” Accessed October 21, 2015, <
<https://www.aclu.org/needle-exchange-programs-promote-public-safety> >

“Injection Drug Use and Infectious Disease Make Needle Exchange Programs Imperative:

- There are an estimated 350,000 regular injection drug users in America – all at increased risk of contracting and spreading fatal blood-borne diseases. 1
- Approximately 950,000 U.S. residents are living with HIV/AIDS. 2
- More than a quarter of AIDS cases in the U.S. among people age 13 or older are directly linked to injection drug use. 3
- When mother-to-child HIV transmission is taken into account, roughly 35 percent of all AIDS infections can be related to injection drug use. 4
- An estimated 61 percent of AIDS cases among women are due to injection drug use or sexual contact with someone infected with HIV through injection drug use. 5
- Over half of HIV infections in children result from injection drug by a parent. 6
- AIDS is the second leading cause of death among African American women and third leading cause of death among African American men. 7
- Injection drug users are also at serious risk of contracting Hepatitis B and Hepatitis C. Hepatitis B infects between 140,000 and 320,000 people every year and kills between 5,000 and 6,000 people in the U.S. Hepatitis C infects about 36,000 people in the U.S. every year, killing 8,000 to 10,000 of those infected. 8

Needle Exchange Programs by the Numbers:

- There are approximately 185 needle exchange programs (NEP) operating nationwide. 9
- A national survey of NEPs found that in addition to exchanging sterile syringes for contaminated ones, 97 percent of programs provide a range of public health services, including referral to substance abuse treatment, prevention education for sexually transmitted diseases, HIV counseling and testing, tuberculosis screening, and primary health care. 10
- It costs an average city about \$160,000 to run an NEP (about \$20 per user per year), whereas one syringe-infected AIDS patient will require upwards of \$120,000 per year in public health expenditures. 11
- Federal law forbids use of federal funds to support needle exchanges – nonetheless, exchanges operate in 38 states. 12

Needle Exchange Programs Promote Public Safety:

- In 2002, NEPs reported removing nearly 25 million used syringes from communities. 13
- According to the Centers for Disease Control, the one-time use of sterile syringes remains the most effective way to limit HIV transmission associated with injection drug use. 14
- A study by the National Institutes of Health found that NEPs “show a reduction in risk behaviors as high as 80 percent in injecting drug users...” 15
- NEP participants have been found five times more likely to enter drug treatment than those who had never used an exchange. 16
- NEPs throughout the country have reduced HIV transmission rates by one-third to two-fifths. 17
- An analyses of a New York State-approved NEP found that during a 12-month period, an estimated 87 HIV infections were averted as a direct result of the use of needle exchange. 18
- Injection drug users who are afraid of being arrested while carrying drug paraphernalia are 1.74 times more likely to share syringes, and 2.08 times more likely to share injection supplies than other users. 19”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence from the American Civil Liberties Union includes tons of powerful stats for an affirmative speech. Overall the stats provide evidence that says that we have a huge problem with intravenous drug use and the spread of disease. NSPs are cost effective and they promote public safety. Use a few of these statistics to strengthen your affirmative speech.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that the World Health Organization supports NSPs. It also gives examples of other services that NSPs commonly provide (bulleted items). It also says that a WHO study found that NSPs are cost-effective and reduce the spread of AIDS without increasing injecting drug use for individuals or communities at large. As the affirmative you can argue that these programs provide more than just needles, and they're cost effective and they work at curbing the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

The second piece of evidence from the American Civil Liberties Union includes tons of powerful stats for an affirmative speech. Overall the stats provide evidence that says that we have a huge problem with intravenous drug use and the spread of disease. NSPs are cost effective and they promote public safety. Use a few of these statistics to strengthen your affirmative speech.

Negative Evidence

NEG – NEPs Negatively Affect the AIDS Epidemic

PBS, “Should needle exchange be publicly funded?” David S. Noffs, Accessed October 21, 2015, < <http://www.thirteen.org/closetohome/viewpoints/html/needle.html> >

“When first introduced in Amsterdam in 1984, and shortly thereafter at various sites in Europe and the United States, needle exchange programs were viewed as an emergency response to both the HIV/AIDS and hepatitis C epidemics. Although promoters claim that needle exchange programs do not encourage drug use, there has been a major increase in heroin use since needle exchange programs have become widespread. Heroin use by American teens has doubled in the past 5 years. Dr. Lucy Sullivan of the Australian Centre for Independent Studies states that hepatitis prevalence among intravenous drug users is 65%, suggesting that free needles are not having their intended effect of preventing exchange of body fluids. Sullivan also states that “There is no sign of an impact on the rate of decline (of HIV incidence rates) with the introduction of needle distribution in 1992.” (Sullivan, 1997).

Even more disturbing is a recent Vancouver study showing significant increases in HIV among intravenous drug users despite Vancouver having the largest needle exchange program in North America. HIV prevalence among intravenous drug users has risen from 1-2% in 1988 to a current rate of 23% (Strathdee, 1997). In a Montreal study, intravenous drug users participating in the needle exchange program were twice as likely to become infected with HIV as those who did not participate (Bruneau J et al, 1995).

Many needle exchange programs do not make any serious effort to treat drug addiction. I have visited sites around Chicago where people who request info on quitting their habit are given a single sheet on how to go cold turkey -- hardly effective treatment or counseling. Furthermore, needle exchange programs, if backed by public funding, i.e., through Government Health Departments, would signal an unprecedented shift in public health policy. Rather than preventing and treating drug addiction, needle exchange programs would use taxpayers money to supply drug paraphernalia to addicts without mandating treatment. Without an ironclad link showing needle exchange programs reduce HIV and do not increase hepatitis C or drug use itself, the constitutional legality of such a proposition should be questioned, even if supported by Congress and the President. Lastly, many needle exchange programs have been introduced without the support of those communities where they set up shop.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article was written by David Noffs who is the Founder and Executive Director of the Life Education Center, USA. He has been directly involved in the establishment of drug abuse prevention programs throughout the world. According to him, studies have shown an increase in intravenous drug use when NSPs are present, and there’s no clear sign that they decrease the spread of HIV/AIDS. (He includes some pretty strong statistics in the first 2 paragraphs). Beyond their lack of effectiveness, NEPs don’t do anything to treat drug addiction. Instead NEPs use taxpayer money to keep drug addicts on drugs.*

NEG – Cons of NSPs

Recovery, “The Pros and Cons of Needle Exchange Programs,” April 17, 2015, < <http://www.recovery.org/the-pros-and-cons-of-needle-exchange-programs/> >

- “The programs promote drugs by offering needles to help a person use

- The apparent “acceptance” of IV drug use will lead to higher rates of drug abuse
- Many of these programs are being funded with taxpayer dollars
- Some reports indicate the HIV rate increases as a result of needle exchange programs
- Locals often feel unsafe due to the constant influx of addicts”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence presents 5 strong cons for NSPs/NEPs. Each of these reasons could be expanded into a negative speech. The two points that are perhaps the strongest are that NSPs use taxpayer money and they make locals feel unsafe. If you argue in negation of this bill, you should say that oftentimes NSPs become government funded. Taxpayers then have to foot the bill. Taxpayers shouldn't have to help drug users use drugs. Beyond that, in towns where NEPs are set up, the local people of the town often don't feel safe. That's a real problem. Do we want to make safe communities unsafe by allowing NEPs to set up shop? It's unrealistic to think that if we passed this resolution there would be an NEP in every city, so the towns that did set up NEPs would surely have an influx of drug users. We have to think about all of the implications of passing this resolution.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article was written by David Noffs who is the Founder and Executive Director of the Life Education Center, USA. He has been directly involved in the establishment of drug abuse prevention programs throughout the world. According to him, studies have shown an increase in intravenous drug use when NSPs are present, and there's no clear sign that they decrease the spread of HIV/AIDs. (He includes some pretty strong statistics in the first 2 paragraphs). Beyond their lack of effectiveness, NEPs don't do anything to treat drug addiction. Instead NEPs use taxpayer money to keep drug addicts on drugs.

The second piece of evidence presents 5 strong cons for NSPs/NEPs. Each of these reasons could be expanded into a negative speech. The two points that are perhaps the strongest are that NSPs use taxpayer money and they make locals feel unsafe. If you argue in negation of this bill, you should say that oftentimes NSPs become government funded. Taxpayers then have to foot the bill. Taxpayers shouldn't have to help drug users use drugs. Beyond that, in towns where NEPs are set up, the local people of the town often don't feel safe. That's a real problem. Do we want to make safe communities unsafe by allowing NEPs to set up shop? It's unrealistic to think that if we passed this resolution there would be an NEP in every city, so the towns that did set up NEPs would surely have an influx of drug users. We have to think about all of the implications of passing this resolution.

Legislation – A Bill to Ban Fracking on National Park Premises Affirmative Evidence

AFF – National Parks Should be Protected

Take Part “Wait, What?! Oil Companies Are Drilling in Our Sacred National Parks” Alison Fairbrother, September 18, 2012 < <http://www.takepart.com/article/2012/09/17/national-parks-risk-due-oil-and-gas-company-land-grabbing> >

“Vast, underground reserves of oil and gas sit beneath federal land—which includes not only protected national parks, but also territory managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

Oil and gas companies are jockeying to obtain rights to extract resources from public soil.

A recent report from the Center for American Progress shows that 12 national parks have been leased to oil and gas companies and are currently undergoing drilling, and an additional 30 park units will likely be drilled in the future...

... Gas and oil drilling in national parks, or any public lands poses huge risks to the environment.

“Drilling involves not just the construction of a well pad but the associated infrastructure, including roads, pipelines, and truck traffic. Often, drilling creates a larger area of disturbance than actually meets the eye,” Jessica Goad told TakePart...

... In North Dakota, there were more than a thousand spills of oil, wastewater, and drilling fluids in 2011 alone. Last year, an ExxonMobil pipeline burst and spilled 1,000 barrels of oil into Yellowstone River.

But the damage goes beyond national parks. Huge swathes of federal lands are being poked, prodded and extracted. Statistics from the Bureau of Land Management show that by 2011, a total of 38 million acres of public land were leased to oil and gas companies...

... Anyone who has witnessed the Old Faithful geyser at Yellowstone, traipsed across the breathtaking Maine coastline in Acadia National Park, or gazed up at the starry night skies from the Adirondack mountains, has enjoyed our national park treasures—and even aided in conservation efforts.

Protected public land helps conserve critical ecosystems, and can slow the loss of endangered species and their habitats. Preserving forests also helps to curb carbon emissions and resulting climate change.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how oil and gas drilling threatens our environment, causes climate change, and the fact national parks should be closed off to that, because drilling could ruin the land. There’s a lot of history in national parks, and that should be preserved. We are nothing without our history – how can we let those things go to the sidelines, just because we want to further fill the pockets of big oil? Things like oil leaks and just the placement of wells and drainage could potentially destroy our national parks. Anyone who has been to a*

national park understands: there are more important things than black gold, and they are one of those things. On top of that, national parks bring in a lot of money on tourism – if they're destroyed, they won't make much money any more. We should pass this bill to keep our national parks alive.

AFF – We Don't Know the Full Effects of Drilling

National Parks Conservation Association “Oil and Gas Development” April 2013 <
<http://www.npca.org/protecting-our-parks/air-land-water/mining-and-fracking/fracking-map.html>>

“The rapid increase of the oil and gas extraction method known as hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” is outpacing our understanding of how massive concentrations of oil and gas wells impact surrounding lands. Without safeguards, the boom in fracking could significantly impact the air, water, wildlife and forests that are protected in our national park system...

... Parks across the country are affected. The report details the existing and potential impacts to Glacier NP, Theodore Roosevelt NP, Grand Teton NP, Upper Delaware SRR and Delaware Water Gap NRA, and Big South Fork NRR and Obed WSR...

EXCERPT:

Hydraulic fracturing (or “fracking”) is a relatively new extraction method that is now responsible for 90 percent of domestic oil and gas production, with thousands of wells peppering the countryside. The number of wells is expected to skyrocket during the next two decades. The Energy Information Administration estimates that the United States has 2,119 trillion cubic feet of natural gas and 25.2 billion barrels of crude oil recoverable through fracking. What will history say about this innovation? What will the impacts be on America's public lands—especially our cherished national parks?...

... Yet even the experts can't predict fracking's impacts. Will it contaminate the air we breathe in national parks? Will it harm native wildlife and the water and forests they depend on for survival? Will it damage the resources we value in our national parks? The answers are just beginning to emerge.

Consequently, the National Parks Conservation Association recommends that policymakers require a measured, thoughtful approach to fracking, especially near national parks and in their surrounding landscapes. We must make every effort to understand and anticipate potential consequences—before they become irreversible.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how we should preserve our national parks. We don't know the potentially devastating effects that oil and gas drilling may have. The kicker – even the experts don't know. We all know the horror stories, with spills and water contamination. Even the presence of wells and pits would hurt the land. If we allow drilling in our parks without knowing the potential consequences, we could destroy our parks. It's not worth the risk – we must know more before we jump right in and start drilling. We need to pass this legislation until we know just how harmful drilling can be.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how oil and gas drilling threatens our environment, causes climate change, and the fact national parks should be closed off to that, because drilling could ruin the land. There's a lot of history in national parks, and that should be preserved. We are nothing without our history – how can we let those things go to the sidelines, just because we want to further fill the pockets of big oil? Things like oil leaks and just the placement of wells and drainage could potentially destroy our national parks. Anyone who has been to a national park understand: there are more important things than black gold, and they are one of those things. On top of that, national parks bring in a lot of money on tourism – if they're destroyed, they won't make much money any more. We should pass this bill to keep our national parks alive.

This second article talks about how we should preserve our national parks. We don't know the potentially devastating effects that oil and gas drilling may have. The kicker – even the experts don't know. We all know the horror stories, with spills and water contamination. Even the presence of wells and pits would hurt the land. If we allow drilling in our parks without knowing the potential consequences, we could destroy our parks. It's not worth the risk – we must know more before we jump right in and start drilling. We need to pass this legislation until we know just how harmful drilling can be.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Drilling in National Parks Could Increase Energy Production

Think Progress, Climate Progress “Texas Congressman Wants National Parks Opened To Drilling” Matt Lee-Ashley, September 8, 2014 < <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/03/26/3419368/congressman-drilling-national-parks/>>

““Guys on the West Coast ... west of the Mississippi, they know they’ve got oil and gas under the land that they can’t touch because it’s on a national park or some sort of federal land,” said Rep. Pete Olson (R-TX) while attending an oil and gas conference in Fort Worth.

Olson argued that cancelling protections of national parks and other protected public lands would help increase energy production and claimed that “the exploration and production industry can operate safely within national parks, while preserving the parks’ scenic and ecological values,” Platts reported.

“Working with the parks system, without destroying the parks’ value, we can do both. We’ve proven that we can do that here in in Texas,” Olson said...”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how drilling in national parks could increase energy production and reduce energy cost, and there’s a way to do it without destroying our parks. I think there needs to be a compromise. If we insist on using oil and gas, rather than renewable energy sources, then we need to start looking for ways to increase the amount of oil we have, while simultaneously decreasing the cost to the consumer. This is an important step, because we have a lot of oil and gas that is not being utilized, because they are protected by our national parks. We shouldn’t ban it all together – we should come up with some kind of compromise to appease both sides.*

NEG – Drilling in Parks Exaggerated

E&E Publishing, LLC “National parks hit by shutdown still open for drilling -- but it's not as widespread as greens claim” Elana Schor, Phil Taylor, October 3, 2013 < <http://www.eenews.net/stories/1059988278>>

“The image is tailor-made to stoke fury over the shuttered government: drillers pulling oil and gas from beneath national parkland that citizens are barred from entering. But what greens decry as painful fallout from this week's shutdown is happening on a smaller scale than some have argued...”

... Oil and gas companies in national parks, however, operate on pre-existing private inholdings that allow firms to work during the shutdown. In many cases, industry-controlled land was grandfathered into the parks' creation.

"One would think that if you own it, you have the right to everything that's legal," Rep. Mike Pompeo (R-Kan.) said in an interview. "I encourage them to continue to create wealth."

No less an environmental stalwart than Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-Ore.) described the phenomenon as a gut check for the broader debate over allowing private energy leases on public lands rather than a political weapon to use against shutdown holdouts.

"How much do we surrender? Who is overseeing this?" Blumenauer asked in an interview, adding that drilling in parks is "the least of our problems," given the broader economic consequences of the closed government. "It's the issue, not the optics."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the issue of drilling in parks has been exaggerated. While it is being done, it is sparingly, and isn't causing any issues. Yes, vacations and hunting trips have to be pushed back, but not indefinitely. This article was written soon after the shutdown, when people were angry that visits to national parks were stalled, but drilling could continue. This article talks about that issue, but also discusses drilling within national parks. Though the public has a skewed mindset of what drilling does to land, we shouldn't bar it completely. First of all, as long as it continues the same way, it would be a project that is done incrementally – just a few parks at a time. Drilling already exists in many parks, especially here in Texas, and no harm has been done. In fact, it brings more money to the national parks and our state and federal government, which desperately need it. If there's a compromise, why not?*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how drilling in national parks could increase energy production and reduce energy cost, and there's a way to do it without destroying our parks. I think there needs to be a compromise. If we insist on using oil and gas, rather than renewable energy sources, then we need to start looking for ways to increase the amount of oil we have, while simultaneously decreasing the cost to the consumer. This is an important step, because we have a lot of oil and gas that is not being utilized, because they are protected by our national parks. We shouldn't ban it all together – we should come up with some kind of compromise to appease both sides.

This second article talks about how the issue of drilling in parks has been exaggerated. While it is being done, it is sparingly, and isn't causing any issues. Yes, vacations and hunting trips have to be pushed back, but not indefinitely. This article was written soon after the shutdown, when people were angry that visits to national parks were stalled, but drilling could continue. This article talks about that issue, but also discusses drilling within national parks. Though the public has a skewed mindset of what drilling does to land, we shouldn't bar it completely. First of all, as long as it continues the same way, it would be a project that is done incrementally – just a few parks at a time. Drilling already exists in many parks, especially here in Texas, and no harm has been done. In fact, it brings more money to the national parks and our state and federal government, which desperately need it. If there's a compromise, why not?

Legislation – A Bill to Allow Criminal Offenders the Option of Military Service as an Alternative to Jail Time
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Military Has History of Allowing Convicts to Enlist

CNN “Some felons serve time and country” February 6, 2007, Randi Kaye <
<http://www.cnn.com/CNN/Programs/anderson.cooper.360/blog/2007/02/some-felons-serve-time-and-country.html>>

“...the U.S. military knowingly allows people convicted of felonies and other crimes to serve. In fact, the Army says soldiers who commit a felony after they've enlisted can continue to serve if a military adjudicator lets them stay.

Pentagon consultant Eli Flyer told us that Army records show it enlisted close to 1,000 people with felony records last year alone. Flyer said the last time the Pentagon matched its personnel records with federal criminal records was 1995. Looking at those records he found that one enlistee with repeated criminal convictions was given clearance for top secret information and another was cleared to serve on a nuclear missile team. Their clearance wasn't revoked until years later.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the military has a history of allowing convicts to join the military. If the negative claims that the military standards wouldn't allow it, you could use this article to argue against it. Whether the negative argues that they can be trusted or not, that doesn't stop the military from already doing it. If a person is fit for duty, they should be allowed to serve. This also presents a unique opportunity to make people convicted of crimes to become productive members of society, and would reduce the cost to taxpayers, because they would be working for the US government, instead of leeching off of the government.*

AFF – Military Could Provide Better Rehabilitation Alternative

Sentencing Law and Policy “Should we consider military service as an alternative to incarceration?” Fall 2008 Issue of the Justice Policy Journal <
http://sentencing.typepad.com/sentencing_law_and_policy/2009/01/should-we-consider-military-service-as-an-alternative-to-incarceration.html>

“While previous research has sought to evaluate prisoners' perceptions of various alternatives to imprisonment, most have centered on the prisoners perspective as to the perceived severity of the alternative punishment. This research is quite different, as the proposed alternative does not seek to punish but rather to rehabilitate. The proposed alternative argues that military enlistment be utilized as an alternative to incarceration we intend to determine if prisoners would welcome such an alternative. Researchers have identified a correlation between military service and desistance from crime among youths, many of whom have had delinquent pasts. This current project is intended to expand upon the life course perspective as the military can act as a “rehabilitative agent” which will act as a hook for change, thereby facilitating desistance from criminal behavior.

In the current study, we argue that military service can facilitate social bonds, promote prosocial network contacts, and teach skills necessary for successful integration into the dominant society. Because of the benefits military service offers, it is hypothesized that prisoners will be receptive to such an alternative to incarceration. Through our

interviews with prisoners at a minimum security facility in Kentucky, we discovered that indeed prisoners overwhelmingly would welcome such an alternative.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how military service has shown to be a proper way to rehabilitate criminals, or criminals who have a propensity for committing more crimes. It gives them a sense of teamwork, promotes social bonds, and teaches them skills for successful integration into society. If we want to truly rehabilitate criminals, this might actually be a BETTER alternative to prison time.*

AFF – Issues Caused by Overcrowding

Portland State University “Prison overcrowding is a growing concern in the U.S.” <
<http://online.ccj.pdx.edu/resources/news-article/prison-overcrowding-is-a-growing-concern-in-the-u-s/>>

“Overcrowding in prisons causes many problems, which is why it is a serious concern in the U.S. Once the causes of crowding have been established, researchers can begin to address the problems it causes and deal with them. However, the best way to solve the problems created by overcrowding is by eliminating overcrowding. Students in criminal justice degree programs may discover more about these issues when learning about corrections work.

Double-celling – Inmates in prisons are required to have a certain amount of space. A legal case in 1981 addressed overcrowding as potentially cruel and unusual punishment.

Prisoner misconduct and its causes – Research from 2003 indicates that jail overcrowding may not be a direct cause of prisoner misconduct. However, the study does show that prison management style is related to misconduct, and it is possible that overcrowding has a direct effect on prison management, as it creates a far more stressful environment on the corrections officers and wardens.

Psychological consequences of prison overcrowding – Another study done in 2006 found that a high prison population has a direct, negative effect on the psychological state of inmates. Overcrowding has been known to cause far more stressful situations and has prompted prison officials to react inappropriately on occasion due to being forced to accommodate ill-advised numbers of prisoners.

The effect of overcrowding on jail population dynamics – The Department of Justice (DOJ) performed a study in 2002 on inmate dynamics and how crowding affects them. This study found that the key to avoiding overcrowding is to “continuously collect, monitor and analyze admission and length-of-stay information, then to share the results with other justice officials and with officials in leadership positions in general government.”

Prison overcrowding and inmate violence – A long-term study on prison population density (PPD) in Japan found that it has a direct correlation with prison violence rates (PVR). This study conclusively states that “the effect of PPD was significant and positive on PVR, even after controlling for the effects of the proportions of males, age younger than 30 years, less than one-year incarceration, and prisoner/staff ratio.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article gives several consequences of prison overcrowding. Inmate violence, population dynamics, psychological consequences, misconduct, and double-celling. There are a lot of problems associated with prison overcrowding that could be solved by*

passing this bill, and could end up saving the American taxpayer a lot of money in the process, and reduce all of the negative consequences of prison overcrowding. It is imperative to solve this issue, and this sounds like the best solution that I have heard.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the military has a history of allowing convicts to join the military. If the negative claims that the military standards wouldn't allow it, you could use this article to argue against it. Whether the negative argues that they can be trusted or not, that doesn't stop the military from already doing it. If a person is fit for duty, they should be allowed to serve. This also presents a unique opportunity to make people convicted of crimes to become productive members of society, and would reduce the cost to taxpayers, because they would be working for the US government, instead of leeching off of the government.

The second article talks about how military service has shown to be a proper way to rehabilitate criminals, or criminals who have a propensity for committing more crimes. It gives them a sense of teamwork, promotes social bonds, and teaches them skills for successful integration into society. If we want to truly rehabilitate criminals, this might actually be a BETTER alternative to prison time.

The third article gives several consequences of prison overcrowding. Inmate violence, population dynamics, psychological consequences, misconduct, and double-celling. There are a lot of problems associated with prison overcrowding that could be solved by passing this bill, and could end up saving the American taxpayer a lot of money in the process, and reduce all of the negative consequences of prison overcrowding. It is imperative to solve this issue, and this sounds like the best solution that I have heard.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Military Won't Take Criminals Who Join to Get Out of Jail

Stars and Stripes “Judge said Army or jail, but military doesn't want him” Jeff Schogol, February 3, 2006 < <http://www.stripes.com/news/judge-said-army-or-jail-but-military-doesn-t-want-him-1.44417>>

“A New York judge gave Michael Guerra the chance to join the Army to avoid a jail sentence. On those terms, the Army doesn't want him.

Guerra, of North Tonawanda, outside Buffalo, was facing up to a year in jail after pleading guilty to an aggravated assault charge for allegedly hitting a woman who came between him and his girlfriend during a domestic dispute, said Niagara County District Attorney Matthew Murphy.

When Guerra's attorney told the judge in the case that his client wanted to join the military, the judge gave Guerra a choice, Murphy said.

“The judge said, ‘Well, I'll give you a conditional discharge: the condition is you join the military,’” Murphy said.

But Army regulations say that people facing pending charges are ineligible to enlist, said Army spokesman Lt. Col. Bryan Hilferty.

“Army policy reflected in Army Regulation 601-210, paragraph 4-32a states ‘waiver is not authorized if a criminal or juvenile court charge is pending or if such a charge was dismissed or dropped at any stage of the court proceedings on condition that the offender enlists in a military service,’” Hilferty said in an e-mail response to questions.

Army recruiters are also banned from helping someone get out of pending charges by joining the Army, Hilferty said.

“It isn't a new regulation. Not taking jailbirds has been our policy for decades,” he said.”

TAKEAWAYS – *This article gives an example of a convicted criminal who was given the option of joining the military instead of serving time. Unfortunately for him, the military didn't want him. The military doesn't allow those who are pending charges. While this law would change with this bill, there's no reason for the military to change their policy. Why would they take someone who's only joining, so that they don't have to go to jail? They would rather ACTUAL volunteers to serve our country. Why trust someone with the lives of other soldiers, if they already have a propensity to disobey laws and might be disgruntled towards our country?*

NEG – Regulations Getting Tougher, More People Being Turned Away

RT “Military turns down 80 percent of applicants as armed forces shrink” May 15, 2014 < <http://rt.com/usa/158992-military-80-percent-rejection-rate/>>

“Gone are the post-9/11 recruiting days where the US military would take just about anyone who walked through its doors, issuing waivers for misconduct and health issues. Now 80 percent of applicants are turned away.

US Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced in February of this year that the Obama administration would work to shrink the US Army to its smallest size since before World War II. Citing the federal government's budgetary concerns and the winding down of the wars in the Middle East, Hagel deemed it necessary to reduce the military personnel and lingering, expensive equipment costs.

He said in a speech that cutting the current level of 522,000 soldiers to 490,000 soldiers by autumn of 2015 was necessary "to protect critical capabilities like Special Operations Forces and cyber resources."

And cutting the size of the military means recruiting fewer people. The Army's recruiting goal dropped from 69,000 new enlistments for the 2013 fiscal year to 57,000 for 2014, the US Army Recruiting Command (USAREC) reported. The Navy's goal dropped from 40,112 in 2013 to 33,800 in 2014, according to its recruiting command.

Fewer spaces means tough choices for recruiters. "We're turning down twice as many as before," Army Sgt. 1st Class Terrence Hoard, who supervises the Army recruiting station in Grandview, Mo., told the Kansas City Star. Potential recruits who might have been granted waivers before are now rejected."

TAKEAWAYS – *This article talks about how the US military has stricter recruitments now, and are turning away twice as many people as they used to. Simply put, they don't need more people in the military. There are people who are volunteering for service, because they want the benefits and they want to serve their country. If we are giving that to criminals instead of people who actually WANT to volunteer, we are doing our country and our citizens a disservice. If someone wanted to join the military, they should have done it before they committed a crime that landed them in jail.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article gives an example of a convicted criminal who was given the option of joining the military instead of serving time. Unfortunately for him, the military didn't want him. The military doesn't allow those who are pending charges. While this law would change with this bill, there's no reason for the military to change their policy. Why would they take someone who's only joining, so that they don't have to go to jail? They would rather ACTUAL volunteers to serve our country. Why trust someone with the lives of other soldiers, if they already have a propensity to disobey laws and might be disgruntled towards our country?

The second article talks about how the US military has stricter recruitments now, and are turning away twice as many people as they used to. Simply put, they don't need more people in the military. There are people who are volunteering for service, because they want the benefits and they want to serve their country. If we are giving that to criminals instead of people who actually WANT to volunteer, we are doing our country and our citizens a disservice. If someone wanted to join the military, they should have done it before they committed a crime that landed them in jail.

Legislation – A Bill to Increase National Education Funding by 10 Billion US Dollars

Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Federal Funding for Education Has Been Cut By 20 Percent

US News, “Report: Federal Education Funding Plummeting,” Allie Bidwell, June 24, 2015, <
<http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2015/06/24/report-federal-education-funding-cut-by-5-times-more-than-all-spending> >

“Over the last five years, Congress has cut federal funding for K-12 education by nearly 20 percent, about five times more than overall spending cuts, according to a new report...

"Districts were forced to lay off teachers and support staff, increase class sizes, and cut services like tutoring, athletics and before- and after-school programs," the report says. "Some school districts even contemplated limiting their school bus routes."

Education spending as a percentage of all government spending has also consistently decreased over the last five years, down to just over 1 percent in 2015 from 1.27 percent in 2011...

The House and Senate both have appropriations bills in the works that make further education-related cuts, such as to the Obama administration's Investment in Innovation Fund, or i3.

"From schools to hunger to homelessness, Congress is cutting investments in nearly every aspect of children's lives," Lesley said. "If Congress is going to turn this around next year, they've got to raise the budget caps for kids, not just weapons systems."

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that federal funding for school has been cut by 20 percent. This is 5 times more than overall spending cuts. Teachers were laid off and extracurricular programs have been cut. Class sizes have increased and support staff has decreased. This is a travesty. As the affirmative you have to argue that we need to pass this bill and stop making cuts and start making contributions towards America's future leaders.*

AFF – More than Half of Schools Need Repairs

Huffington Post, “Survey Finds Many Schools Need Repairs,” Kimberly Hefling, March 6, 2014, <
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/03/06/survey-schools-need-repairs_n_4912987.html >

“A new survey finds that more than half the nation's public schools need to be repaired, renovated or modernized... Many school districts have had to delay maintenance and construction projects because of slashed budgets during tough economic times.

The survey found that on average main school buildings were 44 years old. The data is from the 2012-2013 school year.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that more than half of all of our schools need repairs. The average school is more than 44 years old. Our schools clearly need more budgetary attention. You can use this argument in correlation with the arguments presented in the first piece of evidence to make a strong affirmative speech.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that federal funding for school has been cut by 20 percent. This is 5 times more than overall spending cuts. Teachers were laid off and extracurricular programs have been cut. Class sizes have increased and support staff has decreased. This is a travesty. As the affirmative you have to argue that we need to pass this bill and stop making cuts and start making contributions towards America's future leaders.

The second piece of evidence says that more than half of all of our schools need repairs. The average school is more than 44 years old. Our schools clearly need more budgetary attention. You can use this argument in correlation with the arguments presented in the first piece of evidence to make a strong affirmative speech.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Education Is States Responsibility and Federal Government Has Increased Contribution

U.S. Department of Education, “10 Facts About K-12 Education Funding,” September 19, 2014, < <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/fed/10facts/index.html?exp> >

“1. The U.S. Constitution leaves the responsibility for public K-12 education with the states.

The responsibility for K-12 education rests with the states under the Constitution. There is also a compelling national interest in the quality of the nation's public schools. Therefore, the federal government, through the legislative process, provides assistance to the states and schools in an effort to supplement, not supplant, state support. The primary source of federal K-12 support began in 1965 with the enactment of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*...

2. Total taxpayer investment in K-12 education in the United States for the 2004-05 school year is estimated to be \$536 billion.

Even in this current time of the war against terror, taxpayer investment in education exceeds that for national defense. In addition to the K-12 money mentioned above, taxpayers will spend an estimated \$373 billion for higher education in the same school year...the United States is a world leader in education investment...

3. States and localities are the primary sources of K-12 education funding and always have been.

In the 2004-05 school year, 83 cents out of every dollar spent on education is estimated to come from the state and local levels (45.6 percent from state funds and 37.1 percent from local governments). The federal government's share is 8.3 percent. The remaining 8.9 percent is from private sources, primarily for private schools. This division of support remains consistent with our nation's historic reliance on local control of schools.

4. The federal share of K-12 spending has risen very quickly, particularly in recent years.

In 1990-91, the federal share of total K-12 spending in the United States was just 5.7 percent. Since that time, it has risen by more than one-third and is now 8.3 percent of the total.

5. Total education funding has increased substantially in recent years at all levels of government, even when accounting for enrollment increases and inflation.

By the end of the 2004-05 school year, national K-12 education spending will have increased an estimated 105 percent since 1991-92; 58 percent since 1996-97; and 40 percent since 1998-99. On a per-pupil basis and adjusted for inflation, public school funding increased: 24 percent from 1991-92 through 2001-02 (the last year for which such data are available); 19 percent from 1996-97 through 2001-02; and 10 percent from 1998-99 through 2001-02.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article includes a lot of statistics that you can use in a negative speech. The overall points to take away are that states and local governments are (and have always been) responsible for school funding. It isn't the federal government's responsibility to cover education. In fact, the constitution clearly lays out that education is to be handled by the states. Despite this fact, federal government has already increased its funding towards education. So, if you speak in negation of this bill you should say that the federal government has already done more than it's obliged to do when it comes to education.*

NEG – Increased Funding Does NOT Result in Higher Achievement

The Heritage Foundation, “Does Spending More on Education Improve Academic Achievement?” Dan Lips, Shanea Watkins, Ph.D. and John Fleming, September 8, 2008, < <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2008/09/does-spending-more-on-education-improve-academic-achievement> >

“Simply increasing Education spending does not appear to improve American students' academic achievement. To improve learning opportunities for American children, policymakers should refocus on allocating resources more efficiently and effectively...

Many people believe that lack of funding is a problem in public education, but historical trends show that American spending on public education is at an all-time high...Given the significant increase in resources allocated to public Education, policymakers should consider whether government spending increases have led to improved student outcomes...

A basic comparison of long-term spending trends with long-term measures of student academic achievement challenges the belief that spending is correlated with achievement. Chart 4 compares real per-pupil expenditures with American students test scores on the long-term National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading examination from 1970 to 2004. While spending per pupil has more than doubled, reading scores have remained relatively flat.

High school graduation rates provide another historical barometer of American educational performance. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, the average freshman graduation rate for American public schools has remained relatively flat over time. In 1990-1991, the average graduation rate was 73.7 percent. By 2004-2005, the rate had increased modestly to 74.7.[13] However, the most recent estimate for the 2005-2006 school year shows that the national freshman graduation rate has dipped to 73.4 percent...

Academic researchers have sought to answer the question of whether Education expenditures are correlated with student performance. However, there is a lack of consistent evidence on whether Education expenditures are related to academic achievement. Eric Hanushek has studied the effect of per-pupil expenditures on academic outcomes, finding either no relationship or a relationship that is either weak or inconsistent...

- **American spending on public K-12 education is at an all-time high and is still rising.** Polls show that many people believe that a lack of resources is a primary problem facing public schools. Yet spending on American K-12 public Education is at an all-time high. Approximately \$9,300 is spent per pupil. Real spending per student has increased by 23.5 percent over the past decade and by 49 percent over the past 20 years.
- **Continuous spending increases have not corresponded with equal improvement in American educational performance.** Long-term measures of American students' academic achievement, such as long-term NAEP reading scale scores and high school graduation rates, show that the performance of American students has not improved dramatically in recent decades, despite substantial spending increases. The lack of a correlation between long-term Education spending and performance does not suggest that resources are not a factor in academic performance, but it does suggest that simply increasing spending is unlikely to improve educational performance.
- **Increasing federal funding on Education has not been followed by similar gains in student achievement.** Federal spending on elementary and secondary Education has also increased significantly in recent decades. Since 1985, real federal

spending on K-12 education has increased by 138 percent. On a per-student basis, federal spending on K-12 education has tripled since 1970. Yet, long-term measures of American students' academic achievement have not seen similar increases. Long-term test scores among specific student populations, including ethnic minorities that have been a main focus of federal Education policy, have improved some. However, the achievement gaps among white, black, and Hispanic students persist in test scores and graduation rates.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence is from the Heritage foundation. It says that research shows that increased funding does NOT increase student achievement. There are statistics throughout the evidence that really hit this point home that you should definitely use in your speech. When speaking in negation of this bill, you should say that we shouldn't pass it, because funding isn't going to improve our education ranking or our students' achievement. Instead we should focus our energy on developing curriculum that improves student performance within the education budget that is already established.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article includes a lot of statistics that you can use in a negative speech. The overall points to take away are that states and local governments are (and have always been) responsible for school funding. It isn't the federal government's responsibility to cover education. In fact, the constitution clearly lays out that education is to be handled by the states. Despite this fact, federal government has already increased its funding towards education. So, if you speak in negation of this bill you should say that the federal government has already done more than it's obliged to do when it comes to education.

The second piece of evidence is from the Heritage foundation. It says that research shows that increased funding does NOT increase student achievement. There are statistics throughout the evidence that really hit this point home that you should definitely use in your speech. When speaking in negation of this bill, you should say that we shouldn't pass it, because funding isn't going to improve our education ranking or our students' achievement. Instead we should focus our energy on developing curriculum that improves student performance within the education budget that is already established.

Legislation – A Bill to Suspend Some Authority to the President Affirmative Evidence

AFF – The President has Been Known to Over-Step the Limits of His Power

Christina Science Monitor “Has Obama abused executive power? His 5 most controversial uses.” Linda Feldmann, August 1, 2014 < <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/DC-Decoder/2014/0801/Has-Obama-abused-executive-power-His-5-most-controversial-uses/The-Affordable-Care-Act-Employer-Mandate-Delay>>

“President Obama has become known for his aggressive use of executive power. Faced with a balky Congress that is unwilling to move his agenda or compromise on most matters, he says he has no choice. But House Speaker John Boehner (R) of Ohio isn’t impressed, and plans to sue. Here are our picks for Mr. Obama’s most controversial uses of executive power:

1. The Affordable Care Act – Employer Mandate Delay

The House lawsuit will center on one element of the ACA: the requirement that large employers (those with 50 or more workers) provide health coverage or pay a penalty. That provision was originally due to go into effect in January 2014, but the Obama administration has delayed that deadline twice, and it is now January 2016. The Treasury Department issued rules in February 2014 spelling out the second delay.

2. The Affordable Care Act – Federal Subsidies

Another controversial element of the ACA is the provision that says only people who enrolled in coverage via their state exchange are eligible for federal subsidies. After the law passed, the Internal Revenue Service enacted a rule allowing the subsidies for people who enrolled via the federal exchange, Healthcare.gov. Opponents of the law sued and won in one federal circuit court of appeals and lost in another.

Defenders of the ACA say the wording of the law was a typo.

3. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA

This policy, announced by the Department of Homeland Security in 2012, came via a memorandum that directs authorities to exercise "prosecutorial discretion" in dealing with some young undocumented immigrants.

If they meet the criteria for eligibility, they are shielded temporarily from deportation and allowed to work. Critics say that waiving deportation laws for more than a million people is not "prosecutorial discretion" – it’s policymaking by executive fiat, usurping the role of Congress. Defenders say DACA is an acceptable example of presidential discretion in policymaking.

4. Gay Marriage

In 2011, the Justice Department took the unusual step of announcing that it would no longer defend the constitutionality of the Defense of Marriage Act, a 1996 law that banned federal recognition of same-sex marriages. Two years later, the Supreme Court

struck down part of the law, but that does not lessen the unusual nature of the action by Obama and Attorney General Eric Holder.

As states address their own statutes and constitutional amendments banning same-sex marriage, many state attorneys general have followed the Obama administration's precedent by announcing they will not defend their state's ban in court. Defenders of traditional marriage argue that such an approach flouts the will of the people, as expressed through referenda and laws passed by elected representatives.

5. Recess appointments

In 2012, Obama made three "recess appointments" to the National Labor Relations Board while the Senate was technically still in session. Normally, such nominees would need to be confirmed by the Senate. When the Senate is truly in recess, the president is allowed to make temporary appointments to fill positions that would require Senate confirmation.

The Obama administration argued that Republican senators were using a "gimmick called "pro forma sessions" – quick sessions lasting just a few moments in which no Senate business is conducted – to prevent the president from making recess appointments."

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how President Obama has become known for his aggressive use of executive power. It goes on to list 5 ways that Obama's use of power has been seen as controversial. As the AFF you should read these examples and argue that they were indeed an over extension of executive power, and that the Iran deal is something that is too important for global relationships to let executive power make significant changes. You can go ever further to argue that Congress should be the main governing factor in this issue due to the safety concerns it has. The NEG might have a few arguments ready against the use of Congress in this matter, so just be prepared.*

AFF – The Iran Nuclear Deal is Still Far From Over

CNN "Landmark deal reached on Iran nuclear program" Jethro Mullen and Nic Robertson, July 14, 2015 < <http://www.cnn.com/2015/07/14/politics/iran-nuclear-deal/> >

"The deal reduces the number of Iranian centrifuges by two-thirds. It places bans on enrichment at key facilities, and limits uranium research and development to the Natanz facility.

The deal caps uranium enrichment at 3.67 percent and limits the stockpile to 300 kg, all for 15 years.

Iran will be required to ship spent fuel out of the country forever, as well as allow inspectors from the IAEA inspectors certain access in perpetuity. Heightened inspections, including tracking uranium mining and monitoring the production and storage of centrifuges, will last for up to 20 years.

The U.S. estimates that the new measures take Iran from being able to assemble its first bomb within 2-3 months, to at least one year from now.

Far from over

But the deal between Iran and world powers, brokered during lengthy negotiations in a Vienna hotel, is far from the end of the story.

The accord is expected to face fierce opposition from Republicans in the U.S. Congress, as well as from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, a longstanding critic of the negotiations.

"From the initial reports we can already conclude that this agreement is a historic mistake for the world," Netanyahu said Tuesday. "Far-reaching concessions have been made in all areas that were supposed to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons capability."

For his part, Obama called Netanyahu on Tuesday to discuss the deal. According to a White House statement, Obama reassured the Israeli leader of his administration's "stalwart commitment to Israel's security."

"The President told the Prime Minister that today's agreement on the nuclear issue will not diminish our concerns regarding Iran's support for terrorism and threats toward Israel," the statement said.

Congress has 60 days to review the agreement, giving its opponents plenty of time to dig into the details and challenge the Obama administration's position.

In Tehran, the deal will need the clear backing of Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, to fend off any objections from hardliners suspicious of an accord with the United States after decades of hostility and mistrust.

Rouhani said on Twitter that the deal shows that "constructive engagement works."

"With this unnecessary crisis resolved, new horizons emerge with a focus on shared challenges," he tweeted."

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the current state of the Iran Nuclear program. According to the article Congress has 60 days to review the agreement, giving its opponents plenty of time to dig into the details and challenge the Obama administration's position. As the AFF you should argue that with the current imbalance of power between the executive branch and Congress, we need this legislation to ensure the plan is implemented in a way that protects the interest of all parties. If President Obama can come in and make changes, even at the protest of this Congress, then we have a supreme issue with the balance of power in this country.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article explains how President Obama has become known for his aggressive use of executive power. It goes on to list 5 ways that Obama's use of power has been seen as controversial. As the AFF you should read these examples and argue that they were indeed an over extension of executive power, and that the Iran deal is something that is too important for global relationships to let executive power make significant changes. You can go ever further to argue that Congress should be the main governing factor in this issue due to the safety concerns it has. The NEG might have a few arguments ready against the use of Congress in this matter, so just be prepared.

This second article explains the current state of the Iran Nuclear program. According to the article Congress has 60 days to review the agreement, giving its opponents plenty of time to dig into the details and challenge the Obama administration's position. As the AFF you should argue that with the current imbalance of power between the executive branch and Congress, we need this legislation to ensure the plan is implemented in a way that protects the interest of all parties. If President Obama can come in and make changes, even at the protest of this Congress, then we have a supreme issue with the balance of power in this country.

Negative Evidence

NEG – The President has been Critical in the Iran Nuclear Program

CNN “Landmark deal reached on Iran nuclear program” Jethro Mullen and Nic Robertson, July 14, 2015 < <http://www.cnn.com/2015/07/14/politics/iran-nuclear-deal/> >

“After arduous talks that spanned 20 months, negotiators have reached a landmark deal aimed at reining in Iran's nuclear program.

The agreement, a focal point of U.S. President Barack Obama's foreign policy, appears set to reshape relations between Iran and the West, with its effects likely to ripple across the volatile Middle East.

Representatives of Iran, the United States and the other nations involved in the marathon talks held a final meeting in Vienna on Tuesday.

Obama will hold a press conference on Wednesday in the East Room of the White House to address questions on the agreement.

The president praised the deal on Tuesday morning, saying the agreement met the goals he had in place throughout negotiations.

"Today after two years of negotiation the United States together with the international community has achieved something that decades of animosity has not: a comprehensive long-term deal with Iran that will prevent it from obtaining a nuclear weapon," Obama said from the White House, with Vice President Joe Biden at his side.

"This deal is not built on trust. It's built on verification," Obama said Tuesday.

Iranian President Hassan Rouhani also praised the deal, speaking after Obama finished, as televisions in Iran broadcast the U.S. President's statement live, translated into Farsi.

"Negotiators have reached a good agreement and I announce to our people that our prayers have come true," Rouhani said in a live address to the nation following Obama.

The essential idea behind the deal is that in exchange for limits on its nuclear activities, Iran would get relief from sanctions while being allowed to continue its atomic program for peaceful purposes.

After news of the deal emerged, Yukiya Amano, the chief of the International Atomic Energy Agency, said he had signed a "roadmap" with the Iranian government "for the clarification of past and present outstanding issues regarding Iran's nuclear program."

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the steps that lead to the development of the Iran Nuclear Program. You should take the time to read the whole article to get an idea of the role the Obama had in the development of the program. As the NEG you should argue that a program of this magnitude requires the efforts of Congress and the President working together. You should then argue that Obama was critical in protecting certain interests in the nuclear program which is the only reason this program was successfully developed in the first place.*

NEG – Obama is not the Worst Offender in Over-Using Power

Forbes “When It Comes To Abuse Of Presidential Power, Obama Is A Mere Piker” Richard M. Salsman, January 28, 2013 < <http://www.forbes.com/sites/richardsalsman/2013/01/28/when-it-comes-to-abuse-of-presidential-power-obama-is-a-mere-piker/>>

“Republicans and conservatives have complained loudly lately that President Obama has been resorting to non-democratic and unconstitutional governance; imperiously ignoring the so-called “will of the people” by issuing a cascade of new executive orders. According to Senator Rand Paul (R-KY), Mr. Obama is acting “like a king” by issuing his recent executive orders on gun control. Conservative author and radio talk show host Mark Levin contends that Obama’s executive orders are “un-American” and even “fascistic.”

If so, then certain Republican presidents – including Dwight Eisenhower, Gerald Ford, and Ronald Reagan – must be classified as even more monarchical, un-American and “fascistic” than Barack Obama. The nearby table shows the number of executive orders issued per year by every U.S. president since 1900.

The average for all twenty presidents is 44 per annum (p.a.), with Democrats averaging 59 p.a. and Republicans averaging 34 p.a. Harry Truman had the highest rate of decree issuance (113 p.a.), while Warren Harding had the lowest rate (just 2 p.a.). So far, Mr. Obama has averaged 37 executive orders p.a., which is below the long-term average of 44 p.a., and lower also than the rate of five GOP presidents – including Gerald Ford (84 p.a.), Dwight Eisenhower (60 p.a.), Richard Nixon (58 p.a.), Ronald Reagan (48 p.a.), and George H.W. Bush (41 p.a.).

Of course, a mere *quantification* of executive orders can’t constitute a full-fledged study of the topic, since it does not address the actual *content* or *effects* of such orders. Some have been more tyrannical and rights-violating than others (see more, below), while most have been merely administrative and wholly innocuous. But the numbers give us a start. Others can easily dig into the details of orders, which are available on line at The American Presidency Project.

That Mr. Obama has issued fewer edicts (so far) than his predecessors does not thereby justify his decrees, but it does allow us to question the unrestrained hyperbole we’ve been hearing from the right-hand side of the American political spectrum. In the 1970s the Democrats may have been more justified to complain of Richard Nixon and his “imperial presidency” (indeed, that was the title of a 1973 book by Harvard history professor and JFK acolyte Arthur Schlesinger), because Mr. Nixon issued an average of 58 orders p.a. Yet those same Democrats failed to note that JFK, in his short tenure at the White House, issued 22% more orders (71 p.a.) than did Nixon. If Nixon was dangerously imperial, was JFK positively monarchical?”

TAKEAWAY – *This article compares the number of executive orders that Obama has performed to other US Presidents. This legislation is trying to instill the idea that Obama has been abusing his power while in office, which is simply not the case. As the NEG you should argue that the President had a significant role to play in the implementation of programs such as this-especially when they involve the prevention of nuclear war. Isn’t that his job as Commander-in Chief? You can further argue that his Bill is abusive to the entitled power the President in such issues and should be negated. We should promote the separation of powers that this government was founded upon and should not support any bill that tries to compromise these ideals.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article explains the steps that lead to the development of the Iran Nuclear Program. You should take the time to read the whole article to get an idea of the role the Obama had in the development of the program. As the NEG you should argue that a program of this magnitude requires the efforts of Congress and the President working together. You should then argue that Obama was critical in protecting certain interests in the nuclear program which is the only reason this program was successfully developed in the first place.

This second article compares the number of executive orders that Obama has performed to other US Presidents. This legislation is trying to instill the idea that Obama has been abusing his power while in office, which is simply not the case. As the NEG you should argue that the President had a significant role to play in the implementation of programs such as this- especially when they involve the prevention of nuclear war. Isn't that his job as Commander-in Chief? You can further argue that his Bill is abusive to the entitled power the President in such issues and should be negated. We should promote the separation of powers that this government was founded upon and should not support any bill that tries to compromise these ideals.

Legislation – A Resolution to Sanction Zimbabwe to Promote International
Law
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Violence in Zimbabwe Only Expected to Grow

News Day “No room for political violence in Zim” September 10, 2015 <
<https://www.newsday.co.zw/2015/09/10/no-room-for-political-violence-in-zim/>>

“Recent disclosures by the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission’s (ZHRC) report that Zanu PF continues to use political violence against its perceived enemies shows that the party is retrogressive.

The ZHRC report, which was produced following running battles in the run-up to the Hurungwe West by-election, indicates how President Robert Mugabe’s party has abdicated its role to protect the interests of the majority for selfish means.

Preventing violence is the responsibility of everyone and the police should engage stakeholders to sensitise political parties on the dangers of violence...

... We believe that opposition political parties and the international world must apply pressure on Mugabe to ensure the culprits are brought before a court of law and for the country to reform electoral laws.

If this is not done, Zimbabwe might witness human rights abuses of greater magnitude given the population is living on the edge as a result of the economic meltdown due to Mugabe and Zanu PF’s destructive policies.

Mugabe is likely to use authoritarian means to suppress dissent as the restive population demands change going into the 2018 watershed elections...

... It is ironic that even some top party officials were named as behind the violence. We urge Mugabe to ensure that party youths and all those behind the heinous acts are arrested as a matter of urgency.

It is also high time that police officers are trained to investigate and handle human rights and politically-motivated cases, otherwise ruling party politicians will continue to abuse the officers. The police officers must not act in a partisan manner so as to further the interests of any political party or cause yet, Zanu PF has been abusing the system ordering the arrest of opponents.

The campaign period is no exception with regard to violence. Violence should not be given room and any perpetrators of violence should face the full wrath of the law. The violence that keeps rocking the political campaigns should come to a stop. We condemn violence as we concur with the ZHRC that the people who condone violence have no place in politics and have no role to play in the country’s precious democracy.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the current human rights violations in Zimbabwe, and how they are only likely to continue. The current sanctions put on Mugabe and others are not working. The country is still subject to political violence, and the citizens of Zimbabwe, the ones we want to protect, are suffering as a result. The United States must increase sanctions to*

press on Mugabe and others that change is necessary, and this violence needs to end. The United States can no longer stand for this, and since current sanctions aren't enough, we must increase them.

AFF – Zimbabwe a Threat to American Interest

Daily Nation “US extends sanctions on Robert Mugabe, security chiefs and Zimbabwe firms” Kitsepile Nyathi, March 5, 2015 < <http://www.nation.co.ke/news/africa/Obama-extends-sanctions-on-Mugabe/-/1066/2643286/-/gti5cjz/-/index.html>>

““The threat constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe’s democratic process or institutions has not been resolved,” President Obama said in a statement.

“These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the US.

“For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.”

Western countries accuse President Mugabe of human rights violations and alleged electoral theft.

Zimbabwe has held disputed elections since 2000, when a strong opposition emerged against the 91-year-old leader, who has been in power since the country got its independence from Britain in 1980.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how Zimbabwe poses a threat to the United States and our interests in that region, which is why the United States remains committed to sanctions on the corrupt country. As the affirmative, you can counter argue a negative argument that we should lift sanctions, by saying that Mugabe and a lot of the political leaders in Zimbabwe are terrible threats to the safety of that country. Without completely overturning them, we need to do something. What we shouldn't do – give them money that will further fuel their corruption, and destroy the small semblance of hope that's left in Zimbabwe.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article discusses the current human rights violations in Zimbabwe, and how they are only likely to continue. The current sanctions put on Mugabe and others are not working. The country is still subject to political violence, and the citizens of Zimbabwe, the ones we want to protect, are suffering as a result. The United States must increase sanctions to press on Mugabe and others that change is necessary, and this violence needs to end. The United States can no longer stand for this, and since current sanctions aren't enough, we must increase them.

The second article talks about how Zimbabwe poses a threat to the United States and our interests in that region, which is why the United States remains committed to sanctions on the corrupt country. As the affirmative, you can counter argue a negative argument that we should lift sanctions, by saying that Mugabe and a lot of the political leaders in Zimbabwe are terrible threats to the safety of that country. Without completely overturning them, we need to do something. What we shouldn't do – give them money that will further fuel their corruption, and destroy the small semblance of hope that's left in Zimbabwe.

Negative Evidence

NEG – European Union Sanctions Decreasing, Not Completely Lifting

Reuters “EU renews sanctions on Zimbabwe, Mugabe” February 20 2015 <
<http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/02/20/us-zimbabwe-eu-sanctions-idUSKBN0LO14L20150220>>

“The European Union renewed for another year its sanctions against Zimbabwe, including a travel ban and asset freeze on President Robert Mugabe and his wife, according to a notice on Friday in the EU's Official Journal.

"The restrictive measures should be renewed until Feb. 20, 2016," the notice read. "The application of the travel ban and asset freeze should be maintained for two persons."

Since imposing sanctions in 2002 over electoral fraud and human rights abuses, the EU has eased measures to encourage political reform in Zimbabwe, although it has kept its ban on Mugabe and his wife Grace, as well as an arms embargo.

This week it gave Zimbabwe 234 million euros (173.62 million pounds) in aid, its first since sanctions were imposed. And earlier this month, EU officials said that the 90-year-old president might be allowed in on an exceptional basis during his year-long chairmanship of the African Union, if traveling on AU business.

The Official Journal, however, made clear EU governments are not yet convinced that Mugabe had changed enough to merit a final lifting of restrictions. Representatives of the 28 member states had "carried out a review" of sanctions "taking into account political developments in Zimbabwe", the notice read.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the European Union has steadily been lifting sanctions a little bit at a time, to reward them for improvements made in the country. Though they haven't lifted them completely, they have sent aid for the first time in over a decade, and will continue to reward Zimbabwe, if it continues this path. There's no reason the United States should increase sanctions. In fact, the US should follow the example set by the European Union.*

NEG – US Won't Lift Current Sanctions, Sanctions Are Unwarranted

Voice of America News “US Sanctions Against Zimbabwe to Stay in Place” Megan Duzor, May 29, 2015 <
<http://www.voanews.com/content/united-states-sanctions-zimbabwe/2798784.html>>

“The United States says it will keep in place targeted sanctions on Zimbabwe imposed more than a decade ago.

Shannon Smith, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of state for African affairs, told VOA's Zimbabwe service after a recent trip to the country that the United States was sticking to its wait-and-see strategy regarding the possible lifting of travel bans and other sanctions against President Robert Mugabe and his leadership. She noted that the sanctions were "very targeted."

"The U.S. sanctions are aimed at fewer than 200 individuals and institutions in Zimbabwe, in a nation of over 13 million people," Smith said.

Smith said the United States did not feel pressured to change its policy by the European Union's decision last year to lift a visa ban and assets freeze against members of Zimbabwe's ruling elite, with the exception of Mugabe and his wife, Grace.

"We don't feel pressured. The European Union obviously makes its own policy choices. We continue to share with them the same fundamental goals of seeing a freer, democratic Zimbabwe that adheres to the rule of law and other standards," Smith said.

... Mugabe has for years has used every opportunity to criticize Washington over the sanctions, saying they have been responsible for his country's economic woes and aimed at inciting Zimbabweans to overthrow the government."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about a few things that you can use for the negative side of this legislation. First, it says that the US currently has sanctions on Zimbabwe, and those sanctions are doing enough in the status quo to prove a point to Zimbabwe. Second, you can use this article to say that the United States should lift sanctions, because the sanctions against Zimbabwe are targeting a small group a people, in a nation of millions. Why should we make an entire country even more than they already do?*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the European Union has steadily been lifting sanctions a little bit at a time, to reward them for improvements made in the country. Though they haven't lifted them completely, they have sent aid for the first time in over a decade, and will continue to reward Zimbabwe, if it continues this path. There's no reason the United States should increase sanctions. In fact, the US should follow the example set by the European Union.

The second article talks about a few things that you can use for the negative side of this legislation. First, it says that the US currently has sanctions on Zimbabwe, and those sanctions are doing enough in the status quo to prove a point to Zimbabwe. Second, you can use this article to say that the United States should lift sanctions, because the sanctions against Zimbabwe are targeting a small group a people, in a nation of millions. Why should we make an entire country even more than they already do?

Legislation – A Bill to Remove Credit Unions Tax Exempt Status Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Removing Credit Union Tax Exemption Would Raise \$19 Billion in Tax Revenue

CNBC, “Tax battle: Banks on offensive against credit unions,” Mark Koba, September 11, 2013, < <http://www.cnbc.com/id/101022394> >

“Credit unions offer the same products as banks, and yet they get a tax exemption that costs taxpayers \$2 billion a year,” said James Ballentine, chief lobbyist for the American Bankers Association, an industry trade group. “It’s just fairness for the banking community and the taxpayers to stop the exemption,” he said...

Credit unions are now a \$1 trillion industry. They hold 6 percent of all financial assets in the U.S...

In a 2010 report on tax reform commissioned by President Barack Obama, an advisory board said that eliminating the federal tax exemption for credit unions would raise \$19 billion in Treasury revenue over 10 years.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that credit unions tax exemptions cost taxpayers \$2 Billion a year. They are now a \$1 Trillion industry. Eliminating their tax exemption would raise \$19 Billion in 10 years. As the affirmative you just really have to hit those numbers home.*

AFF – Statistics That Prove Credit Unions Need to Be Taxed

American Bankers Association, “Tax Credit Unions,” Accessed October 21, 2015, < <http://www.aba.com/issues/pages/tax-credit-unions.aspx> >

“In a time of rising debt levels, Congress should examine the affordability of the credit union tax exemption. Instead of focusing on the financial needs of low- and moderate-income individuals—the very individuals Congress envisioned them serving—evidence shows that credit unions use their tax exemption to subsidize wealthy individuals and commercial real estate developers. The credit union special tax-exempt status is no long justified.

Taxpayers can no longer afford to continue subsidizing an industry that no longer aligns with good public policy...

- Credit Unions are now a \$1 trillion industry, competition for the same business and offering the same products as community banks.
- There are now 208 credit unions with more than \$1 billion in assets - a large increase from 1991, when only 11 credit unions were this large.
- A 2006 U.S. Government Accountability Office study found that a bigger portion of credit union customers are upper-income compared to bank customers.
- Of the \$8.6 billion credit union industry profits reported in 2012, three-fourths of those profits were concentrated in credit unions with over \$500 million in assets, representing

less than 6 percent of credit unions.

- Since 2001, credit unions have increased the deficit by not paying an estimated \$20.5 billion in federal income taxes.
- The credit union tax exemption is expected to be the 17th largest corporate tax expenditure by conservative estimates found in the Office of Management and Budget's Analytical Perspectives.
- An individual tax payer will pay more in taxes each year than all credit unions combined.
- Decades ago, mutual insurance companies and mutual savings banks, with ownership structures similar to credit unions, lost their tax exemptions, specifically in the 1940s and 50s and continue to operate, and thrive, while paying taxes.
- Canada and Australia, in 1972 and 1994 respectively, repealed their credit union industries' tax exemptions...

Borrowing from U.S. Treasury

For decades, credit unions have adamantly opposed paying one dime of federal income taxes and continue to do so. Yet, the credit union industry borrowed more than \$29 billion dollars from the U.S. Treasury.

Borrowing:

- more than \$18 billion to stabilize two failed corporate credit unions through the National Credit Union Administration's Credit Liquidity Facility in 2009 and
- more than \$11 billion by the Temporary Corporate Credit Union Stabilization Fund to handle resolution costs of failed corporate credit unions.

More than \$5 billion of the borrowed funds remain outstanding, due to the taxpayers.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence is stuffed full of really powerful statistics for removing credit unions tax exemption status. You could use these stats to strengthen an affirmative speech, or you could choose one of these statistics to build a foundation for a speech.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that credit unions tax exemptions cost taxpayers \$2 Billion a year. They are now a \$1 Trillion industry. Eliminating their tax exemption would raise \$19 Billion in 10 years. As the affirmative you just really have to hit those numbers home.

The second piece of evidence is stuffed full of really powerful statistics for removing credit unions tax exemption status. You could use these stats to strengthen an affirmative speech, or you could choose one of these statistics to build a foundation for a speech.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Credit Unions Deserve Their Tax Exempt Status

Coastal Credit Union, “Why Credit Unions Are Tax-Exempt?” October 21, 2015, <
<https://www.coastal24.com/aboutus/tax-exemption.html> >

“Here are just a few reasons [to keep the tax exemption]

- Credit unions are not-for-profit, democratic, financial cooperatives, owned by their members.
- Credit unions' boards of directors serve as unpaid volunteers, elected by members.
- Credit unions, with limitations on who they can serve and restrictions on products and services, also have a social mission to provide service to people of modest means as part of their member base.

CUs Are Different

- Credit unions were created to provide financial services in a democratic, not-for-profit, cooperative manner, that is, with member ownership and control. Those characteristics are the foundation of the tax exemption. Early in the history of credit unions, the U.S. attorney general declared state-chartered credit unions exempt from federal income taxes because they were "organized and operated for mutual purposes [in which an organization's members share in the profits and expenses] and without profits." Later on, in the 1930s, legislators passed a law to exempt federally chartered credit unions from federal income tax for the same reason. Today, legislators continue to maintain that status because credit unions, while growing and changing, still operate in this unique way.
- Credit unions' boards of directors serve as unpaid volunteers, elected by members. Credit unions return all excess income to members, in the form of higher deposit rates, lower loan rates, and lower fees. Credit unions don't need to create profits to pay stockholders, as do banks. The amounts banks pay stockholders dwarf their tax bills: Over the past five years, they've paid almost \$78 billion more to stockholders than in taxes...

Tax Repercussions

- If credit unions paid income tax, the contribution to state and federal treasuries would make not one penny difference in the taxes you pay as an individual. But the effect such taxes would have on how much you pay for credit union loans for cars, education, and houses, or the dividends you earn on credit union savings, would be significant. Just as banks pass along their tax payments in fees and interest rates, so credit unions would have to pass along that expense to members, also in the form of higher fees, higher loan rates, and lower savings dividends. Credit unions, if taxed, also would have to take the money from funds otherwise dedicated to reserves--the cushion protecting all members and the credit union from economic shifts. Again, not-for-profit credit unions aren't like banks, which have profits aplenty.

CUs Contribute Now

- All taxpayers have legitimate concerns about the federal budget deficit, and state deficits as well. Credit unions and members already participate in reducing those shortfalls. You pay taxes on dividends your credit union accounts earn. And, members of federally chartered and/or insured credit unions had \$5 billion in the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund (NCUSIF) in 2001. This self-sufficient fund, another unique feature of the credit union movement, has never asked for nor needed any money from taxpayers, unlike other deposit insurance funds. Credit unions are not-for-profit, democratic, financial cooperatives that serve members. As long as that's true, they're earning their tax status.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence gives a little history about credit unions. Credit unions were created to provide financial services in a democratic, not-for-profit, cooperative manner, with member ownership and control. Their board members are unpaid volunteers. They aren't focused on profit, so any profit goes back to the members. If credit unions were to lose their tax exempt status they wouldn't be able to offer loans at competitive rates, charge lower fees, etc. As the negative, you have to argue that credit unions are non-profit organization structurally, therefore they shouldn't be taxed. If we remove their tax exempt status, we would have to remove the tax exempt status of all non-profits. Think of the ramifications!*

NEG – Removing Tax Exempt Status from Credit Union Would Cost Consumers \$10 Billion a Year

CNBC, "Tax battle: Banks on offensive against credit unions," Mark Koba, September 11, 2013, < <http://www.cnbc.com/id/101022394> >

"Congress knows the value of credit unions," he said. "We were the only group lending to small businesses during the financial crisis. Our not-for-profit status shows that for us, it's not about stockholders, but about our members."

"If we lost the exemption, we'd be just like the banks," Berger said. "We don't want to be like them."

Credit unions, unlike banks, are not-for-profit, member-owned cooperatives. They have no shareholders and elect their boards of directors using a one-person, one-vote system, regardless of the amount individuals have invested.

Though products can vary, most credit unions are set up to offer more competitive interest rates and credit than banks and provide services like no-fee checking. Many are set up to directly support community development.

Only members of the credit union can deposit or withdraw funds, and the members usually, but not always, belong to a labor union, religious group or are employees of one company. Credit unions differ in terms of size and asset value.

It was under a 1934 law called the Federal Credit Union Act—and partly due to the devastating national bank collapse from the Great Depression—that credit unions got a federal tax exemption because "credit unions are mutual or cooperative organizations operated entirely by and for their members." They still must pay state and local taxes...

They hold 6 percent of all financial assets in the U.S., compared with banks' 93 percent.

"Banks are trying to have it all and drive credit unions out of business with this push to end the tax exemption," said Tony Cherin, a professor of finance at San Diego State University and a board member of the USE Credit Union in San Diego...

A study commissioned by the NAFCU in 2012 countered that, saying that removing the tax exemption would cost credit union consumers about \$10 billion a year through higher fees and interest rates on loans. And it would cost the federal government some \$1.5 billion in lost tax revenue, due to loss of income, if the exemption was eliminated."

TAKEAWAY – *This article, like the first article, gives a bit of background on why credit unions have a tax exempt status. You can use their history to form a negative argument. Beyond that, though, credit unions do pay state and local taxes, so they aren't completely tax exempt. A study shows that removing the federal tax exempt status from credit unions would cost credit union members \$10 Billion a year and would cost the federal government \$1.5 billion in lost tax revenue a year. So, removing the tax exempt status would cost consumers and the federal government money. This is a huge point to hit on in a negative speech.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence gives a little history about credit unions. Credit unions were created to provide financial services in a democratic, not-for-profit, cooperative manner, with member ownership and control. Their board members are unpaid volunteers. They aren't focused on profit, so any profit goes back to the members. If credit unions were to lose their tax exempt status they wouldn't be able to offer loans at competitive rates, charge lower fees, etc. As the negative, you have to argue that credit unions are non-profit organization structurally, therefore they shouldn't be taxed. If we remove their tax exempt status, we would have to remove the tax exempt status of all non-profits. Think of the ramifications!

The second article, like the first article, gives a bit of background on why credit unions have a tax exempt status. You can use their history to form a negative argument. Beyond that, though, credit unions do pay state and local taxes, so they aren't completely tax exempt. A study shows that removing the federal tax exempt status from credit unions would cost credit union members \$10 Billion a year and would cost the federal government \$1.5 billion in lost tax revenue a year. So, removing the tax exempt status would cost consumers and the federal government money. This is a huge point to hit on in a negative speech.

Legislation – A Bill to Amend Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to
More Effectively Restrict the Use of Force
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Child Abuse Cases are on the Rise

Washington Post “The number of child abuse cases in the military hits a decade high” Missy Ryan, September 2, 2015 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/checkpoint/wp/2015/09/02/the-number-of-child-abuse-cases-in-the-military-hits-a-decade-high/>>

“Confirmed cases of abuse and neglect of military children increased markedly in 2014, Defense Department data showed on Wednesday, prompting concerns among Pentagon about efforts to safeguard the nation’s over 1 million military children.

In fiscal year 2014, officials tracking family violence within the military confirmed 7,676 cases of child abuse or neglect, an increase of 10 percent from the previous year, according to annual statistics on child abuse and domestic violence. Confirmed cases of neglect – which excludes physical and sexual abuse – rose by 14 percent, military officials said.

The data, which has not been released publicly and was obtained by the Washington Post, contrasts with a years-long decline in child abuse and neglect among civilian families nationwide.

“It really did get our attention,” a Defense Department official said, speaking on condition of anonymity to discuss the data. But officials equally acknowledged they don’t fully understand the reasons behind – or the significance of – the increase in 2014 abuse figures.

The number of abused and neglected military children dropped steadily from 2004 until 2008, when it began to rise again.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that there were 7,676 confirmed cases of child abuse or neglect in 2014 within military families, an increase of 10 percent from the previous year and confirmed cases of neglect – which excludes physical and sexual abuse – rose by 14 percent. As the AFF you should argue that this increase in such a specific demographic is a prime example of how the CAPTA laws have failed to adjust to the times. If there had been equal enforcement and prevention across the board, then we would not see such an increase in a specific demographic. The laws need to change with a changing demographic to ensure adequate protection of all children from abuse.*

AFF – The Ways in Which Children are Abused has Changed- So Must our Laws

BBC “‘Witchcraft’ abuse cases on the rise” Ruth Evans, October 11, 2015 < <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-34475424>>

“The Metropolitan Police said there had been 60 crimes linked to faith in London so far this year. It saw reports double from 23 in 2013 to 46 in 2014.

Half of UK police forces do not record such cases and many local authorities are also unable to provide figures.

The NSPCC said authorities "need to ensure they are able to spot the signs of this particular brand of abuse".

London is unique in having a police team, Project Violet, dedicated to this type of abuse. Its figures relate to crime reports where officers have flagged a case as involving abuse linked to faith or belief. Many of the cases involve children.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how there are certain forms of abuse that might be harder to detect or spot without the current system of prevention. As the AFF should argue that we need to ensure we are able to spot the signs of this particular brand of abuse, no matter how subtle or unfamiliar these signs are. You should extend this argument by saying that all laws go through some form of revision or alteration to adapt to a changing social environment. These laws are no different. We need to alter them as social issues grow, to be able to stick with the times, and contend with the social issues of today.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that there were 7,676 confirmed cases of child abuse or neglect in 2014 within military families, an increase of 10 percent from the previous year and confirmed cases of neglect – which excludes physical and sexual abuse – rose by 14 percent. As the AFF you should argue that this increase in such a specific demographic is a prime example of how the CAPTA laws have failed to adjust to the times. If there had been equal enforcement and prevention across the board, then we would not see such an increase in a specific demographic. The laws need to change with a changing demographic to ensure adequate protection of all children from abuse.

This second article explains how there are certain forms of abuse that might be harder to detect or spot without the current system of prevention. As the AFF should argue that we need to ensure we are able to spot the signs of this particular brand of abuse, no matter how subtle or unfamiliar these signs are. You should extend this argument by saying that all laws go through some form of revision or alteration to adapt to a changing social environment. These laws are no different. We need to alter them as social issues grow, to be able to stick with the times, and contend with the social issues of today.

Negative Evidence

NEG – CAPTA Laws are Catching more Cases of Abuse than Ever Before

Fox 59 “Child abuse on the rise in Indiana, 2015 a record-breaking year” JAMES GHERARDI, JUNE 2, 2015 < <http://fox59.com/2015/06/02/child-abuse-on-the-rise-in-indiana-2015-a-record-breaking-year/>>

“If you think you’re seeing more child abuse cases than ever before, you’d be correct. Indiana Department of Child Services reports that 2015 has been a record-breaking year for child abuse cases.

Parents in Greenfield are accused of killing their 1-year-old girl. The alleged abuse started at birth. The investigation has been taxing even for police that deal with disturbing cases every day.

“This case in particular has been very taxing on our detectives,” said Chief of Police John Jester.

Also in the news now, the case captivating Indy; the search for 3-month-old baby Janna Rivera, who is now presumed dead.

“There’s not really an end in sight for the increase,” said Carey Haley Wong, chief counsel for Marion County Child Advocates.

The first five months of 2015 have been record-breaking in child abuse cases.

Already, in the first five months of 2015, there are 1,736 new children in need of services in Marion County, that’s a 42 percent jump since that same time in 2014. Wong says there are many factors that have led to this increase, with one in particular though acting as the largest cause for concern.

“It’s largely attributable to heroin though not entirely because there are other factors like poverty and domestic violence and mental health that play as well, but heroin is the new thing that’s leading to this increase,” said Wong.

The problem is not exclusive to Marion County though. DCS announced 2015 is breaking child abuse records across the state as well.

Nearly 18,000 children are in need of service. That is up 26 percent from 2014.

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how there are more reported cases of child abuse during the first 5 months of this year than any of the previous few years. A total of 18,000 children are in need of service. That is up 26 percent from 2014. As the NEG you should argue that that the current system is working, because they are preventing the abuse of and providing more treatment to children every year. We are already seeing an increase in the number of child abuse cases being reported, which allows us to approach and handle them with discretion. These children must be helped, and the current laws are working to help them. If we change the laws, we will make the system more complicated, thus not allowing for the same level of productivity we’ve seen in recent years.*

NEG – This Legislation is too Vague to Ensure the Effectiveness

The Heritage Foundation “CAPTA Successes and Failures at Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect” Patrick F. Fagan, Ph.D., August 2, 2001 < <http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/capta-successes-and-failures-at-preventing-child-abuse-and-neglect>>

“Family Structure and the Role of Parents

We do know that rates of abuse for children are lowest in intact married families. We know that abuse is highest when mother cohabits with a boyfriend who is not the father of the children. This family arrangement is very frequent among the poor, thanks in no small part to the role of the federal government.

Federal welfare payment structures and Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) regulations massively penalize marriage, and in so doing the federal government has an active role in fostering the family structures that feed child abuse the most.

If the federal government wants to see a decrease in the rates of child abuse, logically, it must commit itself to restoring marriage particularly amongst the poor: restoring commitment, loyalty and security. Both abused women and children will benefit.

United Nations and Parental Rights

For decades now among some child advocates there has been a growing hostility towards parents and a dismissal of the rights of parents. This runs from local cases such as described above to the infamous 1980 Washington State Supreme Court judgement against the parents of Sheila Marie Sumey, when the child was removed from her parents at her own request, acknowledged to be without cause on the parents side of the issue. Though history, and the now grown teenage girl both clearly state the courts were wrong, the precedent still stands in Washington State and the court has not renounced its error.

At the United Nations the rights of parents to raise their children according to their moral and religious beliefs is constantly under attack from the U.N. Secretariat.² For instance the committee tasked to bring nations into compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child (which the US has not ratified) rebuked Great Britain for permitting parents to withdraw children from sex-education classes that ran counter to their moral beliefs, even though the rights of parents to direct the moral formation of children is enunciated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the two treaties which implement the Declaration. The U.N. Secretariat has never countermanded the committee rebuke.

In 1998 at the U.N. Lisbon conference of Ministers of Youth the rights of parents to form their adolescent children was repeatedly fought off and deliberately not included in the final concluding document.

Furthermore the U.N. committees are urging states to give minor children:
The right to privacy, even in the household;

The right to professional counseling without parental consent or guidance;
The full right to abortion and contraceptives, even when that would violate the parents' ethics and desires;

The right to full freedom of expression at home and in school;

The legal mechanisms to challenge in court their parent's authority in the home.

For example, the U.N. Committee on the Rights of the Child recommends to the Japanese government that it "guarantee the child's right to privacy, especially in the family." Such a measure would establish legal and structural wedges between parents and their children in the home. Normally, when children rebel against their parents, society frowns. Yet the U.N. is attempting to put in place, in policy and law, structures that foster this type of rebellion.³

These are not distant threats to the rights of parents, they are as close as the Convention on the Rights of the Child already signed by President Clinton, though not ratified by the Senate.

There are dangerous attitudes of hostility towards the roles and rights of parents, attitudes growing among many in the applied fields of children's policy and in the policy community of children's advocates at the national and international level. Because Congress funds so much of the programs that interface the rights of children and the rights of parents it behooves it to protect the constitutional rights of due process of parents...

...Anonymous tips

The highest substantiation rates of reports of abuse come from professionals who report their concerns, while the lowest level of substantiation of abuse comes from anonymous reports.

A huge proportion (70 percent on average, and up to 90 percent in some districts) of the investigations of child abuse triggered by anonymous reports turn out to be without foundation and these investigations eat up a massive amount of the resources needed to deal with real child abuse and neglect.

When an innocent family is confronted with police and social workers in a baseless case they are frequently frightened needlessly. Furthermore when they are treated with the presumption to be felons (when they are innocent) each such treatment erodes citizens confidence in the child protective service and even in law enforcement. This sense of distrust has been growing for a number of years among traditional church-going families and particularly among homeschooling families (who as a group are the superior performers on raising their children), a distrust that should be of concern to all lawmakers and law enforcement officers and court officers...

Due Process Rights

A related abuse of law is that parents are not informed of their rights when investigators call. For instance recently in Missouri a parent was anonymously accused of spanking his child 250 times of chaining the children to chairs and of emotionally abusing them in other ways. Two social workers, a sheriff and two criminal investigators showed up at the door and claimed right of entry. The show of force was overwhelming to the mother who answered the door. The case was eventually judged to be baseless and malicious but only after much trauma to the children and family was this finally the judgement of the police and caseworkers. In other cases when parents know and exercise their rights and refuse entry they are sometimes subject to harassment and abuse by the investigators.⁶

The proper approach would be to remind parents of their rights (that they do not have to let investigators into the home, and that they do have the right to counsel before

proceeding further). Thereafter investigators may try to persuade parents to permit them to investigate and bring the issue to swift close.

These two reforms would massively reduce the unnecessary investigation caseload and help restore the confidence of parents in the child protection system.

Furthermore it would restore due constitutional process to parents, the one group that does not have this fundamental civil right extended to them.

A warrant must be obtained before a home can be entered without the informed consent of the parents, especially in the case of anonymous reports.

To help redress violations of privacy, victims of such violations should be able to inspect their records in order to seek recourse and rectification of the record.

An articulation of parental rights is needed to level the playing field during child welfare investigations.

TAKEAWAY – *This article gives an in depth look at the effect that CAPTA has had on the wellbeing and protection of children. You should skim the article to get an idea of the effectiveness of CAPTA and then argue there is no way to know if a revision of the law would be as effective. As the NEG you have to argue that the vagueness of how this legislation plans on changing the text of the CAPTA law leaves room for concern. Until the Congress can prove that the alteration made to this Law will support the people depending on it, we cannot affirm this legislation. CAPTA has a long history of success and effectiveness, so the Congress should see no reason to change it- especially without being certain what these exact changes will be and that they will be just as, if not more successful, than the status quo.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article explains how there are more reported cases of child abuse during the first 5 months of this year than any of the previous few years. A total of 18,000 children are in need of service. That is up 26 percent from 2014. As the NEG you should argue that that the current system is working, because they are preventing the abuse of and providing more treatment to children every year. We are already seeing an increase in the number of child abuse cases being reported, which allows us to approach and handle them with discretion. These children must be helped, and the current laws are working to help them. If we change the laws, we will make the system more complicated, thus not allowing for the same level of productivity we've seen in recent years.

This second article gives an in depth look at the effect that CAPTA has had on the wellbeing and protection of children. You should skim the article to get an idea of the effectiveness of CAPTA and then argue there is no way to know if a revision of the law would be as effective. As the NEG you have to argue that the vagueness of how this legislation plans on changing the text of the CAPTA law leaves room for concern. Until the Congress can prove that the alteration made to this Law will support the people depending on it, we cannot affirm this legislation. CAPTA has a long history of success and effectiveness, so the Congress should see no reason to change it- especially without being certain what these exact changes will be and that they will be just as, if not more successful, than the status quo.

Legislation – A Bill to Amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to Increase Knowledge Concerning, and Improve Services for, Runaway and Homeless Youth Who are Victims of Trafficking
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Some Things Being Done, But More Awareness and Support is Necessary

WLKY “Conference held to educate people about human trafficking” October 20, 2015 <
<http://www.wlky.com/news/conference-held-to-educate-people-about-human-trafficking/35943714>>

“The summit was organized by Catholic Charities of Louisville after the organization came in contact with a number of victims forced into sex slavery.

Louisville Metro Police Department Chief Steve Conrad said it’s a real issue in the Derby City, and one his department is working to combat.

“Because Louisville is located on some major highways and we know there is a lot of travel involved in some trafficking cases, it is quite easy for traffickers to drive from Indy to Louisville to Nashville and back and forth again and again,” said Marissa Castellanos with Catholic Charities.

It's an issue local law enforcement officers notice more during big events such as the Kentucky Derby and the Farm Machinery Show.

LMPD works with the FBI to fight the crime and has created its own task force. So far this year at events in Louisville, police have arrested more than 50 prostitutes and more than 10 people for promoting prostitution.

The number of human-trafficking victims found across the state so far this year is 332. Most are women and children and many were trafficked for sex.

“That is just the identified number, and we believe there are so many more that never get identified in any way and still continue to be exploited right now,” Castellanos said.

It's a multimillion-dollar industry mostly facilitated on the Internet, and the number of people paying to have sex with children is surprising to some.

“The reason this industry survives is because it is patronized by people who stereotype. Overwhelmingly, people who buy kids for sex have wives and children at home, are prominent and respected members of the community,” former CEO of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children Ernie Allen said. “A lot of these kids, because they are initially runaways or throwaways or come out of the child welfare system, they don’t have a parent looking for them. (They) need to survive on the street. They are easy marks for people offering shelter, sustenance, friendship, even love.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article illustrates how local law enforcement is trying to combat human sex trafficking, and bring more attention and education to it, but that isn’t enough. They still aren’t able to catch most human traffickers, and as a result, these crimes are going unpunished. The federal government needs to step in and take action that will build support and awareness for this growing issue. This legislation is a step in that direction.*

AFF – Human Trafficking in the US Out of Control, More Awareness is Needed

CNN “Sex trafficking: The new American slavery” Leif Coorlim, Dana Ford, July 21, 2015 <
<http://www.cnn.com/2015/07/20/us/sex-trafficking/>>

“What we know about sex crimes is that it's not about sexual pleasure. It's about control,” said Whitmore. “What is similar to some of those girls that I work with is their self-esteem or lack thereof. You either become vulnerable to a man on the street or a man you meet in school. You become vulnerable because you're looking for attention.”

The human traffickers you never even notice

The human traffickers you never even notice 01:00

Soon, Sacharay's trafficker began asking for "favors" -- asking her to help make some money for him, by sleeping with another man.

"He was like, 'I love you for that, I love you so much,'" said Sacharay. "Then he would slowly put two, three more guys. I got upset when I first realized what he was doing, but I kept doing it because he made me feel like I was special."

The exploitation continued to escalate. Sacharay soon was being sold to dozens of men a day. She would meet these sex buyers in motel rooms near a freeway, or even sometimes in the back of the barbershop.

"One day I was like, I can't do this no more. I was in pain. I had sex with almost 40 guys in one day, and I was so tired, and I said, 'I can't do this no more.'"

Her trafficker didn't care. He made sure she knew leaving was not an option.

"He went into the other room, came back with a gun, and he was like: 'If you go somewhere, we'll see.'"

... More than 3,500 sex trafficking cases were reported to the National Human Trafficking Resource Center last year alone.

Under federal law, anyone under 18 years of age induced into commercial sex is a victim of sex trafficking -- regardless of whether the trafficker uses force, fraud, or coercion.

Sacharay's exploiter eventually brought her and another teen to Atlanta, because he could command higher prices.

According to a 2014 study by the Urban Institute, some traffickers in Atlanta make more than \$32,000 a week...

... The study also cited research findings from 2007 that Atlanta's illegal sex industry generates around \$290 million a year.

"It's a big city. There's a lot to do in Atlanta. A lot of conventions, a lot of hotels, a lot of parties going on, a lot of events," said Sgt. Torrey Kennedy with the DeKalb County Internet Crimes Against Children (ICAC) Unit. "So just like any businessmen, these traffickers know that."

A big part of Atlanta's draw is the airport, which is the busiest in the world.

"(A) man could get on that computer, anonymously, say, 'I'm coming in to go have sex with this child.' He'll fly in on a 3:00 flight, meet the child at 6:00, and be gone on the 8:00," said Dalia Racine, assistant district attorney for DeKalb County, which includes part of Atlanta. "How are we to ever find them? How are we to ever know who they are?"...

... "We're starting the process of getting people aware of what is happening at certain levels, so as the layers of the onion continue to get pulled back, we'll continue to learn and understand how this works," said actress Jada Pinkett Smith, who partnered with CNN for the film."

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses how devastating human sex trafficking can be, and how prevalent it is here in the United States. As we know, most cases go unreported, and things like this happen all the time, without the authorities even being aware, or able to stop it. People are being tortured, and some even refer to this as the newest form of slavery. We must make sex trafficking a priority, and help as many victims of this as possible. Agencies and organizations are trying their best, but until the federal government steps up and emphasizes this growing issue, we won't be doing enough.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article illustrates how local law enforcement is trying to combat human sex trafficking, and bring more attention and education to it, but that isn't enough. They still aren't able to catch most human traffickers, and as a result, these crimes are going unpunished. The federal government needs to step in and take action that will build support and awareness for this growing issue. This legislation is a step in that direction.

The second article discusses how devastating human sex trafficking can be, and how prevalent it is here in the United States. As we know, most cases go unreported, and things like this happen all the time, without the authorities even being aware, or able to stop it. People are being tortured, and some even refer to this as the newest form of slavery. We must make sex trafficking a priority, and help as many victims of this as possible. Agencies and organizations are trying their best, but until the federal government steps up and emphasizes this growing issue, we won't be doing enough.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Legislation Passed in 2015 Already Solves This Problem

Rob Portman, United States Senator Website “Portman Measures to Combat Human Trafficking Pass the Senate” April 22, 2015 < <http://www.portman.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2015/4/portman-measures-to-combat-human-trafficking-pass-the-senate>>

“Today, U.S. Senator Rob Portman (R-Ohio), co-chair of the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking, announced that the Senate has passed his bill to combat human trafficking, the Bringing Missing Children Home Act, as well as key provisions of his Combat Human Trafficking Act and the Child Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act. These passed the Senate as part of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, a bipartisan and comprehensive trafficking bill introduced by U.S. Senator John Cornyn (R-TX).

“Human trafficking is a heinous crime, and I’m pleased that we are finally moving forward on this legislation to end modern-day slavery,” Portman stated. “My measures included in the bill will allow us to improve the way we find missing children, strengthen the prosecution against buyers of sex acts from trafficking victims, rightly define victims of child sex trafficking as victims of child abuse and ensure that children who are sex trafficked or sexually exploited are treated as victims, not criminals.

“This legislation had been stalled for too long, and I’m pleased that we’re now closer to enacting these important measures to protect the most vulnerable among us. I urge swift passage in the House so that this critical legislation can be signed into law.”...

... “I support the Bringing Missing Children Home Act because it makes common sense to strengthen the relationship between law enforcement and child welfare agencies,” said Sr. Margaret Ormond, OP, Prioress of the Dominican Sisters of Peace. “If law enforcement and child welfare agencies do not work at good communication-- poor communication will always take its place. Our children are suffering at the hands of sex and labor traffickers who continue to exploit the most vulnerable of our citizens. Families are at the heart of our society and we must do everything we can to protect them.”

“Thanks to Senator Portman, missing children will now have a chance of being rescued and returned home safely,” said Theresa Flores, President of SOAP. “It will also help organizations like mine, SOAP to bring awareness to the huge problem of over 1.3 million missing children who have a 75% chance of becoming trafficked if not rescued.”

“This is great news for missing, runaway and vulnerable children. We know that missing and runaway children are at great risk of victimization in commercial sexual exploitation and human trafficking. Effectively combating human trafficking requires that systems work together well to identify trafficked children and bring them home. The Central Ohio Rescue and Restore Coalition applauds Senator Portman's efforts to strengthen collaborative responses to missing children and we thank him for his leadership in the Senate on this issue,” said Michelle Hanna, Director of the Central Ohio Rescue and Restore, a coalition with over 90 members, comprised of both concerned citizens and those who represent social services, faith-based, medical and law enforcement organizations.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses legislation this year that solves the issue presented in this legislation. Efforts by leaders in our Congress have passed legislation that increases awareness for sex trafficking in the United States, and creates completely separate bills to focus on them entirely. In reality, isn't that better than tacking this onto a piece of legislation that already exists? Instead of amending a current act, wouldn't it show more commitment to create a completely different act that solely focuses on this issue, that works in conjunction with current legislation?*

NEG – Labor Trafficking Needs More Attention, Not Sex Trafficking

Maryland Reporter “Human Trafficking Part 3: Most trafficking in the U.S. is not about sex work, but labor by immigrants” August 4, 2015 < <http://marylandreporter.com/2015/08/04/human-trafficking-part-3-most-trafficking-in-the-u-s-is-not-about-sex-work-but-labor-by-immigrants/>>

““Domestic work is mostly immigrant women,” said Tiffany Williams, former director of the Break the Chain campaign. “So even those who are on visas are in this precarious immigration status because the employer holds the key to the visa.

“Those who are undocumented don't come forward, don't report, don't challenge unless it's really bad,” Williams said, “because they don't want to lose their immigration status.”

Researchers agree that labor trafficking is the leading form of human trafficking, but sex trafficking is the focus of more federal prosecutions, according to a 2015 report by Congressional Research Service, a non-partisan arm of the U.S. House and Senate.

“Unfortunately, the clandestine nature of trafficking makes estimating prevalence really difficult,” Lara Powers, hotline manager and program specialist at the National Human Trafficking Resource Center, said in an email.

The federal trafficking statute defines labor trafficking as obtaining a person for labor or services through the use of force, fraud or coercion to exploit them for involuntary servitude.

In 2012, the Department of Justice successfully prosecuted 138 traffickers, with 76 percent of the cases predominantly sex trafficking and 24 percent predominantly labor trafficking.

Because there is no template for what a labor trafficking case may look like, it often is difficult for the public to identify. And domestic labor trafficking in particular is out of sight, with the worker inside a household.

Victims do not always realize they have been trafficked. Victims' relationships with their employers may start out as ordinary work situations and deteriorate into trafficking over time, Williams said.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that the real trafficking issue in the United States isn't sex trafficking, but labor trafficking. Unfortunately, while both are serious issues, we must focus our time and energy on the side of human trafficking that isn't being addressed. Everyone knows about sex trafficking. It's a hot button issue, and with the first article included, there is already legislation in the status quo that is solving it. In terms of labor trafficking, that isn't something that is a hot button issue, that you can hear about from every mass media outlet in the country. In fact, most people in this country treat those people like they're criminals, when*

in reality, a lot of them are being forced into slave-like labor. This is a new era of indentured servitude, and if we're going to raise awareness for human trafficking, it should be in regards to this.

Negative Takeaways:

The first article discusses legislation this year that solves the issue presented in this legislation. Efforts by leaders in our Congress have passed legislation that increases awareness for sex trafficking in the United States, and creates completely separate bills to focus on them entirely. In reality, isn't that better than tacking this onto a piece of legislation that already exists? Instead of amending a current act, wouldn't it show more commitment to create a completely different act that solely focuses on this issue, that works in conjunction with current legislation?

The second article says that the real trafficking issue in the United States isn't sex trafficking, but labor trafficking. Unfortunately, while both are serious issues, we must focus our time and energy on the side of human trafficking that isn't being addressed. Everyone knows about sex trafficking. It's a hot button issue, and with the first article included, there is already legislation in the status quo that is solving it. In terms of labor trafficking, that isn't something that is a hot button issue that you can hear about from every mass media outlet in the country. In fact, most people in this country treat those people like they're criminals, when in reality, a lot of them are being forced into slave-like labor. This is a new era of indentured servitude, and if we're going to raise awareness for human trafficking, it should be in regards to this.

Legislation – A Bill to Give South Korea 20 Billion Dollars Affirmative Evidence

AFF – American-South Korea Alliance is Important and South Korea is In Danger

The Observer, “Washington Waffles on Korean Missile Defense, Delighting China and Russia,” Taylor Dinerman, September 15, 2015, < <http://observer.com/2015/09/washington-waffles-on-korean-missile-defense-cheering-china-and-russia/> >

“The North Korean ballistic missile threat is obvious, so is the regional threat from Russia and China. Deploying a robust U.S. anti-missile system would protect both U.S. forces on the peninsula and at the same time provide some measure of security to South Korea’s own forces and to its civilian population...

America’s relationship with South Korea is not only important in and of itself, but is a symbol of the benefits of being closely allied with the U.S. It is hard to argue that our relationship with Japan was the key to improving its position in the world. After all, before the U.S. and its allies defeated Japan in 1945, it was indeed a regional power of considerable military and economic heft. South Korea, on the other hand, was an exploited Japanese colony whose development had been retarded by Tokyo.

In the 1950s, after the Korean War, South Korea was one of the poorest nations in the world, by the mid-1970s it was well on its way to becoming not just an Asian “Tiger” economy, but the leader of the other aggressively developing Pacific Rim states. This would not have been possible without U.S. economic and military support. In particular the U.S. opened up its market to South Korean products in ways that it did for few other nations.

Over the final two years of the Obama presidency the threat of North Korean nuclear missile attack on South Korea, Japan and even on the U.S. is an even greater danger than the related threat of Iranian nuclear weapons. After all, Pyongyang has already set off a pair of nuclear explosions and U.S. brass believes that North Korea has, or will have, a warhead design that can fit on top of one or more of their large collection of medium and longer range ballistic missiles. For America’s Asian allies, missile defense is more important than ever.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that South Korea is facing threats from Russia, China, and North Korea. Our relationship with South Korea is important (the history of that relationship is discussed in the second paragraph). As the affirmative, you have to argue that South Korea is an important ally. When our allies are in danger we must step in and help. We’re known as the military center of the global community, so we can’t back down when one of our allies needs military aid. We should pass this bill, because we can help our ally militarily without sending troops. It’s a win/win.*

AFF – South Korea Plans to Increase Military Budget Because of North Korea Threat

The Diplomat, “South Korea Is Planning a Huge Increase in Defense Spending,” Ankit Panda, April 22, 2015, < <http://thediplomat.com/2015/04/south-korea-is-planning-a-huge-increase-in-defense-spending/> >

“South Korea said that its defense budget would grow markedly over the next five years amid a growing perception of threats from North Korea.

According to Yonhap News, South Korean defense spending will grow by \$214.7 billion (232 trillion won) between 2016 and 2020. The annual rate of increase will be roughly 7 percent...

Reports that South Korea will increase its defense spending come amid competing threat assessments from Seoul and Washington regarding the state of North Korea's nuclear weapons program and overall military readiness.

U.S. officials maintain that they believe that North Korea has successfully managed to miniaturize its nuclear devices for delivery via its KN-08 intercontinental ballistic missiles, an assessment senior South Korean defense officials have rejected.

"Our assessment is that they have the ability to put a nuclear weapon on a KN-08 and shoot it at the homeland," Adm. William Gortney of U.S. Northern Command noted two weeks ago.

South Korean Vice Defense Minister Baek Seung-joo noted that Gortney's remarks were "not made with a thorough assessment of North Korea's capabilities."

South Korea's planned defense spending increase is also related to the ongoing process with the United States to shift wartime operational control (OPCON) of South Korean troops from Washington to Seoul."

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that South Korea is increasing its military budget in order to thwart the threat of North Korea. Since South Korea is one of our allies, we should send monetary aid to go towards their military budget. We've had troops on the ground in South Korea, and we've helped them with their military for many years. Now South Korea is looking to become more self-sufficient militarily. It is our obligation to help them do that. We should provide them monetary aid so that they can begin to become more militarily self-sufficient and thwart off threats from North Korea or otherwise.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that South Korea is facing threats from Russia, China, and North Korea. Our relationship with South Korea is important (the history of that relationship is discussed in the second paragraph). As the affirmative, you have to argue that South Korea is an important ally. When our allies are in danger we must step in and help. We're known as the military center of the global community, so we can't back down when one of our allies needs military aid. We should pass this bill, because we can help our ally militarily without sending troops. It's a win/win

The second article says that South Korea is increasing its military budget in order to thwart the threat of North Korea. Since South Korea is one of our allies, we should send monetary aid to go towards their military budget. We've had troops on the ground in South Korea, and we've helped them with their military for many years. Now South Korea is looking to become more self-sufficient militarily. It is our obligation to help them do that. We should provide them monetary aid so that they can begin to become more militarily self-sufficient and thwart off threats from North Korea or otherwise.

Negative Evidence

NEG – South Korea Doesn't Need Our Help—They've Abused It In The Past

The National Interest, “Newsflash: The U.S.-South Korea Military Alliance Isn't Working,” Doug Bandow, September 4, 2015, < <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/newsflash-the-us-south-korea-military-alliance-isnt-working-13772> >

“The disparity between South Korea (ROK) and North Korea (DPRK) is even larger [Than the differences between the U.S. and Mexico]. The South enjoys a population edge of two-to-one and an economic advantage upwards of forty-to-one. Seoul has stolen away the North's chief military allies, China and Russia, which would no longer fight for the DPRK. On every measure of national power, save military, South Korea dominates. And it lags on the latter only out of choice.

Indeed, the South has even surrendered control of its armed forces to the United States. Wartime operational control, or OPCON, goes to the American military. Decades have gone by, but the South Koreans say they still aren't ready to manage their own troops. Some officials candidly admit that they fear taking control might encourage Washington to bring home its forces. Thus, dependence has become a strategy to ensure a continued place on America's defense dole...

Most countries would like to have a superpower pick up a big chunk of their defense tabs. Seoul takes the money saved and invests it in export-oriented industries, education and other domestic programs, and even prestige military assets, such as a blue-water navy designed for use well beyond the Korean peninsula. South Korea would still be prosperous and influential if it had to cover the full cost of its defense, but it would face a tougher set of trade-offs—as does the United States.

The South's dependent relationship does not benefit America. Military spending is the price of a nation's foreign policy.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that South Korea is economically so far advanced that it doesn't need our help to fight North Korea. North Korea isn't even a real threat for South Korea. (There's a great article here <http://theweek.com/articles/570764/time-military-leave-south-korea> that talks more about how South Korea is more than able to fight off North Korea. It's brilliantly written. So, if you have a chance you should check it out!). Beyond that, we've given South Korea money for military aid in the past, and they've used it for other things (third paragraph). While this bill safeguards for that, we would ultimately be putting our money at risk. The best indicator of future behavior is past behavior, and South Korea has shown us that they WILL use our money for other things. You can use either of these points to craft a really strong negative speech.*

NEG – China, Russia, and North Korea Don't Want The U.S. Involved in South Korea

The Observer, “Washington Waffles on Korean Missile Defense, Delighting China and Russia,” Taylor Dinerman, September 15, 2015, < <http://observer.com/2015/09/washington-waffles-on-korean-missile-defense-cheering-china-and-russia/> >

“China and Russia are both putting pressure on Seoul to reject the U.S. system and the South Korean parliament is debating the issue. It should be no surprise that Russia is trying to weaken the U.S.-South Korean alliance. As long as Vladimir Putin is in power the U.S. can expect nothing but hostility from the Kremlin. China’s objections to South Korea protecting itself from missile attack are harder to understand. After all Beijing has excellent relations with Seoul. If China is seen as trying to make it easier for North Korean missiles to hit targets south of the DMZ, China’s image will inevitably suffer.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that Russia, China, and North Korea don’t want the U.S. militarily involved in South Korea. While we have our issues with those three countries, we can’t underestimate the power of Russia and China. Do we really want to make enemies out of those two countries over South Korea? Russia and China are arguably our biggest threats (while they aren’t active threats—they are incredibly dangerous), and passing this bill would anger BOTH of them. As the negative you have to argue for national security. Do we really want to risk increased tensions with Russia and China? No! We need to find a different way to help South Korea, OR pairing according to the first piece of negative evidence, we need to let South Korea take care of itself.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article says that South Korea is economically so far advanced that it doesn't need our help to fight North Korea. North Korea isn't even a real threat for South Korea. (There's a great article here <http://theweek.com/articles/570764/time-military-leave-south-korea> that talks more about how South Korea is more than able to fight off North Korea. It's brilliantly written. So, if you have a chance you should check it out!). Beyond that, we've given South Korea money for military aid in the past, and they've used it for other things (third paragraph). While this bill safeguards for that, we would ultimately be putting our money at risk. The best indicator of future behavior is past behavior, and South Korea has shown us that they WILL use our money for other things. You can use either of these points to craft a really strong negative speech.

The second piece of evidence says that Russia, China, and North Korea don't want the U.S. militarily involved in South Korea. While we have our issues with those three countries, we can't underestimate the power of Russia and China. Do we really want to make enemies out of those two countries over South Korea? Russia and China are arguably our biggest threats (while they aren't active threats—they are incredibly dangerous), and passing this bill would anger BOTH of them. As the negative you have to argue for national security. Do we really want to risk increased tensions with Russia and China? No! We need to find a different way to help South Korea, OR pairing according to the first piece of negative evidence, we need to let South Korea take care of itself.

Legislation – A Resolution to End Economic Assistance to Yemen Affirmative Evidence

AFF – US Aid to Yemen is Harming US International Reputation

Foreign Policy “U.S. Support for Saudi Strikes in Yemen Raises War Crime Concerns’ Colum Lynch
October 15, 2015 < <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/10/15/u-s-support-for-saudi-strikes-in-yemen-raises-war-crime-concerns/>>

“On Sept. 28, the same day President Barack Obama addressed world leaders before the U.N. General Assembly, warplanes from a U.S.-backed Saudi coalition struck a wedding party in Yemen. The attack killed as many as 135 people near the port city of Mokha and raised concerns about the possible perpetration of war crimes in Yemen.

At the United Nations, the U.N. Security Council has devoted little attention to the impact that coalition airstrikes have had on civilians in Yemen. The United States — which frequently condemns the Syrian government’s use of barrel bombs in heavily populated neighborhoods — has registered virtually no public outrage over the Saudi-led coalition’s apparently indiscriminate bombing raids in Yemen. Obama didn’t even mention Yemen in his U.N. speech, which faulted Russia’s military intervention in Syria on behalf of a government that stands accused of killing the vast majority of the more than 200,000 people who have died in Syria’s civil war.

U.S. support for a military campaign that is inflicting extreme hardship on civilians in one of the Mideast’s poorest countries provides an awkward counterpoint to the Obama administration’s stated commitment to stand up for the region’s oppressed people. At the dawn of the Arab Spring, Obama vowed to oppose “the use of violence and repression against the people of the region” and to support “the legitimate aspirations of ordinary people.”

Washington’s support in Yemen has also provided ammunition to critics who have seized on the Saudi-led coalition’s use of American weapons against civilian targets to paint the United States as a hypocritical power that lectures its Syrian adversaries on human rights abuses while furnishing its allies with cluster bombs and precision rockets.

“There is certainly blowback to America’s reputation,” said Christopher Davidson, a British scholar and author of *After the Sheikhs: The Coming Collapse of the Gulf Monarchies*. As a result, any suggestion that the United States was ever committed to the democracy movements arising out of the Arab Spring “will be treated with suspicion, probably well-founded,” he said.

Behind closed doors, the United States has sought to limit international scrutiny of rights abuses in Yemen. Last Friday, the United States blocked a proposal in a U.N. Security Council sanctions committee to have the committee’s chair, Lithuanian U.N. Ambassador Raimonda Murmokaite, approach “all relevant parties to the conflict and stress their responsibility to respect and uphold international humanitarian law and human rights law,” according to Security Council diplomats. The committee also recommended that Murmokaite ask the key players to cooperate with its investigations into potential human rights abuses in Yemen.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the international view of the US after warplanes from a U.S.-backed Saudi coalition struck a wedding party in Yemen. The attack killed as many as 135 people near the port city of Mokha. The article to quote Christopher Davidson, a British scholar and author of *After the Sheikhs* in saying “There is certainly blowback to America’s reputation,” & “will be treated with suspicion, probably well-founded...” As the AFF you should argue that US should not support the actions that take such questionable measures, which ultimately results in the deaths of innocent people. The International reputation of the US could be saved if we took a different approach to supporting Yemen. Our ultimate goal is to increase our international reputation in a positive way, and this legislation seems like the best way to do that. We must stop funding violence in areas like these.*

AFF – There is No Good Answer as to Why the U.S. is Helping to Wreck Yemen

The American Conservative “Why Does the U.S. Support the War on Yemen?” DANIEL LARISON, August 4, 2015 < <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/why-does-the-u-s-support-the-war-on-yemen/>>

“Ryan Cooper asks a good question about U.S. support for the appalling war on Yemen:

But we’re still effectively allowing [the Saudis] to smash a Muslim nation, starve its population, and create a haven for al Qaeda in the process. Why?

The standard answer is that the U.S. wants to “reassure” nervous client governments, and so it has indulged them in their latest reckless intervention in order to prove its reliability. It’s a lousy answer, and it doesn’t explain very much. Encouraging clients in their worst instincts and helping to fuel their paranoia aren’t the actions of a smart patron, but this is what the U.S. has chosen to do in this case. This isn’t so much a reason for U.S. support for the war as it is an excuse. There is no good argument for U.S. involvement in the war on Yemen, and so it has to be presented as part of maintaining good relations with the Saudis. That doesn’t really answer the question, either, since other states that value their relations with the Saudis have refused to participate. If any state is in a position to deny the Saudis support for an unnecessary war, it would have to be the U.S., and yet our government was one of the first to sign on to back the campaign. This is all the more ridiculous when we realize that the war is turning into a disaster for Saudi Arabia as well.

Bruce Riedel reports on growing unease in Riyadh over the war:

Inside the kingdom growing doubts about the war are circulating quietly. The king’s ambitious son, Deputy Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, and minister of defense, is derisively called the “little general” behind his back for his role in starting the war.

The late foreign minister Prince Saud al-Faisal is rumored to have opposed the war and warned that it would be a quagmire or worse before passing away. Saud enjoys great respect among Saudis; invoking him against the young Mohammed bin Salman is a calculated maneuver to undermine the war and the prince.

Whether the former foreign minister actually opposed the war or not, it is significant that such criticism of the war is gaining purchase inside Saudi Arabia. It may take some time, but perhaps eventually the costs of this unnecessary war in Yemen will become too great for the Saudi government to tolerate any longer. That will make our indulgence of the Saudis’ folly all the more disgraceful in the end. There is no good answer as to why the

U.S. is helping to wreck Yemen. It is just another example of our needlessly destructive meddling in the affairs of other nations.

TAKEAWAY – *This article goes through a few different reasons why the US continues to support this war in Yemen. It goes through a few different possibilities but there simple answer is that there isn't one. As the affirmative, you should link the arguments in the first article to this one, and say that we can no longer fund violence for the sake of violence in Yemen. We are fueling the fire in this region, and that needs to stop. We cannot single-handedly let a country be destroyed. By stopping our aid, we could possibly put a stop to this.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article explains the international view of the US after warplanes from a U.S.-backed Saudi coalition struck a wedding party in Yemen. The attack killed as many as 135 people near the port city of Mokha. The article to quote Christopher Davidson, a British scholar and author of *After the Sheikhs* in saying “There is certainly blowback to America’s reputation,” & “will be treated with suspicion, probably well-founded...” As the AFF you should argue that US should not support the actions that take such questionable measures, which ultimately results in the deaths of innocent people. The International reputation of the US could be saved if we took a different approach to supporting Yemen. Our ultimate goal is to increase our international reputation in a positive way, and this legislation seems like the best way to do that. We must stop funding violence in areas like these.

This second article goes through a few different reasons why the US continues to support this war in Yemen. It goes through a few different possibilities but there simple answer is that there isn’t one. As the affirmative, you should link the arguments in the first article to this one, and say that we can no longer fund violence for the sake of violence in Yemen. We are fueling the fire in this region, and that needs to stop. We cannot single-handedly let a country be destroyed. By stopping our aid, we could possibly put a stop to this.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Yemen Government has Begun to Show Signs of Success

The National “US reaffirms support for Yemen’s rightful leaders” Khaled Abdullah October 20, 2015, < <http://www.thenational.ae/world/middle-east/us-reaffirms-support-for-yemens-rightful-leaders>

“The US has reassured Yemen’s leaders of its support for their legitimate government and welcomed moves towards talks to end the conflict.

President Abdrabu Mansur Hadi and prime minister Khaled Bahah met the US ambassador to Yemen to discuss the conflict and the UN-backed talks.

Mr Hadi and his government were driven from the country after Houthi rebels and deposed former president Ali Abdullah Saleh joined forces and took over the capital Sanaa last year, before seizing Aden in March.

A coalition led by the UAE and Saudi Arabia joined loyalist Yemeni forces to drive the rebels from Aden in July, before pushing them north towards Sanaa.

On Sunday, Mr Hadi’s spokesman said the government would take part in the talks to end the conflict, which has killed more than 5,000 people.

US ambassador Matthew Tueller praised the decision in a meeting with Mr Hadi in Riyadh yesterday.

He also backed the president’s efforts in foiling the Houthi’s attempts to take over the country.

Mr Hadi praised the US for supporting the fight to restore security and stability to Yemen and for backing a UN resolution ordering the Houthis to withdraw.

Mr Bahah told Mr Tueller the Yemeni government was committed to stop the violence by the Houthis and Mr Saleh’s forces.

Mr Hadi also met German foreign minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier and members of the German parliament, who expressed support for the internationally recognised president.

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains a recent meeting between several US leaders and the Yemen government. It goes on to explain how the Yemeni government was committed to stop the violence by the Houthis and Mr Saleh’s forces. As the NEG you should argue that the US should encourage and support the foundation of politically sound governments. Even more so, when these governments are fighting against terrorist groups like the ones present in Yemen. With recent successes like the coalition led by the UAE and Saudi Arabia joined loyalist Yemeni forces to driving the rebels from Aden in July, before pushing them north towards Sanaa, this Country has proven its commitment to the fight and this Congress should support such a commitment.*

NEG – Crisis in Yemen has Received too Little Attention

Foreign Policy “U.S. Support for Saudi Strikes in Yemen Raises War Crime Concerns’ Colum Lynch
October 15, 2015 < <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/10/15/u-s-support-for-saudi-strikes-in-yemen-raises-war-crime-concerns/>>

““The humanitarian crisis in Yemen has received too little attention, and it directly, or indirectly, implicates us,” said Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), who noted that the airstrikes may violate legislation he authored barring the United States from providing security assistance to countries responsible for gross human rights abuses. “The reports of civilian casualties from Saudi air attacks in densely populated areas compel us to ask if these operations, supported by the United States, violate” that law, Leahy told Foreign Policy in an emailed statement. In any event, he added, “there is the real possibility that [the air campaign] is making a bad situation worse.”

But other lawmakers have urged the Obama administration to do more to support Saudi Arabia and its Persian Gulf neighbors, which they see as a critical counterpoint to Iranian influence in the Middle East. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee’s chairman, Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), said the administration needs to “close the daylight” between the United States and its Gulf allies. He echoed claims by Gulf powers that Yemen’s Shiite Houthis are receiving backing from the Iranian government... A U.S. official said the White House is carefully tracking the progress of imports and expects “increased commercial activity to Yemen in the near future.”

“To meet growing humanitarian needs and avert a potential famine in Yemen, the Yemeni government and Saudi-led coalition must allow commercial and humanitarian goods, including fuel, to enter Yemen through all of its ports,” said the official, who spoke on the condition of not being named. “We place great importance on commitments made to allow such deliveries, including recently from President Hadi and King Salman.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the current crisis in Yemen and goes on to explain how the US has helped support the people and government in need. As the NEG you should read the article and argue that if the US stops supporting this crisis, then the people of Yemen will have very little international backing. The US has adopted a key role in supporting these people and by passing the Bill we would leave them in a more compromising position than ever before. US involvement has also helped shine an “international light” onto this conflict which will help bring humanitarian support from other countries.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article explains a recent meeting between several US leaders and the Yemen government. It goes on to explain how the Yemeni government was committed to stop the violence by the Houthis and Mr Saleh's forces. As the NEG you should argue that the US should encourage and support the foundation of politically sound governments. Even more so, when these governments are fighting against terrorist groups like the ones present in Yemen. With recent successes like the coalition led by the UAE and Saudi Arabia joined loyalist Yemeni forces to driving the rebels from Aden in July, before pushing them north towards Sanaa, this Country has proven its commitment to the fight and this Congress should support such a commitment.

This second article explains the current crisis in Yemen and goes on to explain how the US as helped support the people and government in need. As the NEG you should read the article and argue that if the US stops supporting this crisis, then the people of Yemen will have very little international backing. The US has adopted a key role in supporting these people and by passing the Bill we would leave them in a more compromising position than ever before. US involvement has also helped shine an "international light" onto this conflict which will help bring humanitarian support from other countries.

Legislation – A Resolution to Advance our Research of Production Methods
of Spider Silk
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Spider Silk is Hard to Produce, But Worth the Investment

Wired “Startup Says It’s the First to Make Synthetic Spider Silk” Davey Alba, June 4, 2015 < <http://www.wired.com/2015/06/bolt-threads-spider-silk/>>

“FOR YEARS, MATERIALS scientists have been trying to figure out a way to give consumers broad access to the benefits of spider silk. As a naturally occurring supermaterial, spider silk is five times stronger than steel and more elastic than rubber bands, which suggests some amazing potential use cases, including bulletproof vests, biodegradable water bottles, and flexible bridge suspension ropes. But so far, every group that’s attempted to produce enough of the stuff to bring it to the mass market, from researchers to giant corporations, has pretty much failed.

The problem is there’s no way to get the silk from spiders themselves—creatures known to be territorial and cannibalistic, which doesn’t lend itself to raising them in groups. So people have had to resort to creative workarounds. They’ve tried raising genetically engineered silkworms, or inserting genes into microorganisms to express the needed spider silk protein. All of these efforts, however, have seen little success. Spider silk protein is complex, and even when experimenters are able to create fibers, these come out so fine that entirely new spinning systems need to be invented from scratch to turn the strands into thread. It doesn’t keep groups from trying though, and every few months or so, it seems, news of some spider silk breakthrough goes viral, only to quiet down after a few months. And consumers keep waiting.

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the usefulness of spider silk, and how it can be applied in our world. The stuff is amazing, and has countless military and consumer applications. It is something that people have been trying to crack for years, and haven’t been able to, because it’s difficult. We now know that substitutions are capable, and if we pour our money into the research at the very beginning of these breakthroughs, we can be in at the forefront of progress in this field.*

AFF – Stronger Than Steel, More Elastic Than Rubber, Spider Silk Could Change the Game, and Perfection Hasn’t Been Attained

Ceramics Expo USA “Spider silk without the struggle—a practical synthetic solution is in our future” June 16, 2015 < <http://www.ceramicsexpousa.com/resources/news/2015/06/16/spider-silk-without-the-struggle%E2%80%94a-practical-synthetic-solution-is-in-our-future/>>

“Spiders store gel-like silk proteins—also known as spidroins—in their glands. But exactly how spiders convert these proteins from a soluble state into a solid fiber was a relative mystery until Swedish researchers published findings in the journal PLOS Biology in August 2014 that revealed a gradual change in pH occurs as the proteins travel through the glands, which triggers the solidification.

What makes spider silk so amazing? Cheryl Hayashi, professor of biology at the University of California, Riverside, describes her research on spider silk on the TED stage, and points out that spiders have been around for nearly 380 million years and can

be found on almost every terrestrial habitat on the planet. Not to mention there are 40,000 species of spiders, and they all make silk at some point in their lives. Silk is crucial to their survival—for shelter, safety, reproduction, and catching prey. And the coolest part? Hayashi says her research shows that almost all types of spider silk surpass the strength of some of the strongest types of fibers known to modern technology—like nylon, wool, Kevlar, and carbon. These alluring properties fascinate scientists in the biomimetics field, who turn to nature to find inspiration for solving complex materials challenges.

For its size, spider silk is stronger by weight than high-grade steel, but it's incredibly flexible and light. It even surpasses the elasticity of rubber.

If commercialized, synthetic spider silk could be a real game changer when it comes strengthening materials for things like bulletproof vests, biodegradable water bottles, flexible bridge suspension ropes, vehicle air bags, and protective cases and covers for electronics. And that list is just the tip of the iceberg...

... But the researchers at Bolt Threads aren't the only ones pioneering the spider silk revolution. Scientists at the University of Trento in Italy have been spraying spiders with water containing carbon nanotubes and graphene flakes to produce "one of the toughest fibers ever measured" by materials science standards, according to a recent MIT Technology review article. Move over, Kevlar!"

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the wonderful uses of spider silk, and how important it could be for the future of almost every industry in the United States and the world. The article also talks about the companies and researchers who have made progress in the status quo, but mentions that nothing has been mass-produced, no one has taken anything to the market, and there's still a chance for two options: one, the government could pump funding into the companies and researchers that are currently researching this, or two, they could independently research it themselves. The first option is best. These companies need investment, because this research and new technology could be a game changer for the United States. A big government contract would look pretty nice, and we could help jumpstart and launch this new innovation.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article discusses the usefulness of spider silk, and how it can be applied in our world. The stuff is amazing, and has countless military and consumer applications. It is something that people have been trying to crack for years, and haven't been able to, because it's difficult. We now know that substitutions are capable, and if we pour our money into the research at the very beginning of these breakthroughs, we can be in at the forefront of progress in this field.

The second article discusses the wonderful uses of spider silk, and how important it could be for the future of almost every industry in the United States and the world. The article also talks about the companies and researchers who have made progress in the status quo, but mentions that nothing has been mass-produced, no one has taken anything to the market, and there's still a chance for two options: one, the government could pump funding into the companies and researchers that are currently researching this, or two, they could independently research it themselves. The first option is best. These companies need investment, because this research and new technology could be a game changer for the United States. A big government contract would look pretty nice, and we could help jumpstart and launch this new innovation.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Private Company Has Engineered Synthetic Spider Silk

Wired “Startup Says It’s the First to Make Synthetic Spider Silk” Davey Alba, June 4, 2015 <
<http://www.wired.com/2015/06/bolt-threads-spider-silk/>>

“But today, after five years of quiet operation, a startup called Bolt Threads has emerged to claim it’s made meaningful progress on the challenge. The Emeryville, California-based company grew out of the graduate school studies of three scientists from the University of California, San Francisco and UC Berkeley, and it has raised \$40 million so far from such notable investors as Foundation Capital, Formation 8 and Founders Fund, as well as from government grants from institutions like the National Science Foundation. If its founders are to be believed, Bolt Threads may have solved the mystery—finally—of how to make spider silk commercially plausible.

“Basically, our mission from the beginning was to make a scalable amount of spider silk and bring that to consumers,” CEO Dan Widmaier tells WIRED. “It’s a problem that’s been around for a long time, and has been hampered entirely by technical challenges.”

Widmaier knows it’s a bold claim. That’s why, he says, the company chose to fly under the radar for so long. “We decided to keep our heads down and try to solve the problem before we went out and started talking about all the cool things we can do with the technology,” he says. “Now, we’re ready to say we’re here.”...

... The result, Widmaier claims, is a technology that can artificially recreate the remarkably strong protein fibers spiders make. On top of that, he says, the fibers can even be tuned to possess different properties on demand: the researchers simply change the protein sequence on the platform to tweak the qualities of the material according to preference. Widmaier says they can make spider silk that’s stronger, stretchier, or waterproof, for example, depending on preference. “What we’ve learned is we could produce a little bit in the lab and engineer these new properties in,” says Widmaier.

“That forms a kind of platform where we are able to design for material property as well as scale up our manufacturing at a good price point, so we can commercialize it.”...

... “After figuring out we could make [spider silk], the next thing we wanted to know was: could you make enough of it to do something interesting?” Widmaier says, “Now we want to create products that people would meaningfully benefit from.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the company Bolt Threads, who has been privately and secretly developing a method to create synthetic spider silk. The company, if you research them any further, have millions of dollars in investments already and are very close to bringing this out to market. Instead of wasting our money on research, we should be at the forefront of purchasing the rights to use this new synthetic material for the US government. We don’t need to research it any further, because it’s already being created in the status quo, by a private company. And isn’t this really something that a private company should be in control of?*

NEG – Spiders Can’t be Wrangled, Breakthroughs Come Without Spiders

MTI News “Spinning a new version of silk” David L. Chandler, May 28, 2015 <
<http://news.mit.edu/2015/simulations-improve-spider-silk-0528>>

“After years of research decoding the complex structure and production of spider silk, researchers have now succeeded in producing samples of this exceptionally strong and resilient material in the laboratory. The new development could lead to a variety of biomedical materials — from sutures to scaffolding for organ replacements — made from synthesized silk with properties specifically tuned for their intended uses.

The findings are published this week in the journal *Nature Communications* by MIT professor of civil and environmental engineering (CEE) Markus Buehler, postdocs Shangchao Lin and Seunghwa Ryu, and others at MIT, Tufts University, Boston University, and in Germany, Italy, and the U.K.

The research, which involved a combination of simulations and experiments, paves the way for “creating new fibers with improved characteristics” beyond those of natural silk, says Buehler, who is also the department head in CEE. The work, he says, should make it possible to design fibers with specific characteristics of strength, elasticity, and toughness.

The new synthetic fibers’ proteins — the basic building blocks of the material — were created by genetically modifying bacteria to make the proteins normally produced by spiders. These proteins were then extruded through microfluidic channels designed to mimic the effect of an organ, called a spinneret, that spiders use to produce natural silk fibers...

... While spider silk has long been recognized as among the strongest known materials, spiders cannot practically be bred to produce harvestable fibers — so this new approach to producing a synthetic, yet spider-like, silk could make such strong and flexible fibers available for biomedical applications. By their nature, spider silks are fully biocompatible and can be used in the body without risk of adverse reactions; they are ultimately simply absorbed by the body...

... “Our goal is to improve the strength, elasticity, and toughness of artificially spun fibers by borrowing bright ideas from nature,” Lin says. This study could inspire the development of new synthetic fibers — or any materials requiring enhanced properties, such as in electrical and thermal transport, in a certain direction.

“This is an amazing piece of work,” says Huajian Gao, a professor of engineering at Brown University who was not involved in this research. “This could lead to a breakthrough that may allow us to directly explore engineering applications of silk-like materials.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the difficulty of producing spider silk, and how people have been going about it the wrong way. Spiders can’t be tamed – it’s as simple as that. The research going into naturally producing spider silk would be a waste of time and money, because the best way to do it doesn’t involve spiders at all. The article also mentions how researching at MIT have developed their own synthetic spider silk, and that can be an extension on the arguments presented in the first article.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article discusses the company Bolt Threads, who has been privately and secretly developing a method to create synthetic spider silk. The company, if you research them any further, have millions of dollars in investments already and are very close to bringing this out to market. Instead of wasting our money on research, we should be at the forefront of purchasing the rights to use this new synthetic material for the US government. We don't need to research it any further, because it's already being created in the status quo, by a private company. And isn't this really something that a private company should be in control of?

The second article discusses the difficulty of producing spider silk, and how people have been going about it the wrong way. Spiders can't be tamed – it's as simple as that. The research going into naturally producing spider silk would be a waste of time and money, because the best way to do it doesn't involve spiders at all. The article also mentions how researching at MIT have developed their own synthetic spider silk, and that can be an extension on the arguments presented in the first article.

Legislation – A Bill to Provide Funding for Convicted Felons’ Children to
Improve Their Education
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Children of the Incarcerated Are Doomed to Repeat the Cycle

Texas Department of Criminal Justice “Incarcerated - Children of Parents in Prison Impacted” E. Mosely, July 6-12, 2008 < https://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/gokids/gokids_articles_children_impacted.html>

“When a loved one is sentenced to prison, the emotional turmoil is difficult for everyone to handle. Perhaps the heaviest burden is felt by those who are unintentional victims of crime - children of incarcerated parents.

Nationally, 7.3 million children have at least one parent in jail or prison. Sadly, 70 percent of these kids are doomed to follow in the same footsteps as their parents becoming imprisoned at some point in their lives. In fact, children of incarcerated parents are five times more likely than their peers to commit crimes. However, these at-risk children are largely ignored before they get in trouble.

More troubling for African Americans are the telling statistics. According to the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, of the 156,235 prisoners in the state of Texas, 57, 857 are Black - the highest of any other ethnicity. Women constitute 12,445 of the total prison population - an increase of 428 from 2007 when 12,017 females were behind bars.

So what becomes of these children whose mother and/or fathers are locked up? Often, they are left to fend for themselves emotionally and the stress of child-rearing falls on a grandmother, usually, or another surrogate parent or the children may end up in protective services. These hardships manifest in the children in mental health issues like depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder and feelings of abandonment, said psychotherapist Dr. Janice Beal. Also, children go through a grieving process. In an effort to curb the cycle of imprisonment and address an overlooked population of at-risk children, more organizations and people are advocating for children with parents in prison.

"One thing I continuously see is depression among this population. The children (of incarcerated parents) express a lot of anger and a lot of aggressive behavior and some anxiety," Beal said. "Children express depression different from adults. They don't verbalize it and say, 'I feel sad right now.' They usually act out their behaviors.

"They go to school and can't focus on what they're doing, and their grades begin to drop," Beal added. "School personnel may feel that their behaviors are symptoms associated with ADHD; however, it could also be depression. It (depression) can manifest itself in different ways. We have diagnosed children with depression as early as five-years old. Depending on when the parent left home and the manner in which they were taken, children face feelings of fear, abandonment, guilt, and they may began to act younger than their stated age", Beal said.

"A lot of times children may, or may not be at home when parents were taken," Beal said. "There is trauma from that. That can result in post-traumatic stress disorder; Not knowing when the person is coming back, if there was violence, or criminal activity prior to the parent leaving." ..."

TAKEAWAY – *This article extends on the arguments presented in the legislation itself, so you can use it to extend and substantiate those arguments. These are the children that need our*

help, and they are children of the United States. We can't just allow them to continue the cycle of their parents. We must end that cycle, and have a great effect on the incarceration of future generations.

AFF – Too Many Kids are Left Behind, Few Organizations Stand Up for Them – Government Support Should be a Given

The Huffington Post “Kids With Incarcerated Parents Find Support, Encouragement With This Brooklyn Program” Joseph Erbentraut, June 23, 2015 < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/06/23/children-of-promise-brooklyn_n_7616988.html>

“The United States' incarcerated population -- the largest in the world -- is at the heart of several national debates: People argue about the economic burden it places on the federal budget, how inmates are treated and the long-term effects of the prison system. But hardly anyone talks about what happens to the children of those behind bars.

That population is a large one. More than 2.7 million U.S. children currently have at least one parent behind bars, according to Rutgers University's National Resource Center on Children & Families of the Incarcerated. Approximately 10 million children have had a parent in prison at some point in their lives.

And those children typically have to deal with a combination of trauma, shame and stigma that they typically don't receive specialized treatment for -- often while also grappling with instability and home and a heightened risk of living in poverty, according to the NRCCFI. Furthermore, the group is plagued by stereotypes and misconceptions, such as the belief that these children inherit a predisposition to misbehave or engage in illegal activity, NRCCFI Director Ann Adalist-Estrin said.

Yet, Adalist-Estrin argues, this population isn't as monolithic as it is often made out to be. Even two children from the same family will often respond to a parent being incarcerated in different ways. This, activists say, is part of why these kids need specific attention...

... "We have to stop assuming that these are kids who are losers or 'incubating convicts,'" Adalist-Estrin said. "We should be doing this work because they're our children, children of America. They're hurting and their hurt is not any less damaging than any other kids' hurts. It's time we really recognized that."

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the problem with children of the incarcerated, and extends on the arguments in the first article. As the affirmative, you need to argue that there might be organizations that are trying to help in the status quo, but they need more help. An official support from the United States Government could be enough to make a difference, and could affect the most children in the country. We cannot allow these kids to go unnoticed, disenfranchised, and destined to repeat the cycle of their parents.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article extends on the arguments presented in the legislation itself, so you can use it to extend and substantiate those arguments. These are the children that need our help, and they are children of the United States. We can't just allow them to continue the cycle of their parents. We must end that cycle, and have a great effect on the incarceration of future generations.

The second article discusses the problem with children of the incarcerated, and extends on the arguments in the first article. As the affirmative, you need to argue that there might be organizations that are trying to help in the status quo, but they need more help. An official support from the United States Government could be enough to make a difference, and could affect the most children in the country. We cannot allow these kids to go unnoticed, disenfranchised, and destined to repeat the cycle of their parents.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Non-Profits All Over the Country Already Supporting These Children

The Huffington Post “Kids With Incarcerated Parents Find Support, Encouragement With This Brooklyn Program” Joseph Erbentraut, June 23, 2015 < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/06/23/children-of-promise-brooklyn_n_7616988.html>

“A number of nonprofit groups have stepped up over the years to address these issues, but few take as comprehensive of an approach as Children of Promise NYC, a Brooklyn, New York-based organization that offers mentoring, after-school and summer camp programs, and an on-site licensed outpatient mental health clinic, all specifically tailored to kids with incarcerated parents. Another arm of the program encourages participants to maintain a relationship with their incarcerated parent by writing letters and visiting.

Sharon Content, the group's executive director, used to work with a traditional after-school program. She realized in 2006 there was a lack of resources for kids whose parents were behind bars, and founded Children of Promise NYC from her basement. The program began offering services three years later, and now helps more than 350 children ages 6 through 18 each year. Most participants are minorities, and all live in Bedford-Stuyvesant, the neighborhood where the program is based. Most kids are referred to the program through partner agencies like soup kitchens and shelters.

Children of Promise NYC is focused on creating a space that is both safe and fun, giving youth the resources and camaraderie they need to work through their feelings, and to help avoid negative outcomes in their own lives such as dropping out of school or getting arrested...

... "The organization allows them to be able to come into a space and have positive energy and some positive reinforcement that, again, every child needs," Content told The Huffington Post. "It's nothing special and we're not doing anything that every child doesn't need for development, but unfortunately many of these kids wouldn't get it otherwise."

"These young people have so much potential, but due to the situation I don't think they realize it," she said."

TAKEAWAY – *This article discusses the different organizations that are helping these children in the status quo. The article actually talks about one organization in particular, but talks about how many organizations are popping up every year to help the children of the incarcerated. As the negative, you should argue that these organizations have it covered, and that the government wouldn't be capable of committing the same kind of love and care that these organization are offering. We should leave this to the non-profit sector. If anything, we should just support these organizations, rather than trying to start up our own organization that wouldn't be able to match the quality of the one mentioned in this article.*

NEG – There are Plenty of Scholarship Opportunities for Children of Convicted Felons

Rutgers University “College and Children of the Incarcerated” Eva Delair, Shannon Ellis, June 16, 2014 < <https://nrccfi.camden.rutgers.edu/2014/06/16/college-and-children-of-the-incarcerated-2/>>

“CIPs are a diverse group and can be represented in every community, ethnicity, and socioeconomic group but the data available to us does suggest that they are disproportionately

poor and children of color. So, there are some criteria in scholarships that may fit with the demographics of some CIP's. We hope the list below is helpful.

And, advice from our children of incarcerated parents advisors suggests that you consider using your experience as a CIP in college application essays ... it has helped many of our young people!

Scholarships for Low Income Families

...Gates Millennium Scholars

To reduce financial hardships faced by children of low income families. Aimed at African American, Hispanic American, Native American/Alaskan Native, and Asian Pacific Islander American, this scholarship helps students from low income families complete their undergraduate degrees. Students who complete their undergraduate degree may then ask for additional funding for graduate school if they plan to major in education, engineering, library science, mathematics, public health, or science.

Google Scholarship

Set up to aid low-income undergraduate and graduate students of Hispanic origin that are pursuing a degree in computer science or computer engineering. Students must be a junior or a senior undergraduate or graduate student, a U.S. citizen, attend a college or university full time, and maintain a 3.5 GPA

Abercrombie & Fitch Scholarship Program

In conjunction with the United Negro College Fund (UNCF), Abercrombie & Fitch offers a scholarship program to African American students from low-income families. The scholarships value is \$3,000 and like the Unmet Need Scholarship Program, it is intended to be used as a supplemental scholarship. The scholarship is available to first year students enrolled a four-year university and can be awarded annually for up to four years.

The Jack Kent Cooke Foundation's scholarship

These scholarship programs are designed to encourage and support outstanding students who work hard, demonstrate a strong will to succeed, and have financial need. Our scholarships provide financial assistance and academic support to high school, undergraduate, and graduate students.

Martin Luther King Jr. Scholarship Fund

...In furtherance of the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr., the Mt. Baker Community Club awards college scholarships to deserving neighborhood students of color who might not otherwise achieve their dream of a college education. We seek out and give highest consideration to young people who show financial need, have overcome obstacles, have worked to improve their community, and might be overlooked by traditional scholarships.

Children of Incarcerated Parents Scholarships

...Available to FL residents in 11 counties in Florida: Brevard, Broward, Indian River, Lake, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach, Sarasota, Volusia, St. Lucie, Duval and Collier. Students signing the contract agree to maintain good grades, be drug-free and crime-free and meet with mentors they are assigned, and upon high school graduation, will receive college scholarships.

Sallie Mae Scholarships: First In My Family Scholarship

...The First in My Family Scholarship Program, developed in partnership with the Hispanic College Fund, offers scholarships to Hispanic-American students who are the first in their family

to attend college and have financial need. The program is open to Hispanic Americans who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents enrolled as full time undergraduate students at approved, accredited institutions. Students must have a minimum grade point average of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale). Scholarships range from \$500 to \$5,000.

American Dream Scholarship

...Established in partnership with the United Negro College Fund, the American Dream Scholarship Program is open to African Americans with financial need. Applicants must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents, with a minimum 2.5 grade point average (on a 4.0 scale), who meet Pell Grant eligibility criteria, and are enrolled full time at approved, accredited, undergraduate institutions. Scholarships range from \$500 to \$5,000

Unmet Needs Scholarship

...As a part of the Sallie Mae Scholarship Funds, the Unmet Need Scholarship Program is available to low-income families with a combined income of less than \$30,000. This scholarship ranges from \$1,000 to \$3,800 and is intended as a supplemental scholarship to fill an “unmet” financial aid need of \$1,000 or more. It is available to students who are U.S. citizens, enrolled full-time as an undergraduate at an accredited college or university.

Peanut Scholarship Fund at Southern Illinois at Carbondale

...The Peanut Scholarship Fund: This fund was established to assist a good student at Southern Illinois University Carbondale who has financial difficulty because one or both parents have been involved in crime. This includes parents who are incarcerated or who because of being victims of crime are unable to provide financial support. The fund recognizes the nickname of a young man in this situation.

Children Impacted by crime Scholarships

...The Children of Inmates Scholarship Fund and the Children as Victims Scholarship Fund will award annual scholarships to students who are pursuing a college education.

TAKEAWAY – *This article is an extension on the arguments presented in the first article, and is simply a list of scholarships that are available to the children of the incarcerated. The affirmative will try to make it seem like nothing is being done in the status quo to help these children, but that’s simply not true. The government does enough as it stands, and colleges and organizations are there to fill in the blanks that the government misses. Beyond that, the government isn’t in the position to economically start something like this up. We should just extend on what’s already working in the status quo.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article discusses the different organizations that are helping these children in the status quo. The article actually talks about one organization in particular, but talks about how many organizations are popping up every year to help the children of the incarcerated. As the negative, you should argue that these organizations have it covered, and that the government wouldn't be capable of committing the same kind of love and care that these organization are offering. We should leave this to the non-profit sector. If anything, we should just support these organizations, rather than trying to start up our own organization that wouldn't be able to match the quality of the one mentioned in this article.

The second article is an extension on the arguments presented in the first article, and is simply a list of scholarships that are available to the children of the incarcerated. The affirmative will try to make it seem like nothing is being done in the status quo to help these children, but that's simply not true. The government does enough as it stands, and colleges and organizations are there to fill in the blanks that the government misses. Beyond that, the government isn't in the position to economically start something like this up. We should just extend on what's already working in the status quo.

Legislation – A Bill to Require all US Citizens to Register with Selective Service in Case of the Implementation of the Draft Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Women Should Have to Register for Selective Service to Establish Equality
Military, “Women Will Likely Have to Register for the Draft, Army Secretary Says,” Richard Sisk, October 12, 2015, < <http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/10/12/women-likely-have-register-draft-army-secretary-says.html> >

“Women will eventually have to register for the draft if “true and pure equality” is to be realized in the U.S. military, Army Secretary John McHugh said Monday.

“If your objective is true and pure equality then you have to look at all aspects” of the roles of women in the military, McHugh said, and registration for the draft “will be one of those things. That will have to be considered...”

However, as more military occupational specialties are opened to women, the debate on Selective Service System registration was inevitable, McHugh said. “If we find ourselves as a military writ large where men and women have equal opportunity, as I believe we should,” he said...

In one panel discussion, retired Navy Adm. Eric Olson, former commander of the SEALs and the Special Operations Command, said that women should have to register for the draft if they also can serve in combat.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that women will have to register for selective service to establish true equality in the military. More military specialties have opened up to women, including combat positions, so it’s natural that we add women to selective service as well. Gender equality in the military has been a long battle, and as we move closer and closer to complete equality, selective service is something that needs to equalize as well. It’s a signal of true equality. As the affirmative, you have to argue for gender equality and progress.*

AFF – The Majority of Americans Believe Women Should Be Included in Selective Service

New York Post, “Could women soon have to register for the draft?” David K. Li, October 14, 2015, < <http://nypost.com/2015/10/14/women-might-soon-have-to-register-for-the-draft/> >

“A majority of Americans appear ready for women to take on a greater military role.

A 2013 Quinnipiac University poll showed Americans strongly oppose the draft, 65 percent to 28 percent. But if there had to be conscription, both genders were for equal draft registration mandates — although less so for female respondents.

Men said women should be drafted by a 59-36 margin while women were OK with females in the draft at a 48-45 clip.

“I think it should be the same for everybody even though I wouldn’t necessarily be nuts about it,” UCLA student Grace Apostolopoulos told KPCC, a Los Angeles radio station, earlier this year.

“I think that’s the fairest thing.”

Former Army officer and Iraq vet Shelly Burgoyne called the draft “a social contract with democracy....If you’re going to take advantage of all of the benefits of a democracy, then I think you should also bear the responsibility as well,” she told the Christian Science Monitor.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that according to polls the majority of Americans feel like women should be included in the draft. It’s the fairest thing to do. The last quote in this article by former Army officer and Iraq vet Shelly Burgoyne is a really strong quote, and it really exemplifies the point that this article makes. Women should be a part of the draft, because it’s the fair thing to do. As the affirmative, you should argue for fairness. It isn’t fair that 17 million men are currently signed up for selective service, and women aren’t required to sign up. If there is a draft, we should all play our parts.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that women will have to register for selective service to establish true equality in the military. More military specialties have opened up to women, including some combat positions, so it's natural that we add women to selective service as well. Gender equality in the military has been a long battle, and as we move closer and closer to complete equality, selective service is something that needs to equalize as well. It's a signal of true equality. As the affirmative, you have to argue for gender equality and progress.

The second article says that according to polls the majority of Americans feel like women should be included in the draft. It's the fairest thing to do. The last quote in this article by former Army officer and Iraq vet Shelly Burgoyne is a really strong quote, and it really exemplifies the point that this article makes. Women should be a part of the draft, because it's the fair thing to do. As the affirmative, you should argue for fairness. It isn't fair that 17 million men are currently signed up for selective service, and women aren't required to sign up. If there is a draft, we should all play our parts.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Not All Women Are Capable of The Physical Demands of The Military

Daily Caller, “Why women shouldn’t be allowed to serve in combat,” Paul Hair, January 20, 2011, <
<http://dailycaller.com/2011/01/20/why-women-shouldnt-be-allowed-to-serve-in-combat/> >

“I am also not making the case that no woman could serve in a combat position. It is no secret that some women have performed well in warfare. Molly Pitcher (allegedly) fighting in the Revolutionary War and Combat Barbie preventing a terrorist from escaping are just two examples. Nevertheless, women remain different from men and their physicality is not designed for fighting. Only in the rarest of cases do women fight at the same level as men. Fully integrating women into combat roles, and other politically correct moves, are bad ideas.

The Department of Defense (DOD) knows that women aren’t suited for combat — even if it won’t outright admit it. The easiest way to demonstrate this is by considering the differences in Army standards for physical fitness for men and women . . . and how the Army skews those differences to the advantage of women.

For instance, if a 33-year-old male were to do 43 push-ups, 55 sit-ups, and run two miles in 15:18 for his Army Physical Fitness Test (APFT), he would earn a score of 224 points (out of a total of 300). This would be considered average at best. Yet if a 33-year-old female did the exact same, she would score a 272 and be considered in vastly better shape than the male.

We can further contrast this discrepancy of standards by comparing how a 21-year-old male and a 21-year-old female would score using the same outcome (43 push-ups, 55 sit-ups, and a 15:18 2-mile run). The 21-year-old male would receive a score of 192 (and would just barely pass his APFT) while the 21-year-old female would receive a score of 263 and might be highly commended.

This demonstrates that the Army (and by association, the DOD) realizes that men and women are different — and that it expects men to possess superior physical abilities.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that not all women are suited for combat. There are women who are just as capable as men in the military (if not better in some cases), those women are the exception—not the standard. Study after study has shown that women can’t match men physically. Even fitness tests in the military set the standards lower for women. As the negative, you should argue that there are women who ARE equal to men in physical fitness, but overall women aren’t as capable. It’s not sexist-it’s just fact. So, requiring women to sign up for selective service isn’t a smart idea, because most women aren’t cut out for combat military. Those women that are capable have the option to join.*

NEG – Selective Service Would Weaken Our Military

US News, “Drafting Women Will Weaken the Military,” Elaine Donnelly, February 12, 2013, <
<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2013/02/12/drafting-women-will-weaken-the-military> >

“Comprehensive studies done over 30 years have shown that in a direct ground combat environment where lives and missions depend on physical strength, women do not have the equal opportunity to survive, or to help fellow soldiers survive. A Selective Service system forced

to disregard these realities would "equalize" tough training standards by driving them down, weakening the culture of the only military we have."

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that studies have shown that women do not have the equal opportunity to survive or help others survive in combat situations. If women were required to sign up for selective service, we would be ignoring over 30 years of data that says women can't match up to men in combat situations. By equalizing our military we are essentially weakening it. We would have to lower training standards to accommodate women drafted, and in doing so would weaken our entire military. While we hope that we never have to use the draft again, if we do, we want to ensure that our military is as strong as it can be. Requiring women to sign up for the draft would weaken our military as whole.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article says that not all women are suited for combat. There are women who are just as capable as men in the military (if not better in some cases), those women are the exception—not the standard. Study after study has shown that women can't match men physically. Even fitness tests in the military set the standards lower for women. As the negative, you should argue that there are women who ARE equal to men in physical fitness, but overall women aren't as capable. It's not sexist—it's just fact. So, requiring women to sign up for selective service isn't a smart idea, because most women aren't cut out for combat military. Those women that are capable have the option to join.

The second article says that studies have shown that women do not have the equal opportunity to survive or help others survive in combat situations. If women were required to sign up for selective service, we would be ignoring over 30 years of data that says women can't match up to men in combat situations. By equalizing our military we are essentially weakening it. We would have to lower training standards to accommodate women drafted, and in doing so would weaken our entire military. While we hope that we never have to use the draft again, if we do, we want to ensure that our military is as strong as it can be. Requiring women to sign up for the draft would weaken our military as whole.

Legislation – A Bill to Enforce Presumed Consent Organ Donation and Implement The Opt Out System Affirmative Evidence

AFF – The Status Quo Isn't Good Enough (2013)

ABC News “Organ Donation Rates: How the US Stacks Up” Sydney Lupkin, June 18, 2013
<<http://abcnews.go.com/Health/organ-donation-rates-us-stacks/story?id=19437070#.Ud23xEE3vmQ>>

“Facebook may have provided a boost to organ donation in the United States since its donor registration button launched last year, but organs are still scarce, and about 18 people die every day as they wait on a transplant list, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Although there are more than 118,000 people on the organ transplant waiting list in the United States, only 8,143 underwent transplants from deceased donors in 2012, according to the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network, which allocates organs as a result of the National Organ Transplant Act of 1984.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the status quo has done everything possible to improve organ donation, but it's still not enough. Unfortunately, thousands of people die a year, because they're waiting on a waiting list for a vital organ that someone could've and would've given if they knew they had to opt-in for it. This resolution allows for people who want to give, give, and those who are in need, receive the organ they need so they can live. This resolution is the best way. If people really don't want to give up their organs, they don't have to. But for those who don't care either way, and are too lazy or unconcerned to give permission, this solves for that issue.*

AFF – Many US Citizens Never Opt-in, Even Though They Might Mean To (2011)

US News “Presumed Consent Wouldn't Boost U.S. Organ Donation: Study” December 16, 2011
<<http://health.usnews.com/health-news/managing-your-healthcare/articles/2011/12/16/presumed-consent-wouldnt-boost-us-organ-donation-study>>

“Most people support organ donation but never formally record their wishes and an presumed consent system might ease the burden of decision-making on grieving families, according to proponents.

In the United States, thousands of people die each year waiting for organs and many viable organs are never made available for donation, according to background information in a Johns Hopkins news release.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article extends on the first article, talking about how there are a lot of people that would like to donate, but never opt-in for it. Presumed consent solves that issue. It makes the most sense. This would not only improve organ donation, but it would give a better idea about why people don't want to donate, and help the organ donation industry solve for those issues. This is a great solution to a serious problem.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the status quo has done everything possible to improve organ donation, but it's still not enough. Unfortunately, thousands of people die a year, because they're waiting on a waiting list for a vital organ that someone could've and would've given if they knew they had to opt-in for it. This resolution allows for people who want to give, give, and those who are in need, receive the organ they need so they can live. This resolution is the best way. If people really don't want to give up their organs, they don't have to. But for those who don't care either way, and are too lazy or unconcerned to give permission, this solves for that issue.

The second article extends on the first article, talking about how there are a lot of people that would like to donate, but never opt-in for it. Presumed consent solves that issue. It makes the most sense. This would not only improve organ donation, but it would give a better idea about why people don't want to donate, and help the organ donation industry solve for those issues. This is a great solution to a serious problem.

Negative Evidence

NEG – This Problem is Already Being Solved in the Status Quo (2013)

Medical News Today “Social Media Initiative May Help Increase Organ Donations” June 18, 2013 <<http://www.medicalnewstoday.com/releases/261997.php>>

“A new social media initiative helped to boost organ donor registration rates, according to a new study published in the American Journal of Transplantation. The findings suggest that social media might be an effective tool for tackling a variety of problems related to public health in which communication and education are essential.

Organ donation rates in the United States have remained static while increasing numbers of individuals join transplant waiting lists each year. To provide organs to the more than 100,000 patients in need, new efforts to boost organ donation through public education are clearly needed.

When the investigators looked at the online registration activity in state registries for the weeks following Facebook's organ donor initiative, they saw a large spike in donor registration in all states. On the first day of the initiative, there were 13,054 new online registrations, representing a 21.1-fold increase over the baseline average of 616 registrations. This first-day effect ranged from 6.9-fold in Michigan to 108.9-fold in Georgia. Registration rates remained elevated in the following 12 days.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how steps are already being taken in the status quo to solve this issue. Rather than forcing people to donate, which is what we're doing, we should give people the choice. Your body shouldn't be donated to science just because you didn't say no. Your wages shouldn't be automatically given to charity, just because you don't opt-out. This is a charitable industry, organ donation, and people should have the right to give if they want to, or not give if they don't want to. This violates our Constitutional rights and puts our government in a bad situation. We shouldn't pass this bill, because there are other, better ways to solve this problem.*

NEG – US Ranks High In Transplants Worldwide

ABC News “Organ Donation Rates: How the US Stacks Up” Sydney Lupkin, June 18, 2013 <<http://abcnews.go.com/Health/organ-donation-rates-us-stacks/story?id=19437070#.Ud23xEE3vmQ>>

“With its opt-in program, the United States has the fourth-highest organ donor rate, with 26 donors per million people in the population, according to data from the National Transplant Organization in Spain, which compiles organ donation rates annually.

The United States, however, leads the world in actual transplant rates, which Dr. Tom Mone, a past president of the Association of Organ Procurement Organizations, says means doctors can use more of the organs they harvest.”

"It's fair to say we're doing as well or better than anyone else," said Mone, who is now the CEO of One Legacy, a nonprofit organization focused on organ donation.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the US already has one of the highest donor rates in the world. Why should we punish out citizens, if the rates in which people give up their vital organs is reasonable? This resolution should not be passed, because it violates our rights and people should be given a choice about what happens to their bodies after they die. The affirmative will argue that they still have a choice with presumed consent, but we know that's not true. It's misleading, because there will be a huge number of people who wouldn't consent, who are forced into it, because they didn't opt-out. This resolution promotes tricking the average citizen, and that's something this Congress should not stand for.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how steps are already being taken in the status quo to solve this issue. Rather than forcing people to donate, which is what we're doing, we should give people the choice. Your body shouldn't be donated to science just because you didn't say no. Your wages shouldn't be automatically given to charity, just because you don't opt-out. This is a charitable industry, organ donation, and people should have the right to give if they want to, or not give if they don't want to. This violates our Constitutional rights and puts our government in a bad situation. We shouldn't pass this bill, because there are other, better ways to solve this problem.

The second article talks about how the US already has one of the highest donor rates in the world. Why should we punish out citizens, if the rates in which people give up their vital organs is reasonable? This resolution should not be passed, because it violates our rights and people should be given a choice about what happens to their bodies after they die. The affirmative will argue that they still have a choice with presumed consent, but we know that's not true. It's misleading, because there will be a huge number of people who wouldn't consent, who are forced into it, because they didn't opt-out. This resolution promotes tricking the average citizen, and that's something this Congress should not stand for.

Legislation – A Resolution to Expand Political Asylum to Syrian Refugees Affirmative Evidence

AFF – The US has Failed to Appropriately Address this Global Crisis

CNN “War has forced half of Syrians from their homes. Here's where they've gone.” Mark Bixler and Michael Martinez, September 11, 2015

<http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/11/world/syria-refugee-crisis-when-war-displaces-half-a-country/>

“Imagine every man, woman and child leaving home in 29 states, mostly in the U.S. West and Midwest. That's everyone west of Ohio and Kentucky and north of Texas, all the way to California.

The 158 million people in those states make up the same share of the U.S. population -- 49% -- as the proportion of Syrians that have fled carnage there.

The war in Syria is so hellish and unrelenting that more people have left that country than any other in recent years. One of every five displaced persons in the world is Syrian.

Here's a look at where those Syrians have gone.

War has displaced half of all people in Syria

Protests against the government in Syria in 2011 soon devolved into chaotic war. The fighting and later rise of ISIS forced 10.6 million people from home -- about half of Syria's pre-war population.

Most Syrians who have left their homeland registered as refugees with the United Nations. Three in four Syrian refugees did that in Turkey, Lebanon or Jordan.

The number of Syrians seeking safety in Europe has more than doubled in the past year. Many left Turkey and other countries for Europe to ask for asylum, a status that allows someone to live and work legally in another country.

Worldwide, 59.5 million people are on the move as refugees or displaced people within their home countries. That population would be enough to make them citizens of the world's 24th biggest country.

Humanity has never seen such displacement. Ever.

"Wars, conflict and persecution have forced more people than at any other time since records began to flee their homes and seek refuge and safety elsewhere," the United Nations said in June.

At least 15 wars and conflicts are to blame -- in Africa, the Mideast and Asia.

Worldwide, 59.5 million people are on the move as refugees or displaced people within their home countries. That population would be enough to make them citizens of the world's 24th biggest country.

Humanity has never seen such displacement. Ever.

"Wars, conflict and persecution have forced more people than at any other time since records began to flee their homes and seek refuge and safety elsewhere," the United Nations said in June.

At least 15 wars and conflicts are to blame -- in Africa, the Mideast and Asia.

The United States has resettled 1,500 Syrian refugees since the start of the conflict in 2011, the vast majority of them this year.

That amounts to about 0.03% of Syria's 4.1 million refugees.

Here's a breakdown: 23 in 2011, 41 in 2012, 45 in 2013, 249 in 2014 and 1,199 so far this fiscal year, which ends September 30, according to the State Department.

About 300 more refugees are expected to be admitted by the end of the month, according to U.S. officials."

TAKEAWAY – *This article examines the number of refugees fleeing Syria. It address where the refugees went, how many have fled to other countries, and current trends in number of refugees. As the AFF you should ask the question: If we're not going to show more support for a crisis of this magnitude, when will we? This article says that, the "United States has resettled 1,500; that amounts to about 0.03% of Syria's 4.1 million refugees." If you argue in affirmation of this resolution, it's imperative that you really hit home the devastation of the crisis, and elevate the United States' moral imperative to step up and grant asylum to more refugees, and encourage other countries to do the same.*

AFF – The EU will Require more Support to House Syrian Refugees

CCN "Syrian refugees: Which countries welcome them, which ones don't" Michael Martinez, September 10, 2015

<http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/09/world/welcome-syrian-refugees-countries/>

"The expanding Syrian refugee crisis highlights the differences among countries that welcome desperate migrants and those that don't.

Some 4.1 million Syrians are fleeing a homeland riven by more than four years of civil war. Some countries have taken in so many migrants it's caused a population spike, while others have done little or nothing at all.

Here's a country-by-country look at what is being done to address the worst refugee crisis since the Rwandan genocide more than 20 years ago, according to experts.

Which countries take in the Syrian refugees?

Turkey: 1.9 million

Remarkably, this country now shelters almost half of the Syrian refugees and clearly has more than it can handle.

It's the No. 1 destination for displaced families.

Geography explains much of it: Turkey and Syria share a border.

The masses are so vast that 14% of them are sheltered in camps, U.S. figures show.

A staggering share of them are children and teens: More than half are under age 17, according to U.N. figures...

...Which countries are getting Syrian asylum requests?

Germany: 98,700

As Germany faces the largest share of Syrian requests for asylum in Europe, Chancellor Angela Merkel called for quotas to be set for each country to take a share of displaced people, including from Syria.

Germany expects the overall asylum requests to soar above the current U.N. count of 98,700 from Syrians alone.

There could be 800,000 applications for asylum in Germany this year, and the country could take 500,000 refugees annually for several years, Vice Chancellor Sigmar Gabriel has said.

Sweden: 64,700

Sweden joins Germany in demonstrating a high standard of responsibility in the refugee crisis, and Swedish Prime Minister Stefan Lofven joined Merkel at a press conference this week in urging a Europe-wide solution for hosting refugees.

In the 1990s, Sweden accepted 84,000 refugees from the Balkans.

"We accept that every person has a right to seek asylum," Swedish Foreign Affairs Minister Margot Wallstrom said. "This also puts the European solidarity to a test. I think it's important that we signal being a community that rests on common values of democracy and defense of human rights."

France: 6,700

The number of asylum requests has been relatively low.

But they will surely increase now that French President François Hollande has said France is ready to take on more responsibility and host 24,000 refugees over the next two years.

The French leader said this number would be France's share under a proposal by the European Commission for EU nations to take in 120,000 refugees over the next two years.

"We will do so because it is the principle to which France is committed," Hollande said.

United Kingdom: 7,000

The United Kingdom will likely see an upswing in asylum requests now that it has said it will take up to 20,000 Syrian refugees over the next five years.

But Britain will focus on resettling vulnerable refugees from camps in countries bordering Syria, not those who have already entered Europe, Prime Minister David Cameron said Monday.

"This provides refugees with a more direct and safe route to the United Kingdom rather than risking the hazardous journey to Europe, which has tragically cost so many lives," he said.

The refugees will receive a five-year humanitarian protection visa, Cameron said. Britain has been the second largest provider of humanitarian aid to Syrian refugees within the Middle East region, according to U.N. figures.

Denmark: 11,300

Denmark has received a relatively large number of Syrian asylum requests but has sought to discourage the arrival of more migrants.

On Wednesday, Danish authorities tried to restrict migrants from crossing into the country from central Europe. Danish police said via Twitter it blocked access to some highways and suspended some international railway traffic.

The country earlier had paid for ads in Arabic in four Lebanese newspapers to get the word out about its new, tightened restrictions -- such as reducing social benefits -- to try to prevent refugees from getting into the Scandinavian nation.

"We cannot simply keep up with the present flow," Immigration and Integration Minister Inger Stojberg, a member of the right-wing Venstre Party, said on Facebook. "In light of the huge influx to Europe these days, there is good reason for us to tighten rules and get that effectively communicated."

Hungary: 18,800

Many Syrian refugees are reluctant to register an asylum application in Hungary.

Having traveled north through the Balkans, those arriving on the country's border with Serbia have had police greet them, and they've been forced to wait, sometimes for days, in holding areas and transit camps, where conditions are said to be poor.

Many migrants would prefer to register as refugees in countries such as Germany, Sweden and Austria, continuing their journey through Hungary to Northern and Western Europe.

Hungary's right-wing government, which has been trying to stop the flood of migrants, has erected a barbed wire fence along its more than 160-kilometer (100-mile) border with Serbia to prevent them from crossing there.

Serbia, which has received 49,500 asylum requests from Syrian refugees, is not a member of the European Union.

Other European countries

Syrian refugees have made a wide range of requests for asylum in other parts of Europe, including -- between April 2011 and this July -- 5,500 in Spain, 14,100 in the Netherlands, 18,600 in Austria, 8,300 in Switzerland and 15,000 in Bulgaria, according to the United Nations.

Italy, where many migrants who've made the perilous Mediterranean crossing from North Africa first land, had received 2,143 asylum applications as of July, the United Nations said.

Greece, which lies on a popular transit route from Turkey north through the Balkans to Northern Europe, has seen more than 250,000 people arrive on its shores this year, according to the International Organization for Migration. It had received 3,545 asylum applications as of July, U.N. figures show.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article takes an in depth look at where refugees are going after leaving Syria. It explains that there is enormous pressure on the EU to step up and take in more refugees. Several countries in the EU have stepped up and are taking in more refugees than they anticipated, however they need help. They have taken about as many refugees as they can handle. It's time that the United States' fulfills its global obligation and offers asylum to more refugees. We should also encourage the rest of the global community to follow suit.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article examines the number of refugees fleeing Syria. It address where the refugees went, how many have fled to other countries, and current trends in number of refugees. As the AFF you should ask the question: If we're not going to show more support for a crisis of this magnitude, when will we? This article says that, the "United States has resettled 1,500; that amounts to about 0.03% of Syria's 4.1 million refugees." If you argue in affirmation of this resolution, it's imperative that you really hit home the devastation of the crisis, and elevate the United States' moral imperative to step up and grant asylum to more refugees, and encourage other countries to do the same.

The second article takes an in depth look at where refugees are going after leaving Syria. It explains that there is enormous pressure on the EU to step up and take in more refugees. Several countries in the EU have stepped up and are taking in more refugees than they anticipated, however they need help. They have taken about as many refugees as they can handle. It's time that the United States' fulfills its global obligation and offers asylum to more refugees. We should also encourage the rest of the global community to follow suit.

Negative Evidence

NEG – The European Union has Taken Direct Action to Support Syria

BBC News “Migrant crisis: EU plan offers more money for Turkey camps” Lachlan Carmichael, October 6, 2015

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-34451660>

“European Council President Donald Tusk said earlier that, according to Ankara's estimates, three million more people could head to Europe from Aleppo and the surrounding area. But the International Organization for Migration (IOM) says it has so far had no reports of more people leaving Syria, and that Mr Tusk's comments were "speculative".

In Brussels, Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan and EU leaders agreed to finalise an action plan with Turkey in the coming days to deal with the refugee crisis.

The draft document includes proposals for the EU to:

§ Provide up to €1bn (£0.74bn) for this year and next to help Turkey cope with refugees from Syria and Iraq

§ Resettlement of some refugees already in Turkey

§ Reinforce the Turkish coast guard to help it tackle smugglers

§ Build on plans for lifting visa requirements for Turks travelling to the EU

In exchange, Turkey would undertake various measures including implementing asylum procedures and giving priority to "the opening of the six refugee reception centres built with the EU co-funding.”

In exchange, Turkey would undertake various measures including implementing asylum procedures and giving priority to "the opening of the six refugee reception centres built with the EU co-funding”.

'We need Turkey'

European Commission chief Jean-Claude Juncker earlier hailed Turkey for having admitted 2.2 million Syrian refugees.

"It is clear that we need Turkey. The Commission will come to its aid," he said.

However, Turkish Economy Minister Nihat Zeybekci was sceptical about the plan, according to Reuters.

His country would welcome a financial contribution from the EU to ease the strain of hosting migrants, but that funding would "not be a solution" to the crisis, Mr Zeybekci was quoted as saying.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains certain actions that the European Union has taken to help support the refugees fleeing from Syria. One of the primary purposes of the EU is to deal with crises like this. If you argue in negation, you can list the support that Turkey is providing and argue that we should allow the EU to take control of the situation. The US has no need to further interfere in a matter that does not directly affect the safety of its people. The refugees from Syria are able to lean on the support of the neighboring countries. The current relationship the US has the EU should not be altered when the EU is already showing its effectiveness in dealing with the Syrian refugee crisis.*

NEG – US already supplying \$500 Million in Aid to Syria

Huffington Post “U.S. Commits \$507 Million For Syrian Aid, Leads Pledges At International Conference”
Kuwait City, March 31, 2015, < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/03/31/us-syria-aid_n_6977440.html >

“The United States pledged \$507 million in humanitarian aid at an international donors' conference for Syria on Tuesday as the United Nations issued an appeal for \$8.4 billion in commitments this year — the organization's largest appeal yet for the war-ravaged country.

Kuwait, which is hosting the third annual conference, pledged \$500 million at the start of the meeting. The European Commission and EU member states pledged close to \$1.2 billion total, double the overall EU pledge at last year's conference...

...U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Samantha Power said that despite the U.N. making its largest humanitarian appeal in history, "many countries are giving the same amount, or even less than they have in the past." Tuesday's roughly half-billion-dollar U.S. pledge is in addition to nearly \$3.2 billion the country has provided since the conflict began, she said.

"Years from now, when Syrians and the world look back on the country's horrific crisis, they will remember which countries stepped up to help people in dire need, and which countries did little or nothing at all," she told the conference.

Some 78 countries and 40 international aid organizations are present at this year's conference.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article takes a look at some of the current aid that the U.S. is giving to Syria to support the refugee crisis. According to the article The United States had pledged \$507 million in humanitarian aid to support the Syrian refugees. If you speak in negation of this legislation, you should argue that the current aid we are supplying to Syria is substantial enough to not require more aid from the U.S. You should further argue the implications of allowing that many refugees into our country and the public safety harms that would arise. We shouldn't risk the safety of our citizens to support the refugees, but we should continue to support them financially, like we have done. We also shouldn't burden other countries who are unwilling to take in more refugees. We should instead encourage them to make financial contributions as well.*

Negative Takeaways

The first article explains certain actions that the European Union has taken to help support the refugees fleeing from Syria. One of the primary purposes of the EU is to deal with crises like this. If you argue in negation, you can list the support that Turkey is providing and argue that we should allow the EU to take control of the situation. The US has no need to further interfere in a matter that does not directly affect the safety of its people. The refugees from Syria are able to lean on the support of the neighboring countries. The current relationship the US has the EU should not be altered when the EU is already showing its effectiveness in dealing with the Syrian refugee crisis.

The second article takes a look at some of the current aid that the U.S. is giving to Syria to support the refugee crisis. According to the article The United States had pledged \$507 million in humanitarian aid to support the Syrian refugees. If you speak in negation of this legislation, you should argue that the current aid we are supplying to Syria is substantial enough to not require more aid from the U.S. You should further argue the implications of allowing that many refugees into our country and the public safety harms that would arise. We shouldn't risk the safety of our citizens to support the refugees, but we should continue to support them financially, like we have done. We also shouldn't burden other countries who are unwilling to take in more refugees. We should instead encourage them to make financial contributions as well.