



TOPICS PLUS

UIL District ESC 10 (4A/6A) Research Pack

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

www.topicsplus.com

Contents

Item 1 – Mandate All Police Wear Body Cameras	
Affirmative Evidence	5
Affirmative Takeaways	8
Negative Evidence	9
Negative Takeaways	12
Item 2 – Equip All Cars with Ignition Interlock Devices	
Affirmative Evidence	13
Affirmative Takeaways	15
Negative Evidence	16
Negative Takeaways	18
Item 3 – Expand Political Asylum to Syrian Refugees	
Affirmative Evidence	19
Affirmative Takeaways	24
Negative Evidence	25
Negative Takeaways	27
Item 4 – Regulate Shadow Banking	
Affirmative Evidence	28
Affirmative Takeaways	30
Negative Evidence	31
Negative Takeaways	33
Item 5 – Legalize Physician Assisted Suicide	
Affirmative Evidence	34
Affirmative Takeaways	37
Negative Evidence	38
Negative Takeaways	40
Item 6 – Ensure All Drivers are Properly Licensed and Identifiable	
Affirmative Evidence	41
Affirmative Takeaways	43
Negative Evidence	44
Negative Takeaways	46
Item 7 – Amend the Constitution to Allow Naturalized Citizens to Run for President	
Affirmative Evidence	47
Affirmative Takeaways	50
Negative Evidence	51
Negative Takeaways	54
Item 8 – Publicly Display Prices for All Hospital Tests, Treatments, and Procedures	
Affirmative Evidence	55
Affirmative Takeaways	57
Negative Evidence	58
Negative Takeaways	60
Item 9 – Enact the Abolishment of the USA Patriot Act of 2001 and Close Guantanamo	
Affirmative Evidence	61

Affirmative Takeaways -----	63
Negative Evidence -----	64
Negative Takeaways -----	66
Item 10 – Commit Any and All Resources to the Restoration of Earth's Environment	
Affirmative Evidence -----	67
Affirmative Takeaways -----	70
Negative Evidence -----	71
Negative Takeaways -----	75
Item 11 – Institute a Flat Tax	
Affirmative Evidence -----	76
Affirmative Takeaways -----	78
Negative Evidence -----	79
Negative Takeaways -----	81
Item 12 – Eliminate Standardized Testing	
Affirmative Evidence -----	82
Affirmative Takeaways -----	86
Negative Evidence -----	87
Negative Takeaways -----	92
Item 13 – Repeal the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation between the US and Japan	
Affirmative Evidence -----	93
Affirmative Takeaways -----	95
Negative Evidence -----	96
Negative Takeaways -----	99
Item 14 – Legalize Marijuana to Limit Crowding in Our Jails and Prisons	
Affirmative Evidence -----	100
Affirmative Takeaways -----	103
Negative Evidence -----	104
Negative Takeaways -----	107
Item 15 – Ban Helium to Consumers	
Affirmative Evidence -----	108
Affirmative Takeaways -----	110
Negative Evidence -----	111
Negative Takeaways -----	113
Item 16 – Implement Income Share Agreements to Improve Higher Ed Financing	
Affirmative Evidence -----	114
Affirmative Takeaways -----	117
Negative Evidence -----	118
Negative Takeaways -----	121
Item 17 – Require E-Verify	
Affirmative Evidence -----	122
Affirmative Takeaways -----	124
Negative Evidence -----	125
Negative Takeaways -----	127
Item 18 – Reform the IRS and Tax Exemptions of Religious Sanctions	
Affirmative Evidence -----	128

Affirmative Takeaways -----	131
Negative Evidence -----	132
Negative Takeaways -----	135
Item 19 – Militarize American Police Forces	
Affirmative Evidence -----	136
Affirmative Takeaways -----	139
Negative Evidence -----	140
Negative Takeaways -----	142
Item 20 – Solve Illegal Immigration to Create New Guest Worker Program	
Affirmative Evidence -----	143
Affirmative Takeaways -----	146
Negative Evidence -----	147
Negative Takeaways -----	149
Item 21 – Prohibit the Privatization of Prisons to Uphold Civil Liberties	
Affirmative Evidence -----	150
Affirmative Takeaways -----	154
Negative Evidence -----	155
Negative Takeaways -----	158
Item 22 – Amend the Constitution to Allow States Direct Authority to Amend	
Affirmative Evidence -----	159
Affirmative Takeaways -----	161
Negative Evidence -----	162
Negative Takeaways -----	164
Item 23 – Colonize Space in order to Ensure the Long-Term Survival of the Human Race	
Affirmative Evidence -----	165
Affirmative Takeaways -----	167
Negative Evidence -----	168
Negative Takeaways -----	170
Item 24 – Regulate Tuition of Public Universities	
Affirmative Evidence -----	171
Affirmative Takeaways -----	173
Negative Evidence -----	174
Negative Takeaways -----	176
Item 25 – A Bill Regarding the Abolition of Non-Federal Prisons	
Affirmative Evidence -----	177
Affirmative Takeaways -----	179
Negative Evidence -----	180
Negative Takeaways -----	182

Legislation – A Bill to Mandate all Police Officers to Wear Body Cameras Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Police Body Cameras Build Trust, Provide Numerous Benefits

Harvard Law Review, Volume 128, Number 6, Considering Police Body Cameras, April 10, 2015
<<http://harvardlawreview.org/2015/04/considering-police-body-cameras/>>

Proponents of body cameras often herald these cameras' unique ability to provide an "unambiguous" account of police-civilian encounters.⁴²×

For example, they claim that, had Officer Wilson been wearing a camera, its footage would have captured the interaction between him and Michael Brown prior to Brown's death. This footage would have provided the jury with a more objective account to use in resolving the discrepancies between Wilson's account and the accounts of eyewitnesses.⁴³×

This technology has also been praised as likely to reveal instances of police misconduct, reform police (and civilian) behavior, and build trust between the police and the community, all of which provide strong justifications for adoption...

...Perhaps the most commonly cited indicator of body cameras' potential to reduce instances of officer-civilian conflict is the "Rialto study." In this study, which ran from February 2012 through July 2013, half of Rialto, California's fifty-four patrol officers were "randomly assigned to wear the TASER AXON body-camera system."⁴⁴×

The results of the study appeared conclusive: "[s]hifts without cameras experienced twice as many incidents of use of force as shifts with cameras," and "the rate of use of force incidents per 1,000 contacts was reduced by 2.5 times" overall as compared to the previous twelve-month period.⁴⁵×

This dramatic reduction in the use of force indicates that body-worn cameras may have had a "civilizing" effect on officers, as the presence of a camera appeared to drastically lower the frequency with which officers "resorted to the use of physical force — including the use of OC spray ('pepper spray'), batons, Tasers, firearms, or canine bites."⁴⁶×

This civilizing effect may also extend to (or stem from) civilians who know they are being filmed, as some police officials believe "the visible presence of a camera [can] . . . compel highly agitated people to calm down more quickly."⁴⁷×

Studies conducted in other locales have also found that body cameras reduce officers' use of force in the field..

...Another benefit, intimately related to reducing instances of officer misconduct, is the ability of camera footage to facilitate efficient resolution of citizen complaints and lower the overall number of complaints filed in the first place.⁵⁰×

Rather than having to resolve a complaint based solely on "a credibility determination as between the complainant and one or more of the officers involved," the supposed objectivity of the camera will ideally lead investigators to "more accurate findings."⁵¹×

Greater accuracy buttresses efficiency, since officers who did not engage in misconduct can be rapidly exonerated.⁵²×

The number of frivolous civilian complaints will likely also be reduced, as people become aware that their actions are on film, making it more difficult for them to prevail on questionable claims...

...Police departments also perceive these cameras as helpful in the context of officer training, because “recordings [can] be used for remedial training or correcting the behavior of individual officers against whom misconduct allegations have been filed.”⁵⁴×

Footage can be incorporated into training programs to demonstrate what actual, on-the-ground civilian encounters should (and should not) look like, and review of body-camera footage may be particularly useful in monitoring new officers. But this benefit does not necessarily require that all officers be outfitted with cameras, as videos taken on certain patrols could be used for training both within and between departments. Still, body cameras may prove most effective as training devices if supervisors are actually able to pull and review officers’ individual footage...

...Footage from body cameras may help both prosecutors and defense attorneys by providing “objective evidence relating to whether a confession was voluntary, a search was consented to or justified, or a physical description matched a ‘lookout.’”⁵⁶×

A recent survey of prosecutors confirms this: ninety-six percent of prosecutors said that video evidence improved their ability to prosecute cases.⁵⁷×

In particular, video evidence has the advantage of “refresh[ing] the officer’s memory” and “verify[ing] the accuracy of written reports and statements surrounding [an] incident.”⁵⁸×

Still, overreliance on video evidence raises several concerns: For one, as discussed below, film is not inherently objective.⁵⁹×

It is also inevitable that video footage will not be available in every case, so creating such an expectation may be dangerous as juries could come to discount “other types of evidence, such as statements from police officers or other eyewitnesses.” ...

...Taken all together, the preceding benefits may lead to improved relations between the police and the communities they serve, assuming body cameras do in fact result in more respectful officer behavior and the disciplining of those officers who abuse their power. Especially if citizens are able to request footage of their encounters with the police, or if departments willingly release footage of disputed incidents, the current climate of distrust may improve. That so many Americans feel they would be safer if all police officers wore body cameras speaks to this technology’s potential to increase accountability and transparency. But, as will be discussed below, if increased accountability ultimately leads mostly to increased government surveillance, the public’s trust may instead be undermined.⁶¹×

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the many benefits of police body cameras. Body cameras would aid in protecting citizens, help reduce police misconduct, provide solutions for complaints made by citizens, provide training material for new police officers, provide*

evidence for trials, which would make convicting criminals easier, and ultimately improve the relationship between police and civilians, which is heightened at the moment. This piece of evidence is from the Harvard Law Review, and provides every piece of evidence you could need for any affirmative argument in favor of police body cameras.

AFF - Police Body Cameras Serve Civilians, and Are Advantageous

American Civil Liberties Union “Police Body-Mounted Cameras: With Right Policies in Place, A Win For All” Jay Stanley, Updated Version Published March 2015, Original Published October 2013
<<https://www.aclu.org/police-body-mounted-cameras-right-policies-place-win-all>>

Although we at the ACLU generally take a dim view of the proliferation of surveillance cameras in American life, police on-body cameras are different because of their potential to serve as a check against the abuse of power by police officers. Historically, there was no documentary evidence of most encounters between police officers and the public, and due to the volatile nature of those encounters, this often resulted in radically divergent accounts of incidents. Cameras have the potential to be a win-win, helping protect the public against police misconduct, and at the same time helping protect police against false accusations of abuse.

We're against pervasive government surveillance, but when cameras primarily serve the function of allowing public monitoring of the government instead of the other way around, we generally support their use. While we have opposed government video surveillance of public places, for example, we have supported the installation of video cameras on police car dashboards, in prisons, and during interrogations...

...At the same time, body cameras have more of a potential to invade privacy than those deployments. Police officers enter people's homes and encounter bystanders, suspects, and victims in a wide variety of sometimes stressful and extreme situations.

For the ACLU, the challenge of on-officer cameras is the tension between their potential to invade privacy and their strong benefit in promoting police accountability. Overall, we think they can be a win-win—but only if they are deployed within a framework of strong policies to ensure they protect the public without becoming yet another system for routine surveillance of the public, and maintain public confidence in the integrity of those privacy protections. Without such a framework, their accountability benefits would not exceed their privacy risks.

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about police body cameras and the benefits they have for the civilian population. Essentially, body cameras would be installed to give the American public further respect for authority and would help alleviate tension between the police and citizens. In this case, people wouldn't be afraid of being confronted by police officers, because they'd know the entire interaction would be recorded, and could be used to prove the time and circumstance of events. Beyond that, situations where civilians are killed, and no one is around to verify what happened, would now be solved, because that information would be readily available. The article also argues that while body cameras are a risk because they could invade privacy, it's ultimately a risk worth taking in our current climate.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about the many benefits of police body cameras. Body cameras would aid in protecting citizens, help reduce police misconduct, provide solutions for complaints made by citizens, provide training material for new police officers, provide evidence for trials, which would make convicting criminals easier, and ultimately improve the relationship between police and civilians, which is heightened at the moment. This piece of evidence is from the Harvard Law Review, and provides every piece of evidence you could need for any affirmative argument in favor of police body cameras.

The second article talks about police body cameras and the benefits they have for the civilian population. Essentially, body cameras would be installed to give the American public further respect for authority and would help alleviate tension between the police and citizens. In this case, people wouldn't be afraid of being confronted by police officers, because they'd know the entire interaction would be recorded, and could be used to prove the time and circumstance of events. Beyond that, situations where civilians are killed, and no one is around to verify what happened, would now be solved, because that information would be readily available. The article also argues that while body cameras are a risk because they could invade privacy, it's ultimately a risk worth taking in our current climate.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Body Cameras Are Expensive, and Violate Citizen Privacy

Harvard Law Review, Volume 128, Number 6, Considering Police Body Cameras, April 10, 2015
<<http://harvardlawreview.org/2015/04/considering-police-body-cameras/>>

This widespread galvanization over body cameras¹⁵× exemplifies the human tendency, in times of tragedy, to latch on to the most readily available solution to a complex problem. But as the outcome of Garner’s case demonstrates, even when high-quality, graphic footage is available, officers may still not be indicted, let alone convicted.¹⁶×

Moreover, body cameras are a powerful — and indiscriminate — technology. Their proliferation over the next decade will inevitably change the nature of policing in unexpected ways, quite possibly to the detriment of the citizens the cameras are intended to protect.

So although video footage has the potential to move citizens as it did in the Garner case,¹⁸× proper implementation of this new policing tool requires careful consideration of current policy proposals, rather than the rapid, reactionary adoptions currently taking place nationwide.¹⁹×

Their adoption should also not be used as an excuse to stifle continued conversation about the root causes of police violence and fractured community relations, as body cameras alone will never be the hoped-for cure-all...

...Privacy is a counterpoint to access: increasing transparency necessarily means more people will view body-camera footage, which will frequently feature civilians who may not want the recordings of themselves shared. This type of access raises the issue of whether officers must affirmatively warn all citizens that they are being recorded. The ACLU, for one, has called for notice to citizens “wherever practicable,” potentially in the form of “an easily visible pin or sticker saying ‘lapel camera in operation’ or words to that effect.”⁹²× But questions remain, especially about the appropriateness of “police recordings made inside private homes” given the footage’s “uniquely intrusive nature.”⁹³× Officers’ ability to review tapes, slow them down, and enhance images means that a recorded search of a home or a vehicle can lead to the discovery of evidence that would otherwise have gone unnoticed...

...As more departments acquire body cameras, and as officers’ cameras roll each day, police departments will inevitably amass a colossal amount of footage, much of it likely irrelevant to any disputes over police-civilian interactions. While the start-up cost of outfitting a force with body cameras is not trivial for cash-strapped departments, the costs of storing and transmitting this data can be particularly staggering: some departments have already spent hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars managing their data.⁹⁶× However, these costs may be offset by savings on litigation, if cameras do in fact lead to fewer complaints and more efficient resolution of police misconduct cases.⁹⁷×

Still, this price tag leaves open the question of who exactly will bear the costs of this new technology — especially when politicians are wary of raising taxes while the country recovers from the Great Recession....

...In a post-9/11 world, the addition of yet another form of government surveillance should not go unexamined: recent technological advances have allowed the state to move beyond the use of traditional electronic surveillance devices — like wiretaps and bugs — toward more pervasive surveillance techniques.¹⁰¹ From the Snowden leaks¹⁰² to reports of police drone use,¹⁰³ citizens are more conscious than ever of being watched by their government.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, “mission creep” on the part of camera manufacturers has already begun: at least one city has made plans to outfit its parking attendants with body cameras,¹⁰⁵ and some advocates have called for expanding cameras into other arenas, like the classroom.¹⁰⁶

So although police body cameras have the potential to benefit citizens and officers alike, they nevertheless represent another substantial step toward a surveillance state. Police departments in recent decades have become increasingly militarized,¹⁰⁷ complete with intelligence departments,¹⁰⁸ devices that mimic cell phone towers,¹⁰⁹ and facial recognition software.¹¹⁰ Facial recognition software in particular may pose a threat to civilian privacy when coupled with body cameras:

[T]he increasing effectiveness of facial recognition software, even in consumer products like Facebook, means that simply recording an image of a person (in a private or public space) can lead to further identification. . . . Officer-mounted wearable cameras, paired with facial recognition, could easily become much like the current crop of automated license readers, constantly reading thousands of faces (license plates), interpreting identity (plate number), and cross-checking this information against national and local crime databases in real-time.¹¹¹

While not necessarily “inimical to individual liberty,” this rapid expansion of police oversight may do less to empower civilians to “watch their watchers,” and more to enable the government to effectively track, detain, and arrest individuals.

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about several key points that are valid when arguing against police body cameras. First, they are very expensive, and shouldering that cost is something that police departments and the federal government can’t afford. Second, there is a large chance that citizen privacy would be violated during recording. It’s an example of being recorded without your express permission, and that should not be allowed. The thought that someone can watch you while you’re going about your day, and all because a police officer was around, is disconcerting. Beyond that, the police officer’s privacy would also be violated, because they couldn’t carry on normal conversations with other officers or talk to their loved ones without the devices on. Last, you could argue that this could perpetuate the surveillance state that currently plagues the United States. We are constantly monitored, and this is just another way for the Government to keep its’ eyes on us.*

NEG – Police Body Cams Hurt Privacy for All

American Civil Liberties Union “Police Body-Mounted Cameras: With Right Policies in Place, A Win For All” Jay Stanley, Updated Version Published March 2015, Original Published October 2013
<<https://www.aclu.org/police-body-mounted-cameras-right-policies-place-win-all>>

Continuous recording would also impinge on police officers when they are sitting in a station house or patrol car shooting the breeze — getting to know each other as humans, discussing precinct politics, etc. We have some sympathy for police on this; continuous recording might feel as stressful and oppressive in those situations as it would for any employee subject to constant recording by their supervisor. True, police officers with

their extraordinary powers are not regular employees, and in theory officers' privacy, like citizens', could be protected by appropriate policies (as outlined below) that ensure that 99% of video would be deleted in relatively short order without ever being reviewed. But on a psychological level, such assurances are rarely enough. There is also the danger that the technology would be misused by police supervisors against whistleblowers or union activists — for example, by scrutinizing video records to find minor violations to use against an officer...

...Police body cameras mean that many instances of entirely innocent behavior (on the part of both officers and the public) will be recorded. Perhaps most troubling is that some recordings will be made inside people's homes, whenever police enter — including in instances of consensual entry (e.g., responding to a burglary call, voluntarily participating in an investigation) and such things as domestic violence calls. In the case of dashcams, we have also seen video of particular incidents released for no important public reason, and instead serving only to embarrass individuals. Examples have included DUI stops of celebrities and ordinary individuals whose troubled and/or intoxicated behavior has been widely circulated and now immortalized online. The potential for such merely embarrassing and titillating releases of video is significantly increased by body cams.

TAKEAWAY – *This article extends on the arguments that citizen and police officer privacy is at stake when we use police body cameras. United States citizens are entitled to a certain level of privacy, and this disturbs that. Beyond that, you can argue that police informants, or people who would like to volunteer information, would be less likely to do so if they didn't have anonymity. Overall, police body cameras have the right intention, because they are intended to bring citizens and police officers closer, but they would end up having the opposite result.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about several key points that are valid when arguing against police body cameras. First, they are very expensive, and shouldering that cost is something that police departments and the federal government can't afford. Second, there is a large chance that citizen privacy would be violated during recording. It's an example of being recorded without your express permission, and that should not be allowed. The thought that someone can watch you while you're going about your day, and all because a police officer was around, is disconcerting. Beyond that, the police officer's privacy would also be violated, because they couldn't carry on normal conversations with other officers or talk to their loved ones without the devices on. Last, you could argue that this could perpetuate the surveillance state that currently plagues the United States. We are constantly monitored, and this is just another way for the Government to keep its' eyes on us.

The second article extends on the arguments that citizen and police officer privacy is at stake when we use police body cameras. United States citizens are entitled to a certain level of privacy, and this disturbs that. Beyond that, you can argue that police informants, or people who would like to volunteer information, would be less likely to do so if they didn't have anonymity. Overall, police body cameras have the right intention, because they are intended to bring citizens and police officers closer, but they would end up having the opposite result.

Legislation – A Bill to Require Ignition Interlocking Devices Included on all New Vehicles Affirmative Evidence

AFF – 2 Million Drunks Drivers With Previous Convictions Driving Everyday

MADD, “Sober to Start,” Accessed October 12, 2015, <<http://www.madd.org/drunk-driving/ignition-interlocks/?referrer=https://www.google.com/>>

“The average drunk driver has driven drunk 80 times before a first arrest, and on any given day, your family shares the roadways with more than 2 million drunk drivers who have had three or more prior convictions.

While suspending the license of these individuals makes sense, in reality, three out of four of those with a suspended license continue to drive, threatening the safety of you and your loved ones. That’s why MADD supports the usage of ignition interlock devices...

Currently, 25 states require interlocks for all offenders...Even when laws are passed, they are not always enforced.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article from MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, starts with some powerful statistics. On any given day there are 2 million drunk drivers on the road who have had prior convictions. ¾ of convicted drunk drivers with suspended licenses still drive with their license suspended. Ignition Interlocking Devices would help to prevent people with prior convictions from repeat offending. 25 states already require ignition interlocking systems for past offenders. However, punishing past offenders isn’t enough, because drunk drivers drive drunk about EIGHTY times before their first arrest. We need to be proactive and stop drunk drivers before they have the opportunity to drive under the influence. This bill would help do that.*

AFF – Ignition Interlock Devices Save Lives and Benefit Young Drivers

Guardian Interlock, “What If Every Car Had An Ignition Interlock?” Shelly Wutke, March 31, 2015, <<http://guardianinterlock.com/blog/every-car-ignition-interlock/>>

“Researchers estimated that if ignition interlock devices were installed in all new vehicles, over a 15 period there would be an 85 percent drop in crash deaths due to alcohol. Another 1.25 million injuries could be prevented too...

It’s proven that ignition interlocks work to reduce the likelihood that a drunk driver will drive again by 65%...

The researchers did state that young drivers age 21 and under would benefit the most from having an ignition interlock in their vehicle, because statistically they are the demographic most likely to die in an alcohol-related crash.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that adding Ignition Interlock Devices to every vehicle would result in an 85% decrease in crash deaths due to alcohol and the prevention of 1.25 million injuries. IIDs reduce the likelihood that a drunk driver will drive under the influence by 65%. Enforcing IIDs in every vehicle would most benefit young drivers under 21. If you speak in affirmation, these are some really strong statistics to use. If we can prevent deaths and*

injuries, there's no reason not to move forward. Beyond that, this would most benefit young drivers, and that's a huge point to hit on. Drivers under 21 are a huge cause for concern, and we could alleviate some of that concern by passing this legislation.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article from MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, starts with some powerful statistics. On any given day there are 2 million drunk drivers on the road who have had prior convictions. $\frac{3}{4}$ of convicted drunk drivers with suspended licenses still drive with their license suspended. Ignition Interlocking Devices would help to prevent people with prior convictions from repeat offending. 25 states already require ignition interlocking systems for past offenders. However, punishing past offenders isn't enough, because drunk drivers drive drunk about EIGHTY times before their first arrest. We need to be proactive and stop drunk drivers before they have the opportunity to drive under the influence. This bill would help do that.

The second article says that adding Ignition Interlock Devices to every vehicle would result in an 85% decrease in crash deaths due to alcohol and the prevention of 1.25 million injuries. IIDs reduce the likelihood that a drunk driver will drive under the influence by 65%. Enforcing IIDs in every vehicle would most benefit young drivers under 21. If you speak in affirmation, these are some really strong statistics to use. If we can prevent deaths and injuries, there's no reason not to move forward. Beyond that, this would most benefit young drivers, and that's a huge point to hit on. Drivers under 21 are a huge cause for concern, and we could alleviate some of that concern by passing this legislation.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Ignition Interlock Devices Have Issues

Egg Pen, “Lifesaver Ignition Interlock: Saving Lives or Putting Lives at Risk,” March 25, 2014, <
<http://eggpen.com/lifesaver-ignition-interlock-saving-lives-or-putting-lives-at-risk/> >

“Con: Distracts you while driving

Texting and driving is now illegal because drivers aren’t watching the road while texting; they’re looking down at their phone. The ignition interlock device randomly beeps while you’re driving, indicating that you have to blow into it. After you take your breath test, you have to look at the device to make sure the pass light turns on, so when you’re doing that, you’re not watching the road, putting lives at risk.

Con: Could possibly shut your car off while driving

There is a certain way you have to take your breath test. You have to make a humming tone for a certain amount of time in order for you to pass. If you don’t do it the exact way that you’re supposed to, the abort light will come on. If you get three aborts in a row, your car either won’t start or it will actually shut your car off while you’re driving. I’d hate to be in the middle of the highway when that happens, again, putting lives at risk.

Con: Takes almost five minutes to warm up in cold weather

You have to turn your key forward in your ignition to turn the device on. In normal weather it will beep about 10 seconds after it gets turned on, allowing you to take your test. In cold weather it can take up to five minutes for the ignition interlock to warm up and then after that you can attempt to start your car. “

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence was written by someone who has been required to have an Ignition Interlock Device in their car because of prior DUIs. They may not be the most reliable source, but they present some valid concerns. Ignition Interlocking Devices are a newer technology, and all new technology has some glitches. IIDs require that you re-breathe into the device while driving, which is distracting. If while driving, you fail or can’t get the machine to respond, your car will literally shut off, regardless of where you are. This could be especially dangerous if you’re driving on a highway. Finally, it takes about 5 minutes to warm up in cold weather. So, a person has to wait 5 minutes before they can even attempt to turn on their car. If you speak in negation of this bill, you should argue that we can’t put ignition interlocking devices in every car, until the glitches are worked out.*

NEG – Required Ignition Interlock Punishes Safe Drivers

Guardian Interlock, “What If Every Car Had An Ignition Interlock?” Shelly Wutke, March 31, 2015, <
<http://guardianinterlock.com/blog/every-car-ignition-interlock/> >

“On the other, having an ignition interlock in every single vehicle will penalize drivers who may never consider driving drunk.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence is small but powerful. This legislation is penalizing EVERY driver, even those who have never gotten a DUI or who have never driven under the influence. Ignition Interlock systems are a nuisance, especially for people who would never drive under the influence. It’s not appropriate to punish everyone for the behavior of a few. If you speak in negation, you could argue that we should instead adopt a bill that requires all*

previously DUI convicted drivers to have an Ignition Interlock system. Several states already require this, and it has been successful at decreasing the incidences of drunk driving accidents and repeat offenders. This bill penalizes people who shouldn't be penalized and that isn't fair.

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence was written by someone who has been required to have an Ignition Interlock Device in their car because of prior DUIs. They may not be the most reliable source, but they present some valid concerns. Ignition Interlocking Devices are a newer technology, and all new technology has some glitches. IIDs require that you re-breathe into the device while driving, which is distracting. If while driving, you fail or can't get the machine to respond, your car will literally shut off, regardless of where you are. This could be especially dangerous if you're driving on a highway. Finally, it takes about 5 minutes to warm up in cold weather. So, a person has to wait 5 minutes before they can even attempt to turn on their car. If you speak in negation of this bill, you should argue that we can't put ignition interlocking devices in every car, until the glitches are worked out.

The second piece of evidence is small but powerful. This legislation is penalizing EVERY driver, even those who have never gotten a DUI or who have never driven under the influence. Ignition Interlock systems are a nuisance, especially for people who would never drive under the influence. It's not appropriate to punish everyone for the behavior of a few. If you speak in negation, you could argue that we should instead adopt a bill that requires all previously DUI convicted drivers to have an Ignition Interlock system. Several states already require this, and it has been successful at decreasing the incidences of drunk driving accidents and repeat offenders. This bill penalizes people who shouldn't be penalized and that isn't fair.

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 Støjberg, 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.

Legislation – A Resolution to Regulate Shadow Banking Affirmative Evidence

AFF – As Shadow Banking Grows, Regulation is Necessary

Bloomberg Business “Fed Focuses on Shadow Banking as It Gauges Financial Risk” Christopher Condon, Ian Katz, March 27, 2015 <<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-03-27/fed-focuses-on-shadow-banking-as-it-gauges-financial-system-risk>>

““These institutions are a significant and growing source of credit in the economy,” Dennis Lockhart, president of the Atlanta Fed, said in a March 20 speech. “They are part of an interconnected financial system that, in extreme circumstances, is prone to contagion.”...

...“To say that the non-bank sector today appears less vulnerable than it did during the global financial crisis is not to say that authorities in the United States have tamed the non-bank sector,” he told an audience in Frankfurt on Friday...

...“Some activities have moved into the shadow banking sector, and the question is do we have regulatory or other means of controlling, mitigating, the possible negative impacts of those things,” Fischer said in response to questions following a speech to bankers and economists in New York this week. “We need to get some coherence about who does what and how those decisions are made.”...

...Worldwide, shadow banking assets have grown, while banking assets stagnated, according to a report by the Financial Stability Board, a global group of regulators. Non-bank financial intermediation grew almost 7 percent to \$75 trillion in 2013, the latest year for which figures are available, while banking assets declined less than 1 percent to \$139 trillion. In the U.S., shadow banking -- also known as market finance -- grew almost 9 percent to \$25.2 trillion in 2013, while banking assets increased almost 5 percent to \$20.2 trillion...

...The Fed also plans to issue a rule implementing an agreement by global regulators to impose minimum margin requirements -- the amount of collateral borrowers must put up -- for repurchase agreements and securities lending. Tarullo has said he hopes margin requirements can combat the buildup of debt and reduce the risk that lenders will act in unison during a crisis to require higher collateral from borrowers.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the shadow banking industry has grown at a significant rate, and points out that without any kind of regulation, this form of banking could dominate the market, which would hurt banks and cause a systemic event. This is something that we need to avoid. We aren’t trying to ban shadow banking – our goal as the affirmative is to recommend that we regulate it, so it doesn’t cause huge financial stress. This kind of stress (which would primarily hit consumers) is avoidable, and we should try to avoid it at all costs.*

AFF – Regulation is Inevitable, Necessary

Reuters “U.S. regulators struggle in effort to tackle shadow banking” Michael Flaherty, Howard Schneider, April 1, 2015 <<http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/04/01/us-usa-fed-shadowbanks-idUSKBN0MS51X20150401>>

“U.S. financial regulators are struggling to agree on how to tackle the huge network of lenders operating outside of traditional banking channels, as worries grow that the lack of oversight over this system is increasing systemic risks.

While the Federal Reserve has vowed to ramp up its efforts to rein in the risks posed by non-bank lenders, defining the sector known as “shadow banks,” and forming a strategy to regulate it continues to elude the central bank.

The value of U.S. financial assets held by non-banks in the U.S. reached \$25.2 trillion in 2013, exceeding pre-crisis levels, according to the Financial Stability Board. Shadow banks provide an estimated 40 percent of credit in the United States...

...Lockhart spoke on the final day of an Atlanta Fed conference dedicated to trying to come to grips with shadow banking and its impact on monetary policy and financial stability. But the most obvious conclusion from the event was the divergent opinions from regulators, economists and financial industry pros on how to handle shadow banking...

...Yet more than six years later, how to make non-bank lending safer is a matter regulators still struggle with.

“It’s not clear at all to me that making the banks safer has made the economy safer. And if you regulate the shadow banks there is less room for evasion. But there is less room for innovation,” Mark Flannery, the Securities and Exchange Commission’s chief economist, said on Tuesday. “There’s a lot of pressure to regulate the shadow banking industry. It’s a very difficult issue to figure out.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how shadow banking regulation could be a necessary step in securing the financial sector. While the negative will argue that this could limit innovation, as the affirmative, you must argue that non-regulation is too risky. Which one is worse? A lack of innovation or the risk of a systemic event, which could lead to economic collapse? Beyond that, this legislation isn’t proposing that these things be done in this setting, without further discussion. As the affirmative, you need to argue that, based on the facts and the testimony of experts in the field, regulation is necessary, and this Congress should get behind the inevitability. This is the only way to set it in motion.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the shadow banking industry has grown at a significant rate, and points out that without any kind of regulation, this form of banking could dominate the market, which would hurt banks and cause a systemic event. This is something that we need to avoid. We aren't trying to ban shadow banking – our goal as the affirmative is to recommend that we regulate it, so it doesn't cause huge financial stress. This kind of stress (which would primarily hit consumers) is avoidable, and we should try to avoid it at all costs.

The second article talks about how shadow banking regulation could be a necessary step in securing the financial sector. While the negative will argue that this could limit innovation, as the affirmative, you must argue that non-regulation is too risky. Which one is worse? A lack of innovation or the risk of a systemic event, which could lead to economic collapse? Beyond that, this legislation isn't proposing that these things be done in this setting, without further discussion. As the affirmative, you need to argue that, based on the facts and the testimony of experts in the field, regulation is necessary, and this Congress should get behind the inevitability. This is the only way to set it in motion.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Shadow Banking Poses No Threat to the Economy

The Wall Street Journal “Roadkill in the Fed’s Race to Regulate Shadow Banking” Peter J. Wallison, April 19, 2015 <<http://www.wsj.com/articles/roadkill-in-the-feds-race-to-regulate-shadow-banking-1429480159>>

“True enough, there was chaos after Lehman unexpectedly declared bankruptcy in September 2008. But that was because financial markets were shocked by the government’s sudden and incomprehensible reversal of the ill-advised policy it had established with the rescue of Bear Stearns six months earlier. A classic case of moral hazard. Lehman’s bankruptcy certainly caused losses—any bankruptcy would—but no financial institution of any substantial size, and specifically no bank, failed because of its exposure to Lehman.

Most important, Mr. Fischer’s concern about financial distress by shadow banks makes no reference to systemic risk—an event or events that might cause the U.S. financial system to become unstable. Counterparty failures, liquidity shortages and losses due to “fire sales” occur routinely in markets. They don’t create systemic risk—and it’s only systemic risks, if they exist at all, that might be deemed to justify government prudential regulation of the routine activities of capital market participants.

The Fed seems to be conjuring a foundation for the prudential regulation of nonbanks without any showing of why it’s necessary to protect either the financial system or bank counterparties. This regulatory overkill—trying to reduce or prevent ordinary failures or losses that pose no threat to the economy—would have significant adverse effects by inhibiting innovation and channeling credit along lines that regulators approve. Through crony capitalism and moral hazard, it would also protect bad managements from the consequences of their own misjudgments.

Instead of protecting banks from competition by seeking to regulate so-called shadow banks, the Fed should consider how insured banks and bank holding companies can be freed from the regulatory straitjackets that have made them uncompetitive.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the US government’s fight against shadow banking is misguided, and there is no proof that shadow banks have any effect on the actual banking system. The government, and the affirmative in this case, is acting without the burden of proof. Shadow banking doesn’t hurt the financial system in this country – the financial system in this country hurts itself. This is a distraction from the real problem, and we need to focus on the real problem, instead of wasting our time on legislation that will have little-to-no effect on our economy.*

NEG – Government Overstepping Boundaries

The Wall street Journal “Regulation of Shadow Banking Takes a Dark Turn” Peter J. Wallison, February 9, 2015 <<http://www.wsj.com/articles/peter-wallison-regulation-of-shadow-banking-takes-a-dark-turn-1423527609>>

“Most people probably imagine that the term shadow banking refers to large nonbank financial institutions that do what regulated banks do—borrow short-term funds like deposits and turn them into long-term assets like loans. Maturity transformation, as it is

called, can be risky, because a firm that has lent out funds it has borrowed short-term may be pressed for cash if its short-term creditors want their funds returned immediately. The fear is that large firms facing this difficulty could fail, creating a “systemic” event...

...The regulators apparently want to cast an even wider net. A 2012 report by the international Financial Stability Board—made up of central bankers and bank regulators of which the U.S. Treasury and the Fed are members—stated that systemic risks are created in the shadow-banking system through “a complex chain of transactions, in which leverage and maturity transformation occur in stages.”

What is a “chain of transactions”? As former Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke explained that year, a finance company might create a pool of auto loans for securitization. Afterward, “an investment bank might sell tranches of the securitization to investors. The lower-risk tranches could be purchased by an asset-backed commercial paper (ABCP) conduit that, in turn, funds itself by issuing commercial paper that is purchased by money market funds.” In other words, a “chain of transactions” involving many different firms can create the same systemic risks as a single large firm.

These are normal transactions in the securities and capital markets. So when Fed officials say that they are investigating and hope to regulate shadow banking, what they mean is that they want to regulate what kind of transactions occur in the securities and capital markets...”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how entities in the financial sector of the United States are trying to take control of shadow banking, and regulate it, without the consent of this Congress or any formal legislative branch. As the negative, you should argue that this is a lobby-effect, where those in power of the financial sector of the United States are trying to control more of the economic structure of the economy. This is another way the government is trying to step into the financial sector, and trying to control every transaction and regulate how businesses work. Our country was founded on capitalism, and by passing this legislation, we are taking one more stab at businesses in the United States. Not to mention, shadow banking provides a safe avenue for money, in a financial environment where the stability of banks could falter. Americans should have the right to choose where their money goes, at least to SOME extent.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the US government's fight against shadow banking is misguided, and there is no proof that shadow banks have any effect on the actual banking system. The government, and the affirmative in this case, is acting without the burden of proof. Shadow banking doesn't hurt the financial system in this country – the financial system in this country hurts itself. This is a distraction from the real problem, and we need to focus on the real problem, instead of wasting our time on legislation that will have little-to-no effect on our economy.

The second article talks about how entities in the financial sector of the United States are trying to take control of shadow banking, and regulate it, without the consent of this Congress or any formal legislative branch. As the negative, you should argue that this is a lobby-effect, where those in power of the financial sector of the United States are trying to control more of the economic structure of the economy. This is another way the government is trying to step into the financial sector, and trying to control every transaction and regulate how businesses work. Our country was founded on capitalism, and by passing this legislation, we are taking one more stab at businesses in the United States. Not to mention, shadow banking provides a safe avenue for money, in a financial environment where the stability of banks could falter. Americans should have the right to choose where their money goes, at least to SOME extent.

Legislation – A Bill to Legalize Physician Assisted Suicide Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Patients Are Asking for It and Doctors Are Complying Without Legislation

The Journal of the American Medical Association, “Physician-Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia in Washington State Patient Requests and Physician Responses,” Anthony L. Back, MD; Jeffrey I. Wallace, MD, MPH; Helene E. Starks, MPH; Robert A. Pearlman, MD, MPH, March 1996, < <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=399087> >

“In the past year, 12% of responding physicians received one or more explicit requests for physician-assisted suicide, and 4% received one or more requests for euthanasia. These physicians provided 207 case descriptions. The diagnoses most often associated with requests were cancer, neurological disease, and the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). The patient concerns most often perceived by physicians were worries about loss of control, being a burden, being dependent on others for personal care, and loss of dignity. Physicians provided assistance more often to patients with physical symptoms. Physicians infrequently sought advice from colleagues. Of 156 patients who requested physician-assisted suicide, 38 (24%) received prescriptions, and 21 of these died as a result. Of 58 patients who requested euthanasia, 14 (24%) received parenteral medication and died.

Conclusions. —Patient requests for physician-assisted suicide and euthanasia are not rare. As perceived by physicians, the most common patient concerns at the time these requests are made are nonphysical. Physicians occasionally provide these practices, even though they are currently illegal in Washington State. Physicians do not consult colleagues often about these requests. These findings raise the question of how to ensure quality in the evaluation of patient requests for physician-assisted death”

TAKEAWAY – *A group of doctors did an experiment to determine how often and why patients were asking for physician assisted suicide. They also, polled to see how many doctors complied. They found that 12% of doctors surveyed were asked for physician assisted suicide, and 4% of doctors had been asked specifically for euthanasia. In this small experiment, 156 patients asked for physician assisted suicide, and 52 of these patients were aided in ending their lives by their physician. (The first paragraph goes into why these patients requested physician assisted suicide. Check that out to create a great speech about dying with dignity.) Overall this experiment tells us 2 things, despite the fact that physician assisted suicide is illegal: Patients are still asking for it and doctors are complying. Oftentimes, when doctors comply, they seek no guidance from their colleagues. Physician assisted suicide is happening regardless of whether or not its legal, this bill would allow for safety and oversight from a second doctor, providing a safer environment for the patients and doctors alike.*

AFF – Physician Assisted Suicide should Be Legalized

John Hopkins Newsletter, “Physician assisted suicide should be legalized,” CARISSA ZUKOWSKI, April 2014, < <http://www.jhunewsletter.com/2014/04/22/physician-assisted-suicide-should-be-legalized-78485/> >

“What would you do if you only had a month to live? This hypothetical question for most healthy individuals is the unfortunate reality for many terminally ill patients. Death is as inevitable for those who are healthy as a horse as it is for those battling incurable diseases; the only uncertainty in this matter is time. We do not know when we are going

to die, but in the back of our minds, we know that at some point the blood will stop pumping through our veins and the world will continue without us. Most of us view death as an unfortunate occurrence, a painful loss. This is certainly true in many and perhaps most instances. However, we sometimes forget that death can also mean the end of suffering, or the ultimate source of closure. As complicated as death is, it is dichotomously simple. Because of its complicated consequences, physician-assisted suicide is a popular topic of debate in America's changing health care policies...

Why is it that the law categorizes death as so black and white? In truth it is much more of a gray area. Clearly murder should always remain illegal, as it carries the connotation that it was against the will of the victim; physician-assisted suicide would then be classified as something that the patient explicitly wanted and had lucidly expressed beforehand as a preferred option...

Approximately 25% of Medicare costs are to treat 5% of Medicare users to cover end-of-life care. I am not suggesting that we shouldn't spend money on end-of-life care, but in many instances, these costs are unnecessary. In some cases it is spent on surgeries that do not improve the quality of life of the patient, but only prolongs their life for a couple of months. From a humanistic perspective, how valuable are these few months of being hooked up to ventilators and IVs, if you are still going to die in the near future?... Physicians should not feel a responsibility to prolong a life if it is not compatible with the patient's desires. Culturally, physician-assisted suicide suggests a doctor has given up on a patient, but in reality is a humbling acceptance of natural defeat...

Not everyone wants to die rather than face the natural course of their illnesses, but not everyone wants to live through them either. Patients should be given the option to take a lethal dose of medication to quickly escape their pain and face their future with dignity and closure, and the government should support this as a viable option. No physician has to sign off on the papers if they are not comfortable, and no patient should ever be coerced into it. But it should be available to any individual."

TAKEAWAY – *This article is a really well written argument for legalizing physician assisted suicide. I encourage you to read the excerpt as it presents many strong points. Ultimately, patients deserve the right to choose how their life will end when they're battling a debilitating terminal illness. The end of life is not a black and white issue, and so we should stop treating it as such. Physicians should have the options to raise the white flag if they can't prolong a patient's life without suffering. Patients and physicians should be allowed to make this choice, not the government.*

AFF – U.S. Citizens Agree with Physician Assisted Suicide and European Countries do Too

Aljazeera America, "Assisted Suicide Should Be Legal," Rafia Zakaria, October 2014, <
<http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/10/assisted-suicidebrittanymaynardoregondeathwithdignity.html> >

"A recent Gallup survey shows that 7 out of 10 Americans polled supported some form of physician-assisted suicide. It's a dramatic increase from just over 50 percent in 1970s. Legislatures in Hawaii, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Pennsylvania have recently introduced death with dignity bills, with votes in New Jersey and Pennsylvania expected this year. Maynard's campaign may serve as the catalyst for other states to consider similar laws.

A handful of European countries — the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland and Luxembourg — have legalized physician-assisted death. But the U.S. doesn't have to look that far for examples. On Oct. 15 the Canadian Supreme Court heard oral arguments on reversing a two-decade-old precedent, which would decriminalize assisted death and even permit physician-assisted suicide.

As the representative from Quebec, which has already legalized the measure, rightly noted, death is part of life, and assistance in death is not suicide but should more accurately be described as end-of-life care. Unfortunately, that kind of thoughtful debate continues to be absent from our discourse in the United States, where death with dignity is often not an option for the terminally ill.

TAKEAWAY – *This article shows that 7 out of 10, or 70% of Americans support physician assisted suicide. Several states are working to pass legislation to legalize this practice. Beyond that Several European countries have legalized: the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Luxembourg. Even Canada has legalized physician assisted suicide. It is time for the U.S. to legalize the right to one's life, including the right to end it.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

In the first piece of evidence, a group of doctors did an experiment to determine how often and why patients were asking for physician assisted suicide. They also, polled to see how many doctors complied. They found that 12% of doctors surveyed were asked for physician assisted suicide, and 4% of doctors had been asked specifically for euthanasia. In this small experiment, 156 patients asked for physician assisted suicide, and 52 of these patients were aided in ending their lives by their physician. (The first paragraph goes into why these patients requested physician assisted suicide. Check that out to create a great speech about dying with dignity.) Overall this experiment tells us 2 things, despite the fact that physician assisted suicide is illegal: Patients are still asking for it and doctors are complying. Oftentimes, when doctors comply, they seek no guidance from their colleagues. Physician assisted suicide is happening regardless of whether or not its legal, this bill would allow for safety and oversight from a second doctor, providing a safer environment for the patients and doctors alike.

The second article is a really well written argument for legalizing physician assisted suicide. I encourage you to read the excerpt as it presents many strong points. Ultimately, patients deserve the right to choose how their life will end when they're battling a debilitating terminal illness. The end of life is not a black and white issue, and so we should stop treating it as such. Physicians should have the options to raise the white flag if they can't prolong a patient's life without suffering. Patients and physicians should be allowed to make this choice, not the government.

The third article shows that 7 out of 10, or 70% of Americans support physician assisted suicide. Several states are working to pass legislation to legalize this practice. Beyond that Several European countries have legalized: the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, and Luxembourg. Even Canada has legalized physician assisted suicide. It is time for the U.S. to legalize the right to one's life, including the right to end it.

Negative Evidence

NEG – The AMA Rejects Physician Suicide

John Hopkins Newsletter, “Physician assisted suicide should be legalized,” CARISSA ZUKOWSKI, April 2014, < <http://www.jhunewsletter.com/2014/04/22/physician-assisted-suicide-should-be-legalized-78485/> >

“The AMA states their stance on physician-assisted suicide on their website, claiming that it would cause too many complications. It writes, “Physician-assisted suicide is fundamentally incompatible with the physician’s role as a healer, would be difficult or impossible to control, and would pose serious societal risks. Instead of participating in assisted suicide, physicians must aggressively respond to the needs of patients at the end of life.” The AMA’s hesitant approach to physician-assisted suicide is understandable.”

TAKEAWAY – *The American Medical Association, arguably one of the biggest medical associations in the United States, formally rejects physician assisted suicide. A physician’s job is fundamentally that of healing. Physician assisted suicide goes against physicians’ roles as healers. Instead of focusing on providing an assisted suicide as a solution, we should make our doctors focus on providing more comfortable solutions for those struggling with debilitating conditions. We should focus on cures, pain management, and lengthening life. Beyond that, it would be difficult to control and regulate. The societal implications are enough to make anyone’s head spin. As the Neg, you should argue for simplicity in healthcare, and bringing our doctors back into their roles as healers.*

NEG – Physician Assisted Suicide is the Wrong Solution to a Big Problem

PBS Thirteen, “Should Physician Assisted Suicide be legalized?” Tracy E. Miller, J.D, < <http://www.thirteen.org/bid/vp-assisted.html> >

“The two most common reasons that lead people to think about or to commit suicide, whether they are terminally ill or not, are untreated pain or depression. Given treatment for pain and depression, most patients, even those with AIDS or cancer, choose to live longer, not to kill themselves.

Unfortunately, all too often, physicians are not trained to offer adequate treatment for pain or depression. As a result, many patients feel that they have only two possible options: to commit suicide or to suffer. But good medical care can give patients relief from pain and control over their medical destiny without creating the severe risks posed by assisted suicide.

Legalizing assisted suicide would be profoundly dangerous. The risks would extend to all who are ill, but would be greatest for patients who lack access to high quality medical care. The gravest danger is not that physicians or family members will be abusive. Other risks will be subtle and more common: elderly patients who worry about being a burden; physicians who are not ill-intentioned but hurried or insensitive; patients who feel that they have no other options. What will it mean to patients if physicians recommend suicide instead of treatment or care? A request for suicide is often a plea for help. How many doctors know their patients well enough to hear that plea?

As a society, we must commit ourselves to caring better for patients at life's end. Authorizing doctors to assist suicide is a simple, but far more dangerous, solution.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains why physician assisted suicide should absolutely not be legalized. Generally, patients request suicide because of pain and depression. If doctors would adequately treat these symptoms, even patients with the most debilitating of illnesses wouldn't choose to end their lives. However, most doctors aren't adequately trained in end of life treatment. Because of this, patients feel they can either suffer or die, and there are no other options. Patients who are most at risk are the elderly who worry about being a burden and patients who can't afford quality health care. Doctors who are rushed and don't take the time to get to know their patients might recommend it, when there are much better solutions available. Also, how would a patient feel if a doctor recommended suicide instead of treatment? Our focus should be on better patient care not physician assisted suicide.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article American Medical Association, arguably one of the biggest medical associations in the United States, formally rejects physician assisted suicide. A physician's job is fundamentally that of healing. Physician assisted suicide goes against physicians' roles as healers. Instead of focusing on providing an assisted suicide as a solution, we should make our doctors focus on providing more comfortable solutions for those struggling with debilitating conditions. We should focus on cures, pain management, and lengthening life. Beyond that, it would be difficult to control and regulate. The societal implications are enough to make anyone's head spin. As the Neg, you should argue for simplicity in healthcare, and bringing our doctors back into their roles as healers.

The second article explains why physician assisted suicide should absolutely not be legalized. Generally, patients request suicide because of pain and depression. If doctors would adequately treat these symptoms, even patients with the most debilitating of illnesses wouldn't choose to end their lives. However, most doctors aren't adequately trained in end of life treatment. Because of this, patients feel they can either suffer or die, and there are no other options. Patients who are most at risk are the elderly who worry about being a burden and patients who can't afford quality health care. Doctors who are rushed and don't take the time to get to know their patients might recommend it, when there are much better solutions available. Also, how would a patient feel if a doctor recommended suicide instead of treatment? Our focus should be on better patient care not physician assisted suicide

Legislation – A Bill to Ensure All Drivers are Properly Licensed and Identifiable Affirmative Evidence

AFF – California Shows This Program Works

Daily News “Nearly 400,000 undocumented immigrants get California driver’s licenses” Susan Abram, July 18, 2015 < <http://www.dailynews.com/government-and-politics/20150718/nearly-400000-undocumented-immigrants-get-california-drivers-licenses>>

“Nearly 400,000 California driver’s licenses were issued to undocumented immigrants in the first half of this year as part of a massive effort to allow them to drive legally in the Golden State, officials announced Friday.

During the first six months that the Safe Driver and Responsibility Act — or AB 60 — went into effect, the Department of Motor Vehicles saw more than 600,000 applications from undocumented immigrants. Of those, state officials said, 397,000 met all requirements to drive in California — more than half the overall total of 759,000 licenses distributed for the same time period.

It’s unclear how many of those who obtained licenses under AB 60 registered vehicles or bought insurance, DMV officials said. But there appears to be no spike in the increases in vehicle registration seen in the last few years due to improvements in the economy, according to the agency.

“The latest numbers reflect the continued successful implementation of AB 60,” said DMV Director Jean Shiomoto in a statement. “The DMV was determined to develop a process that would not only meet the stringent requirements of this new law, but also the unique needs of our newly expanded customer base.”

The DMV prepared for months for the increase in applications and was provided with an additional \$141 million in its budget to open temporary offices across the state, conduct community workshops and provide sample tests. The agency also hired nearly 1,000 new employees to help process the applications.

An estimated 1.5 million applications from undocumented immigrants are expected to be processed over the next three years, DMV officials have said.

“We definitely saw a rush in January and February when we were very busy,” said Jennifer Gonzalez, spokeswoman for the DMV. “Now we’re starting to see that trend go down. I think people may be holding back, or maybe they need to study or still get their documents ready.”

The DMV is continuing to update the type of documents needed to verify identity and residency from more countries, including consular cards from Colombia and Ecuador and passports from Tonga, Sri Lanka and the Republic of Korea. Before the additions, people were sent to a “second revision” phase, which meant their applications were put on hold.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article opens with a great success story of how California issued nearly 400,000 driver’s licenses to undocumented immigrants in the first half of this year. An estimated 1.5 million applications from undocumented immigrants are expected to be processed over the next three years. As the AFF you should use this example in your speech and*

argue that this Bill can be easily implemented across the country. You can also use other information in this article to better support the effectiveness and willingness of State DMV's to implement such programs.

AFF – Getting an ID provides Greater Opportunity for Immigrants to get Jobs

Watchdog “Drivers licenses for illegal immigrants now accepted as employment documents” Bruce Parker, July 16, 2015 < <http://watchdog.org/229501/licenses-illegal-immigrants-employment-documents/>>

“A change in guidance from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services makes driver’s licenses for illegals acceptable ID for employment, creating a new shortcut for illegal immigrants to get jobs.

Federal law prohibits employers from hiring illegal immigrants. However, a recent change by USCIS requires employers to accept driver’s privilege cards as proof of identity, even though the cards are uniquely granted to individuals with no legal presence in the country.

According to guidance USCIS issued in May, a driver privilege card issued by a state is an acceptable List B document for I-9 employment forms “if it contains a photograph or identifying information such as name, date of birth, sex, height, color of eyes, and address.”

Ten states issue some form of driver’s license to illegal immigrants. While the credentials are designated for driving purposes only, the updated federal guidance means the cards now qualify as documents for obtaining work.

“In effect, what has happened here, is USCIS has created a shortcut for illegal immigrants to obtain employment. Now all they need is work authorization, which can be obtained by a counterfeit birth certificate,” Andrew Meehan, policy director for Keeping Identities Safe, told Vermont Watchdog.

Keeping Identities Safe, a nonpartisan crime-prevention group that specializes in secure IDs, claims states have issued nearly half a million driver’s licenses to illegals. Hundreds of thousands of applications are currently pending.

Meehan says the development has significant implications for America’s labor force.

“This could have a very real economic impact on the United States. These are very subtle changes that are not being debated even in a proposed rule or even in Congress. ... We’re talking about what could potentially be a million people who may be looking for work using these licenses.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how a recent push to help immigrants and undocumented persons acquire ID’s and Driver Licenses has created a new shortcut get jobs. Thus far, ten states issue some form of driver’s license to illegal immigrants and their economies have reaped the benefits. As the AFF you should argue that this could have a very real positive economic impact on the United States. This could potentially allow millions of people who may be looking for work and eager to contribute to US industries a way to do so. This would also help legitimize the use of immigrant labor and create better quality in the US workforce. There are several arguments you can make in an affirmative speech.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article opens with a great success story of how California issued nearly 400,000 driver's licenses to undocumented immigrants in the first half of this year. An estimated 1.5 million applications from undocumented immigrants are expected to be processed over the next three years. As the AFF you should use this example in your speech and argue that this Bill can be easily implemented across the country. You can also use other information in this article to better support the effectiveness and willingness of State DMV's to implement such programs.

The second article explains how a recent push to help immigrants and undocumented persons acquire ID's and Driver Licenses has created a new shortcut get jobs. Thus far, ten states issue some form of driver's license to illegal immigrants and their economies have reaped the benefits. As the AFF you should argue that this could have a very real positive economic impact on the United States. This could potentially allow millions of people who may be looking for work and eager to contribute to US industries a way to do so. This would also help legitimize the use of immigrant labor and create better quality in the US workforce. There are several arguments you can make in an affirmative speech.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Current Regulations Prevent Support of Undocumented Immigrants

CBS Denver “Pro-Immigrant Groups Band Together, Say Driver’s License Program Has ‘Been Fumbled’” October 12, 2015 < <http://denver.cbslocal.com/2015/10/12/pro-immigrant-groups-ban-together-say-drivers-license-program-has-been-fumbled/>>

“There’s a push to make it easier for undocumented immigrants to get Colorado driver’s licenses and on Monday supporters rallied outside a Division of Motor Vehicles office in Denver. The demonstrators say it is too hard for immigrants to get driver’s licenses and they’re working to change that.

Part of the problem is that not many offices can’t handle the requests. Originally there were five offices, but that number was reduced to one because of a fight over funding in the Legislature. Now there are three offices and pro-immigrant groups say it’s not enough.

A law allowing undocumented immigrants to obtain a Colorado driver’s license has been controversial from the start. Two years since Gov. John Hickenlooper signed the law, the fight over funding for the program continues.

“It’s been fumbled both by the legislators and the DMV and the (Department of Revenue) ... it really has just become a mess,” Victor Galvan with the Immigrant Rights Coalition said.

It’s a self-funding program, but when the Department of Revenue asked to access the \$166,000 raised by licensing fees the Joint Budget Committee denied their request.

CBS4 spoke with Senate President Bill Cadman, R-Colorado Springs, when the issue was up for discussion earlier this year.

“The turnaround for this is the accountability that has been promised for the program that was lacking before,” Cadman said. “I think the turnaround for this is the equity in the payment.”

Eventually lawmakers reached an agreement allowing partial access to the money.

A group of pro-immigrant organizations are now banding together hoping a new campaign will help persuade lawmakers.

“We need it for a 160,000 people across the state of Colorado,” Galvan said.

Thousands of driver’s licenses have already been issued through the program. The three offices currently operating are in Denver, Grand Junction and Colorado Springs.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the events of a current push in Denver to give uncommented immigrants the ability to acquire driver licenses. This push has been faced with protests, a severe lack of funding and the closing of four offices. As the NEG you should argue that we cannot support the passing of this Bill when there is no legislation ensuring funding for such a program. This article shows the events that unfolded in ONE state. Imagine the social backlash and funding nightmare that would ensue if we tried to implement this across the entire country. We cannot force these undocumented persons to acquire identification if we do not help supply some means in which to help them.*

NEG – Issuing Licenses Places an Unfair Burden on State Programs

Daily News “Nearly 400,000 undocumented immigrants get California driver’s licenses” Susan Abram, July 18, 2015 < <http://www.dailynews.com/government-and-politics/20150718/nearly-400000-undocumented-immigrants-get-california-drivers-licenses>>

“Nearly 400,000 California driver’s licenses were issued to undocumented immigrants in the first half of this year as part of a massive effort to allow them to drive legally in the Golden State, officials announced Friday.

During the first six months that the Safe Driver and Responsibility Act — or AB 60 — went into effect, the Department of Motor Vehicles saw more than 600,000 applications from undocumented immigrants. Of those, state officials said, 397,000 met all requirements to drive in California — more than half the overall total of 759,000 licenses distributed for the same time period...

...The DMV prepared for months for the increase in applications and was provided with an additional \$141 million in its budget to open temporary offices across the state, conduct community workshops and provide sample tests. The agency also hired nearly 1,000 new employees to help process the applications.

An estimated 1.5 million applications from undocumented immigrants are expected to be processed over the next three years, DMV officials have said.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how nearly 400,000 California driver’s licenses were issued to undocumented immigrants in the first half of this year as part of a massive effort to allow them to drive legally. This was only made possible by adding \$141 million to the DMV budget to open temporary offices across the state, conduct community workshops and provide sample tests. The agency also hired nearly 1,000 new employees to help process the applications. As the NEG you should argue that the success of this program was only made possible by the extra funding and support given to the DMV’s of California. If a State decided to implement such a push, then so be it, but this Congress cannot expect every State to have the means to support such a massive undertaking. Programs like this are also unfair to States that have a higher percentage of undocumented residents or those who lack the funding.*

Negative Takeaways:

This article explains the events of a current push in Denver to give uncommented immigrants the ability to acquire driver licenses. This push has been faced with protests, a severe lack of funding and the closing of four offices. As the NEG you should argue that we cannot support the passing of this Bill when there is no legislation ensuring funding for such a program. This article shows the events that unfolded in ONE state. Imagine the social backlash and funding nightmare that would ensue if we tried to implement this across the entire country. We cannot force these undocumented persons to acquire identification if we do not help supply some means in which to help them.

The second article explains how nearly 400,000 California driver's licenses were issued to undocumented immigrants in the first half of this year as part of a massive effort to allow them to drive legally. This was only made possible by adding \$141 million to the DMV budget to open temporary offices across the state, conduct community workshops and provide sample tests. The agency also hired nearly 1,000 new employees to help process the applications. As the NEG you should argue that the success of this program was only made possible by the extra funding and support given to the DMV's of California. If a State decided to implement such a push, then so be it, but this Congress cannot expect every State to have the means to support such a massive undertaking. Programs like this are also unfair to States that have a higher percentage of undocumented residents or those who lack the funding.

Legislation – A Resolution to Amend the Constitution to Allow Naturalized Citizens to Run for President Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Naturalized Citizens Should Be Able to Run for President

The Torrey Pines High School, Falconer, “Pro: Should naturalized citizens be able to run for president?” Student Publication, Austin Zhang, January 2015 Issue < <http://www.tphsfalconer.com/2015/01/20/pro-should-naturalized-citizens-be-able-to-run-for-president/>>

“The United States is a country built by the hands of immigrants. Those who first settled in colonies were immigrants from Europe. The first transcontinental railroad was constructed with scores of emigrant Chinese workers. Dutch influence in New York is still noticeable today with place-names like Brooklyn and Harlem. Despite the internment of Japanese-Americans under former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, young Japanese-American men still served during World War II. The United States itself is a “melting pot” of cultures, and that begs the question: Why is the presidency denied to naturalized citizens?

All branches of the armed forces are open to naturalized citizens, and naturalized citizens also hold office in the Senate, House of Representatives and Supreme Court. No state disallows naturalized citizens from running for governor. But when it comes to the presidency, the Constitution states that “No Person except a natural-born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President,” granted that the person has been a resident of the United States for at least 14 years and is at least 35 years old.

The Constitution, though proven a resilient government doctrine, is by no means flawless. The 27 amendments are a clear example of that. The Constitution has been amended many times to replace or reword outdated clauses or to extend rights to groups not granted them originally. For example, the passage of the 24th Amendment in 1964 put a stop to the infringement of the civil rights of African-Americans and other minorities by white Americans. In 1971, the passage of the 26th Amendment lowered the minimum voting age to 18 from 21 in response to youth protests. Therefore, it is not radical to consider that the Constitution may require further modification to allow naturalized citizens the opportunity to run for the nation’s highest office.

The process toward naturalized citizenship is a long one that proves a person’s devotion to the country. First, a person seeking naturalized citizenship must have lived in the U.S. for at least five years — or three if he or she has been married to a U.S. citizen for at least three years. Then, there is a citizenship test and a 10-step process organized by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services that includes an interview, a biometrics appointment that takes physiological and anatomical data by which a person can be identified, and an Oath of Allegiance. It is fallacious to insinuate that a person who is willing to go through this lengthy, potentially arduous process is any less “American” than a person who was simply born in the United States.

Finally, it is important to remember that just because a person is able to become president does not mean that the person will become president. Opening the opportunity simply gives naturalized citizens greater heights to which they can aspire.

The presidency is seen as the paragon of American authority, and the power to vote is a right that has been sought and obtained by many different groups over the history of the United States. Naturalized citizens, of course, already have the power to vote for president. Now, it is time to give them the power to run.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how naturalized citizens should be allowed to run for president, covering every idea on the spectrum. As the affirmative, you should read the full article and use the points presented to form your affirmative speech. To name a few, it’s important to realize that these people have lived in the United States for years, they are committed to our country and are Americans by law, and shouldn’t being an American represent equal opportunity? People who become citizens of the United States should be allowed a shot at the Presidency, because they are citizens.*

AFF – Time Spent on Debating Eligibility is Wasted

Harvard Law Review “On the Meaning of “Natural Born Citizen”” Neal Katyal, Paul Clement, March 11, 2015 < <http://harvardlawreview.org/2015/03/on-the-meaning-of-natural-born-citizen/>>

“The Constitution directly addresses the minimum qualifications necessary to serve as President. In addition to requiring thirty-five years of age and fourteen years of residency, the Constitution limits the presidency to “a natural born Citizen.”¹×
1. U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 5.

All the sources routinely used to interpret the Constitution confirm that the phrase “natural born Citizen” has a specific meaning: namely, someone who was a U.S. citizen at birth with no need to go through a naturalization proceeding at some later time. And Congress has made equally clear from the time of the framing of the Constitution to the current day that, subject to certain residency requirements on the parents, someone born to a U.S. citizen parent generally becomes a U.S. citizen without regard to whether the birth takes place in Canada, the Canal Zone, or the continental United States...

...There are plenty of serious issues to debate in the upcoming presidential election cycle. The less time spent dealing with specious objections to candidate eligibility, the better. Fortunately, the Constitution is refreshingly clear on these eligibility issues. To serve, an individual must be at least thirty-five years old and a “natural born Citizen.” Thirty-four and a half is not enough and, for better or worse, a naturalized citizen cannot serve. But as Congress has recognized since the Founding, a person born abroad to a U.S. citizen parent is generally a U.S. citizen from birth with no need for naturalization. And the phrase “natural born Citizen” in the Constitution encompasses all such citizens from birth. Thus, an individual born to a U.S. citizen parent — whether in California or Canada or the Canal Zone — is a U.S. citizen from birth and is fully eligible to serve as President if the people so choose.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the fact that the Constitution is pretty clear about who is eligible for President, but the article’s subject matter gave me an idea for an interesting argument. How much time has been spent on President Obama’s birthplace, and his right to hold the title of “President?” How much time might be spent on Ted Cruz’s birthright for*

Presidency, if he moved further in the election process? How much time is wasted on this, and for what reason? An archaic rule that doesn't account for the current political climate, and doesn't account for the amount of naturalized citizens in the United States, shouldn't dictate and limit what naturalized citizens are able to do. We waste so much time during the presidential campaigns debating on technicalities. Why don't we get rid of those rules and allow the REAL issues to take the forefront?

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how naturalized citizens should be allowed to run for president, covering every idea on the spectrum. As the affirmative, you should read the full article and use the points presented to form your affirmative speech. To name a few, it's important to realize that these people have lived in the United States for years, they are committed to our country and are Americans by law, and shouldn't being an American represent equal opportunity? People who become citizens of the United States should be allowed a shot at the Presidency, because they are citizens.

The second article talks about the fact that the Constitution is pretty clear about who is eligible for President, but the article's subject matter gave me an idea for an interesting argument. How much time has been spent on President Obama's birthplace, and his right to hold the title of "President?" How much time might be spent on Ted Cruz's birthright for Presidency, if he moved further in the election process? How much time is wasted on this, and for what reason? An archaic rule that doesn't account for the current political climate, and doesn't account for the amount of naturalized citizens in the United States, shouldn't dictate and limit what naturalized citizens are able to do. We waste so much time during the presidential campaigns debating on technicalities. Why don't we get rid of those rules and allow the REAL issues to take the forefront?

Negative Evidence

NEG – Naturalized Citizens Should Not Be Allowed to Run for President

The Torrey Pines High School, Falconer, “Con: Should naturalized citizens be able to run for president?” Student Publication, Maya Rao, January 2015 Issue <<http://www.tphsfalconer.com/2015/01/20/con-should-naturalized-citizens-be-able-to-run-for-president/>>

“The United States is like “Animal Farm” — all men are created equal, but some are more equal than others. The United States was founded on this sort of selective equality, but over time, many social barriers have been broken, and women and minorities can now participate in government freely. Still, there is one office that has been closed to naturalized citizens — the presidency. The presidency is the highest office in the country, and it cannot be open to those who are torn between two countries — the one in which they were born and the one they claim to love. Changing this part of the Constitution could have disastrous consequences.

Let us assume that this particular requirement was repealed. Now, every naturalized citizen is eligible to become president. People who crossed the border illegally can become president, because under the immigration executive order, some undocumented immigrants can become naturalized citizens. People who were born in China or India or Mexico and lived there for 20 or 30 years would be able to run for the presidency. However, they have lived in another country for a large part of their lives and cannot possibly make foreign policy decisions without considering the effect it would have on their “home” country.

These people lived in that country, whether for 20 days or 20 years, and some part of their life will always be linked to that place. Hating another country is just as bad as loving it. Immigrants who escaped Fidel Castro in Cuba might want to impose strict sanctions on Cuba as a sort of personal revenge. Immigrants who left China peacefully might want to smoothly reach an economic deal that does not benefit the United States.

Presidents are not allowed to be confused in this manner. They have to be undoubtedly loyal to the United States, willing to do anything to better this country. They must be able to scheme against other countries, authorize clandestine operations and missile strikes and most of all, not breathe a single word to a single soul. They have to keep masks of diplomacy up at all times, regardless of their personal feelings on certain matters. If those matters involve relations with a foreign country, extra care should be taken to avoid an international incident.

Some might argue that the United States is an open and free country, and that we should allow immigrants to reap their benefits. But citizens’ lives could be in danger if the president does not act quickly enough to stop a terrorist cell in his or her home country. Undocumented immigrants could cross the border more easily if the president was lax on immigration laws. This has never been a question of morality, but rather a more significant matter of national security.

Allowing naturalized citizens to become president is not only a bad idea, it is a potentially lethal one. A president's allegiance to the United States can never be questioned, and no mentions of the Constitution's imperfections or amendments' citations can change that. People may point out the flaws in the thinking of the Founding Fathers, but the fact remains that the United States cannot risk the lives and the livelihoods of its citizens over an ethical debate. If naturalized citizens ever become president, this country will sink in a morally gilded ship."

TAKEAWAY – *This article brings up some pretty valid points about immigrant presidential candidates, and why we shouldn't allow them to run for President. Whether it's personal biases or higher risk of external terror penetration, or just because being an American is a birthright set out by the Constitution, we shouldn't allow it. You should read the entire article and use the arguments presented to structure your negative speech.*

NEG – Becoming a Citizen Doesn't Automatically Make You an American

Media Matters for America "Naturalized Citizens Can't Be Trusted, Writes Naturalized Citizen" Simon Maloy, June 3, 2013 < <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2013/06/03/naturalized-citizens-cant-be-trusted-writes-nat/194313>>

"There is a common belief that if an immigrant becomes a U.S. citizen, then he has become an American. It is a naive belief," writes Ian de Silva, whose degree of expertise in sociological matters can be gleaned from his author bio, reproduced here in full: "Ian de Silva is an engineer who has interests in politics and history." His first and best example of the unreliable character of the naturalized citizen is accused Boston Marathon bomber Dzhokhar Tsarnaev: "The Boston case exemplifies the sheer naivete of everything that liberals typically gush about immigrants -- they're peace-loving people who become loyal citizens." Usually nativist cranks take some care to disguise the reductive "one bad immigrant means all immigrants are bad" argument that undergirds their xenophobia. De Silva obviously couldn't be bothered...

... In his September 13, 2012 column, headlined "Why Obama Is A Third World President," De Silva observed: "While some critics may hurl any accusation at Obama without any rhyme or reason, my assertion that he is a Third World thinker is based on my unapologetic patriotism for America and my own immigrant experience." Back in 2006, writing about "The Campaign To Third Worldize [sic] The U.S.," De Silva laid it all out:

Why would I, a Third World immigrant myself, who arrived more than 20 years ago as an impecunious and lone young man but made a life for myself in this great country, take this pejorative view of mass Third World immigration? The simple answer: I do not want to see in America -- my adopted homeland -- the very conditions, cultural and political, that I escaped from in the first place.

De Silva's argument is literally that the U.S. can't risk letting more people like him into the country."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how US citizens aren't all loyal to America, and to allow someone with allegiance to another country to RUN the United States is a bad idea. If you think about it, putting someone who came from a country that has a different political climate, who has their own agenda based on their own biases, and doesn't have the United States in the forefront of their priority, wouldn't be a great idea. This article describes the*

opinion of an immigrant, naturalized citizen, who believes that allowing naturalized citizens to run for President could destroy this country. The President of the United States should be able to empathize, but put the values of the American public first. The best person for that job is the person who was born, raised, and has always identified as an American.

Negative Takeaways:

The first article brings up some pretty valid points about immigrant presidential candidates, and why we shouldn't allow them to run for President. Whether it's personal biases or higher risk of external terror penetration, or just because being an American is a birthright set out by the Constitution, we shouldn't allow it. You should read the entire article and use the arguments presented to structure your negative speech.

The second article talks about how US citizens aren't all loyal to America, and to allow someone with allegiance to another country to RUN the United States is a bad idea. If you think about it, putting someone who came from a country that has a different political climate, who has their own agenda based on their own biases, and doesn't have the United States in the forefront of their priority, wouldn't be a great idea. This article describes the opinion of an immigrant, naturalized citizen, who believes that allowing naturalized citizens to run for President could destroy this country. The President of the United States should be able to empathize, but put the values of the American public first. The best person for that job is the person who was born, raised, and has always identified as an American.

Legislation – A Resolution to Publicly Display Prices for All Hospital Tests, Treatments, and Procedures Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Medical Price Transparency is Important to Citizens

Modern Healthcare, “Consumers demand price transparency, but at what cost?” Beth Kutscher, June 23, 2015, < <http://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20150623/NEWS/150629957> >

“The growth of high-deductible health plans has put the onus on consumers to control their own healthcare costs. Out-of-pocket costs for premiums and deductibles have doubled to nearly 9.6% of household income between 2003 and 2013, according to data from the Commonwealth Fund.

In conjunction with the HFMA meeting, credit-reporting agency Transunion released the results of a survey that found that 80% of respondents listed price transparency as a factor in choosing a healthcare provider—on par with bedside manner. And 79% said they'd be more likely to pay their bills in a timely manner if they had price estimates before getting care.

St. Luke's Health System in Kansas City, Mo., began offering price estimates about a decade ago...

“When patients know what they might owe, they're more likely to make a payment,” said Diane Watkins, St. Luke's vice president of revenue cycle, during a presentation on how to improve billing and collections while focusing on the patient.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that 80% of people polled said that price transparency is an important factor when choosing a healthcare provider. 79% of people said they would be more likely to pay their hospital bills if they knew what they had to pay upfront. So, people want to know how much they are going to have to pay, and if they knew they'd be more likely to pay it. A medical company in Kansas City began offering price estimates and it's helped to increase the likelihood that someone will pay on their medical bills. If you speak in affirmation of this resolution, you should say that not only would it lead to better informed consumers, but it would also lead to less medical debt as a whole.*

AFF – Medical Costs Vary Greatly

The Washington Post, “One hospital charges \$8,000 — another, \$38,000,” Sarah Kliff, Dan Keating, May 8, 2013, < <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonkblog/wp/2013/05/08/one-hospital-charges-8000-another-38000/> >

“In the District, George Washington University’s average bill for a patient on a ventilator was \$115,000, while Providence Hospital’s average charge for the same service was just under \$53,000. For a lower joint replacement, George Washington University charged almost \$69,000 compared with Sibley Memorial Hospital’s average of just under \$30,000.

Virginia’s highest average rate for a lower limb replacement was at CJW Medical Center in Richmond, more than \$117,000, compared with Winchester Medical Center charging \$25,600 per procedure. CJW charged more than \$38,000 for esophagitis and gastrointestinal conditions, while Carilion Tazewell Community Hospital averaged \$8,100 in those cases.

Maryland has a unique system for hospital rate charges, so differences were smaller, and its average rate was lower than that of any other state in the most common procedures reviewed by The Washington Post. The highest average charge for a lower joint replacement was \$36,000 by University of Maryland Medical Center in Baltimore, much lower than the highest rates in other states.

Elsewhere, Las Colinas Medical Center just outside Dallas billed Medicare, on average, \$160,832 for lower joint replacements.

Five miles away and on the same street, Baylor Medical Center in Irving, Tex., billed the government an average fee of \$42,632.

In downtown New York City, two hospitals 63 blocks apart varied by 321 percent in the prices they charged to treat complicated cases of asthma or bronchitis. One charged an average of \$34,310; the other billed, on average, \$8,159.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article shows the differences in price for the same procedures. There is clearly a huge difference in the cost of services in the medical industry, and consumers deserve to know and decide where to go. People have the option of car shopping and house shopping—why not medical shopping? Nothing is more important than health, and consumers deserve to have all of the knowledge, including price, in order to make informed decisions about their healthcare.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that 80% of people polled said that price transparency is an important factor when choosing a healthcare provider. 79% of people said they would be more likely to pay their hospital bills if they knew what they had to pay upfront. So, people want to know how much they are going to have to pay, and if they knew they'd be more likely to pay it. A medical company in Kansas City began offering price estimates and it's helped to increase the likelihood that someone will pay on their medical bills. If you speak in affirmation of this resolution, you should say that not only would it lead to better informed consumers, but it would also lead to less medical debt as a whole.

The second article shows the differences in price for the same procedures. There is clearly a huge difference in the cost of services in the medical industry, and consumers deserve to know and decide where to go. People have the option of car shopping and house shopping—why not medical shopping? Nothing is more important than health, and consumers deserve to have all of the knowledge, including price, in order to make informed decisions about their healthcare.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Price Transparency Leads to an Increase in Medical Prices

Modern Healthcare, “Consumers demand price transparency, but at what cost?” Beth Kutscher, June 23, 2015, < <http://www.modernhealthcare.com/article/20150623/NEWS/150629957> >

“I have not drunk the Kool-Aid on price transparency,” said David Newman, executive director of the Health Care Cost Institute, which compiles data on cost and utilization trends and is supported by major payers including Humana, Aetna, Kaiser Permanente and United Healthcare. “There can be adverse effects of price transparency.”

In markets where pricing is very transparent, pricing tends to narrow and the average cost rises, he said.

In healthcare specifically, hospitals may become price-competitive only on selective services or those they are required to publicize, he noted.

That's assuming, of course, that there's real competition in a market, and that patients have the ability to take cost into account when making decisions. “In some markets, the price is the price is the price,” Newman said.

In a medical emergency situation, for instance, patients aren't going to begin price shopping while waiting for an ambulance. And sometimes what seems like minor ailment can turn out to be something more serious—and more expensive—making it difficult for patients to compare prices ahead of time.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that price transparency in health care can actually INCREASE the price of healthcare services. Health care costs in the U.S. are already exorbitantly high, and we shouldn't do anything that would encourage increasing those costs. In addition to prices increasing, when it comes to medical emergencies people don't have time to price shop. Also, if people live in an area without a competitive market, price transparency isn't going to make a difference. As a negative speaker, you have to argue that we don't want to increase health care costs and price transparency wouldn't help everyone. The problem is the price of medical care, not whether or not we can see that price.*

NEG – There are A lot of Hurdles With Making Prices Visible

The Commonwealth Fund, “Quality Matters,” Martha Hostetter, Sarah Klein, May 2012, < <http://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/newsletters/quality-matters/2012/april-may/in-focus> >

“There are many challenges to making comparative pricing information available. A September 2011 report from the U.S. Government Accountability Office outlined some of the most significant, including the difficulty of determining in advance the health services any given patient will need.³ The wide variety of insurance benefit structures, a lack of standard formatting for reporting prices, and the difficulty of determining prices when charges originate from multiple providers further complicate these efforts.

Legal hurdles to reporting prices, including contractual obligations that in some cases prevent health plans from disclosing their negotiated rates with providers, are also factors, as are

concerns from consumer advocates that making patients more price-sensitive requires significant cost-shifting, which may create financial burdens for lower-income patients.

Even if these challenges could be overcome, there's still the question of whether consumers would use price information to inform their health care decision making. A Congressional Research Service study found that early price transparency initiatives, such as one that required California hospitals to publish their charges, did not lead to changes in consumer behavior or pricing.⁴ One reason may be that many people equate higher costs with higher quality—an assumption that often holds true when shopping for furniture or appliances, but not necessarily in health care. Studies of the costs and quality of care reveal a more nuanced relationship between the two.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the hurdles of making prices visible. Everyone’s health insurance is different, so their cost for services is different. Also, health insurance providers often will cut deals with healthcare providers for lower premiums, and these health care providers cannot legally disclose those deals and pricing. In addition, making prices visible, makes cost a bigger focus, and thus puts strain on lower-income patients. If lower income patients know what they are expected to pay, they might not seek medical treatment at all. Finally, there is no evidence to prove that consumers will utilize the price information, in fact there is evidence to suggest the contrary. You can use any of these points for a negative speech.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article says that price transparency in health care can actually INCREASE the price of healthcare services. Health care costs in the U.S. are already exorbitantly high, and we shouldn't do anything that would encourage increasing those costs. In addition to prices increasing, when it comes to medical emergencies people don't have time to price shop. Also, if people live in an area without a competitive market, price transparency isn't going to make a difference. As a negative speaker, you have to argue that we don't want to increase health care costs and price transparency wouldn't help everyone. The problem is the price of medical care, not whether or not we can see that price.

The second article talks about the hurdles of making prices visible. Everyone's health insurance is different, so their cost for services is different. Also, health insurance providers often will cut deals with healthcare providers for lower premiums, and these health care providers cannot legally disclose those deals and pricing. In addition, making prices visible, makes cost a bigger focus, and thus puts strain on lower-income patients. If lower income patients know what they are expected to pay, they might not seek medical treatment at all. Finally, there is no evidence to prove that consumers will utilize the price information, in fact there is evidence to suggest the contrary. You can use any of these points for a negative speech.

Legislation – A Resolution to Abolish the USA Patriot Act of 2001 and Close
Guantanamo Bay
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Cost of Keeping Prisoners in Gitmo Too High

The Wall Street Journal “Obama Weighs Options to Close Guantanamo” Carol E. Lee, Jess Bravin, October 9, 2014 < <http://online.wsj.com/articles/obama-weighs-options-to-close-guantanamo-1412899358>>

“Mr. Obama said in his 2014 State of the Union address that “this needs to be the year Congress lifts the remaining restrictions on detainee transfers and we close the prison at Guantanamo Bay.” ...

... Most of the nearly 800 men held at Guantanamo since it opened in 2002 were released during the George W. Bush administration. Of the 149 who remain, 79 have been approved for transfer by national-security officials but remain because of political or diplomatic obstacles in repatriating them...

... Officials, who declined to say where detainees might be housed if taken to the mainland, said the U.S. has ample space in its prisons for several dozen high-security prisoners. The administration has reviewed several facilities that could house the remaining detainees, with the military brig at Charleston, S.C., considered the most likely...

... Part of the administration’s strategy for reducing political opposition to lifting the ban on transferring detainees is to whittle the number in Guantanamo to the point where the cost of maintaining the installation is unpalatable. The annual cost per inmate is \$2.7 million, in contrast with \$78,000 at a supermax prison on the mainland, officials say.

“As the number becomes smaller at Guantanamo, the case for domestic transfers...becomes that much stronger,” a senior administration official said.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about a few reasons that we should close Gitmo, but the main one to focus on is the cost. There are currently 149 prisoners in Gitmo, and they cost 2.7 million dollars each to detain there. That’s over 402 million dollars a year, compared to the 11.6 million dollars it would cost to keep them on the mainland. That money builds up. On top of that, we definitely have the ability to hold them in our max-security prisons here in the US. The thought of having these terrorists on American soil might be daunting, but they will be behind bars upon bars upon locks and more bars. They would be secure. We keep killers in max security prisons all over the US – this is no different. Guantanamo Bay is a stain on the US’s good name, and we must close it down, move them closer to home, and remove that stain from our already-hurt reputation. Plus, it would save a ton of money!*

AFF – Transfers to US Soil are Best Option – Detainees Go Back to Fight Against US

The Blaze “Defense Department admits that former Guantanamo Bay prisoners are back fighting against the U.S.” October 31, 2014 < <http://www.theblaze.com/blog/2014/10/31/defense-department-admits-that-former-guantanamo-bay-prisoners-are-back-fighting-against-the-u-s-in-iraq-syria/>>

“Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel on Thursday acknowledged that some of the former prisoners the U.S. had been holding in detention facilities in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, have returned to the battlefield and are fighting against the United States.

Hagel admitted this after being asked whether he was worried about former prisoners taking up arms against the U.S. in Iraq and Syria...

... “Well, we know that some of the detainees that have come out of Guantanamo have gone back to the fight, to the battlefield,” he replied. “We’re aware of that.”

At the same time, Hagel said he still believes it’s best for the U.S. to close down Guantanamo Bay and reach agreements to have other countries host prisoners taken in the war against terrorism. Hagel said those commitments are needed because it’s an “imperfect” and “dangerous” world.

“This is why we pay so much attention to getting commitments from host countries in securing those commitments and doing everything we can within our power to assure that those commitments, not to allow those detainees to go beyond what is required in order to secure them in these different host countries that take them,” he said...

... “The re-engagement rate of former Guantanamo detainees is ever-increasing and there are public reports that detainees are specifically rejoining the fight alongside ISIL,” he wrote. “The U.S. government must not release terrorist detainees at the same time we have committed U.S. service members to fight ISIL.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the fact that ex-detainees who have been released are back fighting against the US in Iraq and Syria. This article could honestly go both ways, but as the affirmative, you can use this article to say: first, we need to close down Gitmo, because it’s a stain on our national reputation and the prison is infamous for torture and inhumane treatment. Second, the current plan involves releasing as many prisoners as possible, which, as we can see, could be detrimental to the fight against ISIS and other enemies. In conclusion, we should lift the ban on transfers to US soil, because since we need to close Gitmo, and we can’t transfer them to their own countries for the meantime, we should transfer them to max security prisons in the US. This process would save us money, help our international reputation, and stop the detainees from joining the fight against us in other countries.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about a few reasons that we should close Gitmo, but the main one to focus on is the cost. There are currently 149 prisoners in Gitmo, and they cost 2.7 million dollars each to detain there. That's over 402 million dollars a year, compared to the 11.6 million dollars it would cost to keep them on the mainland. That money builds up. On top of that, we definitely have the ability to hold them in our max-security prisons here in the US. The thought of having these terrorists on American soil might be daunting, but they will be behind bars upon bars upon locks and more bars. They would be secure. We keep killers in max security prisons all over the US – this is no different. Guantanamo Bay is a stain on the US's good name, and we must close it down, move them closer to home, and remove that stain from our already-hurt reputation. Plus, it would save a ton of money!

The second article talks about the fact that ex-detainees who have been released are back fighting against the US in Iraq and Syria. This article could honestly go both ways, but as the affirmative, you can use this article to say: first, we need to close down Gitmo, because it's a stain on our national reputation and the prison is infamous for torture and inhumane treatment. Second, the current plan involves releasing as many prisoners as possible, which, as we can see, could be detrimental to the fight against ISIS and other enemies. In conclusion, we should lift the ban on transfers to US soil, because since we need to close Gitmo, and we can't transfer them to their own countries for the meantime, we should transfer them to max security prisons in the US. This process would save us money, help our international reputation, and stop the detainees from joining the fight against us in other countries.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Closing Gitmo Means Bringing Terrorists to America

Mail Online News “Obama to defy Congress and shut down Guantanamo Bay as Bush stays mum and Boehner blasts president's 'legacy of lawlessness ... even as Islamic jihadists are beheading Americans’”

“House Speaker John Boehner told MailOnline in a statement that 'even as Islamic jihadists are beheading Americans, the White House is so eager to bring these terrorists from Guantanamo Bay to the United States that it is examining ways to thwart Congress and unilaterally re-write the law.'

Former President George W. Bush declined comment through a spokesman.

But a Kansas Republican lawmaker – facing the possibility of seeing Obama transfer Guantanamo's inmates to his state's Leavenworth maximum security prison – pledged Friday during a campaign event that 'if he tries it ... I will shut down the Senate!'

... 'Not only is this scheme dangerous,' Boehner said, 'it is yet another example of what will be this administration's legacy of lawlessness.'

Gallup polled Americans in June after Obama swapped five Taliban prisoners for U.S. Army Sgt. Bowe Bergdal, who reportedly deserted his unit in Afghanistan before being captured.

Just 29 per cent supported closing Guantanamo, and 66 per cent were opposed.

It's clear that there's nothing resembling serious support for the idea on Capitol Hill. In May 2009, with both houses of Congress in Democratic hands, the Senate voter 90–6 against adding \$80 million to the U.S. defense budget that Obama had requested to pay for his plan...

... 'The American people don't want these men walking the streets of America's neighborhoods,' South Dakota Republican Sen. John Thune said at the time.

'The American people don't want these detainees held at a military base or federal prison in their back yard, either.'

Oklahoma Sen. Jim Inhofe told MailOnline on Friday that Obama's zeal to close Gitmo for political gain 'is exceeded only by his willingness to bypass Congress and ignore the law in order to accomplish it.'

'With the threat of terrorism on the rise, the president should be focusing on strengthening U.S. national security,' Inhofe said, 'but instead he is attempting to check boxes before the midterm elections.'...

... 'I think it is dangerous,' Woolsey added. 'And they're down now to 149, I think, prisoners. And most of these, like Khalid Sheikh Muhammad, are really dyed-in-the-wool terrorists.'”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how there is overwhelming opposition to closing Guantanamo Bay. If we close down Gitmo, that means that these prisoners, or some of them, would be transferred to the US, on American soil. 66 percent of Americans do not support closing the detention center. Congress has banned the transfer of prisoners to American soil – and for good reason! We need to keep those people as far away from America and Americans as possible. No one wants these men to step foot on American soil. And, for that matter, we shouldn't transfer them to other countries, because they could just breed more hate against America and join the fight against us in countries like Iraq and Syria.*

NEG – Gitmo Will Never Close

Time “Why Gitmo Will Never Close” Michael Crowley, May 30, 2013 <
<http://swampland.time.com/2013/05/30/why-gitmo-will-never-close/>>

“Opposition still runs high to the idea of releasing or bringing into U.S. prisons dozens of men widely considered dangerous terrorists even if many are not. Asked to gauge the probability that Obama can close Guantánamo before he leaves office, David Remes, a lawyer who represents 18 Guantánamo inmates replies, “Zero.”...

... Nor is America’s long war on terrorism about to end. Obama’s speech revealed a man “haunted” by the deaths of innocents in drone strikes and wrestling with the balance between national security and the Constitution’s integrity. But while he announced tighter standards for ordering drone strikes abroad (including an unspoken plan to partly shift the program from the CIA to the theoretically more accountable Pentagon) and spoke of a day when the war might be declared over, Obama is retaining broad powers to detain or kill suspected terrorists, to conduct aggressive surveillance and to use military force in foreign nations. “To do nothing in the face of terrorist networks would invite far more civilian casualties,” Obama said. “We must finish the work of defeating al-Qaeda and its associated forces.”...

... Understanding why Gitmo hasn’t closed requires understanding who exactly is there. The camp holds three types of inmates, each posing different challenges. The first group consists of those 86 detainees deemed safe to release to their home countries or third nations, so long as they can be monitored and accounted for to ensure they don’t take up arms against the U.S. The second group consists of suspected terrorists whom the Administration is prosecuting or plans to charge with specific crimes. The third group consists of prisoners too dangerous to simply release—for reasons that could include a suspected organizational role in al-Qaeda, explosives training or in some cases an openly stated desire to kill Americans—but also impossible to put on trial, maybe because of evidence rendered inadmissible by torture; because the troops who captured them didn’t collect evidence; or because they supported al-Qaeda before the U.S. made that a crime for foreigners overseas...

... Rhetoric about the founders aside, it’s hard to imagine Obama’s releasing trained al-Qaeda members who have not renounced terrorism into the wild, as it were. “The Administration’s view seems to be that so long as it’s only a small number of very dangerous al-Qaeda terrorists, it is legitimate to hold them without trial,” Waxman says. Obama would prefer not to hold them in the prison that stains America’s international reputation. But he may find the moral high ground he seeks is simply out of his reach.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article gives a few reasons why we won’t/shouldn’t close down Guantanamo Bay, aside from what’s already mentioned in the first article. It talks about how the war on terrorism is far from over, and until then, putting these detainees back onto the battlefield is too much of a risk. Second, it talks about the different detainees that are still there. There are still some that cannot be tried and cannot be released, so what do we do with them? We can’t transfer them to other countries – we can’t transfer them to the US – what can we do? Nothing. They are too dangerous. As long as terrorism runs rampant, and we produce enemies on a daily basis, we can’t add any fuel to that fire. And we can’t allow terrorists to live on American soil – the security risk there is too high. Keep Gitmo open, because it’s the best choice for our national security.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how there is overwhelming opposition to closing Guantanamo Bay. If we close down Gitmo, that means that these prisoners, or some of them, would be transferred to the US, on American soil. 66 percent of Americans do not support closing the detention center. Congress has banned the transfer of prisoners to American soil – and for good reason! We need to keep those people as far away from America and Americans as possible. No one wants these men to step foot on American soil. And, for that matter, we shouldn't transfer them to other countries, because they could just breed more hate against America and join the fight against us in countries like Iraq and Syria.

The second article gives a few reasons why we won't/shouldn't close down Guantanamo Bay, aside from what's already mentioned in the first article. It talks about how the war on terrorism is far from over, and until then, putting these detainees back onto the battlefield is too much of a risk. Second, it talks about the different detainees that are still there. There are still some that cannot be tried and cannot be released, so what do we do with them? We can't transfer them to other countries – we can't transfer them to the US – what can we do? Nothing. They are too dangerous. As long as terrorism runs rampant, and we produce enemies on a daily basis, we can't add any fuel to that fire. And we can't allow terrorists to live on American soil – the security risk there is too high. Keep Gitmo open, because it's the best choice for our national security.

Legislation – A Resolution to Commit Any and All Resources to the
Restoration of Earth’s Environment
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Earth Entering 6th Mass Extinction

Stanford “Stanford researcher declares that the sixth mass extinction is here” Rob Jordan, June 9, 2015 <<http://news.stanford.edu/news/2015/june/mass-extinction-ehrllich-061915.html>>

“There is no longer any doubt: We are entering a mass extinction that threatens humanity's existence.

That is the bad news at the center of a new study by a group of scientists including Paul Ehrlich, the Bing Professor of Population Studies in biology and a senior fellow at the Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment. Ehrlich and his co-authors call for fast action to conserve threatened species, populations and habitat, but warn that the window of opportunity is rapidly closing.

"[The study] shows without any significant doubt that we are now entering the sixth great mass extinction event," Ehrlich said...

... There is general agreement among scientists that extinction rates have reached levels unparalleled since the dinosaurs died out 66 million years ago. However, some have challenged the theory, believing earlier estimates rested on assumptions that overestimated the crisis.

The new study, published in the journal Science Advances, shows that even with extremely conservative estimates, species are disappearing up to about 100 times faster than the normal rate between mass extinctions, known as the background rate.

"If it is allowed to continue, life would take many millions of years to recover, and our species itself would likely disappear early on," said lead author Gerardo Ceballos of the Universidad Autónoma de México...

... Despite the gloomy outlook, there is a meaningful way forward, according to Ehrlich and his colleagues. "Avoiding a true sixth mass extinction will require rapid, greatly intensified efforts to conserve already threatened species, and to alleviate pressures on their populations – notably habitat loss, over-exploitation for economic gain and climate change," the study's authors write."

TAKEAWAY – *This article is from Stanford, and talks about how scientists have theorized that the Earth is entering its 6th wave of mass extinction. What’s causing this? Habitat loss, pressures on population, over-exploitation for economic gain, and climate change. How do we fix that? We pass this legislation. We won’t have an Earth if we don’t. If we don’t focus all of our time, resources, and energy into fixing this world, we won’t be alive anymore. We cannot allow that to happen, at all costs. We must use diplomacy and logical reasoning to convince the entire world that this planet is worth saving.*

AFF – We Can Save the World if We Work Together

Washington Post “Earth is on brink of a sixth mass extinction, scientists say, and it’s humans’ fault” Sarah Kaplin, June 22, 2015 < <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2015/06/22/the-earth-is-on-the-brink-of-a-sixth-mass-extinction-scientists-say-and-its-humans-fault/>>

“Five times in the past, the Earth has been struck by these kinds of cataclysmic events, ones so severe and swift (in geological terms) they obliterated most kinds of living things before they ever had a chance to adapt.

Now, scientists say, the Earth Is on the brink of a sixth such “mass extinction event.” Only this time, the culprit isn’t a massive asteroid impact or volcanic explosions or the inexorable drifting of continents. It’s us...

... In a study published Friday in the journal *Science Advances*, biologists found that the Earth is losing mammal species 20 to 100 times the rate of the past. Extinctions are happening so fast, they could rival the event that killed the dinosaurs in as little as 250 years. Given the timing, the unprecedented speed of the losses and decades of research on the effects of pollution, hunting and habitat loss, they assert that human activity is responsible.

“The smoking gun in these extinctions is very obvious, and it’s in our hands,” co-author Todd Palmer, a biologist at the University of Florida, wrote in an e-mail to *The Washington Post*...

... This rapid species loss is alarming enough, according to the study’s authors, but it could be just the beginning.

“We can confidently conclude that modern extinction rates are exceptionally high, that they are increasing, and that they suggest a mass extinction under way,” they write. “If the currently elevated extinction pace is allowed to continue, humans will soon (in as little as three human lifetimes) be deprived of many biodiversity benefits.”...

... “In terms of scale, we are now living through one of those brief, rare episodes in Earth history when the biological framework of life is dismantled,” paleobiologist Jan Zalasiewicz, who was not involved in the study, wrote in an analysis for the *Guardian*. He went on to note that none of the “familiar horsemen” of planetary change — “massive volcanic outbursts to choke the atmosphere and poison the seas, the mayhem caused by major asteroid impact and the wrenching effects of rapid climate change” — have factored into the current crisis (the effects of current climate change are still in their early stages, he wrote, and can’t yet be blamed for species loss). Instead, the deaths we see now are all due to pollution, predation and habitat change from one species: humans.

Still, scientists say, it’s possible to avert their gloomy predictions. They give us about a generation to make the changes needed to slow the rate of species loss.

“We have the potential of initiating a mass extinction episode which has been unparalleled for 65 million years,” co-author Gerardo Ceballos told CNN. “But I’m optimistic in the sense that humans react — in the past we have made quantum leaps when we worked together to solve our problems.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article extends on the arguments presented in the first article, analyzing the study that shows we are entering into another extinction. As the affirmative, you need to*

argue that we need to stop thinking in terms of our current limitations. We need to fix this, or WE WILL NOT BE ALIVE ANYMORE. We are destroying this planet. It ultimately comes down to what's more important: the status quo, or having a planet? We can keep things going as is if we want to, but then we might as well crash our planet into the Sun. Wouldn't it be nice if we went to the rest of the world, and changed everything? Wouldn't it be great if we stopped fighting, and started working together? A world with no war, no political problems, just every country working together save the planet. A world where humans still exist and will continue to exist for millenniums. As the affirmative, that's our goal. Let's save the world.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article is from Stanford, and talks about how scientists have theorized that the Earth is entering its 6th wave of mass extinction. What's causing this? Habitat loss, pressures on population, over-exploitation for economic gain, and climate change. How do we fix that? We pass this legislation. We won't have an Earth if we don't. If we don't focus all of our time, resources, and energy into fixing this world, we won't be alive anymore. We cannot allow that to happen, at all costs. We must use diplomacy and logical reasoning to convince the entire world that this planet is worth saving.

The second article extends on the arguments presented in the first article, analyzing the study that shows we are entering into another extinction. As the affirmative, you need to argue that we need to stop thinking in terms of our current limitations. We need to fix this, or **WE WILL NOT BE ALIVE ANYMORE**. We are destroying this planet. It ultimately comes down to what's more important: the status quo, or having a planet? We can keep things going as is if we want to, but then we might as well crash our planet into the Sun. Wouldn't it be nice if we went to the rest of the world, and changed everything? Wouldn't it be great if we stopped fighting, and started working together? A world with no war, no political problems, just every country working together save the planet. A world where humans still exist and will continue to exist for millenniums. As the affirmative, that's our goal. Let's save the world.

Negative Evidence

NEG – The Issues the United States MUST Face; Non-Negotiable

The White House “Issues” Accessed 10/11/2015 < <https://www.whitehouse.gov/issues>>

“TOP ISSUES

Economy

This is a make or break moment for the middle class, and President Obama is working to build an economy that works for everyone – where hard work and responsibility are rewarded.

...Related Topics

What \$2,000 Means to Americans

Creating American Jobs

Security for the Middle Class

Supporting American Businesses

...Education

President Obama believes that every child deserves access to the type of education they need to prepare for the challenges of a new century.

...Related Topics

Early Childhood Education

K-12 Education

Support for Higher Education

Reform for the Future

...Energy and the Environment

President Obama is building the foundation for a clean energy economy, tackling the issue of climate change, and protecting our environment.

...Related Topics

An All of the Above Energy Strategy

Securing American Energy

Climate Change Action Plan

Our Environment

...Immigration

Our nation's immigration system is broken. Fixing it is an economic and national security imperative. That's why President Obama is working to pass a common sense, comprehensive set of reforms that ensures everyone plays by the same rules.

...Related Topics

Border Security

Strengthening Enforcement

Earned Citizenship

Streamlining Legal Immigration

Immigration & the Economy

...Health Care

President Obama is reforming health care to ensure a more secure future for American families.

...Related Topics

About the Affordable Care Act
The New Law and You
The Affordable Care Act & Medicare
Myths & Facts About the New Law
Health Care Reform in Action

MORE ISSUES

Civil Rights
Disabilities
Ethics
Family
Fiscal Responsibility
Foreign Policy
Homeland Security
Poverty
Rural
Seniors & Social Security
Service
Taxes
Technology
Urban and Economic Mobility
Veterans
Violence Prevention”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence illustrates how complex and detailed US policies have to be, and we cannot be single-policy focused in our decision making. To put it simply, this is a list of “Issues” on the White House website. It’s a simple piece of evidence, for a very big argument. The affirmative would like us to completely ignore everything we know about the world. If we could ignore the cost issues and political conflicts to pass legislation, there would be a lot of legislation passed. Unfortunately, it doesn’t work that way. The United States must focus on education, ISIS, the military, poverty, homelessness, the economy, technology, space exploration, taxes, social security, trying to gain stability in the Middle East, thwarting possible nuclear attacks by North Korea and Russia and anyone else that wants to attack us, the environment, and so much more. Policy is extremely complicated, and we can’t pass legislation that ignores these things. We can’t just forgo the needs of our nation to serve the world’s environment. Yes, the environment is a priority, but it cannot be the only one.*

NEG – What the EPA is Currently Doing to Combat Climate Change

United States Environmental Protection Agency “What EPA is Doing About Climate Change” accessed 10/11/2015 < <http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/EPAactivities.html>>

“EPA is taking a number of common-sense steps to address the challenge of climate change.

Collecting Emissions Data

EPA collects various types of greenhouse gas emissions data. This data helps policy makers, businesses, and the Agency track greenhouse gas emissions trends and identify opportunities for reducing emissions and increasing efficiency.

The Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks, provides the United States' official estimate of total national-level greenhouse gas emissions. This report tracks annual U.S. greenhouse gas emissions since 1990.

The Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program collects and publishes emissions data from individual facilities in the United States that emit greenhouse gases in large quantities. **Getting Reductions**

EPA is reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting a clean energy economy through highly successful partnerships and common-sense regulatory initiatives.

Developing Common-sense Regulatory Initiatives: EPA is developing common-sense regulatory initiatives, to reduce GHG emissions and increase efficiency. For example, EPA's vehicle greenhouse gas rules, will save consumers \$1.7 trillion at the pump by 2025, and eliminate six billion metric tons of GHG pollution. EPA is also working on carbon pollution standards for the power sector, which is the largest source of carbon pollution in the country. The carbon pollution standards will cut carbon emissions from the power sector by 30 percent nationwide below 2005 levels.

Partnering With the Private Sector: Through voluntary energy and climate programs, EPA's partners reduced over 345 million metric tons of greenhouse gases in 2010 alone - equivalent to the emissions from 81 million vehicles - and saving consumers and businesses of about \$21 billion.

Reducing EPA's Carbon Footprint: EPA is monitoring emissions from its own energy use and fuel consumption and working to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 25% by 2020. Learn more about federal greenhouse gas requirements and EPA's Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan (PDF) (74 pp, 1MB, About PDF).

Evaluating Policy Options, Costs and Benefits

EPA conducts economy-wide analyses to understand the economic impacts and effectiveness of proposed climate policies. Learn more about EPA's economic analyses on climate policies and the associated costs and benefits.

Advancing the Science

EPA contributes to world-class climate research through the U.S. Global Change Research Program and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. [Link to EPA's External Link Disclaimer](#) EPA's Office of Research and Development conducts research to understand the environmental and health impacts of climate change and to provide sustainable solutions for adapting to and reducing the impact from a changing climate.

Partnering Internationally

EPA is engaged in a variety of international activities to advance climate change science, monitor our environment, and promote activities that reduce greenhouse gas emissions. EPA establishes partnerships, provides leadership, and shares technical expertise to support these activities. Learn more about EPA's International Climate Partnerships.

Partnering With States, Localities, and Tribes

EPA's State and Local Climate and Energy Program provides technical assistance, analytical tools, and outreach support on climate change issues to state, local, and tribal governments. See the progress made by our pilot communities.

Helping Communities Adapt

EPA's Climate Ready Estuaries and Climate Ready Water Utilities programs help coastal resource managers and water utility managers, respectively, plan and prepare for climate change. Learn more about EPA's efforts on adapting to climate change.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article is from the EPA website, and outlines everything the Environmental Protection Agency is doing to protect the environment and solve for climate change. Keep in mind, this is just a small picture, but it shows a commitment to fixing the environment and sustaining life on this planet. The affirmative would like you to believe that we can convince the rest of the world to ignore cost, and ignore geo-political issues, and war, and terrorism – that’s just not possible. The best thing we CAN do is put an entire department of the government, that pushes regulations and supports smaller entities, to try to get everything under control. We are doing that in the status quo. Can we do more? Absolutely. But we can’t feasibly do what this resolution is asking.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence illustrates how complex and detailed US policies have to be, and we cannot be single-policy focused in our decision making. To put it simply, this is a list of “Issues” on the White House website. It’s a simple piece of evidence, for a very big argument. The affirmative would like us to completely ignore everything we know about the world. If we could ignore the cost issues and political conflicts to pass legislation, there would be a lot of legislation passed. Unfortunately, it doesn’t work that way. The United States must focus on education, ISIS, the military, poverty, homelessness, the economy, technology, space exploration, taxes, social security, trying to gain stability in the Middle East, thwarting possible nuclear attacks by North Korea and Russia and anyone else that wants to attack us, the environment, and so much more. Policy is extremely complicated, and we can’t pass legislation that ignores these things. We can’t just forgo the needs of our nation to serve the world’s environment. Yes, the environment is a priority, but it cannot be the only one.

The second article is from the EPA website, and outlines everything the Environmental Protection Agency is doing to protect the environment and solve for climate change. Keep in mind, this is just a small picture, but it shows a commitment to fixing the environment and sustaining life on this planet. The affirmative would like you to believe that we can convince the rest of the world to ignore cost, and ignore geo-political issues, and war, and terrorism – that’s just not possible. The best thing we CAN do is put an entire department of the government, that pushes regulations and supports smaller entities, to try to get everything under control. We are doing that in the status quo. Can we do more? Absolutely. But we can’t feasibly do what this resolution is asking.

Legislation – A Bill to Institute a Flat Tax Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Tax Reform is Key for American Businesses

Forbes “Can Congress Pass Tax Reform That Would Stop Inversions?” Martin Sullivan, September 30, 2014

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/taxanalysts/2014/09/30/can-congress-pass-tax-reform-that-would-stop-inversions/>

“Conservatives correctly point out that proposals to stop inversions from the Obama administration and Democrats in the House and Senate are only stopgap measures—a mere Band-Aid. If Congress were to tighten the anti-inversion rules first enacted in 2004 and further increase the foreign ownership requirements for mergers that move American businesses’ corporate legal residence outside of the United States, it would stop the type of deals that are now getting all the attention. But we still will not have solved the fundamental problem of tax motivated foreign ownership of U.S. businesses.

Right now the U.S. tax system favors foreign owned corporations over U.S. owned corporations. Although you often hear about the U.S. having a higher corporate tax rate than other major economies, this really has little to do with the disparity between U.S. and foreign ownership. The two big factors that make foreign ownership attractive for tax purposes are 1) that foreign owned firms can pay a lot less tax on their non-U.S. activities (because as non-U.S. firms they are under territorial regimes) and 2) that they can pay a lot less on their U.S. activities (because U.S. rules make it much easier for foreign owned firms to strip earnings out of the United States).

If not through inversions, shifting foreign ownership can occur through a variety of channels: more start-ups incorporate abroad, large U.S. businesses spin off and sell divisions to foreign multinationals, and foreign-owned multinationals with the tax advantages simply grow faster than U.S. owned businesses. To truly prevent this migration of ownership, we need residence-neutral tax reform.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that right now our tax favors foreign owned corporations while making it more difficult for US based start-up companies. This has also lead to many US corporations sending divisions and branches to other countries to avoid extra cost. By implementing a flat tax rate, we are able to ensure fairness for US based companies while also ensuring economic prosperity for US citizens. With our struggling economy, we must takes step to promote US based companies that will yield US jobs and industries.*

AFF – Tax Reform Will Help American Families

Heritage.org “How Tax Reform Would Help American Families” Curtis Dubay, October 20, 2014

“Tax reform is one of the vital policy improvements necessary to revive the laboring economy. Despite widespread agreement on this fact, the prospects of Congress passing and the President signing a tax reform bill are low...

...The tax code imposes tax rates that are too high, is biased against saving and investment, and wrongly picks winners and losers. Each of these problems hurts families because they create sizeable disincentives against working, investing, and taking risks—activities that are central to increasing prosperity and establishing security. These activities are also the building blocks of economic growth.

High tax rates on families discourage work, especially from second workers who may wish to enter the workforce. The extra tax they would pay on the additional income combined with other costs—such as child care, transportation, loss of certain tax benefits, less time at home, and other work-related expenses—makes the benefits of taking a job not worth the effort...

Rate and Base Equally Important. In tax reform vernacular, the fix is described as broadening the tax base and lowering rates. This phrasing gives a simplified and mostly correct explanation of what tax reform does, but like many clichés it does not tell the whole story.

Certainly, lower rates are a key component of a successful tax reform plan. However, to maximize the growth potential of reform, the lower rates must be applied to a correct tax base. In tax policy parlance, the tax base must be neutral, which means that it does not positively or negatively influence economic decision making by families, businesses, investors, and entrepreneurs...

...Tax reform that established a consumption base and the other policies outlined above would be a significant boon to American families because it would ease the tremendous burden the current system places on them.

A single, low-rate system would make it easier for second earners to enter the workforce. That would raise family incomes, helping them to pay bills and provide a better future for their children.

A tax system with such a consumption base would remove the disincentives to save because it would not tax savings. Families would save more for all the various reasons that they choose to put money away. This would make it easier to buy a new home, afford a good education for their children, handle unexpected expenses, and provide for their retirement.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains the need for tax reform in depth. There are many arguments that can be made from the article. One main problem with the current tax laws is that people are taxed on how much they have, not how much they use. This has some benefits for large industries, but hurts American families and individuals. Current taxes actually discourage people from saving their money. This is the money that a family will buy a house with, pay for college, start their own business, etc. Another benefit of flat rate tax reform is the equality and simplicity. The US tax code has become cumbersome, confusing, and abused because of unnecessary complications. A simpler tax reform will promote fairness, entrepreneurship, and economic opportunity.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that right now our tax favors foreign owned corporations while making it more difficult for US based start-up companies. This has also lead to many US corporations sending divisions and branches to other countries to avoid extra cost. By implementing a flat tax rate, we are able to ensure fairness for US based companies while also ensuring economic prosperity for US citizens. With our struggling economy, we must takes step to promote US based companies that will yield US jobs and industries.

The second article explains the need for tax reform in depth. There are many arguments that can be made from the article. One main problem with the current tax laws is that people are taxed on how much they have, not how much they use. This has some benefits for large industries, but hurts American families and individuals. Current taxes actually discourage people from saving their money. This is the money that a family will buy a house with, pay for college, start their own business, etc. Another benefit of flat rate tax reform is the equality and simplicity. The US tax code has become cumbersome, confusing, and abused because of unnecessary complications. A simpler tax reform will promote fairness, entrepreneurship, and economic opportunity.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Flat Tax Harms Foreign Business Interest

Forbes “Can Congress Pass Tax Reform That Would Stop Inversions?” Martin Sullivan, September 30, 2014

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/taxanalysts/2014/09/30/can-congress-pass-tax-reform-that-would-stop-inversions/>

“If not through inversions, shifting foreign ownership can occur through a variety of channels: more start-ups incorporate abroad, large U.S. businesses spin off and sell divisions to foreign multinationals, and foreign-owned multinationals with the tax advantages simply grow faster than U.S. owned businesses. To truly prevent this migration of ownership, we need residence-neutral tax reform.

Now here’s the rub: A more competitive tax system and a residence-neutral system are not always the same thing. On the one hand, moving from a worldwide system to a territorial system—a system in which foreign profits of U.S. corporations are largely untaxed and the lockout effect is eliminated—makes U.S. multinationals more competitive and also makes the tax system more residence neutral. So, OK, no conflict there for tax reformers. On the other hand, reducing the ability of foreign owned firms to strip income out of the United States—which is necessary to prevent the migration of ownership—makes investing in the United States less attractive to foreign owned businesses, like Nestlé. This is a big political problem.

It is useful to divide foreign owned firms doing business in the United States into two categories: 1) those that became foreign by inverting and 2) foreign firms that began abroad and continue to be managed from abroad (a.k.a. “traditional” or “historical” multinationals). The public is stirred up because of the highly visible first group — and tax barriers can be set up just for inverters. That is what Congress did in 2004. And since then, both the Bush and Obama administrations have proposed earnings stripping limitations that apply only to inverted firms.

But a principled tax reform will have features that include both categories. Otherwise, as conservatives complain, we have only a Band-Aid solution. You don’t hear much from legislators about this because it is a minefield for them. Rightly or wrongly, the public’s wrath is focused on inverted firms, and doing something about them is probably inevitable...

....Proposals to reduce earnings stripping by all foreign owned firms have been seen from Ways and Means Committee Chair Dave Camp, former Senate Finance Committee Chair Max Baucus, and President Obama. (In its latest budget the administration replaced its old proposal that applied only to inverted firms to one that applies to all foreign firms.) But it is a sure bet that foreign owned multinationals will put up a spirited and effective battle to prevent themselves from getting caught up in the anti-inversion net. And if they are successful, as they were in 2004, tax reform will slow down but not stop the outmigration.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article addresses US tax reform from an international stand point. Current US tax laws make it easier for foreign companies to open and operate in the United*

States. This foreign interest plays a major role in our economy and brings valuable international attention to US businesses. The benefit of multinational corporations is not something the US should jeopardize in today's market. If the United States wants to be competitive and successful on a global scale, we need that foreign business interest. A flat tax isn't worth the risk.

NEG – Flat Tax Makes the Middle Class Pay More so the Rich Pay Less

US News “Secret of the Flat Tax” Dean Baker, November 11, 2011

<http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/is-a-flat-tax-a-good-idea/secret-of-the-flat-tax-middle-class-pays-more-so-rich-pay-less>

“Confusing a simple tax code with a flat tax is a cheap political stunt. The number of tax brackets doesn't affect simplicity at all. Regardless of the number of brackets, there is only one calculation needed. The instruction is simple. It looks like this: "pay \$1,000, plus 15 percent of income above \$50,000." You can have a flat tax or 100 tax brackets, it is the same formula. Even a Republican presidential candidate can figure it out.

The other part of the story is that the flat tax means a large tax cut for rich people. Every economist who has examined flat tax proposals over the years comes to that same conclusion: A flat tax means the rich pay less.

And if the rich pay less and we raise the same amount of money, then someone else has to pay more. And the someone in this story is the middle class. It really is that simple.

The flat taxers like to run around with Lake Wobegone economics where we are all going to pay less and still have the same amount of money, but the world doesn't work that way. We have tried reducing taxes to raise revenue. People remember Reagan's tax cuts and the large deficits they led to. They remember Bush's tax cuts and the large deficits they led to.

No one is going to fall for this trick yet again. When we cut taxes on the rich, we get less money and the rest of us will have to make up the shortfall.

For middle-class people, a flat tax means that they will have to pay more taxes. If people think it would be fairer that they pay higher taxes, then the Republican Party has the presidential candidates for you.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how a flat tax still generates the same revenue as current tax methods. The way Dean Baker puts it is crystal clear. “Every economist who has examined flat tax proposals over the years comes to that same conclusion: A flat tax means the rich pay less. And if the rich pay less and we raise the same amount of money, then someone else has to pay more. And the someone in this story is the middle class. It really is that simple.” Most economists agree that a thriving middle class is the key to a healthy economy. If we induce a tax that harms our middle class, we are compromising the future of American industry and jobs. We must support our middle class and generate opportunities for the lower income class.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article addresses US tax reform from an international stand point. Current US tax laws make it easier for foreign companies to open and operate in the United States. This foreign interest plays a major role in our economy and brings valuable international attention to US businesses. The benefit of multinational corporations is not something the US should jeopardize in today's market. If the United States wants to be competitive and successful on a global scale, we need that foreign business interest. A flat tax isn't worth the risk.

The second article explains how a flat tax still generates the same revenue as current tax methods. The way Dean Baker puts it is crystal clear. "Every economist who has examined flat tax proposals over the years comes to that same conclusion: A flat tax means the rich pay less. And if the rich pay less and we raise the same amount of money, then someone else has to pay more. And the someone in this story is the middle class. It really is that simple." Most economists agree that a thriving middle class is the key to a healthy economy. If we induce a tax that harms our middle class, we are compromising the future of American industry and jobs. We must support our middle class and generate opportunities for the lower income class.

Legislation – A Resolution to Eliminate Standardized Testing Affirmative Evidence

AFF-Standardized Testing Has Not Improved Student Achievement

National Research Council, "Incentives and Test-Based Accountability in Education," 2011,
<www.nap.edu >

"After No Child Left Behind (NCLB) passed in 2002, the US slipped from 18th in the world in math on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) to 31st place in 2009, with a similar drop in science and no change in reading.

There's no evidence test-based incentive programs are working: "Despite using them for several decades, policymakers and educators do not yet know how to use test-based incentives to consistently generate positive effects on achievement and to improve education."

TAKEAWAY – There are tons of great arguments in affirmation of this bill. Ultimately, all of the evidence says that standardized testing isn't working. It puts unrealistic burdens on teachers and students alike, without ever improving academic achievement. You can also argue that standardized tests aren't even "standardized." The tests vary from state to state and are costing states millions of dollars annually. If you take an affirmative stance. Another argument is that money currently going towards standardized testing would be better spent elsewhere.

AFF – 22 Reasons to Eliminate Standardized Testing

ProCon, "Is the Use of Standardized Tests Improving Education in America?" Accessed October 18, 2015,
< <http://standardizedtests.procon.org/> >

1. **Standardized testing has not improved student achievement.** After No Child Left Behind (NCLB) passed in 2002, the US slipped from 18th in the world in math on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) to 31st place in 2009, with a similar drop in science and no change in reading. [95] [145] [144] A May 26, 2011, National Research Council report found no evidence test-based incentive programs are working: "Despite using them for several decades, policymakers and educators do not yet know how to use test-based incentives to consistently generate positive effects on achievement and to improve education." [154]
2. **Standardized tests are an unreliable measure of student performance.** A 2001 study published by the Brookings Institution found that 50-80% of year-over-year test score improvements were temporary and "caused by fluctuations that had nothing to do with long-term changes in learning..." [107]
3. **Standardized tests are unfair and discriminatory against non English speakers and students with special needs.**[106] English language learners take tests in English before they have mastered the language. [101] Special education students take the same tests as other children, receiving few of the accommodations usually provided to them as part of their Individualized Education Plans (IEP).[102]

4. **Standardized tests measure only a small portion of what makes education meaningful.** According to late education researcher Gerald W. Bracey, PhD, qualities that standardized tests cannot measure include "creativity, critical thinking, resilience, motivation, persistence, curiosity, endurance, reliability, enthusiasm, empathy, self-awareness, self-discipline, leadership, civic-mindedness, courage, compassion, resourcefulness, sense of beauty, sense of wonder, honesty, integrity." [147]
5. **"Teaching to the test" is replacing good teaching practices with "drill n' kill" rote learning.** A five-year University of Maryland study completed in 2007 found "the pressure teachers were feeling to 'teach to the test' since NCLB was leading to "declines in teaching higher-order thinking, in the amount of time spent on complex assignments, and in the actual amount of high cognitive content in the curriculum." [11][12]
6. **NCLB tests are drastically narrowing the curriculum.** A national 2007 study by the Center on Education Policy reported that since 2001, 44% of school districts had reduced the time spent on science, social studies and the arts by an average of 145 minutes per week in order to focus on reading and math. [1] A 2007 survey of 1,250 civics, government, and social studies teachers showed that 75% of those teaching current events less often cited standardized tests as the reason.[16]
7. **Instruction time is being consumed by monotonous test preparation.** Some schools allocate more than a quarter of the year's instruction to test prep. [Kozol] After New York City's reading and math scores plunged in 2010, many schools imposed extra measures to avoid being shut down, including daily two and a half hour prep sessions and test practice on vacation days. [14] On Sep. 11, 2002, students at Monterey High School in Lubbock, TX, were prevented from discussing the first anniversary of the 2001 terrorist attacks because they were too busy with standardized test preparation. [15]
8. **Standardized tests are not objective.** A paper published in the Fall 2002 edition of the peer-reviewed *Journal of Human Resources* stated that scores vary due to subjective decisions made during test design and administration: "Simply changing the relative weight of algebra and geometry in NAEP (the National Assessment of Educational Progress) altered the gap between black and white students." [130]
9. **Standardized testing causes severe stress in younger students.** According to education researcher Gregory J. Cizek, anecdotes abound "illustrating how testing... produces gripping anxiety in even the brightest students, and makes young children vomit or cry, or both." [7] On Mar. 14, 2002, the Sacramento Bee reported that "test-related jitters, especially among young students, are so common that the Stanford-9 exam comes with instructions on what to do with a test booklet in case a student vomits on it." [8]
10. **Older students do not take NCLB-mandated standardized tests seriously because they do not affect their grades.** An English teacher at New Mexico's Valley High School said in Aug. 2004 that many juniors just "had fun" with the tests, making patterns when filling in the answer bubbles: "Christmas tree designs were popular. So were battleships and hearts." [132]
11. **Testing is expensive and costs have increased since NCLB, placing a burden on state education budgets.** According to the Texas Education Agency, the state spent \$9 million in 2003 to test students, while the cost to Texas taxpayers from 2009

through 2012 is projected to be around \$88 million per year. [94]

12. **The billion dollar testing industry is notorious for making costly and time-consuming scoring errors.** [99] [42] NCS Pearson, which has a \$254 million contract to administer Florida's Comprehensive Assessment Test, delivered the 2010 results more than a month late and their accuracy was challenged by over half the state's superintendents. [100] After errors and distribution problems in 2004-2005, Hawaii replaced test publisher Harcourt with American Institutes for Research, but the latter had to re-grade 98,000 tests after students received scores for submitting blank test booklets. [99] [42]
13. **The multiple-choice format used on standardized tests is an inadequate assessment tool.** It encourages a simplistic way of thinking in which there are only right and wrong answers, which doesn't apply in real-world situations. The format is also biased toward male students, who studies have shown adapt more easily to the game-like point scoring of multiple-choice questions. [77]
14. **America is facing a "creativity crisis," as standardized testing and rote learning "dumb down" curricula and jeopardize the country's economic future.** A 2010 College of William & Mary study found Americans' scores on the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking have been dropping since 1990, and researcher Kyung-Hee Kim lays part of the blame on the increase in standardized testing: "If we neglect creative students in school because of the structure and the testing movement... then they become underachievers." [133]
15. **Finland topped the international education (PISA) rankings from 2001-2008, yet has "no external standardized tests used to rank students or schools,"** according to Stanford University researchers Linda Darling-Hammond and Laura McCloskey. [148] Success has been achieved using "assessments that encourage students to be active learners who can find, analyze, and use information to solve problems in novel situations."
16. **Excessive testing may teach children to be good at taking tests, but does not prepare them for productive adult lives.** [140] China displaced Finland at the top of the 2009 PISA rankings because, as explained by Jiang Xueqin, Deputy Principal of Peking University High School, "Chinese schools are very good at preparing their students for standardized tests. For that reason, they fail to prepare them for higher education and the knowledge economy." [139] China is trying to depart from the "drill and kill" test prep that Chinese educators admit has produced only "competent mediocrity." [112] [113] [1]
17. **Using test scores to reward and punish teachers and schools encourages them to cheat the system for their own gain.** [117] A 2011 *USA Today* investigation of six states and Washington DC found 1,610 suspicious anomalies in year-over-year test score gains. [26] A confidential Jan. 2009 memo, prepared for the DC school system by an outside analyst and uncovered in Apr. 2013, revealed that 191 teachers in 70 DC public schools were "implicated in possible testing infractions," and nearly all the teachers at one DC elementary school "had students whose test papers showed high numbers of wrong-to-right erasures," according to *USA Today*. [155] 178 Atlanta public school teachers and administrators from 44 schools were found to be cheating on standardized tests according to a July 2011 state report. At one school,

teachers attended "weekend pizza parties" to correct students' answers, according to ABC News. [158] Ultimately in Apr. 2015, 11 of those district employees were convicted of racketeering, which carries a sentence of up to 20 years in prison. [159]

18. **Standardized tests are an imprecise measure of teacher performance, yet they are used to reward and punish teachers.** According to a Sep. 2010 report by the Annenberg Institute for School Reform, over 17% of Houston teachers ranked in the top category on the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills reading test were ranked among the two lowest categories on the equivalent Stanford Achievement Test. The results "were based on the same students, tested in the same subject, at approximately the same time of year, using two different tests." [30]
19. **Each state develops its own NCLB standards and assessments, providing no basis for meaningful comparison.** A student sitting for the Connecticut Mastery Test (CMT) is asked a completely different set of questions from a child in California taking the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) test, and while the former includes essay questions, the latter is entirely multiple-choice. [120]
20. **Open-ended questions on standardized tests are often graded by under-paid temporary workers with no educational training.** Scorers make \$11-\$13 per hour and need only a bachelor's degree, not necessarily related to education. As one former test scorer stated, "all it takes to become a test scorer is a bachelor's degree, a lack of a steady job, and a willingness to throw independent thinking out the window..." [97]
21. **Schools feeling the pressure of NCLB's 100% proficiency requirement are "gaming the system" to raise test scores,** according to an Arizona State University report in the June 22, 2009, edition of the peer-reviewed *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*. [141] Low-performing students are "encouraged to stay home" on test days or "counseled to quit or be suspended" before tests are administered. State education boards are "lowering the bar": manipulating exam content or scoring so that tests are easier for students to pass. [141]
22. **An obsession with testing robs children of their childhoods.** NCLB's mandate begins in third grade, but schools test younger students so they will get used to taking tests. [13] Mar. 2009 research from the Alliance for Childhood showed "time for play in most public kindergartens has dwindled to the vanishing point, replaced by lengthy lessons and standardized testing." [21] A three-year study completed in Oct. 2010 by the Gesell Institute of Human Development showed that increased emphasis on testing is making "children feel like failures now as early as PreK..." [20]

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence presents 22 strong arguments for an affirmative speech. You can choose one to build a speech around or combine a few. Either way, these arguments are solid points to hit on in an affirmative speech.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article presents tons of great arguments in affirmation of this bill. Ultimately, all of the evidence says that standardized testing isn't working. It puts unrealistic burdens on teachers and students alike, without ever improving academic achievement. You can also argue that standardized tests aren't even "standardized." The tests vary from state to state and are costing states millions of dollars annually. If you take an affirmative stance. Another argument is that money currently going towards standardized testing would be better spent elsewhere.

The second piece of evidence presents 22 strong arguments for an affirmative speech. You can choose one to build a speech around or combine a few. Either way, these arguments are solid points to hit on in an affirmative speech.

Negative Evidence

NEG- 22 Reasons to Keep Standardized Tests

ProCon.org, "Is The Use of Standardized Tests Improving Education in America," Accessed October 18, 2015 <http://www.standardizedtests.procon.org/#background>

1. **93% of studies on student testing, including the use of large-scale and high-stakes standardized tests, found a "positive effect" on student achievement**, according to a peer-reviewed, 100-year analysis of testing research completed in 2011 by testing scholar Richard P. Phelps. [138]
2. **Standardized tests are reliable and objective measures of student achievement.** Without them, policy makers would have to rely on tests scored by individual schools and teachers who have a vested interest in producing favorable results. Multiple-choice tests, in particular, are graded by machine and therefore are not subject to human subjectivity or bias. [55]
3. **20 school systems that "have achieved significant, sustained, and widespread gains" on national and international assessments used "proficiency targets for each school" and "frequent, standardized testing to monitor system progress,"** according to a Nov. 2010 report by McKinsey & Company, a global management consulting firm. [146]
4. **Standardized tests are inclusive and non-discriminatory because they ensure content is equivalent for all students.** Former Washington, DC, schools chancellor Michelle Rhee argues that using alternate tests for minorities or exempting children with disabilities would be unfair to those students: "You can't separate them, and to try to do so creates two, unequal systems, one with accountability and one without it. This is a civil rights issue." [103]
5. **China has along tradition of standardized testing and leads the world in educational achievement.** China displaced Finland as number one in reading, math, and science when Shanghai debuted on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) rankings in 2009. [150] Despite calls for a reduction in standardized testing, China's testing regimen remains firmly in place. [139] Chester E. Finn, Jr., Chairman of the Hoover Institution's Koret Task Force on K–12 Education, predicts that Chinese cities will top the PISA charts for the next several decades. [150]
6. **"Teaching to the test" can be a good thing because it focuses on essential content and skills, eliminates time-wasting activities that don't produce learning gains, and motivates students to excel.** [18] The US Department of Education stated in Nov. 2004 that "if teachers cover subject matter required by the standards and teach it well, then students will master the material on which they will be tested--and probably much more." [19]
7. **Standardized tests are not narrowing the curriculum, rather they are focusing it on important basic skills all students need to master.** According to a study in the Oct. 28, 2005, issue of the peer-reviewed *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, teachers in four Minnesota school districts said standardized testing had a positive impact, improving the quality of the curriculum while raising student

achievement. [116]

8. **Increased testing does not force teachers to encourage "drill n' kill" rote learning.** According to a study in the Oct. 28, 2005, issue of the peer-reviewed *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, good teachers understand that "isolated drills on the types of items expected on the test" are unacceptable, and principals interviewed said "they would sanction any teacher caught teaching to the test." [116] In any case, research has shown that drilling students does not produce test score gains: "teaching a curriculum aligned to state standards and using test data as feedback produces higher test scores than an instructional emphasis on memorization and test-taking skills." [18]
9. **Most parents approve of standardized tests.** A June-July 2013 Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research poll found that 75% of parents say standardized tests "are a solid measure of their children's abilities" and 69% say the tests "are a good measure of the schools' quality." 93% of parents say standardized tests "should be used to identify areas where students need extra help" and 61% say their children "take an appropriate number of standardized tests." [2]
10. **Testing is not too stressful for students.** The US Department of Education stated: "Although testing may be stressful for some students, testing is a normal and expected way of assessing what students have learned." [19] A Nov. 2001 University of Arkansas study found that "the vast majority of students do not exhibit stress and have positive attitudes towards standardized testing programs." [5] Young students vomit at their desks for a variety of reasons, but only in rare cases is this the result of testing anxiety. [6]
11. **Most students believe standardized tests are fair.** A June 2006 Public Agenda survey of 1,342 public school students in grades 6-12 found that 71% of students think the number of tests they have to take is "about right" and 79% believe test questions are fair. [22] The 2002 edition of the survey found that "virtually all students say they take the tests seriously and more than half (56 percent) say they take them very seriously." [108]
12. **Most teachers acknowledge the importance of standardized tests and do not feel their teaching has been compromised.** In a 2009 Scholastic/Gates Foundation survey, 81% of US public school teachers said state-required standardized tests were at least "somewhat important" as a measure of students' academic achievement, and 27% said they were "very important" or "absolutely essential." [111] 73% of teachers surveyed in a Mar. 2002 Public Agenda study said they "have not neglected regular teaching duties for test preparation." [108]
13. **Standardized tests provide a lot of useful information at low cost, and consume little class time.** [134] According to a 2002 paper by Caroline M. Hoxby, PhD, the Scott and Donya Bommer Professor in Economics at Stanford University, standardized tests cost less than 0.1% of K-12 education spending, totaling \$5.81 per student per year: "Even if payments were 10 times as large, they would still not be equal to 1 percent of what American jurisdictions spend on education." [135] Other cost estimates range from \$15-\$33 per student per year by the nonpartisan US Government Accountability Office (GAO), to as low as \$2 per student per year by testing scholar and economist Richard P. Phelps. [55] A 50-item standardized test can be given in an

hour [134] and is graded instantaneously by computer.

14. **Most teachers and administrators approve of standardized tests.** Minnesota teachers and administrators interviewed for a study in the Oct. 28, 2005, issue of the peer-reviewed *Education Policy Analysis Archives (EPAA)* approved of standardized tests "by an overwhelming two-to-one margin," saying they "improved student attitudes, engagement, and effort." [116] An oft-cited Arizona State University study in *EPAA's* Mar. 28, 2002 edition, concluding that testing has little educational merit, has been discredited by educational researchers for poor methodology, and was criticized for wrongly blaming the tests themselves for stagnant test scores, rather than the shortcomings of teachers and schools. [152]
15. **The multiple-choice format used on standardized tests produces accurate information necessary to assess and improve American schools.** According to the Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, multiple-choice questions can provide "highly reliable test scores" and an "objective measurement of student achievement." [131] Today's multiple-choice tests are more sophisticated than their predecessors. The Center for Public Education, a national public school advocacy group, says many "multiple-choice tests now require considerable thought, even notes and calculations, before choosing a bubble." [39]
16. **Stricter standards and increased testing are better preparing school students for college.** In Jan. 1998, Public Agenda found that 66% of college professors said "elementary and high schools expect students to learn too little." By Mar. 2002, after a surge in testing and the passing of NCLB, that figure dropped to 47% "in direct support of higher expectations, strengthened standards and better tests." [34] [108]
17. **Teacher-graded assessments are inadequate alternatives to standardized tests because they are subjectively scored and unreliable.** Most teachers are not trained in testing and measurement, and research has shown many teachers "consider noncognitive outcomes, including student class participation, perceived effort, progress over the period of the course, and comportment," which are irrelevant to subject-matter mastery. [105]
18. **Cheating by teachers and administrators on standardized tests is rare, and not a reason to stop testing America's children.** The Mar. 2011 *USA Today* investigation of scoring anomalies in six states and Washington DC was inconclusive, and found compelling suggestions of impropriety in only one school. [118] The US Department of Education's Office of Inspector General said on Jan. 7, 2013 that an investigation had found no evidence of widespread cheating on the DC Comprehensive Assessment System tests. [156] It is likely that some cheating occurs, but some people cheat on their tax returns also, and the solution is not to abolish taxation. [152]
19. **Each state's progress on NCLB tests can be meaningfully compared.** Even though tests are developed by states independently, state scores are compared with results on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), ensuring each state's assessments are equally challenging and that gains in a state's test scores are valid. [57]

20. **State-mandated standardized tests help prevent "social promotion," the practice of allowing students to advance from grade to grade whether or not they have met the academic standards of their grade level.** [136] A Dec. 2004 paper by the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research found Florida's 2002 initiative to end social promotion, holding back students who failed year-end standardized tests, improved those students' scores by 9% in math and 4% in reading after one year. [137]
21. **Many objections voiced by the anti-testing movement are really objections to NCLB's use of test results, not to standardized tests themselves.** Prominent testing critic Diane Ravitch, Research Professor of Education at New York University, concedes standardized testing has value: "Testing... is not the problem... information derived from tests can be extremely valuable, if the tests are valid and reliable." She cites the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) as a positive example, and says tests can "inform educational leaders and policy-makers about the progress of the education system as a whole." [1]
22. **Physicians, lawyers, real-estate brokers and pilots all take high-stakes standardized tests to ensure they have the necessary knowledge for their professions.** [23] If standardized tests were an unreliable source of data, their use would not be so widespread.

TAKEAWAY- This piece of evidence presents 22 strong arguments in favor of standardized testing. If you speak in negation of this bill, you can use one or combine several to make a solid negative speech.

NEG- Standardized Tests Make Better Students and Teachers

Astros Temple Education, "The Pros of Standardized Testing," Accessed October 18, 2015, <
<http://astro.temple.edu/~mhicks/standardizedtestingpro.html> >

"Standardized testing provides students with better feedback about their own level of knowledge and skills. It also helps students to associate personal effort with rewards and motivates them to work harder in school. The testing and its feedback send clearer signals to students about what they need to study.

Standardized testing motivates teachers to work harder and more effectively. They can better identify areas of strength and weakness in their teaching plans and then can restructure them. They can also identify what content was not mastered by students and see which students have the greatest needs. Teachers will be more motivated to participate in professional development and support services to improve their instruction.

There is also evidence to suggest that the practice of standardized testing promotes "the development of mentoring relationships between teachers and students." Changes can be seen in the attitudes among staff, as well. Testing promotes greater cohesion among teachers, an openness to new ideas, and esprit de corps. The establishment of a link between teacher performance and student learning is essential to effective schools in America."

TAKEAWAY – This article says that standardized tests help both students and teachers. Students have a clear rubric to test their knowledge. If they see that they are falling behind, they can ask for extra help. Standardized tests are motivating for students. For teachers, standardized tests motivate them to be better teachers. They can identify where they are weaker and improve on their methods. Research shows that standardized tests promote the mentoring relationship between students and teachers, and they also promote comradery

amongst teachers. You can argue that we shouldn't eliminate something that unifies students and teachers. Standardized tests are good for everyone, so we shouldn't pass this legislation.

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence presents 22 strong arguments in favor of standardized testing. If you speak in negation of this bill, you can use one or combine several to make a solid negative speech.

The second article says that standardized tests help both students and teachers. Students have a clear rubric to test their knowledge. If they see that they are falling behind, they can ask for extra help. Standardized tests are motivating for students. For teachers, standardized tests motivate them to be better teachers. They can identify where they are weaker and improve on their methods. Research shows that standardized tests promote the mentoring relationship between students and teachers, and they also promote comradery amongst teachers. You can argue that we shouldn't eliminate something that unifies students and teachers. Standardized tests are good for everyone, so we shouldn't pass this legislation.

Legislation – A Resolution to Repeal the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States and Japan
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Japan-US Relations in Good Shape

Foreign Policy “How Strong Is the U.S.-Japan Relationship?” Bruce Stokes, April 14, 2015 <
<http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/04/14/united-states-japan-relationship-poll-washington-tokyo/>>

“Looking ahead, Americans generally support keeping the U.S. relationship with Japan about where it is, both economically and strategically. When asked whether they would prefer the United States to be closer to Japan, less close, or about as close to Japan as it has been in recent years, 38 percent say closer, 45 percent say about as close, and only 13 percent would like to distance the United States from Japan. There is, however, a generation gap in viewing the future of the relationship: 41 percent of younger Americans would like to see closer ties, but only 27 percent of older Americans would. And there is partisan disagreement on the trajectory of the relationship with Japan: Democrats (41 percent) are more likely than Republicans (30 percent) to support closer ties.

China looms large in the minds of both Americans and Japanese in their consideration of the U.S.-Japan relationship. Only 30 percent of Americans and just 7 percent of Japanese trust China. One reason Americans may trust China more is that only 16 percent say they have heard a lot about territorial disputes between China and neighboring countries...

... At the same time, the American public is divided over whether Japan should play a more active military role in helping to maintain peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region: 47 percent would like to see Tokyo take a more active role and 43 percent would prefer that Japan limit its role. Americans who trust Japan are more likely to want to see Tokyo play a greater strategic role in the region. And Americans who do not trust China are also more likely to want to see Japan take on more of the military burden in Asia...

Japan and the United States have deeply rooted economic and strategic bonds. But, since both nations are functioning democracies, those ties also depend on the attitudes of the Japanese and American people. Seven decades after a horrific war, and despite serious trade frictions in the past and a new challenge posed by China, Americans and Japanese share a mutual trust and respect that is the glue of the relationship.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about public opinion of US-Japan relations, and also talks about the actual state of relations between the two countries. Japan is one of the United States’ biggest allies, and we work hand-in-hand on many fronts. The act in question holds our relationship back, and doesn’t allow Japan to have more control over its own defenses. To show that we are confident in our relationship with Japan, we must repeal this act as a sign of solidarity, and reinforce the trust we have in their nation.*

AFF – Japan is Held Back by American Control

Japan Times “Dependence day: Japan’s lopsided relationship with Washington” Karel Van Wolferen, August 15, 2015 <
<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/08/15/national/history/dependence-day-japans-lopsided-relationship-washington/#.Vhs4AflVhBd>>

“Of all the post-World War II changes in Japan, the most momentous is that it never regained the status of a genuinely independent country.

Tokyo cannot act freely by choosing what is likely to be most beneficial for itself or the region. Productive diplomacy between Japan and its neighbors is obstructed because of limitations imposed by a United States that treats Japan as if it were a protectorate rather than a sovereign country. Having followed the dynamics of the U.S.-Japan relationship for more than half a century, I can only conclude that Japan bends to American wishes because its representatives do not insist that it be treated as a sovereign state. Washington can get away with bullying Japan because it knows that national pride is not a problem with either media or political representatives. Some scrutiny of recent history makes that again very obvious...

... The lopsided relationship of the two nations and Japan’s fundamental subservience, which Hatoyama had wanted to do something about, had for decades worked very well. It is unlikely that Japan would have had its proverbial economic miracle without it. Washington allowed Japan to wall off its financial system from the rest of the world, and allowed full-speed expansion of Japanese market shares in the U.S. to the considerable disadvantage of American domestic industry...

... The world that witnessed the birth of the Cold War alliance no longer exists. Most importantly, Japan’s foreign affairs and defense bureaucrats, and politicians who make it to the U.S.-Japan interface are no longer dealing with the same country they dealt with and could manipulate to a considerable extent for decades.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how Japan has their hands tied by American control over their policy making, including militarily. Japan hasn’t been allowed to become a true independent country again, since this agreement was put in place. The article also goes on to say that the two countries are completely different than they used to be, and it’s important now for Japan to develop itself as a prominent figure in the international community. This agreement, and ones like it, were important to keep Japan secure and to build the relationship between the United States and Japan. That job is done, and it’s time to move on.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about public opinion of US-Japan relations, and also talks about the actual state of relations between the two countries. Japan is one of the United States' biggest allies, and we work hand-in-hand on many fronts. The act in question holds our relationship back, and doesn't allow Japan to have more control over its own defenses. To show that we are confident in our relationship with Japan, we must repeal this act as a sign of solidarity, and reinforce the trust we have in their nation.

The second article talks about how Japan has their hands tied by American control over their policy making, including militarily. Japan hasn't been allowed to become a true independent country again, since this agreement was put in place. The article also goes on to say that the two countries are completely different than they used to be, and it's important now for Japan to develop itself as a prominent figure in the international community. This agreement, and ones like it, were important to keep Japan secure and to build the relationship between the United States and Japan. That job is done, and it's time to move on.

Negative Evidence

NEG – US Presence in Japan Important

Council on Foreign Relations “The U.S.-Japan Security Alliance” Beina Xu, July 1, 2014 <
<http://www.cfr.org/japan/us-japan-security-alliance/p31437>>

“At the time, the United States was keen on keeping its presence in Japan and using the alliance to bolster its strategic presence in East Asia. It faced a divided Korean peninsula in the wake of the Korean War, and a Cold War climate in which Chinese and Soviet militaries were expanding their breadth and capabilities. Against this security backdrop, Yoshida's government created the Self-Defense Force (SDF) in 1954, despite strong domestic objections based on Article Nine of the postwar constitution, which eschews the maintenance of military forces or the use of those forces to settle international disputes.

"With the ebb and flow of what's going on in the region, these are two countries that are highly incentivized to make this work." —Jennifer Lind

Japan had assumed a minimal military role within the alliance in the early post–World War II years, interpreting the constitution to prevent the overseas deployment of Japanese troops. The value of the security pact to Washington, however, was the use of Japanese bases that allowed for the forward deployment of U.S. forces in Asia. The U.S. military used Japanese bases for combat operations during the Vietnam War, which drew vehement opposition in Japan and triggered fears of entrapment within the security alliance. In 1967, then prime minister Sato Eisaku enacted the Three Non-Nuclear Principles—no possession, production, or introduction—in part to allay concerns that the presence of nuclear arms on U.S. bases in Japan would expose the country to attacks. Since then, Japan has relied on the U.S. nuclear umbrella for extended deterrence.

In the 1970s, Japan began to increase its role within the alliance, while the United States disengaged from the Vietnam War. In 1976, Japan put out a National Defense Program Outline, its first comprehensive postwar defense strategy. Two years later, the 1978 Guidelines for Defense Cooperation it signed with the United States established a framework for the roles between the two militaries for Japan's defense. Washington and Tokyo began joint studies on interoperability and, most notably, launched joint training and exercises. The 1990–91 Gulf War prompted a new debate in Japan about SDF participation in UN-sponsored peacekeeping operations. A new law was adopted stipulating the conditions for SDF deployment abroad in UN peacekeeping operations, and the first SDF unit was sent to Cambodia...

... Some experts have defined the modern-day alliance to be more inclusive, advocating initiatives such as trade and energy cooperation as the road to a future framework. "This is bigger than just the military. These are instruments we use to improve our own national prosperity and security, and that's fundamentally what this alliance should be about," Smith says.

The multilateral Trans-Pacific Partnership has been a highly promising economic development that observers hope will tighten the alliance. After the Fukushima nuclear disaster forced Japan to reconsider its energy policies, Washington agreed to a long-term

liquefied natural gas export deal with Japan that could see the United States become a supplier for the island country.

"This is the most relevant the alliance has been in a long time," says Lind. "With the ebb and flow of what's going on in the region, these are two countries that are highly incentivized to make this work."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan is necessary to a continued relationship with Japan. First, it is important to maintain a presence in Asia, and this allows us to do that. Second, we utilize our military umbrella to continue a positive and healthy relationship with Japan that reaches farther than just military. Beyond that, Japan does have a military, and it should remain a priority of the United States to keep a stronghold in Asia and to continue to help protect Japan.*

NEG – New Agreement with Japan Solves for Legislation Issues

USNI News “Inside the New U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines” Kyle Mizokami, April 29, 2015 <
<http://news.usni.org/2015/04/29/inside-the-new-u-s-japan-defense-guidelines>>

“On Monday the United States and Japan agreed to the most sweeping changes to their bilateral alliance in more than fifty years. The so-called “2+2” Security Consultative Committee (SCC), consisting of the U.S. secretary of state, and secretary of defense, and Japan’s foreign minister and defense minister agreed to a series of initiatives that will draw the two allies even closer in defense and security matters.

The SCC agreed on the so-called Guidelines for Japan-U.S. Defense Cooperation, which will supplement the 1960 Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between Japan and the United States of America. The overall goal is tighter, more seamless cooperation between the two countries on a raft of security issues, from ballistic-missile defense to mutual logistical support and cyber warfare.

The primary benefit to the United States will be a more capable alliance partner, as the Japan Self-Defense Forces (SDF) will be empowered to protect American assets and work more closely with their American counterparts. On the Japanese side, the agreement will help Japan break out of constraints on the SDF and the use of force, in line with Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s vision of normalizing Japan’s security situation...

...The cornerstone of the U.S.-Japan alliance continues to be a joint dedication to the defense of Japan. Under the guidelines, in the event Japan were to come under some form of attack, Japan would assume primary responsibility for its own defense, including its surrounding waters and airspace, and air and maritime approaches. This also includes chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) attacks. The United States would provide a supporting and supplementary role.

The guidelines allude to an offensive role for United States forces in wartime. “The United States will take actions to shape the regional environment in a way that supports the defense of Japan and reestablishes peace and security.” That is a reference to offensive action leading to a termination of hostilities, activities the SDF cannot constitutionally provision themselves to conduct.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how there is a new agreement in place between the United States and Japan that allows Japan to be more responsible for its own defense. This is necessary in the current political climate, but also solves for the issues presented in this legislation. There is no point in repealing the act in question, because it doesn't present the same issues illustrated in the status quo.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security between the United States and Japan is necessary to a continued relationship with Japan. First, it is important to maintain a presence in Asia, and this allows us to do that. Second, we utilize our military umbrella to continue a positive and healthy relationship with Japan that reaches farther than just military. Beyond that, Japan does have a military, and it should remain a priority of the United States to keep a stronghold in Asia and to continue to help protect Japan.

The second article talks about how there is a new agreement in place between the United States and Japan that allows Japan to be more responsible for its own defense. This is necessary in the current political climate, but also solves for the issues presented in this legislation. There is no point in repealing the act in question, because it doesn't present the same issues illustrated in the status quo.

Legislation – A Resolution to Legalize Marijuana to Limit Crowding in our
Jails and Prisons
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Marijuana Legalization Does Not Increase Teen Use

Washington Post “Teen pot use holds steady in first year of legal weed, new federal data show”
Christopher Ingraham, September 10, 2015 <
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonkblog/wp/2015/09/10/teen-pot-use-holds-steady-in-first-year-of-legal-weed-new-federal-data-show/>>

“Many opponents of legalization have warned that legal weed would lead to a spike in the number of teenagers using and abusing the substance. New Jersey Governor Chris Christie has frequently said that legalization would "send the wrong message" to kids. Federal drug czars have often echoed a similar refrain.

But these numbers suggest that so far, national conversations about marijuana legalization haven't led to an increase in teen use. This comports with the best available research on marijuana laws, which finds that marijuana laws have so far had little impact on overall teen use trends.

Nationally, 7.4 percent of kids age 12 to 17 use marijuana monthly, according to SAMHSA's new numbers. That's up by 0.3 percentage points from the prior year, a change that SAMHSA says is not statistically significant, but still significantly lower than levels seen in the early 2000s. There has, however, been a significant increase in the number of adults age 26+ smoking weed monthly, from 5.6 percent in 2013 to 6.6 percent in 2014.

The implication is that marijuana legalization in Colorado and Washington has had little to no effect on national teen marijuana use trends, but perhaps has contributed to the increase seen in adult marijuana use. SAMHSA will release state-level numbers later this year, which will give a clearer picture of what's happening in Colorado and Washington.

If you're an advocate of loosening marijuana laws , this is exactly what you want to see -- more adults using a substance that's now legally available to them, with little impact on teen use.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how marijuana legalization has not affected teen use. While adult numbers have increased, one of the biggest arguments against marijuana legalization would be that it increased the use of marijuana with teenagers and pre-teens. That hasn't been the case. Legalization of marijuana has had major effects on local economies, in a positive way, but have not had the negative effects that the negative would like you to believe. As the affirmative, you should argue that national legalization wouldn't increase teen use, either, but would do a lot to increase jobs, pump money into our local economies, and lower the national debt.*

AFF – National Legalization Would Make a Thriving Business Even More Successful

CBS News, 60 Minutes Interview “The Marijuana Effect” Bill Whitaker, January 11, 2015 <
<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/colorado-pot-marijuana-60-minutes/>>

“Update: According to new data released by Colorado and analyzed by the Marijuana Policy Group, Colorado's recreational dispensaries are estimated to ring up \$295 million in sales and \$51 million in tax revenue in 2014...

... Bill Whitaker: I mean, you say you're a business person. I think some parents would look at this and say, "She's just peddling drugs."

Meg Sanders: I can tell you that the drug dealer, illegal drug dealer on the corner in any state in this nation isn't carding, isn't checking your ID, isn't making sure you have a medical marijuana card or you're over 21. This industry does it every day, the stats show it. We've done a phenomenal job.

Mindful expects to rake in \$18 million this year, but it's not easy money. Colorado requires every plant grown by a licensed operator to be tracked from seed to sale. Each one has a barcoded radio frequency ID tag and is logged into a statewide database. Cameras watch it all. The goal is to keep every bud and bit off the black market...

... But the biggest cloud over the industry is banking. As long as the federal government continues to count pot proceeds as illegal drug money, most banks won't touch it. So Colorado's billion dollar marijuana industry is conducted almost entirely in cash: that's why Meg Sanders keeps a two-ton safe.

Bill Whitaker: So your payroll was in cash?

Meg Sanders: Payroll, rent.

Bill Whitaker: Taxes?

Meg Sanders: Taxes, licensing fees, Home Depot, vendors, you name it, our - our electrician, absolutely.

Bill Whitaker: All in cash?

Meg Sanders: Absolutely. From a public safety standpoint, it's definitely the number one issue that this industry faces...

... Today, you can walk into a Mindful dispensary and buy a joint for \$14.53. Business is good. Sanders is planning to expand.

Meg Sanders: We're creating. We're saying, "Please, trust us. We know that we can do this right."

Bill Whitaker: I do I remember when this was rolled out everyone thought that the sky was going to fall.

Meg Sanders: It's still there. (laugh) It didn't fall. And business is thriving. And the customers are still coming through the door. So clearly, if I'm looking at my business and I'm looking at those around me, the consumer is saying, "Yeah, this works."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how much money marijuana legalization has brought into the state of Colorado, and how profitable marijuana is. Of course, that’s an easy sell. We know that marijuana legalization would bring in a lot of money, and would help solve a lot of the economic issues the United States is facing. As the affirmative, you should also argue that the state of Colorado would be even more profitable and free from corruption, thus free to grow and prosper, with national support. If the entire country were to legalize marijuana, we could increase job growth, increase money going into the economy, and decrease the national debt. On top of that, it would make a thriving business (like the one in Colorado) even more successful! Overall, it’s a win-win situation for this Congress, and we should be in affirmation of this bill.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how marijuana legalization has not affected teen use. While adult numbers have increased, one of the biggest arguments against marijuana legalization would be that it increased the use of marijuana with teenagers and pre-teens. That hasn't been the case. Legalization of marijuana has had major effects on local economies, in a positive way, but have not had the negative effects that the negative would like you to believe. As the affirmative, you should argue that national legalization wouldn't increase teen use, either, but would do a lot to increase jobs, pump money into our local economies, and lower the national debt.

The second article talks about how much money marijuana legalization has brought into the state of Colorado, and how profitable marijuana is. Of course, that's an easy sell. We know that marijuana legalization would bring in a lot of money, and would help solve a lot of the economic issues the United States is facing. As the affirmative, you should also argue that the state of Colorado would be even more profitable and free from corruption, thus free to grow and prosper, with national support. If the entire country were to legalize marijuana, we could increase job growth, increase money going into the economy, and decrease the national debt. On top of that, it would make a thriving business (like the one in Colorado) even more successful! Overall, it's a win-win situation for this Congress, and we should be in affirmation of this bill.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Negative Effects of Legal Pot

Fox News “Federally funded agency warns states considering legal pot” Kelly David Burke, October 7, 2015 < <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2015/10/07/federal-agency-warns-states-considering-legal-pot/>>

“States considering legalizing recreational marijuana should think again. That is the message of a federally funded agency which recently released a report on the negative effects of legal pot in Colorado.

"[Traffic] fatalities related to marijuana, it showed about a 28 percent increase [since legalization]," said Tom Gorman, director of the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, which compiled the report.

He said it also showed hospitalizations went up about 36 percent while "marijuana-related ER" visits went up around 30 percent. "Poison control calls [had] about a 72 percent increase. And all of this is within a year's period of time," he said.

RMHIDT is a federal grant program administered by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy that works with local, state and federal law enforcement agencies to fight the trafficking of illegal drugs. For its report, "The Legalization of Marijuana in Colorado, The Impact," it compiled statistics from local, state and national databases.

Gorman said what was found should make other states considering legalization reconsider. "Look at Colorado really close and say ... is that something we want to do?"...

... Gorman notes the report is always candid about the limitations of the data it uses, but says the overall trend the report shows is likely not what Colorado voters were hoping for when they passed an amendment to the state Constitution allowing recreational marijuana sales.

"I don't really think they thought about a whole industry growing up. I don't think they thought about the home grows in neighborhoods. If you look at the number of jurisdictions [in Colorado] who have now banned retail stores you're talking around 70 percent, so what is that telling you?"

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the many negative effects of marijuana legalization in Colorado, which is a place where we can learn a lot about this particular issue. The information is pretty damning. As the negative, you should argue that we need to think about this more seriously before just passing it for financial reasons. While this is a cash-cow, what would it do to our national population? Do we need another legal drug on the street? Do we need to profit from the loss of people's lives? People legalized alcohol for the same reason, but as we know, driving under the influence of alcohol impairs perception. Marijuana does the same thing. This isn't something we should consider unless we're willing to deal with those consequences.*

NEG – Marijuana Legalization in Colorado Paints a Bleak Picture for National Legalization

Newsweek “The Unexpected Side Effects of Legalizing Weed” Marjorie Haun, June 6, 2015 <
<http://www.newsweek.com/unexpected-side-effects-legalizing-weed-339931>>

“Amendment 64 was approved of by 55 percent of Colorado voters in 2012. Promoted as a revenue-generating “regulate marijuana like alcohol” measure, its passage and ensuing repercussions caught many by surprise. Regulating marijuana like alcohol, it appears, is a breathtaking oversimplification of what is required to turn an illegal intoxicant into a viable commodity.

The citizen-led ballot initiative behind Amendment 64 went beyond simple decriminalization and created a new civil right by encoding the possession and use of pot into the Colorado State Constitution...

... Some farmers have expressed alarm over the potential of marijuana growing operations in close proximity to established crops. Plans for a medical marijuana facility in Palisade, a tiny farming town whose main crop is peaches, have peach growers worried about the potential spread of pests, molds and fungi from cannabis to their established orchards. The agricultural implications of the cannabis industry, it seems, were not a consideration at the time it became a legal crop.

The wave of enthusiasm following the passage of Amendment 64 has given way to a drip, drip, drip of unintended consequences. Law-enforcement issues, such as marijuana-intoxicated driving and the illegal movement of vast amounts of cannabis product into other states, are the tip of the iceberg.

Social and law-enforcement issues resulting from the Colorado interstate pot pipeline prompted Nebraska and Oklahoma to file lawsuits against the state, citing the fact that marijuana commerce violates federal law and increases the burdens of law enforcement in other states.

Other symptoms of Colorado’s pot culture include increased use among teens, resulting in educational problems in middle schools and high schools, a spike in “edibles”-related emergency room visits, consumption by children and pets resulting in illness and death and regulatory confusion surrounding public consumption and enforcement.

Colorado’s addiction to cannabis revenue may prove to be the most harmful implication of all. Towns such as De Beque, where cannabis is replacing coal and cattle as a means of income, imperil themselves by staking the future on a substance that is still illegal in most states and that half of Americans still regard as a social evil.

In 2014 and 2015, nearly \$6 million in pot revenues have been distributed to local governments. But the cost of increased law enforcement, drugged-driving incidents, fatal crashes, loss of productivity and a huge spike in gang-related crime bring into question the cost-benefit of those dollars.

Teen drug-related school expulsions are also on the rise. And the notion that prisons filled with minor drug offenders would be relieved of overcrowding—a selling point of legalizing marijuana—has been blown to smithereens.

Denver's homeless population has exploded since Amendment 64 went into effect. And there are indications that finite tourist dollars are going more to pot and less to Colorado's iconic natural wonders.

Cannabis is an intoxicant, proven to be dangerous to adolescents who use regularly, as well as to adults who are addicted to its calming, high-producing chemical, THC. But building a tax empire on a narcotic substance may be a dangerous proposition for the Centennial State.

Colorado's Cannabis-Industrial Complex cannot sustain a complex economy traditionally built on natural resources, agriculture, innovation and family-friendly tourism. The eyes of other states eager to legalize pot should be firmly fixed on the unfolding saga of towns such as Denver, Boulder and De Beque, Colo."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the unintended consequences of legalizing marijuana in Colorado, and how it paints a not-so-flattering picture of national legalization. From increased use among teens, that leads to suspensions and lack of motivation, to overdosing on edibles, and traffic accident-related fatality increases, to creating an economic environment that solely depends on marijuana sales, to the complicated law processes that had to be invented after marijuana legalization, the federal government would have a lot to deal with if we passed this bill. If we think about the situation in Colorado as a pilot study of whether or not this will work, then we should argue that we shouldn't pass this bill, because there have been a lot of negative effects of legalization that the general public didn't perceive originally. In fact, it would also be a very unpopular decision, with support for legalization split right down the middle. This isn't a decision this congress should feel comfortable about making. There isn't enough information from the affirmative to prove this would be a worthy endeavor. But there's a lot of evidence from the negative side that proves it would be an unwise decision.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about the many negative effects of marijuana legalization in Colorado, which is a place where we can learn a lot about this particular issue. The information is pretty damning. As the negative, you should argue that we need to think about this more seriously before just passing it for financial reasons. While this is a cash-cow, what would it do to our national population? Do we need another legal drug on the street? Do we need to profit from the loss of people's lives? People legalized alcohol for the same reason, but as we know, driving under the influence of alcohol impairs perception. Marijuana does the same thing. This isn't something we should consider unless we're willing to deal with those consequences.

The second article talks about the unintended consequences of legalizing marijuana in Colorado, and how it paints a not-so-flattering picture of national legalization. From increased use among teens, that leads to suspensions and lack of motivation, to overdosing on edibles, and traffic accident-related fatality increases, to creating an economic environment that solely depends on marijuana sales, to the complicated law processes that had to be invented after marijuana legalization, the federal government would have a lot to deal with if we passed this bill. If we think about the situation in Colorado as a pilot study of whether or not this will work, then we should argue that we shouldn't pass this bill, because there have been a lot of negative effects of legalization that the general public didn't perceive originally. In fact, it would also be a very unpopular decision, with support for legalization split right down the middle. This isn't a decision this congress should feel comfortable about making. There isn't enough information from the affirmative to prove this would be a worthy endeavor. But there's a lot of evidence from the negative side that proves it would be an unwise decision.

Legislation – A Bill to Ban Helium to Consumers Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Helium cannot be Manufactured. Once it's Gone, it's Gone

The Guardian “Should we ban helium balloons?” Homa Khaleeli, December 12, 2014
<<http://www.theguardian.com/science/shortcuts/2014/dec/11/should-we-ban-helium-balloons>>

“If Christmas feels a bit flat this year, perhaps we should be blaming [Peter Wothers](#). The Cambridge University chemist is calling for a ban on helium balloons, claiming we should not be wasting such a precious gas on the party decorations.

Not even the joy to be had in inhaling the gas to make our voices sound squeaky is enough to deflate the scientist's objections – he insists our limited resources should be used for other admittedly more pressing functions of cooling magnets in MRI scanners, or helping newborn babies to breathe.

Wothers will be calling for an end to helium balloons when he gives the [Royal Institution's Christmas lecture](#) this year, calling the scarcity "a really serious issue". "I can imagine that in 50 years' time our children will be saying: 'I can't believe they used such a precious material to fill balloons,'" he says.

And he's not alone – other scientists have warned that helium is becoming so scarce that research that makes use of its cooling power [may have to be limited or stopped](#). Although it is the second most abundant element in the universe, helium cannot be manufactured, and once released into the atmosphere is lost for ever. Most of our supplies are extracted from the earth's crust in the US. In the 1920s the country started stockpiling helium, before eventually selling this off in the 1990s, causing prices to plummet.

Now prices are on the rise again – but Professor Robert Richardson, of Cornell University, New York, who won the Nobel physics prize in 1996 for his research on helium, argues that a helium party balloon should cost £75, to more accurately reflect the true scarcity value of the gas.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article brings to light the limitation of helium on Earth and the scientific evidence that supports these claims. It explains how helium cannot be manufactured, and once released into the atmosphere is lost forever. As the AFF you should argue that anything at risk of become extinct on the planet should be protected in some way. In this case we are talking about a fragile element that has numerous applications in several critical industries.*

AFF – Helium has Value beyond Filling up Balloons

BBC News “Is it right to waste helium on party balloons?” Tim Bowler, November 18, 2013 <<http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-24903034>>

“Some scientists believe a finite resource that could one day run out should not be used for party balloons.

In the universe as a whole, it is one of the commonest elements, second only to hydrogen in its abundance. On Earth it is relatively rare, and one of the few elements that escapes gravity and leaks away into space.

"All of the other elements we've scattered around the globe, maybe we can go digging in garbage dumps to get them back," says chemist Andrea Sella, of University College London (UCL). "But helium is unique. When it's gone it is lost to us forever."

Helium has the lowest boiling point of any element, at -269C, just a few degrees above absolute zero (-273C).

This makes it of key importance for superconducting magnets used in MRI scanners, which must be supercooled to generate the hugely powerful magnetic fields required...

... The United States is currently the world's biggest supplier, with the bulk of it stored near Amarillo, Texas, in the national helium reserve - which alone accounts for 35% of the world's current supply.

This was set up in 1925 as a strategic store for supplying gas to US airships, while after World War Two it provided coolant for missiles and rockets for the military and Nasa.

But since the mid-1990s, with growing civilian demand for helium in the manufacture of semiconductors and for MRI scanners, among other things, the US has been clawing back the cost of storing the gas by gradually selling it off on the open market."

TAKEAWAY – *This article gives a brief history of the consumption, storage and uses of Helium. It says that the US has been storing Helium since the 1920's and we've known of the possible extinction of the gas for many years. As the AFF you should pair this argument with the first article and add on the importance of Helium for the industries that use this precious element. It's used in MRI scanners, semiconductors, and as a coolant for missiles. Compare the use of helium in those industries versus what most consumers use it for-which is filling up balloons.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article brings to light the limitation of helium on Earth and the scientific evidence that supports these claims. It explains how helium cannot be manufactured, and once released into the atmosphere is lost forever. As the AFF you should argue that anything at risk of become extinct on the planet should be protected in some way. In this case we are talking about a fragile element that has numerous applications in several critical industries.

The second article gives a brief history of the consumption, storage and uses of Helium. It says that the US has been storing Helium since the 1920's and we've known of the possible extinction of the gas for many years. As the AFF you should pair this argument with the first article and add on the importance of Helium for the industries that use this precious element. It's used in MRI scanners, semiconductors, and as a coolant for missiles. Compare the use of helium in those industries versus what most consumers use it for-which is filling up balloons

Negative Evidence

NEG – Helium is More Abundant in Mineral Form and can be Utilized Differently

Forbes “We're Really Not About To Run Out Of Helium--No, Please, Stop It, We're Not” Tim Worstall, June 18, 2015 < <http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2015/06/18/were-really-not-about-to-run-out-of-helium-no-please-stop-it-were-not/2/>>

“One of the old favorites among the [things] we’re going to run out of resources stories appears to be raising its head again. The idea that we’re about to run out of helium. I’m afraid this is simply untrue and the reason that people don’t get this is because people just aren’t understanding what a mineral reserve is. The general idea that most people do have is that it’s the reserve of some mineral that’s available to us to use. Which it isn’t: a mineral reserve is an economic concept meaning the amount of a mineral that we’ve got prepared for us all to use in the near future. And it really is an economic concept too: the origins come from stock market listing rules so the entire concept is firmly rooted in the idea of profitability.

Given that I’ve just published an entire book (see the signature link) on this very point I should probably be the person to point out the error in this story. We get a mention of it at Boing Boing and their reference is to Priceonomics. There’s nothing particularly wrong with the piece except that it entirely fails to get to grips with the most basic points about the subject under discussion. They’re right about the National Helium Reserve and so on, but those are the details, not the major points...

... So, the idea that the helium reserve is going to run out in a few decades isn’t really something that worries anyone in the mining industry. Because, as above, reserves are what has been prepared for people to use in the next few decades

However, with helium this all actually gets very much worse. The misunderstanding that is. That first sentence of that conclusion is wrong for example. Helium is in fact a renewable resource. Or at least one that is constantly being generated.

The Earth’s original endowment of helium boiled off into space a few billion years ago. All of the helium currently around has been recently (in geological terms at least) created. It’s the end result of radioactive uranium breaking down. And the Earth is stuffed full of little bits and pieces of uranium all gradually decaying. The 5.something ppm of He in the atmosphere comes from uranium near the surface decaying (as does that radon gas that plagues the basements of houses in granite areas). With uranium that’s deeper down the He will often collect along with natural gas in those reservoirs of that very useful product.

And that’s where that National Helium Reserve comes in. A few wells in the Oklahoma sort of area are comparatively high in He (1.8% by weight). It’s worth compressing this gas in order to be able to get the He out of it. So, that’s what has been done and that’s where the He for the reserve comes from. But this has nothing at all to do with however much helium there is for the human race to use in the future, the size of that reserve. Not just little relationship, or it’s a guide or anything, but absolutely no connection at all.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains helium is replenished in earth’s atmosphere and crust over time. It says that helium is the end result of radioactive uranium breaking down. The Earth is stuffed full of little bits and pieces of uranium all gradually decaying and with uranium that’s deeper down the helium will often collect along with natural gas in those*

reservoirs. As the NEG you should read the article to get better understanding of the process and use this information to impress everyone in the room and support your argument that we are not running out of helium.

NEG – The Rate of Consumption of Helium is Very Low

Forbes “What Great Helium Shortage?” Tim Worstall, August 27, 2012

<<http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2012/08/27/what-great-helium-shortage/>>

“We’re being regaled again with stories about how the world is running out of a resource. This time it’s helium and as ever, the story is driven by people not really understanding what a resource actually is.

Sounds scary, eh? The thing is there’s a confusion here between the current extraction infrastructure and the total amount of the element available to us.

Helium is usually generated as a byproduct of natural gas mining, the shortage could also be attributed in part to the recession which has slowed natural gas production.

The US provides 75 per cent of the six billion cubic feet of helium used worldwide every year.

A pipeline in Texas which provided 30 per cent of the global supply was closed for maintenance in July, with a major Wyoming plant running below capacity since June.

Production shortfalls and repairs at plants in Algeria, Poland and Australia have also hit supplies.

It is absolutely true that prices are currently tight. That parts of the current production system are closed down and thus supplies are lower than usual. However, this is not the same as stating that we’re actually running out of the stuff. The source for the real numbers is, for an element, always the US Geological Survey. Their helium note tells us that current global consumption is around 180 million cubic metres a year. There’s something like 50 billion cubic metres lying around out there. That’s a near 300 year supply at current usage rates.

Another way of putting this is that sure, party balloons are a bit more expensive right now but there’s no worry over whether our great great grandchildren will still be able to have them.

Oh, and by the way, that’s before anyone has got around to trying to check the helium content of all that shale gas being fracked.

TAKEAWAY – *This article looks at the current usage of helium compared to the total amount on the Earth. It says that there’s around 50 billion cubic meters of helium in the Earth’s crust and we consume around 180 million cubic meters a year. That’s a near 300 year supply at current usage rates. As the NEG you should argue that we are nowhere near the end of our helium supply and should focus our efforts on numerous resources that will disappear before helium.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article explains helium is replenished in earth's atmosphere and crust over time. It says that helium is the end result of radioactive uranium breaking down. The Earth is stuffed full of little bits and pieces of uranium all gradually decaying and with uranium that's deeper down the helium will often collect along with natural gas in those reservoirs. As the NEG you should read the article to get better understanding of the process and use this information to impress everyone in the room and support your argument that we are not running out of helium.

The second article looks at the current usage of helium compared to the total amount on the Earth. It says that there's around 50 billion cubic meters of helium in the Earth's crust and we consume around 180 million cubic meters a year. That's a near 300 year supply at current usage rates. As the NEG you should argue that we are nowhere near the end of our helium supply and should focus our efforts on numerous resources that will disappear before helium.

Legislation – A Bill to Implement Income Share Agreements to Improve Higher Education Financing Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Income Share Agreements Better Alternative to Complicated Loan System

US News “9 Things to Know About Income-Share Agreements” Kevin James, August 4, 2015 <
<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/2015/08/04/why-income-share-agreements-can-be-an-alternative-to-student-loans>>

“This sounds a bit like indentured servitude. Is it? As a colleague and I argued earlier this year, income-share agreements are quite the opposite. Indentured servitude involves pledging your future labor – that is, giving up your free will. In contrast, with ISAs (and loans) you're simply getting money now in exchange for agreeing to make payments in the future. A student is free to choose his or her career and even whether or not to work at all.

In fact, because income-share agreements ensure affordable payments, they offer new levels of freedom from the constraints and anxiety associated with traditional student debt. Whereas a student with debt could see his or her career choices constrained for years or even decades, a student with an ISA could confidently follow his or her passion to public service, starting a business or other interests.

Wouldn't students who expect to earn more choose not to participate? Potentially, however, students often don't have a good sense of their future earnings years or even decades down the line, so many may prefer the "insurance" that an income-share agreement offers even if they think their initial earnings may be high. In addition, providers need not offer the same terms for every program.

Wouldn't people with income-share agreements just choose to work less or take low-paying jobs? Maybe to a small degree, but given that the agreements would represent a relatively small fraction of income, it's hard to imagine people making dramatic life changes to avoid the obligation; after all, people also like earning income.

Can't federal loan borrowers already tie their payments to their income? Yes, but even with this option, called income-based repayment, roughly one in five undergraduate borrowers go into default. There may be many reasons for this: The federal loan system is extremely complicated, some borrowers are probably hesitant to see their loan balances grow for years or decades (even with the prospect of forgiveness), and forgiveness under income-based repayment is currently treated as taxable income. And defaults aside, income-based repayment as currently constituted is expensive and may not be fiscally sustainable for taxpayers.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how income share agreements are better alternatives than the current loan system, and gives answers to a few of the problems people might have with them, which I thought would be valuable in a counter-affirmative speech. These agreements take into account that everyone will earn a different income after they receive their degree, and don't overload the amount of debt at one time, when people are notoriously paying off their debts for decades any way. This would also ensure payment is made, and*

much like taxes, this would be money out of people's pockets that they wouldn't miss or even think about. Taking the choice away, in that sense, makes it easier!

AFF – Current Debt Load Outrageous, Something Must be Done

The Washington Post “Could income-share agreements help solve the student debt crisis?” Mitchell E. Daniels Jr., August 20, 2015 < https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/a-different-solution-to-student-debt/2015/08/20/d2e140b8-37bb-11e5-9d0f-7865a67390ee_story.html >

“Anyone who is unaware that we face a massive problem involving college student debt, contact Earth at your first convenience. The troubling facts are almost universally known: After tripling in 10 years, this debt totals more than \$1.3 trillion, which is more than the debt for credit cards, auto loans and any other category except home mortgages. Default rates parallel those for the subprime housing loans of the financial crisis, and the debt numbers show no signs of decelerating, growing again this year by an estimated 8 percent.

The damage to young people's individual futures is compounded, we now know, by harm to the broader economy and society. Home ownership, marriage, childbearing and new-business formation rates are all down among today's younger cohorts, and causal relationships to student debt have been established.

No one knows all this more pressingly than the 43 million indebted students, and former students and their families, who owe the federal government (or, in a declining number of cases, a private lender) an average of \$27,000. Not dischargeable even in most bankruptcies, these obligations are a modern form of indentured servitude.

Into this dismal picture a glimmer of a better idea has appeared. Income-share agreements, under which a student contracts to pay investors a fixed percentage of his or her earnings for an agreed number of years after graduation, offer a constructive addition to today's government loan programs and perhaps the only option for students and families who have low credit ratings and extra financial need. ISAs are neither a new nor untried idea...

... From the student's standpoint, ISAs assure a manageable payback amount, never more than the agreed portion of their incomes. Although every provider is different, terms tend to range from 5 percent to 10 percent of income for 10 to 15 years, or somewhat higher (10 percent to 15 percent for shorter contracts such as five to seven years). Best of all, they shift the risk of career shortcomings from student to investor: If the graduate earns less than expected, it is the investors who are disappointed; if the student decides to go off to find himself in Nepal instead of working, the loss is entirely on the funding providers, who will presumably price that risk accordingly when offering their terms. This is true “debt-free” college...

... It's time for a new approach that can allow ambitious young people to work their way through college once they have completed college, free of the burden that today's student debt imposes on them and on our whole country.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the current problem the US is having with student loan debt, and gives explosive detail in the number of loans, and amount of debt US students have accrued. The current system is broken, and something needs to be done. Income share agreements allows students the freedom to explore their career, looking for what's right for*

them, without the pressure of that loan payment deadline looming over their heads. This is strictly based on how much money they earn. If they don't earn any, they don't pay anything. The percentages are small enough that they should provide positives for the students, but large enough for the lenders to make their money back. This is a win-win situation, favoring the students for once.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how income share agreements are better alternatives than the current loan system, and gives answers to a few of the problems people might have with them, which I thought would be valuable in a counter-affirmative speech. These agreements take into account that everyone will earn a different income after they receive their degree, and don't overload the amount of debt at one time, when people are notoriously paying off their debts for decades any way. This would also ensure payment is made, and much like taxes, this would be money out of people's pockets that they wouldn't miss or even think about. Taking the choice away, in that sense, makes it easier!

The second article talks about the current problem the US is having with student loan debt, and gives explosive detail in the number of loans, and amount of debt US students have accrued. The current system is broken, and something needs to be done. Income share agreements allows students the freedom to explore their career, looking for what's right for them, without the pressure of that loan payment deadline looming over their heads. This is strictly based on how much money they earn. If they don't earn any, they don't pay anything. The percentages are small enough that they should provide positives for the students, but large enough for the lenders to make their money back. This is a win-win situation, favoring the students for once.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Income Share Agreements Wouldn't Work the Way Intended

Brookings “Who would use income share agreements to pay for college?” Robert Kelchen, August 25, 2015 < <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/brown-center-chalkboard/posts/2015/08/25-income-share-agreements-kelchen> >

“I have to wonder how many students would use ISAs once potential legal issues around their operation in the United States are resolved. Students in less-lucrative fields or those who plan to work in public service careers are unlikely to get better terms from the private sector than the federal government. These students would be likely to continue using federal student loans, although it is possible that ISAs could partially replace Parent PLUS loans as a financing source should parents not want to take out loans for their children when ISAs are available.

This leaves two groups of students who are likely to be interested in ISAs. The first group is those students who are either attending colleges that do not offer their students federal loans (primarily for-profit colleges and community colleges), or those attending short-term training programs such as coding ‘boot camps’ that do not currently qualify for federal student aid...However, all of these programs tend to be relatively inexpensive, meaning that the per-student profit for an ISA provider will be fairly small.

The group of students who would be more lucrative for ISA providers would be those students enrolled in profitable degree programs at traditional undergraduate and graduate institutions. Because these programs tend to be expensive, the contract would need to be designed so the provider could make a profit on a large initial investment. However, students could lock in paying a lower percentage of their income than what they would expect to pay under income-based repayment if their expected earnings are high enough.

But students with high expected incomes may stay away from ISAs because they may expect to pay more in an ISA than under the standard federal repayment plan (a fixed monthly payment over 10 years). It would be difficult for ISA providers to undercut the federal government's price in today's environment of reasonably low interest rates, but it could be possible for students who have the highest likelihood of graduating and making a large salary because of the relatively low risk these students represent to a provider. Additionally, the presence of post-graduation private loan refinancing options such as Earnest and SoFi give successful graduates a way to lower their loan payments without giving up a share of their income.

Income share agreements have the potential to create another option for students looking to pay for college while seeking assurances they will not be overwhelmed by future payments. However, given the current generosity of federal income-based repayment programs and the likely hesitation of those who expect six-figure salaries to sign away a percentage of their income for years to come, the market for these programs may be somewhat limited.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article brings up an interesting point, in that income share agreements wouldn't attract enough high income attention to be worth it. In a sense, more people would get funding, but the idea that the government could profit from this is ridiculous. Students who*

are in valuable degree programs would most likely avoid them, because they wouldn't want to sign away a portion of their income. Students who did need it would be stuck in the same cycle they are now except, in this case, they HAVE to pay it. It comes out of their income before they have a choice to avoid it. This could further the debt load on students, and could ultimately hurt the middle class even more.

NEG – The Challenges of Using Income Share Agreements

Bloomberg “An Alternative to Student Loans, But Not a Great One” Megan McArdle, July 30, 2015 <
<http://www.bloombergvview.com/articles/2015-07-30/an-alternative-to-student-loans-but-not-a-great-one>>

“Some days, it seems as if you can't swing a cat in Washington without sending it wailing through a panel on student loans. Articles are written, bemoaning the burden that lashes graduates to a debt mountain, keeping them from taking amazing nonprofit jobs or buying a home. And everyone has a proposed fix, usually involving the federal government spending even more money on college students.

Here's one fix that doesn't require the government to open up the faucet of tax dollars: income share agreements. That's like taking an equity stake in a student. Funders advance college tuition against a certain percentage of future income, payable over a set number of years...

... The first major issue is simply asymmetric information: College students know more about their work ethic, academic ability and career plans than you do. As long as they have a choice between taking on debt with a fixed balance, and debt that requires them to repay some substantial portion of their future income, you're likely to see people with high expected future incomes looking to finance their education through debt, while those with lower income prospects want to take on the equity finance. In order to compensate for this, the price of the equity finance -- the percentage of income that they will have to repay -- will rise, until this is an attractive financing model only for the worst income prospects, who will, while earning little money, have to repay a very high percentage of their income over a number of years.

Or at least, that's how it works in a frictionless economic model. In the real world, there are complications. Even people who intend to be high earners may place a very high value on the insurance that an equity-finance model offers, for example. Or the financiers can price discriminate, charging engineers a lower percentage than English majors. You could imagine some interesting side effects, like engineering programs charging more to capture some of the benefits of this easier finance. Even so, you could eventually reach equilibrium where some percentage of the population and an adequate number of investors were interested in this form of finance.

However, that is only the first problem. There's also moral hazard after I take out my loan. Knowing that I have to give the lender 5 to 10 percent of my income no matter what, do I choose a lower-paid job that offers me, say, more vacation time?

And then there are the problems outside of borrower and lender. Take regulation. Income share agreements look enough like student loans that they might fall under those rules -- with perverse effects. For example, state usury laws might end up capping loan payments for the best-off graduates, forcing financing companies to jack up rates on people who make less money. And should these obligations be discharged in

bankruptcy? At the expense of other creditors, or last? These issues will probably need to be ironed out if these products are to become widespread.

Another question is whether servicing costs end up being particularly high. Figuring out the pricing may end up being more complicated than it is for mortgage lenders, which just turn to FICO scores and mechanical debt ratios. And complicated underwriting is expensive. Collections could be as well. Though in theory, an income share should be less susceptible to default than a traditional student loan, especially if it stipulates an income threshold below which no payments are due.

Finally, there's the problem of getting a new finance product off the ground. To raise capital for this sort of enterprise, you need to be able to show potential backers what their cash flows might look like. But since the product has only ever been tried on a small scale, no one really has that kind of data. And we wouldn't for a while: At first the market may suffer from more, or less, adverse selection and moral hazard than it would as a mature financial market. So it's hard to get the data so you can get the money so you can make the investments so you can get the data.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the many issues that could arise in enacting income share agreements, most of which were mentioned in the first article. You can use this article to take more time and explain, and have an extra source. The article also continues in saying that these kind of agreements honestly have bad side effects on the lender (in this case, the government), which forces the lender to increase rates, which hurts the low-income and middle-income graduates, which continue the cycle of these students living in poverty, because a large percentage of their money is being syphoned off by the government. Overall, like the name of the article states, it's an alternative to student loans, but not necessarily a good one.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article brings up an interesting point, in that income share agreements wouldn't attract enough high income attention to be worth it. In a sense, more people would get funding, but the idea that the government could profit from this is ridiculous. Students who are in valuable degree programs would most likely avoid them, because they wouldn't want to sign away a portion of their income. Students who did need it would be stuck in the same cycle they are now except, in this case, they HAVE to pay it. It comes out of their income before they have a choice to avoid it. This could further the debt load on students, and could ultimately hurt the middle class even more.

The second article talks about the many issues that could arise in enacting income share agreements, most of which were mentioned in the first article. You can use this article to take more time and explain, and have an extra source. The article also continues in saying that these kind of agreements honestly have bad side effects on the lender (in this case, the government), which forces the lender to increase rates, which hurts the low-income and middle-income graduates, which continue the cycle of these students living in poverty, because a large percentage of their money is being syphoned off by the government. Overall, like the name of the article states, it's an alternative to student loans, but not necessarily a good one.

Legislation – A Bill to Require E-Verify Affirmative Evidence

AFF – E-Verify is Essential for Immigration Reform and HR Professionals Prefer It
Society for Human Resources Management, “Mandatory E-Verify Central to Immigration Reform,” Roy Maurer, March 2013, < <http://www.shrm.org/hrdisciplines/global/articles/pages/mandatory-e-verify-immigration-reform.aspx> >

“Committee Republicans and Democrats expressed their support for the employment verification system.

Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., noted in his opening statement that there is a general consensus among lawmakers and the White House that an employment verification system in some form should be part of any immigration overhaul.

“It’s vital that any immigration reform bill contain a quick and easy way for employers to check the legal status of their newly hired employees,” he said. “E-Verify is an easy and effective tool for American employers to use, and it should be expanded...”

Christopher Gamvroulas, a homebuilder in Utah who testified on behalf of the National Association of Home Builders, told the subcommittee that once HR is trained on how to use E-Verify, it is “efficient, effective and easy to use.”

He said his company, Ivory Homes, based in Salt Lake City, has processed 320 employees through the E-Verify system since 2010 and only four of those came back with a TNC result—and none of the four contested the result.

“Our HR department prefers E-Verify over the I-9,” Gamvroulas said. “It gives us a safe harbor. We can print out the confirmation letter, keep it in our files, and if we’re audited, we can demonstrate that we did things right.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that illegal immigration is a problem in the U.S. We have to start addressing that issue. E-Verify is a necessary tool for doing that. If we make E-Verify mandatory for all employers, we will eliminate the ability for illegal immigrants to work within the United States. While it won’t fix all of our immigration issues, it’s definitely a start. Beyond that, HR professionals and business owners prefer E-Verify to traditional i-9 verification. It’s easier and safer for business owners. So, if you speak in affirmation of this bill, you should say that making E-Verify mandatory is necessary for immigration reform and it’s easier on business owners.*

AFF – E-Verify Helps U.S. Citizens

LA Times, “E-Verify works; let’s use it,” Lamar Smith, Elton Gallegly, June 13, 2011, < <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/13/opinion/la-oe-gallegly-everify-20110613> >

“While 26 million Americans are unemployed or underemployed, 7 million individuals work illegally in the United States. On top of all the challenges Americans face today, it is inexcusable that Americans and legal workers have to compete with illegal immigrants for scarce jobs.

Fortunately, there is a tool available to preserve jobs for legal workers: E-Verify. But the program is voluntary. Congress has the opportunity to expand E-Verify — including making it mandatory — so more job opportunities are made available to unemployed Americans.

Created under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, E-Verify is a Web-based system that allows employers to electronically verify the work eligibility of newly hired employees. The Social Security numbers and alien identification numbers of new hires are checked against Social Security Administration and Department of Homeland Security records to weed out fraudulent numbers and help ensure that new hires are legally authorized to work in the United States.

The program quickly confirms 99.5% of work-eligible employees. Even though E-Verify is not mandatory, many employers willingly use the program. More than 250,000 American employers currently use it, and an average of 1,300 new businesses sign up each week.

Part of the reason for E-Verify's success is that participating employers are happy with the results. Outside evaluations have found that the vast majority of employers using E-Verify believe it to be an effective and reliable tool for checking the legal status of their employees. In fact, after being subjected to several Immigration and Customs Enforcement I-9 audits, Chipotle now uses E-Verify at all of its restaurants nationwide to help ensure that it hires legal workers.

E-Verify has proved to be much more reliable than the current paper-based, error-prone I-9 system. Under the I-9 system, the employer only has to attest that an identification document "reasonably appears on its face to be genuine." The problem is that fake documents are produced by the millions and can be obtained cheaply. This has undermined the I-9 system."

TAKEAWAY – *This article says that there are 7 million people working in the U.S. illegally. This is a huge problem, especially because there are 26 million unemployed Americans. E-Verify helps to fix this problem by making citizenship and worker eligibility painless and easy. Employers that are voluntarily using it are liking it, and they find it to be easier than traditional I-9 verification. It's more reliable and it's harder to forge documents with E-Verify. If you speak in Affirmation of this bill, you have to be the voice for the 26 million unemployed Americans.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that illegal immigration is a problem in the U.S. We have to start addressing that issue. E-Verify is a necessary tool for doing that. If we make E-Verify mandatory for all employers, we will eliminate the ability for illegal immigrants to work within the United States. While it won't fix all of our immigration issues, it's definitely a start. Beyond that, HR professionals and business owners prefer E-Verify to traditional i-9 verification. It's easier and safer for business owners. So, if you speak in affirmation of this bill, you should say that making E-Verify mandatory is necessary for immigration reform and it's easier on business owners.

The second article says that there are 7 million people working in the U.S. illegally. This is a huge problem, especially because there are 26 million unemployed Americans. E-Verify helps to fix this problem by making citizenship and worker eligibility painless and easy. Employers that are voluntarily using it are liking it, and they find it to be easier than traditional I-9 verification. It's more reliable and it's harder to forge documents with E-Verify. If you speak in Affirmation of this bill, you have to be the voice for the 26 million unemployed Americans.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Mandatory Implementation of E-Verify Would Be Disastrous

Electronic Frontier Foundation, “E-Verify: Bad for American Businesses and Worker Privacy,” Sophia Elson, February 27, 2013, < <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2013/02/e-verify-bad-american-businesses-and-worker-privacy> >

“As it turns out, mandatory implementation of E-Verify would be disastrous...forcing employers to navigate a costly and time-intensive bureaucratic system and threatening the security of highly sensitive employee data.

EFF has denounced this invasive proposal in the past and now joins the ACLU and forty-three other organizations in signing a coalition letter that opposes its implementation.

As the letter states, “Congress can and should address illegal immigration without sacrificing Americans’ privacy or imposing the costs of immigration enforcement on small businesses and workers.”

There are many problems with the E-Verify system as it stands.

- Database errors will force legal workers to visit federal offices to appeal for the right to work. An April 2011 report issued by the Government Accountability Office about the current voluntary E-Verify program noted that tentative nonconfirmation (TNC) errors “continue to occur, in part, because of inaccuracies and inconsistencies in how personal information is recorded on employee documents, in government databases, or both.” These errors will disproportionately affect minority groups, including young workers, married women, naturalized citizens, legal immigrants, and individuals with multiple surnames.
- The size and openness of the database will endanger sensitive data, such as Social Security numbers, and could in fact exacerbate the problem of identity theft by increasing the market for false identification documents. And as Amy Peck of the I-9 and E-Verify Blog pointed out, attempts to curtail employment identity theft through photo matching have fallen short: “Despite the expansion of the photo matching process (which now applies to EADs, green cards and US passports), identity and employer fraud remain problematic.”
- There is the potential for mission creep, and for E-Verify systems adopted today to be used for a range of additional purposes over time, from issuing prescription drugs to travel identification. As Cato’s Jim Harper argues, “There is no reason why a system created for immigration control would not be converted to other purposes, of course. Electronic verification could be used to find wanted murderers by requiring E-Verify checks everywhere from bus depots to liquor stores. Nationally mandated E-Verify would move quickly down the scale of uses to enforcement of unpaid parking tickets and “use taxes,” just to name two examples...”

EFF stands with the ACLU, Cato Institute, and many concerned civil liberties organizations in urging Congress to take a stand against this harmful proposal.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence from the Electronic Frontier Foundation talks about the dangers of making E-Verify mandatory. First and foremost, E-Verify is a huge invasion of American’s privacy. Secondly, the database has problems, and these problems will lead to people being out of work. Third, the size of the database and the sensitivity of the information will make it a huge target for identity theft and hackers. Fourth, E-Verify is such a massive*

database, if we required it for every employer, it wouldn't be long before it would be used for other purposes. If we require it for employment, it's a slippery slope for privacy infringement in the future. Right now, 45 companies, including ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) and the Cato Institute are all opposed to making E-Verify mandatory.

NEG – E-Verify Has Huge Problems and Is NOT Free

Immigration Impact, “Mandatory E-Verify Is Not All It’s Cracked Up to Be,” Michele Waslin, February 2011, < <http://immigrationimpact.com/2011/02/10/mandatory-e-verify-is-not-all-it%E2%80%99s-cracked-up-to-be/> >

“While everyone agrees that high unemployment levels must be addressed, simplistic measures like mandating E-Verify are not going to open up jobs for millions of unemployed workers...

Richard Stana of the GAO testified that problems, in fact, remain. For example, E-Verify cannot identify identity fraud. A recent study found that E-Verify had erroneously confirmed half of the undocumented workers run through the system as work authorized. Furthermore, the system’s error rates would still place considerable strain on workers, including U.S. citizens.

Take Jessica St. Pierre, a U.S. citizen who after spending days navigating government bureaucracy trying to fix an error in her record (a spacing issue in her last name), was fired from her job. With the current error rate of .8%, 8,000 of every million workers would receive an erroneous response from the government. But that’s probably underestimating the error rate. Places already using E-Verify have experienced much higher error rates. L.A. County, for example, audited its use of E-Verify and found that between 2.0% and 2.7% of E-Verify findings were erroneous. According to Tyler Moran, policy director at the National Immigration Law Center:

This means that in a mandatory system, 3-4 million workers would have to fix their records. It would be as if all of the residents in Los Angeles had to visit a Social Security or DHS office to keep their jobs.

And E-Verify is not “free” for employers as some would like you to believe, and imposing additional regulations on businesses may hamper their ability to create jobs. In fact, a recent Bloomberg study states that if E-Verify had been mandatory for employers last year, it would have cost U.S. employers \$2.7 billion.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the issues with E-Verify. E-Verify confirmed half of the undocumented workers were eligible to work, while in reality they weren't. In addition, the system has an error rate of .8-2.7%, so .8-2.7% of people have to fix their records with the government. If E-Verify were mandatory, this would lead to 3-4 million works having to fix their records. These aren't illegal immigrants, these are American citizens who would be unable to work because of a computer error. Beyond that, E-Verify isn't free. In fact, if it was mandatory for all employers, it would cost more than \$2.7 BILLION. As the negative, you have to argue that the system has too many glitches and that we have no means to fund \$2.7 Billion. If we don't fund E-Verify, employers would have to, which would lead to many companies going under, resulting in loss of jobs, and an increase unemployment rate.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence from the Electronic Frontier Foundation talks about the dangers of making E-Verify mandatory. First and foremost, E-Verify is a huge invasion of American's privacy. Secondly, the database has problems, and these problems will lead to people being out of work. Third, the size of the database and the sensitivity of the information will make it a huge target for identity theft and hackers. Fourth, E-Verify is such a massive database, if we required it for every employer, it wouldn't be long before it would be used for other purposes. If we require it for employment, it's a slippery slope for privacy infringement in the future. Right now, 45 companies, including ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union) and the Cato Institute are all opposed to making E-Verify mandatory.

The second article talks about the issues with E-Verify. E-Verify confirmed half of the undocumented workers were eligible to work, while in reality they weren't. In addition, the system has an error rate of .8-2.7%, so .8-2.7% of people have to fix their records with the government. If E-Verify were mandatory, this would lead to 3-4 million works having to fix their records. These aren't illegal immigrants, these are American citizens who would be unable to work because of a computer error. Beyond that, E-Verify isn't free. In fact, if it was mandatory for all employers, it would cost more than \$2.7 BILLION. As the negative, you have to argue that the system has too many glitches and that we have no means to fund \$2.7 Billion. If we don't fund E-Verify, employers would have to, which would lead to many companies going under, resulting in loss of jobs, and an increase unemployment rate.

Legislation – A Resolution to Reform the IRS and Tax Exemptions of
Religious Sanctions
Affirmative Evidence

AFF- By Not Taxing Churches We Are Missing Out on \$71 Billion Every Year

Patheos, “The Yearly Cost of Religious Tax Exemptions: \$71,000,000,000,” Hemant Mehta, June 2012, <<http://www.patheos.com/blogs/friendlyatheist/2012/06/16/the-yearly-cost-of-religious-tax-exemptions-7100000000/>>

“While some people may be bothered by the fact that there are pastors who live in multimillion dollar homes, this is old news to most. But here is what should bother you about these expensive homes: You are helping to pay for them! You pay for them indirectly, the same way local, state, and federal governments in the United States subsidize religion — to the tune of about \$71 billion every year...

“The issue of religious tax preferment is especially relevant now because the number of Americans living outside any religious tradition continues to grow,” said Tom Flynn, Free Inquiry’s editor. “That underscores the unfairness of taxing all Americans to subsidize religious institutions that only some Americans utilize...”

States bypass an estimated \$26.2 billion per year by not requiring religious institutions to pay property taxes...Capital gains tax exemptions for religious institutions may be as much as \$41 million a year...U.S. clergy may claim as much as \$1.2 billion in tax exemptions annually via the parsonage allowance.”

TAKEAWAYS – *By tax exempting churches the United States is missing out on about \$71 billion dollars every single year. States are forgoing an average of \$26.2 billion per year by not requiring churches to pay property taxes. Capital gains tax exemptions for religious institutions may be as much as \$41 million a year. U.S. clergy may claim as much as \$1.2 billion in tax exemptions annually via the parsonage allowance. It is clear that there are a lot of tax dollars that the US government is missing out on. The number of American living outside of religious tradition is growing, yet we continue to subsidize and pay with our taxes for these churches to not have taxes. Imagine what \$71 billion dollars a year could do for our economy, education system, healthcare system, social security deficit, etc.*

AFF- Tax Exemptions for Churches are Unfair to Non-Religious Citizens and Non-Profit Organizations

ProCon, “Should Churches (Defined as Churches, Temples, Mosques, Synagogues, etc.) Remain Tax-Exempt?” January 2014, <<http://churchesandtaxes.procon.org/>>

“Tax exemptions for churches violate the separation of church and state enshrined in the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the US Constitution. By providing a financial benefit to religious institutions, government is supporting religion. Associate Justice of the US Supreme court, William O. Douglas, in his dissenting opinion in *Walz v. Tax Commission of the City of New York*, decided May 4, 1970, stated: “If believers are entitled to public financial support, so are nonbelievers. A believer and nonbeliever under the present law are treated differently because of the articles of their faith... I conclude that this tax exemption is unconstitutional.”

A tax exemption is a privilege, not a right. Governments have traditionally granted this privilege to churches because of the positive contribution they are presumed to make to the community, but there is no such provision in the US Constitution.

Churches receive special treatment from the IRS beyond what other nonprofits receive, and such favoritism is unconstitutional. While secular charities are compelled to report their income and financial structure to the IRS using Form 990 (Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax), churches are granted automatic exemption from federal income tax without having to file a tax return.

A tax break for churches forces all American taxpayers to support religion, even if they oppose some or all religious doctrines. As Mark Twain argued: "no church property is taxed and so the infidel and the atheist and the man without religion are taxed to make up the deficit in the public income thus caused."

A tax exemption is a form of subsidy, and the Constitution bars government from subsidizing religion. William H. Rehnquist, then-Chief Justice of the US Supreme Court, declared on behalf of a unanimous court in *Regan v. Taxation with Representation* (1983): "Both tax exemptions and tax deductibility are a form of subsidy that is administered through the tax system. A tax exemption has much the same effect as a cash grant to the organization of the amount of tax it would have to pay on its income."

The tax code makes no distinction between authentic religions and fraudulent startup "faiths," which benefit at taxpayers' expense. In spring 2010, Oklahoma awarded tax exempt status to Satanist group The Church of the IV Majesties. In Mar. 2004, the IRS warned of an increase in schemes that "exploit legitimate laws to establish sham one-person, nonprofit religious corporations" charging \$1,000 or more per person to attend "seminars." The Church of Scientology, which TIME Magazine described in May 1991 as a "thriving cult of greed and power" and "a hugely profitable global racket," was granted federal income tax exemption in Oct. 1993. The New York Times reported that this "saved the church tens of millions of dollars in taxes."

Churches serve a religious purpose that does not aid the government, so their tax exemptions are not justified. Tax exemptions to secular nonprofits like hospitals and homeless shelters are justified because such organizations do work that would otherwise fall to government. Churches, while they may undertake charitable work, exist primarily for religious worship and instruction, which the US government is constitutionally prevented from performing.

Exempting churches from taxation costs the government billions of dollars in lost revenue, which it cannot afford, especially in tough economic times. According to former White House senior policy analyst Jeff Schweitzer, PhD, US churches own \$300-\$500 billion in untaxed property. New York's nonpartisan Independent Budget Office determined in July 2011 that New York City alone loses \$627 million in property tax revenue. Lakewood Church, a "megachurch" in Houston, TX, earns \$75 million in annual untaxed revenue, and the Church of Scientology's annual income exceeds \$500 million.

Despite the 1954 law banning political campaigning by tax-exempt groups, many churches are clearly political and therefore should not be receiving tax exemptions...

American taxpayers are supporting the extravagant lifestyles of wealthy pastors, whose lavish "megachurches" accumulate millions of tax-free dollars every year. US Senator Chuck Grassley, MA (R-IA) launched an investigation into these groups in Nov. 2007 after receiving complaints of church revenue being used to buy pastors private jets, Rolls Royce cars, multimillion-dollar homes, trips to Hawaii and Fiji, and in one case, a \$23,000, marble-topped chest of drawers installed in the 150,000 square foot headquarters of Joyce Meyer Ministries in Fenton, Missouri.

The tax break given to churches restricts their freedom of speech because it deters pastors from speaking out for or against political candidates. As argued by Rev. Carl Gregg, pastor of Maryland's Broadview Church, "when Christians speak, we shouldn't have to worry about whether we are biting the hand that feeds us because we shouldn't be fed from Caesar/Uncle Sam in the first place."

The "parsonage exemption" on ministers' homes makes already-wealthy pastors even richer at taxpayers' expense. The average annual salary for senior pastors with congregations of 2,000 or more is \$147,000, with some earning up to \$400,000. In addition to the federal exemption on housing expenses enjoyed by these ministers, they often pay zero dollars in state property tax. Church leaders Creflo and Taffi Dollar of World Changers Church International had three tax-free parsonages: a million-dollar mansion in Atlanta, GA, a two-million-dollar mansion in Fayetteville, GA, and a \$2.5 million Manhattan apartment. Kenneth and Gloria Copeland, leaders of Kenneth Copeland Ministries in Fort Worth, TX, live in a church-owned, tax-free \$6.2 million lakefront parsonage."

TAKEAWAYS – *This piece of evidence presents a lot of strong points! You can use one or all of them when taking an affirmative stance. Providing tax exemptions to churches is a clear violation of separation of Church and State. By providing a financial benefit to religious institutions, government is supporting religion. Churches receive tax exemptions that non-profit organizations do not. This shows that the government supports religion over nonprofits. This is clear favoritism and is unconstitutional. Tax breaks require all Americans to support religions even if they are not religious. There are several fraudulent churches to take advantage of the Tax breaks. Tax exemptions for churches do not benefit the government like tax exemptions for nonprofits do. While churches may do charitable work, their ultimate priority is worship and spreading their doctrine of beliefs. There are many pastors and mega churches that make inordinate amounts of untaxable money. An interesting argument is that Tax breaks restrict Churches' freedom of speech, because it deters pastors from speaking out against political candidate.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that by tax exempting churches the United States is missing out on about \$71 billion dollars every single year. States are forgoing an average of \$26.2 billion per year by not requiring churches to pay property taxes. Capital gains tax exemptions for religious institutions may be as much as \$41 million a year. U.S. clergy may claim as much as \$1.2 billion in tax exemptions annually via the parsonage allowance. It is clear that there are a lot of tax dollars that the US government is missing out on. The number of American living outside of religious tradition is growing, yet we continue to subsidize and pay with our taxes for these churches to not have taxes. Imagine what \$71 billion dollars a year could do for our economy, education system, healthcare system, social security deficit, etc.

The second piece of evidence presents a lot of strong points! You can use one or all of them when taking an affirmative stance. Providing tax exemptions to churches is a clear violation of separation of Church and State. By providing a financial benefit to religious institutions, government is supporting religion. Churches receive tax exemptions that non-profit organizations do not. This shows that the government supports religion over nonprofits. This is clear favoritism and is unconstitutional. Tax breaks require all Americans to support religions even if they are not religious. There are several fraudulent churches to take advantage of the Tax breaks. Tax exemptions for churches do not benefit the government like tax exemptions for nonprofits do. While churches may do charitable work, their ultimate priority is worship and spreading their doctrine of beliefs. There are many pastors and mega churches that make inordinate amounts of untaxable money. An interesting argument is that Tax breaks restrict Churches' freedom of speech, because it deters pastors from speaking out against political candidate.

Negative Evidence

NEG- Removing Tax Exemptions Violate the Separation of Church and State and Put Unnecessary Strain on Churches

ProCon, "Should Churches (Defined as Churches, Temples, Mosques, Synagogues, etc.) Remain Tax-Exempt?" January 2014, <<http://churchesandtaxes.procon.org/>>

"Exempting churches from taxation upholds the separation of church and state embodied by the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment of the US Constitution... It restricts the fiscal relationship between church and state, and tends to complement and reinforce the desired separation insulating each from the other.

Requiring churches to pay taxes would endanger the free expression of religion and violate the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment of the US Constitution. By taxing churches, the government would be empowered to penalize or shut them down if they default on their payments...

Churches earn their tax exemption by contributing to the public good. Churches offer numerous social services to people in need, including soup kitchens, homeless shelters, afterschool programs for poor families, assistance to victims of domestic violence, etc. These efforts relieve government of doing work it would otherwise be obliged to undertake.

Taxing churches would place government above religion...

A tax exemption for churches is not a subsidy to religion, and is therefore constitutional. As stated by US Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren E. Burger in his majority opinion in *Walz v. Tax Commission of the City of New York* (1970), "The grant of a tax exemption is not sponsorship, since the government does not transfer part of its revenue to churches, but simply abstains from demanding that the church support the state. No one has ever suggested that tax exemption has converted libraries, art galleries, or hospitals into arms of the state or put employees 'on the public payroll.' There is no genuine nexus between tax exemption and establishment of religion."

Poor and disadvantaged people relying on assistance from their local churches would suffer if churches were to lose their tax-exempt status. According to Vincent Becker, Monsignor of the Immaculate Conception Church in Wellsville, NY, the food and clothing programs his church offers would be threatened by a tax burden: "All of a sudden, we would be hit with something we haven't had to face in the past... We base all the things that we do on the fact that we do not have to pay taxes on the buildings." Crucial services would either be eliminated or relegated to cash-strapped local governments if churches were to lose their tax exemptions.

Taxing churches when their members receive no monetary gain would amount to double taxation. The late Rev. Dean M. Kelley, a leading proponent of religious freedom, explained that church members are already taxed on their individual incomes, so "to tax them again for participation in voluntary organizations from which they derive no monetary gain would be 'double taxation' indeed, and would effectively serve to discourage them from devoting time, money, and energy to organizations which contribute to the up building of the fabric of democracy."

The only constitutionally valid way of taxing churches would be to tax all nonprofits, which would place undue financial pressure on the 960,000 public charities that aid and enrich US society. If only churches were taxed, government would be treating churches differently, purely because of their religious nature.

Small churches, already struggling to survive, would be further endangered by a new tax burden. A 2010 survey by the Hartford Institute for Religion Research found that congregations facing financial strain more than doubled to almost 20% in the past decade, with 5% of congregations unlikely to recover. If these churches were obliged to pay taxes, their existence would be threatened and government would thus be impeding religious expression.

The vast majority of churches refrain from political campaigning and should not be punished for the actions of the few that are political...There are 450,000 churches in the US, yet only 500 pastors made political statements as part of Pulpit Freedom Sunday on Oct. 2, 2011. The tax exemption should remain in place to benefit the vast majority of churches.

Withdrawing the "parsonage exemption" on ministers' housing would cost American clergy members \$2.3 billion over five years, which would be a major blow to modestly paid men and women who dedicate their lives to helping people in need. According to the National Association of Church Business Administration (NACBA), the average American pastor with a congregation of 300 people earns less than \$28,000 per year. The NACBA also states that one in five pastors takes on a second job to earn extra income, and that only 5% of pastors earn more than \$50,000. As stated by D. August Boto, Executive Vice President and General Counsel of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, "the housing allowance is critically important for making ends meet—it is not a luxury."

TAKEAWAYS – *There are so many GREAT stances in this piece of evidence. You can take any or all of them as the negative. One of the biggest arguments is that taxing churches infringes upon separation of church and state. Also, by placing a financial burden on churches, some would be forced to close down, denying the church members their freedom of religion. These are both strong arguments because you are dealing with fundamental US rights. Beyond that, churches do a lot of good. We would be taking away their ability to help and serve their communities. Also, if we removed tax exemptions for churches, we would also have to remove them for non-profit organizations who also do a lot of good. A particularly interesting argument is that taxing churches would in turn result in double taxing the congregation members. Since they already pay individual taxes, their tithes and non-paid community service through the church would also be taxed, thus resulting in double taxation. Also, if we removed the parsonage tax exemption as well, we would really be hurting the pastor's and their families, as only 5% of pastors make more than \$50,000 per year.*

NEG- There are Real Social Benefits to Churches Being Tax Exempt

Speak Up, "Should Churches Be Tax Exempt," Erik Stanley, March 2012, <
<http://blog.speakupmovement.org/church/churches-and-politics/should-churches-be-tax-exempt/> >

"There are very sound and valid reasons for church tax exemption. First, there is the "social benefit" theory of tax exemption. This recognizes the fact that churches provide great benefits to society by their good works. Churches minister to the poor and needy in

the community, provide numerous social services for the downtrodden among us, and reach out to the “least of these” in thousands of different ways. The social benefit theory justifies tax exemption for churches as a kind of bargain – churches provide needed services, so they are entitled to tax exemption...

An interesting study conducted a few years ago attempted to put a value on the economic worth of one church. The study estimated that the First Baptist Church of Philadelphia provided over six million dollars of economic value to the community, a figure that is nearly ten times the church’s annual budget.”

TAKEAWAYS - *There are clear social benefits to churches having church exemption status. They help their communities. One study showed that one church provided over \$6 million dollars of economic value to their community. This value to their community far outweighs the value of taxing them.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence presents so many GREAT stances. You can take any or all of them as the negative. One of the biggest arguments is that taxing churches infringes upon separation of church and state. Also, by placing a financial burden on churches, some would be forced to close down, denying the church members their freedom of religion. These are both strong arguments because you are dealing with fundamental US rights. Beyond that, churches do a lot of good. We would be taking away their ability to help and serve their communities. Also, if we removed tax exemptions for churches, we would also have to remove them for non-profit organizations who also do a lot of good. A particularly interesting argument is that taxing churches would in turn result in double taxing the congregation members. Since they already pay individual taxes, their tithes and non-paid community service through the church would also be taxed, thus resulting in double taxation. Also, if we removed the parsonage tax exemption as well, we would really be hurting the pastor's and their families, as only 5% of pastors make more than \$50,000 per year.

The Second Article states that there are clear social benefits to churches having church exemption status. They help their communities. One study showed that one church provided over \$6 million dollars of economic value to their community. This value to their community far outweighs the value of taxing them.

Legislation – A Resolution to Militarize American Police Forces Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Lives of Officers Constantly in Danger

CNN “Fallen officers: Separated by thousands of miles, united by similar dangers” Faith Karimi, September 2, 2015 < <http://www.cnn.com/2015/08/03/us/police-officers-killed-nationwide/>>

“With the fatal shooting of a northern Illinois police officer on Tuesday, the number of U.S. law enforcement officers shot to death this year rose to 24.

Fox Lake, Illinois, police Lt. Charles Joseph Gliniewicz radioed in that he was pursuing three suspects on foot before being shot shortly before 8 a.m. (9 a.m. ET), Lake County Sheriff's Sgt. Christopher Covelli said.

This shooting follows Friday night's killing of Harris County Sheriff's Deputy Darren Goforth in what Sheriff Ron Hickman said appears to be "an unprovoked, execution-style killing."

The deaths at the hands of suspects run the gamut -- veterans and rookie officers -- and span the nation, from Georgia to California.

Add in the officers who died in the line of duty from other causes -- traffic accidents, for example -- and the figure rises to 85 so far this year, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. That's more than in the same January-September stretch of last year, when 73 officers were killed..."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the deaths of police officers this year, and even goes on to name them in the rest of the article. As the affirmative, you need to argue that police officers put their lives on the line every day. The last thing they need is to be targeted by civilians, especially the civilians they are supposed to protect. If police officers were militarized, they would then be a force to be reckoned with. Should policemen be nice? Sure. Should they be feared? By those committing crimes, yes. And if they are in full gear, protecting themselves and other civilians, we can start thinking about policemen the same way we think about soldiers – with respect. Beyond that, it could have great effects on crime rates, because criminals would be less likely to attack or try to kill someone who looked like a member of the military, just based on appearance alone!*

AFF – Police Officers Are Under Attack

CNN “Attacks leave police feeling under siege” Ray Sanchez, September 4, 2015 < <http://www.cnn.com/2015/09/04/us/us-police-feel-under-siege/>>

“As mourners gathered Friday for Goforth's funeral, law enforcement officers throughout the country say they feel under siege after a string of deadly attacks on police. This distrust of police, coming in the wake of controversial deaths by officers in Ferguson, Missouri, and elsewhere, helps fuel the bloodshed, they say.

"It's almost a radical rhetoric causing officers to say, 'Wait a second, I'm out here to serve the public. I saved a little old lady from a purse snatching. I gave CPR on the highway

and saved somebody. Now, I'm a villain?" said Chuck Canterbury, president of the national Fraternal Order of Police, a union representing more than 300,000 officers.

Sheriff: Deputy Goforth was 'one of the good guys';

Sheriff: Deputy Goforth was 'one of the good guys' 02:55

That perception has bad guys putting targets on their backs, according to Canterbury and other officers...

... Goforth's uniform made him a target, and a "dangerous national rhetoric" is partly to blame, said the deputy's boss, Harris County Sheriff Ron Hickman.

"This rhetoric has gotten out of control," Hickman said the morning after the shooting. "We've heard 'black lives matter,' 'All lives matter.' Well, cops' lives matter, too. So why don't we just drop the qualifier, and just say 'Lives matter,' and take that to the bank?"...

... This year, three slain officers were targeted because they were law enforcement, according to Canterbury. The attacks came at a time of unprecedented hostility toward the police, he said. In 2014, nine officers were ambushed and killed, he said.

"Now you have people in social media saying, 'Fry him, glad he's dead,'" Canterbury said.

This climate was on the mind of a six-year police veteran when he was pistol-whipped unconscious in Birmingham.

"A lot of officers are being too cautious because of what's going on in the media," said the officer, who asked to remain anonymous over concerns for the safety of his family. "I hesitated because I didn't want to be in the media."...

... And the Houston Police Officers' Union posted that it's offering a \$2,500 reward for information leading to the arrest of the person who has spray-painted graffiti around the city depicting a police officer with a gun pointed at his head...

... Canterbury, the national police union chief, said morale among rank-and-file members is low.

"Agencies all over the country are losing officers at a rapid pace," he said. "They're unable to hire. They are in some cases reducing standards so that they can try to fill jobs because they need bodies. I don't know of a department in the country that is not having a problem recruiting."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about the war on police, that is currently fueled by tension after several high profile shootings by police officers in recent years. There's no denying that police officers are held under microscopes right now, and that there is a lot of negative opinions in regards to police officers, all over the country. As a result, police officers are put in more danger. Even if they aren't going to be killed by someone randomly attacking them for BEING a police officer, they are less likely to do their job well, because they're afraid of becoming a negative public figure. Militarizing the police will prevent that and makes police lives better, and less likely to end at the hands of a criminal or otherwise, because they'll have the confidence, training, and fear of the general public. That will keep them safe, and they can*

focus on doing their jobs, and doing them well. Their jobs are to uphold the law, and protect and serve the public – we should allow them the ability to do that.

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about the deaths of police officers this year, and even goes on to name them in the rest of the article. As the affirmative, you need to argue that police officers put their lives on the line every day. The last thing they need is to be targeted by civilians, especially the civilians they are supposed to protect. If police officers were militarized, they would then be a force to be reckoned with. Should policemen be nice? Sure. Should they be feared? By those committing crimes, yes. And if they are in full gear, protecting themselves and other civilians, we can start thinking about policemen the same way we think about soldiers – with respect. Beyond that, it could have great effects on crime rates, because criminals would be less likely to attack or try to kill someone who looked like a member of the military, just based on appearance alone!

The second article talks about the war on police, that is currently fueled by tension after several high profile shootings by police officers in recent years. There's no denying that police officers are held under microscopes right now, and that there is a lot of negative opinions in regards to police officers, all over the country. As a result, police officers are put in more danger. Even if they aren't going to be killed by someone randomly attacking them for BEING a police officer, they are less likely to do their job well, because they're afraid of becoming a negative public figure. Militarizing the police will prevent that and makes police lives better, and less likely to end at the hands of a criminal or otherwise, because they'll have the confidence, training, and fear of the general public. That will keep them safe, and they can focus on doing their jobs, and doing them well. Their jobs are to uphold the law, and protect and serve the public – we should allow them the ability to do that.

Negative Evidence

NEG – Turning Neighborhoods Into Warzones

Johns Hopkins Magazine “Does the militarization of American police help them serve and protect?” Bret McCabe, Spring 2015 < <http://hub.jhu.edu/magazine/2015/spring/aclu-militarization-of-police>>

“Kara Dansky spent the better part of the fall of 2014 talking about assault rifles, armored vehicles, and forced-entry tools. As senior counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union Center for Justice, Dansky, A&S '94, is the primary author of *War Comes Home: The Excessive Militarization of American Policing*, an ACLU report released last summer. It provides a succinct introduction to how the federal government has supplied American police forces with military weaponry for the past 30 years and how that equipment is being used today...

... The ACLU has long examined incidents of excessive force and discriminatory policing tactics, and during her 2012–14 tenure at the ACLU, Dansky says the organization kept hearing anecdotal stories of SWAT raids gone wrong—pets killed, children injured, people killed—and decided to seek raw data about such deployments. In March 2013, the ACLU submitted public records requests to more than 260 law enforcement agencies in 25 states and the District of Columbia for incident reports and supplemental records documenting SWAT deployments for 2011 and 2012; by September 2013, the ACLU had received 3,844 records...

... "I think a lot of the public doesn't even know we're still fighting the war on drugs," says Dansky, who is now special adviser to the director of the Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice for New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio. "I think the public is weary of it and is tired of spending money on it. And I think people are really tired of seeing drugs as an evil that needs to be combated with the criminal justice system and specifically with weapons made for combat.

"People don't want their neighborhoods to be treated like war zones," she continues. "And the people are already demanding change."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how militarizing police is completely unnecessary, and how it gives off a feeling that police officers are there to protect and serve – they're there to fight a war. One of the worst things we can do in the current political climate, is create more fear of police officers. This could turn a bad situation even worse. What we need to do is focus on building trust, not eliminating it.*

NEG – 2015 Almost Safest Year for Police Officers in 25 Years

The Guardian “2015 may be one of the safest years for law enforcement in a quarter century” Jamiles Lartey, September 4, 2015 < <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/sep/04/police-deaths-2015-law-enforcement-safety>>

“Despite urgent warnings from police and others about a “war on cops” allegedly linked to the Black Lives Matter protest movement, statistics show 2015 is in fact shaping up to be one of the safest years for law enforcement in a generation.

According to the Officer Down Memorial Page (ODMP), which keeps data on officer deaths going back over 100 years, 24 officers have been shot and killed by suspects this year. This puts the US on pace for 36 non-accidental, firearm-related police fatalities in 2015. Each one of such deaths is a tragedy for the officers killed, their families and the communities they serve, but this would be the lowest total in 25 years, aside from 2013 which saw 31 such deaths.

Analysis Republicans step up attack campaign – and the target is Black Lives Matter
Recent killings of police officers fuel conservatives’ messaging as candidates increasingly find fault in movement but is the blame-game working?

Read more

A series of recent high-profile police deaths has sparked much of the rhetoric tying violence against police to anti-police-brutality protesters. On Friday, Harris County sheriff’s deputy Darren Goforth was gunned down from behind while filling his car at a gas station. The suspect, Shannon Miles, was arrested shortly thereafter and charged with capital murder. Miles has a history of severe mental illness and was found mentally incompetent to stand trial in 2012.

Neither Miles, nor any other person suspected of killing a police officer in 2015, has claimed affiliation with the Black Lives Matter movement or any related organization. Still, the attempt to make a connection has persisted as people work to make sense of the senseless killing.

Advertisement

Harris County sheriff Ron Hickman said that while he did not know the shooter’s motive, “dangerous rhetoric” against law enforcement had “gotten out of control”. “We hear that ‘black lives matter.’ All lives matter. Cops’ lives matter, too,” Hickman said, “So why don’t we drop the qualifier and say lives matter.”

Then on Monday, Fox Lake, Illinois, police officer Joe Gliniewicz was shot and killed pursuing three suspicious suspects, who remain at large...

...

DeRay Mckesson, one of the most visible leaders of the Black Lives Matter movement said these attempts to forge a connection between police deaths and protesters is merely part of ongoing efforts to discredit the movement. “The police continue to be intentionally misleading about their rhetoric and openly hostile to anyone who questions them,” Mckesson said. “It’s a profession that refuses any attempts for accountability and justice.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the amount of police officers that have been killed is completely blown out of proportion, and sensationalized by the media. In reality, 2015 is shaping up to be either the safest or the second-safest year for police officers in 25 years. There is also no link established between police officer killings and the lack of trust in police. The people who are killing police officers are criminals, who would have killed them regardless of the current political movement. We must establish more trust in our police officers, but we must also look at the facts. Let’s solve this issue without creating more.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how militarizing police is completely unnecessary, and how it gives off a feeling that police officers are there to protect and serve – they're there to fight a war. One of the worst things we can do in the current political climate, is create more fear of police officers. This could turn a bad situation even worse. What we need to do is focus on building trust, not eliminating it.

The second article talks about how the amount of police officers that have been killed is completely blown out of proportion, and sensationalized by the media. In reality, 2015 is shaping up to be either the safest or the second-safest year for police officers in 25 years. There is also no link established between police officer killings and the lack of trust in police. The people who are killing police officers are criminals, who would have killed them regardless of the current political movement. We must establish more trust in our police officers, but we must also look at the facts. Let's solve this issue without creating more.

Legislation – A Bill to Create a New Guest Worker Program and Provide a Path to Citizenship for Those in this Country Illegally 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 U.S. 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 and a guest worker program is a good pathway. It will help address the millions of immigrants already living in the U.S.*

AFF – Pros for a Guest Worker Program

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. All of these reasons could be used as a reason to pass this piece of legislation. A guest worker program would promote a legal path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. 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.*

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 U.S. 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 and a guest worker program is a good pathway. It will help address the millions of immigrants already living in the U.S.

The second article presents 7 reasons to increase opportunities for legal immigration. All of these reasons could be used as a reason to pass this piece of legislation. A guest worker program would promote a legal path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. 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.

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 a guest worker program we will inevitable hurt the unemployed U.S. citizens. 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. A new guest worker program isn't the answer to solving America's illegal immigration problem.*

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 are 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. No problem!" Rewarding illegal immigration is not a solution to 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 a guest worker program we will inevitably hurt the unemployed U.S. citizens. 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. A new guest worker program isn't the answer to solving America's illegal immigration problem.

The second piece of evidence says that guest worker programs are 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. No problem!" Rewarding illegal immigration is not a solution to 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 Prohibit the Privatization of Prisons to Uphold Civil Liberties
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Private Prisons Present Several Issues

NPR “Who Benefits When A Private Prison Comes To Town?” November 5, 2011

< <http://www.npr.org/2011/11/05/142058047/who-benefits-when-a-private-prison-comes-to-town> >

“The presence of a prison might actually squeeze out other businesses that could bring greater benefits than the prison itself, he says. Also, many of the jobs created by a private prison don't actually go to people in the community.

The bigger problem, he says, is that state and federal taxpayers — who in the end are paying for these prisons — aren't getting the most value for their money.

To cite just one example, he says, last year the Arizona auditor general found that it actually might be more expensive to hold Arizona prisoners in private, for-profit facilities than in public ones.

The safety and security of private prisons is another concern. Shapiro says some studies have found that the level of violence is actually higher in private prisons.

"Private prisons have incentives to make money [and] to cut costs," he says. "One of the ways they do that is by slashing pay for staff, which leads to much higher rates of turnover."

That high rate of turnover and guards who lack the experience to properly respond to situations like escape attempts is dangerous, Shapiro says.

The savings from those cost cuts do not get passed on to the state, he says...

... "Crime rates are declining, the prison population is declining, and many states, in large part motivated by the economic downturn, are realizing that they can't keep building their way out of the problem," says Michele Deitch, who teaches criminal justice at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas.

Deitch says the new growth market for prison companies is immigrant detention, like the facility in Karnes County. New prisons, possibly for state inmates, like the one in Hardin, Mont., are on the decline.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about several issues that should be discussed by the affirmative. First, private prisons are more expensive to the taxpayers, because these giant corporations are able to pull more money, and work around government regulations. Second, private prisons, while they bring more jobs to smaller towns, they may actually harm other businesses in the area. Third, there are concerns and studies that have shown that private prisons are more violent than public prisons. And last, if the negative argues that there is a need for private prisons due to over-population, this article also talks about how crime and the actual number of inmates are on the decline!*

AFF –Reasons to Abolish For-Profit Prisons

Huffington Post “We Must End For-Profit Prisons” Bernie Sanders, September 22, 2015 <
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bernie-sanders/we-must-end-for-profit-pr_b_8180124.html>

“No one, in my view, should be allowed to profit from putting more people behind bars -- whether they're inmates in jail or immigrants held in detention centers. In fact, I believe that private prisons shouldn't be allowed to exist at all, which is why I've introduced legislation to eliminate them.

Here's why:

For-profit prisons harm minorities.

The prison crisis has disproportionately harmed minorities. If current trends persist, one in four black males born today can expect to be imprisoned during their lifetime. Tragically, 69 percent of African-American men who drop out of high school will end up in jail, according to the most recent statistics.

The Department of Justice found that black motorists were three times more likely than their white counterparts to be searched during a traffic stop. African Americans are twice as likely to be arrested, and almost four times as likely to experience the use of force during encounters with police. Further, African Americans are imprisoned at six times the rate of whites.

For-profit prisons abuse prisoners.

The horror stories from for-profit prisons are plentiful. Here are a few examples: Rat-infested food was served to inmates by a private vendor in Michigan, and other rotten or spoiled food items were served in that state and elsewhere. The same vendor reportedly underfed Michigan inmates.

Privately-run prisons in Mississippi reportedly have two to three times the rate of violent assault as publicly run facilities.

A private prison vendor has reportedly used juvenile offenders in Florida to subdue other young prisoners. "It's the Lord of the Flies," said Broward County's chief assistant public defender.

"The children are used by staff members to inflict harm on other children."

Nurses at a private prison chain in California threatened to strike over the inadequate health care, which one described as "unsafe," and there have even been reported incidents of patient abuse.

For-profit prisons victimize immigrants.

Immigrants have also been victimized by corporate prison greed. As the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) notes in an in-depth report, "The criminalization of immigration ... enriches the private prison industry" by segregating most of the resulting inmates into one of thirteen privately-run "Criminal Alien Requirement" (CAR) prisons. Another report, from Grassroots Leadership, found that 62 percent of all ICE beds are now privately owned.

For-profit prisons profit from abuse and mistreatment.

As the ACLU notes, the bidding process for private immigration centers provides "incentives that keep facilities overcrowded and place excessive numbers of prisoners in isolated confinement." It also reports inadequate medical care, abusive treatment, and "severely overcrowded and squalid living conditions." These are also true for prison populations.

Prison industry money is corrupting the political process.

The prison industry is highly profitable. The two biggest prison corporations in the country made \$3.3 billion in 2012 -- profiting from government payments and prison laborers, who were forced to work for pennies on behalf of companies like Boeing and McDonald's.

With so much money at stake, it's not surprising that the for-profit prison industry is corrupting our political process. According to National Institute on Money in Politics just one such company, the GEO Group, has given more than \$6 million to Republican, Democratic, and independent candidates over the past 13 years.

Moreover, as the Washington Post reports, the two largest for-profit prison corporations and their associates "have funneled more than \$10 million to candidates since 1989 and have spent nearly \$25 million on lobbying efforts."

For-profit prisons are influencing prison policy ...

It's been money well spent for the prison corporations. Between 1990 and 2010, the number of for-profit prisons in this country has increased by 1,600 percent. There are now 130 private prisons in this country, with a total of 157,000 beds.

Through organizations like ALEC (the American Legislative Exchange Council), the prison industry has promoted state laws that increase incarceration rates for nonviolent offenses.

... and immigration policy.

A report from the Council on Hemispheric Affairs outlines some of the ways in which private prison corporations have tried to influence immigration policy and increase incarceration rates, apparently with great success.

Grassroots Leadership found that, "contrary to private prison corporation claims that they do not lobby on issues related to immigration policy, between 2008 and 2014, CCA spent \$10,560,000 in quarters where they lobbied on issues related to immigrant detention and immigration reform."

For-profit companies exploit prison families.

Private prison corporations and their affiliates do everything they can to make a buck off people in prison -- and their families. According to The Nation's Liliana Segura, for example, a tech company called Global Tel*Link charges more than \$1 per minute for families and friends to speak with their loved ones in prison. There is no free market, no competition to drive the price down.

If family or friends are unable to afford Global Tel*Link's prices, prisoners may run a higher risk of social isolation. It's a vicious circle, as studies show that social connections are key to a prisoner's rehabilitation process once he or she is released. FCC Commissioner Mignon Clyburn, a leader on this issue, has also pointed out that 2.7 million children in the United States have an incarcerated parent. Many of them suffer immeasurably when such unaffordable rates rob them of parental contact.

Global Tel* Link makes more than \$500 million per year from exploiting these vulnerable people.

Young people are being mistreated and exploited.

Worst of all, the for-profit system is having a terrible impact on our young people. A Huffington Post report entitled "Prisoners of Profit," paints a vivid picture of the widespread abuse and

brutality -- including fatal medical neglect and sexual abuse. In the "kids for cash" scandal, business people actually paid judges to send young people to their often-brutal facilities, often for very minor infractions.

We must put an end to this shameful industry.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article goes in depth into why for-profit prisons should be abolished. The tag lines for these reason are: for-profit prisons harm minorities, abuse prisoners, victimize immigrants, profit from abuse and mistreatment, are influencing prison policy and immigration policy, exploit prison families, and young people are being mistreated and exploited. (Each of these taglines have an in-depth explanation in the article above). If you speak in affirmation of this legislation, you can pick one of these taglines to form a speech around, or combine a few!*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about several issues that should be discussed by the affirmative. First, private prisons are more expensive to the taxpayers, because these giant corporations are able to pull more money, and work around government regulations. Second, private prisons, while they bring more jobs to smaller towns, they may actually harm other businesses in the area. Third, there are concerns and studies that have shown that private prisons are more violent than public prisons. And last, if the negative argues that there is a need for private prisons due to over-population, this article also talks about how crime and the actual number of inmates are on the decline!

The second article goes in depth into why for-profit prisons should be abolished. The tag lines for these reason are: for-profit prisons harm minorities, abuse prisoners, victimize immigrants, profit from abuse and mistreatment, are influencing prison policy and immigration policy, exploit prison families, and young people are being mistreated and exploited. (Each of these taglines have an in-depth explanation in the article above). If you speak in affirmation of this legislation, you can pick one of these taglines to form a speech around, or combine a few!

Negative Evidence

NEG – Public Prisons are Bursting at the Seams

The Washington Post “Prisons in these 17 states are over capacity” Reid Wilson, September 20, 2014, < <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/govbeat/wp/2014/09/20/prisons-in-these-17-states-are-filled-over-capacity/> >

“The number of Americans in state and federal prisons has exploded over the last three decades, to the point that nearly one in every 200 people is behind bars. And though the rate of growth has slowed, and even declined over the last five years, the tough-on-crime policies and longer sentences that have sent prison rates skyward present a huge problem for states: Where do they put all those people?

That problem is especially acute in 17 states where the prison population is now higher than the capacity of the facilities designed to hold them. Those states, still recovering from a recession that decimated budgets, have to decide whether to build facilities with more beds, turn to private contractors, relax release policies — or simply stuff more prisoners into smaller spaces.

At the end of 2013, Illinois was housing 48,653 prisoners, according to data published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The state’s prison facilities are designed to hold just 32,075 prisoners, meaning the system is operating at 151 percent of capacity. North Dakota’s 1,571 prisoners live in space meant for 1,044 people, 150 percent of capacity.

Nebraska, Ohio, Delaware, Colorado, Iowa and Hawaii are all holding a prison population equal to more than 110 percent of capacity.

What scares states the most is the prospect of federal courts intervening and ordering new action. California has been under court order since 2009 to reduce its prison population, which is far beyond capacity. The state has spent billions housing inmates in county jails or sending them to facilities run by private for-profit companies.

“No state actively wants the federal courts to come in and take over operation of their state government functions,” said Adam Gelb, director of the Public Safety Performance Project at the Pew Charitable Trusts.

The possibility of federal court intervention has spurred Alabama to begin reviewing its corrections procedures. A Justice Department investigation released in January found conditions at the state’s women’s prison violate the Constitution, and DOJ said it would look into conditions at other state prison facilities.

In June, Alabama Gov. Robert Bentley (R) launched the Justice Reinvestment Initiative to study the state’s criminal justice system and make recommendations for easing overcrowding. The state’s prison facilities are designed to house 13,318 inmates, though operationally the facilities can hold 26,145 people. The current prisoner population, 26,271 inmates, is 197 percent of the lowest possible capacity and 100.5 percent of the highest number.

TAKEAWAY – *This article explains how the population of prisons have grown much faster than the infrastructure was designed to withstand. 17 states have prisons whose population is over 100% capacity while some even go as high as 197% capacity. As the NEG you should*

argue that it is impossible to think that these prisons could withstand the addition of all the inmates that currently reside in for-profit prisons. Passing this legislation would result in unsanitary living condition as well as putting these inmates and employees of the prison at greater risk of prison violence.

NEG – No Studies Accurately Show Whether Public or Private Prisons Are Better

The Washington Post “Are private prisons better or worse than public prisons?” Sasha Volokh, February 25, 2014 < <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2014/02/25/are-private-prisons-better-or-worse-than-public-prisons/>>

“How do we determine whether the private sector costs more or less than the public sector? Ideally, we could work off of a large database of public and private prisons and run a regression in which we controlled for jurisdiction, demographic factors, size, and the like. In practice, this large database doesn’t exist, and so the typical study chooses a small set of public and private prisons that are supposedly comparable.

Unfortunately, this comparability tends to be elusive; the public and private facilities compared often “differ in ways that confound comparison of costs.” Sometimes no comparable facilities exist...

... Moving on to quality comparisons, the picture is similarly grim. As with cost comparisons, sometimes no comparable facility exists in the same jurisdiction. Some studies solve that problem by looking at prisons in different jurisdictions, an approach that has its own problems. (If one had a large database with several prisons in each jurisdiction, one could control for the jurisdiction, but this approach is of course unavailable when comparing two prisons, each in its own jurisdiction.) Many studies just don’t control for clearly relevant variables in determining whether a facility is truly comparable.

Often, the comparability problem boils down to differences in inmate populations; one prison may have a more difficult population than the other, even if they have the same security level. Usually prisons have different populations because of the luck of the draw, but sometimes it’s by design, as happened in Arizona, when the Department of Corrections chose “to refrain from assigning prisoners to [a particular private prison] if they [had] serious or chronic medical problems, serious psychiatric problems, or [were] deemed to be unlikely to benefit from the substance abuse program that is provided at the facility.” It’s actually quite common to not send certain inmates to private prisons; the most common restriction in contracts is on inmates with special medical needs...

... After having read the foregoing, one should be fairly dismayed at the state of comparative public-private prison research. In fact, it gets worse. An overarching problem is that most studies don’t simultaneously compare both cost and quality. It is hard to draw strong conclusions from such studies, even if they are state-of-the-art at what they are examining.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how there have been no studies to accurately show whether private or public prisons are better. While the affirmative will try to say that prison qualities are bad, they draw no comparisons to public prisons. There have been no studies to draw comparisons between the two. Even if there were studies, it’s a hard thing to pinpoint – because just like every classroom is different, every prison is different because of the programs they provide and the inmates they keep. More studies should be conducted before we pass a bill like this. Accountability measures should be put in place before a bill like this is passed.*

Currently, few regulations are put on private prisons, compared to public prisons. Let's try to fix the problem before condemning the institutions.

Negative Takeaways:

The first article explains how the population of prisons have grown much faster than the infrastructure was designed to withstand. 17 states have prisons whose population is over 100% capacity while some even go as high as 197% capacity. As the NEG you should argue that it is impossible to think that these prisons could withstand the addition of all the inmates that currently reside in for-profit prisons. Passing this legislation would result in unsanitary living condition as well as putting these inmates and employees of the prison at greater risk of prison violence.

The second article talks about how there have been no studies to accurately show whether private or public prisons are better. While the affirmative will try to say that prison qualities are bad, they draw no comparisons to public prisons. There have been no studies to draw comparisons between the two. Even if there were studies, it's a hard thing to pinpoint – because just like every classroom is different, every prison is different because of the programs they provide and the inmates they keep. More studies should be conducted before we pass a bill like this. Accountability measures should be put in place before a bill like this is passed. Currently, few regulations are put on private prisons, compared to public prisons. Let's try to fix the problem before condemning the institutions.

Legislation – A Resolution to Amend the Constitution to Allow States Direct
Authority to Amend the US Constitution
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Federal Government Can Get Out of Hand

Fox News “State-led push to force convention to amend Constitution gains steam, with high-profile Republican support” February 15, 2015 < <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2015/02/15/state-effort-to-pass-constitutional-amendments-rein-in-washington-gets/>>

““Our founders anticipated the federal government might get out of control,” Coburn said Tuesday. “And they gave us a constitutional mechanism to rein it in.”

Beyond getting Congress to pass a balanced budget, supporters of the largely Republican-backed effort are also focused on such issues as campaign finance reform and making sure the Environmental Protection Agency doesn’t over regulate.

Kasich, a potential 2016 White House candidate, has recently concluded a six-state tour in which he asked legislators to support the convention, largely to push the balanced budget idea.

“Who the heck thinks we should keep spending without any regard to the consequences?” Kasich, a fiscal hawk and former House Budget Committee chairman, asked in South Dakota. “I don’t care if you’re a Republican, a Democrat or a Martian. This is not what we should be doing as a nation. It’s irresponsible.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how the federal government can get a little out of control, and states should have an easier time correcting the mistakes that they make. For instance, in regards to the budget crisis that hit – states wanted to do something, but it’s such an arduous process, that it makes it nearly impossible to do. They have to get enough states involved to hold a convention, then 38 states out of 50 have to agree, and that’s pending US Congress making things easy. This legislation would make everything much easier, and could help with the economic and political growth of the United States.*

AFF – State-Led Amendments Are Good for the United States

Huffington Post “Expanding Democracy by Amending the Constitution” Layne Amerikaner, August 26, 2015 < http://www.huffingtonpost.com/layne-amerikaner/expanding-democracy-by-am_b_8043224.html>

“In a 2010 piece about the suffrage movement, New York Times columnist Gail Collins wrote that “behind almost every great moment in history, there are heroic people doing really boring and frustrating things for a prolonged period of time.” It was a painstaking process of organizing, state by state, that ultimately led to the 19th Amendment.

It's not a fast process to amend the Constitution -- just ask Susan B. Anthony, who organized for decades and didn't live to see the passage of the women's suffrage amendment. It shouldn't be easy to change our country's guiding document. But we have a history of passing amendments, when necessary, to make our democracy more inclusive, and often to correct serious harm done by the Supreme Court. The women's suffrage amendment overturned a 1875 decision that held women didn't have a right to

vote. In all, seven of the 17 constitutional amendments adopted since the Bill of Rights have reversed damaging Supreme Court decisions that threatened popular democracy.

Today we're facing another serious threat to our democracy: Supreme Court rulings like Citizens United.

In the wake of decisions allowing unlimited spending to influence elections, money has inundated our political system like never before. 2014 was the most expensive midterm in history, but with fewer donors than in past elections. The 2016 presidential election is already on its way toward eclipsing all previous records. We're seeing more and more money from fewer and fewer donors, and it's taking a real toll on the functioning of our system.

There is a nationwide movement pushing for a constitutional amendment that would overturn decisions like Citizens United and take our political process back from the tremendous influence of big corporations and moneyed interests. Like the women's suffrage movement, it's a slow process of building support city by city, state by state, one conversation at a time. So far 16 states and 650 cities and towns have gone on record in support of an amendment, and momentum continues to build.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how state-led amendments to the Constitution have been around since almost the beginning of our great country, and they have done wonders to allow States to step in when particular legislatures make decisions that negatively affect their population, without the consent of that population. This is a perfect example of check and balances – state governments should have a say in how Congress is run, because they are elected officials, by the people, just like Senators and Representatives are elected officials. If we can add another fact-checker, another system that can keep everything in line, then why not? Historically, State Amendments have done a lot of great things for the United States. Let’s make it something that is easier to do, and watch the United States prosper.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how the federal government can get a little out of control, and states should have an easier time correcting the mistakes that they make. For instance, in regards to the budget crisis that hit – states wanted to do something, but it's such an arduous process, that it makes it nearly impossible to do. They have to get enough states involved to hold a convention, then 38 states out of 50 have to agree, and that's pending US Congress making things easy. This legislation would make everything much easier, and could help with the economic and political growth of the United States.

The second article talks about how state-led amendments to the Constitution have been around since almost the beginning of our great country, and they have done wonders to allow States to step in when particular legislatures make decisions that negatively affect their population, without the consent of that population. This is a perfect example of check and balances – state governments should have a say in how Congress is run, because they are elected officials, by the people, just like Senators and Representatives are elected officials. If we can add another fact-checker, another system that can keep everything in line, then why not? Historically, State Amendments have done a lot of great things for the United States. Let's make it something that is easier to do, and watch the United States prosper.

Negative Evidence

NEG – States Already Have the Ability to Amend the Constitution

Fox News “State-led push to force convention to amend Constitution gains steam, with high-profile Republican support” February 15, 2015 < <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2015/02/15/state-effort-to-pass-constitutional-amendments-rein-in-washington-gets/>>

“Coburn, a legendary government-waste watchdog, announced this week that he has joined the effort by becoming a senior adviser for the group Convention of States Action, which wants states, not just Congress, to pass constitutional amendments. A primary goal is to get an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced federal budget, in which spending does not exceed revenue.

Article V of the Constitution says amendments can be ratified either by Congress or by states if two-thirds of them petition Congress to call a convention. Then, any amendment proposed at the convention must be ratified by three-fourth, or 38, states.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how state already have the ability to amend the Constitution. Keeping that in mind, the only difference between the status quo and the legislation, is that the status quo requires a second vote, requiring three-fourths of the states to approve before it can be passed. Isn't that enough? If we allow all two-thirds states to pass something, then we could have a ridiculous amount of legislation that one-third of the states in the US don't agree with.*

NEG – State Provided Amendments Is a Bad Idea

The Kansas City Star “States urged to call for convention to amend U.S. Constitution” Brad Cooper, March 19, 2015 < <http://www.kansascity.com/news/government-politics/article15392828.html>>

“Meanwhile, critics worry about where a convention to amend the Constitution might lead.

“The fear comes from both sides,” said David Schneider, a banker from Marion, Kan., who is coordinating efforts to pass a convention resolution in Kansas. “The left sees it as the right trying to grab power and push their agenda. The right sees it as the left trying to take over the Constitution.”

Opponents fret that measures pushed in Kansas, Missouri and elsewhere could set the stage for a runaway convention to make over the entire Constitution. Language in the hallowed document doesn't offer much clarification: “... Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments ...”

Some people are wary of the monied interests — on the left and the right — backing such legislative efforts. For instance, the conservative American Legislative Exchange Council has published a handbook explaining how to make an application for a constitutional convention.

Critics say the real solution to the country's problems is holding its elected leaders accountable at the ballot box.

“It is the wrong solution to the wrong problem,” Olathe lawyer Richard Fry of the conservative Patriot Coalition told lawmakers in written testimony. “Rewriting the Constitution will not turn corrupt politicians into statesmen anymore than revising the Ten Commandments will turn sinners into saints.””

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how State-led amendments to the Constitution could result very badly, with political parties on both sides pushing for their issues, providing yet another avenue for Democrats and Republicans to battle. Is that really necessary? The real solution comes down to voting. If you aren’t happy with the members of Congress, then vote for someone else! Change who sits in the seat that makes the decisions, and you can change how Congress makes decisions. Change should start, like the article says, at the ballot box.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how state already have the ability to amend the Constitution. Keeping that in mind, the only difference between the status quo and the legislation, is that the status quo requires a second vote, requiring three-fourths of the states to approve before it can be passed. Isn't that enough? If we allow all two-thirds states to pass something, then we could have a ridiculous amount of legislation that one-third of the states in the US don't agree with.

The second article talks about how State-led amendments to the Constitution could result very badly, with political parties on both sides pushing for their issues, providing yet another avenue for Democrats and Republicans to battle. Is that really necessary? The real solution comes down to voting. If you aren't happy with the members of Congress, then vote for someone else! Change who sits in the seat that makes the decisions, and you can change how Congress makes decisions. Change should start, like the article says, at the ballot box.

Legislation – A Resolution to Colonize Space in Order to Ensure the Long-term Survival of the Human Race
Affirmative Evidence

AFF – Stephen Hawking Says We Must Colonize Space

Space.com, “Stephen Hawking: Humanity Must Colonize Space to Survive,” Tariq Malik, April 13, 2013, < <http://www.space.com/20657-stephen-hawking-humanity-survival-space.html> >

“Famed British cosmologist Stephen Hawking sees only one way for humanity to survive the next millennium: colonize space. And he’s probably right.

In a lecture Tuesday in Los Angeles, the 71-year-old Stephen Hawking said humanity would likely not survive another 1,000 years “without escaping beyond our fragile planet,” according to the Associated Press. Hawking has long been an advocate of space exploration as a way to ensure humanity’s survival. Living on a single planet leaves us at risk of self-annihilation through war or accidents, or a cosmic catastrophe like an asteroid strike.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence says that Stephen Hawking says that the only way for humanity to survive is to colonize space. He predicts that humankind will not survive another 1,000 years. We are currently at risk of self-annihilation or cosmic catastrophe. As the affirmative you have to argue for the well-being of mankind. If we want to continue as a race, we must colonize space. There is no other option.*

AFF – Earth Entering 6th Mass Extinction

Stanford “Stanford researcher declares that the sixth mass extinction is here” Rob Jordan, June 9, 2015 < <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2015/june/mass-extinction-ehrllich-061915.html> >

“There is no longer any doubt: We are entering a mass extinction that threatens humanity’s existence.

That is the bad news at the center of a new study by a group of scientists including Paul Ehrlich, the Bing Professor of Population Studies in biology and a senior fellow at the Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment. Ehrlich and his co-authors call for fast action to conserve threatened species, populations and habitat, but warn that the window of opportunity is rapidly closing.

“[The study] shows without any significant doubt that we are now entering the sixth great mass extinction event,” Ehrlich said...

... There is general agreement among scientists that extinction rates have reached levels unparalleled since the dinosaurs died out 66 million years ago. However, some have challenged the theory, believing earlier estimates rested on assumptions that overestimated the crisis.

The new study, published in the journal Science Advances, shows that even with extremely conservative estimates, species are disappearing up to about 100 times faster than the normal rate between mass extinctions, known as the background rate.

"If it is allowed to continue, life would take many millions of years to recover, and our species itself would likely disappear early on," said lead author Gerardo Ceballos of the Universidad Autónoma de México...

... Despite the gloomy outlook, there is a meaningful way forward, according to Ehrlich and his colleagues. "Avoiding a true sixth mass extinction will require rapid, greatly intensified efforts to conserve already threatened species, and to alleviate pressures on their populations – notably habitat loss, over-exploitation for economic gain and climate change," the study's authors write."

TAKEAWAY – *This article is from Stanford, and talks about how scientists have theorized that the Earth is entering its 6th wave of mass extinction. What's causing this? Habitat loss, pressures on population, over-exploitation for economic gain, and climate change. Earth is headed towards mass extinction, so it is crucial that we pass this legislation. We must begin colonizing space in order to save the human race from extinction.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence says that Stephen Hawking says that the only way for humanity to survive is to colonize space. He predicts that humankind will not survive another 1,000 years. We are currently at risk of self-annihilation or cosmic catastrophe. As the affirmative you have to argue for the well-being of mankind. If we want to continue as a race, we must colonize space. There is no other option.

The second article is from Stanford, and talks about how scientists have theorized that the Earth is entering its 6th wave of mass extinction. What's causing this? Habitat loss, pressures on population, over-exploitation for economic gain, and climate change. Earth is headed towards mass extinction, so it is crucial that we pass this legislation. We must begin colonizing space in order to save the human race from extinction.

Negative Evidence

NEG – There Will Be Objections to Colonizing Space

Io9, “Why don't people understand the urgency of colonizing other planets?,” Professor John Hickman, December 24, 2010, < <http://io9.com/5717779/why-dont-people-understand-the-urgency-of-colonizing-other-planets> >

“Whatever justification or combination of justifications is ultimately adopted for establishing an extraterrestrial human presence, there will be objections. Cost will be a factor in most of them. Reopening the space frontier will be expensive. Establishing a human presence on the Moon in the form of a base crewed by a handful of astronauts would cost tens of billions of dollars. Establishing the first permanent human settlement on the Moon or Mars is likely to be much more expensive. The opponents of investing large sums to reopen the space frontier will have important advantages over advocates. Biology may be the most important. The harsh truth about human nature is that the majority of people are uninterested in the welfare of their distant descendants and assess risks imperfectly, or even irrationally. Both have important implications for our collective willingness to make sacrifices to enhance the long term survival of our species.

Anthropologists know that humans are generally better at recognizing and responding to immediate risks to themselves and to their small social groups than at recognizing and responding to future risks to larger social groups or the entire species.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence is an excerpt from a book written by Professor John Hickman. He talks about the objections people will have to colonizing space. One of the major objections to space colonization is cost. It will cost billions and billions of dollars to colonize space. Secondly, people aren't willing to make sacrifices for future dangers. The truth is, if it isn't an immediate threat than it isn't an immediate concern. If you speak in negation of this bill you have to argue that costs are too high, and that the threat of extinction is too far in the future to be a concern. Furthermore, you have to argue that this will be these will be the apprehensions of everyone. We cannot urge the global community to jump on board, because costs are too high and the threat isn't real enough. (Side note: This excerpt is really great! You should read it if you have time. ☺)*

NEG – Humans Become Sterile in Space

The Week, “Why humans will never colonize space,” February 2011, < <http://theweek.com/articles/487105/why-humans-never-colonize-space> >

“Any child conceived and born in space is likely to be born sterile. Scientists at NASA say that the high levels of radiation in space would kill any female fetus' lifetime supply of eggs, while males in the womb would likely become sterile. The child could also suffer "mental and physical defects" from exposure to harmful radiation.

Couldn't spaceships protect against this kind of radiation?

No. These are no ordinary protons, but high-energy proton particles from galactic cosmic rays. We on Earth are kept safe from them by our atmosphere and magnetic field, but astronauts in space remain vulnerable.”

TAKEAWAY – *This piece of evidence presents a really strong argument for a negative speaker. NASA says that the high radiation levels in space would kill any female fetus' lifetime*

supply of eggs, and any males in the womb would become sterile. What does this mean? Humans can't reproduce in space. If we're solving for extinction, space isn't the answer. The human race can't survive in space unless we can figure out another way to reproduce.

Negative Takeaways:

The first piece of evidence is an excerpt from a book written by Professor John Hickman. He talks about the objections people will have to colonizing space. One of the major objections to space colonization is cost. It will cost billions and billions of dollars to colonize space. Secondly, people aren't willing to make sacrifices for future dangers. The truth is, if it isn't an immediate threat than it isn't an immediate concern. If you speak in negation of this bill you have to argue that costs are too high, and that the threat of extinction is too far in the future to be a concern. Furthermore, you have to argue that this will be these will be the apprehensions of everyone. We cannot urge the global community to jump on board, because costs are too high and the threat isn't real enough

The second piece of evidence presents a really strong argument for a negative speaker. NASA says that the high radiation levels in space would kill any female fetus' lifetime supply of eggs, and any males in the womb would become sterile. What does this mean? Humans can't reproduce in space. If we're solving for extinction, space isn't the answer. The human race can't survive in space unless we can figure out another way to reproduce.

Legislation – A Bill to Regulate Tuition of Public Universities to Make
Advanced Education More Accessible
Affirmative Evidence

AFF- Rising Tuition Cost Bury Student in Debt

Seattle Times “Crushing’ college costs hurt students, economy” Kyung Song, June 4, 2014
http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2023764919_studentdebt.xml.html

“Runaway college tuition and growing student debt are burdening both borrowers and the U.S. economy, witnesses testified Wednesday at a Senate Budget Committee hearing chaired by Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash...

... Tuition and fees at colleges and universities historically have risen faster than the prices of most goods and services. In the past decade, that pace has quickened even further.

Sticker shock has been particularly acute for students and parents in Washington, thanks to the 2008 recession and the Legislature’s decision to cut state funding for higher education and shift more of the cost to students.

In-state tuition for the coming academic year at the flagship University of Washington in Seattle, for instance, will be \$12,394. That’s 2½ times the 2004-05 tuition of \$5,181 and a 426 percent increase from 20 years ago...

... Murray said 16 percent of young households had outstanding student loans in 1989, according to the Pew Research Center. By 2010, 40 percent of families headed by someone under 35 had college debts. A typical college graduate owes an average of \$30,000.

“Crushing student debt isn’t just hurting borrowers,” Murray said. “There is mounting evidence that student debt is also holding back the economy.”

Excessive student loans threaten far-reaching sectors of the economy, said Rohit Chopra, student-loan ombudsman and an assistant director with the federal Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.”

TAKEAWAY- *This article says that the rising cost of tuition has become an obstacle that students cannot get over. The cost of college has grown 2.5 times larger since 2005 and 426 times larger than 20 years ago. As the Aff you should argue that this increase in cost generates debt for students that they oftentimes cannot recover from. The rising cost also acts as a deterrent for a student to attend college, whereas a cap on tuition could have the reverse effect.*

AFF- Student Loan Debt Has Gotten Out of Control

NY Daily News “Americans owe \$1.2 trillion in student loans, surpassing credit card and auto loan debt totals” Dan Freidman May 17, 2014

<http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/americans-owe-1-2-trillion-student-loans-article-1.1796606>

“Student loans have become the second largest source of personal debt in the United States. Aware of growing public concern over the issue, Senate Democrats are making student loans one of their top election year planks and will vote on legislation to allow refinancing at lower rates.

It's the reason Tiffany Brown, a Queens College graduate, hasn't moved out of her parents' home, and the reason she thinks twice about law school.

It's the biggest obstacle facing Christina Chaise, 24-year-old a graduate student at Columbia's Teacher's College, in her journey from poverty to self-sufficiency.

Brown and Chaise are typical young college graduates in New York — they have student loan debt that will probably affect their choices for decades.

"It scares me," said Chaise who owes \$20,000 but expects to borrow at least another \$20,000 before finishing graduate school.

"I have been pursuing higher education to raise myself out of poverty," she said. "I grew up in the projects. There's nothing wrong with that, but I want a better life. I don't know if I can do everything I want to do, because I have these bills to pay each month."...

... Millions of Americans are in the same boat as these New Yorkers. Americans owe \$1.2 trillion in student loan debt, a number that has tripled in the last decade. New York State residents hold \$60 billion of that debt, and college grads in the state owe on average \$27,310 in student loans, according to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Student loans have passed credit cards and auto loans to become the second biggest source of personal debt in the U.S., trailing only mortgages. Aware of growing public concern over the issue, Senate Democrats are making student loans one of their top election year planks."

TAKEAWAY- *This article says that student loan debt has grown larger than anyone could have imagined. Student loans have passed credit cards and auto loans to become the second biggest source of personal debt in the U.S. Only Mortgage debt is greater. The Aff should argue that this climbing debt makes many students afraid to accept government aid to go to school. Since student loan debt has some of the lowest percentage of repayment, what happens when too many students default in their loans? You should argue that if we want a more educated work force we must make college an option without the threat of debt.*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article says that the rising cost of tuition has become an obstacle that students cannot get over. The cost of college has grown 2.5 times larger since 2005 and 426 times larger than 20 years ago. As the Aff you should argue that this increase in cost generates debt for students that they oftentimes cannot recover from. The rising cost also acts as a deterrent for a student to attend college, whereas a cap on tuition could have the reverse effect..

The second article says that student loan debt has grown larger than anyone could have imagined. Student loans have passed credit cards and auto loans to become the second biggest source of personal debt in the U.S. Only Mortgage debt is greater. The Aff should argue that this climbing debt makes many students afraid to accept government aid to go to school. Since student loan debt has some of the lowest percentage of repayment, what happens when too many students default in their loans? You should argue that if we want a more educated work force we must make college an option without the threat of debt.

|

Negative Evidence

NEG- Changing Tuition is a Recruiting Technique of Many Schools

Huffington Post "Private Colleges Cut Tuition Costs To Lure Students Turned Off By High Cost-High Aid Model" Tyler Kingkade December 13, 2012

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/12/13/private-colleges-tuition-cuts_n_2281477.html

"Roger Williams University recently announced all incoming students at the private university will be given a tuition guarantee, meaning their tuition will not rise during their undergraduate career. "What we're trying to say is we'll take some responsibility here," Farish said. "We'll take on some of the task by not increasing tuition and raise the money some other way."

In recent years, tuition has significantly increased at public universities, driven by state budget cuts and prompting student protests around the country. Yet almost the opposite has happened at private colleges. Their tuition grew at its lowest rate in decades this year and at a slower pace than public university tuition.

Tony Pals, director of communications at the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, said he can't remember another time in which so many private schools have held down tuition as he's seen in the past two years. By the association's count, 41 private colleges have cut or frozen tuition, 12 have implemented guarantees that their undergrads will graduate in four years or that their tuition will never go up, and another 16 have instituted tuition increases at or below inflation levels.

Pals predicted the number of private colleges taking similar action on tuition will continue to grow. "Consumers are increasingly price-sensitive," he said, and there's concern that "prospective students may be ruling out applying to a private college simply because of sticker price."...

... Under the high cost-high aid model -- in which more expensive private colleges reserve a large portion of their budget to award generous financial aid, and public universities generally offer little aid -- a low-income student can expect to pay more to attend the University of California than to study at Harvard. In fighting for top students, scholarships and other financial aid are a powerful tool for private schools. Having the top students can lead to better graduation and job placement rates, which in turn can lead to more donations and support from alumni and others.

Farish argues that the high cost-high aid model can't be sustained in the years ahead. "You'll have schools next year crossing the \$60,000 barrier for the first time," he said, referring to annual tuition. "At what point do we price ourselves out of the market?"

He also wants to get out of the business of charging different students different prices, comparing it to how the airline industry operates. "Everyone feels like they've paid too much for their seat and thinks someone else got a better deal," he said. "We decided rather than changing everything completely, at least let's not make the problem any worse."

TAKEAWAY- *This article looks at the increasing cost of public tuition and how it has affected the cost of private universities. Surprisingly enough, as the cost of public universities has risen,*

the cost for private universities has been on the decline. As the NEG you should argue that placing a cap on tuition of public schools compromises the competitiveness between public and private universities. Universities should be able to charge a tuition that reflects the success of their programs. If a distinguished private University is trying to charge the same as a less competitive state university, let them. Students will reap the benefits.

NEG- Capping College Tuition will not Affect Enrollment

NBS News “ College enrollment going down, but will tuition fees follow?” Liz Weston November 19, 2013 <http://www.nbcnews.com/business/personal-finance/college-enrollment-going-down-will-tuition-fees-follow-f2D11620229>

“College enrollment is declining. That may cause students and their parents to hope tuition costs will go down, but they should not count on that.

In classical economics, lower demand typically triggers lower prices, at least until unprofitable companies merge or go out of business and shrink supply. It does not necessarily work that way, though, in the world of higher education.

In the fall of 2012, published tuition and fees for in-state students at four-year U.S. public schools rose just 2.9 percent from a year earlier, the smallest increase in 33 years, the College Board reported. At private schools, published prices rose 3.8 percent, lower than the increases in recent years.

At the same time, the number of students enrolled in colleges and universities fell by nearly half a million after two decades of substantial growth, according to the U.S. Census Bureau.

Moody's rating service has warned that enrollment declines threaten the finances of many colleges...

...The lower enrollments mostly reflect a better economy, which lured students into the workforce and away from two-year and for-profit schools, said Jennifer Ma, a policy research scientist for the College Board. In coming years, though, there is a more worrisome trend for schools: a smaller pool of high school students.

The number of high school graduates peaked in 2011 at 3.4 million, according to a report by the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education.”

TAKEAWAY- *This article says that the average tuition of colleges has dropped over the past few years, but this is more than likely the result of a better economy. As the economy betters, there is more opportunities available to younger adults. Despite a decrease in tuition, high school graduates are choosing to go straight to the workforce. The issue isn't tuition-- it's a good job market. Capping the cost of tuition, like this resolution suggests won't improve enrollments or accessibility if attractive salaries are available. Until we can make college a more viable option than a stable, decent paying job, we won't increase enrollment simply by capping on tuition.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article looks at the increasing cost of public tuition and how it has affected the cost of private universities. Surprisingly enough, as the cost of public universities has risen, the cost for private universities has been on the decline. As the NEG you should argue that placing a cap on tuition of public schools compromises the competitiveness between public and private universities. Universities should be able to charge a tuition that reflects the success of their programs. If a distinguished private University is trying to charge the same as a less competitive state university, let them. Students will reap the benefits.

The second article says that the average tuition of colleges has dropped over the past few years, but this is more than likely the result of a better economy. As the economy betters, there is more opportunities available to younger adults. Despite a decrease in tuition, high school graduates are choosing to go straight to the workforce. The issue isn't tuition-- it's a good job market. Capping the cost of tuition, like this resolution suggests won't improve enrollments or accessibility if attractive salaries are available. Until we can make college a more viable option than a stable, decent paying job, we won't increase enrollment simply by capping on tuition.

Legislation – A Bill to Abolish the Use of Private, Non-Federal, Prisons Affirmative Evidence

AFF – There Are Better Ways to Solve Overcrowding Besides Private Prisons

Seattle Times “Washington’s return to private prisons?” Jonathan Martin, September 23, 2014 <
<http://blogs.seattletimes.com/opinionnw/2014/09/23/washingtons-return-to-private-prisons/>>

“Pacholke got an up-close look at the problems of private prisons in 2004, when Washington DOC inmates rioted at a CCA-run facility in Olney Springs, Colo. He hopes to not repeat the experience...

... Washington lawmakers should remember the recent history with private prisons as they plan for the future beginning in January. Private prisons are not the way to go, for all the reasons documented in the Sentencing Project’s report, “Too Good to be True: Private Prisons in America.”

Instead, the Legislature should take a good hard look at data recently presented to the Justice Reinvestment Task Force, which was summarized in a Seattle Times editorial earlier this month.

A consultant to the task force looked at decades of data and found that Washington is a national outlier on property crime sentences, with almost no probation supervision for low-level burglars who tend to have high recidivism rates, but with unusually long sentences for serial thieves.

The data leads to a clear conclusion: tweaking property-crime sentences to emphasize lower-cost alternatives (including drug treatment) to head off the projected prison overcrowding. It has the potential to bend down Washington’s third-in-the-nation rate of property crime. And done well, it has the potential to save money.

Washington has done this type of reform before, particularly with drug crimes. It’s time to take a look at property crimes, and figure out how not to build Washington’s 13th prison, as a Seattle Times editorial package, published last year, suggested.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how private prisons are not a solution to overcrowding. Private prisons have an array of problems, from human rights issues, to the fact that private prisons take an institution and turn it into a corporation, with the goal of making more and more money, and cutting costs in other areas. What the government should do is look at particular sentencing for crimes and change them to prevent overcrowding. Drug crimes are one, and as the article talks about, property crimes are another. There are adjustments that can be made besides throwing people into prisons that aren’t fit for living. Private prisons must go.*

AFF – Private Prisons Present Several Issues

NPR “Who Benefits When A Private Prison Comes To Town?” November 5, 2011 <
<http://www.npr.org/2011/11/05/142058047/who-benefits-when-a-private-prison-comes-to-town>>

“The presence of a prison might actually squeeze out other businesses that could bring greater benefits than the prison itself, he says. Also, many of the jobs created by a private prison don’t actually go to people in the community.

The bigger problem, he says, is that state and federal taxpayers — who in the end are paying for these prisons — aren't getting the most value for their money.

To cite just one example, he says, last year the Arizona auditor general found that it actually might be more expensive to hold Arizona prisoners in private, for-profit facilities than in public ones.

The safety and security of private prisons is another concern. Shapiro says some studies have found that the level of violence is actually higher in private prisons.

"Private prisons have incentives to make money [and] to cut costs," he says. "One of the ways they do that is by slashing pay for staff, which leads to much higher rates of turnover."

That high rate of turnover and guards who lack the experience to properly respond to situations like escape attempts is dangerous, Shapiro says.

The savings from those cost cuts do not get passed on to the state, he says...

... "Crime rates are declining, the prison population is declining, and many states, in large part motivated by the economic downturn, are realizing that they can't keep building their way out of the problem," says Michele Deitch, who teaches criminal justice at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas.

Deitch says the new growth market for prison companies is immigrant detention, like the facility in Karnes County. New prisons, possibly for state inmates, like the one in Hardin, Mont., are on the decline."

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about several issues that should be discussed by the affirmative. First, private prisons are more expensive to the taxpayers, because these giant corporations are able to pull more money, and work around government regulations. Second, private prisons, while they bring more jobs to smaller towns, they may actually harm other businesses in the area. Third, there are concerns and studies that have shown that private prisons are more violent than public prisons. And last, if the negative argues that there is a need for private prisons due to over-population, this article also talks about how crime and the actual number of inmates are on the decline!*

Affirmative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how private prisons are not a solution to overcrowding. Private prisons have an array of problems, from human rights issues, to the fact that private prisons take an institution and turn it into a corporation, with the goal of making more and more money, and cutting costs in other areas. What the government should do is look at particular sentencing for crimes and change them to prevent overcrowding. Drug crimes are one, and as the article talks about, property crimes are another. There are adjustments that can be made besides throwing people into prisons that aren't fit for living. Private prisons must go.

The second article talks about several issues that should be discussed by the affirmative. First, private prisons are more expensive to the taxpayers, because these giant corporations are able to pull more money, and work around government regulations. Second, private prisons, while they bring more jobs to smaller towns, they may actually harm other businesses in the area. Third, there are concerns and studies that have shown that private prisons are more violent than public prisons. And last, if the negative argues that there is a need for private prisons due to over-population, this article also talks about how crime and the actual number of inmates are on the decline!

Negative Evidence

NEG – No Studies Accurately Show Whether Public or Private Prisons Are Better

The Washington Post “Are private prisons better or worse than public prisons?” Sasha Volokh, February 25, 2014 < <http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2014/02/25/are-private-prisons-better-or-worse-than-public-prisons/>>

“How do we determine whether the private sector costs more or less than the public sector? Ideally, we could work off of a large database of public and private prisons and run a regression in which we controlled for jurisdiction, demographic factors, size, and the like. In practice, this large database doesn’t exist, and so the typical study chooses a small set of public and private prisons that are supposedly comparable.

Unfortunately, this comparability tends to be elusive; the public and private facilities compared often “differ in ways that confound comparison of costs.” Sometimes no comparable facilities exist...

... Moving on to quality comparisons, the picture is similarly grim. As with cost comparisons, sometimes no comparable facility exists in the same jurisdiction. Some studies solve that problem by looking at prisons in different jurisdictions, an approach that has its own problems. (If one had a large database with several prisons in each jurisdiction, one could control for the jurisdiction, but this approach is of course unavailable when comparing two prisons, each in its own jurisdiction.) Many studies just don’t control for clearly relevant variables in determining whether a facility is truly comparable.

Often, the comparability problem boils down to differences in inmate populations; one prison may have a more difficult population than the other, even if they have the same security level. Usually prisons have different populations because of the luck of the draw, but sometimes it’s by design, as happened in Arizona, when the Department of Corrections chose “to refrain from assigning prisoners to [a particular private prison] if they [had] serious or chronic medical problems, serious psychiatric problems, or [were] deemed to be unlikely to benefit from the substance abuse program that is provided at the facility.” It’s actually quite common to not send certain inmates to private prisons; the most common restriction in contracts is on inmates with special medical needs...

... After having read the foregoing, one should be fairly dismayed at the state of comparative public-private prison research. In fact, it gets worse. An overarching problem is that most studies don’t simultaneously compare both cost and quality. It is hard to draw strong conclusions from such studies, even if they are state-of-the-art at what they are examining.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how there have been no studies to accurately show whether private or public prisons are better. While the affirmative will try to say that prison qualities are bad, they draw no comparisons to public prisons. There have been no studies to draw comparisons between the two. Even if there were studies, it’s a hard thing to pinpoint – because just like every classroom is different, every prison is different because of the programs they provide and the inmates they keep. More studies should be conducted before we pass a bill like this. Accountability measures should be put in place before a bill like this is passed.*

Currently, few regulations are put on private prisons, compared to public prisons. Let's try to fix the problem before condemning the institutions.

NEG – Prison Overpopulation is Still Increasing in 2014

Washington Post “Prisons in these 17 states are over capacity” Reid Wilson, September 20, 2014 <
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/govbeat/wp/2014/09/20/prisons-in-these-17-states-are-filled-over-capacity/>>

“The number of Americans in state and federal prisons has exploded over the last three decades, to the point that nearly one in every 200 people is behind bars. And though the rate of growth has slowed, and even declined over the last five years, the tough-on-crime policies and longer sentences that have sent prison rates skyward present a huge problem for states: Where do they put all those people?

That problem is especially acute in 17 states where the prison population is now higher than the capacity of the facilities designed to hold them. Those states, still recovering from a recession that decimated budgets, have to decide whether to build facilities with more beds, turn to private contractors, relax release policies — or simply stuff more prisoners into smaller spaces.

At the end of 2013, Illinois was housing 48,653 prisoners, according to data published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics. The state’s prison facilities are designed to hold just 32,075 prisoners, meaning the system is operating at 151 percent of capacity. North Dakota’s 1,571 prisoners live in space meant for 1,044 people, 150 percent of capacity.”

TAKEAWAY – *This article talks about how overpopulation is still a growing problem in the United States. While the rate of growth might be lower than previous years, it's still a problem. Some facilities are as much as 50% over capacity. Private prisons are not only an option, they have kept the US prison system afloat, enabling public prisons to turn to private prison corporations for housing prisoners. If we get rid of private prisons, not only would people lose their jobs, but can you imagine what would happen to the overpopulation issues? This bill cannot be passed, because it's an over-step. If there are problems with private prisons, enforce strong regulations – don't just shut them down.*

Negative Takeaways:

The first article talks about how there have been no studies to accurately show whether private or public prisons are better. While the affirmative will try to say that prison qualities are bad, they draw no comparisons to public prisons. There have been no studies to draw comparisons between the two. Even if there were studies, it's a hard thing to pinpoint – because just like every classroom is different, every prison is different because of the programs they provide and the inmates they keep. More studies should be conducted before we pass a bill like this. Accountability measures should be put in place before a bill like this is passed. Currently, few regulations are put on private prisons, compared to public prisons. Let's try to fix the problem before condemning the institutions.

The second article talks about how overpopulation is still a growing problem in the United States. While the rate of growth might be lower than previous years, it's still a problem. Some facilities are as much as 50% over capacity. Private prisons are not only an option, they have kept the US prison system afloat, enabling public prisons to turn to private prison corporations for housing prisoners. If we get rid of private prisons, not only would people lose their jobs, but can you imagine what would happen to the overpopulation issues? This bill cannot be passed, because it's an over-step. If there are problems with private prisons, enforce strong regulations – don't just shut them down.