
West Coast Publishing

Education 2017 Negative Sample

Edited by Jim Hanson

Researchers

Angie Tinker, Eric Robinson, Jonathan Shane, Matt Stannard,
Ross Richendrfer, Shelby Pryor, William James Taylor

Thanks for using our Policy, LD, Public Forum, and Extemp Materials.

**Please don't share this material with anyone outside
of your school**

including via print, email, dropbox, google drive, the web, etc.

We're a small non-profit; please help us continue to provide our products.

Contact us at jim@wcdebate.com

www.wcdebate.com

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding and/or regulation of elementary and/or secondary education in the United States.

NEGATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO

EDUCATION 2017-2018

WEST COAST NEGATIVE

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic and/or diplomatic engagement with the People's Republic of China.

Finding Arguments in this File

Use the table of contents on the next pages to find the evidence you need or the navigation bar on the left. We have tried to make the table of contents as easy to use as possible. You'll find scenario/impacts, affirmatives, disadvantages, counterplans, and kritiks listed alphabetically in their categories.

Using the Arguments in this File

We encourage you to be familiar with the evidence you use. Highlight (underline) the key lines you will use in the evidence. Cut evidence from our files, incorporate your and others' research and make new files. File the evidence so that you can easily retrieve it when you need it in debate rounds. Practice reading the evidence out-loud; Practice applying the arguments to your opponents' positions; Practice defending your evidence in rebuttal speeches.

Use West Coast Evidence as a Beginning

We hope you enjoy our evidence files and find them useful. In saying this, we want to make a strong statement that we make when we coach and that we believe is vitally important to your success: DO NOT USE THIS EVIDENCE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR YOUR OWN RESEARCH. Instead, let it serve as a beginning. Let it inform you of important arguments, of how to tag and organize your arguments, and to offer citations for further research. Don't stagnate in these files--build upon them by doing your own research for updates, new strategies, and arguments that specifically apply to your opponents. In doing so, you'll use our evidence to become a better debater.

Copying and Sharing West Coast Evidence?

Our policy gives you the freedom to use our evidence for educational purposes without violating our hard work.

- You may print and copy this evidence for those on your team.
- **You may not electronically share nor distribute this evidence with anyone other than those on your team unless you very substantially change each page of material that you share.**

For unusual situations, you can e-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com and seek our consent.

Ordering West Coast Materials

1. Visit the West Coast Web Page at www.wcdebate.com
2. E-mail us at jim@wcdebate.com
3. Fax us at 877-781-5058

Copyright 2017. West Coast Publishing. All Rights Reserved.

Visit our web page!
www.wcdebate.com

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding and/or regulation of elementary and/or secondary education in the United States.....2

NEGATIVE EVIDENCE FILE INTRO3

TABLE OF CONTENTS4

Debating on the Negative.....16

Definitions20

Topicality Arguments.....35

*“Increase” T (not create) – 1NC.....36

*“Its” T– 1NC37

*“Funding” T – 1NC38

*“Regulation” T – 1NC.....39

*“Elementary education” T – 1NC.....40

*“Secondary education” T – 1NC41

NEG ARGS EDUCATION GOOD NOW42

Education Good Frontline43

Uniqueness Extensions44

Spending Money on Education Now45

Regulating Education Now47

Impact Extensions.....49

Education System Good Now – Economy50

Education System Good Now – Teacher Qualifications51

Education System Good Now – Poverty.....52

Education System Good Now – Low Income/Minorities.....53

Education System Good Now – Minorities/Studies54

Education System Good Now – Health/Nutrition55

Education System Good Now – Curriculum/Outcomes56

Education System Good Now – Charter Schools.....57

Education System Good Now – DeVos Good60

A/T DeVos Will Destroy the Education System61

A/T Cuts Increase Poverty62

NEG ARGS REGULATIONS BAD63

Uniqueness: Education Regulations Declining Now64

Uniqueness: Education Regulations Declining Now65

Links: Education Regulations Snowball66

Links: Education Regulations Snowball67

Links: Education Regulations Snowball68

Impact: Destruction of Liberty.....69

Impact: Destruction of Liberty.....70

Impact: Mind Control71

Impact: Destruction of Free Market.....72

Impact: No Solvency73

Alternative: Free Market Solves74

NEG HEAD START76

Topicality77

Extra-Topicality 1NC78

Head Start is Extra-Topical.....79

Head Start is Extra-Topical.....81

Politics.....82

(Trump Bad) Plan is popular - Bipartisanship83

(Trump Bad) Plan is popular - Public84

Fund Head Start CP85

Fund Head Start CP – 1NC86

Fund Head Start CP – 1NC88

Fund Head Start CP – Solvency Extension89

Fund Head Start CP – Solvency Extension91

Fund Head Start CP – Does not link to politics93

E-Cig Tax CP94

E-Cig Tax CP – State Solvency95

Pay-for-performance/social impact bonds CP.....96

Pay-for-performance/social impact bonds CP - Solvency97

Solvency Answers98

Federal involvement fails99

Funding alone will not solve100

Vertical alignment fails101

Pro-Head Start studies are wrong102

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Access reforms fail.....103

A2: Education Advantage105

No impact on education for kids106

Educational quality will still vary107

Alternate causes the plan cannot solve.....109

Educational “fadeout” is not true.....110

A2: Poverty Advantage112

Alternate causes the plan cannot solve.....113

A2: Obesity Advantage114

No Solvency115

Alternate causes the plan cannot solve.....116

NEG SCHOOL CHOICE117

School choice doesn’t improve performance.....118

Choice schools are worse120

School choice hurts teacher quality124

School choice increases segregation125

School choice doesn’t help at-risk populations.....128

School choice hurts public schools130

Public schools are good134

Church & State DA136

No real choice138

Tax credits for scholarships fail139

States CP142

States CP—Tax credits144

Politics DA149

Politics DA—Tax credits151

Politics DA—Unions152

NEG SEX EDUCATION155

Case Neg156

Status Quo Solves157

Representations Advantage158

Consent Advantage.....162

Health Advantage167

Solvency169

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Disadvantage Links172

Plan Unpopular173

Plan Popular.....175

Kritik Links.....177

R*pe Talk K178

STD Talk K181

HIV/AIDS Talk K.....183

Counterplan Solvency.....185

States CP186

Advantage CP – Healthcare Professionals.....187

NEG STEM.....188

Economy Frontline.....189

No shortage of STEM workers190

STEM jobs aren’t attractive to workers.....199

K-12 education doesn’t solve202

Science Diplomacy Frontline207

Biodiversity Turn.....209

Liberal Arts Turn211

Politics DA.....215

States CP216

Visas VP.....221

Gender/Race Kritik223

NEG TRANS STUDENTS224

Case Neg225

Status Quo Solves226

A2: School to Prison Pipeline.....227

A2: Student Advocacy.....230

A2 – Democracy Impact.....231

Backlash232

A2 Solvency.....233

Counterplan Solvency.....235

State CP Solves236

Courts CP Solves237

Kritik Links.....240

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Capitalism Links241

Disability Links243

Intersectionality Links.....244

Orientalism Links246

Queer Theory Links.....247

Speaking For Others Links251

Disadvantage Links252

Plan Popular.....253

Plan Unpopular255

Spending DA257

Position Overview.....258

1NC – Spending DA.....259

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now261

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now262

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now263

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now264

Uniqueness – No Regulations Now265

Uniqueness – No Regulations Now266

Uniqueness – No Regulations Now267

Uniqueness – Spending Cuts Now268

Uniqueness – Economy Strong Now269

Links – Education Regulations Hurt the Economy.....270

Links – Education Regulations Hurt the Economy.....271

Links – Education Regulations Hurt the Economy.....272

Links – Regulations Hurt the Economy.....273

Links – Regulations Hurt Consumer Confidence274

Links – Regulations Hurt Consumer Confidence275

Links – Regulations Kill Business Confidence.....276

Links – Spending Hurts the Economy277

Internal Links – US Key to Global Economy.....278

Impacts – World War III.....279

Impacts – No Solvency.....280

Impacts – No Solvency.....281

Impacts – No Turns.....282

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Impacts – No Turns283

Net-Benefits – States CP284

Net-Benefits – A-PLUS Act285

Aff Responses286

Non-Unique – Education Spending Now287

Non-Unique – Education Spending Now288

Non-Unique – Regulations Now289

Non-Unique – Economy Doomed Now290

Non-Unique – Economy Doomed Now291

Non-Unique – Economy Doomed Now292

Non-Unique – Business Confidence Killed Now293

Turn – Status Quo Kills the Economy294

Turn – Status Quo Kills the Economy295

Turn – Status Quo Kills Business Confidence.....296

Turn – Plan Key to Economic Growth.....297

Turn – Education Key to Long-Term Economy Health.....299

Turn – Education Key to State Economies.....300

No Impact – Economy is Resilient301

A2: States CP Net Benefit302

CPLAN GATES FOUNDATION303

1NC Shell.....304

Net Benefits305

Federalism306

Politics – CP Popular307

Politics – CP Unpopular311

Frontlines.....312

A2 Perm313

Solvency.....317

Funding.....318

Speed.....321

Spillover323

Early Childhood Education.....326

Charter Schools.....327

Generic Education328

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Teacher Training329

CPLAN STATES COUNTERPLAN330

Counterplan Explained331

1NC—Shell332

Solvency—A/T Federal Regulations.....333

Solvency—A/T Federal Funding.....334

Solvency—Accountability335

Solvency—General336

Solvency—Regulatory Overreach337

Solvency—Regulations338

A/T Perm—Keep Feds Out.....339

A/T Perm.....340

Federal Regulation Bad—Wasteful Spending.....341

Federal Regulation Bad—Lower Standards/On-Size-Fits-All Bad.....342

Federal Regulation Bad—Lower Standards.....343

Federal Regulation Bad—Lower Standards.....344

Federal Regulation Bad—Bad Education (K Aff Turn)345

Federal Regulation Bad—Doesn’t Improve Edu.....346

Federal Regulation Bad—Strings Attached347

Federal Funding/Regulations Bad—Extortion348

*** Federalism Disad ***349

Uniqueness—Federalism High Now—Policy350

Uniqueness—Federalism High Now—Policy351

Uniqueness—Federalism High Now—ESSA.....352

Uniqueness—Federalism High Now—DeVos353

Uniqueness—Federalism High Now—Fed. Regulation354

Uniqueness—Federalism High Now—Trump.....355

Uniqueness—Federal Push Now356

Uniqueness—States Control now.....357

Link.....358

Link.....359

Link.....360

Link.....361

Impact—Federalism in Edu. Good.....362

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Impact—Disaster Response.....363

Impact—Federalism Good for Minority Rights364

Impact—Federalism Solves Climate Change365

A/T “Federalism Dead Now”366

A/T “Federalism Dead Now”367

A/T “Federalism Dead Now”368

A/T “Links to Politics”369

A/T “Federal Standards Good”370

A/T Federalism Bad—Social Change.....371

*** Federalism DA Answers ***372

Non Unique—Federalism Low Now373

Non Unique—Federalism Low Now—A/T “ESSA”374

Non Unique—Federalism Low Now375

Non Unique—Federalism Low Now376

Non Unique—Squo Overwhelms Link377

Non Unique—Squo Overwhelms Link378

A/T Federalism DA—Link Non Unique.....379

A/T Federalism DA—Link Non Unique.....380

A/T Federalism DA—No Link381

A/T Federalism DA—Turn.....382

A/T Federalism DA—Funding Turn383

A/T Federalism DA—Inequitable Schools.....384

A/T Federalism DA—Hurts Economy.....385

A/T Federalism DA—Federalism is Racist.....386

DISAD REGULATIONS DA387

Position Overview.....388

1NC – Spending DA.....389

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now391

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now392

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now394

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now395

Uniqueness – No Regulations Now396

Uniqueness – No Regulations Now397

Uniqueness – No Regulations Now398

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Uniqueness – Spending Cuts Now399

Uniqueness – Economy Strong Now400

Links – Education Regulations Hurt the Economy401

Links – Education Regulations Hurt the Economy402

Links – Education Regulations Hurt the Economy403

Links – Regulations Hurt the Economy404

Links – Regulations Hurt Consumer Confidence405

Links – Regulations Hurt Consumer Confidence407

Links – Regulations Kill Business Confidence.....408

Links – Spending Hurts the Economy409

Internal Links – US Key to Global Economy410

Impacts – World War III.....411

Impacts – No Solvency.....412

Impacts – No Solvency.....413

Impacts – No Turns.....414

Impacts – No Turns.....415

Net-Benefits – States CP416

Net-Benefits – A-PLUS Act417

DISAD SPENDING TRADEOFF418

Disad Overview419

1NC Shell.....420

Uniqueness423

Not Spending Money on Education Now - General424

Not Spending Money on Education Now – Title 2425

A/T Specific Funding Increases – Title 1426

Spending Money on Defense Now427

Alt. UQ Scenario – Veteran Affairs429

Alt. UQ Scenario – Social Welfare.....430

Alt. UQ Scenario – Science/Alt. Energy/Environment431

Links433

Link – Military Spending434

Link Booster – Education Spending Requires Cuts437

Alt. Link Scenario – School Choice T/O Afterschool Programs438

Alt. Link Scenario – Social Welfare439

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Alt. Link Scenario – Veteran Affairs440

Alt. Link Scenario – Science/Alt. Energy/Environment.....441

Impacts442

Military Spending Good – Conflict.....443

Military Spending Good – Terrorism444

Military Spending Good – Russia War445

Military Spending Good – Economy446

Impact Booster – Modernization Key.....447

Alt. Impact Scenario – Veteran Affairs – Booster448

Alt. Impact Scenario – Veteran Affairs – Public Health449

Alt. Impact Scenario – Social Welfare Good – Poverty.....450

Alt. Impact Scenario – Social Welfare Good – Economy451

Alt. Impact Scenario – Environment Good – LL.....452

Alt. Impact Scenario – EPA Good – Climate Change.....453

KRITIK CAPITALISM KRITIK454

Capitalism Kritik Introduction.....455

Negative Capitalism Kritik.....456

Capitalism 1NC Shell 1/3.....457

Capitalism 1NC Shell 2/3458

Capitalism 1NC Shell 3/3459

Education Links.....460

Education Links.....461

Education Links.....462

Educational Assessment/Achievement Links463

STEM/Science Education Links464

Stem/Science Education Links.....465

Deliberation/Discourse Links.....466

Capitalism Is Generally Bad467

Capitalism is Generally Bad469

Capitalism Destroys Ecology.....470

Capitalism Destroys Ecology.....471

Collapse Inevitable.....472

Paradigm/Framework.....473

Paradigm/Framework.....474

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Answers to “Schools Good” Arguments475

Answers to Permutations476

Answers to Permutations477

AT “Growth/Innovation Good” Arguments478

Alternative Solvency: Embracing the Commons Solves Capitalism and the Affirmative479

Alternative Solvency: Embracing the Commons Solves Capitalism and the Affirmative480

Alternative Solvency: Embracing the Commons Solves Capitalism and the Affirmative482

Alternative Solves483

KRITIK DESCHOOLING KRITIK484

Critique Overview/Explanation485

1NC—Link486

1NC—Impact—Environment/ Violence.....487

1NC—Impact—War488

1NC—Framework489

1NC—Alternative.....490

Link—Education Reform492

Link—Education Reform494

Link—Reform as Conservative Ideology.....495

Link—“Banking” Concept496

Link—Ignores Poverty.....497

Link—Education Reform498

Link—Marketplace of Choices499

Link—Education System500

Impact—Suicidal State.....501

Impact—Dehumanization.....502

Impact—Psychological.....503

Impact—Crisis Exploitation504

Alt Solvency—A/T “No Alt to Schools”505

Alt Solvency—Cooperative Education506

Alt Solvency—Problem-Solving507

Alt Solvency—Homeschooling.....508

Alt Solvency—A/T “No Spillover”509

Home Schooling Good—Learning.....510

Home Schooling Good—Happiness.....511

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Home Schooling Good—Minorities.....512

Framework—Education Discourse513

Framework.....515

Framework: Knowledge DA.....516

Framework—Reconstruct Education518

Framework.....519

Framework—A/T “Must Have Endpoint”520

Framework—A/T “Must Have Endpoint”521

Framework—A/T “Must Work Within the State”523

Framework—Method First524

Framework: A/T ‘Topic Education’525

Framework—Alt=Political.....526

A/T Perm—Neoliberalism DA.....527

A/T Perm—Agency DA.....528

A/T Perm—Still Links529

A/T Perm—No Solvency530

A/T Perm—No Solvency531

A/T Perm—No Solvency532

A/T “Can’t Change Education Model”533

A/T “Your Authors Contradict”534

A/T “Illich Bad”535

Debating on the Negative

Smaller Impacts, Big Importance

Education topics enjoy a wide variety of impacts, the majority of which are not nuclear wars, climate change or anything else that would “cause” extinction (although these are accessible as well). The majority of impacts involve issues like poverty, oppression, racism and gender discrimination. Although some may try to link something like gender discrimination to nuclear war, we all know that internal link is tenuous or at least very long term. Smaller impacts are what we call “systemic”—they are happening now and only getting worse. Yes there is racism today, so that impact is “non-unique”, but that does not mean we should just give up. If fighting racism in education can undermine racism at a broader level then that is a universally good thing. Many of these impacts may be tied to claims of ethics or moral obligations.

In confronting advantages with “small” impacts, it is important to not just race to win the bigger impact game—that you “outweigh” something like racism does not mean your impact wins the day. Impact comparison is essential here: Timeframe, magnitude, probability. The best way is to play defense against the case and have a disadvantage with a parallel impact. If the Aff claims a poverty advantage, run a disadvantage that ends in economic decline. Another option is to run a kritik of the ways in which the Affirmative has described the problem (lots of language kritiks here) or how they get to the end goal is problematic (for example, if someone said kill everyone in poverty that would “solve poverty”, but be infinitely problematic).

Big Impacts, Be Afraid!

Many debaters immediately run for the biggest possible impacts. For this topic, Negatives have a host of options in accessing their favorite world-ending scenarios. Disadvantages can easily claim economic decline, which can access EVERY major impact from hegemony and war to space exploration to environmental collapse. However, so can Affirmatives.

As mentioned earlier, the STEM funding case will be quite popular this year. It accesses the economy, international diplomacy, space wars, cyberterrorism and more. If you like playing the “who’s got the most world ending scenarios” game, then you can take these cases straight up with a combination of offense and defense on the advantages and a few disadvantages to stack the deck. However, the more strategic option is a smart CP to advance STEM education through different means. For example, students could opt for the states or simply increase H1-B visas in combination with a disadvantage and case answers.

Disadvantages

Most disadvantages on this topic will rely on long-term internal links and/or tenuous links. The more specifically they are tied (i.e. assume) education policy the better the links will turn out. For example, politics disadvantages will be popular, but if the internal links do not assume the general link story then it will be easy for Affirmatives to pick it apart. One thing to point out is that there is not *a* politics disadvantage, but many. The election of Trump somewhat jacks the traditional political capital story. Instead, detailed politics arguments will largely concern congressional politics, including midterm elections and general horse trading/concessions (between congressional members).

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Every team should have a politics DA for a specific state. This is useful on both sides of the resolution. On the Affirmative, it becomes a DA to the States CP. On the Negative, you can claim the plan (usually a new regulation) represents an unfunded mandate that undermines a state economy (which is an independent DA itself) and costs X Governor/Congress person their election.

Many DAs will concern the funding side of the resolution, which will become important as soon as we have a new budget passed by Congress. The most likely scenario could see huge cuts to education. This should provide a solid uniqueness story for the Negative (and inherency for the Affirmative). Spending DAs stem from either the overall federal budget/spending levels or a specific agency budget/spending levels.

The first set of Spending DAs involves the general federal budget. Prior to Congress actually passing a new budget, most evidence merely speculates what Trump wants to do. This creates a situation where the links and internal links will be quite generic. Traditional Spending DAs fall into this category. When the budget is set, new spending inevitably trades off with current programs. As with all trade-off DAs, you need to find the “X program is on the chopping block” cards. These say that certain programs in the Dept. may be internally unpopular and/or likely to be cut if necessary. All you have to do then is find out why that is actually a good program and hunt for an impact.

Since the Department of Education would implement most funding plans, it makes sense to have a disadvantage centered on their budget and programs. Impacts for these DAs will likely operate as parallel to the Affirmative. This is strategically valuable because it functionally nullifies the case impact. All you have to do then is win a risk of a case turn or disadvantage. Finally, the Military Recruitment DA accesses big impacts but is infinitely problematic after the budget is set. At that point, the budgetary battle between security spending and education spending is over. However, be cautious of this DA. The more generic the argument the more the Aff. can link turn. As mentioned earlier, there is a host of evidence based on military reports and studies that say a better education is essential to getting *quality* recruits and hence a *better* military.

Disadvantages based on regulations will largely be case specific. Two disadvantages generally apply: Regulations bad (super generic) and Business Confidence. Both of these DAs have huge problems. With the Regulations DA, the argument is that regulations are bad for the economy and currently being rolled back by Trump. However, these cards assume *business* regulations, such as environmental regulations that cost businesses money. Business has confidence in making future investments when regulations are stable. New regulations make them unsure. But again, these are regulations on businesses who are unaffected by education regulations.

Counterplans

On this education topic it is all about the process CP. Negatives enjoy a host of CPs involving alternate agents as well as alterations to the process itself. Most notably, the States CP could easily be the most effective CP on the topic for three reasons. First, the vast majority of education policy occurs at the state level. Therefore, there is no real reason why the states could not enact regulations independent of the USFG—and they commonly do! Secondly, there is little offense against the CP. Even if the federal government acts, the states have to implement those regulations, so whatever DAs link to the CP also link to the plan. For example, say the DA to the States CP was a Brownback Legitimacy DA (KS Gov.-R) that said action by the State of KS would undercut Brownback’s political capital/legitimacy he would not be able to push through state insurance reforms, which tanks the economy. The same would be true of the Affirmative because states would enforce/implement the regulations passed by the USFG, so it links to both. Finally, debaters will be able to find

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

specific solvency and solvency advocates for doing many plans on the state level. Much of this evidence will directly compare the USFG action versus states, which is a little better than evidence that just says the USFG solves.

The States CP faces some difficulty with pure funding Affirmatives. Most states are pretty strapped for cash. Therefore, the States CP is vulnerable to State Budget DAs. While most of these impacts are “small” in scope, some states can have major impacts to the economy: California, Texas and New York to name a few.

Some may argue that Trump could do the plan through an Executive Order and claim a politics DA. Education measures have a little history with Executive Orders. Most recently, Trump signed an Executive Order in April that sought to curtail the federal role in education: “It shall be the policy of the executive branch to protect and preserve State and local control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, and personnel of educational institutions, schools, and school systems, consistent with applicable law.”

(<https://www.forbes.com/sites/waynecrews/2017/04/27/new-trump-executive-orders-spotlight-interior-and-education-regulatory-dark-matter/#6dc1a6c39a7b>)

As a result, XOs could be independent actions or the internal mechanism and Affirmative might use to pass a regulation. Either way, the particular agent of the plan is an essential cross-ex discussion.

Another alternative agent can be found in a host of court systems: the Supreme Court, state Supreme Courts, federal district courts, etc. These usually involve a politics DA. The difficulty here is finding specific solvency evidence referencing the Affirmative.

A final option involves State PICs, or Plan Inclusive CPs. Since federal regulations are directed at states, such as those found in the ESSA, it makes sense that team might try to exclude one state and run a net benefit based on that excluded state. For example, Negatives could exclude Kansas and run the Brownback Credibility DA as the ben-benefit or exclude California and claim an Economy DA. Word of warning—many judges dislike these CPs and view them as illegitimate. The argument here is that they are artificially competitive because they either functionally fiat the link to the net-benefit and/or its uniqueness, when teams could have just run the DA. Others argue that PICS are just not strategic because all the Aff. has to do is win a permutation and it disproves both and/or beat the net-benefit and the CP goes away.

Beyond alternative agents, teams may seek to alter the actual process of federal regulations or funding. Regulations could be conditioned on many things related and unrelated to education, including specific state reforms (such as abortion laws and sex education in schools) or teams could change how the money is distributed (must target at-risk students). Funding Affirmatives are especially vulnerable to process CPs. The Gates Foundation CP is an old standard and included in the West Coast Negative book. Basically, these just fund the plan in a different manner. So instead of the Dept. of Education of the general USFG funding the plan, the Gates Foundation would give states the money they need for the plan. In reality, there is very little reason the USFG *must* do the funding. This gives Negatives two advantages. First, it makes the Spending and/or Budget DAs very clear net benefits—“Any risk of the disadvantage means you vote Negative because the CP solve 100% of the Aff.” Secondly, it proves the CP can solve just as well as the Aff. If there is some reason the USFG must do the plan, it is probably based on some form of regulation. If this happens, then they link to all your regulation DAs!

Kritiks

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Capitalism and Neoliberalism kritiks pop up on every resolution and education is no different. In fact, there are actually quite strong links between the education system and capitalism. Many scholars argue that American schools are basically factories that *produce* liberal subjects aligned with the goals of modern capitalism. Everything students learn in schools trains them to be consumers of not only goods but neoliberal ideology. Professor Henry A. Giroux, the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University has written extensively about American education and capitalism. In his book *America's Education and the War on Youth*, Dr. Giroux challenges the education system on multiple levels (school-to-prison pipeline, lack of access, racial profiling) that connect both democracy and neoliberal capitalism:

“This pervasive regime of neoliberalism is producing unprecedented inequalities in wealth and income, runaway environmental devastation, egregious amounts of human suffering ... At the same time, students are being assaulted by the police for engaging in peaceful protests against the harshest elements of the neoliberal order while low-income and poor minority youth are placed increasingly under the authority of the criminal justice system. Everywhere we look, the rich and powerful use their authority to undermine the social state...Relatively unchecked in imposing its values, social relations, and forms of social death upon all aspects of civic life, neoliberalism has given rise to what Paul Virilio has called a “suicidal state.” The United States now resembles a society in which governments work to destroy their own defenses against anti-democratic forces” (pp. 101-102).

This quote is included to illustrate the interconnectedness of these arguments. Elsewhere, Giroux and others go into detail about educational exclusion based on race and poverty and how this maintains a permanent underclass defined by class stratification that treats people as disposable.

Instead of capitalism, Antiblackness kritik might argue that schools are imbedded in a white subjectivity that excludes black peoples and indigenous people from civil society. School lessons that glorify American leaders who were slave owners is just a taste of how racialization and white supremacy are maintained and bolstered within schools. Much of these argues are reflected in to quote above in reference to social death and poverty.

NEG HEAD START

Topicality

Extra-Topicality 1NC

A. Interpretation: Topical plans must increase funding and/or regulation of elementary and/or secondary education. This excludes Head Start and pre-K

Brianna **Flavin**, Staff Writer for Rasmussen College, May 23, **2016**, “Early Childhood Education vs. Elementary Education: Which Environment is Right for You?,” <http://www.rasmussen.edu/degrees/education/blog/early-childhood-education-vs-elementary-education/>

Early childhood education (ECE) focuses on the academic, social and cognitive skills that develop in children from birth through preschool. Elementary education refers to the primary education that comes after preschool but before middle school (typically kindergarten through fifth or sixth grade.) There are definite distinctions between the two sectors that are important to understand. We’re here to help you make an informed decision about early childhood education versus elementary education. We combined government information, real-time job market data and expert insight to provide you a side-by-side comparison below.

B. Violation: 80% of Head Start covers children before elementary education. This proves they are extra-topical or have almost no internal link to their advantages

US Dept. of Health & Human Services, February 21, **2017**, Head Start, “About Us,” <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/hs/about>, Accessed 4/1/2017

More than 50 years ago, Head Start began as a program for preschoolers. Today 3- and 4-year-olds make up more than 80 percent of the children served by Head Start programs each year. Early Head Start (EHS) was created to serve pregnant women, infants, and toddlers. EHS programs are open to the family until the child turns 3 and is ready to transition into Head Start or another pre-K program. Just recently, many EHS programs have been funded to partner directly with existing infant and toddler child care programs, resulting in higher quality services to all children enrolled in the child care program.

C. Standards

1. Predictable Ground – We base our 1NC strategy on predictable links from elementary education. It’s impossible to predict all the possible permutations between educational efforts at different levels. This leads to shallow debates that magnify the Affirmative infinite prep time advantage and undermine the educational benefits from an in-depth debate. This structurally disadvantages the Negative because they can use unpredictable extra-topical add-ons to mitigate our impacts, which is an unfair strategy skew.

2. Fair Limits – Allowing for Head Start explodes research burdens. It justifies including every pre-K program and higher education, as well as permutations between these and the two topical areas. Negatives could never prepare for the sheer multitude of Affirmatives, which gives them an unfair advantage.

D. Vote Negative on competitive equity and education

We’re a small non-profit. Please don’t share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

Head Start is Extra-Topical

Head Start covers pre-school—That’s extra-topical

Terri J. **Sabol**, Assistant Professor of Human Development & Social Policy at Northwestern University **and** P. Lindsay **Chase-Lansdale**, Associate Provost for Faculty & Frances Willard Professor of Human Development and Social Policy at Northwestern University, January/February **2015**, “Does Head Start Promote Outcomes for Low-Income Parents?,” Aspen Journal of ideas, <http://aspen.us/journal/editions/januaryfebruary-2015/does-head-start-promote-outcomes-low-income-parents>, Accessed 4/4/2017

This year marks the 50th anniversary of President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty, a remarkable package of legislation designed to reduce the number of American families living on very little. One lasting legacy of the initiative was the creation of Head Start, a federal antipoverty program to promote early school success for low-income, preschool-aged children in the hopes of reducing social disparities over time. Head Start is currently the nation’s largest federally funded preschool program, and it serves more than one million low-income children each year.

Head Start funding advocacy covers pre-school

Joe **Heim**, Washington Post staff writer, December 14, **2016**, “Head Start is underfunded and unequal, according to a new study,” Spokesman Review, <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2016/dec/14/head-start-is-underfunded-and-unequal-according-to/>, Accessed 4/4/2017

Head Start, the federal program that provides education, nutrition and health services to low-income children and their families, is not adequately funded and is administered so differently from state to state that children do not benefit equally, according to a new report from the National Institute for Early Education Research. The 478-page report, “State(s) of Head Start,” released Wednesday, calls for a near tripling of the program’s budget – to more than \$20 billion – to fully meet its goals for serving 3- and 4-year-old children living in poverty. It also points to wide gaps in Head Start programs related to quality of instruction, amount of instruction, access to programs and levels of funding. “Despite decades of bipartisan support for Head Start, we conclude that the program suffers from inadequate overall public investment,” the report’s authors wrote. “Simply put, the program is not funded at a level that would make it possible to provide child development services of sufficient quality and duration to achieve its goals while serving all eligible children even at ages 3 and 4, much less for those under age 3.”

Head Start offers programs for parental education-That's extra-topical

Terri J. **Sabol**, Assistant Professor of Human Development & Social Policy at Northwestern University **and** P. Lindsay **Chase-Lansdale**, Associate Provost for Faculty & Frances Willard Professor of Human Development and Social Policy at Northwestern University, January/February **2015**, "Does Head Start Promote Outcomes for Low-Income Parents?," Aspen Journal of ideas, <http://aspen.us/journal/editions/januaryfebruary-2015/does-head-start-promote-outcomes-low-income-parents>, Accessed 4/4/2017

Head Start was designed to improve child and parent outcomes and promote family wellbeing over the life course. From its inception, Head Start did more than just provide early childhood education and services. The program also sought to engage parents in their children's schooling, enhance their childrearing skills, and support parents' own educational progress. Today, the program provides a host of services to parents, including GED coursework, family support services, and opportunities for leadership within Head Start's early childhood education programs.

Head Start is Extra-Topical

Head Start funding advocacy covers pre-school

Joe Heim, Washington Post staff writer, December 14, 2016, "Head Start is underfunded and unequal, according to a new study," Spokesman Review, <http://www.spokesman.com/stories/2016/dec/14/head-start-is-underfunded-and-unequal-according-to/>, Accessed 4/4/2017

Head Start, the federal program that provides education, nutrition and health services to low-income children and their families, is not adequately funded and is administered so differently from state to state that children do not benefit equally, according to a new report from the National Institute for Early Education Research. The 478-page report, "State(s) of Head Start," released Wednesday, calls for a near tripling of the program's budget – to more than \$20 billion – to fully meet its goals for serving 3- and 4-year-old children living in poverty. It also points to wide gaps in Head Start programs related to quality of instruction, amount of instruction, access to programs and levels of funding. "Despite decades of bipartisan support for Head Start, we conclude that the program suffers from inadequate overall public investment," the report's authors wrote. "Simply put, the program is not funded at a level that would make it possible to provide child development services of sufficient quality and duration to achieve its goals while serving all eligible children even at ages 3 and 4, much less for those under age 3."

Politics

(Trump Bad) Plan is popular - Bipartisanship

Early childhood education investments have broad bipartisan support

Mark K. **Shriver**, President, Save the Children Action Network, July **2015**, “Innovative Financing for Early Childhood Education State and Local Options,” Save the Children Action Network, <https://www.savethechildrenactionnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/state-local-toolbox-financing-solutions.pdf>, Accessed 4/4/2017

Americans of all political stripes support early childhood education (ECE). A July 2014 poll commissioned by the First Five Years Fund found that 60 percent of Republicans, 67 percent of Independents, and 84 percent of Democrats support greater investments in early childhood education. Beyond the bipartisan goodwill around this issue, there is mounting scientific evidence of early childhood education’s short- and long-term economic benefits. Financing the expansion of early childhood education, however, remains a challenge. In an era of budget deficits and a high degree of scrutiny over federal spending, new and innovative financing mechanisms are needed to drive new resources into early childhood education or support legislation expanding and improving access to 0-5 services.

(Trump Bad) Plan is popular - Public

Head Start is politically popular

Halley **Potter**, Senior Fellow at The Century Foundation, May 15, **2015**, “50 Years On, Head Start’s Best Hope for the Future May Lie in an Idea from Its Past,” The Century Foundation, <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/50-years-on-head-starts-best-hope-for-the-future-may-lie-in-an-idea-from-its-past/>, Accessed 4/4/2017

Middle-class families enrolled in Head Start programs could also become important political allies when it comes to funding the program. In states and cities with universal pre-K programs, like Georgia, Oklahoma, and—most recently—New York City, popular and bipartisan political support for the programs has stemmed, in part, from the fact that families of all incomes stand to benefit. Seven in ten Americans favor federal funding for universal pre-K programs.

Its mission alone makes Head Start popular with the public

Grace **Lee**, BA Claremont McKenna College, **2017**, “The Politics of Head Start, the Most Popular Survivor of the War on Poverty,” CMC Senior Theses. 1517, http://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/1517/, Accessed 4/4/2017

Moreover, in the area of government social programs for children from low income families, personal anecdotes often trump data. Generally, people are much more moved by “Head Start Success Stories,” narratives of families who have benefited from enrolling their children in Head Start than results based on data that puts into question the program’s effects on children’s lasting educational outcomes. The compelling mission of Head Start of providing low-income children with an array of resources and support because of their already disadvantaged backgrounds has sustained the popularity of the program for over 50 years.

Fund Head Start CP

Fund Head Start CP – 1NC

Text: The United States federal government will increase funding for Head Start programs to \$30 billion annually.

We should fully fund Head Start. It has been life-changing for millions, but hasn't gone far enough to reach 3-4 year-olds in poverty

Lillian **Mongeau**, Engagement editor and West Coast correspondent at The Hechinger Report, August 9, 2016, "The Never-Ending Struggle to Improve Head Start," The Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/08/is-head-start-a-failure/494942/>, Accessed 4/1/2017

"It is some of the most important work in the country," said Joan Lombardi, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, a think tank. Lombardi also served as a deputy assistant secretary in the Administration for Children and Families during both the Clinton and Obama presidencies. "It has been a life-changing program for millions and millions of children," she said. But the work isn't reaching enough children early enough or for long enough, Lombardi argues. Indeed, the program has never reached all of the children it's meant to serve: 3- and 4-year-olds whose families make less than the federal poverty limit, which is currently \$24,300 annually for a family of four. Head Start served just 41 percent of its eligible population in the 2014-15 school year. Early Head Start, for children 3 years old and younger, served 4 percent of those eligible, according to the National Head Start Association, a professional organization. "Many times during the course of its history it's been underfunded and run into issues of quality," Lombardi said. "You've got tremendous potential, but it's time for us to fully fund it." If Head Start were to serve every eligible child at the current rate, it would cost at least twice the \$9.2 billion spent to serve about 1 million children in the 2016 fiscal year. The price tag for Early Head Start, which is included in the \$9.2 billion figure, would have to increase 25-fold. Those increases are rough, back-of-the-envelope calculations based the percentage of eligible children currently served and do not account for possible economies of scale. It should also be noted that some portion of children eligible for and not served by Head Start are covered by state-funded preschool programs. Nevertheless, it's fair to say that the cost of serving every 3- and 4-year-old child living in poverty in America (the United States' poverty rate is more on par with countries like Mexico than with its European allies) would be closer to \$30 billion than \$9 billion. For comparison, that's still less than the \$32 billion available in higher-education tuition support for disadvantaged students though the federal Pell grant program this year.

We're a small non-profit. Please don't share this file with those who have not paid including via dropbox, google drive, the web, printed copies, email, etc. Visit us at www.wcdebate.com

We don't need vertical integration. New studies disprove the fadeout theory. Head Start effects last for a decade

Greg **Toppo**, Staff Writer, August 11, **2016**, "Study: Benefits of high-quality Head Start last into middle school," USA TODAY, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2016/08/11/study-benefits-high-quality-head-start-last-into-middle-school/88583456/>, Accessed 4/11/2017

A new review of Head Start by researchers at Georgetown University finds that, done well, the federal preschool program can have positive academic effects that last nearly a decade. The new findings stand in contrast to a handful of recent studies of Head Start that suggest its effects wear off fairly quickly. While a few studies have shown long-term positive impacts on factors such as grade repetition, high school graduation, college attendance and adult earnings, others have been less promising. Those include a federally sponsored 2010 review that found advantages for graduates of the program in just a few key outcomes by the end of first grade. In that review, children who had been in Head Start as 4-year-olds had much better vocabularies than their peers, but the Head Start children's parents were no less likely than others to engage in "authoritarian parenting," such as spanking, by the time their children were in kindergarten or first grade. The 51-year-old program has served more than 33 million children and babies since its inception in 1965, its sponsors say. Last year it served nearly 950,000 children and their parents. The new review, by researchers in Georgetown's psychology department, its McCourt School of Public Policy and by another researcher at the University of West Virginia, found "very consequential benefits" that last for years. The new study found that the benefits of a high-quality Head Start program lasted into middle school. While the effects diminished over time, researchers found that the benefits remained. Among other findings, Head Start kids: scored significantly higher on state math tests; had significantly lower rates of being held back in a grade; were significantly less likely to be chronically absent from school.

Fund Head Start CP – 1NC

All variation in Head Start effectiveness between states can be traced back to a lack of federal funding. New regulations are in place but need funding

W. Steven **Barnett**, Ph.D. and Allison H. **Friedman-Krauss**, Ph.D, both at NIEER, **2016**, “State(s) of Head Start,” National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/HS_Full_Reduced.pdf, Accessed 4/4/2017

We find large variation among the states in each of these four dimensions that cannot be explained by only the needs of children and families served. The report suggests that Head Start does not have the resources to serve all children in poverty let alone all low-income children who could benefit from the program. Even when children do attend Head Start, the quality is sometimes too low to have the impacts that it could. Currently, overall funding for Head Start is not adequate and the distribution of funding across states is neither rational nor fair. In sum, these findings suggest that the extent to which Head Start has the capacity to achieve its goals is far too limited generally and varies dramatically state-by-state. And this variation among the states cannot be fully explained by any rational policy goal. The current administration, building on the work of previous administrations, continues to raise Head Start standards to increase quality and intensity of services across the country. But implementing these policy changes will be costly. As the report shows, although progress has been made, it is uneven across the states and there is still a long way to go. The revised and streamlined Head Start standards that went into effect this year are designed to improve the program overall and to reduce or eliminate some of the variation noted in this report. These goals can only be accomplished if the program receives greater funding, or if the number of children served is decreased. Teacher pay needs to be on par with public school teachers’ in order to improve the recruitment of strong teachers while reducing their stress and turnover. Ultimately the program’s federal budget is simply not adequate to provide a high-quality program to all of the eligible population. This forces tradeoffs among quality, duration, and the number of children served. Differences in local decisions regarding these tradeoffs and historical precedent seem the likely causes for the state-by-state variations we observe.

Fund Head Start CP – Solvency Extension

Critics will claim that Head Start is ineffective because it doesn't go far enough or the effects are not long-term. The #1 cause of these problems is a lack of funding

Lillian **Mongeau**, Engagement editor and West Coast correspondent at The Hechinger Report, August 9, **2016**, "The Never-Ending Struggle to Improve Head Start," The Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/08/is-head-start-a-failure/494942/>, Accessed 4/1/2017

The only long-term study of the program, called the Head Start Impact Study, began following enrollees in 2002 and stayed with them through third grade. Researchers found that by third grade, all the academic advances the children had made during their Head Start year had faded. And yet, Lipsey also says that enough is known about the potential for strong outcomes that tossing out existing public preschool programs is a bad idea too. "If you've got a platform, the most obvious thing is to see what you can do with that and make it better," Lipsey said, referring specifically to state preschool programs but voicing an idea that could easily apply to Head Start. And that is exactly what Head Start has been doing since the initial results of the Impact Study were released in 2006. New regulations, laid out in the Head Start Act of 2007, require better-educated teachers, a stronger focus on academics, and more stringent requirements for local agencies to continually re-qualify for their grant money. Even those in the world of education research and those closely connected to Head Start who challenged the Impact Study's findings, saying it was poorly set-up, admit that the changes it spurred were positive ones. "There's been a lot of work done to intensify the impact, and I think it's a much stronger program now," Lombardi said. However, none of the changes address the No. 1 culprit advocates blame for Head Start's middling performance: a severe lack of cash. Broadly speaking, many of the most common complaints about Head Start's quality can be traced to money. Many programs have long wait lists, serve children for only a few hours a day, and are sometimes not even able to provide services for the entire school year, let alone the summer months.

Critiques of Head Start variability are wrong and misunderstand its design, while ignoring the effectiveness of new regulations. Congress should fully support Head Start

Yasmina **Vinci**, executive director of National Head Start Association, January 6, **2017**, “Head Start works — Congress should keep it moving forward,” The Hill, <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/education/313006-head-start-works-congress-trump-should-keep-it-moving-forward>, Accessed 4/1/2017

Another hallmark was the release of the new Head Start Performance Standards, a tremendous step forward in enhancing the high-quality early learning programs for nearly one million children each year. Ironically, there is a small cadre of naysayers who assert there is substantial variation in quality across the states. This narrow interpretation of the Head Start delivery model fails to not only acknowledge the demonstrable improvement in quality since the 2007 reauthorization – which was clearly borne out of the recent FACES report conducted by Mathematica – but ignores that variation in local program design is intentional, and quality is consistently high across programs. In reality, the new Head Start standards place higher emphasis on reducing bureaucracy and enhancing efficiency, both of which are critical to the effective delivery of Head Start services. The new rules outline a vision of Head Start that is evidence-based, data-driven, and outcomes-focused – a significant and positive step forward for millions of future Head Start children and families. We are in the midst of a transformative period for Head Start. As we look to the future, we turn to the incoming Congress and administration for support in Head Start’s continuous national commitment to provide community-driven, early learning opportunities for vulnerable children and their families.

Fund Head Start CP – Solvency Extension

Critics will claim that Head Start is ineffective because it doesn't go far enough or the effects are not long-term. The #1 cause of these problems is a lack of funding

Lillian **Mongeau**, Engagement editor and West Coast correspondent at The Hechinger Report, August 9, **2016**, "The Never-Ending Struggle to Improve Head Start," The Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/08/is-head-start-a-failure/494942/>, Accessed 4/1/2017

The only long-term study of the program, called the Head Start Impact Study, began following enrollees in 2002 and stayed with them through third grade. Researchers found that by third grade, all the academic advances the children had made during their Head Start year had faded. And yet, Lipsey also says that enough is known about the potential for strong outcomes that tossing out existing public preschool programs is a bad idea too. "If you've got a platform, the most obvious thing is to see what you can do with that and make it better," Lipsey said, referring specifically to state preschool programs but voicing an idea that could easily apply to Head Start. And that is exactly what Head Start has been doing since the initial results of the Impact Study were released in 2006. New regulations, laid out in the Head Start Act of 2007, require better-educated teachers, a stronger focus on academics, and more stringent requirements for local agencies to continually re-qualify for their grant money. Even those in the world of education research and those closely connected to Head Start who challenged the Impact Study's findings, saying it was poorly set-up, admit that the changes it spurred were positive ones. "There's been a lot of work done to intensify the impact, and I think it's a much stronger program now," Lombardi said. However, none of the changes address the No. 1 culprit advocates blame for Head Start's middling performance: a severe lack of cash. Broadly speaking, many of the most common complaints about Head Start's quality can be traced to money. Many programs have long wait lists, serve children for only a few hours a day, and are sometimes not even able to provide services for the entire school year, let alone the summer months.

State-by-state variances are the result of low funding. Congress should increase funding for Head Start so states do not have to choose between necessary services. This is essential to reducing childhood poverty

W. Steven **Barnett**, Ph.D. and Allison H. **Friedman-Krauss**, Ph.D, both at NIEER, **2016**, “State(s) of Head Start,” National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER), http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/HS_Full_Reduced.pdf, Accessed 4/4/2017

The National Institute for Early Education Research’s (NIEER) State(s) of Head Start report is the first report to describe and analyze in detail Head Start enrollment, funding, quality, and duration, state-by-state. The report focuses on the 2014-2015 program year but also provides longitudinal data beginning with the 2006-2007 program year. Despite the fact that Head Start is a federally funded, national program, the report reveals that access to Head Start programs, funding per child, teacher education, quality of teaching, and duration of services all vary widely by state. Although in some states Head Start meets evidence-based quality standards and serves a high percentage of low-income children statewide, in other states Head Start reaches fewer of those in need, often with low-quality instruction, and insufficient hours. Despite bipartisan support, Head Start suffers from federal funding that restricts the number of vulnerable children who can benefit from Head Start. As a result, some vulnerable children benefit less than others from Head Start participation. Yet we can think of no reason children living in poverty in one state are less deserving of a high-quality education in Head Start than those in another. Revised and streamlined Head Start standards, released in September 2016, address several of the concerns spotlighted in the report, and demonstrate the Administration for Children and Families’ (ACF) commitment to continuous quality improvement and supporting poor children. But without Congress allocating adequate funding, Head Start programs will continue to be forced to choose between providing high-quality or school-day programs; hiring quality teachers (and paying them adequately); or enrolling more children. To be effective, Head Start must be funded sufficiently so that it can provide high-quality learning experiences to more children for longer periods of time per day and per year.

Fund Head Start CP – Does not link to politics

Fully funding Head Start is politically unpopular

Lillian **Mongeau**, Engagement editor and West Coast correspondent at The Hechinger Report, August 9, **2016**, “The Never-Ending Struggle to Improve Head Start,” The Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/08/is-head-start-a-failure/494942/>, Accessed 4/1/2017

But the U.S. has a long tradition of deferring to the family when it comes to the education of very young children. And spending \$30 billion on preschool may be too high a price tag for the American public and politicians to accept. They’d be right to hesitate before signing a check, said Mark Lipsey, the director of the Peabody Research Institute at Vanderbilt University, who has researched large public preschool programs and is uncertain of their efficacy. “I think people are misled about the strength and depth of the evidence of scaled-up public-preschool studies,” Lipsey said.

Spending DA

Position Overview

With links to both increased funding for education and increased regulations, the spending disadvantage is core negative ground on this topic. Here's how the argument unfolds: President Trump is cutting back education regulations and spending in the status quo, shrinking the government's footprint in this space and allowing the economy to get back on the track; the plan erases this deregulatory momentum and crushes the fragile economic recovery; the ultimate result is global conflict. With a new administration in charge, there actually is some uniqueness behind this DA—Trump appears committed to cutting back regulations across the board, the evidence is good that this is providing a needed economic boost. With a strong case for uniqueness, winning the spending DA will likely be a matter of proving that the link is big enough to trigger the impact. Work to show that regulations snowball, that economic recovery is fragile and that the plan's disruption will be swift. Good luck!

1NC – Spending DA

A. Trump is rolling back regulations, boosting economic growth.

Juliet **Eilperin**, senior national affairs correspondent, February 13, **2017**.

“Trump undertakes most ambitious regulatory rollback since Reagan.” Washington Post.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-undertakes-most-ambitious-regulatory-rollback-since-reagan/2017/02/12/0337b1f0-efb4-11e6-9662-6eedf1627882_story.html? (accessed 4/10/17)

According to the White House Office of Management and Budget, the cost of federal regulations has grown every year since 1982. Republicans of all stripes have long railed against what they say are crippling economic effects. "Overregulation has stemmed economic growth and job creation," White House press secretary Sean Spicer recently told reporters. Making sure government rules "are meeting their intent and not stifling job creation at the expense of whatever they were intended to do is something that should be smart and welcome by everybody," he said. The administration's anti-regulatory push goes well beyond a technical review, how-ever. "It's a much more aggressive rollback attempt than we've seen in recent years," said Tevi Troy, who served George W. Bush as a senior White House official and in two Cabinet-level agencies. He noted that many conservatives have long been disappointed that the Bush administration did not do more to "clear out some of the regulatory underbrush."

B. Reducing government spending and regulations is key to the economy.

Clyde Wayne **Crews**, VP for policy and director for technology studies, May 4, **2016**.

“Ten Thousand Commandments: An Annual Snapshot of the Federal Regulatory State.” Competitive Enterprise Institute. <https://cei.org/sites/default/files/Wayne%20Crews%20-%20Ten%20Thousand%20Commandments%202016%20-%20May%204%202016.pdf> (accessed 4/10/17)

All this spending can translate into even higher future regulatory costs. Spending related to bailouts, stimulus, infrastructure, health care, telecommunications, and more will include significant regulatory components as well. Burdening the American economy with even more regulatory mandates and restrictions will lead to more years of slow growth and stagnant job creation. To avoid that fate and truly address Washington's spending and deficit culture and off-budget regulation, policy makers should move toward economic liberalization and a reduced regulatory state.

C. Breaking from Trump's aggressive spending restraints will crush the economy.

Monica **Crowley**, opinion editor, August 17, **2016**.

"The one thing missing from Trump's economic plan." The Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/aug/17/trump-economic-plan-must-address-government-spendi/> (accessed 4/12/17)

Mr. Trump believes — rightly — that the economic growth generated by his proposals will greatly reduce the debt burden. But given the magnitude of the debt, growth is necessary but not sufficient. Proposals to cut spending and reduce the debt may be unlikely to score Mr. Trump many votes, but they will demonstrate his seriousness about our long-term economic well-being, particularly when President Obama will add more than \$8 trillion in debt, more than his 43 predecessors combined, and when Hillary Clinton is running on expanding the menu of taxpayer-subsidized freebies, from health care to college. Out of the gate, Mr. Trump should demand a fundamental attitude adjustment on spending. By adding to the deficit, the feds are stopping businesses from borrowing to create jobs and blocking consumers from getting the capital they need. Treasury debt is up by about 40 percent over the past few years while commercial and consumer debt is down by roughly 20 percent. There's very little movement in the broader economy largely because the government is monopolizing the loan window. The entire economy is tied into the spending levels of Washington.

D. Economic collapse leads to WWII.

Walter Russell **Mead**, senior fellow at Council on Foreign Relations, August 23, **1998**.

"Markets Biggest Threat to Peace." Los Angeles Times. <http://articles.latimes.com/1998/aug/23/opinion/op-15742> (accessed 4/12/17)

How can this be? Think about the mother of all global meltdowns: the Great Depression that started in 1929. U.S. stocks began to collapse in October, staged a rally, then the market headed south big time. At the bottom, the Dow Jones industrial average had lost 90% of its value. Wages plummeted, thousands of banks and brokerages went bankrupt, millions of people lost their jobs. There were similar horror stories worldwide. But the biggest impact of the Depression on the United States--and on world history--wasn't money. It was blood: World War II, to be exact. The Depression brought Adolf Hitler to power in Germany, undermined the ability of moderates to oppose Joseph Stalin's power in Russia, and convinced the Japanese military that the country had no choice but to build an Asian empire, even if that meant war with the United States and Britain. That's the thing about depressions. They aren't just bad for your 401(k). Let the world economy crash far enough, and the rules change. We stop playing "The Price is Right" and start up a new round of "Saving Private Ryan."

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now

Trump is committed to getting the federal government out of education.

Dan **Merica**, political producer and political beat writer, March 28, **2017**.

“Trump tries to make good on promises to roll back Obama-era regulations.”

CNN. <http://www.cnn.com/2017/03/27/politics/donald-trump-sign-regulation-obama-roll-backs/> (accessed 4/10/17)

Trump signaled during the 2016 campaign that he wanted states to have more control in how they structure their education system and the two laws look to do just that. "The purpose of the resolution under consideration is simple: Reining in the federal role in education and protecting the state and local control promised to students, parents, and education leaders," Rep. Brett Guthrie, a Kentucky Republican, said about the bill he sponsored to roll back the rule.

Trump is rolling back Obama-era education regulations now.

Emma **Brown**, national education reporter, March 27, **2017**.

“Trump signs bills overturning Obama-era education regulations.” Washington Post.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/education/wp/2017/03/27/trump-signs-bills-overturning-obama-era-education-regulations/> (accessed 4/10/17)

President Trump signed bills Monday overturning two Obama-era education regulations, continuing the Republican majority’s effort to undo key pieces of the previous administration’s legacy. Trump’s move scraps new requirements for programs that train new K-12 teachers and rolls back a set of rules outlining how states must carry out the Every Student Succeeds Act, a bipartisan federal law meant to hold schools accountable for student performance. In a signing ceremony at the White House Monday, the president hailed the measures for “removing an additional layer of bureaucracy to encourage freedom in our schools.” Leaders of the Republican majority claimed that the accountability rules represented an executive overreach by former president Barack Obama. Democrats argued that rescinding the rules opens loopholes that states can use to shield poorly performing schools from scrutiny, especially when they fail to serve poor children, minorities, English-language learners and students with disabilities.

No new education spending or regulations coming under Trump.

Logan **Albright**, Director of Research for Free the People, January 11, **2017**.

“Will Higher Ed Boom or Bust Under a Trump Administration?” Conservative Review.

<https://www.conservativereview.com/commentary/2017/01/will-higher-ed-boom-or-bust-under-a-trump-administration> (accessed 4/10/17)

Perhaps the most promising sign for the Trump administration’s education policy is that he simply doesn’t seem that interested. During the campaign, Trump took a relatively laissez-faire approach to K-12 education, and barely mentioned higher education at all. In contrast to Obama’s constant meddling in the market, a president who just leaves colleges alone could be a welcome improvement.

Uniqueness – No Education Regulations Now

Congress is rolling back education regulations.

Dana **Goldstein**, education reporter, March 9, **2017**.

“Obama Education Rules Are Swept Aside by Congress.” New York Times.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/09/us/every-student-succeeds-act-essa-congress.html> (accessed 4/10/17)

With all the attention paid to President Trump’s lightning-rod secretary of education, Betsy DeVos, and her advocacy for private school vouchers, little public notice has been paid to the action on education in Congress — where lawmakers have broader power than Ms. DeVos to make changes to the nation’s school system. Now, Congress has done exactly that, voting to repeal crucial regulations associated with the Every Student Succeeds Act, one of President Barack Obama’s final legislative achievements.

Education regulations are being erased by Congress.

Elana **Schor**, congressional reporter, March 8, **2017**.

“GOP chugs along on deregulation campaign.” Politico. <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/03/gop-chugs-along-on-deregulation-campaign-235846> (access 4/10/17)

Calling up more House-passed bills to unravel regulations under the Congressional Review Act “particularly makes sense while we’re dealing with confirmations, because we’re in the personnel business and the House doesn’t have to deal with that,” Cornyn added. “It’s the right time and the right message, and I feel like it’s good policy.” The deregulatory votes also have given individual GOP lawmakers a chance to burnish their economic and policy messaging. Sen. Ben Sasse (R-Neb.), a lead backer of the Wednesday measure killing a Department of Education teacher preparation rule, praised Senate approval as “a win for kids because Washington’s good intentions can’t excuse garbage rules.”

Education regulations are being rolled back now.

Dana **Goldstein**, education reporter, March 9, **2017**.

“Obama Education Rules Are Swept Aside by Congress.” New York Times.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/09/us/every-student-succeeds-act-essa-congress.html> (accessed 4/10/17)

It is customary for federal agencies to issue detailed regulations on how new laws should be put into effect, and Mr. Obama’s Department of Education did so in November. But some lawmakers from both parties saw the regulations as unusually aggressive and far-reaching, and said they could subvert ESSA’s intent of re-establishing local control over education and decreasing the emphasis on testing. Last month, the House of Representatives overturned a broad swath of the rules using the Congressional Review Act, which allows lawmakers to spike federal regulations. The Senate passed a similar resolution on Thursday, and President Trump has indicated that he will sign it. That would leave ESSA on the books, but Ms. DeVos would have more flexibility in how to apply it.