

The Demo Round¹

Everett Rutan

ejrutan3@ctdebate.org

Connecticut Debate Association

Simsbury High School

Novice Scrimmage

September 26, 2015

Resolved: Cities, states and other local governments should cooperate fully with Federal authorities to enforce Federal immigration laws and policies.

A Note about the Notes

I've reproduced my flow chart for the demonstration round at Simsbury High School augmented by what I remember from the debate. The notes are limited by how quickly I could write and how well I heard what was said. I'm sure the debaters will read them and exclaim, "That's not what I said!" I apologize for any errors, but I hope debaters will appreciate this insight: what a judge hears may not be what they said or what they wish they had said.

There are two versions of the notes. The one below is chronological, reproducing each speech in the order in which the arguments were made. It shows how the debate was actually presented. The second is formatted to look more like my written flow chart, with each contention running across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It's close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

The Demonstration Round

The Demonstration Round was between the E.O. Smith team of Tim Watson and Cole Tamburri and on the Affirmative and the Simsbury team of Akash Kaza and William Shaw on the Negative. The debate was not judged but I would have voted Affirmative.

1) First Affirmative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Definitions
 - i) "cooperate fully" means to respond normally as required by law, that is no extraordinary measures.
- c) A1²: Currently too many dangerous illegal immigrants are let free
 - i) Many illegals who are released go on to commit serious crimes
 - ii) In 2014 1900 wanted by ICE and released by local authorities committed crimes
 - iii) Katy Steinle was killed by one

¹ Copyright 2015 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

² "A1" indicates the Affirmative first contention, "N2" the Negative second contention and so forth.

- d) A2: Cooperation is a more organized and consistent approach to the problem
 - i) Federal rules provide a standardized approach to illegal immigration
 - ii) Katy Steinle died due to lack of coordination
 - iii) Mistakes in the current system are frequent
 - iv) There is a division of duties, with Federal dealing with civil issues and locals dealing with criminal issues
- e) A3: Cooperation would not have a negative effect on local law enforcement (“LLE”)
 - i) The duties at each level of law enforcement remain the same
 - ii) Local law enforcement don’t have to act as immigration agents and seek out illegal immigrants
 - iii) When convicted, illegals are turned over
- f) A2/A3 together show that increased organization will improve safety
 - i) Feds and Locals have clear responsibilities
- 2) Cross-Ex of First Affirmative**
 - a) Doesn’t LLE have to change under the resolution? No, they just have to do what they are currently required to do
 - b) Don’t they have to increase criminal enforcement? In partnership with the Feds
 - c) What are LLE’s “normal responsibilities”? Cooperation with the Feds and enforcing criminal law. It’s better than what many do now.
 - d) What is the current system? We’ve explained that
 - e) Who pays for local jails? That is one of the duties of LLE. They are dealing with the same crimes as currently.
- 3) First Negative Constructive**
 - a) Intro
 - b) We will present Neg case then respond to Aff
 - c) N1: Immigration is a Federal issue
 - i) Made clear by Supreme Court in Arizona vs US
 - d) N2: Cities are safer if LLE focuses on crime, not on immigration
 - i) Immigrants are more often victims of crime, not perpetrators
 - ii) They won’t call the police if it questions their immigration status
 - iii) Better to ignore immigration issue and have crimes reported
 - iv) San Francisco isn’t changing its policy after Katy Steinle
 - e) N3: The real problem is firms hiring illegal immigrants
 - i) Cheap labor is attractive to firms, and jobs attract immigrants and increase illegal immigration
 - ii) Curb hiring and illegal immigration will decline
 - iii) E.g., Texas and Florida see those deported continue to return
 - f) A1: Aff relies on just a few examples
 - i) Mostly an emotional and reactionary response, not sound law
 - ii) Politicians are pushing an agenda based on isolated incidents
 - iii) Illegal immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than citizens
- 4) Cross-Ex of First Negative**
 - a) Does Federal law condone employing illegals? Need to actively discover employers

- b) Would this be a problem if the laws were enforced? Feds aren't enforcing it; Aff basically has to advocate deporting them
- c) What is a "sanctuary city"? It's actually a misnomer. It simply means local governments are more lenient.
- d) Could you elaborate? For example, San Francisco releases non-violent offenders regardless of immigration status
- e) Don't some of those immigrants commit crimes? San Fran's crime rate is declining
- f) But that's only one city? It's San Francisco

5) Second Affirmative Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) N1: AZ vs US is just one case
 - i) The idea we are arguing is more important than precedent
- c) N2: "sanctuary" policies don't breed trust between immigrants and police
 - i) It's a less organized approach to the problem
 - ii) Eliminating it will not affect the crime rate
- d) N3: Federal policy does not support employing illegal immigrants
 - i) So N3 is covered by Aff policy
 - ii) Resolution says "cooperate fully"
- e) A1: Katy Steinle is not the only case
 - i) Her murderer was deported 5 times
 - ii) It isn't emotional to want to see the law obeyed
 - iii) Sanctuary cities free criminals, the resolution does not
- f) A2: Full cooperation is fundamental to an organized society
 - i) Better structure means less crime.
 - ii) Safety is more important than money

6) Cross-Ex of Second Affirmative

- a) Are prisons overcrowded? Please explain
- b) Aren't they already overcrowded? We are talking about two different problems. Prison overcrowding is a different debate.
- c) Will all illegal immigrants be deported? It's on a case by case basis. LLE won't seek deportation. They simply abide by Fed rules when an illegal is caught committing a crime.
- d) Is the Fed actively enforcing employment laws? Many Fed policies aren't acted on. It's illegal to employ them.
- e) How can they cooperate if Fed isn't enforcing law? Cooperation is a better policy.

7) Second Negative Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) Aff then Neg
- c) A3: Aff ignores other issues
 - i) Cooperation is not feasible as it would overburden local resources
 - ii) Compare to N3 and the need to remove the incentive to immigrate in the first place
 - iii) Aff also doesn't address the need to deport illegals
- d) A1: There is no correlation between crime and illegal immigrants
 - i) Most are not criminals

- ii) A few examples are over-emphasized, e.g., compare San Fran’s decision to one murder
- e) N3: local enforcement of laws is not the issue
 - i) Jobs offered to illegals is the problem
 - ii) The Feds don’t enforce this, so there is no system
 - iii) We should strictly punish businesses and remove the opportunity
 - iv) Decreasing illegal immigration isn’t foolproof, but it’s better
 - v) Most illegal immigrants come for jobs, not to commit crime
- 8) Cross-Ex of Second Negative**
 - a) Isn’t deporting all illegals a waste of resources? You want to enforce Federal law. Can’t ignore illegal immigration, but we shouldn’t focus on crime.
 - b) Does N3 extend existing law? It’s a different approach to target businesses
 - c) So following Federal policy is okay? There is no active policy on this issue
 - d) But there is a policy in place? As discussed, no one is acting on it.
 - e) How do we increase duties? You require LLE to inquire about immigration status.
 - f) But in A3 we say they don’t need to inquire? Sanctuary cities are based on this idea.
 - g) Is Neg arguing we should turn away immigrants? (Out of time)
- 9) First Negative Rebuttal**
 - a) Will Aff require LLE to inquire about immigration status?
 - i) If not, then what change are they advocating? None
 - ii) How will ICE know to pick up the illegals? They won’t
 - b) Aff plan is not clearly described, so Neg has to assume the details
 - c) A2: Aff requires a huge increase in manpower and resources
 - i) Question immigration status
 - ii) Incarceration
 - iii) How will they fix this?
 - d) N1: Major Supreme Court case on immigration authority
- 10) First Affirmative Rebuttal**
 - a) Plan
 - i) Not increasing police duties or inquiring about immigration status
 - ii) If arrested for a crime, LLE applies Fed policies
 - b) N1: The law isn’t fixed. Supreme Court decision can be changed
 - c) N3: We’ve acknowledge that offering illegals jobs is against Federal policy
 - d) Aff changes when immigrants are handled by the system
 - i) We don’t seek out illegals
 - ii) We check after they have been arrested and tried
 - iii) Criminals are affected; innocent are left alone
- 11) Second Negative Rebuttal**
 - a) Constitution?
 - i) Negative never mentioned the Constitution
 - ii) Supreme Court is a reputable source
 - iii) Supports the idea that Fed is and should be the sole authority
 - b) Aff wants to pick and choose from Federal law
 - i) Resolution says “comply fully”
 - ii) This means all policies and laws

- c) Crime?
 - i) Aff will not clearly lower crime
 - ii) They won't stop illegal immigration
 - iii) Over 11 million in the US today
- d) How is Aff changing the status quo?
- e) N1, N2, N3 all restated

12) Second Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) Clarification
 - i) We want state and local gov't to comply with Federal laws and policies
 - ii) Once they find an illegal immigrant, they apply immigration law
- b) N3 is an Aff point
 - i) It is already against Federal law to hire illegal immigrants
- c) N1 is not an argument against the resolution
- d) Aff summary
 - i) We provide a more organized approach to immigration
 - ii) We require everyone to follow Fed policy
 - iii) No change in required duties—problem is that some localities let illegals go free
 - iv) We get a safer society, a more organized approach to immigration, remove criminals, and ultimately lower crime