

The Final Round¹

Everett Rutan

Xavier High School

everett.rutan@moodys.com

or

ejrutan3@acm.org

Connecticut Debate Association

Newtown High School

January 12, 2008

Resolved: In Connecticut illegal immigrant college students should be eligible to receive academic financial aid including in-state tuition rates.

A Note about the Notes

I've reproduced my flow chart for the final round at Newtown 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. Others may have slightly different versions. 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 that what a judge hears may not be what they say or 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 "flowed" across the page as the teams argued back and forth. It's close to the way I actually take notes during the debate.

The Final Round

The final round at Newtown was between Newtown (Christine D'Alessandro and Biota Hung) on the Affirmative and Glastonbury (Priyanka Saxena and Ian Hosking) on the Negative. The debate was won by the Affirmative team from Newtown.

1) First Affirmative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the Resolution
- c) Definitions: "eligible" based on merit not preference
- d) A1²: Illegal Immigrants ("II"³) have shown dedication and commitment
 - i) This is inherent in the resolution, as they must be college students
 - (1) Some of the best students are IIs
 - (2) They have to be extremely dedicated to overcome their situation

¹ Copyright 2008 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

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

³ This introduces "II" as an abbreviation for "Illegal Immigrant" that I used on my flow chart to save writing and will use in the rest of this transcript to save typing.

- ii) The students themselves didn't break the law
 - (1) As children they lack culpability, like the mentally ill
 - (2) E.g. Lucy Bottomley was brought to the US by her stepfather as a minor
- e) A2: Educating IIs will benefit America in the long run
 - i) It is only a small group that will be eligible, 200-250 in Connecticut
 - ii) Graduates of CT high schools should have the same benefits and options as their peers.
 - iii) It will help poor communities where most IIs live
 - iv) It's positive for the economy in general, an investment by the State in education
 - v) This is not meant to fix the problem of illegal immigration, only improve the situation in CT

2) Cross-Ex of First Affirmative

- a) You say children should not be held responsible? Yes
- b) Isn't an 18 or 19 year old an adult? They've just become an adult
- c) Is an adult responsible for their actions? The government would hold them responsible
- d) Is someone who is aware of a crime responsible? These students were brought here by their parents
- e) Can't they rectify this as an adult? They can apply for citizenship at 17 or 18, but they have only just reached the age at which they can do this.
- f) Are you saying adults are responsible in proportion to how long they've been adults? Yes
- g) Are 20 year olds adults? Yes, but not as much as they will be in another 5 to 10 years
- h) Who's financing these college benefits? The government
- i) Who funds the government? Taxes
- j) Do undocumented workers pay taxes? [TIME]

3) First Negative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Resolution
- c) N1: The resolution will increase the burden on citizens and legal immigrants
 - i) UConn tuition is \$21,000 for out of state residents versus \$7,000 for in state
 - ii) Taxes fund the difference
 - iii) IIs don't pay income tax or social security
- d) N2: The resolution rewards students in direct violation of the law
 - i) The very term "illegal" immigrant says it all. Why given them an advantage?
 - ii) I've been in the US for 10 years, but still only have resident visa status
 - iii) One can get a student visa in two years, at 18 it is the student's own decision
- e) N3: The resolution will worsen the illegal immigration problem by providing an incentive
 - i) The bill says to IIs "Come to CT."
 - (1) Fast track to citizenship for children and good education too
 - ii) I had to jump through hoops as did my parents to come to US legally and stay legal
 - iii) Morally, legally, this resolution is wrong

- iv) Once they are 18, students have many routes to legality.
 - v) I had to return to India to renew my visa
- 4) Cross-Ex of First Negative**
- a) How can we assume that the IIs haven't applied for citizenship? If they choose not to, then it's their own crime once they are 18
 - b) What if they don't know they are illegal? By the time they are 20 they must know. Applying for a visa is less of a burden.
 - c) For those who aren't 18? Many of the financial aid deadlines are after acceptance, so more are 18 or older.
 - d) Don't they have to apply earlier? Morally and legally it's wrong.
- 5) Second Affirmative Constructive**
- a) Intro
 - b) N1: IIs have taxes deducted from their pay, like everyone else
 - i) They use fake Social Security Numbers ("SSNs"), Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") collects
 - ii) So they would not be getting benefits without pay
 - c) N2: Children go where their parents go, and even at 18 may not know their status
 - i) Student visas take time, Neg. said up to two years
 - ii) Applying for a visa may get them deported, so it's not much of a reward
 - d) N3: Aid is merit based. They have to graduate from a CT high school and be accepted to a CT college
 - i) There are many conditions to getting financial aid
 - ii) Immigration may be a Federal issue, but state action puts pressure on the Fed.
 - iii) This is a problem that can't wait
 - e) As to the Aff. case I'd like to make two observations
 - i) This aid is merit-based, and requires a drive to succeed. It follows the American Dream
 - ii) These kids rose from having nothing.
 - f) A1: Lucy Bottomley didn't know her status
 - i) She was set to contribute to society, and was deported anyway
 - g) A2: Better education leads to a better job
 - i) Graduates are likely to apply for citizenship
 - ii) This should be seen as an investment by the Gov't in the future
- 6) Cross-Ex of the Second Affirmative**
- a) This is the American Dream? Yes
 - b) Does the American Dream include disregard of the law? It takes into account culpability
 - c) Aren't adult IIs responsible? They may have no options. You can't snap your fingers and get a visa.
 - d) Are you questioning the credibility of my partner? If it were easy, more would get one.
 - e) Don't they have to obey the law? They have proven their worth with hard work.
 - f) The difference in cost at UConn is \$14,000 per year, who pays? We pay through taxes. It's an investment
 - g) Is the difference fully funded by income tax? Yes

- h) Doesn't Social Security pay into Social Security, not income tax? It's all deducted from your paycheck
- i) They deduct Social Security for income tax? The SSN is just an identifier used for both
- j) Do undocumented IIs pay income tax? They may do so under a fake SSN

7) Second Negative Constructive

- a) Intro
- b) N1: There is a \$14,000 difference in tuition that comes from the taxpayer
 - i) We would be subsidizing IIs who don't pay income or property tax
 - ii) IIs are a load on schools they don't contribute to
 - iii) SSN not relevant, as these go to pay social security
- c) N2: The law is specific and provides channels for legal immigration
 - i) IIs choose to neglect and disobey the law, and the Aff wants to reward them with \$14,000
- d) N3: If you subsidize something you get more of it, in this case illegal immigration
 - i) Why wouldn't they take advantage of this free money
- e) A1: They may have shown dedication, but they are still criminals
 - i) Aff. wants to ignore a crime
 - ii) Education is good, but so is obeying the law
 - iii) Neg. agrees IIs have no culpability as children
 - (1) As adults they are culpable, if at 18 they don't apply for visa or citizenship
- f) A2: It may be a small group of people but they are criminals
 - i) This is an investment in criminals

8) Cross-Ex of Second Negative

- a) Does applying for a visa make them legal? My partner says it does
- b) Are you aware of families who applied and were deported? No. When they apply I believe there is some amnesty
- c) Don't people have more opportunity to contribute after they are educated? That's all well and good if they are legal
- d) If it's so easy to get amnesty, why are so many deported? Lucy had a grace period until the year's end
- e) Why didn't she try to get an easy student visa? If she didn't, she was breaking the law
- f) Should a student get aid if they are waiting for a visa? If they haven't paid into the system, they should get a benefit. I've paid, through my parents, all my life.
- g) IIs using tax money? Yes. We should enforce the laws.

9) First Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) Illegal versus legal is just a word, a definition
 - i) A 2-year old brought in by their parents is illegal
 - ii) The child of a pregnant women who come in illegally and gives birth is legal
 - iii) No difference in the children, just how we draw the line
- b) The Aff says it's their decision at 18
 - i) It takes at least two years to get citizenship
 - ii) Amnesty is not available—apply and you may be deported
 - iii) They can't get an education and become valuable citizens

- iv) Consider the Danbury family, 17 years in the US, sent back when they applied
- c) You cannot assume these students have the option to apply
- d) We should not deny them the opportunity for a good education
- e) Just like someone with a mental disability, these children are not culpable

10) First Negative Rebuttal

- a) The Aff. simply wants to overrule the law of the land with emotion
 - i) The law protects those who follow it, and IIs don't
- b) Visa application issue
 - i) The II examples in the packet all knew they were illegal
 - (1) Lucy did not know, the other two did
 - ii) All they have to do is return to their home country for one month and apply, it might cost \$400
- c) The undocumented aliens don't pay income or property tax
 - i) Some may use fake SSNs, but that's illegal too
 - ii) I'm required to show my alien registration number
 - iii) This undermines legal immigrants who pay taxes
 - iv) Can't have these students creating a tax burden on citizens and legal immigrants

11) Second Negative Rebuttal

- a) It comes down to what is easy versus what is right
 - i) It's easy to take \$14,000 free and clear
- b) N2: IIs have a conscious choice to make as adults
 - i) College students are full adults and should be accountable
 - ii) No right to take a short cut
- c) N3: \$14,000 is not merit based, and the taxpayer pays
- d) A1: The fact that they are dedicated does not excuse their criminality
- e) A2: You don't benefit America by ignoring criminality
 - i) It's a small number acting unfairly; they are hardworking but illegal
- f) There are two major issues
 - i) Fairness: you should pay in order to receive
 - ii) Rule of law is ignored by IIs

12) Second Affirmative Rebuttal

- a) A1: Lucy Bottomley is an exception in that she didn't know her status
 - i) Still, why would she choose not to apply if it were easy?
 - ii) IIs have no wish to be a criminal, but had no other avenue
- b) Neg. says it undermines citizens and legal immigrants
 - i) The fact is these IIs are already here
 - ii) IIs will absorb tax dollars one way or another
 - iii) Aff gives them an alternative
 - (1) College leads to good jobs leads to taxes paid in the future
- c) Aff. would help to solve a problem that is already here in Connecticut