

# The Final Round<sup>1</sup>

Everett Rutan

Xavier High School

[ejrutan3@ctdebate.org](mailto:ejrutan3@ctdebate.org)

or

[ejrutan3@acm.org](mailto:ejrutan3@acm.org)

## Connecticut Debate Association

### Fairfield Warde High School

January 11, 2014

**Resolved: States and municipalities should not provide economic subsidies or incentives to corporations.**

## A Note about the Notes

I've reproduced my flow chart for the Final Round at Fairfield Warde 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 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 Final Round

The Final Round was between the Fairfield Warde team of Brandon Campbell and Sara Murphy on the Affirmative and the Amity team of Kristina Zakoworotny and Eeman Abbasi on the Negative. The debate was won by Amity on the Negative.

### 1) First Affirmative Constructive

- a) Introduction
- b) Statement of the Resolution
- c) Definitions
  - i) Subsidies: per packet page 9
- d) A1<sup>2</sup>: Subsidies allow corporations to hold gov'ts hostage
  - i) \$ go to retain corporations
  - ii) Business who receive funds expect the money to continue, even in good times
  - iii) Bailouts need to be sustained to be competitive
  - iv) Instead we should be limiting the size of gov't

---

<sup>1</sup> Copyright 2012 Everett Rutan. This document may be freely copied for non-profit, educational purposes.

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

- v) Gov't funds should be spent on public not private purposes
- e) A2: Subsidies are ineffective
  - i) E.g., the Connecticut "First Five" program
  - ii) E.g., Jackson Labs subsidies were \$200K per employee
  - iii) E.g., Alexion subsidies were \$1Mill. Per employee
  - iv) These sums are greater than the average income in the state
  - v) E.g., Oklahoma program spent \$27 mill. Created
- f) A3: Gov't should support citizens not corporations
  - i) Giving direct relief to citizens would be more effective
  - ii) This would help the middle class
- 2) Cross-Ex of First Affirmative**
  - a) What was your second contention? Subsidies are ineffective
  - b) You gave a few examples: Jackson Labs, Oklahoma, First Five? Yes
  - c) Is it true in every case? Generically, yes
  - d) So subsidies are never effective? Examples show they don't work as intended
  - e) Couldn't the process be reformed? I don't know what specific reforms you mean
  - f) So failure isn't inherent? Examples show they don't work
  - g) You mention economic relief to citizens: how much, to whom, when and where?  
We don't need a plan. Just take the money currently given to corporations
  - h) But individual citizens would get relief? Yes
  - i) Are we still in recession? We've come out some
  - j) Did the stimulus work? It supported bonds and cars
- 3) First Negative Constructive**
  - a) Intro
  - b) Resolution
  - c) We accept the Aff definitions
  - d) N1: In principle, it's beneficial by providing jobs
    - i) Some subsidies have been poorly regulated, e.g. Jackson Labs
      - (1) Two-thirds of programs are not under the State Department of Development
    - ii) Some state programs are well regulated
      - (1) E.g., Kentucky had much lower cost per job
      - (2) E.g., Virginia redirected subsidies and reduced unemployment
    - iii) Funds must be based on company
      - (1) Gov. Malloy says needed to compete with other states
      - (2) Only give subsidies if there is a net gain
  - e) N2: Subsidies help wider community
    - i) Workers pay taxes and spend locally
    - ii) Subsidies keep people in the state
  - f) N3: Counterplan: better managed subsidy programs
    - i) Can be successful if regulated
    - ii) Loans should only be made in return for jobs that stay for the long term
    - iii) Companies must prove ability to create jobs before getting cash
    - iv) Gradual disbursement, year by year: no jobs, no funds
    - v) Only provided when there is a net gain
- 4) Cross-Ex of First Negative**

- a) Would there be a cap on the subsidies? A \$ limit
- b) The timing? Yearly loans
- c) Loans or subsidies? A subsidy, but it could be a loan
- d) Would the subsidies create jobs or simply retain them? Create jobs
- e) Why does success in Virginia show it would work in all 50 states? We mentioned Kentucky and Virginia. Regulation leads to success
- f) Do you have other examples? Kentucky and Virginia

**5) Second Affirmative Constructive**

- a) Intro
- b) Resolution
- c) Aff then Neg
- d) A3: Money to citizens can provide job assistance, educational subsidies, support
  - i) Could directly create jobs
- e) A1: Need to retain corporations is the key fact
- f) A2: Bailouts show the process just throws money at the corporations
  - i) Resolution says we should not subsidize corporations, nothing about how we might subsidize others
- g) Examples
  - i) Neg cites KY and OK
  - ii) Aff cited CT losses to Jackson Labs and CIGNA
  - iii) Aff cited OK
  - iv) Michigan had the auto subsidies
  - v) You can't monitor these programs closely enough to be effective

**6) Cross-Ex of Second Affirmative**

- a) What is the goal of the debate? To decide about subsidies
- b) Isn't the goal to improve the economy? Yes
- c) Shouldn't we use an active policy? Then you have to decide who to prioritize, which group. In any case you shouldn't subsidize corporations
- d) If not corporations, who? Citizens
- e) Why not corporations? We've given examples
- f) How do you create jobs? Lots of ways
- g) Examples? Welfare, aid
- h) Do these create jobs? Education, training
- i) Do these create jobs? They help people get them
- j) Do subsidies create jobs? Yes

**7) Second Negative Constructive**

- a) Intro
- b) Resolution
- c) Neg then Aff
- d) What is the point of this debate?
  - i) The economy is in turmoil
  - ii) There is a dispersion between the rich and poor
  - iii) We need to fix the economy and incentives are the only state by state tools
- e) N1: the principle behind subsidies is good
  - i) Aff examples had problems with poor regulation
  - ii) Counterplan fixes the problem by investing wisely and regulating well

- f) N2: Subsidies help companies and communities
  - i) vs A3: helping industry helps the community
- g) N3: Counterplan
  - i) Highly regulated, tiered by effectiveness, reviewed each year
- h) A1 vs N3: counterplan prevents dependency
  - i) Won't pay top \$ for jobs like Jackson Labs
- i) A2: subsidies fail in the status quo
  - i) Counterplan fixes problems with better regulation
- j) A3: this contention is just theory and opinion

**8) Cross-Ex of Second Negative**

- a) How do you know subsidies are the only effective way? Tax relief has been tried and doesn't work. Counterplan provides subsidies as incentives to corporations.
- b) Has the US been in a depression for its entire history? No, but economic turmoil has happened
- c) Counterplan is the only way? How do you know? We only pay when the jobs are created
- d) Are you aware of precedents to pay individuals? Yes
- e) Are you saying the status quo is throwing money away? You're misconstruing our argument
- f) But you are going to pay subsidies? Pay slowly, based on performance
- g) State by state? Yes
- h) What if some states don't follow your plan? Some will
- i) But the states have to do it? Not Federal program

**9) First Negative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Aff
- c) A1: Business have other reasons to stay besides subsidies
  - i) E.g., a surfboard company is going to prefer California to CT
  - ii) There is a risk in moving
  - iii) They won't leave if they are getting money
    - (1) Under N3 they can expect payment, but no assurance
- d) A2: Both Aff and Neg have presented examples
  - i) N3 will be highly regulated (like VA and KY)
  - ii) Can cut off funds if companies don't perform
  - iii) N3 only pays if they perform
- e) A3: N3 pays for itself
  - i) Subsidies lead to jobs which leads to spending and tax collections
  - ii) Throw away money? That's A3, giving \$ to individuals
  - iii) N3 is regulated, not random
  - iv) Job creation improves the economy

**10) First Affirmative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Much of this debate is plan vs. plan
  - i) No assurance either plan will work
  - ii) Probability is higher for the Aff plan

- c) N1: example vs example
  - i) \$80 billion has been spent. KY and VA are small
- d) N2: Neg plan is trickle-down economics
  - i) Aff is like FDR/New Deal
  - ii) Subsidies and tax credits go directly to the middle class
- e) N3: Counterplan is hypothetical
  - i) No proof it will be successful
  - ii) No proof it will be better than A3
- f) Repeat A1, A2, A3

### **11) Second Negative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Debate has three themes: Necessity, Accountability and Effectiveness
- c) Necessity: We need to change our policy on subsidies
  - i) Neg believes corporate subsidies are the only way
  - ii) A2 says they are ineffective, but N3 shows why
  - iii) We can reduce cost, increase jobs created
  - iv) No reason to believe it will fail
  - v) A2 says current programs spend too much \$ on too few jobs
  - vi) A3 giving \$ to individuals won't create jobs
  - vii) Governor of Wyoming says corp subsidies create jobs
- d) Accountability
  - i) N3 holds corporations accountable
  - ii) Jackson Labs got a lot of \$ all at once
  - iii) N3 would have annual reviews and targets
- e) Effectiveness
  - i) A3 is vague on details
  - ii) N2 shows subsidies help corporations and communities
  - iii) N3 will create jobs

### **12) Second Affirmative Rebuttal**

- a) Intro
- b) Resolution
- c) Effectiveness: N3 has no proof
  - i) A3 is the same as FDR's New Deal
- d) A1: N3 is hypothetical
  - i) It operates at the state level
  - ii) If some states don't adopt it, corporations will move to the best environment
  - iii) Enforcement is inherently faulty
- e) A3: We don't have to spend \$100K per person
  - i) WY governor is not an authority
  - ii) Aff would spend on education, training, individual relief
  - iii) Neg can't guarantee trickle-down effects