### 50 States Fiat Bad

#### Reject The “50-States” Counterplan:

#### It fiats the object of our advantage. Responding to “state-based education finance systems are bad, so the USFG needs to act” with “we fiat that state-based education finance systems won’t be bad” artificially sidesteps an important policy conversation.

#### That destroys aff ground and undermines topic education because it doesn’t reflect the scholarly controversy over state and federal policymaking. Learning to analyze scholarly proposals is essential to debate education.

#### It’s unrealistic — the 50 states never simultaneously take the same action. Adding uniformity magnifies the harm.

#### Voting Issue to remedy strategic damage already done and to raise the cost of future introduction.

### They Say: “50 States Fiat Bad”

#### 1. Key to Limit Affirmatives — a huge topic necessitates counterplans that test the necessity of the federal government — they push the aff toward bigger cases with better neg ground like Right to Education and Desegregation.

#### 2. Better Topic Education — without aff limits, the neg won’t have case-specific research and will rely on hyper-generics. States forces the aff to debate the core topic controversy of states vs. federal control.

#### 3. Not Object Fiat — the object of the plan is schools, not states.

#### 4. No Impact to Important Policy Conversation — the aff isn’t “realistic” under the Trump administration, and it uses multiple actors too.

#### 5. Maintains Aff Ground — they get “fed key” warrants based off constraints on state spending, overturning Supreme Court precedent, the necessity of federal expertise, or advantages based off the signal the actor sends.

#### 6. No Harm — we don’t fiat interstate uniformity or artificial funding. Reject those versions, not this core-of-the-topic controversy.

#### 7. If they win theory, you should reject the counterplan, not the team.