

2. They steal our core ground. The best generics are based out of increasing numbers and mandating people serve. Adequate negative ground is key to going in depth on the question of national service.

D. Topicality is a voting issue. It is a *prima facie* burden to justify that they fall within the bounds of the resolution. If they do not, it is out of your jurisdiction to vote for them. Next off is the justification argument. The central question posed by this year's resolution is should the United States federal government increase the number of persons in national service. In order to justify an affirmative ballot, the affirmative team must prove that action by the federal government is necessary to solve the significant harm. We believe the affirmative team has failed to justify federal action because the harm isolated by them could easily be remedied if the 50 states, Washington, D.C., and all other relevant sub-national actors should substantially increase funding to secondary schools to establish and maintain policy debate programs. Solving the affirmative's harm without federal action is a more desirable option because it avoids wasteful spending at the federal level. And, expanding NFL style debate would solve for any academic achievement and civic engagement. Russell Hanes, volunteer for the New York and Southern California Urban Debate Leagues in 2007, accessed online in *The Rostrum*:

"The percentage of schools participating in debate has been declining. Educational inequality is something that debate coaches need to confront. A student at a high school without an NFL program is at a serious educational disadvantage. Students most in need of engagement are the least likely to have such options. What is needed from coaches is collective action to address one of the substantive inequalities in education—to give more students the opportunity to participate in NFL through their school. The new strategy must be active, bringing in new schools and helping small programs grow bigger. Equity issues are survival issues for the debate community."

And, debate is the best tool to educate individuals about domestic politics and get people actually involved as informed citizens. Joyner, professor of international law at Georgetown University, Spring of 1999, accessed online:

"Debate can be an effective pedagogical tool for education in the social sciences, helping students understand different perspectives on a policy issue. Debates present the alternatives and consequences in a formal, rhetorical fashion before a judgmental audience, and not mere passive consumers. Students become legal advocates, gaining greater insight into the real-world legal dilemmas, as they realize the complexities of applying and implementing law."

And, educational policies are best handled by the states. Ferejohn, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and political science at Stanford University, and Weingast, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and chairman of the Department of Political Science at Stanford, accessed online, 1997: