

that the United States federal government must do the plan, which is what is mandated by the words in the resolution. Instead the states and Washington, D.C., and all relevant sub-actors can adopt policy debate programs. Even if they win that an increase is a good idea to solve civic engagement, they have not proven that as a policy-maker their policy is a better option than our counter advocacy.

Their last argument is that the states are not able to amend legislation, but we're not trying to claim that they can. Rather, we're trying to claim that the states could do policy debate programs and that the federal government does not have to take action to solve for their harms. They have not met the burden of proof that is a *prima facie*, stock issue burden for the affirmative that they are the only way to solve for their significant harm. Policy debate programs are able to solve because high school NFL programs are at a ... any without a high school NFL program is at a serious educational disadvantage, according to our Hanes evidence, and they are less likely to be civically engaged in the future. This actually means that our counter advocacy is able to get people involved in things like AmeriCorps in the future, so we actually solve civic engagement best.

Secondly, debate is the best tool to get school students educated on domestic politics and international relations. Debates focus on role play and research as the 2AC pointed out in her thank you speech, it is the best way to get people involved and educated throughout their high school experience. We become informed citizens that will continue to be involved in politics and be civically engaged throughout out lives.

Now to topicality. Their first argument is that they meet, but they do not have any evidence that says that people will accept the offer after the bill is repealed in their plan. Their evidence all just says that the bill's effect could have recruiting effects on people, but they do not have any evidence that says that low-income people will accept this offer. They have some rhetorical evidence that says that people might do it for this and this reason, but they do not have any definitive and conclusive evidence which says they will cause an immediate and definite increase. Our Higher Education Funding Council evidence says that it is not how you increase, but that you actually cause an increase in the process.

Their next argument is that they defend an increase; however, even if they defend one it is unpredictable for the negative because no definite increase in the plan text means that we do not get links to our generic disadvantages. For example, we should not have to wait until the 2AC actually answers the spending disadvantage to know whether it is a good idea to read it.

Their third argument ... their third and fourth arguments are about how many people they would increase by, but they do not have evidence that the bill will definitely cause much of an increase; it says it possibly could, but this still does not guarantee our link. It does say that if they do defend this that it guarantees us our link to our spending disadvantage because it spends so much money.