

The solvency debate: They're simply wrong on this debate. Our evidence indicates that we need to get people out of volunteerism and into the workforce. Only our aff is able to do that and go through a college education. That's our empirical Sagawa evidence. They say that there's a long time frame. Our time frame is now. That's our service learning advantage. We immediately get them in, thus they create cross-cultural diversity within these communities, leading to a better economic stability. They're conceding the argument that an economic collapse is inevitable in the status quo due to this. That evidence is on point, saying that it's the key issue in this debate.

They're also conceding we solve one hundred percent of our second advantage. There is only a risk of solvency and no offense from the negative.

I'll answer all of their "civic engagement up" arguments right now. Our evidence is from two days ago, theirs is one year ago. There is no reason to even evaluate it. Additionally, our evidence indicates that it's up everywhere but what the plan takes, proving it's uniquely key. AmeriCorps is going up across the board, just not in the disadvantaged youth area, meaning our plan is uniquely important. Our evidence indicates that Sagawa is an expert on this issue; kids will want to join and they're not answering the empirical data on Charlie. There is no reason they wouldn't want to give up their summer.

He extends his trade-off argument, but our Sagawa evidence specifically says that these people aren't involved in AmeriCorps in the status quo, so getting them on board would not get off of the other people. There is no reason not to do the plan.

On to the justification argument. Let's listen to what this argument really is, folks. It's a counterplan that isn't competitive. Our argument is from the Sagawa evidence on 6/20 that the federal government is uniquely key. Our evidence cites three warrants that the block is not answering. The first is that this has to be universally available, which only the federal government can do. No debate program can do that because they're different from state to state; that's the 1NR's argument itself. This means that only our aff solves.

Secondly, it's a rite of passage only when it's on the national level. Everyone in the United States would have to do this before they go to college, meaning that it would be the rite of passage that our evidence talks to, leading to cross-cultural diversity—not answered in the block either. Additionally, our third piece of evidence indicates that an existence institution that is banded together is key. Another conceded warrant; there is no reason that the states or a different debate program could do this. Additionally, they have no solvency advocate indicating that people would increase the amount of benefits that are existing.

As for debate programs, we solve for that because when people get involved in service learning that's the best way for them to gain education. Our Sagawa evidence is comparative on this subject.