

if there had been more spending and budget proposals, Bush will veto those proposals in practice—means that there is not more spending.

Their next argument they say that spending is not relevant if collapse is inevitable, that was answered above. They say the plan now is critical—also answered above. They were the ones repeating themselves, I guess, a little bit more than I am even.

Their next argument: They say that AmeriCorps is not corrupt, or that there are millions being spent now. Please cross-apply from topicality the fact they said that they literally, quote, “double the size of AmeriCorps.” Combine with our Brady evidence that says any expensive federal program ends up being multiplied 5 times over, means that you should be highly skeptical of them being able to save money.

Our Sanchez evidence says that AmeriCorps is a wasteful bureaucracy anyway because money ends up being wasted and inefficiently used. This is a decision rule question that was not answered by the 1AR.

The justification argument: they have not justified that federal action is critical. If you as a policy-maker are promoting policy debate programs, it is better than promoting this service act for just the summer anyway and giving \$500.

They make a couple solvency deficits. They say it is not universally available; that’s laughable because our justification argument is that we should put debate programs throughout the country. It’s not universally accessible now, we’re saying it should be. They are thus not justified; the federal government is not critical to solving the harms. The states could also effectively address the significant harms of the 1AC, vis-à-vis establishing policy debate programs.

Second is that states are different in their educational activities already in the status quo. Our Ferejohn evidence indicates that it is bad when the federal government says all state education needs to be the same thing. They are no different than yet another establishment for teachers to have to meet the bar federally.

The next argument: they say a rite of passage is good, but first, the plan is obviously not a rite of passage, it is only for lower-income individuals. Meaning they are now saying that lower-income people need to have some kind of rite of passage that the upper-income individuals do not. This is repugnant and turns their own 1AC claims. And additionally, debate is able to incorporate lower-income individuals anyway.

We do have a solvency advocate. The first piece of evidence read in the 1NC and Stephanie’s fantastic explanation in the 1NR why debate is able to give educational benefits and give these cross-cultural contexts such as through UDLs [Urban Debate Leagues] or through project teams. Kids are able to increase their critical thinking, which is also good for the economy.

The case arguments: the plan is not able to put more people into the workforce. The fact that people are volunteering now means that they are more likely to volunteer in not-for-profit organizations in the long run, whereas most debaters go on to be people like