

lawyers who do contribute productively to the U.S. economy, whereas the volunteers that they are contributing go on to non-profit organizations, which do not boost the U.S. economy.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL SPEECH BY SARAH WEINER (SHAWNEE MISSION WEST HIGH SCHOOL)

The order is solvency, then the justification, spending overview, spending proper. He gets to the solvency debate with ten seconds left in his speech. There is nothing for you to vote on that would compel you to believe that we don't solve for 100% of our case.

Extend our Sagawa evidence which specifically talks about Hurricane Charlie when youth were mobilized under AmeriCorps to engage in community service to solve for the terrible effects of Hurricane Charlie. This is an empirical example of 100 percent solvency that we can get people into AmeriCorps and working.

Also extend also our Sagawa evidence that specifically indicates that putting these children in the Summer of Service AmeriCorps now during the summer are not going to be in service for the rest of their life, but they are going to go to college to become productive members of the workforce.

They read absolutely no evidence, qualifications, or warrants as to why these people would not be going into the workforce. Prefer our specific evidence. Specifically extend our Malcolm et al. evidence in 2005 from the 1AC. This is going to be where you vote in this round. This evidence indicates that the only way to solve for the economy and for national security is for youth to be involved in science and math and science and math education. This science and math education is only developed through our 1AC because we get children looking into college. When they get to college, they will be going into science and math education; this is in the 1AC.

This means that their justification doesn't solve because they only talk about civic engagement in their justification. We say that we have to get children going to college in math and science fields in order to solve.

Additionally, prefer the specificity of our argumentation. We are the only people reading evidence about the specific Summer of Service AmeriCorps program under the justification.

What do you think you are voting on with this justification argumentation? In the 1NC we had to justify the federal government; in the 2NC we had to justify that debate was bad, and now they have a complete counter advocacy in which you as a judge get to say that everyone does debate.