THE 2006-2007 RESOLUTION: ORIGINS AND POTENTIAL MEANINGS

Stefan Bauschard, Lakeland High School

Resolved: that the United States federal government should establish a policy substantially increasing the number of persons serving in one or more of the following national service programs: AmeriCorps, Citizen Corps, Senior Corps, Peace Corps, Learn and Serve America, Armed Forces

Origins of the Resolution

Ordinarily, a resolution generally grows out of a problem area that is chosen as a potential topic for debate. At the topic meeting, individuals on the wording committee work to word a topic based on what they know about the area, and they struggle to word multiple resolutions within a very short day to give voters options among different resolutions and topics.

This year’s resolution was initially derived through this method, but when it was announced in January it was found to suffer from a couple of major flaws: 1) There was only one affirmative, and 2) the affirmative wasn’t very good. Individuals on the wording committee, and presumably those who voted for the topic, acted under the assumption that there was more than one affirmative because they thought it would be possible to argue for mandatory national service in more than one area; theoretically a team could argue for mandatory military service, mandatory community service, mandatory border enforcement, etc. The problem was that there was really only one basic proposal for mandatory service – to require young people (usually ages 18-25) to participate in a form of national service of their choosing – either in the military, in schools, in day care centers, etc. If the affirmative wanted to read any solvency evidence, they would have to be left with this option.

The second problem with the mandatory topic was that there was almost no support in the literature for making it mandatory. Although some authors do favor mandatory service, most propose a variety of incentive schemes, all of which would be negative counterparts that would simply be too good. Some effort needed to be made to create a topic that was a little bigger and more balanced.

The current resolution grew out of an effort by individuals on, and working with, the wording committee to come up with a new resolution that met those goals. Unlike others writing a resolution, people working on new resolution were constrained by the fact that the area had already been chosen and they didn’t want to write a resolution that stayed too far from what voters at least likely thought they were getting when they chose that resolution.

The first incarnation of the new resolution simply consisted in removing the word “mandatory,” allowing the affirmative to simply increase “support” for a “national service program.” While the first resolution was too narrow, this resolution was way too broad. Almost any federal agency, such as the Center for Disease Control (CDC), could be defined as a “national service.” Affirmatives could have had cases to simply increase research against impending bioweapons attacks. So, this wording was too broad and the debates would certainly have stayed from what was intended in both the original topic paper and the original resolution.

The second version of the new resolution included a list of national service programs that the wording committee identified as being important in the original topic area paper and which would have received a lot of debate under the “mandatory” wording. The “programs” listed in the current resolution were chosen for this reason.

This second version left the community with “increasing support for one or more of the following…” This new resolution, however, had one significant problem: it wouldn’t have encouraged debates about people actually participating in the programs. Affirmatives could have increased support for the military, for example, by building new missile defenses, space weapons, or aircraft carriers. This topic would have very quickly moved away from debates regarding what is normally understood to be “national service.” So, this second version added the words “persons serving.”

The final discussion revolved around whether or not to even have “national service” in the resolution. After all, affirmative choices were limited to the programs listed, and adding “national service” seemed to, at best, create an unnecessary redundancy. The wording committee chose to keep it, however, to create some unity in the topic and to signal that they were trying to stay with the original topic. That’s the only reason it is there.

The new resolution is far from perfect. Although it may definitively fit, most would not consider the military to be a “program.” Second, the new resolution still fails to match what advocates of “mandatory” national service intend. Those advocates would support giving people substantially more options in a mandatory program than what the resolution supports. Third, more thought should be given to the word “persons.” Not only do philosophers debate as to exactly what constitutes a person, but there are strong definitions that many entities, such as corporations, are legally defined as persons. This also affects my fault since I recommended it as a solution to the “increasing support problem.” As will be discussed, this could open the topic up to having more companies participate in providing services to the military. Fourth, it is not clear what it means to establish a program “increasing the number of persons serving.” Does the program have to mandate that, so that the only topic case is one in which supports mandatory service, recreating the problem this second resolution was meant to avoid? Fifth, what precisely constitutes these programs? How far can these programs be expanded before they become something other than what they are? Sixth, how does the term “national service” function in the topic? Can we just ignore it, or is the affirmative responsible for it? As discussed in the essay on debating the values of national service, defending the term is problematic; and answering that question will have implications far beyond the topicality debate.

There are, of course, many other definitional and interpretation issues that will substantially impact the meaning(s) of the resolution. Each of these will be discussed in more detail in the next part of this essay. The issues in this previous section are important because they highlight why the resolution is as it is and how different ways of looking at the construction of the resolution produce different interpretations.

The Federal Government

The actor in this year’s resolution is the “federal government.” The likely central dispute in any topicality debate on this topic will be whether or not that actor includes only the head of our central government and its agents that operate out of Washington, D.C. or whether that actor also includes the state governments, as the state governments are part of the federal system. Some definitions point to the central authority in Washington (A3-6) and others (A2) include the state governments. Upon consultation with a variety of dictionaries, it does not seem that the capitalization, or lack thereof, of the term has any significance, at least in terms of establishing what set of actors the term refers to. The framers chose not to capitalize the term “federal government” because there is no such thing as “the Federal Government” – it is not a proper noun.

It will be important on the negative for you to win that the “federal government” refers to the central government in Washington, D.C. This will be important for winning links to your own disadvantages
and for you to be able to defend the competitiveness of your states counterplan. You should not have any difficulty doing this, as this is how the term “federal government” has traditionally been understood in debate. Given that you can probably win this topicality argument if you need to, many of the issues in this book have been framed from the perspective that this is how the term “federal government” will be understood.

On a related note, negative teams may also occasionally try to catch affirmative off guard with atypical definitions of federal government, particularly ones involving foreign governments. For example, some teams have argued, “the federal government is the central government of Brazil.” Hopefully, the presence of the term “United States” in the resolution should also suffice in distinguishing which federal government is the agent of the resolution. There are, however, some definitions that refer to the “United States of Brazil”

**Should**

The term “should” in the resolution is typically interpreted to mean “ought” – expressing “obligation, duty, propriety, or desirability” (A7–8). Generally, it does not have any significance in most topicality debates. It exists primarily to provide a contextual basis for flat. The affirmative is arguing that the plan should be done, not necessarily, that it would be done.

It can also be argued that “should” is the past tense of “shall”, essentially meaning, that the federal government should have supported national service programs in the past.

**Establish**

Definitions of “establish” articulate two primarily different meanings: to bring into existence (A9–A11) and to make stable or firm (A14–15).

Both definitions are accurate descriptions of the meaning of the word, but crafty negatives always try to argue that establish only means to bring into existence. They will argue that this “interpretation” of the word provides them with more unique, generic disadvantage ground because if the affirmative can simply “firm up” an existing policy they will always be able to win that the disadvantages are non-unique. One thing worth pointing out here is that the negative’s definition of “to bring into existence” is not exclusive. In other words, the definition that the affirmative cites doesn’t exclude “to put on a firm basis.” In fact, you will notice that the negative is only reading half of the definition of the word, though they won’t let on to that. When you argue this, negatives will argue that they get to “interpret” the word in a way that provides for the best debate. This is a ridiculous idea of what “interpreting” the meaning of a word is. What the negative and the affirmative should be able to interpret are the definitions of the word (what does “bring into existence” mean?). The negative shouldn’t get to interpret the word in a way that changes its definitional meaning! Affirmatives need to be careful not to let the negative get away with this, not only with regard to this violation, but with regard to other topicality violations as well.

Similarly, negatives can argue that establish should be interpreted to mean “firm up” because it limits affirmative to improving existing programs and not creating a new program to serve the existing programs.

You could also make arguments as to what “establish” means, or ought to mean, in the context of the resolution. For example, should the affirmative have to create bring into existence a new policy that is designed to support one of the programs that are listed? Perhaps, but since I’ve never seen a single piece of evidence advocating this, it would leave the affirmative in a rather indefensible position. In another way, however, it could give the affirmative a lot of leverage in that the affirmative could say that it is creating a program, such as a new program for Junior ROTC in schools, to increase the number of persons serving in the military. In this way, the affirmative could create something entirely different than what is listed in the resolution in order to support increasing the number of persons serving in one of the programs mentioned.

**Policy**

“Policy” generally refers to a purposive course of action followed by government or nongovernmental actors in response to some set of perceived problems. The affirmative will want to choose some particular course of action that is designed to support peacekeeping operations.

One controversy related to “policy” is whether or not a policy is a goal or course of action. While most definitions suggest the latter, Cabb, a professor of Political Science at Vassar wrote in 1965 that there are “two elements in foreign policy of any nation: objectives and means for reaching them” (AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE NUCLEAR AGE, p. 65). Negatives have taken advantage of “goal” part of the definition to argue that the affirmative has to change the goals of our national service program. While this works on many topics, it makes little sense on this one since the goal of the resolution is identified to increase participation in one of the stated programs. Generally, a policy is a “course of action”

**Substantially**

In the resolution, “substantially” is an adverb modifying the word “increase(ing)” The “increases” in the number of “persons serving” must be by a “substantial” amount. It is difficult for the negative to use the word “substantial” to limit much affirmative action because there are no precise, generally agreed upon, definitions of the term. Dr. Rich Edwards, the author of the yearly FORENSICS QUARTERLY, explained last year that the “legal encyclopedia Words and Phrases presents more than 500 pages of fine-print definitions of this term.” He explains the origin of such different definitions:

The context for these definitions should be understood: each one involves the judgment of a court in a particular case concerning what the word meant in the context of that case. It is natural that debaters will try to make use of these legal definitions, but it must always be done with a key question in mind: “Is the context for this court case similar to the way that the word ‘substantially’ is used in the debate resolution?” There is, for example, a major difference in the meaning of the word “substantially” in the phrase “substantially all” from the resolutional phrase of “substantially increase.” Many of these definitions warn that the word is not a term of precision. In State v. Rose the court held that the “term ‘substantially’ is relative and must be considered within the context of the particular fact situation; in essence, it means less than totally or the whole, but more than imaginary” (Words and Phrases, Vol. 40, 1995, p. 458).

Often, negatives will read definitions of “substantial” that claims “substantial is ‘X percentage’ and that the affirmative fails to meet ‘X percentage’ so they are not topical. The problem with this interpretation is that these interpretations are arbitrary in different contexts.

Although tying the affirmative down to a specific number may be difficult, there are various definition of the word substantial that may be helpful to the negative without being unrealistic for the affirmative.

First, the negative can argue that the affirmative’s plan has to be “permanent.” In Fisher v. Fisher ruled that “to establish ‘substantial change’ in former spouse’s circumstances, as would warrant modification of child support awarded pursuant to dissolution judgment, change must be significant, material, involuntary and permanent in nature” (Words & Phrases, Vol. 40, 2001, p. 632). Second, the negative can argue that the affirmative can not put a “material qualification” on the increase in participation.

**Increasing**

Increase” is generally defined as “become greater or larger”
Section A: Articles and Topicality, p. A-7

Number

"Number" generally refers to a quantitative amount (A38). If Sally is currently serving, increasing the number generally means adding Tom or Ben.

Persons

As discussed at the beginning of this essay the word "person" is an incredibly ambiguous term. If you were to approach 100 people walking down the street and ask them what a person was, I suspect 40 would point to you another "human being," 50 would run away from you because they think you are a loon, five lawyers will point to a corporation that is visible from the street and another five philosophers will throw up their hands in despair.

The reason for the difference is that I think it is fair to say that most people understand a "person" to be another human being (A39-40). Nonetheless, corporations and other entities have the same legal obligations and responsibilities, making them "persons" at least within some areas of the law (A45-7). Philosophers have argued over the criteria for what constitutes a "person" for hundreds of years (A41).

The "legal entity" interpretation of person opens up a whole slew of affirmatives that one could not ordinarily think of when considering a "national service" topic. Most significantly, affirmatives could increase the participation of various defense industries offering services to the military. Under this interpretation of the topic, any case to acquire more weapons-type technologies from a corporation recognized as a "person" becomes topical. Negatives will need to make a compelling case for limits, or this topic will become quite large.

Interestingly evidence (A63) indicates that contractors are not part of the Armed Forces, but that still leaves open the question as to what it means to serve in the Armed Forces. Do you have to be a member to serve in it? The definitions of serve, or at least the ones included here, are not specific enough. Negatives should try to look at affirmative interpretations of the topic that says that to "serve" in means to "become a member of."

Philosophical disputes over the definition of "person" usually arise within the context of the animal rights debate. Some of my debaters have already suggested that we simply say a particular animal is a person and involve that animal in one of the programs. We may be able to claim an advantage from strengthening a program by using that animal, but more importantly we could argue that we support animal rights by defining the animal as a person.

This "animal rights" approach to the topic will invariably be tried. Negatives can go after it by arguing that a definition of "person" as a human is the only one that should be accepted by the judge. Negatives can also attack it by having a general strategy that argues that animal rights shouldn't be protected by defining them as humans—that reduces them to people rather than celebrating them for what they are. Strong negative teams should argue that argument ready to go.

Serving

To serve generally means "to work for" or "provide goods and services for." I had initially hoped that "serving" may limit out the "person as entity with legal rights and/or obligations of a person" because these entities would really "serve" in the same way a human being would. But, these entities can easily "work for" or "provide goods and services" for the listed programs.

Increasing the Number of Persons Serving

As discussed in the introductory section, unless that topic is interpreted to require mandatory service, which is problematic since there would only be one affirmative, it is difficult to determine how it should be determined for topicality purposes whether or not the affirmative "increases the number of persons serving."

In the instance of a mandatory affirmative (which is still topical under this new resolution) it is clear that the affirmative will definitely be "increasing the number of persons serving"—people will have to serve. But, since there is only one mandatory national service affirmative, and given that it is terrible and doesn't really even match the wording of the topic, it is probably unrealistic to expect that affirmative to run that case. So, the question becomes, how do we determine if the affirmative policy is "increasing..."

There are two other ways that the affirmative could increase the number of persons serving. First, the affirmative could provide an incentive, or a combination of incentives, to attract persons to the various programs. Of course, the incentives could fail, so would the affirmative still be increasing the number of persons. Looking at solvency to determine topicality could "mix burdens" and make it impossible to evaluate the topicality of the plan "on its face."

The other way the affirmative could increase service is to remove a barrier to service. For example, if age is a barrier to serving in the military, the affirmative could lower it. Or, for example, if a particular policy, such as Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) discouraged homosexuals from serving in the military they could remove that.

The basic negative objection will center around "effects topicality." Negative's will argue that increasing the number of persons is simply an effect of the incentive or from removing the barrier, or perceived barrier, to serving in one of the programs. Negatives have a strong limiting argument. Imagine how many different incentives could be provided that have almost no, but a little, impact on the number of persons serving. For example, affirmative could improve the health benefits of soldiers and claim that more people serve, but that the primary benefit comes from improved health care.

Removing barriers is even more problematic from a limits perspective. There are both direct and indirect barriers. Direct barriers include things such as age or weight. Affirmatives could reduce obesity restrictions and claim that it is bad to discriminate against overweight individuals. Indirect barriers include policies such as Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT). DADT only prohibits individuals who are gay who wish to DISCLOSE their sexual identity from serving in the military. They can still serve and not disclose, making it more of a disincentive for service than a barrier to service. Affirmative could potentially eliminate anything that they can find evidence for that discourages people from serving.

Negatives will have difficulty selling the idea that the judge should accept that mandatory service is the only topical case since it is just one case, and a pretty bad one at that. I can already hear, "But judge, one bad case is better than 10,000 good ones (as if the negative defeated the case these days). But, the negative may be able to draw some other lines in the sand, such as only incentives rather than eliminating barriers is topic. Or, at the very least, eliminating barriers is topical, but not indirect barriers.

One or more of the following

There is not a lot of topicality ground here. Affirmatives can pick any of the listed programs, or a combination of the programs, to increase participation in.

The only small, and silly, dispute relates to the definition of "or." There is a card that says "or can be construed to mean "and." Believe it or not, some topicality debates have been won on this definition.

Nonetheless, if you have a counter-definition you will easily be able to defeat the argument, as no judge really wants to vote on it. Moreover, in this resolution such an interpretation makes little sense. Defining "or" as "and" makes the resolution read "one and more"—so the affirmative could have to pick one of the programs plus any other they want—hardly a limiting interpretation.
National Service

This term captures the core area of the resolution, but I still struggle to see its relevance for topicality debates. The programs that are listed are the national service programs that the affirmative could increase participation in.

I did not include a general definition of this term because it is the only one that I found lists only Armed Forces participation as a form of national service, but the topic renders that definition meaningless. There is evidence in the values section that indicates that there are many types of national service programs (B109-110).

Nonetheless, it is important for you to unpack what constitutes "national service" when researching for a couple of reasons. First, as will be discussed, many of the programs identified in the resolution perform both "national" and "community" service. Simply acting through one of the listed programs does not mean that the affirmative's plan is necessarily about national service. For example, helping the elderly in a community may be a form of community service, but it is arguably not a form of national service. Second, affirmative will want to defend national service and use that defense as leverage against states that have already had their critiques. Negatives will want to run critiques and disadvantages to supporting "national service." Negatives may attempt to advocate a "floating pic" — an alternative to a critique that enables the negative to support doing the plan without, in this instance, supporting the idea of "national service."

AmeriCorps. www.americorps.gov. AmeriCorps workers work to solve problems in one of these areas: Early childhood and elementary school education, crime prevention and victim services, rebuilding housing and helping the homeless, and improving national wildlife and community environments. AmeriCorps is really an umbrella for other programs, such as Habitat for Humanity. AmeriCorps is a "1,100" confederation of full-time and part-time national service slots that are locally independent and nationally interdependent. It is "a network," a "flag" that could fly over Peace Corps and VISTA." Individuals volunteer through AmeriCorps. AmeriCorps then receives grants proposals from various non-profit groups whose workers then fill out a paper to become AmeriCorps members. Approximately 50,000 Americans serve through various AmeriCorps-supported programs.

One interesting topic is whether or not the affirmative has to increase participation in the network that administrates the distribution of volunteers or if it can increase participation in the network by directly increasing participation in the programs that AmeriCorps supports. The former interpretation is much more limiting, but the latter interpretation probably more closely captures the meaning of the original topic area and resolution.

An individual can participate in AmeriCorps in one of the following ways.

AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC). One thousand NCCC participants live in four service academies and are supervised by retired U.S. military officers. Individuals are trained to go directly into communities to do community improvement work. Participants may be teachers' aides in classrooms or may test buildings for lead paint. The program was created in 1993 and originally had a budget of approximately $400 million. Participants are ages 18 to 24. Volunteers receive a living stipend and nearly $5,000 to apply to college tuition or student loans. Last year the program was funded at $277 million, but Bush's new budget proposes cutting it to $5 million (Lee 2006; SACRAMENTO BUSINESS JOURNAL (2006)). This $5 million is only enough to shut-down the program.

AmeriCorps-State: AmeriCorps State works with governor-appointed State Service Commissions to provide grants to state and local public service organizations. The purpose of these grants is to recruit and train AmeriCorps members to meet community needs in "education, quality public safety, health, and the environment... Sample activities include tutoring and mentoring youth, assisting crime victims, building homes, and restoring parks." 

AmeriCorps National. The difference between AmeriCorps National and AmeriCorps State is that the national program provides grants to national non-profit organizations, Indian tribes, and consortia that expand across two or more states. The purpose of the grants and the sample activities are identical to what occurs at the state level, except that the service organizations include Indian tribes and work at the national level.

AmeriCorps VISTA. AmeriCorps VISTA provides full-time members to community service organizations and public agencies to expand programs that benefit low-income individuals. AmeriCorps VISTA engages in both national and community service. According to THE MONROE TIMES (2006), "The mission of AmeriCorps is to strengthen communities and develop leaders through team-based national and community services." So, everything that AmeriCorps does may arguably not constitute "national service," thus narrowing the topic substantially.

Citizen Corps. www.citizencorps.gov. Citizen Corps is a national service program that is coordinated by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). DHS works with a variety of partners, such as the National Fire Protection Service and the Civil Air Patrol, to promote community service programs that "support homeland security and community safety." Since this is coordinated by the DHS, it is conceptually more difficult to imagine than the programs just discussed, but since it is state and local councils that actually do the recruiting for the plan it is not difficult to imagine. The Citizen Corps was involved in Hurricane Katrina relief efforts (Citizen Corps, 2005).

Senior Corps. www.seniorkorps.gov. The Senior Corps provides grants and volunteer citizens age 60 and over to Foster Grandparents, a program that connects volunteers with children, the Senior Companion Program, and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) matches senior volunteers with various programs. All of the programs provide Senior volunteers to service individuals in the community that struggle with day-to-day needs. The first two programs offer stipends, the third one does not.

Learn and Serve America. www.learnandservce.org. Learn and Serve America provides support to schools, higher education institutions, and community-based organizations that seek to provide learning opportunities to students through service ("service learning").

AmeriCorps National does not include people in the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) or the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Many proposals to expand national service, particularly those that favor widespread national service, include placing individuals in jobs such as border patrol or port security guards. These proposals are arguably not topical under this resolution because they involve placing people in programs outside the parameters of the programs listed. Affirmatives may be able to push the envelope some by claiming that these individuals are part of the citizen corps, but they are not part of the Armed Forces.
Although the CIA, for example, is an intelligence agency that operates outside of the DOD, there are intelligence agencies that operate within the armed forces. The Air Force (http://www.af.mil), the Army (https://www.army.mil), the Navy (http://www.navy.mil), and the Marine Corps (http://www.military.com) all have their own intelligence services. Affirmatives could recruit individuals to improve each of these.

Moreover, the "Armed Forces" does not include people in the National Guard because those individuals are not considered to be on "active duty." In the United States military active duty refers to military members who are currently serving full time in their military capacity... Members of the Military Reserves and National Guard are not considered active duty (wikipedia.org/wiki/Active_duty) (A70:2). Although some definitions do include the National Guard as part of the Armed Forces (A64-69) these definitions may assume that the Guard has been activated or is participating in training (A67). The best definitions (A71-2) make this distinction and reference the U.S. Code.

The distinction between active duty and non-active duty Guard troops is important because it likely means that cases that attempt to create a general national service corps of people who are generally available to provide homeland security and border security, and fill-in with basic tasks while troops are stationed overseas is not topical.

The affirmative could "make" the case topical by simply having the people it recruits go into the Guard be on "active duty." While this is possible for topicality purposes, it basically creates a permanently militarized Guard which threatens the separation between the military and the police. Negatives could counterplan to leave the troops "off active duty" and argue that it is bad to militarize domestic law enforcement.

**Limited Definitions of the Programs**

One important topicality-related issue is whether or not the affirmative can change the identity of the programs as they currently are. For example, can the affirmative replace the meaning of "Armed Forces" to mean carry peace flags? Increasing the number of persons serving will inherently change the programs, the question is how far can the affirmative go.

**Conclusion**

Writing a resolution from a topic area is an incredibly difficult task. Resolution authors struggle to create a fair balance of affirmative and negative ground for a reasonably-sized while retaining the essence of the topic area and using appropriate and relatively precise language and terms of art. They have to do all of this in a very short amount of time while also working on other resolutions that will appear on the ballot.

*Note: This Resolution was appropriately sized. That resolution, did, however, have the benefit of clarity. The new resolution is quite ambiguous, and could push the debates way beyond what was originally intended.*

For all of its problems, however, I think that the second resolution is a superior one. It gives the affirmative a shot, prevents the creation of a topic that is too small, and accesses, at least when reasonably interpreted, some of the key issues of the national service debate. Negatives will have to become good topicality debaters to retain this focus. Topicality debates can be trivial, but learning the difficulty of arriving at precise definitions is one of the skills that debate teaches through topicality. The important thing to know is that now more than ever you have to be good at it.

---

**Topicality Outline**

I. The is a definite article (A1)
II. United States federal government
   A. Includes the states (A2)
   B. Central government (A3-6)
III. Should express obligation (A7-8)
IV. Establish
   A. Establish means to create (A9-11)
   B. Establish means add to (A12-13)
   C. Establish means to make stable or firm (A14-15)
   D. Establish does not mean maintain (A16)
   E. Establish means to make permanent (A17-19)
   F. Establish means to regulate (A20)
   G. Establish means many things (A21-2)
   H. Establish doesn’t mean enlarge (A23)
   I. Establish means discontinue (A24)
   J. Establish means eight different things (A25-6)
V. Policy
   A. A policy is coercive (A27-8)
   B. Establishing and implementing a policy are different (A29)
   C. A policy is a course of action (A30)
   D. A policy is a general principle (A31)
   E. A policy is the goals (A32)
VI. Substantially
   A. Substantially is of real worth or importance (A33)
   B. Substantially is 25% (A34)
VII. Increasing means to grow (A35-7)
VIII. Numbers is a quantitative (A38)
IX. Person
   A. A person is a human being (A39-40)
   B. A person is not limited to a human being (A41)
   C. A person is no an agency of the federal government (A42-3)
   D. A person is a legal entity (A44)
   E. A person includes a corporation (A45-7)
   F. A person includes government entities (A48)
X. Serving
   A. Serving is to work for (A49)
   B. Serving is to provide goods and services for (A50)
XI. Program
   A. A program is a performance (A51)
   B. A program is the umbrella structure (A52)
   C. A program is an organized set of activities (A53)
XII. American has a network of programs (A54)
XIII. Citizen Corps is a security response program (A55)
XIV. Senior Corps is a network of programs (A56)
XV. The Peace Corps is a federal agency (A57)
XVI. Learn and Serve America described (A58)
XVII. Armed Forces
   A. Limited to active duty troops (A59-60)
   B. Includes civilian roles (A61)
   C. Includes non-combatants (A62)
   D. Includes civilian contractors (A63)
   E. Includes the National Guard (A64-6)
   F. Includes Guard training (A67)
   G. Includes the Army and Air Guard (A68-69)
   H. Excludes the National Guard (A70-72)
   I. Is the entire military organization (A73)