

Q: Let's talk about your topicality violation, first. Our first piece of Sagawa evidence indicates that our bill actively recruits middle schoolers who are underprivileged in the status quo. How do we not meet your violation?

A: Our interpretation is that your affirmative has to beFirst to justify your prima facie burden you have to be different, you have to be a change from the status quo. Which means even if these programs are in place, you do not change them. Second is that ...

Q: Wait. Hold on one sec. The first Sagawa evidence indicates that in the status quo they are not recruiting people. How is this argument applying?

A: The bill ... all of your plan text says that you will enact this bill. It does not actively recruit people to join AmeriCorps, nor does it guarantee that even when you offer this incentive, people will actually take it and join.

Q: Our first Sagawa evidence indicates that the bill does actively recruit people. Where's the violation?

A: Our evidence indicates that an increase refers to a process, not an outcome, and that it has to immediately start with the passage of the plan. Yes, sometime after the bill is passed, after the affirmative, we will start going out and actively recruiting people but it is not an immediate effect of the plan.

Q: So this is more of an immediacy argument than anything else?

A: It's both. It is not a policy that is a definite increase because you cannot guarantee that anyone will accept the monetary incentive offered, especially because it is only \$500.

Q: So do we just need to read evidence on this topic that people will join?

A: Not just evidence but you need to have a justification for why an immediate increase in your plan would be a good idea.

Q: OK, let's go to that justification argument next.

A: Sure.

Q: Are you claiming that debate will solve all aspects of our affirmative?

A: Well, debate could solve all of the aspects of your affirmative, but we are also saying that...

Q: Could?

A: You need to justify your use of the federal government in the resolution.

Q: Awesome. Does debate actively recruit people?

A: Well, our counter advocacy would say that we should actively recruit people into...

Q: Do you have any evidence proving this argument?

A: Yes, I read two pieces of evidence on this question.

Q: No, evidence indicating that they do or will advocate and that will actively recruit people and that will solve?

A: Well, our argument is that they should do that, and that will solve.