

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

Before I begin, I would like to echo my partner and my competitors in thanking the director of NFL, the Executive Committee, the local host committee, the tab room staff, all of the Wichita East volunteers in those yellow shirts who helped us find the elevator every day during the policy tournament. For everyone who has contributed to this tournament, we are eternally grateful. This has been a wonderful experience for both of us and I know I'll never forget it.

I also want to echo our thanks to our coaches who have always been guides to us. I always talk to Mr. King, my head coach, about why he coaches debate and why we do this. The only thing we can come up with is that we just enjoy it. This is one of the best activities I've ever participated in, and I'm proud to stand in front of you today. I also want to thank my debate partner, who is the best debate partner I could ever ask for. I'm going to miss him terribly when he goes to college next year.

Alright, for the order: First topicality, then solvency, justification, and then spending.

First, on topicality: we meet their violation. Our first solvency piece of evidence from Sagawa on 6/20 specifically says that the bill we pass will support legislation to engage youth. The card reads, "legislation would support community efforts to engage young teens in intensive service as a rite of passage during the summer." This legislation would actively recruit teens who are underprivileged; that's the premise of our 1AC.

Additionally, we meet because the intent of our plan is to increase the number of people in AmeriCorps through the Summer of Service program. There is no abuse on this argument because we do defend that increase, and they have links to all of their disadvantages.

Additionally, the plan would provide 100,000 students into a Summer of Service at a cost of only \$100 million. From Sagawa, cited in the 1AC: "Awareness, empowerment, and responsibility could be exhibited by teens everywhere. For \$100 million we could provide 100,000 a Summer of Service and \$500 in college scholarships." Additionally, there are only 70,000 people in AmeriCorps right now, which means we would substantially increase the number of people in AmeriCorps, by over doubling the number of people in the institution.

She says ... Our counter-interpretation is that "increase" is progressive. From *Merriam Webster Online* in 2006: "to become progressively greater, as in size, amount, number, or intensity." And our standards are better. First is limits: No case is topical under the negative interpretation, because people can't immediately be put into any program.

Additionally, we give them more ground, because the only way to immediately increase the number of people in a national service program would be to fiat them in which