

Q: Right, but not domestically.

A: Additionally, the argument is that ... our Gottschalk evidence indicates that the only way that we are going to maintain economic primacy and competitiveness in the future is to have cross-cultural education now. That means that your disadvantage is going to be non-unique; the economy will collapse unless we do our 1AC. We are the only option to saving the economy in the future.

Q: Wait, I have a question, though. In the future, it will inevitably collapse, this is probably true, but why if students are getting involved in debate are we not allowed to still be competitive without spending money on a domestic issue?

A: Because people ... I don't understand, I mean if your argumentation is that people being involved in debate cross-culturally would increase foreign accomplishments ...

Q: Well, do you have evidence that we wouldn't be able to get lower-income people involved in debate programs?

A: You aren't ... like you don't have a policy for these judges to vote on that would actively recruit the underprivileged into debate.

Q: Oh, I think you misunderstand. Our justification also says that we could have a counter advocacy which allows the federal government to substantially increase people in policy debate programs rather than in national service.

A: It is our argumentation that these people will not go into policy debate unless they are civically engaged. If you didn't care about policy issues, you would not join debate. We get these kids the summer before they begin high school and make them civically engaged. We're the internal link to your argument about involving people in this activity.

Q: But if these kids are not already involved in policy issues, why, oh why would they care about going to college and take your \$500 stipend? And why ...

A: That is exactly the argument that our Sagawa evidence indicates. First, parents are looking to do something with these children, but low-income parents can't afford summer camps, and these kids are too young to have jobs. Our Sagawa evidence indicates that this \$500 scholarship, which is not going to pay for college, plants the seed in these children's minds that they are college potential and that they should try to save for college.

Q: So, the way to make them civically engaged is to have their parents force them into these summer programs because they know that it will help them get into college along the way? That doesn't seem like something that will promote getting involved.

A: They learn civic engagement through the program. That is the benefit of our first affirmative.

Q: Sure, and you cite a lot of Sagawa evidence indicating that it would be a good idea to do this, but you don't have one piece of evidence that people will actually want to do this. Is that correct?

A: Our Sagawa evidence indicates that we could recruit 100,00 children.