

Their counter interpretation is not superior to ours because our Rieffel evidence says that it allows an unlimited number of things that can increase the attractiveness of a program, such as pulling out of Iraq, AIDS research, and banning “Stop Loss” orders, that are all ... that all would result from this.

They say that we overlimit, but we allow for a mandate of an increase as long as it is in their plan text, things like the draft or raising the end strength of a program, are the core of the topic. Changing the status quo is easy; there is plenty of literature in favor of mandating ... or changing the status quo. The 1AC evidence proves this. Our evidence is not about mandatory increases.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL SPEECH BY ANDREW BAKER (SHAWNEE MISSION WEST HIGH SCHOOL)

I’m really interested in this Wild West World now. It’s going to be the topicality debate, the solvency debate, then the justification debate, then the overview on the budget disadvantage, and then the budget disadvantage proper.

On topicality, they just don’t go to this argument with enough time in the 1NR. They’re not outlining any case that would be topical; their interpretation just doesn’t make any sense. Extend across first that we meet. Our Sagawa evidence from two days ago indicates that people will immediately join. It cites the empirical example of when this program was tried during Hurricane Charlie; they’re not answering the warrant to our evidence. Additionally, extend across our second “we meet.” Their own definition contradicts their argument. It says that a policy must have a goal; our goal is to increase people, meaning we meet this argumentation. That’s not answered in the block. Additionally, they’re not isolating unique abuse. We still gave them the link to their disad. We straight turned it, though. They’re not making any arguments as to why we’re not proving the link to their disad. Additionally, extend across the Sagawa evidence from two days ago. It indicates that because Hurricane Charlie being empirically effective, our plan will get in 100,000 people immediately.

Additionally, they’re conceding our interpretation that there are only 70,000 people in AmeriCorps right now; we double the size of it ... more than double the size of it. Meaning, we are substantial; they don’t have any arguments against this.

They literally spent a second and a half on our counter interpretation. Our *Merriam Webster*’s evidence proves that their “policy to” definition proves that we’re topical. They don’t answer our argument. This is key to literature because there is no one advocating everybody immediately join AmeriCorps in the context of an affirmative plan text. Additionally, mandatory was removed from the resolution with a justification by the framers meaning there is no unique scenario as to why our case isn’t predictable.