"Local government officials have inherently better information concerning local conditions and local preferences. Public schools have been viewed as a responsibility of local governments. The federal government is likely to have insufficient information to tailor neighborhood schools to local needs and tastes. Local provision has inherent advantages."

Next off is the federal budget disadvantage. The thesis: the plan increases federal government spending at a time when our budget is already overstretched. At a time when our nation has to fight two wars and defend our homeland, the irreversible spending on the plan is reckless and endangers national security.

First the uniqueness—Bush has just appointed Jim Nussle as the new manager of the Office of Management and Budget—he will continue to hold the line on any new spending.

Gerstenzang, a *Times* staff writer, in July 2007 in the *Los Angeles Times:*

"Bush named Jim Nussle to replace Portman. Nussle has been better known for his strict adherence to conservative budget priorities. As OMB director, he will use his expertise about the budget process to ensure that the taxpayers' money is spent with respect and with restraint."

Link: The plan funds a new national service priority—since the plan cannot be repealed, it becomes a sacred cow in the federal budget and causes duplicative and wasteful expenditure of resources. Brady, Republican representative from Texas, 2006, in his Congressional testimony:

"If Congress were a manufacturing plant, we would manufacture spending. Once we create a federal program, it never goes away. The closest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on Earth is a government program. Not only do they not go away, but Congress clones them. Every federal program duplicates five others. At a time of war, with large deficits, we cannot afford this inefficiency. We need no sacred cows."

The Impact—Wasteful spending on domestic priorities endangers national security abroad with devastating global consequences. Peterson, chairman of the council on foreign relations and deputy of the Federal Reserve of New York, January, 1999 in *Foreign Affairs*, accessed online:

"One need not be a Nobel laureate in economics to understand that a GDP growth is the product of workforce and productivity growth. National defense is the classic example. The West already faces grave threats from rogue states armed with biological and chemical arsenals. None of these external dangers will shrink to accommodate our declining GDP. Leading developed countries will no doubt need to spend as much or more on defense as they do today."

Now the Case. First, the type of academic achievement that they promote is different. It just causes volunteerism of people later in life. It does not cause a positive contribution to the economy.