

already spending a lot of money is just another reason why a new untouchable domestic spending priority would be dangerous and irresponsible in the current climate.

The fourth argument: they say that they solve the economy faster. First, I don't know if she was kidding on this in the 2AC because they conceded in the cross-examination it would take at least a couple of years, or at the very worst case a summer, so three months, for them to have any positive impact on the U.S. economy.

Their last argument: They say that diversity is critical to the economy. First is that Stephanie will explain that our counter advocacy of debate is able to access why diversity is good. Second is that solving worker shortages is also a long time frame because people who go to college would not be in the labor force until eight years after the plan happens—so there is a very long time frame in solving for the significant harms of the affirmative.

On the cultural competence argument, their Malcolm evidence and their Gottschalk evidence that they are quoting on this, are talking about education such as science, engineering, and math achievements, not a volunteering of time for other individuals. It is that incompetence in science and in math that is more important to future U.S. economic growth. Thus, they do not access an internal link for why any of this is good.

The case arguments: First, please extend Stephanie's first argument in the 1NC that the individuals that volunteer at the time the affirmative plan says they would volunteer, are just more likely to not get a job in the future, but rather to become to become nonprofit volunteers in the future. These individuals do not contribute productively to the economy because they are not a positive increase in the United States' GDP. All of their evidence assumes a world in which individuals go to college and then are motivated to go on into the labor force, but they do not have evidence saying that that is the case. Rather, it is much more likely that these individuals will be volunteering in not-for-profit organizations after the plan.

The second argument in the 1NC is that it is a very long time frame to solving for the economic harms of the affirmative. That was already explained in the arguments on the spending disadvantage. At the very worse case scenario it would take a couple of years, and fine, maybe the plan is a good idea in a couple of years, but not at a time when the United States is fighting two different wars and thus any new spending now would be irresponsible for Congressional policy-makers.

The third argument is that our Lester evidence indicates that five years prove that civic engagement is very high in the status quo. Their Sagawa evidence, which yes, it is talking about lower-income individuals, is talking about that empirically lower-income individuals have not been able to get involved. Our Lester evidence, which is a snapshot of current volunteering and of trends that will continue, is that more individuals are volunteering in the status quo than their evidence takes into account. Yes, maybe when Sagawa is talking about in the 1980s or the early or late 1990s,