

Under the overview on the fiscal discipline disadvantage. The 2NC makes a critical mistake when he concedes that collapse is inevitable. Our evidence is on point saying that the key issue in this debate is cross-cultural diversity. Additionally, our Sagawa evidence from two days ago indicates that we must pass this plan now or it is completely ineffective. And in the future these people will not graduate from college. Within four years the economy must ... will collapse; we're the only ones with this argument. Additionally, we're solving the impact of the case. They concede our cross-cultural competency argument, which indicates that these different diversities are key to our national security strategy. They have no argument against this, and that's the argument they're citing in the 2NC. Don't go for this at all.

Additionally, our probability comes first. Our evidence indicates that this disadvantage is non-unique. There was discretionary spending on AmeriCorps last month. That's permanent spending; they're not answering this argument. It takes out the entirety of their link. Additionally, a collapse is inevitable. The economy being up right now does not matter in the context of our argument. They concede our turns outweigh because only our argument cites the status quo from two days ago.

Additionally, extend across our EPI [Economic Policy Institute] in 2003 evidence on the line-by-line. It indicates that if we do the plan now because it's a necessity in the future, we can maintain these types of things. Additionally, they're not proving a brink argument. A hundred million now is a drop in a bucket compared to the millions being spent discretionally on AmeriCorps right now.

Additionally extend across our Wayne 6/19 evidence. This is the evidence indicating that Bush has already spent discretionary. They say that this is a bureaucracy in the status quo. Our evidence indicates that this can be solved by putting in cross-cultural diversity. Additionally, this is not impacted or specific to our aff case.

SECOND NEGATIVE REBUTTAL SPEECH BY MATT FISHER (GLENBROOK NORTH HIGH SCHOOL)

OK, I'll be addressing the budget disadvantage, then the justification argument, then the case arguments.

They concede that as policy-makers you have a moral obligation to vote negative if we prove that the plan is an example of irresponsible spending in a time of war. Our Brady evidence read in the 1NC and the evidence read in the 2NC overview on the spending disadvantage indicate that any dollar that the government is not dedicating to the war efforts—the two wars we have going on in the status quo—is a dollar that is not being spent for the American people. Our Weldon evidence said that you need to evaluate this as a prior decision rule question that before you look to any of the tangible benefits of