the 1AC in the long run, you need to look at the current situation now. That we have two wars; we need to be spending on homeland security.

Second, is as policy-makers you should vote negative because we have proven that the plan is worse than the status quo, because they concede that there is a long time frame to solving for the economy and that the jobs that they would cause people to join in the future are not good for the nation's GDP anyway.

And third, is the plan is not the type of educational initiatives that their own evidence is talking about. This means that we will win a risk that the plan makes budget deficits worse. They are not allowed to make new arguments in the next speech. If you think that we are winning the debate after the 2NR, you should be very, very skeptical of any arguments that the 2AR, however pretty she sounds, is able to come up with that level the debate out.

Now, their first argument that they make is economic collapse is inevitable. First, that this is factually not true. Our Bloomberg evidence citing the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas president indicates that the U.S. economy GDP is growing in the status quo. Their evidence for why collapse is inevitable is mostly from 2005 saying that if we do not have more math and science education, collapse of the economy is inevitable, so they do not even access this.

Second is that even if a collapse of the economy is inevitable, the plan does not solve it immediately either. There is only a risk that our justification argument is able to confront economic collapse as well.

Their next argument, they say that four years means the economy will collapse. Yes, there is a long time frame for these individuals getting involved in the workforce. I sound like I am repeating myself already, but it's because they are not getting the message that the individuals that they cause to go to college take at least four years of high school, four years of college, then maybe they will be involved in the labor pool, so thus it is a very long time frame.

Our Peterson evidence indicates that running higher budget deficits at a time of war causes us to not spend on homeland security as much … the homeland security that is necessary to stop a biological or nuclear war and terrorism, which they concede outweighs the impact to economic collapse anyway because that would just be isolated to the United States domestically, whereas a terrorist attack or nuclear attack would be internationally.

They say that they are able to solve cross-cultural competencies, but debate is able to do that better.

Their fourth argument, they say that there is spending now because of discretionary spending, but that does not answer our arguments. The 1NC Gerstenzang uniqueness evidence and the 2NC Weisman uniqueness evidence on this question indicate that even