

It simply does not mesh. Extend the argumentation that this is a counterplan that simply isn't competitive. People can be in debate and in the Summer of Service program. In fact, extend the dropped internal link argumentation from the 1AR that people are not going to join debate unless if they are already civically engaged. It is our plan that makes these youth before high school want to be civically engaged, want to learn about public policy, which is what is going to get them to debate in the first place.

Also extend the argumentation that this civic engagement has to become a rite of passage for all youth. It begins with the underprivileged youth and it spreads to the rest of the community. Debate is never going to be a rite of passage because every high school student is just not going to take debate. But our Sagawa evidence indicates that by doing our 1AC we can make national service over the summer a rite of passage, which is going to solve for the economy in the future. Additionally, this is going to solve in the future.

They say debate is going to increase its education; that simply isn't true because debate doesn't increase that science and math education.

On to fiscal discipline: fiscal discipline is the only argument in the 2NR that you might be voting on because the justification is theoretically illegitimate and we are the internal link to the justification.

On the overview on the spending, he says that you as a judge have a moral obligation not to do wasteful spending, but our entire 1AC shows you that that is not wasteful spending. Specifically extend the Malcolm et al. evidence in 2005 at the bottom of the case which says, and this is in the 2AC and the 1AR—it's on your flow—that we solve for terrorism because we get people into science and math fields. This piece of evidence indicates that the only way to get people into science and math fields is through our 1AC, and science and math fields is not only key to competitiveness in the future, but also our security from terrorist threats and wars in the future because these are the people who will be developing national security.

We are the internal link to the impact of this disadvantage, because our evidence indicates that our national security and economy will inevitably collapse unless we solve for these problems. We are the only affirmative solving for those problems in the status quo.

On to the line-by-line. They do not answer our Economic Policy Institute in 2003 argumentation that spending now is going to prime the pump and create fiscal stewardship in the long term. This is a direct turn to the disadvantage, which they simply do not answer. Additionally, this is good for national security, which means that it is not wasteful spending.

Then extend our Wayne from 6/19 argumentation. This is why you don't vote on the disadvantage. This says that literally a few days ago Bush approved discretionary spending for AmeriCorps. This is the most specific evidence in this round on this fiscal