

# UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

---

## THE HONORS COLLEGE Policy Debate

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its transportation infrastructure investment in the United States.

**Policy Debate Handouts and Worksheets**

**HUDL Seminar**

**September 8, 2012**

Email: [policydebate@honors.uh.edu](mailto:policydebate@honors.uh.edu)

## Table of Contents:

Outline of Speeches .....	3
Stock Issues Worksheet .....	4-5
Topicality Handout .....	6-7
Topicality Worksheet .....	8-9
Elections Example .....	10
Elections "Missing Link" .....	11-12
Elections Uniqueness Exercise....	13
Counterplan Worksheet.....	14
Critique Activity .....	15 - 16
Advanced Topic Handout .....	17
Flowing Worksheets .....	18-19

Speech	Time	Purpose & Goals
<b>1AC</b> First Affirmative Constructive Pre-written speech	8 Min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ There is a problem that could be solved. (Harms)</li> <li>⇒ The status quo is not going to solve the problem. (Inherency)</li> <li>⇒ Give a specific proposal of what ought to be done. (Plan)</li> <li>⇒ Show that the plan will solve the problem. (Solvency)</li> </ul>
<b>CX</b> 2N cross-examines 1A	3 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Ask questions to clarify arguments.</li> <li>⇒ Ask questions to set up arguments to come.</li> </ul>
<b>1NC</b> First Negative Constructive	8 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Attack affirmative from a number of angles.</li> <li>⇒ Make arguments against the specifics of the case. (On-Case)</li> <li>⇒ Argue that bad things will happen if the plan is adopted. (Disads)</li> <li>⇒ Argue that the plan is not an example of the resolution. (Topicality)</li> <li>⇒ Argue that there is a better alternative plan of action. (Counterplan)</li> </ul>
<b>CX</b> 1A cross-examines 1N	3 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Ask questions to clarify arguments. In particular, what is the counterplan text? Can you kick the counterplan?</li> <li>⇒ Ask questions to set up arguments to come</li> </ul>
<b>2AC</b> Second Affirmative Constructive	8 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Pre-prepared blocks that anticipate common negative arguments should be written before the tournament.</li> <li>⇒ Defend affirmative case and attack negative positions.</li> <li>⇒ This is the affirmative's last chance to introduce new issues.</li> <li>⇒ Argue that the counterplan and affirmative plan can coexist. (Perm)</li> </ul>
<b>CX</b> 1N cross-examines 2A	3 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Ask questions to clarify arguments. In particular, what were the permutations? Are there any theoretical voting issues?</li> <li>⇒ Ask questions to set up arguments to come.</li> </ul>
<b>2NC</b> Second Negative Constructive, "The Block, pt 1"	8 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Attack affirmative positions and defend negative positions.</li> <li>⇒ This is the negative's last chance to introduce new issues.</li> <li>⇒ 2NC and 1NR should cover different issues.</li> </ul>
<b>CX</b> 2A cross-examines 2N	3 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Ask questions to clarify arguments.</li> <li>⇒ Ask questions to set up arguments to come.</li> </ul>
<b>1NR</b> First Negative Rebuttal "The Block, pt 2"	5 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Attack affirmative positions and defend negative positions.</li> <li>⇒ 2NC and 1NR should cover different issues.</li> </ul>
<b>1AR</b> First Affirmative Rebuttal	5 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Respond to 2NC &amp; 1NR positions.</li> <li>⇒ Extend 2AC arguments &amp; defend the affirmative case.</li> <li>⇒ Make choices and prioritize arguments.</li> </ul>
<b>2NR</b> Second Negative Rebuttal	5 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Why does the negative win? Anticipate why the aff might win and answer.</li> <li>⇒ Make choices and pick best negative positions.</li> <li>⇒ Weigh the Issues.</li> </ul>
<b>2AR</b> Second Affirmative Rebuttal	5 min	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⇒ Why does the affirmative win? Answer 2NR's reasons that the neg should win.</li> <li>⇒ Make choices and pick best affirmative positions.</li> <li>⇒ Weigh the Issues.</li> </ul>

IAC

What Is It?

What's an Answer?

The US Congress has slashed high speed rail funding. Significant HSR development in the US is not going to happen.

The US economy is bad and getting worse – the lack of growth in the manufacturing sector is crippling the recovery.

Continued recession is likely to slide into a global economic depression and increase the likelihood of conflict worldwide.

Major new investment in high speed rail would cause rapid growth in the manufacturing sector, reversing job losses and ending the recession.

IAC

What Is It?

What's An Answer?

Funding for Next Generation Air Traffic Control technology was cut from the most recent budget

Republicans universally oppose NextGen ATC – they think it's government waste

The current ATC system is old and overburdened – it's only a matter of time until major accidents become common

New accidents would collapse the airline industry and major manufacturers

NextGen ATC would safely allow for projected increases in traffic

## What Is Topicality?

The purpose of topicality is to determine the scope of the topic that is being debated. The resolution is the assignment for the debate. Just like a paper in class, the affirmative has to discuss the assigned topic. The goal for a good topic is that each team, affirmative and negative, will have a reasonable chance of winning the round.

---

## Parts of a Negative Topicality Argument

### Interpretation & Definitions

The interpretation and definition portion of the argument is usually presented first. The Interpretation is used to explain the negative's vision of the ideal scope of the resolution. Definitions are used to support this interpretation.

*Example: In the resolution the word "its" is possessive, this means that the affirmative must increase ONLY federal government investment, not private or state investment.*

### Violation

Explains how the affirmative (particularly the plan) is outside of the scope of the negative's vision (interpretation). Often identifies specific word or words from the resolution that the affirmative does not comply with.

*Example: The affirmative provides incentives for corporations to invest in toll-roads, this is not "its" or the federal government's investment.*

### Reasons to Prefer (aka Standards)

Describes why the negative's interpretation is the best way to understand and debate the resolution. Here are a few common reasons to prefer:

- ⇒ **Ground** - Debate arguments should be fairly divided, with each side having an effective set of available positions (e.g. the resolution "slavery should be abolished, would not have a fair division of ground because the negative wouldn't have much to say).
- ⇒ **Grammar** - The best interpretations are grammatical. Distorting the meaning of words and phrases makes the resolitional meaning difficult to determine. Allowing ungrammatical interpretations is bad education.
- ⇒ **Topic Education** - The best interpretations encourage students to research the specifics of the topic and learn in depth about that year's area of concern (transportation infrastructure or space policy).
- ⇒ **Limits & Predictability** - The best interpretations are those that have a smaller number of possible affirmatives. Large topics are hard to research, and reduce chances that the negative can be prepared to debate and learn about the topic.

*Example: The Negative's interpretation preserves fair limits because the affirmative can only use federal government investment. The affirmative interpretation allows any actor to invest. The negative should not have to be prepared for these kinds of cases.*

### Voting Issue

Explains why the affirmative should lose because they are not topical. Often describes topicality as a rule of the game that the affirmative has not followed.

## Affirmative Answers to Topicality

### Counter-Interpretation

The Counter- Interpretation is used to explain the affirmative's vision of the ideal scope of the resolution, that includes the affirmative plan. Definitions are used to support this interpretation.

*Example: In the resolution the word "its" is possessive, BUT this means that the affirmative must American investment, including private or state investment.*

### We Meet

Explains how the affirmative (particularly the plan) is within of the scope of the negative's vision (interpretation).

*Example: The affirmative's incentives for corporations are investment done by the federal government.*

### Reasons to Prefer

Describes why the affirmative interpretation is the best way to understand and debate the resolution, particularly as opposed to the negative interpretation. See above.

*Example: The affirmative interpretation is best for Topic Education because in transportation policy lots of different investment sources are actually used. Their interpretation forces the affirmative plan to take radically unrealistic actions.*

### Not a Voting Issue & Reasonability

Explains why the affirmative should not lose on account of being slightly outside of the negative's interpretation. Often describes topicality an issue that shouldn't be decided by minor details, but by the more *reasonable* view of the topic.

---

## Extending Topicality in the 2NC/1NR

### Pro-Tips:

- ⇒ **Summarize** - Clearly explain the negative interpretation and the way in which the affirmative violates the interpretation.
- ⇒ **Make a List** - Demonstrate the difference between the negative interpretation and the affirmative interpretation by proposing a hypothetical case list for each side. Don't be afraid to use outlandish examples for possible affirmative cases allowed by their interpretation.
- ⇒ **Being Topical isn't hard...** - Give an example of how the affirmative *could* have been topical. Explain that their mistake can be explained as either laziness or an attempt to cheat and avoid debating your awesome negative positions.
- ⇒ **Answer Reasonability** - Say that the affirmative's interpretation is not reasonable!
- ⇒ **Deter future violations** - Explain why the judge should vote on topicality, even if it is a minor infraction. For instance, to make sure that other teams know not to read affs like this one...

Plans	Interpretations	Violations
<p><i>Carefully read each plan text, imagine that these are plans for the 5 possible affirmatives you might debate at your next tournament.</i></p>	<p><i>Write in the number of the interpretation that would be best for the 1NC against each plan</i></p>	<p><i>Write in the Letter (A-E) of the violation that matches the interpretation and plan.</i></p>
<p>The United States Federal Government should invest in Houston Light-Rail.</p>		
<p>The United States Federal Government should invest in modernization of the Panama Canal.</p>		
<p>The United States Federal Government should grant permits for oil pipeline construction in the United States.</p>		
<p>The United States Federal Government should invest in a fleet of electric cars.</p>		
<p>The United States Federal Government should increase subsidies to those companies who build and maintain toll-roads.</p>		

### Optional Activity.

**After you have completed the chart, use the 1NCs you have constructed in the chart above. Write a hypothetical 2NC (or 1NR) overview to extend Topicality. Hint - use the "Pro-Tips" on the Topicality Handout as a guide.**



## Interpretations -

Find the best interpretation in this list for a INC against each of the 5 plans by writing in the correct number in the second column.

### 1. Transportation infrastructure must transport people and goods

#### Orr and Keever 8 (“Enabling User-Fee Backed Transportation Finance in California,”)

Here transportation infrastructure is defined as “any fixed physical asset designed for transporting people and goods including highways, arterial streets, bridges, tunnels, and mass transportation systems.”

### 2. “Transportation infrastructure” is transport networks, not vehicles

#### Global Cargo & Commodities Limited, 2012

The field of transport has several aspects; loosely they can be divided into a kind of infrastructure, vehicles, and operations. Infrastructure includes the transport networks (roads, railways, airways, waterways, canals, pipelines, etc) that are used, as well as the nodes or terminals (such as airports, railway stations, bus stations and seaports). The vehicles generally ride on the networks, such as automobiles, bicycles, buses, trains, aircrafts.

### 3. “Its’ Investment” requires the federal government to directly fund the project.

#### Anderson 2006 “The Role of Public Investment in Poverty Reduction: Theories, Evidence and Methods.”

Definitions We define (net) public investment as public expenditure that adds to the public physical capital stock. This would include the building of roads, ports, schools, hospitals etc. This corresponds to the definition of public investment in national accounts data, namely, capital expenditure.

### 4. Topical Affs must invest throughout the U.S. “In” means “throughout”:

#### Words and Phrases 2008

In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

#### “United States” means all of the states

#### EPA 2006

United States - When used in the geographic sense, means all of the States.

### 5. “In” means inclusion within --- “investment” must occur within the United States

#### Random House 2012

in 1. (used to indicate inclusion within space, a place, or limits): walking in the park.

---

## Violations -

Find the violation that matches the interpretation and plan in this list for a INC against each of the 5 plans by writing in the correct letter (A-E) in the third column.

### A. Electric cars are vehicles, not infrastructure.

### B. Panama is not within the US. The control of the Panama canal was handed over from the US to Panama in 1999.

#### BBC News, 1999

End of an era, The United States hands over control of the Panama Canal to the Panamanian people - ending more than 80 years of US occupation of the canal zone.

### C. Houston Light Rail exists in only 1 city in 1 state.

### D. Subsidies to companies are an incentive for other actors to build roads, the federal government is not doing the building.

### E. Oil pipelines do not transport people.

## A. Uniqueness - Obama is winning now because of the Economic rebound.

Nate Silver, 9-7, 12, "Sept. 6: A Referendum or a Choice?" Economics University of Chicago, FiveThirtyEight.com 2008 presidential election forecast accurately predicted the winner of 49 of the 50 states <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/07/sept-6-a-referendum-or-a-choice/>

In the meantime, Mr. Obama has been seeing somewhat stronger economic news lately, making his case a bit stronger under the referendum paradigm. On Thursday, the Dow Jones industrial average was up almost 250 points, closing at its highest point since 2008, on an encouraging report about private-sector employment, and a pledge by European Central Bank's president, Mario Draghi, to move toward slacker monetary policy. The FiveThirtyEight economic index, which uses stock market prices as one of its components, was at its highest level of the election cycle on Thursday. This helped Mr. Obama toward his strongest chance to date of winning the Electoral College in the forecast, 77.3 percent.

## B. Link - High Speed Rail is massively unpopular, the general public doesn't perceive benefits - viewed as expensive tax spending.

Dorsey, 12 (Thomas, CEO Soul of America, <http://soulofamerica.com/interact/soulofamerica-travel-blog/interstate-hsr-network/>)

Unfortunately, vote trading for Interstate HSR is harder to come by due to public's lack of knowledge about HSR benefits. Its easy for the average Joe to think, "Not My Tax Dollar", when don't know that existing taxes can pay for it and that its cheaper than more of the stays quo. Turns out, powerful forces have undermined public knowledge about HSR benefits for decades. Lets take a look back to see how we arrived at this sticky situation.

## C. Internal Link - Obama's victory requires REDUCING spending - the plan causes independents to vote Republican.

Stephanie Kirchaessner, 2011 "Obama looks to independent voters," April 15 2011,

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7dd54d5c-678c-11e0-9138-00144feab49a.html#axzz1T844vB9m>

Barack Obama is betting that his attack on the Republican deficit reduction plan, which he has derided as un-American, will resonate with independent voters as he prepares to hit the campaign trail next week. The president will hold town hall meetings in California and two swing states: Nevada and Virginia. ...The White House swiftly condemned the measure but said it was committed to working with Republicans to bring down record deficits that all sides acknowledged imperil the country's economic future. Reuters "I think Obama has had his best week in a while," said Democratic strategist James Carville. "His speech really has got Democrats excited again. Also, they feel they are on the right side of public opinion here." Mr Obama's address on Wednesday satisfied the liberal base by reaffirming his support of tax increases for the wealthy to pay for entitlement programmes for the poor and elderly. It also spoke to independent voters who abandoned Democrats in last year's congressional election by reassuring them that he believed the deficit required immediate action.

## D. Impact - Obama's reelection is necessary to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Chris Schneidmiller, 2011 editor of Global Security Newswire, 7-18-2011, Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty,

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/senate-decision-key-to-future-of-test-ban-treaty/>

Politics plays a role in congressional policy debates and nuclear security will be a topic of discussion during the 2012 presidential election campaign, Kimball said. The White House is already taking heat over what Republicans say are inadequate attempts to rein in suspected proliferation activities in nations such as Iran and Syria (see GSN, March 30). Still, the Senate's ratification last year of the U.S.-Russian New START nuclear arms control pact is cause for optimism about the test ban's chances on Capitol Hill, Kimball said. Thirteen GOP senators voted in favor of the bilateral agreement. The two years it took Moscow and Washington to negotiate and approve New START "was relatively fast for a treaty," according to Kimball. He said the administration should take whatever time is needed to see the test ban passed. "I would hope that the issue of the test ban treaty does not become a partisan political football because there is strong Republican support for the test ban treaty out there," Kimball said. "If the treaty is not seriously considered by the Senate until after 2012, that will be because it took that much time to sort through the issues and to develop enough support to go ahead with the final stages of the ratification effort." That plan, though, would hinge on Obama's re-election. Should he be defeated next year, the pact would almost certainly remain frozen in place in Washington.

## E. Ratification of the CTBT prevents multiple scenarios for nuclear war

Ian Davis, 2007 co-executive director of the ASICI, 4-11-2007, Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track, Huff Post.

Ratifying the CTBT could provide a centerpiece to demonstrating a change in leadership: the US rejoining the rest of the world to promote international cooperative agreements, from reducing global warming to keeping lethal WMD material out of the hands of criminals and terrorists. This can't happen too soon. North Korea has marched through the open door with its first underground test of an atomic device. There is widespread agreement that the test has escalated tension in the region and raised the stakes in the stand-off with the United States. It could also destroy the prospects for the CTBT and open the floodgates to more nuclear-armed states. While we welcome the current agreement with Pyongyang which may ultimately eliminate the North Korean nuclear program, and lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, the details of implementation have yet to be worked out, and already, strong conservative opposition to the agreement is beginning to appear. The door to an alternative way forward is also still open, and the United States could seize the moral high ground by leading the world through it. If President Bush were to press the Senate to reconsider and support ratification of the treaty, it is neglected or discarded. The international community must not only work together to develop more effective diplomatic approaches towards North Korea and Iran, but it must also apply stricter international safeguards on all nuclear programs, prevent the spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, secure a global halt to the production of highly enriched uranium for shoring up the North Korean agreement, peacefully tackling the Iranian nuclear program and for preventing a world with 40 or more nuclear powers. The North Korean and Iranian nuclear crises exemplify an increasing number of damaging developments that make it clear that the non-proliferation system needs to be strengthened and updated, not only fissile material for weapons purposes, take new steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons and achieve the entry into force of the CTBT. If, in 1963, at the height of the Cold War, the US, UK, and USSR could negotiate a limited test ban treaty. Why can't we ratify a comprehensive treaty now? Were we less threatened then? Are Iran and North Korea greater threats to the United States than was the USSR? The CTBT is vital to a system of security that does not rely on nuclear weapons. Its entry into force would put a cap on the nuclear age. Posturing for domestic politics and insisting on a macho attitude in international relations has dangerous long-term implications, both for America and the rest of the world. Since the Bush administration has come to power, global non-proliferation has gone into a holding pattern at best, a tailspin at worst. That can only lead to a world overpopulated with nuclear weapons and a nuclear war sooner or later. The consequences do not bear thinking about. So it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the American and European political agenda and move to secure ratification by other key states.

## Elections Activity 1 - The Missing Link

### A. Uniqueness Romney will win now - Economics and long-term data prove.

Doug Patton 9/3/12 syndicated columnist. The Daily World "A bold prediction: Romney will win the election"

I point out to him that no president from either party since FDR's second campaign in 1936 has ever been re-elected with an unemployment rate even approaching the numbers we are seeing today. I tell him that any incumbent president who cannot get his poll numbers above 50 percent cannot and will not win. Now comes a scientific study of presidential elections, from a pair of faculty members at the University of Colorado, which reinforces the political gut feeling that has been driving my prophecies to a large degree. The long-term model used for this study is the brainchild of Professors Kenneth Bickers and Michael Berry, working at CU's Boulder and Denver campuses, respectively. Their prototype, Bickers and Berry stress, analyzes economic data from the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Since 1980, their model has accurately predicted every presidential election. Their analysis was accurate even in those years when there was a strong third party candidate running (John Anderson in 1980 and Ross Perot in 1992 and 1996). So what does the model forecast for 2012? They predict that Mitt Romney will soundly defeat Barack Obama by winning 32 states, 53 percent of the popular vote and a whopping 320 electoral votes (270 are needed to win). "The apparent advantage of being a Democratic candidate and holding the White House disappears," Professor Berry notes, "when the national unemployment rate hits 5.6 percent." Berry and Bickers are predicting that Romney will defeat Obama in almost every battleground state, as well as a few the GOP hasn't won in decades. These include North Carolina, Virginia, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida and, yes, the "show me" state of Missouri. Bickers notes that their election prediction model suggests that "presidential elections are about big things and the stewardship of the national economy. It's not about gaffes, political commercials or day-to-day campaign tactics "Based on our forecasting model," Professor Bickers adds, "it becomes clear that the president is in electoral trouble."

### B. Link \_\_\_\_\_

### C. Impact - Obama re-election causes Iranian nuclear prolifer—Romney solves

**West and Finnegan 6-17** [Paul West and Michael Finnegan are both senior writers for the Boston Herald "Mitt Romney attacks president's positions on Israel, Iran" 6-17-12 [http://bostonherald.com/news/us\\_politics/view/20120617mitt\\_romney\\_attacks\\_presidents\\_positions\\_on\\_israel\\_iran/](http://bostonherald.com/news/us_politics/view/20120617mitt_romney_attacks_presidents_positions_on_israel_iran/)]//gv CORNWALL, Pa. — In hawkish remarks that drew cheers from an audience of religious conservatives, Mitt Romney accused President Barack Obama on Saturday of being more afraid of Israel attacking Iran than of Iran developing a nuclear weapon. The Republican presidential candidate, who frequently attacks the administration for failing to back Israel's government more aggressively, escalated his criticism a notch. He responded with ridicule when asked what he would do, if elected, to strengthen U.S. relations with the Jewish state. "I think, by and large, you can just look at the things the president has done and do the opposite," Romney said, to laughter and applause from members of the Faith and Freedom Coalition, an evangelical Christian political organization. "You look at his policies with regards to Iran," Romney continued. "He's almost sounded like he's more frightened that Israel might take military action than he's concerned that Iran might become nuclear."

### D. Iranian prolifer causes nuclear war through regional arms race and miscalculation

Michael **Einstadt**, director of Military and Security Studies Program, July 2007 [Washington Institute for Near East Studies Policy Focus #72, "The maturation of Tehran's nuclear program, the regime's growing assertiveness, and the belief that a nuclear Iran will be even more difficult to live with have caused many of its neighbors to reevaluate their nuclear options. The goal of this renewed interest in nuclear technology seems to be to deter Tehran from pursuing its nuclear option, to energize diplomacy to halt the Iranian program, and to pave the way for a decision to pursue a nuclear weapons program at some future date. Egypt, Turkey, Jordan, and the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council have all indicated within the past year or two that they are either considering the possibility of pursuing civilian nuclear technology or actually doing so.<sup>9</sup> Iran's nuclear program may already be contributing to a radical transformation of the proliferation landscape in the Middle East that could greatly complicate efforts to prevent a nuclear war someday.

Which of the following cards could be the link to the DA?

## 1. Economic recovery is key to prevent the collapse of U.S. power--and global great-power wars.

**Khalilzad 11** Zalmay Khalilzad was the United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations during the presidency of George W. Bush and the director of policy planning at the Defense Department from 1990 to 1992. "The Economy and National Security" Feb 8, National Review [www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024](http://www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024)

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States' position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers.

## 2. Ohio is the vital swing state—economy is key

**VOA 6/14** (Voice of America" Obama Romney Spar on Battleground State of Ohio", 6/14/12

<http://blogs.voanews.com/breaking-news/2012/06/14/obama-romney-spar-on-economy-in-battleground-state-of-ohio/>KY

U.S. President Barack Obama said Thursday that the 2012 presidential election is about creating middle class jobs, while Mitt Romney, the likely Republican nominee, criticized the president for failing to revive the sluggish U.S. economy. The two men delivered major speeches on the economy in the battleground state of Ohio. Mr. Obama, speaking at a college in the city of Cleveland, said a "stalemate in Washington between two fundamentally different views" on the direction America should take is hurting efforts to revitalize the economy. He said the 2012 election is a chance for Americans to break that stalemate. During a campaign stop in the city of Cincinnati, Romney accused Mr. Obama of making it harder to create jobs. He also said "almost everything" the president has done has made it more difficult for entrepreneurs to start businesses. Romney said small businesses have been stifled by government regulations. Thursday's speeches in the manufacturing heavy state underscore Ohio's importance to both Mr. Obama and Romney in the November general election. In recent years, no presidential candidate has won the White House without winning Ohio.

## 3. Funding Transportation Infrastructure is popular and can swing elections.

**HNTB '12** National highway survey polled a random nationwide sample of 1,024 Americans April 2-10, 2012. Americans value highways and bridges as a national treasure" – May 18th –

<http://www.hntb.com/news-room/news-release/americans-value-highways-and-bridges-as-a-national-treasure>

A new survey from HNTB Corporation finds two-thirds (66 percent) of Americans who intend to vote during this year's presidential election feel that a candidate's standing on American transportation infrastructure will influence their decision; more than one in five (22 percent) say this will be extremely influential on who they vote for. "Our highways, bridges and other transportation infrastructure are essential assets that support growth and investment in the U.S. economy," said Pete Rahn, HNTB leader national transportation practice. "People expect them to be resilient, reliable and safe." Clearly, Americans hold the nation's infrastructure in high regard. Nearly nine in ten (89 percent) Americans feel it's important for the federal government to fund the maintenance and improvements of interstate highways. Yet, this infrastructure isn't receiving the fiscal attention it deserves. Congress recently approved the ninth extension of transportation legislation that originally expired in 2009. The Highway Trust Fund – due to inflation, rising construction costs and increasingly fuel efficient vehicles – no longer collects enough money to support the U.S. surface transportation system, remaining solvent only through a series of infusions from federal general revenue funds. More than half of Americans (57 percent) believe the nation's infrastructure is underfunded. The uncertainty over a long-term bill also is a challenge for state departments of transportation, which rely heavily on federal funding to support major highway and bridge programs, and creates ambiguity for planners and contractors who need the certainty of a long-term bill to commit to large, complex multiyear projects. "The absence of a long-term bill is hurting our economic competitiveness," said Rahn. "Recent efforts by the House and Senate to move discussions into a conference committee and hammer out potential details of a bill are a step in the right direction, but what's really needed is a stable, long-term authorization that can adequately pay for our transportation system." Overall, 4 in 5 (80 percent) Americans would rather increase funding and improve roads and bridges than continue current funding levels and risk allowing our roads and bridges deteriorate.

## 4. War with Iran will cause many problems including economic collapse

**CSM No DATE** (no date, international newspaper, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Christian\\_Science\\_Monitor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Christian_Science_Monitor))

The negative economic consequences – for the United States and the international community – are huge. Attacks on Iran and Iran's reprisals would likely cause oil prices to spike and investors' confidence to collapse. Such repercussions would doom worldwide hopes for ongoing economic recovery from the Great Recession. Unemployment in the US remains high, industrial production is struggling, the housing market continues to suffer. If recovery is fragile in the US, it is in even more peril in Europe. The euro crisis remains unresolved, and not enough has been done to overcome the problems that followed the collapse of confidence in financial markets.

## Elections Activity 2 - Uniqueness

### Romney will win now - Economics and long-term data prove.

Doug Patton 9/3/12 syndicated columnist. The Daily World "A bold prediction: Romney will win the election"

I point out to him that no president from either party since FDR's second campaign in 1936 has ever been re-elected with an unemployment rate even approaching the numbers we are seeing today. I tell him that any incumbent president who cannot get his poll numbers above 50 percent cannot and will not win. Now comes a scientific study of presidential elections, from a pair of faculty members at the University of Colorado, which reinforces the political gut feeling that has been driving my prophecies to a large degree. The long-term model used for this study is the brainchild of Professors Kenneth Bickers and Michael Berry, working at CU's Boulder and Denver campuses, respectively. Their prototype, Bickers and Berry stress, analyzes economic data from the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Since 1980, their model has accurately predicted every presidential election. Their analysis was accurate even in those years when there was a strong third party candidate running (John Anderson in 1980 and Ross Perot in 1992 and 1996). So what does the model forecast for 2012? They predict that Mitt Romney will soundly defeat Barack Obama by winning 32 states, 53 percent of the popular vote and a whopping 320 electoral votes (270 are needed to win). "The apparent advantage of being a Democratic candidate and holding the White House disappears," Professor Berry notes, "when the national unemployment rate hits 5.6 percent." Berry and Bickers are predicting that Romney will defeat Obama in almost every battleground state, as well as a few the GOP hasn't won in decades. These include North Carolina, Virginia, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida and, yes, the "show me" state of Missouri. Bickers notes that their election prediction model suggests that "presidential elections are about big things and the stewardship of the national economy. It's not about gaffes, political commercials or day-to-day campaign tactics "Based on our forecasting model," Professor Bickers adds, "it becomes clear that the president is in electoral trouble."

---

### Obama will win now - the majority of data supports his reelection but the media won't report it because they need the race to be close.

Bruce Bartlett 9/7/12 "Why Barack Obama Will Win the Election Easily"

<http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Columns/2012/09/07/Why-Barack-Obama-Will-Win-the-Election-Easily.aspx#uDkArPiKdC2FpPgE.99>

Pollster Nate Silver has done an excellent job of assembling all of the known political data on where the presidential race stood as of Wednesday. His analysis leads him to project that Obama will beat Romney 51.2 percent to 47.6 percent in the popular vote, and 311 to 227 in the Electoral College where only 270 votes are needed to win. Overall, Silver gives Obama a 76 percent chance of winning the election. Those who don't follow the data intensively can be forgiven for not knowing what good shape Obama is in, because it is rarely reported in the mainstream media. There is a simple reason for this: it has a huge vested interest in maintaining the idea that the election is so close it cannot be called and will come down to the last vote cast on Election Day. That is because the media have huge political operations with many highly-paid commentators who need people reading and tuning in daily to see if their preferred candidate has made any headway. There is also an enormous amount of data being produced daily that requires reporting and analysis—polls, campaign contributions, charges and counter charges, endorsements, gaffes and so on. It is not hard to spin this vast cacophony of material in such a way as to maintain the fiction that the election will be close.



Compare the two pieces of uniqueness evidence above using the following questions as a guide. Pick which evidence you think is the best and circle it. Be prepared to explain your answer.

Which evidence is most recent ("post-dates")?

What events have happened in between the publication of the two articles that could change the predictions?

Do those events matter to predictions of the election?

What kind of data does each evidence use?

Does the data in each evidence have empirical validity (has it been correct in the past)?

What are the qualifications of those making the predictions in the evidence?

Does the evidence assume or answer the opposing viewpoint? How?

**Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in a national high-speed rail network.**

---

## 1NC CP

### State action on transportation is more efficient and solves.

Patrick B. **McGuigan**, 7-29-2011, "Transportation Federalism -- and Flexibility -- Proposed in New Bill from Coburn, Lankford," [http://lankford.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=756&Itemid=100023](http://lankford.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=756&Itemid=100023))

"It's very apparent how badly Congress can mismanage tax dollars, especially the Highway Trust fund which has needed to be bailed out three times since 2008. The states know their transportation needs better than Congress, so let's put them in the driver's seat to manage their own gas tax." Hatch contended, "The federal government's one-size-fits all transportation policies and mandates are wasting billions of taxpayer dollars and causing inexcusable delays in the construction of highways, bridges and roads in Utah and across the nation."

Using the plan text and the counterplan solvency evidence above, write a counterplan text in the box below.

First fill in the blanks of the acronym SPOT. Then using the plan text and the counterplan text, imagine hypothetical tags for evidence or arguments that are examples of the "SPOT" affirmative method and write them in the corresponding boxes.

S _____	
P _____	
O _____	
T _____	



Carefully read the following argument and evidence. Use context to guess the definition and meaning for the author of the highlighted words. Circle any other words that you think are necessary to explain the core of the argument.

**Transportation policy's obsession with mobility causes ableism and makes discrimination inevitable.**

Imrie 2000 Department of Geography, Royal Holloway, University of London Rob Disability and discourses of mobility and movement Environment and Planning volume 32 <http://www.environmentandplanning.com/epa/fulltext/a32/a331.pdf>

Disabled people's mobility and movement are highly circumscribed by sociocultural attitudes, practices, and the related design of the built environment. From the micro architecture of urban streetscapes, to the discontinuous nature of transportation infrastructure and networks, one can agree with Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 605) who suggest that it is "hegemonic bodies that are culturally formative of the codes and idioms" which condition the norms of movement and mobility (also, see Corker, 1998; 1999; Hughes, 1999). Such norms revolve around conceptions of the bodily incompetence of people with physical and mental impairments, while propagating welfare policies and procedures which seek to discipline disabled people into a state (and status) of nonimpaired carnality. For disabled people, then, their immobility is their own fault or the consequences of a deviant corporeality which requires medical care and rehabilitation or, failing that, the application of charitable works. Law (1999, page 583) suggests that an excavation of the "practices and meanings related to mobility should not detract us from the politics of mobility". For disabled people, a politics of mobility is, however, not divisible from broader challenges to, and reformulations of, the hegemonic values and practices of a society which, as Paterson and Hughes (1999, page 609) note, serves to maintain a hierarchy of identities. Such hierarchies essentialise conceptions of disability (as impairment of a particular type), with the effect that the complexities of disabled people's corporeality and experiences (of mobility and movement) are rarely described, acknowledged, nor understood (see, for example, Corker, 1998; 1999; Gleeson, 1999; Hine, 1999; Hine and Mitchell, 2001; Imrie, 1996; 2000b). Not surprisingly, as some respondents intimated, the shifting, indeterminate, and incoherent corporealities of disability are often at odds with the static categories and practices of, for example, producers and providers of transportation services. Such services treat disabled people as 'different' and 'special' or even as 'burden some'. As Corker (1998, page 82) suggests, the ascription of "difference" to disabled people is often used to distinguish them "as persons who can justifiably be treated unequally". For Corker (1998, page 82), the unequal treatment of (disabled) people, in relation to "the distribution of benefits and burdens, and in the absence of any justification, is a paradigm of injustice". Arguably, these injustices require a politics of mobility in which liberal conceptions of mobility and freedom are reassessed to destabilise the efficacy of 'the mobile body'. Given liberalism's abstract universality and individualism, and its preoccupation with the sameness of treatment of subjects, alternative frameworks are required, so some argue, which seek to develop "a recognition of difference and responsiveness to individuated needs, as well as the protection of the rights of difference" (Gould, 1996, page 180). A politics of movement and mobility, then, ought to enable us to think about, and respond to "the diversity of mobility, networks and access required by diverse groups in their daily lives" (Huxley, 1997, page 2). These ideas are core to a politics of disability which is premised on the eradication of ascribed needs, or processes whereby policy experts and professionals assess disabled people's needs and ascribe the relevant policy prescriptions (for example, the provision of special transport or equipment to facilitate mobility). For Oliver (1990), ascribed needs reinforce the power of professional experts, such as transportation planners, to determine the quality of disabled people's lives. This, according to Oliver, maintains disabled people's dependence on others and does little to create the conditions for disabled people's self-determination. In contrast, Oliver (1996) notes that a politics of disability ought to work from a position of self-defined needs as a basis for rights claims (also, see Handley, 2000). As Oliver (1996, page 74) suggests, "it is rights to appropriate their own self defined needs that disabled people are demanding, not to have their needs defined and met by others"

Carefully read the following arguments and evidence. Imagine these are part of a High-Speed Rail affirmative, in an economy advantage. Using arguments from the Imrie evidence above, circle parts of the evidence that are examples of Ableism. How would you compare the implications of Ableism to global nuclear conflict? How might an Ableism critique prove that the impacts of the advantage are not true?

**Investment in HSR will jumpstart the economy and provides the clearest and fastest way to long-term economic growth.**

Williams 11 (Mantil, researcher for the APTA, The American Public Transportation Association (APTA) is a nonprofit international association of 1,500 public and private member organizations, "Federal Investment in High-Speed Rail Could Spur 1.3 Million Jobs " [http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2011/Pages/110406\\_HSR\\_Business.aspx](http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2011/Pages/110406_HSR_Business.aspx))

The report, "The Case for Business Investment in High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail" reinforces the point that investments in high-speed and intercity rail will have many direct and indirect benefits. Nationally, due to proposed federal investment of high-speed rail over a six-year period, investment can result in supporting and creating more than 1.3 million jobs. This federal investment will be the catalyst for attracting state, local and private capital which will result in the support and creation of even more jobs. According to this new report, investments in building a 21st century rail system will not only lead to a large increase in construction jobs, but to the sustainable, long-term growth of new manufacturing and service jobs across the country. "It is evident that investing in high-speed and intercity rail projects presents one of the clearest and fastest ways to create green, American jobs and spur long-term economic growth," said APTA President William Millar. "Investing in high-speed rail is essential for America as we work to build a sustainable, modern transportation system that meets the environmental and energy challenges of the future." APTA noted for each \$1 billion invested in high-speed rail projects, the analysis predicts the support and creation of 24,000 jobs. In addition to the thousands of new construction jobs, investments in high-speed rail will jumpstart the U.S. economy. The Economic Development Research Group for the U.S. Conference of Mayors studied the business impact of high-speed rail investment in different urban regions. For example, in Los Angeles, CA, high-speed rail investment generates \$7.6 billion in business sales and \$6.1 billion in Chicago, IL. "Federal high-speed rail investment is a strong driver in getting private companies to invest," said Kevin McFall, Senior Vice President at Stacy and Witbeck Inc., a leading public transit construction firm. "This program can be a shot in the arm for the manufacturing industry. These high-speed rail projects will give us the opportunity to put people to work building the rail infrastructure this country desperately needs."

**Economic recovery is key to prevent the collapse of U.S. power—and global great-power wars.**

Khalilzad 11 Zalmay United States ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, "The Economy and National Security" Feb 8, National Review [www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024](http://www.nationalreview.com/blogs/print/259024)

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a "sudden stop" in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence "east of Suez." Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments. We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.





## Transportation Infrastructure Investment

**American Jobs Act, 11** (112 H. Doc. 53, legislation submitted to the House by Obama, 9/13, lexis)//DH

(9) Infrastructure project.--

(A) In general.--The term ``eligible infrastructure project" means any non-Federal transportation, water, or energy infrastructure project, or an aggregation of such infrastructure projects, as provided in this Act.

(B) Transportation infrastructure project.--The term ``transportation infrastructure project" means the construction, alteration, or repair, including the facilitation of intermodal transit, of the following subsectors:

- (i) Highway or road.
- (ii) Bridge.
- (iii) Mass transit.
- (iv) Inland waterways.
- (v) Commercial ports.
- (vi) Airports.
- (vii) Air traffic control systems.
- (viii) Passenger rail, including high-speed rail.
- (ix) Freight rail systems.

(C) Water infrastructure project.--The term ``water infrastructure project" means the construction, consolidation, alteration, or repair of the following subsectors:

- (i) Waterwaste treatment facility.
- (ii) Storm water management system.
- (iii) Dam.
- (iv) Solid waste disposal facility.
- (v) Drinking water treatment facility.
- (vi) Levee.
- (vii) Open space management system.

(D) Energy infrastructure project.--The term ``energy infrastructure project" means the construction, alteration, or repair of the following subsectors:

- (i) Pollution reduced energy generation.
- (ii) Transmission and distribution.
- (iii) Storage.
- (iv) Energy efficiency enhancements for buildings, including public and commercial buildings.

List 1

List 2

List 3

List 4

List 5



