# 1NC

**1. Interpretation and violation – transportation infrastructure must provide a public service – military installations are excluded**

Fourie 6 (Johan, Chief Operating Officer – ArcelorMittal South Africa, “Economic Infrastructure: A Review of Definitions, Theory, and Empirics”, South African Journal of Economics, 74(3), September, Wiley Online Library)

One way to define infrastructure is to describe it in terms of its characteristics. A perhaps sufficiently succinct definition of infrastructure, also called ‘social overhead capital’, is provided by Hirschman (1958). He defines infrastructure as “capital that provides public services”. In essence, infrastructure therefore consists of two elements –‘capitalness’ and ‘publicness’. The first element is used to distinguish between infrastructure (defined as a stock variable) and public goods (defined as a flow variable) (Rietveld and Bruinsma, 1998:18). The latter element involves the general properties of non-rivalry and non-excludability. A distinction can, thus, be made between infrastructure and public capital where infrastructure would include goods that have a capital character, but are not necessarily public. Such goods could include privately owned telecommunications, but would exclude publicly owned military equipment (which are public capital, but does not provide public services). Thus, a common feature of infrastructure seems to be that there is at least a strong public involvement in the use thereof (Rietveld and Bruinsma, 1998:19). Economists label such goods physical infrastructure, or infrastructure capital, while urban planners might refer to them as transportation modalities and utilities.”

**2. Standards**

**a) Ground – public use is key to perception-based disads like politics and investor confidence**

**b) Limits – thousands of small development affs across the entire hierarchy of the military would destroy the core of the topic**

# 2NC O/V

**Transportation infrastructure must be capital that provides public services – that’s Fourie – this excludes military equipment and installations because it does not involve strong public use**

**Here’s a case list – we just exclude military, homeland security, and law enforcement**

**Musick, 10** - CBO’s Microeconomic Studies Division (Nathan, “Public Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure,”

<http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/119xx/doc11940/11-17-infrastructure.pdf>

Although different definitions of “infrastructure” exist, this report focuses on two types that claim a significant amount of federal resources: transportation and water. Those types of infrastructure share the economic characteristics of being relatively capital intensive and producing services under public management that facilitate private economic activity. They are typically the types examined by studies that attempt to calculate the payoff, in terms of benefits to the U.S. economy, of the public sector’s funding of infrastructure.

For the purposes of CBO’s analysis, “transportation infrastructure” includes the systems and facilities that support the following types of activities:

* Vehicular transportation: highways, roads, bridges, and tunnels;
* Mass transit: subways, buses, and commuter rail;
* Rail transport: primarily the intercity passenger service provided by Amtrak;
* Civil aviation: airport terminals, runways, and taxiways, and facilities and navigational equipment for air traffic control; and
* Water transportation: waterways, ports, vessels, and navigational systems.

The category “water infrastructure” includes facilities that provide the following:

* Water resources: containment systems, such as dams, levees, reservoirs, and watersheds; and sources of fresh water such as lakes and rivers; and
* Water utilities: supply systems for distributing potable water, and wastewater and sewage treatment systems and plants.

Consistent with CBO’s previous reports on public spending for transportation and water infrastructure, this update excludes spending that is associated with such infrastructure but does not contribute directly to the provision of infrastructure facilities or certain strictly defined infrastructure services. Examples of excluded spending are federal outlays for homeland security (which are especially pertinent to aviation), law enforcement and military functions (such as those carried out by the Coast Guard), and cleanup operations (such as those conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers following Hurricane Katrina in 2005).

**[At the very least their FX topical – there must be an intent to provide a public utility – just allowing more people to use it later still triggers the links to our standards]**

# 2NC Limits DA

**Now the limits DA – there are nearly an infinite number of military affs that aren’t grounded in the literature – they could pick any thesis paper from a service member or any test-project overview and cut an aff from it but we would never be able to cut the negative because people only submit proposals for projects, not rebuttals – these are multiplied because they could pick any branch of the DoD – there are like 20 – to enact it because all the agencies have the same funding stream**

**The impact is research skills – without limits there are no core expectations before tournaments so teams won’t know what literature body to turn to – they will just default to their states or cap backfiles – the lack of necessity for new arguments mean people won’t do original or trickle-down research – this is good because through research skills we learn how to engage in new information and utilize it towards and end which is key to engaging in democracy and staying active within a community**

**And – err neg because we have yet to define what the topic is – you should always err to overlimiting to underlimiting – teams that have just started will quit debate**

**Rowland 84** (Robert C., Baylor U., “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective. Ed. Parson, p. 53-4)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing both in scope and size. This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breadth. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. National debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change. The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process. Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske believes that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breath of the topic and experience “negophobia,” the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novice through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caught without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.” The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters who eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much time and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity. Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.” The final effect may be that entire programs wither cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.” In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

**And – always prefer breadth over depth – better for education**

Arrington 09 (Rebecca, UVA Today, “Study Finds That Students Benefit From Depth, Rather Than Breadth, in High School Science Courses” March 4)

A recent study reports that high school students who study fewer science topics, but study them in greater depth, have an advantage in college science classes over their peers who study more topics and spend less time on each. Robert Tai, associate professor at the University of Virginia's Curry School of Education, worked with Marc S. Schwartz of the University of Texas at Arlington and Philip M. Sadler and Gerhard Sonnert of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics to conduct the study and produce the report. "Depth Versus Breadth: How Content Coverage in High School Courses Relates to Later Success in College Science Coursework" relates the amount of content covered on a particular topic in high school classes with students' performance in college-level science classes. The study will appear in the July 2009 print edition of Science Education and is currently available as an online pre-print from the journal. "As a former high school teacher, I always worried about whether it was better to teach less in greater depth or more with no real depth. This study offers evidence that teaching fewer topics in greater depth is a better way to prepare students for success in college science," Tai said. "These results are based on the performance of thousands of college science students from across the United States." The 8,310 students in the study were enrolled in introductory biology, chemistry or physics in randomly selected four-year colleges and universities. Those who spent one month or more studying one major topic in-depth in high school earned higher grades in college science than their peers who studied more topics in the same period of time. The study revealed that students in courses that focused on mastering a particular topic were impacted twice as much as those in courses that touched on every major topic.

# 2NC Ground DA

**Next is the ground disad – the distinction between military and non-military infrastructures is that they are accessible to the general public – that’s Fourier – two links to our perception internal**

**a) Perception – if people aren’t using the facilities there’s no reason they will have an interest in them or against them**

**b) Location – non-public installations are located in the periphery of society – nobody sees it being built or money being spend on it because they don’t see it around them**

**That’s key to perception-based links like spending and politics – those are core neg ground arguments that necessarily should be debated this year as many senior debaters will be able to vote and in the current fiscal situation – that’s an external impact – but also ground is key to cost-benefit analysis because it allows us to explore a proposal and test it’s merits from multiple angles which is key to seeing if it’s a good idea or not**

# Military not Trans Infra

#### Military isn’t transportation infrastructure

**Musick, 10** – Congressional Budget Office’s Microeconomic Studies Division (Nathan, “Public Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure,” <http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/119xx/doc11940/11-17-infrastructure.pdf>) SM

Although different definitions of “infrastructure” exist, this report focuses on two types that claim a significant amount of federal resources: transportation and water. Those types of infrastructure share the economic characteristics of being relatively capital intensive and producing services under public management that facilitate private economic activity. They are typically the types examined by studies that attempt to calculate the payoff, in terms of benefits to the U.S. economy, of the public sector’s funding of infrastructure. For the purposes of CBO’s analysis, **“transportation infrastructure” includes the systems and facilities that support** the following types of activities: **Vehicular transportation: highways, roads, bridges, and tunnels;** B **Mass transit: subways, buses, and commuter rail; B Rail transport**: primarily the intercity passenger service provided by Amtrak;5 B **Civil aviation: airport terminals, runways, and taxiways**, and facilities and navigational equipment for air traffic control; **and Water transportation: waterways, ports, vessels, and navigational systems**. The category “water infrastructure” includes facilities that provide the following: Water resources: containment systems, such as dams, levees, reservoirs, and watersheds; and sources of fresh water such as lakes and rivers; and Water utilities: supply systems for distributing potable water, and wastewater and sewage treatment systems and plants. Consistent with CBO’s previous reports on public spending for transportation and water infrastructure, this update excludes spending that is associated with such infrastructure but does not contribute directly to the provision of infrastructure facilities or certain strictly defined infrastructure services. **Examples of excluded spending are federal outlays for homeland** security (which are especially pertinent to aviation), **law enforcement and military functions** (such as those carried out by the Coast Guard), and cleanup operations (such as those conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers following Hurricane Katrina in 2005).

# In

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

Random House 12 (Unabridged Dictionary, “in”, http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/in?s=t)

in   [in] Show IPA preposition, adverb, adjective, noun, verb, inned, in·ning.

preposition

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

2. (used to indicate inclusion within something abstract or immaterial): in politics; in the autumn.

3. (used to indicate inclusion within or occurrence during a period or limit of time): in ancient times; a task done in ten minutes.

4. (used to indicate limitation or qualification, as of situation, condition, relation, manner, action, etc.): to speak in a whisper; to be similar in appearance.

5. (used to indicate means): sketched in ink; spoken in French.

#### That’s the USA

Encarta 7 (Dictionary Online, “United States”, http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/DictionaryResults.aspx?refid=1861708119)

U·nit·ed States [ [y ntəd stáyts](http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/dictionary/Pronounce.aspx?search=United+States) ] country in central North America, consisting of 50 states.  
Languages: English.  
Currency: dollar.  
Capital: Washington, D.C..  
Population: 290,342,550 (2001).   
Area: 9,629,047 sq km (3,717,796 sq mi.)   
Official name  United States of America

#### Voting issue ---

#### Limits --- they explode the topic, allowing investment anywhere in the world --- makes international Affs with unique, unpredictable advantages topical --- and makes the entire space topic Aff ground --- both make research impossible

#### Ground --- best links to spending, politics, and private-sector crowd-out DAs assume the United States