\*^\*^\*^\*OFF CASE\*^\*^\*^\*

T – Investment

A. Excessive expenditure is not investment in the plan

Investment is the investing of capital for profitable returns

Dictionary.com (Dictionary.com, "Investment", http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/Investment?s=t, DOA: 6/27/12)

noun 1. The investing of money or capital in order to gain profitable returns, as interest, income, or appreciation in value. 2. A particular instance or mode of investing. 3. A thing invested in, as a business, a quantity of shares of stock, etc. 4. Something that is invested; sum invested. 5. The act or fact of investing or state of being invested, as with a garment.

B. Violation – the aff does not invest in transportation infrastructure – they only affirm expenditure

C. This is a voter for –

a. Limits – the aff over limits the topic – by simply affirming expenditure, it makes it possible for millions of aff to be run making it impossible for the neg to research them all

b. Ground – the neg loses core neg ground because the aff isn’t investing in transportation infrastructure, therefore the neg can’t garner most links

T- Walking and Bicycling

A. Walking and Bicycling are not “transportation infrastructure”

Transportation Infrastructure is defined as physical projects.

EJTIR 2010, (Chantal C. Cantarelli (Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology), Bent Flyvbjerg (Saïd Business School, University of Oxford), Eric J.E. Molin (Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology), Bert van Wee (Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology), 06-27-12, "Cost Overruns in Large-scale Transportation Infrastructure Projects: Explanations and Their Theoretical Embeddedness", http://www.ejtir.tbm.tudelft.nl/issues/2010\_01/pdf/2010\_01\_01.pdf)

We define transportation infrastructure projects as follows: ‘Transport infrastructures include roads, rail lines, channels, (extensions to) airports and harbours, bridges and tunnels. Of these projects it is the ‘hardware’ that is considered, and the “software”,i.e. projects relating to deregulations, liberalization, privatization, and so forth is excluded’. The literature did not provide one minimum cost level that is generally applied to mark a large-scale project. A large scale project is defined in this paper by a minimum cost level of 500 million euros.

B. Violation – the aff does not create a physical project – they are affirming the action of walking and biking

C. This is a voter for –

a. Limits – It is key to limit the topic so the aff can’t run hundreds of affs that have nothing to do with transportation infrastructure – research would be impossible without limits to the topic

b. Ground – the aff steals core neg ground because generic arguments would not apply to affs that have nothing to do with the topic

T – USFG

A. USFG means the plan is enacted by the United States of America

Resolved means a decision about the topic is made

Dictionary.com, (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/resolved)

re·solve   [ri-zolv] Show IPA verb, -solved, -solv·ing, noun verb (used with object) 1. to come to a definite or earnest decision about; determine (to do something): I have resolved that I shall live to the full.

United States federal government is all three branches

Research 07, Scuton, Research Prof, 07 (Roger Scuton, Research Prof, Institute for the Psychological Sciences in Arlington, Virginia, 2007)

The constitution of 1788 establishes a federal system of government with considerable limits to its power, but with absolute sovereignty in all matters that concern the existence of the US as a single state. The federal government consists of legislative, executive, and judicial branches, interrelated but distinct, and constructed expressly so as to accourd with the theory of the separation of powers, as this had been understood by the Founding Fathers.

B. Violation – the aff doesn’t affirm that the USFG will enact their plan to expend in walking and biking

C. This is a voter for –

a. Limits – it is key to limit the topic to aff that the USFG enacts to reduce the TRILLIONS of affs that could be read with TRILLIONS of agents; research for TRILLIONS of agents would be IMPOSSIBLE. There isn’t even literature on all the agents that could enact the plan

b. Ground – affs that do not have to do with the topic do not link into core neg arguments

Oil DA

#### Prices are under control now – instability causes divisions within Russia

Hulbert 5-20 (Matthew Hulbert is a staff writer for Forbes. “Riyadh's Russia Problem: Oil”. 5-20-12. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/05/20/riyadhs-russia-problem-oil/>)

Obviously, the relatively steady market we see today will continue to mask deep divisions and divides. Despite Russian slips, prices are back ‘under control’ at the top, and despite softening in China, we’re nowhere near the depths of 2008 when prices crashed to $33/b. But investors should beware; inherent Riyadh-Russia divisions exist, and will only get deeper over the next decade as instability creeps in. Ironically when we get into the 2020s, the boot might be on the other foot. Although Riyadh has just reclaimed its oil crown, Russian Arctic production will come good at some point, and Saudi exports could slip to 7mb/d due to domestic consumption without serious policy intervention. In ballpark terms, that would make Russia the swing producer – both in the oil and gas worlds. If that doesn’t give consumers, and particularly America, serious food for thought, then little else will. Amid its new found energy riches, [Washington](http://www.forbes.com/places/dc/washington/) needs to get hold of the energy ‘rope’ first…

Cross-apply Stoekl 7 – through the implementation of their plan we break away from the modern fossil fuel economy “driving”(Lol) away from oil powered cars

#### High oil prices is key to all aspects of Russian power

Petersen and Barysch 2011 (Alexandros Petersen is an energy security advisor to the Woodrow Wilson Centre in Washington DC. Katinka Barysch is deputy director of the Centre for European Reform. November 2011. http://carnegie-mec.org/publications/?fa=47408)

Energy has come to symbolize the geopolitics of the 21st century, reflecting countries’ diminishing reliance on military and political power. Today, energy is an instrument of geopolitical competition, like nuclear weapons or large armies were during the Cold War. The means of international influence have become more diverse and sophisticated, but the goals remain much the same: national security, power projection, and control over resources and territory. In different ways energy is fundamental to the rise of Russia and China as great powers. For Russia, possession of vast oil and gas resources fulfils a function similar to its nuclear weapons in the Soviet era. The post-1999 boom in world oil prices has underpinned Russia’s re-emergence as a great power. The combination of the country’s abundant energy reserves and fast-growing world demand for such resources has given Russia the opportunity to play a more influential role in global politics. When Kremlin officials speak of Russia being an “energy superpower,” they are really saying that it is back as a global, multi-dimensional power. Energy is seen not simply as an instrument of influence in itself, but as underpinning other forms of power: military, political, economic, technological, cultural and soft power.

#### Increasing Russian influence gives Russia bargaining chips to keep the US out of Central Asia

BOURTMAN 2006(Ilya, expert on Russia and has worked with the American Enterprise Institute, the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies, and the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, MERIA, June, http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2006/issue2/jv10no2a1.html)

Given the new international context and the lingering personal interests within his government, Putin has had the unenviable task of steering his country's Middle East policy. While he has relied on Israel to diversify Russian economic interests and train Russia's beleaguered security apparatus, he has also used the high visibility of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to position himself in the eyes of the international community as a key actor in the peace process. All along, Putin has tried to market Russia as an independent, unbiased party with a large role to play in solving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Due to the uncertainty about what Russia's future policies will be towards Israel and the rest of the Middle East, there are few high probabilities. Yet one thing is certain. Given that Russia will take its turn as President of the G-8 this year, and that the meeting with be held in St. Petersburg, Putin will feel pressure to project Russian power. For Israel, this will mean more of Russia's involvement in Israeli-Palestinian affairs as Putin tries to counterweigh the negative portrayal of his country as a leading weapons and energy supplier. Putin will also continue to sit on the proverbial two chairs. For a country whose prestige and power have declined precipitously in the last two decades, Putin has done an effective job of leveraging competing interests in one of the world's most volatile regions. The ambiguity of his two track policy causes confusion and difficulties for some of Moscow's allies in the region, but from Russia's perspective, Putin has succeeded in gaining an economic foothold, developing neutral or warm ties with all the states therein, and maintaining Russia's seat at the adults' table. A final goal of Putin's may be to use Russia's increasing influence in the Middle East as a bargaining chip with the United States. It is possible that Russia is cozying up to governments and organizations with questionable objectives in the Middle East, so as to later trade a pledge of "non-interference" with the United States--by pledging to keep out of the Middle East, Russia could demand that the U.S. keep out of the Caucasus and Central Asia.

#### Nuke war

ELAND 2008[Ivan, Nov, Sr. Fellow, Independent Inst., former Defense Analyst for Congressional Budget Office, The Independent Institute, http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2363]

But the bear is now coming out of a long hibernation a bit rejuvenated. Using increased petroleum revenues from the oil price spike, the Russians will hike defense spending 26 percent next year to about $50 billion—the highest level since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Yet as the oil price declines from this historic high, Russia will have fewer revenues to increase defense spending and rebuild its military. Even the $50 billion a year has to be put in perspective. The United States is spending about $700 billion per year on defense and starting from a much higher plain of capability. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian military fell apart and was equivalent to that of a developing country. Even the traditionally hawkish U.S. military and defense leaders and analysts are not worried about Russia’s plans to buy modern arms, improve military living standards to attract better senior enlisted personnel, enhance training, and cut back the size of the bloated forces and officer corps. For example, Eugene B. Rumer of the U.S. National Defense University was quoted in the *Washington Post* as saying that Russian actions are “not a sign, really, of the Russian military being reborn, but more of a Russia being able to flex what relatively little muscle it has on the global scale, and to show that it actually matters.”[[1]](http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=2363" \l "_ftn1#_ftn1" \o ")In addition, the Russian military is very corrupt—with an estimated 40 percent of the money for some weapons and pay for personnel being stolen or wasted. This makes the amount of real defense spending far below the nominal $50 billion per year. U.S. analysts say, however, that increased military spending would allow Russia to have more influence over nations in its near abroad and Eastern Europe. Of course, throughout history, small countries living in the shadow of larger powers have had to make political, diplomatic, and economic adjustments to suit the larger power. Increased Russian influence in this sphere, however, should not necessarily threaten the security of the faraway United States. It does only because the United States has defined its security as requiring intrusions into Russia’s traditional sphere of influence. By expanding NATO into Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, the United States has guaranteed the security of these allied countries against a nuclear-armed power, in the worst case, by sacrificing its cities in a nuclear war. Providing this kind of guarantee for these non-strategic countries is not in the U.S. vital interest. Denying Russia the sphere of influence in nearby areas traditionally enjoyed by great powers (for example, the U.S. uses the Monroe Doctrine to police the Western Hemisphere) will only lead to unnecessary U.S.-Russian tension and possibly even cataclysmic war.

Disabilities K

#### Their idea of bodily movement reinforces the medical model of disability and results in forced social exclusion.

Ivonne Audirac, Florida State University, 5/16/2008[“Accessing Transit as Universal Design”, Journal of Planning Literature 2008, Sage Journals, http://jpl.sagepub.com/content/23/1/4.full.pdf+html]MW

Although influential transportation planners believe that given the low share of transit travel, transit cannot be the public strategy for improving mobility disadvantaged individuals (Pucher and Renne 2003, 74),4 disability theory and activism have challenged these views as exclusionary on several fronts (Corker and Shakespeare 2002; Pothier and Devlin 2006). First, on the basis that mode-split statistics are a poor measure of transit demand, since they do not account for suppressed trips (i.e., forgone trips for lack of transit service or impaired accesses to it) (Hine and Grieco 2002). Second, that mainstream transportation planning and design are based on the notion of a “universally able and disembodied” subject (i.e., without biological and social attributes) (Hine and Mitchell 2001; Imrie 2000; Langan 2001) and thus exclude not only impaired but also many nonimpaired people. Third, that transportation planning espouses the medical model of disability whereby the individual’s body, rather than the built environment and social attitudes against disabled people, is the main debilitating cause in personal mobility (Langan 2001). Fourth, that the transportation disciplines and lobbies have endorsed and promoted a universal system of auto-mobility that alienates impaired people and discriminates against all who, for financial, physical, temporal, or psychological reasons, cannot access or use automobiles (Imrie 2000; Hine and Mitchell 2001; Langan 2001). The literature on mobility and exclusion research identifies several forms of social exclusion (i.e., physical, geographical, from facilities) resulting from the organization of transportation and the quality of transit service provision and its relation to the built environment, urban form, and land use patterns (see Table 2). These mobility-limiting factors also include economic, fear-based, and time-based exclusions, which condition people’s immobility and capacity to participate in mainstream society (Cass, Shove, and Urry 2005; Church, Frost, and Sullivan 2000; Grieco 2003; Hine and Mitchell 2001; TCRP 1999).

#### This exclusion perpetuates abelism.

Jonathan Drimmer,Editor, UCLA Law Review, UCLA 6/1993 [“CRIPPLES, OVERCOMERS, AND CIVIL RIGHTS: TRACING THE EVOLUTION OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION AND SOCIAL POLICY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES” 40 UCLA L. Rev. 1341, lexis]

Society resonates with the message that people with disabilities n2 are somehow "ruined." Based on this notion of inferiority, people with disabilities are treated as second-class citizens, and suffer from "thoughtlessness and indifference," and "benign neglect." n3 [\*1343] They are both pitied and abused: as historical victims of a mix of intolerance, discrimination, fear, and misunderstanding, they are given charity, and yet not afforded many of the rights and opportunities of people with able bodies. n4 Frequently, people with disabilities are stigmatized as less than human, n5 or viewed as examples of the cruelty of life at its worst. n6 In a culture that values the "protestant work ethic" as well as a strong mind and body, people with disabilities are commonly viewed as deficient and inferior. n7 In an [\*1344] industrialized country where self-support is closely tied to self-esteem and national economic strength, the forty-three million Americans with disabilities n8 are often assumed to be mired in feelings of personal inadequacy, n9 and are viewed as sapping the strength of the country when unable to produce financially. Whether through oversight, such as failing to make curb-cuts or constructing inaccessible buildings; n10 animus, such as sterilization of deaf and retarded individuals; or discrimination, n11 such as refusing to hire or educate someone on the basis of a disability, people with disabilities have often been treated as inherently inferior, and removed from mainstream society. Historically, the legal status of people with disabilities has reflected the view that a person with a disability is intrinsically substandard. During the twentieth century, Congress enacted several laws which focused on people with disabilities. Most of these laws authorized services to help "cure" what are considered "ailments" within individuals who have disabilities in order to increase national production and decrease welfare spending. The few recent laws seeking to provide rights and remedies to people with disabilities have consistently failed to recognize them as complete citizens, acknowledging them only as "flawed" individuals not at fault for shortcomings that society must endure. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"), n12 considered a comprehensive bill of rights for people with disabilities, merely continues this begrudging treatment. In pursuing this course, Congress has issued a message that people with disabilities do not deserve full citizenship or equal participation in the community and are merely tolerated when they [\*1345] can become economic participants. This treatment in the law results in the granting of limited rights that do not guarantee people with disabilities full access to society. This Comment addresses the evolution of the treatment of people with disabilities in federal law, with the express purpose of exposing their historical and systematic mistreatment by society. It examines the legal status of people with disabilities in the context of sociological paradigms commonly used to uncover the underlying assumptions behind the societal treatment of individuals who have disabilities. Part I discusses the predominant interpretations of disability in Western society through the use of three models. The medical and social pathology models are based on the notion that a disability is a problem residing within the individual that doctors and specialists should attempt to cure, while the civil rights model is premised on the concept that the fundamental problem is not within the individual, but with an intolerant society. Part II reviews the historically inferior medical and social pathological treatment of people with disabilities, and discusses the influence of this approach in early federal legislation and social policy. Part III focuses on the birth of the modern civil rights movement with regard to disability and analyzes the initial effects of this movement on federal legislation. Part IV examines the strange fusion of the medical, social pathology, and civil rights treatments of people with disabilities in current legislation, concentrating on Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the ADA. This Comment concludes that until the national consciousness is raised through activities such as those used by other minority communities in their searches for equal treatment, Congress will continue to rely on the medical and social pathology models in enacting laws such as the ADA, and society will continue to view people with disabilities as inherently inferior.

#### Specifically abelism within transportation infrastructure perpetuates broader exclusion of all groups – Justifies eugenics and genocide

Sam Bagenstos, Professor at the University of Michigan, Ex-Harvard Law Prof, 2000 [“Subordination, Stigma, and Disability,” Virginia Law Review, Vol. 86, No. 3, p.437-45, gscholar] 7/16/12 K. Harris

Erving Goffman’s notion of stigma is a useful tool here. Although “stigma” refers colloquially to animus and prejudice, Goffman used the term to refer to a broader problem. He described the condition as an “undesired differentness” from what society deems to be “normal” or expected. 1 5 3 Under Goffman’s approach, the core aspect of stigma occurs when prevailing social practices treat particular “undesirable” traits as universally discrediting. As Goffman emphasized, those who deal with stigmatized persons “tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one.” 1 5 4 As a result, people with stigmatized traits are not considered to be among the “normals” for whom society, and its institutions, are designed. 1 5 5 This stigma is as much about so-cial attitudes as about the traits themselves; even if an individual can “cure” a stigmatized trait, she may still not be accepted in the community of “normals.” 1 5 6 Goffman’s construct of “stigma” provides a useful tool in giving content to my subordination-based understanding of disability rights law for at least two reasons. First, Goffman’s analysis strongly influenced the thoughts of many of the disability rights activists on whose work I rely. 1 5 7 Second, that analysis provides a way of connecting the animus- and stereotype-based discrimination experienced by many people with disabilities with their more systemic neglect in the design of the environment. It therefore provides a way of treating the three basic manifestations of disability discrimination under a single rubric, and it provides a way of predicting which types of impairments are likely to be associated with systematic deprivation of opportunities. Because Goffman wrote primarily about individual interactions between “the normals” and “the stigmatized,” his notion of stigma most directly helps to describe the prejudice and stereotypes people with disabilities experience in such interactions. 1 5 8 It is especially useful in explaining the “spread effect,” under which an impairment to a particular life function is seen as universally disabling. 1 5 9 But Goffman’s analysis of stigma helps to describe the society-wide neglect of people with disabilities as well. 1 6 0 In particular, it helps to explain people with disabilities as well. 1 6 0 In particular, it helps to explain why people with some impairments are likely to be systematically neglected by social decisions, and why those people are likely to be the same people as those who experience animus and stereotyping. 1 6 1 If stigma means that an individual is not considered to be one of “the normals,” then people with stigmatized impairments are likely not to be a part of the social “norm” considered by those who design the social and physical environment. Even if the environment’s “designers” do not harbor prejudiced or stereotyped thoughts about people with stigmatized conditions, they are likely not to consider their needs in the same way that they consider the needs of those who are “normal.” Disability rights advocates have long made this precise point about “disability.” 1 6 2 They have argued that “the entire physical and social organization of life” is frequently structured as though everyone were physically strong, as though all bodies were shaped the same, as though everyone could walk, hear, and see well, as though everyone could work and play at a pace that is not compatible with any kind of illness or pain, as though no one were ever dizzy or incontinent or simply needed to sit or lie down. 1 6 3 This phenomenon is most obvious in the built environment. Architects design structures with a model of the “normal” user in mind, and that model has typically been a person without any discernible impairments. 1 6 4 This “assumption of able-bodiedness as the norm” 1 6 5 can be seen in buildings with unnecessary stairs, doorways that are too narrow to accommodate wheelchairs, and entrances that fail to provide any detectable warning for people with visual impairments. But the phenomenon of neglect extends beyond the decisions that have constructed our physical architecture. It affects our patterns of social organization as well. Among other things, it affects the structure of jobs and the means by which businesses and governments deliver services. 1 6 6 Why have those who constructed our social and physical environment failed to consider people with disabilities as among the “normal” users? One explanation might look to the very history of prejudice and stereotypes noted by Congress. For much of our history, people with a variety of physical and mental disabilities were “shunted aside, hidden, and ignored.” 1 6 7 People with impairments ranging from epilepsy to blindness to mental retardation were segregated from the community in a collection of congregate institutions. 1 6 8 Such segregation “perpetuate[d] unwarranted assumptions that persons so isolated are incapable or unworthy of participating in community life.” 1 6 9 Even among those who were not institutionalized, people with disabilities frequently did not work, patronize businesses, or use government services outside of the home. 1 7 0 (In some cases, they were required by law to stay at home; as late as 1974, some major American jurisdictions still maintained “ugly laws” that prohibited “unsightly” people—a category that encompassed people with disabilities—from appearing in public. 1 7 1 ) A person designing a particular building, production process, or job description could thus be forgiven for failing to think of people with disabilities as potential customers or workers. The designer might have had no particular negative attitudes toward “the disabled.” Indeed, it might never have entered her mind that people with disabilities might wish to use her building or work in her business; she might simply have had no available model of people with disabilities as ordinary people with ordinary needs and tastes. 1 7 2 Al- though people with disabilities have become more and more integrated into society at large in the last two decades, the history of exclusion may have a particularly long “tail.” Buildings and processes designed without people with disabilities in mind may be used for many years to come. And prejudice and stereotypes— which have themselves been fed by the absence of people with disabilities from the larger community 1 7 3—may linger even longer. 1 7 4 The historic exclusion of people with disabilities from “normal” society has interacted in complex and reciprocal ways with broader ideological currents. Lennard Davis has argued that the notion of “norms” dates only to the development of a science of statistics in the early nineteenth century. 1 7 5 Until then, Davis contends, the place now occupied by the “norm” was held by the notion of an “ideal,” which was understood to be unattainable by any human. 1 7 6 But the newfound “concept of a norm, unlike that of an ideal, implie[d] that the majority of the population must or should somehow be part of the norm.” 1 7 7 Early statisticians made this point expressly: They argued that social institutions should be built around the broad middle group of persons who fit the social norm. 1 7 8 As Davis demonstrates, their arguments both provided justification for, and drew strength from, an ideology that accorded a morally privileged position to the middle class. 1 7 9 More darkly, they fed the eugenic ideology that led to the institutionalization and sterilization of many people whom we now label “disabled.” 1 8 0 The nineteenth-century notion that institutions should be designed for the “norm” persists. But our vision of “normal” human attributes has become increasingly idealized, as the eugenics movement (which sought “to norm the nonstandard” 1 8 1 ) may have been the first to demonstrate. Rob Imrie’s account of modernist architecture points out the effect that such an ideology of the “norm” has had on our built environment. In seeking to make form follow function, and to “tie buildings back to the scale of the human being,” modernists harbored a particularly able-bodied vision of who “the human being” was. 1 8 2 Imrie illustrates this vision by pointing to Le Corbusier’s “Modular,” which “utilized the proportions of the (able) body to enable the architect to create the built spaces.” 1 8 3 The “Modular,” a diagram of a muscular six-foot tall man, was “the person for whom functionality in building design and form was being defined.” 1 8 4 Many inaccessible features of today’s buildings, Imrie argues, trace directly to modernism’s exclusion of people with disabilities from its idealized version of the “norm.” 1 8 5 As we move to a new millennium, we seem to believe as strongly as ever that everyone should fit an “ideal” body type. Although there are surely a variety of reasons for this development, the most notable are a consumer/advertising culture that idealizes beauty and a widespread belief in the ability of modern medicine to enhance our mental and physical lives. 1 8 6 As a result, the ideological currents that exclude people with disabilities from our notion of the “norm” stubbornly remain with us. The stigma attached to “disability” thus both represents the legacy of a history of exclusion and reflects a series of broader ideological developments. Whatever the underlying reason for its persistence, however, that stigma can help us to understand the means by which disability-based subordination is transmitted. More importantly, stigma can serve an evidentiary function: It can help us identify cases where impairments are likely to be associated with systematic deprivation of opportunities. Seen in this light, the “disability” category embraces those people who experience impairment-based stigma—that is, those people who, because of present, past, or perceived impairments, are considered by society to be outside of the “norm.” As Carol Gill puts it, “disability is a marginalized status that society assigns to people who are different enough from majority cultural standards to be judged abnormal or defective in mind or body.” 1 8 7 Although I would argue that stigma identifies and explains—but does not necessarily define—disability based subordination, Gill’s analysis substantially overlaps my own. In this view, “disability” is a group status, but it is not one defined by anything inherent in the members of the group. Rather, the attitudes and practices that exclude people with “disabilities” from many opportunities to participate in society are the very ones that create the “disability” category. Although individuals em-braced by the category have vastly different impairments and limitations (indeed, some have no impairment or limitation at all), what is crucial is that society treats them as essentially similar. 1 8 8 In Wendell’s words, “[w]idespread perceptions that people with disabilities are similar in very significant ways create the category, ‘people with disabilities.’” 1 8 9 The widespread acts of “discrimination, segregation, and denial of equal opportunity” directed at people with disabilities have effectively marked that group as a “dependent caste.” 1 9 0

#### Alt – We should endorse the inclusion of disabled people and reject the ablest mindset of Bataille.

Michael Bérubé, Paterno Family Professor in Literature at Pennsylvania State Univerecsity, 2003[“Citizenship and Disability”, Spring, <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=506>]

It is striking, nonetheless, that so few leftists have understood disability in these terms. Disability is not the only area of social life in which the politics of recognition are inseparable from the politics of redistribution; other matters central to citizenship, such as immigration, reproductive rights, and criminal justice, are every bit as complex. Nonetheless, **our society's representations of disability are intricately tied to**, and sometimes the very basis for, **our public policies for "administering" disability.** And when we contemplate, in these terms, the history of people with cognitive and developmental disabilities, we find a history in which "representation" takes on a double valence: first, in that people who were deemed incapable of representing themselves were therefore represented by a socio-medical apparatus that defined—or, in a social-constructionist sense, created—the category of "feeblemindedness"; and second, in the sense that the visual and rhetorical representations of "feebleminded" persons then set the terms for public policy. One cannot plausibly narrate a comprehensive history of ideas and practices of national citizenship in the post-Civil War United States without examining public policy regarding disability, especially mental disability, all the more especially when mental disability was then mapped onto certain immigrant populations who scored poorly on intelligence tests and were thereby pseudo-scientifically linked to criminality. And what of reproductive rights? By 1927, the spurious but powerful linkages among disability, immigration, poverty, and criminality provided the Supreme Court with sufficient justification for declaring involuntary sterilization legal under the Constitution. THERE IS AN obvious reason why disability rights are so rarely thought of in terms of civil rights: disability was not covered in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. And as Anita Silvers points out, over the next twenty-five years, groups covered by civil rights law sometimes saw disability rights as a dilution of civil rights, on the grounds that people with disabilities were constitutively incompetent, whereas women and minorities faced discrimination merely on the basis of social prejudice. Silvers writes, "[t]o make disability a category that activates a heightened legal shield against exclusion, it was objected, would alter the purpose of legal protection for civil rights by transforming the goal from protecting opportunity for socially exploited people to providing assistance for naturally unfit people." The passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990 did add disability to the list of stigmatized identities covered by antidiscrimination law, but thus far the ADA has been interpreted so narrowly, and by such a business-friendly judiciary, that employers have won over 95 percent of the suits brought under the act. Perhaps if plaintiffs with disabilities had won a greater number of cases over the past thirteen years, the conservative backlash against the ADA-currently confined to a few cranks complaining about handicapped parking spaces and a wheelchair ramp at a Florida nude beach-would be sufficiently strong as to spark a movement to repeal the law altogether. But then again, perhaps if the law were read more broadly, more Americans would realize their potential stake in it. In 1999, for instance, the Supreme Court ruled on three lower-court cases in which people with "easily correctable" disabilities—high blood pressure, nearsightedness—were denied employment. In three identical 7-2 decisions, the Court found that the plaintiffs had no basis for a suit under the ADA precisely because their disabilities were easily correctable. As disability activists and legal analysts quickly pointed out, this decision left these plaintiffs in the ridiculous situation of being too disabled to be hired but somehow not disabled enough to be covered by the ADA; or, to put this another way, plaintiffs' "easily correctable" disabilities were not so easily correctable as to allow them access to employment. One case involved twin sisters who were denied the opportunity to test as pilots for United Airlines on the grounds that their eyesight did not meet United's minimum vision requirement (uncorrected visual acuity of 20/100 or better without glasses or contacts) even though each sister had 20/20 vision with corrective lenses (Sutton v. United Airlines, Inc.); another involved a driver/mechanic with high blood pressure (Murphy v. United Parcel Service); the third involved a truck driver with monocular vision (20/200 in one eye) who in 1992 had received a Department of Transportation waiver of the requirement that truck drivers have distant visual acuity of 20/40 in each eye as well as distant binocular acuity of 20/40 (Albertson's, Inc. v. Kirkingburg). Because, as Silvers argues, "litigation under the ADA commonly turns on questions of classification rather than access," all three plaintiffs were determined to have no standing under the law. The question of whether any of them was justly denied employment was simply not addressed by the Court. Indeed, in writing her opinion for the majority, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor explicitly refused to consider the wider question of "access," noting that 160 million Americans would be covered by the ADA if it were construed to include people with "easily correctible" disabilities (under a "health conditions approach"), and since Congress had cited the number 43 million in enacting the law, Congress clearly could not have intended the law to be applied more widely. "Had Congress intended to include all persons with corrected physical limitations among those covered by the Act, it undoubtedly would have cited a much higher number of disabled persons in the findings," wrote O'Connor. "That it did not is evidence that the ADA's coverage is restricted to only those whose impairments are not mitigated by corrective measures." It is possible to object that O'Connor's decision was excessively literalist, and that the potential number of Americans covered by the ADA is, in any case, quite irrelevant to the question of whether a woman can fly a plane when she's got her glasses on. But I've since come to believe that the literalism of the decision is an indirect acknowledgment of how broad the issues at stake here really are. If the ADA were understood as a broad civil rights law, and if it were understood as a law that potentially pertains to the entire population of the country, then maybe disability law would be understood not as a fringe addition to civil rights law but as its very fulfillment. RIGHTS CAN BE created, reinterpreted, extended, and revoked. The passage of the ADA should therefore be seen as an extension of the promise of democracy, but only as a promise: any realization of the potential of the law depends on its continual reinterpretation. For the meaning of the word, just as Wittgenstein wanted us to believe (in order that we might be undeceived about how our words work), lies in its use in the language. Similarly, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1975 (originally the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) was not some kind of breakthrough discovery whereby children with disabilities were found to be rights-bearing citizens of the United States after all, and who knew that we'd had it all wrong for 199 years? On the contrary, the IDEA invented a new right for children with disabilities, the right to a "free and appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment." And yet the IDEA did not wish that right into being overnight; the key terms "appropriate" and "least restrictive" had to be interpreted time and again, over the course of fifteen years, before they were understood to authorize "full inclusion" of children with disabilities in "regular" classrooms. Nothing about the law is set in stone. The only philosophical "foundation" underlying the IDEA and its various realizations is our own collective political will, a will that is tested and tested again every time the Act comes up for reauthorization. Jamie Bérubé currently has a right to an inclusive public education, but that right is neither intrinsic nor innate. Rather, Jamie's rights were invented, and implemented slowly and with great difficulty. The recognition of his human dignity, enshrined in those rights, was invented. And by the same token, those rights, and that recognition, can be taken away. While I live, I promise myself that I will not let that happen, but I live with the knowledge that it may: to live any other way, to live as if Jamie's rights were somehow intrinsic, would be irresponsible. Of course, many of us would prefer to believe that our children have intrinsic human rights and human dignity no matter what; irrespective of any form of human social organization; regardless of whether they were born in twentieth-century Illinois or second-century Rome or seventh-century central Asia. But this is just a parent's—or a philosophical foundationalist's-wishful thinking. For what would it mean for Jamie to "possess" rights that no one on earth recognized? A fat lot of good it would do him. My argument may sound either monstrous or all too obvious: if, in fact, no one on earth recognized Jamie's human dignity, then there would in fact be no human perspective from which he would be understood to possess "intrinsic" human dignity. And then he wouldn't have it, and so much the worse for the human race. In one respect, the promise of the IDEA, like the promise of the ADA, is clear: greater inclusion of people with disabilities in the social worlds of school and work. But in another sense the promise is unspecifiable; its content is something we actually cannot know in advance. For the IDEA does not merely guarantee all children with disabilities a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. Even more than this, it grants the right to education in order that persons with disabilities might make the greatest possible use of their other rights-the ones having to do with voting, or employment discrimination, or with life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. IDEA is thus designed to enhance the capabilities of all American children with disabilities regardless of their actual abilities-and this is why it is so profound a democratic idea. Here again I'm drawing on Nancy Fraser, whose theory of democracy involves the idea of "participatory parity," and the imperative that a democratic state should actively foster the abilities of its citizens to participate in the life of the polity as equals. Fraser's work to date has not addressed disability, but as I noted above, it should be easy to see how disability is relevant to Fraser's account of the politics of recognition and the politics of redistribution. This time, however, I want to press the point a bit harder. Fraser writes as if the promise of democracy entails the promise to enhance participatory parity among citizens, which it does, and she writes as if we knew what "participatory parity" itself means, which we don't. (This is why the promise of disability rights is unspecifiable.) LET ME EXPLAIN. First, the idea of participatory parity does double duty in Fraser's work, in the sense that it names both the state we would like to achieve and the device by which we can gauge whether we're getting there. For in order to maintain a meaningful democracy in which all citizens participate as legal and moral equals, the state needs to judge whether its policies enhance equal participation in democratic processes. Yet at the same time, the state needs to enhance equal participation among its citizens simply in order to determine what its democratic processes will be. This is not a meta-theoretical quibble. On the contrary, the point is central to the practical workings of any democratic polity. One of the tasks required of democrats is precisely this: **to extend the promise of democracy to previously excluded individuals and groups some of whom might have a substantially different understanding** of "participatory parity" than that held by previously dominant groups and individuals. Could anything make this clearer than the politics of disability? Imagine a building in which political philosophers are debating, in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the value and the purpose of participatory parity over against forms of authoritarianism or theocracy. Now imagine that this building has no access ramps, no Braille or large-print publications, no American Sign Language interpreters, no elevators, no special-needs paraprofessionals, no in-class aides. Contradictory as such a state of affairs may sound, it's a reasonably accurate picture of what contemporary debate over the meaning of democracy actually looks like. How can we remedy this? **Only when we have fostered equal participation in debates over the ends and means of democracy can we have a truly participatory debate over what "participatory parity" itself means.** That debate will be interminable in principle, since our understandings of democracy and parity are infinitely revisable, but lest we think of deliberative democracy as a forensic society dedicated to empyreal reaches of abstraction, we should remember that debates over the meaning of participatory parity set the terms for more specific debates about the varieties of human embodiment. These include debates about prenatal screening, genetic discrimination, stem-cell research, euthanasia, and, with regard to physical access, ramps, curb cuts, kneeling buses, and buildings employing what is now known as universal design. Leftists and liberals, particularly those associated with university humanities departments, are commonly charged with being moral relativists, unable or unwilling to say (even after September 11) why one society might be "better" than another. So let me be especially clear on this final point. I think there's a very good reason to extend the franchise, to widen the conversation, to democratize our debates, and to make disability central to our theories of egalitarian social justice. The reason is this: a capacious and supple sense of what it is to be human is better than a narrow and partial sense of what it is to be human, and **the more participants we as a society can incorporate into the deliberation of what it means to be human, the greater the chances that that deliberation will in fact be transformative** in such a way as to enhance our collective capacities to recognize each other as humans entitled to human dignity. As Jamie reminds me daily, both deliberately and unwittingly, most Americans had no idea what people with Down syndrome could achieve until we'd passed and implemented and interpreted and reinterpreted a law entitling them all to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. I can say all this without appealing to any innate justification for human dignity and human rights, and I can also say this: Without a sufficient theoretical and practical account of disability, we can have no account of democracy worthy of the name. Perhaps some of our fellow citizens with developmental disabilities would not put the argument quite this way; even though Jamie has led me to think this way, he doesn't talk the way I do. But those of us who do participate in political debates, whether about school funding in a specific district or about the theory and practice of democracy at its most abstract, have the obligation to enhance the abilities of our children and our fellow citizens with disabilities to participate in the life of the United States as political and moral equals with their nondisabled peers-both for their own good, and for the good of democracy, which is to say, for the good of all of us.

\*^\*^\*^\*CASE\*^\*^\*^\*

Fossil Fuels

Walking and biking causes people to use energy

Walking and biking causes people to use energy

Pucher and Buehler 10, John Pucher, Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy Rutgers University Ralph Buehler, School of Public and International Affairs Virginia Tech, December 2010, “Walking and Cycling for Healthy Cities,” http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/BuiltEnvironment\_WalkBike\_10Dec2010.pdf

The European Union and the USA have officially recognized the importance of walking and cycling as practical modes of urban transport and endorse the dual objectives of raising walking and cycling levels while increasing their safety (CEMT, 2004; European Commission, 2007; USDOT, 1994, 2004). There are many reasons to encourage more walking and cycling. They cause virtually no noise or air pollution and consume far less nonrenewable resources than any motorized transport mode. The energy walking and cycling require is provided directly by the traveler, and the very use of that energy offers valuable cardiovascular exercise. Walking and cycling take up a small fraction of the space needed for the use and parking of cars. Moreover, walking and cycling are economical, costing far less than the private car and public transport, both in direct user outlays and public infrastructure investments. Because they are affordable by virtually everyone, walking and cycling are probably the most equitable of all transport modes. In short, it is hard to beat walking and cycling when it comes to environmental, economic, and social sustainability.

It is necessary to eat large amounts of food to sustain amount of energy used by walking and biking

Merrill and Watt 73, Annabel Merrill, Bernice Watt, February 1973, “Energy Value of Foods… basis and derivation,” http://www.nal.usda.gov/fnic/foodcomp/Data/Classics/ah74.pdf

The chief food sources of energy to the human body are fat, carbohydrate, and protein. Fats and carbohydrates contain carbon and hydrogen which can be oxidized to their products, CO2 and H2O, both in the bomb calorimeter and in the body. In addition, protein contains nitrogen. This nitrogen together with se carbon and hydrogen leaves the body chiefly in the form of urea. Thus protein is incompletely oxidized in the body, whereas it can be completely oxidized in the calorimeter. The heat released by oxidation of food in the bomb calorimeter is its heat of combustion and is a measure of its gross energy value.

When food consumption increases, food production increases – fossil fuels are necessary for food production

Pfeiffer 03, Dale Allen Pfeiffer, writer for From the Wilderness, 10-03-03, “Eating Fossil Fuels,” <http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/100303_eating_oil.html>

October 3 , 2003, 1200 PDT, (FTW) -- Human beings (like all other animals) draw their energy from the food they eat. Until the last century, all of the food energy available on this planet was derived from the sun through photosynthesis. Either you ate plants or you ate animals that fed on plants, but the energy in your food was ultimately derived from the sun. It would have been absurd to think that we would one day run out of sunshine. No, sunshine was an abundant, renewable resource, and the process of photosynthesis fed all life on this planet. It also set a limit on the amount of food that could be generated at any one time, and therefore placed a limit upon population growth. Solar energy has a limited rate of flow into this planet. To increase your food production, you had to increase the acreage under cultivation, and displace your competitors. There was no other way to increase the amount of energy available for food production. Human population grew by displacing everything else and appropriating more and more of the available solar energy. The need to expand agricultural production was one of the motive causes behind most of the wars in recorded history, along with expansion of the energy base (and agricultural production is truly an essential portion of the energy base). And when Europeans could no longer expand cultivation, they began the task of conquering the world. Explorers were followed by conquistadors and traders and settlers. The declared reasons for expansion may have been trade, avarice, empire or simply curiosity, but at its base, it was all about the expansion of agricultural productivity. Wherever explorers and conquistadors traveled, they may have carried off loot, but they left plantations. And settlers toiled to clear land and establish their own homestead. This conquest and expansion went on until there was no place left for further expansion. Certainly, to this day, landowners and farmers fight to claim still more land for agricultural productivity, but they are fighting over crumbs. Today, virtually all of the productive land on this planet is being exploited by agriculture. What remains unused is too steep, too wet, too dry or lacking in soil nutrients.1 Just when agricultural output could expand no more by increasing acreage, new innovations made possible a more thorough exploitation of the acreage already available. The process of “pest” displacement and appropriation for agriculture accelerated with the industrial revolution as the mechanization of agriculture hastened the clearing and tilling of land and augmented the amount of farmland which could be tended by one person. With every increase in food production, the human population grew apace. At present, nearly 40% of all land-based photosynthetic capability has been appropriated by human beings.2 In the United States we divert more than half of the energy captured by photosynthesis.3 We have taken over all the prime real estate on this planet. The rest of nature is forced to make due with what is left. Plainly, this is one of the major factors in species extinctions and in ecosystem stress. The Green Revolution In the 1950s and 1960s, agriculture underwent a drastic transformation commonly referred to as the Green Revolution. The Green Revolution resulted in the industrialization of agriculture. Part of the advance resulted from new hybrid food plants, leading to more productive food crops. Between 1950 and 1984, as the Green Revolution transformed agriculture around the globe, world grain production increased by 250%.4 That is a tremendous increase in the amount of food energy available for human consumption. This additional energy did not come from an increase in incipient sunlight, nor did it result from introducing agriculture to new vistas of land. The energy for the Green Revolution was provided by fossil fuels in the form of fertilizers (natural gas), pesticides (oil), and hydrocarbon fueled irrigation. The Green Revolution increased the energy flow to agriculture by an average of 50 times the energy input of traditional agriculture.5 In the most extreme cases, energy consumption by agriculture has increased 100 fold or more.6 In the United States, 400 gallons of oil equivalents are expended annually to feed each American (as of data provided in 1994).7 Agricultural energy consumption is broken down as follows: · 31% for the manufacture of inorganic fertilizer · 19% for the operation of field machinery · 16% for transportation · 13% for irrigation · 08% for raising livestock (not including livestock feed) · 05% for crop drying · 05% for pesticide production · 08% miscellaneous8 Energy costs for packaging, refrigeration, transportation to retail outlets, and household cooking are not considered in these figures. To give the reader an idea of the energy intensiveness of modern agriculture, production of one kilogram of nitrogen for fertilizer requires the energy equivalent of from 1.4 to 1.8 liters of diesel fuel. This is not considering the natural gas feedstock.9 According to The Fertilizer Institute (http://www.tfi.org), in the year from June 30 2001 until June 30 2002 the United States used 12,009,300 short tons of nitrogen fertilizer.10 Using the low figure of 1.4 liters diesel equivalent per kilogram of nitrogen, this equates to the energy content of 15.3 billion liters of diesel fuel, or 96.2 million barrels. Of course, this is only a rough comparison to aid comprehension of the energy requirements for modern agriculture. In a very real sense, we are literally eating fossil fuels. However, due to the laws of thermodynamics, there is not a direct correspondence between energy inflow and outflow in agriculture. Along the way, there is a marked energy loss. Between 1945 and 1994, energy input to agriculture increased 4-fold while crop yields only increased 3-fold.11 Since then, energy input has continued to increase without a corresponding increase in crop yield. We have reached the point of marginal returns. Yet, due to soil degradation, increased demands of pest management and increasing energy costs for irrigation (all of which is examined below), modern agriculture must continue increasing its energy expenditures simply to maintain current crop yields. The Green Revolution is becoming bankrupt.

Limited Energy

People have a finite amount of energy

Rickman and Ferrer 12, Joseph Rickman, Paula Bianca Ferrer, writers for Rice Today, April-June 2012, “Humans and Machines,” http://www.scribd.com/doc/94383694/RT-Vol-11-No-2-Humans-and-Machines

In physical terms, work or energy is a function of force and distance. The more force you need to apply or distance you need to travel, the more energy is required. The faster you accomplish this, the more power you exert. When humans or animals work in the field, the problem is that they can supply only a finite amount of energy at a given time. When they get tired, efficiency drops and so does the quality of work.

A2: Bataille

#### And Bataille’s notion of glorious expenditure destroys the environment in the name of producing waste,

Boldt-Irons 95 (Leslie Anne “On Bataille: Critical Essay”)

Arkady Plotnitsky takes as his point of departure Bataille's notion of expenditure when he asks whether or not Bataille avoids idealizing waste which he opposes to consumption for productive purposes. While Plotnitsky points to Bataille's tendency at times to "subordinate the effect of exchange and consumption" (to a somewhat idealized insistence on the primordiality of waste), he also underlines Bataille's awareness that to privilege expenditure unconditionally is just as untenable as to not account for its loss. Plotnitsky argues that Bataille's "insistence on waste is saved by his labyrinthine complexity of inscription of these theories." In writing of an exchange of expenditures, Bataille avoids reducing his view of economy to either an exchange economy or to one that is entirely free of exchange, the exuberance of the sovereign operations which he describes always involve more than mere waste or expenditure.

#### Bataille’s argument of expenditure without reserve is totalitarian in nature refusing linearity, logic and reason.

Boldt-Irons 95 (Leslie Anne “On Bataille: Critical Essays” pg.4)

A second early and noteworthy response may be found in Sartre’s article "Un Nouveau mystique." In the first section of this text, Sartre accuses Bataille of putting forward a "totalitarian thought," one that is "syncretic" in approach. Sartre writes: "In contrast to the analytic processes of philosophers, one might say that Bataille's book presents itself as the result of a totalitarian thought" (149). According to Sartre, Bataille's thought "does not construct itself, does not progressively enrich itself, but, indivisible and almost ineffable, it is level with the surface of each aphorism, such that each one of them presents us with the same complex and formidable meaning seen from a particular light" (149). Sartre seems to be accusing Bataille of not being systematic, of not elaborating a system beginning from founding principles. He appears to be dissatisfied with the exposition of Bataille's thought because it refuses to be linear. One can suppose that Bataille's response to this accusation would, in itself, issue from various points of departure, thus once again refusing linearity and system.

\*^\*^\*^\*^\*2NC\*^\*^\*^\*\*

2NC – T-Walking and Bicycling

A. Extend our interpretation from the 1NC that walking and bicycling are NOT transportation infrastructure and that only physical projects are considered transportation infrastructure.

B. Extend the violation that since the aff is affirming to walk and bike, it is not transportation infrastructure

C. This is a voter for limits and ground because they allow for an unlimited number of affs and this causes a research burden for the neg. Also they steal core neg ground when the aff implements something that has nothing to do with the topic.

2NC – T-USFG

A. Extend our interpretation that the plan must be done by one of the three branches of the federal government.

B. Extend our violation that the neg doesn’t even use the USFG therefore they are NOT topical.

C. This is a voter for limits because if the aff doesn’t claim an actor for their plan, there would be millions of affs that that the neg would have to prepare for and that creates a huge research burden. Also this is a voter for ground because the aff is not topical, the neg can’t obtain any of its key neg ground.

2NC Oil DA

#### Oil price high now price needs to be at $120 a barrel to stop collapse

Oprita 6/21

([Antonia Oprita](http://www.cnbc.com/id/15837548/cid/130727) is a Deputy News Editor for CNBC.com. 6/21/12. http://www.cnbc.com/id/47870418)hs

In 2007, according to Capital Economics' calculations, Russia needed the oil price on international markets to be around $40 per barrel to balance its budget — that is, for the state's revenue to match expenditure. However, because of a big fiscal stimulus in 2008-2009 and increasing government spending on welfare, pensions and public sector salaries, it now needs an oil price of around $120 a barrel to incur no budget deficit, Shearing said. "If oil prices continue to fall, the economy is likely to suffer," he said. "They can cope with oil prices being a bit lower for a while, but that could quickly wrap up I think." Russia's Finance Minister Anton Siluanov said in an interview with the Financial Times that the country had earmarked around $40 billion for this year and the next to shore up the economy in case the euro debt crisis spreads. Part of it could be spent on making up for any shortfall to the budget should oil prices stay below $117 a barrel. Halligan pointed out that oil prices are still high, despite the fears about the global slowdown, as the oil market is tighter, with supply issues at the fore. "Year to date, the oil price is actually higher than the annual average in 2011, which was the highest ever," Halligan said. SPIEF 2012 Struchenevsky said Russia's flexible exchange rate policy — with the ruble nearly floating freely — would help it cope with lower oil prices and would not trigger major fiscal imbalances. "Even if the oil price goes down to $80 a barrel, the [budget] deficit would not exceed 3 percent of gross domestic product," he said.

#### Prices are under control now – instability causes divisions within Russia

Hulbert 5-20

(Matthew Hulbert is a staff writer for Forbes. “Riyadh's Russia Problem: Oil”. 5-20-12. <http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/05/20/riyadhs-russia-problem-oil/>) hs

Obviously, the relatively steady market we see today will continue to mask deep divisions and divides. Despite Russian slips, prices are back ‘under control’ at the top, and despite softening in China, we’re nowhere near the depths of 2008 when prices crashed to $33/b. But investors should beware; inherent Riyadh-Russia divisions exist, and will only get deeper over the next decade as instability creeps in. Ironically when we get into the 2020s, the boot might be on the other foot. Although Riyadh has just reclaimed its oil crown, Russian Arctic production will come good at some point, and Saudi exports could slip to 7mb/d due to domestic consumption without serious policy intervention. In ballpark terms, that would make Russia the swing producer – both in the oil and gas worlds. If that doesn’t give consumers, and particularly America, serious food for thought, then little else will. Amid its new found energy riches, [Washington](http://www.forbes.com/places/dc/washington/) needs to get hold of the energy ‘rope’ first…

#### US-Russian relations solve nuclear terrorism

COHEN 2001(Stephen, Prof of Russian Studies at NYU, PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE 11-11-2001)

President Bush's meetings with Russian President Vladimir Putin next week, in Washington and Texas, give the United States a second historic chance, after the squandered opportunity of the 1990s, to establish a truly cooperative relationship with post-communist Russia. Such a relationship is essential for coping with today's real security dangers, which exceed those of the Cold War and make the United States so vulnerable that even it can no longer meaningfully be considered a "superpower." Indeed, both the decay of Moscow's systems of nuclear control and maintenance since 1992 and the "low-tech, high-concept" attacks on America on Sept. 11 may be omens of an unprecedented dark age of international security. None of its dangers can be dealt with effectively without Russia, the world's only other fully nuclearized country and its largest crossroad of civilizations.

2NC Case – Fossil Fuels

DA outweighs the case. Their aff is empirically denied – we have been used cars for decades and their impacts have NOT happened. There card is also 5 YEARS OLD and there impacts have NOT happened. We are the only ones in the round that proved a real nuke war scenario.

A. Extend that when you affirm bodily movement, it causes people to use more energy requiring them to eat more.

B. Extend that to replenish energy, it is required to eat large amounts of food.

C. Extend that fossil fuels are key to produce lots of food, and when we use bodily movement, we use lots of energy, therefore this turns the case because they are affirming to get rid of fossil fuels.

Food production is dependent on the use of fossil fuels.

CSS 11, Center for Sustainable Systems, 2011, “US Food System” http://css.snre.umich.edu/css\_doc/CSS01-06.pdf

The energy consumed in a system is often a useful indicator of its sustainability. Modern agriculture and the food system as a whole have developed a strong dependence on fossil energy. The figure below estimates the energy required throughout the current food system. 7.3 units of (primarily) fossil energy are consumed for every unit of food energy produced. 22  On-farm production amounts to approximately 20% of the total system energy. 40% of agriculture production energy goes into making chemical fertilizers and pesticides. 22  Large amounts of energy go into processing, transporting, storing and serving food. 22  Reliance on large fossil fuel inputs makes the food system increasingly vulnerable. 22  Consolidation of farms, animal production facilities, meat packing plants, food processing operation, and distribution warehouses often places further distance between food sources and consumers. 22

2NC Case – Limited Energy

People have a limited amount of energy

Milton 11, Nick Milton, worker for Knoco ltd, Knoco helps organisations of any size to deliver real business value from their knowledge, 05-24-11, “KM and the personal balance,” <http://www.nickmilton.com/2011/05/km-and-personal-balance.html>

To interest people, knowledge management must satisfy the principle of local value. What they get out of it must exceed what they put into it. This is a very personal equation. People have limited time, limited energy and limited enthusiasm. If they do knowledge management, they must stop doing something else. The value it delivers, must exceed what people have to put into it, otherwise they will not bother. So it's a balance. On one side is the personal cost, on the other, the personal benefit.