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Alternative Fails

#### The alternative fails- their theoretical nonsense cannot be translated to public policy

Vick 08 (M., James Cook University, “Poststructuralist Theory and Methodology: a Complementary Approach to Road Safety Research”, online, October)

The potential for poststructuralism to inform road safety policy and practice at present is limited by at least three critical factors. First, the lack of available research studies and, even more so, evaluated policy and practice initiatives to demonstrate its credibility in the field. Second, the complexity of the theory itself, often coupled with the obscurity of much poststructuralist writing. And third, poststructuralist methodology has little resemblance to mainstream methods in road safety research, raising critical questions about issues such as what constitutes evidence, and how issues of reliability and validity are addressed.

Framework-Theory Shell

#### First, Our Interpretation: The resolution asks the question of desirability of USFG action. The Role of ballot is to say yes or no to the action and outcomes of the plan.

#### Second, is reasons to prefer:

#### (\_\_\_) A. Aff Choice, any other framework or role of the ballot moots 9 minutes of the 1ac

#### (\_\_\_) B. It is predictable, the resolution demands USFG action

#### (\_\_\_) C. It is fair, Weigh Aff Impacts and the method of the Affirmative versus the Kritik, it’s the only way to test competition and determine the desirability of one strategy over another

#### Finally, It is a voter for competitive equity—prefer our interpretation, it allows both teams to compete, other roles of the ballot are arbitrary and self serving

Framework- Policy Making Key

#### The failures of our modern transportation culture exist because of policy making failure, effective policy making such as the aff solves

Dyble 09 (Louise Nelson,  associate director for research, The Keston Institute for Public Finance and Infrastructure Policy, “Reconstructing Transportation”, Technology and Culture, July)

The vast majority of Americans rely on a remarkably costly and inefficient means of getting around. They purchase and maintain automobiles that they use to commute to work and carry out daily business, often sitting behind the wheel all alone, often battling traffic congestion. They pay taxes and fees to help pay for a pervasive network of streets and highways, built and maintained by public agencies with dedicated revenue and reliable budgets. In contrast, a minority of Americans rely on more efficient mass-transit systems that are chronically underfunded, serve only limited areas and segments of the population, and are subject to frequent though unpredictable cuts in funding. Despite the social and environmental benefits of mass transit, as well as growing demand that is reflected by the highest ridership since the 1950s, in most places the prospects for its expansion and improvement are uncertain at best.1 Although in theory, integrated, multimodal transportation systems have broad expert and popular support, U.S. policy makers seem to be a long way from an effective strategy for realizing them. Implementing and sustaining a new approach to transportation in the United States requires much more than shifting appropriations and priorities—it requires the reconstruction of fundamental institutions, including the public organizations and bureaucracies responsible for transportation. If mass transit continues to be financed and managed separately from and [End Page 631] in competition with infrastructure for motor vehicles, there is little chance of achieving a more sane and stable balance. However, as an integral function of new institutions designed to support mobility and accessibility with the most appropriate technologies, mass transit could become a significant component of more efficient and equitable local and regional transportation systems than the ones we have today. There are a few exceptions to the overall pattern of anemic, neglected mass transit in the United States, and they coincide with regional institutions that transcend modes. In particular, the extensive and heavily used mass-transit systems of metropolitan New York and the San Francisco Bay Area benefit significantly from toll revenue generated by local bridges and tunnels. Institutions are defined by their durability, frequently outlasting any of the physical structures they might produce. Economic and political upheaval can reduce or overcome institutional resistance to change and upset the established balance of power, thereby making significant changes in the administration and financing of transportation services and infrastructure much easier to achieve than under ordinary circumstances.2 Policy makers may now have a rare opportunity to transform transportation policy in the United States. Understanding the status quo, including the assumptions, patterns, and relationships that sustain it, is a crucial first step.

Framework-Discourse Focus Fails

#### Discourse describes and reflects reality, it does not shape it—objective reality exists outside of language

Fram-Cohen ‘85

[Michelle, “Reality, Language, Translation: What Makes Translation Possible?” American Translators Association Conference, enlightenment.supersaturated.com/essays/text/michelleframcohen//possibilityoftranslation.html, 9-24-06//uwyo-ajl]

Nida did not provide the philosophical basis of the view that the external world is the common source of all languages. Such a basis can be found in the philosophy of Objectivism, originated by Ayn Rand. Objectivism, as its name implies, upholds the objectivity of reality. This means that reality is independent of consciousness, consciousness being the means of perceiving ?reality, not of creating it. Rand defines language as "a code of visual-auditory symbols that denote concepts." (15) These symbols are the written or spoken words of any language. Concepts are defined as the "mental integration of two or more units possessing the same distinguishing characteristic(s), with their particular measurements omitted." (16) This means that concepts are abstractions of units perceived in reality. Since words denote concepts, words are the symbols of such abstractions; words are the means of representing concepts in a language. Since reality provides the data from which we abstract and form concepts, reality is the source of all words--and of all languages. The very existence of translation demonstrates this fact. If there was no objective reality, there could be no similar concepts expressed in different verbal symbols. There could be no similarity between the content of different languages, and so, no translation. Translation is the transfer of conceptual knowledge from one language into another. It is the transfer of one set of symbols denoting concepts into another set of symbols denoting the same concepts. This process is possible because concepts have specific referents in reality. Even if a certain word and the concept it designates exist in one language but not in another, the referent this word and concept stand for nevertheless exists in reality, and can be referred to in translation by a descriptive phrase or neologism. Language is a means describing reality, and as such can and should expand to include newly discovered or innovated objects in reality. The revival of the ancient Hebrew language in the late 19th Century demonstrated the dependence of language on outward reality. Those who wanted to use Hebrew had to innovate an enormous number of words in order to describe the new objects that did not confront the ancient Hebrew speakers. On the other hand, those objects that existed 2000 years ago could be referred to by the same words. Ancient Hebrew could not by itself provide a sufficient image of modern reality for modern users.

Framework-Policy Making Best Methodology

#### Debates over method are counter-productive for the left—focus on abstract state power is totalizing, prefer specific applications of power like the 1ac evidence

Rose-Redwood, 2006

[Reuben, Dept. of Geography @ Penn. State Univ. “Governmentaity, geography, and the geo-coded world.” Progress in human geography, 30.4, 2006, 469-486, Accessed online] /WFI-MB

In his analysis, Raco often treats ‘government’ and ‘the state’ as synonymous terms. Raco (2003: 76) criticizes governmentality scholars for overemphasizing the coherence and totalizing nature of governmental (state?) programs, and he calls for a more dialectical analysis of governmentality. ‘There has been a tendency’, he maintains, ‘to neglect the extent to which programmes of government are internalized and translated by target communities’ (Raco, 2003: 91). He goes on to argue that ‘in practice government agendas are far from totalizing. They are contradictory, contested and influenced by the actions of subjects who respond to government agendas in a variety of ways’ (Raco, 2003: 91). While adopting what he refers to as a ‘Foucauldian, governmentalist’ approach, 476 Governmentality, geography, and the geo-coded world Raco (2003: 77) stresses the need to shift the methodological focus away from ‘abstract theorizations’ and towards ‘the empirical practices of government’.

Impact Turn-Scenario Planning

#### Scenario planning is good. In a catastrophe-ridden world—it’s vital to make predictions about the future.

Kurasawa, 2004

[Fuyuki, Professor of Sociology at York University, “Cautionary Tales: The Global Culture of Prevention

and the Work of Foresight.” 2004, Constellations, Vol. 11, No. 4]

Independently of this room for maneuver and the chances of success. Humanitarian, environmental, and techno-scientific activists have convincingly shown that we cannot afford not to engage in preventive labor. contractualist justification, global civil society actors are putting forth a number of arguments countering temporal myopia on rational grounds. They make the case that no generation, and no part of the world, is immune from catastrophe. Complacency and parochialism are deeply flawed in that even if we earn a temporary reprieve, our children and grandchildren will likely not be so fortunate unless steps are taken today. Similarly, though it might be possible to minimize or contain the risks and harms of actions to faraway places over the short-term, parrying the eventual blowback or spillover effect is improbable. In fact, as I argued in the previous section, all but the smallest and most isolated of crises are rapidly becoming globalized due to the existence of transnational circuits of ideas, images, people, and commodities. Regardless of where they live, our descendants will increasingly be subjected to the impact of environmental degradation, the spread of epidemics, gross North-South socioeconomic inequalities, refugee flows, civil wars, and genocides. What may have previously appeared to be temporally and spatially remote risks are ‘coming home to roost’ in ever faster cycles. In a word, then, procrastination makes little sense for three principal reasons: it exponentially raises the costs of eventual future action; it reduces preventive options; and it erodes their effectiveness. With the foreclosing of long-range alternatives, later generations may be left with a single course of action, namely, that of merely reacting to large-scale emergencies as they arise. We need only think of how it gradually becomes more difficult to control climate change, let alone reverse it, or to halt mass atrocities once they are underway. Preventive foresight is grounded in the opposite logic, whereby the decision to work through perils today greatly enhances both the subsequent Moreover, I would contend that farsighted cosmopolitanism is not as remote or idealistic a prospect as it appears to some, for as Falk writes, “[g]lobal justice between temporal communities, however, actually seems to be increasing, as evidenced by various expressions of greater sensitivity to past injustices and future dangers.”36 Global civil society may well be helping a new generational self-conception take root, according to which we view ourselves as the provisional caretakers of our planetary commons. Out of our sense of responsibility for the well-being of those who will follow us, we come to be more concerned about the here and now.

Impact Turn- Consequentialism

#### Consequentialism is key to ethical decision making, because it ensures beings are treated as equal—any other approach to ethics is arbitrary because it considers one’s preferences as more important than others

Lillehammer, 2011

[Hallvard, Faculty of Philosophy Cambridge University, “Consequentialism and global ethics.” Forthcoming in M. Boylan, Ed., Global Morality and Justice: A Reader, Westview Press, Online, <http://www.phil.cam.ac.uk/teaching_staff/lillehammer/Consequentialism_and_Global_Ethics-1-2.pdf>] /Wyo-MB

Contemporary discussions of consequentialism and global ethics have been marked by a focus on examples such as that of the shallow pond. In this literature, distinctions are drawn and analogies made between different cases about which both the consequentialist and his or her interlocutor are assumed to have a more or less firm view. One assumption in this literature is that progress can be made by making judgements about simple actual or counterfactual examples, and then employing a principle of equity to the effect that like cases be treated alike, in order to work out what to think about more complex actual cases. It is only fair to say that in practice such attempts to rely only on judgements about simple cases have a tendency to produce trenchant stand-offs. It is important to remember, therefore, that for some consequentialists the appeal to simple cases is neither the only, nor the most basic, ground for their criticism of the ethical status quo. For some of the historically most prominent consequentialists the evidential status of judgements about simple cases depends on their derivability from basic ethical principles (plus knowledge of the relevant facts). Thus, in The Methods of Ethics, Henry Sidgwick argues that ethical thought is grounded in a small number of self-evident axioms of practical reason. The first of these is that we ought to promote our own good. The second is that the good of any one individual is objectively of no more importance than the good of any other (or, in Sidgwick’s notorious metaphor, no individual’s good is more important ‘from the point of view of the Universe’ than that of any other). The third is that we ought to treat like cases alike. Taken together, Sidgwick takes these axioms to imply a form of consequentialism. We ought to promote our own good. Yet since our own good is objectively no more important than the good of anyone else, we ought to promote the good of others as well. And in order to treat like cases alike, we have to weigh our own good against the good of others impartially, all other things being equal. iv It follows that the rightness of our actions is fixed by what is best for the entire universe of ethically relevant beings. To claim otherwise is to claim for oneself and one’s preferences a special status they do not possess. When understood along these lines, consequentialism is by definition a global ethics: the good of everyone should count for everyone, no matter their identity, location, or personal and social attachments, now or hereafter. v Some version of this view is also accepted by a number of contemporary consequentialists, including Peter Singer, who writes that it is ‘preferable to proceed as Sidgwick did: search for undeniable fundamental axioms, [and] build up a moral theory from them’ (Singer 1974, 517; Singer 1981). For these philosophers the question of our ethical duties to others is not only a matter of our responses to cases like the shallow pond. It is also a matter of whether these responses cohere with an ethics based on first principles. If you are to reject the consequentialist challenge, therefore, you will have to show what is wrong with those principles.

Impact Turn-Biopower

#### The liberal state solves all their violence and oppression impacts

Dickinson, Prof @ University of Cincinnati, 2K4 (Edward Ross, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse About “Modernity,” Central European History, vol. 37, no. 1, March)

In short, the continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time are unmistakasble. Both are instances of the “disciplinary society” and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different strategic and local dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes. Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism. Above all, again, it has nowhere developed the fateful, radicalizing dynamic that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic that leads from economistic population management to mass murder. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies. In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce “health,” such a system can —and historically does— create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, there are political and policy potentials and constraints in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of self-direction and participation that is functionally incompatible with authoritarian or totalitarian structures. And this pursuit of biopolitical ends through a regime of democratic citizenship does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies, and to have generated a “logic” or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.90 Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of “liberty,” just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics, the only end point of the logic of social engineering. This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not “opposites,” in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept “power” should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively “the same.” Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, “tactically polyvalent.” Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create “multiple modernities,” modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.

Impact Turn- Management

#### Turn- it is the lack of planning and downsizing of management that hurts the effectiveness of the transportation system—renewed interest is key

Ankner, 2005

[William, PhD is the Executive Director of the Missouri Transportation Institute, Professor of Management at the University of Missouri Rolla and founder of Transportation Solutions, “Revisiting transportation planning.” Public works and management policy, Vol. 9, No. 4, 270-277, Accessed online via sage journals] /WFI-MB

The overall transportation plan becomes the strategic investment and operational plan. It provides the reason or reasons for system investments, the type or types of systems, the data and support for the system investments, the political and social justification for the investments because the investments are tied to the customer purpose in the market shed, and the performance basis expected. The financial allocation of resources then is made against investments that are less politically driven and more performance driven. From this investment plan, one then creates the capital program of projects. To successfully do this, we also need to remove the financial shackles of federal funding silos to allow for funding transportation systems. We need to level the playing field in federal regulations between transit and highways so that the needs, as opposed to the process, drive the transportation decisions. We need to encourage a federal process that considers the best transportation investments, irrespective of mode. Conclusion Transportation planning as it is being practiced today is not making the grade. The narrow project and modal focus have resulted in significant financial and social costs. The inability to understand trip purposes has resulted in unnecessary inefficiencies and disruptions. Even when corridor analysis is undertaken, the analysis focuses on projects in the corridor and single-mode activity. Most corridor analyses do not consider the broad range of purposes for trips. Our transportation infrastructure is one of the more costly investments the public and private sectors can make. The dollar investments for the existing transportation system needs and the growth demands far outpace our current modal financial capacity. We need to be smarter and better in our transportation investment decisions. To accomplish that, we must rethink transportation planning. We cannot afford the luxury of modal competition, the lack of modal connections, the insensitivity to communities, and the lack of transportation management. But most of all, we can no longer remain intolerant of our customers’ purposes for transportation. We need to understand the dynamics of the market and its relationship to fundamental economic and social goals and the opportunities that technology can provide to better plan our transportation system. By focusing transportation on the purpose of trips and by using market sheds and corridors, the transportation community receives an extra bonus of understanding the economic, social, and environmental issues in the corridor early on and engaging the various communities early on. This will allow project planning to better address the potential issues and costs early and better justify their project or recognize that there might be better solutions. Unfortunately, most DOTs and transit properties are embarked on downsizing their planning departments to reduce operating costs. They compensate for this by contracting out the planning. The most available funding is tied to projects; it is not unusual for the majority of planning efforts to be project focused and modal. Thus, we perpetuate the problem. We need to reinvigorate our planning with a new direction and develop a new paradigm where transportation is planned and designed to meet market purposes within market sheds and a transportation system. We need a process that is accountable, with understandable measures. We need to rethink transportation planning in terms of the purposes for mobility, transportation’s role within a larger societal framework, and transportation as a system and not as specific modes with their own funding sources. We also need to level the federal playing field between the modes. Transit investments versus highway investments will fare poorly as long as major transit investments require more federal hoops, more local match, and have more uncertainty in funding than highways.

Impact Turn- Urban Sprawl

#### Public policy discussion of transportation investment is key—the alternative causes sprawl which is worse—causes unsustainable land use

Carvero, 2009

[Robert, “Infrastructure and Development: planning matters.” Planning Advisory Service Report 557 (Jul 2009): 41-V, Accessed online via proquest] /WFI-MB

One of my concerns is that if we blindly invest in new transportation infrastructure, without effective land-use planning, it will further flatten the density gradients and spin off growth to the exurban fringes. For example, if we proceed with President Obama's vision of aggressively investing in high-speed rail, such as in the Central Valley of California, and we site stations on the periphery of cities surrounded by parking lots, we know what will unfold. High-speed rail will induce further sprawl. If land use is simply an afterthought to any kind of regional infrastructure investment, history shows that the added infrastructure will be a force toward more decentralized growth, which in America equates to sprawl. Such infrastructure simply adds a new layer of accessibility to far-flung places, which, absent regulatory controls, unleashes new layers of sprawl. More important, transportation investment without coordinated land-use planning cannot meet the accessibility, mobility, and quality-of-life goals that many persons seek in our urban areas. Consider the example of Los Angeles.

#### Sprawl causes extinction—it reduces the photosynthesis capacity of the planet which destroys food production

Chandler, 2000

[Lynn, Goddard Space Flight Center, “Urban sprawl reduces annual photosynthetic production.” 2-21-2000, Online, <http://eugen.leitl.org/tt/msg01715.html>] /WFI-MB

According to Imhoff's research, urbanization and industrialization have resulted in the development of mega-cities and urban and suburban sprawl. The environment is altered as a result of replacing land cover with roads, housing, and commercial and industrial structures. "Human survival depends on the ability of the landscape to produce food," said Imhoff. "Food production can be fundamentally linked to primary production or photosynthesis. If the capacity of the landscape to carryout photosynthesis is substantially reduced -- then the ability of the planet to support human life must also be diminished." Imhoff said data from the mid-1990's from two different satellite systems were combined with land cover maps and census information on population and housing to study the effect of urbanization on photosynthetic production in the United States. Nighttime images from a Department of Defense satellite, which show a dramatic picture of Earth's city lights, were used to determine which areas and how much land have been converted to urban, suburban, or industrial use. Maps showing urban, peri-urban (suburban), and non-urbanized areas were created from the "city-lights" satellite data. "Using a computer, we combined the city-lights satellite data with another type of satellite data that records a measure of 'greenness' or photosynthetic potential of the landscape over the course of an entire year," Imhoff said. "By merging the satellite data we could examine how urbanization affects the potential of the land surface to carryout photosynthesis by looking at the 'greenness' index inside and outside the urbanized areas for the whole continental United States." Results show that urbanization can have a measurable but variable impact on photosynthetic productivity. Annual photosynthetic productivity can be reduced by as much as 20 days in areas where housing and commercial land use is very dense. "However, we also found that in resource limited regions, human activity can increase productivity by altering the environment," he said. "For example, this was the case for arid and semi-arid areas where lawn irrigation and planting changed the ecosystems from shrub lands and desert to deciduous forests." A most interesting finding according to Imhoff was that urbanization seems to elongate the growing season, yet still reduces the overall productivity of the land. "Vegetation greens up earlier in the spring and takes longer to senesce in the fall, but has lower peak season productivity than similar nearby areas that are not urbanized," he said. "This could be demonstrating a profound urban heat island effect and have implications in climate change, especially in the northern Hemisphere where urban development is most intense." Analysis of the data also found clear evidence that human beings definitely tend to locate themselves on the most productive land and that those lands are being transformed into less productive types. "The results of this study should increase our awareness of the importance of land use planning especially in the context of sustainable growth and development," Imhoff stated. "Human survival depends on photosynthesis. If urbanization and industrialization continue, the capacity of the landscape to carry out photosynthesis is substantially reduced. "

Impact Turn-Terrorism

#### Terrorist attacks against infrastructure are inevitable—they are a high priority target due to their damage to society as a whole

Zeng et al, 2007

[Daniel Zeng, Univ. of Arizona and Chinese Academy of Sciences, Sudarshan S. Chawathe, University of Maine, Hua Huang, Xi’an Jiaotong University, Fei-Yue Wang, Chinese Academy of Sciences, “Protecting transportation infrastructure.” IEEE Intelligent Systems, Sept/Oct 2007, Accessed online via IEEE xplore] /WFI-MB

In the context of homeland security, critical infrastructures are “those physical and information technology facilities, networks, services and assets which, if disrupted or destroyed, would have a serious impact on the health, safety, security, or economic well-being of citizens or the effective functioning of governments.” 1 Transportation infrastructures are a key component of a nation’s critical infrastructures, covering physical assets such as airports, ports, and railway and mass transit networks as well as software systems such as traffic control systems. In effect, among various critical infrastructures spanning a range of economic sectors and government operations, 2 transportation is widely viewed as one of the most significant and impactful. A 2002 study concerning the significance of infrastructure components and the consequences of a destructive event rated transportation as “extremely significant.” 3 Other components at this highest level of significance were communications, power, emergency response personnel and assets, and national security resources. Transportation infrastructures are frequent targets of terrorist attacks because of their significance in several dimensions. Because physical transportation networks attract large numbers of people, they’re high-value targets for terrorists intending to inflict heavy casualties. Transportation infrastructures themselves are important to the modern economy, and related damages and destruction can have quick ripple effects. Operationally, transportation systems interact with and provide support for other systems, such as emergency response and public health, in complex ways. Terrorists can perceive an attack on such a link (that is, one that connects many systems) as an efficient means to create confusion, counter the countermeasures, and damage the targeted society as a whole. Furthermore, transportation infrastructures can be both the means and the end of an attack, making them a critical part of almost all terrorist attacks in the physical world.

#### Only effective management of transportation infrastructure like aff—can counter terrorism

Zeng et al, 2007

[Daniel Zeng, Univ. of Arizona and Chinese Academy of Sciences, Sudarshan S. Chawathe, University of Maine, Hua Huang, Xi’an Jiaotong University, Fei-Yue Wang, Chinese Academy of Sciences, “Protecting transportation infrastructure.” IEEE Intelligent Systems, Sept/Oct 2007, Accessed online via IEEE xplore] /WFI-MB

Effective information sharing across data sets and system boundaries, the ability to fuse information and data from sources that provide (partially) overlapping and complementary coverage, and efficient, secure data management have long been identified as key drivers of effective intelligence and homeland security-related information systems. 8 Information systems for protecting transportation infrastructure share the same design objectives. To support counterterrorism efforts such as preparing, detecting, and responding to terrorism events, large amounts of information in different modalities from many sources must be acquired, integrated, and interpreted in the right context, often in real time. 2 In addition, a critical need exists for a data-management infrastructure that can support information flows across jurisdictional and organizational boundaries (for example, intelligence, law enforcement, and emergency response communities). Despite existing efforts, researchers and practitioners must still make significant progress in this area from both technical and policy perspectives, with careful attention to laws and regulations, privacy considerations, and civil rights.

#### The US would retaliate after a catastrophic terrorist attack and that causes extinction

Morgan 9

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus – South Korea (Dennis, Futures, November, “World on fire: two scenarios of the destruction of human civilization and possible extinction of the human race,” Science Direct), accessed 9-16-2011,WYO/JF

In a remarkable website on nuclear war, Carol Moore asks the question “Is Nuclear War Inevitable??” In Section , Moore points out what most terrorists obviously already know about the nuclear tensions between powerful countries. No doubt, they’ve figured out that the best way to escalate these tensions into nuclear war is to set off a nuclear exchange. As Moore points out, all that militant terrorists would have to do is get their hands on one small nuclear bomb and explode it on either Moscow or Israel. Because of the Russian “dead hand” system, “where regional nuclear commanders would be given full powers should Moscow be destroyed,” it is likely that any attack would be blamed on the United States” Israeli leaders and Zionist supporters have, likewise, stated for years that if Israel were to suffer a nuclear attack, whether from terrorists or a nation state, it would retaliate with the suicidal “Samson option” against all major Muslim cities in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Israeli Samson option would also include attacks on Russia and even “anti-Semitic” European cities In that case, of course, Russia would retaliate, and the U.S. would then retaliate against Russia. China would probably be involved as well, as thousands, if not tens of thousands, of nuclear warheads, many of them much more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would rain upon most of the major cities in the Northern Hemisphere. Afterwards, for years to come, massive radioactive clouds would drift throughout the Earth in the nuclear fallout, bringing death or else radiation disease that would be genetically transmitted to future generations in a nuclear winter that could last as long as a 100 years, taking a savage toll upon the environment and fragile ecosphere as well. And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or “lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of a few minutes, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a rapid escalation of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually less probable since each country would act under the “use them or lose them” strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to “win” the war. In other words, once Pandora's Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be the signal for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, “everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek self-determination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors” In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely that many, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter.

Impact Turn-Environmental Managerialism

The Alternative abandonment of environmental management excuses unlimited ecological destruction

Barry 99 – Politics Lecturer @ Keele

John, Politics Lecturer at Keele University, RETHINKING GREEN POLITICS: NATURE, VIRTUE AND PROGRESS, p. 101-102

In Chapter 3, I argued that the ecological niche for humans is created rather than naturally given and that a humanized or transformed environment is our natural habitat. The collective management, manipulation and intentional transformation of the environment are thus universal features of all human societies. As a universal requirement they are, in a sense, pre-political. It is *how* human socieities create their humanized ecological niches, the various insititutional mechanisms used to maintain a stable metabolism between the social and the natural system , that raise moot political and moral question. In this chapter, collective ecological management is presented as an institutional form regulating this metabolism based on green values and principles. This idea of active ecological management cuts across the deep – shallow, radical – reformist continuum within green theory. What conceptions of green political theory differ over are the scale, type, institutional structure and normative side-constraints operative upon social-environmental metabolic states, not the necessity for environmental management and transformation. For example, even deep ecologists, for whom a pre-emptive hands-off-cum-nature-knows-best position constitutes a central principle, accept that preserving wilderness requires active social, and particularly institutional, intervention. In other words, preservation from development, as much as conservation for (future) development or ecological restoration, all take place within the broad framework of ecological restoration, all take place within the broad framework of ecological management. The deep ecology ideal of wilderness preservation, the preservation of the non-human world from a certain type of collective human transformation (in the form of development), paradoxically necessitates another form of human management. In the form of institutional structures, practices, etc. which function as a form of social governance to limit and/or transform development, such that wilderness is preserved. What appears as non-management at one level is at another level simple another form of management. Walking lighter on the earth is as much a form of ecological management as economic development. The political and normative issue is that collective purposive-transformative interaction with the environment can simply be more or less extensive, have a different character or be more or less sustainable.

**Environmental Management is inevitable- it’s only a question of what kind of intervention is used. Past interventions will result in extinction unless actively reversed**

Levy 99- PhD @ Centre for Critical Theory at Monash

Neil, “Discourses of the Environment,” ed: Eric Darier, p. 215

If the ‘technological fix’ is unlikely to be more successful than strategies of limitation of our use of resources, we are, nevertheless unable simply to leave the environment as it is. There is a real and pressing need for space, and more accurate, technical and scientific information about the non-human world. For we are faced with a situation in which the processes we have already set in train will continue to impact upon that world, and therefore us for centuries. It is therefore necessary, not only to stop cutting down the rain forests, but to develop real, concrete proposals for action, to reverse or at least limit the effects of our previous interventions. Moreover, there is another reason why our behavior towards the non-human cannot simply be a matter of leaving it as it is, at least in so far as our goals are not only environmental but also involve social justice. For if we simply preserve what remains to us of wilderness, of the countryside and of park land, we also preserve patterns of very unequal access to their resources and their consolations (Soper 1995: 207).in fact, we risk exacerbating these inequalities. It is not us, but the poor of Brazil, who will bear the brunt of the misery which would result from a strictly enforced policy of leaving the Amazonian rain forest untouched, in the absence of alternative means of providing for their livelihood. It is the development of policies to provide such ecologically sustainable alternatives which we require, as well as the development of technical means for replacing our current greenhouse gas-emitting sources of energy. Such policies and proposals for concrete action must be formulated by ecologists, environmentalists, people with expertise concerning the functioning of ecosystems and the impact which our actions have upon them. Such proposals are, therefore, very much the province of Foucault’s specific intellectual, the one who works ‘within specific sectors, at the precise points where their own conditions of life or work situate them’ (Foucault 1980g: 126). For who could be more fittingly described as ‘the strategists of life and death’ than these environmentalists? After the end of the Cold War, it is in this sphere, more than any other, that man’s ‘politics places his existence as a living being in question’ (Foucault 1976: 143). For it is in facing the consequences of our intervention in the non-human world that the hate of our species, and of those with whom we share this planet, will be decided?

**Anti-management results in mass extinctions**

Soule 95 - Professor of Environmental Studies

Michael E., Professor and Chair of Environmental Studies, UC-Santa Cruz, REINVITING NATURE? RESPONSES TO POSTMODERN DECONSTRUCTION, Eds: Michael E. Soule and Gary Lease, p. 159-160

Should We Actively Manage Wildlands and Wild Waters? The decision has already been made in most places. Some of the ecological myths discussed here contain, either explicitly or implicitly, the idea that nature is self-regulating and capable of caring for itself. This notion leads to the theory of management known as benign neglect – nature will do fine, thank you, if human beings just leave it alone. Indeed, a century ago, a hands-off policy was the best policy. Now it is not. Given natures`s current fragmented and stressed condition, neglect will result in an accelerating spiral of deterioration. Once people create large gaps in forests, isolate and disturb habitats, pollute, overexploit, and introduce species from other continents, the viability of many ecosystems and native species is compromised, resiliency dissipates, and diversity can collapse. When artificial disturbance reaches a certain threshold, even small changes can produce large effects, and these will be compounded by climate change. For example, a storm that would be considered normal and beneficial may, following widespread clearcutting, cause disastrous blow-downs, landslides, and erosion. If global warming occurs, tropical storms are predicted to have greater force than now. Homeostasis, balance, and Gaia are dangerous models when applied at the wrong spatial and temporal scales. Even fifty years ago, neglect might have been the best medicine, but that was a world with a lot more big, unhumanized, connected spaces, a world with one-third the number of people, and a world largely unaffected by chain saws, bulldozers, pesticides, and exotic, weedy species. The alternative to neglect is active caring – in today`s parlance, an affirmative approach to wildlands: to maintain and restore them, to become stewards, accepting all the domineering baggage that word carries. Until humans are able to control their numbers and their technologies, management is the only viable alternative to massive attrition of living nature. But management activities are variable in intensity, something that antimanagement purists ignore. In general, the greater the disturbance and the smaller the habitat remnant, the more intense the management must be. So if we must manage, where do we look for ethical guidance?