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## Inherency

**New system in New Orleans solves Hurricanes now**

**NYT 6/15** John Schwartz / The New York Times Corps' $14.5 billion 'wall' now shields New Orleans June 15, 2012 12:24 am http://www.post-gazette.com/stories/news/us/corps-145-billion-wall-now-shields-new-orleans-640440/#ixzz1zHjKR9Zs

NEW ORLEANS -- Finally, there is a wall around this city. Nearly seven years after floodwaters from Hurricane Katrina gushed over New Orleans, $14.5 billion worth of civil works designed to block such surges is now in place -- a 133-mile chain of levees, flood walls, gates and pumps too vast to take in at once, except perhaps from space. Individual components of the system can be appreciated from a less-celestial elevation. At the new Seabrook floodgate complex, climb up three steep ladders, open a trap door and step out into the blazing sunlight atop a 54-foot tower that was not here just two years ago. From there, one looks out over a $165 million barrier across the shipping canal that links Lake Pontchartrain, the Mississippi River and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. Two "lift gates," 50 feet across, can be lowered to block Lake Pontchartrain's waters. A navigation gate 95 feet wide, whose curved sides weigh 220 tons each, can be swung gently but mightily into place. When open -- which will be most of the time -- the gates allow easy boat traffic. But when a storm threatens, they will seal off the canal from the kind of surge that devastated the Lower Ninth Ward in Katrina. Yet all that seems puny in comparison to the two-mile "Great Wall" that can seal off the channel from Lake Borgne to the east, or the billion-dollar west closure complex, which features the biggest pumping station on the planet. Hurricane season has returned, as it does each June. Whatever storms might approach New Orleans this year or in the future will encounter a vastly upgraded ring of protection. The question is, will it be enough? When Katrina hit New Orleans in 2005, the city's hurricane protection system became a symbol of America's haphazard approach to critical infrastructure. The patchwork of walls and levees built over the course of 40 years was still far from complete when the storm came, and even the Army Corps of Engineers admitted that this was "a system in name only." Flood walls collapsed, and earthen levees built from sandy, dredged soils melted away. What has emerged since could come to symbolize the opposite: a vast civil works project that gives every appearance of strength and permanence. No other U.S. city has anything like it. "This is the best system the greater New Orleans area has ever had," said Col. Edward R. Fleming, commander of the New Orleans district of the corps.

**New system in New Orleans stops another Katrina now**

**HSNW 1/10** Homeland Security News Wire Flood defense New Orleans flood defense system nears completion Published 10 January 2012 http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/dr20120110-new-orleans-flood-defense-system-nears-completion

The Army Corps of Engineers is rapidly nearing the completion of its upgrades to the massive levee and flood defense system designed to protect the greater New Orleans area from another Hurricane Katrina. Late last year the Corps estimated that the $14.6 billion project was more than 97 percent complete and expected to finish the project by the end of June 2012. The new 133-mile flood defense system that now rings the New Orleans area has been a massive endeavor setting many records for the Corps, the United States, and the world. For instance the 1.8-mile canal surge barrier along Lake Borgne is the largest design-build project in the history of the Army Corps of Engineers, while the barrier itself is the largest of its kind in the world with a wall twenty-eight feet above the water line and three gated structures. In addition, the project’s West Closure Complex features the world’s largest drainage pump station in the world and the largest sector gate in the United States. “The system doesn’t resemble what was here before Hurricane Katrina in terms of the level or risk reduction provided,” said Michael F. Park, the head of Task Force Hope in Louisiana, part of the Corps of Engineers’ Mississippi Valley Division. According to Park a significant amount of research went into designing the new flood protection system which is aimed at preventing storm surges from overtaking the 133-mile perimeter and pumping out any water that exceeds it. “The corps did undertake a very thorough hydraulic analysis to determine what would be the potential storm surge at every point around the perimeter,” Park said. Researchers began by modeling more than 150 storms based on history as well as theory ranging from a twenty-five year event to a 5,000-year event. “We’ve also factored in the subsidence that we’ve experienced in the southern Louisiana region and also the effects of climate change and sea level rise so that hard features are designed to be valid through 2057,” Park said. With the new flood defenses, Park is optimistic that the city will now be able to withstand a storm similar to Hurricane Katrina. “We should fare quite nicely in terms of flood risk reduction,” he said.

**Status quo solves – Gustav proves**

**Sanchez et al. 09** [Thomas W. Sanchez, expert on transportation, land use, urban and regional planning, and environmental justice, John L. Renne, Associate Professor of Planning and Urban Studies at the University of New Orleans, Pam Jenkins, University of New Orleans, and Robert Peterson] Challenge of Evacuating the Carless in Five Major U.S. Cities Identifying the Key Issues http://planning.uno.edu/docs/The%20Challenge%20of%20Evacuation%20the%20Carless.pdf

In September 2008, 3 years of evacuation planning since Katrina were put to the test in New Orleans when the region evacuated for Hurricane Gustav. Although the data have yet to be fully analyzed, most felt that the city-assisted evacuation plan, which addressed carless and special needs populations, was implemented with amazing success in New Orleans. Outreach was a focus of government officials, which led to high participation rates resulting from collaboration across agencies and jurisdictions.

**New Orleans has adequate mass transit.**

**Johnston and Nee 2006 –** Department of City and Regional Planning (Eliza and Brendan “A Methodology for Modeling Evacuation in New Orleans” May 2006, http://blog.bn.ee/wp-content/uploads/2006/10/New\_Orleans\_Evacuation.pdf , maps and diagrams omitted

)//ALo

Mode/Route Assumptions Evacuation of New Orleans during Katrina was done almost completely using the road network, and primarily by private vehicle. However, New Orleans has extensive rail infrastructure, including separate bridges over the east and west ends of Lake Pontchartrain. Also, busses could be used more efficiently if they were allowed to make multiple trips into the city, and if their speeds were increased. Bus Transit Evacuation Modeling The Mardi Gras Index reported that at the time Katrina hit, there were 150,000 residents of New Orleans living in car-less households. Additionally, there are a large number of tourists in New Orleans at any given time, and also a number of individuals with cars who are not able to evacuate due to financial constraints. This population could be evacuated by a large-scale bus evacuation. With the numbers needing evacuation so high, an evacuation scheme that did not send each bus on multiple trips would require an enormous amount of busses. Thus, the key to a bus based evacuation is to minimize the delay and the distance that each bus must travel, and maximize the number of trips each bus can take into and out of the city in a given evacuation time period. New Orleans has 33,000 hotel rooms and 9000 rental cars. However, many tourists have their own cars or rent cars and thus have the ability to self evacuate. Assuming 1.5 persons per hotel room, 60% occupancy and that 50% drive their own car, 11,200 tourists will require evacuation. A survey by the Gulf Coast Reconstruction Watch of the 270,000 people living in shelters during Hurricane Katrina found that 23% in shelters were physically unable to evacuate while an additional 55% were from car-less households. Thus, there are 59,000 and 150,000 from each group respectively. This leaves a total of 262,300 evacuees, when prison and hospital populations are included. The prison, hospital and physically disabled populations will be dealt with in the next section detailing a rail-based evacuation. When these special populations are removed, 182,000 people remain to be evacuated via bus. New Orleans has an existing fleet of busses. The school district of New Orleans has 324 school busses and the transit agency has 364 busses (Infrastructure Final, 2006). The average bus capacity is 72-52 passengers, however the lower-end was used as a conservative capacity assumption. To maximize the number of trips each bus can make, the inbound lanes on the Lake Pontchartrain Causeway will be utilized. One will be converted to outbound busses and emergency vehicles only, while one remain open to inbound traffic. This should allow busses to bypass the severe congestion that will occur at every bottleneck leaving the city. Each bus will pick up passengers at designated pick up locations and shuttle them across the causeway to transshipment points in safe areas, approximately 60 miles away. The process for locating these shelters is discussed later in the paper. If 100 busses per hour both inbound and outbound use the dedicated busway, average speeds for the entire journey could be 30 miles per hour. This includes the congested segment within the city of New Orleans, the relatively quick segment across the causeway, and another congested segment to the designated transshipment points. This will allow busses to make the 120 mile round trip in 5 hours, with one hour for loading and unloading. 3,500 busloads of people will need to be evacuated. However, the **evacuation is possible given New Orleans current fleet of 688 busses.**  If each bus makes the round trip in 5 hours, the total evacuation time will be 26 hours, with most busses taking 5 trips. This is a very feasible solution to evacuating huge numbers of people, but it relies advanced planning and coordination to open up the dedicated bus lanes across the causeway, assemble car-less households at convenient pickup points around the city, and obtaining enough divers to operate almost 18,000 vehicle-hours of bus operations.

## Biopower Defense

**Biopolitics creates a better life- benefits outweigh the costs**

**Dickison**, **2004** - associate professor of history at UC Davis (Edward Ross, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about "Modernity””, accessed from JSTOR on 7/4/12)//BZ

It is striking, then, that the new model of German modernity is even more relentlessly negative than the old Sonderweg model. In that older model, pre­modern elites were constantly triumphing over the democratic opposition. But at least there was an opposition; and in the long run, time was on the side of that opposition, which in fact embodied the historical movement of modern­ization. In the new model, there is virtually a biopolitical consensus.[[1]](#footnote-1) And that consensus is almost always fundamentally a nasty, oppressive thing, one that par­takes in crucial ways of the essential quality of National Socialism. Everywhere biopolitics is intrusive, technocratic, top-down, constraining, limiting. Biopolitics is almost never conceived of— or at least discussed in any detail — as creating possibilities for people, as expanding the range of their choices, as empowering them, or indeed as doing anything positive for them at all. Of course, at the most simple-minded level, it seems to me that an assessment of the potentials of modernity that ignores the ways in which biopolitics has made life tangibly better is somehow deeply flawed. To give just one example, infant mortality in Germany in 1900 was just over 20 percent; or, in other words, one in five children died before reaching the age of one year. By 1913, it was 15 percent; and by 1929 (when average real purchasing power was not significantly higher than in 1913) it was only 9.7 percent.[[2]](#footnote-2) The expansion of infant health programs — an enormously ambitious, bureaucratic, medicalizing, and sometimes intrusive, social engineering project — had a great deal to do with that change. It would be bizarre to write a history of biopolitical moder­nity that ruled out an appreciation for how absolutely wonderful and astonish­ing this achievement — and any number of others like it — really was. There was a reason for the “Machbarkeitswahn” of the early twentieth century: many marvelous things were in fact becoming machbar. In that sense, it is not really accurate to call it a “ Wahn” (delusion, craziness) at all; nor is it accurate to focus only on the “inevitable” frustration of “delusions” of power. Even in the late 1920s, many social engineers could and did look with great satisfaction on the changes they genuinely had the power to accomplish.

**Biopolitics creates strong government through citizen benefits- key to democracy and freedom**

**Dickison, 2004** - associate professor of history at UC Davis (Edward Ross, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about "Modernity””, accessed from JSTOR on 7/4/12)//BZ

Nor should we stop at a reexamination of knowledge and technology. It might make sense, too, to reexamine the process of institution-building, the elaboration of the practices and institutions of biopolitics. No doubt the cre­ation of public and private social welfare institutions created instruments for the study, manipulation, or control of individuals and groups. But it also generated opportunities for self-organization and participation by social groups of all kinds. Grossmann s birth control movement was but one instance of the explo­sive growth of the universe of associational life in the field of biopolitics, which itself was only one small part of a much broader development: the self-creation of a new, urban industrial social order, the creation of a self-government of soci­ety through myriad nongovernmental organizations. In these organizations, cit­izens were acting to shape their own lives in ways that were often fundamentally important as part of lived experience — of the “life world.” Of course there was nothing inherently democratic about these organizations or their social func­tions — many were authoritarian in structure, many cultivated a tendentially elitist culture of expertise, and some pursued exclusionary and discriminatory agendas. Nevertheless, they institutionalized pluralism, solicited participation, enforced public debate, and effectively sabotaged simple authoritarian govern­ment. Again, National Socialist totalitarianism was in part a response precisely to the failure of political, social, and cultural elites to contain and control this proliferation of voices, interests, and influence groups.[[3]](#footnote-3) Private organizations, further, were not the only ones that helped to build habits and structures of participation. The German state deliberately recruited citizens and nongovernmental organizations to help it formulate and implement welfare policy. It had to, for no state could possibly mobilize the resources nec­essary for such a gigantic task. And of course often the policy initiative came from the other direction — from private organizations engaged in elaborating biopolitical discourses of various kinds, and working to mobilize the authority and resources of the state to achieve the ends they defined for themselves. That was an intended consequence of the creation of a democratic republic. As S. N. Eisenstadt wrote in 2000, an important part of the project of modernity was “a very strong emphasis on the autonomous participation of members of society in the constitution of the social and political order.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Again, the massive, state- orchestrated mobilization of the German population in the Nazi period or in the German Democratic Republic (not least in welfare organizations) should remind us that such mobilization is not necessarily democratic in nature; this is a point made amply for the Weimar period too by, for example, Peter Fritzsche.[[5]](#footnote-5) But obviously, it *could* be, and in fact, before 1933 and after 1949 in the Federal Republic of Germany, very often was. One answer might be to argue — as Michael Schwartz and Peter Fritzsche have suggested — that regimes that arise for reasons having little to do with this aspect of modernity “choose” their biopolitics to suit their needs and princi­ples. Victoria de Grazia, for example, has suggested that differing class coalitions determine regime forms, and that regime forms determine the “shape” of biopolitics.[[6]](#footnote-6) This is obviously not the approach that has predominated in the literature on Germany, however, which has explored in great depth the positive contribution that modern biopolitics made to the construction of National Socialism. This approach may well exaggerate the importance of biopolitics; but, in purely heuristic terms, it has been extremely fruitful. I want to suggest that it might be equally fruitful to stand it on its head, so to speak. One could easily conclude from this literature that modern biopolitics “fits” primarily authoritarian, totalitarian, technocratic, or otherwise undemocratic regimes, and that democracy has prevailed in Europe in the teeth of the development of technocratic biopolitics. Again, however, the history of twentieth-century Germany, including the five decades after World War II, suggests that this is a fundamentally implausible idea. A more productive conclusion might be that we need to begin to work out the extent and nature of the positive contribu­tion biopolitics has made to the construction *also* of democratic regimes. Why was Europe’s twentieth century, in addition to being the age of biopol­itics and totalitarianism, also the age of biopolitics and *democracy*? How should we theorize *this* relationship? I would like to offer five propositions as food for thought. First, again, the concept of the essential legitimacy and social value of indi­vidual needs, and hence the imperative of individual rights as the political mechanism for getting them met, has historically been a cornerstone of some strategies of social management. To borrow a phrase from Detlev Peukert, this does not mean that democracy was the “absolutely inevitable” outcome of the development of biopolitics; but it does mean that it was “one among other pos­sible outcomes of the crisis of modern civilization.”[[7]](#footnote-7) Second, I would argue that there is also a causal fit between cultures of exper­tise, or “scientism,” and democracy. Of course, “scientism” subverted the real, historical ideological underpinnings of authoritarian polities in Europe in the nineteenth century. It also in a sense replaced them. Democratic citizens have the freedom to ask “why”; and in a democratic system there is therefore a bias toward pragmatic, “objective” or naturalized answers — since values are often regarded as matters of opinion, with which any citizen has a right to differ. Scientific “fact” is democracy’s substitute for revealed truth, expertise its substi­tute for authority. The age of democracy is the age of professionalization, of technocracy; there is a deeper connection between the two, this is not merely a matter of historical coincidence. Third, the vulnerability of explicitly moral values in democratic societies cre­ates a problem of legitimation. Of course there are moral values that all demo­cratic societies must in some degree uphold (individual autonomy and freedom, human dignity, fairness, the rule of law), and those values are part of their strength. But as people’s states, democratic social and political orders are also implicitly and often explicitly expected to do something positive and tangible to enhance the well-being of their citizens. One of those things, of course, is simply to provide a rising standard of living; and the visible and astonishing suc­cess of that project has been crucial to all Western democracies since 1945. Another is the provision of a rising standard of health; and here again, the democratic welfare state has “delivered the goods” in concrete, measurable, and extraordinary ways. In this sense, it may not be so simpleminded, after all, to insist on considering the fact that modern biopolitics has “worked” phenome­nally well.

**Democracy checks radicalization of biopolitics—empirically proven.**

**Dickinson 04** (Edward Ross, Associate Professor of History at the University of California-Davis, “ Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about "Modernity"”, in Central European History, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2004), pg 18-19.)

In an important programmatic statement of 1996 Geoff Eley celebrated the fact that Foucault's ideas have "fundamentally directed attention away from institutionally centered conceptions of government and the state ... and toward a dispersed and decentered notion of power and its 'microphysics.'"48 The "broader, deeper, and less visible ideological consensus" on "technocratic reason and the ethical unboundedness of science" was the focus of his interest.49 But the "power-producing effects in Foucault's 'microphysical' sense" (Eley) of the construction of social bureaucracies and social knowledge, of "an entire institutional apparatus and system of practice" (Jean Quataert), simply do not explain Nazi policy.50 The destructive dynamic of Nazism was a product not so much of a particular modern set of ideas as of a particular modern political structure, one that could realize the disastrous potential of those ideas. What was critical was not the expansion of the instruments and disciplines of biopolitics, which occurred everywhere in Europe. Instead, it was the principles that guided how those instruments and disciplines were organized and used, and the external constraints on them. In National Socialism, biopolitics was shaped by a totalitarian conception of social management focused on the power and ubiquity of the volkisch state. **In democratic societies, biopolitics has historically been constrained by a rights-based strategy of social management.** This is a point to which I will return shortly. For now, the point is that what was decisive was actually politics at the level of the state. A comparative framework can help us to clarify this point. Other states passed compulsory sterilization laws in the 1930s. Indeed, individual states in the United States had already begun doing so in 1907. Yet they did not proceed to the next steps adopted by National Socialism, mass sterilization, mass "eugenic" abortion and murder of the "defective." Individual figures in, for example, the U.S. did make such suggestions. But neither the political structures of democratic states nor their legal and political principles permitted such poli? cies actually being enacted. Nor did the scale of forcible sterilization in other countries match that of the Nazi program. I do not mean to suggest that such programs were not horrible; but in a democratic political context they did not develop the dynamic of constant radicalization and escalation that characterized Nazi policies.

**Democracy checks biopolitical coercion and violence.**

**Dickinson 04** (Edward Ross, Associate Professor of History at the University of California-Davis, “ Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about "Modernity"”, in Central European History, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2004), pg 32.)

Again, as Peukert pointed out, many advocates of a rights-based welfare structure were open to the idea that "stubborn" cases might be legitimate tar-gets for sterilization; the right to health could easily be redefined as primarily a duty to be healthy, for example. But the difference between a strategy of social management built on the rights of the citizen and a system of racial policy built on the total power of the state is not merely a semantic one; such differences had very profound political implications, and established quite different constraints. The rights-based strategy was actually not very compatible with exclusionary and coercive policies; it relied too heavily on the cooperation of its targets and of armies of volunteers, it was too embedded in a democratic institutional structure and civil society, it lacked powerful legal and institutional instruments of coercion, and its rhetorical structure was too heavily slanted toward inclusion and tolerance.

**Democracy checks biopolitical violence.**

**Dickinson 04** (Edward Ross, Associate Professor of History at the University of California-Davis, “ Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy: Some Reflections on Our Discourse about "Modernity"”, in Central European History, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2004), pg 35.)

In short, the continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time are unmistakable. 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

**Biopower is strategically reversible—it can become a tool of resistance and empowerment**

**Campbell, 98** - professor of international politics at the University of Newcastle - 1998 (David, “Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity,” pg. 204-205)

The political possibilities enabled by this permanent provocation of power and freedom can be specified in more detail by thinking in terms of the predominance of the “bio-power” discussed above. In this sense, because the governmental practices of biopolitics in West­ern nations have been increasingly directed toward modes of being and forms of life — such that sexual conduct has become an object of concern, individual health has been figured as a domain of discipline, and the family has been transformed into an instrument of govern­ment— the ongoing agonism between those practices and the free­dom they seek to contain means that individuals have articulated a series of counterdemands drawn from those new fields of concern. For example, as the state continues to prosecute people according to sexual orientation, human rights activists have proclaimed the right of gays to enter into formal marriages, adopt children, and receive the same health and insurance benefits granted to their straight coun­terparts. These claims are a consequence of the permanent provoca­tion of power and freedom in biopolitics, and stand as testament to the “strategic reversibility” of power relations: if the terms of governmental practices can be made into focal points for resistances, then the “history of government as the ‘conduct of conduct’ is interwoven with the history of dissenting ‘counterconducts.”’39 Indeed, the emer­gence of the state as the major articulation of “the political” has in­volved an unceasing agonism between those in office and those they rule. State intervention in everyday life has long incited popular col­lective action, the result of which has been both resistance to the state and new claims upon the state. In particular, “the core of what we now call ‘citizenship’ consists of multiple bargains hammered out by rulers and ruled in the course of their struggles over the means of state action, especially the making of war.” In more recent times, constituencies associated with women’s, youth, ecological, and peace movements (among others) have also issued claims on society. These resistances are evidence that the break with the discursive/nondiscursive dichotomy central to the logic of interpretation undergirding this analysis is (to put it in conventional terms) not only theoretically licensed; it is empirically warranted. Indeed, expanding the interpretive imagination so as to enlarge the categories through which we understand the constitution of “the political” has been a necessary precondition for making sense of Foreign Policy’s concern for the ethical borders of identity in America. Accordingly, there are manifest political implications that flow from theorizing identity. As Judith Butler concluded: “The deconstruction of identity is not the deconstruction of politics; rather, it establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated.”

## Solvency

**No way to solve for transportation-disadvantaged – laundry list of reasons**

**GAO 06** United States Government Accountability Office GAO Report to Congressional Committees TRANSPORTATIONDISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS Actions Needed to Clarify Responsibilities and Increase Preparedness for Evacuations

According to experts and officials, the challenges state and local governments face in preparing for the evacuation of transportation-disadvantaged populations include identifying and locating these populations, determining their evacuation needs, and providing for their transportation. It is difficult for state and local officials to acquire the necessary information to both identify and locate transportation-disadvantaged populations. The difficulty in identifying these populations is due to the fact that these populations represent large, diverse, and constantly changing groups, and that information about them is not always readily available. Transportation-disadvantaged populations can include numerous categories of people without personal vehicles, such as the following: • the elderly and persons with disabilities who have mobility impairments that preclude them from driving, or who need medical equipment in order to travel; • low-income, homeless, or transient persons who do not have a permanent residence or who do not own or have access to a personal vehicle; • children without an adult present during a disaster; • tourists and commuters who are frequent users of public transportation; • those with limited English proficiency who tend to rely on public transit more than English speakers; 21 or • those who, for any other reason, do not own or have access to a personal vehicle. These populations can also include those who could be placed in, or qualify for, more than one category among transportation-disadvantaged populations, such as a person who has disabilities, is homeless, and speaks limited English. Both the large number of these populations and the potential for double counting can make identification difficult for state and local officials. For example, although 52 percent of the Gulf Coast jurisdictions evaluated in DOT’s Catastrophic Hurricane Evacuation Plan Evaluation had identified and located certain transportation-disadvantaged populations, DOT reported that only three jurisdictions had satisfactorily included provisions for schools and day care centers, trailer parks and campgrounds, incarcerated and transient individuals, and people with limited English proficiency in their evacuation plans. Twenty-six percent of respondents to a question in DHS’s Nationwide Plan Review stated that they needed to improve their identification of these populations. Fifteen percent of respondents to this question indicated that a standard federal definition of “transportation-disadvantaged” would facilitate their planning. Additionally, data on the location of transportation-disadvantaged populations is not readily available because such data: • have not previously been collected; • cannot be collected because of the amount of time, staff, and other resources required, or cannot be shared due to the preference of some transportation-disadvantaged populations; for example, the established registration system in one of the five major cities we visited had only 1400—or 0.3 percent—of the 462,000 people projected to need evacuation assistance registered; • are not compiled in a central location, but reside in separate databases across numerous agencies, companies, or organizations, including social service agencies, departments of motor vehicles, and public and private sector transportation providers; • are not traditionally shared with emergency management officials; for example, a local metropolitan planning organization may collect data on those who are transit-dependent, but may not have shared that information with emergency management officials; or • cannot be shared with emergency officials due to privacy restrictions; for example, social service agencies or nonprofit organizations that regularly transport people during non-emergency times and have information on clients’ needs, but may not be able or willing to share that data because of privacy concerns. In addition to identifying and locating transportation-disadvantaged populations, state and local governments also face the challenge of determining the transportation needs of these populations and providing for their transportation in an evacuation. To adequately prepare for evacuating these populations, state and local officials need information on the medical and transportation needs of each person in addition to his or her location. 22 These needs can vary widely from those who can travel by themselves to a government-assisted evacuation pick-up point to those who: • need to be transported to a government-assisted evacuation pick-up point, but do not require medical assistance or additional transportation; • live in group homes for persons with mental disabilities and may require medical assistance, but not accessible transportation in an evacuation; or • are medically frail but not hospitalized, and require acute medical assistance as well as accessible transportation in an evacuation. However, similar to the location data discussed earlier, it is difficult for state and local officials to obtain information on the transportation needs of these populations. Another challenge that state and local officials face in preparing for the evacuation of transportation-disadvantaged populations is providing for the transportation of these populations. This challenge includes identifying the appropriate equipment and available modes of transport as well as drivers and other needed professionals, providing training to those drivers and other professionals, and communicating evacuation information to the public. When preparing for an emergency, it can be difficult for state and local officials to identify, arrange for the use of, and determine the proper positioning of equipment needed to transport these populations. The transportation needs of such populations can range from persons who can be evacuated in school buses and charter buses to the mobility-impaired who may require low floor buses, wheelchair lift-equipped vans, and other accessible vehicles. Because of the limited number of vehicles (accessible, multi-passenger, or other) available among both public transportation providers (such as transit agencies) and private transportation providers (such as ambulance and bus companies), we found that emergency officials have to spend additional time and resources arranging for transportation and ensuring that those arrangements are coordinated before an evacuation order is issued. Further, state and local governments also need to have drivers and other professionals trained to operate the additional vehicles they have acquired or to move persons with disabilities in and out of vehicles; constraints already exist on the pool of potential drivers. One example of a constrained resource is school bus drivers. If an evacuation is ordered during the school day, the availability of these drivers is severely limited because such drivers must first transport the children home. In addition, drivers who provide transportation to these populations during non-emergency times are often not trained or contracted to provide emergency transportation for these populations. Further, DOT’s Catastrophic Hurricane Evacuation Plan Evaluation reported that, even in urban areas where additional modes of transportation are available, few evacuation plans recognize the potential role for intercity buses, trains, airplanes, and ferries. These modes may be particularly important for persons who cannot evacuate in personal vehicles. In response to a question in DHS’s Nationwide Plan Review on how well all available modes of transportation are incorporated into evacuation plans, 48 percent of respondents stated that plans needed to improve the use of available modes of transport in evacuation planning. For example, one jurisdiction is investigating using ferries and barges in evacuations. According to experts and officials, several legal and social barriers confront state and local governments in addressing the aforementioned challenges to evacuating transportation-disadvantaged populations. (See fig. 2.) To begin, state and local emergency management officials often face legal barriers in obtaining data on the identification, location, or the transportation needs of these populations. For example, 11 percent of respondents to a DHS Nationwide Plan Review question on addressing the needs of transportation-disadvantaged individuals before, during, and after emergencies, stated that they were concerned about privacy issues vis-à-vis obtaining medical information from public or private sector transportation providers about their clients that would help officials in their evacuation preparedness. These providers could include those that provide paratransit services for persons with disabilities, “Meals on Wheels” programs for the elderly, and job access services for low-income individuals. DOT’s Catastrophic Hurricane Evacuation Plan Evaluation also cited privacy as a legal barrier. Officials in three of the five major cities we visited in addition to several federal officials with whom we spoke expressed concern about what impact the Health Information Portability and Accountability Act’s Privacy Rule (the Privacy Rule) might have on their ability to acquire such data. The act’s Privacy Rule limits the disclosure of individually identifiable health information by certain entities or persons, 23 but does not apply to transportation providers unless they are also covered entities. Covered entities include health care providers that conduct certain transactions in electronic form, health-care clearinghouses, or health plans. 24 Therefore, transportation providers that are not covered entities would not be prohibited by the Privacy Rule from sharing such information. However, misunderstanding about the act’s Privacy Rule may still be discouraging some from sharing this information. Additionally, the general concerns that federal, state, and local officials have expressed may extend to other privacy issues beyond the Privacy Rule, such as potential contractual restrictions on Medicare and Medicaid transportation providers. Another example of a legal barrier is that some public or private sector transportation providers are hesitant to evacuate these populations because of concerns about reimbursement and liability. State and local officials must often broker arrangements with transportation providers in order to secure their services. However, although these providers may be willing to help state and local officials evacuate these populations, they will sometimes not do so without legal agreements (such as memoranda of understanding or contracts) that ensure reimbursement and that absolve the providers from, or reduce liability in case of, an accident or injury. Creating such an agreement usually requires legal representation as well as additional liability insurance to protect against potential damage or loss of property or life—all entailing monetary costs that state or local governments and transportation providers may not be willing or able to cover. Officials in one of the five major cities we visited told us that additional liability insurance would be cost prohibitive to obtain. We learned of a school district’s reluctance to provide vehicles for an evacuation without a legal agreement in one of the five major cities we visited. This was largely due to the fact that the school district had provided vehicles for an evacuation 12 years ago, but FEMA has not yet fully reimbursed it. In one of the five major cities and one of the four states we visited, we also learned of agreements that have been pending for months (or had fallen through) because of one party’s liability concerns; these concerns could not be adequately addressed by the state or local government. An additional legal barrier for state and local officials we identified relates to volunteers (such as nonprofit organizations or Good Samaritans) who may also be dissuaded from providing evacuation assistance in an emergency because of liability concerns. 25 Liability concerns may be even more of a barrier after Hurricane Katrina, where volunteers saw that efforts to assist had unintentional consequences, some of which resulted in lawsuits. For example, Operation Brother’s Keeper is a Red Cross program that connects transportation-disadvantaged populations in local faith-based congregations with voluntary providers of transportation in those congregations. However, because of liability concerns in the provision of such transportation, voluntary participants of the program are now less willing to provide such transportation. Given that most state Good Samaritan laws only apply to voluntary assistance provided in circumstances that involve urgent medical care, transportation providers may be held liable unless they are responding to an accident scene or transporting a patient to a medical facility. Moreover, we found that in one state, an addendum introduced to modify an existing Good Samaritan law that would indemnify volunteers assisting in evacuations did not pass. The absence of protection from potential liability may also jeopardize efforts to enlist the assistance of volunteers in evacuating the transportation-disadvantaged.

**The transportation-disadvantaged fear leaving – communication efforts failed**

**GAO 06** United States Government Accountability Office GAO Report to Congressional Committees TRANSPORTATIONDISADVANTAGED POPULATIONS Actions Needed to Clarify Responsibilities and Increase Preparedness for Evacuations

These populations’ unwillingness to evacuate can also stem from fear of losing physical or financial assets. For example, some transportation-disadvantaged populations have limited assets and do not feel safe leaving whatever assets they do have—such as their home or belongings—behind. This sentiment is exacerbated among those whose families have lived in their homes for generations. Further, as was observed during Hurricane Katrina, people may be unwilling to evacuate even if they do have a car; they may not have money to pay for gas or are unwilling to move to a place where their financial situation is less certain. In attempting to address some of these social barriers by informing transportation-disadvantaged populations about the benefits of evacuating as opposed to sheltering in place, we found that communicating with these populations can be difficult because these populations often • are dispersed; • may lack access to a radio or television; • may not trust emergency announcements; or • may not be able to read or understand emergency materials or announcements because of a disability, such as a cognitive or vision impairment, or a lack of proficiency in English.

**Their focus on local change reinforces domination**

**Katz 2000,** (Adam adjunct English instructor at Onondaga Community College (Syracuse, NY) Postmodernism and the Politics of “Culture”, pg. 146-7 Herm

Habermas’s understanding of undistorted communication is situated within the same problematic as the postmodernism of Lyotard in a much more fundamental sense than would be indicated by the apparent opposi­tion between them. Both locate emancipatory knowledges and politics in the liberation of language from technocratic imperatives. And the political consequences are the same as well. In both cases, local transformations (the deconstruction and reconstruction of distorted modes of communica­tion) that create more democratic or rational sites of intersubjectivity are all that is seen as possible, “with the goal,” as Brantlinger says, “of at least local emancipations from the structure of economic, political and cultural domination” (1990, 191—192, emphasis added). The addition of “at least” to the kinds of changes sought suggests a broader, potentially global role for critique, such as showing “how lines of force in society can be transformed into authentic modes of participatory decision making” (19711. However, the transition from one mode of transformation to an­other—what should be the fundamental task of cultural studies—is left unconceptualized and is implicitly understood as a kind of additive or cu­mulative spread of local democratic sites until society as a whole is trans­formed. What this overlooks, of course, is the way in which, as long as global economic and political structures remain unchanged and unchal­lenged, local emancipations can only be redistributions—redistributions that actually support existing social relations by merely shifting the greater burdens onto others who are less capable of achieving their own local emancipation. This implicit alliance between the defenders of modernity and their postmodern critics (at least on the fundamental ques­tion) also suggests that we need to look for the roots and consequences of this alliance in the contradictions of the formation of the cultural studies public intellectual.

## Yes War

**War is possible – laundry list of reasons and scenarios – prefer our expert consensus**

**Mearsheimer 99,** John, Whitney H. Shepardson Fellow, Council on Foreign Relations; R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago Council on Foreign Relations Great Debate Series, “Is Major War Obsolete?” February 25 1999, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10

Now I think the central claim that’s on the table is wrong-headed, and let me tell you why. First of all, there are a number of good reasons why great powers in the system will think seriously about going to war in the future, and I’ll give you three of them and try and illustrate some cases. First, states oftentimes compete for economic resources. Is it hard to imagine a situation where a reconstituted Russia gets into a war with the United States and the Persian Gulf over Gulf oil? I don’t think that’s implausible. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war in the South China Sea over economic resources? I don’t find that hard to imagine. A second reason that states go to war which, of course, is dear to the heart of realists like me, and that’s to enhance their security. Take the United States out of Europe, put the Germans on their own; you got the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other, and in between a huge buffer zone called eastern or central Europe. Call it what you want. Is it impossible to imagine the Russians and the Germans getting into a fight over control of that vacuum? Highly likely, no, but feasible, for sure. Is it hard to imagine Japan and China getting into a war over the South China Sea, not for resource reasons but because Japanese sea-lines of communication run through there and a huge Chinese navy may threaten it? I don’t think it’s impossible to imagine that. What about nationalism, a third reason? China, fighting in the United States over Taiwan? You think that’s impossible? I don’t think that’s impossible. That’s a scenario that makes me very nervous. I can figure out all sorts of ways, none of which are highly likely, that the Chinese and the Americans end up shooting at each other. It doesn’t necessarily have to be World War III, but it is great-power war. Chinese and Russians fighting each other over Siberia? As many of you know, there are huge numbers of Chinese going into Siberia. You start mixing ethnic populations in most areas of the world outside the United States and it’s usually a prescription for big trouble. Again, not highly likely, but possible. I could go on and on, positing a lot of scenarios where great powers have good reasons to go to war against other great powers. Second reason: There is no question that in the twentieth century, certainly with nuclear weapons but even before nuclear weapons, the costs of going to war are very high. But that doesn’t mean that war is ruled out. The presence of nuclear weapons alone does not make war obsolescent. I will remind you that from 1945 to 1990, we lived in a world where there were thousands of nuclear weapons on both sides, and there was nobody running around saying, “ War is obsolescent.” So you can’t make the argument that the mere presence of nuclear weapons creates peace. India and Pakistan are both going down the nuclear road. You don’t hear many people running around saying, “ That’s going to produce peace.” And, furthermore, if you believe nuclear weapons were a great cause of peace, you ought to be in favor of nuclear proliferation. What we need is everybody to have a nuclear weapon in their back pocket. You don’t hear many people saying that’s going to produce peace, do you? Conventional war? Michael’s right; conventional war was very deadly before nuclear weapons came along, but we still had wars. And the reason we did is because states come up with clever strategies. States are always looking for clever strategies to avoid fighting lengthy and bloody and costly wars of attrition. And they sometimes find them, and they sometimes go to war for those reasons. So there’s no question in my mind that the costs of war are very high, and deterrence is not that difficult to achieve in lots of great-power security situations. But on the other hand, to argue that war is obsolescent-I wouldn’t make that argument. My third and final point here is, the fact of the matter is, that there’s hardly anybody in the national security establishment-and I bet this is true of Michael-who believes that war is obsolescent. I’m going to tell you why I think this is the case. Consider the fact that the United States stations roughly 100,000 troops in Europe and 100,000 troops in Asia. We spend an enormous amount of money on defense. We’re spending almost as much money as we were spending during the Cold War on defense. We spend more money than the next six countries in the world spend on defense. The questions is, why are we spending all this money? Why are we stationing troops in Europe? Why are we stationing troops in Asia? Why are we concentrating on keeping NATO intact and spreading it eastward? I’ll tell you why, because we believe that if we don’t stay there and we pull out, trouble is going to break out, and not trouble between minor powers, but trouble between major powers. That’s why we’re there. We know very well that if we leave Europe, the Germans are going to seriously countenance, if not automatically go, and get nuclear weapons. Certainly the case with the Japanese. Do you think the Germans and the Japanese are going to stand for long not to have nuclear weapons? I don’t think that’s the case. Again, that security zone between the Germans and the Russians-there’ll be a real competition to fill that. The reason we’re there in Europe, and the reason that we’re there in Asia is because we believe that great-power war is a potential possibility, which contradicts the argument on the table. So I would conclude by asking Michael if, number one, he believes we should pull out of Europe and pull out of Asia, and number two, if he does not, why not?

**Great power war is possible and is a prior questions**

**Gonsell 12** April,Lieutenant Commander Rachael Gosnell, U,S. Navy and Second Lieutenant Michael Orietti U,S. Marine Corps “Now Hear This - ls Great-Power War Still Possible?”

The Center for Naval Analyses recently published Grand Strategy: Contemporary Contending Analyst Views and Implications for the U.S. Navy , a survey of potential U.S. strategies being debated in the academic and defense communities. The study identifies four competing lines of strategic thought: maintaining American hegemony, selective engagement, offshore balancing, and integrating collective international efforts. Two additional options—isolationism and world government—are noted and disregarded as not viable. Under this list of strategic options a sharp division is apparent, dictated by the question, “Is great-power war obsolete?” This fundamental question must be answered before any logical strategic decisions can be made. If great-power war is possible, then the de facto existential threat to U.S. interests, latent in the international system, must be addressed before all others. There are enormous implications for weapon procurement, operational doctrine, and force levels driven by this single issue. Global strategists point to economic globalization and the proliferation of nuclear weapons as modern guarantors of peace among major powers. However, we contend that these very rational hedges against violence can still be shattered by decidedly irrational and reactionary forces. Thus, the possibility of great-power war between China and the United States cannot be ruled out. Economic interdependence offers benefits beyond the sheer transfer of capital and goods—there can be no doubt of that. However, history renders globalization’s deterrent effects at least somewhat questionable. Substantial economic interdependence existed throughout Europe prior to World War I, and Japan was hugely dependent on American oil imports in the years leading up to World War II. It was this dependence that made the U.S oil embargo intolerable, ultimately motivating the Japanese to attack Pearl Harbor. On the other hand, the existential threat of nuclear weapons has certainly resulted in a universal desire keep Pandora’s Box firmly shut. While we concede the remarkable ability of weapons of mass destruction to dampen the oscillations of great-power relations, **it is unclear that the nuclear restraint against total war ever takes limited war off the table as a strategic option.** More fundamentally, though, the arguments for a nuclear-based “state of peace” are constrained by the limits of rationality. Rational bounds do not apply to the ephemeral—yet extremely powerful—waves of bellicose nationalism that can sweep up an entire nation. National pride is embedded in the Chinese DNA—and rightly so. In certain segments of society, however, the sentiment manifests itself with a particular fervor, and some elements of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) epitomize this zeal. Alarmingly, **the Communist Party leadership appears increasingly unable to act as a check on the military.** Both Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping had ironclad control over the PLA, having earned unquestionable credibility during the Long March. Neither General Secretary of the Communist Party Hu Jintao nor First Secretary Xi Jinping can claim a similar rapport with the PLA. Neither possesses a comparable level of control. Any surge of aggressive nationalism, either in the PLA or among the greater masses, could conceivably compel contemporary party leadership toward a bellicosity it does not desire. How might this happen? The two most likely scenarios deal with Chinese “core interests” in the Pacific: sovereignty in the South China Sea and Taiwan. The South China Sea is no stranger to conflict. Its location and material promise have led to a host of conflicting territorial claims and brought the Chinese and Vietnamese to armed conflict over the Spratly Islands in the late 1980s. After a period of relative calm, tensions have once again begun to flare. American commitment to freedom of the seas in the region, exemplified by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s July 2010 speech in Hanoi, Vietnam, provides ample opportunity for a Sino-American butting of heads. Similarly, the Republic of China remains a perennially sore issue for the Chinese; the furor over the sale of American F-16s provides an ample platform for future, more-polarizing interactions over Taiwan. War between China and the United States is unlikely. Economic interdependence and nuclear weapons are powerful, persuasive deterrents against it. However, Sino-American dealings, particularly in Taiwan or the South China Sea, provide instances in which the powder keg of Chinese nationalism could explode, effectively forcing party leadership into a series of irrational but irreversible actions. As such, the possibility of great-power war, unlimited or otherwise, cannot be ruled out. U.S. policymakers must plan accordingly.

**Nuclear deterrence fails**

**Doyle 09** James E., Nuclear Nonprolif Division at Los Alamos for over a decade, worked on nuclear projects with Russian nuclear weapons institute, senior policy analyst at Science Applications International Corporation, PhD in Int’l Security Studies from U Virginia, “Eyes on the Prize: A Strategy for Enhancing Global Security,” in “Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: A Debate,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/abolishing\_nuclear\_weapons\_debate.pdf

In their essay, Perry, Shultz, Kissinger, and Nunn assert that nuclear deterrence is “increasingly hazardous and decreasingly effective.” In essence, they reject the prevailing belief within national security establishments that nuclear weapons still provide powerful security benefits in the evolving international security environment. Theirs is an unprecedented challenge to the existing nuclear order, and their arguments deserve serious analysis. In many ways, they are consistent with traditional critiques of the risks of nuclear deterrence. But they also go deeper to demonstrate why nuclear deterrence is more unstable in the current environment than in the Cold War and why continued nuclear proliferation is likely to exacerbate rather than attenuate these instabilities, increasing the risks yet further. Nuclear deterrence is increasingly hazardous because a large surplus of nuclear weapons and materials left over from the Cold War is, in some cases, not adequately secured. In addition, an entirely new threat in connection with these weapons and materials has emerged in the form of extremist groups that are willing to carry out catastrophic terrorist attacks. Several states that are acquiring nuclear weapons or increasing existing arsenals are located in conflict-prone regions and have limited financial and technical resources to devote to nuclear security. Nuclear deterrence is decreasingly effective because the conditions that enabled mutual deterrence during the Cold War have changed. In today’s world, nuclear-armed states share disputed borders, have limited experience with nuclear weapon safety and security, and have vulnerable early warning and nuclear weapon control capabilities. Moreover, nuclear deterrence cannot effectively reduce the chance of nuclear terrorism. The more states acquire nuclear weapons for “deterrence,” the more they will also risk providing weapons and materials to terrorists who wish to carry out a nuclear attack. These realities refute the view held most notably by Kenneth Waltz that nuclear weapons provide concrete benefits for states and will have a stabilizing influence on the international system.1 The authors of Abolishing Nuclear Weapons do not give enough emphasis to the transformed nature of the security environment and the implications of that transformation for traditional nuclear strategies. Strategic thought on nuclear arms evolved within a global security environment that no longer exists. That security environment was defined by a single primary state adversary, whose threat of nuclear attack against the United States and its allies could be successfully deterred by a reciprocal threat of nuclear retaliation.

**Taboo and deterrence aren’t credible**

**Gerson 09** Michael S., Research Analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, 9/29/09, Rethinking U.S. Nuclear Posture, Carnegie, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/0929\_transcript\_nuclear\_posture1.pdf

So thus my argument stands in contrast to those who believe that the more options the better, and that ambiguity aids deterrence by creating uncertainty and incalculable risks. My argument comes from a position that a fundamental tenet of deterrence is that limiting your options can in fact enhance deterrence and make you safer. This notion of deliberately tying one’s hands or limiting one’s options is of course attributed to the work of Tom Schelling who argued that limiting one’s own options could be a commitment tactic to enhance the credibility of one’s threats. Examples in this context are burning a bridge – having your army cross and then burning a bridge so that one could not retreat, or more importantly, making your commitments public. Making statements public in fact becomes a commitment tactic by increasing the cost of going back. The example is, if you’re going to go on a diet, one of the best ways to make sure you actually keep on that diet is to tell everybody you know that you’re going on the diet. So that’s the sort of position that I’m come from, is that while the traditional view has been that as many options as possible is the best way to go, and in some ways the military thinks that way in part because their – their job is to put military options in the toolbox of national power, what I want to argue is that limiting our options, limiting U.S. options to use nuclear weapons first by declaring a no-first-use policy will in fact make us safer. My argument is essentially this: Nuclear first use is one of two things. It’s either not credible, in which case it adds nothing to U.S. security, but rather is politically complicating in the nonproliferation context. Or, if it is credible, it’s potentially dangerous by fostering crisis instability. So that’s – I’m going to talk a few more minutes about that. On the one hand, I think you can make a case that U.S. threats, whether they’re implicit or explicit – and really what we’re talking about here is the ambiguous threat – are simply not credible. It’s not credible for a variety of reasons. I mean, one is the nuclear taboo, this moral and political aversion to using nuclear weapons that has emerged in the long absence of nuclear use and conflict. In the nuclear arena, the United States is largely seen as cool-headed, risk-averse and sensitive to casualties and collateral damage. The United States does not seem to be able to benefit from the sort of rationality of irrationality type argument. The prospect that the United States would unilaterally shatter the almost seven-decade record of non-use in conflict I think contributes to the belief that the United States would in fact not use nuclear weapons. Another argument is I think that one could make the case that an unintended consequence of the United States first use – the United States efforts to lead to the global non-proliferation regime is that it reduces the credibility of the United States to use nuclear weapons first. If the United States spends all of this time working on the efforts to prevent others from getting nuclear weapons, it seems – it makes it less credible that the United States would risk shattering that and throwing it all away by using nuclear weapons first. And finally, in the Gulf War, despite the threats of calculated ambiguity and the ambiguous threat of nuclear weapons, which some believe deterred Saddam, Bush, Scowcroft, Powell, and Baker, all said after the conflict that they had actually never intended on using nuclear weapons. And such public admission I think reduces the credibility of those threats.

## Consequentialism/Util

**Utilitarianism is best – it protects rights while not totally rejecting all policies that might infringe.**

**Harvey 2002** (Philip, **,** J.D. at Yale Law School, “Human Rights and Economic Policy Discourse: Taking Economic and Social Rights Seriously”, Spring, *Human Rights Law Review*, 33 Colum., Human Rights L. Rev. 363, lexis) Herm

Perhaps the clearest illustration of this compromise or balancing principle is the distinction drawn in constitutional jurisprudence between the standard of review applied by courts in deciding whether legislative enactments comply with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Laws that do not infringe on certain constitutionally protected rights will pass muster if there is a mere rational basis for their enactment, whereas laws that do infringe on such rights require more compelling justification, with the level of justification varying depending on the right at issue. 196 Human rights claims have bite precisely because they declare that certain actions may be improper, even if those actions are supported by a majority of the population, indeed, even if the actions in question would increase the total utility of the population as a whole. But it is not necessary to take the position that rights-based claims should always trump conflicting utility-maximizing purposes. 197 It should be possible to honor multiple goals in public policy decision-making.

**Do not evaluate their ethics without first assessing the consequences of its actual implementation. Viewing ethics in isolation is irresponsible & complicit with the evil they criticize.**

**Issac** **2002**.,( Jeffery C. Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington & Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life. PhD Yale University. From “Ends, Means, and Politics.” Dissent Magazine. Volume 49. Issue # 2. Available online @ subscribing institutions using Proquest. Herm

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

**Absolutism is moral evasion – consequentialism is key. Gender paraphrased**

**Nielsen 1993,** (Kai Professor of Philosophy at the University of Calgary, Absolutism and Its Consequentialist Critics, ed. Joram Graf Haber, p. 170-172 Herm

Forget the levity of the example and consider the case of the innocent fat man. If there really is no other way of unsticking our fat man and if plainly, without blasting him out, everyone in the cave will drown, then, innocent or not, he should be blasted out. This indeed overrides the principle that the innocent should never be deliberately killed, but it does not reveal a callousness toward life, for the people involved are caught in a desperate situation in which, if such extreme action is not taken, many lives will be lost and far greater misery will obtain. Moreover, the people who do such a horrible thing or acquiesce in the doing of it are not likely to be rendered more callous about human life and human suffering as a result. Its occurrence will haunt them for the rest of their lives and is as likely as not to make them more rather than less morally sensitive. It is not even correct to say that such a desperate act shows a lack of respect for persons. We are not treating the fat man merely as a means. The fat man's person‑his interests and rights are not ignored. Killing him is something which is undertaken with the greatest reluctance. It is only when it is quite certain that there is no other way to save the lives of the others that such a violent course of action is justifiably undertaken. Alan Donagan, arguing rather as Anscombe argues, maintains that "to use any innocent man ill for the sake of some public good is directly to degrade him to being a mere means" and to do this is of course to violate a principle essential to morality, that is, that human beings should never merely be treated as means but should be treated as ends in themselves (as persons worthy of respect)." But, as my above remarks show, it need not be the case, and in the above situation it is not the case, that in killing such an innocent man we are treating him merely as a means. The action is universalizable, all alternative actions which would save his life are duly considered, the blasting out is done only as a last and desperate resort with the minimum of harshness and indifference to his suffering and the like. It indeed sounds ironical to talk this way, given what is done to him. But if such a terrible situation were to arise, there would always be more or less humane ways of going about one's grim task. And in acting in the more humane ways toward the fat man, as we do what we must do and would have done to ourselves were the roles reversed, we show a respect for his person. In so treating the fat man‑not just to further the public good but to prevent the certain death of a whole group of people (that is to prevent an even greater evil than his being killed in this way)‑the claims of justice are not overriden either, for each individual involved, if he is reasonably correct, should realize that if he were so stuck rather than the fat man, he should in such situations be blasted out. Thus, there is no question of being unfair. Surely we must choose between evils here, but is there anything more reasonable, more morally appropriate, than choosing the lesser evil when doing or allowing some evil cannot be avoided? That is, where there is no avoiding both and where our actions can determine whether a greater or lesser evil obtains, should we not plainly always opt for the lesser evil? And is it not obviously a greater evil that all those other innocent people should suffer and die than that the fat man should suffer and die? Blowing up the fat man is indeed monstrous. But letting him remain stuck while the whole group drowns is still more monstrous. The consequentialist is on strong moral ground here, and, if his reflective moral convictions do not square either with certain unrehearsed or with certain reflective particular moral convictions of human beings, so much the worse for such commonsense moral convictions. One could even usefully and relevantly adapt herethough for a quite different purpose‑an argument of Donagan's. Consequentialism of the kind I have been arguing for provides so persuasive "a theoretical basis for common morality that when it contradicts some moral intuition, it is natural to suspect that intuition, not theory, is corrupt."" Given the comprehensiveness, plausibility, and overall rationality of consequentialism, it is not unreasonable to override even a deeply felt moral conviction if it does not square with such a theory, though, if it made no sense or overrode the bulk of or even a great many of our considered moral convictions, that would be another matter indeed. Anticonsequentialists often point to the inhumanity of people who will sanction such killing of the innocent, but cannot the compliment be returned by speaking of the even greater inhumanity, conjoined with evasiveness, of those who will allow even more death and far greater misery and then excuse themselves on the ground that they did not intend the death and misery but merely forbore to prevent it? In such a context, such reasoning and such forbearing to prevent seems to me to constitute a moral evasion. I say it is evasive because rather than steeling himself to do what in normal circumstances would be a horrible and vile act but in this circumstance is a harsh moral necessity, he [it] allows, when he has the power to prevent it, a situation which is still many times worse. He tries to keep his `moral purity' and **[**to] avoid `dirty hands' at the price of utter moral failure and what Kierkegaard called `double‑mindedness.' It is understandable that people should act in this morally evasive way but this does not make it right.

**Consequences come first**

**Weiss, 99 –** Professor of political science at cuny graduate center (Thomas, “principles, politics and humanitarian action”, ethics and international affairs)

Scholars and practitioners frequently employ the term “dilemma” to describe painful decision making but “quandary” would be more apt.27a dilemma involves two or more alternative courses of action with unintended but unavoidable and equally undesirable consequences. If consequences are equally unpalatable, then remaining inactive on the sidelines is an option rather than entering the serum on the field. A quandary, on the other hand, entails tough choices among unattractive options with better or worse possible outcomes. While humanitarians are perplexed, they are not and should not be immobilized. The solution is not indifference or withdrawal but rather appropriate engagement. The key lies in making a good faith effort to analyze the advantages and disadvantages of different alloys of politics and humanitarianism, and then to choose what often amounts to the lesser of evils. Thoughtful humanitarianism is more appropriate than rigid ideological responses, for four reasons: goals of humanitarian action often conflict, good intentions can have catastrophic consequences; there are alternative ways to achieve ends; and even if none of the choices is ideal, victims still require decisions about outside help. What myron wiener has called “instrumental humanitarianism” would resemble just war doctrine because contextual analyses and not formulas are required. Rather than resorting to knee-jerk reactions to help, it is necessary to weigh options and make decisions about choices that are far from optimal. Many humanitarian decisions in northern iraq, somalia, bosnia, and rwanda—and especially those involving economic or military sanctions— required selecting least-bad options. Thomas nagle advises that “given the limitations on human action, it is naive to suppose that there is a solution to every moral problem. “29 action-oriented institutions and staff are required in order to contextualized their work rather than apply preconceived notions of what is right or wrong. Nonetheless, classicists continue to insist on pictet’s “indivisible whole” because humanitarian principles “are interlocking, overlapping and mutually supportive. . . . It is hard to accept the logic of one without also accepting the others. “30 the process of making decisions in war zones could be compared to that pursued by “clinical ethical review teams” whose members are on call to make painful decisions about life-and-death matters in hospitals.sl the sanctity of life is complicated by new technologies, but urgent decisions cannot be finessed. It is impermissible to long for another era or to pretend that the bases for decisions are unchanged. However emotionally wrenching, finding solutions is an operational imperative that is challenging but intellectually doable. Humanitarians who cannot stand the heat generated by situational ethics should stay out of the post-cold war humanitarian kitchen. Principles in an unprincipled world why are humanitarians in such a state of moral and operational disrepair? In many ways western liberal values over the last few centuries have been moving toward interpreting moral obligations as going beyond a family and intimate networks, beyond a tribe, and beyond a nation. The impalpable moral ideal is concern about the fate of other people, no matter how far away.szthe evaporation of distance with advances in technology and media coverage, along with a willingness to intervene in a variety of post–cold war crises, however, has produced situations in which humanitarians are damned if they do and if they don’t. Engagement by outsiders does not necessarily make things better, and it may even create a “moral hazard by altering the payoffs to combatants in such a way as to encourage more intensive fighting.“33 this new terrain requires analysts and practitioners to admit ignorance and question orthodoxies. There is no comfortable theoretical framework or world vision to function as a compass to steer between integration and fragmentation, globalization and insularity. Michael ignatieff observes, “the world is not becoming more chaotic or violent, although our failure to understand and act makes it seem so. “34gwyn prins has pointed to the “scary humility of admitting one’s ignorance” because “the new vogue for ‘complex emergencies’ is too often a means of concealing from oneself that one does not know what is going on. “3sto make matters more frustrating, never before has there been such a bombardment of data and instant analysis; the challenge of distilling such jumbled and seemingly contradictory information adds to the frustration of trying to do something appropriate fast. International discourse is not condemned to follow north american fashions and adapt sound bites and slogans. It is essential to struggle with and even embrace the ambiguities that permeate international responses to wars, but without the illusion of a one-size-fits-all solution. The trick is to grapple with complexities, to tease out the general without ignoring the particular, and still to be inspired enough to engage actively in trying to make a difference. Because more and more staff of aid agencies, their governing boards, and their financial backers have come to value reflection, an earlier policy prescription by larry minear and me no longer appears bizarre: “don’t just do something, stand there! “3sthis advice represented our conviction about the payoffs from thoughtful analyses and our growing distaste for the stereotypical, yet often accurate, image of a bevy of humanitarian actors flitting from one emergency to the next.

**Rejecting consequences effaces responsibility, freedom and politics**

**Williams, 2005-** Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales (Michael, “the realist tradition and the limits of international relations”, p 174-176)

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of ‘self-clarification’, and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in international relations, has called a ‘reflexive principle’. In the wilful realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the ‘reality’ of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one’s views. The blithe, self-serving, and uncritical stances of abstract moralism or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world ‘as it is’. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable ‘object’ that is not reducible to one’s wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 objectivity is not a naïve naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one’s will. A recognition of the limits imposed by ‘reality’ is a condition for a recognition of one’s own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one’s own will. But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the precondition for freedom. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 but it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility.

## AT: Levinas/Compassion

**Pity and compassion are insulting actions – it’s better to focus on overcoming personal suffering**

**Cioran 34** (E.M, Romanian Philosopher, Prof of Philosophy at Andrei Saguna, 1934, On the Heights of Despair, p. 61, AD: 7/7/09)

How can one still have ideals when there are so many blind, deaf, and mad people in the world? How can I remorselessly enjoy the light another cannot see or the sound another cannot hear? I feel like a thief of light. Have we not stolen light from the blind and sound from the deaf? Isn’t our very lucidity responsible for the madman's darkness? When I think about such things, I lose all courage and will, thoughts seem useless, and compassion, vain. For I do not feel mediocre enough to feel compassion for anyone. Compassion is a sign of superficiality: broken destinies and unrelenting misery either makes you scream or turn you to stone. Pity is not only inefficient; it is also insulting. And besides, how can you pity another when you yourself suffer ignominiously? Compassion is as common as it is because it does not bind you to anything! Nobody in this world has yet died from another's suffering. And the one who said that he died for us did not die; he was killed.

**Attempts to hold back the temptation for cruelty and atrocities are attempts to hold back the foundations of life – we can create beauty in that cruelty**

**Miller 90** (James, Professor of Political Science and Chair, Department of Liberal Studies @ Fullerton, “Carnivals of Atrocity: Foucault, Nietzsche, Cruelty,” Political Theory 18: 3, Aug, 470-491, Jstor, AD: 7/8/09)

Suing for peace, the human being, in time, comes to swear allegiance to a kind of psychological "oligarchy," with "regulation, foresight, and pre-meditation" keeping at bay "our underworld of utility organs working with and against one another. "With the" aid of the morality of mores and the social straitjacket," as Nietzsche puts it, the organism's oligarchy is kept in power; man learns "to be ashamed of all his instincts." Stifling his cruel and murderous impulses, he becomes "calculable, regular, necessary" - a subject of civilized reason and morality.'9 But the organism's cruel impulses do not disappear altogether. What otherwise might be inexplicable-namely, the pleasure many men have clearly learned to feel In taking pains to rule themselves - Nietzsche explains through the survival of internalized cruelty and the paradoxical convergence of pleasure and pain that characterizes it . The idea of "self-chosen torture"- prima facie, a monstrous oxymoron- becomes the key in the Genealogy of Morals to interpreting a host of intertwined phenomena: guilt; the bad conscience; and, above all, the triumph of asceticism in Christianity.20 The internalization of cruel impulses represented by the triumph of asceticism ramifies in unpredictable ways. Guilt hobbles man's animal energies; shared taboos make exercising the will difficult and sometimes unpleasant. Yet in some rare souls, the masochistic pleasures of self-rule paradoxically strengthen the will to power in all of its cruel splendor; the old animal impulses, cultivated with foresight and transmogrified through the use of memory, imagination, and reason erupt in new forms of mastery. "This secret self-ravishment, this artist's cruelty, this delight in imposing a form upon oneself as a hard, recalcitrant, suffering material and in burning a will, a critique, a contradiction, a contempt, a No into it, this uncanny, dreadfully joyous labor of a soul voluntarily at odds with itself that makes itself suffer out of joy in making suffer-eventually this entire active bad conscience-you will have guessed it- as the womb of all ideal and imaginative phenomena, also brought to life an abundance of strange new beauty and affirmation, and perhaps beauty itself."

**The ability for humans to exercise cruelty on others is the only potential for greatness – the plans attempts to create less cruelty aim are perfecting power to the point it becomes useless.**

**Miller 90** (James, Professor of Political Science and Chair, Department of Liberal Studies @ Fullerton, “Carnivals of Atrocity: Foucault, Nietzsche, Cruelty,” Political Theory 18: 3, Aug, 470-491, Jstor, AD: 7/8/09)

By contrast, contemporary societies, which seek to institute" less cruelty, less suffering, more gentleness, more respect, more 'humanity,' " aim at a "perfection of power" that would "render its actual exercise useless." With the abolition of death by torture, "the people was robbed of its old pride in its crimes." No longer was traversing the law permitted to be a source of shared pleasure. The criminal was no longer cast as an outlaw, a hero, a fitting adversary of sovereign power, but rather as a "deviant," an anomaly, an aberration from the norms of a universal humanity, and therefore a "case," to be analyzed, rehabilitated, and, if possible, cured. Deprived of a shared public forum for savoring displays of cruel omnipotence, subject to disciplinary regimens that painlessly "dissociate power from the body," dissipating savage impulses by acting in depth "on the heart, the thought, the will, inclinations," mankind finds its potential for greatness - its ability to exercise its "super-power"-s quandered. The eagle - Nietzsche's proud symbol of sovereign power - becomes useless, as does the "dancing star" born of chaos: "Incipit tragoedia."32

**The concept of Compassion destroys beneficial suffering, and it gives the ultimate weapon to the impoverished**

**Frazer, ‘6** (Michael, Ph, The Compassion of Zarathustra: Nietzsche on Sympathy and Strength,http://www.gov.harvard.edu/files/The%20Compassion%20of%20Zarathustra.pdf; WBTR)

In discussing what can be translated into English alternately as “pity,” “sympathy,” or “compassion,” Nietzsche almost always uses variations on the German term Mitleid—literally, “suffering-with”—and only rarely uses alternative German terms such as Mitempfinden, Mitgefu¨ hl (both “feeling-with”) or Sympathie. Nietzsche was never entirely satisfied with the vocabulary available in German to describe the phenomenon in question— he complains “how coarsely does language assault with its one word [i.e., Mitleid ] so polyphonous a being!”—but it is the vocabulary he uses nonetheless (MR 2:133, p. 133). The English words “compassion,” from the Latin for “suffering with” (com-passion), or “sympathy” from the Greek for the same (sym-pathos), would be appropriate translations of Mitleid. In virtually all English-language translations of and commentaries on Nietzsche, however, variations on the term “pity” are chosen instead.29 Yet “pity,” which has an entirely different etymology, often carries negative  connotations of superficiality and condescension which Mitleid lacks.30 Perhaps much of the subtlety of Nietzsche’s position on Mitleid has been overlooked in the English-speaking world at least in part because of the widespread translation of the term as “pity.”31 Regardless of how Mitleid is translated, however, Nietzsche’s condemnation of the sentiment could hardly appear more straightforward to a superficial reader. As has been established, Nietzsche evaluates any human phenomenon as a symptom of strength or weakness, a sign of the advancement of life or of its decline. His question concerning compassion is thus, “Is it, above all else, good for you yourselves to be compassionate [mitleidige] men?” (FW IV:338, p. 269). The answer seems obvious. “Compassion [Mitleiden],” Nietzsche writes, “insofar as it really causes suffering [Leiden]— and this is here our only point of view—is a weakness” (MR II:134, p. 134). “One is deprived of strength when one feels compassion [mitleidet],” he explains. “Compassion makes suffering contagious,” and therefore “stands opposed to the tonic emotions which heighten our vitality” (AC 7, pp. 572–573).32 Yet this line of argument, taken in isolation, would categorize compassion one weakness among many others, little different from the suffering which it leads one to share, and Nietzsche’s critique of the sentiment seems to go much further.33 “The virtue of which  Schopenhauer still taught that it is the supreme, the only virtue, and the basis of all virtues,” Nietzsche wrote in his notes, “precisely compassion [Mitleiden] I recognized as more dangerous than any vice” (WM 54, p. 34). How is this unique status of compassion to be understood? Perhaps we should turn our attention from the subject of compassion to its object. Nietzsche does ask whether such an emotion is good, not only for those who feel it, but also “for those who suffer [den Leidenen]” (FW IV:338, p. 269). His answer here, too, is that compassion is of no value; “if one does good merely out of compassion [Mitleid ], it is oneself one really does good to, and not the other” (WM 368, p. 199). To be sure, one’s painful sympathy may be soothed, but the object of this sympathy has been shamed by the condescension charity implies, and, even more importantly, been deprived of the opportunity to build real strength from his own efforts to overcome his suffering. Indeed, the potential value of suffering as a challenge to be met head-on, a spur to greatness, and a test of one’s mettle is a central theme in Nietzsche’s ethics. “It almost determines the order of rank,” he repeatedly insists, “how profoundly human beings can suffer” (JGB IX:270, p. 410). “To those of my disciples who have any concern for me,” Nietzsche therefore reasons, “I wish suffering, desolation, sickness, ill-treatment, indignities . . . I have no compassion [Mitleid ] for them, because I wish them the only thing that can prove today whether one is worth anything or not” (WM 910, p. 481).34 These are all strong arguments against compassion, to be sure. But Nietzsche insists that there is still “a more important one. . . . Quite in general, compassion [das Mitleiden] crosses the law of development, which is the law of selection. It preserves what is ripe for destruction, it defends those who have been disinherited and condemned by life” (AC 7, p. 573).35 The eugenic argument against compassion is a direct extension  of the medical nature of Nietzschean ethics. “Life itself recognizes no solidarity, no ‘equal rights,’ between the healthy and the degenerate parts of an organism: one must excise the latter—or the whole will perish,” Nietzsche explains. As a result, “Compassion for [Mitleiden mit] decadents, equal rights for the ill-constituted—that would be the profoundest immorality; that would be antinature itself as morality!” (WM 734, p. 389). The physician to humanity, in order to save it from its degenerate parts, must therefore first play physician to the individual psyche, for it is the compassion in the individual that feeds the degeneracy in the collective. “To be physicians here, to wield the scalpel here,” Nietzsche explains, “that is our part; that is our love of man; that is how we are philosophers” (AC 7, p. 574). Even this eugenic view, however, fails to capture the full danger of compassion, for it portrays the weak and sickly who are its objects as mere passive recipients of aid. To the contrary, compassion is actively wielded as a weapon in the hands of the weak. For the most degenerate of the degenerate, it is the one weapon they have left, the one last strength which shows that they are still alive as manifestations of the will to power. They therefore wield compassion with relish. When the weak beg the strong for sympathy, “the compassion [Das Mitleiden] which these [the strong] then express is a consolation for the weak and suffering, inasmuch as it shows them that, all their weakness notwithstanding, they possess at any rate one power: the power to hurt” (MAM I:50, p. 39). The result is not only the objective degeneration of humanity over the generations, but also a subjective sense of shame on the part of those who remain strong. Full power over another, remember, is control over his values. The ultimate victory of the slaves over the masters thus comes when they have “succeeded in poisoning the consciences of the fortunate with their own misery, with all misery, so that one day the fortunate begin to be ashamed of their good fortune and perhaps say to one another: ‘it is disgraceful to be fortunate: there is too much misery’” (GM III:14, p. 560). According to Nietzsche, the recent development of Schopenhauer’s Mitleids-Moral is evidence that slave morality is finally coming to selfconsciousness, stripping itself of its theological underpinnings and realizing that it is founded on nothing more (or, for that matter, nothing less) than the coercive power of compassion, the one great weapon of the weak. MitleidsMoral hence has the advantage of a certain clear-headedness, a certain lack of illusions about itself not present in earlier (e.g., Christian) forms of slave morality. But it is slave morality all the same and, from the perspective of life, deserves the fiercest ethical opposition.

## Cede the Political

**Infinite obligation to the other produces political deadlock and philosophical irrelevance**

**Rorty ’98** Richard, Professor of Philosophy, Achieving Our Country

These futile attempts to philosophize one's way into political relevance are a symptom of what happens when a Left retreats from activism and adopts a spectatorial approach to the problems of its country. Disengagement from practice produces theoretical hallucinations. These result in an intellectual environment which is, as Mark Edmundson says in his book Nightmare on Main Street, Gothic. The cultural Left is haunted by ubiquitous specters, the most frightening of which is called "power." This is the name of what Edmund- son calls Foucault's "haunting agency, which is everywhere and nowhere, as evanescent and insistent as a resourceful spook."10 In its Foucauldian usage, the term "power" denotes an agency which has left an indelible stain on every word in our language and on every institution in our society. It is always already there, and cannot be spotted coming or going. One might spot a corporate bagman arriving at a congressman's office, and perhaps block his entrance. But one cannot block off power in the Foucauldian sense. Power is as much inside one as outside one. It is nearer than hands and feet. As Edmundson says: one cannot "confront power; one can only encounter its temporary and generally unwitting agents . . . [it] has capacities of motion and transformation that make it a preternatural force."1' Only interminable individual and social self-analysis, and perhaps not even that, can help uses- cape from the infinitely fine meshes of its invisible web. The ubiquity of Foucauldian power is reminiscent of the ubiquity of Satan, and thus of the ubiquity of original sin— that diabolical stain on every human soul. I argued in my first lecture that the repudiation of the concept of sin was at the heart of Dewey and Whitman's civic religion. I also claimed that the American Left, in its horror at the Vietnam War, rein-vented sin. It reinvented the old religious idea that some stains are ineradicable. I now wish to say that, in committing itself to what it calls "theory," this Left has gotten something which is entirely too much like religion. For the cultural Left has come to believe that we must place our country within a theoretical frame of reference, situate it within a vast quasi-cosmological perspective. Stories about the webs of power and the insidious influence of a hegemonic ideology do for this Left what stories about the Lamanites did for Joseph Smith and what stories about Yakkub did for Elijah Muhammad. What stories about blue-eyed devils are to the Black Muslims, stories about hegemony and power are to many cultural leftists—the only thing they really want to hear. To step into the intellectual world which some of these leftists inhabit is to move out of a world in which the citizens of a democracy can join forces to resist sadism and selfishness into a Gothic world in which democratic politics has become a farce. It is a world in which all the day lit cheerfulness of Whitmanesque hypersecularism has been lost, and in which "liberalism" and "humanism" are synonyms for naivete—for an inability to grasp the full horror of our situation. I have argued in various books that the philosophers most often cited by cultural leftists—Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, and Derrida—are largely right in their criticisms of Enlightenment rationalism. I have argued further that traditional liberalism and traditional humanism are entirely compatible with such criticisms. We can still be old- fashioned reformist liberals even if, like Dewey, we give up the correspondence theory of truth and start treating moral and scientific beliefs as tools for achieving greater human happiness, rather than as representations of the intrinsic nature of reality. We can be this kind of liberal even after we turn our backs on Descartes, linguistify subjectivity, and see everything around us and within us as one more replaceable social construction. But I have also urged that insofar as these antimetaphysical, anti-Cartesian philosophers offer a quasi-religious form of spiritual pathos, they should be relegated to private life and not taken as guides to political deliberation. The notion of "infinite responsibility," formulated by Emmanuel Levinas and sometimes deployed by Derrida—as well as Derrida's own frequent discoveries of impossibility, unreachability, and unrepresentability—may be useful to some of us in our individual quests for private perfection. When we take up our public responsibilities, however, the infinite and the unrepresentable are **merely nuisances**. Thinking of our responsibilities in these terms is as much of a stumbling-block to effective political organization as is the sense of sin. Emphasizing the impossibility of meaning, or of justice, as Derrida sometimes does, is a temptation to Gothicize—to view democratic politics as ineffectual, because unable to cope with preternatural forces. Whitman and Dewey, I have argued, gave us all the romance, and all the spiritual uplift, we Americans need to go about our public business. As Edmundson remarks, we should not allow Emerson, who was a precursor of both Whitman and Dewey, to be displaced by Poe, who was a pre- cursor of Lacan. For purposes of thinking about how to achieve our country, we do not need to worry about the correspondence theory of truth, the grounds of normativity, the impossibility of justice, or the infinite distance which separates us from the other. For those purposes, we can give both religion and philosophy a pass. We can just get on with trying to solve what Dewey called "the problems of men." To think about those problems means to refrain from thinking so much about otherness that we begin to acquiesce in what Todd Gitlin has called, in the title of a recent book, "the twilight of common dreams." It means deriving our moral identity, at least in part, from our citizenship in a democratic nation-state, and from leftist attempts to fulfill the promise of that nation.

## Politics

**Plan insures a fight**

**Washington Post 05** By Charles Babington and Shailagh Murray Washington Post Staff Writers Thursday, September 8, 2005

A Republican-led Congress cannot be trusted to make a thorough investigation of a Republican administration, said Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.). "Democrats strongly prefer that the response to Hurricane Katrina be investigated by a commission of independent experts like the 9/11 commission," he said. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) said the new commission "is not truly bipartisan, will not be made up of equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, cannot write legislation and will not have bipartisan subpoena power." From the moment the dimensions of New Orleans' devastation became apparent, Democrats and some nonpartisan groups have said the Bush administration's response was slow, uncertain and unenergetic. Some said the tragedy required a strong and visceral devotion to social services, which are dearer to Democrats than to Republicans.

**Plan will be all about placing blame – ensures fights**

**Washington Post 05** By Charles Babington and Shailagh Murray Washington Post Staff Writers Thursday, September 8, 2005

Congressional Republicans had hoped to devote this fall to tax cuts, private investment accounts for Social Security and tilting the judiciary further to the right. Instead, they are appropriating massive sums for the Hurricane Katrina recovery effort and retreating, at least for now, from plans to eliminate the estate tax. As a day of dueling speeches and news conferences made clear yesterday**, the** two **parties will battle intensely to influence the inevitable investigations into the serious shortcomings in the government's response to the catastrophe in New Orleans and its environs**. While Republicans have more members in the House and Senate, Democrats say they have more credibility and enthusiasm for the government services that Katrina's wreckage will require: urban renewal, aid to the poor and robust social programs. With the midterm congressional elections 14 months away, both parties see high stakes in where blame will eventually fall for the government's lagging response to Katrina. Yesterday, congressional Republicans tried to get a head start, announcing the formation of an investigative commission that they can control. They rejected Democratic appeals to model the panel after the Sept. 11 commission, which was made up of non-lawmakers and was equally balanced between Republicans and Democrats. That commission won wide praise for assessing how the 2001 terrorist attacks occurred, and for recommending changes in the government's anti-terrorism structure. House and Senate GOP leaders announced the "Hurricane Katrina Joint Review Committee," which will include only members of Congress, with Republicans outnumbering Democrats by a yet-to-be-determined ratio. The commission, which will have subpoena powers, will investigate the actions of local, state and federal governments before and after the storm that devastated New Orleans and other portions of the Gulf Coast. "Congress is actively responding to the disaster caused by Hurricane Katrina," House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) and Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) said in a statement released during an appearance attended only by Republicans, after an all-GOP planning session. The announcement came a day after President Bush said his administration would conduct an investigation into the Katrina response and House Majority Leader Tom DeLay (R-Tex.) ordered the House Government Reform Committee to suspend plans for immediate hearings. Democrats denounced both actions, and they called the Frist-Hastert plan inadequate. They vowed to push their own proposals for helping the storm's victims and investigating government agencies' responses.

**Republican backlash**

**Niman 05** professor of journalism in the communications department at Buffalo State College Katrina’s America: Failure, racism, and Profiteering by Michael I. Niman http://www.thehumanist.org/humanist/articles/Niman.Katrina.pdf

Furthermore, rather than act on Bush’s rhetorical promises, his administration and his allies in congress are moving ahead in business-as-usual fashion, continuing to screw hurricane survivors while covering up their own tracks. The day before Bush made his “we’ll do everything possible” speech, senate **republicans killed an attempt to establish a bipartisan commission** to investigate the federal government’s handling of the response to Hurricane Katrina and the new orleans levee breaks—this as hundreds of reports are emerging of federal officials preventing thousands of aid workers, boats, and truckloads of donated food and water to enter the region. The senate’s action came on the same day that Knight ridder uncovered federal documents showing that it was Homeland security chief michael chertoff, and not fema chief michael Brown, who had the authority to dispatch immediate aid to the region. Brown, who was certainly inept, took the fall while chertoff escaped responsibility—in effect living on to screw up the next disaster. and there will be no investigation.

**It is partisan politics**

**New York Times 06** By MICHIKO KAKUTANI Published: May 16, 2006 http://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/16/books/16kaku.html?pagewanted=all

A professor of history at Tulane University, Mr. Brinkley writes not as a detached observer but as a longtime resident of New Orleans, and his passion for his beleaguered city — and his anger at the government's mismanagement of the situation — are palpable in these pages. He describes "Katrinaworld" as "a denuded black hole of double-talking gibberish where the bureaucrats hid behind the white marble walls of statistical procedure and partisan politics," and he charges that "every time the Bush administration and the State of Louisiana hesitated, lawyered up and read the fine print on homeland security procedure, an American died prematurely."

**Plan costs PC**

**The Economist 05** Lexington The ice storm Katrina has probably frozen politics, not changed it Sep 15th 2005 | from the print edition http://www.economist.com/node/4403361

The third safety net is partisanship: faithful Republicans and Democrats witnessed different catastrophes in the Gulf. Most Republicans still approve of Mr Bush's performance. Indeed, the fact that one American in four “strongly approves” of his actions over Katrina suggests that nothing short of evidence of treason can turn diehard conservatives against this president—if that. The partisan divide also means that the White House has few incentives to change “Bush business-as-usual”. Yes**, he must devote his political capital to reforming homeland security** rather than reforming Social Security, but pension reform was a dead duck before Katrina. Yes, he will have to blow as much as $200 billion on rebuilding the Gulf coast, but he hardly had a reputation for fiscal frugality. Mr Bush now has even more reasons to pander to the people who are keeping him from political free-fall: hard-core Republicans. The chances that he will nominate a conservative judge to replace Sandra Day O'Connor—probably Priscilla Owen—are higher than ever.

**Plan unpopular – FEMA**

**The Daily Caller 11** Senate reaches deal in FEMA budget battle Published: 8:11 PM 09/26/2011 By C.J. Ciaramella - The Daily Caller http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/26/senate-reaches-deal-in-fema-budget-battle/

The two chambers of Congress were at loggerheads last week over disaster aid funding to FEMA, with House Republicans demanding spending cuts to offset additional funds to the agency. The Republican-crafted resolution which passed the House on Friday included roughly $3.2 billion in FEMA funding for fiscal year 2012, but about $1.5 billion of that was offset by spending cuts to a Department of Energy loan program for manufacturers of fuel-efficient cars. Democrats bitterly objected to the offsets and blocked the House bill, leaving legislators scrambling to reach a deal before a government shutdown occurred on Friday, when current government funding runs out. (RELATED: ‘Nope,’ Cantor doesn’t want to abandon FEMA pet evacuation funding) Senate Democrats accused Republicans of playing politics with disaster aid and repeatedly pinned blame on House Majority Leader Rep. Eric Cantor for the hold-up, calling the offsets the “tea party agenda” and the “Cantor doctrine.”

**FEMA is a political battle ground**

**Palm Beach Post 11** FEMA DISASTER RELIEF FUND COULD FACE $5 BILLION SHORTFALL By Laura Green Palm Beach Post Published Thursday, September 1, 2011

But long-term projects such as school and road repairs that are not yet approved and stem from the spring tornadoes and past storms, including hurricanes Katrina and Rita, will not receive money for now, Administrator Craig Fugate said. Congress can remedy the agency's budget woes by injecting cash into the fund, but politicians have signaled they intend to make FEMA the next battleground in a partisan fight over government spending. Using language reminiscent of the recent debt ceiling debate, congressional Republicans say additional FEMA funding is contingent on cuts being made elsewhere in the budget. Rep. Ron Paul, R-Texas, a presidential candidate, wants to abolish the agency. FEMA has made Americans too dependent upon it, rewarding those who build on beaches and other precarious spots and then rescuing them when a storm wipes out their houses, he said. "We've conditioned our people that FEMA will take care of us and everything will be OK," Paul told Fox News. "But you can't just keep saying, 'Oh, they need money.'" The House has approved funding for FEMA contingent on other budget cuts, but the Democratic-controlled Senate has not taken up the bill. Rep. Tom Rooney, R-Tequesta, agreed that "new spending " for FEMA should be offset by budget cuts.

**Republicans hate disaster relief**

**Rason 11** Dina Rasor, an investigator, journalist and author Obama's FEMA: First Look at How It Worked Friday, 02 September 2011 05:23 By, Truthout | Solutions

However, this bipartisan approach to the storm hasn't lasted. Even as Irene was dumping its deluge of rain onto the East Coast and inland, Republicans began to take out the long knives on Obama and FEMA. Although he voted several years ago to do just the opposite, House Republican Leader Eric Cantor has insisted that all the emergency money spent on this and other disasters must have equal cuts in the already beleaguered nondiscretionary spending budget. This came from a member of Congress whose district was the epicenter of the unexpected earthquake that hit the mid-Atlantic states right before Irene. Other Republicans piled on, and Republican presidential candidate Ron Paul, true to his idealistic libertarian roots, wants FEMA to be eliminated all together and to go back to the time when each local town and their state were on their own when disaster struck.

**Plan causes budget battles**

**ABC News 11** AMY BINGHAM (@Amy\_Bingham) Aug. 31, 2011 Hurricane Irene Puts Spotlight on Partisan Battles Over FEMA Emergency Funding http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/hurricane-irene-flooding-put-spotlight-fema-emergency-funding/story?id=14414230#.T\_DvWLWXRSQ

The natural disaster streak of 2011 seems to be giving the apocalypse a run for its money and has left the U.S. government in need of even more. Devastating flooding in the Mississippi River Valley, deadly tornadoes in Missouri and an enormous hurricane on the East Coast have wrung all the spare change from a cash-strapped Federal Emergency Management Agency still reeling from Hurricane Katrina. **But emergency supplemental appropriations that have traditionally passed quickly through Congress after past natural disasters are going to be a tougher sell this year**. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, the No. 2 Republican in the House, said Monday that any additional disaster funding must be offset by spending cuts, which **could throw emergency funds into the fire of partisan budget battles.**

**AT: Plan popular – current environment means the plan is unpopular**

**LA Times 11** Senate Democrats seek $6 billion in disaster aid Senate Democrats want to replenish FEMA funds to help victims of Hurricane Irene and other disasters, but Republicans say emergency assistance must be offset by spending cuts elsewhere. September 07, 2011|By Lisa Mascaro, Washington Bureau http://articles.latimes.com/2011/sep/07/nation/la-na-fema-congress-20110908

"I am not for holding up any money," said Cantor, reiterating that he raced home from a visit to the Middle East after a rare magnitude 5.8 earthquake struck his central Virginia district last month. "I just think we can act responsibly." Disaster aid, which typically enjoys bipartisan support, has run up against the kind of conservative-driven belt-tightening that has dominated other heated budget debates this year. Republicans in the GOP-led House, particularly freshmen and "tea party"-affiliated lawmakers, are resistant to adding to the nation's record deficits, even in the case of emergencies. Cantor's office has pointed to the nation's $14.3-trillion debt load as reason for austerity. But FEMA has been left short of funds by back-to-back disasters that have touched states across the nation. Floods and tornadoes pummeled Midwestern states this year and led to severe damage in Missouri. Last month, Hurricane Irene raced up the East Coast, bringing heavy flooding in New Jersey and Vermont.

## Federal Gov’t Bad

**Government will fail in disaster relief**

**Boaz, 05** (is executive vice president of the Cato Institute, Catastrophe in Big Easy Demonstrates Big Government's Failure, September 19, 2005, cato.org).

But it's no accident that governments often fail at their tasks. The incentives are all wrong. Profit-seeking companies are constantly driven to innovate, improve, cut costs, and deliver better service for less money, lest they lose customers to their competitors or even go out of business. Churches and charities are motivated by love and commitment, as well as by the need to satisfy donors or run out of money. Governments can raise taxes or print money. If a government agency fails at its mission, the usual response is to give it more money next year--not a very good incentive for success. Politicians would rather cut a ribbon at a Cowgirl Hall of Fame than fix potholes or levees. Before and after Hurricane Katrina, businesses and charities responded effectively. Government failed at even its most basic task of protecting lives and property from criminals. When massive and bloated governments at all levels disappoint, the solution is not to give them more money. Rather, the solution lies in a government limited in scope and ambition, and focused on its essential functions.

**Government fails for New Orleans protection**

**Powell 09** Jim Powell, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, Why the Government Fails to Maintain Anything October 2009 • Volume: 59 • Issue: 8

The nearly half-million people of New Orleans wanted to live in their big bowl below sea level, and they entrusted politicians with the job of maintaining more than 125 miles of levees. These large walls, typically made of earth and/or stone, surrounded the city to keep out water from the Mississippi River (to the south and southeast of the city), Lake Borgne (to the east), Lake Pontchartrain (to the north), and various canals. Since water continuously leaked into the city, there were floodwalls, about 200 floodgates, plus pumps and drainage canals for additional protection. Then Hurricane Katrina hit. It crossed Florida on Thursday, August 25, 2005, as a Category 1 (weakest category) hurricane, then gathered strength as it reached the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico. Wind velocities accelerated, and by Sunday, August 28, Katrina was a Category 5. It weakened somewhat to a Category 4 when it made landfall east of New Orleans the next day, with winds of up to 145 miles per hour. We all know what happened next. But why did it happen? There seemed to be problems almost everywhere in New Orleans’s levee system. Dr. Peter Nicholson, associate professor of civil and environmental engineering at the University of Hawaii, headed a study of the levee failures on behalf of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He reported, “We found literally dozens of breaches throughout the many miles of levee system. A number of different failure mechanisms were observed.” Ivor van Heerden, deputy director of Louisiana State University’s Hurricane Center, criticized the design and suggested that inadequate construction could also be an issue. Forensic teams that studied these levees generally agreed with the assessment. Who was responsible for the failure of the levees? They needed maintenance because everything needs maintenance and because each year the city was sinking about an inch deeper into the Mississippi River mud. Although New Orleans politicians’ most important job was public safety and the levees obviously affected public safety, politicians seemed to believe doing maintenance work–which would probably go unseen–wouldn’t serve their personal interests (especially getting reelected). The state had established the New Orleans District Levee Board in 1890 to be responsible for maintaining the levees around the city. But the board members, a majority of whom are appointed by Louisiana’s governor, pursued their interests by expanding their power, gaining jurisdiction to develop properties around the levees. Board members spent time on such matters as licensing a casino, leasing space to a karate club, and operating an airport and marinas. The Senate Homeland and Governmental Affairs Committee reported, “A review of the levee-district board minutes of recent years revealed that the board and its various committees spent more time discussing its business operations than it did the flood-control system it was responsible for operating and maintaining.” James P. Huey, who had been on the board for 13 years and served as its president for nine years, blamed the state legislature. He claimed that the board had to generate money from those time-consuming extraneous businesses because the state legislature had cut the board’s revenue in half. So even though members of the board knew that a levee in New Orleans East was three feet below its design height–which would affect its ability to withstand a storm surge and therefore jeopardized the people in the city–they didn’t get it fixed because they were squabbling about who would pay for it. The Army Corps of Engineers refused. The board wrote letters to their members of Congress asking Washington for money, but they were busy with other things. And the Flood Control Act, which Congress passed in 1965, sent a clear signal that the federal government would bail out people who wanted to live in flood-prone areas like New Orleans. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers handled design and construction of the levees, as it handled flood-control projects throughout the United States. But its budget consisted almost entirely of “earmarks,” assuring that appropriations would be spread around congressional districts. That gave incumbents something to brag about during their election campaigns. The problem was that spending a lot more money on New Orleans flood protection wasn’t the top priority for the state’s politicians. J. Bennett Johnston Jr., for example, when he was a Louisiana senator, secured appropriations for four new dams on the Red River between Mississippi and Shreveport, costing $2 billion. Bottom line: Nobody in the city, state, or federal governments wanted responsibility for maintaining the levees.

**The federal government should be taken out of disaster control – fails for multiple reasons**

**Sobel and Leeson, 06** (Flirting with Disaster: The Inherent Problems with FEMA by Russell S. Sobel and Peter T. Leeson July 19, 2006, Cato policy analysis paper #573, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa573.pdf)

The federal government’s top-down disaster response system is fundamentally flawed. The federal government usually has neither the incentive nor the information needed to effectively coordinate relief management. Thus, **the best reforms to the Federal Emergency Management Agency would take control away from the federal government,** not give it more. Effective disaster relief efforts have to overcome the problems of bureaucracy, coordination, and adverse incentives. Nonfederal relief suppliers— particularly those in the private sector—are able to overcome those problems. FEMA—a top-heavy bureaucracy that cannot effectively allocate relief resources and subjects its decisionmakers to all the wrong sorts of incentives—suffers an inherent and unique inability to solve those problems. In addition, the power to control relief funds encourages federal policymakers to help ensure reelection by spending that money on key political districts. States that are politically important to the president in his reelection bid usually have a significantly higher rate of disaster declaration. States represented on the congressional oversight committees for FEMA receive significantly more money for disasters than do states not represented on those committees. The best reform Congress could undertake would be to decentralize and depoliticize the task of disaster relief management by taking the federal government out of the disaster relief process altogether. Short of that, Congress should enact reforms that restrict the federal government’s role to only those activities that enhance the ability of the private sector to more effectively respond to disasters.

**Bureaucracy breeds failure**

**Sobel and Leeson, 06** (Flirting with Disaster: The Inherent Problems with FEMA by Russell S. Sobel and Peter T. Leeson July 19, 2006, Cato policy analysis paper #573, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa573.pdf)

The Problem of Bureaucracy The conventional wisdom is that the failure of the federal government to quickly and effectively respond to the devastation wrought by Hurricane Katrina was at least partly a result of an unprepared top-heavy bureaucracy. 1 As there is to much conventional wisdom, there is a great deal of truth to that. Disaster relief that is managed by the federal government necessarily becomes bureaucratized. FEMA was created to oversee and administer disaster relief. It is in turn overseen by people in other government agencies and members of Congress. Following 9/11, for example, FEMA was placed under the umbrella of the Department of Homeland Security, which added a new layer of bureaucracy. With so many political decisionmakers involved in the actions of FEMA, it is easy for relief efforts to be slowed or stalled and resources allocated to less important uses. As Louisiana’s governor Kathleen Blanco complained after Hurricane Katrina, “No one, it seems, even those at the highest level, seems to be able to break through the bureaucracy.” 2 That is not necessarily the result of incompetence or malice on the part of the people involved in federal disaster relief operations. Nor should it imply that congressional oversight of disaster relief is more hassle than it is worth. As we discuss later, however, political decisionmakers face incentives that often conflict with the public interest. At each level of bureaucratic action, the key decisionmakers involved may face different incentives than do the people above or below them in the chain of command. What is important to realize here is that the result of the multiple layers of bureaucracy inherent to centralized decisionmaking is usually slow and delayed action. Thus, it should come as no surprise that the real success stories in the Katrina relief effort came from those who flouted the bureaucratic decisionmaking process and took action without explicit approval by FEMA. The U.S. Coast Guard, for example, began its helicopter rescue efforts without waiting for any other government agency’s approval or coordination. As the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs concluded in its final report on its investigation of the federal response to Katrina, the Coast Guard was so effective because it operated “without significant bureaucratic hurdles.”

**Coordination failures**

**Sobel and Leeson, 06** (Flirting with Disaster: The Inherent Problems with FEMA by Russell S. Sobel and Peter T. Leeson July 19, 2006, Cato policy analysis paper #573, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa573.pdf)

Can a bureaucracy use dispersed information to coordinate demands of disaster victims with available supplies and scarce resources? As Hayek points out, that type of coordination simply cannot be achieved by channeling demands and supplies through a centralized agency. Individuals with local knowledge and the ability to act on it must be allowed to make the decisions. Decentralized markets for goods accomplish this, and in doing so solve what economists call the “coordination problem.”

**Resource allocation failures**

**Sobel and Leeson, 06** (Flirting with Disaster: The Inherent Problems with FEMA by Russell S. Sobel and Peter T. Leeson July 19, 2006, Cato policy analysis paper #573, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa573.pdf)

If a private firm had misallocated its resources the way FEMA did, it would have suffered losses. That’s because the profit and loss mechanism of decentralized markets tells suppliers whether or not they are satisfying the needs of demanders. Suppliers who do so successfully earn profits and those who do not suffer losses. Profits and losses communicate to suppliers whether or not their activities are desirable to demanders and whether or not output should be increased. In the context of relief management, the logic of profits and losses gives private providers of disaster relief essentials—such as water, food, and shelter—valuable information about whether or not they are effectively fulfilling the needs of disaster victims.

**Government misuses funding to help themselves**

**Sobel and Leeson, 06** (Flirting with Disaster: The Inherent Problems with FEMA by Russell S. Sobel and Peter T. Leeson July 19, 2006, Cato policy analysis paper #573, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa573.pdf)

Another inherent problem with the federal government’s disaster relief programs is that they are often subject to political manipulation. When government is in charge of allocating some share of disaster relief resources, political actors seeking private ends, such as reelection, face an irresistible incentive to cater to important geographic constituencies that are not always those most in need of assistance. In addition, government officials in charge of agencies such as FEMA will cater to those who determine their budgetary allocations rather than to the citizens they are supposed to serve. The incentive of political actors is to help themselves by distributing money in ways that benefit them and their political careers. 36

## States CP Solvency

**States solve- facilitation and jurisdiction.**

**Renne et al., 2008** – Renne is a PhD from the University of New Orleans, Sanchez is a PhD from the University of Utah, and Litman is a director at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (John Renne, Thomas Sanchez, and Todd Litman, “National Study on Carless and Special Needs Evacuation Planning: A Literature Review”, October 2008, accessed 7/3/12)//BZ

Similar to the federal government, state governments can facilitate carless and special needs evacuation planning through funding and facilitating intergovernmental coordination. Agencies, such as the state police, department of transportation, and departments of health and/or human services should meet on a regular basis. In larger states, with multiple urbanized areas such as California, the state should allow the metropolitan planning organizations or other regional entities to take the lead role in coordinating across jurisdictions and agencies for carless and special needs evacuation planning.

**Devolution solves- responsibility to localities**

**Renne et al., 2008** – Renne is a PhD from the University of New Orleans, Sanchez is a PhD from the University of Utah, and Litman is a director at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (John Renne, Thomas Sanchez, and Todd Litman, “National Study on Carless and Special Needs Evacuation Planning: A Literature Review”, October 2008, accessed 7/3/12)//BZ

Local government (including municipal and county government) serves an important function in emergency preparedness and disaster response. Emergency response works best when disasters do not cross political boundaries and when people are able to evacuate by car. Of course, disasters are not sensitive to political boundaries and as this report has demonstrated, many groups within society do not and cannot drive for a number of reasons. Professor Brian Wolshon, Chair of the Transportation Research Board’s Subcommittee of Emergency Evacuation stated at the 2007 National Hurricane Conference in New Orleans that automobile- based evacuation planning is the “low-hanging fruit.” He noted that a more difficult task is to plan for the more marginalized groups within society that are not able to evacuate by automobile. Planning at the local government level is critical for carless and special needs evacuation planning. Important functions include: Creating all hazards emergency response plans that considers both sheltering in-place and evacuation depending upon the extent and type of disaster Planning, testing, implementing and evaluating emergency response plans Coordinating with transportation providers, nonprofits, metropolitan planning organizations, state and federal government Signing memoranda of understanding with various agencies to ensure all liability concerns are addressed before a disaster Tracking, mapping, and coordinating transportation resources such as buses, vans, and trains Tracking and mapping where carless and special needs residents live Establishing and maintaining a special needs registry Continual public education efforts to ensure that everyone is prepared at all times for any type of disaster

**Metropolitan planning organizations solve.**

**Sanchez and Brenman 2007 – \***Director and Associate Professor, Urban Affairs and Planning Program, Virginia Tech – Alexandria Center \*\*Executive Director, Washington State Human Rights Commission (Thomas W. and Marc, “TRANSPORTATION EQUITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE: LESSONS FROM HURRICANE KATRINA”, March 29-31, 2007) //ALo

The principle of environmental justice is the product of a much broader movement to address the economic and health impacts of environmental racism. Environmental justice serves as an effective framework for understanding why low-income and minority communities face the brunt of negative impacts from transportation investment. Residents understand that toxic dumps and polluting industries are more likely to find their way into low-income and minority communities. Similarly, residents understand that low-income and minority communities are more likely to face a number of transportation-related burdens. The substantially adverse and disproportionate effects of Hurricane Katrina on African Americans in August 2005 demonstrated to many advocates that what they call “institutional racism” as one such barrier continues to exist in the United States. Institutional racism includes underlying systems and policies that keep people of color and white unequal. There are certain areas of local policy where racism becomes prominent and visible, including policing, zoning, housing, and transportation. Governmental policies and programs can either promote equality, tolerance, and justice or (consciously or not) promote division and inequality and engender the belief that specific racial and ethnic groups are second-class citizens. One area of planning with increasing potential to implement transportation equity principles is metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). While state DOTs control the majority of overall transportation planning decisions, MPOs play an important role in shaping urban transportation policies that affect the major concentrations of population within states that also include significant numbers of minorities and low-income individuals. Both of these organizations can play an increasingly important role in promoting social equity through the broad view of social inclusion. Some argue that transportation service provision is a crucial factor, feeling that the consequences of interaction between land use and transportation decisions and issues of spatial equity are effectively addressed on a regional basis and at appropriate stages in the planning process. To be effective, this requires balancing the roles of state, regional, and local agencies through a coordination, listening, and action mechanism that does not currently exist. It is in the best interest of MPOs to proactively address issues of fairness in decision making, planning, and representation, especially as they relate to allocating transportation funds. Many MPOs already have policies guided by either Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice, with several of them outlining specific strategies for public participation as key elements to guide planning. In addition, MPOs can protect themselves against legal challenges such as those faced by the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), where constituents challenged the representativeness of voting board members and were dissatisfied with expenditure levels for transit compared to highways in the Detroit metropolitan region. Successful challenges may either be the impetus to improve MPO processes or, if ignored, could undermine MPO effectiveness. The concept of MPOs, as federally mandated regional institutions, is different than the fair housing paradigm. Transportation by definition involves movement from one place to another. Housing is regarded as static. In 1966, the White House Conference on Civil Rights developed four housing goals that went further than merely removing barriers to free selection of housing. The goals were affirmative action to achieve open markets, dispersion of moderateand low-cost housing throughout metropolitan areas, development of racially inclusive new towns and suburbs, and revitalization of the existing ghettos. The lack of opportunity in education, housing, and transportation are joined together in perpetuating racial separation in America. Education, like housing, is segmented by governmental jurisdiction. For this reason, its success is viewed by advocates and analysts as insufficient. Transportation planning, because it crosses government jurisdictions in the form of MPOs, should be more successful in reducing barriers between people of different racial and ethnic groups. But the Anglo-dominated governance structure of MPOs seems to work at keeping transportation as a social barrier. We do not automatically conclude that this is due to institutional racism, as appears caused some of the problems following Hurricane Katrina. In part, because transportation equity is discussed so little, we have to substitute discussion of housing and education equity as proxy measures. Discussion of equity in a regional context also helps to substitute for the lack of transportation equity discussion and analysis. Jurisdictional issues help keep inequities in place. School integration, which had its heyday between 1966 and 2000, always stopped at the borders of school districts. There are over 15,000 school districts in the United States. In all states but two, school board members are elected. This example of grassroots democracy has helped keep school districts racially distinct. Generally, older cities have worse schools, and suburbs have better schools, measured in terms of achievement. The ability to get to and from the suburbs depends on transportation infrastructure. The freeway system, government housing policies, and suburban developers kept them separate. Have any of the 1966 housing goals been achieved? An argument can be made that they have not.

## Private CP Solvency

**AT: Irene Proves FEMA Works – Irene doesn’t prove anything and the private sector is still better**

**Watts 12** Watts, assistant professor of economics at Ball State University and the winner of the 2012 Beth A. Hoffman Memorial Prize for Economic Writin It Just Ain't So | Tyler Watts Disaster Response Restores Confidence in Government? January/February 2012 • Volume: 62 • Issue: 1

I’ll concede that Hurricane Irene was FEMA’s best showing ever. (We’re all still here, aren’t we?) This sudden outbreak of governmental competence notwithstanding, Milbank’s appraisal of FEMA as a model of salubrious big government is flawed on economic grounds. Resting his newly buttressed faith in big government on a sample size of n=1, Milbank precludes some highly relevant comparisons. Perhaps FEMA functioned well for once, but should we take this as the new normal for FEMA, or the exception to the rule? And even if we can count on a better FEMA, is federal government-centered emergency response the best we could possibly have? It’s easy to say FEMA was better this time than in its dismal past. The agency’s infamous blundering response to Hurricane Katrina (a truly epic category 5 storm) would be comic if it weren’t so tragic. Bureaucratic ineptitude led to a hesitant response, as federal officials actually halted emergency supplies and workers coming into New Orleans in the days after the storm. FEMA arguably contributed directly to Katrina’s death toll of over 1,800 by blocking or overriding local evacuation efforts. FEMA’s top-heavy D.C. bureaucracy was roundly criticized as, well, a disaster. In stark contrast, a slew of nonfederal response initiatives, from local government authorities to mega-corporations, brought in all manner of people and supplies quickly and effectively, where they were needed most. As Freeman contributor Steven Horwitz has amply documented, companies like Walmart were far more efficient and proactive than the centralized FEMA bureaucracy in getting relief goods to the people in need. Horwitz and others have noted that incentive structures facing different organizations explain the difference between successful and bungled relief efforts. Those in decentralized competitive situations, such as retailers like Walmart, have the localized knowledge of what goods are needed and where, as well as profit-and-loss incentives motivating them to act on this knowledge. Folks in centralized bureaucracies, on the other hand, naturally lack intricate knowledge of the local details and tend to be motivated by political concerns in distributing the resources they do have. The divergent results after Katrina are not surprising. While FEMA bureaucrats were halting relief convoys, misdirecting their own supplies, and hosting phony press conferences to placate the media, Walmart, Home Depot, and others were tracking the storm and massing supplies days in advance. They delegated authority to local store managers, some of whom took drastic steps to get their stores open and supplies flowing immediately. Politicians’ knee-jerk response to government failure is, naturally, to increase their own budgets. But with bureaucracies facing such systematically bad incentives, increasing their budgets is not guaranteed to improve results. Nonetheless, Milbank frets about as-yet-unspecified potential cuts to FEMA’s budget. To put his worries into perspective let’s look at FEMA’s spending record over the last few years. In 2005—a year of at least three major hurricane strikes in the United States—FEMA spent around $4.8 billion. By 2010, a year with many hurricanes (but none making landfall in the United States), FEMA’s budget had been pumped up to a whopping $10.4 billion, and it was on pace to meet or exceed that number last year. So FEMA’s budget has doubled since Katrina, and only now do we see basic competence, in relatively quiet disaster years? If FEMA faces another really harsh hurricane season—a repeat of 2005—and drops the ball again, does this mean its budget will again need to be doubled, to $20 billion? I can see the dollar signs in the bureaucrats’ eyes already. Indeed, as Public Choice economics predicts, and former Obama White House chief of staff Rahm Emmanuel conveniently admitted, big-spending bureaucrats like those in FEMA have strong incentives to “never let a crisis go to waste.” They thrive on crises as a primary rationale for larger budgets, even if they played a big hand in making such crises worse to begin with. In light of this it’s not at all surprising that the number of “major disaster” declarations has been rising over time, even in years when nature is relatively calm. FEMA had already declared 78 disasters by the fall of 2011, 30 more than the mega-storm year of 2005. Because disaster declarations are a prerequisite for unlocking federal disaster funds, it’s not surprising that FEMA finds ways to define disaster down, or that the number of declarations goes up for election years and in politically sensitive swing states (tinyurl.com/5usys7s). In reality FEMA’s seemingly fantastic response to Irene is likely a product of media hype. The storm had basically fizzled out by the time it hit densely populated areas. Recall that Irene had weakened to a mere tropical storm by the time it reached the Jersey shore, and the main effect on the mid-Atlantic and New England states was torrential rain—not nearly as severe as the massive storm surge and catastrophic flooding from Katrina. Yes, there were power outages and locally severe flooding with Irene, but such are common in the United States. Private businesses and local authorities responded well, as they always do. Milbank offers no compelling reason to believe that a bloated FEMA bureaucracy is essential, or even beneficial, in helping these responses along.

**Government fails but the private sector solves – any government action directly tradesoff**

**Anderson 10** William L. Anderson associate professor of economics at Frostburg State University New Orleans: Victim of Government Neglect? Or just of government? Posted September 01, 2010

Five years ago Hurricane Katrina, a massive Category 3 storm, hit the Gulf Coast region, destroying property, killing nearly 2,000 people, and leaving damage that still dots the landscape. Although the brunt of the storm hit the Mississippi coast, Katrina is best-known for the flooding of New Orleans, which happened when levees created to keep out the floodwaters burst and drowned the city. The standard tale one still hears from the mainstream media is that the Bush administration, driven by racism and antigovernment, free-market sentiment, simply neglected New Orleans when Katrina hit and failed to send enough help. Recently, President Obama declared that the government has not forgotten the city and that federal help still is on the way. The “I’m from the government and I am here to help you” line supposedly was missing after Katrina, according to the pundits. In the immediate aftermath of the disaster, Paul Krugman declared: [T]he federal government’s lethal ineptitude wasn’t just a consequence of Mr. Bush’s personal inadequacy; it was a consequence of ideological hostility to the very idea of using government to serve the public good. For 25 years the right has been denigrating the public sector, telling us that government is always the problem, not the solution. Why should we be surprised that when we needed a government solution, it wasn’t forthcoming? Yet, as Daniel Rothschild pointed out two years later in an article in Reason, the Gulf Coast, including New Orleans, did not suffer from government neglect. Instead, it suffered from government involvement — or better put, interference — in the daily affairs of people trying to clean up the mess and rebuild. He wrote: The most effective solutions are being found locally, mostly in spite of government efforts, not because of them. The real problem, as economists Sanford Ikeda and Peter Gordon suggest, is not that political leaders aren’t doing enough, it’s that they’re doing too much, and doing it poorly. There’s too much centralized control preventing people from finding the solutions that best fit their own communities. John Stossel wrote in a similar vein: When Hurricane Katrina struck, private citizens wanted to help, but often the government got in the way. The doctors who wanted to heal people in New Orleans, but were told to fill out tax forms instead, experienced just one of many horror tales. Government seemed to have declared a monopoly on helping people — but then its insane bureaucracy made certain it did a lousy job helping. Because New Orleans was tagged for special government help, that also meant that any clearance or rebuilding had to be approved by officials, which meant waiting days for bureaucrats to sign the appropriate forms. The deadening effect of such red tape cannot be underestimated. As Rothschild noted: The commonly held notion that post-Katrina recovery effort has been hampered by a lack of leadership is true only if “leadership” refers only to political leadership. There, there’s not only a lack of leadership, but a stifling bureaucracy that’s smothering real progress. Across the Gulf Coast, there are real people taking real risks, trying to buck the obstacles thrown in their way, and many are seeing real results. Governments at all levels have spent billions of dollars on New Orleans, yet the city still lags. The stories of government bungling and outright interference with common sense are abundant and contrast dramatically with private efforts. Governments also slapped down price controls, which slowed economic adjustment, which in turn meant a slower recovery. One can only wonder what might have happened had the federal government spent no money at all. We never will know, but I suspect that the Crescent City very well might have been much better off. A few months after the disaster economist Richard Ebeling predicted that government efforts to rebuild New Orleans would be disastrous and that it would be better to let the free market work.

**Government involvement makes it worse – private sector key**

**Boettke 11** Peter J. Boettke, University Professor of Economics and Philosophy at George Mason University and director of the F. A. Hayek Program for Advanced Study in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics at the Mercatus Center, The Militarization of Compassion July/August 2011 • Volume: 61 • Issue: 6

The language of disaster and recovery efforts is one of centralization—a military effort is presumed to be required to tackle the urgent problem. But the militarization of compassion is not very effective in achieving improvement. As my colleague Chris Coyne (author of After War and a forthcoming book on humanitarian aid) suggests in his paper “Delusions of Grandeur,” imagine you asked the firemen responding to a raging fire at a corporate building to also coordinate the provision of medical supplies and treatment, oversee the reconstruction of the building, and then rebuild the company’s supply chain after the fire was extinguished and the building rebuilt. This is precisely what happens through the creeping militarization of humanitarian efforts. The militarization of compassion does not help strengthen families, rebuild communities, or cultivate commerce. Instead, it centralizes efforts and ignores the local knowledge that resides in individuals and that is embedded in communities. Our intuition pushes toward command and control, but the science of economics pushes back against this intuition and favors the decentralized, on-the-ground information possessed by individuals—who are capable of embracing the challenges of the “cares of thinking and all the troubles of living” (as Tocqueville argued was required of a society of free and responsible individuals). The militarization of compassion may help those far away to feel they are doing their best to address the crisis, but once we get beyond the initial search-and-rescue phase and on to the second, rebuilding phase, the result is usually planned chaos. Government Roadblocks What emerged from our studies of the rebuilding after Hurricane Katrina was the vital role that both civil society and commercial life, as opposed to government direction, played in successful efforts to bounce back from the disaster. Whenever government attempted to guide individuals in their decisions rather than allow them to base those decisions on their local knowledge and to follow their private motivations, roadblocks to recovery arose. Mill’s observation about the amazing rapidity of recovery was confirmed in those areas where the free movement of labor and capital was permitted, and frustration was produced by restrictions on the freedom to choose. What we have learned from the study of disasters and recovery is that efforts to provide immediate humanitarian aid will always have elements of chaos. The chaos is alleviated not through the militarization of compassion, but rather through the market mechanism that takes over the allocation of resources and signals the required adjustments through relative prices and the feedback of profit and loss.

**Privatization solves better**

**Block 05** (Professor of Economics, New Orleans Loyola, Walter, The Katrina Came, http://www.lewrockwell.com/block/block51.html)

I. Private Enterprise First of all, the levees that were breached by the hurricane were built, owned and operated by government. Specifically, by the Army Corps of Engineers. The levees could have been erected to a greater height. They could have been stronger than they were. The drainage system could have operated more effectively. Here, the New Orleans Sewerage and Water Board was at fault. It consists of three main operating systems: sewerage, water, and drainage. See here, here and here. Had they been, a lot of the inconvenience, fright, and even loss of life undergone in this city could have been avoided. Then, too, these facilities may have fooled many people into thinking they were safer than they actually were. I know this applies to me. Thus, people were in effect subsidized, and encouraged to settle in the Big Easy. Without this particular bit of government mismanagement, New Orleans would likely have been settled less intensively. (On the other hand, at one time this city was the largest in the South; statist negligence of a different kind — graft, corruption, over-regulation — is responsible for it having a smaller population than otherwise.) I am not appalled with these failures. After all, it is only human to err. Were these levee facilities put under the control of private enterprise, there is no guarantee of zero human suffering in the aftermath of Katrina. No, what enrages me is not any one mistake, or even a litany of them, but rather the fact that there is no automatic feedback mechanism that penalizes failure, and rewards success, the essence of the market system of private enterprise. Will the New Orleans Sewerage and Water Board suffer any financial reverses as a result of the failure of their installations to prevent the horrendous conditions now being suffered by New Orleanians? To ask this question is to answer it. One crucial step forward then, would be the privatization of this enterprise as part of the rebuilding process (if that indeed occurs; for more on this, see below). Perhaps a stock company could be formed; I suspect that the largest hotels, restaurants, universities, hospitals and other such ventures would have an incentive to become owners of such an enterprise. Right now, the levees are run by the very same types of folks responsible for the post office and the motor vehicle bureau. I take no position on whether levees are a good or bad thing; only that if they are to be built, this should be done by an economic entity that can lose funding, and thus put its very existence at risk, if it errs**. This can only apply to the market, never the state.** This is neither the time nor place to examine in detail the case for private ownership of bodies of water such as the Mississippi River, Lake Ponchartrain, and, indeed, all oceans, rivers, seas and lakes. But the same principles apply here as they do to land. Suffice it to say that this is a question that should be explored, for it is no accident that where there is private property there is safety and responsibility, and where there is not there is not.

**Privatization solves the root cause – government is what created the conditions for great natural disasters.**

**Block 05** (Professor of Economics, New Orleans Loyola, Walter, The Katrina Came, http://www.lewrockwell.com/block/block51.html)

III. Weather Socialism But there is a third element we cannot ignore: weather socialism. According to an old adage, critics of government can properly blame this institution for many things, but bad weather is not among them. Wrong, wrong. At the risk of sounding out of step with the mainstream (a new experience for me) the state is responsible not only for hurricanes, but for tornados, storms, typhoon, tsunami, excessive heat, excessive cold, too much rain, too little rain, floods, droughts, desertification, tempests, squalls, gales, rainstorms, snowstorms, thunderstorms, blizzards, downpours, cyclones, whirlwinds, twisters, monsoons, torrential rains, cloudbursts, showers, etc. You name any kind of bad weather conditions, and the government is to blame. Why, pray tell? Because the state at all levels grabs off almost 50% of the GDP in taxes, and its regulations account for a significant additional amount of wealth not created. If the voracious government left all or even most of the property created by its rightful owners — those who created it in the first place with their own hands — the weather problem could undoubtedly be better addressed by private enterprise. And for what wondrous tasks does the government waste trillions of our earnings? Let me count some few of the ways. It subsidizes farmers who ought to be allowed to go bankrupt when they cannot earn an honest profit in their industry. As the number of farmers has declined over the years, the number of bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture has increased. Welfare for farmers and agricultural mandarins. Speaking of welfare, this is but the tip of the iceberg. Our masters in Washington D.C. distribute our hard-earned money to people who bear children they cannot afford to feed, and to corporate welfare bums. Then there is the Department of Education (weren't the Republicans going to get rid of this sore on the body politic?) that presides over a public school system that warehouses and mis-educates our children. And don't get me started on our system of medical socialism that wastes yet other precious resources. We don't have HillaryCare yet but we are well on our way. Then, too, we must count government throwing our money at the Post Office, the Space program, ethanol, foreign "aid," unemployment insurance, the list goes on and on. The drug war incarcerates thousands of innocent people — who could be out there creating additional wealth — at a cost exceeding tuition and room and board at some of our most prestigious universities. Last but certainly not least, speaking of war, the U.S. has been bullying its way around the world for decades, creating untold havoc. Katrina can't hold a candle to our armed forces in terms of killing innocent people. There are no truer words than that "War is the health of the State." Suppose that the "public sector" were not wasting untold riches. What has this got to do with improving weather conditions? Well, a lot of the money returned to the long-suffering taxpayers (and much of the additional wealth created by the ending of economic regulations) would be allocated in the usual directions: sailboats and pianos, and violin lessons and better food and more entertainment, etc. But some of it would likely be invested in more research and development as to the causes and cures of unwelcome weather conditions.

**CP solves the aff better than the perm**

**Sobel and Leeson, 06** (Flirting with Disaster: The Inherent Problems with FEMA by Russell S. Sobel and Peter T. Leeson July 19, 2006, Cato policy analysis paper #573, http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa573.pdf)

The problem with many “privatization” reforms, for instance, is that they do not fully de-politicize disaster relief management. For instance, proposals for disaster relief outsourcing still leave a substantial decisionmaking role for government. 43 Although possibly an improvement over the status quo, this type of reform only partially and very imperfectly corrects just one part of the problem. Leaving government at the helm of disaster relief management keeps in place the incentive problems of centralized disaster relief discussed previously. As long as the federal government has the power to dispense disaster relief funds, its incentive is to do so in a way that maximizes political ends instead of dispensing them to those with genuine need. Furthermore, adverse incentives may be introduced by allowing private suppliers to vie for federal disaster relief contracts. Potential suppliers might be selected on the basis of favoritism. Disaster relief reforms that only partially “privatize” disaster relief are also likely to continue to suffer from the government waste and fraud that have repeatedly plagued FEMA. 44 An investigation by the South Florida Sun-Sentinel, for example, found widespread fraud in FEMA spending. Looking at only 20 of the 313 disasters declared between 1999 and 2004, that investigation found that 27 percent of the $1.2 billion doled out by FEMA went to areas (or individuals) that suffered little or no damage. Examples include $31 million paid to Miami-Dade County residents who did not experience hurricane conditions and $168.5 million to Detroit residents for a rainstorm in 2000 that the mayor at the time couldn’t even recall. 45 A much more effective and consequently more appealing form of disaster relief management reform involves taking government out of disaster relief altogether. Hurricane Katrina demonstrated that even in the face of government-erected barriers private relief efforts are amazingly effective. Totally depoliticizing disaster relief also completely eliminates the potential for the political problems, manipulations, and obstacles to genuine aid that centralized disaster management necessarily entails

**Government fails in disaster relief – private sector is best**

**Boaz, 05** (is executive vice president of the Cato Institute, Catastrophe in Big Easy Demonstrates Big Government's Failure, September 19, 2005, cato.org).

Let's look at the facts. Government failed to plan. Government spent $50 billion a year on homeland security without, apparently, preparing itself to deal with a widely predicted natural disaster. Government was sluggish in responding to the disaster. Government kept individuals, businesses, and charities from responding as quickly as they wanted. And at the deepest level, government so destroyed wealth and self-reliance in the people of New Orleans that they were unable to fend for themselves in a crisis. And some people conclude that we have too little government? Start with the failure to plan. As Paul Krugman wrote on September 2: Before 9/11 the Federal Emergency Management Agency listed the three most likely catastrophic disasters facing America: a terrorist attack on New York, a major earthquake in San Francisco and a hurricane strike on New Orleans. "The New Orleans hurricane scenario," The Houston Chronicle wrote in December 2001, "may be the deadliest of all." It described a potential catastrophe very much like the one now happening. The warning was there. And after 9/11, federal spending on homeland security skyrocketed, up to about $50 billion in the current fiscal year. A Department of Homeland Security was created, with FEMA folded into it. Meetings were held, memos were written, 190,000 employees went on the DHS payroll, billions were spent. If the FEMA memo and the Houston Chronicle article weren't enough, the New Orleans Times-Picayune published a five-part series in 2002 titled "Washing Away." So federal, state, and local governments were prepared for Katrina, right? Wrong. During the Bush administration, Louisiana received far more money for Army Corps of Engineers civil projects than any other state, but it wasn't spent on levees or flood control. Surprisingly enough, it was spent for unrelated projects favored by Louisiana's congressional delegation. What about the state and local governments? If you're going to have a city below sea level in hurricane country, you'd better have some disaster plans. And plans they had. But apparently those plans didn't include strengthening the levees or evacuating residents. After Katrina left a path of destruction in Florida and picked up steam over the Gulf of Mexico, Governor Kathleen Babineaux Blanco conferred emergency powers upon herself. So she knew disaster was coming, not that that seemed to matter. Her Department of Homeland Security refused permission for the Red Cross and the Salvation Army to go into the city and deliver water, food, medicine, and other relief supplies to those suffering at the Superdome and convention center. Similarly, she took several days to sign a simple proclamation allowing doctors licensed out of state to help the sick and injured. Several doctors sat around for days waiting to go to work. As the storm hit New Orleans with full force, the local government effectively abdicated. Reports of looting began only hours after the assault. FEMA issued a sternly worded release on August 29, the same day the hurricane made landfall along the Gulf Coast, titled "First Responders Urged Not to Respond to Hurricane Impact Areas." FEMA wanted all the responders to be coordinated and to come when they were called. And that was one plan they followed. As the New York Times reported September 5: When Wal-Mart sent three trailer trucks loaded with water, FEMA officials turned them away, [Jefferson Parish president Aaron Broussard] said. Agency workers prevented the Coast Guard from delivering 1,000 gallons of diesel fuel, and on Saturday they cut the parish's emergency communications line, leading the sheriff to restore it and post armed guards to protect it from FEMA, Mr. Broussard said. Those weren't the only examples. The city declined Amtrak's offer to carry evacuees out of the city before the storm. On September 2, the South Florida Sun-Sentinel reported, "Up to 500 Florida airboat pilots have volunteered to rescue Hurricane Katrina survivors, transport relief workers and ferry supplies. But they aren't being allowed in." Hundreds of firefighters responding to a call for help were held in Atlanta by FEMA for several days of training on community relations and sexual harassment. Even President Bush acknowledged September 13 that "all levels of government" failed to respond adequately to the most-anticipated natural disaster in history. But the government failure in this instance runs deeper. Who were the people who suffered most from Hurricane Katrina? The poorest residents of New Orleans, many of them on welfare--the very people the government has lured into decades of dependency. The welfare state has taught generations of poor people to look to government for everything--housing, food, money. Their sense of responsibility and self-reliance had atrophied. When government failed, they had few resources to fall back on. Some journalists have suggested that the despair of poor New Orleanians undermines President Bush's case for the "ownership society." In fact, the suffering visible in the poorest parts of the city is a perfect example of the failure of the "non-ownership society." People had become trapped in dependency, with neither financial nor moral assets to rely on.

**Private sector will fill in**

**Boaz, 05** (is executive vice president of the Cato Institute, Catastrophe in Big Easy Demonstrates Big Government's Failure, September 19, 2005, cato.org).

Even though private companies have no obligation for disaster relief, they started planning for a Katrina response before the hurricane made landfall. Two Washington Post reporters wrote that it's "unsettling but inescapable" that commerce resumes quickly after natural disasters, that "Wal-Mart and Home Depot are in a class by themselves, going to extraordinary lengths to keep their customers supplied." Would they really prefer that Wal-Mart and Home Depot closed in honor of the victims? Surely it was better for the survivors that these companies planned for disaster and reopened their stores rapidly. Wal-Mart's emergency preparedness division had ordered 10,000 seven-gallon water jugs for hurricane season. A full week before Katrina hit New Orleans, Wal-Mart ordered 40,000 more. Jefferson Parish president Broussard said that "if American government would have responded like Wal-Mart has responded, we wouldn't be in this crisis." Drug companies created their own distribution systems to move medicines and medical devices into the storm-ravaged areas. Ten days after the storm the U.S. pharmaceutical industry had donated cash and products worth $42.5 million. Churches and charities in the area and as far away as New Mexico and Maryland began sending trucks loaded with food and clothing and offering homes to evacuees. The Washington Post reported that "owing to stealthy acts of hospitality that are largely invisible to government"--and fortunately so, lest the government try to shut down these uncoordinated efforts --"hundreds of thousands of people displaced by Hurricane Katrina seem to be disappearing--into the embrace of their extended families."

**AT: All corporations are based on profit – corporations are not based just on profit – they give large amounts of charity.**

**Block 05** (Professor of Economics, New Orleans Loyola, Walter, The Katrina Came, http://www.lewrockwell.com/block/block51.html)

Stuff and nonsense. First of all, this task need not be accomplished on a for profit basis. Non-profit organizations, too, are part of the private sector of the economy. Just looking at the charitable outpourings to New Orleanians from all corners of the country, we can see that there is no shortage of benevolence and good will for the victims of Katrina. I should single out for special mention in this regard that “evil” profit maximizing large corporation that grinds down suppliers, immiserates its ownworkers due to its anti union policies, bankrupts small grocers, and just all around exploits every else it touches: . This hated corporation contributed $1 million to the Salvation Army for hurricane relief. More recently, Wal-Mart committed an additional $15 million for this purpose. As part of this commitment , Wal-Mart will “establish mini-Wal-Mart stores in areas impacted by the hurricane. Items such as clothing, diapers, baby wipes, food, formula, toothbrushes, bedding and water will be given out free of charge to those with a demonstrated need. In contrast, I do not recommend the American Red Cross. I still have not forgiven them for turning aside risks of spreading AIDS and infecting hundreds of people, many of them hemophiliacs. Unhappily, from my own point of view, Wal-Mart, sent another $1 million to the Red Cross. But my favorite charities, if you want to really help the inhabitants of the Gulf Coast, are two. Both support free enterprise, the last best hope for people there and everywhere. One is the Mises Institute ; two, any of the State Libertarian Parties of Louisiana, Mississippi, or Alabama. But not the national party, until they deal with this issue. The point is, if we the people had vastly more money at our disposal than we do now, thanks to government profligacy with our funds, we would be able to donate some of it to the not-for-profit sector to engage in research and development for weather control.

**AT: Perm – The perm is immoral and fails – any government involvement is bad**

**Block 05** (Professor of Economics, New Orleans Loyola, Walter, The Katrina Came, http://www.lewrockwell.com/block/block51.html)

Further, **no tax money should be poured into New Orleans**. These are stolen funds, and should be returned to their rightful owners, the taxpayers of the nation. Of course, this applies, in spades, to those victimized by Katrina. But the refunds should be in the form of money, not expenditures for rebuilding, which their proper owners may or may not favor. Private enterprise alone should determine if the Big Easy is worth saving or not. Problems of "transactions costs" will be far easier to overcome than challenges presented by an inept and economically irrational government. Possibly a Donald Trump type might try to buy up all the buildings at a fraction of their previous value, and save his new investment by levee building and water pumping. He wouldn't need to get 100% sales. A lesser amount, say, 90%, might do, and he would only make his initial purchases subject to reaching this level. That is, he might first purchase options to buy.

**The state continues to fail – only the private sector solves**

**Votlucka, 06** (Hurricane Katrina Victims...Will They Ever Learn? Submitted by Marcel Votlucka on April 18, 2006 - 9:32pm. World News | USA | http://www.thestonybrookpress.com/?q=node/287).

You fool! Have you learned nothing? Hurricane Katrina should’ve at least made us rethink the premise that the State can solve all our problems. It should’ve at least made us think to ourselves, “Hmm…maybe there are other ways we can address these issues…maybe we have to use our minds and wills and come up with our own solutions as well. Maybe we have to take more responsibility for ourselves and not place blind faith in undependable forces.” I’ve said time and time again that the reason the people of the Gulf Region met such a fate was because they sat around and waited for the State to step in. And the State did not deliver. Between the Army Corps of Engineers’ insane flood control strategies, the government’s red tape, and the people’s apathy, things turned bad real fast. The market and civil society, however, stepped in far more abundantly. As I explained in my article, “It Could Happen Here”: “**In the case of Katrina it was the private sector that pulled through every time**: intervention by the Red Cross and other humanitarian agencies; countless community food drives; donations of money from people all over the country (over $600 million as of this writing); families opening up their homes to victims made homeless by the floods, a non-profit hospital that struggled to remain functional despite a lack of supplies; businesses chartering buses to deliver victims from the flooded hellhole; ordinary people coming in to help any way they can. Also, SUNY Stony Brook is offering New York students attending Tulane University in New Orleans, as well as other universities in the afflicted areas, places as transfer students for the fall semester.” Worse yet, during the aftermath the media wanted to blame the market when it was their precious State that failed miserably. Pundits say the culprit was “anarchy” in the Gulf, even though the biggest, wealthiest, most powerful government in the history of the world was there, bumbling around in full force. People are not asking the right questions and are sticking with the status quo. The people of Louisiana and the Gulf need to change their thinking and learn from their experience. And we on Long Island had better start doing the same. The article from which I just quoted addressed the real threat of a Katrina-strength hurricane attacking Long Island. There are lessons for all of us that we need to learn. We can’t–and shouldn’t–depend on the State to solve our problems when civil society is more than capable to solve them if we all put the effort into it.

**Private sector solves- interest, resources, and incentives**

**Renne et al., 2008** – Renne is a PhD from the University of New Orleans, Sanchez is a PhD from the University of Utah, and Litman is a director at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (John Renne, Thomas Sanchez, and Todd Litman, “National Study on Carless and Special Needs Evacuation Planning: A Literature Review”, October 2008, accessed 7/3/12)//BZ

**The private and nonprofit sectors have expressed their interest in having a larger, planned role in the provision of services in preparation, evacuation, mitigation, and recovery from emergencies and disasters.** The American Bus Association, which includes private charter coaches and tourism operators, through their sponsorship of the 2006 report card by the American Highway Users Alliance, pointed out a role for private coaches in moving large groups of people to diverse destinations during a disaster. They add that private coaches, unlike school buses, have room for luggage and personal belongings, without loss of seat space (AHUA 2006). At a January 2007 conference, the Business Executives for National Security (BENS) released their report to outline a framework for involving the private sector in emergency plans, training, and response. With the private sector owning or operating 85 percent of the US infrastructure, they point out that a community cannot return to normal after a disaster without their involvement. The goal would be to involve them with more foresight and awareness of the specific ways they can contribute. To institutionalize their involvement, they recommend giving the private sector a seat within Emergency Operation Centers (EOCs). They also suggest the **private sector should maintain parallel structures** to EOCs, referred to here as “Business Operation Centers (BOCs)” that can plug-in to government operations and “scale up” in a parallel and coordinated manner with government coordination. Employers, retailers, and distributors have key advantages. Employers should be encouraged to develop programs that help their employees stockpile personal emergency supplies; this may also help employees return to work more quickly. The public sector can use public sector transport to ensure delivery of goods to retailers providing key supplies before or after the event. Safe Harbor and Good Samaritan Acts, which relieve individuals who come to the aide of others from liability, should be explored by Congress through hearings in order to produce legislation for a nationwide body of “Disaster Law” (Business Executives for National Security 2007). White et al. in their 2007 report on the impact of Hurricane Katrina on persons with disabilities, recommends that private centers for independent living (CILs) communicate and coordinate with local/regional Emergency Management Agencies (EMAs), other CILS, other disability agencies, and community input to create evacuation plans for persons with mobility needs. Statewide Independent Living Councils (SILCs) should play a leadership role in bringing together various organizations throughout the state (White, et al. 2007). There may be a role for state regulations or oversight of these entities to encourage this. CILs and SILCs should also campaign for state and regional EMAs to separate people with disabilities from other people with so-called “special needs” (usually defined in terms of major medical support needs) in their emergency evacuation plans. In addition, this distinction should be clearly outlined in training to front-line emergency personnel. They should also have systematic training by staff and clients of CILs so that persons with disabilities have personal disaster plans. Personal disaster plans are a theme in other reports as well. White also encourages community-wide efforts to identify people with disabilities in the community and to link them with services they will need in a disaster to either evacuate or shelter in place (White, et al. 2007). **Investing in local non-governmental organizations at the community level can also help post-disaster** since people whose ability to function independently are dependent on access to medical and social supports (White, et al. 2007). Other researchers also provide evidence of the effectiveness of government working with local trusted groups to collect and disseminate information and provide training and support. Prior to a disaster, planners can contact individuals and community groups to learn the kind and type of information each group wants to receive during emergencies and which modes work best, or are preferred, for delivering the information (Liu and Schachter 2007). Wallrich provides examples of information sharing after the disaster through his Chain of Information concept from Los Angeles, Miami-Dade County, and Malibu. For instance, information passed from the Los Angeles County Office of Emergency Services (LACO OEM) to the Central American Resource Center (CARECEN), via Emergency Network Los Angeles (ENLA), “will get on the street quickly, it will reach the people, and it will be trusted” (ENLA is a county level coalition of NGOs for emergencies, see: www.enla.org). Switchboard of Miami played the same role after Hurricane Andrew; it was able to provide FEMA and the County EMA with staff that had valuable language and telephone communications skills, and unmatched knowledge of local resources. Switchboard has since been incorporated in the Dade County emergency operations plans. These groups have also helped to staff FEMA Disaster Application Centers.

## Levees CP

**The new levee system doesn’t work – it’s just hype**

**Bowser 2010** (Betty Ann Bowser has been named health correspondent at The NewsHour “Will New Levees Protect New Orleans From the Next Hurricane?” PBS Newshour August 26, 2010 http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2010/08/five-years-after-katrina-some-question-whether-new-levees-will-protect-the-city-next-time.html Herm

Professor Bob Bea, one of the country's top civil engineers -- whom President Barack Obama has asked to help investigate the Deepwater Horizon incident -- says the New Orleans levees and floodwalls today are still not a "system." Bea, who teaches at the University of California Berkeley, says "it is still a patchwork quilt." Bea believes nothing in the Army Corps of Engineers has changed significantly. "They have received raises, more funding, promotions, larger appropriations, larger projects. They have talked change," he says. But there's been "little walk to match the talk." Sandy Rosenthal agrees. For five years now she has been a thorn in the side of the Corps, keeping a watchful eye on every move made by the federal government's chief civil engineers. And she doesn't like what she's seen.

**Levees are at near-failing grades**

**Schleifstein 11** Mark Schleifstein, The Times-Picayune, Journalist on Hurricanes, 2006 Pulitzer Prizes for Public Service and Breaking News Reporting and the George Polk Award for Metropolitan Reporting “New Orleans levees get a near-failing grade in new corps rating system” http://www.nola.com/environment/index.ssf/2011/08/new\_orleans\_levees\_get\_a\_near-.html

A new Army Corps of Engineers rating system for the nation’s levees is about to deliver a near-failing grade to New Orleans area dikes, despite the internationally acclaimed $10 billion effort to rebuild the system in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, corps officials have confirmed. Preliminary rankings obtained by The Times-Picayune show that the corps believes there’s still a significant risk of flooding from major hurricanes or river floods that are greater than the design heights of Mississippi River levees and hurricane levees on both the east and west banks. In both cases, the levees were rated Class II or “urgent (unsafe or potentially unsafe),” on a scale of I to V, with V representing normal or “adequately safe.”

**Levees are likely to fail**

**Associated Press 11** Six years after Katrina, slow progress on nation's levees Out of nation's 2,000 systems, only 700 have been inspected, says Corps of Engineers 10/27/2011 http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/45066867/ns/us\_news-life/t/six-years-after-katrina-slow-progress-nations-levees/#.T-8kp7WXRSQ

Inspection ratings from nearly 700 of the roughly 2,000 levee systems under the Corps' jurisdiction have been added to the database thus far, said spokesman Pete Pierce. Of those, 77 percent had ratings of "minimally acceptable," meaning they have "minor deficiencies" that make the levees less reliable but are not expected to seriously impair their performance. **An additional 11.6 percent were rated "unacceptable," or likely to fail during a flood**, while 11.3 percent were graded as "acceptable," or without deficiencies. **Experts say the government is moving too slowly to complete the inventory**. "We need to be really candid with the American people," said Sam Riley Medlock, policy counsel for the Association of State Floodplain Managers and a member of the levee safety panel. "This is yet another class of infrastructure that is aging and posing risks and we're going to have to do something about it." Levee network receives a D- Gerald Galloway, a former Army Corps district engineer and University of Maryland engineering professor, told a Senate committee this month **the levee network has "significant" problems** and received an overall grade of "D minus" from the American Society of Civil Engineers in 2009. The group estimated that $50 billion worth of improvements was needed over five years. "So today hundreds of levees, whose integrity is in question, are in place in front of communities and properties with little realistic hope of funding for inspection, repair or upgrade," Galloway said. Concern about the levees dates to the 1920s and 1930s, when killer floods on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers led Congress to order construction of more levees. Many were designed for the biggest flood likely to strike a particular area within 500 years or even 1,000 years. But starting in the late 1960s, federal policies have inadvertently encouraged the building of levees according to a less protective standard, the safety committee report said. One required financially strapped local governments to help cover levee building and maintenance costs. Relatively low death tolls from major floods in recent decades also fed complacency that ended with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the report said. Together, they killed more than 1,800 people and caused $200 billion in damages, spurring calls for a nationwide levee inventory and upgrades. The portion of the inventory developed thus far includes data on about 13,500 of the 14,700 miles of levees covered by the Army Corps' safety program. Data on the rest will be added by the end of the year, officials said. Many of the levees are operated and maintained by the Corps, or were built by the Corps and turned over to local officials. John Paul Woodley Jr., who served as assistant secretary of the Army for public works during the George W. Bush administration, said the Corps has made good progress on the levee inventory but acknowledged "we're definitely behind where everybody had hoped we'd be."

**Levee systems are being scrapped, but they are necessary to protect New Orleans from emergency flooding and hurricanes.**

**Burdeau 6/27/12** – reporter in New Orleans (Cain, WWLTV, Associated Press, “Corps scraps $1B levee project in Barataria basin”, http://www.wwltv.com/news/Corps-scraps-1B-levee-project-in-Barataria-basin--160619515.html)//BZ

NEW ORLEANS -- The Army Corps of Engineers said Wednesday that it was **scrapping its plans to build a $1 billion levee system to protect areas** between the Mississippi River and Bayou Lafourche **against hurricane flooding** coming up the Barataria estuary southwest of New Orleans. The corps said it was nixing its detailed $10 million feasibility study for the Donaldsonville-to-Gulf of Mexico project because it could not find a way to build the levee system at a cost that was worth it. The project, approved by Congress in 1998, technically is still alive because it has not been de-authorized by Congress. But completing a feasibility study is a key step before a project of this scale can proceed. Local officials were disappointed by the corps' decision. "They love to study things, but they don't implement," said Tim Kerner, the mayor of Jean Lafitte, a fishing town that hoped to see the levee system built so it could be better protected against flooding. His town is often flooded by hurricanes. Kerner said his hope now rests with new levees being built with money that the state is expected to get in coming years from increased offshore oil and gas royalties and other sources, such as money BP PLC is expected to pay for damage caused by its 2010 oil spill. "I got confidence that local government will save us and not let us drown like the Corps of Engineers," the mayor said. The corps said it could not find an economically feasible way to build levees or raise enough homes to give parts of nine parishes protection against a storm with a 1 percent chance of occurring a year, also known as 100-year protection. The project was supposed to provide additional protection for parts of Ascension, Assumption, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. James, St. John the Baptist and St. Charles. Garret Graves, a top coastal aide to Gov. Bobby Jindal, said the corps' decision was a disappointment. "To suggest that there is not a federal interest in improving protection in this region is frustrating," Graves said. "Lafitte, St. Charles, Lafourche and many other communities deserve better from their government." Denise Reed, a coastal scientist at the University of New Orleans, said the levee system's costs escalated after Hurricane Katrina when the corps began demanding higher standards in its levee designs. "These things are expensive," Reed said. The corps raised its engineering standards for levees after floodwalls and levees that it built around New Orleans failed catastrophically when they were assaulted by Katrina, leading to the flooding of more than 80 percent of New Orleans and widespread devastation in surrounding areas. Instead of big levee systems, Reed said engineers may need to consider more targeted levees -- known as "ring levees" -- that encircle towns in need of flood protection. Officials initially envisioned the Donaldsonville-to-the-Gulf system protecting 126,000 structures. But after levee improvements were undertaken following Katrina around parts of the West Bank of New Orleans, the Donaldsonville-to-the-Gulf levee system was expected to protect about 36,000 structures. The corps said in a report that was a major factor in making the project less appealing. **The area that was supposed to benefit from the levee system has repeatedly been flooded by heavy rains and hurricanes**. The corps says the area was flooded in 1959, 1980, 1989 and 1991 and also by Hurricane Juan in 1985. It has been declared a federal disaster area three times since 1985, the corps said. Lower Vacherie, Chackbay, Des Allemands, Raceland, Willowdale, Crown Point and Lafitte were among the towns hoping to get protected under the plan. The system would have protected U.S. Highway 90 too, a main route between New Orleans and Houma.

**Levee funding is necessary to protect New Orleans from hurricanes.**

**The Times, 2012** – Newspaper in Picayune (“New hurricane protection system is built”, January 23, 2012, http://www.nola.com/175years/index.ssf/2012/01/2011\_new\_hurricane\_protection.html)//BZ

Corps of Engineers worked feverishly to meet a 2011 congressional deadline to have a new, stronger system in place to protect the area from a 100-year storm. Congress assigned the corps to oversee New Orleans hurricane protection after Hurricane Betsy in 1965. Forty years later, **the corps acknowledged that the patchwork of walls and levees was "a system in name only**.” It took the corps 10 months, but it finally admitted that its design for the failed floodwalls on the 17th Street and London Avenue canals was faulty. With the houses of many of its employees flooded, the corps vowed to get the new system right. Levees failed in Katrina because they were made from porous soils. Millions of tons of heavy clay were dug out from across the region to fix and raise old levees and build new ones on the West Bank and in the River Parishes. Walls and levees that breached were replaced with walls with foundations 70 or more feet deep. The keys to the new system are two new structures designed to keep the east and west banks protected from storm surge. The Lake Borgne Surge Barrier, also called **The Great Wall of Louisiana**, is a nearly two-mile-long, 26-foot-high barrier to **prevent the kind of flooding** that ravaged the Lower 9th Ward. The West Closure Complex in Belle Chasse will prevent the Harvey Canal from inundating the West Bank. Giant pumps are used to get rainwater runoff past the barrier. Parishes got into the act by building safehouses to keep drainage pumps powered and staffed during hurricanes. The Corps of Engineers will still spend billions to armor new levees and build permanent gates and pumps at four New Orleans drainage canals.

**Levees are necessary shields to protect citizens from floods, current levees are failing.**

**Burdeau and Flesher, 2011** – MSNBC Reporters (Cain and John, “Six years after Katrina, slow progress on nation's levees”, http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/45066867/ns/us\_news-life/t/six-years-after-katrina-slow-progress-nations-levees/)//BZ

NEW ORLEANS — More than six years after Hurricane Katrina's rampage, authorities have taken only halting steps toward identifying weaknesses in a nationwide patchwork of levees intended to protect millions of Americans' lives and property during potentially catastrophic floods. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, accused of building substandard levees and floodwalls that failed when Katrina swamped the Gulf Coast in 2005, has spent $56 million since then developing the initial phase of a national levee inventory as required by Congress. The Corps on Thursday was releasing a database with information about nearly 14,000 miles of levees under its jurisdiction. But the inventory doesn't include what is believed to be more than 100,000 additional miles of levees not covered by the Corps' safety program. Some are little more than mounds of earth piled up more than a century ago to protect farm fields. Others extend for miles and are made of concrete and steel, with sophisticated pump and drainage systems. They shield homes, businesses and infrastructure such as highways and power plants. The National Committee on Levee Safety, established after the Katrina disaster to evaluate the system and recommend improvements, issued a report in 2009 calling for the Corps to catalog and inspect every levee so deficiencies could be fixed. But Corps officials say Congress has not provided enough authority or money to add non-federal levees to the database, a massive undertaking that would take years. "The reality is, we don't know how many levees are out there," said Eric Halpin, the Army Corps' special assistant for dam and levee safety and vice chairman of the levee safety committee. He acknowledged the inventory presently includes only about 10 percent of the likely total. "I think we've done a great job putting forward a state-of-the-art tool," Halpin said. "It's a first step. It will be much more powerful once we can get all the data in there." **For each levee system, the database will include its location, design and rating following one or more safety inspections**. Inspection ratings from nearly 700 of the roughly 2,000 levee systems under the Corps' jurisdiction have been added to the database thus far, said spokesman Pete Pierce. Of those, 77 percent had ratings of "minimally acceptable," meaning they have "minor deficiencies" that make the levees less reliable but are not expected to seriously impair their performance. An additional 11.6 percent were rated "unacceptable," or likely to fail during a flood, while 11.3 percent were graded as "acceptable," or without deficiencies. Experts say the government is moving too slowly to complete the inventory. "We need to be really candid with the American people," said Sam Riley Medlock, policy counsel for the Association of State Floodplain Managers and a member of the levee safety panel. "**This is yet another class of infrastructure that is aging and posing risks and we're going to have to do something about it." Levee network receives a D-** Gerald Galloway, a former Army Corps district engineer and University of Maryland engineering professor, told a Senate committee this month the levee network has "significant" problems and received an overall grade of "D minus" from the American Society of Civil Engineers in 2009. The group estimated that $50 billion worth of improvements was needed over five years. "So today hundreds of levees, whose integrity is in question, are in place in front of communities and properties with little realistic hope of funding for inspection, repair or upgrade," Galloway said. Concern about the levees dates to the 1920s and 1930s, when killer floods on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers led Congress to order construction of more levees. Many were designed for the biggest flood likely to strike a particular area within 500 years or even 1,000 years. But starting in the late 1960s, federal policies have inadvertently encouraged the building of levees according to a less protective standard, the safety committee report said. One required financially strapped local governments to help cover levee building and maintenance costs. Relatively low death tolls from major floods in recent decades also fed complacency that ended with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the report said. Together, they killed more than 1,800 people and caused $200 billion in damages, spurring calls for a nationwide levee inventory and upgrades. The portion of the inventory developed thus far includes data on about 13,500 of the 14,700 miles of levees covered by the Army Corps' safety program. Data on the rest will be added by the end of the year, officials said. Many of the levees are operated and maintained by the Corps, or were built by the Corps and turned over to local officials. John Paul Woodley Jr., who served as assistant secretary of the Army for public works during the George W. Bush administration, said the Corps has made good progress on the levee inventory but acknowledged "we're definitely behind where everybody had hoped we'd be."

## Media Imagery K

**The affirmatives description of New Orleans and Katrina are nothing more than “reality TV.” Our alternative does not reject the idea that Katrina was terrible, but racist media imagery.**

**Rodríguez and Dynes 06** Havidán Rodríguez is the current Director of the Disaster Research Center at the University of Delaware, Newark, DE. He has conducted field research following Hurricanes Georges (Puerto Rico), Mitch (Honduras), and Katrina (Louisiana). Along with colleagues, Russell Dynes and E.L. Quarantelli, he is editing the Handbook of Disaster Research to be published by Springer in 2006. Russell R. Dynes is Co-Founder of the Disaster Research Center. He has conducted field research during the emergency period in Hurricanes Cindy (Texas), Betsy (New Orleans), and Camille (Mississippi). Finding and Framing Katrina: The Social Construction of Disaster http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/Dynes\_Rodriguez/

Over time, however, New Orleans became the feature presentation, and the rest of Louisiana and Mississippi became very minor themes. Certainly, because of the breaks in the levees and the flooding, the helicopter rescues, film clips of looting, angry crowds at the Superdome and the Convention Center, it was vivid TV drama and suspense. Many viewers would have fond recollections of New Orleans and also TV personnel could find some high dry ground there. So, New Orleans became the center of operations for the media regarding Katrina. Its mayor and police superintendent were available for interviews, but New Orleans was presented as a disorganized city on the brink of collapse, less from the storm than from its residents. On September 2, The Army Times (newspaper) reported that “combat operations are now underway on the streets…This place is going to look like little Somalia…We’re going to go out and take the city back.” “This will be a combat operation to get this city under control,” was the lead comment by the commander of Louisiana National Guard’s Joint Task Force. Several weeks after the storm, the story of Katrina can now be better told. Framing Themes Certain programmatic themes emerged in the TV coverage, identified here as finding damage, finding death, finding help, finding authority and finding the bad guys. Finding Damage. Certainly, TV excels in presenting damage. Often, however, it is difficult to place that damage either in a particular geographical location or within a meaningful social context. In certain ways, that lack of context can enhance concern, as well as sympathy. It allows viewers to use their own imaginations projecting the meaning of such losses for those people who live in the area, or to the home owners of what is now not salvageable. Electronic technology can enhance the images and provide views from all angles. The levee system and the canals in New Orleans provided outlines of the destruction of neighborhoods. Finding Death. From the very beginning of the hurricane impact, and with the onset of flooding in New Orleans, there were predictions of the death toll. The Mayor of New Orleans predicted the figure at 10,000 and there were repeated statements that FEMA had ordered 25,000 body bags. Several days into the flood, there was repeated visual evidence of bodies in the flooded area and continuous allegations that such conditions pose serious health risks. However, the Pan American Health Organizations have reviewed the research of the epidemiological risks of dead bodies in disaster situations and concluded that dead bodies seldom constitute health risks, and suggest that the anxiety which leads to the inept removal of bodies often destroys information necessary for identification (PAHO, 2004). In such cases, family members are unnecessarily exposed to a second episode of unresolved grief. As of October 15th, the death toll in Louisiana was declared to be 972 and in Mississippi 221. In Louisiana, the search for bodies was recently declared complete, but the state has released only 61 bodies and made the names of only 32 victims public (New York Times, Oct. 5, Al). This raises the question whether predictions regarding the total death toll in the early response period have any value. Although Katrina has one of the highest death rates in US hurricane history, it is still significantly lower (10%) than the projected number publicized. This raises questions about why these projections were released and reemphasized by the local government. Perhaps it was to speed up efforts to provide assistance and disaster relief aid from the State and Federal level. This can also reflect the inherent difficulties and problems with estimating the death toll immediately following disaster impact. It is noteworthy that in past disaster events initial death estimates could be quite low, particularly in impact-isolated areas of developing countries. This was certainly the case with the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami when initial estimates suggested several thousand dead and now the actual figure comes closer to 300,000. Finding Help. In the immediate post-impact period, reporters often asked those they were interviewing whether they had received any type of help or aid, often inquiring directly if FEMA had been there. In every disaster, the first to help (the “first” responders) are actually neighbors, family members and other community members. Most persons (including reporters) do not think of such usual assistance as help; rather “help” is someone they do not know. Also, more recently, the term “first responders” has come into vocabulary to describe police, fire, and EMS personnel. Perhaps that terminology has created the expectation for “victims” to anticipate that a first responder would be at their house “quickly.” Nevertheless, “true” first responders are also community members who have been impacted by the same events, but who are characterized by altruistic behavior in their response to these disaster events. In addition, TV coverage early in the response period revealed tremendous confusion about the role of FEMA, both on the part of TV reporters and those they interviewed; this problem was exacerbated given the inadequate response and performance of the FEMA and DHS bureaucracy in the initial stages of the response process. There was also an initial tendency to describe FEMA as the organizational location for a national 911 phone number; if hurricane victims called, someone would allegedly respond to their needs and provide the necessary assistance. This misunderstanding regarding the role of FEMA in assisting state and local governments among state and local officials, as well as by victims, added to the perception of the lack of help. The perception of the absence of help in the face of overwhelming need combined with bureaucratic niggling can persuade members of a national TV audience of the need to volunteer, to come to the disaster locale to help remedy that lack of help. At times, they can fill a need. On the other hand, at considerable personal expense in time and money, volunteers may arrive days later to find they are not needed or that they are not welcomed by government personnel at the scene. Just as victims might need helpers, helpers also need victims. Frustrated helpers are often prime candidates for TV interviewers, accusing government bureaucrats of preventing their involvement while emphasizing their skills and their sacrifice as well as their conviction that they are needed. Certainly, there may be a lack of knowledge by victims about the help that is available within a community and the location where information might be obtained. It is also possible that some victims will have much higher expectations about the nature and/or scope of help that will be available. Many will discover that the type of homeowner’s insurance on which they have paid on for years will not cover their losses as they had long expected, nor will a reimbursement be quickly forthcoming. The long-run problem of “finding help” will be a topic of conversation in town councils, state legislatures, in Congress, and in the media for years to come. Finding Authority. First of all, let us admit that the issue of authority in disasters is complex. Part of the complexity centers on the relationship among political jurisdictions and the understanding that current political officials have of that relationship. This is further complicated by the fact that US political system officials come and go after elections, but disasters do not happen on that schedule. In fact, for most political officials, every disaster is their first in office. Historically, in the United States, responsibility for dealing with disaster response is located at the local level. If the demands are too great for the local community, the responsibility to assist the “locals” is assumed to involve the state. Again, if state resources are not sufficient, the federal government is expected to provide additional resources. There are certain events (e.g., a terrorist attack) which are not respectful of local or state boundaries and in those cases, federal assistance can be predicted to be necessary. In those cases, federal resources and personnel are often pre-positioned. As such, this creates the expectation that resources will be made immediately available to be used by local and state officials. With the long lead time to Katrina, some TV reporters were already on location interviewing local officials who usually expressed their expectation that FEMA would be immediately available. The same conversations were repeated in other localities but the director of FEMA, also appearing in the media, seemed equivocal about assuming total responsibility; that ambivalence, in time, led to his replacement and eventually his resignation. Appearing before a congressional committee after his resignation, Michael Brown asserted that one of the problems with the response to Hurricane Katrina was that local officials in Louisiana were dysfunctional, thus trying to shift the blame away from the federal government, and in this case, FEMA. In addition to the problems of legal authority among different levels of political units, the notion of authority has been complicated by the adoption of a “command and control” vocabulary by some emergency management organizations. In a disaster with diffuse impact such as Katrina, the notion of having command and control is self-delusional. However, in the reorganization of FEMA and its inclusion in the new Department of Homeland Security, a standardized organizational system identified as the “Incident Command System” was administratively decreed as normative for disasters in the United States. There are elements of that notion which have considerable utility. For example, the notion of a command post as a location for coordinating the activities of the multiple organizations that will become involved in a disaster response makes sense. However, the idea that this is the location of someone who is commanding those organizations in their activities and is in control of the incident is out of touch with the reality and the events that are taking place. The media’s constant question as to “Who’s in Charge?” seems to be based on what might be called the “Oz Theory of Authority,” with apologies to Max Weber. The Oz theory is that behind some curtain, there is a wizard. It is the media’s responsibility to pull back that curtain to reveal the wizard commander. Perhaps the best advice is that if the question is answered by person’s identifying themselves as being in command, the person being interviewed does not understand the complexity of the response. A response to a disaster such as Katrina is complicated and involves coordination and extensive communication, a complex task accomplished by many different groups and individuals. The decision-making necessary is decentralized and usually made at levels much lower in the status hierarchy implied by the command and control model (Dynes & Aguirre, 1978). In other words, there is no curtain and no wizard, simply a very complicated mosaic of individuals and organizations with skills, resources, energy, the capacity to improvise, and the knowledge of the impacted community. Merging their knowledge and energy in a coordinated effort is the real wizardry. Finding the Bad Guys. Probably the most dramatic “evidence” of social chaos assumed to be created by Katrina was centered on New Orleans. The city was heavily populated by poor African Americans2 who lived in areas that were the first ones flooded. They were directed to go to the Superdome where assistance would be available. The photographic opportunity to show “mobs” of residents located together provided the backdrop for repetitive stories of looting, rape, murder, sniping and roving gangs preying on tourists. Such stories introduced the next time segment with an implication that it would continue as the major programmatic theme. Such rumors were also promulgated by the New Orleans police department and other local officials; they were even presented as facts by local officials on “The Oprah Winfrey Show.” There were stories of piles of bodies in the Superdome and outside the Convention Center where bodies were stored in basement freezers. One of the consequences of these stories was the diversion of security forces to follow-up on such reports when they were needed for other duties. Also, as the climate of fear increased, some EMS personnel refused assignments, citing their own apprehension. While it is common for rumors of looting and all kinds of anti-social behavior to emerge in most major disasters, the volume and persistence of such rumors on TV in Katrina was unparalleled. The staff of writers from the Times Picayune provided a major critique of those stories in the September 26th issue. Among their stories, they quoted the Orleans Parish District attorney pointing out that there were only four murders in New Orleans in the week following Katrina, making it a “typical” week in that city which expected 200 homicides throughout the year. When the Louisiana National Guard at the Superdome turned over the dead to federal authorities, that representative arrived with an 18-wheel refrigerated truck since there were reports of 200 bodies there. The actual total was six; of these, four died of natural causes, one from a drug overdose and another had apparently committed suicide. While four other bodies were found in the streets near the Dome, presumably no one had been killed inside as had been previously reported. There were more reports that 30 to 40 bodies were stored in the Convention Center freezers in its basement. Four bodies were recovered; one appeared to have been slain. Prior to this discovery, there had been reports of corpses piled inside the building. In reference to reports of rapes during the six days that the Superdome was used as a shelter, the head of the N.O. P. D. sex crime unit said that he and his officers lived inside the Dome and ran down every rumor of rape and atrocity. In the end, they made two arrests for attempted sexual assault and concluded the other incidents rumored had not happened, although it is important to note that rape is generally underreported in non-disaster times. In reference to claims of looting, similar observations can lead to quite different conclusions. Is the person sifting through debris a friend or relative, or a looter? Is the person pushing a grocery cart full of clothes someone flooded out of his home trying to save what few possessions he had left, or is it filled with looted materials? Are claims of looting at times used to inflate future insurance settlements? Again, rumors of looting are common in other disasters, but valid cases are rare. Some valid cases of looting can involve security forces brought in to protect against looting. It does seem to someone who has studied disaster behavior over a long period that the rumors of anti-social behavior were particularly virulent in New Orleans. Certainly, media coverage facilitated that impression. On the other hand, New Orleans has always had a reputation as the place for “hedonistic behavior,” particularly among some religious observers, in part because of its repute for Mardi Gras. Perhaps, for many TV viewers, it was a short step from the Big Easy to the Big Mess, thus lending public credibility to the stories disseminated through the media. Fractured Frames There were many frames which were briefly mentioned on TV, but never became a focal point of stories. While there was preoccupation with death, there was less concern for the possibilities for suffering. Asking a victim who has lost family members or their entire possessions “How They Feel?” evokes sound bites which are neither cathartic nor reflective. They may evoke the initiation of a longer period of suffering the consequences of being a victim. But that longer period will be of little interest in future programming. Loss of jobs, economic security, and familiar neighbors, along with possible relocation and the initiation of a journey into the unknown are seldom captured in a short response. And the transition from being a victim to being a survivor will not be newsworthy to prime time audiences, nor will the rediscovery of racism and poverty which flooded the screens. Much of the flood damage seen was difficult to differentiate from the dilapidation of sub-standard housing. The loss of fragile resources was more hurtful for those who had little to lose. The lack of resources also created the inability to evacuate easily and efficiently. Also, many of the medical problems experienced by evacuees had little to do with the hurricane itself, but were the result of the quality and availability (or lack thereof) of health care services prior to the hurricane. There were other views that were difficult to visualize. One could not see the historic depletion of wetlands along the Gulf Coast which for centuries had cushioned the effects on coastal areas. Nor could one easily see the quality of building codes and their previous enforcement, or the abundance of manufactured homes in certain coastal areas. It is also noteworthy that there has been a significant movement of the US population toward high risk coastal areas. Population density in coastal (high-risk) regions continues to increase, sometimes at a higher rate than the non-coastal populations. Currently, coastal counties constitute about 17 percent of the land mass (excluding Alaska) in the US, but 53 percent of the US population (153 million people) live in these areas. Also, coastal population increased by 28% from 1980 to 2003, and ten of the fifteen cities with the highest population counts are in coastal counties (see Crosett, K.M., et. al., 2004). Such population movement results in more building in desirable coastal areas. Further, in some coastal areas, gambling has become a major economic sector. When Camille hit Biloxi in 1969, there were no casinos to be blown across the highway. Hurricane Katrina was an event of catastrophic proportions, resulting in an extensive loss of life, property and human suffering; problems that were greatly compounded by significant deficiencies in governmental preparedness and response at all levels. Nevertheless, now that the waters have receded, we have come to realize that the images of chaos and anarchy portrayed by the mass media were primarily based on rumors and inaccurate assumptions. Some of these were supported by official statements by elected officials. **This view of the drama of disasters is assumed to be another version of “reality TV.”** Now, a month after Hurricane Katrina, less attention is given to the hundreds of thousands of displaced, uprooted from their communities, and their loss of economic livelihood. The efforts for reconstruction are not likely to appear in prime time any time soon.

**Their description of Katrina is the media’s presentation of the spectacle in order to enhance capitalism – it is not based on reality**

**Gotham 07** (No Date Given, Last Date Cited) Kevin Fox Gotham is an associate professor of sociology at Tulane University in New Orleans. Fast Spectacle: Reflections on Hurricane Katrina and the Contradictions of Spectacle http://www.tulane.edu/~kgotham/Fast%20Capitalism%202\_2%20%20Fast%20Spectacle%20Reflections%20on%20Hurricane%20Katrina%20and%20the%20Contradictions%20of%20Spectacle.htm

Hurricane Katrina as Media Spectacle The destruction and devastation caused by Hurricane Katrina and the subsequent media coverage and political discourse suggest several processes by which powerful actors and organizations construct and present tragic events as spectacles. First, as competitive corporations, television news companies are structurally constrained to minimize costs and maximize profits using strategies of labor exploitation, market segmentation, packaging, and adoption of sophisticated technologies. Market segmentation refers to the development of new forms of cultural fragmentation and commodity differentiation that split consumers, markets, and spaces of consumption into ever smaller segments, resulting in a shift away from mass markets and homogeneity to specialization and heterogeneity. Packaging is a strategy in which producers arrange and sequence a series of events to assign meaning to those events and impose coherence to the overall story. Early work by Stuart and Elizabeth Ewen (1982) located the rise and bureaucratization of early news reporting in the extension of the commodity form to art, news, and information. Richard Wrightman Fox and T.J. Jackson Learns (1983) examined how the commodification process assimilated science, advertising, reading magazines, and motion pictures to the emerging "consumer culture" of early twentieth century America. Today, the strategies of market segmentation and packaging are major factors in the commodification and rationalization of information and news. Along with market segmentation and packaging comes greater differentiation and specialization of news which, in turn, feeds into competitive pressures for news to be attractive to mass audiences. As a result, news corporations treat people as consumers and they tailor their programming and coverage to various cultures of consumption that differentiate the population. Processes of commodification and rationalization have an elective affinity with processes of differentiation and specialization. In this context, people experience an increasing pervasiveness of the force of spectacle - fashion, hype, and glitz - in determining the appearance and desirability of certain kinds of news. In recent years, researchers have turned their attention to examining how entertainment and news broadcasting are increasingly dominated by a few monopoly firms that seek to standardize and homogenize the production of information and news (for overviews, see Herman and Chomsky 1988; Kellner 1990; Schiller 1990; and Bagdikian 1997). The past decade's wave of media mergers between some corporate giants as Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation, Viacom, AOL Time Warner, Sony, and Vivendi, among others, have produced a complex web of bureaucratically organized firms that now control the production of news and entertainment (Croteau and Hoynes 2001). These large firms have incorporated labor-saving and -replacing technologies, pooled diverse inputs through vertical integration, and consolidated access to markets. As media critics Norman Solomon and Jeff Cohen (1997) have observed, the total effect of these bureaucratic and technological transformations has been to increase the power of the dominant conservative and corporate organizations while stifling alternative voices and views of reality. As a result, democratic institutions and groups increasing confront a media atmosphere that discourages social criticism and broad-based participation. Herman and Chomsky (1988) note that the economic desires to accumulate capital and control media and information markets shape the selection and framing of "news" for viewer consumption, and invariably distort the definition of what is news. In addition, Bagdikian (1997) and Kellner (1990; 2004) have discussed the threats to democracy and free speech and expression that have accompanied the monopolization of media during the 1980s and 1990s. As corporations have consolidated economic power through monopolization and mergers they have abdicated their traditional role of providing information necessary to inform and promote a democratic citizenry (Halberstram 1979; Parenti 1986; and McChesney 2000). Today, digital communication, virtual reality, and the Internet have joined the arsenal of media technologies that large corporations use to produce spectacles for global consumption. New media technologies enable the globalization of spectacles to the extent that these technologies facilitate instant worldwide availability. In his famous book, Introduction to Modernity, Henri Lefebvre ([1962] 1995:164) lamented the "vicious cycle" of repetition in the mass media where "any event could be slotted in with similar events and circulated worldwide as soon as it happens, reduced to an instant image (omnipresent) and catch phrase (repetitive) ... a massive pleonasm." For Lefebvre, "the demand for sensational news becomes translated into repetition" and new techniques of image presentation tend to shrink the news to "the size of the socially instantaneous" (166). Such points resonate with Theodor Adorno's ([1967] 1989) argument that cultural products and organizations tend to exhibit "incessantly repeated formulae" that suppress critical analysis and reflexivity. In Debord's (1994) work, the production of repetition and instantaneity are connected to a process of unification and trivalization. The mass production of images abstracts and dissipates the independence and quality of places and relations and achieves "as nearly as possible a perfect static monotony" (#165) and "quantitative triviality" (#62). In this process, all events, including disasters and other tragic occurrences, become what Boorstin (1962) calls "pseudo-events." Quoting Debord (#157), "the pseudo-events that vie for attention in the spectacle's dramatizations have not been lived by those who are thus informed about them." Media narration and depictions of disasters "are quickly forgotten, thanks to the perception with which the spectacle's pulsing machinery replaces one by the next." The above insights from Lefebvre, Debord, and Adorno help us to understand that repetition and instanteneity are not ends in themselves but reflect and express the ephemerality, chaos, fragmentation, and discontinuity that define contemporary capitalism. Several examples are noteworthy. First, the instant viewer access to media coverage of New Orleans, for example, provided an efficient and highly rationalized vehicle for subjecting people to commercial advertisements. In watching major news coverage, people were forced to view commercials as an essential component of their consumption of the disaster. Like other television shows and media, the presentation of Katrina directly addressed people as consumers and the logic was to persuade them to spend money on goods and services offered by the advertisers. Second, in a media saturated world, news corporations and 24-hour weather channels increasingly subject viewers to a wide variety of non-stop disasters. At any given time, there is a disaster occurring somewhere in the world. Media constructions of reality inevitably present a proliferation of disasters in an effort to create new avenues for consuming goods and services. Reflecting Lefebvre and Debord, disasters never stop; there is always one ready to take the place of another. Time has no meaning either. To truly make all time available for consuming disasters, the disasters have to implode into the home, so that people are subjected to tragic events on a constant basis on a variety of television stations. The Weather Channel and CNN Headline news have served to eliminate time as barrier to disaster reception, consumption, and viewing. These channels are "on" around the clock, every day, at all hours. Another example of repetition and instanteneity is the adoption and insertion of entertainment codes and performance into information production frameworks, transforming news into "infotainment" to appeal to the widest possible audience (Gabler 1998). While information suggests collections of facts and verifiable statements about past and present events, entertainment is amusement or diversion intended to hold the attention of an audience. Infotainment represents what social theorist Jean Baudrillard (1983) calls the "implosion" of reality where the boundaries between information and entertainment blur and become indistinguishable. The term implosion explains corporate attempts to eschew boundaries, collapse distinctions, and combine several different images or activities into one meaning. In the media coverage of Katrina, for instance, viewers were repeatedly shown a sensational show of provocative facts and high drama contained in a narrative structure that emphasized instantaneity, shock, and apocalypse. Websites operated by religious fundamentalists, for example, interpreted the hurricane as an act of retribution by a vengeful God, dismissing the pain and suffering experienced by residents. As reported by Reuters, an al Qaeda group in Iraq hailed the hurricane deaths in "oppressor" America as the "wrath of God."[3] For some Israeli rabbis, Katrina was divine punishment against President George W. Bush for having supported the Israeli Prime Minister's decision to force Israeli settlers out of Gaza. According to one rabbi, "New Orleans was also flooded because of its residents' lax moral standards and 'lack of Torah study.'"[4] In a widely circulated story and image, the Columbia Christians for Life blamed the devastation of Hurricane Katrina on abortion in Louisiana, explaining that the hurricane attacked the region in the form of a giant, angry fetus.[5] Douglas Kellner (1990; 2003) has suggested that the selection of information deemed newsworthy, episodic and dramatic presentations of information, and techniques of narrative storytelling are political strategies that reflect conscious decisions to reinforce the status quo. Even when venting criticism, major news organizations tend to be restrained in their coverage of events for fear of projecting an image of bias or instability (Alterman 1999; 2003). News coverage of Katrina, for example, purported to be unbiased, objective, and unadulterated. Yet it is important to recognize that claims to "objectivity" and "impartiality" are ideological constructions that reflect power relations including organized efforts to obscure conflict, marginalize dissent, and legitimate dominant interpretations of reality. In the case of Katrina, news corporations and media outlets created a spectacular disaster that was insulated from the reality of life and experience on the streets of New Orleans. "News" and "information" presented the city in a media world that was hermetically sealed off from reality (from real locals and the real consequences of social inequalities) while producing and legitimating simulations of the real (racialized looting, violence, crime).

**This imagery makes their racism impacts inevitable**

**Greening 08** (No Date Given, Last Date Cited) Assistant Director, McNair Scholars Program at Augsburg College English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Past Editor at The Origins Program English Professor at Saint Louis University Student Facilitator for the McNair Scholars Program at Saint Louis University English Professor at Fontbonne University English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Education Saint Louis University University of Saint Thomas University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Spectacular Disaster: The Louisiana Superdome and Subsumed Blackness in Post-Katrina New Orleans Brian Greening http://www.rochester.edu/in\_visible\_culture/Issue\_16/pdfs/greening.pdf

Following Katrina’s landfall in New Orleans, with the Superdome serving as a media-saturated microcosm of the city that spawned it, tuned-in world citizens viewed stories about roving murderous hordes, pedophiles raping infants, and makeshift morgues storing bodies by the hundreds in the Superdome’s sublevels. By using these shocking (and often aggrandized or falsified) tales of intrigue as an in-road for their abject positioning of the mostly black urban poor, journalists and willing subscribers allowed for blackness to be either repositioned or reified as a space where, without supervision, lawlessness prevailed. In this period of strain, **many journalists reverted to archaic color-based stereotypes**. 3 Black people looted while white people salvaged; blacks were obdurate in their decision to remain in the city while whites were largely victims taken by surprise; blackness was temperamental and violent while whiteness was composed and unwavering. But the images from inside and just outside the Superdome often resisted these assertions, suggesting instead that government negligence and media malpractice produced negative portrayals of black citizens rather than the other way around. In an effort to support my assertions above, I will use W. J. Thomas Mitchell’s image-rendering model “sounding the idols.” Adopted from Friedrich Nietzsche’s notion of “sounding out idols,” Mitchell broadens Nietzsche’s method of striking at eternal, mystifying idols to entail “a delicate critical practice that [strikes] images with just enough force to make them resonate, but not so much as to smash them.” 4 Mitchell’s declaration that images are “doubly conscious” and paradoxical—that they are both alive and dead, powerful and weak, meaningful and meaningless—is in keeping with the images that issued forth from the Superdome shortly after Katrina hit. 5 In this study, I adopt Mitchell’s concept of sounding the idols to show how images from within the Superdome speak against widespread news stories that portrayed New Orleans’ “so poor and so black” citizens as agents of their own displacement rather than victims of a natural (or national) disaster. 6 I seek to problematize the polarizing news stories coming out of post-Katrina New Orleans by examining rumor-laden accounts from in and around the Superdome during the weeklong ordeal following Hurricane Katrina’s landfall and juxtaposing them with pictures that resist these assertions. In the days after Hurricane Katrina struck New Orleans, the Superdome served as a site of contested visual space where whiteness faded into the background of images, out of consciousness, while black bodies bore the burden of the white gaze. The tragedy that befell New Orleans citizens is one that brought the conjoined issues of class and race to the forefront of American consciousness. If only for a moment, media consumers who previously subscribed to the notion that New Orleans was a “cultural gumbo” saw the folly in this widely-held misconception. 8 In fact, before Katrina hit, New Orleans was a contested space where people of disparate racial backgrounds blended tensely, like the brackish waters where the Mississippi flows into the Gulf of Mexico. 9 But the storm and the ensuing flooding plunged eighty percent of the city under water, necessitating racial commingling. It created spectacular interzones, with the Superdome serving as the largest structure housing racially diverse evacuees. While recognizing the position of power his “racelessness” provides, Richard Dyer writes: “Race is not the only factor governing…people [who] everywhere struggle to overcome the prejudices and barriers of race, but it is never not a factor, never not in play. And since race in itself…refers to some intrinsically insignificant geographical/physical differences between people, it is the imagery of race that is in play.” 10 Thus, Dyer seeks to dislodge white authority by bringing whiteness into consciousness. Though not a disaster that struck only African Americans, Katrina galvanized racial disparities in the retelling of horror stories from within the Superdome. While the majority of those stories stemmed from black pain, they were often retold and mythologized by white journalists.

**These images create the destruction of the “blackness” and alchemy of reality**

**Greening 08** (No Date Given, Last Date Cited) Assistant Director, McNair Scholars Program at Augsburg College English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Past Editor at The Origins Program English Professor at Saint Louis University Student Facilitator for the McNair Scholars Program at Saint Louis University English Professor at Fontbonne University English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Education Saint Louis University University of Saint Thomas University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Spectacular Disaster: The Louisiana Superdome and Subsumed Blackness in Post-Katrina New Orleans Brian Greening http://www.rochester.edu/in\_visible\_culture/Issue\_16/pdfs/greening.pdf

What remained consistent in Superdome portrayals was that, for those running the sports facility, the onset of more black bodies making their way to this sporting structure necessitated greater security, reduced freedoms, and a break from any perceived politically correct colorblindness. On September 2 nd , in a thinly-veiled swipe at black residents, then-Louisiana Governor Blanco authorized 300 U.S. troops to shoot to kill “hoodlums.” In the wake of sensational stories designating victims housed in and around the Superdome as looters, rapists, thugs, crack-smoking drug addicts, and derelicts, Blanco further entrenched public perception of a New Orleans overrun by unleashed blackness. In a threat-ridden public statement, Blanco said of the troops: “They have M-16s and they are locked and loaded. These troops know how to shoot to kill, and are more than willing to do so if necessary. And I expect they will.” 34 President Bush reiterated Blanco’s warning, insisting that looters be treated with “zero tolerance.” 35 In the midst of these absolutist caveats villanizing black people, still shots and live CNN footage of fully-armed soldiers patrolling the Superdome with black Katrina victims flanking them became commonplace on television, the Internet, and elsewhere (see Figure 4). As Sontag notes, “Photographs objectify: they turn an event or a person into something that can be possessed. And photographs are a species of alchemy, for all that they are prized as a transparent account of reality.” 36 As Figure 4 reveals, the measures endorsed by Blanco and Bush to counter looting and other disobedience were extreme, if not wholly irresponsible considering the tens of thousands of residents still stranded in the city; plus, Katrina had largely produced the docile bodies Foucault mentions. Lieutenant General Russel Honoré recognized this, ordering his troops traversing streets and other public zones with weapons raised to lower them because, as Honoré recognized, “This is not Baghdad; these are American citizens.” 37 And yet, images portraying white soldiers on guard against black subversion proved difficult to neutralize.

**The affirmative moots questions of reality and replaces it with the photograph**

**Greening 08** (No Date Given, Last Date Cited) Assistant Director, McNair Scholars Program at Augsburg College English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Past Editor at The Origins Program English Professor at Saint Louis University Student Facilitator for the McNair Scholars Program at Saint Louis University English Professor at Fontbonne University English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Education Saint Louis University University of Saint Thomas University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Spectacular Disaster: The Louisiana Superdome and Subsumed Blackness in Post-Katrina New Orleans Brian Greening http://www.rochester.edu/in\_visible\_culture/Issue\_16/pdfs/greening.pdf

Following Katrina, much of the American public revealed its continued bifurcation of black subjects into distinct realms of “acceptable” and “objectionable,” with the later designation reserved for the black urban poor who populated the Superdome. The Superdome’s use as a refuge of last resort during Katrina and the ensuing coverage are doubly ironic because they reveal how viewers invite and celebrate certain African Americans in our homes via television while dismissing or vilifying others. The black citizens who stared out from the Superdome’s darkened and drenched alcoves, with their stories and torments diluted or rendered mute through falsification, continue to charge America with socialized racism. Perhaps Sontag is correct in noting that people ultimately desire to have their vision of reality confirmed and their experiences enhanced by photographs. 58 Even though self-reflexive journalists and scholars have illuminated these errors, Americans remain largely complicit in their original telling because they remained, at least for a short time, untroubled. Transfixed by these early reports, world citizens stared in horror at scenes and still photos representing a terror zone similar to apocalyptic scenarios played out in Hollywood cinema. And while these same citizens have learned a great deal about the delayed and ineffective local and federal governmental response to this the worst natural disaster to strike American soil in the country’s history, and cultivated or reformed their sympathetic bounds in response to the depths of human suffering played out live via satellite, the stories from within the Superdome during this brief one-week period remain shrouded in rumor, hearsay, and myth.

**Our alternative is the deconstruction of the affirmatives imagery to understand it correctly**

**Greening 08** (No Date Given, Last Date Cited) Assistant Director, McNair Scholars Program at Augsburg College English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Past Editor at The Origins Program English Professor at Saint Louis University Student Facilitator for the McNair Scholars Program at Saint Louis University English Professor at Fontbonne University English Professor at University of Saint Thomas Education Saint Louis University University of Saint Thomas University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Spectacular Disaster: The Louisiana Superdome and Subsumed Blackness in Post-Katrina New Orleans Brian Greening http://www.rochester.edu/in\_visible\_culture/Issue\_16/pdfs/greening.pdf

In the wake of post-Katrina New Orleans media coverage, an observer may find it necessary to reexamine Foucault’s proclamation that “Our society is one not of spectacle, but of surveillance; under the surface of images, one invests bodies in depth; behind the great abstraction of exchange, there continues a meticulous, concrete training of useful forces.” 44 Contemporary media outlets have found a way to unite both spectacle and surveillance, as was evident in their coverage in and around the Superdome. 45 In these instances, spectacular surveillance served to affirm a conservative, bootstrapping ideology proclaiming that New Orleans’ largely black population brought on their own suffering. On his Fox News Channel program The O’Reilly Factor, taped shortly after Katrina made landfall, conservative pundit Bill O’Reilly co-opted footage from the Superdome and the surrounding area. At the height of insensitivity, O’Reilly opined that “Every American kid should be required to watch videotape of the poor in New Orleans and see how they suffered, because they couldn’t get out of town. And then every teacher should tell the students, ‘If you refuse to learn, if you refuse to work hard, if you become addicted, if you live a gangsta-life, you will be poor and powerless just like many of those in New Orleans.’” 46 O’Reilly’s use of post-Katrina footage, along with his linking of poor black urban bodies with “gangsta-life”—i.e., selfelected black lawlessness—reveals a tendency to render these images as absolutisms. This visual event was, in O’Reilly’s opinion, a spectacle of fear. But, as Sontag posits, “Photographs of an atrocity may give rise to opposing responses. A call for peace. A cry for revenge. Or simply the bemused awareness, continually restocked by photographic information, that terrible things happen.” 47 If deconstructed in their proper complexity, the pictures that descend from the Superdome continue to contest the endorsed façade of black culpability in this tragedy. This is a great paragraph.

**their representations are othering the other – turns case**

**Ortega 09** John Carroll University Othering the Other: The Spectacle of Katrina for our Racial Entertainment Pleasure Mariana Ortega

Such photographic appropriations and objectifications persist. They continue to make a spectacle of race and racism, and now the story of this spectacle has a new chapter called Katrina. In this paper I would like to point to the function of visual representations of hurricane Katrina in popular media as helping to “other” the other in various dangerous ways and providing additional racial entertainment that further sediments views about the so-called black-white experience in this country. [5] The story of Katrina that we witnessed through newspapers, photos, television, perhaps even in person, was a story of enormous pain and suffering, of enormous grief and loss, that could have “made a tenuous ‘we” of us all.” [6] It did for a brief but important moment, as countless numbers of U.S citizens of various races denounced the structural racism that turned a natural disaster into an unnatural one and demanded that justice be served, that this country repair its classist and racist ways. [7] However, doubts ensued as dark bodies were “shown” looting, misbehaving in the “safe” ground of the Superdome or the Convention Center, misbehaving everywhere and creating chaos, and other “illegal” bodies showed up from all over the U.S., Mexico, Central and South America in the aftermath of the storm. **In the end, we got a new racial spectacle, an attempt to hold on to our so dear black-white racial dichotomy despite the facts of the make-up of the U.S. population, and a convenient “othering” of the other which guarantees further fragmentation among those who are already vulnerable and forgotten and in the bottom steps of the ladder of economic success and social respectability.** 2. The Double Function of Visual Representation The event that concerns us, Katrina, has already been shaped in various ways by its photographic representations. I wonder which photograph comes to mind when I mention Katrina, in the way that September 11 is imprinted in our minds with a photograph of a fireman carrying a baby to safety, or the Vietnam War is exemplified by that child running naked in the middle of the street after a napalm attack. Memory is a tricky thing and photographs come to its rescue. Of the many photographs of tragedy and suffering, only a few are bound to become iconic, representative of the event. Which one will it be for Katrina? What visual representation of Katrina will become fixed in your consciousness, in our national consciousness? Will it be the photograph of those with whom you identify, whose suffering gets to your heart? Or will it be the photograph of regular, law-complying people just trying to save their loved ones? Can the photograph that points to the unruliness of the poor of color who will act up just as expected even in a moment of crisis be the chosen one? Or will you, us, the “nation” choose the iconic beautiful, sad photograph representing a nation in crisis, the photograph that demands justice for those who have been forgotten? And it is important to ask, What about the photographs we didn’t see, photographs representing people that were also affected but whose photographs were not taken and if they were, they were not shown to us, photographs of the Hondurans and other Latinos, of the many Vietnamese who were affected, of the Native Americans living in the Isle de Jean Charles? [8] In her last musings on photography, Sontag revisits her early position on the negative function of photography and offers a revised interpretation of the role of photographs regarding the suffering of others. She says that photographs of suffering carry a double message: “They show a suffering that is outrageous, unjust, and should be repaired” and “They confirm that this is the sort of thing which happens in that place.” [9] How could we not be outraged, saddened, grief-stricken by the suffering of Katrina victims represented in the photographs we saw in newspapers and magazines? But very soon the stories of the suffering of the victims are supplanted by stories and images of unruliness and of misbehaving dark bodies. Somehow, **the media find it more profitable to show representations of looters instead of victims -- of scandal and chaos instead of patient, virtuous victims waiting for relief. Dark bodies are represented as “looting” while light-skinned ones are represented “finding bread and soda from a local grocery store.” Conscious or unconscious beliefs about those people, “those others” are confirmed: that is the sort of thing that happens in that place.** The moment of mourning brought about by the heart-wrenching images of people on top of roofs, sweaty, vanquished African-Americans waiting for relief, the old, the young, the strong, the weak, all in the same helpless situation, is transformed. Images of angry African-Americans tired of waiting; images of chaos and disorder; images of that is what those people do -- of that is what happens there, trickle in and take over. The discussion no longer emphasizes the pain, the tragedy that people are suffering but their terrible, undesirable behavior. And the spectacle for our racial entertainment continues with another chapter in a tradition in the exhibition of the otherness of the other.

**Media representations shaped reality of Post-Katrina**

**Jorgenson 11** Hurricane Katrina: Humanitarian Obligations and Lessons Learned Ellen Jorgenson Case-Specific Briefing Paper Humanitarian Assistance in Complex Emergencies University of Denver 2011

The media plays an imperative role in any disaster. Post-Katrina, the media should have recognized the delayed efforts of leaders and the large amount of work still needed to help the people of New Orleans and other coastal areas. Most importantly, **the reporting should not have focused so heavily on racial elements that became central in stories as the disaster unfolded**. In the future, the focus must incorporate a balanced conversation on race, class, and poverty; key technological findings and implications of the disaster; and what still needs to be done programmatically. Linked to the media’s role is a need for a societal change. Obligation by, for, and amongst the American people must be considered in the context of poverty. More broadly, advocacy is essential as we consider the repressed, depressed, and oppressed of the world

Media guides actions – their depictions of Katrina shapes their political response – if we win that their representations are bad, then their plan backfires.

Mabrey 09 – Master of Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences Georgia State University (Paul E. Mabrey III, “Hurricane Katrina and the Third World: A Cluster Analysis of the "Third World" Label in the Mass Media Coverage of Hurricane Katrina” 7-17-2009, http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1054&context=communication\_theses )//ALo

Beyond highlighting the need for an effective communication infrastructure, scholars have increasingly focused on the central role of the mass media during Hurricane Katrina. Russell R. Dynes and Havidán Rodríguez argue that, “Katrina was the first hurricane to hit the United States to the accompaniment of continuous (24/7) television coverage.” By telling stories that disseminated throughout the American public, journalists covering Katrina actively influenced how the hurricane was mediated to the world. Twenty-four hour media coverage, seven days a week made the communication about Hurricane Katrina very important to how the public understood and reacted to Hurricane Katrina. 11 Scholars have long understood that the mass media plays an important role in American politics and culture. Doris Graber points out that the role of distributing information is nothing new: “Not only are the media the chief source of most Americans’ views of the world, but they also provide the fastest way to disperse information throughout the entire society.” 12 Hurricane Katrina demonstrates the important role the media plays in disseminating news information throughout society. Mainstream news reporting was the only vehicle for most of Americans to learn about the pending crisis. In some instances, media outlets, rather than the government, were responsible for disseminating information on assistance, aid, and awareness. Thevenot argues that the media are largely responsible for the publics’ knowledge of the events occurring on the Gulf Coast. Americans rely on the mainstream mass media to know what is happening in their states, country and around the world. We read the newspaper in the morning. We check our email, voice messages and online news at work. We even actively seek out news on our portable electronic devices. Even if one is not actively seeking the news, Americans are bombarded with news information at home, in the office and in the salon/barbershop. One even encounters mainstream media news when walking outside or commuting to work. Individuals turn to mass media information especially in times of crisis because of its ubiquity and constant updating. 13 The importance of accuracy in reporting consequently cannot be understated. Dynes and Rodríguez maintain the importance of accuracy, when they argue, “[T]his portrayal of disasters and their aftermath result in both decision makers and the general public (those impacted by the disaster agent and not) reaching incorrect conclusions about the event thus impacting the decision-making process.” 14 The stakes were high for the media because they were only way that anyone received information about Katrina’s landfall. The effects of Hurricane Katrina reminded the American public of the significance of the mass media lens when reporting news information. Besides simply serving as a source of news, the mass media provide a contextual framework for understanding what they cover. 15 The media provide models for public attitude, behavior and orientation, as Graber notes, The impact of news stories on political leaders and on the average citizen’s views about the merits of public policies and the performance of public officials demonstrates how mass media, in combination with other political factors, can influence, American politics. News stories take millions of Americans, in all walks of life, to the battlefields of the world. They give them ringside seats for space shuttle launches or basketball championships. They provide the nation with shared political experiences, such as watching presidential inaugurations or congressional investigations, that then undergird public opinions and unite people to decide when political action is required. Print, audio, and audiovisual media often serve as attitude and behavior models. The media function as more than a model. The media can drive individuals and whole populations toward certain beliefs and motivate the very same group against other forms of action. The choice to display certain images, headlines or labels has consequences for those already impacted by Hurricane Katrina. Carol Winkler contends that, “The process of labeling is not neutral. Each use of a term is a choice (whether conscious or unconscious) that emphasizes certain aspects of what is being described, while de-emphasizing others…By happenstance or by design, labeling necessarily entails perspective taking.” 17 Despite claims or attempts at objectivity, media use of labels inevitably, as Winkler demonstrates, involve privileging one perspective at the expense of another. But labeling is not confined to perspective taking or emphasis. Power relationships, authority, and social order are at stake in the process of labeling. Geof Wood argues, Thus the validity of labels becomes not a matter of substantive objectivity but of the ability to use labels effectively in action as designations which define parameters for thought and behaviour, which render environments stable, and which establish spheres of competence and areas of responsibility. In this way labelling through these sorts of designations is part of the process of creating social structure. 18 The mainstream mass media, through the use of labels, participates in the creation of social order. These rhetorical constructions help render certain ways of thinking and behaving as acceptable or unacceptable. Mass media communication provided the groundwork for the nation to talk about and respond to Hurricane Katrina and its consequences.

Their representations of Katrina as a “Third World” disaster promotes otherization, turns case.

Mabrey 2009 – Master of Arts in the College of Arts and Sciences Georgia State University (Paul E. Mabrey III, “Hurricane Katrina and the Third World: A Cluster Analysis of the "Third World" Label in the Mass Media Coverage of Hurricane Katrina” 7-17-2009, http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1054&context=communication\_theses )//ALo

This study will examine one particular label associated with Katrina coverage: “Third World.” The mass media repeatedly employed the label “Third World” to communicate the immediate effects of Hurricane Katrina. Kristin Gazlay, the Associated Press Deputy Managing Editor for National News, refers to the aftermath of Katrina as “Third World devastation in a First World country.” 19 The Times Picayune, a regional paper, reports that “Americans watched Third World scenes play out in a beloved American city.” 20 Evoking the imagery and memory of the Third World was a constant theme used to report the various effects and consequences of Hurricane Katrina. Dr. Dwayne A. Thomas, chief executive officer for two of the hospitals in New Orleans, witnessed dead bodies, rising water and overflowing sewage. He describes his first hand experience as being “as close as I've gotten to the third world.” 21 The need for close examination of the media’s use of the “Third World” label is multifaceted. Peter Worsley argues that because Third World is “used in so many different ways that Given the prevalence of the “Third World” label in the media’s coverage of Katrina to describe what many considered the First World, this study will examine the uses, motives and implications for employing the label. 6 we no longer assume that we all know what is meant.” 22 The label has been used to demarcate nation-state alliances along ideological, geo-political and economic lines and for both domination and resistance. 23 Heloise Weber claims that “the political utility of the Third World can be seen to have had a disciplinary function in that it legitimated inequality within through stories about the external Other.” 24 The mass media’s use of the label “Third World” suggests provocative questions about rhetoric and identity. Labeling the region Third World conveyed more than just the devastation wrought; it rhetorically lifts the Gulf Coast right out of the United States. The U.S. is typically not referred to as a Third World country. Instead, it historically belongs to a group of nations of the so-called First World. Third World is associated with poverty, chaos and in need of development; it is generally aligned with “Africa, Asia and the southern Americas.” Throughout the media coverage of Hurricane Katrina, the “Third World” label evoked certain values, judgments and beliefs. 25 Referring to part of the typically First World United States as a Third World country reveals paradoxical tensions. For example, Cynthia Young highlights the danger “that conflating people in the First World with those in the Third World borrows the latter’s legitimacy while maintaining the spotlight firmly on the First World.” 26 To better understand how the media utilized the “Third World” label, the remainder of this chapter will explore current understandings of the rhetorical context surrounding Katrina coverage. Afterwards, it will justify the use of a rhetorical analysis, cluster analysis in particular, to further explore how the media employed the “Third World” label. Finally, this chapter will Exploring the potential for empathy and resistance in identifying with the Third World is just one avenue for thinking about the tensions between labeling part of a so-called First World the Third World.7 outline how the study’s analysis is organized into chapters related to the impacted inhabitants, the governments involved and the spaces affected by Katrina.

## AT: K of Politics

**Their kritik of politics is wrong and circular**

**Kraus and Giles 89** Sidney Kraus and Dennis Giles Department of Communication Cleveland State University Constructing the Political Spectacle by Murray Edelman Review by: Sidney Kraus and Dennis Giles Political Psychology, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Sep., 1989), pp. 517-525 Published by: International Society of Political Psychology Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3791366 . Accessed: 04/07/2012 14:15

A main thread throughout this work is the notion that political dis- course/spectacle is only an "interpretation of an interpretation." All political languages are "constructions of reality." By implication, the "facts" are ultimately inaccessible, they are not "objectively" given in political or any other kind of discourse - all is language, i.e., "constructions." Hence to get at meaning, intents, motives(?), it is necessary to deconstruct the discourse, and/or the spectacle. Notwithstanding Edelman's reproach of social scientists who disagree with him (see p. 6), they may avoid his theoretical notions in forming operational definitions of political reality with the argument that such a theory put into practice defies agreement. Still, despite the initial (and summary) claim that there are no objec- tive facts, "The very concept of 'fact' becomes irrelevant because every meaningful political object and person is an interpretation that reflects and perpetuates an ideology" (p. 10). Throughout his elaboration of theory, Edel- man, in constant examples, contrasts the mystifications of the political spec- tacle to a cited "reality" which seems to prove the illusory construction of political language "about" that reality. For example, he states that Ronald Reagan has misled the country about the effects on the poor of his tax reduc- tions and his cuts in social programs, about the human rights records of foreign govern- ments he supports, and about his administration's responsibility for deficits and for unemployment. (p. 58) However much this statement reflects the conventional liberal-to-left view of the deceptive practice of the Reagan administration, it is presented, it seems, to describe a factual world which is covered up by political discourse. Edelman's practice in this book is ambivalent in that he invokes a world outside the mystifying practice of political discourse which seems intended as a correction of political spectacle, or an expose of its falsities. Are state- ments like the Reagan statement, then, intended as "proof" of his theory, or as brief illustrations of the kind of analysis that could be carried out utiliz- ing his theory? At times, he cites analytical or historical studies (in footnotes) as sup- port of his statements, but more often he seems to present such statements as though they were self-evident "facts**." If all political reality is indeed a construction of language, how can one regard Edelman's statements of ap- parently self-evident facts as anything other than a further instance of self- interested linguistic construction?** Statements like the description of the "real- ity" behind the mystifications of Reagan's political discourse can only be regarded, then, as mere opinions of the author, since they are unsupported by an extensive analysis. Edelman says that "the notion of reality construc- tion implies that some are valid and others not.... It can be done well or badly and be right or wrong" (pp. 6, 121). But how can the reader judge the validity of statements such as the one about Reagan? Why is Edelman's statement "right" whereas other such statements may be "wrong"? Although Edelman here does not claim to be writing a book of extended analysis, but rather elaborates theory, many of the statements he makes about "reality" remain unpersuasive since they are not accompanied by analytical work which could show why this "opinion" is more valid than any other. If, according to his own theory, Edelman's statements about reality are themselves con- structed according to the social/political position and the "interests" of the speaker/observer, there is no reason why a critical reader should regard them as demystifications or deconstructions of political discourse.

## AT: K of Process CP

**For any change to happen, we must analyze the process**

**Komesar, 94** (Neil, professor of law at the University of Wisconsin, Imperfect Alternatives: Choosing Institutions in Law, Economics, and Public Policy)

Most of us live in massive and complex societies in which the quality of life is dependent on decision-making processes operating somewhere beyond the horizon. Amorphous markets determine what we get and what we pay. Decisions made by faceless bureaucracies, distant legislatures, and isolated courts mold our opportunities. This book is about these decision-making processes. More particularly, it is about the way we choose to allocate authority to and among them. It is about deciding who decides. This decision is the essence of such global tasks of social definition as the making of constitutions. Sweeping ideologies from laissez-faire capitalism to centralized socialism are defined by their positions on who decides. Moreover, choices between markets, courts, and political processes pervade law and public policy at all levels. These choices determine what one views as the correct response to air pollution and the correct pattern of tort reform. They underlie a full range of judicial decisions from, for example, the unconstitutionality of prayer in schools to the remedy for breach of contract. Scratch the surface of any important issue of law and public policy, and important and controversial questions concerning the choice between decision-makers will appear. In this book, I refer to the decision of who decides as "institutional choice" The term "institutional" reflects the reality that the decision of who decides is really a decision of what decides. The alternative decision-makers are not individuals or even small numbers of individuals. They are complex processes, such as the political process, the market process, and the adjudicative process, in which the interaction of many participants shape performance. In tum, I refer to the analysis of institutional choice as "comparative institutional analysis" because the analysis of the choice among decision-making alternatives requires the sophisticated comparison of these alterative. The argument in favor of comparative institutional analysis takes up part l of this book. In addition to arguing that institutional choice is an essential part of law and public policy choice, and, therefore, that comparative institutional analysis is an essential part of any analysis of law and public policy, I propose a framework or approach for doing comparative institutional analysis. I define this "participation-centered approach" below and develop it in parts 2 and 3 of this book.

**It is essential for decision making**

**Komesar, 94** (Neil, professor of law at the University of Wisconsin, Imperfect Alternatives: Choosing Institutions in Law, Economics, and Public Policy)

Goal choice and institutional choice are both essential for law and public policy. They are inextricably related. On the one hand, institutional performance and, therefore, institutional choice can not be assessed except against the bench mark of some social goal or set of goals. On the other, because in the abstract any goal can be consistent with a wide range of public policies, the decision as to who decides determines how a goal shapes public policy. It is institutional choice that connects goals with their legal or public policy results. Institutional choice is difficult as well as essential. The choice is always a choice among highly imperfect alternatives. The strengths and weak-nesses of one institution versus another vary from one set of circumstances to another. For example, whether the adjudicative process is the best protector of property rights or the worst determiner of safety is by no means obvious. Sometimes the courts will be the best protectors of private property, and sometimes that task will be better assigned to the political process. Sometimes the courts will be the best determiners of safety, and sometimes that task will be better assigned to the political process or the market.

### Anthro K

**Katrina disaster response created anthropocentric culture – this is immoral and error replication – incorporating animals into response policies is more effective**

**Irvine 06** Leslie Irvine, Ph.D. in sociology and teaches at the University of Colorado, Boulder. Her research examines relationships between people and companion animals, animal sheltering, and animals in disasters “Animals in Disasters: Issues for Animal Liberation Activism and Policy”

Because institutional thinking can only frame problems selectively, the proffered solutions often fall short of addressing the problems as experienced by those outside the institution’s purview. In other words, institutional thinking overlooks relevant aspects of the situation or circumstances that are salient for those experiencing the problem. As Loseke (2001) argues, institutional formulations may not capture the complexities of lived experience. This failure leads to “discursive disjunctions” between incompatible systems of meaning (Chase 1995, 123). An example appeared in Hurricane Katrina, when rescuers forced people to leave their companion animals. Residents faced the choice between leaving animals they considered family members and risking their own lives. Because of institutional thinking, new problems may emerge later, through the cracks of the “organizationally embedded” solutions (Gubrium 1992; see also 1987). As I explain later, disaster myths about dogs in the aftermath of Hurricane Charley offer a good illustration of this. In addition to the pitfalls of institutional thinking, the disaster response system, at least as currently practiced through the command and control model, reveals thoroughgoing speciesism and a paternalistic attitude about the right to use force and violence. To be sure, the command and control model should not be singled out for accusations of speciesism; our entire anthropocentric culture is to blame. The point I focus on here concerns the speciesist assumptions that direct emergency responders to save human lives first, and often at the expense of animal lives. Coupled with this, the use of state-sanctioned force and the threat and reality of violence poses an intriguing paradox for animal rights activists. For example, following Hurricane Katrina, the lack of government response required subsequent animal rescuers to engage in tactics such as breaking and entering, which are denounced when engaged in by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF). For a deeper exploration of these and other issues, I turn now to the case studies. Case Studies Case #1: Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans, Louisiana The unprecedented catastrophe of Hurricane Katrina highlights numerous issues related to animal liberation and welfare. Although many stages in the response could provide critical and analytical points of departure, I limit the discussion to an aspect with which I have first-hand experience: the housing of companion dogs rescued from New Orleans (see Irvine forthcoming). Along with three staff members from a local humane society at which I volunteer, I assisted for a week in the overwhelming task of caring for the more than 2000 dogs housed at the Lamar-Dixon Expo Center in Gonzales, Louisiana (about 60 miles northwest of New Orleans). The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) leased Lamar-Dixon as the primary staging area for the New Orleans animal response. At that time, Lamar-Dixon was the largest functioning animal shelter in the United States. Conditions in the field were extremely taxing, and I succumbed to heat exhaustion during my stay. Among the many insights that the experience afforded me, two stand out as particularly relevant for this paper. The priority placed on human lives, a basic tenet of disaster response, essentially created a second disaster, in the form of the overwhelming numbers of homeless animals needing rescue, housing, and veterinary care. The more basic issue however, and the one that has not entered the conversation about legislating animals into disaster response plans, is the speciesism implicit in the belief that companion animals are a basic entitlement. Having one or more dogs, cats, or both is practically a birthright, regardless of the hazards to which people might expose the animals. The Event Katrina made landfall on August 29, 2005. It is widely known that in the flooding that followed, many of the residents who evacuated New Orleans left their companion animals behind. Many people did so because they were going to motels that would not accept animals. Others, rescued in boats, helicopters, and emergency vehicles, report that responders insisted that they would only take people. Some residents were forced, under threat of arrest, to abandon their dogs and cats. Evacuees who went to emergency shelters had to find alternative arrangements for their animals, as most shelters do not accept non-human animals. In many emergencies, some animal shelters will house companion animals temporarily. As I explain below, this practice worked well during Hurricane Charley in 2004. However, Katrina’s floodwaters destroyed the Louisiana Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in New Orleans. Residents who managed to bring their dogs and cats to the Convention Center were forced to leave them behind when they evacuated that facility, simply because animals are not permitted on public transportation. Numerous media accounts depict National Guardsmen simply letting dogs and cats run free as their guardians watched helplessly. One of the most famous—and heartbreaking—images from the disaster depicts the little white dog named “Snowball” being torn from a boy’s arms by a police officer as the boy boarded a bus to leave the Superdome. Video showed the boy so upset that he vomited. The officer separated the dog and boy to uphold the policy that prohibits animals on public transportation. Evacuees reported being told that their animals would be rescued later, and some thought they could soon return for their animals themselves. As is now widely known, some residents have never returned. As Katrina approached, animal response teams from all over the country were staging near Baton Rouge. However, police and military blockades prohibited animal rescuers from entering New Orleans for six days following the flood. Once rescue teams could enter the city, rescuers caught and transported animals to Lamar-Dixon, where they received veterinary examinations and treatment, decontamination baths (if needed), and 24-hour care, albeit at the most basic level. The vast majority of the animals housed at Lamar-Dixon were dogs. They received food, water, and a clean kennel every day, but walks were a luxury available only if we had additional volunteers. The minimal paperwork taped to the kennels told the location of rescue. The record of one especially sad dog described her rescue from a house where the other two dogs had died, most likely of heat, thirst, and starvation. Most of the dogs were mixed breeds, and most had nice dispositions, especially considering what they had endured. All were thin. Many were sick. Many had mange and diarrhea. Most male dogs were intact, and numerous females were in heat. For security reasons, the Lamar-Dixon management insisted that the lights remain on in the facility overnight. Consequently, the animals had no natural day and night. The relentless heat and humidity took a toll on the dogs as well as the volunteers. Volunteers worked around the clock, as vehicles continually arrived with rescued animals. The greatest number of animals arrived after dark, once the curfew in New Orleans forced rescue teams to leave the city. When I first arrived, the facility was terribly overcrowded because the state veterinarian would not allow dogs to be transferred to shelters outside Louisiana. Within the week, however, dogs who had been unclaimed since the flood could be transferred out of state, while newly rescued animals had to remain within Louisiana for a designated time to allow guardians a chance to locate them. After a transfer of dogs, the newly empty kennels gave volunteers momentary false hope. Just moments after a truckload of dogs departed for other shelters, new ones arrived by the dozens from the streets and rooftops of New Orleans. Discussion The overwhelming numbers of homeless animals after Katrina highlighted the speciesist assumptions in the disaster response. Emergency responders make human lives their first priority. Fire fighters, police officers, and other first responders will not rescue a dog or cat instead of a human being. **This policy draws a line between different kinds of life, and assumes that the lives on the human side of the line are more valuable.** The debate about the relative value of lives is, I believe, misguided. The speciesism inherent in the construction of a human-animal boundary assumes that rescue cannot be reinvented in such a way that can spare the lives of animals and humans. The policy of putting humans first inhibits thinking about disaster response “outside the box,” as it were. If disaster response policy were examined with an eye to eliminating speciesist assumptions, small changes could improve the situation for people and animals. For example, in a conversation I had with a veterinarian volunteer about six months after Katrina, I learned that Red Cross responders are not permitted to carry dog and cat food in their vehicles. This particular veterinarian had traveled through New Orleans in Red Cross vehicles several times as part of his service, during a time early in the response when travel in the city was restricted to emergency vehicles. He pointed out the need for dog and cat food at his site, and requested that the Red Cross bring some on their next trip. The responders told him that they were prohibited from carrying animal feed or animals. The veterinarian explained that the food was human-grade, securely packaged, and unlikely to cause any contamination of any sort. The rule prevailed. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of dogs and cats starved because emergency vehicles were reserved for human needs. Only once animal response teams were allowed in the city could food be made available to stranded and stray animals. In the rescue efforts, animal response teams broke into evacuated homes, smashing doors and windows and using the same tactics that the ALF uses to rescue farmed and lab animals. In both cases, the rescuers offered the same justification for their actions, claiming that the animals were suffering and that saving them trumped any rights to property. However, in the Katrina response, the state had in effect granted permission for rescuers to engage in breaking and entering. Companion animals have a different status than those confined in labs and on farms (as demonstrated by their inclusion in the PETS Acts). Moreover, the public, once aware of the plight of the abandoned dogs and cats, supported the rescue effort. The violence was state sanctioned to compensate for the government’s incompetence in the response. In contrast, ALF actions are on behalf of animals who are generally invisible to and forgotten by the public. To protect corporate interests, the government portrays ALF activists as terrorists rather than rescuers. The significant point is that the cases are similar in the most important respects, highlighting the arbitrariness of the laws that demonize liberation as terrorism. The Katrina response can potentially inform people about what liberation is and why it is necessary. During the response to Katrina, charges of racism surfaced regularly in the media, but the Katrina response also demonstrated rampant speciesism, and the links between the two forms of discrimination became real as dogs from poor, predominantly African American parishes crowded into Lamar-Dixon. Although steps such as challenging the human-animal boundary on the response end could improve the situation for animals, there are additional speciesist assumptions at work on a more basic level in the practice of keeping dogs and cats as companions. In the interest of full disclosure, I will admit that my cat and dog companions surround me as I write this. Nevertheless, I believe that, in a morally just world, we would not reproduce other species to keep for our companionship. Before we humans reach that stage of moral maturity, we must ask serious questions about the risks to which we expose companion animals when we keep them in our homes. Most of the animals at Lamar-Dixon came from parishes in which heavy flooding was anticipated early on in the incident. These parishes were also mostly lower-income areas, where residents had few resources to evacuate on their own. Because the practice of keeping animals as companions is taken for granted, regardless of the hazards to which people might expose the animals, thousands of dogs and cats were abandoned when their human guardians were rescued. This raises a political minefield of a question: should people who have few resources to insure their own safety also put animals at risk? The question smacks of middle-class privilege, and I want to be clear that I am not saying the poor are incapable of caring for animals. Rather, I want to raise the issue that incorporating animals into disaster response is a positive step, but more basic steps in educating people about responsible guardianship might go further to reduce the hazards that animals face in future disasters. “Responsible” guardianship must go beyond simply providing food, water, and shelter. It must involve acknowledging a lifelong commitment, and fighting against threats to that commitment. The experience of losing a companion animal in Hurricane Katrina should have compelled New Orleans residents, particularly African-Americans, to activism on behalf of animals. However, most people seem content to believe that the government has allegedly solved the problem of animals in disasters. Time will most likely reveal that exclusively human interests once again prevail.
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