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# Work

## Terror

### 1NC

1. Limited sensor range precludes detection of bioweapons

Demirev et al 05 Plamen A. Demirev, Andrew B. Feldman, and Jeffrey S. Lin, the Sensor Sciences Group of APL’s Research and Technology Development Center Johns Hopkins APL Technical Digest, Volume 26, Number 4 (2005)

Chemical and Biological Weapons: Current Concepts for Future Defenses http://techdigest.jhuapl.edu/TD/td2604/Demirev.pdf

A further challenge for BW defense is posed by the requirements to defend large populations (large areas). In most such scenarios, the likelihood of directly detecting a BW surreptitiously released into the atmosphere is exceedingly low because of the low spatial coverage of the biosensors. In this case, human “sentinels” represent the frontline systems for detecting the release of a human pathogen. Here, medical surveillance and surveillance of nontraditional indicators such as sales of over-the-counter drugs (“syndromic surveillance”) can be used to detect early indications of a BW-induced disease outbreak. The sheer volume, noisiness, and inherent variation of nontraditional surveillance data present a daunting data-mining obstacle. However, intelligent information fusion incorporating epidemiological knowledge has the potential to meet this challenge. A significant technical hurdle is to encode the delicate interplay between expert knowledge and real-time data feeds into automated algorithms for alerting with acceptable false alarm rates. Finally, as such surveillance-based systems evolve to additionally fuse available sensor and intelligence data, a truly net-centric biodefense capability will emerge.

2. Processing, searching, matching, and datafusion gut aff solvency

Yang – your author 02 (2002 Chaowei Phil Yang Professor of GIScience, George Mason University “UTILIZING REMOTE SENSED DATA IN A QUICK RESPONSE SYSTEM” Menas Kafatos, Ruixin Yang, Chaowei Yang, Richard Gomez, & Zafer Boybeyi)

Hyperspectral imaging is an emerging, enabling technology -- useful to both DoD and civil organizations in areas including: remote sensing of chemical and biological agents to combat terrorism; locating mobile rocket launchers, detecting fuel leaks at our nation’s pipeline systems, discriminating missiles by plume spectra, controlling urban development, detecting narcotic-related agents; and detecting pollution sources. Hyperspectral and other modern imaging systems such as radar and laser systems are becoming increasingly available to perform quantitative measurements that will yield information not available from more conventional sources. Unique literal and non-literal measurements made with these systems from ground, airborne, and spaceborne platforms can help with many applications. However, for this capability to be exploitable, it is essential that a well-populated spectral library information system exists and be accessible in a user-friendly way by the user of this technology. This will also require the development of faster processing algorithms, better search methods, improved spectral matching techniques, data fusion, availability of digital elevation data, and cost-effective data handling and management structures, all of which need to be addressed. Modern ground, airborne and spaceborne modern systems are currently demonstrating that the very high efficiencies and extreme flexibility of these sensors provide a powerful measurement technology.

3. Bioterror risk is low—dispersal problems, tech barriers, risk of back spread—experts agree

John Mueller, Professor, Political Science, Ohio State University, OVERBLOWN: HOW POLITICIANS AND THE TERRORISM INDUSTRY INFLATE NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS, AND WHY WE BELIEVE THEM, 2009, p. 21-22.

For the most destructive results, biological weapons need to be dispersed in very low-altitude aerosol clouds. Because aerosols do not appreciably settle, pathogens like anthrax (which is not easy to spread or catch and is not contagious) would probably have to be sprayed near nose level. Moreover, 90 percent of the microorganisms are likely to die during the process of aerosolization, and their effectiveness could be reduced still further by sunlight, smog, humidity, and temperature changes. Explosive methods of dispersion may destroy the organisms, and, except for anthrax spores, long-term storage of lethal organisms in bombs or warheads is difficult: even if refrigerated, most of the organisms have a limited lifetime. The effects of such weapons can take days or weeks to have full effect, during which time they can be countered with medical and civil defense measures. And their impact is very difficult to predict; in combat situations they may spread back onto the attacker. In the judgment of two careful analysts, delivering microbes and toxins over a wide area in the form most suitable for inflicting mass casualties—as an aerosol that can be inhaled—requires a delivery system whose development "would outstrip the technical capabilities of all but the most sophisticated terrorist" Even then effective dispersal could easily be disrupted by unfavorable environmental and meteorological conditions." After assessing, and stressing, the difficulties a nonstate entity would find in obtaining, handling, growing, storing, processing, and dispersing lethal pathogens effectively, biological weapons expert Milton Leitenberg compares his conclusions with glib pronouncements in the press about how biological attacks can be pulled off by anyone with "a little training and a few glass jars," or how it would be "about as difficult as producing beer." He sardonically concludes, "The less the commentator seems to know about biological warfare the easier he seems to think the task is.""

#### 4. Remote sensing cannot detect covert nuclear weapons

Sagan 12 Scott D. Sagan is the Caroline S. G. Munro professor of political science and a senior fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University, N AT U R E | VO L 4 8 7 | 5 J U LY 2 0 1 2

http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/23778/Nature-Scott\_Sagan.pdf

The technical and political challenges that confront proponents of nuclear dis­armament are complex and serious. We lack adequate disarmament-verification technology, such as techniques to permit remote sensing of covert weapons-related activities. Some allies rely on extended nuclear security guarantees — US com­mitments to retaliate with nuclear weap­ons if the ally is attacked. And increasing numbers of countries are both developing nuclear power and demanding the right to build uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing facilities, which could be used for peaceful or nefarious purposes. It is by no means clear that the United States and other nuclear-weapons states will overcome these challenges any time soon. What is clear is that existing nuclear-weapons states cannot disarm without the partnership of non-nuclear-weapons states9.

#### 5. No nuclear terror – No desire, no market, and locks check.

Mueller, Political Science at Ohio State, 11 [John, Professor of Political Science at Ohio State, The Truth About Al-Qaeda, August 2, 2011, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68012/john-mueller/the-truth-about-al-qaeda?page=show]

Thus far terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists on the issue, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. It is **highly improbable** that a would-be atomic terrorist would be given or sold a bomb by a generous like-minded nuclear state because the donor could not control its use and because the ultimate source of the weapon might be discovered. Although there has been great worry about terrorists illicitly stealing or purchasing a nuclear weapon, it seems likely that neither “loose nukes” nor a market in illicit nuclear materials exists. Moreover, finished bombs have been outfitted with an array of locks and safety devices. There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were utterly to fail, collapsing in full disarray. However, even under those conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory, would still have locks, and could probably be followed and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The most plausible route for terrorists would be to manufacture the device themselves from purloined materials. This task requires that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered in sequence, including the effective recruitment of people who at once have great technical skills and will remain completely devoted to the cause. In addition, a host of corrupted co-conspirators, many of them foreign, must remain utterly reliable, international and local security services must be kept perpetually in the dark, and no curious outsider must get consequential wind of the project over the months or even years it takes to pull off. In addition, the financial costs of the operation could easily become monumental. Moreover, the difficulties are likely to increase because of enhanced protective and policing efforts by self-interested governments and because any foiled attempt would expose flaws in the defense system, holes the defenders would then plug. The evidence of al-Qaeda’s desire to go atomic, and about its progress in accomplishing this exceedingly difficult task, is remarkably skimpy, if not completely negligible. The scariest stuff—a decade’s worth of loose nuke rumor—seems to have no substance whatever. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in an al-Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan: “Make use of that which is available ... rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach.” In part because of current policies—but also because of a wealth of other technical and organizational difficulties—the atomic terrorists’ task is already monumental, and their likelihood of success is vanishingly small. Efforts to further enhance this monumentality, if cost-effective and accompanied with only tolerable side effects, are generally desirable.

### Bio – No Detection

#### **Background clutter precludes detection of bioweapons**

Demirev et al 05 Plamen A. Demirev, Andrew B. Feldman, and Jeffrey S. Lin, the Sensor Sciences Group of APL’s Research and Technology Development Center Johns Hopkins APL Technical Digest, Volume 26, Number 4 (2005)

Chemical and Biological Weapons: Current Concepts for Future Defenses http://techdigest.jhuapl.edu/TD/td2604/Demirev.pdf

The rapid identification of CBW outside the laboratory poses another daunting challenge, frequently likened to the proverbial “needle in a haystack” problem: the agents in trace amounts must be detected in complex backgrounds (soil, seawater, bodily fluids, etc.). These backgrounds contain chemicals that may inhibit the sensor and/or “clutter” that can confound agent detection. Real-world backgrounds are diverse and highly variable and can impact sensor performance unpredictably (e.g., limit of detection). How then does one objectively characterize the performance of a biological sensor when the admixture of potential confounders in any given sample is not known?

#### **Engineered DNA sequencing precludes detection of bioweapons**

Demirev et al 05 Plamen A. Demirev, Andrew B. Feldman, and Jeffrey S. Lin, the Sensor Sciences Group of APL’s Research and Technology Development Center Johns Hopkins APL Technical Digest, Volume 26, Number 4 (2005)

Chemical and Biological Weapons: Current Concepts for Future Defenses http://techdigest.jhuapl.edu/TD/td2604/Demirev.pdf

Underlying a robust surveillance and detection regime are the various sensor systems used to detect the presence of a chemical or biological warfare agent. A major challenge for any CBW sensor is the uniqueness of the signature (specificity of the response) produced by the sensor. This response is based on the precise physical and/or chemical properties of the targeted agent. Depending on the particular target, sensor response uniqueness can vary widely. For CW agents, toxic industrial chemicals, and biological toxins, the detection target is usually an agent-specific molecule or a small set of molecules. For BW, there are a variety of potential molecular targets— DNA, RN A, proteins, metabolites—that allow identification of a particular microorganism. Since DNA sequence information is available only for a fraction of the microbial “universe,” the uniqueness of target organism sequences used for DNA-based detection can only be assessed with respect to the available genome sequence data. Thus, rapid identification of an emergent or bioengineered threat (with unknown DNA sequence) represents a significant technological challenge. Such a challenge could be met

### Bio – No Impact

Bioweapons won’t spread and cause epidemics – even if they do, not many would die

Gregg Easterbrook, senior fellow at The New Republic, July 2003, Wired, “We’re All Gonna Die!” http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=2&topic=&topic\_set=

3. Germ warfare!Like chemical agents, biological weapons have never lived up to their billing in popular culture. Consider the 1995 medical thriller Outbreak, in which a highly contagious virus takes out entire towns. The reality is quite different. Weaponized smallpox escaped from a Soviet laboratory in Aralsk, Kazakhstan, in 1971; three people died, no epidemic followed. In 1979, weapons-grade anthrax got out of a Soviet facility in Sverdlovsk (now called Ekaterinburg); 68 died, no epidemic. The loss of life was tragic, but no greater than could have been caused by a single conventional bomb. In 1989, workers at a US government facility near Washington were accidentally exposed to Ebola virus. They walked around the community and hung out with family and friends for several days before the mistake was discovered. No one died. The fact is, evolution has spent millions of years conditioning mammals to resist germs. Consider the Black Plague. It was the worst known pathogen in history, loose in a Middle Ages society of poor public health, awful sanitation, and no antibiotics. Yet it didn’t kill off humanity. Most people who were caught in the epidemic survived. Any superbug introduced into today’s Western world would encounter top-notch public health, excellent sanitation, and an array of medicines specifically engineered to kill bioagents. Perhaps one day some aspiring Dr. Evil will invent a bug that bypasses the immune system. Because it is possible some novel superdisease could be invented, or that existing pathogens like smallpox could be genetically altered to make them more virulent (two-thirds of those who contract natural smallpox survive), biological agents are a legitimate concern. They may turn increasingly troublesome as time passes and knowledge of biotechnology becomes harder to control, allowing individuals or small groups to cook up nasty germs as readily as they can buy guns today. But no superplague has ever come close to wiping out humanity before, and it seems unlikely to happen in the future.

### Nuke – No Impact

#### No impact – Prefer conventional weapons

Craig 11 [Campbell, professor of international relations at the University of Southampton Special Issue: Bringing Critical Realism and Historical Materialism into Critical Terrorism Studies Atomic obsession: nuclear alarmism from Hiroshima to al-Qaeda Critical Studies on Terrorism Volume 4, Issue 1, 2011, April, pages 115-124]

Let us address each of his claims, in reverse order. Mueller suggests that the risk of an act of major nuclear terrorism is **exceptionally small**, along the lines of an asteroid hitting the earth. Drawing upon his powerful book against terrorism alarmism, *Overblown* (2006), he shows that serious anti-Western terrorist groups are today **widely scattered and disorganized** – precisely the wrong kind of arrangement for the sustained and centralized project of building an atomic bomb. Looking for immediate results, terrorist groups are likely to go with what works today, rather than committing to a long-term and likely futile project. He points out, as have other authors, that so-called ‘rogue’ nations, even if they obtain a bomb, are never going to hand it over to terrorists: to do so would utterly negate everything they had worked so hard for. A nation such as Iran that somehow decided to give its bomb to al-Qaeda (leaving aide their completely different objectives) would not only be handing over a weapon that it had spent years and billions to build, and giving up the prestige and deterrence the bomb supposedly confers, it would also be putting itself at acute risk of being on the receiving end of a retaliatory strike once the terrorists did their work. By what rationale would any leader make such a move? The potential costs would be astronomical, the benefits non-existent.

## Soft Power

### 1NC

1. American soft power is unworkable – nations don’t believe in benevolent hegemony enough to overwhelm their resentment and fear\*\*\*

Christopher Layne (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) 2007 “American Empire: A Debate” p 68

Doubtless, American primacy has its dimension of benevolence, but a state as powerful as the United States can never be benevolent enough to offset the fear that other states have of its unchecked power. In international politics, benevolent hegemons are like unicorns—there is no such animal. Hegemons love themselves, but others mistrust and fear them—and for good reason. In today's world, others dread both the overconcentration of geopolitical weight in America's favor and the purposes for which it may be used. After all,"Nogreat power has a monopoly on virtue and, although some may have a greatdeal more virtue than others, virtue imposed on others is not seen as such bythem. All great powers are capable of exercising a measure of self-restraint, butthey are tempted not to and the choice to practice restraint is made easier by theexistence of countervailing power and the possibility of it being exercised."While Washington's self-proclaimed benevolence is inherently ephemeral, the hard fist of American power is tangible. Others must worry constantly that ifU.S. intentions change, bad things may happen to them. In a one-superpower world, the overconcentration of power in America's hands is an omnipresent challenge to other states's ecurity, and Washington's ability to reassure others of its benevolence is limited by the very enormity of its power.

#### 2. Status Quo solves response coordination – No impact to FEMA credibility

Ripley ’07 [Amanda Ripley, homeland security writer for Time magazine and author of the forthcoming book, The Unthinkable: Who Survives When Disaster Strikes — and Why: http://www.freakonomics.com/2007/11/09/what-is-the-state-of-us-disaster-preparedness-a-freakonomics-quorum/]

America has some of the best emergency planners and responders in the world. We know which disasters are going to strike where, and, in the case of hurricanes, we even get enough warning to name them. The problem is not about the technology, the forecasting, or even money, in most places. It’s about ideology and risk perception. It’s about people, in other words. Your fate in a disaster in America depends to a large degree on where you live. We are very enamored of states in this country, and so in any emergency, everything comes down to the state and local officials. The feds do almost nothing, and this is by design. Despite how satisfying it is to blame FEMA for everything that goes wrong, and despite the fact that FEMA could be much, much better, it is not really meant to do much more than process checks and paperwork. This arrangement is okay if you live in a place like California or Florida, which have excellent emergency planners and responders, and if the disaster is manageable. (Then again, one reason California and Florida are so good at responding to most disasters is that they do it all the damn time. So actually, it would be even better to be in Delaware or Vermont, and avoid the disaster to begin with.) But if the skies open up in, say, New Orleans, Dallas or Oklahoma City, all places with less-than-impressive emergency plans, then you could be in serious trouble. Even in California, when the big one hits, it will be at least three to seven days before any first responders make it to your house. Meanwhile, Americans increasingly insist on living in dense, vertical cities near water. About 91 percent of Americans now live in places at a moderate-to-high risk of earthquakes, volcanoes, tornadoes, wildfires, hurricanes, flooding, high-wind damage, or terrorism, according to an estimate calculated for Time last year by the Hazards and Vulnerability Research Institute at the University of South Carolina. So disasters are getting more frequent and more destructive. The question is, when will the disincentives for living in high-risk places finally overwhelm the incentives? And can the process be forced?

3. Timeframe --- it will take decades to repair soft power

Freeman ‘06 (Chas W., Ambassador (USFS, Ret.), “Why Not Let Them Hate Us, as Long as They Fear Us?”, 11-4, http://www.publicdiplomacy.org/71.htm)

To rediscover public diplomacy and to practice it successfully, in other words, we must repudiate Caligula’s maxim and replace it with our traditional respect for the opinion of mankind. I do not think it is beyond us to do so. We are a far better and more courageous people than we currently appear. But when we do restore ourselves to mental balance, we will, I fear, find that decades are required – it will take decades – to rebuild the appeal and influence our post-9/11 psychoses took a mere five years to destroy. In the process of reaffirming our traditions, as I am confident we shall, Americans may well find a renewed role for an independent agency that can facilitate the projection of our democracy and its values abroad.

3. Self-correction --- move to multilateralism happening now

Economist ’07 (Kevin Kalaugher, “Still No.1: Wounded, tetchy and less effective than it should be, America is still the power that counts,” 6-28, http://www.economist.com/opinion/PrinterFriendly.cfm?story\_id=9407806)

If America were a stock, it would be a “buy”: an undervalued market leader, in need of new management. But that points to its last great strength. More than any rival, America corrects itself. Under pressure from voters, Mr Bush has already rediscovered some of the charms of multilateralism; he is talking about climate change; a Middle East peace initiative is possible. Next year's presidential election offers a chance for renewal. Such corrections are not automatic: something (a misadventure in Iran?) may yet compound the misery of Iraq in the same way Watergate followed Vietnam. But America recovered from the 1970s. It will bounce back stronger again.

4. Soft power cannot prevent conflict – empirically proven

Fen Hampsen et al, 1998 International Journal

Perhaps the two best examples of the continued utility of military force are the Persian Gulf conflict of 1990-1 and the coalition deployment to the same region, led by the United States (and supported by the United Nations), in early 1998 to ensure Iraq's compliance with the 1991 ceasefire agreement. Both missions have occasioned much debate in the scholarly community, and deservedly so, but we take it as axiomatic that for both sides on each occasion the role of military force was critical in the evolution -- and resolution -- of the crisis. In 1990-1, this would appear to be self-evident, while in 1998 no less a commentator than Kofi Annan, in the wake of Iraq's decision to again permit weapons inspectors access to its presidential palaces, dubbed the United States and Britain 'the perfect UN peacekeepers' for their show of force in support of UNSCOM. It is important to note that in each case soft power proved singularly unable to affect the actions of a single, isolated, pariah state, albeit one that possessed considerable military wherewithal and a modicum of regional legitimacy. It is certainly dangerous to generalize from the Iraqi example, but one might at least question the applicability of soft power to powerful rogue states in bold defiance of international law and international agreements.

Alt causes to soft power decline ---

A) Prisoner abuse

Wang ’05 (Jisi, Dean – School of International Studies, Peking U., Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct, Lexis)

Since then, the extent of armed resistance to the U.S. occupation of Iraq has exceeded the Bush administration's expectations. Meanwhile, revelations of prisoner abuse by U.S. personnel in Iraq and elsewhere have undermined the credibility of U.S. rhetoric on human rights and further damaged the United States' image in the world. U.S. "soft power"--the country's ability to influence indirectly the actions of other states--has been weakened. The United States also faces serious competition and disagreement from Europe, Japan, and Russia on many economic and development-related issues, and there have been disputes on arms control, regional policies, and the role of the United Nations and other international organizations.

B) United Nations support

Shattuck ’07 (John, CEO – John F. Kennedy Library Foundation, CQ Testimony, 3-29, Lexis)

4. The U.S. decision to disengage from U.N. human rights institutions undermines its position as a human rights leader. For more than sixty years the U.S. has been a world leader in building international institutions to promote human rights. Today, unfortunately, we seem to have renounced that leadership by withdrawing from the new U.N. Human Rights Council and by refusing to participate in efforts to shape the new International Criminal Court. In both cases the U.S. now has no influence over the future of these two flawed institutions. In the case of the Human Rights Council, the U.S. abandoned its support when it was unable to limit the Council's membership to countries with good human rights records, despite the fact that the Council membership requirements adopted in the recent U.N. reforms are an improvement over those of the dysfunctional Human Rights Commission which it replaced. In the case of the International Criminal Court, many structural changes need to be made in order for the U.S. to become a full participant. Nevertheless, in recent years the U.S. has lost all leverage over the Court's development by withdrawing its signature from the treaty establishing it. In addition, an active U.S. campaign to put pressure on governments not to join the Court has engendered international ill will and further undermined the capacity of the U.S. to exercise human rights leadership.

### No Solve – Personal Preparedness

#### No Solvency – personal preparedness is the only internal link to disaster response

**Salahi ’11** [Lara Salahi, contributor to ABC News, march 14 2011 “Disaster Preparedness: Could the U.S. Hold Water?” <http://abcnews.go.com/Health/Wellness/disaster-preparedness-us-hold-water/story?id=13135457&page=2#.UB2t5dmsOSo>

Unlike desperate countries like Haiti, many experts agree that so far Japan, a developed country, has fared well overall in disaster preparedness, which is measured by the country's immediate response following an earthquake and tsunami. But many may wonder whether Americans are as prepared to handle such natural disasters. The United States has experienced an average of 50 natural disasters each year in the last decade, more than 560 total, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The agency documented eight natural disasters this year already, mostly severe winter storms and flooding. While there are national and local emergency plans in place, making the big picture response look satisfactory, experts say it's likely that most Americans themselves are not prepared to handle emergencies. Indeed, many state and federal government organizations have their own set of challenges. A survey released Monday by the American Medical Association suggested many state health departments have no plan in place to assess human radiation exposure should a radiation emergency similar Japan's nuclear plant explosion should take place. But experts say what could be as concerning is that family preparedness fares far worse than any governmental infrastructure. **"It's really in the personal preparedness phase rather than the response phase that we need to be paying more attention,"** said Jonathon Links, director of the Johns Hopkins Center for Public Health Preparedness in Baltimore. In fact, according to Links, most cities and towns across the United States have experienced some type of natural disaster. Yet, it is estimated that only about 10 percent of households are prepared to handle emergencies. Emergency Preparation is Both Physical and Mental, Experts Say For many families, the answer is simple, says ABC News' chief health and medical editor, Dr Richard Besser. According to Besser, the top items necessary for families to keep on reserve in case of a disaster is a pack that includes a flashlight, radio, food, water, a heavy duty breathing mask, light sticks, and a first aid kit. Relief agencies like the Red Cross or FEMA offer emergencies preparation kits which include these essentials for anyone to purchase. But the hard part, says Links, is getting folks to buy in to preparedness. For years, health communicators have worked to develop campaigns to motivate citizens to set up a personal plan should there ever be a disaster. But many consumers don't listen, he said, until an actual disaster occurs. One of the major reasons is that many don't believe what has been happening abroad can happen at home, he said. "The essence of the model is you have to convince people that there's a threat, and that there's something they can do about it," Links said. And while it seems difficult to motivate many to physically prepare for emergencies, mental preparation may prove even more difficult. "When people hear fearful messages of what might happen, they're more likely to tune it out," Links said.

### No Solve – Population

#### Plan can’t solve – public intervention is universally rejected

**Meisel and Carr ’11** [Dr. Zachary Meisel, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation clinical scholar and an emergency physician at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Brendan Carr is an assistant professor of emergency medicine at the University of Pennsylvania.

“Persuading Americans to Prepare for Disaster” http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2059457,00.html]

As the tragedy of the Japanese earthquake and tsunami continues to unfold, foreign media have inevitably begun to ask, What are the lessons for disaster preparedness at home? A clear caveat to this narrative is that the Japanese experience cannot be transposed easily across borders, because disasters and the public-health crises they seed are inherently shaped by local factors, not least geography, infrastructure and governmental organization. Perhaps less commonly explored is the collective conduct of a country's people: how a population tends to behave both in the immediate aftermath of a disaster and in response to the interventions designed to mitigate it. Reports out of Japan have indicated that its citizens were, on the whole, prepared to react calmly during the earthquake, and they have been remarkably compliant and orderly in response to the government's directions after the event. This may be because many Japanese have experienced earthquakes before, including the horrific Kobe quake of 1995. But some reports suggest that deeply rooted cultural and social factors have also played a role in these crucial behaviors. (See how Japan became a leader in disaster preparation.) So how would Americans react to such a disaster? As a nation, we are often thought to be individualistic, anti-authoritarian and resistant to paternalism. Yet necessary public-health interventions are by nature paternalistic: think fluoridation of municipal water supplies, compulsory vaccinations and mandatory reporting of communicable diseases. Therefore, when determining how to get Americans to follow the public-health recommendations and interventions involved in disaster preparedness, we would be wise to consider how our citizens have responded to public-health efforts historically. First, let's examine certain planning and preparedness efforts that would require specific behaviors. In the category of individual preparation, we can look at the website Ready.gov, which lists key goals for families, including making a rendezvous plan, stockpiling an emergency kit (an easily accessible backpack with canned food, bottled water, a flashlight, batteries, money, a solar charger for a mobile phone and copies of identification) and staying informed about official reports and recommendations in case of a disaster. Not hard to do, right? Well, by some estimates, fewer than a third of Americans have a "go bag" (or the stuff that goes into such a kit) in their homes. Another priority in public-health crises is keeping people in place or getting them out. During a radiation leak, say, from a malfunctioning nuclear reactor, there may be competing priorities: evacuate residents closest to the site and keep more-remote residents in their homes so as not to clog the roadways or become exposed. Or, in the more distant aftermath of a crisis, say, an infectious pandemic, planners may need to motivate people to stay home if they're sick and seek orderly preventive medical care, like vaccinations, to stem the spread of infection. These are public-health initiatives designed to preserve the population's health in a disaster. (See "Safety Check: Are the U.S.'s Plants Better Prepared?")

### Alt Cause – Middle East

#### No Impact to disaster percetpion – middle east credibility comes first

Pew ’11 [“U.S. Status as World's Superpower Challenged by Rise of China” <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/2059/-superpower-china-us-image-abroad-afghanistan-terrorism>]

Despite the view in many countries that China either has or will surpass the U.S. as the leading superpower, opinion of America remains favorable, on balance. The median percentage offering a positive assessment of the U.S. is 60% among the 23 countries surveyed. The U.S. receives high marks in Western Europe, where at least six-in-ten in France, Spain, Germany and Britain rate the U.S. positively. Opinion of the U.S. is also consistently favorable across Eastern Europe, as well as in Japan, Kenya, Israel, Brazil and Mexico. As in years past, U.S. image continues to suffer among predominantly Muslim countries, with the exception of Indonesia, where a majority expresses positive views of the U.S. One-in-five or fewer in Egypt, the Palestinian territories, Jordan, Pakistan and Turkey view America favorably. In Lebanon, opinion of the U.S. is split, reflecting a religious and sectarian divide; the country's Shia community has overwhelmingly negative views of America, while Lebanese Sunnis and Christians are more positive. Views of the U.S. in the Muslim world reflect, at least in part, opposition to the war in Afghanistan and U.S. efforts to fight terrorism. Moreover, few in predominantly Muslim countries say the U.S. takes a multilateral approach to foreign policy. Fewer than a quarter in Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, Pakistan and Turkey say the U.S. takes the interests of countries like theirs into account when making foreign policy decisions. In Western Europe, fewer than half in Britain (40%), France (32%) and Spain (19%) say the U.S. takes the interests of other countries into account when making foreign policy decisions. Only in Germany does a majority feel otherwise. In Eastern Europe, a third or less believe America acts multilaterally. Interestingly, a majority of Chinese (57%) credit America with considering the interests of other nations, although last year more (76%) held this view. Elsewhere, majorities in Israel, India, Japan, Brazil and Kenya describe the U.S. as multilateral in its approach to foreign policy. Majorities or pluralities in nearly every country surveyed say the U.S. and NATO should remove their troops from Afghanistan as soon as possible; the only exceptions are Spain, Israel, India, Japan and Kenya, where more say troops should remain in that country until the situation is stabilized than say they should be removed. However, in many parts of the world, there is strong support for the broader, American-led effort to combat terrorism. About seven-in-ten in France (71%), two-thirds in Germany, 59% in Britain and 58% in Spain back U.S. anti-terrorism efforts. Majorities in Eastern Europe also support the U.S.-led fight against terrorism, as do most in Israel and Kenya.

## Turns

### Heg

Turn – Hegemony

Increasing soft power decreases unilateralism

Jaime Coronado (Department of Latin American and Iberian Studies, University of Guadalajara ) 2005“Between Soft Power and a Hard Place: Dilemnas of the Bush Doctrine for Inter-American Relations, Journal of Developing Societies, http://jds.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/21/3-4/321,

Multilateralism and diplomacy are weakened while unilateralism and coercion are strengthened. The official declaration regarding the existence of an ‘Axis of Evil’ represented by the countries the US ruling elite considers is supporting, financing or not sufficiently fighting against terrorism creates the possibility of an expanding set of targets and enemies list. The Bush administration challenged all countries to define themselves around support for US actions in the post 9/11 scenario, by restating unambiguously the Karl Schmidt ‘friend-foe’ principle: ‘Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists.’ Congruent with the neo-conservative pre-9/11 proto-doctrines discussed above (Wolfowitz, Kristol, Kagan, Rice), the US government declared that it could unilaterally perform ‘preventive strikes’ in case it perceived its security being in danger. The administration passed over the UN Security Council and unilaterally invaded Iraq, alleging an imminent threat posed by non-existent weapons of mass destruction, and subsequently attempted to legitimize its intervention by summoning a multilateral occupation force and calling the UN to get involved. The Bush administration confirmed its opposition to the International Criminal Court and lobbied for bilateral agreements to provide immunity to its citizens, including its officials and security forces. Thus, it reinforced its disdainful position towards international legal regimes, a stand it had already taken when it decided to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and not to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. This unilateralism even extended to the WTO on the issue of steel imports, though it eventually relented under economic pressure**.**

Solves leadership

Dr Frank Harvey (Director of the Center for Foreign Policy Studies at Dalhousie University) August 2002 “GLOBALISM, TERRORISM and PROLIFERATION: Unilateral vs. Multilateral Approaches to Security After 9/11 and the Implications for Canada”

Two final points should be noted regarding the ‘choice’ between multilateralism and unilateralism. First, policy choices are not always a matter of ‘preferences’ but rather are products of systemic pressures that push leaders in one or another direction – imperatives, not choices, explain behaviour. “People and countries might shape systems, but systems shape countries and people. It is impossible to divorce the exercise of power from the context in which it is set….A singularly unipolar political structure will produce, absolutely inevitably, a unilateralist outcome….The sole viable alternative to unilateralism is not multilateralism, but isolationism.”59 In order to protect their own security and economic imperatives after 9/11, European, Canadian and Russian leaders simply cannot afford American isolationism and will reluctantly come to support almost any U.S. foreign policy initiative (unilateral or multilateral), even while criticizing the approach in public. Second, the unilateralism-multilateralism debate often creates a false dichotomy – there are no pure unilateralists or multi-lateralists, and ones preferences are likely to vary from issue to issue, region to region, threat to threat. Historically, American foreign policy has exhibited elements of both strategies – in fact, some recent descriptions of contemporary U.S. strategy include multiple bilateralism and à la carte multilateralism. But Washington tends to receive far more criticism for its unilateral initiatives than praise for its contributions to multilateralism. This often creates an exaggerated impression that Washington prefers unilateralism even when the record is more balanced. However, when it comes to American ‘security’ after 9/11 unilateral priorities are likely to prevail for the many reasons outlined in this report. In essence, multilateralism has become a liability and a security threat. It is perceived by Washington today as “a strategy by smaller states to tie the U.S. down like Gulliver among the Lilliputians. It is no wonder that France prefers a multi-polar and multilateral world, and less developed countries see multilateralism as in their interests, because it gives them some leverage on the United States.” These states are not driven by some higher moral imperative to create a truly global order based justice and international law; they are motivated by the same fundamental imperatives that drive American foreign policy: power, security, self interest and survival.

Extinction

Khalilzad, 95

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

### China

US soft power destroys Chinese soft power

Kurlantzick, 07 – Visiting scholar in the Carnegie Endowment’s China Program (Joshua Kurlantzick, Charm Offensive: How China's Soft Power is Transforming the World. p. 208-209)

But China's growing soft power will threaten the United States as well: the emergence of China's soft power is already having a strategic impact on US foreign policy. China could wield its influence in a growing clash over resources. Like China, the United States needs continued access to oil and gas, since esti­mates suggest that America could be importing nearly 70 per­cent of its oil in two decades, up from just over 50 percent today. Oil and gas do not trade on a completely free market, tend to be controlled by state-linked companies—and may be running out. Stores of easily accessible petroleum, like the fields in Saudi Arabia, could be dwindling. Colin Campbell, the former chief geologist for Amoco, argues that 2006 may have been the peak production year for oil, after which re­serves and production will hit a long downward slope.19 With oil becoming scarcer, Latin American and West African and Asian oil remain among the cheapest for the United States, and the easiest for American companies to refine and use.The United States cannot afford to loseaccess to these re­serves to any potential competitor. As we saw in Chapter 7, China has enjoyed success in winning access to oil and gas, and Beijing views energy as a zero-sum game. "For China's leaders, energy security clearly is too important to be left to the mar­kets," argues the Asia energy specialist Mikkal Herberg, who believes competing US and Chinese demands for energy will eventually lead to a clash over resources. “The Chinese are seeking to achieve assured sources of supply in Latin America through a strategy that focuses on securing the entire supply chain in critical industries,” believes R. Evan Ellis, a Latin America specialist. “This strategy of ‘vertical integration’ involves using strategic purchases and investments to ensure an acceptable amount of leverage over… all elements of the supply chain.”

Chinese soft power is critical to preventing a Taiwanese push for independence

Gill and Huang 06 (Bates holds the CSIS Freeman Chair in China, Yanzhong is an assistant professor at the John Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations, Survival, “Sources and limits of Chinese 'soft power',” Volume Issue 2 June, pg 17-36, http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a747985000&fulltext=713240928)

A most intriguing example of China's soft power can be seen in its relations with Taiwan. In 2005, China launched a charm offensive against the politicians and people in the island by inviting opposition party leaders to visit the mainland, extending tuition benefits to Taiwanese studying at mainland universities, and, through a zero-tariff policy on imports of Taiwan's fruit, offering export incentive perks to farmers in the south of Taiwan (traditionally a pro-Taiwan independence stronghold). This 'hearts-and-minds' policy not only aims to reduce the perception of military threat from China, but also gives the Chinese government leverage to exercise influence in Taiwan's political culture and society, and politically marginalise Taiwan's independence-oriented president, Chen Shui-bian.In part as a result of Beijing's manoeuvres in recent years - and Chen's increasingly frustrated but worrisome responses - the possibility for Taiwan independence seems more distant and difficult. Chen Shiubian has increasingly alienated American supporters in Washington who do not appreciate what they see as his provocative political stance on cross-Strait issues. In the meantime, some 1 million, or about 5%, of the Taiwan population lives and works in China, and Taiwan business has invested more than $100bn on the mainland.

Extinction

Hsiung 01 – Professor of Politics and International Law at NYU (James, 21st Century World Order and the Asia Pacific, p. 359-360)

Admittedly, it is harmless for an analyst like Lind to be so oblivious of lessons from the past and of the reasons behind both the dogs barking and not barking. But decision-makers cannot afford such luxury. Lee Kuan Yew, Singapore’s Senior Minister, issued a grave warning presumably directed at all government leaders, including the United States, that the Taiwan powder keg could ignite a conflagration that will engulf the entire region. It might even embroil the United States in a nuclear holocaust that nobody wants. Oftentimes, well-meaning analysts raise the question whether China, with its present military capability and modest defense expenditures (about U.S. $15 billion annually), can or cannot take Taiwan by force. But this is the wrong question to pose. As the late patriarch Deng Xiapoing put it, “We’d rather have it proven that we tried but failed [to stop it] even by force, than be accused [by our disgruntled compatriots and posterity] of not trying to stop Taiwan from going independent.” Earlier, I raised the issue of stability within the U.S.-China-Japan triad, precisely with the U.S.-Japan alliance in view. Apparently, many in Japan have apprehensions about the stability. Japanese Nobel laureate (for literature) Ohe Kenzaburo, for instance, once told a pen pal that he was fearful of the outcome of a conflict between the United States and China over the question of Taiwan. Because of its alliance relationship, Japan would be embroiled in a conflict that it did not choose and that might escalate into a nuclear holocaust. From the ashes of such a nuclear conflict, he figured, some form of life may still be found in the combatant nuclear giants, China and the United States. But, Kenaburo rued, there would be absolutely nothing left in Japan or Taiwan in the conflict’s wake. By now, I hope it is clear why stability in the U.S.-China-Japan triadic relationship is a sine qua non for geopolitical peace in the Asia Pacific region.

# Off Case

## T

### 1NC – Investment

#### **You don’t lead to an actual increase in infrastructure investment- everything is already in place**

You author-Williamson 2 (Ray A. Williamson, Research Professor of International Affairs and Space Policy in the Space Policy Institute of the George Washington University http://www.isprs.org/proceedings/XXXIV/part1/paper/00082.pdf)

Finding One: Local, state, and federal responses to the events of September 11, 2001, illustrate the need to develop more effective coordination among emergency response agencies in their use of geospatial data and information. Many geospatial tools already exist but cannot be used effectively because of weak or nonexistent mechanisms for sharing critical information. Workshop participants concluded that although many of the necessary geospatial tools were already in place, their utility was limited in large part because of structural or institutional barriers. Accordingly, the nation needs new institutional policies to support improved transportation security and coordinated emergency response. Meaningful progress toward preparing the nation for both prevention and response to attacks on elements of the nation’s transportation networks requires the harmonized effort of agencies across the federal government: among federal, state and local governments, as well as among government and private sector geospatial data providers and analysts.

#### You’re Geospatial information infrastructure, not transportation infrastructure

You author-Williamson 2 (Ray A. Williamson, Research Professor of International Affairs and Space Policy in the Space Policy Institute of the George Washington University http://www.isprs.org/proceedings/XXXIV/part1/paper/00082.pdf)

The U.S. Department of Transportation should lead an effort to develop an accessible geospatial transportation information infrastructure corresponding to, and compatible with, the nation’s transportation infrastructure. Each element of the transportation infrastructure can be characterized in a geospatial database. The totality of such databases would constitute a geospatial information infrastructure reflective of the nation’s transportation infrastructure. The Department of Transportation should join the efforts of the FGDC and other organizations to establish interoperability standards for geospatial transportation information. Such standards should be promulgated throughout federal, state, and local transportation entities.

#### “Transportation infrastructure” is defined as facilities of transport --- this excludes security, law enforcement, and military support

Musick 10 (Nathan, Microeconomic and Financial Studies Division – United States Congressional Budget Office, Public Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure, p. 2)

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

#### “Infrastructure” must be physical- the aff only alters the security of information and effectiveness of information beaming

Garvin 7 (Michael J., Professor of Construction – Virginia Tech University, et al., “America’s Infrastructure Strategy: Drawing on History to Guide the Future”, http://crgp.stanford.edu/events/presentations/CA/CRGP\_KPMG\_whitepaper.pdf)

Inspection of these definitions suggests that infrastructure is broadly defined as the physical assets that facilitate the delivery of both social and economic services. Interestingly, the definitions have evolved from an emphasis upon public works and their adequacy to critical infrastructures and their security (Moteff and Parfomak 2004). In addition, the characterization of infrastructure as purely public systems has clearly diminished with time. The significance of the characterization will become very evident later in the paper when discussion regarding the contemporary role of private participants is more fully examined. Whichever way the term is defined, infrastructure is “physical” – society can see and usually come in contact with it – and “deliberate” – society develops and uses it for some purpose; it is not arbitrary. Thus, it requires creation, operation, and maintenance, which involves a number of production activities throughout its lifecycle – most of which are interdependent. Figure 1 broadly depicts these activities.2

#### And, communication systems are regulated utilities, not “transportation infrastructure”- they let anything from telephone services to public internet access into the topic- links to our limits and ground DA’s

Quadrant 7 (Real Estate Investors, “Global Diversified Infrastructure Fund of Funds”, <http://www.quadrantrealestateadvisors.com/investments/public/uploads/documents%5CGlobal%20Diversified%20Infrastructure%20Fund%20of%20Funds.pdf>)

II. Defining Infrastructure Assets Starting with the failure of the levy systems in New Orleans, followed by the collapse of the Mississippi River Bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota on August 1, 2007, American infrastructure capital needs were brought to the forefront of America. The aging stock of infrastructure continues to deteriorate and the demand for public and private investment continues to grow. The question now becomes, which entity is going to address this growing need? However, an even more fundamental question also exists, what are infrastructure assets? According to the American Heritage Dictionary, infrastructure comprises the “basic facilities, services and installations needed for the functioning of a community or society, such as transportation and communication systems, water and power lines, and public institutions including schools, post offices and prisons.” The dictionary also notes that the term infrastructure has been used since 1927 to refer to the public works required for an industrial economy to function or the installations necessary for the defence of a country. The expectation most have is that infrastructure assets primarily involve government regulated monopolies and governmentally maintained assets. Unfortunately, classification is not that simple. When defining infrastructure investments, the common definition accepted in the institutional investment management community is “the physical assets that are needed to provide essential services to society,” which has lead managers to have highly different interpretations of the definition of “essential.” In general**,** the infrastructure market is divided into two general sectors—economic infrastructure and social infrastructure. Economic infrastructure includes transportation assets and regulated utilities, which includes communication, water, and energy systems. Social infrastructure is more vaguely defined and may include any asset in which the government maintains control or assets that are necessary for the longevity of the population. Such assets include schools, prisons, hospitals, parks, and others.

#### We’ll define the aff for you, you’re a space system that collects geographical data

Saxena et al 09 (“Application of spatial technology in malaria research & control: some new insights,” Rekha, National Institute of Malaria Research, Indian Journal of Medical Research, http://www.icmr.nic.in/ijmr/2009/august/0904.pdf)

GIS is defined as an information system that is used to input, store, retrieve, manipulate, analyze and output geographically referenced data or spatial data. All methods of collecting information about earth without touching it are forms of remote sensing. Satellites, radars and aerial photographs are the different ways of acquiring remotely sensed data. GPS is a system of twenty-four satellites that allows the co-ordinates of any point on or near earth’s surface to be measured with extremely high precision 3. GIS is an umbrella term which integrates wide range of datasets available from different sources including RS and GPS. Therefore, GIS is often termed as core of spatial technology having built-in power to analyze integrated dataset and to present the results as useful information to assist decision making.

#### “its” means ownership or possession to the noun it refers to

English grammar 5 (glossary of english grammar terms, <http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html>)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership. EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### The United States is the 50, DC, and Puerto Rico- That means you’re not topical

USDA 08 (“Regulations Governing the Financing of Commercial Sales of Agricultural Commodities § 17.2 Definition of terms”, P.L. 480 Federal Regulations, Last modified: Monday, April 14, 2008 06:13:23 PM, <http://www.fas.usda.gov/excredits/FoodAid/Title%201/pl00172.html>)

United States--the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

#### Example limits argument: Limits: There are an unlimited number of places outside of the U.S. or places where the aff could affect transportation infrastructure-makes it impossible for the neg to predict and adequately prepare to debate. They justify affs that build roads and bridges in South America or Asia.