# **Remote Sensing Neg**

#### Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in commonality, compatibility, and interoperability of geospatial data for transportation infrastructure in the United States.

#### For those of you who don’t know, interoperability is the ability of diverse systems and organizations to work together (inter-operate). The term is often used in a technical [systems engineering](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Systems_engineering) sense, or alternatively in a broad sense, taking into account social, political, and organizational factors that impact system to system [performance](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Performance_improvement) (Wikipedia).

#### T and Solvency are the only things so far. I haven’t even cut cards outside of taking stuff from their case and I think this case can be beaten with just this.

#### The plan doesn’t do anything!!!!!!!!!!!!! Other than share a little bit of data.

# Terror

### 1NC

#### First on the nuclear terror scenario

#### 1. 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.

#### 2. Their evidence says that security officials know that Iran would be a loose cannon and that terrorism is likely. If that is true, security officials wouldn’t jump to the conclusion that China or Russia attacked us. They would at the very least consider the possibility of a terrorist attack.

#### 3. Rationality checks miscalculation.

Quinlan 9 [Sir Michael, co-founder and President Emeritus of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 2009, Thinking About Nuclear Weapons: Principle, Problems, Prospects, p. 68-71]

Similar considerations apply to the hypothesis of nuclear war being mistakenly triggered by false alarm. Critics again point to the fact, as it is understood, of numerous occasions when initial steps in alert sequences for US nuclear forces were embarked upon, or at least called for, by indicators mistaken or misconstrued. In none of these instances, it is accepted, did matters get at all near to nuclear launch-extraordinary good fortune again, critics have suggested. But the rival and more logical inference from hundreds of events stretching over sixty years of experience presents itself once more: that the probability of initial misinterpretation leading far towards mistaken launch is remote. Precisely because any nuclear-weapon possessor recognizes the vast gravity of any launch, release sequences have many steps, and human decision is repeatedly interposed as well as capping the sequences. To convey that because a first step was prompted the world somehow came close to accidental nuclear war is wild hyperbole, rather like asserting, when a tennis champion has lost his opening service game, that he was nearly beaten in straight sets. History anyway scarcely offers any ready example of major war started by accident even before the nuclear revolution imposed an order-of-magnitude increase in caution. It was occasionally conjectured that nuclear war might be triggered by the real but accidental or unauthorized launch of a strategic nuclear-weapon delivery system in the direction of a potential adversary. No such launch is known to have occurred in over sixty years. The probability of it is therefore very low. But even if it did happen, the further hypothesis of its initiating a general nuclear exchange is far-fetched. It fails to consider the real situation of decision-makers, as pages 63-4 have brought out. The notion that cosmic holocaust might be mistakenly precipitated in this way belongs to science fiction. One special form of miscalculation appeared sporadically in the speculations of academic commentators, though it was scarcely ever to be encountered-at least so far as my own observation went-in the utterances of practical planners within government. This is the idea that nuclear war might be erroneously triggered, or erroneously widened, through a state under attack misreading either what sort of attack it was being subjected to, or where the attack came from. The postulated misreading of the nature of the attack referred in particular to the hypothesis that if a delivery system-normally a missile-that was known to be capable of carrying either a nuclear or a conventional warhead was launched in a conventional role, the target country might, on detecting the launch through its earlywarning systems, misconstrue the mission as an imminent nuclear strike and immediately unleash a nuclear counter-strike of its own. This conjecture was voiced, for example, as a criticism of the proposals for giving the US Trident SLBM, long associated with nuclear missions, a capability to deliver conventional warheads. Whatever the merit of those proposals (it is not explored here), it is hard to regard this particular apprehension as having any real-life credibility. The flight time of a ballistic missile would not exceed about thirty minutes, and that of a cruise missile a few hours, before arrival on target made its character-conventional or nuclear-unmistakable. No government will need, and no nonlunatic government could wish, to take within so short a span of time a step as enormous and irrevocable as the execution of a nuclear strike on the basis of early-warning information alone without knowing the true nature of the incoming attack. The speculation tends moreover to be expressed without reference either to any realistic political or conflict-related context thought to render the episode plausible, or to the manifest interest of the launching country, should there be any risk of doubt, in ensuring-by explicit communication if necessary-that there was no misinterpretation of its conventionally armed launch.

#### Go to the bioterror scenario

#### 1. Their Yang 2 evidence says:

Yang 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)

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.

Their plan doesn’t mandate any of this so they don’t solve.

#### 2. Their CSIS evidence takes out solvency and the impact

CSIS, 6 (“STRATEGIC STUDY ON BIOTERRORISM, <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/061016_bioterrorism.pdf>)

It is almost impossible to detect and deter the movement and/or transfer of a small quantity of dangerous infectious agents. It is very difficult to forecast consequences of a bioterrorist attack. For example, in the case of a sudden appearance of an epidemic type of avian flu H5N1, the epidemic will travel the globe quickly, while the development, testing and production of the necessary quantities of a vaccine against the avian flu will take at least 4 to 5 months; this will provide protection for 50% of the world population.

#### 3. Their evidence saying that bioterror is an imminent threat was from 4 years ago and the evidence saying it would be so easy to steal was from 6 years ago. If it is so easy, they why hasn’t it happened yet?

### Ext. No Nuclear Terror

#### Terrorists 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.

# FEMA

#### 1. The Walter evidence says nothing about US credibility or Hurricane Katrina. It literally is simply posing the question of whether or not FEMA can make a comeback from its recent failures.

#### 2. All the NASA and USDOT evidence says is that, in the case of evacuation, congestion will be a tiny bit smaller after the plan is implemented

#### 3. Their Hartford Courant evidence that says that Katrina harmed America’s image has no warrants, and here is the next paragraph in the card-the harmed image is only temporary so there is no internal link

Hartford Courant 6 (Hartford Courant is a Tribune Newspaper website for the Connecticut area. 8/27/6 “In New Orleans, Yes They Can” http://articles.courant.com/2006-08-27/news/0608270084\_1\_disaster-response-natural-disaster-victims)

How the reconstruction of the Gulf region is handled will be key to restoring public confidence. Devastating loss should be viewed as an opportunity to learn from past mistakes and begin anew.

#### 4. There’s no warrant in Nye 4. It just asserts that soft power solves for their impacts.

#### 5. Single issues not key – perceptions change slowly.

Gray, International Politics at Reading, 11 [COLIN S. GRAY is Professor of International Poli- tics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, England. He worked at the International Institute for Strategic Studies (London), and at Hudson Institute (Croton-on-Hudson, NY) before founding the Na- tional Institute for Public Policy, a defense-oriented think tank in the Washington, DC, area. Dr. Gray served for 5 years in the Reagan administration on the President’s General Advisory Committee on Arms SSI Monograph HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY Colin S. Gray April 2011]

The error lies in the search for, and inevitable finding of, “golden keys” and “silver bullets” to resolve current versions of enduring problems. Soft-power salesmen have a potent product-mix to sell, but they fail to appreciate the reality that American soft power is a product essentially unalterable over a short span of years. As a country with a cultural or civilizational brand that is unique and mainly rooted in deep historical, geographical, and ideational roots, America is not at liberty to emulate a major car manufacturer and advertise an extensive and varied model range of persuasive soft-power profiles. Of course, some elements of soft power can be emphasized purposefully in tailored word and deed. However, foreign perceptions of the United States are no more developed from a blank page than the American past can be retooled and fine-tuned for contemporary advantage. Frustrating though it may be, a country cannot easily escape legacies from its past.

# Solvency

#### **1. Emergency response personnel require training**

Fan and Zlatanova 11 [Zhengjie Fan and Sisi Zlatanova, associate professor at the GIS Tecnology section, Delft University of Technology, 5/10/11, “Exploring ontologies for semantic interoperability of data

in emergency response” <http://www.gdmc.nl/publications/2011/Ontologies_for_semantic_interoperability.pdf>]

Emergency response personnel in different domains are generally not experts in spatial data and SII. Therefore, the

emergency responders are not familiar with the technological aspects of the system. They may request information in their own words or based on their understanding, which is usually not the domain vocabulary that can be ‘used’ by certain software. For example, a fire brigade may use ‘house’ for the same real-world feature that is usually indicated as a ‘building’ on the topographic map. This complicates the work of emergency responders, who must usually train in advance to learn the large amount of domain vocabulary required to locate the desired information. Thus, a way to provide emergency responders with the necessary information is a challenging problem in emergency response (Visser et al. 2002; van Harmelen 2008).

#### **Emergency management doesn’t want to train in this-the aff can’t fiat this and this is their own evidence**

National Research Council ’07 (National Research Council, Working arm of the National Academies of the United States, Committee on Planning for Catastrophe: A Blueprint for Improving Geospatial Data, Tools, and Infrastructure, 2007, “Successful Response Starts with a Map: Improving Geospatial Support for Disaster Management”, http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=11793&page=R1)

The fact that both of these are professions in their own right, with the emergency management community often seen as conservative with regard to the adoption of new technologies, presents a challenge. Without the support—and preferably the leadership—of the emergency management community, the geospatial data community’s own efforts will have little benefit.

#### 2. Double-bind: The only thing the aff is fiating is a sharing of data within the federal government. Either they don’t solve because they don’t involve state and local governments and the private sector or they are non-topical because they include actors that are not the USFG. This is their solvency evidence.

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)

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.

#### This explodes the topic because it justifies the advocacy of any actor and any number of actors. Voter for fairness and education

#### It justifies this counterplan-all of state, local, and national governments as well as the private sector should substantially increase its investment in commonality, compatibility, and interoperability of geospatial data for transportation infrastructure in the United States. This solves better than the affirmative because it is implemented in the whole world.

#### The National Research Council evidence doesn’t apply because they do not fiat the cooperation between state, local, and federal governments, nor do they access the private sector.

# Topicality-TI Investment

### T – Investment 1NC

#### A. “Investment” is spending government resources to develop infrastructure

LMPI ’10 (Laos Ministry of Planning and Investment, “Manual For Public Investment Program (PIP) Program Management”, August, <http://www.jica.go.jp/project/laos/0700667/materials/pdf/ProgramManual/ProgramMa> nual\_eng.pdf)

Public investment is defined as investment from government resources, domestic or foreign, with the objective of development in the sector and/or region. Domestic PIP projects, ODA in forms of grant, technical assistance and loan are main components. Provision of public infrastructure (ex. roads, bridges, irrigation systems, public hospitals and schools, rural electrification etc.) and technical promotion (ex. training) is generally done using public investment.

#### B. The affirmative does not invest in Transportation infrastructure - commonality, compatibility, and interoperability of geospatial data is distinct.

#### C. voter for limits - they explode the topic to include anything that improves transportation infrastructure, hurts negative research burden and creates shallow debates

### Ext. Interp

#### Extend LMPI 10 – Investment must be the spending of government resources to develop infrastructure - best definition in the round

#### It has intent to define in a policy setting

#### It limits the topic to direct investment in transportation infrastructure, as opposed to anything that helps transportation – provides a clear bright line for what is topical.

#### And, The Department of Transportation agrees - Transportation Infrastructure Investment is determined by monetary value

DOT 03 (U.S. Department of Transportation, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, "Transportation Investment-Concepts, Data and Analysis," draft, compiled based on data from U.S. Department of Commerce (USDOC), Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), "Fixed Assets and Consumer Durables," and personal communications with BEA; and USDOC, U.S. Census Bureau, "Value of Construction Put in Place Statistics," Detailed Construction Expenditure Tables, available at http://www.census. gov, as of February 2003. http://www.bts.gov/publications/transportation\_statistics\_annual\_report/2003/html/chapter\_02/figure\_109.html

Investment in transportation infrastructure includes the purchase or construction value of transportation facilities and structures. Data on state and local transportation investment are not available separately. For rail infrastructure, only state and local investment from 1993 to 2000 are included. Government investment in pipeline infrastructure and federal investment spending on railroads are not covered due to lack of data. Investment in rolling stock consists of government outlays for motor vehicles only. Government spending on other rolling stocks (e.g., aircrafts, vessels, and boats) and other machinery and equipment used by federal, state, and local DOTs are not counted in the estimates due to lack of data. All dollar amounts are expressed in chained 1996 dollars, unless otherwise specified. Current dollar amounts (which are available in appendix B of this report

### Ext. Aff not topical

#### The affirmative results in data policy change –

#### This does not cost money which means they are not investing in the affirmative policy

#### Even if they win that is investment, It is not transportation infrastructure. At best the Aff improves transportation infrastructure, but does not invest in it or have it as a mandate of the plan.

#### The affirmative doesn’t spend money or construct facilities. It is just sharing data.

Microsoft NO DATE [you know what Microsoft is, “Interoperability” <http://www.microsoft.com/about/legal/en/us/interoperability/default.aspx>]

Interoperability allows disparate information systems from multiple vendors to readily work together and exchange data. It enables valuable business connections, whether across processes, between people and information, or among companies in a value chain. Providing Interoperability helps customers decrease complexity and better manage heterogeneous environments—while enhancing choice and innovation in the market.

#### **GIS is communications infrastructure**

ESRI 3 [Economic and Social Research Institute, January 2003, “Spatial Data Standards and GIS Interoperability” <http://www.esri.com/library/whitepapers/pdfs/spatial-data-standards.pdf>] LZ

Geographic information system (GIS) technology is evolving beyond the traditional GIS community and becoming an integral part of the information infrastructure in many organizations. The unique integration capabilities of a GIS allow disparate data sets to be brought together to create a complete picture of a situation. GIS technology illustrates relationships, connections, and patterns that are not necessarily obvious in any one data set, enabling organizations to make better decisions based on all relevant factors. Organizations are able to share, coordinate, and communicate key concepts between departments within an organization or between separate organizations using GIS as the central spatial data infrastructure. GIS technology is also being used to share crucial information across organizational boundaries via the Internet and the emergence of Web Services.

### AT: Investment = to make better

#### 1. Your definition sucks – it is not from a government source and was never intended to be used in policymaking

#### 2. Un-limits the topic - there are literally thousands of things that could make transportation infrastructure better, justifies small affs that spend no money such as traffic light timing, agency creation, road planning, legal revisions etc.

#### It also un-limits the word substantial – there is no way to quantify an improvement and any debate about a substantial improvement is contingent on the case debate. Only standards based of monetary value can be determined substantial before the round begins.

### AT: Aff = Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure is transportation networks – it’s distinct from transport control and regulation

CSFT 6 (“Aboard Transportation”, http://www.cfst.org/transportation.html)

Transportation Transportation or transport is the carrying of people and goods from one destination to another. The term comes from the Latin trans meaning “across” and portare meaning “to carry”. Transportation can be divided into three distinct fields: 1. Infrastructure - When we refer to infrastructure it includes our transport networks such as roads, railways, airways, canals, and pipeline. This also includes the terminals or nodes such as airports, railway stations, bus stations, and seaports. 2. Vehicle – These comprises of the vehicles that we regularly ride in the networks for instance automobiles (buses, cars, taxis, and etc.), trains and airplanes. 3. Operations – They are the control of the whole transport system including traffic lights/signals on roads, ramp meters, railroad switches, air traffic control, and etc.

#### And, Transportation infrastructure is highways, roads, bridges, intermodal transit, inland waterways, ports, aviation, and rail systems.

Congress ‘11

[The US House of Representatives – the 112th Congress of the United States. “HR 402 – National Infrastructure Development Bank Act of 2011” 1/24/11 [http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hr402/text//Cal-JV](http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hr402/text/Cal-JV)]

(25) TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT- The term ‘transportation infrastructure project’ means any project for the construction, maintenance, or enhancement of highways, roads, bridges, transit and intermodal systems, inland waterways, commercial ports, airports, high speed rail and freight rail systems.

### k/t Fairness

#### Predictable Limits is vital to fairness. Un-liming means the aff will always be one step ahead because the neg won’t be prepared, only with a precise topic can both teams have competitive equity.

#### And, Un-limiting Explodes the research burden because the number of unpredictable transportation programs is huge, this means smaller teams can’t keep up and encourages picking a small aff so no one will have answers to it.

#### Fairness is a voter – it’s a pre requisite to education. Competitive equity is key in any game, without it people will quit the game because they repeatedly lose to random infrastructure aff’s.

### k/t Education

#### Limits is key to Education – big topics result in a worse form of debate. It promotes generic strategies that gut topic specific education like a process counterplan and politics because they apply to every aff and are an attractive option if you don’t have specific arguments.

#### Smaller topics mean the neg will be prepared with aff specific Disads and case strategies which make for a better debate.

#### Topic specific education comes first because it is the point of the resolution and can only be obtained for that year.

#### And education about the topic according to the official government is key, it is more real world and is what we are supposed to be focusing on in the first place.

#### Education is a voter – it’s the only thing that effects us outside the round, or after our debate careers, And THE POINT OF POLICY DEBATE IS EDUCATION!!!, its what sets it aside from other games like chess. T is a prior issue to evaluate - it determines whether this round should have ever taken place.

# States CP

This CP probably is bad because the 1AC solvency evidence essentially advocates for the perm and we’re giving the aff a stronger option than the plan.

### 1NC

#### Counterplan: The fifty states should uniformly increase their investment in commonality, compatibility, and interoperability of geospatial data for transportation infrastructure in the United States.

#### Their Walter 10 evidence says that federalization of FEMA is the source of its failure and that a more local emergency response is key to solve.

"They really haven't been tested." One fundamental issue that undergirds FEMA's comeback is the federalization of an emergency management response -- and the public's expectations of who should be in charge. In an ideal world, an effective emergency management structure's foundation is a combination of well developed local response capacity -- with some help from the state -- along with long-range efforts to mitigate each disaster's impact. This includes looking at local zoning, planning and building codes to ensure that they feed into and enhance emergency needs and mitigation.

# Elections-Obama Bad

### **1NC**

#### Romney will win – has an edge from likely poll voters.

Silver 7/19 (Silver, Nate, runs the Five Thirty Eight NY Times Blog, 07/19/12, Five Thirty Eight, Does Romney have an edge from likely voter polls, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/19/does-romney-have-an-edge-from-likely-voter-polls/)

Is Mitt Romney’s position more advantageous than some polls imply? That’s what Mark Blumenthal of The Huffington Post suggested in a column on Wednesday. He noted that many of the polls out now were conducted among registered voters. But when pollsters switch over to likely voter models, which account for their estimate of how likely each respondent in the survey is to vote, as the election draws closer, they may be expected to show slightly more favorable results for Mr. Romney, enough to potentially matter in a close election. I mostly agree with Mr. Blumenthal. In fact, our forecast model builds in a “likely voter adjustment” — it is already shifting those registered voter polls a bit toward Mr. Romney. But it would also be possible to overestimate how much difference this might make. In the past six presidential election years, the shift to likely voter models has always helped the Republican candidate, but the difference has also always been small, usually amounting to a net of one or two percentage points in the margin between the two candidates.

#### **Their Gaines-Ross evidence doesn’t actually say that disasters tank US credibility. It only tanks the American public’s perception of the current administration. The plan would be perceived as a step in the right direction.**

Gaines-Ross 12 (Dr. Leslie Gaines-Ross is a chief reputation strategist and leads public relations firm Weber Shandwick’s global reputation consulting services and proprietary thought leadership development. Dr. Gaines-Ross is also the author of two books, CEO Capital: A Guide to Building CEO Reputation and Company Success (2003) and Corporate Reputation: 12 Steps to Safeguarding and Recovering Reputation (2008). 2012. “Reputation Matters” <http://www.europeanbusinessreview.com/?p=356>)

Equally disturbing, Americans believed that the disaster’s response had worsened the already battered overseas image of the United States. Worse still, the American public was left with the impression that the administration’s response to the deadly hurricane reflected a lack of compassion and management ability. Hurricane Katrina had a powerfully negative impact on perceptions of President Bush and his cabinet. The government’s missteps served as a negative tipping point for the Bush administration’s reputation. Its poor handling of the disaster took on epic proportions and was viewed as intrinsic to the core of the administration’s character. Each mistake generated a whole new set of problems. It was not just the administration’s failure to anticipate and react in time to the deadly hurricane, but also the magnitude of this failure that led to a material loss in the president’s and his administration’s reputation. The traditional rally of support for a president during the aftermath of a national emergency such as the September 11 terrorist attacks was nowhere to be found. Coupled with growing dissatisfaction with the war in Iraq, popular support for the administration reached a point of no return. Unfortunately for President Bush, the administration’s past and future actions would thereafter be viewed through the lens of another devastating event. With no appropriate and effective reputation recovery program for the handling of Hurricane Katrina and the continuing violence in Iraq, the November 2006 midterm Senate, House, and gubernatorial elections were all but preordained. Both houses of Congress gained Democratic majorities, thereby demonstrating just how irreparably damaged the administration’s reputation, and that of the political party it represented, had become. This is not to say that local political issues did not play a role in Hurricane Katrina’s devastation. New Orleans Mayor Ray Nagin and Louisiana Governor Kathleen Blanco were both heavily criticized for not ordering New Orleans residents to evacuate early enough. Emergency evacuation plans were implemented less than one day before the hurricane hit, and many people were unable to find safe routes out of the city. Reputation Advantage As the Hurricane Katrina episode shows, reputation matters. Reputation means how positively, or negatively, a company or similar institution is perceived by its key stakeholders-the people or entities that the company or institution relies on for its success. For many for-profit companies, typical stakeholders might include customers, employees, suppliers, or financial analysts. For governments or political entities such as the Bush and now President Obama administrations, stakeholders are, above all, the electorate.

#### Voters want safer public transportation options.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 3)

Voters’ top priorities for additional infrastructure investments are safer streets and having more transportation options. • Voters’ top goal by far is “safer streets for our communities and children”—57% say this should be one of the top-two priorities if more money is invested in infrastructure. This is the top choice for most major subgroups of the electorate. • The second-highest priority for voters overall at 32% is “**more transportation options**.” But there is a socioeconomic difference here—for voters in lowerincome households the second-highest priority (at 37%) is “less money spent out-of-pocket on transportation.” • In addition, 85% agree that “spending less time in traffic would improve quality of life, make communities safer, and reduce stress in people’s daily lives.” • Moreover, the vast majority also believe the country (80%) and their own community (66%) would benefit from an expanded and improved public transportation system.

### Romney Win

#### Romney is ahead in fund raising --- will win him the election.

The Portland Press Herald, 7/10/2012 (Election 2012: President trails Romney in June fundraising sum, p. http://www.pressherald.com/news/nationworld/president-trails-romney-in-june-fundraising-sum\_2012-07-10.html)

President Obama has fallen behind Republican Mitt Romney in monthly fundraising totals and may now be the underdog in the 2012 money race, given the juggernaut he faces of conservative groups with unlimited contributions at their disposal. The trend has set off at least a mild sense of panic at the Obama campaign, which warned donors on Monday: "We will get beat if this continues." The Romney campaign announced Monday that it raised an eye-popping $106 million last month in conjunction with the Republican National Committee, compared with just $71 million announced by Obama and the Democratic National Committee. The gap, at $35 million, is wider than it was in May, when Romney and his party allies raised $17 million more than the Democratic side. The momentum shift marks a change in fortunes for Obama, whose 2008 victory was propelled by a breathtaking fundraising operation that brought in $745 million by Election Day, much of it fueled by grass-roots donations. In September 2008 alone, Obama and the DNC brought in $193 million.

#### Romney is gaining momentum on Obama.

The Hill, 7/19/2012 (Overnight Campaign: New message, new momentum, p. http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/other-races/239087-overnight-campaign-new-message-new-momentum)

TOP STORY: Romney building a campaign message off Obama’s building remark Mitt Romney appears to be gaining some traction with his latest campaign message: hammering President Obama over the president's suggestion that the success of private enterprises are dependent on public infrastructure and programs. Republicans have seized on a moment during a town-hall speech last week where Obama, discussing infrastructure like roads and highways, argued that "if you’ve got a business — you didn’t build that. Somebody else made that happen."

#### Romney winning most swing states – mainstream polls wrong

Chambers 7/16 (Dean Chambers, an Internet journalist and commentator on Examiner.com, 7.16.12, Clarity Digital Group, LLC, http://www.examiner.com/article/mitt-romney-leads-most-key-swing-states)

Romney actually leads in most of the key swing states, but that might not be indicated in some of the polls and projections done by or based on those done by the mainstream media. But an analysis of the best available polling data indicates a Romney lead in most of those states. Many of the mainstream media polls are showing results favoring President Obama overall and in swing states. Often these polls are inaccurate because they survey registered voters rather than more statistically reliable method of polling likely voters, and often they over sample Democrat voters. The recent Washington Post/ABC News poll sampled voters on a faulty assumption that Republican voters make up just 24 percent of the electorate when Rasmussen's very accurate and exhaustive surveying indicates that 35.4 percent of the electorate are Republicans.

#### Obama reelection results in unilateral disarm --- kills deterrence and results in nuclear war.

**Ferrara**, 4/4/**2012** (Peter – Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute and General Counsel of the American Civil Rights Union, served in the White House Office of Policy development under President Reagan, Obama’s Unilateral Nuclear Disarmament, American Spectator, p. <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/04/04/obamas-unilateral-nuclear-disa>)

America's Nuclear Suicide Obama's literally crazy idea is that if we just lead by example and phase out our nuclear weapons, everyone else will realize we mean them no harm, and do the same. As a result, because of the messiah, the lion will lie down with the lamb, and the world will live as one. As Gaffney further explained, "He evidently is prepared to take such a step unilaterally in order to encourage by our example other nations to join his long-standing ambition to 'rid the world of nuclear weapons.'" The problem is if President Obama is reelected, he as the commander-in-chief would be free to carry out this flower child policy on his own authority, without Congressional approval. As Gaffney further explained in the March 27 Washington Times, "Mr. Obama's subordinates are signaling, however, that he is prepared to disarm us unilaterally through what one of them, Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller, recently called 'executive action.'" Gaffney rightly concluded in his February 22 column, "It is an astonishing insight into the President's commitment to 'fundamentally transforming the United States of America' -- in the worst sense of the phrase -- that he is willing to take such steps in the midst of his reelection campaign. Imagine what he would do if the last vestiges of restraining accountability are removed in a second term." In these modern times, a full blown nuclear war would be over in a matter of days. America will not have four years to build up the arsenal of democracy if caught by surprise. A dew-eyed miscalculation on these matters literally threatens your very life, and the lives of your family and children. That is why not only President Obama must be held accountable for this national defense foolishness, but the entire Democrat party that supports and enables him. That includes his contributors, whose names are publicly available, and his voters. This is a Paul Revere moment. The survival of you, your family and your nation is at stake, far more so than even on that April night in 1775. Exercise your rights of freedom of speech and democratic participation while you still have them, indeed, while you are still alive.

### TI Jobs Link

#### Transportation spending will win Obama the election --- perceived as a job creator.

Cooper, 1/25/2012 (Donna – Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?, Center for American Progress, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure_sotu.html>)

Just as America refocused its war resources on building our nation’s highway system after World War II, President Barack Obama’s State of the Union address included a courageous call for Congress to redirect half of the funds formerly claimed for the war in Iraq to rebuild our nation’s crumbling infrastructure. His strong pitch for putting Americans to work repairing our infrastructure is an essential element of the president’s strategy to **help the middle class grow and prosper**. At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats. Echoing President Theodore Roosevelt’s progressive sentiments, he said: We simply cannot return to this brand of "you're on your own" economics if we're serious about rebuilding the middle class in this country. We know that it doesn't result in a strong economy. It results in an economy that invests too little in its people and in its future. We know it doesn't result in a prosperity that trickles down. It results in a prosperity that's enjoyed by fewer and fewer of our citizens.

#### The public supports transportation infrastructure spending as a critical tool for economic growth.

Smart Growth America, March **2011** (Building for the 21st Century: American support for sustainable communities, p. <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/building-for-the-21st-century.pdf>)

The findings also reveal that spending on transportation infrastructure – like road repair, trains or buses – ranks higher than both investing in technology/innovation and investments in clean energy and green jobs as ways to rebuild the economy. The majority of Americans agree about problems that can be solved by smart growth solutions. Across all regions and all political parties, Americans agree that our country faces several problems that can be solved, in part, by smart growth solutions: • 84% of Americans believe that our country is too dependent on oil. 77% of Independent voters, 77% of Republicans, 95% of Democrats and 82% of those polled with no party affiliation agree with this statement. Smart growth strategies provide alternatives to driving that give families lower cost transportation choices, reduce how much they need to drive and decrease our dependence on oil. • 82% of Americans agree that spending 50% of a household budget on housing and transportation – which most Americans families do – is simply too much. 77% of Independent voters, 77% of Republicans, 87% of Democrats and 90% of those polled with no party affiliation agree that 50% of a household budget is too much to spend on transportation and housing. By providing low-cost transportation choices, reducing the distance between home and work and placing schools and shops close by smart growth strategies help reduce these combined costs. • 82% of Americans believe that rebuilding our economy and creating new jobs is the most important issue of our generation. 76% of Independent voters, 84% of Republicans, 84% of Democrats and 81% of those polled with no party affiliation agree that rebuilding our economy is more important than any other issue facing America today. Smart growth strategies help build the foundation for long-term economic growth by creating jobs today and reducing the fiscal burden on towns and states for the future. • 75% of Americans agree that infrastructure spending on roads, trains, and buses creates jobs and helps the economy get stronger. 68% of Independent voters, 67% of Republicans, 89% of Democrats and 70% of those polled with no party affiliation agree that investing in transportation infrastructure creates jobs and helps the economy get stronger. This isn’t just belief, it’s a fact: Repairing roads and bridges creates 16% more jobs per dollar than building new ones, and building public transportation creates 31% more jobs per dollar than building roads.

#### Transportation spending is a high-profile jobs issue for voters.

**Reuters**, 6/7/**2012** (Boehner floats 6-month US transport funding extension, p. http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/usa-infrastructure-boehner-idINL1E8H7AH320120607)

The fight in Congress over the transportation bill is one of several being waged between Democrats and Republicans on high-profile issues, with each side trying to gain the upper hand in their bids to win re-election on Nov. 6. The highway bill is particularly important as it would authorize major job-creating construction projects across the United States at a time when the economic recovery is losing momentum and jobs are the top issue for voters.

#### The public perceives transportation infrastructure as job creators.

**The Rockefeller Foundation 2011** (The Rockefeller Foundation Infrastructure Survey, Conducted by Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, p. 2)

The public understands the economic benefits of infrastructure improvement. • Four in five (80%) voters agree that federal funding to improve and modernize transportation “will boost local economies and create millions of jobs from construction to manufacturing to engineering.” Just 19% disagree with this. • And 79% agree that “in order for the United States to remain the world’s top economic superpower we need to modernize our transportation infrastructure and keep it up to date.” Again, 19% disagree.

#### Transportation infrastructure resonates with voters as economic development and job promotion.

State Smart Transportation Initiative, May **2012** (Building Support to Fund Preservation Work, Prepared by Spitfire Strategies, p. 5)

Repair and maintenance messages should also tap into the values of target audiences. Just because you may care about the environmental impact of repair and maintenance of existing infrastructure doesn’t mean that’s what your target audience cares about. Understand what moves voters or policymakers. Try to meet your voter or policymaker audiences where they are, instead of highlighting the arguments that might resonate well within your office or the broader transportation community. According to national polling, the most effective values to tap in your preservation messages are job growth, economic development and safety (particularly for policymakers). A 2010 survey by Smart Growth America (SGA) found that 68 percent of voters believe now is the time for state governments to invest in transportation, because if done right, these investments will create jobs and attract new business. The poll found that 91 percent of U.S. voters believe that maintaining and repairing our existing roads and bridges should be the top or a high transportation priority for state governments. Also according to the survey, voters responded best to messages that linked transportation spending to jobs and economic development. Saving money by using tax dollars efficiently is also a compelling message. For voters, the cost-savings message also resonates. They respond well to the fact that spending $1 to keep a road in good condition now prevents spending $7 to reconstruct it once it has fallen into poor condition. Another message that moves this audience is that repair and maintenance projects provide at least a 400 percent return on investment, on average, by preventing the need for future reconstruction, spurring economic development and reducing damage from potholes. 1

#### Obama will use transportation spending to campaign on jobs --- key to his reelection.

**Johnson**, 2/17/**2012** (Fawn – correspondent for the National Journal, Infrastructure Becomes Campaign Fodder, Transportation Experts Blog at the National Journal, p. http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/02/infrastructure-becomes-campaig.php)

If you want proof that President Obama is distancing himself as far from Congress as he can, look no further than his proposed infrastructure budget. The White House proposed $476 billion over six years for surface transportation in the fiscal 2013 budget, which is at least $200 billion more than House Republicans are proposing. It's also at least $150 billion more than current infrastructure spending levels. Obama is aiming high, even though he knows he'll probably get much less. Infrastructure means jobs, and "jobs" are the name of the game for his reelection. It's an added bonus that infrastructure has been in the news, which gives politicians of all stripes the opportunity to exploit it for reelection purposes. Both the House and the Senate are attempting (and so far not succeeding) to pass surface transportation bills. Obama ideally wants to increase federal infrastructure investment, but he has also praised the Senate for its more modest bill that simply maintains the current spending levels over two years. Leaders say it could take a few weeks to get that measure completed.

# Security K

### Surveillance Links

#### US surveillance technology is the new panopticon-ultimate biopower

Dickens and Omrod ’07 (Peter Dickens, Fellow of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cambridge, UK and Visiting Professor of Sociology, University of Essex, UK, and James S. Omrod, Teaching Fellow in the Department of Sociology, University of Essex, UK, 8/2007, Sage Journals Online, http://soc.sagepub.com/content/41/4/609)

There are two mechanisms through which the majority of the world’s population are kept in a state of reverence towards the cosmos. Both go towards constructing it as a subject, a powerful agent in its own right, and one dominating Earthly affairs. This is a scenario with a long history stretching back to early Greece and into Parsons’ ‘cosmological societies’ (Parsons, 1966; see also Assmann, 2002), and witnessed in E.B. Tylor’s animistic tribal religions. The first is a sense of fear related to the kinds of military and surveillance applications mentioned above. The second is a feeling of inadequacy in the face of contemporary cosmological theory. There is a direct parallel between Bentham’s panopticon and this new orbital or ‘planetary’ panopticon (Whitaker, 2000). Both involve a watch station up on high that watches deviant populations, and in neither case do the monitored have any knowledge of whether or not they are being watched. Foucault (1977) argued that this results in the watched regulating their own behaviour and conforming to the required social order. There are signs that the orbital panopticon is having a similar effect on people’s subjectivity and relationship with the universe. The ‘eye in the sky’ reinforces the idea that the heavens are distinct from Earthly affairs as far as monitored populations are concerned; a remystification of, and alienation from, the universe, which reduces people to passive conformists. Those able to utilize satellite technology have symbolically replaced God in the Heavens: the American military, for example, gaining a ‘God’s eye view’ over the planet (Weiner, 2004). Public knowledge that wars from space can be conducted instantaneously, without the possibility of forewarning or resistance, furthers this fear that parallels pre-modern anxiety in the face of angry and punishing gods in the sky. US plans to construct ‘rods from God’, tungsten rods suspended from a satellite that can be dropped on targets on Earth with the impact of a nuclear explosion, play on this kind of sentiment.

#### Surveillance seeks to impose order

Nardon 7 [Laurence, French Institute for International Relations (IFRI), Paris, 2007, Astropolitics, 5:1, 29 – 62, 'Cold War Space Policy and Observation Satellites']

A characteristic of contemporary society is that the focus of interest has switched from the King as source of power—with the rest of society remaining an obscure mass—to a system where different techniques seek to watch the latter, putting them in full light. This feature is reminiscent of satellite observation, a hidden technology that monitors human activities. A further element of Foucault’s work also provides a link to post 1945 observation techniques. In his book, Discipline and Punish, the Birth of the Prison, Michel Foucault describes the reformatory prison as a disciplining institution that is characteristic of contemporary power. In the second half of the 18th Century, British philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) devised a new model of jailhouses.6 Bentham was the founder of Utilitarian philosophy. He believed that the ultimate moral principle is to create means of progress for the human condition.7 His jailhouse model, called the Panopticon, would be such that convicts sent there would acquire social discipline and be redeemed. The building has a very precise plan. The cells holding the prisoners are set in a ring around a central tower, in which the sentinel is sitting. Each cell has a window looking inside the ring. The sentinel can look into each cell whenever he wants to. The prisoners cannot hide from him and have no way of knowing when they are being watched. They know they cannot misbehave without behind found out and punished. Very quickly, they will interiorize the discipline enforced by the prison system and stop misbehaving of their own accord. When let out of prison, they will be responsible citizens. According to Foucault, the Panopticon prison is symbolic of the contemporary power exerted on members of society. Constant surveillance brings self-discipline to the prisoners. A Panopticon in Space Can the Panopticon scheme be adapted to the post-1960s era, when observation satellites were first deployed for purposes of intelligence? The defining elements are the same indeed. Observation satellites provide an all-powerful means of surveillance. Everybody can be watched by a single power, via deployment of technical devices. The fact that the watchers (the satellites) now circle the inmates (people on Earth), in a role reversal of the Bentham plan, does not alter the governing principles of the Panopticon. In order to complete the parallel between the Bentham jailhouse and observation satellite systems, the possibility of a reformatory motive for the latter must be explored. Were the space observation systems deployed by the U.S. after 1960 given the purpose of disciplining other countries of the world? Was that their political raison d’eˆtre? Although military space systems were classified after 1962, the U.S. government made sure other countries’ leadership knew about their new intelligence-gathering tool. The Soviet Union was well aware of the new technology, since it was already working on its own version. Under the Kennedy Presidency, official tours of Western capitals were organized to brief political leaders, military, foreign affairs, and intelligence authorities about space imagery.8 In the ensuing years, it may therefore have been possible to exert influence based on space-based intelligence on the Soviet Union as well as allied countries. Careful analysis of government archives, ranging from 1946 to the 1960s sheds light on the political intent behind American space observation.

### Softpower Links

#### Their rhetoric of “soft” power *is a reality* of the worst forms of violent foreign policy – their truth is racism.

Kaplan 3 [Amy, Prof. of English @ Univ. of Pennslyvania, American Quarterly 56.1, “Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today,” p. muse]

Another dominant narrative about empire today, told by liberal interventionists, is that of the "reluctant imperialist." 10 In this version, the United States never sought an empire and may even be constitutionally unsuited to rule one, but it had the burden thrust upon it by the fall of earlier empires and the failures of modern states, which abuse the human rights of their own people and spawn terrorism. The United States is the only power in the world with the capacity and the moral authority to act as military policeman and economic manager to bring order to the world. Benevolence and self-interest merge in this narrative; backed by unparalleled force, the United States can save the people of the world from their own anarchy, their descent into an [End Page 4] uncivilized state. As Robert Kaplan writes—not reluctantly at all—in "Supremacy by Stealth: Ten Rules for Managing the World": "The purpose of power is not power itself; it is a fundamentally liberal purpose of sustaining the key characteristics of an orderly world. Those characteristics include basic political stability, the idea of liberty, pragmatically conceived; respect for property; economic freedom; and representative government, culturally understood. At this moment in time it is American power, and American power only, that can serve as an organizing principle for the worldwide expansion of liberal civil society." 11 This narrative does imagine limits to empire, yet primarily in the selfish refusal of U.S. citizens to sacrifice and shoulder the burden for others, as though sacrifices have not already been imposed on them by the state. The temporal dimension of this narrative entails the aborted effort of other nations and peoples to enter modernity, and its view of the future projects the end of empire only when the world is remade in our image. This is also a narrative about race. The images of an unruly world, of anarchy and chaos, of failed modernity, recycle stereotypes of racial inferiorityfrom earlier colonial discourses about races who are incapable of governing themselves, Kipling's "lesser breeds without the law," or Roosevelt's "loosening ties of civilized society," in his corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. In his much-noted article in the New York Times Magazine entitled "The American Empire," Michael Ignatieff appended the subtitle "The Burden" but insisted that "America's empire is not like empires of times past, built on colonies, conquest and the white man's burden." 12 Denial and exceptionalism are apparently alive and well. In American studies we need to go beyond simply exposing the racism of empire and examine the dynamics by which Arabs and the religion of Islam are becoming racialized through the interplay of templates of U.S. racial codes and colonial Orientalism. These narratives of the origins of the current empire—that is, the neoconservative and the liberal interventionist—have much in common. They take American exceptionalism to new heights: its paradoxical claim to uniqueness and universality at the same time. They share a teleological narrative of inevitability, that America is the apotheosis of history, the embodiment of universal values of human rights, liberalism, and democracy, the "indispensable nation," in Madeleine Albright's words. In this logic, the United States claims the authority to "make sovereign judgments on what is right and what is wrong" for everyone [End Page 5] else and "to exempt itself with an absolutely clear conscience from all the rules that it proclaims and applies to others." 13 Absolutely protective of its own sovereignty, it upholds a doctrine of limited sovereignty for others and thus deems the entire world a potential site of intervention. Universalism thus can be made manifest only through the threat and use of violence. If in these narratives imperial power is deemed the solution to a broken world, then they preempt any counternarratives that claim U.S. imperial actions, past and present, may have something to do with the world's problems. According to this logic, resistance to empire can never be opposition to the imposition of foreign rule; rather, resistance means irrational opposition to modernity and universal human values. Although these narratives of empire seem ahistorical at best, they are buttressed not only by nostalgia for the British Empire but also by an effort to rewrite the history of U.S. imperialism by appropriating a progressive historiography that has exposed empire as a dynamic engine of American history. As part of the "coming-out" narrative, the message is: "Hey what's the big deal. We've always been interventionist and imperialist since the Barbary Coast and Jefferson's 'empire for liberty.' Let's just be ourselves." A shocking example can be found in the reevaluation of the brutal U.S. war against the Philippines in its struggle for independence a century ago. This is a chapter of history long ignored or at best seen as a shameful aberration, one that American studies scholars here and in the Philippines have worked hard to expose, which gained special resonance during the U.S. war in Vietnam. Yet proponents of empire from different political perspectives are now pointing to the Philippine-American War as a model for the twenty-first century. As Max Boot concludes in Savage Wars of Peace, "The Philippine War stands as a monument to the U.S. armed forces' ability to fight and win a major counterinsurgency campaign—one that was bigger and uglier than any that America is likely to confront in the future." 14 Historians of the United States have much work to do here, not only in disinterring the buried history of imperialism but also in debating its meaning and its lessons for the present, and in showing how U.S. interventions have worked from the perspective of comparative imperialisms, in relation to other historical changes and movements across the globe. The struggle over history also entails a struggle over language and culture. It is not enough to expose the lies when Bush hijacks words [End Page 6] such as freedom, democracy, and liberty. It's imperative that we draw on our knowledge of the powerful alternative meanings of these key words from both national and transnational sources. Today's reluctant imperialists are making arguments about "soft power," the global circulation of American culture to promote its universal values. As Ignatieff writes, "America fills the hearts and minds of an entire planet with its dreams and desires." 15 The work of scholars in popular culture is more important than ever to show that the Americanization of global culture is not a one-way street, but a process of transnational exchange, conflict, and transformation, which creates new cultural forms that express dreams and desires not dictated by empire. In this fantasy of global desire for all things American, those whose dreams are different are often labeled terrorists who must hate our way of life and thus hate humanity itself. As one of the authors of the Patriot Act wrote, "when you adopt a way of terror you've excused yourself from the community of human beings." 16 Although I would not minimize the violence caused by specific terrorist acts, I do want to point out the violence of these definitions of who belongs to humanity. Often in our juridical system under the Patriot Act, the accusation of terrorism alone, without due process and proof, is enough to exclude persons from the category of humanity. As scholars of American studies, we should bring to the present crisis our knowledge from juridical, literary, and visual representations about the way such exclusions from personhood and humanity have been made throughout history, from the treatment of Indians and slaves to the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

#### Soft Power is the most supreme and insidious form of power - US constructs its interest as rational and coerces non-compliants.

Bilgin and Elis 8 [Pinar Bilgin, Prof. of IR @ Bilkent, Berivan Elis, PhD Candidate in IR @ Ankara, “Hard Power, Soft Power: Toward a More Realistic Power Analysis” http://www.bilkent.edu.tr/~pbilgin/Bilgin-Elis-IT-2008.pdf]

On another level, Nye’s (soft) power analysis is problematic insofar as his own agenda of ‘success in world politics’ is concerned. This is not only because his analysis fosters the **false impression** that ‘soft power’ is a nice and cuddly surrogate to ‘hard power’, but also because he underestimates the extent to which U.S. soft power is produced and expressed through compulsion. After all, compulsory power is not limited to the use of material resources. Non-material forms of power, such as ‘symbolic power’, may also be used for the purpose of coercing another. Barnett’s analysis of Arab politics is highly illuminating in this regard; during the Arab Cold War ‘symbolic power’ was used by ‘radical’ Arab states to bring into line their ‘conservative’ counterparts by touting the attractiveness of ‘Arab nationalism’ for Arab peoples across the Middle East.51 By failing to inquire into how the production and expression of soft power can also cause harm, Nye does disservice to both his power analysis and his agenda for U.S. ‘success’ in world politics. To recapitulate, in Part I we pointed to the poverty of realist power analysis for taking agents as well as the stockpile of power as pre-given and focusing on decision-making in cases of visible conflict. Following Lukes, we called for adopting Bachrach and Baratz’s conception of two-dimensional power, which would allow looking at instances of decision-making and nondecision-making. Nye’s conception of soft power constitutes an improvement upon realist power analysis insofar as it raises the analyst’s awareness of the ‘second face of power’. For, the very notion of ‘attraction’ suggests that there is a conflict of interest that does not come to the surface. That is to say, B does not express its grievances and does what A wants it to do, because it is attracted to A’s culture, political values and/or foreign policy. That said, Nye’s analysis rests on a conception of power that is somehow less than three-dimensional. While Nye encourages the analyst to be curious about those instances of power expression where there is no visible conflict and/or clash of interests, his failure to register how soft power is ‘not-so-soft’ means that his (soft) power analysis does not fully capture the ‘third face of power’. Let us clarify. Lukes understands the ‘third face of power’ as those instances when “A may exercise power over B by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping, or determining his very wants”.52 Post-colonial peoples’ post-WWII rush towards sovereign statehood may be viewed as an example of the ‘third face of power’ whereby the international society shaped their wants while their actual circumstances called for other forms of political community. That is to say, in Lukes’ framework, B does what A wants in apparent readiness contrary to its own interests. Put differently, by exercising soft power, A prevents B from recognizing its own ‘real interests’. While Nye’s attention to A’s ability to shape B’s wants seem to render his analysis three-dimensional, his lack of curiosity into ‘not-so-soft’ expressions of U.S. power renders his (soft) power analysis two-and-a-half dimensional. This is mostly because Nye assumes that B’s ‘real interests’ are also served when it follows A’s lead. It is true that soft power does not involve physical coercion, but as Lukes reminded us, it is the supreme and most insidious exercise of powerto prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it as divinely ordained and beneficial.53 Going back to the example of North/South relations, power is involved not only when the South does not express its grievance because of the absence of opportunities to do so, but also when it seemingly has no grievances as a consequence of the prevalent system of ideas that depoliticizes its status within the international economic order.54 In a similar fashion, Nye is not interested in inquiring into the sources of U.S. ‘attraction’, for he considers the U.S.’s ability to shape the wants of others as befitting the latter’s ‘real interests’. Accordingly, he misses a ‘fundamental part of soft power’, what Bohas describes as “the early shaping of taste, collective imaginary and ideals which constitutes a way of dominating other countries. This includes the reinforcing effect of the social process in favor of American power through goods and values”.55 As such, Nye’s analysis remains limited in regard to the third face of soft power, where the existing state of things is internalized by the actors, and the U.S.’s expression of power seems benign and in accordance with the ‘real interests’ of others. In sum, the limits of Nye’s approach, which could be characterized as ‘two-and-a-half dimensional power analysis’, does not allow him to offer a theory of power that reflects upon its own moment(s) and site(s) of production and ‘not-so-soft’ expression. This is not to underestimate what Nye’s (soft) power analysis delivers. Rather, our aim has been to push his analysis further towards generating a more realistic framework where one’s scope of research is not limited to the acts or inacts of actors but investigates how different actors’ needs and wants as well as their understanding of themselves and their ‘real interests’ are shaped by other actors or by the existing structures.

### Terror Link

#### **Terrorism and the idea of rogue states are developed due to the security logic engrained within our society.**

Reid 10 (Julian, Lecturer in International Relations, Department of War Studies, King’s College London, “On the Implications of Foucault’s Security, Territory, Population Lectures for the Analysis and Theorisation of Security in International Relations,” September, 2010, http://www.mcrg.ac.in/Development/draft\_Symposium/Julian1.pdf 4-5)

The security discourses of the global liberal order reproduce so many of the tropes and signatures of the early modern liberal state which Foucault analyses in these lectures. He demonstrates how the liberal state of the early modern era, on account of its problematisation of life as the referent object of security, invented entire new species of enmity and threats. Once the referent object of security became the life of the population so the circulatory infrastructures on which the life properties and processes of the populations of states were said to rely became identified as sites of insecurity and threat. So, new domains and practices of regulation concerned with the governance of roads and highways, the suppression of vagrancy, and so on, came into existence. The development of the contemporary global liberal order is generative of new and yet very comparable forms of security problems. An excellent example of this is the current discourse surrounding so- called ‘rogue states’, the constitutions of which are represented as hostile to the smooth functioning of the circulatory infrastructures of global liberal order. Indeed the extension of this discourse of the rogue and of roguery to the international suggests, as Jacques Derrida has also demonstrated, continuities with liberal regimes of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. In a brilliant analysis which I think in many ways can be read as a supplement to Foucault’s, delivered not long before his death, Derrida demonstrated the genealogical intertwinements of the word ‘rogue’ and its equivalents in French, ‘voyeur’ and ‘roué’, with concepts of humanity and animality, and its roles in the development of liberal practices of security and order. In English the word ‘rogue’ designates deviance in both human and non- human life forms. Derrida demonstrates this by quoting from an article in which ‘a rogue is defined as a creature that is born different...incapable of mingling with the herd, which keeps itself to itself, and can attack at any time, without warning’. Crucially, this concept of the rogue and of roguery derived from early modern theories of biology. In reference to the vegetable kingdom, Charles Darwin in Origin of Species referred to 'roguing' as the practice by which nurserymen would weed out plants that deviated from the proper standard of plants in seed-beds, literally pulling-up what they called the 'rogues'. He then adapted the concept of roguing to describe the process by which natural selection functions throughout living systems to maintain order among species. In French, Derrida argues, the word has a more human resonance, for ‘the word voyou has an essential relation with the voie, the way, with the urban roadways (voirie), the roadways of the city or the polis, and thus with the street (rue), the waywardness (dévoiement) of the voyou consisting in making ill use of the street, in corrupting the street or loitering in the streets, in “roaming the streets”’ Politically, Derrida shows, the representatives of liberal order have consistently tried ‘to present as vo yous all rebels, agitators, and insurgents, indeed all revolutionaries, regardless of whether they come from bad neighbourhoods, or from the suburbs’. Thus, the rogue is marked by its inhumanity, aggression, non-conformity, and disorder, while always being ‘a part of mankind, always human, of our kind.’ The concept of the ‘rogue state’ has, during the post-Cold War era, become a regularly deployed reference for regimes said to threaten the boundaries of global liberal order. This proliferation of the discourse of roguery from the biological to the social to the international tells us a lot about the increasing complexities of liberal security practices as well as their continuities with the early modern era. It tells us also a lot about the power of their biological imaginaries upon the conceptions of fear and danger which have motivated the development of the security practices of liberal regimes historically, and which are proving definitive of their strategic response to the new threats posed by terrorism. In their responses to terrorism, liberal regimes of the present have made the protection of global architectures of circulation and infrastructure a strategic priority. The conduct of the Global War on Terror has been defined in particular by the development of strategies for the protection of ‘critical infrastructure’. In the US, for example, George W. Bush has provided a series of presidential directives in response to the attacks of September 11 for the development of what is termed a National Infrastructure Protection Plan. The response to the directive is expressed in The National Plan for Research and Development in Support of Critical Infrastructure Protection published by the US Department of Homeland Security in 2004. In Europe, the European Union is pursuing what it terms a European Programme for Critical Infrastructure Protection ‘to enhance European prevention, preparedness and response to terrorist attacks involving critical infrastructures’. The United Nations is seeking meanwhile to identify the critical infrastructure needs of member states globally, as well as continuing to ‘explore ways to facilitate the dissemination of best practices’ with regard to critical infrastructure protection.

#### **Terrorism is used to justify the destruction of personal privacy in the aim of security**

German 6/8 [Michael is the Senior Policy Counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union’s Washington Legislative Office, where he develops policy positions and pro-active strategies on pending legislation and executive branch actions concerning national security and open government. German served sixteen years as a Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, where he specialized in domestic terrorism and covert operations. Mr. German served as an adjunct professor for Law Enforcement and Terrorism at the National Defense University and is a Senior Fellow with GlobalSecurity.org. He has a B.A. in Philosophy from Wake Forest University and a J.D. from Northwestern University Law School, 6/8/2012, “INCOMPETENT TERRORISTS, COURAGEOUS AIRLINE PASSENGERS, VENGEFUL WIVES” <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2012/06/08/michael-german/incompetent-terrorists-courageous-airline-passengers-vengeful-wives/>] LZ

In fact, the available evidence points to the opposite conclusion: despite the increasing scrutiny of Muslim-Americans and the still expanding counterterrorism intelligence gathering authorities, a small number of actual terrorists continue to slip through the cracks while tens of thousands of innocent people become ensnared in the surveillance dragnet. Making this point is crucial in this discussion, because the motive behind the drumbeat of fear-mongering about a growing homegrown threat is to justify continuing expansion of the surveillance industrial complex, even as we see the degradation of al Qaeda and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan winding down. While an honest evaluation of the threat would argue for a reduction in security budgets and a normalization of police and intelligence powers, in March of this year the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) re-wrote its guidelines to remove traditional protections for U.S. person information, even where no terrorism connection exists. This change, which authorizes the NCTC to ingest entire databases belonging to other federal agencies, regardless of the countless innocent Americans impacted, comes closer to realizing Admiral John Poindexter’s dystopian dream of Total Information Awareness than any previous single change in policy. Whether it will help NCTC become any better at finding terrorists is doubtful according to a 2008 National Research Council study of the feasibility of data mining technology for finding terrorists.

#### **Rhetoric of terrorism is strategically deployed to create a sense of vulnerability within the lives of citizens**

Reid 10 (Julian, Lecturer in International Relations, Department of War Studies, King’s College London, “On the Implications of Foucault’s Security, Territory, Population Lectures for the Analysis and Theorisation of Security in International Relations,” September, 2010, http://www.mcrg.ac.in/Development/draft\_Symposium/Julian1.pdf 6-7)

The liberal conception of society as an organism comprising networks and infrastructures of relations gathered apace throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, culminating in the prevailing conception of a networked world society held together and empowered economically, social, politically, and militarily by the density of its critical infrastructures. Likewise the principle that the regimes which govern such societies are vulnerable on account of their reliance on the vitality of those networked infrastructures, the principle governing Al-Qaeda’s strategy, developed simultaneously within liberal regimes themselves. This was evident not least in the development of the practice of interstate warfare. The increasing investment in the strategic value of airpower in the UK, the US, and France during the twentieth century worked on the assumption that enemies could be defeated by inflicting critical damage on the infrastructures on which their security depended. Today we see the same logic being applied not just within the domain of liberal regimes themselves, but in the violent intervention and enforced reconstruction of illiberal states and societies. The solution to Terror is presumed to lie in the destruction of illiberal regimes, in the regeneration of their socio-economic infrastructures of circulation, with a view to reinserting them into the networks of exchange and flows which constitute the global liberal polity. This is especially true of the strategies which are currently and errantly being applied to the so-called rogue states of Afghanistan and Iraq. NATO, for example, once a military alliance to protect Western European states from the geopolitical threat of the former Soviet Union, is currently engaged in a strategy which stands and falls on their ability to convince Afghanis to give up their reliance on poppy seed for an economy centred on the production of grain. The irony of this will not be lost on the reader of Security, Territory, Population. For such military strategies of the liberal present depend on precisely the same assumption that classical liberal strategies against sedition depended in the historical eras which Foucault analysed. That is the assumption that historically constituted peoples can be politically suborned and transformed into the utile stuff of population in accordance with the needs and interests of governmental regimes seeking security from those selfsame peoples.

### Nuclear Terror Link

#### The construction of nuclear terror ensures radical US interventionism in the name of security

Joseph Masco, Prof. of Anthro @ U-Chicago, ‘6 [The Nuclear Borderlands, p. 328-332]

The post-Cold War period ended after September 11, 2001, with the formal conversion of the United States to a counterterrorism state. Americans who once thought the end of the Cold War had fundamentally transformed their relationship to the bomb were, after the terrorist strikes on September 11, once again witness to an escalating discourse of nuclear terror: the air¬waves were filled with stories of vulnerability, of unsecured ports through which a terrorist nuclear device could be smuggled, of unprotected nuclear power plants open to suicide attacks by airplane, of radiological dirty bombs, which might contaminate major U.S. cities, rendering them uninhabitable. A newly formed Department of Homeland Security (DHS) soon launched the first civil defense campaign in more than a generation, seemingly designed more to maintain nuclear fear than reduce it. The Ready.Gov campaign officially advised citizens to stockpile potassium iodide pills to deal with potential radioactive poisoning, while doing their best to avoid contact with an exploding nuclear device (see Figure 8.1). Meanwhile, a new Homeland Security Advisory System kept Americans at a state of "elevated" to "high" risk of terrorist attack, institutionaliz¬ing a new kind of official terror, buttressed by frequent speculations from the DHS and FBI about possibly imminent catastrophic attacks. By the fall of 2004, when asked in their first debate to identify the single greatest threat to the national security of the United States, both presidential candidates agreed it was the atomic bomb: Senator Kerry put it in the context of "nuclear proliferation," while President Bush stated the greatest danger to the United States was nuclear weapons "in the hands of a terrorist enemy."1 In the new century, nuclear insecurity once again formally linked the foreign and the domestic under the sign of apocalyptic nuclear risk, creating a political space in which **anything seemed possible**. National Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice, for example, made a case for war with Iraq simply by stating that "we don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud."2 In doing so, she mobilized the threat of an imaginary Iraqi nuclear arsenal to enable the **most radical foreign policy decision in modern American history**: a "preventative" war, which involved invading another country to eliminate a nuclear threat before it actually existed.3 In a few short years, nuclear fear writ large was politically mobilized into an enormously productive force in the United States, enabling a reconfiguration of U.S. military affairs (embracing covert action on a global scale), a massive bureaucratic reorganization of federal institutions (the Department of Homeland Security), a reconfiguration of civil liberties and domestic policing laws (the U.S.A. Patriot Act), and an entirely new concept of war (preemption). All of these projects were pursued in the name of a "war" on "terror," which was energized by an explicit nuclear discourse after the September 11 attacks on Washington, D.C., and New York. The post-Cold War period (1991-2001), thus', concluded with the official transformation of the United States from a countercommunist to a counterterrorist state, a conversion that would not have been possible in its speed, scale, or lack of debate without a discourse of nuclear terror. Given the scale of this transformation, it is difficult now to remember a time, only a few years ago, when it was difficult to focus American public attention on the bomb. Looking back on when I started researching this book in the mid-1990s, public reactions to nuclear weapons from the early post-Cold War moment now appear quite strange. Outside of New Mexico, a description of this book project, for example, often produced puzzled looks from U.S. citizens, and statements that suggested for many Americans the bomb had already become a thing of the past, of historical interest but not an ongoing political concern. A common response was surprise that Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) was "still" involved in nuclear weapons work, and/or "shock" that the United States remained committed to the bomb after the demise of the Soviet Union. This immediate psychological effort to declare the bomb history in the wake of the Cold War is as remarkable as the feverish nuclear discourses following the decidedly non-nuclear September 11 attacks, and is part of the same structural logic: these psychosocial strategies reveal the American cultural tradition of approaching the bomb either as a banal object, not worthy of attention, or as a hysterical threat, **requiring a total mobilization** of the imagination. This banal/apocalyptic dual structure works to deny the U.S. commitment to the bomb by either cloaking it in a normative everyday space or by displacing attention onto solely external nuclear threats. In both instances, the internal politics and effects of the U.S. nuclear arsenal are erased, even as the core relevance of U.S. nuclear weapons to everyday American life is powerfully revealed by a bomb that is either all too absent or all too present.