### Contention One: The squo

**Evacuations are happening now but don’t help the transportation disadvantaged. Agencies, states, and areas affected by Katrina lack mass transit evacuation plans.**

**Renne et al 11-** Renne is a PhD from the University of New Orleans, Sanchez is a PhD from the University of Utah, and Litman is a director at the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (John L. Renne, Thomas W. Sanchez and Todd Litman Carless and Special Needs Evacuation Planning : A Literature Review  *Journal of Planning Literature*2011 26: 420 originally published online 10 October 2011 Pg 428-429 accessed 12/7/12)

An example of successful plans for carless evacuation is an initiative between FEMA, Army Corps of Engineers, and FHWA facilitating cross-agency and cross-jurisdictional planning exercises in a few pilot regions throughout the country. This program appears to understand the need for better evacuation planning and is working with the agencies directly responsible for either emergency planning or providing service to carless populations. Another appropriate target would be to include specific and detailed procedures and corresponding capacity for evacuating carless populations within the federal mandates that require state emergency planning. In sum, many of the **components, agencies, technologies, or capabilities exist for handling carless populations in evacuations, but they are not working together** on this issue, or at an appropriate level of detail or scale. The FEMA’s Emergency Information Management System (EIMS) works to coordinate across agencies and jurisdictions but outcomes in practice are not clear. The majority of the literature shows that **none of these planning efforts have enough involvement from organizations that service or represent citizens with impairments, disabilities, or who lack cars**. This last issue refers to the theme that more emphasis should be placed on institutional, operational, and technological aspects, as prior emphasis has been placed on law enforcement and infrastructure. For instance, as of 1997, transit agency police forces were prepared or preparing to respond to terrorism threats, but in 2003, **LEP populations were still complaining that the transit system routes and the transit personnel were still not meeting their needs** in terms of where they needed to go or in providing assistance in using the system. As Liu and Schachter (2007) pointed out, if these systems are not meeting the needs of patrons on a regular basis in a normal environment, **they are even less likely to do so in an emergency**. Different roles for each level of government have also been identified in the literature. **Federal government is more likely to sponsor research, mandate standards, and facilitate crossagency communications**. They may also explore the development or modification of commerce laws that allow the private sector to be involved in disaster planning and response with reduced risk and liability. States can have a funding and coordination role in assisting local and regional governments and statewide nonprofit associations. **States typically include ‘‘special needs’’ groups in their state emergency operations plans, but they need to specifically address the evacuation of lowmobility and special needs populations**.

**Disads are nonunique-spending for Sandy should have triggered all their disads. Future funding is piecemeal which necessitates future legislation**

**Moser 1/29** (Haggling over Hurricane Sandy relief: The unraveling of a rational disaster relief policy By Marian Moser Jones, author, The American Red Cross from Clara Barton to the New Deal - 01/29/13 10:00 AM ET <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/279587-haggling-over-hurricane-sandy-relief-the-unraveling-of-a-rational-disaster-relief-policy#ixzz2JQ6ccQ00> Jones, an assistant professor in the Department of Family Sciences at the University of Maryland School of Public Health, is author of The American Red Cross from Clara Barton to the New Deal Johns Hopkins University Press, Nov. 2012. She has previously served as an Assistant Professor at Virginia Commonwealth University’s Science, Technology and Society Program. Jones received her Ph.D. and M.P.H. degrees in Sociomedical Sciences from Columbia University, and her A.B. from Harvard College. Before beginning her graduate studies, Jones worked as a journalist, most recently serving as Editorial Director at GenomeWeb, an online life sciences news service in New York City.)

The frustrating delay in moving Hurricane Sandy relief through Congress reflects **more than regional resentments and the fiscal conservatism of some House members. Yes, it did take the House until seventy eight days after the storm to pass a substantial $50.7 billion relief bill**. One hundred eighty members, mostly Republicans from outside the Northeast, opposed it. And yes, the bill may not become law until the storm’s three-month anniversary or after. (As of this writing, the Senate had still not introduced the bill). But the problem goes deeper than dysfunction in Congress: the real problem is that Congress is debating such appropriations at all. Ever since President Harry Truman signed the Federal Disaster Relief Act of 1950, control over disaster relief appropriations was supposed to be in the hands of the Executive Branch. And for good reason. Prior to this time, Congress had accumulated a colorful, 150-year record of special appropriations for survivors of fires, floods, storms, and other crises. But these appropriations proved erratic. Regional rivalries, political pettiness, economic gyrations and racial prejudice could sink a disaster relief bill. In 1893 for example, the Senate considered a bill to provide $50,000 to survivors of a hurricane in South Carolina’s Sea Islands. The storm had destroyed the farms and fishing boats that the Sea Islanders – mostly former slaves and their families – relied on for subsistence. The bill’s Senate co-sponsor warned that every hour of legislative inaction would likely result in “some human being perishing of starvation.”  Clara Barton, whose fledgling American Red Cross was helping the Sea Islanders, lobbied for the appropriation. Barton managed to enlist a South Carolina Democrat and a Massachusetts Republican, polar extremes in the smoldering postwar resentments between North and South, to jointly champion the bill. But opponents from other states objected and the bill died on the Senate floor. In subsequent years, the Sea Islanders continued to suffer from the storm’s aftermath, while better-represented disaster survivors received generous federal assistance.  Truman had proposed the 1950 law as a fiscal planning measure, so special disaster relief appropriations would no longer throw federal budgets out of whack. Subsequent overhauls of this legislation, together with President Jimmy Carter’s creation of FEMA in 1979, were supposed to streamline the process. These actions were aimed at taking decision-making over disaster assistance away from Congress, and putting it into the hands of expert public servants and the president, in order to insulate this process from the kind of petty politics that we have seen with Hurricane Sandy relief. But disasters these days tend to overrun Executive Branch agencies’ budgets. **Sandy’s cost has been estimated at over $70 billion, but FEMA’s disaster relief fund is currently less than $6.5 billion, and other federal agencies cannot make up the difference**. So to fill the gap**, Congress must pass big fat appropriations bills to funnel money to these agencies**. If large-scale disasters continue to escalate in severity and frequency, and no meaningful action is taken at the highest levels of government, this pattern will likely worsen.  But what if President Obama were to take up Truman’s mantle of disaster relief reform? He could begin by ordering a report that uses data from recent disasters to forecast the real costs to the federal government for disaster relief over the next ten years. Such a report, if well publicized, could inform the debate over the relative costs of relief vs. prevention and planning. The president could meanwhile lead a national conversation on how Americans can stop disasters from costing so much: Do we want to continue to seesaw between denial and shock, living in the most hazard-prone areas and expecting Washington to pay for the cleanup whenever disasters strike? Or do we want to change how and where we live? Such dialogue needs to take place soon, and it is doubtful that Congress will start it.

### Plan

**The plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in mass evacuation transportation infrastructure in areas affected by Hurricane Katrina in 2005 in the United States.**

### Contention Two: the Advantage

**The intersection of race and poverty and car-lessness made the aftermath of Katrina into an overwhelming display of institutional racism. Mass transportation is critical for evacuation.**

**Wailoo et al. 10** (Keith Wailoo- B.A, 1984, Yale University; M.A., 1989, and Ph.D. (History and Sociology of Science), 1992, University of Pennsylvania; joint appointment: Associate Professor of History, Karen M. O’Neill- Karen M. O’Neill studies how land and water policies change the standing of program beneficiaries and experts and change government's claims to authority and power., Jeffrey Dowd- graduate student, Roland Anglin- Associate Research Professor; Director, Joseph C. Cornwall Center for Metropolitan Studies School of Public Affairs and Administration (SPAA) Rutgers University-Newark ; Katrina’s Imprint: Race and Vulnerability in America; 11/2010; pages 23-27)

A landmark decision most known today for its application beyond transportation, Plessy v. Ferguson provided the legal basis for basis for separate schools, restaurants, theaters, hospitals, cemeteries, and public facilities of all kinds from 1896 through 1954, when the legal doctrine of separate but equal was overturned by the Supreme Court’s Brown v. Board of Education decision. However, in wake of recent events in New Orleans, the issues involved in Plessy’s support of segregated transportation retain their relevance and are worth revisiting. For, despite the broad applications that would shape its subsequent history, Plessy ultimately turned on the issue of public access to transportation, which Justice John Marshall Harlan, the sole dissenter on the Plessy verdict, discussed with great eloquence. Railroads, he noted, were public “highways.” Although privately owned, they served the public and exercised public functions, as demonstrated by legislatures’ use of the public-spirited right of eminent domain to seize land for the construction of railroad tracks. “The right to eminent domain nowhere justifies taking property for private use,” he emphasized. Accordingly, Harlan reasoned, all citizens should have equal rights to the use of the railroads as a matter of civil rights. “Personal Liberty,” he maintained, citing Black’s Constitutional Law, “consists of the power of locomotion, or changing situation, or removing one’s person to whatsoever places one’s inclination may direct.” **Harlan’s words are newly resonant in the aftermath of** Hurricane **Katrina**, where we saw a tremendous failure in the power of personal locomotion that was largely defined by race. Katrina’s illustration of persistent and pervasive racial inequalities regarding transportation in the United States suggests how little this nation has really traveled since Plessy. Described by some as a wake-up call about racial inequality in America, Katrina left behind – in the Superdome, stranded on the rooftops of their homes, and paddling through the waters that flooded New Orleans – a group of residents who were overwhelmingly black. Also among those unable to evacuate were prisoners, the elderly and disabled people, both black and white – many of whom did not survive. Indeed, the old and the sick number prominently among Katrina’s fatalities – for obvious reasons. What unifies this group is their social status as immobile people, a status overcome during emergencies only if adequate money and planning are in place. But what explains that race, rather than age and physical fragility, was the common factor that united the vast majority of those who remained in the city after Katrina struck? Of the 270,000 Katrina survivors stuck in New Orleans, 93 percent were black. And those left behind shared characteristics that are often unevenly distributed by race. They were predominantly poor and unskilled: 77 percent had a high school education or less, 68 percent had neither money in the bank nor a useable credit card, and 57 percent had total household incomes of less than $20,000 per year. Poverty is one of the major reasons why many of the evacuees did not manage to leave before the storm. They lacked the resources to either travel or support themselves once they had relocated. Moreover, the evacuees also tended to share one characteristic closely related to both their racial and economic demographics: 55 percent had no car or other way to evacuate. In this respect, Hurricane Katrina’s victims were not unique to New Orleans. Although no longer legally prohibited from traveling freely on the nation’s “public highways,” like their segregation era counterparts, many contemporary African Americans both in New Orleans and elsewhere experience a similar restriction on their mobility, largely as a consequence of low levels of car ownership and a deficient public transportation system. Access to Transportation Across the nation, African Americans are three times more likely to lack a car then whites. Latinos come in second when it comes to carlessness – they are two and half times more likely to own no vehicle. The racial shape of this disparity becomes clear when one looks at the statistics: only 7 percent of white families in the United States own no vehicle, as compared with 21 percent of black households, 17 percent of Latino households, 15 percent of Native American households, and 13 percent of Asian Americans households – and disparities with whites are even greater in urban areas. Across the nation, people of color are also less able to rely on the cars they do own for longer trips, as might be required during emergencies like evacuation. Their cars are usually significantly older and cheaper than those owned by whites. Stereotypes about African Americans favoring Cadillacs not withstanding, cars owned by blacks and Latinos have median values in the $5,000 range, while the value of cars owned by white family households averages well over $12,000. Meanwhile, the many blacks and Latinos who own no car are still worse off, as automobile owners typically have better access to employment, healthcare, affordable housing, and other necessities. More to the point, as Katrina demonstrated, in a disaster, access to a car can be a matter of life or death. **This is especially true in urban areas such as New Orleans**, where people of color constitute a larger portion of the population than they do in the country as a whole. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, people of color make up 30 percent of the nation’s population, but 73 percent of the population in New Orleans. In the counties affected by Hurricane Rita, Katrina, and Wilma in 2005, blacks and Latinos made up 24 percent and 14 percent of the carless households, respectively, whereas only 7 percent of white households lacked a car. These statistics acquire real urgency in the case of disasters such as the hurricanes of 2005. Unlike the citizens of nations such as Germany, Japan, Holland, and Britain, all of which have fairly comprehensive public transportation systems in place, Americans who have no access to cars are carless in a society where an automobile is often crucial to both daily life and emergency transportation. The stranding of African Americans in New Orleans, then, can be read through the intersection of economics and racial discrimination. Although urban dwellers in metropolitan areas with effective public transportation, like New York city, sometimes choose not to own automobiles as a matter of convenience, not owning a car is inconvenient in many other American cities. The infrastructure of the highway informs the preparation of America as a nation obsessed with cars and ownership. As a result, in the Big Easy, as in most of the nation’s urban areas, “public transit is considered a mode of last resort or a novelty for tourists and special events. Most middle-class residents seldom use public transit and so have little reason to support it. As a result, service quality is minimal, and poorly integrated into the overall transport system.” African Americans, however, depend on public transportation despite its many limitation. For low-income African Americans in New Orleans and elsewhere, the economic challenges posed by car ownership and American car culture are only compounded by the expensive and exclusionary forms of discrimination that attend virtually every economic transaction required to buy and maintain an automobile. African Americans routinely pay more for cars of similar value than whites. Though no research group has yet produced a national study of this, a 1996 class action suit against an Atlanta-area car dealership revealed that the dealership routinely made between two and seven times as much profit on cars sold to African Americans as compared with vehicles sold to whites. Moreover, broader evidence from a study performed by economists Ian Ayres and Peter Siegelman suggests that such practices are not unusual. Audits of the car prices offered to more than three hundred pairs of trained testers dispatched to negotiate with Chicago-area car dealerships produced final price offers on which black males were asked to pay $1,100 more than white males for identical vehicles, while the prices offered to black and whte women exceeded those offered to white men by $410 and $92, respectively. Once they do buy a car, blacks and Latinos alike are often required to pay a significantly higher annual percentage rate than whites on car loans – on average, 7.5 percent as compared with 6 percent, which accounts to a difference of $900 over the life of a six-year loan on a $20,000 car. Car insurance differentials, while they vary from state to state, are even more striking. In California, a recent proposal to eliminate zip code insurance premium pricing by the California Insurance Commissions (the outcome of which has yet to be resolved) illuminates the problem. The Consumers Union found that California’s largest insurance companies typically charge a female driver with a perfect driving record and twenty-two years driving experience an average of 12.9 percent, or $152, more if she lives in a predominantly Latino zip code versus a non-Hispanic white area. In some cases, differentials were as high as 66 percent – the surcharge imposed on the predominantly African American residents of Baldwin Hills, California. Another less well documented, but perhaps more formidable barrier to car ownership among black urbanites is the lack of affordable parking in many of their neighborhoods. Suburban development around cities such as New Orleans was designed with car ownership (as well as white flight) in mind, but the older housing stock and apartment buildings that dominate many urban areas do not include garages or space for parking. Moreover, as tourism and business travel increasingly displace other forms of commerce in many historic cities, even less parking is available to residents – making car ownership ever more expensve and difficult in many inner-city neighborhoods.

**The media’s images after disasters like Katrina turn the victims into savages, desecrating their individuality into a new type of reality TV. The government prohibits response by erecting “walls” of economic racism.**

**Žižek 05** (OCTOBER 20, 2005 The Subject Supposed to Loot and Rape Reality and fantasy in New Orleans BY SLAVOJ ŽIŽEK  Slovenian philosopher and psychoanalyst, is a senior researcher at the Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities, in Essen, Germany. He has also been a visiting professor at more than 10 universities around the world. Žižek is the author of many other books, including *Living in the End Times*, *First As Tragedy, Then As Farce*, *The Fragile Absolute*and *Did Somebody Say Totalitarianism?* He lives in London http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/2361/

According to a well-known anecdote, anthropologists studying “primitives” who supposedly held certain superstitious beliefs (that they descend from a fish or from a bird, for example) asked them directly whether they “really” believed such things. They answered: “Of course not–we ‘re not stupid! But I was told that some of our ancestors actually did believe that.” In short, they transferred their belief onto another. We do **the same thing with our children by going** **through the ritual of Santa Claus**. Since our children (are supposed to) believe in him and we do not want to disappoint them, they pretend to believe so as not to disappoint us by puncturing our belief in their naivety (and to get the presents, of course). Isn’t this also the usual excuse of the mythical crooked politician who turns honest? “I cannot disappoint **the ordinary people who believe in me**.” Furthermore**, this** **need to find another who “really believes” is also what propels us to stigmatize the Other** as a (religious or ethnic) “fundamentalist.” In an uncanny way, some beliefs always seem to function “at a distance.” In order for the belief to function, there *has to be* some ultimate guarantor of it, and yet this guarantor is always deferred, displaced, never present *in persona*. The point, of course, is that this other subject who directly believes does not need to actually exist for the belief to be operative: It is enough precisely to *presuppose* his existence, i.e. to *believe* in it, either in the guise of the primitive Other or in the guise of the impersonal “one” (“one believes…”). **The events in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina struck the city provide a new addition to this series of “subjects supposed to…”–*the subject supposed to loot and rape***. We all remember the reports on **the disintegration of public order,** **the explosion of black violence, rape and looting**. However, later inquiries demonstrated that, in the large majority of cases, **these alleged orgies of violence *did not occur*: Non-verified rumors were simply reported as facts by the media**. For example, on September 3, the Superintendent of the New Orleans Police Department told the*New York Times* about conditions at the Convention Center: “**The tourists are walking around there, and as soon as these individuals see them, they ‘re being preyed upon. They are beating, they are raping them in the streets**.” In an interview just weeks later, **he conceded that some of his most shocking statements turned out to be untrue: “We have no official reports to document any murder. Not one official report of rape or sexual assault**.” **The reality of poor blacks, abandoned and left without means to survive, was thus transformed into the specter of blacks exploding violently, of tourists robbed and killed on streets that had slid into anarchy, of the Superdome ruled by gangs that were raping women and children. These reports were not merely words, they were words that had precise *material effects*: They generated fears that caused some police officers to quit and led the authorities to change troop deployments, delay medical evacuations and ground helicopters**. Acadian Ambulance Company, for example, locked down its cars after word came that armed robbers had looted all of the water from a firehouse in Covington–a report that proved totally untrue. Of course, the sense of menace had been ignited by genuine disorder and violence: **Looting, ranging from base thievery to foraging for the necessities of life, *did* occur after the storm passed over New Orleans. However, the (limited) reality of crimes in no way exonerates “reports” on the total breakdown of law and order–not because these reports were “exaggerated,” but for a much more radical reason**. Jacques Lacan claimed that, even if the patient’s wife is really sleeping around with other men, the patient ‘s jealousy is still to be treated as a pathological condition. In a homologous way, **even if rich Jews in early 1930s Germany “really” *had* exploited German workers, seduced their daughters and dominated the popular press, the Nazis ’ anti-Semitism would still have been an emphatically “untrue,” pathological ideological condition. Why? Because the causes of all social antagonisms were projected onto the “Jew”–an object of perverted love-hatred, a spectral figure of mixed fascination and disgust**. And exactly the same goes for the looting in New Orleans: Even if *all* the reports on violence and rapes had proven to be factually true, the stories circulating about them would still be “pathological” and racist, since what motivated **these stories were not facts, but racist prejudices, the satisfaction felt by those who would be able to say: “You see, Blacks really are like that, violent barbarians under the thin layer of civilization!” In other words, we would be dealing with what could be called *lying in the guise of truth*: Even if what I am saying is factually true, the motives that make me say it are false**. Of course, we never openly admit these motives. But from time to time, they nonetheless pop up in our public space in a censored form, in the guise of denegation: Once evoked as an option, they are then immediately discarded. Recall the recent comments by William Bennett, the compulsive gambler and author of *The Book of Virtues*, on his call-in program “Morning in America”: “But I do know that it ‘s true that if you wanted to reduce crime, you could, if that were your sole purpose, you could abort every black baby in this country, and your crime rate would go down. That would be an impossibly ridiculous and morally reprehensible thing to do, but your crime rate would go down.” The White House spokesman immediately reacted: “The president believes the comments were not appropriate.” Two days later, Bennett qualified his statement: “I was putting a hypothetical proposition … and then said about it, it was morally reprehensible to recommend abortion of an entire group of people. But this is what happens when you argue that ends can justify the means.” This is *exactly* what Freud meant when he wrote that the Unconscious knows no negation: **The official (Christian, democratic … ) discourse is accompanied and sustained by a whole nest of obscene, brutal racist and sexist fantasies**, which can only be admitted in a censored form. But we are not dealing here only with good old racism. Something more is at stake, a fundamental feature of the emerging “global” society. On September 11, 2001, the Twin Towers were hit. Twelve years earlier, on November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. November 9 announced the “happy ’90s,” the Francis Fukuyama dream of the “end of history”: **the belief that liberal democracy had, in principle, won, that the search is over, that the advent of a global, liberal world community lurks just around the corner, that the obstacles to this ultra-Hollywood happy ending are merely empirical and contingent (local pockets of resistance where the leaders did not yet grasp that their time is over**). In contrast, 9/11 is the main symbol of the end of the Clintonite happy ’90s, of the forthcoming era in which **new walls are emerging everywhere, between Israel and the West Bank, around the European Union, on the U.S.-Mexico border. The rise of the populist New Right is just the most prominent example of the urge to raise new walls**. A couple of years ago, an ominous decision of the European Union passed almost unnoticed: a plan to establish an all-European border police force to secure the isolation of the Union territory, so as to prevent the influx of the immigrants. *This* is the truth of globalization: the construction of *new* walls safeguarding the prosperous Europe from a flood of immigrants. **One is tempted to resuscitate here the old Marxist “humanist” opposition of “relations between things” and “relations between persons**”: In the much celebrated free circulation opened up by the global capitalism, **it is “things” (commodities) which freely circulate, while the circulation of “persons” is more and more controlled.** We are thus not dealing with “globalization as an unfinished project,” but with a true “dialectics of globalization.” **The segregation of the people is the reality of economic globalization**. This new racism of the developed world is in a way much more brutal than the previous one: Its implicit legitimization is neither naturalist (the “natural” superiority of the developed West) nor culturalist (we in the West also want to preserve our cultural identity). Rather, it ‘s an unabashed economic egotism–the fundamental divide is the one between those included into the sphere of (relative) economic prosperity and those excluded from it. In the beginning of October 2005, the Spanish police, who have dealt with the problem of desperate African migrants trying to penetrate the small Spanish territory across Gibraltar with lethal force, displayed their plans to build a wall between the Spanish and Moroccan border. **The images presented–a complex structure with all the latest electronic equipment–bore an uncanny resemblance to those of the Berlin Wall, only with the opposite motive, designed to prevent people from coming in, not getting out.** The cruel irony is that it is the government of Zapatero, arguably the most anti-racist and tolerant in Europe, that is forced to adopt these measures of segregation–a clear sign of the limits of the multiculturalist “tolerant” approach which preaches open borders and acceptance of Others. It is thus becoming clear that the solution is not “tear down the walls and let them all in,” the easy, empty demand often put forth by soft-hearted liberal “radicals.” Rather, **the real solution is to tear down the *true* wall, not the police one, but the social-economic one: To change society so that people will no longer desperately try to escape their own world**. This brings us back to rumours and “reports” about “subjects supposed to loot and rape:” **New Orleans is one of those cities within the United States most heavily marked by the internal wall that separates the affluent** **from ghettoized blacks**. And it is about those on the other side of the wall that we fantasize: **More and more, they live in another world, in a blank zone that offers itself as a screen for the projection of our fears, anxieties** and secret desires. *The “subject supposed to loot and rape” is on the other side of the Wall*–this is the subject about whom Bennett can afford to make his slips of the tongue and confess in a censored mode his murderous dreams. More than anything else, the rumors and fake reports from the aftermath of Katrina bear witness to the deep class division of American society.

**Hurricane Sandy proves that all cities are vulnerable**

**Bloomer 5** (Meteorlogist, “Other U.S. Cities Prone to Natural Disasters”, <http://www.erh.noaa.gov/car/Newsletter/htm_format_articles/headlines/naturaldisaster_prep_mb.htm)//A> MV

The crisis that hit New Orleans at the end of August was an event emergency planners had been concerned about for many years. Much of the city is below sea level and when hurricane Katrina hit, the storm surge combined with rough seas caused breaks in the levee that flooded the city. The storm was well forecasted; however the magnitude of the disaster was greater than anything emergency responders had dealt with in the past. It left emergency planners asking how a response system could be organized to function much more efficiently in the event of another great disaster. One of the questions forecasters and emergency planners may be asking is “what kinds of disasters are other cities vulnerable to?” **New Orleans is not the only city vulnerable to large scale natural disasters**. Many other American cities are prone to a major natural crisis including the three great cities of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. It may seem gloomy to think of the potential for great disasters, but maintaining an awareness of what the forces of nature can do will keep both emergency planners and the civilian population aware and prepared. I am going to take a look at some specific American cities and cite some foreboding concerns that each may need to consider. New York City is dangerously at risk for a serious coastal flood in the Long Island Sound. The occurrence of an extreme tide requires special conditions combining a very strong Nor’easter with an astronomical high tide. Very strong Nor’easters, the kind which produce wind fields around 70 knots in the open water, occur a couple times a year in the northeast. The Nor’easters that produce the highest storm surges in Long Island Sound take a track close to eastern Long Island producing a northeast wind. The force of the wind upon the water combined with an aquatic Coriolis force known as Eckman transport acts to push the waters at right angles to the wind field. This carries the water in toward the land resulting in a tide much above normal. Super astronomical tides most commonly occur either during spring nights at the time of the full moon or during fall days at the time of the new moon. The combination of a very strong Nor’easter taking the right track and an extreme spring tide are very rare, but could be catastrophic when they occur. The New York City subway system, and many coastal homes, could be submerged during an event of this kind. Being aware that an event like this is possible can help forecasters and emergency responders prepare well ahead of time. Plans to evacuate the New York City subway system and coastal New York and Connecticut should probably be put in place incase an extreme tidal flood ever occurs. Chicago is at risk for a great blizzard which could strand hundreds of thousands of motorists if it hit with the right intensity and at the right time. One of the scenarios for very heavy snow in Chicago would be a low center slowly tracking northeast into western Ohio. A storm in this position may result in a north northwesterly wind over southern Wisconsin and northern Illinois and a north northeasterly wind over Lake Michigan resulting in strong coastal surface convergence near Chicago. Sharp surface convergence combined with vigorous upper level dynamics could combine to generate very heavy snowfall of 2 to 3 inches an hour for several hours in metro Chicago. Snowfall of this intensity can accumulate on road surfaces faster than snow removal crews can clear the roads. This would cause traffic to come to a stand still stranding commuters for hours or even days and putting them at risk for hypothermia or carbon monoxide poisoning. Awareness of this scenario can put emergencies planners including forecasters and local officials in a position of readiness to close roads ahead of time should this ever occur. Boulder Colorado is at risk for a serious flash flood similar to the kind that hit Rapid City in 1972, Big Thompson in 1976 or Fort Collins in 1997. A large thunderstorm complex stationed over Boulder Canyon for several hours, producing close to a foot of rain, could send a surge down the narrow Canyon taking out much of downtown Boulder. Other potential natural disasters include earthquakes and tsunamis along the west coast, fires in California and the Rockies and great tornadoes in the plains. For many of these disasters, it’s not a matter of if they will occur, but when they will occur. Being aware of the risks can prepare cities ahead of time for their potential. New York City needs a very close and cooperative line of communication between the National Weather Service and the New York City transit authority. The transit authority has to have a plan for stopping the trains and getting people out to the streets above in hour’s notice of a flood. The City of Chicago and the cities of the northeast have to strategize a means for getting people off the roads before a blizzard. Boulder needs a flash flood warning system and an evacuation plan in the event of a flood. Preparation for a natural disaster must occur at many levels. Being aware of the risks that each city or location has is the first step. Having the forecasters and observing equipment in place to forecast and issue warnings is another important element. Aggressive communication of the warnings is essential for making sure that everyone who needs to be warned receives the warnings and is aware of how they need to respond. The infrastructure of the town or city should be designed to allow people to evacuate and responders to enter in a rapid and efficient way. There are many areas vulnerable to a variety of natural disasters. But being aware is the first step to being prepared.

**A federal response is the only ethical route. We need to recognize our collective responsibility to vulnerable populations.**

**Giroux, 2006** – Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, previous professors at BU, Miami U, and Penn State (Henry, “Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability”, accessed from JSTOR 7/1/12)//BZ

In a May 25, 2001 interview, Grover Norquist, head of the right-wing group Americans for Tax Reform, told National Public Radios Mara Liasson: “I don’t want to abolish government. I simply want to reduce it to the size where I can drag it into the bathroom and drown it in the bathtub” (Qtd. in Hertmann 2005). As a radical right-wing activist and practical strategist, Norquist has been enormously instrumental and successful in shaping tax policies designed to “starve the beast,” a metaphor for policies designed to drive up deficits by cutting taxes, especially for the rich, in order to paralyze government and dry up funds for many federal programs that offer pro tection for children, the elderly, and the poor. Norquist saw his efforts pay off when thousands of people, most of them poor and black, drowned in the basin of New Orleans and upwards of one million were displaced. Under such circumstances, a decades-long official policy of benign neglect became malign neglect, largely rationalized through a market fundamentalism in which the self-interested striving of individuals becomes the cornerstone of both freedom and democracy. This is a politics that wages war against any viable notion of the democratic social. And as Lawrence Grossberg points out, “The free market in neoliberalism is fundamentally an argument against politics, or at least against a politics that attempts to govern society in social rather than economic terms” (117). The neoliberal efforts to shrink big government and public services must be understood both in terms of those who bore the brunt of such efforts in New Orleans and in terms of the subsequent inability of the government to deal adequately with Hurricane Katrina. Reducing the federal governments ability to respond to social problems is a decisive element of neoliberal policymaking, as was echoed in a Wall Street Journal editorial that argued without irony that taxes should be raised for low-income individuals and families, not to make more money available to the federal government for addressing their needs but to rectify the possibility that they “might not be feeling a proper hatred for the government” (Qtd. in Krugman 2002, 31). If the poor can be used as pawns in this logic to further the political attack on big government, it seems reasonable to assume that those in the Bush administration who hold such a position would refrain from using big government as quickly as possible to save the very lives of such groups, as was evident in the aftermath of Katrina. The vilification of the social state and big government—really an attack on non-military aspects of government—has translated into a steep decline of tax revenues, a massive increase in military spending, and the growing immiseration of poor Americans and people of color. Under the Bush administration, Census Bureau figures reveal that “since 1999, the income of the poorest fifth of Americans has dropped 8.7 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars . . . [and in 2005] 1.1 million were added to the 36 million already on the poverty rolls” (Scheer 2005).While the number of Americans living below the poverty line is comparable to the combined populations of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Texas, and Arkansas, the Bush administration chose to make in the 2006 budget $70 billion in new tax cuts for the rich while slashing programs that benefit the least fortunate (Legum et al 2005). Similarly, the projected $2.7 trillion budget for 2007 includes a $4.9 billion reduction in health funds for senior citizens (Medicare) and the State Children s Health Insurance Program; a $17 million cut in aid for child- support enforcement; cutbacks in funds for low-income people with disabil ities; major reductions in child-care and development block grants; major defunding for housing for low-income elderly; and an unprecedented rollback in student aid. In addition, the 2007 budget calls for another $70 billion dollars in tax cuts most beneficial to the rich and provides for a huge increase in military spending for the war in Iraq (Weisman 2006, A10). While President Bush endlessly argues for the economic benefits of his tax cuts, he callously omits the fact that 13 million children are living in poverty in the United States, “4.5 million more than when Bush was first inaugurated” (Scheer 2005). And New Orleans had the third highest rate of children living in poverty in the United States (Legum et al 2005).The illiteracy rate in New Orleans before the flood struck was 40 percent; the embarrassingly ill-equipped public school system was one of the most underfunded in the nation. Nearly 19 percent of Louisiana residents lacked health insurance, putting the state near the bottom for the percentage of people without health insurance. Robert Scheer, a journalist and social critic, estimated that one-third of the 150,000 people living in dire poverty in Louisiana were elderly, left exposed to the flooding in areas most damaged by Katrina (2005). It gets worse. In an ironic twist of fate, one day after Katrina hit New Orleans, the U.S. Census Bureau released two important reports on poverty, indicating that “Mississippi (with a 21.6 percent poverty rate) and Louisiana (19.4 percent) are the nations poorest states, and that New Orleans (with a 23.2 percent poverty rate) is the 12th poorest city in the nation. [Moreover,] New Orleans is not only one of the nation’s poorest cities, but its poor people are among the most concentrated in poverty ghettos. Housing discrimination and the location of government-subsidized housing have contributed to the city’s economic and racial segregation” (Dreier 2005). Under neoliberal capitalism, the attack on politically responsible government has only been matched by an equally harsh attack on social provisions and safety nets for the poor. And in spite of the massive failures of market-driven neoliberal policies—extending from a soaring $420 billion budget deficit to the underfunding of schools, public health, community policing, and environmental protection programs—the reigning right-wing orthodoxy of the Bush administration continues to “give precedence to private financial gain and market determinism over human lives and broad public values” (Greider 2005). The Bush administration’s ideological hostility towards the essential role that government should play in providing social services and crucial infra-structure was particularly devastating for New Orleans in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Prior to 9/11, the Federal Emergency Management Agency listed a hurricane strike on New Orleans as one of the three most likely catastrophic disasters facing America. The Houston Chronicle wrote in December 2001 that “[t]he New Orleans hurricane scenario may be the deadliest of all” (Krugman 2005). And yet the Bush administration consistently denied repeated requests for funds by the New Orleans Army Corps of Engineers. Ignoring such requests, the Bush administration cut the Army Corps’ funding by more than a half-billion dollars in its 2002 budget, leaving unfinished the construction for the levees that eventually burst. And in spite of repeated warnings far in advance by experts that the existing levees could not withstand a Category 4 hurricane, the Bush administration in 2004 rejected the Southeast Louisiana Urban Flood Control Project’s request for $100 million, offering instead a measly $16.5 million. Huge tax cuts for the rich and massive cuts in much-needed programs continued unabated in the Bush administration, all the while putting the lives of thousands of poor people in the Gulf Basin in jeopardy. As David Sirota has reported, this disastrous underfunding of efforts to build the levee infrastructure, coupled with even more tax cuts for the rich and less revenue for the states, continued right up to the time that Hurricane Katrina struck, making it almost impossible for governments in the Gulf region either to protect their citizens from the impact of a major hurricane or to develop the resources necessary for an adequate emergency response plan in the event of a flood.

**The 1AC is a pedagogical advocacy that opens up new opportunities for democratic deliberation and political action that disrupts the images of “powerlessness” of populations. A recognition of our obligations to the materially deprived helps to combat the biopolitics of disposability*.***

**Giroux, 2006** – Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, previous professors at BU, Miami U, and Penn State (Henry, “Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, Class, and the Biopolitics of Disposability”, accessed from JSTOR 7/1/12)//BZ

Biopolitics is not just about the reduction of selected elements of the population to the necessities of bare life or worse; it is also potentially about enhancing life by linking hope and a new vision to the struggle for reclaiming the social, providing a language capable of translating individual issues into public considerations, and recognizing that in the age of the new media the terrain of culture is one of the most important pedagogical spheres through which to challenge the most basic precepts of the new authoritarianism. The waste machine of modernity, as Bauman points out, must be challenged within a new understanding of environmental justice, human rights, and democratic politics (2000, 15). Negative globalization with its attachment to the mutually enforcing modalities of militarism and racial segregation must be exposed and dismantled. And this demands new forms of resistance that are both more global and differentiated. But if these struggles are going to emerge, especially in the United States, then we need a politics and pedagogy of hope, one that takes seriously Hannah Arendt s call to use the public realm to throw light on the “dark times” that threaten to extinguish the very idea of democracy Against the tyranny of market fundamentalism, religious dogmatism, unchecked militarism, and ideological claims to certainty, an emancipatory biopolitics must enlist education as a crucial force in the struggle over democratic identities, spaces, and ideals. Central to the biopolitics of disposability is the recognition that abiding powerlessness atrophies the public imagination and leads to political paralysis. Consequently, its policies avidly attack critical education at all levels of cultural production in an all-out effort to undermine critical thought, imagination, and substantive agency. To significantly confront the force of a biopolitics in the service of the new authoritarianism, intellectuals, artists, and others in various cultural sites—from schools to higher education to the media—will have to rethink what it means to secure the conditions for critical education both within and outside of the schools. In the context of formal schooling, this means fighting against the corporatization, commercialism, and privatization of public schools. Higher education has to be defended in the same terms. Against the biopolitics of racial exclusion, the university should be a principal site where dialogue, negotiation, mutual understanding, and respect provide the knowledge and experience for students to develop a shared space for affirming differences while simultaneously learning those shared values necessary for an inclusive democratic society. Similarly, both public and higher education must address with new courage the history of American slavery, the enduring legacy of racism in the United States, and its interface with both political nationalism and the enduring market and religious fundamentalisms at work in contemporary society Similarly, racism must be not be reduced to a private matter, a case of individual prejudice removed from the dictates of state violence and the broader realm of politics, and left to matters of “taste, preference, and ultimately, of consumer, or lifestyle choice” (Gilroy 2005,146-47). What must be instituted and fought for in higher education is a critical and anti-racist pedagogy that unsettles, stirs up human consciousness, “breeds dissatisfaction with the level of both freedom and democracy achieved thus far,” and inextricably connects the fates of freedom, democracy, and critical education (Bauman 2003,14). Hannah Arendt once argued that “the public realm has lost the power of illumination,” and one result is that more and more people “have retreated from the world and their obligations within it” (1955, 4).The public realm is not merely a space where the political, social, economic, and cultural interconnect; it is also the pre-eminent space of public pedagogy—that is, a space where subjectivities are shaped, public commitments are formed, and choices are made. As sites of cultural politics and public pedagogy, public spaces offer a unique opportunity for critically engaged citizens, young people, academies, teachers, and various intellectuals to engage in pedagogical struggles that provide the conditions for social empowerment. Such struggles can be waged through the new media, films, publications, radio interviews, and a range of other forms of cultural production. It is especially crucial, as Mark Poster has argued, that scholars, teachers, public intellectuals, artists, and cultural theorists take on the challenge of understanding how the new media technologies construct subjects differently with multiple forms of literacy that engage a range of intellectual capacities (2001). This also means deploying new technologies of communication such as the Internet, camcorder, and cell phone in political and pedagogically strategic ways to build protracted struggles and reclaim the promise of a democracy that insists on racial, gender, and economic equality. The new technoculture is a powerful pedagogical tool that needs to be used, on the one hand, in the struggle against both dominant media and the hegemonic ideologies they produce, circulate, and legitimate, and, on the other hand, as a valuable tool in treating men and women as agents of change, mindful of the consequences of their actions, and utterly capable of pursuing truly egalitarian models of democracy. The promise of a better world cannot be found in modes of authority that lack a vision of social justice, renounce the promise of democracy, and reject the dream of a better future, offering instead of dreams the pale assurance of protection from the nightmare of an all-embracing terrorism. Against this stripped-down legitimation of authority is the promise of public spheres, which in their diverse forms, sites, and content offer pedagogical and political possibilities for strengthening the social bonds of democracy, new spaces within which to cultivate the capacities for critical modes of individual and social agency, and crucial opportunities to form alliances to collectively struggle for a biopolitics that expands the scope of vision, operations of democracy, and the range of democratic institutions—that is, a biopolitics that fights against the terrors of totalitarianism. Such spheres are about more than legal rights guaranteeing freedom of speech; they are also sites that demand a certain kind of citizen informed by particular forms of education, a citizen whose education provides the essential conditions for democratic public spheres to flourish. Cornelius Castoriadis, the great philosopher of democracy, argues that if public space is not to be experienced not as a private affair, but as a vibrant sphere in which people learn how to participate in and shape public life, then it must be shaped through an education that provides the decisive traits of courage, responsibility, and shame, all of which connect the fate of each individual to the fate of others, the planet, and global democracy (1991, 81-123). In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the biopolitical calculus of massive power differentials and iniquitous market relations put the scourge of poverty and racism on full display. To confront the biopolitics of disposability, we need to recognize the dark times in which we live and offer up a vision of hope that creates the conditions for multiple collective and global struggles that refuse to use politics as an act of war and markets as the measure of democracy. Making human beings superfluous is the essence of totalitarianism, and democracy is the antidote in urgent need of being reclaimed.

**Rejecting racism comes first – its the precondition to ethical political decision making.**

**MEMMI** **2000 –** Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Paris (Albert, “RACISM”, translated by Steve Martinot, pp.163-165)

The **struggle against racism will be long, difficult**, without intermission, without remission, **probably never achieved**, yet for this very reason, it is **a** **struggle to be undertaken** without surcease and **without concessions**. **One cannot be indulgent toward racism**. One cannot even let the monster in the house, **especially not in a mask**. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people which is to diminish what is human. **To accept the racist universe** to the slightest degree **is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence**. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. **It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim** (and which [person] man is not [themself] himself an outsider relative to someone else**?). Racism illustrates** in sum, **the** inevitable **negativity** of the condition **of the dominated;** that is it illuminates in a certain sense **the entire human condition**. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduct only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. **One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism** because **racism signifies the exclusion of the other** and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view**,** if one can deploy a little religious language, **racism is “the** truly **capital sin**.**”**fn22 It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All **unjust society contains** within itself **the seeds of its** own **death.** It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall,” says the bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. Itis an ethical and a practical appeal – indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, **the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality**. Because, in the end, **the ethical choice commands the political choice**. **A just society must be a society accepted by all**. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

**Structural harms outweigh**

**Abu-Jamal 98** (Mumia, award-winning PA journalist, 9/19, <http://www.flashpoints.net/mQuietDeadlyViolence.html>)

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural' violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; By "structural violence" I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting "structural" with "behavioral violence" by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. --(Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it--really? Gilligan notes: [E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. [Gilligan, p. 196] Worse still, in a thoroughly capitalist society, much of that violence became internalized, turned back on the Self, because, in a society based on the priority of wealth, those who own nothing are taught to loathe themselves, as if something is inherently wrong with themselves, instead of the social order that promotes this self-loathing. This intense self-hatred was often manifested in familial violence as when the husband beats the wife, the wife smacks the son, and the kids fight each other. This vicious, circular, and invisible violence, unacknowledged by the corporate media, uncriticized in substandard educational systems, and un-understood by the very folks who suffer in its grips, feeds on the spectacular and more common forms of violence that the system makes damn sure -- that we can recognize and must react to it. This fatal and systematic violence may be called The War on the Poor. It is found in every country, submerged beneath the sands of history, buried, yet ever present, as omnipotent as death. In the struggles over the commons in Europe, when the peasants struggled and lost their battles for their communal lands (a precursor to similar struggles throughout Africa and the Americas), this violence was sanctified, by church and crown, as the "Divine Right of Kings" to the spoils of class battle. Scholars Frances Fox-Piven and Richard A Cloward wrote, in The New Class War (Pantheon, 1982/1985): "They did not lose because landowners were immune to burning and preaching and rioting. They lost because the usurpations of owners were regularly defended by the legal authority and the armed force of the state. It was the state that imposed increased taxes or enforced the payment of increased rents, and evicted or jailed those who could not pay the resulting debts. It was the state that made lawful the appropriation by landowners of the forests, streams, and commons, and imposed terrifying penalties on those who persisted in claiming the old rights to these resources. It was the state that freed serfs or emancipated sharecroppers only to leave them landless." The "Law", then, was a tool of the powerful to protect their interests, then, as now. It was a weapon against the poor and impoverished, then, as now. It punished retail violence, while turning a blind eye to the wholesale violence daily done by their class masters. The law was, and is, a tool of state power, utilized to protect the status quo, no matter how oppressive that status was, or is. Systems are essentially ways of doing things that have concretized into tradition, and custom, without regard to the rightness of those ways. No system that causes this kind of harm to people should be allowed to remain, based solely upon its time in existence. Systems must serve life, or be discarded as a threat and a danger to life. Such systems must pass away, so that their great and terrible violence passes away with them.

### Contention Three: Framing

**Impacts should be viewed through the lens of environmental and racial justice– this is necessary to understand and rebuild after Katrina.**

**Sze 06** Julie Sze is an assistant professor in American Studies at the University of California, Davis. Her forthcoming book on the culture, politics and history of environmental justice activism in New York City is under contract with MIT Press. It looks at the intersection of planning and health, especially through the prism of asthma, and at changes in garbage and energy systems as a result of privatization, globalization and deregulation. Toxic Soup Redux: Why Environmental Racism and Environmental Justice Matter after Katrina By Julie Sze Published on: Jun 11, 2006

Thus, the Gulf Coast region was, in many ways, “Ground Zero” of the environmental justice movement, and its advocates led the way in publicizing the troubling racial disparity in exposure to pollution from the oil and petrochemical sectors. But environmental racism refers not only to the disparity of pollution effects, it also refers to the larger systemic problems that caused it, such as the exclusion of voices and perspectives of racial minorities and working-class populations from environmental policy-making. **The term “transportation racism**,” for example, is given by sociologists like Robert Bullard among others **to the application of an environmental justice framework to transportation planning and policy**.6 And given that transportation is a key component of disaster planning and evacuation, the fact that the stranded were poor, black, disproportionately elderly, young and old, and without private transportation reflects dimensions of environmental racism. Environmental justice is also a useful framework for understanding Katrina because it is an integrative approach that refuses a divide between the natural/ environmental and the social/ racial. Environmental justice expands the concept of environment to include public and human health concerns, in addition to natural resources such as air, land and water. Thus, taking an environmental justice perspective on Katrina necessarily refuses an analysis that divides natural and social disasters. This analysis is perhaps best represented by Eric Klinenberg’s account of how race and class intersected with the natural disaster discourse in Chicago’s 1995 heat wave that killed 700 Chicagoans, many of them poor and African-American. He rejects the rhetoric of natural disaster adopted by politicians as a simplified mode of explanation for who, why and how so many died.7 Similarly, environmental justice activists reject race and class “neutrality” by forcing a closer look at who benefits and who bears the burdens of environmental and energy policies. Years before Katrina hit, environmental justice activists were anticipating the racially disproportionate effects of climate change, in terms of coastal flooding and the health effects of heat waves, through the Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (EJCC). The EJCC is a coalition of 28 U.S. environmental justice, climate justice, religious, policy, and advocacy groups that formed to pressure the Bush Administration and Congress on climate change and the Kyoto Protocol. As their 2002 fact sheet stated: “People of color are concentrated in urban centers in the South, coastal regions, and areas with substandard air quality. New Orleans, which is 62 percent African-American and 2 feet below sea level, exemplifies the severe and disproportionate impacts of climate change in the U.S.” 8 Lastly, despite the centrality of environmental racism and environmental justice frameworks to understanding the racially disproportionate ways in which Katrina’s effects and its aftermath were and are being experienced, **this analysis has been largely ignored in media, academic, and policy perspectives**. In part, the lack of analysis stems from the literal disappearance of environmental justice activists from the region who, like millions of others, are displaced or in some cases perhaps dead. Without the vigilance of these environmental justice activists in the rebuilding effort, the clean-up and redevelopment of New Orleans will not include perspectives that prioritize environmental justice and community health concerns.9 This trend is already exemplified by the Bush Administration’s temporary suspension of environmental regulations in the wake of rebuilding, which they hope to make permanent in reconstruction legislation (and that echo the Administration’s suspension of environmental regulations in the name of national security).10 Although these moves to dismantle environmental laws are not surprising, they are particularly dangerous given the literal erasure of the meaning of environmental justice by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency just weeks before Katrina. In June, the Administration announced that it was removing race and class from special consideration in its definition of environmental justice, pulling back from Clinton’s 1994 Executive Order on Environmental Justice which mandated that all federal agencies generate agency-specific strategies to address the disproportionate pollution experienced by minority communities, and set a controversial and abbreviated public comment period, ending just 10 days before Katrina hit. Thus, **the moment that the concept of environmental racism is being most attacked**, is paradoxically the most crucial time to bring environmental justice back into the center of the analysis of Katrina in particular, and of how the health and environments of communities of color in the United States in general are fundamentally shaped by race and class considerations. **Inserting an environmental justice framework into Hurricane Katrina ensures that the perspectives of local environmental justice activists, community and environmental health views on rebuilding New Orleans, and the concept of environmental justice in national policy terms, will not be easily erased**. The vibrancy of the regional environmental justice movement was a product of local histories of economic development, environmental pollution, and race relations. With Katrina, we need to hear more, not less, from environmental justice activists who have been long engaged with the toxic, environmental and disaster politics in the region.

**Pure consequentialism is impossible – there are too many reactions that are unforeseeable – as an alternative, we suggest a view of morals. This is because we can understand the virtue of an action but we can never understand the consequences**

**Lenman 00** Univeristy of Glasglow and the United Kingdom Arts and Humanities Research Board.Consequentialism and Cluelessness Author(s): James Lenman Reviewed work(s): Source: Philosophy & Public Affairs, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Autumn, 2000), pp. 342-370 Published by: Blackwell Publishing Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2672830 . Accessed: 24/07/2012 09:53

A typical morally significant action will have a host of consequences that are neither foreseen nor foreseeable. Distant causal ramifications such as the atrocities performed by Angie's distant descendants are of this sort. Let us call these the invisible consequences of an action as op- posed to its visible consequences. The distinction is vague. Some consequences might be visible only to a heroically conscientious agent; others might be visible to the agent but only as more-or-less salient risks. There are some consequences we can confidently expect and others that are merely envisaged as more or less likely. Rather than bogging down in \*this complication, let us count as invisible only consequences that are, in practice, not visible to an ideally conscientious agent, where this is nonetheless a human agent and not some Laplacean fantasy; an agent we will suppose to have weighted all envisaged consequences by prob- ability in some ideally reasonable but humanly manageable way. It remains likely that most of an action's consequences will be invisible, especially for the more intuitively morally significant actions. Here is what I suggest nonconsequentialists may plausibly say an agent should do about the invisible consequences of his or her actions. Rather than act on the profoundly shaky assumption that they cancel each other out, the agent should ordinarily simply not regard them as of moral concern. The agent should not think of himself or herself as maximizing the goodness of the consequences of his or her action by maximizing that of the expected consequences and hoping these manage to be somehow representative. Rather insofar as the agent's concern is with consequences at all, it is with visible consequences that he or she should be, even indi- rectly, concerned. It is not an objection to this claim as I have formulated it that we often plausibly have a duty not to be negligent in exploring and anticipating the consequences of our action. For I have defined "visible" to mean, not de facto foreseen but foreseeable to an ideally conscientious agent. It is certainly plausible that we have duties to be conscientious in this way but that is nothing to do with invisible consequences as defined. If you find consequentialism attractive, you will think this a surpris- ing claim. For a consequentialist the point of maximizing the goodness in the visible consequences of our actions has to be as a means to maximizing the goodness in their overall consequences. But if the foregoing reasoning is sound, we have only the most feeble of grounds to suppose that means-or any feasible other-is a remotely reliable means to this end. It may, however, make far better sense for ethical theories for which the focus is on the character of agents and the qualities of their wills, for theories that are broadly Kantian or Aristotelian in spirit. Such theories would move us away from consequentialism to some radically less impersonal understanding of how best to live whereby we should be morally engaged not by the quite futile project of promoting good long-term results but by more local projects and concerns whereby, recognizing the fact of our epistemic limitations, we seek nonetheless to live virtuously, with dignity and mutual respect. What matters for theories such as these is the virtues of character our actions manifest and/or the forms of respect we show for others in acting; and perhaps in particular (many such theories are not ashamed to say) for certain others, those closest to us in a number of senses of "close," those most concerned in the inten- tions and warranted expectations on which we act. What is common ground to all plausible ethical theories is the moral significance of visible consequences. When we can foresee harm to others in the outcome of our actions, we owe them the respect of taking this properly into account. And we owe it to others also to be adequately conscientious in foreseeing such harm. Of course, the invisible consequences of action very plausibly matter too, but there is no clear reason to suppose this mattering to be a matter of moral significance any more than the consequences, visible or otherwise, of earthquakes or meteor im- pacts (although they may certainly matter enormously) need be matters of, in particular, moral concern. There is nothing particularly implau- sible here. It is simply to say, for example, that the crimes of Hitler, al- though they were a terrible thing, are not something we can sensibly raise in discussion of the moral failings or excellences of Richard's conduct. This could be justified on a number of theoretical perspectives. Thus a Scanlonian contractualist2l might plausibly urge that, on principles that we could not reasonably reject, Richard owes it to Angie not to kill her but does not plausibly owe it to the Poles, Russians, Jews, and others of a distant generation not to perform actions with massive causal ramifica- tions that might result in harm to them. He would have the first obliga- tion because recognizing it is a quite fundamental way in which he shows respect for her; but he would lack the second because it is manifestly unreasonable not to agree to principles that limit the sphere of our re- sponsibility to those harms and goods that are visible to us. A consequentialist might seek to agree to this limiting of moral focus by again taking the line that, in matters of assessing the moral or rational merits of actions, of assigning praise and blame, we should concern ourselves with subjective rightness, for subjective rightness is precisely concerned only with visible consequences. The trouble is that, as I have noted, a consequentialist must understand this concern as motivated by the belief that maximizing value with respect to visible consequences is a reliable means to maximizing value with respect to overall consequences. And this belief does not appear at all secure.22 Given this, we might prefer a theory that tells a different story about what the point is of our concern with visible consequences. And such a story would precisely not be consequentialist.

**The state is inevitable – our obligation is to make it as ethical as possible**

**Simmons 99** William Paul, current Associate Professor of Political Science at ASU, formerly at Bethany College in the Department of History and Political Science, “The Third: Levinas' theoretical move from an-archical ethics to the realm of justice and politics,” Philosophy & Social Criticism November 1, 1999 vol. 25 no. 6

Since ‘it is impossible to escape the State’, 70 Levinas insists that the state be made as ethical as possible. The world of institutions and justice must be held in check by the an-archical responsibility for the Other. Levinas calls for both an-archy and justice. Alongside the an-archical responsibility for the Other there is a place for the realm of the said, which includes ontology, justice and politics. Levinas’ thought is not apolitical as many have charged. His harsh critiques of the political realm refer to a politics unchecked by ethics. For example, in Totality and Inﬁnity, Levinas sees politics as antithetical to an ethics based on the Other. ‘The art of foreseeing war and winning it by every means – politics – is henceforth enjoined as the very exercise of reason. Politics is opposed to morality, as philosophy to naïveté.’ 71 Politics unrestrained, by necessity, totalizes the Other by reducing him or her to abstract categories. Levinas will call for a politics that is founded on ethics and not on ontology. The state must be answerable to the an-archical relationship with the Other, it must strive to maintain the exteriority of the Other. Levinasian heteronomic political thought oscillates between the saying and the said, an-archy and justice, ethics and politics. The liberal state is the concrete manifestation of this oscillation. Levinas calls for a balance between the Greek and the Judaic traditions. Neither tradition should dominate. The fundamental contradiction of our situation (and perhaps of our condition) . . . that both the hierarchy taught by Athens and the abstract and slightly anarchical ethical individualism taught by Jerusalem are simultaneously necessary in order to suppress the violence.0020Each of these principles, left to itself, only hastens the contrary of what it wants to secure.

Politics of crisis-control can never hope to address the underlying structures of violence. Every singular “war” the negative hopes to prevent will just reappear over and over again—every time we do crisis-control, it trades off with deeper structural changes.

Chris J. Cuomo, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Cincinnati, 1996 (“War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence,” *Hypatia*, Volume 11, Number 4, Fall, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 31-32)

Ethical approaches that do not attend to the ways in which warfare and military practices are woven into the very fabric of life in twenty-first century technological states lead to crisis-based politics and analyses. For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives. Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism. Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies concerning war and military violence also enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance. For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war." Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns.

**Util promotes a decision calculus that is inherently racist - if we win our ethics then you vote aff before you ever consider a body count. Voting neg denies the value to life**

**Odell 2004** (University of Illinois is an Associate Professor of Philosophy (Jack, Ph.D., “On Consequentialist Ethics,” Wadsworth, Thomson Learning, Inc., pp. 98-103) Herm

A classic objection to both act and rule utilitarianism has to do with inequity, and is related to the kind of objection raised by Rawls, which I will consider shortly. Suppose we have two fathers-Andy and Bob. Suppose further that they are alike in all relevant respects, both have three children, make the same salary, have the same living expenses, put aside the same amount in savings, and have left over each week fifteen dollars. Suppose that every week Andy and Bob ask themselves what they are going to do with this extra money, and Andy decides anew each week (AU) to divide it equally among his three children, or he makes a decision to always follow the rule (RU) that each child should receive an equal percentage of the total allowance money. Suppose further that each of his children receive five degrees of pleasure from this and no pain. Suppose on the other hand, that Bob, who strongly favors his oldest son, Bobby, decides anew each week (AU) to give all of the allowance money to Bobby, and nothing to the other two, and that he instructs Bobby not to tell the others, or he makes a decision to follow the rule (RU) to always give the total sum to Bobby. Suppose also that Bobby gets IS units of pleasure from his allowance and that his unsuspecting siblings feel no pain. The end result of the actions of both fathers is the same-IS units of pleasure. Most, if not all, of us would agree that although Andy's conduct is exemplary, Bob's is culpable. Nevertheless, according to both AU and RU the fathers in question are morally *equal.* Neither father is more or less exemplary or culpable than the other. I will refer to the objection implicit in this kind of example as (H) and state it as: ' (H) Both act and rule utilitarianism violate the principle of just distribution. What Rawls does is to elaborate objection (H). Utilitarianism, according to Rawls, fails to appreciate the importance of distributive justice, and that by doing so it makes a mockery of the concept of "justice." As I pointed out when I discussed Russell's views regarding partial goods, satisfying the interests of a majority of a given population while at the same time thwarting the interests of the minority segment of that same population (as occurs in societies that allow slavery) can maximize the general good, and do so even though the minority group may have to suffer great cruelties. Rawls argues that the utilitarian commitment to maximize the good in the world is due to its failure to ''take seriously the distinction between persons."· One person can be forced to give up far too much to insure the maximization of the good, or the total aggregate satisfaction, as was the case for those young Aztec women chosen by their society each year to be sacrificed to the Gods for the welfare of the group.

**Racism creates a permanent condition of war**

**Mendieta 02**, Eduardo Mendieta, PhD and Associate professor of Stonybrook School of Philosophy, “‘To make live and to let die’ –Foucault on Racism Meeting of the Foucault Circle, APA Central Division Meeting” http://www.stonybrook.edu/commcms/philosophy/people/faculty\_pages/docs/foucault.pdf

This is where racism intervenes, not from without, exogenously, but from within, constitutively. For the emergence of biopower as the form of a new form of political rationality, entails the inscription within the very logic of the modern state the logic of racism. For racism grants, and here I am quoting: “the conditions for the acceptability of putting to death in a society of normalization. Where there is a society of normalization, where there is a power that is, in all of its surface and in first instance, and first line, a bio-power, racism is indispensable as a condition to be able to put to death someone, in order to be able to put to death others. The homicidal [meurtrière] function of the state, to the degree that the state functions on the modality of bio-power, can only be assured by racism “(Foucault 1997, 227) To use the formulations from his 1982 lecture “The Political Technology of Individuals” –which incidentally, echo his 1979 Tanner Lectures –the power of the state after the 18th century, a power which is enacted through the police, and is enacted over the population, is a power over living beings, and as such it is a biopolitics. And, to quote more directly, “since the population is nothing more than what the state takes care of for its own sake, of course, the state is entitled to slaughter it, if necessary. So the reverse of biopolitics is thanatopolitics.” (Foucault 2000, 416). Racism, is the thanatopolitics of the biopolitics of the total state. They are two sides of one same8 political technology, one same political rationality: the management of life, the life of a population, the tending to the continuum of life of a people. And with the inscription of racism within the state of biopower, the long history of war that Foucault has been telling in these dazzling lectures has made a new turn: the war of peoples, a war against invaders, imperials colonizers, which turned into a war of races, to then turn into a war of classes, has now turned into the war of a race, a biological unit, against its polluters and threats. Racism is the means by which bourgeois political power, biopower, re-kindles the fires of war within civil society. **Racism normalizes and medicalizes war. Racism makes war the permanent condition of society, while at the same time masking its weapons of death and torture.** As I wrote somewhere else, **racism banalizes genocide by making quotidian the lynching of suspect threats to the health of the social body. Racism makes the killing of the other**, of others, **an everyday occurrence by internalizing and normalizing the war of society against its enemies**. To protect society entails we be ready to kill its threats, its foes, and if we understand society as a unity of life, as a continuum of the living, then these threat and foes are biological in nature.

**Embracing the Other makes war impossible**

**Caygill 02** Howard, Professor of Cultural History at Goldsmiths College, University of London, Levinas and the Political

#### The other makes possible the time of labour and possession while also putting it into question. It makes possible the time of war while forbidding murder. This is because the other teaches the I, showing it to be implicated in a totality of opposed forces. Through this teaching, the I ‘discovers itself as a violence, but thereby enters into a new dimension’ (TI, 171). Levinas takes several precautions to ensure that the other cannot be considered to be on a war footing with the I that it has made and now challenges. The other is above totality, not within it; the other is ‘fundamentally pacific’, not another freedom to oppose mine; its ‘alterity is manifested in mastery that does not conquer, but teaches’ (TI, 171). Its teaching is essentially moral, putting into question violence and substituting the word for war in a ‘primordial dispossession, a first donation’ (TI, 173). Yet there is need for more argument to sustain the claims that this dispossession is not an act of war, tha Even if they make race visible, since it’s a debate and we have to give a 1NC, we are literally incapable of agreeing with them. Teams write blocks and cut strats to beat them, not to cooperate in changing the community.  They actively trade-off with productive public non-competitive discourse outside of rounds—prefer our evidence because it’s specific to debate practice, not just academia

Atchison and Panetta ‘9 [Jarrod Atchison, Director of Debate @ Trinity University, and Edward Panetta, Director of Debate @ the University of Georgia, Intercollegiate Debate and Speech Communication: Issues for the Future, p. 317-34 //liam]

**The larger problem** with locating the “debate as activism” perspective within the competitive framework **is that it overlooks the communal nature of the community problem. If each** individual **debate is a decision about how the debate community should approach a problem**, then the **losing debaters become collateral damage in the activist strategy** dedicated toward creating community change. One frustrating example of this type of argument might include a judge voting for an activist team in an effort to help them reach elimination rounds to generate a community discussion about the problem. Under this scenario, **the losing team serves as a sacrificial lamb on the altar of community change. Downplaying the important role of competition and treating opponents as scapegoats** for the failures of the community may increase the profile of the winning team and the community problem, but **it does little to generate the critical coalitions necessary to address the community problem, because the competitive focus encourages teams to concentrate on how to beat the strategy with little regard for addressing the community problem**. There is no role for competition when a judge decides that it is important to accentuate the publicity of a community problem. An extreme example might include a team arguing that their opponents’ academic institution had a legacy of civil rights abuses and that the judge should not vote for them because that would be a community endorsement of a problematic institution. This scenario is a bit more outlandish but not unreasonable if one assumes that each debate should be about what is best for promoting solutions to diversity problems in the debate community.¶ If the debate community is serious about generating community change, then it is more likely to occur outside a traditional competitive debate**. When a team loses a debate because the judge decides that it is better for the community for the other team to win, then they have sacrificed two potential advocates for change** within the community. Creating change through wins generates backlash through losses. **Some proponents are comfortable with generating backlash and argue that the reaction is evidence that the issue is being discussed.**¶From our perspective, **the discussion that results from these hostile situations is not a productive one where participants seek to work together** for a common goal. Instead of giving up on hope for change and agitating for wins regardless of who is left behind, **it seems more reasonable that the debate community should try the method of public argument that we teach in an effort to generate a discussion of necessary community changes**. Simply put, debate competitions do not represent the best environment for community change because it is a competition for a win and only one team can win any given debate, whereas addressing systemic century-long community problems requires a tremendous effort by a great number of people.

#### Their necessity for a pedagogical advocacy fails – it’s doomed to be ineffective unless it adopts a capital-centric approach

**McLaren 2k- prof at UCLA** (Peter, “Knowledge and power in the global economy,” edited by David Gabbard, Chapter 39. *Critical Pedagogy*//MGD*)*

Critical pedagogy has become closely allied with multicultural education (McLaren, 1995; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995). However, **just as we have witnessed in** the project of **critical pedagogy an avoidance of** **issues related to class** and the social relations of production, **so too have we witnessed in multicultural education an absence of discussions linking the practice of racism to capitalist social relations**. Consequently, bo**th critical pedagogy and multicultural education need to address themselves to** **the adaptive persistence of capitalism** and to issues of capitalist imperialism and its specific manifestation of accumulative capacities through conquest (which we know as colonialism). In other words, **critical pedagogy needs to establish a project of emancipation centered around** t**he transformation of property relations and the creation of a j**ust **system** **of** appropriation and **distribution of social wealth**. **The domestication of critical pedagogy has not infirmed its revolutionary potential.**

#### The affirmative engages in a framework of ordering in which, through progressive solutions, they attempt to solve problems through an externalized global framework. This top-down methodology produces global ordering and replicates violence.

Nayar 99 Jayan, associate professor at the School of Law at University of Warwick, “SYMPOSIUM: RE-FRAMING INTERNATIONAL LAW FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: Orders of Inhumanity,” Fall 1999, 9 Transnat'l L. & Contemp. Probs. 599, lexis

The discussion in this article thus far on the technologies of ordering may be regarded by some readers as being quite irrelevant to our current concerns of addressing the ills of the world. However, I must disagree. My purpose in engaging in this discussion has been to relocate ourselves, the "critics" of world (mis)orderings within the social sphere of ordered violence. As we contemplate transformations, therefore, it is essential that we do not detach ourselves from the "worlds" which are the objects of our critique and imaginations. To some, those who might have the occasion to read this current article, the changes brought about by the advent of the so-called post-colonial, post-communist, post-ideological, post-modern period may indeed have been beneficial. Some of us--the expert intellectual community, the development planners, the security strategists, the bureaucratic elites, even the "students" who might have been encoura ged to refer to the insights contained in this Symposium--are, to some extent or the other, the beneficiaries of this [\*626] order(ing). From this location, then, it becomes not too difficult to rationalize the limited successes, if not defend the fundamentals, of "our world" within a transnational, global reality. n49 It becomes not too difficult to intellectualize pleasure and pain and to project toward ever-more "new beginnings" in which the virtues of "our world" may be extolled. For this is the "truth" of the "world" as experienced within these locations of privilege. Others among us, without the comforts of such complacencies and with the best of intentions, may seek to extend and apply the benefits of the world that we know, that is "our" truth, to those who we identify as being "excluded." The politics of inclusion then dominates our attention--inclusion of the poor in "development," inclusion of the terrorized in the framework of "security," inclusion of all those thus far marginalized into the "world." n50 The keyword for this new politics of inclusion, we often hear, is "participation." So we might struggle to bring the excluded within the fora of national, international and transnational organizations, articulate their interests and demand service to their cause. And yet, so much inclusion has done little to change the culture of violence. However sympathetic, even empathetic, we may be to the cause of the "subaltern," however sophisticated and often self-complicating our exposition of violence, one thing is difficult for us to face: when all is said and done, most of us engaged in these transformatory endeavors are far removed from the existential realities of "subaltern" [\*627] suffering. For "them," what is the difference, I wonder, between the violence of new orders and that of the old, what is the difference between the new articulations of violence and those of the old, when violence itself is a continuing reality? But we push on, keeping ourselves busy. What else can we do but suggest new beginnings? I am not suggesting that all "new beginnings" of world-order, past and present, were envisioned with cynical intent. Quite the opposite is the reason for the point I wish to make. The persistent realities of violence within "ordered" worlds are all the more glaring when we acknowledge that they arise in the name of human aspirations that were mostly articulated by progressive forces, in the wake of real struggles, to contribute to the transformation of the inequities and violence of the then existing "orders." Yet more and more talk of universal human welfare, transformed world-orders, new beginnings and the like have only given us more and more occasion to lament the resulting dashed hopes. My questioning is not of intent, or of commitment, or of the sincerity of those who advocate world-order transformations. Rather, my questionings relate to a perspective on "implications." Here, there is a very different, and more subtle, sort of globalized world-order that we need to consider--the globalization of violence, wherein human relationships become disconnected from the personal and are instead conjoined into distant and distanced chains of violence, an alienation of human and human. And by the nature of this new world-ordering, as the web of implication in relational violence is increasingly extended, so too, the vision of violence itself becomes blurred and the voice, muted. Through this implication into violence, therefore, the order(ing) of emancipatory imagination is reinforced. What we cannot see, after all, we cannot speak; what we refuse to see, we dare not speak.

#### Additionally, the affirmative externalizes violence through role-play – they conceive violence as a problem to be addressed by the state or other grand institutions, upholding the mindset that responsibility for violence rests solely on someone else’s shoulders. This makes violence inevitable.

Kappeler 95 Susanne, Professor at Cal-Berkeley and Al-Akhawayn University, The Will to Violence: The Politics of Personal Behavior, pg 10-11

‘We are the war’ does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society—which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of collective irresponsibility1, where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equivalent of a universal acquittal. 6 On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyze the specific and differential responsibilities of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective ‘assumption’ of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility**—**leading to the –well-known illusion of our apparent ‘powerlessness’and its accompanying phenomenon, our so-called political disillusionment**.** Single citizens- even more so those of other nations – have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia – since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgment, and thus into underrating the respons­ibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls ‘organized irresponsibility’, upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or­ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers**.** Forwe tend to think that we cannot ‘do’ anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made**.** Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of ‘What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?’ Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as ‘virtually no possibilities’: what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN — finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like ‘I want to stop this war’, ‘I want military intervention’, ‘I want to stop this backlash’, or ‘I want a moral revolution.’7 ‘We are this war’, however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so—called peace talks, namely as Drakuli~ says, in our non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer**.** And we ‘are’ the war in our ‘unconscious cruelty towards you’, our tolerance of the ‘fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don’t’ — our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the ‘others’.We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape ‘our feelings, our relationships, our values’ according to the structures and the values of war and violence.

### Solvency

#### Policymakers attempts to impose order and certainty on the world result in constant war and violence

**Burke in 2007**

(Anthony, Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at UNSW, Sydney, “Ontologies of War: Violence, Existence and Reason”, Theory & Event, Volume 10, Issue 2, 2007, pMUSE, cheek)

# At the same time, **Kissinger's hubris and hunger for control was beset by a corrosive anxiety: that, in an era of nuclear weapons proliferation and constant military modernisation**, of geopolitical stalemate in Vietnam, and the emergence and militancy of new post-colonial states, **order and mastery were harder to define and impose**. He worried over the way 'military bipolarity' between the superpowers had 'encouraged political multipolarity', which 'does not guarantee stability. **Rigidity is diminished, but so is manageability...equilibrium is difficult to achieve among states widely divergent in values, goals, expectations and previous experience'** (emphasis added). He mourned that 'the greatest need of the contemporary international system is an agreed concept of order'.57 **Here were the driving obsessions of the modern rational statesman based around a hunger for stasis and certainty that would entrench U.S. hegemony**: For the two decades after 1945, our international activities were based on the assumption that technology plus managerial skills gave us the ability to reshape the international system and to bring about domestic transformations in "emerging countries". This direct "operational" concept of international order has proved too simple. **Political multipolarity makes it impossible to impose an American design.** Our deepest challenge will be to evoke the creativity of a pluralistic world, to base order on political multipolarity even though overwhelming military strength will remain with the two superpowers.58 **Kissinger's statement revealed that such cravings for order and certainty continually confront chaos, resistance and uncertainty: clay that won't be worked, flesh that will not yield, enemies that refuse to surrender. This is one of the most powerful lessons of the Indochina wars, which were to continue in a phenomenally destructive fashion for six years after Kissinger wrote these words.** Yet as his sinister, Orwellian exhortation to 'evoke the creativity of a pluralistic world' demonstrated, Kissinger's hubris was undiminished. This is a vicious, historic irony: a desire to control nature, technology, society and human beings that is continually frustrated, but never abandoned or rethought. By 1968 U.S. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the rationalist policymaker par excellence, had already decided that U.S. power and technology could not prevail in Vietnam; **Nixon and Kissinger's refusal to accept this conclusion, to abandon their Cartesian illusions, was to condemn hundreds of thousands more to die in Indochina and the people of Cambodia to two more decades of horror and misery**.59 In 2003 there would be a powerful sense of déja vu as another Republican Administration crowned more than decade of failed and destructive policy on Iraq with a deeply controversial and divisive war to remove Saddam Hussein from power. **In this struggle with the lessons of Vietnam, revolutionary resistance, and rapid geopolitical transformation, we are witness to an enduring political and cultural theme: of a craving for order, control and certainty in the face of continual uncertainty. Closely related to this anxiety was the way that Kissinger's thinking -- and that of McNamara and earlier imperialists** like the British Governor of Egypt Cromer -- **was embedded in instrumental images of technology and the machine: the machine as both a tool of power and an image of social and political order**. In his essay 'The Government of Subject Races' Cromer envisaged effective imperial rule -- over numerous societies and billions of human beings -- as best achieved by a central authority working 'to ensure the harmonious working of the different parts of the machine'.60 **Kissinger analogously invoked the virtues of 'equilibrium', 'manageability' and 'stability' yet, writing some six decades later, was anxious that technological progress no longer brought untroubled control: the Westernising 'spread of technology and its associated rationality**...**does not inevitably produce a similar concept of reality'**.61 # **We sense the rational policymaker's frustrated desire: the world is supposed to work like a machine, ordered by a form of power and governmental reason which deploys machines and whose desires and processes are meant to run along ordered, rational lines like a machine**. Kissinger's desire was little different from that of Cromer who, wrote Edward Said: ...envisions a seat of power in the West and radiating out from it towards the East a great embracing machine, sustaining the central authority yet commanded by it. What the machine's branches feed into it from the East -- human material, material wealth, knowledge, what have you -- is processed by the machine, then converted into more power...the immediate translation of mere Oriental matter into useful substance.62 # **This desire for order in the shadow of chaos and uncertainty** -- **the constant war with an intractable and volatile matter -- has deep roots in modern thought, and was a major impetus to the development of technological reason and its supporting theories of knowledge**. As Kissinger's claims about **the West's Newtonian desire for the 'accurate' gathering and classification of 'data' suggest, modern strategy, foreign policy and Realpolitik have been thrust deep into the apparently stable soil of natural science, in the hope of finding immovable and unchallengeable roots there**. While this process has origins in ancient Judaic and Greek thought, it crystallised in philosophical terms most powerfully during and after the Renaissance. The key figures in this process were Francis Bacon, Galileo, Isaac Newton, and René Descartes, who all combined a hunger for political and ontological certainty, a positivist epistemology and a naïve faith in the goodness of invention. Bacon sought to create certainty and order, and with it a new human power over the world, through a new empirical methodology based on a harmonious combination of experiment, the senses and the understanding. With this method, he argued, we can 'derive hope from a purer alliance of the faculties (the experimental and rational) than has yet been attempted'.63 In a similar move, **Descartes sought to conjure certainty from uncertainty through the application of a new method that moved progressively out from a few basic certainties (the existence of God, the certitude of individual consciousness and a divinely granted faculty of judgement) in a search for pure fixed truths**. Mathematics formed the ideal image of this method, with its strict logical reasoning, its quantifiable results and its uncanny insights into the hidden structure of the cosmos.64 Earlier, Galileo had argued that scientists should privilege 'objective', quantifiable qualities over 'merely perceptible' ones; that 'only by means of an exclusively quantitative analysis could science attain certain knowledge of the world'.65 **Such doctrines of mathematically verifiable truth were to have powerful echoes in the 20th Century, in the ascendancy of systems analysis, game theory, cybernetics and computing in defense policy and strategic decisions, and in the awesome scientific breakthroughs of nuclear physics**, **which unlocked the innermost secrets of matter and energy and applied the most advanced applications of mathematics and computing to create the atomic bomb.** Yet this new scientific power was marked by a terrible irony: **as even Morgenthau understood, the control over matter afforded by the science could never be translated into the control of the weapons themselves, into political utility and rational strategy**.66

#### Media coverage of Katarina only furthered the lines between different races there

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

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

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

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

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

#### Transportation infrastructure is designed to maximize the extraction of labor from the populace and identify and quarantine social deviants and unproductive workers

Elden ‘8 Stuart Elden, “Strategies for Waging Peace: Foucault as Collaborateur,” Foucault on Politics, Security and War, ed. Michael Dillon and Andrew W. Neal, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2008, p. 28-30

In sum, over a million francs was projected for this work, worth about 773,000 euros today, 13 enough to support a fairly large team for a few years. 14 Various outputs came from this work, culminating in the book Les équipements du pouvoir which was originally published as a special issue of the journal Recherches in 1973, and then reissued in 1976. 15 Recherches was the house journal of CERFI, and although all the projects clearly influenced the work, this is very much based on Fourquet’s research project. 16 The equipments of power analysed in this book are the three items in the subtitle: towns, territories and ‘collective equipments’ – équipements collectifs. By these Fourquet and Murard mean something akin to public amenities or the infrastructure of society. These are tools or utensils that are utilised collectively – roads, transportation and communication networks, and the more static apparatus of towns. Circulation necessarily plays a crucial role, with the flux and flow of people, goods and capital as money (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 35). For Fourquet and Murard, these elements of infrastructure are means of production, or perhaps more accurately the means by which production can be achieved (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 32). The town is in their terms a ‘collective equipment’, ‘and the network [réseau] of towns distribute capital across the whole of the national territory’ (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 35). Foucault himself takes place in two dialogues in the book, after the outlining of various ideas by Fourquet and Murard. 17 In the English translation of the dialogues the order is reversed, and the accompanying material left aside. This makes for a peculiarly decontextualised discussion. Fourquet and Murard note that the three key terms that they are interested in thinking through are power, territory and production, particularly in their interrelation (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 7). The stress on power and territory within a broadly Marxist analysis allows for a ‘displacement’ rather than a revision or critique (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 8). This context is supplemented by an interest in Deleuze and Guattari’s work Anti-Oedipus, and earlier texts which the authors received while working on this, and an interest in Foucault’s work on madness and the clinic (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 10). The original title of the work, Généalogie des équipements collectives (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 9) perhaps betrays this Foucaultian influence – a Foucault then engaging with Nietzsche’s ideas in detail. Indeed in the extended introduction, Fourquet and Murard acknowledge Deleuze and Foucault’s readings of Nietzsche, as well as the pioneering work of Bataille and Klossowski (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 17). All sorts of Foucaultian themes are found in this work – the use of the panopticon, relations of power and knowledge, surveillance, control of population and normalisation of individuals and so on. The dating of the material to the early 1970s shows that this relation was not solely a one-way influence. Murard and Fourquet utilise Foucault’s research on madness, medicine and other issues, but the bulk of the material predates Discipline and Punish, although there is some editing between the 1973 journal article and the 1976 book. Some of Foucault’s ideas about the division of space in schools and the control of children’s bodies and medical plans for towns are discussed in this work (see Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 197–8, 210). A range of other contemporary thinkers are utilised, including those of a more obviously Marxist perspective such as Lefebvre (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 55–6) and Castells. The ideas of normalisation are explicitly related to Canguilhem, just as Foucault does in his Les Anormaux lectures (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 155, see 7). But the other key role is played by Fernand Braudel, who is mentioned in a number of places (Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 7, 10). The book is organised on the following plan: • La ville-ordinateur – the town-machine • La ville-métaphore – the town-metaphor • Les territoires – territories • Formation des équipements collectives – formation of collective equipments or facilities • Le discours du plan – the discourse of the plan • Économie politique sans famille – political economy without the family. In the second dialogue Foucault takes the example of a road, and suggests that it plays three strategic functions: to produce production, to produce demand, and to normalise. While the first two are unsurprising from a Marxist perspective, the third is perhaps most interesting. Production requires transport, the movement of goods and labour, and the levies or tithes of state power and tax collector. The bandit is an ‘antithetical person’ in these relations. Demand requires ‘the market, merchandise, buyers and sellers’, it creates a whole system of coded places of business, regulates prices and goods sold. The inspector, controller or customs agent face-to-face with the smuggler of contraband, the peddler (Foucault, 1996: p. 106; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 215–16). Both production and demand are the subject of the procedure of normalisation, in the adjusting and regulation of these two domains. Foucault talks about the aménagement du territoire, the control and planning of the land or territory of the state that the road allows. The role of engineers is important both as a product of normalising power – their education and authentic knowledge – and as its privileged agent. In opposition to them are those who do not fit the allowed circuits – the vagabond or the sedentary: ‘in both cases, abnormal’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 216; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: p. 107). Foucault stresses that this is merely one example of the kind of collective equipment that Fourquet and Murard are analysing. He suggests that the chronology of the industrial and the disciplinary state – we should note that it is of the state, not society, that he is speaking – do not match up, although they are correlatives. ‘Education produces producers, it produces those who demand and at the same time, it normalises, classes, divides, imposes rules and indicates the limit of the pathological’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 107; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 217–18). Deleuze responds to this, suggesting that the three aspects are rather investment, treating someone as a producer in potential or actuality; control, treating someone as a consumer; the public service aspect, the citizen as a user. Utilising concepts that he and Guattari would develop in their collaborative work, Deleuze suggests that ‘the highway today is channelled nomadism, a partitioning into a grid, while public service implies a general nomadism’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 107; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 217–18). Foucault’s point in response is that the state is tasked with the balancing of production of production (i.e. supply) with the production of demand. The state’s role in other areas, such as the normalisation undertaken by the police, hospitals, treatment of the insane, is ambiguous: on the one hand the state’s role expands, but on the other private corporations are part of a process of de-statisation. Foucault’s telling point is that the difference between socialist and capitalist utopias is that the latter worked. But now, instead of private ventures of this kind, there are ‘housing projects’ that the state must control, that ‘depend on the State apparatus. The deck has been reshuffled’ (Foucault, 1996: p. 108; Fourquet and Murard, 1976: pp. 218–20). Murard and Fourquet give their own examples, of hospitals that act as means of production in terms of producing the healthy workforce required by capital.

#### And, that facilitates biopolitical relations of power

Campbell ‘5 ,David ‘ The Biopolitics of Security: Oil, Empire, and the Sports Utility Vehicle’ American Quarterly, Vol. 57, No. 3, Legal Borderlands: Law and the Construction of American Borders (Sep., 2005), pp. 943- JSTOR BSH

This theoretical concern with biopolitical relations of power in the context of networked societies is consistent with an analytical shift to the problematic of subjectivity as central to understanding the relationship between foreign policy and identity. That is because both are concerned with "a shift from a preoccupation with physical and isolated entities, whose relations are described largely in terms of interactive exchange, to beings-in-relation, whose structures [are] decisively influenced by patterns of connectivity."23A t the same time, while conceptual approaches are moving away from understandings premised on the existence of physical and isolated entities, the social and political structures that are produced by network patterns of connectivity often appear to be physical and isolated. As Lieven de Cauter argues, we don't live in networks; we live in capsules. Capsules are enclaves and envelopes that function as nodes, hubs, and termini in the various networks and contain a multitude of spaces and scales. These enclaves can include states, gated communities, or vehicles - with the latter two manifesting the "SUV model of citizenship" Mitchell has provocativelyd escribed. Nonetheless, though capsules like these appear physical and isolated, there is "no network without capsules. The more networking, the more capsules. Ergo: the degree of capsularisation is directly proportional to the growth of networks."The result is that biopolitical relations of power produce new borderlands that transgress conventional understandings of inside/outside and isolated/ connected.

**Transportation infrastructure instrumentalizes the environment for solely human ends—This reinforces our separation from the ecological systems in which we participate, ensuring catastrophic collapse.**

**Duyser ’10** Mitchell Duyser. Master of Architecture at University of Cincinnati. April 2010. “Hybrid Landscapes: Territories of Shared Ecological and Infrastructural Value”. Masters Thesis.Pages 3-7.

The construct of modern human life is built upon an invisible foundation. Not invisible as in undetectable, but invisible as in hidden and forgotten. Representative of the **infrastructure** that **enables civilization**, this foundation is formed from the human and ecological systems that support the continued expansion of modern society. Often unnoticed**,** this myriad of pipes, wires, rivers, and oil ﬁelds is pushed out of the collective conscious and awareness. **So dependent have we become** on these systems, **minor disruptions** in their functionality **can threaten civilization itself**. **As exempliﬁed byevents like the** 2007 Minneapolis **bridge disaster1**, **and** more abstract issues like **climate** **change, these systems are approaching** the point of **widespread failure**. Such **threats of disaster are** currently the only events capable of **bringing infrastructure to** the surface of **everyday experience**, **and will occur with increasing frequency unless** widespread **societal action is taken. Humans need to change** **how they interact with the rest of the world**, speciﬁcally focusing onthe technologies that enable civilization, and the collectively held societal perspective of the environment. **Civilization can no longer** afford to **forget** about **the systems that enable existence**, **nor can it assume** that such **infrastructures will be available indeﬁnitely.** **Infrastructure has** traditionally **been** intentionally and **methodically hidden from view,** buried underground, and moved to the outskirts of town. Allowing humans to live free of concern for how necessities are acquired, organized, and distributed. **The infrastructure that is exposed, such as** power lines, **roads**, and cellular towers, **are rendered invisible by their ubiquity,** subsumed by the contemporary urban landscape. Throughout modern time, infrastructure has served to insulate human activity from its effects on the rest of the planet. “Away” was a place anywhere but here, removed from inﬂuence over problems like water quality and climate change. The unavoidable truth however, that this isolation is not physical but psychological, has been slowly revealing itself over the past ﬁfty years. Book’s like Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring, published in 1962, and movies like Al Gore’s An Inconvenient Truth, (2006) have helped illuminate the previously “invisible” systems binding civilization to the rhythms of the planet. **We can** now **attribute** **much of** **the current** environmental **ﬂux**us **to the ignorance of our participation in global and local ecology**. Today, truly no place exists that has not experienced the impacts of humanity.2 This ignorance or rather, willingness to overlook man’s interaction with the environment is not a recent societal or cultural development. Our actions and reasoning are deeply rooted in the classical tradition, dating back to the founding myths of Christianity and ancient Greece. Perpetuated and augmented through the Enlightenment and Industrialization, western culture has been left with a fractured view of nature. One that idolizes and romanticizes the “virgin wilderness” while simultaneously working feverishly to exploit every available natural resource in the name of societal and economic progress. Romanticism values nature for its aesthetic and sentimental appeal, while **Industrialization’s commoditization of the environment makes it subservient to human needs** and desires. The assimilation of these views has led to the perception of nature-as-beauty, **allowing** for the **consumption of less beautiful landscapes** with disregard for ecological consequences. 3 New conceptualizations of nature must recognize the presence of complex and emergent systems, where the whole behaves in a way that cannot be understood through the isolation of individual parts.4 Work in the ﬁeld of biomimicry, championed by the biologist Janine Benyus and the architect William McDonough, is already moving towards this end. Both call for a new industrial organization that looks to nature to provide speciﬁc technologies as well as methodologies for production that displace consumption and disposal with nutrient cycles that are endlessly renewable and detoxifying for the environment.5 6 An architecture responsive to a redeﬁned conception of ”nature” must address both the physical and cultural relationships humans have with their environment. Such an architecture must visually and functionally integrate the previously disparate activities of civilization and nature.**Infrastructural solutions can no longer come through human ingenuity alone, bu**t **through mentorship** and comprehension **of the complex systems already existing** in nature. This use of biomimicry allows environmental design to evolve beyond the current sustainability movement where simply being “less bad” is still good enough.7 Concepts like the USGBC’s LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) system, and other **supposedly “green” building practices do nothing to change the fundamental relationship** humans have with the planet. **They function under the** dated and **false assumption of humanity as a separate system from** the rest of **nature**. Polluting **and consuming at a slightly slower rate is not a** thoughtful **means of reintegrating civilization with ecology**.

**This ordering is the foundation of the war machine and drives the exclusion of populations based on race, ethnicity and gender**

**Kochi, 2K9** (Tarik, Sussex law school, Species war: Law, Violence and Animals, Law Culture and Humanities Oct 5.3

Grotius and Hobbes are sometimes described as setting out a prudential approach, 28 or a natural law of minimal content 29 because in contrast to Aristotelian or Thomastic legal and political theory their attempt to derive the legitimacy of the state and sovereign order relies less upon a thick con-ception of the good life and is more focussed upon basic human needs such as survival. **In the context of a response to religious civil war such an approach made sense in that often thick moral and religious conceptions of the good life** (for example, those held by competing Christian Confessions) **often drove conflict and violence.** Yet, **it would be a mistake to assume that the categories of “survival,” “preservation of life” and “bare life” are neutral categories.** Rather **survival, preservation of life and bare life as expressed by the Westphalian theoretical tradition already contain distinctions of value** – in particular, **the specific distinction of value between human and non-human life**. **“Bare life” in this sense is not “bare” but contains within it a distinction of value between the worth of human life placed above and beyond the worth of non-human animal life.** In this respect **bare life within this tradition contains within it a hidden conception of the good life. The foundational moment of the modern juridical conception of the law of war already contains within it the operation of species war. The Westphalian tradition puts itself forward as grounding the legitimacy of violence upon the preservation of life, however its concern for life is already marked by a hierarchy of value in which non-human animal life is violently used as the “raw material” for preserving human life.** Grounded upon, but concealing the human-animal distinction, **the Westphalian conception of war makes a double move: it excludes the killing of animals from its definition of “war proper,” and, through rendering dominant the modern juridical definition of “war proper” the tradition is able to further institutionalize and normalize a particular conception of the good life.** Following from this original distinction of life-value realized through the juridical language of war were other forms of human life whose lives were considered to be of a lesser value under a European, Christian, “secular” 30 natural law conception of the good life. **Underneath this concern with the preservation of life in general stood veiled preferences over what particu-lar forms of life (such as racial conceptions of human life) and ways of living were worthy of preservation, realization and elevation**. **The business contracts of early capitalism, 31 the power of white males over women and children, and, especially in the colonial context, the sanctity of European life over non-European and Christian lives over non-Christian heathens and Muslims, were some of the dominant forms of life preferred for preservation within the early modern juridical ordering of war.**

#### The images of catastrophe and destruction they present are like a drug, used by the first world nations to feed off the suffering of the rest of the world. Their efforts to solve these problems are coproductive with the disasters themselves, and this constant search for new spectacle will lead to the destruction of the human species as the ultimate reality TV show.

**Baudrillard in 94** [Jean, “The Illusion of the End” p. 66-71]

**We have long denounced the** capitalistic, economic **exploitation of the poverty of the 'other half of the world'** [['autre monde]. **We must today denounce the moral and sentimental exploitation of that poverty - charity cannibalism being worse than oppressive violence**. The extraction and humanitarian reprocessing of a destitution which has become the equivalent of oil deposits and gold mines. The extortion of the spectacle of poverty and, at the same time, of our charitable condescension: a worldwide appreciated surplus of fine sentiments and bad conscience. We should, in fact, see this not as the extraction of raw materials, but as a waste-reprocessing enterprise. Their destitution and our bad conscience are, in effect, all part of the waste-products of history- the main thing is to recycle them to produce a new energy source. We have here an escalation in the psychological balance of terror. World capitalist oppression is now merely the vehicle and alibi for this other, much more ferocious, form of moral predation. One might almost say, contrary to the Marxist analysis, **that material exploitation is only there to extract that spiritual raw material that is the misery of peoples, which serves as psychological nourishment for the rich countries and media nourishment for our daily lives.** The 'Fourth World' (we are no longer dealing with a 'developing' Third World) is once again beleaguered, this time as a catastrophe-bearing stratum. The West is whitewashed in the reprocessing of the rest of the world as waste and residue. And the white world repents and seeks absolution - it, too, the waste-product of its own history. The South is a natural producer of raw materials, the latest of which is catastrophe. The North, for its part, specializes in the reprocessing of raw materials and hence also in the reprocessing of catastrophe. Bloodsucking protection, humanitarian interference, Medecins sans frontieres, international solidarity, etc. The last phase of colonialism: the New Sentimental Order is merely the latest form of the New World Order. Other people's destitution becomes our adventure playground. Thus, the humanitarian offensive aimed at the Kurds - a show of repentance on the part of the Western powers after allowing Saddam Hussein to crush them - is in reality merely the second phase of the war, a phase in which charitable intervention finishes off the work of extermination. We are the consumers of the ever delightful spectacle of poverty and catastrophe, and of the moving spectacle of **our own efforts to alleviate it** (which, in fact, **merely function to secure the conditions of reproduction of the catastrophe market**); there, at least, in the order of moral profits, the Marxist analysis is wholly applicable: we see to it that extreme poverty is reproduced as a symbolic deposit, as a fuel essential to the moral and sentimental equilibrium of the West. In our defence, it might be said that this extreme poverty was largely of our own making and it is therefore normal that we should profit by it. There can be no finer proof that the distress of the rest of the world is at the root of Western power and that the spectacle of that distress is its crowning glory than the inauguration, on the roof of the Arche de la Defense, with a sumptuous buffet laid on by the Fondation des Droits de l'homme, of an exhibition of the finest photos of world poverty. Should we be surprised that spaces are set aside in the Arche d' Alliance. for universal suffering hallowed by caviar and champagne? Just as the economic crisis of the West will not be complete so long as it can still exploit the resources of the rest of the world, so the symbolic crisis will be complete only when it is no longer able to feed on the other half's human and natural catastrophes (Eastern Europe, the Gulf, the Kurds, Bangladesh, etc.). We need this drug, which serves us as an aphrodisiac and hallucinogen. And the poor countries are the best suppliers - as, indeed, they are of other drugs. We provide them, through our media, with the means to exploit this paradoxical resource, just as we give them the means to exhaust their natural resources with our technologies. Our whole culture lives off this catastrophic cannibalism, relayed in cynical mode by the news media, and carried forward in moral mode by our humanitarian aid, which is a way of encouraging it and ensuring its continuity, just as economic aid is a strategy for perpetuating under-development. Up to now, the financial sacrifice has been compensated a hundredfold by the moral gain**. But** when the catastrophe market itself reaches crisis point, in accordance with the implacable logic of the market, when distress becomes scarce or the marginal returns on it fall from overexploitation, **when** we run out of disasters **from elsewhere or when they can no longer be traded like coffee or other commodities, the** West will be forced to produce its own catastrophe for itself**,** **in order to meet its need for spectacle and that voracious appetite for symbols which characterizes it even more than its voracious appetite for food**. It will reach the point where it devours itself. When we have finished sucking out the destiny of others, we shall have to invent one for ourselves. The Great Crash, the symbolic crash, will come in the end from us Westerners, but only when we are no longer able to feed on the hallucinogenic misery which comes to us from the other half of the world. Yet they do not seem keen to give up their monopoly. The Middle East, Bangladesh, black Africa and Latin America are really going flat out in the distress and catastrophe stakes, and thus in providing symbolic nourishment for the rich world. They might be said to be overdoing it: heaping earthquakes, floods, famines and ecological disasters one upon another, and finding the means to massacre each other most of the time. The 'disaster show' goes on without any let-up and our sacrificial debt to them far exceeds their economic debt. The misery with which they generously overwhelm us is something we shall never be able to repay. The sacrifices we offer in return are laughable (a tornado or two, a few tiny holocausts on the roads, the odd financial sacrifice) and, moreover, by some infernal logic, these work out as much greater gains for us, whereas our kindnesses have merely added to the natural catastrophes another one immeasurably worse: the demographic catastrophe, a veritable epidemic which we deplore each day in pictures. In short, there is such distortion between North and South, to the symbolic advantage of the South (a hundred thousand Iraqi dead against casualties numbered in tens on our side: in every case we are the losers), that one day everything will break down. One day, the West will break down if we are not soon washed clean of this shame, if an international congress of the poor countries does not very quickly decide to share out this symbolic privilege of misery and catastrophe. It is of course normal, since we refuse to allow the spread of nuclear weapons, that they should refuse to allow the spread of the catastrophe weapon. But it is not right that they should exert that monopoly indefinitely. In any case, the under-developed are only so by comparison with the Western system and its presumed success. In the light of its assumed failure, they are not under-developed at all. They are only so in terms of a dominant evolutionism which has always been the worst of colonial ideologies. The argument here is that there is a line of objective progress and everyone is supposed to pass through its various stages (we find the same eyewash with regard to the evolution of species and in that evolutionism which unilaterally sanctions the superiority of the human race). In the light of current upheavals, which put an end to any idea of history as a linear process, there are no longer either developed or under-developed peoples. Thus, to encourage hope of evolution - albeit by revolution - among the poor and to doom them, in keeping with the objective illusion of progress, to technological salvation is a criminal absurdity. In actual fact, it is their good fortune to be able to escape from evolution just at the point when we no longer know where it is leading. In any case, a majority of these peoples, including those of Eastern Europe, do not seem keen to enter this evolutionist modernity, and their weight in the balance is certainly no small factor in the West's repudiation of its own history, of its own utopias and its own modernity. It might be said that the routes of violence, historical or otherwise, are being turned around and that the viruses now pass from South to North, there being every chance that, five hundred years after America was conquered, 1992 and the end of the century will mark the comeback of the defeated and the sudden reversal of that modernity. The sense of pride is no longer on the side of wealth but of poverty, of those who - fortunately for them - have nothing to repent, and may indeed glory in being privileged in terms of catastrophes. Admittedly, this is a privilege they could hardly renounce, even if they wished to, but natural disasters merely reinforce the sense of guilt felt towards them by the wealthy – by those whom God visibly scorns since he no longer even strikes them down. One day it will be the Whites themselves who will give up their whiteness. It is a good bet that repentance will reach its highest pitch with the five-hundredth anniversary of the conquest of the Americas. We are going to have to lift the curse of the defeated - but symbolically victorious - peoples, which is insinuating itself five hundred years later, by way of repentance, into the heart of the white race. No solution has been found to the dramatic situation of the under-developed, and none will be found since their drama has now been overtaken by that of the overdeveloped, of the rich nations. The psychodrama of congestion, saturation, super abundance, neurosis and the breaking of blood vessels which haunts us - the drama of the excess of means over ends – calls more urgently for attention than that of penury, lack and poverty. That is where the most imminent danger of catastrophe resides, in the societies which have run out of emptiness**. Artificial catastrophes**, like the beneficial aspects of civilization**, progress much more quickly than natural ones**. The underdeveloped are still at the primary stage of the natural, unforeseeable catastrophe. We are already at the second stage, that of the manufactured catastrophe - imminent and foreseeable - and **we shall soon be at that of the pre-programmed catastrophe,** the catastrophe of the third kind, **deliberate and experimental**. And, **paradoxically, it is our pursuit of the means for averting natural catastrophe** - the unpredictable form of destiny - **which will take us there**. Because it is unable to escape it, humanity will pretend to be the author of its destiny. Because it cannot accept being confronted with an end which is uncertain or governed by fate, it will prefer to stage its own death as a species.

t we are still not duped by morality, or that the conditions of welcoming the other and making the donation are not themselves a possession that must be defended by war.

**No Nuclear War**

**Tepperman, 2009** [Jonathan, Newsweek International's first Assistant Managing Editor (now Deputy Editor), “Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb” 8-29, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html, SM]

Why indeed? The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling, it's led to what's known as the nuclear peace: the virtually unprecedented stretch since the end of World War II in which all the world's major powers have avoided coming to blows. They did fight proxy wars, ranging from Korea to Vietnam to Angola to Latin America. But these never matched the furious destruction of full-on, great-power war (World War II alone was responsible for some 50 million to 70 million deaths). And since the end of the Cold War, such bloodshed has declined precipitously. Meanwhile, the nuclear powers have scrupulously avoided direct combat, and there's very good reason to think they always will. There have been some near misses, but a close look at these cases is fundamentally reassuring—because in each instance, very different leaders all came to the same safe conclusion. Take the mother of all nuclear standoffs: the Cuban missile crisis. For 13 days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union each threatened the other with destruction. But both countries soon stepped back from the brink when they recognized that a war would have meant curtains for everyone. As important as the fact that they did is the reason why: Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev's aide Fyodor Burlatsky said later on, "It is impossible to win a nuclear war, and both sides realized that, maybe for the first time." The record since then shows the same pattern repeating: nuclear-armed enemies slide toward war, then pull back, always for the same reasons. The best recent example is India and Pakistan, which fought three bloody wars after independence before acquiring their own nukes in 1998. Getting their hands on weapons of mass destruction didn't do anything to lessen their animosity. But it did dramatically mellow their behavior. Since acquiring atomic weapons, the two sides have never fought another war, despite severe provocations (like Pakistani-based terrorist attacks on India in 2001 and 2008). They have skirmished once. But during that flare-up, in Kashmir in 1999, both countries were careful to keep the fighting limited and to avoid threatening the other's vital interests. Sumit Ganguly, an Indiana University professor and coauthor of the forthcoming India, Pakistan, and the Bomb, has found that on both sides, officials' thinking was strikingly similar to that of the Russians and Americans in 1962. The prospect of war brought Delhi and Islamabad face to face with a nuclear holocaust, and leaders in each country did what they had to do to avoid it.