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## Inherency

#### Washington just turned down a bill to up port security – our ports are uniquely susceptible in the squo

Bobby Calvan, political analyst for The Boston Globe, 7-12-2012, “US to miss target for tighter port security” The Boston Globe, http://articles.boston.com/2012-06-12/nation/32176427\_1\_homeland-security-cargo-containers-nuclear-bomb, //eR

WASHINGTON - The Department of Homeland Security will miss an initial deadline of July 12 to comply with a sweeping federal law meant to thwart terrorist attacks arriving by sea, frustrating border security advocates who worry that the agency has not done enough to prevent dangerous cargo from coming through the country’s ocean gateways, including the Port of Boston. Only a small fraction of all metal cargo containers have been scanned before arriving at US ports, and advocates for tighter port security say all maritime cargo needs to be scanned or manually inspected to prevent terrorists from using ships bound for the United States to deliver a nuclear bomb. The scenario might be straight out of a Hollywood script, but the threat of terrorism is not limited to airplanes, according to Homeland Security critics, including Representative Edward Markey of Massachusetts. Markey accuses the agency of not making a good-faith effort to comply with a 2007 law he coauthored requiring all US-bound maritime shipments to be scanned before departing overseas docks. “We’re not just missing the boat, we could be missing the bomb,’’ the Malden Democrat said. “The reality is that detonating a nuclear bomb in the United States is at the very top of Al Qaeda’s terrorist targets.’’ Only about 5 percent of all cargo containers headed to the United States are screened, according to the government’s own estimate, with some shipments getting only a cursory paperwork review.

#### The current system is old and flawed – upgrades are needed

Bobby Calvan, political analyst for The Boston Globe, 7-12-2012, “US to miss target for tighter port security” The Boston Globe, http://articles.boston.com/2012-06-12/nation/32176427\_1\_homeland-security-cargo-containers-nuclear-bomb, //eR

“The existing system has some real problems,’’ said Stephen Flynn, the founding codirector of the Kostas Research Institute for Homeland Security at Northeastern University. “We should be focusing on how to improve the system,’’ he said, “and that’s really not happening.’’ November will mark a decade since Congress approved the sweeping maritime law that put in place standards and procedures for screening cargo. In 2007, Markey and other Democrats won approval of the 100-percent scanning program, opposed by Homeland Security officials but ultimately signed by President Bush. “They don’t agree with the law. They think we should run the risk of nuclear devastation,’’ said Representative Jerrold Nadler, a New York Democrat. “This is a huge threat to the country.’’ Because of those threats, ports across the country, including in Boston, have tightened security at facilities, including more rigorous background checks of dock workers. Earlier this year, the federal government awarded Massachusetts $21.7 million in Homeland Security funds, part of which will be used to further enhance security at the Port of Boston. In 2009, the Boston area was elevated to Tier 1 status by federal authorities. That acknowledged the city’s high risk for terrorist threats, particularly because of its stature as a large port city and its distinction of having one of the country’s busiest storage facilities for liquefied natural gas. “Port security is always a high priority,’’ said Joseph Lawless, director of maritime security for the Port of Boston and chairman of the security committee for the American Association of Port Authorities. Boston Port officials are especially sensitive to acts of terrorism because of the tragic connection to the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. Two airplanes used in the deadly attacks originated from Logan Airport.

#### Ports are really important and terrorists have a lot of opportunities to blow them up

http://web.mit.edu/cis/pdf/Audit\_11\_07\_derugy.pdf

Ports offer terrorists vast opportunities to inflict damages. As the primary mode of transportation¶ for world trade goods, maritime commerce is essential to America’s economic vitality.¶ 2 Every year approximately nine million cargo containers—26,000 a day—arrive at U.S.¶ ports from all over the world.3 The U.S. maritime system includes more than 361 sea and¶ river ports with more than 3,700 cargo and passenger terminals and more than 1,000 harbor¶ channels along thousands of miles of coastline.4¶ In FY 2007, President Bush requested $2.3 billion for port security out of a $57 billion¶ government-wide budget for homeland security.5 However, the important question is not¶ how much money is spent but rather whether the money is allocated toward the most costeffective¶ programs. In other words, is America getting the maximum level of protection in¶ exchange for our tax dollars?¶ A close look at port security allocation decisions indicates that spending occurs without¶ regard for risk analysis let alone cost-benefit analysis, leading to a large array of misallocated¶ spending. For instance, what should be the highest priorities—preventing terrorists from¶ acquiring nuclear devices and material—receive less money than much less cost-effective¶ policies such as nuclear detection in the ports or post-disaster response activities.

#### we should be spending more money on port security

Veronique de Rugy, Marcatus Center George Mason University, “Audit of the Convential Wisdom,” MIT, <http://web.mit.edu/cis/pdf/Audit_11_07_derugy.pdf>, CP

More telling is the fact that the $1.1 billion we spend on denying¶ terrorists access to nuclear weapons and material pales in comparison¶ with the amounts we spent each year on much less catastrophic¶ threats. For example, in airline security, improved cockpit security¶ has limited the worst-case scenario witnessed on 9/11 to the¶ destruction of a plane and loss of approximately 300 passengers.¶ Yet, we will spend $5.8 on baggage screening for airlines in FY¶ 2008 and over $3 billion to help state and local government build¶ their response capacity.22 First responder grant programs are predicated¶ on the notion of cleaning up after terrorists have successfully¶ attacked and hence are not making us more secure. Furthermore,¶ nuclear experts predict that these investments will be irrelevant if¶ we are actually attacked with a WMD weapon.23

#### Port security is currently underfunded

Anthony Kimery, ASBPE 2011 winning journalist, 3-9-12, “Counternarcotics, Terrorism & Intelligence Security, Port Authorities Associations Urge DHS To Reconsider Port Allocations,” HSToday, <http://www.hstoday.us/focused-topics/counternarcotics-terrorism-intelligence/single-article-page/security-port-authorities-associations-urge-dhs-to-reconsider-port-allocations.html>, TF

This week the Security Industry Association (SIA), along with the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), sent a letter to Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Janet Napolitano urging her to reconsider grant allocations assigned to the Fiscal Year 2012 Port Security Grant Program, or to offer waivers on cost share agreements of previously awarded grants. The letter was sent in response to DHS grant guidance issued on February 17, 2012 in which DHS slashed the Port Security Grant Program by 59 percent. “Even though Congress reduced the budget for preparedness grants by 40 percent, we are concerned with the allocation decisions made by the department,” SIA and AAPA said in their letter to Napolitano. “The recently announced cuts result in a 59 percent reduction in funding for the Port Security Grant Program and are 75 percent less than authorized by Congress in the SAFE Port Act.” Continuing, the two organizations stated that “this allocation will not come close to meeting local needs. It will result in continued struggles to bring port security into the 21st century and hamper meeting government mandates, such as the Transportation Worker Identity Card.” The two groups said that, “while we understand that Congress initiated this cut because of what it saw as a backlog of unspent funds, we believe such a drastic reduction of funds will have negative consequences on port security.

#### **Federal intervention is the key to port security**

AAPA, 3-7-12, “Seaport Experts Urge Congress to Support Port Security Grants, Fully Use Harbor Maintenance Tax & Fund Channel Construction,” American Association of Port Authorities, <http://www.aapa-ports.org/Press/PRdetail.cfm?itemnumber=18434>, TF

Underfunding Key Programs Poses Challenges for National Security, U.S. International Competitiveness. At two separate Congressional hearings today, AAPA representatives emphasized the need for federal support for seaport security and maintenance and improvements to federal navigation channels. Port industry leaders illustrated the challenges that underfunding security and dredging pose for national security and US international competitiveness. As the House Appropriations Committee begins work on the Fiscal Year 2013 budget, AAPA executives reminded Congressional leaders of the critical role that ports play for the nation – serving as a front line of defense on international borders and facilitating overseas trade, 99 percent of which moves by water. Captain John Holmes, Deputy Executive Director of Operations at the Port of Los Angeles, testified before the Homeland Security Subcommittee regarding Port Security Grants within the Federal Emergency Management Agency. “The FY 2012 funding level represents a 59 percent cut from the prior year and 75 percent less than the authorized level,” Holmes stated. “This will harm our ability to expand protection of our maritime assets, carry out Port-Wide Risk Management Plans and fund federal mandates such as installation of TWIC readers.” AAPA President and CEO Kurt Nagle submitted testimony to the Energy and Water Subcommittee on the budget for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Civil Works program. The testimony focused on the need for full use of the Harbor Maintenance Tax annual revenue for maintenance dredging and the need to adequately fund needed channel deepening projects. Nagle wrote, “The federal government has a unique Constitutional responsibility to maintain and improve the infrastructure that enables the flow of commerce, and much of that infrastructure in and around seaports have been neglected for too long, particularly the capacity of the federal channels which affects the ports’ ability to move cargo efficiently into and out of the U.S. This hurts U.S. business, hurts U.S. workers and hurts our national economy.”

#### Current attempts at 100 percent inspection fail – new security strategy needed

Stewart Powell; Steward Powell; joined the Houston Chronicle in April 2008 after 21 years with Hearst Newspapers in Washington, D.C., generated daily coverage from the White House, the Pentagon, national security agencies, Congress and various federal departments and agencies for distribution to 600 newspapers served by the New York Times; July 26, 2012; “Homeland security chief defends failure to inspect 100 percent of cargo arriving in U.S.;” Chron.com Houston News;

http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2012/07/homeland-security-chief-defends-failure-to-inspect-100-percent-of-cargo-arriving-in-u-s/ ET

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano faced congressional criticism Wednesday for her department’s failure to inspect 100 percent of arriving cargo containers as required by federal law.¶ Napolitano told the House Committee on Homeland Security that the 100 percent standard was “not yet attainable” and that she had waived the requirement as permitted by Congress.¶ The department of homeland security has “actually done quite a bit to form and strengthen” partnerships with foreign countries and shipping operations “to secure containers and freight as it leaves foreign ports to the extent that we can,” Napolitano said.¶ But the former governor of Arizona and ex-federal prosecutor the Obama administration and Congress are “at odds” over the extent of inspections of inbound cargo.¶ Inspections target so-called high risk shipments from suspicious origins based on probability calculations and random selection of “a small percentage” of other containers, Napolitano said.¶ “There are a lot of ways to protect the ports of the United States and the interior of the United States from dangerous cargo as we keep in mind the 100 percent law,” Napolitano said.¶ Customs and Border Protection teams operate at 58 ports in North and South America, Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East covering approximately 80 percent of all maritime containerized cargo imported into the United States, Napolitano said.¶ The Cabinet officer declined to publicly estimate the percentage of inbound containers subjected to searches by Customs and Border Protection.¶ “Sometimes those laws are very difficult standards to attain and we have to move in other directions in the near term to do everything we can with respect to cargo,” Napolitano said.¶ Rep. Bennie Thompson, a Mississippi Democrat and the ranking Democrat on the Republican-led committee, told Napolitano that he was not satisfied with the failure to inspect all inbound cargo.¶ Federal law “mandates” inspection of all inbound cargo, Thompson said. “It was Congress that said you should do it – they didn’t say look at it and come back to us.¶ Thompson added: “It’s not a good omen that you can’t get the numbers” showing the percentage of cargo subjected to inspection, Thompson said.¶ Napolitano said she didn’t have the percentages “at my fingertips at this hearing.”¶ “We have to recognize that Congress also gave the secretary the power to waive that (100 percent) requirement if it’s not feasible, practical, affordable or causes undue interference with cargo that transits into the ports,” she said.¶ The United States economy relies on $2 trillion in annual legitimate trade that could be disrupted by 100 percent inspection, Napolitano said.

### **A2: 2008 CGA**

#### CGA not effective – Too resource intensive

James A. Lyons Jr., Commander in Chief of the US Pacific Fleet, 7-21-2008, “LNG port security,” The Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jul/21/lng-port-security/>, TF

The U.S. House of Representatives Coast Guard Authorization Act 2008, HR 2830 in Section 720 and 721 takes some positive steps to improve security for LNG terminals and tankers. While positive in intent, the House Bill incorrectly places full responsibility for security on government, state and local agencies. The U.S. Coast Guard and the administration are right in objecting to the requirements as drafted. As written, it is too resource intensive at all levels. Further, it does not provide the U.S. Coast Guard any flexibility in adjusting resources to address various threat levels.

## Economy Advantage

### Internal Link

#### Seaports are key to the global economy

Center for American Progress, 7-14-08, “Idea of the Day: Internationalize Supply Chain Security Standards,” http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/ideas/2008/07/071408.html, ZM

Seaports are the on-off ramps to the multi-trillion dollar global economy. Any major system disruption will generate economic losses equal to the gross domestic product of many countries. The closure of West Coast ports, which handle half of all U.S. imports, would start at $1 billion a day and rise rapidly after the first week. A decision to close all ports following a terrorist attack, a likely political response absent a strong management system, would actually fulfill the perpetrators’ key objective.¶ Better tools are required to help future leaders avoid such a decision. But private sector efforts to secure supply chains, such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, or C-TPAT, are voluntary. Government on-site validation of security procedures is subject to advance notice, company cooperation, and only performed once.¶ Meanwhile, the participating companies enjoy preferences in container screening. Security standards should be applied that differentiate shippers and importers who do the minimum from those willing to do more. The existing system depends heavily on unreliable cargo descriptions on shipping manifests. More can be inspected without measurable impact on cargo flow. Reductions in cargo theft, currently estimated at $25 billion per year, can offset at least some security costs

#### Seaports are the linchpin of the economy

USACE, US Army Corps and Engineers, No Date, “Deep Water Ports and Harbors,” The Institute for Water Resources, http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/value\_to\_the\_nation/DeepWaterPorts.pdf, ZM

Even in this era of instant ordering and realtime communication we still need to move¶ goods from Point A to Point B. In the majority of¶ cases the most cost-efficient, environmentally friendly way to do so is by ship.¶ The cost-per-unit to transport goods by¶ water is two to three times lower than¶ other forms of transportation. The¶ extensive use of waterborne shipping is¶ helping to keep the costs of durable, bulk¶ and consumer goods affordable for¶ businesses and consumers. ¶ Our nation’s ports and harbors are a crucial¶ component of our shipping system and a¶ linchpin of our economy, allowing America¶ to remain one of the world’s largest¶ trading nations.¶ For example, did you know that…¶ ■ The U.S. marine transportation industry¶ supports nearly $1 trillion in commerce¶ and creates employment for more than¶ 13 million people;¶ ■ U.S. ports and harbors handle more than¶ 2.3 billion short tons of domestic and¶ foreign commerce;¶ ■ Every day, 9 million barrels of oil to heat our¶ homes and businesses, and fuel our cars, are¶ imported into the United States by ship;¶ ■ Over 50 percent of imported oil comes¶ through harbors maintained by the Corps; and¶ ■ More than 67 percent of consumer goods¶ bought by Americans pass through harbors¶ maintained by the Corps.

### Impact

#### Ports matter economically – Hurricane Katrina proves

http://www.springerlink.com/content/6365j53845604765/fulltext.pdf

In the author’s experience, the major limitation of typical economic impact analyses¶ is that they underestimate the indirect and induced economic effects and the geographical¶ scope of impacts. Specifically, the direct consequences include impacts on port-related¶ business. Indirect effects are changes in sales of businesses impacted by the event. Induced¶ effects include shifts in sales due to changes in residential income. That is, when people¶ lose their jobs, they begin to reduce their purchases. The local impact is the area directly impacted¶ by the event. Regional impacts occur in surrounding areas that are effected by direct¶ losses. State, national and international impacts are felt as economic consequence ripples¶ across the landscape. Some of these impacts are felt immediately or within a month or two¶ of the event. Others are intermediate in length and measured in months and even a year or¶ two out from the events. If the event is large enough there will also be long-term impacts¶ that can be measured for many years. One actual and one hypothetical case illustrate economic impacts of events at port facilities.¶ Hurricane Katrina is estimated to have caused well in excess of $100 billion ineconomic impacts (Burton and Hicks 2005; Reed 2005). Much of the local impact was in¶ the Gulf region where the hurricane struck, causing tens of billions of dollars of destruction¶ of existing land uses and requiring massive local and regional investments in housing, commercial¶ demolition and reconstruction, highways, water and sewer, and other infrastructure¶ replacement. In addition, the hurricane is estimated to have cost hundreds of thousands of¶ jobs both locally and nationally, as well as impacts on the availability and price oil, food¶ and other products that used Gulf ports. Yet, the local impact of Hurricane Katrina was so¶ great that it is an excellent example of direct local damage exceeding indirect and induced¶ national and international effects.

#### Terrorism proves

http://www.springerlink.com/content/6365j53845604765/fulltext.pdf

The second example is the impact of a dirty bomb attack on the ports of Los Angeles¶ and Long Beach (Rosoff and von Winterfeldt 2007). In this case, the actual physical damage¶ is relatively limited to a small part of the port. However, using an input-output model,¶ the authors estimated potential costs that could exceed $100 billion. In one scenario, the¶ port was closed for up to 15 days, and in that case economic damage was relatively small¶ because cargo ships would wait until decontamination was completed. But if the port were¶ to be closed for a period of 120 days to a full year, then the costs would reach tens of billions¶ of dollars because of reduced sales, delays in delivering goods, and worker layoffs in¶ industry across the country that require raw materials unloaded at these west coast ports.¶ Economic costs could increase to even higher levels if a plume of radioactive laden material¶ were to drift outside the port and required decontamination. This hypothetical case illustrates¶ potentially massive off-site, indirect and induced effects from arguably minor on-site¶ damage.

### A2: You decrease economy

#### Increased security entails little to no economic damage to ports

Marc Thibault, researcher, Homeland Security Institute, Mary R. Brooks, Chair of Commerce, Dalhousie University, and Kenneth J. Button professor of public policy and director at George Mason, 2006, “The Response of the U.S. Maritime Industry to the New Container Security Initiatives” Transportation Journal, Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter 2006, JSTOR //eR

Impact of security on business costs and operations. In contrast to port security officers, container line executives reported that new security requirements did not have significant impacts on their operations or costs. All of those interviewed indicated that they evaluated their physical security and operational procedures and made changes when and where necessary. Container lines and marine terminal operators met the new security requirements by purchasing equipment, hiring additional personnel, or assigning new responsibilities to their current employees. For many, the costs of meeting new security obligations amounted to less than 1 percent of the firm's total operating costs. Container line executives indicated that they did not change the markets in which they operate and did not turn away customers unless a shipment raised suspicion. Several indicated that their companies were not able to pass on the full costs of the improved security to customers.

## Environment Advantage

### Uniqueness

#### Oil spills escalating

Alan Levin, staff writer for USA Today, 6-8-2010, “Oil spills escalated in this decade,” USA Today, <http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2010-06-07-oil-spill-mess_N.htm>, TF

The number of spills from offshore oil rigs and pipelines in U.S. waters more than quadrupled this decade, a trend that could have served as a warning for the massive leak in the Gulf of Mexico, according to government data and safety experts. The spills — and the amount of oil that leaked — grew markedly worse even when taking increases in production into account, a USA TODAY analysis of federal data shows.

#### Massive amounts of oil is spilled each year

Andrea Thompson, staff writer for Live Science, 4-23-2010, “FAQ: The Science and History of Oil Spills,” Live Science, <http://www.livescience.com/9885-faq-science-history-oil-spills.html>, TF

According to the U.S. Department of Energy, 1.3 million gallons (4.9 million liters) of petroleum are spilled into U.S. waters from vessels and pipelines in a typical year. A major oil spill could easily double that amount. Between 1971 and 2000, the U.S. Coast Guard identified more than 250,000 oil spills in U.S. waters, according to a 2002 report from the U.S. Department of the Interior Minerals Management Service. Approximately 1.7 billion gallons (6.4 billion liters) of oil were lost as a result of tanker incidents from 1970 to 2009, according to International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation Limited, which collects data on oil spills from tankers and other sources.

### Links

#### **Port security key to hazardous material control**

EPA, 7-16-12, “Shipping Port Security,” The Environmental Protection Agency, <http://www.epa.gov/radtown/port-security.html>, TF

U.S. shipping ports handle a range of cargo including legitimate hazardous material such as chemicals and radioactive material and must take actions to ensure the safe handling and security of such material while on site. Ports also have to guard against smuggled or unwanted radioactive material entering the U.S. Each year, millions of tons of scrap metal, semi-finished metal, and metal products are imported to the U.S. Ports must ensure that these metal products are not contaminated with radioactive material. Also, cargo containers must be checked for radioactive material that could pose a potential threat to our national security.

#### **Port Security key to preventing spills**

James A. Lyons Jr., Commander in Chief of the US Pacific Fleet, 7-21-2008, “LNG port security,” The Washington Times, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jul/21/lng-port-security/>, TF

Rising oil and gas prices, environmental concerns and the possibility of domestic gas shortages have drastically increased demand for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) within the United States. There are six active U.S. LNG terminals, with 40 more marine LNG facilities proposed to service the U.S. market. LNG facilities are unique and the ships transporting it are highly visible and easily identified targets. They are extremely vulnerable to a terrorist attack, which if successful, could have catastrophic results. Within the continental United States, the U.S. Coast Guard, under the Department of Homeland Security, currently has the lead responsibility for LNG tanker and marine terminal security. As the frequency of LNG tanker arrivals in U.S. ports increases, and new LNG terminals are built, U.S. Coast Guard resources and personnel are being severely overextended and are unable to balance the demand of LNG security requirements against other critical and growing Homeland Security responsibilities, as well as carry out their traditional search and rescue, law enforcement, marine safety and environmental protection missions. Recent congressional testimony has shown there is a widening gap between the extent of LNG missions that the Coast Guard is called upon to perform and the budgets and resources currently available. In many cases, the U.S. Coast Guard is forced to fill these gaps by calling upon local law enforcement agencies to provide additional waterside security when LNG tankers deliver their shipments. In most cases, the local police departments do not have the level of training or legal authority that the Coast Guard has to conduct the water-based security missions and interventions. Furthermore, neither the Coast Guard nor the local law enforcement agencies are adequately funded or staffed to perform this mission.

#### Seaports can be used to help the environment

USACE, US Army Corps and Engineers, No Date, “Deep Water Ports and Harbors,” The Institute for Water Resources, http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/value\_to\_the\_nation/DeepWaterPorts.pdf, ZM

Corps personnel consistently work to identify¶ environmentally beneficial ways to use¶ dredged material from harbor maintenance¶ projects. For instance, dredged material has¶ been used by the Corps to enhance wildlife¶ habitats by creating nesting islands for¶ waterfowl. Fisheries also have been improved¶ by mounding¶ dredged material¶ to establish fish¶ refuge habitats.¶ One of the key uses of dredged material,¶ though, is to create, preserve and restore¶ wetlands. These projects are particularly¶ important because of the crucial role wetlands¶ play in our environment, providing homes for¶ thousands of plants, fish and wildlife, including¶ many species that are endangered. Wetlands¶ also serve as rest stops for migratory birds, help¶ prevent flooding and control erosion.¶ Corps personnel carefully consider the¶ environmental impact of each construction or¶ dredging project they undertake. During the¶ planning phase, we conduct computer modeling¶ to project the potential impact of proposed¶ changes and make adjustments as needed before¶ work even begins. We also conduct dredging¶ operations during “environmental windows“,¶ which are time periods when disruption to¶ marine species can be minimized.

### Impacts

#### Oil spills currently leading to extinction

Mickle Bryan, network administrator, 6-5-2010, “BP OIL SPILL. May Kill mankind.,” <http://micklebryan.com/2010/06/05/bp-oil-spill-you-know-i-have-to-talk-about-it-again/>, TF

Correct me if I am wrong but, This would mean that, at this rate, in 200 years we will have no more oceans, and in less than that, the ocean would be depleted of all existent life as we know it. So to put it lightly no more algae, no more oxygen, no more life. Cyanobacteria is the building block of life on this planet. It can not live in oil. This bacteria has been called such things as “The Gods seed”. It has made our world what it is today. For many scientists it is THE building block for life on this planet. We look for water on other planets because it contains this bacteria which means life could exist. Without it, life does not exist. If algae and bacteria can not make oxygen guess what happens? You guessed it, the human race is no more. The planet is no more. Life is no more. Math never lies. You really need to take a step forward and figure out what we as a people can do about this. As far as criminal charges, get caught pouring oil into a lake, by fish and game and see what happens to you. I’m just a guy who had a really awesome Reef tank at one time a “fish nerd” if you will. I sure hope the shore line is a big enough protein skimmer to make all this bad just go away, but I can’t seem to add up how it will. Here is the truth, dispersant and all the techniques we have will never get rid of the true pollutants. This means that we may make them idle but it will not save our race. The serious impact of this is that this is an event that we do not have the technological knowledge to handle as a biological creature on this planet. This type of scenario will kill us all and it is real and it is happening now. It’s just math people, you look into it.

#### Oil spills cause human extinction

Peter Fairley, science writer for the technology review, 6-8-2010, “BP'S LEAKY SPILL CAP: BETTER THAN IT LOOKS?,” The technology review, <http://www.technologyreview.com/view/419295/bps-leaky-spill-cap-better-than-it-looks/>, TF

I am not an oil engineer, I am an Environmental Chemist, and I have yet here for any of the BP or USA engineers to state the larger issue then the Gulf being coated with oil, though that is bad enough. The larger issue is the oil which is entering the Gulf Stream, the current which is part of the inter ocean beltway. If this oil spill continues, which I am sure it will, the tropical storms will churn the gulf, and this great oil spill will begin to spread, world-wide, killing the phytoplankton as it spreads. Phytoplankton, first of all food webs, and more important, produces 80% - 90% of the Oxygen for EARTH. All environmentalists understand that if the PHYTOPLANKTON DIES, humans have 6 month to a year to live. So, the engineers of BP are not working to save birds and fish in the gulf, but now after 7-8 weeks, need to think of the 6.5 billion humans!

#### Oil spills destroy the environment and lead to extinction of species – BP proves

Whit Gibbons, Professor of ecology at Georgia University, 6-13-2010, “WILL OIL SPILL CAUSE EXTINCTIONS?,” <http://srel.uga.edu/ecoviews/ecoview100613.htm>, TF

The salt marsh snake is a harmless watersnake species that inhabits coastal regions from the Atlantic coast in Florida, through the Florida Keys, to Brownsville, Tex. Typically restricted to brackish waters, the snakes live in habitats that will be affected by the oil spill. Along the Atlantic coast the species is officially protected in Volusia, Brevard, and Indian River counties in Florida, including Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge. Many populations of salt marsh snakes will be in jeopardy not only because individual snakes will be dealing directly with the oil but also because much of their prey, which includes small brackish water and marine fish, may disappear in localized areas. Hopefully, some of the populations will be only minimally affected by the oil because they inhabit coastlines that are protected by barrier islands or by ocean currents. By the time the oil reaches the Atlantic side of Florida, if it does, it should be diluted enough so that the salt marsh snakes in that area will not be significantly impacted. As is often the case with lower profile species such as most reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates, the salt marsh snake per se is not likely to get any special attention with regard to its environmental welfare. It is unfortunate that the only way certain kinds of environmental protection can be achieved is through emotional appeal. People cringe at pictures of an egret, a brown pelican, or a baby manatee dying in an oil slick, and many will contribute to efforts to save such appealing animals. But the far-reaching environmental devastation caused by the BP oil spill will affect virtually every species that relies on the coastal habitat, including species that cannot capture media attention. We must hope that the detrimental effects on the likable species are brought to everyone's attention and that the environmental solutions for the birds, mammals, and other charismatic mega fauna will also be effective for the snakes through a form of trickle down environmental stewardship…However, the focus should be on the populations of species that are affected rather than on the entire species. Some populations will definitely be eliminated by oil pollution, and the loss of individuals will be extensive. No one knows exactly how many millions of gallons of oil will ultimately be released into the Gulf of Mexico and how much will reach the Atlantic. But the amounts estimated so far are staggering and will cause untold damage to coastal habitats, killing countless fish, birds, and marine invertebrates. Without question, millions of individual animals of numerous species will die. But all vertebrate species that inhabit the Louisiana Gulf Coast are found in other areas where the oil is unlikely to reach. So no wildlife species will be lost as a result of the spill. Extinction, however, sometimes happens as a cumulative effect of negative impacts, including the gradual disappearance of local populations until too few are left to propagate successfully. As the geographic range of the species contracts, an environmental disaster, even a natural one such as a hurricane or unexpected cold spell, can be the death knell for a species. And although no wildlife species is likely to go extinct as a direct result of the oil spill, jobs that depend on harvesting shrimp, oysters, and other shellfish in the Gulf Coast region may indeed disappear completely.

#### **Loss of biodiversity leads to extinction**

Kira Johnson, masters in conservation biology, 12-1-2010, “The Sixth Great Extinction,” National Geographic, <http://newswatch.nationalgeographic.com/2012/03/28/the-sixth-great-extinction-a-silent-extermination/>, TF

Countless species have gone extinct throughout history, and as many as 100,000 species will become extinct this year (Wilson 2000). Since most people probably cannot name a single recently extinct species, does it really matter to the human race whether we save biodiversity or let much of it disappear into the history books? The answer is a very strong and profound Yes. By not recognizing the importance of biodiversity, in addition to assuring the demise of most other species, we may be assuring the demise of our own human species as well. We need biodiversity. By choosing to act in ways that negatively impact species globally, we are laying the foundation of our own extinction. All species are connected, and the loss of one creates a domino effect of negative impacts to interdependent species. Evidence of this lies in Yellowstone, where the removal of the wolf, a keystone predator, resulted in a trophic cascade of negative effects throughout the ecosystem. Trophic cascade refers to the effect that the change in population size of a top predator has on the food web, especially impacting the species on which it depends for food or shelter. Predators play an important role in ecosystems – when they are eliminated, the species they preyed on have fewer animals controlling their population numbers, which allows their populations to grow. Wolves were exterminated from the western United States by the mid-1930s. In the following decades, scientists found that without a predator, deer, elk and moose ceased their normal migration patterns and began spending large amounts of time consuming the abundant vegetation in and around rivers and streams. The reduction of trees and other woody vegetation in these areas led to a drastic decline of beavers in the area, which in turn changed the flow of the rivers (Wolf Wars). Which species' extinction might start the succession of events that causes our extinction?...Our survival as a species ultimately rests on biodiversity. Each species plays a role in the global ecosystem, and we may not know until it is too late whether a given species was vital to our existence, but we can safely assume that we won't survive without a diversity of other species. Biodiversity creates and cleans our air and water. The Amazon rainforest is estimated to produce 20 to 25 percent of the planet's oxygen and 25 percent of our freshwater, as well as countless plants that may be cures for disease (Cox 2008, Butler 2010, Wilson 2010). Yet the rainforest is being destroyed at an alarming rate. Since 1970, 232,000 square miles of Amazon rainforest have been lost, equaling a land area twice the size of Greece. The latest available statistics showed an 11 percent increase in the rate of deforestation in the region (Monga Bay). Likewise, the United States continues to destroy its primary, or old growth, forests. From 2000 to 2005, an average of 831 square miles of primary forest was cleared in the United States each year. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) published a report in 2005 that ranks the United States seventh in annual loss of primary forest globally (Butler 2005). We depend on biodiversity to provide us with clean air and water, medicine and food, and yet we continue to accelerate the pace of its destruction.

### A2: Oil spills mostly inland

#### More oil is spilled by tankers than any other source

NOAA, 3-26-2007, “FAQ: Oil Spills in History,” National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, <http://archive.orr.noaa.gov/topic_subtopic_entry.php?RECORD_KEY%28entry_subtopic_topic%29=entry_id,subtopic_id,topic_id&entry_id(entry_subtopic_topic)=325&subtopic_id(entry_subtopic_topic)=2&topic_id(entry_subtopic_topic)=1>, TF

Q. Do most oil spills originate from tankers? A. Information from several sources tells us that the answer to your question is: No, as long as you consider spills of all sizes. But tanker accidents have accounted for most of the world's largest oil spills. They are less frequent than other kinds of oil spills, such as pipeline breaks, but typically involve large volumes of spilled oil relative to other kinds of oil spills. (To learn more about oil and chemical tankers, see the UN Atlas of the Oceans Web page, Tankers and Passenger Ships.) Here are some sources of information on this topic: Analysts for the Oil Spill Intelligence Report track oil spills of at least 10,000 gallons (34 tons). In their annual "International Oil Spill Statistics" report for 1999, they reported that in that year--the latest year for which they have analyzed data--about 32 million gallons of oil spilled into the water or onto land, in 257 incidents. Of those incidents, only 11 were spills from tankers, accounting for about 6.6 million gallons, or about one-fifth of the total volume of oil spilled. Twenty-five of the 257 spills were from barges and other kinds of vessels, such as freighters (totaling 1.5 million gallons). Eighteen spills were from trucks or railroad trains (totaling about half a million gallons). The largest number of spills, and the largest volume of oil spilled were from accidents involving pipelines or fixed facilities (131 pipeline spills, totaling about 18.8 million gallons; 66 spills from facilities, totaling about 4.7 million gallons). The percentages of oil spilled from different sources vary greatly from year to year; in some years, tanker accidents represent the largest single source of spilled oil, but only in a very few years is it the case that most of the oil spilled (in significant spills) during that year came from tankers. DeCola (2000) presents a graph showing the volume of oil spilled from various sources, including tankers, from 1978 to 1992. However, tanker accidents have been the cause of most of the very largest oil spills.

## Terrorism Advantage

### Uniqueness - Ports Vulnerable

#### Ports are vulnerable to terrorist attack – current funding levels don’t solve

CFR; Council on Foreign Relations; January 2006; “Targets for Terrorism: Ports;” Council on Foreign Relations; <http://www.cfr.org/port-security/targets-terrorism-ports/p10215> ET

Could terrorists attack U.S. ports? ¶ Yes. Experts warn that U.S. seaports could be tempting targets for terrorists bent on killing large numbers of people, grabbing media attention, and disrupting the U.S. economy. Port, ferry, and cruise-ship terminals are often located in highly congested areas where large numbers of people live and work. [Liquefied natural gas](http://www.cfr.org/publication/9810/) terminals and refineries that produce highly volatile petrochemicals and convert crude oil into gasoline and heating oil are also often nearby. Given the importance of foreign trade to the U.S. economy, an attack that shut down a major American port for even a few days could devastate the regional economy served by that port.¶ Are U.S. ports vulnerable to terrorist attacks? ¶ Yes. CFR Senior Fellow [Stephen Flynn](http://www.cfr.org/bios/3301/) says “maritime transportation is one of our nation’s most serious vulnerabilities.” At current staffing and funding levels, U.S. Coast Guard personnel and Customs agents can thoroughly inspect only about 5 percent of the 9 million shipping containers that arrive at U.S. ports every year. Though the Customs Service is using increasingly sophisticated risk-assessment technology to choose which shipments to inspect, many outside experts are unsure about the system’s effectiveness.¶ What’s the volume of traffic at U.S. ports? ¶ Some 7,500 ships with foreign flags make 51,000 calls on U.S. ports each year. They carry the bulk of the approximately two billion tons of freight, three billion tons of oil transports, and 134 million passengers by ferry each year. The volume of traffic gives terrorists opportunities to smuggle themselves or their weapons into the United States with little risk of detection; in May 2002 there were reports that twenty-five Islamist extremists entered the United States by hiding in shipping containers.¶ Are ports hard to protect? ¶ Yes. They’re often large and busy, offering multiple opportunities for terrorists to get in and attack. The port of Houston, for example, is twenty-six miles long, and thousands of trucks enter and exit its major terminals every day. Moreover, ships often traverse narrow channels; a sunken ship in such a channel could close the port for weeks or months and cause economic chaos.¶ How many large seaports are there in the United States? ¶ There are 361 major ports in the United States and many other harbors, piers, and ferry landings.

#### Ports are vulnerable to nuclear terrorism by detonating containers

Clark C. Abt, Ph.D; Chairman Emeritus and past President of Abt Associates Inc.; Associate, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University; April 30, 2003; “The Economic Impact¶ of Nuclear Terrorist¶ Attacks on Freight¶ Transport Systems in¶ an Age of Seaport¶ Vulnerability;” Abt Associates Inc.¶ <http://www.abtassociates.com/reports/es-economic_impact_of_nuclear_terrorist_attacks.pdf> ET

Today a third of the world economy, and a quarter of America’s, depends on safe international¶ commerce and trade, most of which since the last thirty years is transported across the oceans and¶ land borders in standardized steel cargo containers carried by ships, trucks, and rail.¶ Thirty percent of the world economy and 20 percent of the U.S. economy - $2 trillion - depend on¶ trade. The transport of world trade is absolutely dependent on the shipping portals at seaports, land¶ borders, and airports. These major seaport cities, together with their usually co-located international¶ airports, constitute both the most valuable and vulnerable targets of catastrophic nuclear terrorism.¶ The world’s seaports have some 72 million containers moving through them every year (7 million in¶ the United States alone), in any one of which a 60-to-600-pound nuclear weapon could be delivered¶ to the seaport and detonated before unloading.

#### Nuclear terrorism from containers at ports is very high risk now

Clark C. Abt, Ph.D; Chairman Emeritus and past President of Abt Associates Inc.; Associate, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University; April 30, 2003; “The Economic Impact¶ of Nuclear Terrorist¶ Attacks on Freight¶ Transport Systems in¶ an Age of Seaport¶ Vulnerability;” Abt Associates Inc.¶ <http://www.abtassociates.com/reports/es-economic_impact_of_nuclear_terrorist_attacks.pdf> ET

The vulnerability of the trade and transportation sectors of the U.S. economy to disruption and¶ destruction by nuclear terrorism remains high in 2003. This vulnerability to great costs is avoidable.¶ Currently available and affordable technology and systems could be deployed within two to three¶ years that would dramatically reduce the likelihood and destruction of a container-based nuclear¶ terrorist attack.¶ Current defense efforts are aimed in the right direction but are inadequate in scope, speed and¶ intensity. The U.S. Customs strategy of intelligence-based sampling of a small fraction the flow of¶ millions of containers a year can be too easily countered by terrorists and their supporters. Terrorists¶ can evade or deceive the data and intelligence collection and intelligence information analyses of¶ suspicious cargoes, conveyances, and personnel handlers, by shielding and decoying the weapons¶ from external gamma-ray detector screening, by saturating the inspection process with higher peak¶ traffic loads than can be carefully screened by current methods without seriously impeding the flow¶ of trade, and by leaving most foreign container ports unsecured and without uniformly high¶ inspection standards. A nuclear weapon loaded on to a container in a foreign port has a very high¶ probability of passing undetected through the foreign port of embarkation. A terrorist who can get a¶ nuclear device into a container is virtually assured of achieving at least a dockside detonation.¶ The technology and the organizational and procedural designs exist which could greatly reduce the¶ risk of deaths and damages from nuclear terrorist attack on seaport-based transport. The key¶ technology is the shielded pulsed-active neutron interrogation device, or scanner, augmenting the¶ currently partially deployed gamma ray scanners. Expertise in this technology exists in government¶ labs, university research labs, and private industry firms. An effective system of defenses built around¶ this technology would include:¶ · Forward deployment of customs inspection to foreign container ports of embarkation for¶ the United States, 100 percent external scanning of all U.S.-bound containers, using fixed¶ drive-through installations, mobile truck-mounted scanners, and scanners on container lift¶ cranes

#### Ports vulnerable to terrorist attacks – Coast guard have jurisdiction over ports to solve

Joe Lieberman, United States Senator for Connecticut; site devoted to Lieberman’s statements and past legislation; 12.06.01; “PORT VULNERABILITY TO TERRORIST ATTACK IS ‘TERRIFYING,’ LIEBERMAN SAYS;” <http://www.lieberman.senate.gov/index.cfm/news-events/news/2001/12/port-vulnerability-to-terrorist-attack-is-terrifying-lieberman-says> ET

Governmental Affairs Committee Chairman Joe Lieberman, D-Conn., Thursday said the high vulnerability of the nation's 400 shipping ports to terrorist attack was "literally terrifying" and called for systemic revisions in how ports are secured.¶ "U.S. ports are our nation's key transportation link for global trade, and yet there are no federal standards for port security and no single federal agency overseeing the 11.6 million shipping containers, 11.5 million trucks, 2.2 million railcars, 211,000 vessels, and 489 million people that passed through U.S. border inspection systems last year," Lieberman said. "The plain fact is that the movement of goods into the U.S. - five million tons per day - is now so efficient that port security has been sacrificed. It is simply impossible to physically inspect more than a small sample of containers as they arrive in the U.S. Less than one percent are actually examined."¶ The vulnerability of ports, in turn, leads to potential danger along our highways, rails and waterways. Containers arriving from Europe, Asia or Canada are virtually always inspected only at their final destinations, rather than at the arrival port, meaning at any given time, authorities have virtually no idea about the contents of thousands of multi-ton containers traveling on trucks, trains or barges.¶ "The ease with which a terrorist might smuggle chemical, biological or, at some point, even nuclear weapons in a container, without detection, is, literally terrifying," Lieberman said.¶ Federal agencies charged with safeguarding harbors are handicapped by a lack of resources and failure to coordinate and communicate with one another, the Chairman noted. In addition, significant concerns have been raised about federal agency cooperation with state and local governments, as well as their access to national security intelligence.¶ "Our ports don't need a bail out. They just need a sensible strategy to keep them safe and sound economic hubs. We must establish a much higher level of safety than we have at present, without sacrificing the speed and efficiency with which we now move goods around the globe."¶ Lieberman expressed interest in several proposals offered by hearing witnesses, including:¶ pushing back our borders to require inspections at ports of embarkation, rather than final destinations.¶ using technologies such as electronic seals and alarms on containers, and x-rays and global positioning satellite systems to track goods throughout their shipping routes.¶ reorganizing the federal government to improve coordination and communication between agencies in charge of port security with the state, local and private sectors.¶ Witness F. Amanda DeBusk, a former member of the Commission on Crime and Security in U.S. Seaports, said at least15 federal agencies have jurisdiction at the nation's seaports - the primary ones being the Coast Guard, the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service - in addition to scores of state and local agencies and private sector concerns. Coordinating these groups would be a "monumental undertaking," she said. Both she and witness Stephen Flynn, a national security fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, suggested a Department of National Homeland Security could help coordinate these agencies. Lieberman has introduced legislation with Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., that would combine the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, and the Border Patrol - as well as other agencies - in a Department of National Homeland Security.¶

#### The threat of port terrorism is high – Coast Guard can solve port security

Mr. Maxwell; a senior instructor in the Marine Training Branch of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia; and Mr. Blanda; a senior instructor in the Marine Training Branch of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia; 2005; “Terror by sea: the unique challenges of port security;”

[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Terror+by+sea%3a+the+unique+challenges+of+port+security.-a0137713576](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Terror%2Bby%2Bsea%3A%2Bthe%2Bunique%2Bchallenges%2Bof%2Bport%2Bsecurity.-a0137713576) ET

¶ Post-September 11 World Before the tragic events of September 11, marine enforcement officers received specialized training to combat drug smuggling and [illegal immigration](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Illegal%2Bimmigration) "Illegal alien" and "Illegal aliens" redirect here. For other uses, see Illegal aliens (disambiguation).
**Illegal immigration** refers to immigration across national borders in a way that violates the immigration laws of the destination country. and to protect America's natural resources and environment. Today, however, because of the threat of maritime terrorism, the need for advanced, specialized, and tactical training of these officers has become far more critical. As the tip of the spear, the U.S. Coast Guard and Customs and Border Protection ([CBP](http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/CBP)CBP

competitive protein binding.
**.....** Click the link for more information.) are tasked with the protection of America's ports. One of the Coast Guard's principal missions involves safeguarding U.S. ports and waterways, whereas the primary mission of CBP is to inspect cargoes and cargo containers entering U.S. ports. (3) To meet the unprecedented challenges facing them, the Coast Guard and the CBP have allocated additional workers to their respective port- and cargo-security missions and have initiated several programs designed to tighten security not only of port areas but also of merchant ships, the cargoes they carry, and their crews. The United States has taken the common-sense approach of detecting and deterring potential threats long before they escalate into clear and present dangers. In the maritime arena, this requires "identifying and intercepting threats well before they reach U.S. shores." (4) This strategy supports national-level objectives while recognizing the uniqueness of the maritime environment, including the difficulty associated with the shared use of oceans and waterways. Denying the use and exploitation of the maritime domain by terrorists as a means to attack U.S. territory, population, and critical infrastructure requires increased maritime domain awareness and enhanced security operations. Currently, the U.S. maritime domain is protected via intelligence information and layered, multiagency security operations nationwide, including the strengthening of the security posture and reduction of vulnerability of American ports.

#### Terrorist attacks at ports are a threat – only 7 ports have 100% container scanning now

[Naraphorn J. Haphuriwat, University of Wisconsin–Madison](http://research.create.usc.edu/do/search/?q=author_lname%3A%22Haphuriwat%22%20author_fname%3A%22Naraphorn%22&start=0&context=2634622) [Vicki M. Bier, University of Wisconsin–and Madison](http://research.create.usc.edu/do/search/?q=author_lname%3A%22Bier%22%20author_fname%3A%22Vicki%22&start=0&context=2634622) [Henry H. Willis](http://research.create.usc.edu/do/search/?q=author_lname%3A%22Willis%22%20author_fname%3A%22Henry%22&start=0&context=2634622); 2011; “[Deterring the Smuggling of Nuclear Weapons in Container Freight Through Detection and Retaliation](http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1129&context=published_papers);” CREATE Homeland Security Center; <http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1129&context=published_papers> ET

1. Introduction

Since the attacks on September 11, 2001, the United¶ States has been concerned about protecting the country¶ against terrorism. One major concern is the smuggling¶ of nuclear weapons into the United States¶ through container freight. This creates question about¶ how security can be used to prevent a successful¶ nuclear attack against the United States by terrorists.¶ Debates about security against the threat of nuclear¶ terrorism cover questions about how effective inspection¶ technologies can be (Cochran and McKinzie¶ 2008), whether security can deter or dissuade a terrorist¶ group from attempting to acquire nuclear weapons¶ or attack using them (Jenkins 2008), and whether¶ 100% container inspection is effective or even necessary¶ (Martonosi et al. 2005, Wein et al. 2006).¶ Since 2002, the availability of inspection equipment¶ for detecting radioactive materials at ports¶ has increased dramatically. The current technology,¶ polyvinyl toluene (PVT) portal monitors, is designed¶ as a passive, nonintrusive method for screening containers.¶ However, PVT scanners have only limited¶ ability to differentiate between radioactive materials.¶ Recently, the United States has considered enhancing¶ the nuclear detection system used to inspect shipping¶ containers by installing advanced spectroscopic¶ portals (ASPs) based on sodium iodide detection¶ capabilities. These detectors can discriminate between¶ different types of radiation sources, and thus could¶ improve how inspection operations handle innocuous¶ radiation sources (such as certain ceramics) that are¶ commonly encountered in commerce.¶ Currently, seven overseas ports scan 100% of¶ U.S.-bound maritime cargo, according to the Secure¶ Freight Initiative (U.S. Customs and Border Protection¶ 2007). These seven ports use nonintrusive and passive radiation-detection equipment to detect illicit¶ nuclear and radiological materials. In addition, ASP is¶ being deployed as a secondary inspection technology¶ at foreign port locations including Southampton in¶ the United Kingdom, Antwerp in Belgium, Colombo¶ in Sri Lanka, Manila in the Philippines, and Hong¶ Kong. This new technology is being investigated further¶ for its costs and benefits before being deployed¶ at U.S. ports.

#### Threat of port terrorism and weapons smuggling high – piracy turns to terrorism

Mr. Maxwell; a senior instructor in the Marine Training Branch of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia; and Mr. Blanda; a senior instructor in the Marine Training Branch of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia; 2005; “Terror by sea: the unique challenges of port security;”

[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Terror+by+sea%3a+the+unique+challenges+of+port+security.-a0137713576](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Terror%2Bby%2Bsea%3A%2Bthe%2Bunique%2Bchallenges%2Bof%2Bport%2Bsecurity.-a0137713576) ET

Piracy Connection A report on piracy and other criminal attacks at sea highlighted the vulnerability of shipping to terrorist attacks. "Today's pirate is tomorrow's terrorist and one can foresee that a nexus will ultimately develop between terrorist organizations and pirates. Both are acts of violence against innocent people, one done for monetary gains and the other perhaps for a political purpose. Since piracy is largely undertaken for a commercial gain, pirates will not hesitate to carry out a terrorist act if someone pays them enough and they have a reasonable chance of getting away." (2) This nexus cannot be ruled out. After all, if terrorist groups are to sustain their operations, they likely will tend toward mounting suicide attacks on commercial and military vessels for such purposes as-- \* procuring alternative revenue for their main initiatives (i.e., simple piracy); \* carrying out suicide attacks on unsuspecting ships or ports in the spirit of September 11; \* [smuggling](http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Smuggling) weapons and explosives to their affiliates in other parts of the world, probably by [hijacking](http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Hijacking). Although by the late 20th century hijacking most frequently involved the seizure of an airplane and its forcible diversion to destinations chosen by the air pirates, when a ship before renaming and otherwise disguising its identity and providing a new crew and manifest; ¶ seeking ransoms and trading hostages for members of their groups detained by authorities; and \* placing mines aboard innocent-looking tugs and barges, commonly found in the coastal and intracoastal waters and ports of the United States.

#### Terrorist nuclear attack within next five years – improving security now key

The Telegraph; Daily Newspaper in London; 7:32PM GMT 02 Dec 2008; “US should expect a nuclear or biological terrorist attack by 2013, report says;” The Telegraph; <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/3543345/US-should-expect-a-nuclear-or-biological-terrorist-attack-by-2013-report-says.html> ET

The United States should expect a terrorist attack using nuclear or biological weapons within the next five years, a US study said. 7:32PM GMT 02 Dec 2008¶ The margin of safety in America is "shrinking, not growing", the bipartisan report said, and it urged the US to "move with a sense of urgency" to improve security.¶ The report, which will be published on Wednesday, cites US ally Pakistan as a hotspot for danger: "Were one to map terrorism and weapons of mass destruction today, all roads would intersect in Pakistan."¶ The Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism report said terrorists are more likely to be able to obtain biological weapons, with anthrax a particular danger, than nuclear weapons, as nuclear facilities are more carefully guarded.¶ Civilian laboratories with potentially dangerous pathogens abound, and could easily be compromised, the report said.¶ While militant groups lack the scientific and technical ability to make weapons out of pathogens or nuclear bombs, the gap could easily be overcome if terrorists found scientists willing to share or sell their knowledge, the report said.¶ The report also found that al-Qaeda remains the only terrorist group judged to be actively intent on conducting a nuclear attack against the US.¶ It is not yet capable of building such a weapon and has yet to obtain one, but that could change if a nuclear weapons engineer or scientist were recruited to al-Qaeda's cause, the report said.

#### Terrorists want to attack our ports and will continue to in the future

Niyazi Onur Bakir, postdoctoral research associate at University of Southern California Center for Homeland Security, 1-1-2007, “A Brief Analysis of Threats and Vulnerabilities in the Maritime Domain” CREATE Research Archive, http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=nonpublished\_reports //eR

Besides Al-Qaeda, some other organizations are believed to harbor intentions to launch seaborne attacks that target United States and its allies. In Southeast Asia, where piracy is rampant, Jemaah Islamiya (JI), Lashkar Jundullah (LJ), and Kampulan Mujahidin Malaysia (KMM) are among the active terrorist organizations that could potentially direct their attention to maritime terrorism. Elsewhere, as mentioned in the previous section, Al-Aqsa Martyr's Brigade has already shipped two suicide bombers to an Israeli port disguised in a container. It is expected that terrorism in open seas will continue be a threat unless radical measures that foster coordination between nations and intelligence sharing are taken.

### Internal Link

#### Middle Eastern proliferation ensures that terrorists will have access to nuclear weapons

Greg Sheridan, foreign editor, 7-26-2012, “COMPLEX WEB OF TERROR AND NUKES MAGNIFIES THREATS” The Australian, Lexis //eR

This is part of the very difficult nexus of terrorism and traditional strategic issues. A nuclear-armed Iran is a threat in at least four distinct ways. Iran might decide to use such weapons. It might threaten, explicitly or implicitly, to use them and thereby gain great geo-strategic power. Or its mere possession of nuclear weapons may lead to a ``cascade'' of other Middle Eastern powers acquiring nukes for themselves, with all the dangers that would bring. And finally, a nuclear Iran might pass nuclear material to terrorists. But the calculus is infinitely complex, for a strike on Iran's nuclear program may not work definitively, and may have its own disastrous consequences. From the very first, one of the most difficult aspects of dealing with terrorism was that all the other, pre-9/11 geo-strategic issues -- the rise of China and the like -- still had to be dealt with, while containing terrorism demanded a serious, continuing effort. Barack Obama has done well on terrorism. This has partly been technical and partly a matter of unpredicted political resolve. The technical aspect is the extraordinary development of drone technology. This has allowed the Americans to destroy most of al-Qa'ida's leadership in Afghanistan and Pakistan, and some parts of Africa. This is exceptionally important in part because it is al-Qa'ida that, more than any other terrorist group, has demonstrated a serious desire to get hold of nuclear material. The surprising political dimension has been Obama's willingness to use lethal force. In many ways Obama makes George W. Bush look like a sissy. Most Washington insiders, not to mention the general public, have been seriously surprised by this aspect of Obama's presidency. Al-Qa'ida central is for the moment on the ropes. Its most serious offshoots now are in Yemen and in parts of Africa. The Americans have had considerable tactical, almost surgical, success against the leadership of many of these groups as well. The Obama camp makes a perfectly plausible case that it has got the balance pretty right here. It has decimated al-Qa'ida's leadership but it has not got involved in ground wars in Yemen, or Africa. Nor has it gone into the tribal areas of Pakistan with a heavy, ground military force. But this very success conceals two disturbing realities about terrorism. Although al-Qa'ida central is on the ropes, its ideas and recruitment continue apace. Al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghreb, al-Shabaab and many other groups continue the al-Qa'ida vision. The central organisation would regenerate if the Americans released the pressure. That means there needs to be a continuing military effort against terrorists, as well as all the various political efforts. And the long-term trend line in several areas is pretty bad. Pakistan continues to see a growth in jihadi outfits, even as the population is weary of jihadis. There is complicity from parts of the Pakistani military, but almost more disturbing are signs that Pakistan is losing control of some of the terror groups it created or succoured. And Pakistan has many more than a hundred nuclear weapons. It is increasing its nuclear arsenal, and moving it around in irresponsible ways, in part because it is scared the Americans may one day decide to try to destroy or impound this arsenal. So Pakistan is making that option completely impossible. Yet there is nowhere on earth that terrorists are likelier to come by some nuclear material than Pakistan.

#### Terrorists are capable of countering current detection tech

Jonathon Medalia, Specialist in National Defense¶ Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, 1-24-2005, “CRS Report for Congress” Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21293.pdf>, CP

Terrorists can counter new technologies. If the United States deploys sensors at¶ some ports, terrorists might detonate a weapon before it is inspected, or ship it to another¶ port. If foreign ports screened containers before being loaded onto U.S.-bound ships,¶ terrorists could infiltrate the ports. Securing the largest ports might lead terrorists to use¶ smaller ones. Securing every U.S.-bound container might lead terrorists to smuggle a¶ weapon in a small boat or airplane. Detecting an HEU bomb is difficult because HEU¶ emits very little radiation. R&D is underway to address this key issue.¶ In 2002 and 2003, ABC News shipped shielded 15-pound cylinders of depleted¶ uranium (DU, natural uranium minus most uranium-235) into U.S. ports in containers.¶ CBP did not detect these shipments. ABC claimed that DU is a good surrogate for HEU;¶ CBP claimed the opposite. In September 2004, DHS issued a report on the topic. It¶ concluded “[i]mprovements are needed in the inspection process to ensure that weapons¶ of mass destruction ... do not gain access to the U.S. through oceangoing cargo¶ containers” and recommended improving detection equipment and search methods.

#### Of course terrorists are a huge threat…

George Michael, Associate Professor Nuclear Counterprolifation & Deterrence Theory, 7-7-2012, “Trategic Nuclear Terrorism of State Decapitation http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14702436.2012.683974

Over the past two decades, the likelihood of global thermonuclear war¶ has drastically decreased, yet the threat of a nuclear attack could be¶ greater than ever. In fact, on the eve of the Nuclear Security Summit in¶ April 2010, US President Barack Obama announced that the prospect of¶ nuclear terrorism was ‘the single biggest threat to US security, both¶ short-term, medium-term and long-term’.1 Likewise, in its final report,¶ the 9/11 Commission reported that the greatest danger that America¶ faced was the threat from terrorists armed with a weapon of mass¶ destruction (WMD).2 Echoing these concerns, former CIA Director¶ George Tenet opined that the main threat of WMD was the nuclear¶ one and that Al-Qaeda was making efforts in that direction.3 Writing in¶ 2004, Graham Allison, an authoritative scholar on the topic, stated that¶ in his ‘own considered judgment, on the current path, a nuclear terrorist¶ attack on America in the decade ahead is more likely than not.’4 As¶ an indication of how serious the international community has taken the¶ issue, in 2005, the United Nations created the International Convention¶ for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.

### Impacts -

Jon Haveman, and Howard Shatz, 2006, “Protecting the¶ Nation’s Seaports:¶ Balancing Security¶ and Cost, <http://web.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf>, CP

The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are jurisdictionally¶ separate but share San Pedro Bay and effectively serve as one giant port¶ complex (see the port map, p. xxiii). Combined, the complex is the¶ largest port by value in the United States and the fifth-largest container¶ port in the world. If terrorists wanted to wreak havoc on the U.S.¶ economy, the Los Angeles–Long Beach complex would certainly be a¶ prime target for attack. In 2004, the complex processed $243 billion¶ worth of traded goods, just over 10 percent of all U.S. trade, 25 percent¶ of all waterborne trade, or an amount equal to about 2 percent of U.S.¶ gross domestic product (GDP). Because imports constitute the vast¶ majority of this trade, and because these imports are often used as inputs¶ to other products, a terrorist attack on these ports could disrupt the U.S.¶ economy. Opinions on the extent of disruption differ significantly,¶ however.

Jon Haveman, and Howard Shatz, 2006, “Protecting the¶ Nation’s Seaports:¶ Balancing Security¶ and Cost, <http://web.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf>, CP

These are not trivial costs. For comparison, the new eastern span of¶ the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge is expected to cost around $6¶ billion, and policymakers have gone to enormous pains finding money to¶ pay for it. The estimated costs of a one-year closure of Terminal Island¶ are more than seven times that large. Nevertheless, U.S. GDP is more¶ than $11.7 trillion, next to which the economic costs of an attack do¶ seem small.12¶ Such an attack would also cost jobs. Under the one-year scenario,¶ the equivalent of 280,000 jobs would be lost before the ports were¶ restored. Of these, 101,000 would be in the five-county Los Angeles¶ region. If these jobs had been lost in 2004, and all the workers¶ who occupied them remained in the labor force, the five-county¶ unemployment rate could have been as high as 7.1 percent rather than¶ the actual 5.9 percent. All of these costs likely would be magnified if terrorists struck successfully at multiple ports, although the authors do¶ not investigate this further possibility.

#### Terrorists have the capability to access the bomb – Russia, Pakistan, building it are all options

Jonathon Medalia, Specialist in National Defense¶ Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, 1-24-2005, “CRS Report for Congress” Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21293.pdf>, CP

CBP [Customs and Border Protection]¶ Commissioner Robert Bonner believes an attack using a nuclear bomb in a container¶ would halt container shipments, leading to “devastating” consequences for the global¶ economy. ...”5 People can, however, find ways to minimize economic problems.¶ Terrorist Nuclear Weapons: Routes to a Bomb. A terrorist group might¶ obtain a bomb, perhaps with the yield of the Hiroshima bomb, by several plausible routes.¶ Russia. Strategic (long-range) nuclear weapons are reportedly well guarded on¶ missiles or, thanks in part to U.S. assistance, in storage. In contrast, thousands of shorterrange¶ lower-yield weapons intended for use in combat are less well secured, and numbers¶ and locations are uncertain. (See CRS Report RL32202, Nuclear Weapons in Russia:¶ Safety, Security, and Control Issues.) A fear is that terrorists might buy or steal one of¶ these weapons along with information on how to bypass any use-control devices.¶ Pakistan. U.S., British, Chinese, French, and Israeli nuclear weapons are thought¶ to be well guarded. Control is less certain for India and Pakistan. Reports indicate that¶ Pakistanis aided nuclear programs in Iran, Libya, and North Korea, and there are concerns¶ about the security of Pakistani nuclear weapons if President Musharraf were assassinated.6¶ Build a Bomb. The Hiroshima bomb was a “gun assembly” weapon. Its nuclear¶ explosive was a gun barrel about 6 inches in diameter by 6 feet long. It was capped at¶ each end, with standard explosive at one end, a mass of uranium highly enriched in the¶ isotope 235 (highly enriched uranium, or HEU) next to the explosive, and a second HEU¶ mass at the other end. Detonating the explosive shot one mass of HEU into the other,¶ rapidly assembling a mass large enough to support a fission chain reaction. (Plutonium¶ cannot be used.) This is the simplest type of nuclear weapon. U.S. scientists had such¶ high confidence in the design that they did not test the Hiroshima bomb. Experts agree that terrorist groups could not make special nuclear material (SNM, i.e., fissile plutonium¶ or HEU). Many believe that a terrorist group with access to HEU and key skills could¶ build a crude nuclear weapon. Five former Los Alamos nuclear weapons experts held that¶ such a weapon “could be constructed by a group not previously engaged in designing or¶ building nuclear weapons, providing a number of requirements were adequately met.”7¶ A National Research Council study stated: “The basic technical information needed to¶ construct a workable nuclear device is readily available in the open literature. The¶ primary impediment that prevents countries or technically competent terrorist groups from¶ developing nuclear weapons is the availability of SNM, especially HEU.”8 Many believe¶ it would be hard for a terrorist group to obtain enough HEU for a weapon; others fear that¶ terrorists could do so. The National Research Council study rated the threat level from¶ SNM from Russia as “High — large inventories of SNM are stored at many sites that¶ apparently lack inventory controls and indigenous threats have increased.”

#### Terrorists are radicals… they don’t think like your evidence wants them

George Michael, Associate Professor Nuclear Counterprolifation & Deterrence Theory, 7-7-2012, “Trategic Nuclear Terrorism of State Decapitation http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14702436.2012.683974

During the Cold War, the nuclear balance of terror was thought to¶ follow a certain train of logic, as both the United States and the Soviet¶ Union pursued their foreign policy goals in a rational manner and were¶ loath to risk nuclear annihilation in the form of mutually assured¶ destruction. Some observers fear, though, that nuclear-armed extremist¶ groups would not follow this logic because of their radical worldviews.6¶ Moreover, inasmuch as terrorists usually have no return address or fixed¶ assets, classic deterrence theory would be less applicable.7 As Thomas¶ C. Schelling once explained, deterring nuclear terrorists would be challenging:¶ [A]n organization that needs only a small boat to dock in a metropolitan¶ harbor, with a nuclear weapon on board and someplace to operate¶ a two-way radio, can hardly be starved into second thoughts of¶ denial of soybeans, military spare parts, or air traffic, and it evidently¶ cannot be invaded or captured or we wouldn’t have the problem in¶ the first place.8¶ A nuclear first strike launched against the United States by way of¶ intercontinental ballistic missiles would almost assuredly occasion a¶ massive retaliatory strike against the culprit, as the attack, though swift,¶ would not come as a complete surprise insofar as satellites would detect¶ the launch well before the weapons reached their intended targets. By¶ contrast, terrorists would not deliver a nuclear weapon by aircraft or¶ missile, but by a truck or a freighter, thus the attack could come as a¶ complete surprise.9 Moreover, the time necessary to attribute the attack¶ to the responsible party would rule out a quick retaliatory response.

#### Bioweapons outweigh every other impact and cause extinction

Richard Ochs, freelance writer and resident printer for the D.C. Black Panther Party, 6-9-2002, “BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUST BE ABOLISHED IMMEDIATELY” http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html //eR

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks have demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and Ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### A bioweapon attack would be impossible to control and would cause extinction

John D. Steinbruner, Professor of Public Policy at the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and Director of the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 1998, “Biological Weapons: A Plague upon All Houses” Foreign Policy, 109, Winter 1997-1998 //eR

 Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The after effects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens—ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use—the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from on victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population. The 1918 influenza epidemic demonstrated the potential for a global contagion of this sort but not necessarily its outer limit.

#### Yes – other groups besides al-Qaida exist

Lisa Daniel, American Forces Press Service, 2-16-2012, “US Faces Broad Spectrum of Threats, Intel Leaders Say,” DoD, <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=67231>, CP

With continued, robust counterterrorism efforts and cooperation from international partners, Clapper said, “there is a better-than-even chance that decentralization will lead to fragmentation of the movement within a few years,” although he added that terrorist groups will continue to be a dangerous transnational force.¶ Intense counterterrorism pressure has made it unlikely that a terrorist group would launch a chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear mass attack against the United States in the next year, Clapper said, but groups such as al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula continue to show interest in such an attack. Most terrorist groups, however, remain locally focused, Clapper said, noting that al-Qaida in Iraq remains focused on overthrowing the Shiia-led government in Baghdad in favor of a Sunni-led government.¶ In Africa, the al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb and al-Shabaab organizations struggle with internal divisions and outside support, and have been diminished by government and military pressure in Somalia, Kenya and Ethiopia, he said.¶ Clapper also said that extremist “lone actors,” including criminals and homegrown terrorists, continue to be a concern inside the United States. The intelligence community, he added, will stay alert to events that might precipitate an attack, such as a perceived anti-Islamic bias, military involvement in another Muslim country, or unrest overseas.

#### Impacts are big enough that any threat of a bomb means you vote neg

Dafna Linzer, Washington Post Staff Writer, 12-29-2004, “Nuclear Capabilities May Elude Terrorists, Experts Say,” Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A32285-2004Dec28.html>, CP

Still, the sheer magnitude of the danger posed by a nuclear weapon in terrorist hands -- and classified intelligence assessments that deem such a scenario plausible -- has spurred intelligence and military operations to combat a threat once dismissed as all but nonexistent. The effort includes billions of dollars spent on attempts to secure borders, retrain weapons scientists in other countries and lock up dangerous materials and stockpiles.¶ "The thing to keep in mind is that while it is extremely difficult, we have highly motivated and intelligent people who would like to do it," said Daniel Benjamin, a former National Security Council staff member and senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Each type of weapon of mass destruction -- nuclear, biological and chemical -- presents special challenges for the groups seeking to acquire them, but also opportunities that can be exploited by people determined to unleash their awesome destructive powers. This is the first of three articles aimed at exploring those risks and challenges.

#### Ports are uniquely susceptible to terrorist attacks – no substantial barriers to either development or implementation

Dafna Linzer, Washington Post Staff Writer, 12-29-2004, “Nuclear Capabilities May Elude Terrorists, Experts Say,” Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A32285-2004Dec28.html>, CP

The uranium would have to be smuggled out of the facility and then transferred, possibly across several borders, seaports and airports, to a location where the device could be assembled. As described in unclassified literature, the gun-type bomb works when one mass of uranium is shot into another inside a tube. Such a device would be small enough to hide in a corner of a shipping container, but that would mean getting it to a port, onto a container and probably bribing a shipper or cargo crew to transport it.¶ An oil shipment would be optimal for a ready-made device, according to the congressional report, because the "size of the supertanker and thickness of the steel, especially with the use of double hulls," renders some detection equipment unusable.¶ But HEU emits low levels of radioactivity anyway, and that could be masked with lead shielding. A primitive device could be assembled in a small garage using machine tools readily available at an auto shop and concealed in a lead-plated delivery truck about the size of a delivery van, experts said.

### Impacts – Economy

#### **A nuclear terrorist attack on our ports would kill sixty thousand and ruin the nation’s economy**

James M. Klatell, political analyst, 2-11-2009, “Are U.S. Ports Open To Nuclear Attack?” http://www.cbsnews.com/2100-18563\_162-1914030.html //eR

To a country now focused on the threat of "liquid" terror in the sky, Wednesday's bomb scare at the port of Seattle was just a brief blip on the radar. But what turned out to be a false alarm was eerily similar to a nightmare scenario outlined by the Rand Corporation, a security think tank. The Rand study explored what might happen if a 10-kiloton nuclear bomb – the size of the one dropped on Hiroshima – was hidden by terrorists in a cargo container and detonated at the port of Long Beach, Calif. "Sixty thousand people probably would be killed in the immediacy of the blast or would die from severe radiation sickness," Rand's Michael Wermuth said. The nearby port of Los Angeles would also be destroyed. Almost 200,000 people could be exposed to deadly radiation while 2 to 3 million southern Californians could be forced to relocate. "We made it clear that we do not think this is the next likely attack," Wermuth said. But the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles are tempting economic targets. More cargo moves through these two ports than nearly every other major U.S. port combined. Finding a bomb here would be like finding a nuclear needle in a haystack. Customs officials at both ports scan every container for radiation before it heads out into the community. Some are checked using handheld sensors, while others are x-rayed using special trucks. Richard Steinke, the executive director of the Port of Long Beach, said, "We're a lot safer than we were pre-9/11." The head of the Department of Homeland Security acknowledged all the security efforts are still not enough. "The real answer is to go overseas," Sec. Michael Chertoff said. "Because ideally we don't want the container with the nuclear device to even get on the ship that's coming to the U.S." Rand officials stress their dark scenario was not meant to scare people, but to get them thinking about what will happen in the days, weeks, even years after a catastrophic event. Economist Jack Kyser points out a nuclear attack could send the insurance, real estate and financial markets into tailspin. "Los Angeles doesn't just make movies, it is an international business center," said Jack Kyser of the L.A. County Economic Development Corporation. "There would be ramification all the way around the world." Besides the loss in human life, it's estimated the initial cost of nuclear port attack could hit a trillion dollars – that's more than 10 times worse than September 11.

#### A nuclear terrorist attack on a port would shut down US trade indefinitely and ruin our economy

Charles Meade, RAND scientist, and Roger C. Molander, senior policy researcher on terrorism with a Ph.D. in engineering and nuclear engineering, 2006. “Considering the Effects of a Catastrophic Terrorist Attack” RAND Center for Terrorism Risk Management Policy, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\_reports/2006/RAND\_TR391.pdf //eR

In the aftermath of the attack, different stakeholder groups affected might have differing interests. Consequently, their decisions might often be at odds. How to contend with such conflicting interests is the key challenge for policymakers. In terms of global shipping, the main tension might be between the political aim of preventing a future attack and the business interest in seeing that U.S. ports and the global shipping supply chain continue to operate. The only way to completely mitigate the risk of a second strike would be to close all U.S. ports and suspend all imports indefinitely. This would be the national security community’s likely position. Yet in business terms, this position would be untenable. The loss of the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles alone, which handle 30 percent of U.S. shipping imports, would already be substantial. All U.S. ports combined carry out 7.5 percent of world trade activity. Accordingly, the business community would likely call for ports to stay open, or to reopen as early as possible. But harsh realities facing the financial and real estate communities might prove a barrier. The Long Beach attack might cripple an insurance industry struggling to absorb massive losses from claims. Insurance would be in tremendously short supply—particularly for terrorist and nuclear risks. Without it, ports and related infrastructure could not operate. Further complicating the issue is the high probability that people would flee port cities, severely depleting local labor supplies. Given these conditions, all U.S. ports would likely close indefinitely or operate at a substantially reduced level following the attack. This would severely disrupt the availability of basic goods and petroleum throughout the country.

#### Oil and natural gas terrorism in ports major threat – would tank economy

Steward Powell; joined the Houston Chronicle in April 2008 after 21 years with Hearst Newspapers in Washington, D.C., generated daily coverage from the White House, the Pentagon, national security agencies, Congress and various federal departments and agencies for distribution to 600 newspapers served by the New York Times; [September 8, 2011;](http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2011/09/top-white-house-official-says-port-security-has-been-improved/) “Top White House official says port security has been improved;” chron.com Houston News; <http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2011/09/top-white-house-official-says-port-security-has-been-improved/> ET

The top White House official responsible for protecting the nation against follow-on al-Qaida attacks says there have been “a number of very important improvements” in security at maritime ports such as the 52-mile Houston Ship Channel since the 9/11 attacks a decade ago.¶ John Brennan, President Obama’s counter-terrorism adviser, said the administration has effectively extended U.S. maritime borders to ports around the world by requiring U.S.-bound ships from countries with ties to terrorism to undergo pre-departure security screening.¶ Brennan was responding to security concerns raised during a congressional field hearing in Houston last month. Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Austin, chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee’s investigations subcommittee, used the hearing to highlight the potential threat of al-Qaida affiliated terrorists targeting oil and natural gas tankers en route into U.S. harbors by using explosives-packed suicide boats, coordinated rocket-propelled grenade strikes or even seizing control of the ships’ bridge.¶ Houston’s shipping channel and port handle 7,800 vessels a year and 150,000 barge movements on the waterway. On any given day, up to 30 oil and chemical tankers are moving along the ship channel—location of 31 percent of the nation’s crude oil refining capacity.¶ Were terrorist to cripple or sink a tanker in the channel it could interrupt gasoline production and inflict enormous damage on the U.S. economy.¶ Brennan said authorities are constantly trying to balance security with accessibility.¶ “The thing about the United States that we hold dear is that we are a country that is known for its openness to the world,” Brennan said. “Therefore we cannot hermetically seal it. We don’t want to close off our ports, we don’t want to close off our coasts.”¶ Brennan said the federal government has implemented precautions “that will optimize our security” by requiring U.S.-bound ships to clear their cargo in advance.¶ “What we have looked at over the last ten years through successive administrations are those steps and measures that we can take that will enhance that security,” Brennan said. “But it can’t just be inside the port. If they have already gotten there, they’ve gotten too far.”¶ Brennan said the U.S. approach depends upon cooperation by U.S. allies to help carry out pre-departure screening of ships’ cargoes “so that we have assurance that it has met some security requirement of our own before it even comes close to our coastline.”

### Solvency

#### Improving the ability to detect nuclear weapons decreases the probability of attack

Jonathon Medalia, Specialist in National Defense¶ Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division, 1-24-2005, “CRS Report for Congress” Congressional Research Service, <http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21293.pdf>, CP

The 9/11 Commission wrote,¶ “Opportunities to do harm are as great, or greater, in maritime or surface transportation¶ [compared to commercial aviation]. Initiatives to secure shipping containers have just¶ begun.” Terrorists “may be deterred by a significant chance of failure.”20 Improving the¶ ability to detect terrorist nuclear weapons in the maritime transportation system may make¶ a terrorist attack on a port less likely to succeed, and thus less probable. The American¶ Association of Port Authorities, a trade association, welcomed federal grants for port¶ security upgrades to comply with the MTSA, but called for “substantially greater¶ resources.”21 Others agree that more resources are needed to secure U.S. ports, such as¶ to reduce overcrowding of cargo-handling facilities and to hire more workers.22 A similar¶ case could be made for gas pipelines, electric power plants, rail yards, or bridges. At issue¶ for Congress is how to allocate security funds among ports and other potential targets.

### Oil Scenario

#### Our ports are key to trade and oil – security is key to prevent terrorist attacks

Mr. Maxwell; a senior instructor in the Marine Training Branch of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia; and Mr. Blanda; a senior instructor in the Marine Training Branch of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia; 2005; “Terror by sea: the unique challenges of port security;”

[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Terror+by+sea%3a+the+unique+challenges+of+port+security.-a0137713576](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Terror%2Bby%2Bsea%3A%2Bthe%2Bunique%2Bchallenges%2Bof%2Bport%2Bsecurity.-a0137713576) ET

The United States always has defended its borders and natural resources from harm. Unlike threats of the past, however, maritime terrorism constitutes a multifront conflict both at home and abroad. It recognizes no borders and can originate from organized groups and individuals operating inside or outside the United States. The fight against maritime terrorism, unlike conventional threats, is a complicated struggle with neither an easy nor a rapid conclusion. The U.S. maritime jurisdiction represents a daunting challenge: more than 1,000 harbor channels with 25,000 miles of inland intracoastal and coastal waterways that serve 361 ports containing more than 3,700 passenger and cargo terminals. Annually, the U.S. Maritime Transportation System manages over 2 billion tons of freight, 3 billion tons of oil, more than 134 million ferry passengers, and an estimated 7 million cruise ship travelers. The dimensions of the extraordinarily difficult task confronting the United States center on an estimated 7,500 foreign ships, manned by 200,000 sailors, entering U.S. ports every year. The more than 6 million intermodal cargo containers that enter annually represent two-thirds of the total value (as opposed to tonnage) of all U.S. maritime trade. (1) Monitoring the intricate waterways, ports, and interstate connections falls to the marine enforcement officers in the field.¶ Perhaps, a review of the ports on the Mississippi River can put the challenge these officers face into proper perspective. The lower 255 miles of the Mississippi River, from the mouth to Baton Rouge, contain 4 of the top 11 ports in the country The [Port of South Louisiana](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Port%2Bof%2BSouth%2BLouisiana)The **Port of South Louisiana** is the largest volume shipping port in the Western Hemisphere and 4th largest in the world. It is the largest bulk cargo port in the world.
**.....** Click the link for more information., located between [New Orleans](http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/New%2BOrleans)New Orleans (ôr`lēənz –lənz, ôrlēnz`), city (2006 pop. 187,525), coextensive with Orleans parish, SE La., between the Mississippi River and Lake Pontchartrain, 107 mi (172 km) by water from the river mouth; founded
**.....** Click the link for more information. and Baton Rouge, encompasses a total of 54 miles, while the [Port of New Orleans](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Port%2Bof%2BNew%2BOrleans)The **Port of New Orleans** is a port located in New Orleans, Louisiana. It is the 5th largest port in the United States based on volume of cargo handled, second-largest in the state after the Port of South Louisiana, and 12th largest in the U.S. based on value of cargo.
**.....** Click the link for more information. includes 33 miles of the river. The Port of Greater Baton Rouge comprises 85 miles, and the Port of Plaquemines, located south of New Orleans, covers over 80 miles of the Mississippi River. Of particular interest is the [Louisiana Offshore Oil Port](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Louisiana%2BOffshore%2BOil%2BPort)¶ The nation's only offshore deepwater port, it can handle 100,000 barrels of oil an hour, or 2.4 million [barrels per day](http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Barrels%2Bper%2Bday)Barrels per day (abbreviated BPD, bbl/d, bpd, bd or b/d) is a measurement used to describe the amount of crude oil (measured in barrels) produced or consumed by an entity in one day, and services over 30 percent of this country's refineries. Such a valuable resource as the Mississippi River obviously requires protection from the threat of maritime terrorism.

#### Oil terrorism is a major threat – tanks US economy

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND NONPROLIFERATION; standing subcommittee within the [House Foreign Affairs Committee](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_Foreign_Affairs_Committee); WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2005; “TERRORIST THREATS TO ENERGY SECURITY;” Committee on International Relations; <http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/intlrel/hfa22655.000/hfa22655_0f.htm> ET¶

The possibility of energy terrorism—attacks on the world's energy infrastructure—doesn't generate the same attention as potential chemical or biological or nuclear terrorism. But the economic implications of such attacks are potentially enormous. Many believe that the reason we are looking at oil at $60 a barrel is the fact that we have a ''terror premium'' factored into the price of a barrel of oil. Some suggest that oil terrorism is emerging as a major threat to the global economy. Combating this threat should be a part of our complex goal of improving our Nation's energy security. Because of U.S. energy demands and the global nature of energy markets, terrorists can strike at us almost anywhere in the world. Oil markets are tight, with little spare capacity, and demand is increasing. As we will hear today, there is strong evidence that a relatively small disruption to oil production throughout the world could spike world energy prices, severely harming the American economy. We have taken steps to improve the security of the energy infrastructure of this country since 9/11. But, unfortunately, terrorist attacks abroad could hurt us as if they were committed here at home.

#### Attacks on oil infrastructure tank the economy – terrorists threats high and status quo solutions fail

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND NONPROLIFERATION; standing subcommittee within the [House Foreign Affairs Committee](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_Foreign_Affairs_Committee); WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2005; “TERRORIST THREATS TO ENERGY SECURITY;” Committee on International Relations; <http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/intlrel/hfa22655.000/hfa22655_0f.htm> ET¶

III) What We Learned From ''Oil ShockWave''? It is useful to review some of the key findings from *Oil ShockWave*. We did not seek to reach unanimous conclusions among the participants, however, a majority of participants would most likely embrace most of the findings and recommendations. First, there is really no such thing as ''foreign oil.'' Oil is a fungible global commodity. A change in supply or demand anywhere will affect prices everywhere. Second, we discovered that taking such a small amount of oil off the market could have significant impact on crude oil prices and gasoline. Oil markets are currently precariously balanced. Small supply/demand imbalances can have dramatic effects. We essentially took only 3.5 million barrels off a roughly 84 million barrel global daily market. This means that a supply shortfall of approximately 4% could cause prices to rise to $161 per barrel of oil or to $5.74 per gallon of gasoline. This would create tremendous national security and economic problems for the country.¶ Third, the prices of crude oil rose quickly. It would not necessarily take much to go from $60 to $123 or even $161. Fourth, once oil supply disruptions occur, little can be done in the short term to protect the US economy from its impacts. There are few good short-term solutions. Fifth, there are a number of supply-side and demand-side policy options available that would significantly improve US oil security. Benefits from these measures will take a decade or more to mature, and thus should be enacted as soon as possible. This is the reason we must act now to end this national and economic security vulnerability. Sixth, US foreign and military policy is influenced by—and often constrained by—US oil dependence. For example, during *Oil ShockWave*, the Saudi Arabian and the Chinese governments attempt to extract concessions out of the US in order for them to accede to US requests to help alleviate the crisis. In Segment 1, the Saudi Arabian government demands among other things that the US stop pressuring them to democratize and to stop discussing and investigating money laundering allegations and donations to al Qaeda in order to increase production capacity. In Segment 2, the Chinese government demands the US stops discussing Chinese human rights violations and stops selling weapons to Taiwan in order to accede to a request to reduce demand voluntarily. It should be noted that in both cases the *Oil ShockWave* Cabinet refused to accede to these demands. Seventh, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR) or the emergency supply of federally owned crude oil (approximately 640 million barrels of oil) in underground salt caverns, offers at best limited protection against a major supply disruption. More importantly, determining when to use the SPR was more of an art than a science. There never seemed to be an appropriate opportunity and the Cabinet spent much time arguing when and how to release oil from the SPR. For instance, military and security were always concerned that releasing oil from the SPR could leave the US without any options if matters deteriorated further. There were also concerns that any announcement of a release of oil from the SPR could be overtaken or overshadowed by world events and thus prove meaningless as a psychological weapon. Furthermore, it was noted that releasing oil from the SPR could have the opposite effect and actually contribute to an increase in prices, as any release would be seen as confirmation about the acuteness of the crisis. Finally, the SPR is virtually meaningless in Segment 3 if Saudi Arabia is truly unable to increase production for a sustained period of time.¶ Eighth, the oil system is vulnerable to attacks on key energy infrastructure both overseas and at home. Because that infrastructure is simply too vast to protect, we must seek other ways to reduce this vulnerability such as reducing demand and finding alternatives to diversify fuel sources. It should be noted that during *Oil ShockWave* in Segment 2 Saudi Arabian security forces were able to foil terrorist attacks on Ras Tanura, a major oil facility. We thought it would be useful and telling to have a crisis despite the fact that Saudi Arabia was generally successful in protecting their major oil facilities. Most ominously, al Qaeda and Bin Laden have explicitly called for attacks and even attempted attacks on the oil infrastructure and by extension the Western economic system.

#### US economic collapse causes global nuclear war

By [AARON FRIEDBERG](http://online.wsj.com/search/term.html?KEYWORDS=AARON+FRIEDBERG&bylinesearch=true); professor of politics and international relations at Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School; and [GABRIEL SCHOENFELD](http://online.wsj.com/search/term.html?KEYWORDS=GABRIEL+SCHOENFELD&bylinesearch=true); senior editor of Commentary, visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute in Princeton, N.J.; OCTOBER 21, 2008; “The Dangers of a Diminished America - In the 1930s, isolationism and protectionism spurred the rise of fascism;” Wall Street Journal; <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html> ET

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures. As for our democratic friends, the present crisis comes when many European nations are struggling to deal with decades of anemic growth, sclerotic governance and an impending demographic crisis. Despite its past dynamism, Japan faces similar challenges. India is still in the early stages of its emergence as a world economic and geopolitical power. What does this all mean? There is no substitute for America on the world stage. The choice we have before us is between the potentially disastrous effects of disengagement and the stiff price tag of continued American leadership.

#### Natural gas key to US energy

Eben Kaplan; Metro Area Industry International Affairs; February 27, 2006; “Liquefied Natural Gas: A Potential Terrorist Target?”; Council on Foreign Regulations; <http://www.cfr.org/port-security/liquefied-natural-gas-potential-terrorist-target/p9810#p3> ET

What is Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)?¶ When natural gas is cooled to -260˚F, it condenses into a liquid. In this liquid state, natural gas can be shipped and stored in large quantities via refrigerated tankers before being converted back into gas and distributed through pipelines. In the absence of a pipeline, the only way natural gas can be shipped is in this liquid form. Such shipments are likely to increase: According to the Energy Information Administration, global natural gas consumption is expected to increase 70 percent from 2002 to 2025. Over the same time frame, natural-gas consumption in China is expected to more than quintuple. Today nearly a quarter of U.S. energy comes from natural gas, and within twenty years it could be responsible for as much as one third of American energy consumption. The percentage of liquefied gas imports to the United States is expected to rise sharply in that period.¶

#### Terrorists will attack natural gas terminals – disrupts US gas supply

Eben Kaplan; Metro Area Industry International Affairs; February 27, 2006; “Liquefied Natural Gas: A Potential Terrorist Target?”; Council on Foreign Regulations; <http://www.cfr.org/port-security/liquefied-natural-gas-potential-terrorist-target/p9810#p3> ET

Are LNG ships and terminals potential terrorist targets?¶ Yes, because of LNG's explosive potential, experts say. Al-Qaeda, for example, has specifically cited LNG as a desirable target, says [Rob Knake](http://www.goodharbor.net/about-knake.html), senior associate at Good Harbor Consulting, LLC, a homeland-security private consulting firm. Pipelines are not as attractive because the flow of gas can quickly be cut off and an explosion easily contained. Terminals make better targets because an attack could result in a massive fire that could potentially kill scores of people. They are also good targets because "if you take out those terminals, you could have a significant disruption [in the U.S. gas supply,]" Knake says.

#### Scanning solves terrorist attacks on natural gas terminals

Eben Kaplan; Metro Area Industry International Affairs; February 27, 2006; “Liquefied Natural Gas: A Potential Terrorist Target?”; Council on Foreign Regulations; <http://www.cfr.org/port-security/liquefied-natural-gas-potential-terrorist-target/p9810#p3> ET

What safety precautions are taken to prevent such attacks?¶ LNG tankers approaching U.S. waters must provide ninety-six hours' notice, allowing the Coast Guard to provide a small flotilla to safely escort the boat to its destination. Added security detail includes local police boats, divers, firefighting tugboats, and a helicopter. Bridges along the tanker's route are closed and nearby airports suspend flights. Any private vessels that drift too close are sternly turned away. Tankers are inspected and screened for explosives before they are allowed to approach land, and tanker crews must pass a security check before being allowed to board the vessels. At LNG terminals, there is also a heavy security presence; access to the terminals is controlled, and security personnel perform regular threat-response drills. ¶ Because of its low cost and high impact, a U.S.S. Cole-style attack remains an important security concern for defense planners. "It's not a difficult thing to do if you're determined to do it," Fay says. "It doesn't require trained experts to evade the Coast Guard." When a passenger jet enters restricted airspace over a nuclear plant, it is the U.S. president, Knake says, who must decide whether to repel the plane with force. Yet when a private craft drifts too close to an LNG tanker, "you could have a petty officer in the Coast Guard making this call," he says.

#### Limited funds mean security gaps at U.S. ports – high risk oil terminals

Jospeh F. Bouchard, Ph.D.; Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense, United States Navy Captain; 2005; “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy;” <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf> ET

Only this year has the department made an initial effort to implement a¶ “risk-based” approach in the current fiscal year 2005 (Round 5) program. This¶ effort to articulate risk-based priorities is laudable, but is seriously flawed.¶ Because of limited funds, only 66 of our largest ports are eligible for grants, with¶ emphasis placed on prevention and detection of improvised explosive devices,¶ particularly those delivered by small craft, underwater or in vehicles on ferries.22¶ Prioritizing entire ports for grant allocations misses the important point that not¶ all facilities within a port present the same level of risk: some may be seriously¶ threatened because an attack on them would cause catastrophic consequences, while other facilities in the same port would be of little interest to¶ terrorists. Although DHS recognizes that “the highest risk assets include oil,¶ chemical, gas terminals and passenger/ferry vessels/terminals,”23 this was not¶ incorporated into this year’s grant prioritization process. Thus, a low-risk facility¶ at a high-risk port can apply for a port security grant, while a high-risk facility in¶ an otherwise low-risk port cannot. The failure to distinguish priorities within¶ rather than between ports means that the allocation of scarce port security grant¶ funds will not accrue the greatest return on investment, leaving significant and¶ exploitable security gaps at U.S. ports.

#### Security threats leave US oil and economy susceptible – leads to global instability

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM AND NONPROLIFERATION; standing subcommittee within the [House Foreign Affairs Committee](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/House_Foreign_Affairs_Committee); WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 2005; “TERRORIST THREATS TO ENERGY SECURITY;” Committee on International Relations; <http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/intlrel/hfa22655.000/hfa22655_0f.htm> ET¶

Good morning Chairman Royce and Members of the Committee and thank you for holding this hearing to advance our understanding of America's dependence on oil and the serious national security vulnerabilities of this dependence which, if exploited, could result in widespread economic dislocation and increased global instability. ¶ I) Why We Developed ''Oil ShockWave''? We believed that developing and conducting a simulation would be an engaging format to generate attention for this issue, but more importantly to foster an understanding of our energy insecurity. The simulation was designed to make this issue real and tangible for the public as well as lawmakers and policymakers.¶ The oil markets are so vast and complex and the threats are so varied that sometimes it is difficult to comprehend the issue of oil use, oil dependence, and oil security threats and risks. We received great feedback for the SAFE brochure that simply laid out the key facts with very little editorial comment. The facts themselves are incredibly compelling and persuasive. For instance (quoting directly): ''97% of transportation in the United States is fueled by oil'' ''The transportation sector alone consumes 68% of all US oil'' ''Total US oil consumption is forecasted to increase by 40% from 2003 to 2025'' ''125% increase in the demand for oil in India and China 2003 to 2025'' ''$7.4 billion increase in the US oil bill per year for each one-dollar increase in the price of oil.''

#### Preventing terrorism domestically solves globally

Jospeh F. Bouchard, Ph.D.; Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense, United States Navy Captain; 2005; “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy;” <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf> ET

The President and Vice President have reiterated this strategy multiple¶ times this year, at least in part to counter growing criticism of the failure of their¶ Iraq policy. Vice President Cheney’s recent claim that the Iraqi insurgents were¶ in their “last throes” is simply not credible. Although taking the offensive¶ against terrorists may appeal to the Republican conservative political base¶ (though less every day to the American public), it is not, in and of itself,¶ a viable strategy for protecting the United States against the threat of terrorism.¶ The current stress that is evident within our military forces, and the strain that¶ operations in Iraq and Afghanistan on the federal budget, suggest strongly that¶ after Iraq, we will require a strategic pause and a change in approach. The¶ question is whether we are doing what is necessary now to make our homeland¶ more secure. The answer is no.¶ Actions speak louder than words and budget priorities speak loudest of¶ all. The Bush administration is spending much less on homeland security than it¶ is in Iraq, which has become an inspiration and training ground for a new¶ generation of terrorists – much in the same way that Afghanistan was after the¶ Soviet invasion. Our current strategy of taking the offensive against terrorists¶ and rogue regimes accurately (in the case of the Taliban in Afghanistan) or¶ inaccurately (in the case of Iraq) perceived as supporting al Qaeda has increased¶ the long-term terrorist threat to the United States. By starving homeland security¶ initiatives of badly needed funds, it has exacerbated our vulnerability here at¶ home.¶ The United States needs to find a better approach to integrating the¶ various dimensions of our national power and reach a better balance between¶ offense and defense. We cannot win the war on terror just through military¶ operations overseas, but we can lose the war on terror through vulnerability and¶ inattention at home. Enhancing homeland security not only contributes to¶ protecting Americans from attack at home, it contributes to winning the war on¶ terror by forcing potential attackers to devote much greater time and resources to¶ planning and executing an attack – thus increasing our opportunities to detect and¶ stop them.

#### Nuclear terrorist attack or regional conflict spreads - causes extinction

ABC News; the [news](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Journalism) gathering and broadcasting division of the [American Broadcasting Company](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/American_Broadcasting_Company); Dec. 12, 2006; “Even a Small Nuclear War Could Change the World;” ABC News; <http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/story?id=2720173&page=1> ET

The decline of the Soviet Union may have left many Americans feeling safer from nuclear war, but a disturbing new study argues that an attack by terrorists sponsored by a small nuclear state could be just as lethal.¶ Such an attack "could generate casualties comparable to those once predicted for a full-scale nuclear exchange in a superpower conflict," says the report, presented Monday during the fall meeting of the American Geophysical Union in San Francisco.¶ Furthermore, Americans should not think of themselves as isolated from potential small-scale, regional nuclear conflicts in such distant areas as the Middle East or Asia. The impact of such an encounter would be global, probably plunging the planet into a "nuclear winter" and blanketing wide areas of the world with radioactive fallout.¶ The report, which cautions that there are many uncertainties in its own conclusions, was produced by a team of scientists who have been long active in studying the consequences of nuclear war.¶ The study assumes that weapons used by terrorists, or smaller states, would be much smaller than those available to the superpowers, probably on the scale of those dropped on Japan during World War II. But the results would be catastrophic because the weapons would most likely be targeted at major cities.¶ "The current combination of nuclear proliferation, political instability, and urban demographics forms perhaps the greatest danger to the stability of society since the dawn of humanity," Brian Toon of the University of Colorado in Boulder told a press conference prior to the presentation.¶ The number of countries known to have nuclear weapons has grown to eight, but as many as 40 have some fissionable material and could produce bombs fairly quickly, the scientists said, basing their conclusions partly on studies by the National Academy of Sciences, the Department of Defense, and their own years-long research. Toon said Japan, for example, has enough nuclear material on hand to produce 20,000 weapons, and "most think they could do it in weeks."¶ Many of the conclusions are based on the consequences of two nations, each with 50 bombs, delivering their full complement of weapons on each other. That's not a hypothetical figure, they suggested, because both India and Pakistan are believed to have at least that many weapons.¶ So what would happen if they had at it?¶ About 20 million persons in that area would die, the scientists concluded. But the weapons would send up such a plume of smoke that the upper atmosphere would become opaque, blocking out so much solar radiation that temperatures around the world would plummet.¶ "You would have a global climate change unprecedented in human history," said Alan Robock, associated director of the Center for Environmental Prediction at Rutgers Cook College and a member of the research team. "It would instantaneously be colder than the little ice age." There would be shorter growing seasons, less rain, less sun, and starvation around the world.¶ Richard Turco, the founding director of the Institute of the Environment at the University of California, Los Angeles, said the results would be about 10 times worse than the historic eruption of Tambora in Indonesia in 1815, which sent killing frosts across North America. That year became known as "the year without a summer."¶ The scientists concede there are "many uncertainties" in their findings, partly because it's impossible to predict just who is likely to go to war with whom, and how those wars will be fought. But they point out, as astronomer Carl Sagan did years ago, that during World War II the United States had only two nuclear bombs, and it dropped both of them on Japanese cities. So it's not unprecedented that other countries would also likely attack major cities.¶ ¶ And that's one reason the scientists are so alarmed. Urbanization has swept the planet, and today there are many cities with more than 10 million inhabitants, many of them in areas where the political climate is unstable and hostile. Even one nuclear weapon, they concluded, could kill more people than some countries have lost through war during their entire history.¶ ¶ That lead Turco to conclude that "human society is extremely vulnerable at this time," a modest statement considering these conclusions in the report:¶ ¶ "Thirty-two countries that do not now have nuclear weapons possess sufficient fissionable nuclear materials to construct weapons, some in a relatively short period of time."¶ ¶ In some cases, the casualties could "rival previous estimates for a limited strategic war between the superpowers involving thousands of weapons carrying several thousand megatons of yield," partly because more people live in concentrated areas, surrounded by more and more volatile materials.¶ ¶ "An individual in possession of one of the thousands of existing lightweight nuclear weapons could kill or injure a million people in a terrorist attack."¶ ¶ "Many nuclear weapons are small in size and light in weight and could easily be transported in a car or van." Some tactical nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal, for example, weigh only about 300 pounds.¶ ¶ The scientists admit that the lethality of a weapon is subject to many variables, even such things as local wind and whether it's raining, so their numbers should not be taken as absolutes.¶ ¶ But they insist that while many Americans may think the world is growing safer and the nuclear threat is easing, the opposite is true.¶ ¶ "We're on a trend toward a buildup (in nuclear weapons) around the world," Toon said.¶ ¶ And it wouldn't take a huge arsenal, or many weapons, to produce catastrophe. "Even a single surface nuclear explosion, or an air burst in rainy conditions, in a city center is likely to cause the entire metropolitan area to be abandoned at least for decades owing to infrastructure damage and radioactive contamination," the scientists say in the conclusion of their report. It would also leave at least a million dead, and a million more injured.¶ ¶ The danger from nuclear weapons is not less today than when two superpowers threatened each other just a few years ago. It is more, they said repeatedly. Much more.

## Trade Advantage

#### Trade is key to the global economy and spurs innovation

Alex Tabarrok, professor of economics at George Mason University, 12-16-10, “On The Importance of Trade and New Economic Growth,” The Daily Reckoning, http://dailyreckoning.com/author/kateincontrera/, ZM

The story of economic growth has changed. But when you say innovation, you also mean change, and that has two sides. Sometimes people are afraid of the change.¶ So during the Great Depression, in that crisis, there was definitely world retrenchment in trade. We had those things like the Smoot Holly Tariff, and trade just declined all over the world. Fortunately, in this last recession, we have not seen that to anywhere near the same extent. So that is an optimistic point. That is a good point. That is something that we have done right. We have not seen a lot of trade wars.¶ It’s something we need to be concerned about because, yes, any time other people start to get rich, people begin to wonder about their own position in the world. They begin to fear. But so far, I think we’ve been – I think we have learned actually some lessons from the past, and we have not cut down on trade as much as we have done in the past.¶ Trade is absolutely critical. Think about it this way. The reason trade is important is because it makes markets much larger, and that increases the incentive to do research and development. So I like to say, you know, if China and India were as rich as the United States is today, then the market for cancer drugs would be five or six times larger than it is now, and that means five or six times the purchasing power, the incentive to do research and develop new drugs.¶ So part of what we have to understand is that when other countries get rich, that is a benefit to us. That is not a cost. When other countries get rich, they start to contribute to the incentive to do research and development – to research and develop new drugs, new computers, new software, all kind of ideas. And this makes us rich as well.¶ Think about the world economy as a massive parallel computer. Well, for most of the last century, most of those processes were offline. We had more than a billion people in China and India not contributing. A processor being offline. Today those processes are coming back online and are finally contributing to the world economy.¶ Well, I’m really very optimistic about the future. And, really, for the very first time, in at least a 1000 years, the world economy is really operating almost on all four cylinders. Think about it this way. For well over a 100 years, most of the world economy has been driven by the United States, Britain, Japan, a few other countries. Today, we have China and India coming online.¶ So what I mean by this is that we have billions of people in these countries who have been cut off from the world economy, whether through communism or whether through abject poverty, they have basically been, simply, producing enough agriculture to feed themselves, sometimes not even that, and that’s it. They haven’t been part of the world economy.¶ Today that’s changing. Today, for the first time, we have billions of people in China and India who are beginning to contribute ideas, innovations, new discoveries, who are beginning to contribute to the world economy.

#### Transport Security is Crucial to National Security

E.I.B.U.S. , Export-Import Bank of the US, 4-25-2012, "Transport Security Exports Program," <http://www.exim.gov/products/special/tsep.cfm>, AE

The international trading system is critical to U.S. economic and national security. Consequently, the U.S. government gives high priority to programs that bolster the security of systems that support the movement of passengers and cargo between countries. The Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im Bank) has responded to the challenge with the Transportation Security Exports Program (T-SEP). This initiative provides enhanced financing support for U.S. exports that are related to international transportation security.

#### Backing out of trade security is not Recommended

Henry Willis, Associate Director of Homeland Security, 3/26/06,"Securing America's Ports," <http://www.rand.org/commentary/2006/03/26/SDUT.html>

The decision by Dubai Ports World to back out of its deal to manage port facilities in six American cities will not solve serious security problems plaguing U.S. ports. Regardless of who runs them, ports on America's Pacific, Atlantic and Gulf coasts remain dangerously vulnerable to terrorist attack because global trade has interconnected economies and sharply increased shipping traffic. Closing U.S. ports and shutting down global trade are not a realistic option. Even individually inspecting every entering container is far too costly and time-consuming to be practical. But just because we can't make ports 100 percent secure doesn't mean we can't make substantial security improvements.

#### Port Security Key to Efficient Trade, Nigeria Proves

Africa News, 7/28/12, "Nigeria; Stakeholders Demand Total, Effective Port Reforms," lexisnexis AE

He said beyond the recent sack of top executive officers of the Nigerian Maritime Administration and Safety Agency (NIMASA) and the Nigerian Ports Authority (NPA), there is the need for government to take drastic action towards addressing crude oil theft, while urging the National Assembly to hasten the passage of all maritime related bills pending before it. Speaking on the role of the National Assembly on the matter, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Alhaji Aminu Waziri Tambuwal said theirs is only to promulgate municipality law and domesticate appropriate international conventions that provide dynamic legal framework for the conduct of international trade.

#### Trade Implementation Through Port Security Engaging Now

Ruth Banomyong, 5/05, Thammasat Business School, Thammasat University,Bangkok 10200, Thailand," The impact of port and trade security initiatives on maritime supply-chain management,"

The fundamental objective of the Container Security Initiative (CSI) is to engage

both so-called ‘mega-ports’ (ports sending the highest volume of ocean going

container traﬃc into the US) and the national governments where these ports

are located in a way that will facilitate the pre-screening of outbound containers

destined to the US. The emerging issue of security as a key factor in global supply

chains can be perceived as inconsistent with the objective of facilitating international trade (Dulbecco and Laporte, 2003). However, this perception does

not stand up to analysis. Security is an evident part of the mainstream supply-chain paradigm while security can also become a driver for trade facilitation.

#### Ports Benefit the Nation

A.A.P.A., Port Authority Association, 09, US Port Industry, <http://www.aapa-ports.org/industry/content.cfm?itemnumber=1022&navitemnumber=901>, AE

Today, the U.S. is served by publicly- and privately-owned marine facilities located in approximately 360 commercial sea and river ports. These are found along the Atlantic, Pacific, Gulf and Great Lakes coasts, as well as in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Some 150 state, local and county seaport agencies, navigation districts and port authorities make up the public sector port industry today. Public ports develop and maintain the shoreside facilities for the intermodal transfer of cargo between ships, barges, trucks and railroads. Ports build and maintain cruise terminals for the growing cruise passenger industry.

#### Ports are Gateways to Global Trade

A.A.P.A., Port Authority Association, 09, US Port Industry, <http://www.aapa-ports.org/industry/content.cfm?itemnumber=1022&navitemnumber=901>, AE

Seaports are gateways to domestic and international trade, connecting the United States to the world. Because of the nation's port system, food grown by Iowa farmers reaches tables in Japan and Russia. Manufacturers in Texas can sell goods and services profitably to foreign countries. And Appalachian and Midwest coal moves through inland waterways and coastal ports to power plants domestically and around the world, providing the fuel to heat and light homes, businesses and cities.

#### **Our ports are key to the world economy – security is necessary to keep it running smoothly**

Marc Thibault, researcher, Homeland Security Institute, Mary R. Brooks, Chair of Commerce, Dalhousie University, and Kenneth J. Button professor of public policy and director, George Mason, 2006, “The Response of the U.S. Maritime Industry to the New Container Security Initiatives” Transportation Journal, Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter 2006, JSTOR //eR

The U.S. is the world's biggest trading nation. Marine transportation plays a major role in the American economy as it transports roughly 75 percent of the goods that are imported to or exported from America (U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2005). The U.S. is the world's leading merchandise importer and second largest exporter, accounting in 2003 for approximately 17 percent of the value of imports and 10 percent of exports in world merchandise trade (World Trade Organization 2004). America's top twenty-five maritime trading partners accounted for 70 percent by value of U.S. foreign waterborne trade and 83 percent of container shipments (U.S. Mari time Administration 2005). Container shipping plays a prominent role in the U.S. economy. It is estimated that the liner shipping industry directly and indirectly generates 1.1 million American jobs and annually contributes over $100 billion to the U.S. gross domestic product (World Shipping Council 2004). There are over 100 ports in the U.S. and over 4,000 deep draft ocean facilities (U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics 2005). However, the top twenty-five container ports handle approximately 98 percent of all the container cargo entering and leaving the U.S. (U.S. Maritime Administration 2005). Many of America's major container ports must contend with significant port congestion during their normal operations and would have difficulty responding to the backup of containers that would result from a major disruption or stop page in operations at a major facility. The security of the container supply chain poses a significant policy challenge for the U.S. Many of the actors involved in the international container trade either fall completely outside U.S. jurisdiction or are subject to limited U.S. oversight. America's top twenty-five trading partners accounted for 83 percent of U.S. container shipments (U.S. Maritime Administration 2005). Foreign maritime operators carry 90 percent of U.S. imports and exports. There are over 178,000 foreign exporters who ship goods by container to the U.S. It is estimated that four million containers are being used in the U.S. trades at any given time (World Ship ping Council 2004). The U.S. does not have jurisdiction over foreign firms, containers, or vessels until they reach U.S. waters. It also does not have the resources to guarantee the security of every container arriving at an American port.

### TRADE ADD-ON

#### 1. \*\*\*[Extend Meade and Molander ’06 AND/OR Maxwell and Blanda ‘05]\*\*\*

(Essentially says ports key to trade)

#### 2. International trade is key to the global economy- this is the best internal link.

Arnold C. Harberger, U.S. Economist & coined the term ‘Harberger’s Triangle’, 5-25-2006, “Trade and Economic Growth, Part I,” National Center for Policy Analysis, http://wps.fep.up.pt/wps/wp106.pdf, ZM

International trade - the essence of globalization - benefits the world economy as a whole. It allows people, regions and nations to specialize in the production of what they do best, to enjoy the economies of large-scale production and to buy more cheaply those things that others do best. Impediments to trade limit the benefits of trade.¶ Freer trade - from reduced tariffs, regulations and restrictions - permits an economy to make better use of its resources but does not automatically give a country a new and much higher growth rate. Its main benefit is its effect on the level of output rather than on the long-term rate of growth. Trade liberalization stimulates growth and efficiency by allowing producers to exploit areas in which they have a comparative advantage over foreign producers and by reducing their real costs.¶ Comparative Advantage. One way that trade contributes to an increase in economic output is through comparative advantage, which creates more value with the same resources.¶ For example, in 1983 almost all cars in China were versions of the 1942 Pontiac sedan, for which the dies and machinery had been shipped to China decades earlier. These cars weighed about two tons and had a voracious appetite for fuel. Sprinkled in among these behemoths, however, were a few contemporary Toyotas. The Chinese realized that if they took the same value of resources used to make one of these big old cars, shifted those resources to produce textiles and shoes and then exported them, they could use the proceeds to buy two brand-new Toyotas for the same amount of resources it took to produce one gas guzzler.¶ Trade Liberalization. Countries can also become more efficient by reducing tariffs. For example, consider a hypothetical country with a 50 percent import tariff. Because of the tariff, a dollar's worth of import substitutes uses resources up to $1.50, while it takes only a dollar's worth of resources (devoted to exports) to buy an equivalent imported product. Lowering the tariff to 10 percent would reduce this inefficiency in resource use. The 40 cents of resources saved could be used to buy more imports or invested to produce more exports. With liberalization, the tariff-inclusive price of imports falls, and resources shift to export production.¶ The tariff reduction's net benefit is the gain to trade minus the cost. For the first incremental increase in trade (at the initial tariff rate), the benefit exceeds the cost by 50 percent. For the final incremental increase in trade (after the tariff reduction), the excess benefit is 10 percent. The "average" net benefit is thus 30 percent [(50 percent + 10 percent) ÷ 2].¶ Let us assume that as a result of the tariff reduction, there is a spectacular increase in trade, with exports rising from 10 percent to 30 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). (Although this is a hypothetical case, such a large increase in trade is not unrealistic - see "Trade and Growth, Part II.") Applying the average net benefit (30 percent) to the incremental increase in exports (20 percent of GDP), we obtain 6 percent of GDP as the overall benefit of the liberalization (30 percent x 20 percent = 6 percent).

**\*\*I DIDN’T CUT THESE\*\***

**3. Growth key to interdependence – solves all wars.**

Valentin **Krustev**, Department of Political Science at Rice University, **2006**, “Interdependence and the Duration of Militarized Conflict,” Journal of Peace Research, sage

**According to the opportunity-cost argument, interdependence promotes peace by raising the costs of militarized conflict** (Polachek, 1980; Polachek, Robst& Chang, 1999). **Conflict becomes more costly, in turn, because the fighting parties, i**n addition to bearing the costs of waging warfare, **forfeit the potential gains from trading**, owing to government-imposed restrictions and increased business risks. However, **these conflict-inhibiting effects of interdependence are not limited only to the pre-conflict phase of a dispute, and the opportunity-cost argument can explain how the prospect of further trade losses provides incentives for conflict termination as well.** As some scholars have observed, any theory of the effect of interdependence on conflict should be grounded in a solid understanding of the occurrence and dynamic of conflict itself (Morrow, 1999, 2003; Gartzke, 2003b). While traditionally multiple theories of conflict have proliferated in the study of IR, recent scholarship has drawn attention to its informational origins (Fearon, 1995; Gartzke, 1999). As Fearon (1995) argues, if **most conflicts end in some negotiated settlement over the disputed issue, rational states should prefer to conclude that settlement prior to incurring the conflict costs, as the bargaining range of mutually acceptable settlements is guaranteed to be non-empty when these costs are positive**. A very common reason for states sometimes being unable to reach a rational pre-conflict settlement emerges in the asymmetry of information, combined with states’ incentives to misrepresent their reservation values. Conflict, on the other hand, helps states to credibly communicate these reservation values by demonstrating their willingness to incur its costs or revealing the true magnitude of the costs, as an expanding informational literature on war suggests (e.g. Wagner, 2000; Filson& Werner, 2002; Slantchev, 2003). The opportunity-cost logic implies that interdependence can enter the theoretical framework outlined above through the conflict-cost parameters, as interdependence increases these costs. Following Fearon’s (1995) discussion, higher conflict costs increase the pre-conflict bargaining range and should, therefore, decrease the probability of conflict. In their calculus, states balance the size of their demands against the probability that these demands exceed the opponent’s reservation value and are rejected. **Higher conflict costs due to greater interdependence worsen states’ conflict payoffs and push them to lower their demands, which, in turn, results in a reduced probability of conflict onset**.8 Signaling arguments, on the other hand, suggest that interdependence allows states to credibly communicate their resolve or reservation values by severing an advantageous economic relationship that an unresolved state would not terminate.**The credible communication made possible by interdependence reduces the uncertainty existing over the bargaining range and increases the likelihood of a settlement short of war** (e.g. Gartzke, 2003a,b; Morrow, 2003). Thus, if we adopt Fearon’s (1997) terminology, signaling implies that interdependence allows states to ‘sink costs’, while the opportunitycost logic is more reminiscent of ‘tying hands’; that is**, interdependence affects states’ behavior by changing their incentives**. The opportunity-cost argument for why **interdependence inhibits militarized conflict can be easily extended to account for the effect of interdependence on the duration of conflict. If interdependence raises the opportunity costs of conflict prior to its onset, then these costs should also remain high after onset, because, at least in the short term when firms have not permanently reoriented their business operations, they will gain if hostilities cease and normal trade with the adversary is restored. Then, just as the higher prospective costs of conflict push states to lower their demands and avert conflict prior to its onset, so do these higher prospective costs push states to settle early**, even if conflict has not fully served its informational purpose and states might be forfeiting the better deal they can get if they know more. That is, the purpose of militarized conflict is to overcome asymmetric information, but conflict costs are the price states have to pay to extract that information. **The higher these costs are due to interdependence**, the more expensive the information-revelation process is, and **the sooner are states likely to settle on unfavorable terms rather than continue fighting.**

**4. Statistically proven**

Brock **Blomberg**, Professor of Economics at Wellesley College, Gregory **Hess**, Professor of Economics at Oberlin College, February **2002**, “The Temporal Links between Conflict and Economic Activity,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, sage

To begin this temporal “causal” investigation, we first need to develop a statistical framework to estimate the joint, dynamic determination of the occurrence of internal conflict, external conflict, and growth. Because conflict is measured as a discrete variable, researchers typically estimate the occurrence as a probability, or if we consider both internal and external conflict, we can always estimate the joint probability distribution. But are there similar interpretations of economic activity as a discrete state? Indeed, a broad literature considers the evolution of states in the economy as the natural progression of phases. In fact, one of the key historical studies of U.S. and international business cycles, undertaken by Burns and Mitchell (1944), treated the state of the economy as either an expansion or contraction, on which the National Bureau of Economic Research’s dating procedure for recessionswas founded.4 The relevance for our study is that **breakpoints in the state of the economy, either expansion or recession, are analogous to break points in peace**—internal or external conflicts.5 Using an unbalanced panel of data covering 152 countries from 1950 to 1992, we therefore consider the joint determination of internal conflict, external conflict, and the state of the economy as measured by the aforementioned discrete variables.We find that the relationship between the variables is not a simple one.**Conflict does appear to be highly related to the economy** for the entire sample.However, it seems to be most highly related when considering certain nation-groups. **For nondemocracies or in regions highly populated by nondemocracies, there seems to be an intimate link between a poor economy and the decision to go to war—both internally and externally**. These results confirm much of the original hypotheses put forth in Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2001)—namely, that there is compelling evidence of a conditional poverty-conflict trap.

## US-Japan Alliance Advantage

#### Growing instability in Asia due to military expansion – deterrence key to solve conflicts

Lindsey Ford; research associate at the Center for a New American Security; December 2009; “The Value of the U.S.-Japan Sea Power Alliance;” Pacific Forum CSIS; <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n22.pdf> ET

The most important issue the U.S. will face in the Asian maritime domain in the coming years will be the growing assertiveness of regional powers over maritime territories and resources, most notably in the South China Sea. Continued disputes over small islands and their accompanying territorial waters present a challenge to regional stability and cooperation and will require the U.S. to play a delicate balancing role between firm deterrence and studied neutrality. ¶ Although many territorial disputes in Asia are deeply rooted in historical claims, the assertiveness with which Asian nations are protecting these claims underscores a more important point about the shifting nature of the maritime domain. The maritime domain is now longer primarily used for the transportation of commerce, but is increasingly a source of commerce as well – as evidenced by the growing drive to obtain energy and mineral resources from the oceans. Nowhere is this more evident than in the Asia-Pacific region. The rapid development of Asian economies in recent decades has been accompanied by an equally remarkable surge in the need for new energy resources for the region. Recently, Asian nations have begun looking to the oceans for their energy potential through exploration for resources such as oil, gas, and methyl hydrates. ¶ The energy vulnerability of the major Asian nations and their competing searches for new potential sources of maritime energy resources has perpetuated and intensified existing maritime territorial disputes in the region. Competing claims to territory and maritime EEZs (exclusive economic zones) are further exacerbated by the weakness of international laws policing and adjudicating these disputes. As one of the leading international powers in the region, it will be essential for the U.S. to maintain a sufficient deterrent presence to dissuade potential aggression over resources that might spark a larger regional confrontation or crisis. At the same time, in order to promote regional stability, the U.S. will be forced to continually demonstrate and reiterate its neutrality in territorial disagreements. Given the limited dissuasive power of international legal mechanisms, and America’s continued commitments to its allies and partners in the region, the U.S. will be challenged by the difficult balance between deterrence and neutrality. ¶ The harassment of the UNSS Victorious by Chinese sailors this past spring highlights the challenges the U.S. will face. China’s interpretation of its international rights within its EEZs is inconsistent with the internationally accepted interpretation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Adherence to China’s alternate interpretation would significantly reduce the freedom and flexibility of U.S. maritime forces in the strategically and economically vital South China Sea. Yet at the same time, the U.S. does not actively support any one nation’s territorial claims within the South China Sea, limiting our ability to take a stronger deterrent stance to prevent China’s growing aggressiveness in the area. ¶ The rapid military buildup of maritime forces in the region will only intensify the challenge of maintaining stability and openness of the seas. The aggressive modernization plans of China’s naval forces are the most notable, and most troubling, development on this front. China’s growing naval might is an essential part of its broader efforts to develop anti-access capabilities, including space and cyber capabilities that could be used in an attempt to deny U.S. forces access to the region. ¶ In recent years, Asian powers both large and small have moved to bolster their maritime presence. Although not directly correlated to the search for maritime energy resources and ongoing territorial disputes, growing naval capabilities of Asian powers provide them with a new ability to protect territories and waters in response to China’s growing power. The U.S. should welcome the ability of Asian nations to play a more significant role in their own defense and in promoting regional stability. Unfortunately, increased international patrols and maneuvers within a small area increase the likelihood of miscommunications, misunderstandings, and accidents between military forces. ¶ The U.S.-Japan Seapower Alliance can combat these challenges in a number of ways. First, the U.S.-Japan alliance serves as a force multiplier for U.S. power projection in the region. Due to our treaty alliance and the forward-deployed presence of U.S. forces in Japan, the U.S. Navy and Japan’s Maritime Self-Defense Forces have our closest, most interoperable maritime relationship. Our two nations hold over 100 joint exercises every year and the new Bilateral Joint Operations Coordination Center serves as an invaluable hub for all U.S. and Japanese forces, which will promote prompt and coordinated responses in a crisis. Additionally, the combined power of the U.S.-Japan alliance is a powerful deterrent to any regional powers considering an overly aggressive stance vis-à-vis ongoing territorial disputes. The U.S.-Japan Seapower Alliance can also promote greater regional exercises and maritime coordination mechanisms that can help minimize the risk of conflict or miscommunications associated with increasingly crowded regional waters.

#### US – Japan Alliance key to solve Asian instability

Lindsey Ford; research associate at the Center for a New American Security; December 2009; “The Value of the U.S.-Japan Sea Power Alliance;” Pacific Forum CSIS; <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n22.pdf> ET

The rapid military buildup of maritime forces in the region will only intensify the challenge of maintaining stability and openness of the seas. The aggressive modernization plans of China’s naval forces are the most notable, and most troubling, development on this front. China’s growing naval might is an essential part of its broader efforts to develop anti-access capabilities, including space and cyber capabilities that could be used in an attempt to deny U.S. forces access to the region. ¶ In recent years, Asian powers both large and small have moved to bolster their maritime presence. Although not directly correlated to the search for maritime energy resources and ongoing territorial disputes, growing naval capabilities of Asian powers provide them with a new ability to protect territories and waters in response to China’s growing power. The U.S. should welcome the ability of Asian nations to play a more significant role in their own defense and in promoting regional stability. Unfortunately, increased international patrols and maneuvers within a small area increase the likelihood of miscommunications, misunderstandings, and accidents between military forces. ¶ The U.S.-Japan Seapower Alliance can combat these challenges in a number of ways. First, the U.S.-Japan alliance serves as a force multiplier for U.S. power projection in the region. Due to our treaty alliance and the forward-deployed presence of U.S. forces in Japan, the U.S. Navy and Japan’s Maritime Self-Defense Forces have our closest, most interoperable maritime relationship. Our two nations hold over 100 joint exercises every year and the new Bilateral Joint Operations Coordination Center serves as an invaluable hub for all U.S. and Japanese forces, which will promote prompt and coordinated responses in a crisis. Additionally, the combined power of the U.S.-Japan alliance is a powerful deterrent to any regional powers considering an overly aggressive stance vis-à-vis ongoing territorial disputes. The U.S.-Japan Seapower Alliance can also promote greater regional exercises and maritime coordination mechanisms that can help minimize the risk of conflict or miscommunications associated with increasingly crowded regional waters. ¶ Second, the U.S. and Japan should be able to provide a coordinated front to proactively support and promote a unified interpretation of the UNCLOS provisions. Japan is a direct participant in maritime territorial disputes. By making a proactive effort to encourage peaceful resolution of these disputes, Japan can provide an example for the rest of the region that will help promote stability. Additionally, Japan has a vested interest in developing the energy and mineral resources in its EEZs. By working together to encourage multilateral discussions and agreement on acceptable rules and standards for exploration of these resources, Japan and the U.S. can help minimize the likelihood of disputes and conflicts. ¶ The U.S.-Japan alliance remains the cornerstone of America’s engagement in the Asia-Pacific region. Although long-standing territorial disputes and contested maritime resources will increasingly challenge the region, the U.S.-Japan Seapower Alliance is well poised to address these problems. As two of the world’s most powerful economies, like-minded democracies, and leading naval powers, together the U.S. and Japan can play a leading role in ensuring the Asian region remains peaceful and prosperous.

#### Container scanning at ports and tech key to US – Japan cooperation and alliance

Brian Harding; research associate at the Center for a New American Security; December 2009; “U.S. Port Security and the U.S.-Japan Alliance;” Pacific Forum CSIS; <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n22.pdf> ET

¶ The principal security responsibility of the U.S. government is to protect the U.S. homeland. Therefore, the primary maritime security interest of the United States is to protect its ports. While this is primarily a task that the United States must do itself, the importance of international trade necessitates international cooperation. As one of the United States’ most important and reliable partners, Japan should be engaged in this area. It is also an area that can provide new scope for the alliance. ¶ The Problem ¶ The United States learned on Sept. 11, 2001 that asymmetric attacks on the United States constitute a clear and present danger to the security of the nation as well as the U.S. economy, as demonstrated by the near collapse of the U.S. aviation industry in the following months. Post-mortem studies of vulnerabilities of U.S. homeland defense concluded that an attack on a U.S. port is among the most likely and damaging asymmetric threats the country faces. Meanwhile, with over a billion dollars worth of goods moving in and out of U.S. ports in 7 million containers everyday – often close to major population centers – the importance of keeping U.S. ports safe is self evident. However, even with new attention to port security since the founding of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, the U.S. remains vulnerable, precisely because it must remain open to be prosperous. ¶ The most significant initiative to enhance port security since 9/11 has been the Container Security Initiative (CSI). Created in 2002, CSI allows U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), an agency within the Department of Homeland Security, to examine shipping containers in 58 foreign ports, from which over 85 percent of U.S.-bound maritime cargo originate. They do this, primarily, by 1) identifying high-risk containers through automated targeting tools; 2) prescreening and evaluating containers before they are shipped; and 3) employing high-tech processes to screen goods quickly to limit disruptions to trade flows.¶ U.S.-Japan Cooperation ¶ Japan is a key partner in CSI, with ports in Yokohama, Tokyo, Nagoya, and Kobe currently participating, more than any country in Asia and third in the world after the United Kingdom and Italy. Since CSI is intended to be a reciprocal program, foreign customs officials are permitted to be stationed at U.S. ports to inspect cargo bound for their own countries. To date, Japan and Canada are the only countries participating in this manner. ¶ There remains room for the United States and Japan to increase their bilateral cooperation in port security matters through technology and intelligence sharing. In particular, the two countries should work together on supply chain security to better understand where goods transported through Japan, and to the United States, originate. 4

#### Port security key to US – Japan Alliance

Brian Harding; research associate at the Center for a New American Security; December 2009; “U.S. Port Security and the U.S.-Japan Alliance;” Pacific Forum CSIS; <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n22.pdf> ET

Japan and the United States face a host of challenges in the maritime domain, but, in terms of national interest, nothing is more important to the United States than the security of its major ports. This is an area in which international cooperation is critical. Fortunately, it is also an area ripe for quiet, constructive U.S.-Japan cooperation. It also presents a new arena to expand the scope of the alliance to achieve common interests globally, something that our partnership must do to modernize itself for the 21st century.

#### South China Sea instability leads to military crisis and undermines US economy

Shoko Kohama; is a Ph.D. student at the Graduate Schools of Law and Politics, University of Tokyo and at the Woodrow Wilson Department of Politics, University of Virginia.; December 2009; “Dealing with a Rising China on the Seas;”Pacific Forum CSIS; <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n22.pdf> ET

Several countries claim control over parts of the South China Sea and the situation surrounding the sea lanes is unstable23. These disputes may cause serious trouble for Japan in two ways. In the first scenario a serious military crisis in this area, even short of war, prevents Japan’s commercial cargos from passing the straits, which would impose huge costs on the Japanese economy. Another scenario predicts the political settlement of these territorial disputes in favor of China. This leads to the expansion of China’s influence over the sea lanes, which will undermine Japanese and U.S. security and economy. The possibility of the second scenario has increased as Chinese power has developed. ¶ Before addressing the affects of the increasing power of China, let’s note the consequences of expanded Chinese control over the sea lanes. China’s influence over vital sea lanes will enhance China’s bargaining power against Japan in cases of crises by enabling China to cut off energy supplies to Japan. The 2009 U.S. Defense Department report states that the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) “Navy doctrine for maritime operations” involves campaigns of “anti-sea lines of communication.”24 Additionally, China may attempt to amend the rules of freedom of navigation as it has challenged current norms by claiming control over the airspace above its EEZ and so forth. ¶ China’s Ambition in the South China Sea and Its Growing Bargaining Power ¶ What will happen in the South China Sea? This essay anticipates intensive disputes and eventual settlements that are advantageous to China. Generally, bargaining power requires both capability and credibility, i.e., strong motivation to prevail in the issue at stake. In both capability and credibility, China’s position has rapidly improved. ¶ Presumably, China is highly motivated to acquire control over this area. China has publicly claimed sovereignty over the Paracel Islands and Spratly Islands in order to ensure access to the sea lanes, as a base for naval forces and to claim maritime resources. According to the U.S. Defense Department, President Hu Jintao has stressed the importance of secure sea lines of communication.25 As Chinese power has developed, it employed more aggressive policies. For example, “[i]n December 2007, China announced the establishment of a city administration, “Sansha City,” to assert “indisputable sovereignty” and jurisdiction over the islands of the South China Sea “and the adjacent waterways,” prompting street protests in V26

#### South China Sea ripe for instability – key to oil and US economy

Shoko Kohama; is a Ph.D. student at the Graduate Schools of Law and Politics, University of Tokyo and at the Woodrow Wilson Department of Politics, University of Virginia.; December 2009; “Dealing with a Rising China on the Seas;”Pacific Forum CSIS; <http://csis.org/files/publication/issuesinsights_v09n22.pdf> ET

Japan and the United States share common interests in secure access to sea lanes in the South China Sea. Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, whose security and economy are highly dependent on oil from the Middle East, import approximately 80 percent of the crude oil through the South China Sea. In the mid 1990s, about 40 percent of Japanese trading commodities were transported through Southeast Asian sea lanes16. Similarly, U.S. naval forces navigate through Southeast Asian sea lanes to access the Indian Ocean and the Gulf region. If the waterway in Southeast Asia is closed, vessels have to get around “Australia… adding some 5.800 nautical miles and 15 days to the trip (assuming a speed of 15 knots). Additionally, restrictions on transit through Malacca would add millions of dollars to the cost of shipping between Australia and Japan.”17 Stability of maritime transportation in this area is critical to the U.S. economy since top five U.S. cargo trading partners (China, Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea and Taiwan in order) are in Asia.18

#### Tesnions over South China Sea high – lead to US – China conflict

[James Grubel](http://blogs.reuters.com/search/journalist.php?edition=us&n=james.grubel&); Senior Correspondent, Canberra; Tue Jun 28, 2011 6:55am EDT; “South China Sea disputes could lead to Asian war: think tank;” Reuters; <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/28/us-southchinasea-idUSTRE75R0C820110628> ET

(Reuters) - Risks are growing that incidents at sea involving [China](http://www.reuters.com/places/china) could lead to war in Asia, potentially drawing in the United States and other powers, an Australian think tank warned on Tuesday.¶ The Lowy Institute said in a report that the Chinese military's risk-taking behavior in the South and East China Seas, along with the country's resource needs and greater assertiveness, had raised the chances of an armed conflict.¶ "The sea lanes of Indo-Pacific Asia are becoming more crowded, contested and vulnerable to armed strife. Naval and air forces are being strengthened amid shifting balances of economic strategic weight," report authors Rory Medcalf and Raoul Heinrichs wrote.¶ "China's frictions with the United States, [Japan](http://www.reuters.com/places/japan) and India are likely to persist and intensify. As the number and tempo of incidents increases, so does the likelihood that an episode will escalate to armed confrontation, diplomatic crisis or possibly even conflict," they said.¶ The study on major powers and maritime security in Indo-Pacific Asia was published as China prepares to unveil its first aircraft carrier, perhaps this week, a development that has added to worries in the region about China's military expansion and reach.¶ This month, China sent its biggest civilian patrol ship to the South China Sea. That rattled the Philippines, which makes competing claims to some waters thought to hold vast oil and gas reserves.¶ On Monday, the U.S. Senate passed a resolution that deplored China's use of force against Vietnamese and Philippine ships in the South China Sea.¶ Senator Jim Webb, chair of an east Asian and Pacific affairs subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said "a growing number of nations around the South China Sea are now voicing serious concerns about China's pattern of intimidation."¶ Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Hong Lei, speaking at a regular news briefing in Beijing, said the U.S. resolution "did not hold water" and that countries not directly involved in the dispute should not interfere.¶ "Countries not involved should respect the hard work of countries actually involved to peacefully resolve the dispute bilaterally through dialogue," Hong said.¶ "DANGER ZONE"¶ Ian Storey, an expert on maritime security in Asia, said the¶ report was a "balanced and credible assessment" of the risks of a clash in the South China Sea as "competition over territorial claims, maritime boundaries and natural resources heats up, and as China adopts more aggressive tactics."¶ "The complete absence of confidence-building measures and conflict prevention mechanisms between the various claimants suggests that it is only a question of time before an incident at sea escalates into a more serious confrontation, with worrying implications for regional stability," said Storey, a security analyst at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in Singapore.¶ Medcalf and Heinrichs said more maritime patrols and intrusive surveillance, nationalism and resources disputes would together make it harder to manage arguments over maritime sovereignty.¶ "All of these factors are making Asia a danger zone for incidents at sea: close-range encounters involving vessels and aircraft from competing powers, typically in sensitive or contested zones," the authors said.¶ The report detailed tension between Beijing and Tokyo, which stemmed from an April 2010 Chinese naval exercise near the Japanese islands of Okinawa and were exacerbated by Japan's arrest of a Chinese fisherman whose trawler had rammed a coastguard vessel.¶ Those incidents provoked a diplomatic crisis during which China cut its exports of crucial rare earth minerals to Japan, the United States' closest ally in the region.¶ Despite initial signs of warmer bilateral ties following the March tsunami and nuclear crisis in Japan, a long-running dispute over a chain of isles which are close to potentially significant oil and gas reserves simmers.¶ "Helicopter buzzing incidents have continued, with Japan deploring as especially insensitive an instance that occurred in the weeks following the March disaster," the authors said.¶ They said Beijing has caused concern in Southeast Asia over its "core interest" claim on the South China Sea and in [Australia](http://www.reuters.com/places/australia) about its possible future security behavior, while the emergence of competition between India and China at sea is "only a matter of time."¶ New efforts were needed to build regional confidence and to involve China in a continued military dialogue with the United States and Japan, they said.¶ They also said maritime security hotlines were needed between the United States and China, and Japan and China, to allow real-time responses to any incidents.

#### Asian instability leads to nuclear proliferation

Brad Roberts; US Military Academy; August 2001; “East Asia’s Nuclear Future: A Long-Term View of Threat Reduction;” Defense Threat Reduction Agency; <http://www.wslfweb.org/docs/dtraasco/east_asia_nuke_future.pdf> ET

For many U.S. security analysts, the nuclear problem in East Asia is defined¶ solely by the nuclear challenge in North Korea. This is far too simple a view. Cold War¶ nuclear confrontation between the Soviet Union and United States had a significant Asian¶ dimension, and the end of the Cold War caused the virtual disappearance of this¶ dimension of the Asian nuclear dynamic. But the nuclear history in the region¶ significantly transcends the U.S.-Soviet dimension. Many of the states of the region have¶ had nuclear ambitions in the past, ambitions that could conceivably be re-ignited in the¶ future—including U.S. allies such as South Korea and Japan, as well as Taiwan. None of¶ Asia’s subregions is free of nuclear proliferation risks—even Southeast Asia. The major¶ power nuclear overlay is an important additional factor, which may both generate and¶ react to nuclear developments in the regional subsystems. The circumstances exist in¶ Asia for dramatic shifts in the nuclear status quo. There are a lot of nuclear dominoes that¶ could fall in Asia, along with nuclear wildcards and nuclear flashpoints.

#### Asia is specifically prone to nuclear proliferation

Brad Roberts; US Military Academy; August 2001; “East Asia’s Nuclear Future: A Long-Term View of Threat Reduction;” Defense Threat Reduction Agency; <http://www.wslfweb.org/docs/dtraasco/east_asia_nuke_future.pdf> ET

A fourth camp defines stability in primarily nuclear terms. This camp tends to¶ emphasize the following aspects of the East Asian security environment. The end of the¶ Cold War brought a draw-down of U.S. and Soviet/Russian nuclear forces in the region,¶ but so too rising concern about the long-term nuclear prospect in Asia. This concern is¶ driven by four factors. The first is the chronic failure of efforts to resolve the North¶ Korean nuclear situation. The second is the nuclear tests in South Asia and the prospect¶ of nuclear arms racing and crises there, with spillover effects to other subregions. The¶ third is strategic modernization by China and the intersections of that effort with the¶ nuclear programs of India and Russia and the ballistic missile defense program of the¶ United States (and its East Asian allies). The fourth is the development of commercial¶ nuclear fuel cycles in a number of Asian states, bringing with them both latent weapons¶ capabilities and debates about the “true intentions” behind such programs. Growing¶ concern about the viability of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and associated¶ regimes has served as a reminder that the NPT closed the door on many nuclear programs¶ and/or ambitions in the region. For this camp, stability is defined as the absence of new¶ incentives for countries in the region to make adjustments to their strategic postures,¶ defined as encompassing nuclear, latent nuclear, and non-nuclear military means. The¶ security dynamic consists of the interplay of hedging behaviors.

#### Asian proliferation escalates to nuclear conflict – deterrence doesn’t solve

Stephen J. Cimbala; Distinguished Professor of Political Science, Penn State; March 2008; “Anticipatory Attacks: Nuclear Crisis Stability in Future Asia;” Comparative Strategy, , Vol. 27 #2

The spread of nuclear weapons in Asia presents a complicated mosaic of possibilities in this regard. States with nuclear forces of variable force structure, operational experience, and command-control systems will be thrown into a matrix of complex political, social, and cultural crosscurrents contributory to the possibility of war. In addition to the existing nuclear powers in Asia, others may seek nuclear weapons if they feel threatened by regional rivals or hostile alliances. Containment of nuclear proliferation in Asia is a desirable political objective for all of the obvious reasons. Nevertheless, the present century is unlikely to see the nuclear hesitancy or risk aversion that marked the Cold War, in part, because the military and political discipline imposed by the Cold War superpowers no longer exists, but also because states in Asia have new aspirations for regional or global respect.12 The spread of ballistic missiles and other nuclear-capable delivery systems in Asia, or in the Middle East with reach into Asia, is especially dangerous because plausible adversaries live close together and are already engaged in ongoing disputes about territory or other issues.13 The Cold War Americans and Soviets required missiles and airborne delivery systems of intercontinental range to strike at one another’s vitals. But short-range ballistic missiles or fighter-bombers suffice for India and Pakistan to launch attacks at one another with potentially “strategic” effects. China shares borders with Russia, North Korea, India, and Pakistan; Russia, with China and NorthKorea; India, with Pakistan and China; Pakistan, with India and China; and so on. The short flight times of ballistic missiles between the cities or military forces of contiguous states means that very little time will be available for warning and attack assessment by the defender. Conventionally armed missiles could easily be mistaken for a tactical nuclear first use. Fighter-bombers appearing over the horizon could just as easily be carrying nuclear weapons as conventional ordnance. In addition to the challenges posed by shorter flight times and uncertain weapons loads, potential victims of nuclear attack in Asia may also have first strike–vulnerable forces and command-control systems that increase decision pressures for rapid, and possibly mistaken, retaliation. This potpourri of possibilities challenges conventional wisdom about nuclear deterrence and proliferation on the part of policymakers and academic theorists. For policymakers in the United States and NATO, spreading nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in Asia could profoundly shift the geopolitics of mass destruction from a European center of gravity (in the twentieth century) to an Asian and/or Middle Eastern center of gravity (in the present century).14 This would profoundly shake up prognostications to the effect that wars of mass destruction are now passe, on account of the emergence of the “Revolution in Military Affairs” and its encouragement of information-based warfare.15 Together with this, there has emerged the argument that large-scale war between states or coalitions of states, as opposed to varieties of unconventional warfare and failed states, are exceptional and potentially obsolete.16 The spread of WMD and ballistic missiles in Asia could overturn these expectations for the obsolescence or marginalization of major interstate warfare.

#### Port security and transportation infrastructure key to US – Japan collaboration

Brad Glosserman, executive director for the Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu, editor for The Japan Times, and Katsu Furukuwa, Research Fellow of the Research Institute of Science and Technology for Society (RISTEX) in Japan Science and Technology Agency; ¶ ¶ March 2008; “A New U.S.-Japan Agenda;”¶ Pacific Forum CSIS, Issues and Insights ¶ Vol. 8-No. 4 ¶ ; <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/issuesinsights_v08n04.pdf> ET

The first area of opportunity should be attempts to expand and increase global prosperity. Our two governments should be doing more to create economic opportunities for our citizens and others around the world. That means implementing reforms that increase efficiency and open our economies as well as promoting good governance and rule of law around the world. We should be setting examples for other countries through unilateral action, joint efforts – such as a free trade or economic partnership agreement – and multilateral initiatives, such as providing real leadership in the Doha Round of international trade negotiations and trade liberalization in ASEAN and APEC. ¶ Similarly, the U.S. and Japan should be coordinating development assistance, creating more aggressive and effective aid programs. Money is needed but equally important is building capacity in developing countries: developing infrastructure, providing help in meeting international standards, and ensuring good governance. A related effort would bring the U.S and Japan together to promote the development of civil society. A robust civil sector, with active and independent nonprofit organizations, is vital to the health and ultimate stability of a society. Our two countries have experience, knowledge, and capital that can spur the growth of such organizations around the world. A preliminary test for the two countries is the Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD), which Japan will host in May 2008. TICAD should be closely coordinated with the G8 Summit that Japan will host in July. The United States and Japan should call for an international initiative to establish criteria for evaluating progress toward realization of the UN Millennium Development goals and press to see that they are met. ¶ Second, the U.S. and Japan should be leading efforts to increase trade security. The globalization of international production has raised alarms about product quality and the safety and security of supply chains. Two of the world’s largest trading and manufacturing countries can set standards in these areas. Their multinational corporations can disseminate knowledge, knowhow, and a mindset that ensures safety and security. ¶ A related concern is transportation. Globalization has facilitated the mobilization (and movement) of people, which requires increased levels of safety and security of transportation. Our two governments can collaborate to strengthen international initiatives for trade and transportation security, such as those related to aviation, maritime, and port security.

#### Collaboration on security solves US – Japan Alliance – key to stability

Brad Glosserman, executive director for the Pacific Forum CSIS in Honolulu, editor for The Japan Times, and Katsu Furukuwa, Research Fellow of the Research Institute of Science and Technology for Society (RISTEX) in Japan Science and Technology Agency; ¶ ¶ March 2008; “A New U.S.-Japan Agenda;”¶ Pacific Forum CSIS, Issues and Insights ¶ Vol. 8-No. 4 ¶ ; <http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/issuesinsights_v08n04.pdf> ET

After the halcyon days of the Bush-Koizumi era, friends and supporters of the U.S.-Japan alliance look at the future with trepidation. A retreat from the high-water mark set by those two leaders was inevitable, but few suspected alliance relations would become the focal point of domestic politics in Japan as has occurred in recent months. The prospect of a new U.S. president is always unnerving in Tokyo, especially given Japanese fears that a Democratic president would be less committed than a Republican to the alliance (which is not true, historically). ¶ The U.S.-Japan relationship remains central to regional and global security. The bilateral alliance is a cornerstone of U.S. engagement with Asia. The extended nuclear deterrent provides stability and assurance for Japan. Most significantly, however, the coordinated application of the two countries’ resources to international problems is a force multiplier: working together, Japan and the U.S. can do far more than they can by themselves. Indeed, the most important challenge for alliance managers is the use of those considerable assets in new and creative ways. We believe that with a fundamentally new approach, our two nations can rejuvenate, sustain and solidify our bilateral relationship, enhance regional and global security, and better the lives of our two countries’ citizens and those of millions more around the world. ¶ Of course, the two countries must deal with traditional security concerns, most critically the maintenance of peace and stability in a region that is increasingly important to world trade and the global economy. The projection of power remains vital, which means the U.S. must maintain its forward presence. The safety and security of the maritime domain is a key shared objective for two allies that rely on trade to survive. In short, the military dimension of the relationship remains critical. ¶ Those points and the U.S. commitment to the defense of Japan notwithstanding, we do not believe that military issues should be the single core of the relationship. Just about every discussion of the future of the alliance starts with Japan’s contributions to international peacekeeping or multilateral security programs. Political and legal-constitutional constraints invariably overshadow Japanese debates over such policies. While some change is inevitable, its pace is uncertain; bringing the alliance into those discussions tends to sidetrack the debate, raising questions about U.S. involvement and heightening sensitivities about Japanese sovereignty. Those are unwanted distractions that can damage bilateral relations. ¶ It is more efficient and more effective to focus elsewhere. There are new security concerns that are better suited to the capabilities of two of the world’s richest and most technologically advanced countries. Cooperative policy approaches in several areas will enhance the strength of the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship while promoting a positive image to other states. This approach will seek to improve the material conditions in regions of greatest need while developing policies that advance the national interests of the U.S. and Japan.

#### Conflict over South China Sea on brink now

Austen Ramzy; Beijing correspondent for TIME , Middlebury College degree in Asian Studies, and journalism school at Berkeley; July 24, 2012 “China’s Newest City Raises Threat of Conflict in South China Sea;” TIME World; <http://world.time.com/2012/07/24/chinas-newest-city-raises-threat-of-conflict-in-the-south-china-sea/> ET

Sansha, [China](http://topics.time.com/china/)’s newest city, would seem to be a paradise. It has tropical waters, [about](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/china/2012-07/17/c_131721193.htm) 2 million sq km and just 3,500 permanent [residents](http://www.21cbh.com/HTML/2012-7-24/3NNDEzXzQ4MTY3Nw.html) on 13 sq km of palm-covered islands. There’s an airstrip but no airlines yet, so [transportation](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/photo/2012-07/10/content_15564956.htm) is still largely relegated to a 17-hour boat trip. But perhaps the biggest drawback is that it sits in the South China Sea, where rival territorial claims have intensified in recent months. On Tuesday, Sansha established a prefecture-level municipal government, and China’s People’s Liberation Army (PLA) [says](http://eng.mod.gov.cn/TopNews/2012-07/21/content_4386334.htm) it will soon establish a military garrison there. Sansha is the tiniest city of its kind in China, but it is having an outsize impact on the country’s increasingly tense territorial disputes with some of its Southeast Asian neighbors.¶ China and [Taiwan](http://topics.time.com/taiwan/) both claim almost all of the 3 million-sq-km South China Sea, and the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia and Brunei have partial claims. All except Brunei occupy disputed islands and reefs in the sea. The possibility of rich, undersea [oil](http://topics.time.com/oil/) and gas resources has led to increasing conflict between the neighboring states, and analysts say China’s new city will only worsen the disputes. “All trends are in the wrong direction,” says Ian Storey, a senior fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in Singapore. “The claimant countries have hardened their positions on jurisdictional claims. That’s made a legal resolution or a negotiated settlement harder because there’s less room for compromise.”¶ The dispute roiled the Association of Southeast Asian Nations foreign-ministers meeting in Cambodia that took place July 9–13. It failed to agree on a concluding joint statement for the first time since the group was founded in 1967. While the Philippines and Vietnam pushed for adding the South China Sea standoff to the statement, China’s ally Cambodia balked at including the issue, which China says it wants to resolve in bilateral discussions with each claimant rather than in a multilateral forum.¶ In April, the Philippines’ largest warship, the World War II–era frigate Rajah Humabon, confronted Chinese fishing boats it accused of harvesting endangered species near the Scarborough Shoal, which China calls Huangyan Island and the Philippines the Bajo de Masinloc. China sent marine surveillance vessels, and the Philippines soon replaced its warship with coast-guard craft, resulting in a standoff that still festers. The Philippines says it recalled its ships, but Chinese vessels remain near the shoal. “If someone entered your yard and told you he owned it, would you agree?” Philippine President Benigno Aquino said in his annual state of the nation [address](http://president.gov.ph/speech/english-translation-benigno-s-aquino-iii-third-state-of-the-nation-address-july-23-2012/) on Monday. “Would it be right to give away that which is rightfully ours?”¶ Many Southeast Asian states are beefing up their armed forces in response to China’s new assertiveness. Last year the military budget for the Philippines, one of the weakest military powers in Asia, nearly doubled. That means increased risk in the South China Sea, according to a [report](http://www.crisisgroup.org/en/regions/asia/north-east-asia/china/229-stirring-up-the-south-china-sea-ii-regional-responses.aspx) released Tuesday by the International Crisis Group, a Brussels-based think tank. “While increased military power is likely to raise the threshold for, as well as cost of, armed conflict, it could also embolden countries to be more pro-active in their territorial claims, making skirmishes harder to resolve,” the report said. “There is a risk that in seeking to flex their military muscle, claimant states will engage in brinkmanship that could lead to unintentional escalation.”¶ The Philippines and Vietnam both protested China’s creation of Sansha. China announced the move on the same day that Vietnam issued a law declaring the Paracels and Spratlys to be in its jurisdiction. China, which took control of the Paracels after a brief war with South Vietnam in 1974, established Sansha’s government on the largest Paracel isle, Woody Island. Also known as Yongxing in Chinese, the island has a grocery store, hospital, library and karaoke parlor but as yet no kindergarten, according to reports of Chinese journalists who have visited. Yongxing will likely be the headquarters of a new PLA garrison, though few details have been revealed. “This pronouncement of a garrison is symbolic,” says Rory Medcalf, director of the international security program at the Lowy Institute for International Policy in Sydney. “It may take a long time to operationalize, but it is placing a firm military marker on China’s claim in the South China Sea.”¶ The disputing parties have often used paramilitary and civilian forces such as coast guard and fisheries enforcement agencies to defend their territorial claims. The move to establish a Sansha garrison, though, is a sign of the growing reliance on hard power. Another indicator was the July 11 grounding of a Chinese navy frigate on Half Moon Shoal, which is claimed by both China and the Philippines. Perhaps more surprising than the initial presence of the Chinese navy ship just 100 km off the Philippines’ Palawan province was the speed with which it received assistance from its compatriots. “In about 24 hours they got five ships, including a tugboat, to Half Moon Shoal, and that’s quite a way from China,” says Storey. “That goes back to the point of increasing militarization. These warships were clearly on patrol or somewhere in the area.”¶ For now, the most significant impact of Sansha may be to increase the importance of the conflict for average Chinese citizens. In recent weeks Chinese media have run [personalized](http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/721902.shtml) [stories](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2012-07/13/content_15578338.htm) of reporters visiting the islands. “Both the city and the garrison unfortunately raise the emotional stakes for Chinese people,” says Medcalf. “That makes compromise even harder.”¶

#### Asian instability on the brink – Japan may militarize, China and North Korean aggression

Song Sang-ho; writer for [the Korea Herald](http://www.koreaherald.co.kr); 7-9-2012 “US-Japan alliance grows for Asia-Pacific security balance;” Asian News; <http://www.asianewsnet.net/home/news.php?id=33084&sec=1> ET
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Japan is more aggressively pushing to become a “normal state” with a full-fledged military as China increasingly flexes its naval might and North Korea tests its patience with missile and nuclear tests.¶ Japan’s increasing assertiveness comes as the US is deepening its strategic engagement in the Asia-Pacific to maintain its preeminence challenged by China’s rise. ¶ Despite its constitutional ban on war-related activities, the Japanese prime ministerial panel has reportedly claimed the need to recognise Japan’s right for collective self-defence ― the use of force to respond to an attack on an ally, namely the US.¶ Last month, Japan’s legislature passed the first revision in 34 years to the Atomic Energy Basic Act including “national security” among its goals, paving the way for the archipelago state’s nuclear armament.¶ These moves have prompted protests from its neighbours that still have bitter memories of Japan’s wartime atrocities.¶ But they are seen as a positive development for the US as Japan’s strategic enhancement may help maintain its primacy in the changing security landscape in the region. ¶ “In light of China’s rise, it makes good strategic sense for Japan to build up its military capabilities and act more like a normal state in the Asia-Pacific region. The US will certainly welcome this development,” John J. Mearsheimer, a leading realism theorist of international relations, told The Korea Herald via email.¶ “In fact, Washington has been pushing Japan to improve its military forces and act more assertively, because the US is increasingly worried about growing Chinese power, and wants Japan to play a key role in checking China if it adopts an overly ambitious foreign policy,” Mearsheimer, a professor at the University of Chicago, said.¶ Commensurate with its military and economic power, Japan’s political right has stressed the need for their country to assume a greater regional and global role beyond the defence of its own land. ¶ They have argued that the interpretation of Article 9 in the country’s so-called pacifist constitution should be altered to allow Japan’s Self-Defence Forces to actively engage in global security operations led by its ally US.¶ Such arguments have gained greater support due to continuing threats from China’s military buildup and an increasingly bellicose North Korea. ¶ Some observers said that Japan’s pursuit of a stronger military also derives from its efforts to shore up its global status, which has apparently declined due to a prolonged economic slump and political instability.

#### US – Japan alliance is on the brink – key to solve China and North Korea

Song Sang-ho; writer for [the Korea Herald](http://www.koreaherald.co.kr); 7-9-2012 “US-Japan alliance grows for Asia-Pacific security balance;” Asian News; <http://www.asianewsnet.net/home/news.php?id=33084&sec=1> ET

US-Japan alliance deepens¶ As the US has been shifting its military and diplomatic priorities toward the economically vibrant region, its alliance with Japan, along with its one with South Korea, will continue to be the core of its strategy to maintain primacy in the region.¶ “Washington hopes to work with China’s neighbours to put together a balancing coalition that will contain China and prevent it from dominating Asia the way the US dominates the Western Hemisphere,” said Mearsheimer.¶ On the surface, the alliance between the US and Japan appears to have worsened in recent years due to a long-standing controversy over the relocation of the Futenma airbase in Okinawa.¶ But this would not undermine the core of the alliance between the two countries that share security interests and values of democracy, and take initiatives against global terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, experts pointed out.¶ “People should not misconstrue a long-running local dispute over how to close one Marine air base with the durability and capability of that vital alliance,” said Patrick M. Cronin, senior director of the Asia Programme at the Centre for a New American Security.¶ After the Democratic Party of Japan took power in 2009, ending a half-century of almost unbroken conservative rule, the alliance appeared to have deteriorated with the Tokyo leadership pursuing a closer yet “equal” relationship. ¶ But it has apparently re-prioritised its relationship with Washington as it recognised growing security challenges from China and North Korea.¶ Amid its strategic pivot toward Asia, the US is likely to escalate its calls for the Asian ally to contribute more to maintaining stability in the region.

#### US – Japan Alliance key to solve North Korean aggression

Song Sang-ho; writer for [the Korea Herald](http://www.koreaherald.co.kr); 7-9-2012 “US-Japan alliance grows for Asia-Pacific security balance;” Asian News; <http://www.asianewsnet.net/home/news.php?id=33084&sec=1> ET

Challenges in forging triangular ties¶ US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on her tour of eight countries in Asia, Europe and the Middle East, plans to visit Laos for the first time in 57 years as America’s top diplomat. Last year, she also visited Myanmar. The two Southeast Asian states located close to China are of great geostrategic interest to the US.¶ The US has long strived to encourage South Korea and Japan to push aside their historical conflicts and move forward to have stronger trilateral cooperation to better deal with Pyongyang and apparently counterbalance China.¶ But historic animosity turned out to be more challenging than it thought it would be. ¶ For months, Seoul and Tokyo had sought to ink a rudimentary military intelligence-sharing pact in efforts to lay the groundwork for deepened defence cooperation. ¶ But the efforts faltered due to strong opposition from some political circles and civil society that have criticised the Seoul government for pushing for the deal without forming public consensus.¶ For South Korea, the trilateral cooperation is burdensome given that China is its largest trading partner, and that Beijing has a significant leverage to persuade North Korea from renouncing its nuclear ambitions.¶ Tensions in bilateral alliances were also one of the hurdles for the three-way security ties.¶ Like the alliance between South Korea and the US, America’s alliance with Japan has suffered friction due to crimes and accidents involving US service members, and environmental damage caused by US troop facilities.¶ Public antipathy toward US troops has continued particularly in Okinawa due to crimes and accidents including a 2004 plane crash at a university campus. ¶ The country’s southernmost area has more than 60 per cent of the US troops in Japan due to its strategic location that enables rapid deployment to the Korean Peninsula, the Taiwan Straits and other parts of areas in the region, in case of contingencies.¶ The relocation of the Futenma base along with the US troop realignment has been a tough nut to crack for both countries. Delinking the two issues, Washington and Tokyo agreed in April to withdraw some 9,000 marines from Okinawa. ¶ “For decades, we have placed a great burden on the people of Okinawa by concentrating the majority of military forces there,” said Cronin of the CNAS. ¶ “Moving some of our forces in Japan to other parts of the Asia-Pacific region not only makes our bases more politically sustainable, but they also help to make our forces less vulnerable to attack.” ¶ Impact of US-Japan alliance on Korean Peninsula¶ The US-Japan alliance is one of the three pillars defending South Korea. The two others are South Korea’s alliance with the US and its own military might, according to security experts.¶ “Troops in Japan are to provide significant logistical and intelligence support in the event of contingencies on the peninsula,” said Nam of Inha University. “Should any of the three pillars fail to work, there will be serious problems in our deterrence as well as war-managing capabilities.” ¶ There are seven rear bases of the UN Command in Japan that will help support South Korea in case of a war on the peninsula. The US-led UNC is a unified command structure for multinational military forces, which was established after the UN adopted its Security Council Resolution 84 on July 7, 1950.¶ The UNC bases include Camp Zama near Tokyo; Kadena Air Base, the hub of America’s airpower in the Asia Pacific; and Yokosuka Naval Base, the largest US Navy installations in the Western Pacific.

#### US – Japan Alliance solves North Korea

L. Gordon Flake; Executive Director of The Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation. Before joining The Mansfield Foundation, he was a Senior Fellow and Associate Director of the Program on Conflict Resolution at The Atlantic Council of the United States and prior to that Director for Research and Academic Affairs at the Korea Economic Institute of America; March 2011; “Different Beds, Same Nightmare: US–Japan Policy Coordination on North Korea and Implications for the US–Japan Alliance;” Stimson; <http://www.stimson.org/images/uploads/research-pdfs/Full_-_North_Korea_Challenge_for_the_US-Japan_Alliance.pdf> ET

The sinking of the Cheonan as a further illustration of the need for the US–Japan alliance¶ The March 2010 Cheonan incident, which claimed the lives of 46 South Koreans in the aftermath of a surprise attack by the North, provided a very tangible rationale for Japanese officials seeking to make the case for the necessity of America’s security guarantees. The Cheonan attack also provided a political fig leaf for the Hatoyama administration, which condemned the attacks while regarding the crisis as an opportunity to justify its policy reversal. The Hatoyama administration shifted from evicting the American air base in Okinawa to upholding the former agreement with US officials. The American military presence was needed, it was argued, to contain the threat posed by North Korea as made evident through North Korea’s sinking of a war vessel. Sensing the reversal, the United States capitalized on the moment to restore traditional relations between the two countries. ¶ In a joint press conference in May 2010 with Secretary Clinton and then Foreign Minister Okada, both the United States and Japan emphasized the link between the Cheonan incident and the US–Japan alliance.¶ (Clinton) We appreciate Japan’s support of South Korea and this investigation, because we recognize the threat that North Korea’s aggression poses is also to the people of Japan. Last year I met with families of the abducted, and expressed my personal sympathy and concern. The United States and Japan continue to work side by side to meet the challenges posed by North Korea. We agree that North Korea must stop its provocative behavior, halt its policy of threats and belligerence toward its neighbors, and take irreversible steps to fulfill its denuclearization commitments, and comply with international law...¶ (Okada) At the same time, to the Japanese people, we would like to have their understanding that in the current security environment the presence of US forces is indispensible for the security and stability of Japan. But not only just that, but the region’s stability.7¶ Even in the course of his resignation, Prime Minister Hatoyama used North Korea as primary justification for the US–Japan alliance.¶ “I hope you understand my pained grief that we must sustain trust between Japan and the United States,” he said, noting that the March sinking of a South Korean warship, apparently by North Korea, shows that “security has not been secured in Northeast Asia.”¶ At some point in the distant future, Hatoyama also said, Japan will not need the security umbrella provided by the United States, nor will it have to accommodate the “burden” of hosting tens of thousands of Americans troops. But he said that “is not possible in my era” to secure regional peace without Japan’s partnership with the United States.8 ¶ The sinking of the Cheonan and the more recent November 2010 North Korean artillery barrage on South Korea’s Yeonpyeong Island have served to highlight the immediate threat from North Korea and thus moved the rationale for the US–Japan alliance from the conceptual and theoretical to the more tangible. This transition was clearly evident in late November and early December 2010, when the United States and the ROK and the United States and Japan held back-to-back large-scale naval exercises in the region.

#### Instability causes Japan prolif – leads to nuclear use

Frank Barnabie, Nuclear Issues Consultant to Oxford Research Group, and Shaun Burnie, Coordinator of Greenpeace International nuclear campaigns; September 8, 2005; “Thinking the Unthinkable: Japanese nuclear power and proliferation in East Asia;” Japan Focus <http://japanfocus.org/-Frank-Barnabie/1931> ET

Political momentum towards nuclear weapons Through most of this period the justification has been for obvious reasons, put in the context of national (self) defence, but in most cases without explicit threats being named (at least in public). Today the threats are now more explicitly cited. In recent years leading politicians such as Ozawa Ichiro warned that Japan could use its commercial plutonium stockpile for making nuclear weapons. Ozawa, leader of the opposition party Jiyuto (Liberal Party), declared in 2002 that if the military threat posed by China continued to grow: “It would be so easy for us to produce nuclear warheads - we have plutonium at nuclear power plants in Japan, enough to make several thousand such warheads.”9 The crisis over North Korea’s nuclear weapons program, based around plutonium reprocessing, stengthened the position of those in Japan advocating nuclear weapons development. Acknowledged by no less than the U.S. Ambassador to Japan Thomas Schieffer: “If you had a nuclear North Korea, it just introduces a whole different dynamic… That increases the pressure on both South Korea and Japan to consider going nuclear themselves.” (Tokyo, June 2005). While such a declaration is intended to put pressure on China to act more forcefully with its ally in Pyongyang, it is also highly significant in terms of U.S. policy towards Japan. In the 1960’s, the Nixon administration considered the option of arming Japan with nuclear weapons. Forty years on it would be surprising if there were not those in Washington considering that such a development would be in the medium term interests of the United States. And anyway, the U.S. is already signalling that it would not be able to stop it. Of course, according to most analysts North Korea already possesses a few or several nuclear weapons. It has not yet demonstrated their existence through an actual nuclear test, although it has been speculated that it is imminent. At which point the debate in Japan over its security vulnerability to North Korean missiles would become frantic. More likely a test remains a threat, which will be deployed only when North Korea has run out of other options. But the general atmosphere remains threatening and therefore fertile for those in Japan who would move towards weaponisation. A further factor to consider is the general view that international opprobrium/condemnation would be visited on Japan if it were to go nuclear. It is true that the consequences for Japan’s nuclear trade would be problematic, perhaps severely damaging as Japan is supplied nuclear materials and technology under condition of peaceful use. But what of wider diplomatic and economic consequences? It is worth considering the reality of international relations in the early 21st century. Japan’s major nuclear trading partners are in possession of their own nuclear weapons (and currently modernizing them) or covered by the U.S. nuclear umbrella. Current nuclear non-proliferation policy is based upon the double-standards of opposing the programmes of Iran or North Korea while maintaining or expanding their own weapons programs. Japan is unlikely to be labelled part of the axis of evil. If triggered by a North Korean test, or equivalent dramatic development, while not welcoming a Japanese bomb, it is likely that Japan’s allies would explain it as a regrettable but understandable reaction. And it gets worse. Witness the experience of India and Pakistan in the aftermath of their nuclear weapons tests in 1998. While sanctions were applied, including by Japan, the reality today is that their relations with the United States and allies (especially Japan) have never been closer. They are both identified as strategic partners, with India seen as vital in terms of economic production and future markets, an ally in the ‘war against terror’ in the case of the military elite ruling Pakistan, and a counter balance to China in the case of India. The reality is that both countries have gotten away, nay thrived, in the aftermath of becoming nuclear powers. India is due to sign nuclear cooperation agreements with the United States and Pakistan is soon to take delivery from the U.S. of nuclear strike capable F-16s. As the world’s second largest economy, the important and dangerous lesson for policy makers in Japan is that the world soon learns to live with nuclear realities. If India and Pakistan can do it, then Japan certainly can. Japan’s strategic importance to the United States has moved centre stage under the Bush administration. There are pressures to revise its constitution with the active encouragement of the U.S., and Japan’s military is being deployed overseas, and undertaking joint training with the U.S. as never before. The prospects of Japan moving further towards nationalism and militarism are made worse by the likely successor to Prime Minister Koizumi, Shinzo Abe in 2006. “Treat nothing as inevitable” is a good principle to live one’s life by. Unfortunately, in the case of Japan’s nuclear development, it may not be sufficient. The international community - read governments - will learn to live with Japanese nuclear weapons if that occasion arises. The consequences would of course be terrible for Northeast Asia. Pressure in South Korea to respond would be huge, relations with China could become disastrous, and the global nuclear non-proliferation regime centred around the NPT reduced to a historical footnote.

#### East Asia on the brink of war – South China Sea dispute draws in countries into conflict

ROBERT D. KAPLAN; senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security, national correspondent for the Atlantic, and a member of the U.S. Defense Department's Defense Policy Board; [SEPT/OCT 2011](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/issues/188/contents/); “[The South China Sea Is the Future of Conflict](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/the_south_china_sea_is_the_future_of_conflict);” Foreign Policy;

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/the_south_china_sea_is_the_future_of_conflict?page=0,0> ET

EAST ASIA IS A VAST, YAWNING EXPANSE stretching nearly from the Arctic to Antarctic -- from the Kuril Islands southward to New Zealand -- and characterized by a shattered array of isolated coastlines and far-flung archipelagos. Even accounting for how dramatically technology has compressed distance, the sea itself still acts as a barrier to aggression, at least to a degree that dry land does not. The sea, unlike land, creates clearly defined borders, giving it the potential to reduce conflict. Then there is speed to consider. Even the fastest warships travel comparatively slowly, 35 knots, say, reducing the chance of miscalculations and giving diplomats more hours -- days, even -- to reconsider decisions. Navies and air forces simply do not occupy territory the way that armies do. It is because of the seas around East Asia -- the center of global manufacturing as well as rising military purchases -- that the 21st century has a better chance than the 20th of avoiding great military conflagrations. ¶ Of course, East Asia saw great military conflagrations in the 20th century, which the seas did not prevent: the Russo-Japanese War; the almost half-century of civil war in China that came with the slow collapse of the Qing dynasty; the various conquests of imperial Japan, followed by World War II in the Pacific; the Korean War; the wars in Cambodia and Laos; and the two in Vietnam involving the French and the Americans. The fact that the geography of East Asia is primarily maritime had little impact on such wars, which at their core were conflicts of national consolidation or liberation. But that age for the most part lies behind us. East Asian militaries, rather than focusing inward with low-tech armies, are focusing outward with high-tech navies and air forces. ¶ As for the comparison between China today and Germany on the eve of World War I that many make, it is flawed: Whereas Germany was primarily a land power, owing to the geography of Europe, China will be primarily a naval power, owing to the geography of East Asia. ¶ East Asia can be divided into two general areas: Northeast Asia, dominated by the Korean Peninsula, and Southeast Asia, dominated by the South China Sea. Northeast Asia pivots on the destiny of North Korea, an isolated, totalitarian state with dim prospects in a world governed by capitalism and electronic communication. Were North Korea to implode, Chinese, U.S., and South Korean ground forces might meet up on the peninsula's northern half in the mother of all humanitarian interventions, even as they carve out spheres of influence for themselves. Naval issues would be secondary. But an eventual reunification of Korea would soon bring naval issues to the fore, with a Greater Korea, China, and Japan in delicate equipoise, separated by the Sea of Japan and the Yellow and Bohai seas. Yet because North Korea still exists, the Cold War phase of Northeast Asian history is not entirely over, and land power may well come to dominate the news there before sea power will. ¶ Southeast Asia, by contrast, is already deep into the post-Cold War phase of history. Vietnam, which dominates the western shore of the South China Sea, is a capitalist juggernaut despite its political system, seeking closer military ties to the United States. China, consolidated as a dynastic state by Mao Zedong after decades of chaos and made into the world's most dynamic economy by the liberalizations of Deng Xiaoping, is pressing outward with its navy to what it calls the "first island chain" in the Western Pacific. The Muslim behemoth of Indonesia, having endured and finally ended decades of military rule, is poised to emerge as a second India: a vibrant and stable democracy with the potential to project power by way of its growing economy. Singapore and Malaysia are also surging forward economically, in devotion to the city-state-cum-trading-state model and through varying blends of democracy and authoritarianism. The composite picture is of a cluster of states, which, with problems of domestic legitimacy and state-building behind them, are ready to advance their perceived territorial rights beyond their own shores. This outward collective push is located in the demographic cockpit of the globe, for it is in Southeast Asia, with its 615 million people, where China's 1.3 billion people converge with the Indian subcontinent's 1.5 billion people. And the geographical meeting place of these states, and their militaries, is maritime: the South China Sea. ¶ The South China Sea joins the Southeast Asian states with the Western Pacific, functioning as the throat of global sea routes. Here is the center of maritime Eurasia, punctuated by the straits of Malacca, Sunda, Lombok, and Makassar. More than half the world's annual merchant fleet tonnage passes through these choke points, and a third of all maritime traffic. The oil transported through the Strait of Malacca from the Indian Ocean, en route to East Asia through the South China Sea, is more than six times the amount that passes through the Suez Canal and 17 times the amount that transits the Panama Canal. Roughly two-thirds of South Korea's energy supplies, nearly 60 percent of Japan's and Taiwan's energy supplies, and about 80 percent of China's crude-oil imports come through the South China Sea. What's more, the South China Sea has proven oil reserves of 7 billion barrels and an estimated 900 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, a potentially huge bounty.¶ It is not only location and energy reserves that promise to give the South China Sea critical geostrategic importance, but also the coldblooded territorial disputes that have long surrounded these waters. Several disputes concern the Spratly Islands, a mini-archipelago in the South China Sea's southeastern part. Vietnam, Taiwan, and China each claim all or most of the South China Sea, as well as all of the Spratly and Paracel island groups. In particular, Beijing asserts a historical line: It lays claim to the heart of the South China Sea in a grand loop (widely known as the "cow's tongue") from China's Hainan Island at the South China Sea's northern end all the way south 1,200 miles to near Singapore and Malaysia. ¶ The result is that all nine states that touch the South China Sea are more or less arrayed against China and therefore dependent on the United States for diplomatic and military support. These conflicting claims are likely to become even more acute as Asia's spiraling energy demands -- energy consumption is expected to [double by 2030](http://www.eia.gov/cabs/South_China_Sea/Full.html), with China accounting for half that growth -- make the South China Sea the ever more central guarantor of the region's economic strength. Already, the South China Sea has increasingly become an armed camp, as the claimants build up and modernize their navies, even as the scramble for islands and reefs in recent decades is mostly over. China has so far confiscated 12 geographical features, Taiwan one, Vietnam 25, the Philippines eight, and Malaysia five. ¶ China's very geography orients it in the direction of the South China Sea. China looks south toward a basin of water formed, in clockwise direction, by Taiwan, the Philippines, the island of Borneo split between Malaysia and Indonesia (as well as tiny Brunei), the Malay Peninsula divided between Malaysia and Thailand, and the long snaking coastline of Vietnam: weak states all, compared with China. Like the Caribbean Sea, punctuated as it is by small island states and enveloped by a continental-sized United States, the South China Sea is an obvious arena for the projection of Chinese power. ¶ Indeed, China's position here is in many ways akin to America's position vis-à-vis the similar-sized Caribbean in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The United States recognized the presence and claims of European powers in the Caribbean, but sought to dominate the region nevertheless. It was the 1898 Spanish-American War and the digging of the Panama Canal from 1904 to 1914 that signified the United States' arrival as a world power. Domination of the greater Caribbean Basin, moreover, gave the United States effective control of the Western Hemisphere, which allowed it to affect the balance of power in the Eastern Hemisphere. And today China finds itself in a similar situation in the South China Sea, an antechamber of the Indian Ocean, where China also desires a naval presence to protect its Middle Eastern energy supplies. ¶ Yet something deeper and more emotional than geography propels China forward into the South China Sea and out into the Pacific: that is, China's own partial breakup by the Western powers in the relatively recent past, after having been for millennia a great power and world civilization. ¶ In the 19th century, as the Qing dynasty became the sick man of East Asia, China lost much of its territory to Britain, France, Japan, and Russia. In the 20th century came the bloody Japanese takeovers of the Shandong Peninsula and Manchuria. This all came atop the humiliations forced on China by the extraterritoriality agreements of the 19th and early 20th centuries, whereby Western countries wrested control of parts of Chinese cities -- the so-called "treaty ports." By 1938, as Yale University historian Jonathan D. Spence tells us in [The Search for Modern China](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0393307808/ref%3Das_li_ss_tl?ie=UTF8&tag=fopo-20&linkCode=as2&camp=217145&creative=399369&creativeASIN=0393307808), because of these depredations as well as the Chinese Civil War, there was even a latent fear that "China was [about to be dismembered](http://books.google.com/books?id=vI1RRslLNSwC&lpg=PP1&dq=The%20Search%20for%20Modern%20China&pg=PA300#v=snippet&q=%22about%20to%20be%20dismembered%22&f=false), that it would cease to exist as a nation, and that the four thousand years of its recorded history would come to a jolting end." China's urge for expansion is a declaration that it never again intends to let foreigners take advantage of it.¶ JUST AS GERMAN SOIL constituted the military front line of the Cold War, the waters of the South China Sea may constitute the military front line of the coming decades. As China's navy becomes stronger and as China's claim on the South China Sea contradicts those of other littoral states, these other states will be forced to further develop their naval capacities. They will also balance against China by relying increasingly on the U.S. Navy, whose strength has probably peaked in relative terms, even as it must divert considerable resources to the Middle East. Worldwide multipolarity is already a feature of diplomacy and economics, but the South China Sea could show us what multipolarity in a military sense actually looks like. ¶ There is nothing romantic about this new front, void as it is of moral struggles. In naval conflicts, unless there is shelling onshore, there are no victims per se; nor is there a philosophical enemy to confront. Nothing on the scale of ethnic cleansing is likely to occur in this new central theater of conflict. China, its suffering dissidents notwithstanding, simply does not measure up as an object of moral fury. The Chinese regime demonstrates only a low-calorie version of authoritarianism, with a capitalist economy and little governing ideology to speak of. Moreover, China is likely to become more open rather than closed as a society in future years. Instead of fascism or militarism, China, along with other states in East Asia, is increasingly defined by the persistence of old-fashioned nationalism: an idea, certainly, but not one that since the mid-19th century has been attractive to intellectuals. And even if China does become more democratic, its nationalism is likely only to increase, as even a casual survey of the views of its relatively freewheeling netizens makes clear.

## Solvency

### Now!

### Feasibility

#### Port Security Feasible

W.C.N., World Cruise Network, 3/01/05, "Maximum Security", <http://www.worldcruise-network.com/features/feature447/>, AE

With the bitter experience of the al-Qaeda bombing of the USS Cole (which occurred while the ship was refueling in the port of Aden in Yemen), and the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington, the US Coast Guard convinced the IMO, an arm of the United Nations, to create an international standard for ship and port security.

### Economy

#### Seaports vital to US economy – many warrants

**AAPA** American Association of Port Authorities **2009** “New Study Details Economic Benefits of U.S. Seaports” <http://www.aapa-ports.org/press/prdetail.cfm?itemnumber=3485> JD

Last year, United States deep-draft seaports and seaport-related businesses generated approximately 8.4 million American jobs and added nearly $2 trillion to the economy, according to a just-completed study by a Lancaster, Pa.-based business consulting service that specializes in port-sector economic impact studies.¶ Based upon 2006 U.S. port cargo statistics and thousands of recent port-sector interviews, Martin Associates late this month completed an in-depth study into the economic impacts of coastal and Great Lakes ports, examining aspects ranging from jobs and wages to business and tax revenues. Of the 8,397,301 Americans working for ports and port-related industries in 2006, nearly 7 million were employed by firms involved in handling imports and exports, such as retailers, wholesalers, manufacturers, distributors and logistics companies.¶ "The tremendous growth in overseas trade volumes moving through our ports in the past decade has been a huge boon to the American economy," said Kurt Nagle, president and chief executive officer for the American Association of Port Authorities. "The jobs these imports and exports create are spread throughout the country, not just in port cities, making them a vital part of our nation's economic fabric."¶ In addition to citing employment numbers, Martin Associates' new study also shows that businesses providing goods and services to U.S. seaports directly and indirectly paid $314.5 billion in total wages and salaries. Of this total, $207.4 billion came directly from businesses involved in handling international waterborne commerce. Moreover, the 2006 report shows that port-sector businesses generated a high rate of economic output, with business revenues and the value of the goods and services they provided totaled $1,976.4 billion, or nearly $2 trillion.

#### **Seaports support over 1 million jobs – economic stimulus**

**AAPA** American Association of Port Authorities **2009** “New Study Details Economic Benefits of U.S. Seaports” <http://www.aapa-ports.org/press/prdetail.cfm?itemnumber=3485> JD

"Compared to the last study we developed in 2000 (based upon 1999 data), these figures indicate a significant increase in the financial benefits that the port industry provides the American economy," said Dr. John C. Martin, president of Martin Associates, "This new report shows that port-related activities are contributing to the economy in record numbers."¶ With a doctorate in economics from George Washington University and having performed more than 300 individual economic impact analyses and port strategic and master plans for ports throughout the country in his 30 years in business, Dr. Martin is widely regarded as a leader in port market and economic studies.¶ Looking specifically at employment in the nation's seaports, the study shows that 507,448 Americans held jobs such as terminal operators, longshoremen, freight forwarders, steamship agents, ship pilots, tug and towboat operators, chandlers, warehousemen, as well as jobs in the dredging, marine construction, ship repair, trucking and railroad industries. These direct port-sector jobs supported another 630,913 induced jobs due to purchases of food, housing, transportation, apparel, medical and entertainment services.¶

#### **Ports provide short and long term economic stimulus**

**AAPA** American Association of Port Authorities **2009** “New Study Details Economic Benefits of U.S. Seaports” <http://www.aapa-ports.org/press/prdetail.cfm?itemnumber=3485> JD

 Also included as induced jobs were those with local, state and federal agencies providing support functions such as education and municipal services. The port-sector firms providing direct services to the cargo and vessel activity at the nation's seaports made $26.3 billion in purchases to support their direct activity, supporting another 306,289 indirect jobs. These include, for example: jobs with suppliers of parts and equipment; firms providing maintenance and repair services to the businesses dependent on port operations; utilities providing services to marine terminals; and office supply firms.¶ "One thing that isn't obvious in the new report is that port-sector jobs tend to pay above-average wages, which is important to ensuring America remain a strong economic force in the global community," said Dr. Martin. In his 2006 report, Dr. Martin found that the number of direct, induced and indirect jobs from business activities at our nation's ports stood at 1,444,650, and the earnings and consumption dollars from those jobs came to $107.1 billion. Overall, he said port-sector workers today earn, on average, about $50,000 a year, which is $13,000 more per year than the National Average Wage Index, as computed by the Social Security Administration.¶ The study was developed using individual economic impact models that Martin Associates has developed for the majority of the nation's seaports. These models are based on interviews with more than 10,000 port tenants, maritime service providers, trucking firms, railroads, terminal operators, towing companies, pilot associations and other port-related entities. The models were updated using 2006 import and export data provided by the U.S. Maritime Administration (MARAD), as well as port-specific data for domestic cargo shipments handled at the ports but not included in the international cargo data provided by MARAD.

#### **Ports vital to economy – government key**

Kurt J. **Nagle** economic analyst at Inbound Logistics 7/**2009** “Healthy Seaports: An 'Open for Business' Sign” <http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/healthy-seaports-an-open-for-business-sign/> JD

Nearly everything we buy or consume—from the clothes we wear, to the food we eat, to the coffee we start our day with—comes to us on a ship, through one of our nation's seaports. In turn, nearly everything the United States sells in the global marketplace makes its way there via our seaports. This includes valuable domestic commodities such as machinery, steel, and building materials.¶ Today, as we confront a host of national challenges—chief among them, recovery from the current economic crisis—our seaports play a clear and critical role.¶ Deep-draft seaports—both coastal and fresh water—are dynamic, vibrant centers of trade and commerce, but what's most important to understand is that they depend on partnerships, both public and private.¶ A successful seaport is supported by clear and navigable federal waterways—dredged deep and wide enough for ships to pass through, and kept clean for the plants, fish, and wildlife around it to thrive. A successful seaport is also supported by a federal government that properly funds the roads, highways, waterways, and rail systems that lead to it. Finally, a successful seaport is one whose state and local officials take an active role in the maintenance and upkeep of those systems.¶

#### **Local and national economic stimulus**

Kurt J. **Nagle** economic analyst at Inbound Logistics 7/**2009** “Healthy Seaports: An 'Open for Business' Sign” <http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/healthy-seaports-an-open-for-business-sign/> JD

For every task performed on port sites, every piece of cargo they process, and every new capability ports can offer their customers, there is an associated employment and economic impact.¶ For example, in 2007, U.S. seaports were responsible for nearly $3.2 trillion in economic activity. They generated more than $212 billion in tax revenue, moved more than 99 percent of the country's overseas cargo, handled more than two billion tons of cargo, and supported more than 13 million American jobs, accounting for $649 billion in personal income.¶ As broad and as big as their impact is, ports also serve as local economic engines. Consider the location of the largest U.S. metropolitan centers—such as New York, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, Seattle, Miami—and you'll notice a high percentage have ports that handle ocean-going vessels. Centers of international trade like these are magnets for business and economic development. Consequently, now, when an economic shot in the arm is needed more than ever, it is critical to invest in ports, their infrastructure, and their operations.¶ With multi-million-dollar projects underway at seaports around the country, port authorities have done a lot to stimulate the economy in recent months—and the transportation infrastructure investments they are making are working. But there's still more to do.

### Federal

#### 50 states doesn’t solve – federal action key to solvency

Jospeh F. Bouchard, Ph.D.; Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense, United States Navy Captain; 2005; “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy;” <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf> ET

Port security is a national imperative and requires a national approach.¶ Since the benefits of maritime operations extend to 50 states, we should have a¶ system where the costs of better security are shared across the country. That is¶ what a genuine partnership really does. The federal government, states,¶ municipalities and private owners and operators are now all players in our global¶ system of commerce and all have responsibilities to help secure it. But only the¶ federal government can set up appropriate mechanisms so that the burden is¶ spread appropriately across the system and is thus sustainable over the long-term.¶ The current approach fails to achieve that goal. A new approach is necessary.

### Government

#### **Government ready for seaport improvement**

Janet Napolitano secretary for U.S Department of Homeland Security 7/25/2012 “House Homeland Security Committee Hearing; "Understanding the Homeland Threat Landscape."; Testimony by Janet Napolitano, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security” <http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/auth/checkbrowser.do?rand=0.13832816278170923&cookieState=0&ipcounter=1&bhcp=1> JD

Earlier this year, the Administration announced the U.S. National Strategy for Global Supply Chain Security to set a government-wide vision of our goals, approach, and priorities to strengthen the global supply chain system. The National Strategy establishes two explicit goals: promoting the efficient and secure movement of goods and fostering resilient supply chain systems. As we work to achieve these goals, we will be guided by the overarching principles of risk management and collaborative engagement with key stakeholders who also have key supply chain roles and responsibilities.¶ DHS is now working in close partnership with other federal departments and agencies to translate the high-level guidance contained in the Strategy into concrete actions. We are focusing our immediate efforts on the priority action areas identified in the Strategy.¶ In addition to the National Strategy for Global Supply Chain Security, DHS continues to advance a range of other measures and programs to strengthen different components of this vital system in partnership with multilateral organizations such as the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the World Customs Organization (WCO), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) as well as bilaterally with trading partners.¶ We are also working closely with industry and foreign government partners to identify and address high-risk shipments as early in the shipping process as possible by collecting and analyzing advance electronic commercial data. This allows DHS to make risk informed decisions about what cargo is safe to be loaded onto vessels and aircraft prior to their departure from a foreign port and facilitates the clearance of those shipments upon their arrival in the United States.¶ Through the Container Security Initiative (CSI), CBP works with host government customs services to examine high-risk maritime containerized cargo at foreign seaports, before they are loaded on board vessels destined for the United States. CSI teams currently operate at a total of 58 ports in North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin and Central America--covering approximately 80 percent of all maritime containerized cargo imported into the United States.¶ In the aviation environment, we are working with leaders from global shipping companies and the International Air Transport Association (IATA) to develop preventive measures, including terrorism awareness training for employees and vetting personnel with access to cargo. We are reviewing our foreign partners' cargo screening to determine whether their programs provide a level of security commensurate with U.S. air cargo security standards. Those who meet these requirements are officially recognized to conduct screening for cargo traveling to the U.S. We are also building partnerships, through mutual recognition arrangements, with foreign governments maintaining industry partnership programs comparable to the Customs-Trade Partnership against Terrorism. We concluded such an agreement with the European Union in May which will give us better visibility into the security applied early in the supply chain for shipments from all 27 Member States of the EU.

#### **Government action necessary**

Kurt J. **Nagle** economic analyst at Inbound Logistics 7/**2009** “Healthy Seaports: An 'Open for Business' Sign” <http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/healthy-seaports-an-open-for-business-sign/> JD

In the United States, seaports invest more than $2.5 billion every year to maintain and improve their infrastructure. In recent years, however, this commitment has not been adequately matched by the federal government. Many land and water connections are insufficient and outdated, affecting the ports' ability to move cargo into and out of the country. In turn, this hurts U.S. businesses, our workforce, and our national economy.¶ U.S. seaports need increased federal infrastructure investments that will correct this imbalance while delivering much-needed economic prosperity to the country. Recent estimates that the volume of international trade through our ports will double by 2020 only underscore this need.¶ Across the United States and around the globe, seaports are so much more than just safe havens in rough waters. They're centers of commerce and trade, busy and dynamic transportation hubs that are constantly adapting to meet ever-changing global trade demands.¶ Seaports are where imported goods make their first landfall, and where the goods we export to the world first leave our shores.¶ Seaports help build and grow international trade, and strengthen local and national economies. They provide high-paying jobs and help increase our standard of living. And they connect us with the rest of the world—at a time when our mutual dependence on trade is becoming even more important. This is why keeping ports modern, navigable, safe, and properly supported must be a core priority for the nation.

#### **Federal government key**

Kurt J. **Nagle** economic analyst at Inbound Logistics 7/**2009** “Healthy Seaports: An 'Open for Business' Sign” <http://www.inboundlogistics.com/cms/article/healthy-seaports-an-open-for-business-sign/> JD

We must ensure that there's adequate, safe, and congestion-free access to ports from land, which is a federal responsibility. Another federal responsibility is to ensure modern, navigable waterside access—with channels that are deep and wide enough to handle today's modern vessels—and marine highways to provide transportation options for moving cargo between ports.¶ These priorities should be included in a long-term, national transportation plan that addresses freight mobility, congestion, and productivity. Without such a plan—and the necessary investment to support it—America will be less competitive, consumers will pay higher prices for the things they need, and national, state, and local economies will suffer.¶ The federal government should play the appropriate role by helping enhance the movement of goods to help America regain its competitive footing.¶ Addressing goods movement challenges and alleviating freight congestion must be a top priority of the upcoming surface transportation legislation in order to help ensure U.S. farmers, manufacturers, and other businesses remain competitive in the global marketplace. Seaports can play a critical role in our national economic recovery; however, connecting infrastructure to ports requires higher levels of federal investment to create jobs, alleviate congestion, and deliver prosperity.

#### **Government funding increase seaport security**

AAPAAmerican Association of Port Authorities 3/1/**2012** “DOT Grant Program to Provide Much-Needed Port Security Funding” <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/dot-grant-program-to-provide-much-needed-port-security-funding-76230887.html> JD

ALEXANDRIA, Va., March 1 /PRNewswire/ -- U.S. ports will soon begin¶ applying for $93.3 million in funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation¶ (DOT) to enhance seaport security. The new Port Security Grants program will¶ be administered by the Maritime Association (MARAD) and the U.S. Coast Guard¶ on behalf of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).¶ "We're very pleased that Congress recognized the tremendous need for¶ Federal help at U.S. seaports and appropriated emergency funding for security¶ enhancements," said Kurt J. Nagle, president of the American Association of¶ Port Authorities. "We commend DOT's extraordinary efforts to get this grant¶ program up and running quickly."¶ "While the $93.3 million is a good initial investment, we anticipate that¶ much more will be needed to protect America's ports from terrorism and other¶ Federal crimes. Seaports are vital to the nation's economic growth and¶ vitality. We hope that Congress will provide significant additional funding¶ for grants during the upcoming appropriations process," Nagle added.¶ Ports need to submit grant applications electronically through MARAD's web¶ site, http://www.portsecuritygrants.dottsa.net . The two categories for¶ grants include: security assessments and mitigation strategies; and enhanced¶ facility and operational security, including facility access control, physical¶ security, cargo security and passenger security. All grants will be awarded¶ by the end of June 2002.¶ Protecting international seaport borders is a shared responsibility¶ between the Federal, state and local governments. Since September 11,¶ enhancing seaport security has been a top priority for ports. They want to¶ maintain the safest, most secure facilities possible while moving goods¶ efficiently to their destination. Ports have invested millions of their own¶ dollars to increase security measures at their facilities.¶ The Fall 2000 Report to Congress of the Interagency Commission on Crime¶ and Security at U.S. Seaports estimated that enhanced security could cost¶ between $10 and $50 million per port. Just among AAPA's 85 U.S. port members,¶ security enhancements could exceed $2 billion.

### Funding

#### **Funding key to port security**

**DLT Grants** Grants Office actively manages your grant development project from our initial conversation through proposal submission. Grants development teams typically consist of members from different functional areas, including grant writing, grant research project management, account management and strategic planning. Grants Office's successful approach is based on extensive collaboration and regular communication between our grants development team and our clients. The result is a robust grants development function that reduces cost, lowers risk, shrinks typical investment of time and resources, and secures grant funding. **2012** “Port Security Grant Program (PSGP)”, <http://dltgrants.info.dnnmax.com/GrantDetails.aspx?gid=17040> JD

The PSGP is one of the DHS’s FY 2012 grant programs which directly support transportation infrastructure security activities. The PSGP is one tool in the comprehensive set of measures authorized by Congress and implemented by the Administration to strengthen the Nation’s critical infrastructure against risks associated with potential terrorist attacks. The vast majority of U.S. critical infrastructure is owned and/or operated by State, local, and private sector partners. The PSGP funds available to these entities are intended to support increased port-wide risk management; enhanced domain awareness; training and exercises; expansion of port recovery and resiliency capabilities; and further capabilities to prevent, detect, respond to, and recover from attacks involving improvised explosive devices (IED) and other non-conventional weapons. The FY 2012 PSGP plays an important role in the implementation of Presidential Policy Directive 8 (PPD-8) by supporting the development and sustainment of core capabilities. Core capabilities are essential for the execution of each of the five mission areas outlined in the National Preparedness Goal (NPG). The development and sustainment of these core capabilities are not exclusive to any single level of government or organization, but rather require the combined effort of the whole community. The FY 2012 PSGP supports all core capabilities in the Prevention, Protection, Mitigation, Response, and Recovery mission areas based on allowable costs.

#### TSA funding the program

**TSA,** Transportation Security Administration employs a risk-based strategy to secure U.S. transportation systems, working closely with stakeholders in aviation, rail, transit, highway, and pipeline sectors, as well as the partners in the law enforcement and intelligence community. The agency continuously sets the standard for excellence in transportation security through its people, processes, technologies and use of intelligence to drive operations, **2004** “TSA And The State Of Florida Team Up To Tighten Seaport Security”, <http://www.tsa.gov/press/releases/2004/press_release_0403.shtm> JD

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA), Florida state House and Senate leaders, and the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles announced a groundbreaking new partnership today to strengthen security at the State's seaports.¶ The partnership, formalized in a Memorandum of Agreement signed in mid-February, will define requirements for background checks and state-of-the-art identification credentials for truck drivers, dockworkers and others who require unescorted access to the secure areas of the seaports. TSA will provide the infrastructure of the Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC), which offers a giant leap in transportation security by balancing the needs of commerce and individual privacy with those of security. The program provides a high-tech credential that verifies workers' identities and ties each worker to a background check to ensure that high-risk individuals are denied access to sensitive areas of the nation's transportation system.¶ "This partnership is an example of what can be accomplished when federal and state governments work together," stated Lolie Kull, TSA's Program Manager for TWIC. "By pooling our resources and expertise, Florida will be helping TSA take the next step in its effort to implement a national credentialing program for the transportation workforce."¶ The uniform credential will serve as an identity management tool to keep terrorists out of secure areas of the transportation system, including seaports and airports as well as such critical modes as rail, pipelines, trucking and mass transit. The TWIC will contain a biometric identifier, like a fingerprint, to positively authenticate the identity of the holder.¶ By having one universally recognized credential, workers will no longer have to carry numerous cards or go through redundant background investigations to enter secure areas at multiple facilities. Advanced technologies on the TWIC will also allow facilities to better manage access to various areas at a site. ¶ The Florida partnership was made possible by legislation passed by the Florida Legislature in 2003. The bill was principally crafted by the Senate's Home Defense, Public Security and Ports Committee chaired by Sen. Paula Dockery, R-Lakeland. In the House of Representatives the bill advanced through the efforts of the House Policy Chair, Rep. Dudley Goodlette, R-Naples. ¶ Officials of the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles have worked closely on the TWIC program with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and their counterparts at TSA, an agency of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The agencies also sought input from seaport and trucking industry officials.

#### **TSA and Coast Guard alliance**

**TSA** Transportation Security Administration employs a risk-based strategy to secure U.S. transportation systems, working closely with stakeholders in aviation, rail, transit, highway, and pipeline sectors, as well as the partners in the law enforcement and intelligence community. The agency continuously sets the standard for excellence in transportation security through its people, processes, technologies and use of intelligence to drive operations,  **8/17/11,** “TSA and U.S. Coast Guard Initiate Homeland Security Exercises for U.S. Seaports” <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/tsa-and-us-coast-guard-initiate-homeland-security-exercises-for-us-seaports-54951697.html> JD

WASHINGTON, Aug. 18 /PRNewswire/ -- The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) and the U.S. Coast Guard began a series of transportation system port security exercises today in San Francisco. The Port Security¶ Training Exercises Program (PortSTEP) is focused on building links within the Area Maritime Security (AMS) Committee. The committee assists the captain of the port in writing, reviewing and updating an AMS Plan in addition to supporting other transportation entities that depend upon the port being secure. The exercise will involve the entire port community, including both public governmental agencies and private industry. The partnership is intended to¶ improve connectivity of various surface transportation modes and enhance¶ current Area Maritime Security Plans. Scenarios range from how officials¶ react to discovering a suspect cargo container to an explosion at a seaport¶ rail yard. Communication and coordination abilities of the government and¶ maritime industry will be tested at each of the 40 seaports scheduled to¶ participate over the next three years.¶ "PortSTEP is designed to benefit maritime and surface transportation security communities throughout the U.S. via a suite of training exercises, evaluations and accompanying information technology products," said Noreen¶ Brown, TSA's PortSTEP Project Officer. "This information will prove¶ invaluable as we work to balance freedom of commerce and protection of our¶ nation's transportation system."¶ "Our nation's seaports are vital to the economic health of this country,"¶ said Capt. Frank Sturm, Chief of the Coast Guard's Office of Port, Vessel, and¶ Facility Security. "Through these exercises and other programs, we will be continually testing and evaluating how ready we are to deal with an actual threat to our ports." PortSTEP will foster and support institutional relationships within the port environment including the surface transportation and maritime industry, transportation and port security managers, emergency managers, law enforcement, medical professionals, private security personnel, and all others involved in preparing for and responding to a Transportation Security Incident¶ (TSI). In addition, PortSTEP will be carried out with the participation of various federal, state and local government agencies

#### Federal investment key – Coast Guard risk – based strategy will cost less in long term

Jospeh F. Bouchard, Ph.D.; Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense, United States Navy Captain; 2005; “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy;” <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf> ET

funding for MTSA implementation and long-term¶ sustainability. Meeting MTSA mandates and implementing Coast Guard¶ Maritime Facility Security Regulations requires a significant financial¶ commitment. It is not a financial obligation that ports can avoid because of¶ potential MTSA and Coast Guard fines or sanctions. Yet MTSA-mandated¶ security measures are far more extensive and demanding than those the maritime¶ transportation industry would implement for the security of their own facilities¶ based on a routine risk management approach.41 Clearly, the intent of MTSA is to cripple the¶ American economy by forcing large-scale closure of seaports. In short, the¶ maritime transportation industry has been mandated by federal law to protect the¶ entire nation against terrorist attacks.¶ Although MTSA placed significant responsibility for homeland security¶ on the shoulders of the port industry, the federal government has not provided¶ funding commensurate with that responsibility. DHS should increase annual¶ funding for the Port Security Grant Program to $500 million per year to ensure¶ proper MTSA implementation. If an effective risk-based strategy is adopted,¶ where low-risk maritime transportation facilities have security requirements that¶ are more appropriate to the threat – and affordable – the cost of MTSA¶ compliance probably could fall below the current Coast Guard estimate of $7.3¶ billion over ten years. Any long-term estimate must take into account the extent¶ to which the program is broadened to cover additional requirements. The key¶ point is to provide sufficient funding that matches the critical importance of¶ maritime security to the people and economy of the United States.¶ Finally, to ensure MTSA implementation and sustainability over the long¶ term, adequate funding is essential. Port security is too important to remain¶ hostage to annual budget submissions and competing demands. The federal¶ government should establish a port security trust fund into which 3-5% of the¶ $15.2 billion in customs revenues collected on goods moving through the¶ nation’s ports each year would be placed. Allocation of those funds would be via¶ a process incorporating the best features of the current Port Security Grant¶ Program, particularly the review of funding requests by subject matter experts,¶ and applying the enhanced risk-based approach to setting priorities described¶ earlier. Such an approach is consistent with dedicated funding arrangements for¶ other transportation priorities, such as the security fee added to all airline tickets.

### DHS

#### DHS on board with ports

Janet Napolitano secretary for U.S Department of Homeland Security 7/25/2012 “House Homeland Security Committee Hearing; "Understanding the Homeland Threat Landscape."; Testimony by Janet Napolitano, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security” <http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/auth/checkbrowser.do?rand=0.13832816278170923&cookieState=0&ipcounter=1&bhcp=1> JD

DHS is also focused on preventing the exploitation of the global supply chain by those seeking to use the system to transport dangerous, illicit, contraband, contaminated, and counterfeit products. For example, under Program Global Shield, we are working with more than 90 countries to prevent the illegal theft or diversion of precursor chemicals that can be used to make Improvised Explosive Devices, or IEDs. Through these efforts, we have already seized more than 62 metric tons of these deadly materials.¶ DHS, through ICE and CBP, also continues to investigate U.S. export control law violations, including those related to military items, controlled .dual-use. commodities, and sanctioned or embargoed countries. We are committed to ensuring that foreign adversaries do not illegally obtain U.S. military products and sensitive technology, including weapons of mass destruction and their components, or attempt to move these items through the global supply chain. In Fiscal Year 2011, ICE initiated 1,780 new investigations into illicit procurement activities, made 583 criminal arrests, and accounted for 2,332 seizures valued at $18.9 million. ICE also manages and operates the Export Enforcement Coordination Center (E2C2), an interagency hub for streamlining and coordinating export enforcement activities and exchanging information and intelligence.¶ Securing and Managing Our Borders¶ DHS secures the nation's air, land, and sea borders to prevent illegal activity while facilitating lawful travel and trade. The Department's border security and management efforts focus on three interrelated goals: effectively securing U.S. air, land, and sea borders; safeguarding and streamlining lawful trade and travel; and disrupting and, in coordination with other federal agencies, dismantling transnational criminal and terrorist organizations.

### Terrorism

#### American ports are uniquely susceptible to nuclear terrorism – Plan key to address the failures of past programs

Henry H. Willis, Associate Director, RAND Homeland Security and Defense Center; Senior Policy Researcher; Professor, Pardee RAND Graduate School, and David S. Ortiz, Senior Engineer; Professor, Pardee RAND Graduate School, 3-26-2006 “Securing America's Ports”, RAND database, http://www.rand.org/commentary/2006/03/26/SDUT.html //eR

The decision by Dubai Ports World to back out of its deal to manage port facilities in six American cities will not solve serious security problems plaguing U.S. ports. Regardless of who runs them, ports on America's Pacific, Atlantic and Gulf coasts remain dangerously vulnerable to terrorist attack because global trade has interconnected economies and sharply increased shipping traffic. Today a great deal of the clothes you wear, the food you eat and the products you use at home and work likely entered America's supply chain packed in large containers on ships that docked at U.S. ports. Unfortunately, terrorists can ship chemical, biological and even nuclear weapons (if they have them) into the United States in the same way. What to do? Closing U.S. ports and shutting down global trade are not a realistic option. Even individually inspecting every entering container is far too costly and time-consuming to be practical. But just because we can't make ports 100 percent secure doesn't mean we can't make substantial security improvements. Since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, billions of dollars have been spent to secure U.S. ports and global supply chains. The Port Security Grant Program funds old-fashioned security: fences, gates, cameras and lights. The U.S. Coast Guard ensures the safety and security of all vessels that operate in U.S. navigable waters. In addition, U.S. Customs and Border Protection now requires that it be notified of cargo information a day before a container is loaded onto a ship bound for the United States. The agency also requires a complete list of crew members four days before arrival of a ship at a U.S. port. In the intervening time, Customs and Border Protection analyzes cargo and shipper information to determine the relative risk level of each container, so officials can decide whether to X-ray or open and unpack the container. Reflecting the nature of today's supply chains, the port security effort is international in scope. The Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism is a voluntary program in which participants certify the integrity of their supply chains back to the remote supplier. Through the Container Security Initiative, U.S. inspectors are stationed at foreign ports to inspect U.S.-bound cargo long before it reaches America. The International Ship and Port Facility Security Code – along with the U.S. version, the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 – provides a foundation for securing vessels across the globe. Other programs have been slow to get off the ground. The U.S. Transportation Security Administration has yet to work out the details of an ID card that would certify workers in the transport system, including truck drivers and rail engineers. Container seals remain a challenge because of the diversity of types and the complexity of methods use to check and verify those seals as a container travels along its route, often changing hands a dozen times. The installation of radiation monit

#### CSI tech prevents terrorist attacks

**CBP** Customs and Border Protection 10/7/**2011** “CSI In Brief” <http://www.cbp.gov/xp/cgov/trade/cargo_security/csi/csi_in_brief.xml> JD

As the single, unified border agency of the United States, U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s (CBP) mission is extraordinarily important to the protection of America and the American people. In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, U.S. Customs Service began developing antiterrorism programs to help secure the United States. Within months of these attacks, U.S. Customs Service had created the Container Security Initiative (CSI).¶ CSI addresses the threat to border security and global trade posed by the potential for terrorist use of a maritime container to deliver a weapon. CSI proposes a security regime to ensure all containers that pose a potential risk for terrorism are identified and inspected at foreign ports before they are placed on vessels destined for the United States. CBP has stationed multidisciplinary teams of U.S. officers from both CBP and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to work together with our host foreign government counterparts. Their mission is to target and prescreen containers and to develop additional investigative leads related to the terrorist threat to cargo destined to the United States.¶ The three core elements of CSI are:¶ Identify high-risk containers. CBP uses automated targeting tools to identify containers that pose a potential risk for terrorism, based on advance information and strategic intelligence.¶ Prescreen and evaluate containers before they are shipped. Containers are screened as early in the supply chain as possible, generally at the port of departure.¶ Use technology to prescreen high-risk containers to ensure that screening can be done rapidly without slowing down the movement of trade. This technology includes large-scale X-ray and gamma ray machines and radiation detection devices.¶ Through CSI, CBP officers work with host customs administrations to establish security criteria for identifying high-risk containers. Those administrations use non-intrusive inspection (NII) and radiation detection technology to screen high-risk containers before they are shipped to U.S. ports.¶ Announced in January 2002, CSI has made great strides since its inception. A significant number of customs administrations have committed to joining CSI and operate at various stages of implementation.¶ CSI is now operational at ports in North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin and Central America. CBP’s 58 operational CSI ports now prescreen over 80 percent of all maritime containerized cargo imported into the United States.

#### Increased port security key to prevent terrorism

**EPA** Environmental Protection Agency7/16/**2012** “Shipping Port Security” <http://www.epa.gov/radtown/port-security.html> JD

U.S. shipping ports handle a range of cargo including legitimate hazardous material such as chemicals and radioactive material and must take actions to ensure the safe handling and security of such material while on site.¶ Ports also have to guard against smuggled or unwanted radioactive material entering the U.S. Each year, millions of tons of scrap metal, semi-finished metal, and metal products are imported to the U.S. Ports must ensure that these metal products are not contaminated with radioactive material. Also, cargo containers must be checked for radioactive material that could pose a potential threat to our national security.¶ As a result of the events of September 11, 2001, all levels of government implemented additional actions to ensure port security and to minimize the threats. That included potential threats posed by radioactive material. The Federal government increased the licensing requirements on the import and export of radioactive material.¶ The Federal government also developed and implemented an enhanced strategy to identify, target, and inspect cargo containers before they reach U.S. ports. Officials prescreen all cargo, and any shipment that poses a potential threat is physically inspected with radiation detectors either prior to or upon arrival.¶ The U.S. government created a partnership with over 7,000 businesses, including most of the largest U.S. importers. Under this partnership program, legitimate companies that conduct regular business with the U.S. have increased their own security to prevent terrorists from infiltrating their shipments. This system of prevention, early detection and immediate action helps keep our ports safe from terrorist threats.

#### **Current ports vulnerable to terrorist attacks, increasing security is key**

STEPHEN **FLYNN** Dr. Stephen Flynn became the sixth President of the Center for National Policy (www.cnponline.org), founded in 1981. He focused the work of the Center on informing and advancing societal and infrastructure resilience and lead the effort to organize the 9/11 Tenth Anniversary Summit in Washington, DC to mark the Tenth Anniversary of the 9/11 Attacks. Prior to being selected to lead the Center, he spent a decade as a senior fellow for National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations.9/6/**2005** “U.S. Port Security and the Global War on Terror” <http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=65> JD

The harbor shared by Los Angeles and its neighbor Long Beach is arguably America's most important seaport. Its marine terminals handle more than 40 percent of all the ocean-borne containers shipped to the United States. Its refineries receive daily crude oil shipments and produce one-quarter of the gasoline, diesel and other petroleum products that are consumed west of the Rocky Mountains. It is a major port of call for the $25 billion ocean cruise industry. Just three bridges handle all the truck and train traffic to and from Terminal Island, where most of the port facilities are concentrated. In short, it is a tempting target for any adversary intent on bringing its battle to the U.S. homeland.¶ Yet no one in the Pentagon sees it as his job to protect Los Angeles and the nation's other busiest commercial seaports from terrorist attacks. Oakland, Seattle, Newark, Charleston, Miami, Houston and New Orleans are America's economic lifelines to the world, but the U.S. Department of Defense does not view them as national security priorities. These ports do not deploy the navy ships, troops, munitions and supplies needed for overseas combat operations. Lacking such "defense critical infrastructure", DoD has decided that the responsibility for safeguarding them is not its job.¶ It is the Department of Homeland Security that should be assuring that there is credible security along America's long-neglected waterfront. But the new Department lacks both the resources and the White House mandate to undertake this critical mission. This is because the Office of Management and Budget sees port security as primarily the responsibility of state and local governments and the private companies that operate marine facilities. The 2002 National Homeland Security Strategy sets forth principles to guide federal outlays for homeland security, maintaining that all levels of government must "work cooperatively to shoulder the cost of homeland security." It also hands much of the tab for protecting critical infrastructure to the private sector. "The [federal] government should only address those activities that the market does not adequately provide--for example, national defense or border security. . . . For other aspects of homeland security, sufficient incentives exist in the private market to supply protection."

#### **Current port security failing, increasing now is key to solving**

John F. Frittelli Specialist in Transportation 5/27/2005 “Port and Maritime Security: Background and Issues for Congress” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/RL31733.pdf> JD

The U.S. maritime system consists of more than 300 sea and river ports with¶ more than 3,700 cargo and passenger terminals. However, a large fraction of¶ maritime cargo is concentrated at a few major ports. Most ships calling at U.S. ports¶ are foreign owned with foreign crews. Container ships have been the focus of much¶ of the attention on seaport security because they are seen as vulnerable to terrorist¶ infiltration. More than 9 million marine containers enter U.S. ports each year. While¶ the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) analyzes cargo and other¶ information to target specific shipments for closer inspection, it physically inspects¶ only a small fraction of the containers. ¶ The Coast Guard and CBP are the federal agencies with the strongest presence¶ in seaports. In response to September 11, 2001, the Coast Guard created the largest¶ port-security operation since World War II. The Coast Guard has advanced its 24 hour Notice of Arrival (NOA) for ships to a 96-hour NOA. The NOA allows Coast¶ Guard officials to select high risk ships for boarding upon their arrival at the entrance¶ to a harbor. CBP has also advanced the timing of cargo information it receives from¶ ocean carriers. Through the Container Security Initiative (CSI) program, CBP¶ inspectors pre-screen U.S.-bound marine containers at foreign ports of loading. The¶ Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT) offers importers expedited¶ processing of their cargo if they comply with CBP measures for securing their entire¶ supply chain. ¶ To raise port security standards, Congress passed the Maritime Transportation¶ Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-295) in November 2002. The focus of debate in¶ Congress has been about whether current efforts to improve port security are¶ adequate in addressing the threat. While many agree that Coast Guard and CBP¶ programs to address the threat are sound, they contend that these programs represent¶ only a framework for building a maritime security regime, and that significant gaps¶ in security still remain. The GAO has investigated how the CSI and C-TPAT¶ programs are being implemented and found several shortcomings that need¶ correction. The GAO found that C-TPAT participants were benefitting from reduced¶ scrutiny of their imported cargo after they had been certified into the program but¶ before CBP had validated that the participants were indeed carrying out the promised¶ security measures. The GAO also found that not all containers that CBP had targeted¶ for inspection at the overseas loading port were being inspected by the host customs¶ administration. This report will be updated periodically

#### Actors will use ports to smuggle nuclear weapons into the US – plan solves

Henry H. Willis, Associate Director, RAND Homeland Security and Defense Center, 7-6-2012, “Revisiting 100% Inspection” RAND Commentary, http://www.rand.org/commentary/2012/07/06/RAND.html //eR

Like the congressmen, advocates of 100 percent inspection of U.S.-bound containers paint a picture of a looming catastrophe. My early analysis of securing the global supply chain described how the system's vastness both drives the global economy and makes it an attractive way to move illicit materials. As the recent op-ed highlights, another RAND study described how if a terrorist were to successfully import a nuclear weapon into the United States in a container and detonate it, the resulting catastrophe could exceed even those global disasters the world has seen in Katrina, Fukushima, or Haiti. A study by researchers from CREATE (PDF) at the University of Southern California shows that even a dirty bomb would be a disaster. To address this threat, Steve Flynn and colleagues from the Wharton School (PDF) show that it is possible to implement container inspection globally.

### Tech

#### PostSTEP already here

**TSA**, Transportation Security Administration employs a risk-based strategy to secure U.S. transportation systems, working closely with stakeholders in aviation, rail, transit, highway, and pipeline sectors, as well as the partners in the law enforcement and intelligence community. The agency continuously sets the standard for excellence in transportation security through its people, processes, technologies and use of intelligence to drive operations., “PortSTEP”, <http://www.tsa.gov/what_we_do/layers/portstep/editorial_with_table_0061.shtm> JD

The Port Security Exercise Training Program (PortSTEP) was established to develop port security exercise and evaluation services and solutions for maritime and surface industry partners under our guidance and direction. In association with the [U. S. Coast Guard](http://www.uscg.mil/USCG.shtm), has assembled a Program Team to provide strategic support, planning, and analytical and technical services for the delivery of a series of port security training exercises for the transportation security community.¶ PortSTEP will provide forty port security training exercises between August 2005 and October 2007 through the Area Maritime Security (AMS) Committees that will include a mix of basic tabletop, advanced tabletop and functional exercises. PortSTEP will achieve several performance objectives aimed at improving the intermodal transportation industry's ability to prepare for and contend with a transportation security incident (TSI). These objectives are centered around increasing awareness, improving processes, creating partnerships, and delivering port incident training through the exercise program.¶

#### **Tech ready now**

**Nguyen** writer for Fleetowner.com 3/4/**2004** “U.S. Customs To Install Truck Scanners at Seaports”, <http://fleetowner.com/news/fleet_us_customs_install> JD

In an effort to curb terrorist attempts to smuggle nuclear or radiological weapons into the country via oversees cargo, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is deploying equipment that will scan all trucks leaving cargo terminals operated by the Port of Authority of New York and New Jersey.¶ The scanning equipment, called portal radiation monitors, will be installed over roadways leading out of cargo terminals at the ports to scan all trucks leaving the area, the New York Times reported. The monitors— which have already been deployed to scan passenger vehicles along the Canadian and Mexican border— are set to send an alert when they detect radiation as a truck passes through.¶ “What’s important about the New York and New Jersey Ports is that this marks the first time the portals have been installed in a seaport environment,” Janet Rapaport, spokeswoman for the Dept. of Homeland Security told Fleet Owner.¶ All manifest data on containers is examined before the cargo reaches the port to determine high-risk cargo. X-ray machines capable of scanning a sea container within two to three minutes and radiation isotope identifiers will be used in conjunction with the monitors to pinpoint the source of radiation when necessary.¶ “What we do is use advance information regarding cargo manifest of each container and determine what containers are high-risk— then we pick what we deem as high risk and go through the secondary detection procedures,” Rapaport said.¶ CBP is deploying these devices to all major U.S. seaports. By the end of the year the systems will be installed at all port terminals receiving oversees cargo, the New York Times reported.¶ “The recent terrorist attacks in Madrid drive home the increased need to secure our borders against terrorist penetration,” said Commissioner Robert Bonner of the CBP. “The new highly sophisticated radiation detection devices CBP is deploying in our seaports are a major step in ensuring that our border and our country is more secure.”¶ The New York Times reported that about three million shipping containers pass through the New York and New Jersey ports each year.

#### **PSG key to good port security**

Captain John M. **Holmes** Deputy Executive Director of Operations Port of Los Angeles 3/7/**2012** “Budget Hearing - Federal Emergency Management Agency – Director and State & Local Witnesses” <http://appropriations.house.gov/uploadedfiles/hhrg-112-ap15-jholmes-20120307.pdf> JD

Since 9/11, port security has become a top priority for U.S. ports, including the Port of Los ¶ Angeles. Safe and secure seaport facilities are fundamental to protecting our borders and moving goods. Protecting the people and freight that move through seaports and ¶ surrounding communities is essential to keeping seaports safe and open for business. ¶ With 99.6 percent (by volume) of overseas trade flowing through U.S. ports, a terrorist incident at a port could have a drastic impact on the U.S. economy. In the decade since 9/11, a key component of our nation’s effort to harden the security of seaports has been the Port Security Grant Program, currently managed by FEMA. The Port of Los Angeles alone has spent more than $250 million to upgrade its security, over $100 million of which was provided through grant funding. These upgrades would not have been possible if it were not for the Port Security Grant Program.¶ As is the case in Los Angeles, Port Security Grant funds have helped port facilities and port areas to strengthen facility security and work in partnership with other agencies to enhance the security of the region. In the Port of Los Angeles, Port Security Grant funding ¶ has been used to procure equipment such as vessels and vehicles, install detection ¶ systems such as cameras and sensors, and provide equipment maintenance for the ¶ systems recently installed. Port Security Grant funds have also been used to harden port IT infrastructure, and most recently this funding has been used to fill a serious training gap -- Maritime Security Training for State and Local police officers.¶ Under the SAFE Port Act, the Port Security Grant program is authorized at $400 million. ¶ Unfortunately, in the last few years, the funding for this program has decreased, currently ¶ standing at a dangerously low level. The current level of $97.5 million is 75 percent less ¶ than the authorized level, and it is currently at one of the lowest funding levels ever for this ¶ program. As costs of systems, maintenance and equipment continue to rise, this level of ¶ funding will bring into question the sustainability of the protection levels we have worked so ¶ hard to build over the last decade.

### Coast Guard

#### Coast Guards key to port security – solve standards and container inspections

CFR; Council on Foreign Relations; January 2006; “Targets for Terrorism: Ports;” Council on Foreign Relations; <http://www.cfr.org/port-security/targets-terrorism-ports/p10215> ET

Who guards U.S. ports? ¶ The captain of the port—an officer in the U.S. Coast Guard—is responsible for providing security on the water, inspecting and regulating ships coming in and out. The Bureau of Customs and Border Protection—which has absorbed the personnel and the border inspection functions of both the Immigration and Naturalization Service and Customs—is responsible for security on the ground, inspecting foreign vessels’ cargoes and clearing crews and passengers. Ports are owned by state port authorities, which lease pier and terminal space to private companies. These firms often hire their own private security; usually low-paid contract guards who patrol the facilities and staff the entrances and exits. The role of private companies at U.S. ports was thrust into the spotlight in early 2006, when [Dubai Ports World](http://www.cfr.org/publication/9918/), a state-owned shipping company, took over leases at six major ports along the United States ’ East Coast. The company backed out of the deal after significant pressure from Congress.¶ What has been done to protect our ports?¶ While the Coast Guard remains at a heightened state of alert, some of the reforms to secure nationwide ports include:¶ Implementing uniform standards of security throughout the U.S. ports under the Maritime Transportation Security Act.¶ Commissioning new Maritime Safety and Security Teams in San Francisco, Houston, New York and St. Mary's, Ga., bringing the total number of teams nationwide to eight.¶ Identifying and funding business-driven initiatives to enhance security for the movement of cargo throughout the entire supply chain. Many such initiatives are being spearheaded by Operation Safe Commerce, a test bed project between the Transportation Safety Authority, the Department of Transportation, Customs, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Department of Defense, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the State Department, and the Justice and Commerce departments.¶ Launching a Container Security Initiative, aimed at identifying and inspecting potentially dangerous containers as they are being loaded abroad, before they ever reach U.S. ports.

#### Risk mitigation and Coast Guard enforcement solve oil spills

Jospeh F. Bouchard, Ph.D.; Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense, United States Navy Captain; 2005; “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy;” <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf> ET

Risk mitigation focuses on safety, reliability and disaster prevention¶ measures already covered in laws and regulations addressing safety and¶ environmental protection. In other words, the Environmental Protection Agency¶ (EPA) and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) have an¶ important role to play in U.S. homeland security efforts. For example,¶ double-hull tankers are required to reduce the likelihood of an oil spill in an¶ accident, but they can also reduce the likelihood of an oil spill as a result of a¶ terrorist attack. Similarly, oil pollution prevention and response regulations¶ enforced by EPA and the Coast Guard contribute to reducing the consequences¶ of a terrorist attack on a waterfront petrochemical terminal. The weakness in¶ current laws and policies is that they are designed to prevent or mitigate the¶ consequences of accidents or natural disasters and in many cases may not be¶ adequate for the magnitude of damage that can be caused by a terrorist attacks

### Ports Say Yes

#### The maritime industry likes the plan

Marc Thibault, researcher, Homeland Security Institute, Mary R. Brooks, Chair of Commerce, Dalhousie University, and Kenneth J. Button professor of public policy and director at George Mason, 2006, “The Response of the U.S. Maritime Industry to the New Container Security Initiatives” Transportation Journal, Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter 2006, JSTOR //eR

In conclusion, from our survey the maritime industry seems generally pleased with the in creased security cooperation between government and the container shipping industry. Those questioned, by-and-large, seem confident that this evolving cooperative relationship will lead to the development of cost-effective maritime security solutions, but only if the government develops a stronger focus and a clear understanding of what works to secure a balance between effective security and efficient trade.

### Plan key

#### Shifting personnel and conducting inspections key to solve port security

Jospeh F. Bouchard, Ph.D.; Executive Director of the Center for Homeland Security and Defense, United States Navy Captain; 2005; “New Strategies to Protect America: Safer Ports for a More Secure Economy;” <http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/port_security.pdf> ET

To a large degree the shipping system is self-synchronizing and shippers¶ will immediately begin making plans to divert vessels and cargo to other ports in¶ the event of a terrorist incident disrupting maritime transportation through a port.¶ The federal government should not attempt to directly control this process; it has¶ neither the knowledge nor the resources to do so effectively. However, only the¶ federal government is in a position to inform the private sector of existing port¶ restrictions so that any diversion of shipping and cargo following a terrorist¶ attack will work; and require reports from the private sector and port authorities¶ on ship diversion plans so that federal resources in those ports, especially the¶ Coast Guard and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) are available to¶ support those plans. The Coast Guard Captains of the Port and CBP Port¶ Directors will play critical roles, rapidly identifying personnel and equipment¶ needs at ports that remain open and accessible. The Coast Guard would need to¶ shift personnel and small craft to increase their capacity to conduct ship¶ boardings, inspections and elevated harbor security. CBP probably would need to¶ shift agents and inspection equipment (Gamma and X-ray scanners and radiation¶ detection equipment) to increase its capacity for container and cargo inspections,¶ and immigration control, particularly if passenger vessels must be diverted. The¶ development of a standard methodology for such resource assessments and a¶ national “triage” system for reallocating Coast Guard, CBP and other DHS¶ resources among multiple ports in order to keep ports open and our economy¶ functioning must be a priority.

## A2: DAs

### Politics

#### No opposition – Congress views port security as permissible

Steward Powell; joined the Houston Chronicle in April 2008 after 21 years with Hearst Newspapers in Washington, D.C., generated daily coverage from the White House, the Pentagon, national security agencies, Congress and various federal departments and agencies for distribution to 600 newspapers served by the New York Times; [September 8, 2011;](http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2011/09/top-white-house-official-says-port-security-has-been-improved/) “Top White House official says port security has been improved;” chron.com Houston News; <http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2011/09/top-white-house-official-says-port-security-has-been-improved/> ET

The top White House official responsible for protecting the nation against follow-on al-Qaida attacks says there have been “a number of very important improvements” in security at maritime ports such as the 52-mile Houston Ship Channel since the 9/11 attacks a decade ago.¶ John Brennan, President Obama’s counter-terrorism adviser, said the administration has effectively extended U.S. maritime borders to ports around the world by requiring U.S.-bound ships from countries with ties to terrorism to undergo pre-departure security screening.¶ Brennan was responding to security concerns raised during a congressional field hearing in Houston last month. Rep. Michael McCaul, R-Austin, chairman of the House Homeland Security Committee’s investigations subcommittee, used the hearing to highlight the potential threat of al-Qaida affiliated terrorists targeting oil and natural gas tankers en route into U.S. harbors by using explosives-packed suicide boats, coordinated rocket-propelled grenade strikes or even seizing control of the ships’ bridge.¶ Houston’s shipping channel and port handle 7,800 vessels a year and 150,000 barge movements on the waterway. On any given day, up to 30 oil and chemical tankers are moving along the ship channel—location of 31 percent of the nation’s crude oil refining capacity.¶ Were terrorist to cripple or sink a tanker in the channel it could interrupt gasoline production and inflict enormous damage on the U.S. economy.¶ Brennan said authorities are constantly trying to balance security with accessibility.¶ “The thing about the United States that we hold dear is that we are a country that is known for its openness to the world,” Brennan said. “Therefore we cannot hermetically seal it. We don’t want to close off our ports, we don’t want to close off our coasts.”¶ Brennan said the federal government has implemented precautions “that will optimize our security” by requiring U.S.-bound ships to clear their cargo in advance.¶ “What we have looked at over the last ten years through successive administrations are those steps and measures that we can take that will enhance that security,” Brennan said. “But it can’t just be inside the port. If they have already gotten there, they’ve gotten too far.”¶ Brennan said the U.S. approach depends upon cooperation by U.S. allies to help carry out pre-departure screening of ships’ cargoes “so that we have assurance that it has met some security requirement of our own before it even comes close to our coastline.”

#### Opposition fails – 100 percent scanning proves

Stewart Powell; Steward Powell; joined the Houston Chronicle in April 2008 after 21 years with Hearst Newspapers in Washington, D.C., generated daily coverage from the White House, the Pentagon, national security agencies, Congress and various federal departments and agencies for distribution to 600 newspapers served by the New York Times; July 26, 2012; “Homeland security chief defends failure to inspect 100 percent of cargo arriving in U.S.;” Chron.com Houston News;

http://blog.chron.com/txpotomac/2012/07/homeland-security-chief-defends-failure-to-inspect-100-percent-of-cargo-arriving-in-u-s/ ET

Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano faced congressional criticism Wednesday for her department’s failure to inspect 100 percent of arriving cargo containers as required by federal law.¶ Napolitano told the House Committee on Homeland Security that the 100 percent standard was “not yet attainable” and that she had waived the requirement as permitted by Congress.¶ The department of homeland security has “actually done quite a bit to form and strengthen” partnerships with foreign countries and shipping operations “to secure containers and freight as it leaves foreign ports to the extent that we can,” Napolitano said.¶ But the former governor of Arizona and ex-federal prosecutor the Obama administration and Congress are “at odds” over the extent of inspections of inbound cargo.¶ Inspections target so-called high risk shipments from suspicious origins based on probability calculations and random selection of “a small percentage” of other containers, Napolitano said.¶ “There are a lot of ways to protect the ports of the United States and the interior of the United States from dangerous cargo as we keep in mind the 100 percent law,” Napolitano said.¶ Customs and Border Protection teams operate at 58 ports in North and South America, Europe, Asia, Africa and the Middle East covering approximately 80 percent of all maritime containerized cargo imported into the United States, Napolitano said.¶ The Cabinet officer declined to publicly estimate the percentage of inbound containers subjected to searches by Customs and Border Protection.¶ “Sometimes those laws are very difficult standards to attain and we have to move in other directions in the near term to do everything we can with respect to cargo,” Napolitano said.¶ Rep. Bennie Thompson, a Mississippi Democrat and the ranking Democrat on the Republican-led committee, told Napolitano that he was not satisfied with the failure to inspect all inbound cargo.¶ Federal law “mandates” inspection of all inbound cargo, Thompson said. “It was Congress that said you should do it – they didn’t say look at it and come back to us.¶ Thompson added: “It’s not a good omen that you can’t get the numbers” showing the percentage of cargo subjected to inspection, Thompson said.¶ Napolitano said she didn’t have the percentages “at my fingertips at this hearing.”¶ “We have to recognize that Congress also gave the secretary the power to waive that (100 percent) requirement if it’s not feasible, practical, affordable or causes undue interference with cargo that transits into the ports,” she said.¶ The United States economy relies on $2 trillion in annual legitimate trade that could be disrupted by 100 percent inspection, Napolitano said.

## A2: CPs

### Private Sector

#### The USFG is key – the private sector doesn’t have the money

Marc Thibault, researcher, Homeland Security Institute, Mary R. Brooks, Chair of Commerce, Dalhousie University, and Kenneth J. Button professor of public policy and director, George Mason, 2006, “The Response of the U.S. Maritime Industry to the New Container Security Initiatives” Transportation Journal, Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter 2006, JSTOR //eR

Establishment of maritime security funding mechanisms. The senior port officials and terminal security officers interviewed indicated that the U.S. government should establish a long-term maritime security funding mechanism.8 Most of the port individuals interviewed indicated that market conditions prevented them from passing on the costs of meeting the new maritime security requirements to their customers. Some of the officials suggested the U.S. government impose a user fee on all of the firms participating in container trade. They felt that the shipping industry was bearing the new security costs while the general public was receiving the security benefits. User fees would not only provide a dedicated maritime security funding source, but it would also spread the cost more.

#### Perm solves best – cooperation is key to the most cost-effective and effective solutions

Marc Thibault, researcher, Homeland Security Institute, Mary R. Brooks, Chair of Commerce, Dalhousie University, and Kenneth J. Button professor of public policy and director at George Mason, 2006, “The Response of the U.S. Maritime Industry to the New Container Security Initiatives” Transportation Journal, Vol. 45, No. 1, Winter 2006, JSTOR //eR

Cooperation between the shipping industry and the U.S. government. The shipping industry respondents shared the view that the new security environment requires continuing cooperation between U.S. government and industry. Most of the respondents believed that the maritime shipping industry must continue to take a leadership role in improving maritime security. They believe that most U.S. elected officials and residents do not have a good understanding of the shipping industry. They felt that cost-effective security solutions would not be developed if the industry does not continue to cooperate with the U.S. government. To conclude, the maritime industry and U.S. government have started building a long-term relationship that will allow both to respond to suspicious activity or actual terrorist attacks. There are now mechanisms and working relationships that did not exist prior to 2001 that have improved security. Concerns remain about the impact of security costs and about the effectiveness of the institutions established. As the result of the new security requirements, however, shipping industry officials indicate they might divert shipments rather than shut down their operations in the case of a future incident. There is general concern about the capacity of the system and consequently the ability to handle a terrorist incident.

## A2: Topicality

### Transportation Infrastructure

#### Transportation infrastructure includes ports

Rosson et al, 1-11, “Impacts of Transportation Infrastructure on the U.S. Cotton Industry” Parr Rosson is Professor/Extension Economist and Director, Center for North American Studies; Flynn Adcock is International Program Coordinator and Assistant Director, Center for North American Studies; Rafael Costa is Graduate Research Assistant, Center for North American Studies; and John Robinson is Professor/Extension Economist. Texas A&M CNAS, http://www.ams.usda.gov/AMSv1.0/getfile?dDocName=STELPRDC5092073 //eR

The U.S. transportation system, including roads, air, rail, waterways and ports is under constant use and strain. At a recent conference at the University of Virginia it was concluded “Before the onset of the recession, bottlenecks in all transport modes had begun to compromise both the quality of people’s lives and America’s global competitiveness. Today, the transportation system’s deficiencies will almost certainly impede the pace of economic recovery,” (Miller Center of Public Affairs). The U.S. cotton industry operates within these constraints and its competitiveness is linked directly to the efficiency of U.S. and global systems and transportation infrastructure.

#### Transportation infrastructure is any piece of public capital such as ports

Susan Trimbath, Ph. D., former Senior Research Economist in Capital Market Studies at Milken Institute, teaches graduate finance, economics and accounting for Bellevue University and University of Liverpool, 2011, “Transportation Infrastructure: paving the way” http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/issues/infrastructure/files/2009TPI\_Update\_Economics\_White\_Paper\_110712.pdf //eR

Most of the other research papers we reviewed and included in the references in our September 2010 report are also in the RAND review. The RAND report has more references for "roads" because they did not include the other pieces of "transportation infrastructure" – the US Chamber’s TPI encompasses roads, transit, waterways (ports), airports, and railroads. The RAND study notes as we did that there is a lack of comprehensive transportation infrastructure research: it's either just roads or it includes roads with other infrastructure pieces described as "public capital" (i.e., roads lumped in with sewers, schools and parks). Finally, the RAND report concludes by emphasizing the need for research measuring all parts of transportation infrastructure, which is what the US Chamber’s TPI project does. As Shatz et. al. point out a comprehensive examination is needed to get a better picture of the true, long-run economic impact of transportation infrastructure performance. As we wrote in September 2010, the TPI allowed us to do just such an examination.