# AT: All Ports

## Topicality

#### Its not ports-Transportation infrastructure is roads, public transportation and rail systems – not ports.

**Transportation for America 9** (no month, major organization primarily focused on building support for progressive transportation and land use policy , “The Route to Reform”, <http://t4america.org/docs/blueprint_summary.pdf>, accessed 6/29/12) CGC

We need a bold vision for the nation’s transpor­tation infrastructure investments that promotes maximum economic benefits, access to oppor­tunity, public health and environmental sustain­ability for people living in urban, suburban and rural communities. It is particularly urgent that our roads, public transportation and rail systems be made safer and more accessible for the grow­ing numbers of older Americans. This means planning our transportation systems – and our development patterns – to ensure that there are convenient and affordable travel options available to everyone, in every community, at every stage of life.

#### **Transportation infrastructure facilitates trips for motor vehicles and aircraft**

Winston 91 (Clifford Winston is an applied microeconomist and senior fellow in the Economic Studies Program at the [Brookings Institution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brookings_Institution). He specializes in the analysis of and has written extensively on industrial organization, regulation, and transportation. Clifford Winston“Efficient Transportation Infrastructure Policy” The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Winter, 1991), pp. 113-127 http://www.jstor.org/stable/1942705.)

Transportation infrastructure provides capacity,in the form of traffic lanes and runways, for highway and air trips, as well as durability,in the form of thick pavement, to facilitate trips in heavy motor vehicles and large aircraft. Users of the infrastructure impose costs on themselves and others by contributing to congestion, which increases travel time, and by wearing out the infrastructure, which necessitates maintenance expenditures to repair pavement and vehicles.Efficient infrastructure policy maximizes the difference between social benefits and the costs of use, including the costs that users impose on others, by specifying pricing guidelines to regulate demand and investment guidelines to specify design. (Winston (1985) presents a mathematical derivation of these guidelines.)

#### Transportation infrastructure is interstate highways or pedestrian malls.

O’Malley 6/4 (Chris O’Malley, writer for Indiannapolis Business Journal, June 4 2012. “Proposal calls for city planners to consider non-drivers”http://www.ibj.com/proposal-calls-for-city-road-planners-to-consider-non-drivers/PARAMS/article/34782)

The ordinance would apply to city-owned transportation assets and to privately constructed streets and parking lots. Exceptions could include transportation infrastructure such as (is) interstate highways or pedestrian malls, which serve a narrower, more specific use.

#### Transportation Infrastructure includes bike lanes, rapid transit, toll roads, commuter rail and road projects.

Belton 08 (2008, Timothy Belton Conference Chairman of Texas Lyceum Board of Committee Journal “Transportation Infrastructure:Establishing Public Policy Priorities” http://cdn.publicinterestnetwork.org/assets/WGsZ0M7EPW3R4YUrqLn7Zw/Lyceum-Journal-Transportation.pdf)

While the Federal Highway Trust Fund has been the primary source of funding for maintenance and improvement of the interstate highway system, it does not generate enough money to accomplish its mission today or provide for future growth. Nor does it incorporate Texas’ multimodal transportation infrastructure requirements. Going forward, the issue is one of balancing feasibility and benefits across complementary or alternative transport modes including bike lanes, bus rapid transit, toll roads, and commuter rail, but there is not even sufficient current funding for current road projects. This additional transportation infrastructure requires identification of funding sources. No single funding solution will work for every community, but the funding process must start with a clear understanding of the statewide and local requirements, lest the arteries of the Texas transportation system become even less effective in meeting our growing needs.

## Trade Off – Security/Efficiency

#### Enhanced security trades off with commerce in the short and long term

Conrad et al 6 (Stephen Conrad, professor of law with a PhD, Walter Beyeler, Technical Staff at Sandia National Laboratories, Richard Thomas, Technical Staff at Sandia National Laboratories, Thomas Corbett, PhD and asst. professor, Theresa Brown, PhD and Technical Staff at Sandia National Laboratories, Gary Hirsch, SM from MIT, and Christopher Hatzi, Transportation Strategies International, 4 July 2006, “How Do We Increase Port Security Without Imperiling Maritime Commerce? Using Flight Simulators and Workshops to Begin the Discussion”, http://www.garybhirsch.com/industry\_files/A-port-paper.pdf SC)

Short-Term Operational Model- Our first goal was to explore the tradeoffs between security and port performance by evaluating performance under a variety of alternative security policies. We designed a short-term simulator of port operations to help us assess port performance under various conditions, including imposition of diverse security policies. There are many possible security policies, each combining some subset of available technologies. Each policy will have some associated performance characteristics. In the short term, the tradeoffs between security and performance are shown schematically in the following figure: In this figure, each dot represents a different potential security policy option. Conceivably, there could be an infinite number of security policies, but in this schematic we show that there are many possible policies. It is possible (though probably unlikely) that a low cost, high security option could be identified. This is represented by the red dot to the upper left of the graph. There are also many inferior options shown as orange dots. For each of these options there exist other preferable options that provide either (1) more security for the same cost, or (2) the same security at less cost. We anticipate there will exist a continuum of preferable options (shown here as the blue dots connected by the green line) where there will be direct tradeoffs between shipping performance and enhanced security. Long-Term Economic Viability Model- Our second goal was to understand whether the consequences of additional security measures on port operations, particularly the cost and time required to ship cargo, might initiate a death spiral due to the large capital costs involved port and carrier operations.

#### Security and efficiency trade off, and affording both is not possible

Wilson et al 7 (Anna Arciszewska, University of Minnesota, Jessica Horning, Research Assistant at Minnesota Traffic Observatory, University of Minnesota, Patrick Phenow, University of Minnesota, Ryan Wilson, PhD at the University of Washington, September 14, 2007, “Security vs. Efficiency: Assessing Transportation Security Policies and Trade-Offs”, http://nexus.umn.edu/Courses/Cases/CE5212/F2007/CS1/CS1-report.pdf SC)

Security and efficiency have long been trade-offs in the world of passenger and freight mobility. The security of products and people, whether it is physical screening or requirements for the transportation of hazardous materials, requires time, money, and manpower. Efficiency, the ability to move products and people with the least amount of delay, requires different types of investments of time, money, and manpower. Establishing a balance between security and efficiency has always been a difficult job for the legislators, regulators (executive branch), and the regulated (special interest groups and businesses). The trade-off debate grew quickly in the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11th when new questions about security arose. Legislators were quick to act, enacting legislation that created, among other things, the Department of Homeland Security and associated Transportation Security Administration. Security tightened, particularly at airports. Critics of these actions were no further behind in establishing their case, asserting the new security measures are overly restrictive resulting in unnecessary inefficiencies. As this paper will discuss, the argument remains an issue of trade-offs. In a world of limited time, money, and resources affording both the best security and highest efficiency isn’t practical and likely not possible. Strong emotions, staunch supporters, value-laden arguments, and empirical evidence fill each side of the debate. Perhaps unsurprisingly, a security/efficiency balance point remains undefined. Equally unclear are the terms or performance measures that might be used to reach the balance point. An examination of security and efficiency could occur in several contexts. This report focuses solely in the field of transportation, discussing both freight/non-airline security and airport/airline security. We will discuss and weave freight/non-airline issues and evidence throughout, but focus more heavily on airports. Freight concerns are important but security responses have been fewer in number and less rapid in deployment, limiting the number of sources.

#### Port Security trades off with infrastructure

Abbott 07 (Paul Scott Abbott. “Security or Infrastructure?” American Journal of Transportation. February, 2007 Accessed Online: <http://www.secureportamericas.com/pdf/AJOT_2007_new.pdf>) MB

Security or infrastructure? That’s the tough decision US port leaders continue to face. “Security costs have complicated port development,” Steve Cernak, the Port of Galveston’s port director, said last week at the SecurePort 2007 Western Hemisphere Port Security Conference and Trade Exhibition in Houston. Ports often have to either divert funds away from important projects to pay for mandated security enhancements, or reduce the scope of their security enhancements,” Cernak continued. Kurt J. Nagle, president and chief executive officer of the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), echoed such concern at the SecurePort event, held Jan. 29-31. “Prior to 9/11, the industry consistently rated the funding of needed infrastructure development as its No. 1 challenge,” Nagle told the gathering of 250 leaders from port management and security sectors. The dramatically increased level of resources being devoted to security enhancements has exacerbated the challenge of funding development of non-security infrastructure to handle the growing levels of international trade,” Nagle went on to say. AAPA, which represents 160 Western Hemisphere port authorities, has advocated increased federal funding for port security, but despite authorization of some $400 million a year in US Department of Homeland Security grants for ports, actual funding appropriated by Congress is about half that figure. Federal estimates have put the cost of needed port security projects through 2012 at $5.4 billion. Nagle said the ports association is opposed to new taxes or fees on the industry to pay for security demands. Rather, A APA favors funding security projects with a portion of the user fees and taxes, including $17.5 billion a year in Customs duties, that the maritime community already pays the federal government. Most of that money now goes to federal pro- grams not associated with ports. The Port of Galveston’s Cernak put it simply: “America’s ports need more federal help.”

#### Security and commerce trade off

Bakir 6 (Niyazi Onur Bakir, researcher for CREATE with a PhD, 14 March 2006, “Vulnerabilities along US Borders: A Brief Analysis Risks Posed by Terrorist, Illegal Weapons, and Explosives Traffic through US Borders, and Countermeasures for Risk Mitigation”, Pg 1-2, http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=nonpublished\_reports SC)

The trade-offs between the free flow of commerce and border security make technology and policy decisions more complex. Today, we realize that we need to avoid “too much” security as most security solutions slow trade. There is a need to determine the relation between terrorism risk tolerance and maximum inconvenience that the nation can bear on business continuity. There is a fine balance between those two, and this fine balance can be maintained only if a systems-based risk management approach is followed to distribute security dollars. An overall assessment of the threats and vulnerabilities along US borders is detrimental to allocate homeland security grants in parallel to the nation’s interests rather than political interests. We expect that this report will feed useful input to grant allocation decisions.

#### Improvements in port security detract from trade.

**Bain, Associate Editorial Producer-CNN Intl. 9** (Benjamin, 12-2-9, Media, Inc, “DHS to miss 2012 deadline to scan containers for radiation,” http://fcw.com/Articles/2009/12/02/DHS-cargo-radiation-scanning-extension.aspx?Page=, accessed 6-29-12, AS).

**The Homeland Security Department will miss a July 2012 deadline for radiation scanning of all containers bound for U.S. seaports,** and will have to seek an extension, Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano said today. “**Prohibitive challenges” will require DHS to seek more time to implement a program to scan 100 percent of cargo bound for the United States with non-intrusive imaging and radiation detection equipment before it leaves foreign ports,** Napolitano told the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. In February, she said an initial review had indicated that the 2012 deadline wouldn’t be met. DHS’ Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agency is responsible for the security of cargo containers. The 100 percent requirement was imposed in a 2007 law and allows for the possibility of extensions on the deadline. **The requirement has raised logistical, technological and diplomatic concerns from shippers, carriers, port and terminal operators and foreign governments. Many countries around the world are resistant to the requirement, but in some respects are offended that the United States would require radiation scanning at their ports,** Napolitano testified. She cited insufficient technology, a high rate of false positives, **port logistics, negative effects on the flow of shipments, high costs to deploy scanning equipment and the predicted increases to shipping costs as barriers to putting the program in place**. “DHS would need significant resources for greater manpower and technology, technologies that do not currently exist, and the redesign of many ports,” she said. In fiscal 2008, 9.8 million containers bound for the United States were shipped from 611 ports, according to the Government Accountability Office (GAO). DHS, and the State and Energy departments formed the Secure Freight Initiative (SFI) pilot program in 2007 to test the overall feasibility and efficiency of 100 percent scanning. **Napolitano told the committee that the pilot program that's been deployed at five non-U.S. ports has “encountered a number of serious challenges to implementing the 100 percent screening mandate.**

#### Large amount of trade makes complete port security infeasible.

**American Shipper, 12** (5-11-12, International Federation of Customs Brokers Associations, “DHS waives deadline for 100% box scans,” <http://www.ifcba.org/content/dhs-waives-deadline-100-box-scans>, accessed 6/29/12, AS).

**The decision is not unexpected as it became clear to many lawmakers in recent years that the 2007 law requiring every container to pass through x-ray and radiation detection monitors was unrealistic and would massively disrupt international trade flows while imposing huge costs on the system.** The Department of Homeland Security, going back to the Bush administration, strongly resisted the scan-all law when it was introduced and worked hard after the fact to educate lawmakers about the logistical, financial, jurisdictional, diplomatic, economic and technological challenges involved in implementing such a program at hundreds of overseas ports where the United States lacks legal power. Shortly after taking office in 2009, Napolitano indicated that DHS would likely invoke the two-year scanning waiver allowed for under the law. The conference report accompanying the DHS fiscal year 2010 appropriations law passed by Congress acknowledged that "**it has become increasingly clear that, at least for now, a 100 percent scanning goal is not feasible, and even if it were, would come at an unacceptably high cost monetarily and in the displacement of other efforts.**" A pilot program to test full-scale inspections on U.S.-bound freight at six foreign ports reinforced DHS' position on the implementation hurdles. DHS estimates it would cost $16.8 billion just to deploy high-tech inspection equipment and associated technology at foreign ports.

## Politics

### AT: Plan Doesn’t Spend Money

#### The plan would still be subject to a debate in Congress about appropriations for the Trust Fund

Hurst 6/16/12 (Nathan, CQ Staff, “Dredging Up More Money for Maitenance” CQ Weekly – In Focus, June 16th 2012)

The good news is that there’s plenty of money available to address the upkeep problem — at least on paper. The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, supported by a tax of $1.25 per $1,000 on imported and domestic cargo, boasts a growing surplus that exceeds $7 billion. But the trust fund is not a separate, off-budget account, so expenditures are set by appropriators and subject to Corps of Engineers budget ceilings. That encourages congressional budget writers to hang on to much of the money to mask overall budget deficits. “We don’t fund dredging enough for maritime commerce,” Sen. David Vitter, a Louisiana Republican, lamented during the opening session of the House-Senate highway bill conference. “We allow that trust to be stolen from, and we really need to stop that.”

## Plan Hurts Obama

#### **The way port dredging is funded is unpopular**

**Gale 2-14-12** (Kevin Gale, Feb 14, 2012, Editor in Chief- South Florida Business Journal, “Port dredging is a hot topic in D.C.” [http://www.bizjournals.com/southflorida /blog/2012/02/port-dredging-is-hot-topic-in-dc.html](http://www.bizjournals.com/southflorida%20/blog/2012/02/port-dredging-is-hot-topic-in-dc.html)) MB

Some members of Congress are starting to get antsy about getting East Coast harbors dredged to accommodate post-Panamax ships. While [PortMiami](http://www.bizjournals.com/profiles/company/us/fl/miami/portmiami/1089568/)    has $77 million in state funding to help launch its project, ports further north are fighting for federal funding. [In his Fine Print column](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/panama-project-should-boost-us-shippings-fortunes/2012/02/11/gIQAOoWyBR_story_1.html) in The Washington Post on Tuesday, [Walter Pincus](http://www.bizjournals.com/southflorida/search/results?q=Walter%20Pincus) tells how the Senate Armed Services Committee grilled Army Lt. Gen. [Thomas Bostick](http://www.bizjournals.com/southflorida/search/results?q=Thomas%20Bostick), who has been nominated to lead the [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers](http://www.bizjournals.com/profiles/company/us/dc/washington/us_army_corps_of_engineers/1212400/)    . ([Bostick is already facing a roadblock](http://www.courier-journal.com/usatoday/article/38565279?odyssey=mod%7Cnewswell%7Ctext%7CLocal%20News%7Cp) from Sen. Rand Paul, R-Ky., over repairs on a dam in his home state.) The problem for ports and their congressmen is that earmarks aren't supposed to happen anymore, and that's a classic way for port dredging projects to get funded.

#### Port dredging funding faces extreme republican opposition

Bendavid and McWhirter 10 ([Cameron Mcwhirter](http://online.wsj.com/search/term.html?KEYWORDS=CAMERON+MCWHIRTER&bylinesearch=true) and [Naftali Bendavid](http://online.wsj.com/search/term.html?KEYWORDS=NAFTALI+BENDAVID&bylinesearch=true), December 1, 2010, Bendavid is he Congressional reporter for The Wall Street JournalMcwhiter is a staff reporter for The Wall Street Journal “Projects Test Resolve on Earmarks” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703994904575647152924275836.html?mod=WSJ_Election_LeftTopStories>) MB

SAVANNAH, Ga.—Congressional Republicans are eagerly promoting their promise to abstain from earmarks, saying the move is necessary to contain federal spending and mollify voters angry at Washington. But the pledge made on the campaign trail is proving more complicated in practice. A container ship heads upriver to the Port of Savannah, which is seeking $105 million in federal funds to begin deepening its harbor. Some senators' resolve is being tested as two of the nation's major ports, one here and another in Charleston, S.C., urgently seek funding to expand. Port officials say federal dollars will be crucial next year so they can deepen their harbors to accommodate bigger ships after the Panama Canal is widened and reopens in 2014. It isn't clear that can be done without earmarking—special funding that lawmakers request for projects in their home states. The Savannah port is seeking $105 million for the upcoming fiscal year to begin dredging the port, while Charleston wants $400,000 for a feasibility study for its own deepening project. If the ports cannot receive the mega-ships, Savannah and Charleston officials say, the cargo will go to New York or Norfolk, Va., which they argue would be inefficient and deliver an economic blow to the Southeast, costing jobs. Earmarks were denounced by conservative activists during the recent midterm election campaigns, and Republicans in both chambers banned them last month. But several GOP senators have suggested they'll make exceptions if they see fit, including three of the four from Georgia and South Carolina. Spending on items such as ports, bridges and roads are included in the president's annual budget, which is then reviewed by congressional committees. It's at that point that lawmakers often go to a committee chairman to get their earmarked projects inserted. Individual projects could also be funded in free-standing bills, but that would be impractical, given how numerous such projects are. The controversial nature of earmarks was highlighted Tuesday when the Senate voted 56-39 against expanding an earmark ban to the full chamber that was similar to the one adopted by Senate Republicans at a closed-door meeting Nov. 16. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.) supports the earmark ban but has vowed to earmark funds for the Charleston port if necessary. "I'm in a spot where I have to get the port deepened for economic reasons," he said. Democrats from the region say the ban never made any sense. "Charleston is going to be dead in the water because of this short-sighted myopic view that seems to be controlling," said Rep. James Clyburn (D., S.C.). Savannah, the second-busiest port on the East Coast after the Port of New York/New Jersey, has been pressing an application with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers since 1999 to dredge the Savannah River from its current 42-feet depth at low tide to 48 feet. This month, the Corps recommended dredging to 47 feet. The cost has been estimated at about $600 million—$400 million of which would be sought in federal funds. Anxious port officials have recruited Kasim Reed, the Democratic mayor of Atlanta and an ally of President Barack Obama, to push the administration for funding. Some Republicans had been concerned that their earmark ban would lead to a transfer of power over budgeting decisions to the president. Curtis Foltz, executive director of the Georgia Ports Authority, said in an interview that he and other officials had visited Washington repeatedly to lobby the White House and the state's congressional delegation. Having no port for large ships in the Southeast would increase the cost of transporting imported and exported goods from one of the fastest-growing parts of the nation, he said. "This is not infrastructure for a water park or a bicycle path," Mr. Foltz said. "This is infrastructure that is absolutely necessary for the nation." Georgia's Republican senators are touting their opposition to earmarks but also suggesting they'll do whatever it takes for the port. "My position has consistently been, I'm going to support reform or total elimination of earmarks," said Sen. Saxby Chambliss (R., Ga.). "But if a project is vital to the economy and jobs of my state, I'm sent here by the people of my state to make sure their interests are looked after." Sen. Johnny Isakson (R., Ga.), who also supported the ban, said he would "continue to fight for funding for projects such as the expansion of the Savannah port that is critical to my state and to U.S. trade." Many senators are allowing themselves such wiggle room. Other Republicans oppose the ban outright and are not committed to abstaining from earmarks at all. Democrats, who have a majority in the Senate, have not adopted a ban. In the House, the earmark ban may be more effective, since Republicans will control that chamber and say they won't advance any bill that includes such projects.

#### **Taxes for maritime infrastructure are politically unpopular**

Clott 09 (Christopher Clott, 10/8/2009, Associate Professor, ABS School of Maritime Policy and Management, California Maritime Academy; California State University, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure” <http://www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf>) MB

Constraints: U.S. Cities, municipalities, states and regional entities are under intense financial strain and shifting away from the status of landlords of established cargo businesses to operating as contractors selling attractive public works to real estate investors. Ports faced with the possibility of losing financial support argue that private assistance is critical if they are to maintain their market share. Upgrading and expanding maritime terminals and equipment are considered necessities to long term survival and the ability to raise taxes to pay for it is politically unpopular.

## Plan Helps Obama

#### **Link Turn-HMT is not an earmark process, and Private funding CP links**

Feigenbaum 1-9-12 (Baruch Feigenbaum, 1-9-2012, a policy analyst at Reason Foundation, a non-profit think tank advancing free minds and free markets. He specializes in transportation policy. “Top Twelve Transportation Priorities for 2012” http://reason.org/news/printer/top-twelve-transportation-prioritie)MB

A solution to the port funding problem: One of the most challenging tasks in Transportation is to understand how harbors receive money for port dredgings. Move over quantum physics--port dredging is more complicated. Following is the current port funding process. Harbor maintenance dredgings (continuously maintaining the depth of existing harbors) are funded by the Harbor Maintenance Tax. Only a small portion of the money collected from this tax is allocated to port dredgings. Much of the rest of the funding is allocated based on Office of Management and Budget priorities. Additionally, ports have different dredging needs based on the physical qualities of their harbors. While some ports may need dredging every few years, others never need dredgings. In anticipation of the new larger ships using the deeper Panama Canal, many east coast ports want to deepen their harbors permanently so these ships can unload in their ports. Funding for this dredging comes through a political process where each harbor begs for federal money. This is not an earmark process since there is no other method to get the funds. And private sector financing is not popular since most ports eventually receive federal funds.

#### **Port dredging has bipartisan support in congress**

Atlanta Journal-Constitution 11 (Atlanta Journal-Constitution, December 17, 2011, newspaper for Atlanta, “Ga. senators applaud deal to fund deeper ports” <http://www.ajc.com/news/ga-senators-applaud-deal-1263143.html>) MB

Georgia's U.S. senators Saturday applauded a bipartisan deal in Congress that frees up federal dollars to deepen waterways to East Coast seaports such as Savannah, the nation's fourth busiest container port. The breakthrough was part of the year-end spending bill that passed the Senate by a 67-32 vote Saturday. The bill contains a new $460 million account for port projects, which previously were funded either through the president's spending recommendations or via earmarks requested by members of Congress for pet projects in their home states. However, the federal budget crisis took earmarks off the table, with Republican lawmakers refusing to seek them and President Barack Obama vowing to veto them. In a statement Saturday, Georgia Sens. Johnny Isakson and Saxby Chambliss called this new source of ports money a "commonsense approach toward funding of the critical harbor deepening projects at our nation's ports now that earmarks are a thing of the past." They issued the statement jointly along with fellow Republican Sen. Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, who gave details of the port-funding plan to reporters Friday. The Georgia ports authority is funding for a $600 million proposal to dredged the river channel to the Port of Savannah, and needs the federal government to foot about $360 million of the bill. Port officials are pushing to get final construction permits by next summer.

#### PORTS Caucus is rallying bipartisan support now

Keller 11 (Robert Kellar, Oct, 25, 2011, “Hahn and Poe Found Bipartisan PORTS Caucus” <http://hahn.house.gov/press-release/hahn-and-poe-found-bi-partisan-ports-caucus>) MB

Washington, DC – Today, Congresswoman Janice Hahn (D-CA) and Congressman Ted Poe (R-TX) announced the formation of the bipartisan House Ports Opportunity, Renewal, Trade, and Security (PORTS) Caucus. The caucus’ mission will be to promote the importance of our ports to the nation’s economy and the need to secure them. United States ports support 13.3 million jobs and account for $3.15 trillion in business activity to the economy. “As a long-time advocate for the Port of Los Angeles, I understand how vital the ports are for our nation’s economy,” explained Rep. Hahn. “This bi-partisan caucus will bring together Members who represent diverse ports across the country, so we will find ways together to promote our ports and keep them safe.”  “Promoting and protecting our nation’s ports is critical to both national security and economic security,” said Rep. Poe. “Ports are the gateway in and out of the United States. They are our country’s link to the rest of the world and the global economy. I look forward to working with Representative Hahn to building an effective congressional caucus that advocates on the behalf of ports nationwide.” The United States is served by more than 350 commercial sea and river ports that support 3,200 cargo and passenger handling facilities. Each day United States ports move both imports and exports totaling some $3.8 billion worth of goods through all 50 states. Additionally, ports move 99.4 percent of overseas cargo volume by weight and generate $3.95 trillion in international trade.  Given the importance of ports to our national economy, they must remain competitive and secure. “Ports are a critical piece of our nation's economic infrastructure,” said Geraldine Knatz, Executive Director of the Port of Los Angeles. “Maintaining secure, reliable and efficient seaports will generate much needed jobs and make American businesses more competitive abroad.  Because our nation’s seaports must remain a national priority, we stand ready to support Rep. Hahn and Rep. Poe’s efforts to advance the issues of ports and the communities they serve.” “We support Congressman Poe’s efforts to raise awareness of all the nation’s ports and port communities,” said Floyd Gaspard, Executive Director of the Port of Port Arthur. “Our ports represent a vital part of our nation’s economic engine and are key to continued success. Seaports of all sizes from all regions of the country create sustainable jobs and economic growth. The benefits of a efficient port reach every American in every state.  As a region and a nation, sound investments in port infrastructure create supply chain efficiencies and make us globally competitive.”   Every congressional district in the country is dependent on U.S. ports, from the products on store shelves to the technology in our living rooms. Ports allow businesses, large and small, access to markets around the world and the opportunity to grow and create new American jobs.

# AT: TERROR

## No solvo

#### **No foolproof way to prevent terror attack of ports – should work on recovery plans to minimize impact instead**

PPIC 6 (Public Policy Institute of California, June 27, 2006, “No Guarantees Against Terror Attacks; Focus on Recovery Should Be Primary”, <http://www.ppic.org/main/pressrelease.asp?i=631>, ML)

A new study of U.S. seaport security delivers a message that leaders and citizens may not want to hear: Because there is no foolproof way to protect America’s ports from a terrorist attack, current policies and programs need to focus much more on recovery and economic restoration. In a report released today by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), a team of economists and maritime security experts looks at an array of security issues to provide one of the most comprehensive examinations of port security to date. Given that 41 percent of U.S. international trade passes through the nation’s 361 seaports and that millions of American paychecks depend on this flow, how devastating would an attack be to the nation’s economy? The report’s chapters provide a range of estimates: At the high end, some of the authors argue that an attack on a major seaport such as Los Angeles-Long Beach could cost the nation tens of billions of dollars. However – if response and recovery is appropriate and sufficient – other authors find that the economic cost would be relatively small. The study evaluates security provisions put in place by the federal government after September 11, when protecting the nation’s ports quickly and all at once was the impulse. Limited staff, time, and money have led to slipped schedules, unclear priorities, uncoordinated strategies and programs, and vague lines of responsibility. One example is a program to roll out identification cards for transportation workers, which is now years behind schedule. “No matter what we do to protect the ports, it will not be enough to ensure – absolutely – against an attack at some location,” says PPIC program director Jon Haveman, who edited the volume with PPIC research fellow Howard Shatz. One of the report’s strongest recommendations is that comprehensive recovery plans be created specifically to reduce economic panic and to restore global supply chains quickly following a catastrophe. “How well government reacts to the problems caused by an attack is probably as important as how well it anticipates them,” adds Shatz. In fact, the authors also suggest that rigorous recovery plans can serve as a disincentive to terrorists, who have been shown to focus on targets where they can do the most damage—economic and otherwise.

#### **US is hiring companies from UAE to run our ports – the security laws for ports is just hollow talk**

Cooney, 06’(BRIAN COONEY, Staff Central Kentucky News, <http://articles.centralkynews.com/2006-03-07/opinion/24886956_1_port-security-dubai-ports-international-terror>, March 7, 2012, NC)

The political storm over the Bush administration's contract with Dubai Ports International to manage six large American ports is a striking example of poetic justice. Bush has spent years whipping up a national mood of dread and anger against a vaguely defined enemy whose name is "terror." This enemy's lair is in Islamic countries where evil Muslims hide in the midst of good Muslims, and are ready to inflict another 9/11 if we relax our vigilance. We're lucky to have Michael Chertoff, the hero of Katrina, in charge of the Department of Homeland Security. Having effectively terrorized the American people with the threat of Islamic terrorism, the Bush administration still saw no problem with turning over the management of major U.S. ports to a company owned by the government of the United Arab Emirates. Two of the 9/11 hijackers were citizens of the U.A.E. It was one of only three countries in the world to recognize the Taliban as Afghanistan's legitimate government. It has also been involved in shipping contraband nuclear components from Pakistan to Libya, Iran and North Korea. Whether this Dubai contract makes the ports much more insecure than they are now is a matter of debate. Perhaps the promised 45-day review of the contract will help to clarify this issue. Unfortunately, the review is nothing but a public relations stunt, since the deal will be closed before the review is over. Also, the president has said that he already knows there is no security risk ("People don't need to worry"). This is a president who knows what he believes and sticks with it. However the security question is answered, the Bush team's handling of this incident is a demonstration of incredible political stupidity. Or perhaps that is too harsh. After all, early reports of this deal emerged while the White House was preoccupied with damage control over the vice president shooting a hunting companion in the face.

## Squo Solves

#### DHS squo protocol already solves.

**Zuckerman, research associate in The Heritage Foundation, 12** (Jessica, Feb 10-12, heritage.org, “The Reality of Maritime Cargo Security: 100 Percent Scanning Not the Answer,” <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/02/10/the-reality-of-maritime-cargo-security-100-percent-scanning-not-the-answer/>, accessed 6-29-12, AS).

Instead, DHS has turned to a risk-based approach to maritime cargo security. And, as Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Acting Assistant Commissioner Kevin McAleenan explained, in fiscal year 2011, CBP scanned 96 percent of high-risk cargo. In doing so, they have never discovered an explosive or nuclear device. While some were quick to criticize the remaining 4 percent that was left unscanned, DHS should instead be applauded for taking a step in the right direction. Scanning 100 percent of cargo does little more than give the illusion of 100 percent security. The reality is that no scanning system will ever be perfect. Rather than taking a blanket approach to cargo security, using a risk-based approach allows DHS to analyze cargo attributes, such as contents and origin of the cargo container, to single out high-risk cargo for further inspection. Kudos to DHS for recognizing the realities of the maritime supply chain. Now if only Congress would follow suit.

#### CSI system offers best port security.

**Mehnazd, Marine Insight, 11** (Sept 15-11, Marine Insight, “What are the Benefits of Container Security Initiative (CSI),”http://www.marineinsight.com/misc/marine-safety/what-are-the-benefits-of-container-security-initiative-csi/, accessed 6-29-12, AS).

Some of the major benefits of container shipping through CSI are: Additional and highest security offered. Since there is no delay in container shipping, the trade faces no setbacks. This system allows the host countries to have access to containerized cargo leaving for their ports, ensuring more security of their own shores. This is an economical system with no hassles and only increased security The shipment of cargo containers can actually be increased through this system with no additional security checks conducted through rest of the US ports once they have been scanned under CSI It not only offers a greater global security for container shipping industry but to all facets of the shipping industry. Container security initiative is a unique system which is bilateral in true sense. A country signing up for such system agrees not only to scan cargo containers but actually takes a major step towards overall global security.

#### ****Highest risk ports already have funding by PSGP for fy 2012****

U.S. Department of Homeland Security 6/29 (6/29/12, federal organization in charge of homeland security, “FY 2012 Port Security Grant Program”, <http://www.fema.gov/government/grant/psgp/>, accessed 6/29) CGC

**Total Funding Available in FY 2012:  $97,500,000 Purpose:** As appropriated by the *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012, Division D* (Public Law 112-74), the Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) is one of the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) FY 2012 grant programs which directly supports 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 FY 2012 PSGP provides funds for transportation infrastructure security activities to implement Area Maritime Security Plans and facility security plans among port authorities, facility operators, and state and local government agencies required to provide port security services. 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 to fulfill the *National Preparedness Goal* (NPG). **Eligible Applicants:** Seven port areas were selected as Group I (highest risk), 48 port areas were selected as Group II, and 35 port areas were selected as Group III. Ports not identified in Group I, II, or III competed for the funding identified for the “All Other Port Areas” Group.  Ports that qualified under the “All Other Port Areas” category that were located within Group I, II, or III port areas were eligible to receive grant funds from their geographically proximate higher group if the project had regional impact across the entire port area, but were not able to receive funding from both groups for the same project.

#### FY 2013 budget has minimum of 150 million for port security.

King, Chairman for Committee on National Homeland Security, 5/16 (Peter, 5/16/12, Chairman for Committee on National Homeland Security, “King Statement on Markup of FY 2013 DHS Appropriations Bill “,http://homeland.house.gov/press-release/king-statement-markup-fy-2013-dhs-appropriations-bill, accessed 6/29) CGC

Note:  The FY 2013 Homeland Security Appropriations Bill as passed by the Committee today appropriates $1.76 billion for State and Local Programs at DHS, including key grant programs such as the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI), State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP), Port Security Grant Program (PSGP), and Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP).  This is an increase from last year’s appropriated amount of $1.34 billion.  Of the appropriated amount, no less than $150 million is to be dedicated for the areas “at highest risk of terrorist attack,” increased from $100 million last year.  In the Appropriations Committee Report on the bill, the Committee expressed its support for utilizing UASI funding for the 25 highest-risk urban areas.

## No Retaliation

#### Obama won’t retaliate against terror attack – morality

Spero 11 (president of Caucus For America, Rabbi Aryeh, September 15, “Would Obama Retaliate against a Nuclear Attack?” <http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/09/would_obama_retaliate_against_a_nuclear_attack.html>, ML)

None of this is remotely to imply that the president would be sanguine if our country were attacked; rather, one wonders if he has the stomach to retaliate overwhelmingly against the attackers, especially since he could rationalize his reluctance in terms of a "higher morality" that says: we can't bring back our dead by killing citizens elsewhere who did not pull the trigger against us. His dilemma will be compounded if a dirty bomb or EMP were launched against us not by a government per se but by a group of terrorists independent of a government which nonetheless gives them sanctuary. After all, the Arab/Muslim cause has been very adept and successful in demanding that its territories and people be spared retaliation by claiming that terrorism is the work of individuals and not a particular state or government -- and Mr. Obama is part of that chorus. Furthermore, are we certain that Mr. Obama considers American life more important than, say, Iranian life, or that there is something exceptional about America that warrants choosing it and its people over the exceptional nature he has equally granted other countries and peoples? Forget all these assumed notions that a president will always do what is best for Americans -- it boils down to Mr. Obama's moral compass. If he thinks the way I think he does, he may likely consider it immoral to kill Pakistanis in order to save Americans, or Canadians.

#### No nuclear retaliation – even from CBW or cyber-attack

**Sanger and Baker 5**(David E. Sanger, chief Washington correspondent of The New York Times & Peter Baker attended Oberlin College and journalist, April 5,2010, “Obama Limits When U.S. Would Use Nuclear Arms”, ML)

WASHINGTON — President Obama said Monday that he was revamping American nuclear strategy to substantially narrow the conditions under which the United States would use nuclear weapons. But the president said in an interview that he was carving out an exception for “outliers like Iran and North Korea” that have violated or renounced the main treaty to halt nuclear proliferation. Discussing his approach to nuclear security the day before formally releasing his new strategy, Mr. Obama described his policy as part of a broader effort to edge the world toward making nuclear weapons obsolete, and to create incentives for countries to give up any nuclear ambitions. To set an example, the new strategy renounces the development of any new nuclear weapons, overruling the initial position of his own defense secretary. Mr. Obama’s strategy is a sharp shift from those of his predecessors and seeks to revamp the nation’s nuclear posture for a new age in which rogue states and terrorist organizations are greater threats than traditional powers like Russia and China. It eliminates much of the ambiguity that has deliberately existed in American nuclear policy since the opening days of the cold war. For the first time, the United States is explicitly committing not to use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear states that are in compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, even if they attacked the United States with biological or chemical weapons or launched a crippling cyberattack

## No Attack/Winning WOT

#### The US is crushing the WOT – the US keeps whipping out the terrorists faster than they can pop up

K.T. McFarland, 9/30/2011 “Al Awlaki Dead – Terrorists Run, But They Cannot Hide”

http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/09/30/al-awlaki-dead-terrorists-may-run-but-cannot-hide/

Remember the final scene of "Godfather III"? When Michael Corleone takes out all his enemies all around the world, in one fell swoop, from the steps of the Sicilian opera house to a New York barbershop?

Okay, maybe that’s taking it too far, but we are taking out Al Qaeda senior leaders, one after another. First it was Bin Laden, now it's Al Awlaki, and countless Al Qaeda middle level managers in between.

We’ve got the momentum, and every Al Qaeda operative has to be looking over his shoulder wondering if he’s next. If they’re busy scurrying for cover, their ability to recruit, train and launch new attacks is greatly reduced. Many will go silent, and off the grid, worrying that they will be tracked by cell phone calls or e-mail traffic. And a terrorist network in disarray is terrorist network that is vulnerable -- these guys will scatter like cockroaches.

The strategic implications are profound, especially in light of the Arab Spring.

If you’re an angry, young, disaffected Muslim in the Arab world, you’ve got two narratives bouncing around your head. Al Qaeda, Bin Laden, Al Awlaki, September 11. But what has Al Qaeda done lately? Failed underwear bomber, failed Times Square bomber, dead leaders, but not a lot more dead Americans. And how does Al Qaeda make your life better?

The other narrative is the Arab Spring – Muslim youth organizing, demonstrating, and forcing out long time dictators in their own countries. The Arab Spring may ultimately turn into the winter of their discontent for young people in the Middle East, but for now it looks to have a bright future. And it’s a cause that, for now, you figure could make your life better.

Usama Bin Laden was the founding father of Al Qaeda. Even though he was hiding out in a safe house in Pakistan when the Navy SEALs killed him, the intelligence cache captured indicates he was still plotting attacks and in touch with the network.

But no matter how revered he was in the international jihadist movement, he was the past. He was a pathetic old man, sitting in dirty clothes, in a windowless room in a safe house in Pakistan, watching pornography and old videos of himself. Al Awlaki was the next generation, he was the future.

Al Awlaki was the crown prince, he was the future of the international jihadist movement. He was a cyber-warrior – younger, Internet saavy, inspirational and a master recruiter.

And his bona fides were unshakable.

The 9/11 hijackers met with him. He was connected to the Fort Hood shooter Maj. Hassan, the so-called "Underwear Bomber," the Times Square Bomber, and the UPS cargo plane dry run bombs.

He was an American citizen, educated in the U.S., fluent in English and founder of the popular online jihadist lifestyle magazine Inspire.

And most important for the future of Al Qaeda, he specialized in recruiting homegrown terrorists in the English speaking world, the lone wolf American or Brit, inspired by Al Awlaki could tplant bombs on himself, in trucks or in public places.

Killing Al Awlaki not only settles a score, but like Michael Corleone in "The Godfather," killing him is also a massive blow to the future of Al Qaeda. We have demonstrated that Americans do not forget, that terrorists may run, but they can’t hide forever. And while they may not yet be finished, they are seriously wounded.

#### Terrorism is deteriorating and is not a threat: 3 reasons

Vindis 12 (Mar. 5, graduate student at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs pursuing a Master of Global Policy Studies degree with specializations in Energy, Environment and Technology, as well as Security, Law and Diplomacy, "The True Threat of Terrorism” , <http://www.lbjjournal.com/baines/?p=1798>, ML)

There is little doubt that terrorism presents an immediate concern to the United States, but it does not necessarily represent a serious crisis. While groups like al-Qaeda have the resources to plan attacks, their capability to carry them out has significantly deteriorated. There are several reasons for this. First, law enforcement and intelligence agencies are more adept at acting in concert. The lessons from the September 11, 2011 attacks are fairly clear: lack of information-sharing, poor coordination and uncreative thinking were all part of the problem that allowed 19 men to carry out inventive, deadly attacks. New cooperation between agencies and information-sharing with international partners has made U.S. attacks much more difficult. Terrorist groups’ decisions to focus attacks on soft targets outside of the U.S. supports this assertion. For example, the 2004 Madrid train bombings sought to target a U.S. ally where attacks were easier to orchestrate. However disruptive such attacks may be, the fact that they take place outside of the United States is proof that current measures have had some degree of success. The second reason terrorist organizations’ capabilities have deteriorated is because their bases of power have eroded through two means: regime change and financial law enforcement. The removal of the Taliban from power in Afghanistan, pressure and sanctions on Iran and regime changes ushered in by the “Arab Spring” led to changes that, in the short term, have removed a number of potential safe havens. In addition, new financial regulations and controls have successfully limited fundraising capabilities of terrorist groups. These actions, as well as assassinations of key terrorist leaders, have severely hampered the ability of terrorist groups to carry out attacks. Finally, terrorist capabilities have declined because we have successfully controlled one of the greatest threats: the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by terrorist groups. We know that non-state actors have tried to acquire radiological, chemical and biological weapons. However, effectively developing and deploying such weapon systems requires a degree of expertise that is fairly well “controlled.” Increased international cooperation in law enforcement has made the detection of proliferation of WMD technology, material and know-how much more effective.

#### **Bin Laden is a devastating blow to Al-Qaeda**

[Mendelsohn](http://www.fpri.org/about/people/mendelsohn.html) 11 ([Barak Mendelsohn](http://www.fpri.org/about/people/mendelsohn.html), May 24, 2011, an assistant professor at Haverford College and a senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute. “A Devastating Blow” <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2011/05/02/the-war-on-terror-after-osama-bin-laden/a-devastating-blow-to-al-qaeda>)

Osama bin Laden’s death is a devastating blow to Al Qaeda, but it is not the end of jihadi terrorism. While it is demoralizing for the whole jihadi camp, it will not eliminate the motivation to attack the U.S. and is likely to trigger revenge attacks. Bin Laden’s demise puts the future of the broader Al Qaeda network in doubt. But from a strategic point of view, Bin Laden’s death could mark a critical juncture in the process of demilitarizing the war on terrorism and the beginning of the end for the U.S. presence in Afghanistan. Although his operational role has greatly diminished since 9/11, he was still vital for Al Qaeda’s existence. He devised the group’s strategy, and was a unique symbol of resistance. Others may prove to be better strategists but no individual, including his lieutenant, Ayman al-Zawahiri, possesses a similar aura of invincibility and appeal among jihadists. Bin Laden’s demise also puts the future of the broader Al Qaeda network in doubt. Groups that swore allegiance to bin Laden himself may not accept the authority of his successor. The leadership of Al Qaeda’s branch in the Arabian Peninsula, which in the past couple of years eclipsed the central organization, may even present a direct challenge to the leadership in South Asia and vie for leadership of the jihadi movement.

#### Al-Qaeda has made too many mistakes, the US is ahead on the war on terror

Eedle 11 (Paul Eedle ,September 5,2011, Currently Director of Programmes at Al Jazeera English in Doha and staff writer for Express.co.uk, “The War Al Qaeda Has Now Lost” <http://www.express.co.uk/posts/view/269200/The-war-Al-Qaeda-has-now-lost-The-war-Al-Qaeda-has-now-lost-The-war-Al-Qaeda-has-now-lost-The-war-Al-Qaeda-has-now-lost-The-war-Al-Qaeda-has-now-lost>)

Today the West is cheering democratic uprisings across the Arab heart of the Muslim world. Osama Bin Laden is dead and his followers have been left on the sidelines as millions of Arabs have risked their lives to replace dictators, not with some extremist Islamic state but with democracies built on freedom and justice.  So did the West win the War on Terror? And is the first great conflict of the 21st century over? The truth is the West may have come out on top for the moment but this was a war Al Qaeda lost, not one which the West won.   If the West doesn’t learn its lessons next time round it may not be so lucky. The history of the years after 9/11 is a sorry tale of mistake piled on mistake by the US and its allies.  The Americans bungled their chance to wipe out the Al Qaeda leadership in the Tora Bora mountains of Afghanistan, revolted world opinion with abuse of prisoners in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo and never matched Al Qaeda’s clever internet propaganda.   Most damaging, US-led coalitions invaded Afghanistan and Iraq losing 7,000 of their own soldiers and provoking conflicts that killed hundreds of thousands of Muslims.  This was exactly what Osama Bin Laden and his deputy Ayman Al Zawahiri wanted. The 9/11 attacks set a trap and George Bush and Tony Blair walked into it.  “Definitely Osama Bin Laden and Ayman Al Zawahiri wanted to ignite a clash of civilisations,” says Abdel Bari Atwan, editor of the London-based Arab newspaper Al Quds Al Arabi.   “They wanted a clash with the West in particular, they hated Western civilisation and considered it a threat to the Muslim civilisation. “I remember when I met Osama Bin Laden. I said to him, ‘Look you know, what’s your plan for the future? You are going to fight the greatest power in history – not just in our time – so it is suicidal’.   He said to me, ‘My strategy is to bring the Americans to our area. If I succeed in bringing them to Muslim grounds I can fight them and I can defeat them’.”  Michael Scheuer, who led the CIA unit hunting Bin Laden in the Nineties, says simply: “Basically Bin Laden said jump and Mr Bush and Mr Cheney said how high? We did exactly what they wanted to do by going to Afghanistan.”  The West’s reaction to 9/11 propelled Bin Laden to great popularity in some Muslim countries – he was approved of by more than 70 per cent of Palestinians, more than 50 per cent of Jordanians and nearly half of Pakistanis.   Al Qaeda recruits bombed commuters in Madrid and London, tourists in Bali and banks in Turkey. “The Arabs were looking for a hero in a way or another, somebody who can challenge those mighty Americans who are humiliating them,” says Atwan.   The tide turned because Al Qaeda made even bigger mistakes than the West. They were so utterly convinced of the righteousness of their cause that they couldn’t care less who they killed.  They horrified Saudis by suicide bombing housing compounds in Riyadh in 2003, supposedly targeting Christians and foreigners but actually killing many Muslims.   They revolted Jordanians by blowing up three hotels in Amman in 2005, slaughtering even more Muslims.   ADNAN BADRAN, who was prime minister of Jordan at the time, says: “For the first time preachers in the mosques were attacking and spelling out, this is Al Qaeda and this is inhuman. They are terrorists, they are murderers and really should be fought everywhere.”  But the place Al Qaeda really came to grief was Iraq. In 2004 the leadership in hiding in Pakistan allowed ultra-violent commander Abu Musab Al Zarqawi to brand his organisation in Iraq as Al Qaeda.

#### Bin Laden demoralized Al-Qaeda

Dorronsoro 11 ([Gilles Dorronsoro](http://www.carnegieendowment.org/experts/index.cfm?fa=expert_view&expert_id=435), May 2, 2011, a visiting scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. “Seek a Political Solution in Afghanistan” http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2011/05/02/the-war-on-terror-after-osama-bin-laden/finding-new-qaeda-recruits-in-the-mideast)

Osama bin Laden’s death is a clear victory with greater significance for the war in Afghanistan than for the dynamics of radical jihadist groups around the world. Al Qaeda will have ample chances to recruit new militants in the Middle East. Meanwhile, the U.S. should negotiate with the Taliban. Under pressure, Al Qaeda has not been able to carry out major operations against Western countries for the last few years. Bin Laden had mostly taken on a symbolic role and his removal doesn’t directly affect an organization that is largely decentralized. The fate of [Ayman al-Zawahri](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/z/ayman_al_zawahri/index.html), Al Qaeda’s second-in-command, remains unknown, but he will probably replace Bin Laden and an internal crisis like the one that divided the Pakistani Taliban is unlikely. Of course, the current events in the Middle East — from Yemen to Iraq — give Al Qaeda ample opportunities to recruit militants, and it is wishful thinking to believe that Bin Laden’s death will cause a major shift in the perceptions of the United States. In addition, nothing indicates that other jihadist groups, for example [Lashkar-e-Taiba](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/l/lashkaretaiba/index.html) in Pakistan, will be affected by Osama's killing. The real impact could be on the Afghan war. On the military side, Al Qaeda has not played an important role and one should not wait for a different strategy or a less aggressive Taliban this summer. The “surge” has failed and the momentum is definitively with the Taliban. But on the political side, the removal of Bin Laden from the political equation opens a window of opportunity for the White House to start negotiations with Taliban leaders. First, after such a victory, Obama has gained a great deal of political capital — he is immune for the moment from Republican criticism and can more easily negotiate with the Taliban. Second, it will be easier for the Taliban to distance itself from Al Qaeda after Bin Laden’s death. Finally, the Pakistani military is now under pressure to explain how the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks was able to stay so deep inside Pakistan near a military academy. Whatever the answer — incompetence or complicity — this gives the White House some leverage in pushing Pakistan to make positive steps. Osama bin Laden’s death will certainly not put an end to jihadist groups, but it could help facilitate a political solution in Afghanistan. With conditions on the ground making it obvious that a military solution doesn’t make sense, this is a chance for Washington to change strategy and do the sensible thing in Afghanistan after almost 10 years at war. The question becomes: will President Obama use his newly acquired political capital to make a major diplomatic opening?

#### **The chances of a terrorist smuggling in a dirty bomb are very low**

NTI 7 (part of the national journal, Aug 8, "Dirty Bomb" Unlikely, But Costly, Researchers Say”, http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/dirty-bomb-unlikely-but-costly-researchers-say/, ML)

For terrorists to conduct a radiological weapon attack, they would need to achieve several challenging intermediate tasks, making final success unlikely, said Heather Rosoff and Detloff von Winterfeldt of the university's Center for Risk and Economic Analysis of Terrorism Events. "Considering the difficulties associated with obtaining and transporting radioactive material, building the dirty bomb, and detonating the device successfully, our preliminary analyses suggest that the chances of a successful attempt are no better than 15-40 percent" for a scenario in which terrorists dispersed a medium amount of radioactive material through a bomb at the port. Attempts to use larger amounts of material would reduce the chances of success, they said, and terrorists would probably attack different targets if they were only able to acquire smaller amounts.

## AT: Disease Mpx

#### Vaccines solve diseases

Brill, 11’ (Alex Brill, Alex Brill, a former policy director and chief economist of the House Ways and Means Committee, also served on the staff of the President's Council of Economic Advisers (CEA), http://www.aei.org/print/recognizing-the-promise-of-vaccines-public-policy-must-adapt-to-new-innovations-event, June 29, 2011,NC)

Vaccinations are conquering infectious disease and putting rates of vaccine-preventable diseases at all-time lows. Today, vaccine coverage rates are high, many new vaccines have recently been introduced, and the United States has reduced social and economic disparities in immunization rates. The United States has entered a new era of disease prevention. Unlike vaccines of the past, which focused on combating diseases that affect large populations, many vaccines under development today are for devastating diseases with high impact but low incidence or societal burden.

#### SQ efforts coupled with future plans solve all major diseases

Neondo, 5/30/12’ (Henry Neondo, science journalist based in Nairobi, Kenya. I hold a post-grad diploma in journalism with a background in range management, <http://www.nl-aid.org/continent/global/new-vaccine-bid-to-save-millions-of-children/>, 5/30/12, NC)

In a move aimed at saving lives of millions of children, ministers of Health from 194 countries last week endorsed a new roadmap that could see a more equitable access to existing vaccines. This comprehensive plan calls for strengthening routine immunization to meet vaccination coverage targets, accelerating control of vaccine-preventable diseases and introducing new and improved vaccines besides spurring research and development for the next generation of vaccines and technologies. The plan is expected to reduce global childhood mortality, surpassing the targets of the United Nations Millennium Development Goal 4. Currently, four out of every five children receive at least a basic set of vaccinations during infancy that allow them to lead healthy, productive lives. However, this means 20 percent of children still do not benefit from basic immunization. “While immunization already prevents millions of deaths and uncounted illness, we cannot rest until life-saving, cost-effective vaccine technology reaches people in every community and every country through this global plan,” said Dr. Ciro de Quadros, Executive Vice President of the Sabin Vaccine Institute and co-chair of the Decade of Vaccines Collaboration’s Steering Committee. “The Global Vaccine Action Plan focuses on the health needs of people at all stages of life,” said Dr. Flavia Bustreo, Assistant Director-General for Family, Women’s and Children’s Health of the World Health Organization. “The plan promotes greater coordination and synergies between immunization and other child, adolescent and reproductive health interventions leading to healthier communities everywhere.” The GVAP was coordinated by the Decade of Vaccines Collaboration, a group of leading international vaccine experts, and represents the collective vision of hundreds of global health stakeholders to extend the full benefits of immunization to all people, regardless of where they are born, who they are, or where they live.

#### Vaccines save millions of lives a year

Wilson, 10’ (Paul Wilson, Oxfam staff, <http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/giving-developing-countries-best-shot-vaccines-2010-05.pdf>, April, 2010, NC)

Vaccines have made possible some of the greatest public health successes of the past century. Immunisation helps avert an estimated 2.5 million child deaths each year, as well as millions more bouts of illness and disability. 1 Poor countries as well as rich have benefited, although developing countries almost always benefit only after long delays. Basic childhood immunisation is one of the few health interventions to which most of the world’s poor have access, free of charge and through the public sector. In fact, immunisation is one of the most equitable health interventions, protecting girls and boys alike, and reaching the poor within countries at higher rates relative to the wealthy than other services.

## Privates Key To Port Security

#### Private industry key - too many cargo movements for the government to track

Frittelli 04 (John F. Frittelli, August 12, 2004, Specialist in Transportation Resources, Science, and Industry Division, “Port and Maritime Security: Background and Issues for Congress” <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rl31733.pdf>) MB

Private Industry’s Role. A broad policy question for Congress is how much of a role the private sector should have in enhancing maritime security. Many observers believe that businesses will worry more about near term profits than the remote possibility that their property will be attacked.66 At the same time, most experts acknowledge that there are just too many cargo movements for the government to monitor on its own. Security experts believe that tightening control over maritime commerce requires that security be “embedded” into everyday business processes. CBP’s C-TPAT program is intended to enlist the effort of the many companies involved in international container shipments. In its oversight responsibilities, Congress may evaluate the effectiveness of this program, particularly in ensuring the due diligence of maritime traders over the long term. Congress may consider how best to ensure sustained follow through on the part of C-TPAT participants. A “trust but verify” approach utilizing regular CBP security audits may be one strategy policymakers consider.67

#### Private companies are taking the lead as government steps out of Maritime Security

Isenberg, 12’ (Washington-D.C. based analyst and writer on military, foreign policy, national and international security issues, "The Rise of Private Maritime Security Companies.”, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/rise-private-maritime-security-companies>, May 26, 2012, NC)

The emerging economic paradigm indicates that use of maritime armed guards will only increase. That means the private security companies, many based in Britain or elsewhere in northern Europe, that combat the pirates were earning much more than the pirates themselves. Thus piracy is good for at least some businesses. Maritime private security companies now pull in $52.2m a month from an estimated 1,500 escorted journeys. Newcastle upon Tyne-based, Convoy Escort Programme Ltd. intends to deploy seven armored former naval patrol boats, each with an eight-man security team. Convoy Escort reportedly will charge about $30,000 for a boat traveling in a convoy of about four commercial vessels for three to four days According to the Independent Maritime Security Association the use of a private armed security team general costs about $50,000 per transit. If only 25% of vessels employed guards, that would work out to 10,612 transits At the 25% figure that works out to $530.6 million for private armed security. At 50% it would be a billion dollar dollar a year industry... just in the Gulf of Aden. And, given that some underwriters give discounts to ships that hire armed guards, they are likely to pull in more business in the future. Although Somalia is the current epicenter for acts of piracy, it is a global problem with some disturbing forecasts. According to Peter Cook, the head of the Security Association for the Maritime Industry (SAMI), which represents 120 armed security outfits, more than half of which are British, over the next 20 years maritime traffic will increase 50% but navies will shrink by 30%. In addition to commercial traffic, there are 4,500 super yachts afloat and over half a million tourists aboard cruises ships every day of the year. Coming up with a clear agreed upon standard for the provision of armed security will not be easy. There are more than 8,000 ports covered by the ISPS (International Port and Ship Security Code with no clear regulation on armed security. This does not include the potential problems posed at thousands of ports around the world, the threat to offshore oil and gas industry or even how the use of armed security affects something like the undersea cable laying sector. Currently many major maritime entities insist on armed escorts which keep armed men off their corporate vessels as well as the liability.

#### Should privatize state owned ports, profit creates efficiency – UK proves

Edwards, 09’ (Chris Edwards, Edwards was a senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, a manager with PricewaterhouseCoopers, and an economist with the Tax Foundation, <http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/privatization>, Feb, 2009, NC)

Nearly all U.S. seaports are owned by state and local governments. Many operate below world standards because of inflexible union work rules and other factors. A Maritime Administration report noted that "American ports lag well behind other international transportation gateways such as Singapore and Rotterdam in terms of productivity."5 Dozens of countries around the world have privatized their seaports. One Hong Kong company, Hutchinson Whampoa, owns 30 ports in 15 countries. In Britain, 19 ports were privatized in 1983 to form Associated British Ports. ABP and a subsidiary, UK Dredging, sell port and dredging services in the private marketplace. They earn a profit, pay taxes, and return dividends to shareholders.6 Two-thirds of British cargo goes through privatized ports, which are highly efficient. Because of the vital economic role played by seaports in international trade, this should be a high priority reform area in the United States.

#### New forms of privatization are ket to port infrastructure and creation of industrial centers

Aiyar, 09’ (Swaminathan S. Anklesaria Aiyar is a research fellow at the Cato Institute with a special focus on India and Asia. His research interests include economic change in developing countries, human rights and civil strife, political economy, energy, trade and industry, The Benefits of Port Liberalization, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/dpa/DPA7.pdf>, 2009, NC)

Gujarat has broken new ground with different forms of privatization, ranging from private provision of port services to completely private ownership of new ports. The process started in the 1980s and gathered momentum rapidly after the central government in New Delhi enacted major economic reforms in the early 1990s. Gujarat has taken advantage of a constitutional loophole to convert its minor ports into some of the biggest ports in the country, vastly improved the availability and efficiency of port infrastructure, and facilitated the development of industrial centers that otherwise would not have existed. Gujarat’s port liberalization, along with its status as one of the economically freest states in India, should serve as a model for the rest of India and other developing countries, which can also benefit from the dynamic gains of port privatization.

#### New Technologies from private companies are key to prevent terrorism

DeGaspari, 05’(John DeGaspari, I am a writer based in New York with over 20 years of experience reporting on technology and business, <http://www.johndegaspari.com/Port_Security_Falls_to_Private_Sector.html>, 2005, NC)

James Woolsey, former director of the CIA and now senior vice president of Booz Allen Hamilton Inc., does not mince words when detailing the vulnerability of U.S. seaports to devastating terrorist attacks. "We need to disabuse ourselves of the notion that we have already figured out what to do," he said at a recent maritime security conference in New York. The supply-chain shipping infrastructures that must be protected exist in a web of hundreds of complex networks, which were created for accessibility, low cost and transparency but without a thought given to terrorism, he explained. Modern supply chains have eliminated large inventories in favor of just-in-time production, and they work like a finely tuned Swiss watch. But they are also exceedingly vulnerable to terrorist attack. Woolsey says everyone connected to this complex global shipping network needs to boost security using new technologies to prevent a total shutdown of the world trading system if an attack succeeds. But who's going to pay for these technology expenditures? And who's going to set the priorities? The answers today are alarming, though recent moves by a number of high-technology security providers, port operators and shipping companies may compensate for U.S. government delays and confusion on the port security front in the war on terrorism, say industry executives.

## Terror Talk/Security

#### Treating terrorists as if they were objects without meaning in the way of an ultimate goal of security creates war and justifies the killing of innocent lives

**Fedler 01** (Kyle Fedler, Assistant Professor at Ashland University, September 17, “ON THE RHETORIC OF A "War ON TERRORISM"”, <http://www.crosscurrents.org/Felder.htm>, ML)

But I will share with you some of my thoughts on the rhetoric surrounding the terrorist attack, in particular the rhetoric of the "War on Terrorism." Language is a powerful tool; the most powerful tool that humans have ever devised. It does more than describe in some kind of neutral way. Rather language has the power to create realities, to shape the very way we experience events. It allows us to communicate ideas and to convince people to view reality in a particular way. And, so as a Christian and an ethicist who studies and teaches issues surrounding warfare, this language troubles me (and I think it ought to trouble you) for a number of reasons. First, warfare is often the pretext for the suspension of human rights. This takes place on two fronts, the suspension of the rights of the people being attacked and the violation of rights of people in the nation doing the attacking. Let me talk about the rights of those being attacked. Too many people wrongly believe that there are no rules in warfare. They hold with General Sherman, that "War is Hell" and with Prussian General von Milke that "the greatest kindness in war is to bring it to a speedy end." When this attitude is taken, then **the intentional destruction of innocent lives is not seen as a limitation upon our actions. As long as the goal of winning the war is achieved, then any kind of means is justifiable, including killing the innocent with the wicked**. This seems to be the attitude in a startlingly poor piece of moral reasoning by the syndicated columnist Ann Coulter who writes in a piece called "Drop Bombs, Take Names Later": This is no time to be precious about locating the exact individuals directly involved in this particular terrorist attack. Those responsible include anyone anywhere who smile in response [to the attack].We should invade their countries, kill their leaders, and convert them to Christianity. We weren't punctilious about locating and punishing only Hitler and his top officers. We carpet bombed German cities. We killed civilians. That's war. And this is war. (Ann Coulter, Mansfield News Journal, September 17, 2001) According to Coulter and her like, invoking the language of war permits the direct and intentional killing of innocent people. But how is this any different than terrorism? Michael Walzer talks about terrorism in light of the bombing of Hiroshima. "The bombing of Hiroshima was an act of terrorism; its purpose was political not military. The goal was to kill enough civilians to shake the Japanese government and force it to surrender. And this is the goal of every terrorist campaign" (Michael Walzer, "An Exchange on Hiroshima," New Republic, September 23, 1981). In other words, terrorism is defined as the direct and intentional killing of innocent people with the purpose of achieving some greater goal, usually from the government of the people killed. If we engage in terrorism to combat terrorism, then the terrorists have surely already won. I can only imagine that the devil is licking his (or her) lips over the possibility of Coulter's all-out war on the just and unjust alike. If, however, we use the rhetoric of a war on terrorism and maintain a policy of "just war" in which a clear distinction is drawn between combatants and noncombatants, then I am less anxious about the rhetoric. Nevertheless I am still wary because war often leads to the suspension of the rights of our own citizens. It wasn't just Hitler who used the pretext of war (on both Europe and the Jews) as a justification for the suspension of rights. We have a long history of the same here in the United States. Even as great a president as Lincoln used the pretext of war to suspend habeas corpus and have civilians tried in secret military courts. During World War I the First Amendment was all but suspended, as war protesters and pamphleteers were commonly detained and imprisoned. We have seen the Japanese internment and the McCarthy red scare, which allowed men like Martin Luther King and Arthur Miller to be secretly recorded, followed and photographed. During the Iran-Contra arms deal Reagan and men like Oliver North felt free to bypass and lie to Congress all for the greater good of winning the Cold War. (This is not to mention the violation of the rights of neutral countries in which we engaged in operations to overthrow democratically elected leaders of nations like Chile.) All of these actions were rationalized by the language of war. The evil means justified the morally good end of winning the "war." Too often, the means include the widespread violation of our human and constitutional rights. From a more Christian perspective, there is another reason that I am suspicious of the rhetoric of a "war on terrorism." During war our tendency is to depersonalize and demonize our enemies. John Glenn Gray talks about this in his book The Warriors, in which he says that during war, we tend to talk about enemies either in the abstract "The" enemy, or as subhuman (Have you heard the language of "vermin" filth, "animals"?) or we characterize them as "demonic" (Remember Reagan's language of Russia as the "Evil Empire"?) So what is wrong with such rhetoric? **When we totally dehumanize our enemies, the terrorists, once again, have won**. What democratic nations are grounded on is equality of all persons, that no person is below consideration. And at the heart of Christianity is the notion that all persons, no matter how sinful, are made in the image of God. I think this is what stands behind Jesus' injunction to pray for one's enemies -- you can't pray for the devil or for vermin -- you pray for human beings. When we demonize our enemies we see ourselves as totally righteous and the abstract enemy as totally evil. This may be comforting but it is naive, self-righteous, and in my opinion supremely un-Christian. When we do this we have been drawn into the simplistic dualism of the terrorists who see themselves as totally righteous and all Americans as totally evil. To demonize our enemies, such that we can no longer envision them as humans is to abandon the very symbols that have been so prevalent during this crisis -- our churches and the flag

#### By talking about the terrorist as irrational something to be afraid of you make them the monster

**Puar and Rai 02** (Jasbir K. Puar, assistant professor of women's studies and geography at Rutgers University. Amit S. Rai teaches cultural and literary studies at the New School University in New York City. “Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots” Social Text 20.3 (2002), project muse.) ML

To begin, let us consider the monster. Why, in what way, has monstrosity come to organize the discourse on terrorism? First, we could merely glance at the language used by the dominant media in its interested depictions of Islamic militancy. So, as an article in the New York Times points out, "Osama bin Laden, according to Fox News Channel anchors, analysts and correspondents, is 'a dirtbag,' 'a monster' overseeing a 'web of hate.' His followers in Al Qaeda are **'terror goons.'** Taliban fighters are 'diabolical' and 'henchmen.'" 2 Or, in another Web article, we read: "It is important to realize that the Taliban does not simply tolerate the presence of bin Laden and his terrorist training camps in Afghanistan. It is part and parcel of the same evil alliance. Al-Qa'ida and the Taliban are two different heads of the same monster, and they share the same fanatical obsession: imposing a strict and distorted brand of Islam on all Muslims and bringing death to all who oppose him." 3 In these invocations of terrorist-monsters an absolute morality separates good from a "shadowy evil." 4 As if caught up in its own shadow dance with the anti-Western rhetoric of radical Islam, 5 this discourse marks off a figure, Osama bin Laden, or a government, the Taliban, as the opposite of all that is just, human, and good. The terrorist-monster is pure evil and must be destroyed, according to this view. 6 But does the monster have a mind? This begs another question: Do such figures and such representational strategies have a history? We suggest this language of terrorist-monsters should be read by considering how the monster has been used throughout history in Western discourses of normality. We could begin by remembering, for instance, that the monster was one of three elements that Foucault linked to the formation of the "abnormals." The group of abnormals was formed out of three elements whose own formation was not exactly synchronic. 1. The human monster. An Ancient notion whose frame of reference is law. A juridical notion, then, but in the broad sense, as it referred not only to social laws but to natural laws as well; the monster's field of appearance is a juridico-biological domain. The figures of the half-human, half-animal being . . ., of double individualities . . ., of hermaphrodites . . . in turn represented that double violation; what makes a human monster a monster is not just its exceptionality relative to the species [End Page 118] form; it is the disturbance it brings to juridical regularities (whether it is a question of marriage laws, canons of baptism, or rules of inheritance). The human monster combines the impossible and the forbidden. . . . 2. The individual to be corrected. This is a more recent figure than the monster. It is the correlative not so much of the imperatives of the law as of training techniques with their own requirements. The emergence of the "incorrigibles" is contemporaneous with the putting into place of disciplinary techniques during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in the army, the schools, the workshops, then, a little later, in families themselves. The new procedures for training the body, behavior, and aptitudes open up the problem of those who escape that normativity which is no longer the sovereignty of the law. 7 According to Foucault, the monster can be both half an animal and a hybrid gender (later in this text Foucault will go on to position the onanist as the third of the abnormals). But crucially the monster is also to be differentiated from the individual to be corrected on the basis of whether power operates on it or through it. In other words, the absolute power that produces and quarantines the monster finds its dispersal in techniques of normalization and discipline. What Foucault does, we believe, is enable an analysis of monstrosity within a broader history of sexuality. This genealogy is crucial to understanding the historical and political relays, reinvestments, and resistances between the monstrous terrorist and the discourse of heteronormativity. And that is because monsters and abnormals have always also been sexual deviants. Foucault tied monstrosity to sexuality through specific analyses of the deployment of gendered bodies, the regulation of proper desires, the manipulation of domestic spaces, and the taxonomy of sexual acts such as sodomy. As such, the sexualized monster was that figure that called forth a form of juridical power but one that was tied to multiform apparatuses of discipline as well. 8 We use Foucault's concept of monstrosity to elaborate what we consider to be central to the present war on terrorism: monstrosity as a regulatory construct of modernity that imbricates not only sexuality, but also questions of culture and race. Before we tie these practices to contemporary politics, let us note two things: First, the monster is not merely an other; it is one category through which a multiform power operates. As such, discourses that would mobilize monstrosity as a screen for otherness are always also involved in circuits of normalizing power as well: the monster and the person to be corrected are close cousins. Second, if the monster is part of the West's family of abnormals, questions of race and sexuality will have always haunted its figuration. The category of monstrosity is also an implicit index of civilizational development and cultural adaptability. As the machines of war begin to narrow the choices and life [End Page 119] chances people have here in America and in decidedly more bloody ways abroad, it seems a certain grid of civilizational progress organized by such keywords as "democracy," "freedom," and "humanity" have come to superintend the figure of the monster. We turn now to this double deployment of the discourse of monstrosity in "terrorism studies." [End Page 120]

#### When we view terrorists as irrational actors with flawed phsyce and construct them as the other who is excluded from being a part of our normal way of life

**Puar and Rai 02** (Jasbir K. Puar, assistant professor of women's studies and geography at Rutgers University. Amit S. Rai teaches cultural and literary studies at the New School University in New York City. “Monster, Terrorist, Fag: The War on Terrorism and the Production of Docile Patriots” Social Text 20.3 (2002), project muse.) ML

As a leading light in the constellation of "terrorism experts," Jerrold Post has proposed that terrorists suffer from pathological personalities that emerge from negative childhood experiences and a damaged sense of self. 15 Post argues for two terrorist personality types, depending on the specific quality of those childhood experiences. First, Post suggests, there is the "anarchic-ideologue." This is the terrorist who has experienced serious family dysfunction and maladjustment, which lead to rebellion against parents, especially against the father. Anarchic-ideologues fight "against the society of their parents . . . an act of dissent against parents loyal to the regime." Second, there is the terrorist personality type known as the "nationalist-secessionist"—apparently the name indicates "a sense of loyalty to authority and rebellion against external enemies." During childhood, a terrorist of this personality type experienced a sense of compassion or loyalty toward his or her parents. According to Post, nationalist-secessionists have pathologically failed to differentiate between themselves and the other (parental object). Consequently, they rebel "against society for the hurt done to their parents . . . an act of loyalty to parents damaged by the regime." Both the anarchic-ideologue and nationalist-secessionist find "comfort in joining a terrorist group of rebels with similar experiences." 16 The personality defect model views terrorists as suffering from personality defects that result from excessively negative childhood experiences, giving the individual a poor sense of self and a resentment of authority. As Ruby notes, "Its supporters differ in whether they propose one (Kaplan), two (Post and Jones & Fong), or three (Strentz) personality types." 17 What all these models and theories aim to show is how an otherwise normal individual becomes a murderous terrorist, and that process time and again is tied to the failure of the normal(ized) psyche. Indeed, an implicit but foundational supposition structures this entire discourse: the very notion of the normal psyche, which is in fact part of the West's own heterosexual family romance—a narrative space that relies on the normalized, [End Page 123] even if perverse, domestic space of desire supposedly common in the West. Terrorism, in this discourse, is a symptom of the deviant psyche, the psyche gone awry, or the failed psyche; the terrorist enters this discourse as an absolute violation. So when Billy Collins (the 2001 poet laureate) asserted on National Public Radio immediately after September 11: "Now the U.S. has lost its virginity," he was underscoring this fraught relationship between (hetero)sexuality, normality, the nation, and the violations of terrorism. Not surprisingly, then, coming out of this discourse, we find that another very common way of trying to psychologize the monster-terrorist is by positing a kind of failed heterosexuality. So we hear often the idea that sexually frustrated Muslim men are promised the heavenly reward of sixty, sixty-seven, or sometimes even seventy virgins if they are martyred in jihad. But As'ad Abu Khalil has argued, "In reality, political—not sexual—frustration constitutes the most important factor in motivating young men, or women, to engage in suicidal violence. The tendency to dwell on the sexual motives of the suicide bombers belittles these sociopolitical causes." 18 Now of course, that is precisely what terrorism studies intends to do: to reduce complex social, historical, and political dynamics to various psychic causes rooted in childhood family dynamics. As if the Palestinian Intifada or the long, brutal war in Afghanistan can be simply boiled down to bad mothering or sexual frustration! In short, these explanatory models and frameworks function to (1) reduce complex histories of struggle, intervention, and (non)development to Western psychic models rooted in the bourgeois heterosexual family and its dynamics; (2) systematically exclude questions of political economy and the problems of cultural translation; and (3) attempt to master the fear, anxiety, and uncertainty of a form of political dissent by resorting to the banality of a taxonomy. 19 Our contention is that today the knowledge and form of power that is mobilized to analyze, taxonomize, psychologize, and defeat terrorism has a genealogical connection to the West's abnormals, and specifically those premodern monsters that Western civilization had seemed to bury and lay to rest long ago. The monsters that haunt the prose of contemporary counterterrorism emerge out of figures in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that have always been racialized, classed, and sexualized. The undesirable, the vagrant, the Gypsy, the savage, the Hottentot Venus, or the sexual depravity of the Oriental torrid zone shares a basic kinship with the terrorist-monster. As we know, in the twentieth century these disparate monsters became case studies, objects of ethnographies, and interesting psychological cases of degeneracy. The same Western, colonial modernity that created the psyche created the racial and sexual monster. [End Page 124] In other words, what links the monster-terrorist to the figure of the individual to be corrected is first and foremost the racialized and deviant psyche. Isn't that why there is something terrifyingly uncanny in the terrorist-monster? As one specifically liberal article in the Rand journal put it, "Members of such groups are not infrequently prepared to kill and die for their struggles and, as sociologists would attest, that presupposes a sort of conviction and mindset that has become uncommon in the modern age. Thus, not only the acts of 'terrorism' but also the driving forces behind them often appear incomprehensible and frightening to outsiders. Terrorism studies emerged as a subcategory within the social sciences in the early 1970s seeking to explain the resurgence of the seemingly inexplicable." 20

#### Terror talks are American rhetoric designed to strike compliance into the American psyche justifying wars based on fear

**Appelbaum, 10 '** (Robert Appelbaum, senior lecturer in Renaissance studies at Lancaster University, <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=410242&sectioncode=26>, 4 February, 2010, NC)

**All terror is "rhetorical", for terror tries to be persuasive. It tries to convince a public to think and feel one thing rather than another. But surrounding the rhetoric of terror comes another rhetoric: a rhetoric of response, of process, elaboration and reaction.** According to Marc Redfield, in the aftermath of 11 September 2001, a rhetoric developed that was metaphysical in scope. **Take the name "9/11". A name has come into being that designates not just a date, or an event that took place on a certain date, but a kind of rupture in the fabric of reality**. Moreover, the rupture the term marks is something that we are supposed to both remember and forget. **The name imposes an America-centred version of recent history** (for example, in reversing the European system of dating, which would force us to say "11/9", or in effacing the significance of other 9/11s, such as the one on which American-sponsored reactionaries assassinated Chilean president Salvador Allende) and thereby signifies a triumph of the (American) will even while it commemorates a terrible (American) defeat**. The rupture in American life shall be a rupture in the life of us all. The name even serves, along with other such commonplaces attached to the event as the widespread idea that "it was like a movie", to reverse our sense of causality.** First there was the Hollywood-promoted spectacle of the imagination, hovering over our anxieties about the future; then there was the realisation of the spectacle in an actual disaster. Our fear seems, in retrospect, to have brought into existence the thing we feared**. The challenge that 9/11 and the subsequent War on Terror posed to the way we think and feel about the world was taken up quickly by a number of our most prominent philosophers and social theorists. Within weeks of the event, Jacques Derrida, Slavoj Zizek and Jean Baudrillard were weighing in brilliantly on the calamity, calling attention to the contradictions of heart, mind and public policy that this spectral "event" inevitably evoked.** They were soon followed by Susan Sontag and other social thinkers, not to mention journalists, novelists, film-makers, historians, visual artists, museum curators and government commissions. From the beginning, 9/11 was a mediatised disaster; its power as an event depended on its mediatisation. And the response to it has been more and more mediatisation, and thus more and more of what Redfield calls "virtual trauma". **The War on Terror, it is well known, started as a kind of reaction formation, in defiance of the trauma 9/11 had inflicted on the American psyche, and the effects of this reaction formation still abide with us even after the Obama Administration has officially declared the rhetorical war to be over. But Redfield has a further suggestion to make. The declaration of a War on Terror by the George W. Bush Administration, he argues, was an expression of the nature of sovereignty itself**. The declaration was a "performative act" - an act whose pedigree can be traced at least as far back as Edmund Burke's reaction to the French Terror - which in fact attributed sovereignty to "the terrorist" in order to claim back sovereignty for itself**. Indeed, for Redfield, sovereignty itself is terror, and nothing exemplifies that more than the hysterical conduct of the War on Terror from late 2001 to early 2009. The Rhetoric of Terror doesn't so much break new ground about 9/11 and the War on Terror as provide a masterly elaboration of post-structuralist thought on the subject.** The guiding spirit behind the work is Jacques Derrida.

#### Anti-muslim rhetoric justifies terrorist on the very people America constructs as terrorists

Devore, 11 ( Elliott Devore is a graduate in psychology, <http://utdailybeacon.com/opinion/columns/the-social-network/2011/jul/26/muslim-terrorist-rhetoric-divisive/>, 26 July, 2011, NC)

Terrorism, terrorist — both words have been etched into the minds of millennials across the world, but especially those of red-blooded Americans. Since 9/11 American media has lead much of the USA to think of Muslim, brown or Middle Eastern as synonymous with "terrorist." Sitting in classes at UT I've witnessed this first-hand, listening to the bias spewing of ignorant students in political science classes. My heart hurts every time I hear anti-Muslim slurs, calling them terrorists; however, I'm hoping that the terror attacks in Norway will shift some perceptions. So many media sources are failing to acknowledge that Ander Behring Breivik was in fact a terrorist; instead they are depicting him as a mad man, an individual, separating him from his Christian Fundamentalism, anti-immigration values and flagrant opposition of multiculturalism and left-wing politics. Why is it that they aren't painting him as a terrorist? Is it because he isn't Muslim, or because he is white with blonde hair and blue eyes? Days before the attacks in Norway Breivik posted a 12-minute video on his YouTube page titled "Knights Templar 2083" as well as a 1,500-page manifesto. Out of curiosity I watched the video and was frightened to find the level of hatred towards Muslims, the United Nations and America. Breivik seemed to think that the educational trend of multiculturalism was weakening European heritage and was as oppressive as the ignorance they were educating against: going as far as to say that multiculturalism is anti-European hate ideology created for the eradication for an entire population. Cultural Marxism, says Breivik, is the weapon that the cultural liberals will use to weaken Europe, quickening its Islamization. He misquoted the Qu'ran, saying that Muslims taught their children that they needed to lie to the infidels to obtain power. After watching this video it was clear that he wanted to start a worldwide revolution, another religious military crusade. When questioned about the attacks he was quoted as saying that they were "atrocious" yet "necessary." As a part of the "Knights Templar," he and many others have taken the path of martyrdom in order to cleanse Europe. His YouTube post says, "If the multiculturalist elites of Europe continue to refuse to voluntarily transfer political and military power to our conservative revolutionary forces then the WW2 is likely going to appear as a picnic compared to the coming carnage." The media has it wrong, he was not just a mad man, but a terrorist, one who had a specific agenda that targeted the ideals he loathed. He specifically targeted the government buildings in Oslo because of the Labour Party being in power, as well as the camp in Utoeya because it was run by the Labour Party as camps for politically active youth. This intentional attack upon Labour Party entities perfectly aligns with his self-proclaimed life purpose of cleansing Europe of the "Multicultural/Cultural Marxists" because the Labour Party supports much more liberal policies than he would favor. His lawyer, Geir Lippestad, said: "He's stated that he went to Utoeya to give the Labour Party a warning that 'doomsday would be imminent' unless the party changed its policies." The camp was filled with mostly teenagers, who were members of the Workers' Youth League, which is affiliated with the governing social democratic Labour Party of Norway. His lawyer said that Breivik is fully aware of his actions and considers himself sane. This is extremism at it's finest and is most definitely terrorism. Some news sources stated that, if convicted, he could serve up to 21 years in Norwegian prison. I believe those who share his beliefs should be locked up for life. From what he posted it's obvious that he isn't alone in his goal of cultural cleansing. Pure hatred and rejection of difference must not be tolerated. Terror and hatred know no boundaries, and this is why the multicultural education that Breivik hates is such a crucial aspect of creating cultural appreciation and respect amongst the world's people. It's time the world stops blaming terror attacks on Muslim Extremists and starts seeking the truth. Not only is it racist to automatically assume that Muslim Extremists are the culprits, but it also creates and maintains a veil under which other extremist groups can attack with partial anonymity. If we are to truly dismantle terror groups we must open our eyes and accept that those we fear are often those we least expect.

#### The level to which we construct the threat to ports from terrorism is irrational and justifies putting any means to protect our already secure liberties

Lennon, 06 (Sheila Lennon, Staff Providence Journalhttp://shenews.projo.com/2006/02/the-ports-deal.html, Feb 23, 2006, NC)

The administration cannot have it both ways. Either the terrorist threat is real, in which case we need to zip up America, run our own ports and restrict investments in critical infrastructure to our longtime allies. Or bin Laden is a boogeyman, useful for achieving a level of domestic control long held in check by the protections for civil liberties and privacy inherent in the American Constitution, but definitely in the way when it comes to attracting investment from Arab countries flush with oil money. Having scared Congress into blessing most of its foreign and domestic initiatives in the name of security, the administration is now forced to wink as it hauls out Homeland Security chief Michael Chertoff, who retains his position despite the disastrous handling of Katrina, to "reassure" us on Meet the Press Sunday, “We’ve built in, and we will build in safeguards to make sure that these kinds of things don’t happen. And, you know, this is part of the balancing of security, which is our paramount concern, with the need to still maintain a real robust global trading environment.”

# AT: TRADE

## Dredging Now

#### **Port of Savannah has already gotten approval and money so that it can be dredged**

Associated Press for the AJC 12 (Feb 8, “Feds put $2.5M more toward Savannah River dredging”, <http://www.ajc.com/news/feds-put-2-5m-1338831.html>, ML)

The agency overseeing plans to deepen the river channel to the Port of Savannah announced Wednesday it will funnel an additional $2.5 million in federal funding toward pre-construction planning, which Georgia port officials said should help keep the projected on target for completion by 2016. Opting not to play favorites between two shipping rivals, federal officials announced plans to give the same amount of money to Charleston, S.C., for studying whether a similar port expansion is feasible there. Both Georgia and South Carolina are scrambling to deepen their harbors to accommodate supersize cargo ships expected along the East Coast after the Panama Canal completes a major expansion in 2014. The Savannah project is years ahead. South Carolina lawmakers are trying to stop deepening of the Savannah River, which the states share, saying the environmental damage would be unacceptable. Regardless, port officials in both states put aside the bickering between the states Wednesday as they praised the latest infusion of cash from Washington, where the banning of earmark spending made port funding all but impossible to get last year. "The credit for this important new funding goes to Georgia's delegation in Washington and other congressional leaders, whose efforts will move this project forward in a significant way," said Curtis Foltz, executive director of the Georgia Ports Authority. Georgia got its money from $741 million in discretionary spending the Army Corps had available for navigation projects. South Carolina's funding came from a $460 million account Congress created late last year to allow unfunded port projects to get money based on merit. Joyce McDonald, a spokeswoman for the Army Corps of Engineers in Savannah, said the $2.5 million for Georgia — along with $588,000 that President Barack Obama had already requested — will go toward detailed engineering plans both for dredging the river and mitigating environmental damage.

#### Miami looking to have ports dredged

Port Miami 10 (“Deep Dredge Project”, <http://www.miamidade.gov/portofmiami/deep_dredge.asp>, ML)

Governor Rick Scott asked the Department of Transportation to allocate $77 million to the Port of Miami to deepen the channel to minus 50 feet so larger ships can gain access to the port. The Port’s Deep Dredge project is timed to coincide with the opening of an expanded Panama Canal in 2014, which will allow a new generation of larger cargo vessels to pass through the Canal. We value the state’s recognition of the important role the Port of Miami plays in South Florida’s economy. As the second largest economic engine in Miami-Dade County, the Port supports more than 176,000 jobs. Governor Scott directed the Florida Department of Transportation to amend their work plan to include $77 million for the dredging project. “This is the type of infrastructure project that will pay permanent, long-term dividends, and provide a solid return on investment for Florida’s taxpayers,” said Mayor Alvarez. The Port of Miami dredge project is expected to result in more than 30,000 new jobs for the region in the coming years. Once the port is dredged to a depth of 50 feet, larger, “New Panamax” ships can load and unload cargo there, enabling the Port of Miami to become a “first port of call” for ships coming through the expanded Panama Canal in 2014. “This is a solid first step toward enhancing Florida’s infrastructure and getting our state ready for a new generation of international trade with South America and beyond,” said Governor Scott. There are a number of worthy infrastructure projects that deserve our attention, and as Floridians, we know best where our resources should be focused.”

#### Oakland already taking steps to dredge there ports

Port of Oakland 12 (“50 Foot Dredging Project”, <http://portofoakland.com/portnyou/50ftdred.asp>, ML)

The U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency expects the volume of imported cargo flowing through the nation’s ports to triple by 2020. The Port of Oakland, as the fourth busiest container port in the country, plays a crucial role as a major international gateway to our nation’s complex trade and transportation infrastructure systems. Thus, dredging at the Port is vitally needed to enhance the nation’s overall shipping capacity.

However, the Oakland seaport’s existing harbor channels, with a draft of –46 feet, can no longer adequately accommodate the latest generation of container vessels. These larger ships, with their expanded capacity, help create economies of scale, which translates into greater shipping efficiency and reduced costs for businesses. The Port of Oakland must therefore, finish deepening its harbors to –50 feet in a timely manner or risk container traffic diversion to Canada and Mexico, thus raising costs to shippers.

Congruently, the benefits of the –50 Foot Project reach far beyond cost-savings and improved efficiency for businesses nationwide. As the channels are deepened, nearly 100% of the resulting dredge material is being used for wetland restoration, habitat enhancement, and upland use within the San Francisco Bay. Hence, this project is not only improving national shipping capacity but also helping to restore and protect the local environment.

The advantages of this project are readily apparent locally, regionally and nationally. In fact, the 11:1 benefit to cost ratio that the -50 Foot Project continues to enjoy has placed it amongst the highest in the nation for all ongoing projects. The President has listed the -50 Foot Project as a "Priority Project;” due to its tremendous success, the project’s previous ranking amongst the nine highest national projects for priority federal funding has been elevated to within the top six. The project has also been placed amongst the top two deep dredging navigation projects nationwide.

This year, the Corps reported that it has the capability to expend $60 million for the –50 Foot Project in FY 2008. We are pleased to report that as the project nears the final stages of completion, this year with Congressional appropriation of the full $60 million we anticipate reaching the -50 foot mark for both of our channels. Meanwhile, taking into consideration current federal budget constraints, the $42 million earmarked for allocation in the President's proposed FY ’08 budget, while less than requested, still represents a significant portion of the Corps funding capability for this year. However, we must reiterate that, with the full appropriation of the requested $60 million, the project will achieve -50 foot drafts in both channels and be substantially complete.

#### **East coast ports are all in the process of dredging and are determined to reach their goals**

Port Strategy 12 (Jun 14, “Eggs in one basket”, <http://www.portstrategy.com/features101/area-survey/north-america/us-east-coast/a-canal-too-far2>, ML)

Dredging and transhipment are bumping heads in the heady rush along the East Coast to capitalise on the supposed bounty of the Panama Canal after 2014. Ports are clamouring and competing for 14.6 and 15.2 metres main channel drafts for 13,000 teu vessels while the canal is talking of transhipment, probably in the 6,000-8,000 teu range. One indication is the construction of the new terminal at Colon (PCCP), at the Atlantic end of the canal, with a capacity of 2m teu a year. John Carver, of Jones Lang LaSalle, the development advisor, says: “Too many seaports do not currently, and may never, have the harbour depth required to take advantage of the trend towards post and super-post panamax vessels." He sees the terminal as "further enhancing Panama’s already strategic designation as one of the world’s primary global transshipment hubs. "We expect transhipment terminals such as PCCP to play an integral role in the long-term success of the Panama Canal,” says Ricardo Quijano, Panama's Minister of Commerce and Industry. Contrast this with East Coast expansion: Global at Bayonne, New Jersey building a terminal capable of handling 1.7m teu a year, with a 50 foot draft. The Port Authority of New York/New Jersey is raising the height of the Bayonne Bridge to cope with super post-panamax vessels. Ports America has deepened its Baltimore terminal berth to 15.2 metres, while the port's main channel is also 15.2 metres. Charleston is determined to go down to 50 feet. Savannah is being dredged to 47 feet (down from the 48 feet originally wanted), and is in a vicious political fight with neighbour Charleston, In turn, Charleston is engaged in its own political infighting, with the governor pushing for the state to help pay for a joint terminal project with Savannah, while state leaders are vehemently opposed. Miami is going deeper to 15.2 metres and aiming to double container capacity within the next few years.

#### States are funding projects for Panama via dredging

Vock 12 (Daniel, 2/6/12, http://nyaltnews.com/2012/02/eastern-ports-scramble-to-get-ready-for-new-panama-canal-era-4/5602/, accessed on 6/29/12, EW)

Today, Norfolk, Virginia, is the only East Coast port that could handle the fully laden vessels that soon might sail through Panama. A few Atlantic ports have handled the larger vessels, which arrive from Europe or through the Suez Canal, but only by waiting for the right tides or servicing ships that are not fully loaded. New York, Baltimore and Miami are the next in line with improvements that will let them unload fully loaded vessels from the new class of megaships. But it could take years. The process of deepening a harbor depends on numerous approvals from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers before dredging can even begin. And federal approval is no guarantee of quick action. For example, work on deepening the Port of Miami, which secured a federal blessing for dredging, is now on hold because of litigation over the project’s potential environmental impact. In the New York area, it is the height of the new ships, rather than their depth, that poses a major problem. Right now, an 80-year-old bridge between Staten Island and New Jersey has such a low clearance that container ships on their way to Newark or Elizabeth sometimes have to wait for low tide before they can pass under. Things would only get worse when ships with containers stacked nine high, rather than the current six, start coming through the Panama Canal. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey wants to solve that problem by raising the roadway on the Bayonne Bridge by some six stories, which would give ships a clearance of 215 feet, but this work would not be completed until long after the bigger ships can traverse the Panama Canal. “These are not things that happen in a couple months,” says Sujit CanagaRetna, of the Council of State Governments. “In a way, we are coming to the party late. But it’s better late than never. Policymakers in all these states realize it’s critical for the continued expansion of the economy.” Western competition Port consultant John Martin says the idea that the Panama Canal will instantly bring more business to the Eastern Seaboard is an “urban myth.” Whatever business the Atlantic ports could easily take from Los Angeles and other Pacific cities has already moved east, he says. A 10-day labor lockout on the West Coast nearly a decade ago forced shippers to reconsider their heavy reliance on the Pacific ports. Since then, the haulers increasingly have sent more business east, especially when it comes to cargo destined for or produced by East Coast markets. Because of this, a sizable increase in Eastern port business has already happened. The competition is now over goods going to or arriving from the interior. West Coast ports and the railroads that serve them doubt the Panama Canal expansion will siphon off that business. “Time-sensitive cargo will typically flow through the West Coast ports which have the infrastructure and technology to process and disperse freight via rail with elevated efficiency, and that doesn’t look like it will change,” says Aaron Hunt, a spokesman for Union Pacific railroad. Krista York-Woolley, a spokesperson for the BNSF railroad system, echoes that sentiment. She says the larger canal is a “positive step toward enhancing world trade” but it would not, on its own, move trade eastward. Western port officials say they are well-positioned to handle new Eastern competition. The two ports in California’s San Pedro Bay (Los Angeles and Long Beach) handle roughly 100 freight trains a day, a volume no other U.S port comes close to approaching, says spokesman Phillip Sanfield. At seven of the port’s eight terminals, trains can be loaded directly from container ships, cutting transit times for goods headed into the nation’s interior. Los Angeles’ massive head start in infrastructure brings down shippers’ total costs, argues Kraig Jondle, the port’s director of business and trade development. While shipping freight by water is generally cheaper than moving it by rail, Jondle says the extra time it takes to get goods through the East Coast makes Eastern routes more expensive. For example, he says, moving cargo from Shanghai to Chicago by using New York’s port would take 28 days, with all but two at sea. By comparison, moving the same freight through Los Angeles would only take 18 days — 13 at sea and five on a train. A changing industry Regardless, Eastern ports have a lot at stake with their expansion plans. They may not gain as much business as they hope, but without deeper harbors and cranes that can service bigger ships, they will lose future business. Shippers are using bigger and bigger vessels, and ports that cannot handle the larger craft risk being relegated to second-tier status. The shipping industry may be moving toward a system where increasingly large ships service a decreasing number of ports, CanagaRetna says. That would mean that East Coast ports would be serviced from a hub somewhere in the Caribbean on “feeder” routes. Whether large ships stop in the Caribbean first or head straight to the United States, the contest among the Eastern ports is about which ones will be the first American ports of call for the new vessels. It is those first destinations that get the most cargo and the most economic benefit.

## Dredging bad – Oil Spills

#### Dredging has already caused oil spills

Jacksonville Business Journal 08 (Jacksonville Business Journal, May 23, 2008,qualified business journal, “Dredging causes oil spill in St. Johns River” <http://www.bizjournals.com/jacksonville/stories/2008/05/19/daily42.html>) MB

A dredge barge owned by [Misener Marine](http://spillcontainment.wordpress.com/jacksonville/gen/Misener_Marine_9C0F897E6ECF4A6C86B89F408180336C.html) caused an oil spill Thursday morning in the Metro Park Marina in Downtown. While driving pylons into the river bottom it struck a six-inch thick power line filled with insulating oil and copper wire, according to a U.S. Coast Guard news release. Cleanup crews contained the spill and established three forms of containment around the leak with a skimming system to remove the oil from the water as it leaks from the cable. JEA, which owns the cable, reported the spill to the Coast Guard at 9:39 a.m. Thursday. The three-mile long cable is filled with about 6,000 gallons of insulating oil. JEA shut down the pumping station that supplies oil to the cable, but all the oil in the cable would need to be bled out before repairs on the cable are made, the Coast Guard said. In the meantime, booming and skimming systems are expected to prevent oil from spreading. The Coast Guard is overseeing the cleanup and environmental assessment with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. The agencies have not received reports of affected wildlife, although there was isolated oil sheening near the point of the cable that is leaking. The Coast Guard has approved the containment and clean-up plan and will monitor its progress. The cleanup is expected to take about two days. The Coast Guard shut down some waterway traffic, although the channel remained opened to regular boating. Metro Park Marina had already been closed for dredging.

## Dredging bad – Environment

#### Dredging can stir up hazardous material where dredged.

Bailey et al. 04 (Diane Bailey Thomas Plenys Gina M. Solomon, M.D., M.P.H. Todd R. Campbell, M.E.M., M.P.P. Gail Ruderman Feuer Julie Masters Bella Tonkonogy, all part of the NRDC research team, HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF PORT POLLUTION, June 28, 2012)

Ports are routinely dredged to remove sediment that builds up in ship channels from erosion and silt deposition, as well as to create new channels and deepen existing ones. Each year, more than 300 million cubic yards of sediment in waterways and harbors is dredged to allow ships to pass through.91 The total amount of these annual “dredge spoils” is enough to cover a four-lane highway with a 20-foot mound from New York City to Los Angeles.92 Much of this sediment is disposed of in open water or near shore, but some may also be used as fill in various land-based projects. About 5 to 10 percent of dredged sediment is contaminated with toxics, including polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury and other heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic VOCs (PAHs), and pesticides, all of which can cause water contamination and complicate sediment disposal.93 Dredging may increase water turbidity (cloudiness), harm habitat, and disturb or kill threatened and endangered species. It may also risk stirring up and releasing buried contaminants. Dredging performed by the Port of Miami in the early 1990s raised concerns over the destruction of seagrasses and the harbor’s rocky seabeds, or “hardbottom.” Post-dredging hardbottom restoration was fairly effective, but measures introduced to mitigate the loss of seagrass were far less so, successfully replacing only 10 percent of lost seagrass and robbing manatees and sea turtles of an important food source and habitat.94,95 The dangers of dredging have taken on even greater significance in recent years, with the growing popularity of post-Panamax vessels, which require channel depths of 45 to 50 feet.96 In a scramble to remain competitive, many ports are being redredged to deepen or widen their shipping channels. The ports of Charleston, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Miami, Savannah, New York/New Jersey, and Houston are all involved in such projects, creating millions of extra cubic yards of dredge material that will need to be disposed of somewhere.97 Alternative methods of disposal of dredged sediment are available. They include construction and industrial uses, fill material for parking lots and roads, landfill cover, shoreline erosion control, artificial reef material, and wetland creation and restoration. The Port of Houston has built marshes and a wildlife habitat with its ship channel sediment, more than 16 million cubic yards of which has been removed since 1998. Over the course of the ongoing project, about 4,250 acres of intertidal salt marsh and a six-acre bird nesting and habitat island are being constructed, and 40 acres of an eroded island are being restored in the largest effort of its kind in the country.98 The sediment used for the project was deemed nontoxic by a coalition of government agencies called the Beneficial Uses Group. Many organizations are advocating for the beneficial reuse of dredge material, as long as it is not contaminated.99 A number of groups are exploring further alternative methods for disposal of contaminated dredge.10

#### Hazardous materials are spread further around during dredging.

Sharda 11(Sharda, Sharda is a freelance writer with a post graduation in journalism and mass communication, Effects of Dredging on the Marine Environment, http://www.marineinsight.com/marine/environment/effects-of-dredging-on-the-marine-environment/, June 28, 2012)

**Dredging is an activity that is required to be carried out to remove the unwanted deposits from water pathways. But even though the activity aids regularity in marine traffic, it is not without its disadvantages. Dredging possess a huge threat to the marine environment and is required to be carried out quite carefully aided only with the help of the right dredgers and dredges.** Since the main focus of dredging is to remove the deposits submerged under, the environmental effects of the process also revolve around this focal point. Some of the effects of dredging can be enumerated as follows: **The soil deposits in any water-body have a certain pre-disposed composition. Through dredging this composition is altered Because of the said alteration, the existing habitat of creatures and organisms that depends on the original composition of the soil dies out due to the unfavourableness of the changes caused.** The turbidness of the soil under the water also changes because of this alteration in the underwater soil composition. This poses problems by way of creation of newer and harmful organisms, transferring of unwanted organisms to other parts in the water-body leading to a wider spread of contamination and organic processes by way of release of extra and unwanted nutrients. **The turbidness also causes the already existing contaminations to spread further into the water-body which also affects the marine environment adversely** However, all the points mentioned above pertain to dredging of water-bodies with clean soil deposits. But sometimes, dredging is also carried out to weed out the contaminations present in the soil. **The effects and the biodiversity impacts of contaminated deposit-dredging are: The dredging of contaminated materials will cause the harmful particles to regroup and spread to a larger area in the water body** Since dredging loosens up the soil, those substances which were previously held fast to the contaminated deposit will find their way into the water and the un-dredged soil. If these substances are harmful organisms then they will cause a substantial degradation to the environment even after dredging the area **The water could get polluted because of the soil particles mixing with the water. And while this does not have huge biodiversity impacts, it is indeed an unwanted side-effect of dredging** contribution to put an end to the negative environmental effects of dredging.

#### Unconfined disposal of dredged material leads to environmental problems.

Van Dolah et al. 12(Robert F. van Dolah, Dale R. Calder and David M. Knott, All part of the Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation, Effects of Dredging and Open-Water Disposal, June 28, 2012)

**Dredging and disposal of dredged material constitutes one of the most important problems in coastal zone management. Over 300 million m3 of materials are dredged annually to maintain prescribed channel depths in waterways of the United States** (Lee 1976). **Published studies** on the ecological effects of dredging and disposal of dredged material, reviewed by Saila et al. (1972), Windom (1976), Morton (1977), and others, **indicate that initial impacts vary from minimal to severe, and that disruptions range from short to long term.** Alternative methods for disposal of dredged material are being explored in many areas because the number of diked spoil disposal areas is limited. One alternative to the use of costly diked disposal areas, which often destroy valuable wetlands and provide breeding grounds for insect pests, is open water disposal. Yet, **the biological impacts of such unconfined disposal are inadequately known, particularly in the estuarine environment. Windom (1976) noted that the effects of unconfined disposal vary depending upon factors such as the volume and sediment characteristics of the material discharged at a given site;** water depths, volumes, and hydrography of the disposal area; the time of year; the types of organisms inhabiting the disposal area; the similarity of sediments in dredged and disposal areas; the amount of resulting turbidity; and the presence of toxic substances in the dredged material. Our study was initiated to assess the impact of dredging and open water disposal of dredged material on macrobenthic communities inhabiting an estuarine system in South Carolina. The primary goal of the investigation was to determine whether open water disposal represented a satisfactory environmental alternative to diking and filling at this location.

#### Dredging creates silt clouds killing plants fish and phytoplankton

Talley 08’(Wayne K. Talley Professor Talley received his Ph.D. from the University of Kentucky. He is the Executive Director of the International Maritime, Ports and Logistics Management Institute and holds the designations of Eminent Scholar and the Frederick W. Beazley Professor of Economics., “Port Pollution and Abatement Policies”, 2/22/08’, NC)

Dredging is the process of removing underwater sediments. A special type of equipment, a dredger, is used to excavate the sediments. Dredging may be undertaken to: create greater water depths, recover valuable materials and remove harmful toxins. Port waterways, harbors and water bottoms at marine terminal berths are often dredged to create greater water depths that are needed for the maritime navigation of larger vessels. A side benefit of dredging is that the dredged material may be used to create new land on which a new marine terminal can be built. Negative environmental impacts from dredging can arise from the dredging operation itself and in the disposal of dredged materials, e.g., in the creation of turbidity plume and other harmful effects to the ecosystem.

Turbidity plume are elevated suspended solids that emanate when waterways are dredged. Sediments raised by dredging can bury plants near (or away from) the dredged site, thereby reducing their density. The reduction in plant density, in turn, can erode bottom sediments and increase silt. The distance the plume moves from the point of origin is dependent upon the scope of dredging, waterway currents, the nature of the plume, and the preventive measures employed by the dredging contractor. Large quantities of turbidity can affect fish species by clogging gills, abrading sensitive epithelial tissues, and reducing light penetration. Light reduction reduces the photosynthesis of phytoplankton and water oxygen.

A vessel may intentionally or accidentally spill oil into a port harbor. Intentional spillage is typically operational dumping that involves ballast water -- e.g., after discharging its oil cargo, a tanker vessel takes on ballast water into its cargo tanks to ensure stability on the return trip, but then dumps the dirty ballast in-oil-water mixture on or before arrival at the destination port. Accidental spillage may result from a vessel accident or during oil transfers, i.e., during the loading and unloading of oil cargo and fueling while in port. Vessels may spill oil from oil-cargo tanks as well as from fuel tanks.

The environmental impact of a vessel oil spill will depend on the speed of recovery and the type of the oil that is spilt. The speed of oil recovery is affected by: the type of oil spilt, the climate and season of year, and the physical and biological characteristics of the area. Light oils, e.g., gasoline, are more toxic than heavy oils and thus more likely to penetrate and disrupt cell membranes of organisms. However, heavy oils that spill on shorelines may blanket organisms and kill them from the physical effect of smothering rather than from toxic effects.

#### Port construction bad for environment- Laundry list

Clayton 6/28/12’ (DTN Ag Policy Editor Chris Clayton joined DTN in October 2005 after working more than seven years for the Omaha World-Herald, his agricultural coverage uncovered a fraud case the FBI called the largest cattle scam in U.S. history, <http://www.dtnprogressivefarmer.com/dtnag/common/link.do?symbolicName=/ag/blogs/template1&blogHandle=policy&blogEntryId=8a82c0bc37ec102e013832dd84cf02c8&showCommentsOverride=false>, 6/28/12, NC)

Everybody wants to go to 50 feet. In the battle amongst U.S. port cities along the East and Gulf Coasts, there is a rush to see which major ports can make a 50-foot depth to dock the larger post-Panamax cargo ships that will move through the Panama Canal, possibly as early as August 2014 if the Panamanians can hit their desired completion date. Ahem, but DTN wrote a simply marvelous series nearly 18 months ago on the Panamanian boom and expected shift in shipping routes once the new, super-sized lock opens. But you have to have the capability to handle those mega cargo ships to get the millions or possibly billions of dollars of trade, not to mention the accompanying shipping, rail, highway and river infrastructure jobs that come with handling those mega cargo ships at your terminal. Your port has to handle a ship's 50-foot draft, or get awfully close to it.

Battles over port expansions within the ranks of Congress prompted lawmakers to ask the U.S. Army's Corps of Engineers for a report examining some of the various factors to consider. Cost, capability of making the draft, other infrastructures, potential for expanded rail and interstate capacity are just some of the factors. Then there are environmental challenges, if you want to consider them, such as increases in greenhouse-gas emissions. "Modernization will need to be accompanied by justified mitigation to avoid further 1) degraded air and water quality that threatens human health and safety, especially of low-income and minority groups; 2) loss of important natural and cultural heritage found in parks, refuges, wetlands and scarce species; or 3) loss of recreational, commercial and other economically important resources."

#### Ports are heavy polluters with unchecked pollution that leads to local respiratory illness, cancer, smog, and water, air, light, and noise pollution that will only increase with the expansion

NRDC, 04’ (Natural Resources Defense Counsel, <http://www.nrdc.org/air/pollution/ports1/contents.asp>, Harboring Pollution, March, 2004, NC)

The study by the Corps gives a good summary of trends in population, infrastructure capacity of roads, rail and waterways, as well as trade across the country Marine ports in the United States are major hubs of economic activity and major sources of pollution. Enormous ships with engines running on the dirtiest fuel available, thousands of diesel truck visits per day, mile-long trains with diesel locomotives hauling cargo, and other polluting equipment and activities at marine ports cause an array of environmental impacts that can seriously affect local communities and the environment. These impacts range from increased risk of illness, such as respiratory disease or cancer, to increases in regional smog, contamination of water, and the blight of local communities and public lands. Most major ports in the United States are undergoing expansions to accommodate even greater cargo volumes. The growth of international trade has resulted in corresponding rapid growth in the amount of goods being shipped by sea. Despite the enormous growth within the marine shipping sector, most pollution prevention efforts at the local, state, and federal levels have focused on other pollution sources, while the environmental impacts of ports have grown. Marine ports are now among the most poorly regulated sources of pollution in the United States. The result is that most U.S. ports are heavy polluters, releasing largely unchecked quantities of health-endangering air and water pollution, causing noise and light pollution that disrupts nearby communities, and harming marine habitats.

## Post-Panamax = Pollution

#### Post-Panamax ships run on dirtest fossil fuel – cause massive pollution

Bailey et al 04 (Diane Bailey, Thomas Plenys, Gina M. Solomon, Todd R. Campbell, Gail Ruderman, Feuer, Julie Masters, Bella Tonkonogy, August 2004, The Natural Resources Defense Council is a national, nonprofit environmental organization with environmental specialists. “Harboring Pollution Strategies To Clean Up U.S. Ports” <http://www.nrdc.org/air/pollution/ports/ports2.pdf>) MB

The new generation of container ships, dubbed post-Panamax because they cannot fit through the Panama Canal, are longer than three and a half football fields, or longer than the Eiffel Tower is tall. These vessels produce great quantities of polluting emissions, both because of the power required to propel their enormous mass and because they tend to run on the dirtiest grade of diesel fuel available, called “bunker” or “residual” fuel.58 Other vessels contributing to pollution at U.S. ports include tanker and cruise ships and such harbor craft as tugboats and towboats. All are large consumers of diesel fuel. In the Los Angeles area, oceangoing ships, harbor tugs, and commercial boats emit twice as many smog-forming emissions as all of the area’s power plants combined.59 Cargo-Handling Equipment Every day, thousands of railcar-size container units arrive by ship at U.S. ports, laden with a broad range of imported products. Once on dry land, the containers are then transferred to rail and truck and carried to market. These containers, and the ships that carry them, require special cargo-handling equipment at ports. Primarily powered by diesel fuel, the equipment is used to load and unload containers from ships, locomotives, and trucks, as well as to shuttle those containers around container yards for storage. Cargo-handling equipment includes large gantry cranes used to load and unload ships, yard trucks that shuttle containers, and various others called top-picks, side-picks, straddle carriers, and forklifts. Regulation of off-road diesel equipment lags a few decades behind the regulation of on-road diesel trucks and buses.60 In fact, emission standards for heavy diesel equipment were not established until 1996 and are much weaker than on-road standards.61 Indeed, by 2007, new heavy diesel equipment will create 15 times more PM and NOx pollution than new highway trucks or buses.62 The Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) recently adopted off-road diesel rule will significantly strengthen standards for off-road equipment. However, the rule will be phased in from 2008 to as late as 2015 and will cover only new equipment. Container operations have considerably larger pollution effects than other types of cargo-handling operations at ports. At the Port of Houston, for example, only 42 per- cent of equipment is associated with container operations, but that equipment accounts for approximately 70 percent of NOx emissions from on-site port activities.63 The significant emissions from container-handling equipment is problematic at ports such as Los Angeles and Long Beach, where more than 90 percent of the roughly 2,000 pieces of equipment are associated with container operations.

## Invasive Species

#### Aff results in the introduction of invasive species, and dumping of gray water, garbage, sewage, and TBT -“ the most toxic substance ever deliberately introduced into the marine environment”

Talley 08’(Wayne K. Talley Professor Talley received his Ph.D. from the University of Kentucky. He is the Executive Director of the International Maritime, Ports and Logistics Management Institute and holds the designations of Eminent Scholar and the Frederick W. Beazley Professor of Economics., “Port Pollution and Abatement Policies”, 2/22/08’, NC)

Vessel waste includes gray water (drainage from laundry, bath, shower, dishwasher and washbasin drains), garbage (food waste and disposable items such as utensils, plastic cups, bottles, and tins) and sewage (water containing fecal matter and urine). Gray water may contain high levels of bacteria that are harmful to marine ecosystems. The disposal of food waste has fewer environmental concerns than the disposal of metals and plastics, since organic matter is easier to biodegrade. Waste disposal by cruise ships is especially a concern given that they have greater amounts of waste relative to that of other types of vessels.

Vessels while in port to take on and discharge water in order to ballast (or stabilize) the vessel. When cargo is removed, the ballast water may be pumped into specially designed (or cargo) tanks to compensate for the variance in cargo weight distributions. When cargo is loaded, the ballast water is released. Ships worldwide transfer three to five billion tons of ballast water each year (Staff, 2006).

When ballast water is taken in by vessels, microscopic organisms and the larval stages of larger organisms indigenous to the region may also be found in this water. These organisms can then transported to other regions (beyond their natural habitat), where they are released with the discharge of ballast water. The discharged aquatic life may then thrive and disrupt the local ecological system. When there are no natural predators, the non-indigenous aquatic life may alter or destroy the natural marine ecosystem.

Fouling is the unwanted growth of biological material, e.g., algae and barnacles, on the water-immersed surfaces of vessels. When vessel hulls are clean and smooth, i.e., free of fouling, vessels consume less fuel and travel faster through water. Fouling can be physically removed from vessels when they are in dry dock or future fouling can be reduced by applying anti-fouling coatings to vessel hulls. Prior to the 1960s anti-fouling coatings such as lime and arsenical and mercurial compounds were applied to vessel hulls. Beginning in the 1960s anti-fouling paints with metallic compounds, e.g., organotin compounds such as tributyltin (TBT), were painted on vessel hulls. By the 1970s TBT was painted on the hulls of most ocean vessels.

Although anti-fouling TBT paints are effective in killing sea life attached to vessel hulls, they also kill and caused genetic alterations in other sea life, e.g., causing shell deformations in oysters. TBT is the most toxic substance ever deliberately introduced into the marine environment (Evans, Leksono and McKinnell, 1995). Further, it persists in the marine environment. “The half-life of TBT sediments is 10-15 years” (O’Mahony, 2006). High concentrations of TBT have been found in the world’s coastal waters, especially in port harbor waters where vessels are concentrated.

#### While increasing the number of ships entering our ports the RAMP act does nothing to fund APHIS –Responsible for controlling invasive species entering through ports

CRS 02’ (Congressional report, “Invasive Non-Native Species: Background and Issues for Congress”, <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RL30123.pdf>, November, 2002, NC)

The agency conducts preclearance activities, treatment programs, detection surveys, and eradication efforts to prevent the introduction of specific foreign pests that would threaten U.S. agricultural production and natural ecosystems through an agriculture quarantine inspection program conducted at 178 U.S. ports of entry. These foreign pests include insects, plant and animal diseases, mollusks, mites, and invasive plants. Domestically, APHIS cooperates with federal and state agencies as well as non-governmental organizations to detect, contain, and eradicate infestations of selected foreign pests before they become well-established and spread. APHIS may use integrated management approaches including biological control to address widespread insects, diseases, and selected weeds that cannot otherwise be eradicated. 69 The majority of APHIS’s relatively small budget for non-native species concerns is devoted to border control, with relatively little expended for treatment of infested sites. 70

#### Ballast water entering US ports brings with it invasive species

CRS 02’ (Congressional report, “Invasive Non-Native Species: Background and Issues for Congress”, <http://www.nationalaglawcenter.org/assets/crs/RL30123.pdf>, November, 2002, NC)

There are a few instances of regulation and prevention by pathway. Among the most comprehensive has been NANPCA, as amended by NISA. Its focus is on ballast water as a risk to saltwater and freshwater ports, bays, and estuaries. Its goals put prevention on an equal or higher footing with control of species that are already established. It requires the participation of several federal agencies, promotes research, and implements regulations on the mid-ocean exchange of ballast water and various other measures to prevent non-natives from entering U.S. ports. Similarly, APHIS inspects imported agricultural products for pests. Pathway approaches also exist at the state level. Minnesota, for example, prohibits the transport of nearly all aquatic plants (native or non-native) and of zebra mussels on public roads. Depending on the particular offense, fines range from $50 to $500. 100 Pathway approaches do not require lists of organisms to be implemented or effective, and may even block the entry of species whose very existence is unknown to science.

## SQuo Solves

#### West coast ports solve – there is no economic boost from the plan

South East Shipping News 5/2/12 (“Excellent Analysis of US Ports and Panama Canal Relationships”)

But Jean-Paul Rodrigue, a transportation scholar at Hofstra University, said it didn’t make sense for Charleston, Savannah and Miami all to have deeper harbors without more business. “You need a lot of volume,” he said. “It’s not certain those ports can generate that level of volume.” Several factors make a significant shift from one coast to the other unlikely. The first is speed. It’s less expensive for a ship to go the all-water route to the East Coast instead of docking on the West Coast and offloading containers onto trucks or trains, but it also takes at least a week longer. For consumer electronics and other high-end goods that need to get to store shelves quickly, retailers will pay more for faster transit times. Second, ports in Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland, Calif., and Seattle and Tacoma, Wash., are deep enough to handle the bigger ships. They have warehousing space for containers, and they have highly developed rail connections to the Midwest and Southeast. “Why not just unload all of it here?” asked Art Wong, a spokesman for the Port of Long Beach, which is second only in volume to Los Angeles in the U.S. “We hope to maintain those kinds of advantages.” Third, the Panama Canal authority must pay off billions of dollars in construction costs, and it’s unknown how much the canal will charge the bigger ships in tolls. Last, the Suez Canal can handle any size ship, and some cargo ships bound from Asia to North America already use it. “Depending on what Panama Canal charges in fees, it still makes economic sense to hit LA-Long Beach and be in Kansas City, Chicago or Louisville pretty darn quick,” said Charles Clowdis, the managing director of North American markets at economic forecaster IHS Global Insight. Rodrigue said the Atlantic states were using the canal as a rationale for their own port expansion plans. “If I was a port authority, I would be doing the same thing,” he said. “They want to do what they perceive is best for their own ports.”

Alternative routes solve free trade

Prince 12 (Theodore, Supply Chain Quarterly, “Panama Canal Expansion: Game Changer, or More of the Same?”)

One of those options is to use the Suez Canal. Suez has no physical constraints on ship size, thus it is possible for carriers to deploy larger vessels on this route than is currently possible through the Panama Canal—and, of course, enjoy the resulting linehaul savings.[6](http://www.supplychainquarterly.com/topics/Global/201201panama/" \l "fn6) A major consideration in the future will be whether industrial production will migrate from North Asia to Southeast Asia and the Indian subcontinent. If production is located "west of Singapore," then the Suez Canal to the USEC will be the preferred route. However, if the source market is "east of Singapore"—especially China—there will be no transit-time advantage to using Suez.

## USACE Bad

#### **USACE has history of high wasteful spending**

Coburn 11 (Tom, OK US Senator, http://www.coburn.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/files/serve?File\_id=f8447710-cd35-4a92-9029-4ae52ca464ec, accessed on 6/29/12, EW)

The Corps of Engineers has a long history of wasteful, low priority, and questionable spending. For example, a 2004 joint report by the National Wildlife Federation and Taxpayers for Common Sense identified 29 wasteful Corps projects that would cost the federal government $12 billion. 1 The report stated, ―The fact that damaging and wasteful proposals continue to receive federal funds and are proceeding is a dramatic testament to the need to overhaul the Corps of Engineers.‖ 2 Additionally, Congress has refused to prioritize the completion of ongoing Corps of Engineers projects before beginning new projects. This behavior has resulted in a construction backlog ranging from $61 billion to more than $80 billion. 3 This backlog has had a negative impact on our economy and the environment. According the Office of Management and Budget, ―The Corps‘ enormous backlog of ongoing civil works construction represents a significant source of unrealized economic and environmental benefits. The size of the backlog and the amount of funding necessary to complete it have grown in recent years, largely because of the continued addition of new projects to the Corps workload each year… This growth trend in the construction backlog unfairly penalizes both taxpayers and project sponsors.‖ 4 Congress should stop authorizing new Corps of Engineers projects until it addresses its $80 billion backlog. Congress also needs an automatic process to trim the Corps‘ to-do list by systematically de-authorizing outdated or unfunded projects. Current laws for unfunded projects can easily be circumvented by Congress or the agency spending a small amount on an updated study or evaluation to keep the project authorized. 5 The National Academy of Public Administration also found the Corps is unable to adequately address national priorities because of parochialism in Congress. ―Annual appropriations for specific, individual projects, or project segments, are not conducive to efficient and effective completion of major infrastructure systems; they often do not adequately support system-wide performance improvements… The present project-by-project approach, with lagging project completions, on-again-off-again construction schedules, and disappointed cost-share sponsors that do not know what they can count on, is not the best path to continued national prosperity.‖ 6 With the current earmark ban in the 112 th Congress, this is a rare opportunity for Congress to restructure the federal government‘s role in civilian works. Congress must clearly and more narrowly define the central mission of the Corps of Engineers to allow it to focus on meeting the nation‘s most urgent needs. The agency should also be removed from projects or studies that overlap other federal agencies, or supplant state, local, or private functions. Terminate Low Priority Corps Construction Projects – Ten Year Savings: $2.38 billion The Corps of Engineers currently employs a very low threshold for determining what projects it undertakes, only requiring that the expected total benefit of a project (including reduction of costs to government and private entities, and environmental, recreational, and other benefits) is equal to or greater to the cost of the project (this includes the fiscal, environmental, and other costs). President Obama recommended eliminating hundreds of millions in unrequested funds Congress annually appropriates to the Corps of Engineers to construct low-priority projects, which would result in one year savings of $214 million. 7 Eliminate Water and Wastewater Treatment Projects – Ten Year Savings: $1.43 billion The White House and the Corps of Engineers have both concluded that the Corps‘ wastewater treatment projects are duplicative and outside of the scope of the Corps‗mission, yet Congress continues to fund these projects. The President‘s Fiscal Year 2010 budget stated, ―The Corps does not assess the economic and environmental costs and benefits of these water and wastewater treatment projects and, therefore, has no basis to determine the value of these projects to the Nation… Providing funding in the Corps of Engineers' budget for environmental infrastructure projects is not cost effective and duplicates funding for these types of projects in other Federal agencies, including the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture…‖ The elimination of these projects would result in one year savings of $129 million. 8 Given the backlog, it makes sense for Congress to prioritize only those projects that demonstrate a compelling need and cost-benefit ratio of more than 3:1."

#### USACE is ineffective, wasteful, mismanaged, laundry list of reasons

Chris 12 (Edwards, director of tax policy studies at Cato, senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee, Fiscal Future Commission of the National Academy of Sciences, 3/12, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/usace, accessed on 6/29/12, EW)

The Army Corps has built some impressive structures, such as the Washington Monument and the Panama Canal. But the agency's projects have been prone to large cost overruns, and they have often not produced the large benefits promised. Some projects have suffered from major failures, such as the levee system in New Orleans, while other projects have damaged the environment. These sorts of problems started in the 19th century. Melvin Dubnick notes that in the post–Civil War period, "the wastefulness and mismanagement of Corps' operations were the subject of many articles in the professional and popular press of the time, and a growing list of fiascoes was being used by the agency's enemies to challenge its effort to develop a more comprehensive civil works program.**"**31 In 1951 Arthur Maass wrote an influential book about the Army Corps, Muddy Waters, which detailed the agency's politically driven decisions and poor planning processes.32 In the forward to the book, former secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, said, "no more lawless or irresponsible federal group than the Corps of Army Engineers has ever attempted to operate in the United States, either inside or outside the law."33 The opinion of Ickes was harsh, but it reflected a common view that the Corps was outside of presidential control and working for special interests at the expense of the general public. A 1971 book by Arthur Morgan, Dams and other Disasters, was even more critical. The book rips into the Corps for its arrogant and damaging mismanagement. Morgan found that "there have been over the past 100 years consistent and disastrous failures by the Corps in public works areas . . . result[ing] in enormous and unnecessary costs to ecology [and] the taxpayer."34 Morgan was a former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and a highly distinguished engineer, who had worked on water resource issues for decades. In his book, he documents how the Corps—with a bullheaded mentality—consistently underestimated the costs of its projects, followed shoddy engineering practices, treated Native American tribes poorly, lied to the public, hid information, pursued environmentally damaging projects, and demonized its enemies in order to silence dissent. Some of these charges still ring true. The nation was reacquainted with the Corps' shoddy engineering with the tragic failure of the levees in New Orleans during Hurricane Katrina. In recent years, the Corps has hidden information from the public, and has been caught distorting economic analyses to justify wasteful projects. Because of its pro-construction mindset, the Corps continues to pursue projects that would damage the environment and produce limited economic benefits. In recent decades, for example, "the Corps has channelized dozens of rivers for barges that never arrived."35 These longstanding problems are the result both of the agency's pro-building culture and congressional politics. The ad hoc way that the agency's projects are funded creates further problems. New projects are typically authorized in Water Resources Development Acts, which are passed every few years. The last of such acts was enacted in 2007 over a veto by President George W. Bush.36 After authorization, each project included may or may not receive funding a year at a time in annual appropriations bills. The problem is that Congress has crammed far too many projects into the Corps' pipeline, with the result that progress on each project is slow and erratic. For example, Congress has authorized more than 400 municipal water and sewer projects for the Corps, with a total price tag of more than $5 billion. However, only about $140 million or so is actually appropriated for these projects each year.37 The slow progress of Corps' projects contrasts with private sector construction projects, which are built as quickly as possible to hold down costs. A Government Accountability Office report on the Corps found that "funding projects in increments hinders project efficiency by increasing costs and timelines."38 One Corps' official told the GAO, "this is one of the reasons that a civil works project takes 20 years to execute, instead of 3 if we were fully funded from the start."39 The Corps currently has a backlog of more than 1,000 feasibility studies and construction projects worth more than $80 billion that have been authorized but not funded.40 The Corps is an engineering and construction organization, and in our economy such activities are usually carried out by private businesses. The Corps has never been run like a private business—it doesn't have an efficient structure, it doesn't pursue the highest-return projects, and it doesn't construct projects quickly and efficiently. Former Senate majority leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) said the Corps is "one of the most incompetent and inept organizations in all the federal government."41 The good news is that we don't need a civilian Army Corps organization because most of its functions could be carried out by state and local governments and the private sector.

## California Econ DA

#### RAMP would help the East Coast ports at the expense of the California ports – hurts their economy

Talley 9 (Wayne K., Frederick W. Beazley Professor of Economics and Executive Director of the Maritime Institute at Old Dominion University, http://books.google.com/books?id=awclWUpzVDoC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q=In%202006%2C%20the%20voters%20of%20Panama%20approved%20a%20U.S.%20%245.25%20billion%20plan%20to%20&f=false, accessed on 6/29/12, EW)

In 2006, the voters of Panama approved a U.S.S5.25 billion plan to expand and modernize the Panama canal (to be completed in 2014). Two new lock facilities will be constructed, one on the Atlantic Ocean side and the other on the Pacific Ocean side of the canal. Also, the Gatun Lake's navigational channels will be widened and deepened — widened to no less titan 280 meters in their straight sections and 366 meters in their turns, permitting post-Panamax ship encounters (where the ships are moving in opposite directions) in the channels. The deepening of the channels will accommodate ship drags of up to 50 feet. The expansion will allow post-Panamax containerships up to l2,000 TEUs in size to pass through the canal and will be self-financed by canal tolls that will be increased annually over time. The Panama Canal expansion will benefit U.S. East Coast ports to the detriment of U.S. West Coast ports. Forecasts indicate that the percentage of contained cargo from northeast Asia passing through the canal destined to U S. East Coast ports will increase with (decrease without) the expansion from 8 percent in 2005 to 44 (36), 4' (29), and 49 (23) percent in 2015, 2020, and 2025, respectively (Panama Canal Authority 2006). PostPanamax containerships that previously called at West Coast ports (since they were too large to transit the Panama canal prior to its expansion) will be able to transit the expanded Panama Canal for calls at East Coast ports. The Panama Canal expansion will also likely lead tn an increase in trade between northeast Asia and countries on the Atlantic side nf South America, e . Brazil therefore benefitting the orts of these countries.

## AT: Jobs – Not Key

#### Jobs not solely key to economic growth-shale gas fracking proves

Baily and Verleger 12 (Martin and Philip, staff writers, June 27, 2012, CNN Money, “Could cheap gas save the economy?” <http://money.cnn.com/2012/06/27/news/economy/shale-gas/>, June 29, 2012) ALK

Something is badly needed to get the economy moving again and avoid another slowdown. The good news is that cheaper gas could be the answer. America has hit the energy jackpot with new techniques to extract oil and gas from shale. The recent widespread use of a technique called hydraulic fracturing, or "[fracking](http://money.cnn.com/galleries/2012/technology/1204/gallery.how-fracking-works.fortune/index.html?iid=EL)," and improved drilling technologies such as horizontal completion to harvest gas from shale, could provide a much-needed economic boost. [Shale extraction](http://money.cnn.com/2011/06/21/news/economy/fracking_public_relations/index.htm?iid=EL) represents one of the most important developments for the economy in the last 60 years. It's pushing down [energy prices](http://money.cnn.com/data/commodities/?iid=MKT_Sub) and creating many new opportunities for jobs, investments and manufacturing. And the new innovations are unique to the United Sates. Although other countries will exploit shale, none will come close to the low costs in the U.S. That's because the U.S. has a unique governmental structure in which many powers remain with the states, along with a very competitive market for the product, as opposed to the monopolies and oligopolies that control the market in almost every other country.

##### **Economic growth is key to job growth. Not the other way around. Regalia 11**. (Marty Regalia, Writer for the US chamber of commerce, Jobs and Growth, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/2011/08/jobs-and-growth/>, June 29, 2012) Recently many reporters have pointed out the slow growth in jobs and labeled it an **anomaly**. Actually, **the anomaly is not job growth but rather weak economic growth. The relationship between job growth and economic growth has been relatively stable for decades. Thus focusing on job growth rather than on the underlying economic growth may be focusing on the wrong target**. The economic recoveries up until 1991 were characterized by very strong economic growth in the first year or two and equally rapid job growth. The economy was generally able to put people laid off during the downturn back to work in a very short time. However, beginning with the 1991 recovery and extending through the current recovery, economic growth early in the recovery has been relatively weak, barely equaling our long-run potential rate of growth. **The resulting job growth has been weak as well. The main difference between the last three economic cycles and those prior to that is the rate of growth in the economy not the difference in job growth. In other words, job growth has been slow because economic growth has been slow**. In the early 1960s, Arthur Okun, President Kennedy’s chief economist examined the phenomena of economic growth and job growth. His analysis led to the development of what has since been called Okun’s Law. Roughly speaking, the current version of this law states that the economy must grow at about two percentage points above its long-run potential for a year to drive the unemployment rate down one percentage point. While Okun’s Law is more like a rule of thumb, it does provide a ballpark figure for what kind of growth we need to re-employ workers displaced by the recession. **Our economic growth rate since the recovery started has averaged about 2.5% annually, but the growth over the last 12 months has been only 1.6%. So our lack of jobs can be explained primarily by a lack of economic growth**. At 2.5% we are barely reaching our potential and at 1.6% we are likely below our potential. **The key to job growth is getting more economic growth. By targeting job growth, Washington is aiming at the wrong target. To put unemployed Americans back to work, policymakers need to make economic growth the priority**.

## Supply Chain Resilient

#### Global supply chain is resilient in the squo

**TSA 11** (Transportation Security Administration, March 24, “TSA Administrator Pistole’s Prepared Remarks to the World Custom Organization”, <http://www.tsa.gov/press/happenings/2011/11_0324_wco.shtm>, date accessed 6/27/12, A.R.)

Earlier this year, Secretary Napolitano of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the Secretary General of the WCO announced a critical new collaboration to strengthen the security and resiliency of the global supply chain across the air, land, and sea environments. The initiative will enlist fellow nations, international bodies and the private sector. Our focus throughout 2011 will be on working collaboratively to outline new measures that will make the global supply chain stronger, smarter, and more able to recover from the shocks of potential disruptions. This initiative is critical. The modern global supply chain is a powerful engine of global commerce and prosperity, allowing for the quick and efficient transportation of goods across the world. Even now there are groups and individuals plotting to use our transportation system to take innocent lives and disrupt commerce. It is vital that as an international community with shared values and mutual interests, that we act together to strengthen security measures throughout the world. One of the principle interests of this “Secure Supply Chain” Initiative is to leverage the expertise, interest, and resources of the major international organizations responsible for different components of supply chains. This of course includes the WCO as well as other key groups such the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Maritime Organization, and the Universal Postal Union. There is strong support from each of these organizations to continue and enhance our collaboration on this effort.

**US and Japan have already ensured that the supply chain is efficient**

**WCO 4-30-12** (World Commerce Organization, WCOOMD, “US-Japan Joint Statement on Global Supply Chain Security”, <http://www.wcoomd.org/files/1.%20Public%20files/PDFandDocuments/Press%20releases/US_Japan_Joint_Statement_Global_Supply_Chain_Security_30_Apr_2012.pdf>, date accessed 6/27/12, A.R.)

The inherent intermodal nature of the supply chain necessitates better integration among relevant international organizations and stakeholders to ensure seamless security across all modes. The two countries intend to enhance support to the World Customs Organization (WCO), International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the Universal Postal Union (UPU), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) in their efforts to strengthen the global supply chain. At a strategic level, this agenda will strive to ensure that: The global supply chain is resilient in response to large-scale events and disruptions; Terrorists, transnational criminal organizations, and other illegitimate actors do not exploit the global supply chain to plan and execute attacks or illegal activities. The most critical elements of the supply chain system, such as transportation hubs and related critical infrastructure, are identified and protected from attacks and disruptions. Improve information sharing and analysis to identify and respond to evolving threats by supporting the development and maintenance of risk management guidelines, such as the ICAO Aviation Security Working Group's Risk Context Statement and the WCO's Risk Management Compendium, and participating in the discussions in the WCO and other appropriate fora, such as ICAO, to address emerging global threats. 2. Assist development of robust global pre-departure information requirements in alignment with the discussions on the WCO SAFE Framework of Standards to facilitate screening and targeting of potential threats, and develop common definitioniol;s, standards, and recommended practices for high-risk air cargo; 3. Enhance information exchange between the two countries regarding advance cargo information, taking into account Japan's legislation on Advance Filing Rules on Maritime Container Cargo Information (the 24-Hour Rule); 4. Stem the flow of illicit shipments of dangerous materials by actively reporting shipping information and intelligence through the WCO's Program Global Shield, and facilitating the expansion of regional participation in, and support of, Global Shield; 5. Advance the development of AEO programs consistent with the WCO SAFE Framework of Standards, based on public-private partnerships and the mutual recognition between the U.S. C-TPAT and Japan AEO programs as best practices; 6. Under the UPU framework, with consideration for the unique requirements of international mail, enhance the security of international mail by fostering more stringent advance data requirements, establishing baseline screening standards, and developing response protocols; and 7. Guide the establishment of international standards for trade recovery collaboration and information requirements in APEC, WCO, and other appropriate for.

**Global supply chains are resilient, despite trade crisis**

**Altomonte and Ottoviano 9** (Carlo and Gianmarco, Nov. 27, Vox, “Resilient to the crisis? Global supply chains and trade flows”, <http://www.voxeu.org/article/resilient-crisis-global-supply-chains-and-trade-flows>, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

A number of transmission mechanisms have recently been proposed to account for these three attributes of the contraction of trade flows, many of which impinge upon the role that global supply chains might have played in exacerbating the drop in global demand. The basic argument is that in a world characterised increasingly by vertical specialisation, goods are produced sequentially in stages across different countries – so-called international supply chains. The constituent parts and components of a final good crosses borders several times before the final product reaches the consumer; at each border crossing, the full value of the partially assembled good is recorded as trade. As a result, for a given reduction in world income, trade should decline “not only by the value of the finished product, but also by the value of all the intermediate trade flows that went into creating it”. O’Rourke (2009), with his Barbie-doll example, has been the first to doubt whether, as a result of fragmentation, changes in world trade should necessarily outweigh changes in world GDP.2 Even if the Barbie parts cross the border twice in the production of a final doll that sells for $20 in the US, the final sales and total trade should contract by the same percentage; a 50% drop in US Barbie sales reduces world Barbie trade by 50%. More recently, Fontagnè et al. (2009a) have provided a more structured analysis confirming the insight of the Barbie-doll example. First of all, they give a very simple accounting example showing that, if relative prices are held constant, fragmented trade flows within global supply chains should react proportionally to a fall in world GDP. Then they validate and generalise this finding via a simulation based on a multi-country, multi-sector CGE model. Their simulation shows that, if all trade flows are deflated by their specific prices (rather than the world GDP deflater) and GDP flows are aggregated at the world level using current exchange rates (as done for trade flows) rather than PPIs, the measured drops in trade volumes and GDPs converge to roughly comparable values, -2.4% and -2.6% respectively. This implies that the extensive presence of supply chains does not automatically explain why world trade overshot the world GDP drop; other explanatory factors are needed. These may include: The collapse in internal demand and production, affecting current and future level of (tradable) inventories worldwide; Fiscal stimulus plans with a relatively stronger support of non-tradable sectors, like construction and infrastructures (Bénassy-Quéré et al. 2009); The rise of ‘murky’ protectionism; and The problems of trade finance with financial spreads still well-above ‘normal’ (i.e. pre-crisis) market rates (Auboin, 2009). Trade finance and liquidity constraints Do the above arguments mean that global supply chains are totally neutral as a transmission mechanism of the crisis from GDP to trade? Of course not. In all likelihood, however, the channels are much more complex than originally thought, and entail important compositional effects. For the sake of argument, let us take the following story based on the idea that a relatively large part of the overreaction of trade has been caused by the sudden drying up of liquidity in trade finance. Auboin (2009) notes that, in the second part of 2008, spreads on short-term trade credit facilities suddenly soared to between 300 to 600 basis points above LIBOR, compared to 10 to 20 basis points in normal times, leading to a virtual freeze of important trade deals throughout the globe, with supply chain operations being disrupted by lack of financing, especially for developing country suppliers. Under this assumption we would have a scenario in which the liquidity channel has led trade to overshoot the fall in demand, with the effect being larger within supply chains, as the trade financing of these operations is typically managed by large international financial institutions, particularly hit by the crisis.3 In this scenario, we would still obtain a severe, sudden and synchronised drop in trade flows, with the effects correlated with (but not caused by) the behaviour of global supply chains. Moreover, under the same scenario, we would also observe that, during the crisis,trade falls more along the intensive margin (i.e. value per trade) than the extensive margins (i.e. number of traders). The reason being that, if the overreaction of trade was caused relatively more by liquidity constraints than by a disruption of supply chains, the above effects would lead to a reduction in the volume of trade, but not necessarily to a similar reduction in the number of traders worldwide. This is exactly what Bricongne et al. (2009) find in a paper analysing the behaviour of French exporters during the crisis. Relying on monthly data for individual French exporters observed until April 2009, the authors find that the drop in French exports is mainly due to the intensive margin of large exporters, with small and large firms evenly affected once sectoral and geographical specialisation are controlled for. Interestingly, they also find that firms (small and large) in sectors more dependent on external finance are the most affected by the crisis. Long-lasting relations Equally plausible stories suggest that trade flows within supply chains are more, rather than less, resilient to large adverse shocks like the current crisis. Such resilience would derive from the fact that setting up organised supply chains entails some sunk costs, so firms would prefer to adjust the entire chain along the intensive margin (i.e. reducing volumes), rather than the extensive margin (i.e. disrupting part of the supply chain). Moreover, even if some adjustment along the extensive margin has to be made (e.g. by dropping some suppliers), it could well be that some long-term contractual relationships within supply chains are more difficult to sever in the short run. Finally, it is also possible that large multinational corporations at the centre of several supply chains could alleviate the liquidity constraints of suppliers, thus protecting the entire supply chain from external finance shortages. Although a precise distinction between general trade flows and those flows happening within supply chains is difficult to make, on the basis of the available macro data, the foregoing considerations are consistent with two pieces of evidence observed in US and European data. New evidence In Europe, the process of east-west integration has triggered the emergence of international networks of production involving, in particular, German and Italian companies investing in the new member states of Central and Eastern Europe (CEECs).4 Figure 1 looks at the most recent trade data on average year-on-year monthly growth rates for the four biggest European economies (France, Germany, Italy and the UK), which are also the biggest exporters to the CEECs. At the world level, all these countries have experienced negative growth rates in their total exports, with little differences among them (average monthly rates ranged from -12% and -15% from July 2008 to July 2009.). However, when looking at the trade flows with the CEECs, the figure shows that, until March 2009 (the worst moment of the crisis), Italian and German exports had fallen much less than those of France and the UK. Since trade between Germany, Italy and the CEECs takes place within supply chains to a larger extent than that of France and the UK, one may find here an indirect confirmation of the resilience of supply-chain-related trade flows during the crisis. Clearly, resilience does not necessarily mean that trade within these international value-added chains is insulated from the crisis (differences between German and Italian trade flows on one hand, and French and UK ones on the other, have recently disappeared). The supply chain trade, however, might have reacted later to the shock. Figure 1 Growth rates in exports to Central and Eastern Europe. Source: authors’ calculations on Eurostat data. Along the same lines, Bernard et al. (2009) analyse the behaviour of US exports at the time of the Asian crisis, when trade slumped rapidly and trade finance was also severely hit. They show that, overall, US exports to Asia declined by 21% between 1996 and 1998, while exports to the rest of the world increased by 3%. Within Asia, however, the decline in arm’s length exports was substantially greater than the drop of trade undertaken within supply chains (-26% versus -4% by 1998), while two figures evolved in a similar way in the case of exports to the rest of the world. This is again evidence consistent with the idea that, in a crisis context, trade undertaken within supply chains does not necessarily overreact to a drop in demand, but rather exhibits some degree of resilience. Special interests and sheer luck While any conclusion must wait for more data to become available, there are good reasons to believe that the rise of global supply chains has not necessarily been the main cause of the recent “severe, sudden and synchronised” fall in global trade flows. Based on the available evidence, one may even be tempted to conclude that, under certain circumstances, international networks of production may also display some degree of ‘resilience’ to adverse shocks like the current crisis: supply-chain-related trade flows may react later (rather than sooner) to an adverse shock. Their fall may be smaller and, eventually, their recovery may happen faster relative to overall trade flows. The observed resilience of supply chains may arise from some intrinsic attribute of production chains, as argued above. Alternatively, it may be the outcome of the political economy. Fearing that a collapse of supply chains would set off a sudden process of de-globalisation and implosion of international trade, governments may intervene in favour of supply chains. For example, the massive bail-outs of large financial institutions have helped their best customers, among them the big players within supply chains. Finally, of course, this indirect support of supply chains may have also been an unintended consequence of financial bailouts implemented for very different reasons. De-regulation vs re-globalisation There are too many blind spots in our current understanding of the nature and operation of international supply chains. Once data become available, the current crisis should give us material to substantially improve our understanding. In the end, it may well be that we discover that without supply chains, things would have been much worse than they actually were; and that this crisis may eventually boost rather than cripple the globalization process.

## Ports Not Key

#### **Export decline unrelated to port efficiency – global choices in trade and overall economic growth are real causes, China would still lead even if we were at max production.**

Mandel, Economist**, 12** (May 21, 2012, Liberty Street Economics, “What Falling Export Share Says about U.S. Export Competitiveness,” http://libertystreeteconomics.newyorkfed.org/2012/05/what-falling-export-share-says-about-us-export-competitiveness.html, accessed 6-28-12, AS).

The U.S. market share of world merchandise exports has declined sharply over the past decade. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, approximately 12 percent of the value of goods shipped globally originated in the United States; by 2010, this share had dropped to only 8.5 percent. How can we account for the United States’ flagging merchandise export performance? Have U.S. manufacturing firms simply become less competitive than their foreign counterparts? In a recent article and discussion paper, I investigate possible factors for the fall in the U.S. export share (illustrated below) and, to the extent possible, try to determine the importance that changing productivity of U.S. firms relative to their competitors has played. Productivity, in turn, is a key driver of an exporter’s sales in global markets compared to foreign firms selling similar products. What is at stake if productivity principally explains the evolution of U.S. export share? For one, it may have a bearing on trade policy. For instance, the effectiveness of a policy that opens foreign markets or otherwise promotes U.S. exports depends on the fundamental health and competitiveness of the export sector. The most direct way to measure competitiveness due to productivity differences would be to compute relative productivity measures for all U.S. export industries. However, in many instances, and particularly for international comparisons, existing data are not detailed enough for that exercise. Thus, we take a “top-down” approach where, allowing for an effect of productivity differences, we examine other factors that might have lowered the U.S. export share and evaluate their importance. In this way, we can indirectly gauge the contribution of changes in the relative productivity of U.S. firms to movements in the U.S. export share. It turns out that two alternative factors can account for over half of the decline in the U.S. export share between 1984 and 2008. The first relates to the composition of world trade. If the rest of the world is increasingly trading goods that the United States does not produce, then the U.S. export share will fall—even if U.S. firms remain just as productive as their competitors in the goods that they do trade. We investigate this possibility by decomposing changes in the U.S. export market share into contributions from individual sectors, and find that only a handful of sectors contributed to the share decline. This trend is illustrated by the green bars in the figure below, where the overall decline in U.S. export share between 1984 and 2008 is dominated by three sectors: crude materials, food and live animal products, and machinery and transportation. Among those industries that did contribute, a significant part of the decline was driven by the shrinking fraction of world trade claimed by those sectors, which we term an extensive margin. As shown by the red bars above, over half of the falling overall share in the crude materials and food and live animals sectors was accounted for by the shrinking relative size of those sectors in the basket of internationally traded goods. The remainder of the overall share decline is due to shrinking market share within those sectors, called the intensive margin, which has more to do with falling competitiveness. According to this measure, the United States did lose ground to its competitors in the export of certain products that were expanding briskly as a share of world trade—in particular, machinery and transportation products. GDP Growth Relative to Foreign Exporters The second factor that helps to explain the declining U.S. export share is the slower growth rate of the U.S. economy relative to that of its competitors. In a large body of research, the size of a nation’s economy has been shown to be an important determinant of the size of its international trade flows, with larger countries both importing and exporting more. Therefore, the brisk rate of, say, China’s GDP growth relative to that of the United States would imply a higher Chinese share and a lower U.S. share in traded goods markets.

#### Panama Canal is not key to free trade – air traffic checks.

**Beijing, Flight Daily News, 12** (Beijing, Jun 9 2012, Flight Daily News, “IATA: Trade body looks to bring air cargo to the forefront,” <http://www.flightglobal.com/news/articles/iata-trade-body-looks-to-bring-air-cargo-to-the-forefront-372804/>, accessed 6/28/12, AS).

IATA will be underscoring the value of air cargo for the wider economy during the annual general meeting here in Beijing as it looks to raise the profile of this sector of the industry. "One of the messages is to recognise that air cargo is a great driver of global trade," says IATA global head of cargo Desmond Vertannes, noting the sector handles $5.3 trillion worth of goods a year. "People have to understand how precious it is. When it is worth $5.3 trillion and growing, you have to look at the infrastructure." One of the key targets for IATA is to speed up the adoption of e-freight. "On the e-commerce side, we have a target to go paperless by the end of 2015, at least in the countries where we are allowed to do e-trading," he says. "Security has been added to safety as the number one priority; providing data to the state has become essential," he says. "The whole world of e-commerce has to be accelerated so we can improve the efficiency, and for compliance with the regulators." Change in the sector has been difficult to implement quickly, partly because airlines have had so many challenges over the last decade that they do not have much free capital left to invest in air cargo technology, but also because airlines only form part of the air cargo chain. "IATA, under the new director general, is very pro an industry collaborative approach. It doesn't need to be led by IATA," says Vertannes. He believes the timing is right to press for change, especially through the global advisory group it has formed with other associations. "You have the entire supply chain pursuing these goals," he says. One bonus for the industry is the recent EU-USA deal to recognise each other's cargo security programmes. The agreement between the European Commission and the US Transportation Security Administration is the culmination of seven years of effort by regulators and industry stakeholders to achieve the alignment of air cargo security measures. Under the deal, the USA and EU will recognise the equivalence and effectiveness of each other's cargo security regimes.

[IATA – International Air Transportation Association]

#### **Protectionism in Russia, global recession, collapsing trade – the aff is a drop in a bucket**

Lazzaro 9(Joseph, managing editor of financial news on WallStreetEurope.com/WallStreetItalia.com, “WTO predicts worst trade decline in more than 60 years”, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

As far as international trade is concerned, the G-20 meeting cannot occur a moment too soon. The World Trade Organization **(**WTO**)** hasjust issued a report predicting that global trade will plunge about nine percent in 2009 -- the worst performance in the 62 years the WTO has been keeping such records. The takeaway from the findings, based on new data for the first months of the year, couldn't be clearer**:** The economic crisis is having a devastating effect on world trade, and further adverse developments in the financial markets could prolong the misery. The question now is whether the developed-nation leaders meeting this week in London will take the steps needed to ease the global slump and get the economy back on a sustainable growth track. Break down the WTO's numbers and it's not pretty: In January, China's exports plummeted -26 percent**;** Japan's, -35 percent; Germany's, -28 percent, Canada's, -34%; and the U.S.'s, -21 percent.. Overall, developed-world trade is expected now to fall -10 percent in 2009; the developing world will fare somewhat better, at about -3 percent. Those drops compare to a global trade increase of 2 percent in 2008 (up to $15.8 trillion). Adding insult to injury, global GDP is predicted to contract by about -2 percent. The WTO said four factors have lead to the trade contraction: 1) the synchronized global recession -- the world's first in the modern era, 2) tapped-out consumers in developed countries, who overspent during the recent economic expansion, 3) the globalized supply chain, where lower demand for goods in the U.S or E.U. leads to factory closures in China, and, most ominously 4) an uptick in protectionism, with countries as Russia and Mexico starting to break their free-trade promises and impose tariffs.

#### Protectionism crushing trade now

**TCP 5-31-12** (The Conservative Papers, 5/31, “Trade Protectionism is Clogging the World’s Economic Arteries”, <http://conservativepapers.com/news/2012/05/31/trade-protectionism-is-clogging-the-worlds-economic-arteries/#.T-zJtLXZCf5>, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

In its latest joint report with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the World Trade Organization (WTO) issued sharp warnings on global trade restrictions: The past seven months have not witnessed any slowdown in the imposition of new trade restrictions. And there is no indication that efforts have been stepped up to remove existing restrictions, particularly those introduced since the start of the global crisis.… The accumulation of trade restrictions is a matter of concern, which is aggravated by the relatively slow pace of rollback of existing measures. This situation is clearly adding to the downside risks to the global economy. Moreover, government support to selected sectors is distorting competition and restricting trade. Sadly, various pledges by world leaders not to disrupt global free trade with more barriers have been repeatedly broken since 2008. WTO chief Pascal Lamy sums up the danger of rising protectionism: Protectionism is like cholesterol: the slow accumulation of trade restrictive measures since 2008—now covering almost 3 per cent of world merchandise trade, and almost 4 per cent of G20 trade—can lead to the clogging of trade flows. The collateral damage of rising trade protectionism can only get costlier over time. Unless the trend is reversed soon, the economic sclerosis we are currently suffering could turn into a full-blown economic health crisis.

## ALT Causes

#### Ports aren’t key to supply chain efficiency -

Laventhal 9 (William, May, “CONTAINER PORTS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY”, pg. 60, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

Robinson cites the importance of these ideas but, as Notteboom and Rodrigue (2005) did more recently, suggests that the competitive position of a port can be won or lost outside of the port itself. Access to hinterlands is important, but Robinson stresses the importance of the port’s position as only a piece of the total supply chain. Supply chains compete against other chains. A port’s competitiveness is heavily dependent on the value that the entire chain brings to shippers. Ports may be operationally efficient and offer an advantage to the firms with which they directly interact, but this might be of little value to the exporter or importer that is managing a complex global supply chain.

#### Investing in scientific research is key to the economy- not ports

Gross et al 09 ([David Gross](http://www.nydailynews.com/authors?author=David%20Gross), [Eric Kandel](http://www.nydailynews.com/authors?author=Eric%20Kandel) and [Kenneth Miller](http://www.nydailynews.com/authors?author=Kenneth%20Miller), January 15, 2009, writers for New York Daily News, “To stimulate the economy, invest in scientific research” http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/stimulate-economy-invest-scientific-research-article-1.423145#commentpostform)

As [President-elect Barack Obama](http://www.nydailynews.com/topics/Barack+Obama)'s team designs an economic stimulus program involving large expenditures, it may seem to others that administration's priorities, such as strongly increased federal investment in the sciences, must wait for better times. We believe, with Obama, to the contrary. The stimulus provides a great opportunity to begin rebuilding [U.S.](http://www.nydailynews.com/topics/United+States) science, because increased science funding is an ideal stimulus: It creates good jobs across the economy; there is large pent-up need so that money can be spent immediately, and it represents an investment in the infrastructures of research and higher education that are vital to the future. Basic science research in the U.S. is largely funded by grants to individual investigators or national laboratories from the [National Institutes of Health](http://www.nydailynews.com/topics/National+Institutes+of+Health), [National Science Foundation](http://www.nydailynews.com/topics/National+Science+Foundation), the Department of Energy and other agencies. Federal money that science agencies invest can be spent immediately to support research programs already approved, salaries for laboratory scientists, purchases of supplies and equipment (most from small U.S. businesses) and institutional expenses of the colleges, universities and medical schools where researchers work. Scientific funding creates good jobs. [Families USA](http://www.nydailynews.com/topics/Families+USA) has estimated that each $1 billion of NIH research grant funding creates more than 15,000 jobs with an average wage of $52,000 a year and generates $2.21 billion of new business activity. Federal funding for nondefense research in the life sciences has fallen in real dollars every year since 2004 and for far longer in the physical sciences. Success rates for investigator-initiated research grants are dangerously low, a situation that not only threatens established productive investigators but endangers even more the emerging careers of young investigators on which our research future depends. Money could be spent within weeks of passage of a stimulus to fund the many highly rated applications that had been waiting for support in 2008 and to restore dollars cut from funded grants in recent years. NIH alone could spend up to $5 billion immediately and a similar amount over the next year. Many national laboratories have been operating on inadequate budgets, with projects delayed and staff cut or forced to work reduced hours. Investing in scientific research serves a dual purpose: It is an immediate stimulus to the economy and an investment in U.S. leadership in science, engineering, technology and education. This leadership is vital to the economy and U.S. prestige, as well as to success in such goals as achieving energy independence, mitigating global warming and treating and curing disease. In addition, the intellectual property created by publicly funded research leads to the creation of innumerable small companies and, ultimately, many large companies in biotechnology, energy, computer technology and other scientific and engineering fields.

#### Manufacturing is key to the economy

Vidal 07 (Matt Vidal, April 2007, PhD in sociology from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 2007, where he specialized in organizations, the sociology of work, economic sociology and comparative political economy, “Lean Enough” <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CE8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fciteseerx.ist.psu.edu%2Fviewdoc%2Fdownload%3Fdoi%3D10.1.1.118.9810%26rep%3Drep1%26type%3Dpdf&ei=IJzsT43AFIjErQGN4f3BBQ&usg=AFQjCNE24HPaLjOYohlEWzRBbZ9_Yu6avw&sig2=5Qr0R97DeY5Otv3i3h9WsA>) MB

Manufacturing is vital to the economy of the United States of America and will likely remain so throughout the 21st century. The manufacturing sector does not simply produce goods from cars to computers to clothes. It is also the primary source of technological innovation in the economy. Modern factories producing durable goods are technological marvels. In metals manufacturing, for example, modern factories use sophisticated computerized machine tools, massive hydraulic presses, progressive dies with dozens of stations, multiple-tool machining centers, proprietary industrial robots, laser cutters, plasma cutters, self-cleaning and lubricating conveyor belts, and so on. In addition to these and countless other physical process innovations, the manufacturing sector has been a fertile source of organizational process (managerial) innovations. Frederick Winslow Taylor’s “scientific management,” an early capitalist managerial innovation developed at the beginning of the 20th century for manufacturing, was heralded equally by Vladimir Lenin and Henry Ford and is now widely applied in the service sector in the 21st century. Another widely celebrated organizational process innovation developed in the manufacturing sector is lean production, the subject of this dissertation. Equally, if not more important than such process innovations are the new products that are continually turned out by the manufacturing sector, the innovations from which periodically cumulate into industrial “revolutions.” Indeed, microprocessor-based and new information technologies have supposedly transformed the old economy into a knowledge economy.

## AT: Arctic Impact – No

#### Arctic Conflict is just hyperbole – checked by diplomacy and harsh conditions

Ackerman 11 (Spencer, staff writer specializing in defense, June 8, 2011, Wired, “War for the Arctic: Never Mind”, <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2011/06/war-for-the-arctic-never-mind/> , June 29, 2012) ALK

It wasn’t long ago that the press was running wild with hyperbolic claims of the U.S. losing out in an impending Arctic conflict. After all, global warming is freeing up access to large deposits of oil, gas and minerals right in the backyard of the Russians. But the press forgot to tell other polar nations to freak out. Indeed, at a forum convened on Wednesday by the Center for Strategic and International Security, ambassadors from four polar nations, including some traditionally menaced by Russia, were sanguine about the future of polar exploration. “We actually think we handled these areas for decades during the Cold War rather well,” said Wegger Strommen, Norway’s man in Washington. The U.S Geological Survey assesses that the North Pole holds about 13 percent of the world’s untapped oil supplies. Companies and nations are champing at the bit to expand exploration as the ice caps melt. The Russians have an advantage: a fleet of six nuclear powered icebreakers on its northern shore. By contrast, the U.S. Coast Guard has just one, the cutter Healy. But no one’s sweating it. Should there actually be an arctic sea conflict, the U.S. submarine fleet is second to none, as my colleague David Axe has pointed out. And a massive Arctic oil rush is “years off,” Strommen added, since the “climate is harsh, the conditions are difficult and it’s incredibly expensive.” Beyond that, the Russians are warm in the Arctic. Russia finalized a maritime border with Norway on Tuesday that took 30 years to negotiate. Strommen’s colleagues from Greenland, Canada and Sweden gave high marks to a meeting last month of the Arctic Council, the diplomatic contact group of arctic nations, in which Russia signed onto an accord for search and rescue missions in the cold waters. Think of it as a diplomatic thaw.

#### Arctic wars have no magnitude – they will be short and small

Holmes 11 (James, Defense analyst for The Diplomat and an associate professor of strategy at the US Naval War College where he specializes in US, Chinese and Indian maritime strategy and US diplomatic and military history, April 20, 2011, The Diplomat, “The Arctic Sea—a New Wild West?”, <http://the-diplomat.com/2011/04/20/the-arctic-sea%E2%80%94a-new-wild-west/?all=true>, June 29, 2012) ALK

What about conditions within the Arctic Sea itself? A few observations. First, and most obviously, cold weather will restrict transit through the polar sea to approximately one month per year. In effect the strategic geography of the Arctic Sea will metamorphose constantly as the ice advances and retreats. The strategic value of geographic positions in and around the region will fluctuate as navigable waters open and close. Second, shifting geography may make the Arctic region a region of relative calm. Bradford’s logic of an unsparing Arctic will reassert itself outside the short ice-free interval each summer. Sustained combat among surface warships would range from difficult to impossible for most of the year. Any armed conflict among the polar states would probably be brief and sporadic. The Arctic will remain mostly a domain for air and submarine warfare. Episodic clashes are conceivable as coastal states delineate their maritime jurisdictions, much as showdowns between China and its neighbours have become de rigueur in the East China Sea and the South China Sea in recent years. With regard to law enforcement, piracy would likely remain a nuisance at most. Weather patterns damp pirate attacks even in relatively friendly climes like the Indian Ocean. Whether corsairs could entrench themselves in the Arctic Sea—and whether the short season for raiding would pay off for them—remains dubious.

## AT: NEI – No Impact

#### The NEI takes funds from other places and is also naïve and protectionist

Guyer 10 (Peter Guyer, staff for AMI, 7 Apr 2010, “Obama’s National Export Initiative – Helpful or Hindrance?” http://www.athenaintl.com/blog/obamas-national-export-initiative-helpful-or-hindrance.html SC)

The Obama Administration has now turned its focus from health care to job creation. On March 11 the Executive Order – National Export Initiative (NEI) was signed by Barak Obama to ensure “that U.S. businesses can actively participate in international markets by increasing their exports of goods, services, and agricultural products.” The goal is to increase job creation, a noble goal in the current economic climate. The initiative is designed to “directly affect the private sectors ability to export” by removing trade barriers and alleviating hurdles to enter new export markets. The language of the NEI is optimistic, lofty and naïve. It will promote trade missions, educational tools for small businesses and first-time exporters, and endeavor to reduce trade barriers in foreign countries. That is the good news. The bad news is that the NEI would reduce funding for the highly successful Market Access Program (MAP), which this year will provide about $160 million to small- and medium-sized U.S. food and beverage companies to gain access to foreign markets. The Market Access Program (MAP) uses funds from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to help U.S. producers, exporters, and private companies finance promotional activities for U.S. agricultural products. MAP funds promote the development, maintenance, and expansion of commercial export markets for agricultural commodities. Despite the numerous “success stories” of U.S. food and beverage companies penetrating foreign markets as a result of the MAP, the current Administration appears to value more highly other export promotion activities. The Administration believes the private sector should replace funding of the MAP budget. Nonetheless, there has been a surprising backlash from several U.S. Senators and Representatives, whose constituents depend on agricultural exports for their livelihood. Those interested in expressing their opinions on this issue may consider contacting their local representatives. The NEI is also naïve in that it pushes a U.S. agenda without consideration of other countries or their objectives. In other words, it promotes U.S. exports but not imports to America. Other countries seem to resent this and find it hypocritical of a country that promotes “free trade.” The Obama Administration has failed to study history and recognize that cross-border trade, free and transparent markets, and foreign direct investment have brought enormous prosperity not only to the U.S. but also to other developed economies. The NEI seems more like a token gesture to U.S. labor unions and protectionist movements than a meaningful initiative to stimulate global trade and investment. Just days before U.S. Secretary of Commerce Gary Locke lead a U.S. trade mission to Brazil to promote US products last month, the Brazilian government announced that it will levy $600 million in extra import duties on U.S. products in retaliation for U.S. subsidies of cotton, which “protects” the U.S. cotton industry. Apparently, the Administration failed to consult other countries about its new export initiatives.

#### NEI fails- it only boosts exports

Markheim 10 (Daniella Markheim, member of the Heritage Foundation and Senior Analyst of trade, 12 February 2010, “National Export Initiative Falls Short as a Winning U.S. Trade Policy”, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/02/national-export-initiative-falls-short-as-a-winning-us-trade-policy SC)

On February 4, Commerce Secretary Gary Locke fleshed out the details of President Obama’s National Export Initiative (NEI), a plan unveiled in the 2010 State of the Union address that promises to double U.S. exports over the next five years and support 2 million American jobs.[1] The NEI aims to bolster U.S. international competitiveness by creating (1) an export promotion cabinet that will oversee the expansion of both government programs and special financing for firms and farmers seeking oversees market opportunities and (2) tougher enforcement of international trade laws. Recognizing the important role exports play in America’s economic recovery is an important first step in forming an effective U.S. trade policy—and a welcome one from an Administration that has remained silent on the shape of U.S. trade policy for too long. However, export promotion and trade enforcement are only parts of a winning, comprehensive American trade policy, and these parts must be implemented in a way that truly yields success in global markets. Therefore, instead of just an export and enforcement strategy, America needs a plan that addresses all aspects of trade. For America to excel in the world marketplace, U.S. trade objectives need to be clear and consistent with the open-market principles America has long promoted and, indeed, demands from other nations. These objectives, which would reestablish America as a credible global partner for economic growth and throw open doors to U.S. exporters, include: The formation of a comprehensive trade agenda, The dismantling of U.S. trade barriers enacted since the onset of the economic downturn, Reform of U.S. trade remedies to make them compliant with international trade rules, and A firm commitment to conclude—not just “shape”—the Doha Round. It Is Not Just About Exports- Promoting exports alone undermines the primary benefits to be gained from freeing all trade: more efficient resource use and lower prices for households and firms that occur when a nation lowers its own barriers to trade. While imports may drive down production in less competitive industries, exporters and domestic producers that use lower-cost imported inputs gain a competitive boost that promotes investment, productivity, and growth in these industries. Lower prices for imported goods also help households stretch their incomes, enabling families to buy more of everything, including goods and services that are produced domestically. With freer trade overall, investment increases and resources flow from less competitive uses to more competitive and efficient uses, creating opportunity and bolstering long-term economic growth and job creation. Without the new investment that flows from trade liberalization, U.S. exports would increase largely as a result of lower production for domestic demand. This represents a shift of resources from one activity to another, not growth in all productive activities. Additionally, as countries continue to struggle with their own economic weakness, their demand for all products—including those from the U.S.—will be less. Were America to actively advance broad trade reform both abroad and at home, other nations would be able to join the U.S. in trading their way to prosperity—for the benefit of all. The Best Trade Policy for Job Creation- U.S. trade policy should seek to eliminate costly barriers to trade and investment, subsidies, and government-run activities that are better provided by the private sector. While it is tempting to embrace subsidies as a means to promote U.S. exports and jobs, the cost of those subsidies on the economy as a whole would be less than the benefit that might accrue to the firms receiving government handouts. Instead, the following recommendations embody some of the more important elements of a successful U.S. export-promotion strategy that bolsters both long-term growth and economic opportunity.

## Free Trade Bad – Conflict

#### **Free trade only solves conflict between trading partners – increases risk to other countries**

[Martin](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/105) et al 05  ([Philippe Martin](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/105), [Thierry Mayer](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/352), [Mathias Thoenig](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/353), September, 2005, [Philippe Martin](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/105) Professor of Economics at Sciences Po (Paris) and CEPR Research Fellow , [Thierry Mayer](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/352) Professor of Economics at Sciences-Po and CEPR Research Fellow, [Mathias Thoenig](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/353) Mathias Thoenig is Professor of Economics at the University of Geneva and associate researcher at Paris School of Economics, “Make Trade Not War” http://economix.fr/pdf/sem\_economix/2005-11-26\_Thoenig.pdf) MB

This paper explores the impact of trade on the prevalence of international conflicts. Our main theoretical result is that an increase in bilateral trade between two countries reduces the probability of conflicts between them but increases the probability of conflicts with other countries. Another theoretical finding is that the worldwide intensification of trade flows, as observed after the WWII has changed the nature of conflicts, with less global confrontations, involving distant countries, but more local confrontations, involving closer countries. The rationale is that globalization, by enabling trade links with distant regions, has reduced countries’ dependency on local trade and thus reduced the opportunity costs of local wars. On the period 1948-2001, we find strong evidence in favor of the contrasting effects of bilateral trade vs multilateral trade.Our work is motivated by the growing concern that the end of the Cold War did not contribute to pacifying international relations.

#### Trade flows lead to problems bargaining and war

[Martin](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/105) et al 05  ([Philippe Martin](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/105), [Thierry Mayer](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/352), [Mathias Thoenig](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/353), September, 2005, [Philippe Martin](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/105) Professor of Economics at Sciences Po (Paris) and CEPR Research Fellow , [Thierry Mayer](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/352) Professor of Economics at Sciences-Po and CEPR Research Fellow, [Mathias Thoenig](http://www.voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/353) Mathias Thoenig is Professor of Economics at the University of Geneva and associate researcher at Paris School of Economics, “Make Trade Not War” http://economix.fr/pdf/sem\_economix/2005-11-26\_Thoenig.pdf) MB

The objective of this paper is to shed light on the following question: if trade promotes peace as illustrated by the European example, why is it that globalization, interpreted as trade liberalization at the global level, has not lived up to its promise of decreasing the prevalence of violent interstate conflicts? We offer a theoretical and empirical answer to this question, based on the interaction between asymmetric information and trade between many countries. On the theoretical side, we build a framework where escalation to war may occur because of the failure of negotiations in a bargaining game. The structure of this game is fairly general: (i) countries must mutually agree on a utility transfer to avoid escalation to war; (ii) war is Pareto dominated by peace; (iii) countries have some private information on their disagreement payoffs, ie. what happens in case of war; (iv) we impose no institutional constraint so that countries can choose any type of negotiation protocol. We then embed this game in a standard new trade theory model with trade costs. Our argument therefore does not rest on the fact that trade may generate internal conflicts between factors of production (see Schneider and Schulze 2005, for an analysis along these lines) or terms of trade effects between resource scarce countries and resources abundant ones as in Hecksher-Ohlin-Samuelson trade models. Our analysis first highlights that information flows matter: the larger is information asymmetry between countries, the more inefficient is the bargaining process and so the highest is the probability of war. Second, a pair of countries with more bilateral trade, will have a lower probability of bilateral war. Third,multilateral trade openness has an opposite effect: any pair of countries with more trade openness with the rest of the world will decrease their degree of bilateral dependence and this results in a higher probability of bilateral war. A theoretical prediction of our model is that globalization of trade flows changes the nature of conflicts. It decreases the probability of global conflicts (may be the most costly in terms of human welfare) but increases the probability of local conflicts. The reason is that globalization decreases the bilateral dependency for all country pairs.

#### Free markets lead to violence.

Bezemer and Jong-A-Pin 9

(Dirk and Richard, Febuary, Ph.D. degree in Economics from the University of Amsterdam, “Democratization, Globalization and Ethnic Violence”, http://smye2009.org/file/270\_Jong-A-Pin.pdf)

With regard to the presumed catalysts of violence, two arguments may be proposed. The first is that globalization and free markets increase the probability of violence. Economic globalization the increase in trade, migration and FDI - has been increasing domestic income inequality over the last thirty years (Goldberg and Pavcnik, 2007). As this typically also implies rising inequality between MDMs and the rest of the population, the result could well be growing popular resentment towards the MDM waiting to erupt in violence against it, if not repressed politically. Alternatively, globalization may bring wealth to those outside the traditional MDM, empowering them to organize protest and violence. In the present study we are not able to distinguish between these two channels. But either way, economic globalization would increase the likelihood of violence. A second argument implied in our hypothesis is that the introduction of democracy in countries with an MDM further contributes to the likelihood of internal violence. This relationship between democracy and violence finds some theoretical support in Glaeser s (2005) model of the market for political hatred. On the supply side of this market, politicians with different income redistribution agendas compete for office. To gain electoral support, they supply hatred towards a minority if this can discredit a more minority-friendly competitor. The demand side of the market consists of rational voters who may believe the hate-creating messages sent out by the politician. Their willingness to do so depends inversely on their incentives to learn about the minority. But incentives to learn are weak particularly if there are high costs of interacting with the minority (due to, for instance, language or cultural differences) or low returns of interacting with the minority (due to, for instance, occupational segregation between the minority and the majority population). Thus Gleaser (2005) emphasizes that political office seeking combined with inter-ethnic ignorance may be the breeding ground for ethnic hatred. Chua s (2003) emphasis on the MDM being a small, wealthy and ethnically different group active in (typically commercial and financial) sectors not normally accessed by the majority of the population (typically employed in agriculture) fits in naturally with this model. An environment where globalization increases income inequality (Goldberg and Pavcnik, 2007) and thereby popular resentment, would increase the incentives of politicians to supply hatred, increasing the likelihood of violence.

## Free Trade Bad – Environment

#### Free trade destroys the environment

Venkat , writer for Silicon Valley industries, 4

(Kumar, January 8, “Free Trade: Benefit or Peril for the Environment?” <http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0108-10.htm>, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

If a car is manufactured in Japan and then shipped to the U.S., there would be some local pollution in Japan due to the manufacturing process. Some natural resources -- both local and imported -- would also be used pin manufacturing the car. There would be additional resource use and pollution from transporting the car to the U.S., and even more from driving that car year after year. Pollution from transportation and consumption of goods, as well as resource use throughout the life cycles of products, are all potentially major avenues through which global trade can damage the environment. When all these effects are combined with production-driven pollution, the final outcome could easily reverse the optimistic result that trade benefits the environment. The argument that polluting industries will stay in capital-rich developed countries also loses steam when capital itself is highly mobile. China, for example, received $44 billion in direct foreign investment in 2001.Even if companies are investing in China to take advantage of its cheap labor, an indirect consequence of concentrating an increasing part of the world’s manufacturing in China will be heavy resource use and pollution locally. A more direct instance of the “pollution haven” effect is the routine transfer of e-waste -- used computers and other electronic appliances that contain highly toxic chemicals -- from the U.S. to countries like India, China and the Philippines. Low-paid workers in these countries work under hazardous conditions to salvage valuable materials from this fast-growing waste stream, while polluting the soil, air and water in the process. These recent examples heighten the concern that developing countries, where the bulk of the world’s population lives, may be unprepared for the environmental consequences of global trade. Studies of air quality show that it deteriorates in the early stages of economic growth, and then starts improving when per-capita income exceeds $5000 per year. If this holds for most kinds of pollution and resource depletion, then incomes will have to increase by a factor of five to ten in large developing countries like China and India before there is sufficient local demand for environmental protection. Assuming that free trade can eventually deliver this income growth, a big unknown is whether it will result in income-induced policy changes before the cost of cleaning up the environment becomes prohibitively high. Equally troublesome is the issue of trans-boundary pollution such as greenhouse-gas emissions, where countries with widely different income levels will have to come together with a unified policy response. Between 1973 and 2001, a period in which many domestic economies were turned inside out by globalization, annual carbon-dioxide emissions from worldwide fuel combustion increased by 50 percent. By 2030, these emissions are projected to be 60 percent higher than in 2001 if no new policies are adopted. Power generation and transportation -- two sectors crucial to trade -- will account for three-quarters of this increase. A great deal of uncertainty remains about the long-term environmental impacts of globalization. But the evidence we have so far suggests that free trade unconstrained by environmental protection could be a recipe for disaster.

#### Environmental collapse causes extinction

Cairns, Professor of Biology @ Virginia Tech, 4(John, Professor at Virginia Tech,  “Future of Life on Earth,”, <http://www.int-res.com/esepbooks/EB2Pt2.pdf>, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

One lesson from the five great global extinctions is that species and ecosystems come and go, but the evolutionary process continues. In short, life forms have a future on Earth, but humankind’s future depends on its stewardship of ecosystems that favor Homo sapiens. By practicing sustainability ethics, humankind can protect and preserve ecosystems that have services favorable to it. Earth has reached its present state through an estimated 4550 million years and may last for 15 000 million more years. The sixth mass extinction, now underway, is unique because humankind is a major contributor to the process. Excessive damage to the ecological life support system will markedly alter civilization, as it is presently known, and might even result in human extinction. However, if humankind learns to live sustainably, the likelihood of leaving a habitable planet for posterity will dramatically increase. The 21st century represents a defining moment for humankind—will present generations become good ancestors for their descendants by living sustainably or will they leave a less habitable planet for posterity by continuing to live unsustainably?

## AT: Free Trade – No Impact

#### Free trade doesn’t solve – limitations

Haslam, Ex-Governer of Vermont, 2 (James, August, “Free Trade Is Bad For Everybody”, <http://www.vtlivablewage.org/vwc/docs/james_freetrade02.html>, accesed 6/28/12, A.R.)

#### But let's be clear, the corporations that basically run our country have never really wanted "free trade". What they have wanted is to make as much money as possible, whatever the costs. Sometimes this means opening foreign labor and natural resource markets to corporate exploitation under the guise of "free trade", no matter the effect on the populations at home or abroad. But in other instances, making as much money as possible means going completely against free trade policies, for example, by having major domestic industries such as aerospace, computer technology and pharmaceuticals, be highly subsidized by the public while profits go to private shareholders. The editorial called for something they termed "free trade-plus", which puts some fetters on corporations by including some sort of basic labor and environmental standards. Others call this crazy idea - "fair trade". And fair trade is exactly what Rep. Sanders has been fighting for. The good news is that Vermonters and millions of people around the world are joining him in the struggle to change our economy from one focused on corporate profit, to one that puts people first.

#### Squo conditions make free trade theory wrong

Bernal, Jamaican Ambassador to the U.S , 93 [Richard, “Regional Trade Arrangements in the Western Hemisphere,” The American University Journal of International Law & Policy, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.]

Free trade theoretically constitutes the most beneficial situation. In the real world, however, conditions prevent the realization of this optimism. Hence, reality compels a resort to second best solutions, one of which is regional integration. Pursuit of this option was encouraged by the protectionism in industrialized countries which constrained industrialization and trade in Latin America and the Caribbean. Regional integration in the 1950s and 1960s was viewed as a means to spur growth and industrialization through increased trade induced by liberalization, the stimulus [\*718]  of competition, and the economies of scale generated by larger markets. The experience of the 1960s produced an increase in intra-regional trade. This momentum dissipated in the 1970s and 1980s due to external shocks, economic crisis, and political instability. In the late 1980s, there was a resurgence of interest in regional trade arrangements and regional integration.

#### Free Trade doesn’t deter war

Barbieri, Professor of Political Science, 96 (Katherine, Department of Political Science University of North Texas, February Journal of Peace Research, p. 42-43, date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.)

This study provides little empirical support for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace. Even after controlling for the influence of contiguity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities, the evidence suggests that in most instances trade fails to deter conflict. Instead, extensive economic interdependence increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; however, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war. The greatest hope for peace appears to arise from symmetrical trading relationships. However, the dampening effect of symmetry is offset by the expansion of interstate linkages. That is, extensive economic linkages, be they symmetrical or asymmetrical, appear to pose the greatest hindrance to peace through trade. Although this article focuses exclusively on the pre-WWII period, elsewhere I provide evidence that the relationships revealed here are also observed in the post WWII period and more extended period, 1870—1985 (Barbieri, 1995). Why do the findings differ from those presented in related studies of the trade—conflict relationship, which reveal an inverse relationship between trade and conflict? Several explanations, other than the temporal domain, can be offered. First, researchers differ in the phenomena they seek to explain, with many studies incorporating both conflictual and cooperative interstate behavior (e.g., Gasiorowski, 1986a, b; Gasiorowski & Polachek, 1982; Polachek, 1980, 1992; Polachek & McDonald, 1992). Studies that focus exclusively on extreme forms of conflict behavior, including disputes and wars, differ in their spatial and temporal domains, their level of analysis, and their measurement of central constructs. Preliminary tests reveal that the composition of dyads in a given sample may have a more dramatic impact on the empirical findings than variations in measurement. For example, the decision to focus exclusively on ‘politically relevant dyads’ may be one source of difference (O’Neal et al., 19%). Perhaps the primary component missing from this and related research is the inclusion of a more adequate assessment of the costs and benefits derived from interdependence. I have repeatedly argued that the conflictual or pacific elements of interdependence are directly related to perceptions about trade’s costs and benefits. Yet, a more comprehensive evaluation of these costs and benefits is needed to see whether a link truly exists between the benefits enjoyed in a given trading relationship and the inhibition of conflict in that relationship, or con¬versely, the presence of net costs for at least one trading partner and the presence of conflict in that relationship. For example, are trading relationships that contain two partners believed to benefit from trade less conflict-prone than those containing at least one partner perceived to be worse off from trade? I have merely outlined the types of relationships believed to confer the greatest benefits, but such benefits and costs require a more rigorous investigation.

#### Trade can’t solve war – US-Sino relations

Posner and Yoo, 6 [Eric A., Professor of Law at the University of Chicago and John, Professor of Law at Berkeley, “SYMPOSIUM: LEGAL IMPLICATIONS OF A RISING CHINA: International Law and the Rise of China,” date accessed 6/28/12, A.R.]

The problem with the WTO is that its effectiveness depends on a political consensus among major states that symmetric reduction in trade barriers is desirable. Right now, the WTO mediates trade conflicts between the EU, Japan, and the US. As Chinese economic power increases, the triangle will become a square. If these four powers can continue to cooperate over trade, then the WTO will be able to avoid disruptions on the margin. If they do not, then the WTO will be rendered irrelevant. A possible future is one in which China and the US seek to use trade as a means for strengthening their own spheres of influence and undermining those of the other. The US, for example, has already strengthened the economic bases of its power through the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico, and it is engaged in an effort to expand its economic leadership through a Free Trade of the Americas Agreement ("FTAA") [44](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=d85f1ef5ff8862674fe2edebd70fdf2e&docnum=1&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkAz&_md5=7cf68af845fd6c45acb0e637d9cda306&focBudTerms=%22free%20trade%22%20and%20%22trade%20barriers%22%20and%20%28war%20w/10%20%22great%20power%22%29&focBudSel=all" \l "n44" \t "_self) that would include the entire hemisphere. The FTAA has the virtue of both enhancing the economic strength of the US and furthering its hegemonic role in the Americas. The US also has strong economic ties to nations in East Asia, such as Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. China may seek to undermine American power by pushing the region into a trade bloc that would exclude the US. The outcome of such an effort will reflect the relative balance of power between the US and China in the region.  
In this future, trade relations might be a weapon for expanding influence or containing the influence of rivals. China will open its market to political friends and close it to allies of the US. The US will respond in kind. Over time, the world may split into separate trading blocs. The US will be the center of a western constellation including Canada and Latin America; China will dominate the east. A big question is whether states with major economies such as the EU and Japan will side with the US or China. Most likely, the EU will try to maintain trade relationships with both blocs, and neither bloc will be strong enough to demand allegiance. Japan will side with the US as long as the US can credibly promise to protect it from Chinese dominance.

## AT: Hege – Inevitable

#### The US will stay the hegemon for a while- other countries are unable to lead

Blumenthal 11(Dan Blumenthal, current commissioner and former vice chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 22 May 11, “Why It’s Still a Unipolar Era”, http://www.american.com/archive/2011/march/why-its-still-a-unipolar-era?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+American+%28AMERICAN.COM+--+A+Magazine+of+Ideas%2C+Online%29 SC)

Sometimes it takes a crisis to dispense with intellectual fads. The world’s response to Libya has made clear that currently fashionable arguments about the “rise of the Rest” and the world’s new “nonpolarity” are simply untrue. Charles Krauthammer was wrong about one thing in his description of the “unipolar moment” at the end of the Cold War: We are not living in a unipolar moment, we are witnessing a unipolar era. Why? Because the “rest”—China and India—are unable and unwilling to lead. The current fashion in foreign policy argumentation is to explain that America is in decline, particularly relative to Asia. The new declinists usually line up an impressive array of statistics that tell a story of India and China’s high rates of economic growth, military spending, energy consumption, and so on. The new declinists have a point—the raw numbers are impressive. But power is about much more than raw numbers. It is the most elusive concept in politics. It usually cannot be measured accurately until it is used. The recent example of the West’s decision to use force against Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi is a case in point. The United States was supposed to be entering a new era of constraints, perhaps even decline, bound by a severe financial debt crisis and an unwillingness to properly fund our military forces. Moreover, we have a president as ambivalent about exercising American power as we have seen in a generation. President Obama did all he could to dither and procrastinate while Qaddafi butchered his people. After all the hand-wringing, President Obama understood two things: the world order Washington needs demands that Qaddafi be stopped, and only America could stop him. Obama’s rhetoric about the United States not being in the lead against Qaddafi is just that: rhetoric meant to further a bizarre public relations agenda (Does anyone in the Middle East really believe we are not leading the effort in Libya? What purpose does pretending to take a back seat serve except to satisfy the Western left-wing intelligentsia?). Until President Obama directed his staff to secure a UN Security Council resolution and commit the U.S. military to stopping Qaddafi, the “international community” was paralyzed by inaction. The United Kingdom and France admirably made a strong moral and strategic case for intervention, but could not act without U.S. leadership.

[…]

What the new declinists miss is that while the United States is not as far ahead of India and China in material strength as it used to be, the vision of world order it shares with its NATO allies provides it with a moral strength and legitimacy impossible to measure. The new declinists point to the ways in which the “Rest” can make life marginally more difficult for the West. But while the “Rest” may carp from the sidelines and gum up the works on international trade and financial agreements, when it comes to upholding international order, Delhi and Beijing will take a pass. We may be tiring of it, but the Unipolar Era is alive and well.

#### Heg inev- no one will challenge our military, and it solves competitiveness

SWR 11(Southwest Ranch Financial, January 2011, “Market Timing for Investors Identify Turning Points in Asset Classes”, Pages 13-14, http://www.gleasonreport.com/emails/2011-01-tgr.pdf)

**US military influence will wane but not collapse** for a while. The American Model is the **projection of military might to gain economic dominance.** This is the age-old method of all successful empires. **The powerful military provides protection to allies but they must buy things from the empire at a hefty mark-up.** In return, the protected need spend very little on their own defense**. It’s an economy of scale idea and not evil in itself. The method of modern power delivery is the aircraft carrier fleet. These are functionally obsolete already with the invention of cruise missiles and silent running small diesel/electric submarines. No one seems willing to test this vulnerability because of the backup capability of America’s military.**

#### Heg inevitable- its supported by the international community

Norrlof 10 (Carla Norrlof, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto, America’s Global Advantage: US Hegemony and International Cooperation, 2010, <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=lMfuht7crW4C&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=hegemony+us&ots=hI5qlsjyxd&sig=ST9DlbxtORsbXAgyH15DAlFf_Hg#v=onepage&q&f=false>)

We have seen erroneous predictions of American decline before. In the 1970s, the combination of high inflation, high interest rates, high unemployment, the Vietnam War, political and military challenges from China and the Soviet Union, and the economic rise of Japan led to eerily similar forecasts. Pessimists then, as today, underestimated the longevity of American power. The main reason the United States has continued to occupy a unique place in the international system is because a sufficient number of major and lesser powers have a strong interest in maintaining America at the top of the hierarchy. To bring America down would take a deliberate, coordinated strategy on the part of others and this is simply not plausible. As much as the United States benefits from the space it has carved out for itself in the current world order, its ability to reap unequal gains will remain unless and until allies start to incur heavy losses under American dominance. Even that, by itself, will not be sufficient to sink American hegemony. A strong alternative to American rule will have to come into view for things to fundamentally change. At present, no credible alternative is in sight. The United States is not invincible but its dominance is currently steady. Those who are incline to think that American hegemony will persist – at least for a while – tend to dwell on the claim that the United States is providing a range of public goods to the benefit of all at its own expense. This is a chimera. The United States is self-interested, not altruistic. The illusion of benevolence has meant that very little attention has been given to uncovering the mechanism through which the United States gains disproportionately from supplying a large open market, the world’s reserve currency, and a military machine capable of stroking or foiling deadly disputes. This book exposes the mechanism through which the United States reaps unequal gains and shows that the current world system, and the distribution of power that supports it, has built-in stabilizers that strengthen American power following bouts of decline. Although all dominant powers must eventually decline, I will show that the downward progression need not be linear when mutually reinforcing tendencies across various power dimensions are at play. Specifically, I will demonstrate how the United States’ reserve currency status produces disproportionate commercial gains; how commercial power gives added flexibility in monetary affairs; and, finally, how military preponderance creates advantages in both monetary and trade affairs.

## AT: China

#### Port security is not the heart of conflict in trading with China

Ernst 11 (Dieter Ernst, August 11, Dr. Ernst is a former senior advisor to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development “Toward Greater Pragmatism? China’s Approach to Innovation and Standardization” <http://igcc.ucsd.edu/assets/001/502077.pdf>) MB

Why china’s approach matters. Only a few years ago, China’s approach to innovation and standardization barely played a role in international economic diplomacy. With its economic power on the rise, that assessment has changed dramatically. Today, China’s innovation policy and its perceived threat to American innovation and competitiveness is a hot topic in U.S.– China economic relations, adding to contentious disputes about exchange rates, trade, and foreign direct investment. Standardization, as well as intellectual property rights and government procurement, are at the center of this conflict. As the United States and China display fundamental differences in their levels of development and in their economic institutions, they pursue different approaches to standards and innovation policy. The U.S. consensus is that market forces and the private sector should play a primary role in innovation and standardization. China, on the other hand, relies much more on the government to define strategic objectives and key parameters.

#### China doesn’t depend on the US- the US is 5% of China’s GDP

Barry 1/24 (J.W., financial writer, 24 Jan 2012, “Report: Chinese economy 176% dependent on the US”, Helium, http://www.helium.com/items/2283977-us-trade-relations-with-china SC)

China relies on the United States for between $.27-$.30 trillion dollars in net trade revenue per U.S. Census Bureau data. This trade surplus amounts to 175.6 percent of China's total trade surplus according to a report by Forbes Magazine. Stated differently, China's trade surplus from the United States during 2011 demonstrates that China is importing more from other countries which is why the total Chinese trade surplus is lower than with the United States alone. To illustrate further, according to Gordon G. Chang, of Forbes magazine, China's trade surplus, or balance of imports and exports was $155.1 billion in the first 11 months of 2011. $272.3 billion divided by $155.1 billion is 175.6 percent, which is why Forbes thinks China is so reliant on the U.S. This conclusion is somewhat faulty and underdeveloped as it does not take into account China's trade patterns with other countries. For example in 2010, according to the US-China Business Council, China exported 53.8 percent more to Italy than it did in 2009, whereas the increase in exports to the United States for the same two years was 28.3 percent. The Chinese economy is also not solely reliant on trade. This is evident in statements made by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) about Chinese GDP. Specifically, exports out of China only account for 30 percent of Chinese gross domestic product, and one-third of economic growth per the IMF. This means, taken as a weighted percentage of total Chinese exports as a percent of GDP, the Chinese exports to the U.S. is more like .052 or near five percent of the Chinese GDP i.e. $273.3 billion divided by $1.578 trillion multiplied by 30 percent 17.3 .052 percent or five percent of the Chinese economy. Despite the numerical actualities that illustrate how China's economy is not 176.5 percent dependent on the United States, there are additional problems with the data. Moreover, Constantine Von Hoffman of CBS news reports there are issues surrounding the statistical validity and actuality of Chinese economic data. For example, according to CBS, Chinese debt numbers are dubious because only 231 or 3.5 percent of financial institutions are accountable for over 75 percent of the presumably accurate $759 billion in national debt. CBS goes on to report inconsistencies with the housing market, and monetary easing policy that is typically used as economic stimulus, and not during economic expansion. If the Chinese economy changes by reversing problems described by the CIA World Factbook and including things such as high savings, and low consumption, it could even mean the U.S. will become more dependent on Chinese imports. This is a pattern that has already begun per USCBC data, as U.S. exports to China increased $72.7 billion between 2001-2010. Additionally, U.S. loans from China in the form of Treasury Security purchases amounts to approximately 26.4 percent of U.S. government loans per Treasury Department data. This indicates an increasing reliance on funding from the Chinese government as this number was lower in previous years.

#### China is reducing its export dependency

China Economic Review 1/9 (China Economic Review, 9 Jan 2012, “World Bank urges China to lessen dependence on exports”, http://www.chinaeconomicreview.com/content/world-bank-urges-china-lessen-dependence-exports SC)

The World Bank will urge China to consolidate and improve transparency at financial institutions, loosen controls on savings and interest rates, and deepen its capital markets in a set of recommendations due to be issued in February, Reuters reported, quoting World Bank President Robert Zoellick on Saturday. Beijing realizes that the export-led growth model that has sustained the country in the last 30 years will not work in the decades ahead, Zoellick told economists at an annual meeting of the Allied Social Science Institution. The World Bank's recommendations would help China reduce its dependence on exports for sustaining growth, changes that might in turn help to lessen tensions with the US over the value of China's currency and its ballooning trade surplus. The US trade deficit with China swelled to US$245.5 billion between January and October 2011, compared with US$273.1 billion in 2010 and US$226.9 billion in 2009. The World Bank will also recommend that China limit the role of powerful state-owned companies, break up monopolies, and lower entry barriers for private firms, Zoellick said.

#### China will be completely food independent in 2020.

Beek 6/27 (Vincent 6/27/12, graduated from Groningen University in 2001, holds an MA in history and journalism and he followed a post-graduate journalism course in the United Kingdom, “China – heading for food self-sufficiency and more”, http://www.pigprogress.net/background/china-%E2%80%93-heading-for-food-self-sufficiency-and-more-8981.html)

How will China cope with its growing population and growing demand for foods? Is the country able to feed its projected 1.34 billion inhabitants by 2050? Clearly, yes, says Jikun Huang, of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. By 2020 the country will be 99% self-sufficient. The story has been well-known for some time. When it comes to food security in China, many have pointed to rapid economic growth, the rising food demand, increasing imports of feedstuffs like soybeans. So often, the question is: Who will feed China? A question for Jikun Huang, from the Center for Chinese Agricultural Policy at the Chinese Academy of Sciences. He addressed the audience at the ‘*Feeding the World*’ summit, organised by the Economist Group and sponsored by DSM, in Geneva, Switzerland, on 8 February. His answer can be summarised as: China will take care of itself – and others too. Huang pointed to the time frame between 1992 and 2010, stating that in 17 years, China was a net food exporter. It is only in the last three years that China had to import. He also mentioned the fact that both national and household food security has significantly improved in this time. Huang continued by explaining how China had managed to achieve this. The annual growth rate of China’s agriculture has been 4.4 times the rate of the population growth in the last 30 years. To support this, he showed figures of a staggering grain production growth (74%) between 1978 and 2009; a whopping oil crop production growth by 505% in that same time frame. Similarly, meat production has grown extremely strong over the last 30 years, be it for pork, poultry, beef or mutton. Two developments in Beijing are at the basis of these achievements, Huang explained – a combination of strong investments in agriculture and a national policy reform. **Investments** Between 1984 and 1997, the Chinese central government invested roughly between 50-100 billion yuan (€6-12 billion) annually in the agricultural sector. As from 1998, the budget was increased virtually every year to reach 450 billion yuan (€56 billion) in 2008 with more growth projected. Part of the investments went into stepping up the amount of irrigated land. About 50% of total cultivated land in China is now used for irrigation, a total of almost 60 million ha. In comparison, by 1950, this was approximately 15 million ha. The key element of future investments (e.g. for 2012) will be Research & Development-related, Huang said. **Policy changes** Water always used to be a key element in the agricultural investments and in the future, water management will continue to receive a lot of attention. Huang said that in the next ten years, about 4,000 billion yuan (€495 billion) will be invested in water conservancy. This eventually has to lead to improvements in water use in both agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. The rising food import pressure is also a theme the Chinese government is working on, Huang said. Policy responses include a target of 95% of grain self-sufficiency and nearly 100% food self-sufficiency. The investments in agriculture in China were mentioned, but this also includes investments in Africa. All these changes ought to lead to a reasonably positive outlook in the longer term with regard to imports

## AT: Food Prices/Ag

#### US can’t sustain Grain Exports – severe water shortages are the new norm from megadroughts and aquifer depletion

**Snyder 12** (Michael, 2/28/12, http://articles.businessinsider.com/2012-02-28/news/31106855\_1\_water-problems-ogallala-aquifer-drought-conditions, accessed on 6/28/12, EW)

For decades, the heartland of America has been the breadbasket of the world. Unfortunately, those days will shortly come to an end. The **central United States is rapidly drying up and dust bowl conditions will soon return**. There are a couple of major reasons for this. Number one**, the Ogallala Aquifer is being depleted at an astounding pace**. The **Ogallala Aquifer one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the entire world**, and **water from it currently irrigates more than 15 million acres of crops**. When that water is gone we will be in a world of hurt. Secondly**, drought conditions have become the "new normal" in** many areas of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas and other **states in the middle part of the country**. Scientists tell us that the wet conditions that we enjoyed for several decades after World War II were actually the exception to the rule and that most of time time the interior west is incredibly dry. They also tell us that when dust bowl conditions return to the area, they might stay with us a lot longer than a decade like they did during the 1930s. Unfortunately, without water you cannot grow food, and with global food supplies as tight as they are right now we cannot afford to have a significant decrease in agricultural production. But it is not just the central United States that is experiencing the early stages of a major water crisis. Already many other areas around the nation are rapidly developing their own water problems. As supplies of fresh water get tighter and tighter, some really tough decisions are going to have to be made. Fresh water is absolutely essential to life, and it is going to become increasingly precious in the years ahead. Most Americans have never even heard of the Ogallala Aquifer, but the truth is that it is one of the most important bodies of water on the globe. It covers well over 100,000 square miles and it sits underneath the states of Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, Wyoming and South Dakota**. Water drawn from the Ogallala Aquifer is used to water more than 15 million acres of crops. Without this source of water, the United States would not be the breadbasket of the world.** That is why what is happening right now is so alarming. The following are 20 signs that dust bowl conditions will soon return to the heartland of America.... #1 The Ogallala Aquifer is being drained at a rate of approximately 800 gallons per minute. #2 According to the U.S. Geological Survey, since 1940 "**a volume equivalent to two-thirds of the water in Lake Erie" has been permanently lost from the Ogallala Aquifer**. #3 Decades ago**, the Ogallala Aquifer had an average depth of approximately 240 feet, but today the average depth is just 80 feet. In some areas of Texas, the water is gone completely**. #4 **Scientists are warning that nothing can be done to stop the depletion of the Ogallala Aquifer. The ominous words of David Brauer of the Ogallala Research Service should alarm us all**.... "Our goal now is to engineer a soft landing. That's all we can do." #5 According to a recent National Geographic article, the average depletion rate of the Ogallala Aquifer is picking up speed.... Even more worrisome, the draining of the High Plains water account has picked up speed. The average annual depletion rate between 2000 and 2007 was more than twice that during the previous fifty years. The depletion is most severe in the southern portion of the aquifer, especially in Texas, where the water table beneath sizeable areas has dropped 100-150 feet; in smaller pockets, it has dropped more than 150 feet. #6 **According to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. interior west is now the driest that it has been in 500 years**. #7 It seems like the middle part of the United States experiences a major drought almost every single year now. Last year**, "the drought of 2011" virtually brought Texas agriculture to a standstill**. More than 80 percent of the state of Texas experienced "exceptional drought" conditions at some point, and it was estimated that about 30 percent of the wheat fields in Texas were lost. Agricultural losses from the drought were estimated to be $3 billion in the state of Texas alone. #8 Wildfires have burned millions of acres of vegetation in the central part of the United States in recent years. For example, **wildfires burned an astounding3.6 million acres in the state of Texas alone during 2011**. This helps set the stage for huge dust storms in the future. #9 Texas is not the only state that has been experiencing extremely dry conditions. **Oklahoma only got about 30 percent of the rainfall that it normally gets last summer.** #10 In some areas of the southwest United States we are already seeing huge dust storms come rolling through major cities. You can view video of a giant dust storm rolling through Phoenix, Arizona right here. #11 Unfortunately, scientists tell us that it would be normal for dust bowl conditions to persist in parts of North America for decades. The following is from an article in the Vancouver Sun.... But University of Regina paleoclimatologist Jeannine-Marie St. Jacques says that decade-long drought is nowhere near as bad as it can get. St. Jacques and her colleagues have been studying tree ring data and, at the American Association for the Advancement of Science conference in Vancouver over the weekend, she explained the reality of droughts. **"What we're seeing in the climate records is these megadroughts, and they don't last a decade—they last 20 years, 30 years, maybe 60 years, and they'll be semi-continental in expanse," she told the Regina Leader-Post** by phone from Vancouver. "So it's like what we saw in the Dirty Thirties, but imagine the Dirty Thirties going on for 30 years. That's what scares those of us who are in the community studying this data pool." #12 Experts tell us that U.S. water bills are likely to soar in the coming years. It is being projected that repairing and expanding our decaying drinking water infrastructure will cost more than one trillion dollars over the next 25 years, and as a result our water bills will likely approximately triple over that time period. #13 Right now, **the United States uses approximately 148 trillion gallons of fresh water a year, and there is no way that is sustainable in the long run**. #14 **According to a U.S. government report, 36 states are already facing water shortages or will be facing water shortages within the next few years**. #15 Lake Mead supplies about 85 percent of the water to Las Vegas, and since 1998 the level of water in Lake Mead has dropped by about 5.6 trillion gallons. #16 A federal judge has ruled that the state of Georgia has very few legal rights to Lake Lanier, and since Lake Lanier is the main water source for the city of Atlanta that presents quite a problem. #**17 It has been estimated that the state of California only has a 20 year supply of fresh water left.** #18 It has been estimated that the state of New Mexico only has a 10 year supply of fresh water left. #19 Approximately 40 percent of all rivers in the United States and approximately 46 percent of all lakes in the United States have become so polluted that they are are no longer fit for human use. #20 Eight states in the Great Lakes region have signed a pact banning the export of water from the Great Lakes to outsiders - even to other U.S. states. Unfortunately, it is not just the United States that is facing a shortage of fresh water in the near future. The reality is that most of the rest of the world is in far worse shape than we are. Just consider the following stats....

#### US can’t support/supply grain Global; Climate Change

**Stebbins 11** (Christine, , 9/5/11, http://www.trust.org/alertnet/news/feature-in-worlds-breadbasket-climate-change-feeds-some-worry/, accessed on 6/28/12, EW)

The United States, the breadbasket and supplier of last resort for a hungry world, has been such an amazing food producer in the last half-century that most Americans take for granted annual bounteous harvests of grain, meat, dairy, fruits, vegetables and other crops. When horrific images of drought or famine in Africa, Asia or other regions land in American media, America is usually first in line with food aid shipments, air drops, and other rescue efforts from its seemingly endless stores. **The U.S. alone accounts for half of all world corn exports, 40 percent of soybean exports and 30 percent of wheat exports**. But climate change fears are sounding some warning bells. Some scientists and agronomists are becoming increasingly concerned about the real effects they see now on growing conditions in the Midwest, the vast black-soiled region long the core region of the U.S. agricultural miracle. They also say that not only skeptical farmers but also government authorities are trying to quietly adapt, from equipment to planting to research. "We don't have a long-term reserve. We have a global food supply of about 2 or 3 weeks," said Eugene Takle, Professor of Agricultural Meteorology and Director of the Climate Science Program at Iowa State University. "We've become insensitive to climate -- with air conditioning, irrigation and better practices," he said. "Well, I think we need to rethink that. Just how vulnerable are we?" Takle and others say the future is now**. "It's not the long-term climate trends," Takle says, "It's the variability. It's the extreme events that have brought the vulnerability of agriculture to climate into the forefront. We think about, and wring our hands for awhile."** Jerry Hatfield, Laboratory Director at the National Soil Tilth Laboratory in Ames, Iowa, has worked with other scientists in research for the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. He says climate change is occurring right now, as is adaptation to it, in the U.S. farm belt. "We don't have to think about 2030 or 2050, in the recent memories we've had a lot more variability in our weather," Hatfield said. "This increasing variability of weather, which is associated with our changing climate scenarios, is going to continue to increase the variability in production. "That's what concerns a lot of us," Hatfield said. GOVERNMENT FUNDING RESEARCH, FARMERS ADJUSTING The IPCC, which has been attacked by climate change skeptics, concluded in 2007 that increased frequency of heat stress, droughts and floods are "creating the possibility for surprises, with impacts that are larger, and occurring earlier, than predicted using changes in mean variables alone." **"Climate variability and change also modify the risks of fires, pest and pathogen outbreak, negatively affecting food, fiber and forestry," the Panel said**. Despite the attacks by skeptics, IPCC's conclusions have been accepted as valid by institutions like the U.S. National Academies of Sciences. In June 2009, the science academies of the G8 countries, plus Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa, demanded action to address global climate change that "is happening even faster than previously estimated." Takle said Midwest farmers are already adapting. **"Farmers say they don't believe in climate change, but you look at how they spend money and are adapting," he said. Takle pointed to bigger machinery to allow faster and denser seeding amid rainier springs in the Midwest.** Frosts are trending later so crops are kept in fields longer to dry. But many of the changes are more subtle and hidden than the weather events that grab the headlines, like the massive wildfires, flooding and tornadoes that have hit agricultural areas of the Midwest, Plains and Southwest this year. Takle said measurable trends of more humidity, for example, has led to higher night-time summer temperatures in the Corn Belt and likely trimmed corn yields in recent years. Corn likes hot days but cool nights. In Iowa, dew point temperatures have risen 3-1/2 degrees Fahrenheit in the last 35-40 years, equating to 13 percent more moisture in the air during the summertime, he said. "It's very important that we recognize the vulnerability," Takle said. "We have situations like in Texas. Huge reservoirs have just vanished. You can't do a work around**." The U.S. Agriculture Department this year issued its first grants to study crops and climate change**. "If you're interested in adapting to changes in climatic norms you need to have access to diversity," said Randy Wisser of the University of Delaware, who will study the genetics in exotic tropical maize to see how this might help farmers. Other grants will address greenhouse gas emissions that affect climate, notably methane from livestock and carbon dioxide from growing crops. "We are just trying to find a suitable way to keep these farmers in business. It took generations to create the problem it will take generations to fix the problem," said William Horwath of the University in California, who will develop strategy for rice growing in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. "It's a pretty darn complex problem," Hatfield said. "We poke at it, but we need to get very serious about how do we think about adapting our crop production goals to the concepts of variability."