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# 1ac - plan

The United States federal government should substantially increase investment to modernize inland waterways infrastructure.

# 1ac - inherency

**First is inherency --**

**Inland waterways are massively underfunded and failing in the status quo – by 2020 80% of locks will be obsolete**

**ASCE 12** [American Society of Civil Engineers, “ASCE Tells Congress More Must Be Invested in Inland Waterways”, May]

Testifying on April 18 before the U.S. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee’s Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, James A. Rossberg, P.E., M.ASCE, the Society’s managing director of engineering programs, said that efforts by the administration and Congress to address the growing investment deficit in waterways infrastructure have largely been ineffectual because of political considerations that give precedence to deficit reduction and tax cuts over the badly needed restoration of critical infrastructure. “We can sum up the present situation concisely,” Rossberg said before the subcommittee chair, Bob Gibbs (R-Ohio), and the ranking minority member, Tim Bishop (D–New York). “These policy failures at the White House and in Congress threaten the nation’s economic competitiveness in a global economy. “ASCE’s 2009 Report Card for America’s Infrastructure gave the nation’s inland waterways a grade of D–, an indication that the system is near failure. Neither [the] president nor Congress has done anything in the years since to improve upon that extremely dismal assessment by adopting a long-term, systematic approach to improve the performance and condition of our national waterways.” The Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment deals with water resources development, water pollution control, water infrastructure, conservation and management, and hazardous waste cleanup. It held the April 18 hearing to receive expert testimony on how the reliability of inland waterways systems will affect the country’s economic competitiveness. Rossberg began by citing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Great Lakes and Ohio River Navigation Systems Commerce Report, 2008 in telling the subcommittee that the United States has more than 25,000 mi of inland, intracoastal, and coastal waterways. The federal government improves and maintains almost 11,000 mi, or about 45 percent, of the total channel length. This includes dredging and the installation and maintenance of such navigation structures as locks, dams, dikes, revetments, and groins. The federal and state governments, along with port authorities and carriers, he said, share responsibility for the nation’s waterway transportation system. The inland waterway transportation industry, he explained, is characterized by extensive cooperation and coordination on the part of the public and private sectors, and the waterway navigation projects that facilitate safe passage for vessels are maintained by the Corps of Engineers. “Because of their ability to move large amounts of cargo, the nation’s inland waterways are a strategic economic and military resource,” stressed Rossberg. “An analysis by the U.S. Army War College concluded that ‘the strategic contributions of these inland waterways are not well understood. The lack of adequate understanding impacts decisions contributing to efficient management, adequate funding, and effective integration with other modes of transportation at the national level. Recommendations demonstrate that leveraging the strategic value of U.S. inland waterways will contribute to building an effective and reliable national transportation network for the 21st century.’” The administration’s budget proposal for fiscal year (FY) 2013 for the Corps of Engineers would provide $4.7 billion, a decrease of more than 5 percent from the $5 billion approved for the current fiscal year. Rossberg said that ASCE believes this level of spending is insufficient to meet the country’s national security, economic, and environmental needs in the 21st century. “The president’s budget for FY 2013 is inadequate to meet the needs of an aging waterways infrastructure and must be increased,” said Rossberg. “Congress must increase funding for the Corps in the coming fiscal year in order to protect an essential economic asset and ensure American competitiveness in the 21st century. “The administration’s proposal for FY 2013 would reduce construction funding from $1.694 billion to $1.471 billion, a reduction of 13 percent. Operations and maintenance funding would be down slightly, from $2.412 billion to $2.398 billion. The Mississippi River and tributaries account would decline from $252 million to $234 million, or seven percent. Investigations—the money used to complete project feasibility studies—would go from $125 million to $102 million, a decline of 18 percent. In all, the [Corps of Engineers] civil works program budget for FY 2013 would be cut from $5.002 billion in FY 2012 to $4.731 billion in FY 2013, an overall reduction of 5.4 percent.” Rossberg told the subcommittee that ASCE recommends $5.2 billion in new budget authority for the Corps of Engineers in FY 2013 to account for inflation and to halt the continuing decline in funding for the Corps’s work. This level of funding is necessary to ensure safe infrastructure and a sound economy. Public investment in inland waterways, he said, is needed throughout the country to reverse the present course of declining infrastructure. “Forty-seven percent of all locks maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers were classified as functionally obsolete in 2006,” he told the subcommittee. “Assuming that no new locks are built within the next 20 years, by 2020 another 93 existing locks will be obsolete, rendering more than 8 out of every 10 locks now in service outdated. Most locks now are anywhere from 50 to 70 years old. “The current system of inland waterways lacks resilience. Waterway usage is increasing, but facilities are aging and many are well past their design life of 50 years. Recovery from any event of significance would be negatively impacted by the age and deteriorating condition of the system, posing a direct threat to the American economy.” To obtain the funds for greater investment, Rossberg mentioned a proposal made in April 2010 by the Inland Waterways Users Board, a consortium established by Congress. That plan called for increasing the diesel fuel tax from 20 cents to as much as 29 cents per gallon. It also recommended that the practice of equal sharing of costs for projects costing more that $100 million by federal and local authorities continue but suggested that the federal government cover the full cost of projects costing less than $100 million. The Inland Waterways Users Board estimated that its plan would provide $7.6 billion in new revenues over 20 years. “Doing more with less is not a solution,” concluded Rossberg. “It is a political slogan that ignores the consequences of continuing to underinvest in essential infrastructure, and it contains the seeds of future disasters. It is obvious that recent drastic budget cuts or the complete elimination of funding means that little or nothing will be done to maintain these vital programs. America cannot compete in the world marketplace with 100-year-old locks, too-shallow harbors, impoverished investments in key infrastructure systems, and a seeming blindness on the part of policy makers to the economic peril we face. Enabling the eventual failure of the nation’s essential public infrastructure through arbitrary budget cutting is deeply troubling. Placing abstract notions of budget deficits above the primary duty of the federal government to protect human life and promote economic growth is a dubious policy choice, a choice whose lethal consequences were amply demonstrated in New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina and the failure of that city’s inadequately budgeted and constructed levee system. Congress must never be able to escape the knowledge that it was complicit in the failure. Congress and the president can never say, ‘We weren’t told.’”

# 1ac - econ

Advantage <One> is the economy --

Subpoint A is Stimulus

**Investment in inland waterways is crucial to increasing employment and sustainable shipping.**

**Aging infrastructure means a failure could come at any time and collapse the economy.**

**House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee 11** [“HEARING FOCUSES ON ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF AGING U.S. INLAND WATERWAYS SYSTEM”, Press Release, September 21]

“Transportation savings are a key factor to growing our economy and getting Americans back to work,” said U.S. Rep. Bob Gibbs (R-OH), Chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee. “The continual rise in fuel prices means that waterway transportation is a more attractive and cost effective shipping method. But an inefficient transportation system will raise costs and when transportation costs go up, the competitiveness of American-made products on the world market goes down. And that means lost jobs.” Gibbs highlighted the current state of the nation’s inland waterways system, and elaborated on some of the economic impacts created by system inefficiencies. Fifty-seven percent of the structures on the system are more than 50 years old. Thirty-even percent are more than 70 years old. Locks built in the 1830s remain in service today. Age is taking its toll on the reliability of this important mode of transportation. “The system provides freight mobility that otherwise would be costly or even impossible to address,” Gibbs said. “However, navigation outages along the system are increasing. For instance, Ohio River outages have increased from 25,000 hours in 2000 to 80,000 hours today. This trend of increasing outages is expected to continue. While it affects the reliability of the system, it also foretells the likelihood of a major physical failure at one of the structures. A failure could shut down navigation for a few weeks or a few years. The enormous economic consequences would be felt nationwide. “Addressing the infrastructure needs of the inland waterways system is not about economic benefits to a few barge companies. It is about keeping American farms and businesses competitive and growing American jobs,” Gibbs added. Witnesses at today’s hearing provided insight into the economic importance of inland waterways as part of a balanced multi-modal freight transportation network. According to Larry Bray, with the University of Tennessee’s Center for Transportation Research, “The use of inland waterways to support freight transportation saves shippers (and their customers) billions of dollars annually. Moreover, in some cases, the freight that moves by water cannot be moved any other way. In these cases, the value of available barge transportation is literally incalculable.” Bray said that the inland waterways transportation saves shippers and customers over $7 billion every year. Bray described the impacts on the U.S. freight system in the event of a significant disruption of the inland waterways system: “A wholesale diversion of waterway traffic to the nation’s rail network would require roughly 100 thousand additional railroad freight cars and 2,500 additional locomotives.” Gibbs stated that if the amount of cargo that moves by inland waterways was to move by truck, it would require 58 million truck loads. Steve Ebke, representing the National Corn Growers Association, spoke about the importance of the system to the agriculture sector, which accounts for nearly one-third of all freight transportation services in the United States. “Farmers move their crops and receive their inputs by barge, rail and truck,” Ebke said. “The competition among these modes of transportation helps farmers receive the best price for their crops, meet their customers’ demand for timely delivery of products and successfully compete with foreign producers. Without the competition that comes from access to efficient, alternative transportation methods, farmers can pay significantly more to transport their grain. “The American farmer’s international competitiveness has always hinged on the ability to move crops to market. The lower the cost of transportation, the lower the cost of U.S. grain on the world market; thus, the more grain the U.S. is able to sell. South American countries are investing large sums in river infrastructure to upgrade their river systems to be more competitive with the U.S. America cannot afford to allow any aspect of river commerce to deteriorate for fear of losing export market share to South America at the expense of our agriculture industry,” said Ebke. Mike Toohey, President and CEO of Waterways Council, Inc, the national public policy organization advocating a modern and well-maintained system of ports and inland waterways, added, “In this sluggish economy where the unemployment rate is over 20% for construction workers, these projects can put thousands of people to work right away. And, these projects, once completed, will provide billions of dollars of activity for the American economy.” Stephen Little, former Chairman of the Inland Waterways Users Board and president of a company that employs 350 people and operates a fleet of 35 towboats and 1,000 barges, testified about the substantial increases in the amount of time for completing navigation projects compared to years past. “Our nation’s inland waterway modernization challenge going forward is the need to create and implement an improved program for the future. We have an aging system that needs recapitalization,” Little said. “We have a project funding and delivery system that is terribly inefficient, resulting in enormous wasted time and taxpayer dollars. He continued, “In the past our nation could build 26 projects in 10 years on the Upper Mississippi River, 7 lock and dam projects in 9 years on the Illinois River, locks and dams at 10 sites in 12 years on the Tennessee-Tomibigbee Waterway, and seven new projects in 4 to 8 years following WRDA 86. Today it is taking 30 years to build new projects in each of two locations and 14 years to build what it took 3 years to build at another location. This is completely unsatisfactory and is wasting billions and billions of dollars of scarce national investment resources.” Little went on to outline the Inland Waterways Users Board’s recommendations for improving the Corps’ project delivery performance.

# 1ac - econ

Subpoint B is congestion

Congestion on highways and railroads causes prices to skyrocket and hurts the economy

**US DOT 7** [U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, “The Maritime Administration and the U.S. Marine Transportation System: A Vision for the 21 st Century”, November, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/Vision\_of\_the\_21st\_Century\_10-29.pdf]

What about the cost of congestion? Ever y person in the countr y bears congestion’s heavy price: close to $200 billion is incurred each year in lost revenue and wasted time and fuel, which is eventually passed on to the American consumer. Savings gained from economies of scale and other efﬁciencies, such as advanced vessel and cargo handling designs, are quickly wiped out if vessels are not fully loaded, there are delays in loading or unloading ships, highways are gridlocked, or rail systems are at capacity. Congestion constrains not only growth but distorts business decisions. The lack of reliability in the transportation infrastructure drives up costs for retailers who must hold more inventory to counter supply chain delays. This can lead to increased prices for goods, which has a negative impact on businesses, consumers and the U.S. economy. It means lost export opportunities for American businesses, par ticularly agricultural products. These are but some of the problems congestion brings, but there are also solutions to them.

**Inland waterways relieve congestion**

**US DOT 7** [U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, “The Maritime Administration and the U.S. Marine Transportation System: A Vision for the 21 st Century”, November, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/Vision\_of\_the\_21st\_Century\_10-29.pdf]

The greater use of America’s Marine Highways is one answer to congestion on our highways and railroads. The use of vessels could reduce major bottlenecks, such as bridges and tunnels, as well as congested interstates, such as I-95 which parallels the U.S. Atlantic coastwise routes. Properly developed, the Marine Highway can greatly relieve the increased stress on the overall transportation system. The use of Marine Highways can reduce overall fuel consumption and limit the amount of air pollution. Moreover, studies have shown the fuel efﬁciency and pollution reduction beneﬁts by switching to newer, environmentally friendly vessels. Using the Marine Highways is cheaper too. However, a barrier exists in those areas in which the Harbor Maintenance Tax is imposed and collected. Effor ts have been under taken to address this impediment to greater use of U.S. water ways. Shippers and maritime community stakeholders have sent the message that the time for talk is over. They want to expand America’s Marine Highway to ease landside congestion problems, improve transportation efﬁciencies and grow the economy. The Maritime Administration suppor ts the development of new Nor th American Marine Highway ser vices and aligning and integrating them into the national, state and local transpor tation planning process. The Agency is also working with U.S. shipyards to develop and promote new vessel designs and construction efﬁciencies to build and repair the vessels needed to expand the Marine Highway System.

# 1ac - econ

**Subpoint C is trade**

**Inland waterways are crucial to domestic and foreign trade as other transportation methods at capacity**

**Nachtmann and Pohl 11** [Heather, PhD, Associate Professor in the Department of Industrial Engineering at the University of Arkansas, and Letitia, PhD, an aircraft logistics analyst for the Air Force, “Sustaining Resilient Inland Waterways via Renewable Energy”, July, http://www.uark.edu/rd\_engr/MBTC/MBTC\_DHS\_1108.pdf]

The U.S. transportation system consists of a complex network of highways, railways and inland waterways. Freight transportation along this network is essential to the nation’s social and economic welfare. Projected population and economic growth, increasing globalization of trade, and the emphasis on just‐in‐time deliveries, reinforces the need for an efficient transportation network. This increasing reliance on transportation comes at a time when highways are already congested with truck traffic and the railways are operating near capacity. The Government Accountability Office concluded that future demand for transportation (both passenger and freight) will strain an aging and already heavily‐used transportation network (GAO, 2007). Over the past 25 years, route miles of public roads increased by 4%, while vehicle miles increased by 94%. Likewise, the number of miles of railroad dropped by more than 20%, while rail shipments in ton‐ miles increased by 81% (DOT, 2008). The Federal Highway Administration’s projected increase in congestion on U.S. highways is illustrated in Figure 2. Transportation congestion negatively impacts the U.S. economy, reduces air quality, greatly increases infrastructure maintenance and upgrade costs, and generally decreases quality of life for the American public. Inland waterway transportation plays a critical role in the U.S. economy today, and has the potential to be even more important as our dependence on limited transportation assets increases. The inland waterway system is vital to both domestic and foreign trade by carrying nearly one‐sixth of the volume of cargo moved between U.S. cities, and connecting ocean shipping to major inland ports. Inland and intracoastal waterways directly serve 38 states. In 2007, total domestic waterborne commerce (inland, coastal and Great Lakes) amounted to over 1.1 billion tons, with a value of over $380 billion. Cargo shipped on inland waterways alone totaled over 622 million tons, with primary commodities being coal, petroleum and petroleum products, farm products, raw materials and chemicals (USACE, 2009). Inland waterway transportation offers a safe, economical and energy‐efficient alternative to highway and rail freight movement, causes relatively little congestion, produces little air/noise pollution and creates minimal land use and negative social impact. Barges are well‐suited to moving heavy or bulk commodities such as petroleum, coal and grain. A typical barge can carry as much coal or grain as 15 rail cars or 58 truck trailers. Figure 3 shows that a typical 15‐barge tow carrying 22,500 tons is the equivalent of 216 railcars (2.25 unit trains) and 1,050 trucks (USACE, 2008). The USACE estimates that it would take an additional 6 million rail cars or 24 million trucks to transport the amount of cargo currently carried on inland waterways each year (USACE, 2009). Without the use of inland waterways as a transportation mode, waterborne cargo would have to be transferred to highway and rail, thereby increasing shipment costs, highway and rail congestion, wear and tear on rail systems and road surfaces, and air pollution. Considering just one commodity, there are over 180 million tons of coal shipped on inland waterways each year (USACE, 2008). The Federal Highway Administration estimates that for every one million tons of coal diverted from barge to truck, 45,600 additional trucks would be needed to move the coal at a cost of $1.14 million in surface repairs alone (USACE, 2002). Towboat emissions per ton‐mile are considerably less than truck emissions, with the comparative fuel efficiency as noted in Figure 4. The economic health of numerous industries and geographic regions and the security of tens of thousands of U.S. jobs (IRS, 2010) are tied to inland waterway transportation. Two important waterborne commodities are explored in further detail below. 2.1.1 Coal Shipments on the Ohio River System Coal accounts for half of our nation’s electricity production, and over 20% of U.S. coal is transported on inland waterways (USACE, 2009). This dependence on barge shipments is perhaps best illustrated in the Ohio River basin, where coal represents 55% of waterborne cargo. Two major coal fields are located near the Ohio River: the Appalachian Region and the Illinois Basin. In 2007, the Appalachian Region alone produced 377.8 million tons of coal, or 33% of total U.S. coal production. Almost 37% of Appalachian coal is shipped by waterway, 41% by rail, 16% by truck, and 6% by conveyor/slurry (USACE, 2008). Many coal‐consuming cement, steel and power plants have been built along the Ohio River system, due in part to a plentiful water supply and the proximity of the waterways to coal fields. Figure 5 shows the locations and relative capacities of waterside power plants. Regional electrical costs/rates, and therefore the economic viability of the area, depend on the reliability and security of the inland waterways (Güler, 2009). 2.1.2 Grain Shipments on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers Over 60% of farm exports move on inland waterways, which translates to nearly 80 million tons of grain that move by barge annually (USACE, 2009). In contrast, almost all domestic shipments of grain are moved by either truck or short line rail. This difference in mode selection is due to the savings barge travel affords when travel distances are long, as in trips from the upper Midwest to a Gulf Coast seaport. As the domestic market for grain dramatically increases (primarily due to ethanol production increases), the trend is towards a greater reliance on trucking for grain shipment. This has led to increasing concern with the wear and tear on rural roads and bridges, and has motivated advocacy for inland waterway use for domestic grain shipments (Frittelli, 2005). Currently, about 90% of exported corn and the bulk of exported soybeans are moved by barge, since these crops are grown relatively close to the Upper Mississippi, Illinois and Ohio Rivers (Frittelli, 2005). Nearly 500 U.S. grain transfer facilities (see Figure 6) are served by water transportation, with over 125 facilities located on the Upper Mississippi River and the Illinois Waterway (USACE, 2005). This high barge traffic has resulted in congestion on critical waterways and wait times at the locks. Because of this, a major infrastructure improvement project under Congressional consideration is enlargement of the locks on the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway to make grain barge travel more efficient (Frittelli, 2005). Disruptions in this trade route could increase delays and have significant economic impact on the agricultural and waterways communities, particularly given the perishability of agricultural products. The future of the U.S. grain export market is dependent on a number of complex issues. An Institute of Water Resources study, which attempts to forecast grain shipments on the Upper Mississippi River, identifies three key changes occurring in the world grain trade which could impact both foreign demand and U.S. surplus: Brazil’s soybean sector, China’s agricultural import demand, and domestic ethanol production (Wilson et al., 2006). Future developments, while uncertain, have the potential to greatly impact the U.S. grain export market, thereby affecting the quantity of grain exports shipped on the rivers. 2.2 Vulnerabilities and Resilience of Inland Waterways The Mississippi River and its tributaries have been described as a lifeline to the U.S. economy**.** Inland waterways as a transportation mode contribute significantly to the U.S. economy, as measured by the value of the domestic and export cargo transported on barges, and by the tens of thousands of jobs associated with river transport and inland ports. The rivers are also critical sources of water for agricultural irrigation, industrial applications, and hydropower. Major metropolitan areas, such as Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Memphis and New Orleans, as well as thousands of smaller communities, were located to take advantage of commercial and recreational opportunities offered by the rivers. Critical infrastructure along inland waterways includes nuclear power plants, military installations, major rail and highway bridges and locks and dams. As an important component of the nation’s transportation system, inland waterways are vulnerable to disruptions due to failures of aging infrastructure, flooding, accidents, hazardous cargo spills and natural disasters (e.g., earthquake in New Madrid Seismic Zone). The waterways are also potential means for launching terrorist attacks on waterside infrastructure and population centers. The resilience of inland waterways is the ability of the system to respond or recover from potential threats due to either natural or manmade causes.

# 1ac - econ

Maritime trade is the keystone of the economy. Inland waterways need to be modernized now to accommodate larger vessels from the widening of the Panama Canal

**USACE 12** [US Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, “U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy: Options for the Future”, April 2]

The health of the U.S. economy depends upon the vitality and expansion of international trade. International trade depends upon the nation’s navigation infrastructure, which serves as a conduit for transportation, trade and tourism and connects us to the global community. Marine transportation is one of the most efficient, effective, safe and environmentally sound ways to transport people and goods. It is a keystone of the U.S. economy. \_\_\_ percent [data to be inserted in next draft] of our international trade moves through the nation’s ports. The navigation industry is building ever larger ships to serve this global trade more effectively, reducing transportation costs across the world. These larger vessels, known as post-Panamax vessels, are expected to call at U.S. ports in increasing numbers, especially after the expansion of the Panama Canal in 2014. A modern, robust navigation infrastructure can exist without significant harm to the environment, reduce the transportation system’s carbon footprint and enhance economic opportunities for future generations. Sustaining a modern U.S. navigation system will require a coordinated effort between government, industry and other stakeholders. Critical Need for Capacity Maintenance and Expansion Congress has directed the USACE Institute for Water Resources to submit to the Senate and House committees on appropriations this report on how the Congress should address the critical need for additional port and inland waterways modernization to accommodate post-Panamax vessels. This report identifies the critical need for capacity maintenance and expansion on both the nation’s inland waterways and blue water ports. This identification has been accomplished through an evaluation of the future demand for capacity in terms of freight forecasts and vessel size expectations and an evaluation of the current capacity of the nation’s inland waterways and blue water ports. Despite the recent worldwide recession, international trade is expected to grow as the world’s population and standard of living grow. Export of U.S. agricultural goods could increase as larger bulk vessels reduce the cost of delivery to foreign markets. Trade at the nation’s blue water ports is expected to expand as the population grows, especially in regions where most of that growth occurs. As international trade expands, the number of post-Panamax vessels is expected to increase. The nation’s ability to attract these vessels and allow full use of their capacity is the key to realizing the trade opportunities these vessels represent. There is a high degree of uncertainty in the details of when such vessels will arrive in large numbers, which ports they will call, how deep calling vessels will draft and, consequently, how deep and wide navigation channels and other related navigation infrastructure must be. One pivotal uncertainly is the role that transshipment hubs in the Caribbean or on U.S. shores could play in transferring freight from large vessels to smaller feeder vessels. Over time these uncertainties will be reduced as experience replaces expectation. We can be more certain that in the absence of transshipment centers, post-Panamax vessels will call at ports in large numbers, they will call at most major ports and their sailing drafts and other dimensions will become known. Our challenge is to invest in capacity expansion in the right places at the right time consistent with industry needs. Port capacity depends upon channel depths, channel widths, turning basin size, sufficient bridge heights and port support structures such as dock and crane capacity to offload and onload goods. Vessels can be filled to their weight capacity or their volume capacity. Vessels loaded to their weight capacity sail at their maximum design draft; they sit deeper in the water. The deepest channel requirements are likely to be driven by these “weight trade” services. The Asian export trade, however, is considered a “cube trade” (i.e. volume trade). For volume trade routes, channel width and turning basin size may be of greater importance than additional channel depth at some ports, as vessels loaded to their volume capacity often sail at significantly less than their design draft. Careful consideration is needed when determining channel depth requirements at U.S. ports for this trade route. The deployment of post-Panamax vessels to deliver U.S. agricultural products to Asian markets through the expanded Panama Canal could significantly reduce the delivery costs. One estimate suggests cost reductions as high as $ 0.35 per bushel, which could result in a surge in exports and traffic on the inland waterway system. The inland waterway system can accommodate the forecasted increase in exported agricultural products as long as other non-grain traffic remains at current levels and the system is maintained at current capacity. Existing inland waterway system capacity is maintained through maintenance dredging and major rehabilitation projects. A Vision for Sustaining a Globally Competitive Navigation System As a maritime nation our economic prosperity is directly linked to our investments in navigation infrastructure. Just as current generations benefit from investments made in the past, the ability of future generations to prosper and grow will depend on infrastructure investment decisions made today. A globally competitive U.S. navigation transportation system for the 21 st Century will have these characteristics:

Independently, trade solves war—it creates relationships that cement peace

Boudreux 6 [Donald J. Boudreux, Chairman of the economics department at George Mason University, 11/20/06, “Want world peace? Support free trade,” http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/1120/p09s02-coop.html]

During the past 30 years, Solomon Polachek, an economist at the State University of New York at Binghamton, has researched the relationship between trade and peace. In his most recent paper on the topic, he and co-author Carlos Seiglie of Rutgers University review the massive amount of research on trade, war, and peace. They find that "the overwhelming evidence indicates that trade reduces conflict." Likewise for foreign investment. The greater the amounts that foreigners invest in the United States, or the more that Americans invest abroad, the lower is the likelihood of war between America and those countries with which it has investment relationships. Professors Polachek and Seiglie conclude that, "The policy implication of our finding is that further international cooperation in reducing barriers to both trade and capital flows can promote a more peaceful world." Columbia University political scientist Erik Gartzke reaches a similar but more general conclusion: Peace is fostered by economic freedom. Economic freedom certainly includes, but is broader than, the freedom of ordinary people to trade internationally. It includes also low and transparent rates of taxation, the easy ability of entrepreneurs to start new businesses, the lightness of regulations on labor, product, and credit markets, ready access to sound money, and other factors that encourage the allocation of resources by markets rather than by government officials. Professor Gartzke ranks countries on an economic-freedom index from 1 to 10, with 1 being very unfree and 10 being very free. He then examines military conflicts from 1816 through 2000. His findings are powerful: Countries that rank lowest on an economic-freedom index - with scores of 2 or less - are 14 times more likely to be involved in military conflicts than are countries whose people enjoy significant economic freedom (that is, countries with scores of 8 or higher). Also important, the findings of Polachek and Gartzke improve our understanding of the long-recognized reluctance of democratic nations to wage war against one another. These scholars argue that the so-called democratic peace is really the capitalist peace. Democratic institutions are heavily concentrated in countries that also have strong protections for private property rights, openness to foreign commerce, and other features broadly consistent with capitalism. That's why the observation that any two democracies are quite unlikely to go to war against each other might reflect the consequences of capitalism more than democracy. And that's just what the data show. Polachek and Seiglie find that openness to trade is much more effective at encouraging peace than is democracy per se. Similarly, Gartzke discovered that, "When measures of both economic freedom and democracy are included in a statistical study, economic freedom is about 50 times more effective than democracy in diminishing violent conflict." These findings make sense. By promoting prosperity, economic freedom gives ordinary people a large stake in peace. This prosperity is threatened during wartime. War almost always gives government more control over resources and imposes the burdens of higher taxes, higher inflation, and other disruptions of the everyday commercial relationships that support prosperity. When commerce reaches across political borders, the peace-promoting effects of economic freedom intensify. Why? It's bad for the bottom line to shoot your customers or your suppliers, so the more you trade with foreigners the less likely you are to seek, or even to tolerate, harm to these foreigners.

# 1ac - econ

And, economic decline causes war – statistics prove

Royal 10 [Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-214]

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such. exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon. 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second. on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline. particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources, Crises could potentially he the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.' Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflict self-reinforce each other. (Blomber & Hess,. 2002. p. 84) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg. Hess. & Weerapana. 2004). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. 'Diversionary theory' suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996). DeRouen (1995), and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999). and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic. dyadic and national level, This implied connection between integration. crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.
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**Advantage** <Two> **is hegemony --**

**Subpoint A is sealift –**

**Failing inland waterways are hampering military transport**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

The USDOT is the lead government agency responsible for integrating the national freight transportation system. The USDOT provides a national strategic vision for transportation in the draft 2006 Framework for a National Freight Policy. To support economic growth and provide for national security our domestic transportation infrastructure must be efficiently managed, adequately funded, and effectively integrated at the highest level. Throughout the 1900’s, the growth of the United States was directly related to capital investment by the federal government in freight infrastructure supporting the movement of finished goods, raw materials, farm products, and people. 32 According to new estimates, over 19 billion tons of freight, valued at $13 trillion, was carried over 4.4 trillion ton-miles in the United States in 2002. This means that on a typical day in the United States in 2002, about 53 million tons of goods valued at about $36 billion moved nearly 12 billion ton-miles on the nation’s transportation network. 33 In addition, global deployments from bases in the continental United States increases the demand for surge transportation resources, compared to relying on overseas garrisons. 34 A key element of the U.S defense strategy is the capability for power projection-the ability to quickly move troops and supporting equipment worldwide and to sustain their presence if necessary. 35 The number one objective of the Framework for a National Freight Policy is improving the operations of the existing freight transportation system, developing efficiencies that maximize the contributions of existing infrastructure. The policy proposes several strategies leading to the creation of a more efficient and effective system at the national level. The first of these 9 strategies directs improvement of the management and operations at existing facilities. 36 Supporting this strategy are a number of tactics seeking to leverage better management practices, emerging technologies, and alternative transport options to mitigate strategic chokepoints in the freight transportation system. Creation of new infrastructure does not marginalize inefficient business practices. In fact, modern technologies could provide the ability to optimize existing infrastructure by carefully managing increasing traffic flows and creating seamless transfers between transport modes. The U.S. trucking industry leads other modes of transport in leveraging technology for efficient fleet management. Using global positioning satellite systems connected to integrated freight databases, managers effectively link cargo with trucks to maximize load efficiencies and minimize haul requirements. 37 Using similar technologies, this just-in-time technology could be possible to increase efficiency in other modes of transport. A second strategy, supporting the improvement of existing freight transportation system operations, is maintaining and preserving existing infrastructure. 38 Supporting this strategy are funding objectives that prioritize federal investment in transportation infrastructure, targeting resources to existing intermodal connectors where the potential for the greatest efficiencies reside. Congress must address infrastructure maintenance requirements strategically and holistically. Measures must be consistent to ensure adequate funding is authorized and appropriated throughout the life cycle of each federally approved maintenance or construction project. The inland waterway system, for example, continues to suffer from inconsistencies in federal funding that cause numerous projects to be delayed or lie dormant for years. Funding inconsistencies hamper the ability of publicly owned freight transportation infrastructure to provide reliability for military planners and commercial shippers, regardless of commodity. Delayed and inconsistent funding increases the cost to the taxpayer for needed and timely repairs, raising the risk associated with multiple, simultaneous repair requirements in the future. This ultimately brings an even greater financial burden to the government and transportation stakeholders.

**And, inland waterways are key to providing military supplies and power projection**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

Contributions of the U.S. Inland Waterway System Inland waterways present a possible alternative to overland transport that has been underutilized in the past. The EU recognizes and relies upon their existing water highways, committing to a more balanced approach for future transport. The core network links the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Germany, and Austria via a myriad of easily accessible rivers and canals, carrying cargo such as heavy materials, bulk industrial goods, building products, containers, oversized loads, and waste. Inland waterway transport in the EU has experienced a growth rate of 17% over the past decade. 48 Inland waterways are a strategic asset to the nation, enabling the U.S. to significantly increase economic output in both domestic and international markets, and project military power more rapidly and effectively into the 21 st Century. Over the next 20 years economists estimate that inland navigation will increase by more than 35%. 49 The inland waterway system is a potential resource upon which we can increase the flow of military cargo. Continued application of technology to barge operations and integration of the inland waterway system into the nation’s intermodal system makes this an area ripe for additional development. 50 Waterways already move important national defense resources and other supplies in large quantities for the armed forces. As a mode of transportation, the inland waterway system is quiet, low profile, and off the public radar.
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Lack of maritime transportation infrastructure devastates hegemony and military readiness

**US DOT 7** [U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, “The Maritime Administration and the U.S. Marine Transportation System: A Vision for the 21 st Century”, November, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/Vision\_of\_the\_21st\_Century\_10-29.pdf]

The U.S. merchant marine has a proud histor y of protecting the Nation and helping to win the peace. For more than two centuries, our national defense has relied heavily on the U.S. commercial sector--and continues so today. This includes using ships as naval auxiliaries, vessels to transport military personnel and supplies and trained seafarers for naval ser vice. For the Marine Transpor tation System today, defense mobilization still equates to having a strong industrial base as well as sufﬁcient U.S. commercial ships and civilian crews available to meet defense sealift requirements, but now also includes the shoreside equipment and infrastructure necessary to keep the intermodal system moving. Within the Maritime Administration, there are four core programs that suppor t Depar tment of Defense sealift requirements: • The interlocking Maritime Security Program and Voluntar y Intermodal Sealift Agreement Program provide the Depar tment of Defense assured access to U.S. commercial ships and crews as well as their intermodal equipment and facilities. The 60-vessel Maritime Security Program also provides employment and training oppor tunities to U.S. seafarers in order to ensure their availability in times of national crisis. • The National Defense Reser ve Fleet (NDRF) comprised of government owned militarily-useful cargo vessels that can be used in time of national emergency. The NDRF includes the Ready Reser ve Force (RRF) made up of vessels in an enhanced state of readiness that permits them to be under way to suppor t militar y operations in only a few days time. • The graduates of U.S. maritime academies with ser vice obligations who are essential to ensuring that sufﬁcient ofﬁcers are available to meet both commercial and national defense requirements. • The National Shipping Authority that permits the Maritime Administration to assume responsibility for the Nation’s vessels and por ts during a national emergency. This responsibility includes the peacetime planning oversight of 15 DOD-designated strategic commercial por ts needed by the militar y for deployment during contingency operations. The United States simply cannot respond to conﬂicts or emergencies overseas without sealift. It is ﬁguratively and literally a lifeline to U.S. armed forces and their missions. This is being proven once again during the current Global War on Terrorism. The U.S. marine transportation industry has established itself as an indispensable and effective tool for projecting and sustaining military operations, no matter where they may be. Under the leadership of the U.S. Transportation Command, U.S.-ﬂag ships have carried more than 90 percent of the materiel destined for Middle East combat theaters. This includes RRF vessels operated by the Maritime Administration under the control of the Military Sealift Command (MSC) and MSC’s own surge assets. The Maritime Administration works closely with the U.S. Transpor tation Command and the MSC to ensure that ships are available to support the military. It is also essential that the active commercial U.S. ﬂag ﬂeet and its intermodal systems are available to serve the United States’ military and economic needs. The Maritime Security Program and the Voluntar y Intermodal Sealift Agreement Program are critical to ensuring that a core of U.S. vessels are available to transpor t munitions, food, weapons and equipment to suppor t our troops.

**Subpoint B is competitiveness –**

**Inland waterways are key to US competitiveness – other nations are ramping up investment and the US is falling behind**

**Casavant 2k** [Ken, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Washington State University, “Inland Waterborne Transportation – An Industry Under Siege”, November]

Because much of U.S. agricultural production is at interior locations far from domestic markets and ports that link our economy to the world, transportation is critical to the competitiveness of the U.S. economy. By investing in an extensive inland waterway system, the United States has been able to improve its competitiveness in international markets. These investments have facilitated lower input costs for U.S. agriculture, provided greater access to international agricultural markets, and strengthened agricultural commodity prices.

CONTINUED…

Just as in the United States, investments in waterborne transportation increase the competitive position of the investor nation in international trade. This competitive position may well be shifting, particularly to China, Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, and, to a lesser degree, Paraguay. With access to World Bank financing, China has been upgrading both domestic grain transportation systems and ports for international trade. These improvements have the potential to aid U.S. exports by improving port delivery systems but could also increase competition by making Chinese grains more cost effective in the international market. Further, these improvements could internally facilitate better grain distributions from producing to consuming regions, thus reducing the need for imports or reducing export potential. Argentina’s public and private sectors have invested heavily in port infrastructure, dredging three or more port areas and investing in inland water transportation systems. Plans are underway to bring in soybeans from Argentina, Bolivia, and Brazil; processing the soybeans near these ports; and then exporting the processed products into the international market. Some soybeans are currently being barged down the Parana River to Rosario, Argentina, where they are crushed. Both navigable waterways and railroads have received attention and investment in Brazil. Successful privatization of the railroads is expected to lead to new lines and access to new markets. New dams and navigable waterways are expected to open new markets as well as increase the profitability and production of Brazilian agriculture. The net result of these new transportation efficiencies is new production, spurred on by biotech transfer and new, more cost- effective access to international and domestic markets.
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**Competitiveness is key to hegemony**

**Tellis 9** (Ashley, Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Preserving Hegemony: The Strategic Tasks Facing the United States, Global Asia, accessed on July 14, 2011, <http://www.globalasia.org/Back_Issues/Volume_4_Number_1_Spring_2009/Preserving_Hegemony_The_Strategic_Tasks_Facing_the_United_States.html>)

Second, and equally importantly, who wins in the ensuing struggle — whether that struggle is short or long, peaceful or violent — is as important as by how much. This is particularly relevant because the past record unerringly confirms that the strongest surviving state in the winning coalition usually turns out to be the new primate after the conclusion of every systemic struggle. Both Great Britain and the United States secured their respective ascendancies in this way. Great Britain rose through the wreckage of the wars with Louis XIV and with Napoleon. The United States did so through the carnage of the hot wars with Hitler and Hirohito, finally achieving true hegemony through the detritus of the Cold War with Stalin and his successors. If the United States is to sustain this hard-earned hegemony over the long term, while countering as necessary a future Chinese challenge should it emerge, Washington will need to amass the largest differential in power relative not only to its rivals but also to its friends and allies. Particularly in an era of globalization, this objective cannot be achieved without a conscious determination to follow sensible policies that sustain economic growth, minimize unproductive expenditures, strengthen the national innovation system, maintain military capabilities second to none and enjoin political behaviors that evoke the approbation of allies and neutral states alike. The successful pursuit of such policies will enable the United States to cope more effectively with near-term challenges as well, including the war on terrorism and managing threatening regional powers, and will ineluctably require — to return full circle — engaging the central tasks identified earlier as facing the new US administration. These tasks involve the need to satisfactorily define the character of desirable US hegemony, the need for sound policies that will renew the foundations of US strength, and the need to recover the legitimacy of US purposes and actions. What is clearly implied is that the principal burdens facing the next US president transcend Asia writ large. The success of these pursuits, however, will inevitably impact Asia in desirable ways, even as the resolution of several specifically Asian problems would invariably contribute to the conclusive attainment of these larger encompassing goals.

And, perception of US economic weakness collapses hegemony

Rothkopf 8 [David Rothkopf is chairman of the National Strategic Investment Forum Dialogue, a forum convening leading institutional investors for discussions about critical issues of investment strategy. “9/11 Was Big. This Is Bigger.” URL: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp dyn/content/article/2008/10/03/AR2008100301969.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp%20dyn/content/article/2008/10/03/AR2008100301969.html). DA:7/14/11]

On Sept. 16, 2001, President Bush addressed the nation to express his faith in the American people and "the resiliency" of the U.S. economy. Seven years later, the president again spoke to a country in crisis, using eerily similar language to try to shore up concerns about the market. This time, however, he felt compelled to go further. During a prime-time broadcast to the nation, the president of the richest and most powerful nation on Earth felt compelled to offer a defense of the free-market capitalism whose final and enduring triumph we had been celebrating only a few years earlier after the fall of our Soviet foes. "Despite corrections in the marketplace and instances of abuse," Bush said, "democratic capitalism is the best system ever devised." To many around the world, however, the president's words were not so reassuring. Not only did his argument ring hollow to those who felt anxiety and rage over Wall Street's ineptitude and greed, its attempt to buoy American capitalism by lashing it to the virtues of democracy contrasted uncomfortably with a chorus of critical assessments from leaders in democracies worldwide. French President Nicolas Sarkozy concluded recently that the world has seen the end to free-market economies. "Laissez-faire, it's finished. The all-powerful market that is always right, it's finished," he said. We would, he added, need "to rebuild the entire global financial and monetary system from the bottom up, the way it was done at Bretton Woods after World War II." Germany's finance minister offered a similar perspective in remarks to his parliamentary colleagues. "The U.S. will lose its status as the superpower of the world financial system," Peer Steinbrück declared. "This world will become multipolar. The world will never be the same again." Governments long criticized by the United States for intervening in their own economies were reveling in the spectacle of U.S. policymakers wading into their own financial markets in ways that even some socialist leaders would never have dreamt of.
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**Hegemony is key to deterrence and conflict containment—it prevents every scenario for global war**

**Felzenberg and Gray 11** [Alvin S. Felzenberg, Professorial Lecturer at The Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University, Presidential Historian and Adjunct Faculty Member at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, former Fellow at the Institute of Politics at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, served as Principal Spokesman for the 9/11 Commission, holds a Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton University,--- and Alexander B. Gray, Student at the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University and the War Studies Department of King’s College, London, 01-03-2011 “The New Isolationism,” The National Review, January 3rd, Available Online at http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/print/256150]

Anything Reps. Ron Paul (R., Tex.) and Barney Frank (D., Mass.) both support should give the rest of us pause. Their proposal to slash defense spending by $1 trillion over a decade — only the most recent joint effort by the new isolationists on the Left and Right to curtail American military strength around the world — is as foolhardy as it is unrealistic. Were such a policy enacted, the nation and the world would be set on a path not toward peace, but toward instability, conflict, and a lessening of freedom in many corners of the world. As the deteriorating situation on the Korean peninsula reminds us, the security concerns of the United States do not disappear in times of economic distress. America’s interests, whether economic, strategic, diplomatic, or moral, cannot be set aside when Congress tires of them. The United States and the world paid a severe price for the ostrich-like behavior too many democratic nations exhibited during the 1920s and 1930s. Reps. Paul and Frank appear determined to repeat this mistake. The United States continues to face an array of global challenges that require a modern, technologically superior military. It is very much in the interests of the United States to uphold the territorial integrity and economic independence of much of Asia, maintain the security of critical waterways such as the Strait of Hormuz, and protect American trade from pirates and terrorists worldwide. Rather than regard the nation’s defenses as a ready source of money available for diversion to domestic concerns, Congress and the president should identify the challenges America faces and assure that its military is able to meet them. At its core, the Frank-Paul effort appears to be an attempt to prevent repetitions of wars the two congressmen regard as either unnecessary or faultily executed. But the United States has broader and more important long-run national-security concerns than Iraq and Afghanistan. As the U.S. became bogged down in those two countries, it began feeling strains elsewhere, precipitated by China, Russia, and potentially toxic menaces such as Iran and Venezuela. Counterinsurgency warfare and Predator-drone strikes against transnational terrorists certainly defined much of the last decade. But the next decade will witness increasing competition among nation-states for control of valuable resources and the exertion of influence worldwide. Russia, through its control of vital energy pipelines, seeks to draw Western Europe more closely into its orbit, thereby weakening the latter’s historical ties to the United States. By taking a similar approach to Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, the Baltics, and Moldova, Russia is on the verge of re-colonizing economically many of its former satellites. China, while continuing to upgrade its naval capabilities, grows increasingly assertive. In pursuit of its own Monroe Doctrine for East Asia, Beijing has proclaimed its sovereignty over the entire South China Sea, menaced neighbors from India to Vietnam, used its economic muscle to intimidate Japan, and increased its threats against Taiwan. China’s leaders have been studying the writings of the 19th-century American naval theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan, who demonstrated the connection between sea power and economic strength. At the turn of the last century, Theodore Roosevelt found in Mahan the blueprint for achieving unprecedented American influence in world affairs. His efforts to build both a strong navy and a sound economy ushered in the “American century,” the period in which the United States became a force for good throughout the world and a beacon of hope for those yearning to breathe free. In pursuing a “blue-water” ocean-going navy capable of supporting their expanding global economic ambitions, the Chinese are acting from a desire to defend their nation’s trade and access to world markets, with a focus on energy supplies. It is critical that the Chinese — who are closely studying both Mahan’s writings and the history of the Monroe Doctrine — and Americans who see Chinese hegemony over Asia as either inevitable or a price they are willing to pay in exchange for slashing defense spending not draw the wrong lessons from history. Both sides should understand that it was not American might that gave the Monroe Doctrine force, but the then all-powerful British navy. For much of the 19th century, Great Britain had reasons of its own for keeping other nations out of the Western Hemisphere and for wanting to see the United States develop internally. If appropriately funded, the United States Navy has the capacity to play a similar role in China’s rise — perhaps, in the process, influencing how China develops. Should China conclude that the United States intends to remain a visible and active presence in the region, it will respond accordingly. Acting together, the two nations might embark on a series of cooperative ventures designed to help assure a steady flow of trade and an unimpeded exchange of people, goods, and ideas. They can also work together to combat a rise in piracy and terrorism in Asia and elsewhere and to respond to humanitarian crises, like the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. For its part, China, should it continue to hold North Korea in check, will achieve some of the status it seeks as a rising world power, with commensurate influence on the world stage. Should China conclude, on the other hand, that the United States intends to turn inward, it may grow even more ambitious and assertive in its region and beyond, potentially menacing world peace. Its smaller neighbors nervously wait to see how the United States will respond to China’s growing assertiveness. Should they come to believe that the U.S. is in retreat, they will make their own accommodations with Beijing. That result would wreak irreparable damage both to America’s economy and to its security. Messrs. Frank and Paul and their supporters have taken it into their minds that a reduced American presence in world affairs, particularly where the military is involved, would be a good thing. They had better think again: World politics, like nature, is hardly prone to respect vacuums. Iran and Venezuela remain as bellicose and destabilizing as ever, in spite of two years of Obama “engagement.” Iran squats beside the Strait of Hormuz, through which much of the world’s energy supply travels. Iran has also, the original Monroe Doctrine be damned, extended its military cooperation with Hugo Chávez’s authoritarian regime. Evidence is strong that Venezuela is providing sanctuary for Hezbollah terrorists in South America. The alliance of these two anti-American and increasingly menacing states could pose a threat to the United States of a kind that would make us nostalgic for the Cuban Missile Crisis. Faced with such challenges, the United States can ill afford military retrenchment as advocated by the new isolationists. While waste in the Pentagon’s budget can and should be cut, the new isolationists want to do it with a chainsaw when a scalpel is needed. In the last decade, the U.S. Navy’s fleet has shrunk to its smallest size since the 19th century, just as potential rivals such as China have not only expanded theirs but have begun to target perceived American maritime vulnerabilities. The U.S. Air Force is fielding an aging and shrinking force, while China is developing an advanced fighter for sale to adversaries of America, including Iran. A world in which the United States willingly ceded power and influence would both be more dangerous and prove less receptive to values that most Americans share, such as respect for human rights, the need to restrain governments through the rule of law, and the sanctity of contracts. By reducing its military strength to alarmingly low levels, the United States would create dangerous power vacuums around the world that other nations, with entirely different values, would be only too happy to fill. That, as history shows, would make war more, rather than less, likely. Congress and the president would do well to reflect on those lessons and remember their duty to provide a dominant American military presence on land, at sea, and in the air.
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Advantage <Three> is global warming --

Global warming is real and anthropogenic – aggregations of data prove

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

How do we know that global warming is real and primarily human caused? There are numerous lines of evidence that converge to this conclusion. Figure 1. The Moberg et al. (2005) plot (updated from the Mann et al., 1999, plot) of the last 2000 years of earth’s average surface temperature, which shows over 800 years of relative stability followed by the rapid warming of the past two centuries, giving it the shape of a “hockey stick.” The slight warming trend of the Medieval Warm Period can also be seen (data from 900–1200 A.D.) and is nowhere near the magnitude of the warming in the past century. (Click diagrams to enlarge them.) Carbon Dioxide Increase. Carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased at an unprecedented rate in the past 200 years. Not one data set collected over a long enough span of time shows otherwise. Mann et al. (1999) compiled the past 900 years’ worth of temperature data from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and direct measurements of the past few centuries, and the sudden increase of temperature of the past century stands out like a sore thumb. This famous graph (see Figure 1 above) is now known as the “hockey stick” because it is long and straight through most of its length, then bends sharply upward at the end like the blade of a hockey stick. Other graphs show that climate was very stable within a narrow range of variation through the past 1000, 2000, or even 10,000 years since the end of the last Ice Age. There were minor warming events during the Climatic Optimum about 7000 years ago, the Medieval Warm Period, and the slight cooling of the Little Ice Age from the 1700s and 1800s. But the magnitude and rapidity of the warming represented by the last 200 years is simply unmatched in all of human history. More revealing, the timing of this warming coincides with the Industrial Revolution, when humans first began massive deforestation and released carbon dioxide by burning coal, gas, and oil. Melting Polar Ice Caps. The polar icecaps are thinning and breaking up at an alarming rate. In 2000, my former graduate advisor Malcolm McKenna was one of the first humans to fly over the North Pole in summer time and see no ice, just open water. The Arctic ice cap has been frozen solid for at least the past 3 million years and maybe longer3, but now the entire ice sheet is breaking up so fast that by 2030 (and possibly sooner) less than half of the Arctic will be ice covered in the summer.4 As one can see from watching the news, this is an ecological disaster for everything that lives up there, from the polar bears to the seals and walruses to the animals they feed upon, to the 4 million people whose world is melting beneath their feet. The Antarctic is thawing even faster. In February–March 2002, the Larsen B ice shelf—over 3000 square km (the size of Rhode Island) and 220 m (700 feet) thick—broke up in just a few months, a story typical of nearly all the ice shelves in Antarctica. The Larsen B shelf had survived all the previous ice ages and interglacial warming episodes for the past 3 million years, and even the warmest periods of the last 10,000 years—yet it and nearly all the other thick ice sheets on the Arctic, Greenland, and Antarctic are vanishing at a rate never before seen in geologic history. Melting Glaciers. Glaciers are all retreating at the highest rates ever documented. Many of those glaciers, especially in the Himalayas, Andes, Alps, and Sierras, provide most of the freshwater that the populations below the mountains depend upon—yet this fresh water supply is vanishing. Just think about the percentage of world’s population in southern Asia (especially India) that depend on Himalayan snowmelt for their fresh water. The implications are staggering. The permafrost that once remained solidly frozen even in the summer has now thawed, damaging the Inuit villages on the Arctic coast and threatening all our pipelines to the North Slope of Alaska. This is catastrophic not only for life on the permafrost, but as it thaws, the permafrost releases huge amounts of greenhouse gases and is one of the major contributors to global warming. Not only is the ice vanishing, but we have seen record heat waves over and over again, killing thousands of people, as each year joins the list of the hottest years on record. (2010 just topped that list as the hottest year, surpassing the previous record in 2009, and we shall know about 2011 soon enough). Natural animal and plant populations are being devastated all over the globe as their environment changes.5 Many animals respond by moving their ranges to formerly cold climates, so now places that once did not have to worry about disease-bearing mosquitoes are infested as the climate warms and allows them to breed further north. Sea Level Rise. All that melted ice eventually ends up in the ocean, causing sea level to rise, as it has many times in the geologic past. At present, sea level is rising about 3–4 mm per year, more than ten times the rate of 0.1–0.2 mm/year that has occurred over the past 3000 years. Geological data show that sea level was virtually unchanged over the past 10,000 years since the present interglacial began. A few millimeters here or there doesn’t impress people, until you consider that the rate is accelerating and that most scientists predict sea level will rise 80–130 cm in just the next century. A sea level rise of 1.3 m (almost 4 feet) would drown many of the world’s low-elevation cities, such as Venice and New Orleans, and low-lying countries such as the Netherlands or Bangladesh. A number of tiny island nations such as Vanuatu and the Maldives, which barely poke out above the ocean now, are already vanishing beneath the waves. Eventually their entire population will have to move someplace else.6 Even a small sea level rise might not drown all these areas, but they are much more vulnerable to the large waves of a storm surge (as happened with Hurricane Katrina), which could do much more damage than sea level rise alone. If sea level rose by 6 m (20 feet), most of the world’s coastal plains and low-lying areas (such as the Louisiana bayous, Florida, and most of the world’s river deltas) would be drowned. Most of the world’s population lives in coastal cities such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Miami, Shanghai, and London. All of those cities would be partially or completely under water with such a sea level rise. If all the glacial ice caps melted completely (as they have several times before during past greenhouse episodes in the geologic past), sea level would rise by 65 m (215 feet)! The entire Mississippi Valley would flood, so you could dock your boat in Cairo, Illinois. Such a sea level rise would drown nearly every coastal region under hundreds of feet of water, and inundate New York City, London and Paris. All that would remain would be the tall landmarks, such as the Empire State Building, Big Ben, and the Eiffel Tower. You could tie your boats to these pinnacles, but the rest of these drowned cities would be deep under water.

# 1ac – global warming

Current trends in overland transportation lead to congestion and are a major supplier of GHG emissions

**Ribeiro et al**, **2007** [ Kahn, S., S. Kobayashi, M. Beuthe, J. Gasca, D. Greene, D. S. Lee, Y. Muromachi, P. J. Newton, S. Plotkin, D. Sperling, R. Wit, P. J. Zhou, “Transport and its infrastructure”, Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,]

Transport activity, a key component of economic development and human welfare, is increasing around the world as economies grow. For most policymakers, the most pressing problems associated with this increasing transport activity are traffic fatalities and injuries, congestion, air pollution and petroleum dependence. These problems are especially acute in the most rapidly growing economies of the developing world. Mitigating greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions can take its place among these other transport priorities by emphasizing synergies and co-benefits (high agreement, much evidence). Transport predominantly relies on a single fossil resource, petroleum that supplies 95% of the total energy used by world transport. In 2004, transport was responsible for 23% of world energy-related GHG emissions with about three quarters coming from road vehicles. Over the past decade, transport’s GHG emissions have increased at a faster rate than any other energy using sector (high agreement, much evidence). Transport activity will continue to increase in the future as economic growth fuels transport demand and the availability of transport drives development, by facilitating specialization and trade. The majority of the world’s population still does not have access to personal vehicles and many do not have access to any form of motorized transport. However, this situation is rapidly changing. Freight transport has been growing even more rapidly than passenger transport and is expected to continue to do so in the future. Urban freight movements are predominantly by truck, while international freight is dominated by ocean shipping. The modal distribution of intercity freight varies greatly across regions. For example, in the United States, all modes participate substantially, while in Europe, trucking has a higher market share (in tkm1), compared to rail (high agreement, much evidence). Transport activity is expected to grow robustly over the next several decades. Unless there is a major shift away from current patterns of energy use, world transport energy use is projected to increase at the rate of about 2% per year, with the highest rates of growth in the emerging economies, and total transport energy use and carbon emissions is projected to be about 80% higher than current levels by 2030 (medium agreement, medium evidence). There is an ongoing debate about whether the world is nearing a peak in conventional oil production that will require a significant and rapid transition to alternative energy resources. There is no shortage of alternative energy sources, including oil sands, shale oil, coal-to-liquids, biofuels, electricity and hydrogen. Among these alternatives, unconventional fossil carbon resources would produce less expensive fuels most compatible with the existing transport infrastructure, but lead to increased carbon emissions (medium agreement, medium evidence). In 2004, the transport sector produced 6.3 GtCO2 emissions (23% of world energy-related CO2 emissions) and its growth rate is highest among the end-user sectors. Road transport currently accounts for 74% of total transport CO2 emissions. The share of non-OECD countries is 36% now and will increase rapidly to 46% by 2030 if current trends continue (high agreement, much evidence). The transport sector also contributes small amounts of CH4 and N2O emissions from fuel combustion and F-gases (fluorinated gases) from vehicle air conditioning. CH4 emissions are between 0.1–0.3% of total transport GHG emissions, N2O between 2.0 and 2.8% (based on US, Japan and EU data only). Worldwide emissions of F-gases (CFC-12+HFC134a+HCFC-22) in 2003 were 0.3–0.6 GtCO2-eq, about 5–10% of total transport CO2 emissions (medium agreement, limited evidence).

**Inland waterways reduce emissions by providing the most efficient alternative to highway and rail transport**

**Miller and Stich 9** [Chad PhD, Assistant Professor at University of Southern Mississippi, and Bethany PhD, Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Administration at the Mississippi State University, “Collective Action Regimes in Inland Marine Port Clusters: The Case of the Tenn-Tomm Waterway System”, Mississippi Water Resources Conference]

Waterways are the only mode of transportation that have the capacity to handle large increases of freight movement. Furthermore, the system has enough excess capacity that it can handle the in- crease in domestic and international freight as well as ease increasing highway and railway congestion by carrying cargo that would otherwise travel via those modes. America’s inland waterway system currently carries the equivalent of 58 million truck trips each year. Without this system, truck traffic on the Interstates would double or rail tonnage would increase by 25% (Kruse et. al., 2007). International freight movement is expected to double by 2020 to 6 million tons per day and domestic freight move- ment is expected to increase to 62 million tons per day (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2007. With highways and railroads at or near full capacity, the waterways will be in more demand. In addition to congestion leading to increased demand, rising fuel prices are likely to increase the interest in moving more freight by water due to its energy-efficiency and affordability. Its energy consumption per ton-mile of transported goods corresponds to one-sixth of the consumption by truck and to half that of rail transport (Inland Rivers Ports & Terminals Inc., 2009). One 15-barge river tow has the same capacity as 1,050 trucks and 216 rail cars pulled by six locomotives. As a result, barges can move one ton of freight 576 miles per gallon of fuel while a modern locomotive would move that same ton of freight 413 miles per gallon of fuel, and a truck would move it 155 miles (Kruse et al., 2007. That means barges have energy efficiency 31⁄2 times that of trucks and provide a $10.67 per ton cost advantage (Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center, 2009). Waterborne transportation saves shippers and consumers more than $7 billion annu- ally compared to alternate transportation modes (American Society of Civil Engineers, 2009). Related to the efficiency factors are the environmental and carbon foot print implications of moving freight by water instead of road or rail. Inland waterway transport generates fewer emissions than rail or truck per ton-mile. The total external costs of inland navigation, in terms of acci- dents, congestion, noise emissions, air pollution and other environmental impacts, are significantly lower than those of road transport (Flemish Institution for Technological Research, 2004; Sudar, 2005). Inland waterway transport generates fewer emissions of particulate matter, hydrocarbons, carbon monox- ide and nitrous oxide than rail or truck on a per ton mile moved basis. With environmental and global warming concerns increasing, there is more incen- tive than ever to move freight by water.
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And, inland waterways are crucial to transporting ethanol and wind turbines but the system desperately needs modernizing

NEED 9 [National Energy Education Development Project, a project that releases publications by experts to inform students and teachers about renewable energy, “Energy and Our Rivers”, http://www.riverworksdiscovery.org/downloads/need\_curriculum/StudentBackgrounder.pdf]

How does the energy industry utilize the inland waterway system? • Coal: The barge industry transports 20 percent of the coal consumed in the U.S., enough to generate 10 percent of the electricity used each year. • Petroleum: Over 130 million tons of petroleum and petroleum products are shipped along the nation’s rivers. This accounts for 22 percent of the nation’s petroleum supply. • Ethanol: River barges carry 10 percent of the nation’s ethanol supply. • Wind: Up to 18 turbine blades can be stacked on a single barge. Transporting wind turbine parts by barge is expected to grow. Not only does the energy industry transport raw materials on the rivers, but they also transport parts needed at power plants, such as generators and boilers. There continues to be a growing demand for inland navigation, and economists estimate that there will be a 35 percent increase in the next 20 years. To continue to be successful in transporting materials to meet consumers’ demand, the inland waterway infrastructure needs to be modernized and maintained. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for maintaining nearly 12,000 miles of commercially navigable waterways, and 207 lock chambers at 171 lock sites. Most of the 207 lock chambers were built in the 1930s and were only designed for a life of 50 years. More than half of the locks and dams operated by the Corps are over 50 years old. About 2,000 of the United States’ 74,000 dams are owned by the federal government. These structures are also aging, with dams averaging 40 years old. Other entities responsible for maintaining waterways are facing similar challenges. To address the problem of an aging inland waterway infrastructure, the Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) was established. This fund was created and is maintained through a 20-cent per gallon fuel tax. These monies, almost $100 million a year, support half of the capital construction and rehabilitation of the locks and dams on the waterways. The other half is federally funded. In recent years, projects have seen many significant delays and cost overruns. This has hindered the progress toward modernizing the inland waterway system. The Inland Waterways Users Board is working with representatives of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to prioritize the needs for the inland navigation system, developing reasonable costs and a strategy to make sure funding stays closer to budget and that projects are completed on time. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provided over $400 million in stimulus funds for projects to construct and improve locks and dams. This money does not have to be matched by the IWTF. However, it is estimated that projects currently under construction or ready to begin would require approximately seven billion dollars. Given current funding practices and trends between IWTF and the government, these projects would take 40 years to complete. If the inland waterway system is not modernized, it may force cargo to be shipped by other methods. The U.S. highway system is already congested in many areas and the railway lines are near capacity. Accordingly, moving cargo from barges to trucks or trains could be challenging. The amount of cargo transported on rivers is equivalent to 58 million truck trips annually, which would double the number of tractor trailers currently on the interstates and require significant upgrades to highways. If river cargo was moved to the railway, it would add almost 25 percent more tonnage to the railway system. Not only would diverting barge cargo loads to railways and highways have a physical impact to the capacity and maintenance of these systems, it would also have an environmental impact. The amount of fuel required to ship cargo varies between each transportation mode. One ton of cargo can be shipped 59 miles by truck using one gallon of fuel. That same gallon can move one ton of cargo 202 miles by rail, and 514 miles by barge. Shipping goods by barge is energy efficient and releases fewer carbon dioxide emissions than the other options. Accidents can occur while transporting some environmentally hazardous materials. There are fewer accidents and fuel spills by barge than by rail and truck. The inland shipping industry works closely with the Coast Guard to ensure the safety of its workers and the environment. Since 1994, oil spills in the inland shipping industry have been reduced by 82 percent. From Native American canoes to contemporary barges and towboats, rivers have played an important part in America’s growth and commerce. River transportation also plays a vital role in our country’s energy picture, moving many of our natural energy resources to plants and refineries allowing us to put these sources to work.

Locks and dams provide 72% of the world’s renewable energy through hydropower

**Nachtmann and Pohl 11** [Heather, PhD, Associate Professor in the Department of Industrial Engineering at the University of Arkansas, and Letitia, PhD, an aircraft logistics analyst for the Air Force, “Sustaining Resilient Inland Waterways via Renewable Energy”, July, http://www.uark.edu/rd\_engr/MBTC/MBTC\_DHS\_1108.pdf]

Inland waterways play an important role in the nation’s sustainability effort. Water transportation has environmental and economic benefits, existing capacity, and low energy consumption. The inland waterway system of the United States includes more than 25,000 miles of navigable rivers and canals, with approximately 12,000 of these miles being utilized for commercial purposes. These inland and intracoastal waterways directly serve 38 states and carry approximately 16% of the total domestic intercity freight, as measured by tonnage shipped (USACE, 2009). Inland waterways are recognized as energy‐friendly. The nearly 200 active locks maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to facilitate commercial shipping are operated primarily by gravity. Hydropower, generated mostly from dams, provides about 17% of the world’s installed electrical power capacity and over 72% of its renewable energy (IHA, 2011).
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The US holds the largest share of the energy market – US action to reduce emissions spills over internationally

**Roberts 5** [Paul Roberts, Harper’s Magazine, Finalist for the National Magazine Award, 2005, The End of Oil: A Perilous New World, p.14-5]

But by necessity, much of this book will focus on the United States. For all that the new energy economy is an international issue, no nation will play a greater role in the evolution of that economy than ours. Americans are the most profligate users of energy in the history of the world: a country with less than 5 percent of the world’s population burns through 25 percent of the world’s total energy. Some of this discrepancy is owing to the American economy, which is bigger than anyone else’s and therefore uses more energy. But it is also true that the American lifestyle is twice as energy-intensive as that in Europe and Japan, and about ten times the global average. The United States is thus the most important of all energy players: its enormous demand makes it an essential customer for the big energy states like Saudi Arabia and Russia. Its large imports hold the global energy market in thrall. (Indeed, the tiniest change in the U.S. energy economy – a colder winter, an increase in driving, a change in tax law – can send world markets into a tailspin. And because American power flows from its dominance over a global economy that in turn depends mainly on oil and other fossil fuels, the United States sees itself as having no choice but to defend the global energy infrastructure from any threat and by nearly any means available – economic, diplomatic, even military. The result of this simultaneous might and dependency is that the United States is, and will be, the preeminent force in the shaping of the new energy economy. The United States is the only country with the **economic muscle**, the **technological expertise**, and the **international standing truly to mold** the next energy system. If the U.S. government and its citizens decided to launch a new energy system and have it in place within twenty years, not only would the energy system be built, but **the rest of the world would be forced to follow along**. Instead, American policymakers are **too paralyzed to act**, terrified that to change U.S. energy pattersn would threaten the nation’s economy and geopolitical status – not to mention outrage tens of millions of American voters. Where Europe has taken small but important steps toward regulating carbon dioxide (steps modeled, paradoxically, on an American pollution law), the United States has made only theatrical gestures over alternative fuels, improved efficiency, or policies that would harness the markets to reduce carbon. As a result, the energy superpower has not only surrendered its once-awesome edge in such energy technologies as solar and wind to competitors in Europe and Japan but made it less and less likely that an effective solution for climate change will be deployed in time to make a difference.

Runaway warming causes extinction

Deibel 7 (Terry L. Professor of IR @ National War College, 2007. “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

# 1ac - solvency

**Next is solvency --**

**Federal government investment to modernize the inland waterway system is key**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

Navigation industry groups argue that the current system makes a significant contribution to the national economy and that the aging infrastructure warrants increased investment by the federal government. The USDOT Framework advocates prioritizing timely operations and maintenance projects for inland waterways as a method of maintaining and preserving existing infrastructure. 66 Some taxpayer advocacy groups, however, oppose even current levels of federal investment and argue for a greater share of the financial burden to be borne by the users of these facilities. 67 A possible solution would be to share more of the cost of 14 infrastructure repair with users of the system. The inland waterway system, for example, not only supports navigation but also provides a multitude of recreational opportunities as well as hydroelectric power generation for constituents within their respective watersheds. Currently this public service provides little to no revenue for waterway infrastructure maintenance or construction. Funding needed improvements in the waterway system is a national problem. 68 Effective integration of the U.S. Inland Waterway System is key to expanding the capacity of the national freight transportation infrastructure. Through strategic examination of the entire intermodal transportation system, and a detailed look at the many factors inhibiting the inland waterways from being a preferred route for goods movement, we can determine the best method of integrating the inland waterways system, leveraging them into the nation’s current intermodal transportation system. 69 Traditional methods of overland transport are not easily usurped by inland waterways. The U.S. Inland Waterway System has historically served to move large, bulk cargoes and suffers from recent bouts of unreliability. Decreasing reliability of inland waterways is a factor of increasing age and recent budget constraints that combine to result in increased downtime at commercial lock facilities, both scheduled and unscheduled. USACE reports lock unavailability time has more than doubled since the early 1990s from about 60,000 hours to over 120,000 hours annually. Shippers on inland waterways can generally prepare for scheduled lock maintenance; however, The Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative unscheduled lock downtime can seriously disrupt shipment schedules and contract commitments, leaving shippers scrambling for delivery alternatives typically at a much higher cost. 70 Unfortunately, this trend is alarming to shippers and must be adequately addressed to leverage the capacity potential desperately needed to support national freight transportation requirements. The inland waterway system infrastructure requires some modernization and expansion to account for changes in barge technology and capability. The current design and capacity of existing locks do not account for, or take advantage of, advances in barge operations. 71 Lock delays attributed to waiting in line to use the lock are currently over 550,000 hours annually, translating into about $385 million in increased transportation costs. 72 USACE reports that some modernization of the system has been taking place since the 1950s-mainly along the Ohio River-with enlargement or replacement of older 600-foot lock chambers with new 1200-foot facilities that will pass a 15-barge tow in a single lockage. Other principal high volume waterways-the Upper Mississippi, Tennessee, and Illinois Rivers, as well as the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway remain dominated by 600-foot lock chambers. One important trend improving the value and capability of the inland waterway system is the increase, especially since 2000, of container-on-barge transport. Containerization is 15 increasing the adaptability of inland ports to transport large quantities of goods on barges never before thought possible. The European Federation of Inland Ports estimates that further growth in the container sector is likely and inland ports will continue their investment efforts in this field in order to further improve their position in the transport market. 73 Containers can now hold non-traditional cargo such as liquids, perishable (using refrigeration) and non-perishable agricultural products, as well as bulk cargo such as minerals, petroleum, and others. 74 Improved cargo security is an important benefit of containerization. Container on barge is highly developed in Europe. 75 Containers are designed to be modular for easy interchange among transportation modes, allowing cargoes to be moved by the combination of ship, rail, and truck that best meets the needs of shippers and receivers. 76 Containers can hold more when transported by barge since they are not held to same weight limitations as overland transport. Every container transported by barge means one less truck on the highway. Container-on- barge operations save fuel, ease congestion on roads, and can haul hazardous materials or other cargo not suitable for transport through large population centers. Barges facilitate military deployment, moving unit containers and vehicles in a secure manner preventing pilferage and equipment damage associated with fast moving and relatively unguarded transport. Inland waterways are positioned to take some of the lower to moderate value container traffic off the even more congested roadways. The Columbia-Snake River system already has significant container-on-barge traffic, and similar services are growing along the Gulf Intra-coastal and North Atlantic ports. 77 Conclusion The inland waterway system of the United States stands as a minimally exploited system that, if optimized, could help eliminate the congestion of overland transport, pollution, and provide a low cost alternative to long haul passages. 78 The USDOT should aggressively promote inland waterways as an effective alternative to overland transportation. U.S. Inland Waterway System stakeholders must embrace emerging technologies that more efficiently manage traffic on inland waterways to mitigate lock-imposed delays. An intra-governmental approach to managing national water resources must be better integrated at the local, state, and federal level, eliminating political impediments to system efficiency. Integrated planning to effectively link the national transportation network with state and local intermodal infrastructure must be encouraged and managed strategically. The federal government must lead efforts to develop adequate funding strategies, seeking public-private collaboration, to maintain the investment streams that support new construction, operations, and maintenance of the inland 16 waterway system, making it a reliable and affordable means of transportation in the future. Inland waterway infrastructure must be prioritized and resources focused on the most valueadded gateways supporting objectives of the national freight transportation system. Overall the system should be repaired and modernized and, in certain cases, enlarged to meet the industry standard requirement for locks of 1200 feet. The federal government and the USDOT, using an interagency approach, must continue to develop transportation strategies that encourage the balanced growth of each industry sector, leading leads to more effective integration of inland waterway transportation. The USTRANSCOM deployment and distribution model should be commercially replicated at the national level to highlight alternative freight transportation planning opportunities that leverage the capabilities of each transport mode. The USDOT must provide shippers incentives for increased use of inland waterways, expanding container-onbarge opportunities to alleviate congestion and increase capacity of the freight transportation system at the national level. In order to maintain our competitive edge, we must assure the strategic mobility of our economic and military elements of power. The inland waterway system can provide a key, strategic capability that enables the current and future economic prosperity and national security of the United States. The federal government, however, must efficiently manage, adequately fund, and effectively integrate inland waterways with other modes of transportation at the national level for this to achieve success. Promotion of the inland waterway system, using an interagency and intra-governmental approach, positions this capability to provide the additional capacity necessary to meet current and future freight transportation requirements. Leveraging the strategic value of inland waterways is integral to building an effective and reliable national transportation network for the 21 st Century.
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# IW key to econ

**Inland waterways are crucial to the economy – provides jobs and key to shipping and trade**

**Martin 9** [John, PhD, president of Martin Associates -- an economic consulting firm with over 20 years experience assessing economic impacts to the world’s transportation systems, “Transportation System Demands Stimulus Aid”, APAA magazine]

In 2007, Martin Associates estimated that U.S. deepwater ports supported more than 13 million jobs throughout the United States and contributed about $3.2 trillion to the national economy. The economic value of this cargo activity represents about 25 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product. The deepwater ports system is vital to the movement of foreign trade, and the components of the coastal ports system are essential to the operation of the entire logistics system used by the nation's exporters and importers. The coastal ports system is the only economically feasible method for handling the export of raw materials, grains, most manufactured products and perishable cargos. If the deepwater component of the logistics system fails, not only are port industry jobs lost, but also the entire export-related economic sector suffers. Similarly, the coastal ports system, with its connections to the highway and rail systems, is vital to importers, including importers of retail consumer goods as well as importers of raw materials and manufactured products. Without the efficient port system and accompanying inland delivery system, imported consumer goods such as clothing, electronic goods and seasonal fruit would not reach store shelves. With respect to manufacturing activities, the growing reliance on "just-in-time" inventory underscores the need for an efficient port system to receive and to distribute imported manufacturing components. In addition, the inland waterway system is critical to the nation's economic vitality. Based on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers data, about 630 million tons of cargo are transported on the U.S. inland waterway system. While no formal economic impact study has been conducted for the importance of the inland waterway system, using job estimates from Martin Associates' 2003 Port of Pittsburgh economic impact study, these 630 million tons of cargo are estimated to generate about 2.5 million jobs nationwide. The deepwater and inland port industries are facing critical infrastructure issues that have been exacerbated by the most recent economic conditions. The deepwater ports are in need of dredging funds, capital improvement dollars and terminal infrastructure investment to increase terminal densification and prepare for the next-generation container vessels that will transit the expanded Panama Canal after 2014. Between 2007 and 2008, international containerized cargo volume at U.S. ports fell by 5 percent, while noncontainerized cargo volume fell by 10 percent. In terms of 20-foot-equivalent container units, the largest reduction in total TEU moves was recorded in the San Pedro Bay ports (Los Angeles and Long Beach), where TEU throughput fell by 10 percent between 2007 and 2008, followed by the Pacific Northwest ports, which reported a 4 percent decline in total TEUs. With the 5 percent decline in containerized tonnage at U.S. ports, revenue received by the ports was similarly impacted, even for those ports where minimum annual guarantees were in place, as these minimums in many cases were relaxed. Similarly, with a 10 percent decline in breakbulk and bulk tonnage, wharfage revenue received by the U.S. ports will also be down. With the loss in revenue streams and the continued loss in throughput projected through 2009 at minimum, the ports will face increasing budgetary restrictions, impacting not only capacity enhancement investments but system preservation investments as well. The loss in international cargo traffic also impacts the rail and trucking industries serving the ports, further impacting much-needed rail investments to maintain, as well as enhance, rail system velocity. For ports more dependent on intermodal cargo, the impact of curtailed rail investments will be particularly hard-felt, as the curtailment of investments will further exacerbate the declining market share of ports in the Pacific Northwest as well as in the San Pedro Bay area. Further impacting funding availability for the U.S. port system, the financial crisis has lead to curtailment, to some extent, of private-sector funds available for port infrastructure. While this market for capital has not completely evaporated, as exemplified by the recent offer by CenterPoint Properties for Virginia Port Authority marine facilities and the Ports America concession at Oakland, the multiples on earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization, commonly known as EBITDA, have fallen from a high of 30-plus for the Maher Terminal acquisitions in March 2007, to about an 8 multiple in current times. With respect to the inland waterways, Martin Associates reported that, in 2000, the majority of the locks and lock chambers in place on U.S. inland waterways are fewer than 1,000 feet in length. In this same report, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers reported that 15 percent of the locks are 1,000 to 1,200 feet long, 60 percent are between 600 and 900 feet long, and 25 percent are fewer than 600 feet long. More importantly, about 50 percent of the locks and dams are now approaching 60 years of age and reaching the end of their economic life. Not only is age and the need to replace these aging locks and dams a constraint on the ability of the inland waterways to handle cargo in the future, but the potential failure of one or more of the lock systems would be catastrophic in terms of loss of life as well as economic impact. The inefficiency of the older lock and dam system results in direct costs to barge operators as well as other users of the inland waterways system in terms of time delays and lost export opportunities of the nation's agricultural sector, according to a December 2000 white paper sponsored by the Marine Transportation System National Advisory Council. With the need to stimulate the faltering economy, the marine transportation system offers an attractive and productive segment to which funds should be directed. It would be difficult to identify a single transportation sector that supports nearly 16 million high-paying jobs, as well as a sector that is vital to enhancing the competitive position of U.S. manufacturing and agricultural sectors in the global economy, and where investments in infrastructure, such as the locks and dams on the inland waterway system, will not only improve the competitive economic environment of the nation, but, more importantly, potentially avert a major life-threatening catastrophe.
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Inland waterways are key to the economy – the most qualified source proves

**Bray 11** [Larry, PhD in economics, Research Professor with the University of Tennessee Center for Transportation Research, an acknowledged expert on US Inland Waterways, “Prepared Remarks Presented before: The United State House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment”, September]

For more than a generation, I’ve studied and described the importance of commercial inland navigation to the US economy. Today, by virtue of the Committee’s invitation, I again have an opportunity to discuss this topic. My appearance here leaves me both humbled and energized. To those who have helped bring me here, particularly Chairman Mica, Congressman Rahall, and Subcommittee Chairman Gibbs, I offer my sincere thanks. Finally, to my Congressman, Representative Jimmy Duncan from Tennessee’s Second District I wish to say thank you for the many years of leadership and service you’ve provided East Tennessee. This morning, I hope to make four points. First, at this very moment, inland barge transportation is functioning as an essential element within our nation’s system of freight transport. The navigation industry’s history is long and storied. Similarly, navigation’s potential value to forward-looking commerce is important. However, neither topic should obscure the fact that, today in 2011, barge transportation fills important freight mobility needs that would, otherwise, be costly or even impossible to address. Second, the capacity and flexibility afforded by inland barge transport is important to the United States as we look to the future. With regard to global commerce, inland navigation can safely connect interior cities and regions to international markets, adding to the interior’s prosperity, while reducing the congestion and environmental challenges faced by coastal regions. At the same time, available inland navigation (much like truck-rail intermodal transport) can, everywhere, play an increasingly important role in segregating the most disruptive freight movements from those passenger activities necessary to personal mobility and livable communities. Unfortunately, much of the infrastructure that currently sustains barge transport has aged beyond its design life. It requires renewed federal investment if navigation is to continue its current role and be available as an even more productive future resource. The monolithic nature of the locks, dams and other required structures, the Herculean efforts of those who maintain them, and the geographic isolation of most such facilities has hidden their deterioration from the public, but this lack of visibility does not diminish the threat that chronic underinvestment now poses to the inland navigation system. Finally, in an era of fiscal scrutiny, I wish to make clear that federal investments in transportation infrastructures like those represented by the nation’s navigation system remain an economically justified and theoretically sound form of government intervention into, otherwise, freely functioning transportation markets. Assuming that the fiscal responsibility of reinvestment is appropriately apportioned between all those who benefit – both directly and indirectly – from available inland navigation, the federal government’s share of this responsibility will represent a prudent and equitable expenditure of public funds. The balance of my remarks expand on these four points. Does Inland Commercial Navigation Play a Meaningful Role in Twenty-First Century Freight Transportation? The current economic value of inland barge transportation falls into four distinct categories (1) the highly efficient and affordable movement of traditional bulk commodities such as coal, grain, stonebased aggregates, metallic ores, and chemical products, (2) the vastly less expensive movement of oversized and overweight shipments that cannot be moved by either truck or rail, (3) the competitive influence that available commercial navigation has on the rates available to rail shippers, and (4) the indirect benefits that navigation provides in terms of environmental outcomes and concurrent uses of navigable inland waterways. I briefly discuss each of these in turn. Moving Bulk Commodities In a normal year on the inland waterway system between 500 and 700 million tons of bulk commodities with a current approximate value of nearly $125 billion are moved an average of roughly 500 miles to produce in excess of 300 billion ton-miles of freight transportation. 1 Given that freight shippers choose barge transport over other modal alternatives, it is safe to assume that every bit of this freight traffic moves at a total supply-chain cost that is lower than what would, otherwise, be available. 2 Work that I and many of my colleagues have done in conjunction with the US Army Corps of Engineers suggests an average shipper savings of $12 per ton, so that barge shippers and their customers save more than $7 billion annually. 3 1 The representative tonnage and distance figures reflect averages for the period 2005 -2009. The commodity value figure is based on a 2002 US Army Corps of Engineers figure of $86 billion that was subsequently adjusted to 2010 dollars by use of the Producer Price Index’s aggregated producer commodity component. 2 It is often necessary to include more comprehensive inventory management costs along with actual transportation charges in order to understand the transportation choices made by shippers. 3 The per-ton savings is based on an average of the savings computed for the upper Mississippi River (2007) and the Ohio River main stem (2010). The highly aggregated values obscure the sometimes dramatic shipper savings yielded by available navigation. Indeed, in many cases, the cost of shipping by an alternative mode or modal combination is sufficiently high to preclude any movement at all in the absence of barge. While most residents don’t directly observe the shipper savings that inland barge transportation produces, they enjoy the consequences of these savings in the form of lower product or service prices. For example, a recent University of Tennessee study of coal traffic on the Ohio River and its tributaries suggests that electricity users within the region save millions annually on electricity purchases by virtue of barge transport. When this savings is extended to reflect its overall economic impact on the region, the UT study estimates that the barge movement of coal and correspondingly lower electricity rates is responsible for more than 75 thousand jobs and over $2 billion in annual incomes within the region. 4 Oversized Shipments Inland barge transportation is also a valuable means of moving overweight or over-dimensioned shipments. Example include massive generators used in both steam-powered and nuclear generating facilities, extremely large bridge components, rocket engine boosters and other aerospace components, windmill blades and turbines, and uncategorized military equipment. 5 In some cases, there are no feasible alternatives to inland navigation, so that the location of activities is wholly predicated on available barge transport. In other cases, modal alternatives, while physically feasible, involve the construction (or reconstruction) of roadway and railroad facilities at tremendous cost for what is often a one-time use. In either case, it is difficult to assign a dollar value on the availability of navigation. Hence, the true value of these inland barge movements is obscured, seldom counted, and almost never incorporated into the benefit-cost calculations used to evaluate infrastructure construction and maintenance costs. Competitive Influence for Railroad Freight Movements Not everything that can move on the inland waterway system does so. However, there is overwhelming evidence that even when railroad carriers retain traffic that could move by barge, they do so only by competing with the available barge rate(s). Thus, the railroad prices observed as result of this navigation influence are typically
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referred to as “water-compelled” rail rates. Estimates across various regions where navigation is available suggest that these competitively enforced transportation rates yield shipper savings of several billion dollars annually. 6 There are a number of interesting aspects related to the competitive relationship between rail and barge. First, federal transportation policy is aimed at assuring effective competition among largely deregulated freight transportation providers. Thus, in an environment where railroad competition is a perennial concern, available navigation dampens the arguments of those who advocate renewed railroad rate oversight. Also, the degree to which railroads are sensitive to a water alternative provides a good gage of available railroad capacity. In the early post-deregulation period, when ample railroad capacity was available, rail carriers were very sensitive to available navigation in the prices they charged. However, as rail traffic continued to grow through the mid 1990s and railroad capacity became scarce, available rail rates became far less responsive to a barge alternative. 7 Avoiding Negative Externalities and Securing Benefits to Other Waterway Users Most goods and services are produced and consumed so that only those involved are affected. This is not true of transportation. The production of freight transport necessarily involves traversing space – space that is routinely occupied by thousands of people who have no direct connection to the freight or its movement except for their proximity. These people are “external” to the transaction that produced the freight movement and any negative outcomes they suffer are called “negative externalities”. Freight produces many of these – diminished air quality, roadway congestion and delay, noise pollution, and increased exposure to hazardous materials. However, across transport modes and externality categories, commercial navigation is the least offensive. With the exception of recreational waterway users, very few people are ever close to barge transportation. Railroads are more intrusive and motor carriage is much more so. The reduced incidence of negative externalities is a tangible benefit of commercial navigation that is easily recognized, but seldom counted within decision-making processes. Ostensibly, this is because of the uncertainties involved in accounting for the value of reduced exposure to unpleasant outcomes. It is, in fact, a difficult area in which to assign reliable numbers. Still, to ignore the environmental or other quality of life improvements associated with a greater reliance on inland transport also assures getting the wrong policy answer. 8 I, along with many of my colleagues, have worked for more than a decade to remedy this problem, but have achieved only modest progress. The final source of economic value attributable to commercial navigation on the inland waterways is one which we have only recently begun to treat empirically. Waterways that support commercial navigation also support a number of other uses that include hydro-electric power generation, cooling for other means of electricity generation, municipal and industrial water supply, personal recreation, crop irrigation, and regional flood control. Almost without exception, these other uses are enhanced by the maintenance of a navigation channel and the operation of the structures that support it. Historically, these “other beneficiaries” have, more often than not, been asked to pay fees as a result of their waterway use. However, very little has ever been done to quantify the magnitude of benefits they enjoy or to ensure that fee payments at least cover the system costs that are incremental to their codependence on the maintenance of predictable channel depths or rates of flows. 9 To date, only navigation users have been asked to demonstrate that their economic contributions are aligned with system expenditures. Summarizing the Current Economic Value of Inland Waterway Commerce The use of inland waterways to support freight transportation saves shippers (and their customers) billions of dollars annually. Moreover, in some cases, the freight that moves by water cannot be moved any other way. In these cases, the value of available barge transportation is literally incalculable. Beyond these seemingly obvious benefits, inland navigation also provides competition that helps discipline railroad pricing. This, in turn, diminishes the need for federal railroad oversight. Next, increased reliance on barge transportation reduces the incidence of most negative externalities, thereby, providing uncounted benefits to populations that are exposed to fewer of the ”bads” commonly associated with moving freight. Finally, maintaining a navigable waterway channel makes waterways more useful for other purposes. Many, perhaps even most, of these other beneficiaries do pay for this benefit, but their required contributions would almost certainly increase in the absence of waterborne commerce.

CONTINUED 10 pages later…

While my years of study have rewarded me with both a familiarity and a fondness for commercial navigation, I am an analyst not an advocate. Accordingly, I’m inclined to address questions surrounding industry’s future value and viability with available reason rather than rhetoric. This motivates a number of questions. The first of these is whether or not inland navigation is now and will continue to be important to the vitality of the US economy. I am convinced the answer to this question is “yes” for both now and foreseeable years to come. The next questions deal with the current system’s state of repair, the need for reinvestment, and the likely consequences if this investment is not forthcoming. In my introductory remarks, I observed that many of the physical facilities that support commercial navigation are well beyond their design-lives. In spite of this fact very few facilities have experienced actual failures. This is the result of careful monitoring and maintenance. However, this necessary vigilance imposes additional costs on both users and the federal government that could be avoided if assets were replaced in a timely way. More importantly neglect sows the seeds of uncertainty among users. Facility failures are unlikely to compromise the navigation system’s overall viability, but uncertainty might. The severely degraded condition of many locks and dams sends a powerful signal to both current and would-be users – a signal that future availability is far from assured. This signal causes uncertainty. Uncertainty slows private investment in waterway terminal facilities and other assets. Shippers, who can, investigate their alternatives. 18 Those who have no alternative must decide whether to risk further waterway-related investment in the face of uncertain future access or simply make do with the facilities they already have in place. In this way, the failure to adequately invest in public infrastructure or even prolonged periods of indecision can induce the quiet collapse of system use. 19 Those who doubt the impact of user expectations on subsequent traffic volumes need only look to the Missouri River basin for a powerful example. 20 If national transportation policy includes commercial inland navigation going forward, then significant system investments must be planned and plans must be executed sooner rather than later.
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**Inland waterways are key to shipping and the economy – other transport methods fail**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

Challenges Facing the U.S. Transportation Infrastructure The ability of existing domestic transportation infrastructure to support future economic growth may be at risk. The tremendous growth in the U.S. economy continues to add great pressure on our domestic transportation infrastructure, much of which currently operates at or near maximum capacity. By 2020, the nation’s freight tonnage is projected to increase nearly 70%. 25 Many critical gateways of our freight transportation infrastructure, particularly intermodal transfer facilities and stretches of road and rail corridors, are located in or near major urban areas. Increases in local traffic combined with greater volumes of freight throughput over time create bottlenecks in the system resulting in congestion, delay, and higher shipping and travel costs. 26 The challenges involved with integrating the nation’s freight transportation systems, and the jurisdictional issues that arise, are perhaps most apparent at these interconnections of the nation’s inland ports, public highway systems, and private railroads. 27 At these points, federal, state, local, and private sector interests and responsibilities intersect, but they are difficult to coordinate because of differing planning horizons, resource constraints, and investment priorities. 28 The capability of existing transportation infrastructure to meet a growing future demand should be cause for concern by Congress and other national policy makers. U.S. freight transportation infrastructure is not efficiently managed, adequately funded, or effectively integrated at the national level. Our ability to efficiently move cargo from domestic origins to international destinations at the lowest cost possible ensures our economic stability and national security. A capable and reliable freight transportation infrastructure is the necessary means to accomplish this national end state. U.S. freight transportation infrastructure is inefficiently managed at the national level. National policy makers must provide effective oversight to ensure transportation industries can provide the required capability and capacity necessary for our economy to grow and prosper. 7 They do this through establishing policies and regulations that balance the contributions of each industry to manageable levels in order to avoid congestion and competing interests. Inefficiencies emerge when leaders fail to capitalize on available technologies and business practices to streamline operations that naturally lead to more adequate traffic management, improved reliability, and lower shipping costs. National transportation advisors should provide incentives to encourage industry cooperation and interdependencies that more efficiently move cargo from domestic origins to the nation’s ports for shipment overseas. Congestion is a problem facing all forms of domestic transport. The USDOT 2006-2011 Strategic Plan recognizes this shortfall and addresses the reduction of congestion as a national strategic goal. Congestion reduces both capability and reliability. Although road and rail traffic have long dominated the transport market, the ability to expand this infrastructure to meet the increased demands of a growing economy are limited. These limitations are caused not only by congestion, but also right of way development, fuel prices, and concerns over vehicle emissions. Second, U.S. domestic transportation infrastructure is inadequately funded to remain a reliable and capable artery for international commerce. While much of the transportation infrastructure in the United States is becoming antiquated, our international competitors are improving their infrastructure and, consequently, their competitiveness in world markets. 29 Most freight transportation infrastructure, with the exception of railways, is publicly owned. In the case of highways and waterways, an intra-governmental approach is used for operations and maintenance as well as new construction. To make matters worse, state and local authorities own the intermodal facilities through which the national transportation arteries traverse, leading to unsynchronized modernization and expansion efforts. In each case the cost is extremely high, resulting in delayed response to needed repair and a cascading failure of the infrastructure to support needed transportation requirements. “Fix it when it breaks” is not a effective method of maintaining reliability. For the most part, users of freight transportation infrastructure pay little in comparison to the benefits they reap for its use. National policy makers and industry stakeholders continue to examine new and innovative ways of funding operations and maintenance but it is often too little, too late. Finally, U.S. transportation infrastructure is ineffectively integrated at the strategic level. Today businesses depend on the interconnected transportation network to move a myriad of goods, from raw materials such as lumber, coal, and petroleum products to manufactured goods including medical supplies, furniture, household appliances, and computers. 30 The current freight transportation architecture operates, without effective collaboration, as stove-piped 8 organizations with minimal communication and planning between industries. Stakeholders operate independently, as opposed to interdependently. Integration is not a priority because it is not yet an absolute necessity. The rail and trucking industries are currently meeting their freight capacity requirements and see integration as a potential loss of business. For example, the inland waterway system is not fully integrated or synchronized with other transportation industries due to the lack of capability and accessibility of road and rail options in place; this despite increasing demands for commercial transportation capacity on the inland waterways. As our nation has matured both physically and legislatively, the inland waterway system has fallen under the jurisdiction of many levels of governmental structure. Local, regional, state, and federal guidelines and regulations on use and expansion of the waterways affect several portions of the potential inland river transportation system. These overlapping regulatory boundaries present seams that impose unique challenges toward further improvements in the system. 31 National Strategy for Improvement The USDOT is the lead government agency responsible for integrating the national freight transportation system. The USDOT provides a national strategic vision for transportation in the draft 2006 Framework for a National Freight Policy. To support economic growth and provide for national security our domestic transportation infrastructure must be efficiently managed, adequately funded, and effectively integrated at the highest level. Throughout the 1900’s, the growth of the United States was directly related to capital investment by the federal government in freight infrastructure supporting the movement of finished goods, raw materials, farm products, and people. 32 According to new estimates, over 19 billion tons of freight, valued at $13 trillion, was carried over 4.4 trillion ton-miles in the United States in 2002. This means that on a typical day in the United States in 2002, about 53 million tons of goods valued at about $36 billion moved nearly 12 billion ton-miles on the nation’s transportation network. 33 In addition, global deployments from bases in the continental United States increases the demand for surge transportation resources, compared to relying on overseas garrisons. 34 A key element of the U.S defense strategy is the capability for power projection-the ability to quickly move troops and supporting equipment worldwide and to sustain their presence if necessary. 35 The number one objective of the Framework for a National Freight Policy is improving the operations of the existing freight transportation system, developing efficiencies that maximize the contributions of existing infrastructure. The policy proposes several strategies leading to the creation of a more efficient and effective system at the national level. The first of these 9 strategies directs improvement of the management and operations at existing facilities. 36 Supporting this strategy are a number of tactics seeking to leverage better management practices, emerging technologies, and alternative transport options to mitigate strategic chokepoints in the freight transportation system. Creation of new infrastructure does not marginalize inefficient business practices. In fact, modern technologies could provide the ability to optimize existing infrastructure by carefully managing increasing traffic flows and creating seamless transfers between transport modes. The U.S. trucking industry leads other modes of transport in leveraging technology for efficient fleet management. Using global positioning satellite systems connected to integrated freight databases, managers effectively link cargo with trucks to maximize load efficiencies and minimize haul requirements. 37 Using similar technologies, this just-in-time technology could be possible to increase efficiency in other modes of transport. A second strategy, supporting the improvement of existing freight transportation system operations, is maintaining and preserving existing infrastructure. 38 Supporting this strategy are funding objectives that prioritize federal investment in transportation infrastructure, targeting resources to existing intermodal connectors where the potential for the greatest efficiencies reside. Congress must address infrastructure maintenance requirements strategically and holistically. Measures must be consistent to ensure adequate funding is authorized and appropriated throughout the life cycle of each federally approved maintenance or construction project. The inland waterway system, for example, continues to suffer from inconsistencies in federal funding that cause numerous projects to be delayed or lie dormant for years. Funding inconsistencies hamper the ability of publicly owned freight transportation infrastructure to provide reliability for military planners and commercial shippers, regardless of commodity. Delayed and inconsistent funding increases the cost to the taxpayer for needed and timely repairs, raising the risk associated with multiple, simultaneous repair requirements in the future. This ultimately brings an even greater financial burden to the government and transportation stakeholders.
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**Inland waterways are crucial to recreation based revenue**

**Bray et al 11** [Dr. Larry G. Bray, Research Professor with the University of Tennessee Center for Transportation Research, an acknowledged expert on US Inland Waterways, C. Michael Murphree, M.A., and Chrisman A. Dager, MBA, “Toward A Full Accounting of the Beneficiaries of Navigable Waterways”, January]

3.2.4. Recreation It is not possible with current data to determine precisely how lack of the navigation system would affect recreation nationally. What can be said, however, is that 382,523 recreation vessels passed thorough navigation locks in 2009. These vessels were processed in 147,679 recreational lockages. This is often an enjoyable experience for recreation boaters, and the Corps of Engineers allows these boaters access to the locks with no lockage fee. The deep navigation channels provide an excellent venue for pleasure boats, some of which have a fairly deep draft. Additionally, considering all Corps of Engineers recreational facilities, more than 372 million person-trips across the nation occurred in 2006. In that year, visitors to these lakes spend $18 billion on trip expenses and durable goods. Considering both these direct expenditures and the associated indirect economic impacts, visitor spending supported more than 250,000 jobs and $16 billion in the value added generated.

# Maritime transport key to econ

This also *spills over* to other industries—kills jobs and the overall economy.

US Commission on Ocean Policy 4 [“SUPPORTING MARINE COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION” 2004; <http://www.oceancommission.gov/documents/prepub_report/chapter13.pdf>]

The U.S. marine transportation system is the nation’s link to global commerce and an essential and growing component of the national economy. The movement of manufacturing jobs from the United States to overseas, the nation’s dependence on raw materials from other countries, global competition to provide high quality goods at competitive prices, and consumer demand have combined to increase the nation’s dependence on the import of foreign materials and goods. At the same time, increasing affluence in foreign nations, coupled with worldwide population growth, has stimulated international demand for U.S. agricultural and manufactured products. The world’s oceans and inland waterways are the highways of choice for the global movement of this vast international trade. As the world’s largest trading nation, the United States imports and exports more merchandise than any other country and has one of the most extensive marine transportation systems in the world (Table 13.1).1 U.S. marine import-export trade accounts for nearly 7 percent of the nation’s gross domestic product.2 Domestically, coastal and inland marine trade amounts to roughly one billion tons of cargo, worth more than $220 billion a year.3 The U.S. marine transportation system is a complex public–private partnership with many participants. It consists of state, territorial, local, and privately-owned facilities managed, financed, and operated by federal, state, territorial, and local governments. The system is a highly complex and interconnected mix of waterways, ports and terminals, water- and land-based intermodal connections, vessels, vehicles, equipment, personnel, support service industries, and users. This system provides a number of services, including: supporting the waterborne movement of foreign and domestic cargo; moving passengers and vehicles through numerous ferry systems; serving recreational boating, commercial fishing vessels, and cruise liners; and generating millions of jobs for Americans and for the nation’s international trading partners. The U.S. marine transportation system also plays an important national security role as a point of entry for foreign shipment and a conduit for the movement of military equipment, supplies, and personnel to and from overseas locations.

It’s the key internal link.

Coble and Larsen 11 — Representatives in the U.S. House (Federal News Service 5/24. “HEARING OF THE COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE; SUBJECT: "CREATING U.S. MARITIME INDUSTRY JOBS BY REDUCING REGULATORY BURDENS"; CHAIRED BY: REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD COBLE -Search using: Biographies Plus News News, Most Recent 60 Days (R-NC); WITNESSES: REAR ADMIRAL KEVIN COOK, DIRECTOR OF PREVENTION POLICY, U.S. COAST GUARD; COAST GUARD DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL CALVIN LEDERER; LOCATION: 2167 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.” URL: <http://0-www.lexisnexis.com.wizard.umd.umich.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=297373>. DA: 7/31/11)

The subcommittee is meeting today to review the Coast Guard's regulatory program and examine ways to improve the service's rulemaking process. We're also interested in the status of various pending rules and the impact they will have on maritime safety and commerce. The Coast Guard has broad authority to regulate maritime commerce, including establishing and enforcing rules to ensure mariner safety and vessel and facility safety and security, and the protection of the environment. With such vast authority comes great responsibility to regulate industry in a fair and reasonable way. This hearing will focus on ensuring that Coast Guard rulemaking is just that, fair and reasonable. It's important to remember that the United States economy is fueled by maritime commerce. While regulations must address concerns related to safety, security and stewardship, they must also balance the importance of maintaining the free flow of maritime commerce. Domestic shipping alone is responsible for over 500,000 American jobs and $100 billion in annual economic output. Additionally, 90 percent of all global trade and over 25 percent of our gross domestic product moves via sea. With the water treatment systems aboard -- strike that. With the economy still in a fragile state and unemployment at record levels, it is imperative that federal government can foster an atmosphere where our maritime industry can compete and expand. To that end, I'm concerned about the cost and impact of several forthcoming Coast Guard rulemakings, specifically rules requiring fishing vessel examinations. The purchase of automatic identification systems for small vessels and the installation of ballast water treatment systems aboard vessels could have tremendous impacts on the economy. If these and other rules are not done on a commonsense manner, I'm concerned that they could drastically increase operating costs for businesses, hamper growth and kill jobs at a time when our nation can ill afford economic setbacks. Finally, just as we're facing tough decisions on how to cut the deficit, these and other pending regulations will require additional personnel and funding for the Coast Guard. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses how the Coast Guard intends to fund the -- to find the resources to pay for the expansion of its regulatory mission, as well as what steps it is taking to ensure rules are put forth in an efficient and commonsense manner. I thank you all for appearing today. And I'm now pleased to recognize the distinguish gentleman from Washington for his opening statement. REPRESENTATIVE RICK LARSEN (D-WA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning and thank you for convening today's hearing to examine the status of major rulemaking activities by the U.S. Coast Guard, and their impact on job creation in our domestic maritime industries and the overall economy. Revitalizing and growing our maritime economy is a high priority for me, and I want to thank you for taking interest in this matter this morning, Mr. Chairman. REP. COBLE: You're welcome. REP. LARSEN: The Coast Guard is a multi-mission maritime military service of the United States. It is the principal federal agency responsible for ensuring marine safety, preserving maritime and port security, enhancing maritime commerce and protecting the marine environment.
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Inland waterways are crucial to linking the US to global trade but locks and dams are failing now

**Pointon and Grier 4** [Mark and David, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, “THE CHALLENGE TO MODERNIZE THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAYS”, ftp://ftp.hamburg.baw.de/pub/Kfki/Bib/2002\_Dredging/PDFs/40680-021-005.PDF]

INTRODUCTION: The coastal ports of any nation play a vital role in linking that nation with world trade and in expanding the reach of its domestic economy to all corners of the globe. For a port to sustain and expand its role as a national conduit of trade with the world it must have reliable transportation links with inland points of production and consumption. In a developed industrialized economy this usually includes a sophisticated highway, rail and pipeline infrastructure. In the United States this infrastructure includes a fourth modal alternative -- a vast network of inland waterways stretching deep into the nation's heartland. Inland waterways in the United States play a vital role in the movement of bulk cargoes and manufactured goods in both foreign and domestic commerce. The inland waterway system allows the competitive movement of huge quantities of liquid and dry bulk cargoes between deepwater ports and distant points of production or consumption in the nation's interior. In recent years, U.S. inland waterway traffic has approximated 630 million tons annually, 1 accounting for about 15 percent of total intercity commerce by volume. Over 50 percent of U.S. grain exports depend on this river network. 2 Millions of tons of U.S. foreign trade in petroleum products, chemicals, forest products, metal ores, steel products and mineral aggregates all depend on the inland waterway system. The federal government has taken the lead to develop and maintain our inland waterways infrastructure through a combination of dredging, navigable dams, river training works, and 276 chambers at 230 lock sites. The replacement value of these improvements is estimated at over $120 billion in current dollars and annual maintenance exceeds $450 million. Nearly half of these locks and dams now exceed their 50-year design lives. At the same time traffic has continued to grow and there is a need for larger replacement locks at many locations. A new lock is an expensive proposition, ranging from $150 million to over $1 billion, depending on the size, type and location. Further, as the system ages the need for maintenance increases. Federal budget constraints have postponed critical maintenance while at the same time the queue of new or replacement lock projects awaiting construction continues to grow. Due to budget constraints, the construction schedules of many projects now underway are being stretched, increasing congestion and reducing project benefits. Other authorized projects may not be started for the foreseeable future. Yet replacement or major rehabilitation at many locks will become necessary in the next few years if the integrity of the inland navigation system is to be preserved. As yet there is no political consensus within the federal government or between commercial users and other stakeholder interests (such as recreation users, environmental concerns, hydropower, and water supply) over what actions to take and how to fund them.
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**Inland waterways are crucial to US exports and international trade**

**Khachatryan and Casavant 11** [Hayk, Research Associate at Washington State University, and Ken, Director of the Freight Policy Transportation Institute and Professor of Economics at Washington State University, “THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN U.S. TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE”]

Ocean ports are one of the most vital hubs for U.S. international trade flows. Congestion and low efficiency result in delays and disruptions, which impact the entire supply chain (Blonigen and Wilson, 2006). Clark et al., (2004) show that an increase in port efficiency from 25 th to 75 th percentile reduces port shipping costs by 12%. In addition to port efficiency, an increase in the inland transport infrastructure efficiency from 25 th to 75 th percentile improves the bilateral trade by 25%. This estimate is comparable to the estimate of 28% reported in Limao and Venables, (2001). Port efficiency can be measured by linking its impact on transportation costs. In their investigation of the transportation cost determinants, Sánchez et al. (2003) found statistically significant positive correlation between transport costs and distance and value per weight variables. The frequency of services and the level of containerization were both negatively correlated, but only the frequency of services was found to be statistically significant. Waterborne imports and exports account for about 1.4 billion tons, an equivalent of $3.95 TN in international trade, and U.S. ports secure about 13.3 million jobs that generate about $649 billion in personal income (AAPA, 2010). Improving the capacity and efficiency of U.S. public ports infrastructure is particularly important given the projected increases in freight shipment for the next decade. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, the volume of containerized cargo will double by 2020 (BTS RITA, 2009). U.S. total exports to the top 15 countries for 2000, 2005, and 2010 are compared in Figure 7. Compared to 2000 and 2005 levels, exports in 2010 were increased significant especially for Canada, Mexico and China. Except for Japan, 2010 exports to all 15 countries are increased. This increasing trend in U.S. merchandise is directly comparable to agricultural export statistics discussed above. Figure 8 shows the Pacific region’s top 15 export product categories. Even with a decreased 2010 level, the computer and electronics category still provides the highest exports, followed by the transportation equipment category. Agricultural products exports category is the third, with substantial increases from 2000 to 2010. Among the Pacific ports, Port of Los Angeles provides the highest number of import and export twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) followed by Port of Long Beach, Port of Oakland, Port of Seattle, Port of Tacoma and Port of Portland (Figure 9). With the exception of Port of Oakland, imports exceed exports at all of the Pacific ports. In particular, the three biggest ports import twice of the export volumes. 2 The increased levels of U.S. total merchandise and agricultural commodities exports emphasize the importance of both port and inland waterways infrastructure improvements. One of those improvement projects is the recent lock repair project on Columbia-Snake River System (CSR) by the Army Corps of Engineers that operates about 12,000 miles of waterways in the US. The CSRS links the Pacific Northwest (PNW) economy to the rest of the world through the 16 th largest container port in the U.S. – the Port of Portland. This waterway system is a gateway for 37% of U.S. wheat exports, 70% of U.S. barley exports, and most of the West Coast’s forest/paper products and bulk mineral products exports. It is also number one for West Coast auto imports (Bureau of Transportation Statistics, 2009). The CSRS was shut down for about 15 weeks for replacing downstream gates on three dams’ navigation locks, some of which were replaced 54 (The Dalles Dam) and 40 years ago (John Day Dam). The material and construction modernization of the aging infrastructure of the CSRS will allow the new locks last longer, be more efficient, and better serve this vital commerce waterway that averages about 10M tons of cargo movement, worth of more than $3 B/year.

# Congestion now

**Congestion on highways and railroads is increasing – inland waterways solve**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

 By 2020, projected increases in truck volumes of 62 percent and rail freight volumes of 44 percent will strain the U.S. freight transportation system. Shippers favor trucks for speed and reliability, but increasing truck traffic aggravates highway congestion creating significant social, economic, and environmental problems. Railroads provide shippers with cost-effective freight transportation, especially for longdistance trips and heavy and bulky commodities. 9 In 2004, Class I railroads in the United States transported 1.8 billion tons, the highest originating tonnage ever. This record tonnage reflects steady growth in rail traffic for six straight years. U.S. freight trains serve almost every economic sector in the nation, hauling approximately 31.1% of total cargo as measured in ton- miles. Railroads are unique among transportation industry sectors. Railroad infrastructure is privately owned and operated with access limited to the owners of the track. 10 Although the railroad industry is now competitive and productive, railroads are very capital-intensive industries. Railroads are not attracting enough long-term investment, and the freight-rail system may not expand proportionate to economic growth if current trends continue. Unlike most other transportation industries, railroads receive very little subsidy from federal or state governments and rely on their ability to raise necessary capital for maintenance and improvements. U.S. railroads are hauling more freight than ever before and rely more heavily on a shrinking and 4 aging infrastructure. These traffic increases result in capacity constraints and service issues at certain junctions and corridors within the rail network. In fact, excess capacity has disappeared from many critical segments of the national rail system altogether. 11 Failure of the railroad industry to expand exponentially with national economic growth pushes additional freight traffic onto other modes of transport, leading to increased congestion along surface transportation corridors. As our road and rail networks have become increasingly congested and near maximum capacity, we must look to the inland waterway system as a solution. 12 The inland waterway system provides an alternative to overland transportation, reducing congestion plaguing existing road and rail infrastructure. Inland waterways account for approximately 11% of total domestic freight (as measured in ton-miles), third behind road and rail.

# Econ impact extension

Economic collapse causes multiple scenarios for nuclear war

**Burrows and Harris 9** - [Mathew J. Burrows is a counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC), the principal drafter of Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, Jennifer Harris is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, The Washington Quarterly, April, http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf]

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groupsinheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacksand newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world. What Kind of World will 2025 Be? Perhaps more than lessons, history loves patterns. Despite widespread changes in the world today, there is little to suggest that the future will not resemble the past in several respects. The report asserts that, under most scenarios, the trend toward greater diffusion of authority and power that has been ongoing for a couple of decades is likely to accelerate because of the emergence of new global players, the worsening institutional deficit, potential growth in regional blocs, and enhanced strength of non-state actors and networks. The multiplicity of actors on the international scene could either strengthen the international system, by filling gaps left by aging post-World War II institutions, or could further fragment it and incapacitate international cooperation. The diversity in both type and kind of actor raises the likelihood of fragmentation occurring over the next two decades, particularly given the wide array of transnational challenges facing the international community. Because of their growing geopolitical and economic clout, the rising powers will enjoy a high degree of freedom to customize their political and economic policies rather than fully adopting Western norms. They are also likely to cherish their policy freedom to maneuver, allowing others to carry the primary burden for dealing with terrorism, climate change, proliferation, energy security, and other system maintenance issues. Existing multilateral institutions, designed for a different geopolitical order, appear too rigid and cumbersome to undertake new missions, accommodate changing memberships, and augment their resources. Nongovernmental organizations and philanthropic foundations, concentrating on specific issues, increasingly will populate the landscape but are unlikely to affect change in the absence of concerted efforts by multilateral institutions or governments. Efforts at greater inclusiveness, to reflect the emergence of the newer powers, may make it harder for international organizations to tackle transnational challenges. Respect for the dissenting views of member nations will continue to shape the agenda of organizations and limit the kinds of solutions that can be attempted. An ongoing financial crisis and prolonged recession would tilt the scales even further in the direction of a fragmented and dysfunctional international system with a heightened risk of conflict. The report concluded that the rising BRIC powers (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) seem averse to challenging the international system, as Germany and Japan did in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but this of course could change if their widespread hopes for greater prosperity become frustrated and the current benefits they derive from a globalizing world turn negative.

# \*Heg advantage extensions\*

# IW key to heg

**Sustainable transportation infrastructure is key to power projection**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

The collaborative efforts of U.S. transportation industries, and the infrastructure upon which they operate, provide the lifelines of American economic prosperity. Viable transportation infrastructure is essential to our national security, providing power projection platforms access to sea and aerial ports of embarkation capable of rapidly moving American military forces, equipment, and material anywhere in the world. Capable and reliable transportation infrastructure is a vital national interest of the United States. Domestic transportation infrastructure must be efficiently managed, adequately funded, and effectively integrated at the national level to serve as productive commercial conduits that support future economic growth. The United States has become one of the wealthiest nations 2 in the world, in part, by leveraging its reliable and effective transportation infrastructure; only through further advancements in this imperative system will it maintain this status.

**Maritime transportation infrastructure is crucial to supply military missions**

**US DOT 7** [U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, “The Maritime Administration and the U.S. Marine Transportation System: A Vision for the 21 st Century”, November, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/Vision\_of\_the\_21st\_Century\_10-29.pdf]

Since 1775, the marine transpor tation industr yhas met the needs of our Nation during peace and war. Our ﬂeet continues to be a critical component of the Nation’s transpor tation infrastructure and militar y readiness. The domestic “Jones Act” component, a ﬂeet of over 38,000 vessels, is “Made in America” and represents an aggregate $48 billion investment. Building and maintaining the Jones Act ﬂeet sustains roughly 150,000 jobs throughout the U.S. economy. This ﬂeet is being continuously upgraded and renewed, with domestic maritime carriers moving almost one billion tons of cargo annually along our coasts, on our rivers and lakes, the Great Lakes, and to and from Alaska, Hawaii, Puer to Rico and Guam. In addition to their commercial functions, U.S.-ﬂag ships and their connecting intermodal systems play an integral but often unheralded role in bringing critical supplies to militar y missions across the globe. The Nation’s sealift assets, strategic por ts and suppor ting infrastructure are integral links in the defense logistics chain and the projection of American power.

# IW key to heg

**Modernizing inland waterways is key to military mobilization and sealift**

**US Propeller Club 9** [a grassroots, non-profit organization, dedicated to the enhancement and well-being of all interests of the maritime community on a national and international basis, “Resolutions”, http://propellerclubhq.com/about/resolutions]

The revitalization and development of the nation’s aging waterways infrastructure, including the ports, inland and coastal waterways of the United States, are essential in maintaining the Merchant Marine’s vital contribution to the American economy and to the U.S. Sealift mobilization capability. Implementing Clause The Propeller Club calls upon all government officials to devote serious attention to the grave problems faced by the American Merchant Marine and maritime industry in general. The membership of The Propeller Club of the United States, after much consultation and internal deliberation has reached a consensus on the key components of a nationwide policy designed to preserve and expand all segments of our Merchant Marine. In implementation of the principles enunciated in this preamble, the following specific resolutions are authorized and adopted. I. A PROGRESSIVE NATIONAL MARITIME POLICY AND PROGRAM The Propeller Club urges the executive branch of Government, the Congress, all elements of maritime labor and management and the public to cooperate in developing and executing a sound, progressive national maritime policy which builds upon the maritime Security Act of 1996, The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, the Jones Act and other cabotage laws, and other statutes and programs and which helps assure the development and maintenance of an economically sound and militarily useful United States flag shipping capability on the high seas, Great Lakes, and our coastal and inland waterways. It is imperative that the United States pursue the following maritime objective: 1. Promote an effective program for all segments of the U.S. Merchant Marine including (1) Container, break-bulk, and bulk service vessels in our foreign trade, (2) towboat, tugs, barges and other vessels in our inland and coastal trades, (3) carriers in Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway trade, (4) carriers in our offshore domestic trade, (5) mobile offshore units and vessels of the ocean industries engaged in offshore oil and mineral exploration and development, (6) fishing vessels, and (7) Passenger Vessels. 2. Insure a consistent vessel replacement program geared to the changing patterns of domestic and international trade and achieve vessel operating cost competitiveness for all U.S. flag ships in foreign commerce; 3. Sustain, for national economic and security purposes strong United States shipbuilding and allied industries to meet a defined and agreed need for a shipyard mobilization base. Revitalize the Title XI mortgage guarantee program for the construction of vessels, including passenger ships, in the United States; implement incentives for the construction of militarily useful vessels in U.S. shipyards and enact a competitive tax deferral, cost recovery and investment program for American vessels; 4. Maintain U.S. cabotage for domestic waterborne commerce under the Jones Act; and the Passenger Vessel Services Act; 5. Review and revise as necessary existing maritime laws and regulations to keep current with the ever changing nature of the maritime industry and enact and promulgate new laws and regulations which do not reduce the competitiveness of the U.S. maritime industry and do not burden it with unnecessary costs; 6. Encourage the use of commercial and/or governmental agreements to promote cargo sharing in order to generate adequate cargo so that “…a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import commerce of the United States…”is carried as required in Title I of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended and achieve the improved federal compliance with U.S. flag preference requirements for government-impelled cargoes; 7. Increase government use of privately owned and operated vessels to satisfy federal transport requirements; 8. Promote the development of modern and efficient port and deep water port facilities capable of handling vessels of all types and develop our inland waterways to their full potential; 9. Maintain adequate support for the Federal and State maritime academies; 10. Promote a strong and coordinated industry government program of research and development, including improved and energy-efficient propulsion equipment and safety systems for crew survival; 11. Continue, for national security purposes, existing United States citizenship requirements for licensed and unlicensed crews aboard United States flag vessels and develop and maintain a U.S. flag fleet capable of meeting the national security needs of our country; and 12. Establish in the National Security Council a Special Assistant to the President for Maritime Affairs and such Directors as the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs shall designate. The Special Assistant shall cooperate and consult with appropriate offices in the Department of Defense, the Department of Transportation, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, and any other departments of the federal government whose actions concern the United States merchant marine in order to assure that the United States merchant marine is capable of meeting the national security and national defense needs of the United States in peacetime, during conditions of national emergency, or in the event of other hostilities which involve the military forces of the United States. II. DETERRENCE OF AGGRESSION Effective deterrence of aggression against the vital interests of the nation requires that both an adequate inventory of sealift assets, including United States flag vessels and United States citizen crews and an adequate shipyard mobilization base be maintained. There is, therefore, an innate linkage between maritime policy and the national security which is at present largely unrecognized in the formulation of maritime policy. The Propeller Club of the United States calls upon the President of the United States to establish and maintain as a part of the executive branch a function which on a continuing basis: 1) assesses the adequacy and availability of sealift assets and the shipyard mobilization base to meet national requirements, and 2) develops programs which insure that these vital assets are available.
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hegemony prevents *all major impacts*.

**Thayer 6** Associate Professor in the Department of Defense and Strategic Studies at Missouri State University [Bradley, In Defense of Primacy, The National Interest, December (lexis)]

A grand strategy based on American primacy means ensuring the United States stays the world's number one power--the diplomatic, economic and military leader. Those arguing against primacy claim that the United States should retrench, either because the United States lacks the power to maintain its primacy and should withdraw from its global commitments, or because the maintenance of primacy will lead the United States into the trap of "imperial overstretch." In the previous issue of The National Interest, Christopher Layne warned of these dangers of primacy and called for retrenchment.1 Those arguing for a grand strategy of retrenchment are a diverse lot. They include isolationists, who want no foreign military commitments; selective engagers, who want U.S. military commitments to centers of economic might; and offshore balancers, who want a modified form of selective engagement that would have the United States abandon its landpower presence abroad in favor of relying on airpower and seapower to defend its interests. But retrenchment, in any of its guises, must be avoided. If the United States adopted such a strategy, it would be a profound strategic mistake that would lead to far greater instability and war in the world, imperil American security and deny the United States and its allies the benefits of primacy. There are two critical issues in any discussion of America's grand strategy: Can America remain the dominant state? Should it strive to do this? America can remain dominant due to its prodigious military, economic and soft power capabilities. The totality of that equation of power answers the first issue. The United States has overwhelming military capabilities and wealth in comparison to other states or likely potential alliances. Barring some disaster or tremendous folly, that will remain the case for the foreseeable future. With few exceptions, even those who advocate retrenchment acknowledge this. So the debate revolves around the desirability of maintaining American primacy. Proponents of retrenchment focus a great deal on the costs of U.S. action--but they fail to realize what is good about American primacy. The price and risks of primacy are reported in newspapers every day; the benefits that stem from it are not. A GRAND strategy of ensuring American primacy takes as its starting point the protection of the U.S. homeland and American global interests. These interests include ensuring that critical resources like oil flow around the world, that the global trade and monetary regimes flourish and that Washington's worldwide network of allies is reassured and protected. Allies are a great asset to the United States, in part because they shoulder some of its burdens. Thus, it is no surprise to see NATO in Afghanistan or the Australians in East Timor. In contrast, a strategy based on retrenchment will not be able to achieve these fundamental objectives of the United States. Indeed, retrenchment will make the United States less secure than the present grand strategy of primacy. This is because threats will exist no matter what role America chooses to play in international politics. Washington cannot call a "time out", and it cannot hide from threats. Whether they are terrorists, rogue states or rising powers, history shows that threats must be confronted. Simply by declaring that the United States is "going home", thus abandoning its commitments or making unconvincing half-pledges to defend its interests and allies, does not mean that others will respect American wishes to retreat. To make such a declaration implies weakness and emboldens aggression. In the anarchic world of the animal kingdom, predators prefer to eat the weak rather than confront the strong. The same is true of the anarchic world of international politics. If there is no diplomatic solution to the threats that confront the United States, then the conventional and strategic military power of the United States is what protects the country from such threats. And when enemies must be confronted, a strategy based on primacy focuses on engaging enemies overseas, away from American soil. Indeed, a key tenet of the Bush Doctrine is to attack terrorists far from America's shores and not to wait while they use bases in other countries to plan and train for attacks against the United States itself. This requires a physical, on-the-ground presence that cannot be achieved by offshore balancing. Indeed, as Barry Posen has noted, U.S. primacy is secured because America, at present, commands the "global commons"--the oceans, the world's airspace and outer space--allowing the United States to project its power far from its borders, while denying those common avenues to its enemies. As a consequence, the costs of power projection for the United States and its allies are reduced, and the robustness of the United States' conventional and strategic deterrent capabilities is increased.2 This is not an advantage that should be relinquished lightly. A remarkable fact about international politics today--in a world where American primacy is clearly and unambiguously on display--is that countries want to align themselves with the United States. Of course, this is not out of any sense of altruism, in most cases, but because doing so allows them to use the power of the United States for their own purposes--their own protection, or to gain greater influence. Of 192 countries, 84 are allied with America--their security is tied to the United States through treaties and other informal arrangements--and they include almost all of the major economic and military powers. That is a ratio of almost 17 to one (85 to five), and a big change from the Cold War when the ratio was about 1.8 to one of states aligned with the United States versus the Soviet Union. Never before in its history has this country, or any country, had so many allies. U.S. primacy--and the bandwagoning effect--has also given us extensive influence in international politics, allowing the United States to shape the behavior of states and international institutions. Such influence comes in many forms, one of which is America's ability to create coalitions of like-minded states to free Kosovo, stabilize Afghanistan, invade Iraq or to stop proliferation through the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI ). Doing so allows the United States to operate with allies outside of the UN, where it can be stymied by opponents. American-led wars in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Iraq stand in contrast to the UN's inability to save the people of Darfur or even to conduct any military campaign to realize the goals of its charter. The quiet effectiveness of the PSI in dismantling Libya's WMD programs and unraveling the A. Q. Khan proliferation network are in sharp relief to the typically toothless attempts by the UN to halt proliferation. You can count with one hand countries opposed to the United States. They are the "Gang of Five": China, Cuba, Iran, North Korea and Venezuela. Of course, countries like India, for example, do not agree with all policy choices made by the United States, such as toward Iran, but New Delhi is friendly to Washington. Only the "Gang of Five" may be expected to consistently resist the agenda and actions of the United States. China is clearly the most important of these states because it is a rising great power. But even Beijing is intimidated by the United States and refrains from openly challenging U.S. power. China proclaims that it will, if necessary, resort to other mechanisms of challenging the United States, including asymmetric strategies such as targeting communication and intelligence satellites upon which the United States depends. But China may not be confident those strategies would work, and so it is likely to refrain from testing the United States directly for the foreseeable future because China's power benefits, as we shall see, from the international order U.S. primacy creates. The other states are far weaker than China. For three of the "Gang of Five" cases--Venezuela, Iran, Cuba--it is an anti-U.S. regime that is the source of the problem; the country itself is not intrinsically anti-American. Indeed, a change of regime in Caracas, Tehran or Havana could very well reorient relations. THROUGHOUT HISTORY, peace and stability have been great benefits of an era where there was a dominant power--Rome, Britain or the United States today. Scholars and statesmen have long recognized the irenic effect of power on the anarchic world of international politics. Everything we think of when we consider the current international order--free trade, a robust monetary regime, increasing respect for human rights, growing democratization--is directly linked to U.S. power. Retrenchment
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proponents seem to think that the current system can be maintained without the current amount of U.S. power behind it. In that they are dead wrong and need to be reminded of one of history's most significant lessons: Appalling things happen when international orders collapse. The Dark Ages followed Rome's collapse. Hitler succeeded the order established at Versailles. Without U.S. power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. As country and western great Ral Donner sang: "You don't know what you've got (until you lose it)." Consequently, it is important to note what those good things are. In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causes many positive outcomes for Washington and the world. The first has been a more peaceful world. During the Cold War, U.S. leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy helps keep a number of complicated relationships aligned--between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. This is not to say it fulfills Woodrow Wilson's vision of ending all war. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood, particularly war's worst form: great power wars. Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and other elements of its ideology of liberalism. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because, as John Owen noted on these pages in the Spring 2006 issue, liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview.3 So, spreading democracy helps maintain U.S. primacy. In addition, once states are governed democratically, the likelihood of any type of conflict is significantly reduced. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Indeed they do. Rather, it is because they are more open, more transparent and more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with U.S. leadership. And so, in general, democratic states are good for their citizens as well as for advancing the interests of the United States. Critics have faulted the Bush Administration for attempting to spread democracy in the Middle East, labeling such an effort a modern form of tilting at windmills. It is the obligation of Bush's critics to explain why democracy is good enough for Western states but not for the rest, and, one gathers from the argument, should not even be attempted. Of course, whether democracy in the Middle East will have a peaceful or stabilizing influence on America's interests in the short run is open to question. Perhaps democratic Arab states would be more opposed to Israel, but nonetheless, their people would be better off. The United States has brought democracy to Afghanistan, where 8.5 million Afghans, 40 percent of them women, voted in a critical October 2004 election, even though remnant Taliban forces threatened them. The first free elections were held in Iraq in January 2005. It was the military power of the United States that put Iraq on the path to democracy. Washington fostered democratic governments in Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Caucasus. Now even the Middle East is increasingly democratic. They may not yet look like Western-style democracies, but democratic progress has been made in Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, the Palestinian Authority and Egypt. By all accounts, the march of democracy has been impressive. Third, along with the growth in the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, and mobility of capital and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good from which all states benefit, particularly the poorest states in the Third World. The United States created this network not out of altruism but for the benefit and the economic well-being of America. This economic order forces American industries to be competitive, maximizes efficiencies and growth, and benefits defense as well because the size of the economy makes the defense burden manageable. Economic spin-offs foster the development of military technology, helping to ensure military prowess. Perhaps the greatest testament to the benefits of the economic network comes from Deepak Lal, a former Indian foreign service diplomat and researcher at the World Bank, who started his career confident in the socialist ideology of post-independence India. Abandoning the positions of his youth, Lal now recognizes that the only way to bring relief to desperately poor countries of the Third World is through the adoption of free market economic policies and globalization, which are facilitated through American primacy.4 As a witness to the failed alternative economic systems, Lal is one of the strongest academic proponents of American primacy due to the economic prosperity it provides. Fourth and finally, the United States, in seeking primacy, has been willing to use its power not only to advance its interests but to promote the welfare of people all over the globe. The United States is the earth's leading source of positive externalities for the world. The U.S. military has participated in over fifty operations since the end of the Cold War--and most of those missions have been humanitarian in nature. Indeed, the U.S. military is the earth's "911 force"--it serves, de facto, as the world's police, the global paramedic and the planet's fire department. Whenever there is a natural disaster, earthquake, flood, drought, volcanic eruption, typhoon or tsunami, the United States assists the countries in need. On the day after Christmas in 2004, a tremendous earthquake and tsunami occurred in the Indian Ocean near Sumatra, killing some 300,000 people. The United States was the first to respond with aid. Washington followed up with a large contribution of aid and deployed the U.S. military to South and Southeast Asia for many months to help with the aftermath of the disaster. About 20,000 U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines responded by providing water, food, medical aid, disease treatment and prevention as well as forensic assistance to help identify the bodies of those killed. Only the U.S. military could have accomplished this Herculean effort. No other force possesses the communications capabilities or global logistical reach of the U.S. military. In fact, UN peacekeeping operations depend on the United States to supply UN forces. American generosity has done more to help the United States fight the War on Terror than almost any other measure. Before the tsunami, 80 percent of Indonesian public opinion was opposed to the United States; after it, 80 percent had a favorable opinion of America. Two years after the disaster, and in poll after poll, Indonesians still have overwhelmingly positive views of the United States. In October 2005, an enormous earthquake struck Kashmir, killing about 74,000 people and leaving three million homeless. The U.S. military responded immediately, diverting helicopters fighting the War on Terror in nearby Afghanistan to bring relief as soon as possible. To help those in need, the United States also provided financial aid to Pakistan; and, as one might expect from those witnessing the munificence of the United States, it left a lasting impression about America. For the first time since 9/11, polls of Pakistani opinion have found that more people are favorable toward the United States than unfavorable, while support for Al-Qaeda dropped to its lowest level. Whether in Indonesia or Kashmir, the money was well-spent because it helped people in the wake of disasters, but it also had a real impact on the War on Terror. When people in the Muslim world witness the U.S. military conducting a humanitarian mission, there is a clearly positive impact on Muslim opinion of the United States. As the War on Terror is a war of ideas and opinion as much as military action, for the United States humanitarian missions are the equivalent of a blitzkrieg.
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Transition from U.S. dominance causes conflict—the *perception* of weakness empirically spurs war

Friedberg 11 (July/August, Aaron L., professor of politics and international affairs at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton University, Hegemony with Chinese Characteristics, The National Interest, lexis)

THE UNITED States and the People’s Republic of China are locked in a quiet but increasingly intense struggle for power and influence, not only in Asia, but around the world. And in spite of what many earnest and well-intentioned commentators seem to believe, the nascent Sino-American rivalry is not merely the result of misperceptions or mistaken policies; it is driven instead by forces that are deeply rooted in the shifting structure of the international system and in the very different domestic political regimes of the two Pacific powers. Throughout history, relations between dominant and rising states have been uneasy—and often violent. Established powers tend to regard themselves as the defenders of an international order that they helped to create and from which they continue to benefit; rising powers feel constrained, even cheated, by the status quo and struggle against it to take what they think is rightfully theirs. Indeed, this story line, with its Shakespearean overtones of youth and age, vigor and decline, is among the oldest in recorded history. As far back as the fifth century BC the great Greek historian Thucydides began his study of the Peloponnesian War with the deceptively simple observation that the war’s deepest, truest cause was “the growth of Athenian power and the fear which this caused in Sparta.” The fact that the U.S.-China relationship is competitive, then, is simply no surprise. But these countries are not just any two great powers: Since the end of the Cold War the United States has been the richest and most powerful nation in the world; China is, by contrast, the state whose capabilities have been growing most rapidly. America is still “number one,” but China is fast gaining ground. The stakes are about as high as they can get, and the potential for conflict particularly fraught. At least insofar as the dominant powers are concerned, rising states tend to be troublemakers. As a nation’s capabilities grow, its leaders generally define their interests more expansively and seek a greater degree of influence over what is going on around them. This means that those in ascendance typically attempt not only to secure their borders but also to reach out beyond them, taking steps to ensure access to markets, materials and transportation routes; to protect their citizens far from home; to defend their foreign friends and allies; to promulgate their religious or ideological beliefs; and, in general, to have what they consider to be their rightful say in the affairs of their region and of the wider world. As they begin to assert themselves, ascendant states typically feel impelled to challenge territorial boundaries, international institutions and hierarchies of prestige that were put in place when they were still relatively weak. Like Japan in the late nineteenth century, or Germany at the turn of the twentieth, rising powers want their place in the sun. This, of course, is what brings them into conflict with the established great powers—the so-called status quo states—who are the architects, principal beneficiaries and main defenders of any existing international system. The resulting clash of interests between the two sides has seldom been resolved peacefully. Recognizing the growing threat to their position, dominant powers (or a coalition of status quo states) have occasionally tried to attack and destroy a competitor before it can grow strong enough to become a threat. Others—hoping to avoid war—have taken the opposite approach: attempting to appease potential challengers, they look for ways to satisfy their demands and ambitions and seek to incorporate them peacefully into the existing international order. But however sincere, these efforts have almost always ended in failure. Sometimes the reason clearly lies in the demands of the rising state. As was true of Adolf Hitler’s Germany, an aggressor may have ambitions that are so extensive as to be impossible for the status quo powers to satisfy without effectively consigning themselves to servitude or committing national suicide. Even when the demands being made of them are less onerous, the dominant states are often either reluctant to make concessions, thereby fueling the frustrations and resentments of the rising power, or too eager to do so, feeding its ambitions and triggering a spiral of escalating demands. Successful policies of appeasement are conceivable in theory but in practice have proven devilishly difficult to implement. This is why periods of transition, when a new, ascending power begins to overtake the previously dominant state, have so often been marked by war.

# Impact extension

**Hegemony solves great power war**

Kagan 12 – [Senior Fellow @ the Brookings Institution, Robert, The importance of U.S. military might shouldn’t be underestimated, Washington Post, 2-2, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-importance-of-us-military-might-shouldnt-be-underestimated/2012/02/02/gIQAX5pVlQ\_story.html]

These are sensible arguments. Power takes many forms, and it’s smart to make use of all of them. But there is a danger in taking this wisdom too far and forgetting just how important U.S. military power has been in building and sustaining the present liberal international order. That order has rested significantly on the U.S. ability to provide security in parts of the world, such as Europe and Asia, that had known endless cycles of warfare before the arrival of the United States. The world’s free-trade, free-market economy has depended on America’s ability to keep trade routes open, even during times of conflict. And the remarkably wide spread of democracy around the world owes something to America’s ability to provide support to democratic forces under siege and to protect peoples from dictators such as Moammar Gaddafi and Slobodan Milosevic. Some find it absurd that the United States should have a larger military than the next 10 nations combined. But that gap in military power has probably been the greatest factor in upholding an international system that, in historical terms, is unique — and uniquely beneficial to Americans. Nor should we forget that this power is part of what makes America attractive to many other nations. The world has not always loved America. During the era of Vietnam and Watergate and the ugly last stand of segregationists, America was often hated. But nations that relied on the United States for security from threatening neighbors tended to overlook the country’s flaws. In the 1960s, millions of young Europeans took to the streets to protest American “imperialism,” while their governments worked to ensure that the alliance with the United States held firm. Soft power, meanwhile, has its limits. No U.S. president has enjoyed more international popularity than Woodrow Wilson did when he traveled to Paris to negotiate the treaty ending World War I. He was a hero to the world, but he found his ability to shape the peace, and to establish the new League of Nations, severely limited, in no small part by his countrymen’s refusal to commit U.S. military power to the defense of the peace. John F. Kennedy, another globally admired president, found his popularity of no use in his confrontations with Nikita Khrushchev, who, by Kennedy’s own admission, “beat the hell out of me” and who may have been convinced by his perception of Kennedy’s weakness that the United States would tolerate his placing Soviet missiles in Cuba. The international system is not static. It responds quickly to fluctuations in power. If the United States were to cut too deeply into its ability to project military power, other nations could be counted on to respond accordingly. Those nations whose power rises in relative terms would display expanding ambitions commensurate with their new clout in the international system. They would, as in the past, demand particular spheres of influence. Those whose power declined in relative terms, like the United States, would have little choice but to cede some influence in those areas. Thus China would lay claim to its sphere of influence in Asia, Russia in eastern Europe and the Caucasus. And, as in the past, these burgeoning great-power claims would overlap and conflict: India and China claim the same sphere in the Indian Ocean; Russia and Europe have overlapping spheres in the region between the Black Sea and the Baltic. Without the United States to suppress and contain these conflicting ambitions, there would have to be complex adjustments to establish a new balance. Some of these adjustments could be made through diplomacy, as they were sometimes in the past. Other adjustments might be made through war or the threat of war, as also happened in the past. The biggest illusion is to imagine that as American power declines, the world stays the same. What has been true since the time of Rome remains true today: There can be no world order without power to preserve it, to shape its norms, uphold its institutions, defend the sinews of its economic system and keep the peace. Military power can be abused, wielded unwisely and ineffectively. It can be deployed to answer problems that it cannot answer or that have no answer. But it is also essential. No nation or group of nations that renounced power could expect to maintain any kind of world order. If the United States begins to look like a less reliable defender of the present order, that order will begin to unravel. People might indeed find Americans very attractive in this weaker state, but if the United States cannot help them when and where they need help the most, they will make other arrangements.

# US intervention inevitable

the U.S. will always try to maintain hegemony—it is only a question of *success*

Ferguson 9 (Niall, American Interest, http://www.the-american-interest.com/ai2/article.cfm?Id=335&MId=16)

So much for the American predicament. What of Posen’s alternative grand strategy based on American self-restraint? The terms he uses are themselves revealing. The United States needs to be more “reticent” about its use of military force, more “modest” about its political goals overseas, more “distant” from traditional allies, and more “stingy” in its aid policies. Good luck to the presidential candidate who laces his next foreign policy speech with those adjectives: “My fellow Americans, I want to make this great country of ours more reticent, modest, distant and stingy!” Let us, however, leave aside this quintessentially academic and operationally useless rhetoric. What exactly does Posen want the United States to do? I count six concrete recommendations. The United States should: 1) Abandon the Bush Doctrine of “preemption”, which in the case of Iraq has been a policy of preventive war. Posen argues that this applies even in cases of nuclear proliferation. By implication, he sees preventive war as an inferior option to deterrence, though he does not make clear how exactly a nuclear-armed Iran would be deterred, least of all if his second recommendation were to be implemented. 2) Reduce U.S. military presence in the Middle East (“the abode of Islam”) by abandoning “its permanent and semi-permanent land bases in Arab countries.” Posen does not say so, but he appears to imply the abandonment of all these bases, not just the ones in Iraq, but also those in, for example, Qatar. It is not clear what would be left of Central Command after such a drastic retreat. Note that this would represent a break with the policy not just of the last two Presidents, but with that of the last 12. 3) Ramp up efforts to provide relief in the wake of natural disasters, exemplified by Operation Unified Assistance after the Indian Ocean tsunami of December 26, 2004. No doubt the American military did some good in the wake of the tsunami, but Posen needs to explain why a government that so miserably bungled the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina less than a year later should be expected to be consistently effective in the wake of natural disasters. 4) Assist in humanitarian military interventions only “under reasonable guidelines” and “in coalitions, operating under some kind of regional or international political mandate.” Does Posen mean that he would favor sending American troops to Darfur at the same time as he is withdrawing them from other “abodes of Islam?” He does not say. 5) Promote not democracy abroad but “the rule of law, press freedom and the rights of collective bargaining.” Here again I am experiencing cognitive dissonance. The government that sought systematically to evade the Geneva Conventions in order to detain indefinitely and torture suspected terrorists as an upholder of the rule of law? 6) Stop offering “U.S. security guarantees and security assistance, [which] tend to relieve others of the need to do more to ensure their own security.” This is in fact the most important of all Posen’s recommendations, though he saves it until last. He envisages radical diminution of American support for other members of NATO. Over the next ten years, he writes, the United States “should gradually withdraw from all military headquarters and commands in Europe.” In the same timeframe it should “reduce U.S. government direct financial assistance to Israel to zero”, as well as reducing (though not wholly eliminating) assistance to Egypt. And it should “reconsider its security relationship with Japan”, whatever that means. Again, this represents a break with traditional policy so radical that it would impress even Noam Chomsky, to say nothing of Osama bin Laden (who would, indeed, find little here to object to). Posen, in other words, has proceeded from relatively familiar premises (the limits of American “hyperpower”) to some quite fantastic policy recommendations, which are perhaps best summed up as a cross between isolationism and humanitarianism. Only slightly less fantastic than his vision of an American military retreat from the Middle East, Europe and East Asia is Posen’s notion that it could be sold to the American electorate—just six years after they were the targets of the single largest terrorist attack in history—in the language of self-effacement. Coming from a man who wants to restart mainstream debate on American grand strategy, that is pretty rich.

# \*global warming advantage extensions\*

# IW solves global warming

**Inland waterways are key to service hydropower and nuclear power stations**

**Bray et al 11** [Dr. Larry G. Bray, Research Professor with the University of Tennessee Center for Transportation Research, an acknowledged expert on US Inland Waterways, C. Michael Murphree, M.A., and Chrisman A. Dager, MBA, “Toward A Full Accounting of the Beneficiaries of Navigable Waterways”, January]

While it was not possible to isolate every likely component that influences the economies of locating on the water, it was surmised that coal steam plants across the board primarily benefit from a combination of transportation savings in coal and limestone shipping and in plant maintenance. Many coal steam plants can be accessed by either rail or barge transportation, and, even if serviced by rail rather than barge, the presence of a competitive alternative can cause railroads to price their services more competitively. Where located on navigable streams, both coal-fired and nuclear generating plants are designed to be serviced from the water side of the plants. For example, cranes that are used for the transloading of extremely heavy generators, rotors, and other equipment are mounted on flat deck barges and are moved from pool to pool rather than moved by truck. The trucking alternative is expensive in that it can require weeks to assemble and disassemble each crane and a fleet of trucks to transport the disassembled parts. 9 The waterway is also used to service the hydropower system through shipment of heavy replacement components by water and by barged-based general maintenance. Large bargemounted cranes are used to clean out the trash racks and install components at the hydropower facilities. Although not included in the ORS impact estimate, power plants on navigable streams, in some instances, enjoy water supply and temperature control advantages. Older steam electric power plants typically use once-through cooling systems in the electric generation process. 10 Water is taken from the river, passed through the plant’s cooling system, and returned to the river at a higher temperature. Newer plants have a closed-cycle cooling system that utilizes towers to cool the water leaving the plant. Permits are required that establish maximum temperatures that can exist in the river as a result of the use of once-through or closed cycle cooling. A constant and predictable flow of water maintaining a minimum nine foot channel can result in lower generation costs and, indeed, provide the means to keep the plant on line during the warmer summer months. And where possible, cool mountain water is released in the summer and fall seasons to not only augment stream flows (necessary for navigation) but, also, for cooling at the power plants. The reported ORS impact estimates, calculated over 44 years, are derived using current point-in-time values projected into the future. Shipper savings can, of course, vary over time as transportation costs change in any or all transport modes. Congestion could become a significant factor affecting shipper savings. Although outside the scope of the ORS study, shipper savings can be tracked dynamically in response to projected congestion lock traffic levels. The USACE Navigation Economic Technologies Program 11 and Ohio River Navigation Investment Model web site are good sources for information on the subject of dynamic estimation. In simulation, lock feasibility studies begin with shipper savings at a point in time. From this point river traffic is forecast 50 years or so into the future and, with fixed capacity, congestion at the affected navigation locks increases, diminishing the shipper savings value and thus constituting a basis for lock construction benefit calculations. Where barge and rail compete to carry industry’s freight, those industries that prefer rail may benefit from the inducement the barge alternative offers for the alternative mode to hold its rates as low as it can to hold onto those customers. In the aforementioned TVA study on ORS navigation shipper savings and other utility advantages, these non-navigation shipper savings for coal-fired plants are likely accounted for in the impact estimation. However, to the extent that water-compelled rates exist in the region for the other industries, at least some of the non-utility savings and their impacts would not be captured in the estimated impacts. Although it’s generally acknowledged these non-navigation shipper beneficiaries exist, there is considerable controversy concerning calculations made to value these savings, and a wide range of estimates have resulted; therefore, no value is provided here. As is the case with recreation and, possibly other beneficiary categories, water-compelled rate savings, unlike navigation shipper savings, may represent in whole or part regional impacts (see Dager and Burton in the references section for more on this issue). 3.2.4. Recreation It is not possible with current data to determine precisely how lack of the navigation system would affect recreation nationally. What can be said, however, is that 382,523 recreation vessels passed thorough navigation locks in 2009. These vessels were processed in 147,679 recreational lockages. This is often an enjoyable experience for recreation boaters, and the Corps of Engineers allows these boaters access to the locks with no lockage fee. The deep navigation channels provide an excellent venue for pleasure boats, some of which have a fairly deep draft. Additionally, considering all Corps of Engineers recreational facilities, more than 372 million person-trips across the nation occurred in 2006. In that year, visitors to these lakes spend $18 billion on trip expenses and durable goods. Considering both these direct expenditures and the associated indirect economic impacts, visitor spending supported more than 250,000 jobs and $16 billion in the value added generated. 13 Within the benefit assessment process, such ‘regional’ economic impacts may be considered to be primarily economic transfers and may thus be given less weight than “national” benefits (that is, than those raising GDP or increasing productivity). They are, nonetheless, important to the regions that benefit from the availability of recreation opportunities. Additionally, of course, some recreation would take place without commercially navigable water, or even without the pools created by the dams. 3.2.5. Flood Damage Avoidance Untangling the statutory mandates and judicial decisions that define the purposes of waterway structures and operations is difficult. Differing reaches of the inland waterway system function with varying efficacy and are authorized for differing purposes. Historically, the three least challenged uses have been navigation, hydroelectric generation, and flood control. 14 Concerning the flood control project purpose, the Corps of Engineers and TVA maintain data bases to quantify these benefits. Nationally, most of the flood control benefits occur in the headwaters of the Missouri River but they are also significant in the headwaters of the Tennessee River. Multipurpose dams in the tributaries of the main rivers operate to collect runoff in the rainy seasons of the year, maintain their pools for summer recreation and irrigation if needed, and then release the stored water in the dry part of the year to support navigation. 15 In 2008, the Corps of Engineers reported a savings of $10 billion on all rivers but the Tennessee; TVA reported as savings of $230 million on that river. 16,17 Hydropower production or value data for Corps facilities are reported by the Corps of Engineers in aggregated fashion, not for individual sites, some of which are on navigable water and some not. TVA reports production but not value. The Corps reports that 75 hydro plants and 350 generating units produce 21,000 MW of capacity, representing 24% of total national hydropower generation. These units generate approximately 70 billion KWH of energy annually, enough to meet the electricity demands of 30 cities the size of Seattle, Washington. This system generates over $4.0 billion in gross annual revenue. 18 The support of navigation strengthens flows and makes these flows more regular. However, navigation can also require the release of water at times that are not beneficial to hydroelectric generation. Thus, the simultaneous pursuit of these purposes requires a careful balance between the water releases needed to preserve channel depth and the preservation of generating capacity for those times when electricity is most needed. Fortunately, the men and women charged with achieving this balance are well practiced so that intractable conflicts seldom arise. TVA reports a hydropower production of 14.0 billion kWhs in 2010 but does not report value. Assuming that the generated power is priced at its wholesale rate, TVA hydropower generation in 2010 can be valued at approximately $900 million to $1.0 billion. The navigation system supports the hydropower system through the servicing of the facilities through shipment of heavy replacement components by water and through general maintenance that is barged based. Additionally, the large barge-mounted cranes mentioned above are also used to clean out the trash racks at the hydropower facilities.

# Iw solves global warming

Inland waterway transport substantially reduces GHG emissions

**IGMS 8** [Institute for Global Maritime Studies, 2008, America’s Deep Blue Highway: How Coastal Shipping Could Reduce Traffic Congestion, Lower Pollution, and Improve National Security, http://www.igms.org/docs/americas\_deep\_blue\_highway\_IGMS\_report\_sept\_2008.pdf]

The estimated air emissions benefits from increased coastal shipping vary greatly by fuel type, vessel design, and cruising speed. Most researchers agree that moving goods over water is more fuel-efficient than moving them over land. One marine propulsion system replaces nu- merous truck engines required to move the same amount of cargo. A December 2007 study by the Texas Transportation Institute found that inland vessels are more fuel efficient per ton-mile than trucks and even railroads. For instance, an inland barge enjoys 576 ton-miles to the gallon, compared to 155 on a truck and 413 on a train. From a greenhouse gas emissions perspective, many US coastal shipping operations offer substantial savings.

# At WSJ 1-27-12

**All quotes are out of context – the article is purposefully misleading**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

On January 27, 2012, the Wall Street Journal ran an Opinion Editorial written by 16 people who deny the evidence of human-induced climate change. Most of the authors of the editorial were not climate scientists; one of two actual climate scientists of the group, Richard Lindzen, is a notorious global warming denier who also denies that smoking causes cancer. Predictably, the Rupert Murdoch-owned Journal refused to run a statement by 255 members of the National Academy of Sciences, although a “Letter to the Editor” by 38 of the world’s leading climate scientists1 did manage to get published there. The letter pointed out the numerous lies, mistakes, and fallacies in the editorial, along with a scathing rebuke by climate scientist Kevin Trenberth, whose remarks were quoted out of context to make them seem the opposite of what he actually said. As the Trenberth et al. letter pointed out, the 16 authors of the editorial were so far out of their depth in discussing the topic that they were the “climate-science equivalent of dentists practicing cardiology.” And as if to answer the editorial, the earth sent a resounding message in reply. On Feb. 2, 2012, an 18-mile crack appeared in Pine Island Glacier in Antarctica (see photo above and sidebar for details), a prelude to the calving off an iceberg 350 square miles in area, one of the largest icebergs ever seen.2

# At climatic variability

**Paleoclimatic data proves this warming is far outside natural variations**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“It’s just natural climatic variability.” No, it is not. As I detailed in my 2009 book, Greenhouse of the Dinosaurs, geologists and paleoclimatologists know a lot about past greenhouse worlds, and the icehouse planet that has existed for the past 33 million years. We have a good understanding of how and why the Antarctic ice sheet first appeared at that time, and how the Arctic froze over about 3.5 million years ago, beginning the 24 glacial and interglacial episodes of the “Ice Ages” that have occurred since then. We know how variations in the earth’s orbit (the Milankovitch cycles) controls the amount of solar radiation the earth receives, triggering the shifts between glacial and interglacial periods. Our current warm interglacial has already lasted 10,000 years, the duration of most previous interglacials, so if it were not for global warming, we would be headed into the next glacial in the next 1000 years or so. Instead, our pumping greenhouse gases into our atmosphere after they were long trapped in the earth’s crust has pushed the planet into a “super-interglacial,” already warmer than any previous warming period. We can see the “big picture” of climate variability most clearly in the EPICA cores from Antarctica (see Figure 2 below), which show the details of the last 650,000 years of glacial-interglacial cycles. At no time during any previous interglacial did the carbon dioxide levels exceed 300 ppm, even at their very warmest. Our atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are already close to 400 ppm today. The atmosphere is headed to 600 ppm within a few decades, even if we stopped releasing greenhouse gases immediately. This is decidedly not within the normal range of “climatic variability,” but clearly unprecedented in human history. Anyone who says this is “normal variability” has never seen the huge amount of paleoclimatic data that show otherwise.

# At natural warming episode

**Current warming is global – proves it’s not natural**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“It’s just another warming episode, like the Mediaeval Warm Period, or the Holocene Climatic Optimum” or the end of the Little Ice Age.” Untrue. There were numerous small fluctuations of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years of the Holocene. But in the case of the Mediaeval Warm Period (about 950–1250 A.D.), the temperatures increased by only 1°C, much less than we have seen in the current episode of global warming (see Figure 1). This episode was also only a local warming in the North Atlantic and northern Europe. Global temperatures over this interval did not warm at all, and actually cooled by more than 1°C. Likewise, the warmest period of the last 10,000 years was the Holocene Climatic Optimum (5000–9000 B.C.) when warmer and wetter conditions in Eurasia caused the rise of the first great civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, and China. This was largely a Northern Hemisphere-Eurasian phenomenon, with 2–3°C warming in the Arctic and northern Europe. But there was almost no warming in the tropics, and cooling or no change in the Southern Hemisphere.7 To the Eurocentric world, these warming events seemed important, but on a global scale the effect is negligible. In addition, neither of these warming episodes is related to increasing greenhouse gases. The Holocene Climatic Optimum, in fact, is predicted by the Milankovitch cycles, since at that time the axial tilt of the earth was 24°, its steepest value, meaning the Northern Hemisphere got more solar radiation than normal—but the Southern Hemisphere less, so the two balanced. By contrast, not only is the warming observed in the last 200 years much greater than during these previous episodes, but it is also global and bipolar, so it is not a purely local effect. The warming that ended the Little Ice Age (from the mid-1700s to the late 1800s) was due to increased solar radiation prior to 1940. Since 1940, however, the amount of solar radiation has been dropping, so the only candidate for the post-1940 warming has to be carbon dioxide.8

# at sun/cosmic rays/volcanoes/methane

**No other explanation is viable besides anthropogenic C02 based warming**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“It’s just the sun, or cosmic rays, or volcanic activity or methane.” Nope, sorry. The amount of heat that the sun provides has been decreasing since 1940, just the opposite of the denialists’ claims. There is no evidence (see Figure 3 below) of increase in cosmic radiation during the past century.10 Nor is there any clear evidence that large-scale volcanic events (such as the 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia, which changed global climate for about a year) have any long-term effect that would explain 200 years of warming and carbon dioxide increase. Volcanoes erupt only 0.3 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide each year, but humans emit over 29 billion tonnes a year11, roughly 100 times as much. Clearly, we have a bigger effect. Methane is a more powerful greenhouse gas, but there is 200 times more carbon dioxide than methane, so carbon dioxide is still the most important agent.12 Every other alternative has been looked at, but the only clear-cut relationship is between human-caused carbon dioxide increase and global warming.

# At records show cooling

**Overall trends prove warming is happening – other data is cherry-picked**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“The climate records since 1995 (or 1998) show cooling.” That’s a deliberate deception. People who throw this argument out are cherry-picking the data.13 Over the short term, there was a slight cooling trend from 1998–2000 (see Figure 4 below), because 1998 was a record-breaking El Niño year, so the next few years look cooler by comparison. But since 2002, the overall long-term trend of warming is unequivocal. This statement is a clear-cut case of using out-of-context data in an attempt to deny reality. All of the 16 hottest years ever recorded on a global scale have occurred in the last 20 years. They are (in order of hottest first): 2010, 2009, 1998, 2005, 2003, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2001, 1997, 2008, 1995, 1999, 1990, and 2000.14 In other words, every year since 2000 has been in the Top Ten hottest years list, and the rest of the list includes 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000. Only 1996 failed to make the list (because of the short-term cooling mentioned already).

# At record winters

**Local weather is irrelevant to overall warming trends**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“We had record snows in the winters of 2009–2010, and in 2010–2011.” So what? This is nothing more than the difference between weather (short-term seasonal changes) and climate (the long-term average of weather over decades and centuries and longer). Our local weather tells us nothing about another continent, or the global average; it is only a local effect, determined by short-term atmospheric and oceanographic conditions.15 In fact, warmer global temperatures mean more moisture in the atmosphere, which increases the intensity of normal winter snowstorms. In this particular case, the climate denialists forget that the early winter of November–December 2009 was actually very mild and warm, and then only later in January and February did it get cold and snow heavily. That warm spell in early winter helped bring more moisture into the system, so that when cold weather occurred, the snows were worse. In addition, the snows were unusually heavy only in North America; the rest of the world had different weather, and the global climate was warmer than average. And the summer of 2010 was the hottest on record, breaking the previous record set in 2009.

# At c02 helps plants

**A small amount of c02 is good, but the amount caused by global warming will destroy ecosystems**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“Carbon dioxide is good for plants, so the world will be better off.” Who do they think they’re kidding? The people who promote this idea clearly don’t know much global geochemistry, or are trying to cynically take advantage of the fact that most people are ignorant of science. The Competitive Enterprise Institute (funded by oil and coal companies and conservative foundations16) has run a series of shockingly stupid ads concluding with the tag line “Carbon dioxide: they call it pollution, we call it life.” Anyone who knows the basic science of earth’s atmosphere can spot the deceptions in this ad.17 Sure, plants take in carbon dioxide that animals exhale, as they have for millions of years. But the whole point of the global warming evidence (as shown from ice cores) is that the delicate natural balance of carbon dioxide has been thrown out of whack by our production of too much of it, way in excess of what plants or the oceans can handle. As a consequence, the oceans are warming18 and absorbing excess carbon dioxide making them more acidic. Already we are seeing a shocking decline in coral reefs (“bleaching”) and extinctions in many marine ecosystems that can’t handle too much of a good thing. Meanwhile, humans are busy cutting down huge areas of temperate and tropical forests, which not only means there are fewer plants to absorb the gas, but the slash and burn practices are releasing more carbon dioxide than plants can keep up with. There is much debate as to whether increased carbon dioxide might help agriculture in some parts of the world, but that has to be measured against the fact that other traditional “breadbasket” regions (such as the American Great Plains) are expected to get too hot to be as productive as they are today. The latest research19 actually shows that increased carbon dioxide inhibits the absorption of nitrogen into plants, so plants (at least those that we depend upon today) are not going to flourish in a greenhouse world. Anyone who tells you otherwise is ignorant of basic atmospheric science.

# Global warming is anthropogenic

**Multiple sources of data proves that warming is human caused**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

“I agree that climate is changing, but I’m skeptical that humans are the main cause, so we shouldn’t do anything.” This is just fence sitting. A lot of reasonable skeptics deplore the “climate denialism” of the right wing, but still want to be skeptical about the cause. If they want proof, they can examine the huge array of data that directly points to humans causing global warming.20 We can directly measure the amount of carbon dioxide humans are producing, and it tracks exactly with the amount of increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Through carbon isotope analysis, we can show that this carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is coming directly from our burning of fossil fuels, not from natural sources. We can also measure oxygen levels that drop as we produce more carbon that then combines with oxygen to produce carbon dioxide. We have satellites in space that are measuring the heat released from the planet and can actually see the atmosphere get warmer. The most crucial proof emerged only in the past few years: climate models of the greenhouse effect predict that there should be cooling in the stratosphere (the upper layer of the atmosphere above 10 km (6 miles) in elevation, but warming in the troposphere (the bottom layer of the atmosphere below 10 km (6 miles), and that’s exactly what our space probes have measured. Finally, we can rule out any other culprits (see above): solar heat is decreasing since 1940, not increasing, and there are no measurable increases in cosmic radiation, methane, volcanic gases, or any other potential cause. Face it—it’s our problem.

# Scientific consensus proves

**There is scientific consensus for global warming being real and human caused – dissenters are funded by political interests**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

Thanks to all the noise and confusion over the debate, the general public has only a vague idea of what the debate is really about, and only about half of Americans think global warming is real or that we are to blame.21 As in the debate over evolution and creationism, the scientific community is virtually unanimous on what the data demonstrate about anthropogenic global warming. This has been true for over a decade. When science historian Naomi Oreskes22 surveyed all peer-reviewed papers on climate change published between 1993 and 2003 in the world’s leading scientific journal, Science, she found that there were 980 supporting the idea of human-induced global warming and none opposing it. In 2009, Doran and Kendall Zimmerman23 surveyed all the climate scientists who were familiar with the data. They found that 95–99% agreed that global warming is real and that humans are the reason. In 2010, the prestigious Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences published a study that showed that 98% of the scientists who actually do research in climate change are in agreement with anthropogenic global warming.24 Every major scientific organization in the world has endorsed the conclusion of anthropogenic climate change as well. This is a rare degree of agreement within such an independent and cantankerous group as the world’s top scientists. This is the same degree of scientific consensus that scientists have achieved over most major ideas, including gravity, evolution, and relativity. These and only a few other topics in science can claim this degree of agreement among nearly all the world’s leading scientists, especially among everyone who is close to the scientific data and knows the problem intimately. If it were not such a controversial topic politically, there would be almost no interest in debating it, since the evidence is so clear-cut. If the climate science community speaks with one voice (as in the 2007 IPCC report, and every report since then), why is there still any debate at all? The answer has been revealed by a number of investigations by diligent reporters who got past the PR machinery denying global warming, and uncovered the money trail. Originally, there was no real “dissenters” to the idea of global warming by scientists who are actually involved with climate research. Instead, the forces with vested interests in denying global climate change (the energy companies, and the “free-market” advocates) followed the strategy of tobacco companies: create a smokescreen of confusion and prevent the American public from recognizing scientific consensus. As the famous memo25 from the tobacco lobbyists said “Doubt is our product.” The denialists generated an anti-science movement entirely out of thin air and PR. The evidence for this PR conspiracy has been well documented in numerous sources. For example, Oreskes and Conway revealed from memos leaked to the press that in April 1998 the right-wing Marshall Institute, SEPP (Fred Seitz’s lobby that aids tobacco companies and polluters), and ExxonMobil, met in secret at the American Petroleum Institute’s headquarters in Washington, D.C. There they planned a $20 million campaign to get “respected scientists” to cast doubt on climate change, get major PR efforts going, and lobby Congress that global warming isn’t real and is not a threat. The right-wing institutes and the energy lobby beat the bushes to find scientists—any scientists—who might disagree with the scientific consensus. As investigative journalists and scientists have documented over and over again,26 the denialist conspiracy essentially paid for the testimony of anyone who could be useful to them. The day that the 2007 IPCC report was released (Feb. 2, 2007), the British newspaper The Guardian reported that the conservative American Enterprise Institute (funded largely by oil companies and conservative think tanks) had offered $10,000 plus travel expenses to scientists who would write negatively about the IPCC report.27 We are accustomed to the hired-gun “experts” paid by lawyers to muddy up the evidence in the case they are fighting, but this is extraordinary—buying scientists outright to act as shills for organizations trying to deny scientific reality. With this kind of money, however, you can always find a fringe scientist or crank or someone with no relevant credentials who will do what they’re paid to do.

# At climate deniers [at “climategate”]

**There’s no conspiracy to prove global warming is real – objective data and independent scientists have reached this conclusion**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

The climate deniers have a lot of other things in common with creationists and other anti-science movements. They too like to quote someone out of context (“quote mining”), finding a short phrase in the work of legitimate scientists that seems to support their position. But when you read the full quote in context, it is obvious that they have used the quote inappropriately. The original author meant something that does not support their goals. The “Climategate scandal” is a classic case of this. It started with a few stolen emails from the Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia. If you read the complete text of the actual emails29 and comprehend the scientific shorthand of climate scientists who are talking casually to each other, it is clear that there was no great “conspiracy” or that they were faking data. All six subsequent investigations have cleared Philip Jones and the other scientists of the University of East Anglia of any wrongdoing or conspiracy.30 Even if there had been some conspiracy on the part of these few scientists, there is no reason to believe that the entire climate science community is secretly working together to generate false information and mislead the public. If there’s one thing that is clear about science, it’s about competition and criticism, not conspiracy and collusion. Most labs are competing with each other, not conspiring together. If one lab publishes a result that is not clearly defensible, other labs will quickly correct it. As James Lawrence Powell wrote31: Scientists….show no evidence of being more interested in politics or ideology than the average American. Does it make sense to believe that tens of thousands of scientists would be so deeply and secretly committed to bringing down capitalism and the American way of life that they would spend years beyond their undergraduate degrees working to receive master’s and Ph.D. degrees, then go to work in a government laboratory or university, plying the deep oceans, forbidding deserts, icy poles, and torrid jungles, all for far less money than they could have made in industry, all the while biding their time like a Russian sleeper agent in an old spy novel? Scientists tend to be independent and resist authority. That is why you are apt to find them in the laboratory or in the field, as far as possible from the prying eyes of a supervisor. Anyone who believes he could organize thousands of scientists into a conspiracy has never attended a single faculty meeting. There are many more traits that the climate deniers share with the creationists and Holocaust deniers and others who distort the truth. They pick on small disagreements between different labs as if scientists can’t get their story straight, when in reality there is always a fair amount of give and take between competing labs as they try to get the answer right before the other lab can do so. The key point here is that when all these competing labs around the world have reached a consensus and get the same answer, there is no longer any reason to doubt their common conclusion. The anti-scientists of climate denialism will also point to small errors by individuals in an effort to argue that the entire enterprise cannot be trusted. It is true that scientists are human, and do make mistakes, but the great power of the scientific method is that peer review weeds these out, so that when scientists speak with consensus, there is no doubt that their data are checked carefully. Finally, a powerful line of evidence that this is a purely political controversy, rather than a scientific debate, is that the membership lists of the creationists and the climate deniers are highly overlapping. Both anti-scientific dogmas are fed to their overlapping audiences through right-wing media such as Fox News, Glenn Beck, and Rush Limbaugh. Just take a look at the “intelligent-design” creationism website for the Discovery Institute. Most of the daily news items lately have nothing to do with creationism at all, but are focused on climate denial and other right-wing causes.32 If the data about global climate change are indeed valid and robust, any qualified scientist should be able to look at them and see if the prevailing scientific interpretation holds up. Indeed, such a test took place. Starting in 2010, a group led by U.C. Berkeley physicist Richard Muller re-examined all the temperature data from the NOAA, East Anglia Hadley Climate Research Unit, and the Goddard Institute of Space Science sources (see Figure 5 below). Even though Muller started out as a skeptic of the temperature data, and was funded by the Koch brothers and other oil company sources, he carefully checked and re-checked the research himself. When the GOP leaders called him to testify before the House Science and Technology Committee in spring 2011, they were expecting him to discredit the temperature data. Instead, Muller shocked his GOP sponsors by demonstrating his scientific integrity and telling the truth: the temperature increase is real, and the scientists who have demonstrated that the climate is changing are right. In the fall of 2011, his study was published, and the conclusions were clear: global warming is real, even to a right-wing skeptical scientist. Unlike the hired-gun scientists who play political games, Muller did what a true scientist should do: if the data go against your biases and preconceptions, then do the right thing and admit it—even if you’ve been paid by sponsors who want to discredit global warming. Muller is a shining example of a scientist whose integrity and honesty came first, and did not sell out to the highest bidder.33

# Impact – nuclear war

**Global warming causes resource wars**

**Prothero 12** [Donald, PhD, was Professor of Geology at Occidental College in Los Angeles, and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He earned M.A., M.Phil., and Ph.D. degrees in geological sciences from Columbia University in 1982, and a B.A. in geology and biology (highest honors, Phi Beta Kappa) from the University of California, Riverside, “How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, February 8th, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/#feature]

The Pentagon (normally not a left-wing institution) is also making contingency plans for how to fight wars in an era of global climate change, and what kinds of strategic threats might occur when climate change alters the kinds of enemies we might be fighting, and water becomes a scarce commodity. The New York Times reported37 that in December 2008, the National Defense University outlined plans for military strategy in a greenhouse world. To the Pentagon, the big issue is global chaos and the potential of even nuclear conflict. The world must “prepare for the inevitable effects of abrupt climate change—which will likely come [the only question is when] regardless of human activity.” Insurance companies have no political axe to grind. If anything, they tend to be on the conservative side. They are simply in the business of assessing risk in a realistic fashion so they can accurately gauge their future insurance policies and what to charge for them. Yet they are all investing heavily in research on the disasters and risks posed by climatic change. In 2005, a study commissioned by the re-insurer Swiss Re said, “Climate change will significantly affect the health of humans and ecosystems and these impacts will have economic consequences.”38 Some people may still try to deny scientific reality, but big businesses like oil and insurance, and conservative institutions like the military, cannot afford to be blinded or deluded by ideology. They must plan for the real world that we will be seeing in the next few decades. They do not want to be caught unprepared and harmed by global climatic change when it threatens their survival. Neither can we as a society.

# \*Other\*

# Solvency extension

**Modernizing the inland waterway system is crucial to meet shipping capacity**

**Darcy 9** [Jospeh, B.S. Ocean Engineering, United States Naval Academy and Naval Engineer from MIT, “Short Sea Shipping: Barriers, Incentives and Feasibility of Truck Ferry”, June]

Coastal shipping could be a key part to an urgently needed national, comprehensive and strategic transportation vision [5]. The Congress has paved the way to using the seas as a portion of the solution to the transportation crisis. The Energy legislation referred to in Chapter 1 allows the Maritime Administration to designate water routes as Highways of the Sea, opening them up to other avenues of finance and support. As an example, the State of Alaska designated the water route known as the Inland Passage as the Alaskan Marine Highway and included it as part of the highway system [2]. Those concerned with the shipment of freight in the United States will need to reevaluate their positions in the near future. Larger ships with huge capacities and deeper drafts will dominate the container shipping markets (although as this document is being prepared, they 35 are mostly entering layup due to tough economic times). The Panama Canal expansion project will bring new volumes to the East Coast of the United States as California and other West Coast ports (with price, environmental and labor issues dominating) allow competing ports to take an advantage. Over the next 20 years or so, most shipping industry analysts/aficionados expect a doubling, if not a tripling of container volumes. With this dramatic increase in shipping volumes, some studies show that current systems will be too congested to handle this jump in volume [30]. Even if the roads and railroads could handle today’s traffic efficiently, there needs to be a concerted effort in the near future to find alternate ways to accommodate this anticipated freight in an economical, efficient and ecological way. There is unsung transportation capacity in the United States. MARAD reminds shippers that there are tens of thousands of miles of navigable waterways and coastlines in the United States that represent “capacity” [32]. The only problem with this argument is that that capacity is undredged. For other corridors where additional capacity is needed, small investments in parallel water routes can give shippers an alternative and let lawmakers and the populace recognize that redundancy is good with respect to failing infrastructure, rising freight volumes and terrorist threats [2]. Short Sea Shipping is good because it can be reliable due to its relative independence from traffic and other transit concerns. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) are transportation policy making organiza- tions that combine government, populace and industry in metro areas to plan expansion, pro- pose projects and channel federal transportation funds to the transportation in their purview. These MPOs can use the Marine Highway to pool their money and efforts to reduce conges- tion on their roads and the impact that 12-15% of the traffic that is trucks that pass through their jurisdiction over which they would normally not have control [15]. LGEN Kenneth Wykle (ret) estimates that investing $2B in coastal shipping and ports could take 700,000 trucks from I-95 and I-81. By comparison, $8.5B to widen I-81 through Virginia would add a few hundred lane-miles and keep those same 700,000 trucks on the road 36 [12].

# IW solves hazardous material transport

Moving hazardous materials by truck risks hazardous spills in residential and urban areas

**USDOT 11** [US Department of Transportation, April 2011, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD\_AMH\_Report\_to\_Congress.pdf]

USDOT reports that approximately 5,000 fatalities per year were associated with heavy truck crashes over the last two decades (fatalities fell to just over 4,200 in 2008, however). Whereas USDOT, other agencies, and the industry are working hard to improve the safety of heavy vehicles, there are inherent dangers caused by the mixed operation of light and heavy vehicles in the same traffic streams. Our transportation system’s current reliance on land-based transportation modes also creates potential safety problems involving the movement of hazardous materials through urban and residential areas.

Water transportation best for hazardous materials transport

**US DOT 11** [US Department of Transportation, April 2011, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD\_AMH\_Report\_to\_Congress.pdf]

The transportation of hazardous materials (hazmat) is naturally more complex than the movement of non-hazardous freight. The most hazardous of these materials are classified under Toxic by Inhalation Hazards (TIH). The safety, security, and liability issues surrounding the movement of these materials combine to encourage their transport by means that: a) provide the greatest separation between populations and the hazmat; and b) present the lowest risk of a release. While release of hazmat, especially TIH, is an infrequent occurrence, an incident can have very serious consequences. Not only does it endanger human lives, health, and the environment, it also has the potential to incapacitate critical transportation corridors or entire areas in the event of damage to infrastructure or forced evacuations. America’s Marine Highway offers several strengths in the carriage of TIH and other hazmat, including: ␣ An established safety record in the carriage of cargo that compares favorably with highway and rail;83 ␣ Extensive experience in the movements of some bulk TIH products such as anhydrous ammonia and chlorine; ␣ The ability to carry hazardous cargo at sea or on rivers that typically provide significant separation from residences and businesses in the event of an accidental release; ␣ Little vulnerability to bridge or tunnel failures, including acts of sabotage targeting these structures; and ␣ Lower cost of transportation, including economic and societal costs. The high potential costs of moving hazmat by land were clearly illustrated on July 18, 2001, when a CSX train derailed in Baltimore’s Howard Street Tunnel causing a chemical tank car to rupture and catch fire. The blaze spread to adjacent rail cars and burned for five days, which the National Transportation Safety Board reported caused $12 million in response and cleanup costs.84 The fire damaged infrastructure (including the street system above the tunnel) and shut own parts of the city. Additionally, the accident blocked the primary north-south rail corridor that serves the nation’s I-95 freight corridor – a corridor that serves as a key route for the movement of hazmat, freight, and passengers. If this cargo had been moved along the Marine Highway corridor that runs adjacent to I-95, a release of this type, had it occurred, would likely have been much less disruptive to adjacent surface transportation systems. Other examples of hazmat incidents illustrate the danger and high potential cost of land transportation of hazmat cargo. As an alternative to land-based movement, water transportation of TIH and other hazmat materials could mitigate the risk of TIH releases, in large part by bypassing large cities and residential areas altogether. However, its full potential in this regard is not being met in part because many of the true costs of rail transportation of TIH are not borne by TIH shippers under current U.S. transportation policy. In 2007, 64 percent of TIH moved by rail, amounting to 105,000 rail-car shipments. Not all of this carriage is voluntary on the part of rail carriers, however. Under Federal law, the railroads have common-carrier obligations to carry hazmat cargo and are limited in their ability to raise their rates to cover the costs of the risk (e.g., higher insurance costs) of carrying such cargoes.87 As a result, shippers are able to move TIH cargo at rates that may be below the actual costs to railroads once the cost of insurance and risk are included. Marine Highway providers are not subject to the requirement to carry such cargoes and may not wish to offer services for TIH or hazmat products at rates competitive with those the railroads are required to offer. Ultimately, to move more hazardous cargoes safely on Marine Highway services, Federal action would be required to modify the common carriage obligations and rate regulation of the railroads to reflect more accurately the monetary risk and operating costs of moving such cargoes. As noted earlier, significant policy determinations must be made to augment the economic viability of Marine Highway services, potentially including policies related to cost-based pricing of hazmat transportation services. There are certain caveats associated with expansion of water transportation of TIH and other hazmat products. Obviously, water transportation cannot serve sections of the country where waterways are not present. Marine vessels typically carry larger amounts of materials and, while in port, must be protected from acts of terrorism (this concern is greatest with regard to large international movements of dangerous cargoes into and out of urban ports). Also, as greater use of water transportation of hazmat develops, increased training for first responders to spill sites must be provided. Plans and resources must be in place to ensure that there is sufficient capacity to respond to, contain, and clean up hazardous materials in the event that a spill occurs in a waterway or port.

Shipping is a safer way of handling hazardous materials

**IGMS 8** [Institute for Global Maritime Studies, 2008, America’s Deep Blue Highway: How Coastal Shipping Could Reduce Traffic Congestion, Lower Pollution, and Improve National Security, http://www.igms.org/docs/americas\_deep\_blue\_highway\_IGMS\_report\_sept\_2008.pdf]

Shipping offers a cheaper and safer means of carrying hazardous materials. It promises fewer accidents, reduces the risk to population centers, and would reduce wear and tear on roads. Trucks may account for only 10% of vehicle miles traveled but they cause over 75% of the Federal Highway Administration’s pavement maintenance costs.

# Oil dependence add on

Coastal shipping reduces oil dependence

**IGMS 8** [Institute for Global Maritime Studies, 2008, America’s Deep Blue Highway: How Coastal Shipping Could Reduce Traffic Congestion, Lower Pollution, and Improve National Security, http://www.igms.org/docs/americas\_deep\_blue\_highway\_IGMS\_report\_sept\_2008.pdf]

Coastal shipping also has two other tangential security benefits. Hazardous cargos that we pre- fer not pass through our neighborhoods can be moved to the relative safety of offshore in a functioning coastal shipping system. And from a macro-energy perspective, efficient shipping that can move cargo more efficiently per ton mile at a fraction of the cost of land bound alterna- tives can reduce the nation’s overall dependency on imported oil. Thus coastal shipping could help the nation deal with its oil addiction, and help the US achieve a long-standing goal of re- ducing its oil imports from dangerous regions of the world.

The use of marine highways will reduce oil dependence

**Maritime Administration News 11** [US DOT, Maritime Administration, April 5, 2011, “Secretary LaHood Argues Case of Better Transportation Use of America’s Coasts, Waterways” http://www.marad.dot.gov/news\_room\_landing\_page/news\_releases\_summary/news\_release/MARAD\_03-11.htm]

“America’s maritime transportation system is a major priority for President Obama’s administration,” said Secretary Ray LaHood. “When we finish America’s fully-integrated, national marine highway system, our legacy will be more than routes on water. It will be a country less dependent on foreign oil. It will be a 21st century means of moving people and goods. It will be a future that America is prepared to win.” The report highlights the Department’s accomplishments in supporting the development of America’s marine highway system. Since formally starting the program last year, Secretary LaHood designated 18 Marine Highway Corridors that will support economic growth and create jobs in communities across the country. In addition, the Department awarded $215.3 million from the TIGER I and TIGER II (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery) programs to jumpstart or expand marine highway projects. Finally, the Department commissioned a study of new ship design to serve the marine highway markets and to be useful to the military if needed. “America’s new clean energy economy will rely on a green, efficient transportation system that means making better use of our underutilized marine highways,” said Maritime Administrator David Matsuda. “This report is a valuable instrument in helping chart our course toward better energy security, reduced highway congestion and more balanced transportation networks.”

Oil dependence makes war inevitable and causes extinction

**LENDMAN 07** Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization

[Stephen Lendman, “Resource Wars - Can We Survive Them?,” rense.com, 6-6-7, pg. <http://www.rense.com/general76/resrouce.htm>]

With the world's energy supplies finite, the US heavily dependent on imports, and "peak oil" near or approaching, **"security" for America means assuring a** sustainable **supply of what we can't do without**. It includes waging wars to get it, protect it, and defend the maritime trade routes over which it travels. **That means** energy's partnered with predatory New World Order globalization, militarism, **wars, ecological recklessness, and** now **a**n extremist **US** administration **willing to risk Armageddon** for world dominance. Central to its plan is first controlling essential resources everywhere, at any cost, starting with oil and where most of it is located in the Middle East and Central Asia. The New "Great Game" and Perils From It The new "Great Game's" begun, but this time the stakes are greater than ever as explained above. The old one lasted nearly 100 years pitting the British empire against Tsarist Russia when the issue wasn't oil. This time, it's the US with help from Israel, Britain, the West, and satellite states like Japan, South Korea and Taiwan challenging Russia and China with today's weapons and technology on both sides making earlier ones look like toys. **At stake is more than oil. It's planet earth with survival of all life on it** issue number one twice over. Resources and wars for them means militarism is increasing, peace declining, and the planet's ability to sustain life front and center, if anyone's paying attention. They'd better be because beyond the point of no return, there's no second chance the way Einstein explained after the atom was split. His famous quote on future wars was : "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." Under a worst case scenario, it's more dire than that. There may be **nothing left but resilient beetles and bacteria** in the wake of a nuclear holocaust meaning even a new stone age is way in the future, if at all. **The threat is real** and once nearly happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October, 1962. We later learned a miracle saved us at the 40th anniversary October, 2002 summit meeting in Havana attended by the US and Russia along with host country Cuba. For the first time, we were told how close we came to nuclear Armageddon. Devastation was avoided only because Soviet submarine captain Vasily Arkhipov countermanded his order to fire nuclear-tipped torpedos when Russian submarines were attacked by US destroyers near Kennedy's "quarantine" line. Had he done it, only our imagination can speculate what might have followed and whether planet earth, or at least a big part of it, would have survived.

# At states cp

**National policymaking is key to coordination**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

Transportation infrastructure requires a strategic-level approach to management, funding, and integration. National policy makers must balance the strengths and limitations of each transportation industry sector, ensuring their collective capabilities support projected U.S. economic and national security requirements. Based upon the capabilities inherent in each of these industries, supporting infrastructure must be available, expanded, or modernized that enable them to meet current and future transportation requirements. American transportation infrastructure requires continual investment to remain a viable means of moving freight, as well as routine maintenance, periodic modernization, and expansion to maintain adequate operability. The federal government has a Constitutional responsibility to provide adequate transportation infrastructure that supports the nation’s economy, as a means of regulating interstate commerce. While federal responsibilities for transportation infrastructure are collectively substantial, they are, however, widely disbursed and not well coordinated. 6 Congress is responsible for synchronizing the efforts of industry stakeholders and government entities, making tough decisions on resource allocations that collectively meet the strategic requirements of the transportation system. This effort requires both an interagency and intragovernmental approach. This study begins by providing an overview of U.S. domestic transportation infrastructure (road, rail, and waterway), highlighting the important contributions of each supporting industry. In addition to the value added there are challenges to maintaining operability for current and future demands on this transportation infrastructure from a national perspective. These challenges may impact our ability to meet the future capacity requirements of a growing economy. Second, the study examines several objectives of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) national strategy for overcoming these challenges, focusing on the draft 2006 Framework for a National Freight Policy as a potential way ahead. Finally, this paper highlights the U.S. Inland Waterway System, addressing the potential contributions of inland waterways, making recommendations that might alleviate the capacity challenges placing attainment of the nation’s strategic transportation requirements at risk.

**The federal government has constitutional authority over waterways**

**CGER 99** [Commission on Geosciences, Environment and Resources, National Research Council, “New Directions in Water Resources Planning for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers”]

The early 1800s saw lengthy and heated debates regarding federal involvement in regional water resource development. The debate culminated in the 1824 Gibbons v. Ogden Supreme Court decision, which was strongly profederal. In this historic ruling, Chief Justice John Marshall's majority opinion declared that federal power to regulate interstate commerce carried with it a similar federal authority over navigation (Rogers, 1993), providing entry for the Corps into a variety of programs for the nation's waterways. In 1850 the U.S. Congress directed the Corps to engage in its first planning exercise. The Corps was authorized to "determine the most practical plan" to control flooding along the lower Mississippi River (Clarke and McCool, 1996). Two strongly diverging reports were produced. A report by Captain Andrew Humphreys promoted a levees-only strategy, focused on completing a levee system along the lower river to the exclusion of other tactics. The other report, by the respected civil engineer Charles Ellet, backed a more comprehensive strategy of strengthening downstream levees along with upstream storage reservoirs and enlarged river outlets. In 1861, the Corps finally decided in favor of Humphreys' levees-only strategy.

**Only the aff solves heg – close coordination between the federal government and military is necessary for military transport on waterways**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

Transportation infrastructure supports our national security as well as our economy. The Defense Transportation System (DTS) is an integral part of the U.S. national transportation system. Close coordination among a wide variety of military and federal agencies is essential to meeting national wartime or contingency transportation requirements. The U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) provides the process for Defense Department (DOD) global transportation management. This process establishes an integrated transportation system that is used across the range of military operations, providing the most effective use of all transportation modes from origin to destination. 20 In 2003 the Secretary of Defense designated USTRANSCOM the Distribution Process Owner (DPO). As the DPO, USTRANSCOM develops and directs the Joint Deployment and Distribution Enterprise to globally project national security capabilities. 21 Future distribution requirements are not limited to contingency operations in distant lands. The Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative is a distribution initiative that contributes to logistics transformation. This concept identifies use of a transportation 6 coordinator to integrate and synchronize movement of freight within the continental United States. 22 This coordinator leverages the entire transportation industry, streamlining the process of moving a variety of DOD cargo. In 2005, USTRANSCOM’s Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) synchronized 212 vessel operations and the related land movement by truck, rail, and barge in support of DOD operations worldwide, moving over 22,239,700 square feet of unit cargo.

# At states cp

**Federal leadership is key – only national policy can coordinate**

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

At these points, federal, state, local, and private sector interests and responsibilities intersect, but they are difficult to coordinate because of differing planning horizons, resource constraints, and investment priorities. The capability of existing transportation infrastructure to meet a growing future demand should be cause for concern by Congress and other national policy makers. U.S. freight transportation infrastructure is not efficiently managed, adequately funded, or effectively integrated at the national level. Our ability to efficiently move cargo from domestic origins to international destinations at the lowest cost possible ensures our economic stability and national security. A capable and reliable freight transportation infrastructure is the necessary means to accomplish this national end state. U.S. freight transportation infrastructure is inefficiently managed at the national level. National policy makers must provide effective oversight to ensure transportation industries can provide the required capability and capacity necessary for our economy to grow and prosper. 7 They do this through establishing policies and regulations that balance the contributions of each industry to manageable levels in order to avoid congestion and competing interests. Inefficiencies emerge when leaders fail to capitalize on available technologies and business practices to streamline operations that naturally lead to more adequate traffic management, improved reliability, and lower shipping costs. National transportation advisors should provide incentives to encourage industry cooperation and interdependencies that more efficiently move cargo from domestic origins to the nation’s ports for shipment overseas. Congestion is a problem facing all forms of domestic transport. The USDOT 2006-2011 Strategic Plan recognizes this shortfall and addresses the reduction of congestion as a national strategic goal. Congestion reduces both capability and reliability. Although road and rail traffic have long dominated the transport market, the ability to expand this infrastructure to meet the increased demands of a growing economy are limited. These limitations are caused not only by congestion, but also right of way development, fuel prices, and concerns over vehicle emissions. Second, U.S. domestic transportation infrastructure is inadequately funded to remain a reliable and capable artery for international commerce. While much of the transportation infrastructure in the United States is becoming antiquated, our international competitors are improving their infrastructure and, consequently, their competitiveness in world markets. 29 Most freight transportation infrastructure, with the exception of railways, is publicly owned. In the case of highways and waterways, an intra-governmental approach is used for operations and maintenance as well as new construction. To make matters worse, state and local authorities own the intermodal facilities through which the national transportation arteries traverse, leading to unsynchronized modernization and expansion efforts. In each case the cost is extremely high, resulting in delayed response to needed repair and a cascading failure of the infrastructure to support needed transportation requirements. “Fix it when it breaks” is not a effective method of maintaining reliability. For the most part, users of freight transportation infrastructure pay little in comparison to the benefits they reap for its use. National policy makers and industry stakeholders continue to examine new and innovative ways of funding operations and maintenance but it is often too little, too late. Finally, U.S. transportation infrastructure is ineffectively integrated at the strategic level. Today businesses depend on the interconnected transportation network to move a myriad of goods, from raw materials such as lumber, coal, and petroleum products to manufactured goods including medical supplies, furniture, household appliances, and computers. 30 The current freight transportation architecture operates, without effective collaboration, as stove-piped 8 organizations with minimal communication and planning between industries. Stakeholders operate independently, as opposed to interdependently. Integration is not a priority because it is not yet an absolute necessity. The rail and trucking industries are currently meeting their freight capacity requirements and see integration as a potential loss of business. For example, the inland waterway system is not fully integrated or synchronized with other transportation industries due to the lack of capability and accessibility of road and rail options in place; this despite increasing demands for commercial transportation capacity on the inland waterways. As our nation has matured both physically and legislatively, the inland waterway system has fallen under the jurisdiction of many levels of governmental structure. Local, regional, state, and federal guidelines and regulations on use and expansion of the waterways affect several portions of the potential inland river transportation system. These overlapping regulatory boundaries present seams that impose unique challenges toward further improvements in the system.

Commerce clause of constitution means inland waterways are the responsibility of the federal government – counter plan will be rolled back

**USACE 2000** [US Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, “Inland Waterway Navigation: Value to the Nation”, May http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/value\_to\_the\_nation/InlandNavigation.pdf]

Federal Role Supporting Navigation A s the world’s leading maritime and trading nation, the United States relies on an efficient Maritime Transportation System (MTS) to maintain its role as a global power. The Federal government’s involvement in navigation projects dates to the early days of the United States, when rivers and coastal harbors were the primary paths of commerce in the new country. Federal interest in navigation stems from the Commerce Clause of the Constitution and subsequent Supreme Court decisions defining the Federal government’s authority to regulate commerce and navigation, and to provide navigation improvements. Today, navigable inland waterways provide a cost-effective means for moving major bulk commodities, such as grain, coal and petroleum. Inland navigation is a key element of State and local government economic development and job-creation efforts, and is essential in maintaining economic competitiveness and national security. The Federal agencies most directly involved in the development and operation of the Nation’s navigation system are the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). The responsibilities of both agencies are part of their broader jurisdictions that include both maritime and inland waterways transportation. The DOT, through the U.S. Coast Guard, has responsibility for vessel and navigation safety and provides navigation aids and search and rescue services. The DOT’s Maritime Administration supports the development of U.S. ports, intermodal systems, and domestic shipping. The responsibility of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps) is to facilitate the safe, reliable and economically efficient movement of vessels, and it does so by constructing and maintaining navigation channels and harbors, and regulating water levels on inland waterways. The system of harbor channels and waterways developed and maintained by the Corps is an integral link in the Nation’s intermodal transportation system. The inland waterway system carries one-sixth of the Nation’s volume of intercity cargo. Meanwhile, on the coasts and Great Lakes, the importance of maintaining channel depths at more than 900 deep and shallow draft harbor projects is underscored by the estimate that nearly 25 percent of the nation’s economic activity depends on foreign trade handled by these ports. The MTS also provides critical national defense value by supporting the mobilization and sustainability of America’s military.

# At states cp

Federal leadership necessary to solve

**US DOT 11** [US Department of Transportation, April 2011, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD_AMH_Report_to_Congress.pdf>]

The report concludes with a section on conclusions. It cites the essential role that the private sector must play in making America’s Marine Highway successful, but notes that without strong leadership from the Federal government the nation's water assets will continue to be underutilized for freight transportation.

Federal leadership is necessary to expand inland water transportation - perception

**US DOT 11** [US Department of Transportation, April 2011, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD\_AMH\_Report\_to\_Congress.pdf]

While progress has been made to advance the concept of America’s Marine Highway, much more work remains to achieve the expansion of Marine Highway services in our country. A modest number of Marine Highway services are currently active; MARAD is currently monitoring 32 regularly-scheduled domestic services that move containers and trailers by water (some of these services are to non-contiguous locations in the United States). Many in the industry, however, point out that the concept of revitalizing short sea shipping has existed for well over a decade. In numerous conversations with industry officials, MARAD has observed a widely-held perception that Federal leadership is required to make further significant progress. Key legislation has recently coordinated efforts, established milestones, and funded activities to make notable progress. This section of the report will summarize MARAD’s achievements in meeting legislative mandates as well as other initiatives currently underway to foster a vibrant industry of Marine Highway services.
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# 1nc global warming

**1. Global warming is not anthropogenic – their models are flawed. And even if they’re right, increased C02 is good**

**Anderson 9** [Charles, PhD, Material Physicist, “A Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming Denier”, March 14, http://objectivistindividualist.blogspot.com/2009/03/catastrophic-anthropogenic-global.html]

I became interested in the issue of the global warming alarmism several years ago, because the reports I kept hearing about it did not present the context of our knowledge of the earth's climate history well and because it seemed that many so-called scientists were leaping to the conclusion that recent warming was largely or mostly due to man's activities without seeming to have done a thorough job of examining the natural forces effects which have long caused much more drastic changes in the earth's climate than those we have seen in recent times. I was also concerned that so much of the justification for man's role was based on complex computer models, which nonetheless did not take into account many major natural effects and which had a well-established history of being modified to produce ever-decreasing rates of temperature increases. The more I studied the issue, the more problems I found with the claims that man had suddenly become so powerful that he was dominating the natural climate forces. I was also concerned about two other observations. One was that when people do bad science, they tend to become very angry when they are challenged. I have seen this effect time and time again. Observe which side resorts to the most vociferous name-calling and you are likely to have identified the side with the weaker argument and they know it. Of course, just because a man has written many peer-reviewed papers and is in a science department at a university does not mean that he is doing good science. Good science starts with acute and critical observations, attention to the context of one's knowledge, a rational and critical examination of factors affecting the outcome, and finally an ability to predict as-yet unobserved events or historical events about which one had no prior knowledge. Most of the scientists working on global climate issues were either working for universities or for government agencies, and these institutions have become so highly politicized, predominantly toward the left, that it is common to find scientific reasoning weaknesses whenever there is a political consequence to the scientific outcome. I saw much that was lacking in the scientific work which was backing the claim that man was causing or soon would be causing catastrophic global warming. The other observation of concern was that catastrophic anthropogenic global warming was a perfect tool to use to make the civilized and advanced societies cut back on energy use to the point that life was going to be much more miserable for human beings. This has always been something that the socialists have been willing and happy to do to their fellow human beings. They like it so much that they develop a religious fervor whenever offered the opportunity to hurt others. This may seem paradoxical because they always say they are more motivated to help others than most people. They are so motivated in fact, that they are always very eager to use brutal force to make others do what they want. It has become clear that this use of force has become in itself very exhilerating for them, like a dopamine drug for their minds. So, when you examine who believes fervently in man-made global warming, do you find that fervor cutting across the usual political spectrum with respect to commitments to personal and economic liberties or do you find the fervor in one camp only? In this case, there is pretty much that one camp of socialists. I have developed computer models myself for the study of materials properties. When developing and using models, it is very important to keep a clear physical picture of the aspect of reality you are modeling. It is easy to mess up your boundary conditions, which is a known problem with many of the climate models; it is easy to fall into divergent conditions such as the claims of catastrophic positive warming feedback are likely to be; and it is easy to overlook some factors of importance in a complex problem, which the global climate most certainly is. The most important checks for these problems are to apply your model to a number of available simple situations if there are any and to already observed events and see if it is consistent with those events. There may be no simple climate system for such checks, but the past is available. I observed that there was anguishingly little effort to apply the climate prediction models to past climate changes. The reason for this was that the models really only contained elements of the Big Picture of factors affecting the climate of the earth. But, even granted that, some effort could have been put into comparing the model-predicted effects with those of high CO2 atmospheric concentrations from the geological record. This is an obvious check and no one was eager to do it. This is a clear warning sign. However, because it is their bread and butter to use the models to predict future rapid temperature increases, these predictions have been made. Every time, the models predicted too much temperature increase and had to be scaled back. Every IPCC report shows scaled back computer predictions and yet every future IPCC report shows another scale-back. Clearly, the modelers do not know what they are doing. Nonetheless, on the strength of their predictions of unacceptable man-made warming, we are to make drastic cuts in our use of the inexpensive fossil fuels and have a future of expensive electric power only when the wind blows or the sun shines. Even this is provided that enough Democrats are willing to have wind generators and acres of photovoltaic panels in their backyards or in areas inhabited by animal species. The very fact that the CO2 effect models did not contain sufficient factors affecting the global climate to make predictions about the past increases the likelihood that many of the factors affecting feedback mechanisms are not adequately handled. That there are critical feedback mechanisms is obvious. We know for instance that as the oceans warm, more water is evaporated, which is a cooling process. We also know that as the humidity of the atmosphere increases due to warming and ocean water evaporation, there are increased possibilities for cloud formation, which is usually a cooling mechanism. There is reason to believe these effects of water are not handled adequately. I have also looked at the sinks and sources for CO2 and have found that it is unlikely that they are adequately understood as yet. One problem exists with respect to the effects of the earth's crust absorbing CO2 both to form many carbonates, carbonate hydroxides, and lamellar (layered) minerals which absorb water with high CO2 concentrations between their expanding layers as water becomes available. Increases in precipitation will lead to increases in CO2 absorbtion in many minerals. We also know that the earth's geological record shows that it has a tendency to never get warmer than an average temperature of about 22C and that the glacial periods tend never to get cooler than an average temperature of about 12C. We are now and have been for a few thousand years in a temperature regime which is between these extremes, but the earth over the last 600 million years has tended to be at one or the other of these two extremes most of the time. We do not know why we are not at one of the extremes now and we do not know how to predict when the earth may go to one or the other in the future. We do know that man did not cause any of the previous extreme temperature conditions. Let me make it clear that I am not saying that man does not affect the weather or the climate. I am sure he does. But my evaluation is that man's affect upon the global climate is still small compared to the natural forces at work and that they are incapable of causing anything on the scale of a catastrophe. But, man can cause a catastrophe to his lifestyle and to his lifespan. An example would be the catastrophe which would be caused if Obama and the anthropogenic global warming alarmists force us to give up half of our electric generating capacity due to coal-fired power plants. This cannot be replaced by wind power and solar power by any technology yet known. It is a fool's errand to destroy half of our electricity generation capability while we have nothing to replace it with, when the reason given for doing this is to decrease the amount of CO2 added to the atmosphere. Any warming that is caused by man, is probably the cause of more good than bad. The higher CO2 concentrations in the air are certainly good for plant growth, which is good for both man and other animals. As I have pointed out before, most of the predicted warming is in the northern parts of North America, northern Europe, northern Russia, northern China, northern Japan, southern Chile, and southern Argentina, all of which would benefit from warmer temperatures in the winter and at night, which appears to be when the warming is greatest. This makes life in these areas easier for man, animals, and plants in most cases. This is not a bad outcome and it most certainly is not a catastrophe!

# 1nc global warming

**2. Multiple alternate causes for global warming**

**Climate Depot 11** [a project of Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow – a conservative Washington, D.C.-based non-profit organization whose stated mission is to promote free market solutions to environmental problems, “Climate Depot Special Report: A-Z Climate Reality Check -- Sub-Prime Science Exposé: 'The claims of the promoters of man-made climate fears are failing' -- Presented to UN Summit”, December]

But this exclusive Climate Depot exhaustive A-Z Climate Reality Check report on the scientific reality of the failure of man-made global warming shatters any such illusions that the climate is “worse than we thought.” As the real world evidence mounts that global warming claims are failing, the climate activists have ramped up predictions of future climate change impacts to declare that it “worse than we thought.” But a prediction or projection of 50-100 years into the future is not “evidence.” Recent scientific data and developments reveal that Mother Nature is playing a cruel joke on the promoters of man-made climate fears. The scientific reality is that on virtually every claim -- from A-Z -- the claims of the promoters of man-made climate fears are failing, and in many instances the claims are moving in the opposite direction. The global warming movement is suffering the scientific death of a thousand cuts. This Climate Depot special report categorizes and indexes the full range of climate developments in a handy A-Z reference guide. The A-Z report includes key facts, peer-reviewed studies and the latest data and developments with links for further reading, on an exhaustive range of man-made global warming claims. The Antarctic sea ice extent has been at or near record extent in the past few summers and the ice is expanding, the Arctic has rebounded in recent years since the low point in 2007, polar bears are thriving, sea level is not showing acceleration and is actually dropping, Cholera and Malaria are failing to follow global warming predictions, Mount Kilimanjaro melt fears are being made a mockery by gains in snow cover, global temperatures have been holding steady for a decade or more and many scientists are predicting global cooling is ahead, deaths due to extreme weather are radically declining, global tropical cyclone activity is near historic lows, the frequency of major U.S. hurricanes has declined, the oceans are missing their predicted heat content, big tornados have dramatically declined since the 1970s, droughts are not historically unusual nor caused by mankind, there is no evidence we are currently having unusual weather, scandals continue to rock the climate fear movement, the UN IPCC has been exposed as being a hotbed of environmental activists, former Vice President Al Gore is now under siege by his fellow global warming activists for attempting to link every bad weather event to man-made global warming and scientists from around the world continue to dissent from man-made climate fears at a rapid pace. Climate Depot's new A-Z report reveals that the great man-made global warming catastrophe that was predicted – has been cancelled. In addition to the scientific collapse of anthropogenic global warming fears, the political collapse has been just as stunning. President Obama has been criticized by former Vice President Al Gore for failing to do enough when it comes to climate change legislation. The now defunct and “scientifically meaningless” Congressional climate bill failed because the Democrats realized it was political suicide. The new political expediency in Washington is global warming skepticism. The UN global warming treaty process lay in shambles. See: Democrat Walter Russell Mead analyzes Gore: Gore steered the green movement 'into a tsunami of defeat that...will loom as one of the greatest failures of civil society in all time.' Proponents of anthropogenic climate change have been reduced to making outlandish claims of a mythical 97% or 98% consensus. See: Global Warming: A '98% Consensus Of Nothing': 'Only shameless activists or statistically ignorant claim that survey of 77 anonymous scientists' is proof of 98% 'consensus'. Once esteemed science groups like the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) have now corrupted and have used taxpayer money to lobby for the passage of climate bills. See: Ralph Cicerone's Shame: NAS Urges Carbon Tax, Becomes Advocacy Group -- 'political appointees heading politicized scientific institutions that are virtually 100% dependent on gov't funding' & NAS Pres. Ralph Cicerone Turns Science Org. into political advocacy group: $6 million NAS study is used to lobby for global warming bill & MIT's Richard Lindzen: 'Cicerone of NAS is saying that regardless of evidence the answer is predetermined. If gov't wants carbon control, that is the answer that the NAS will provide' Movement 'was bound to fail' A movement that had Al Gore – one of the most divisive political figures – as the face of the movement, was bound to fail. A movement that utilized the scandal ridden United Nations – which is massively distrusted by the American people – as the repository of science, was doomed to fail. Gore and the UN IPCC are now reduced to pointing to every storm, flood, hurricane or tornado as proof of man-made global warming. The UN has been reduced to blaming man-made global warming for prostitution. See: Climate Astrology -- 'It Has Been Foretold' of Extreme Weather: 'UN IPCC science has a status similar to interpretations of Nostradamus and the Mayan calendars' & Climate Astrology borrows from the past: 'Before That Witch Moved Into The Neighborhood, We Never Had Bad Weather Or Disease' But a scientific moment of clarity is now prevailing: The UN and the U.S. Congress do not have the power to legislate, tax or regulate the weather. See: Princeton University Physicist Dr. Will Happer: 'The idea that Congress can stop climate change is just hilarious' - Warns of 'climate change cult' - July 8, 2009 - Prominent scientists continue to challenge the alleged “consensus.” See: Nobel Prize-Winning Physicist Who Endorsed Obama Dissents! Dr. Ivar Giaever Resigns from American Physical Society Over Group's Promotion of Man-Made Global Warming 'Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables' The idea that CO2, a trace essential gas in the atmosphere that humans exhale from their mouth, is the main climate driver is now being challenged by peer-reviewed studies, data and scientists from around the globe. It is not simply, the sun or CO2 when looking at global temperatures, it is the Sun, volcanoes, tilt of the Earth's axis, water vapor, methane, clouds, ocean cycles, plate tectonics, albedo, atmospheric dust, Atmospheric Circulation, cosmic rays, particulates like Carbon Soot, forests and land use, etc. Climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables, not just CO2. Professor Emeritus of Biogeography Philip Stott of the University of London explained the crux of the entire global warming debate when he rebutted the notion that CO2 is the main climate driver. “As I have said, over and over again, the fundamental point has always been this: climate change is governed by hundreds of factors, or variables, and the very idea that we can manage climate change predictably by understanding and manipulating at the margins one politically-selected factor (CO2), is as misguided as it gets,” Stott wrote. Even the global warming activists at RealClimate.org admitted to this key climate reality in a September 20, 2008 article. “The actual temperature rise is an emergent property resulting from interactions among hundreds of factors,” RealClimate.org explained. The global warming movement continues to lose scientists, many formerly with the UN IPCC. See: More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Challenge UN IPCC & Gore The future does not look bright for global warming activists as more scandals continue to rock the movement. See: Climate Depot's Exclusive Round Up of Climategate 2.0 – Read about the most comprehensive report on the latest global warming scandal – Even warmists are lamenting that Climate 2.0 may be 'devastating': 'These [emails] sound worse than I thought at first – their impact will be devastating' MIT climate scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen has observed that “Ordinary people see through man-made climate fears -- but educated people are very vulnerable.”
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**Warming tipping points inevitable**

**NPR 9** (1/26, Global Warming Is Irreversible, Study Says, All Things Considered, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=99888903)

Climate change is essentially irreversible, according to a sobering new scientific study. As carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise, the world will experience more and more long-term environmental disruption. The damage will persist even when, and if, emissions are brought under control, says study author Susan Solomon, who is among the world's top climate scientists. "We're used to thinking about pollution problems as things that we can fix," Solomon says. "Smog, we just cut back and everything will be better later. Or haze, you know, it'll go away pretty quickly." That's the case for some of the gases that contribute to climate change, such as methane and nitrous oxide. But as Solomon and colleagues suggest in a new study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, it is not true for the most abundant greenhouse gas: carbon dioxide. Turning off the carbon dioxide emissions won't stop global warming. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide that the climate would go back to normal in 100 years or 200 years. What we're showing here is that's not right. It's essentially an irreversible change that will last for more than a thousand years," Solomon says. This is because the oceans are currently soaking up a lot of the planet's excess heat — and a lot of the carbon dioxide put into the air. The carbon dioxide and heat will eventually start coming out of the ocean. And that will take place for many hundreds of years. Solomon is a scientist with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Her new study looked at the consequences of this long-term effect in terms of sea level rise and drought.

**India and China make emissions inevitable**

**Sensenbrenner 9** – Congressman and ranking minority member of the House Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming (James, 4/3, Technology Is the Answer to Climate Change, WSJ, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123871985916184973.html#mod=loomia?loomia\_si=t0:a16:g2:r3:c0.191864:b23626456,)

The U.S. cannot reduce the growth of greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere without the developing nations cutting their emissions as well. A 2007 study by the Battelle Memorial Institute found that if China, India and the other developing countries keep growing at current rates, they will emit nearly three times as much carbon dioxide as will the developed countries by the end of this century. But will China and India join in the effort to reduce CO2 emissions? During December's U.N. climate-change conference in Poznan, Poland, I asked delegates from both of these nations if they would agree to cut their emissions. Both said, unequivocally, "no." The Poznan conference wasn't my first experience with the developing world's refusal to sign up for the West's global-warming agenda. I led the congressional delegation to the infamous Kyoto, Japan, negotiations in 1997, and the story then was the same as now. Without China and India, there can be no deal. It's understandable why the developing nations are reluctant to cut emissions -- it means higher energy costs and reduced growth. China and India are more concerned with growing their economy, expanding access to electricity, and reducing poverty. I don't blame them.

**Inland waterway modernization hurts the environment**

**IWR 12** [Institute for Water Resources, US Army Corps of Engineers, “U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy: Options for the Future”,<http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port_and_Inland_Waterways_Options_for_the_Future_Working_Draft_v1_2012_Apr_01.pdf>, April]

All forms of transportation have an environmental footprint. Development and maintenance of navigation-based transportation systems in the United States have contributed significantly to altered air, water, land and biological characteristics of waterways, coastlines, and rail and highway corridors. Sources of such environmental impacts include channel and basin excavation, maintenance dredging, lock and dam structures, intermodal links and vehicular/vessel emissions. Since the 1970s, implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act and other regulatory legislation have contributed to reducing the persistent impacts of many previous practices. Coastal ports and inland waterways occur within proximity of two of the scarcest ecosystem categories—free flowing rivers and estuarine wetlands. Further unmitigated impact is unlikely to be accepted. Any modernization strategy must consider possible alteration of the environmental footprint. Locks and dams have contributed substantially to the imperilment of numerous freshwater species by totally changing their riverine habitat. Excavation and dredging of navigation channels reduce abundances of submerged aquatic vegetation and various commercial, recreational and threatened animal species. In general, dredging of nontoxic bottoms impacts coastal and riverine benthic organisms temporarily and bottoms typically colonize quickly following disturbance. Dredging also has had more persistent effects, including some unavoidable taking of imperiled species (e.g. sea turtles). In 1992 USACE was authorized to beneficially use dredge material for environmental improvement. Since then, dredged material has also been used for habitat creation and other beneficial uses at other project sites. The specific environmental ramifications must be weighed for a dredged site or for a site that will environmentally benefit from the dredged material. Comparing navigation to other forms of transportation, however, navigation’s footprint can be viewed favorable to truck and rail for many types of impacts.

# ext global warming – at sci consensus

**Many qualified scientists disagree that warming is human caused – their ev is alarmism**

**WSJ 12** [Wall Street Journal, written by Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, “No Need to Panic About Global Warming”, January 27]

A candidate for public office in any contemporary democracy may have to consider what, if anything, to do about "global warming." Candidates should understand that the oft-repeated claim that nearly all scientists demand that something dramatic be done to stop global warming is not true. In fact, a large and growing number of distinguished scientists and engineers do not agree that drastic actions on global warming are needed. In September, Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ivar Giaever, a supporter of President Obama in the last election, publicly resigned from the American Physical Society (APS) with a letter that begins: "I did not renew [my membership] because I cannot live with the [APS policy] statement: 'The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth's physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.' In the APS it is OK to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is incontrovertible?" In spite of a multidecade international campaign to enforce the message that increasing amounts of the "pollutant" carbon dioxide will destroy civilization, large numbers of scientists, many very prominent, share the opinions of Dr. Giaever. And the number of scientific "heretics" is growing with each passing year. The reason is a collection of stubborn scientific facts. Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." But the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO2. The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—suggests that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO2 can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO2. The fact is that CO2 is not a pollutant. CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere. Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing, many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted—or worse. They have good reason to worry. In 2003, Dr. Chris de Freitas, the editor of the journal Climate Research, dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the politically incorrect (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. The international warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have Dr. de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position. Fortunately, Dr. de Freitas was able to keep his university job. This is not the way science is supposed to work, but we have seen it before—for example, in the frightening period when Trofim Lysenko hijacked biology in the Soviet Union. Soviet biologists who revealed that they believed in genes, which Lysenko maintained were a bourgeois fiction, were fired from their jobs. Many were sent to the gulag and some were condemned to death. Why is there so much passion about global warming, and why has the issue become so vexing that the American Physical Society, from which Dr. Giaever resigned a few months ago, refused the seemingly reasonable request by many of its members to remove the word "incontrovertible" from its description of a scientific issue? There are several reasons, but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, "Follow the money." Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them.

# 1nc hegemony

**1. Inland waterways aren’t key to heg – other transport methods solve**

**Gardner 96** [Major Gregory, School of Advanced Military Studies, “INFRASTRUCTURE: THE FOURTH ELEMENT OF STRATEGIC MOBILITY”, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA314299]

Inland waterway traffic in the US provides a redundant mode of transportation for military needs. US highway and rail transportation have the capacity to efficiently haul military commodities that can be transported on inland waterways. However, the military utility of inland waterways is much greater in other areas oft he world where highway and rail capabilities are not so robust. In Europe, the major tributaries and canals support a strong commercial transportation economy. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization uses this capability in peacetime and plans for its use in wartime. Inland waterways, while inflexible, are capable o f moving large quantities of bulk supplies, such as fuel and ammunition, to make up for shortfalls in other modes oftransportation. Many areas ofthe world which do not possess good highway and rail routes have navigable inland CO waterways that can be used to transport military cargo.

**2. US sea transport capabilities are the best in the world**

**Wilson 10** [JR, specialist in aerospace defense and technology, authored or co-authored more than 100 books, “The State of U.S. Sealift”, Jul 6]

On any given day, MSC estimates it has about 110 ships in operation around the globe and offers overall contingency support for 15.4 billion gallons of fuel and 109.4 million square feet of dry cargo. With the coming new additions to the fleet, adding to capability already in place, Buzby believes the United States stands alone in the ability to deliver both military cargo and humanitarian relief quickly and efficiently by sea to any coastal point on Earth. Given seas and oceans cover some 65 percent of the planet and the vast majority of the population lives within 100 miles of a coast, that is a significant advantage. “There is no other nation with the logistics capabilities we have to mount an initial response and sustain that response any faster or with the depth and range of response we made in Haiti,” he said. “Who else can move a city hospital 3,000 miles in three days and have it operating on arrival? Only the Comfort and Mercy offer that capability.”

**3. Heg doesn’t solve conflicts**

**Preble 2010** [Christopher, director of foreign policy studies at CATO, “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?”, Aug 3rd, <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/2010/08/03/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/>]

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

# 1nc hegemony

**4. Multiple political, economic, and structural global changes make hegemony unsustainable**

**Haass 8** (Richard , President of the Council on Foreign Relations (Bottom of Form The Age of Nonpolarity What Will Follow U.S. Dominance, *Foreign Affairs*, May/June)

But even if great-power rivals have not emerged, unipolarity has ended. Three explanations for its demise stand out. The first is historical. States develop; they get better at generating and piecing together the human, financial, and technological resources that lead to productivity and prosperity. The same holds for corporations and other organizations. The rise of these new powers cannot be stopped. The result is an ever larger number of actors able to exert influence regionally or globally. A second cause is U.S. policy. To paraphrase Walt Kelly's Pogo, the post-World War II comic hero, we have met the explanation and it is us. By both what it has done and what it has failed to do, the United States has accelerated the emergence of alternative power centers in the world and has weakened its own position relative to them. U.S. energy policy (or the lack thereof) is a driving force behind the end of unipolarity. Since the first oil shocks of the 1970s, U.S. consumption of oil has grown by approximately 20 percent, and, more important, U.S. imports of petroleum products have more than doubled in volume and nearly doubled as a percentage of consumption. This growth in demand for foreign oil has helped drive up the world price of oil from just over $20 a barrel to over $100 a barrel in less than a decade. The result is an enormous transfer of wealth and leverage to those states with energy reserves. In short, U.S. energy policy has helped bring about the emergence of oil and gas producers as major power centers. U.S. economic policy has played a role as well. President Lyndon Johnson was widely criticized for simultaneously fighting a war in Vietnam and increasing domestic spending. President Bush has fought costly wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, allowed discretionary spending to increase by an annual rate of eight percent, and cut taxes. As a result, the United States' fiscal position declined from a surplus of over $100 billion in 2001 to an estimated deficit of approximately $250 billion in 2007. Perhaps more relevant is the ballooning current account deficit, which is now more than six percent of GDP. This places downward pressure on the dollar, stimulates inflation, and contributes to the accumulation of wealth and power elsewhere in the world. Poor regulation of the U.S. mortgage market and the credit crisis it has spawned have exacerbated these problems. The war in Iraq has also contributed to the dilution of the United States' position in the world. The war in Iraq has proved to be an expensive war of choice -- militarily, economically, and diplomatically as well as in human terms. Years ago, the historian Paul Kennedy outlined his thesis about "imperial overstretch," which posited that the United States would eventually decline by overreaching, just as other great powers had in the past. Kennedy's theory turned out to apply most immediately to the Soviet Union, but the United States -- for all its corrective mechanisms and dynamism -- has not proved to be immune. It is not simply that the U.S. military will take a generation to recover from Iraq; it is also that the United States lacks sufficient military assets to continue doing what it is doing in Iraq, much less assume new burdens of any scale elsewhere. Finally, today's nonpolar world is not simply a result of the rise of other states and organizations or of the failures and follies of U.S. policy. It is also an inevitable consequence of globalization. Globalization has increased the volume, velocity, and importance of cross-border flows of just about everything, from drugs, e-mails, greenhouse gases, manufactured goods, and people to television and radio signals, viruses (virtual and real), and weapons. Globalization reinforces nonpolarity in two fundamental ways. First, many cross-border flows take place outside the control of governments and without their knowledge. As a result, globalization dilutes the influence of the major powers. Second, these same flows often strengthen the capacities of nonstate actors, such as energy exporters (who are experiencing a dramatic increase in wealth owing to transfers from importers), terrorists (who use the Internet to recruit and train, the international banking system to move resources, and the global transport system to move people), rogue states (who can exploit black and gray markets), and Fortune 500 firms (who quickly move personnel and investments). It is increasingly apparent that being the strongest state no longer means having a near monopoly on power. It is easier than ever before for individuals and groups to accumulate and project substantial power. NONPOLAR DISORDER The increasingly nonpolar world will have mostly negative consequences for the United States -- and for much of the rest of the world as well. It will make it more difficult for Washington to lead on those occasions when it seeks to promote collective responses to regional and global challenges. One reason has to do with simple arithmetic. Herding dozens is harder than herding a few. The inability to reach agreement in the Doha Round of global trade talks is a telling example. Nonpolarity will also increase the number of threats and vulnerabilities facing a country such as the United States. These threats can take the form of rogue states, terrorist groups, energy producers that choose to reduce their output, or central banks whose action or inaction can create conditions that affect the role and strength of the U.S. dollar. The Federal Reserve might want to think twice before continuing to lower interest rates, lest it precipitate a further move away from the dollar. There can be worse things than a recession. Iran is a case in point. Its effort to become a nuclear power is a result of nonpolarity. Thanks more than anything to the surge in oil prices, it has become another meaningful concentration of power, one able to exert influence in Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, the Palestinian territories, and beyond, as well as within OPEC. It has many sources of technology and finance and numerous markets for its energy exports. And due to nonpolarity, the United States cannot manage Iran alone. Rather, Washington is dependent on others to support political and economic sanctions or block Tehran's access to nuclear technology and materials. Nonpolarity begets nonpolarity.

# 1nc hegemony

**5. No transition wars --- nuclear deterrence checks**

**Ikenberry**, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton, 200**8** [John G., The Rise of China and the Future of the West, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb]

The most important benefit of these features today is that they give the Western order a remarkable capacity to accommodate rising powers. New entrants into the system have ways of gaining status and authority and opportunities to play a role in governing the order. The fact that the United States, China, and other great powers have nuclear weapons also limits the ability of a rising power to overturn the existing order. In the age of nuclear deterrence, great-power war is, thankfully, no longer a mechanism of historical change. **War-driven change has been abolished as a historical process.**

**6. 1NC HEGEMONY**

**No transition wars --- nuclear deterrence checks**

**Ikenberry, Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton, 2008 [John G., The Rise of China and the Future of the West, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb]**

**The most important benefit of these features today is that they give the Western order a remarkable capacity to accommodate rising powers. New entrants into the system have ways of gaining status and authority and opportunities to play a role in governing the order. The fact that the United States, China, and other great powers have nuclear weapons also limits the ability of a rising power to overturn the existing order. In the age of nuclear deterrence, great-power war is, thankfully, no longer a mechanism of historical change. War-driven change has been abolished as a historical process.**

**Decrease in US hegemony will not cause war**

**Zakaria, Editor of Newsweek International, 2008 [Fareed, The Post-American World, p. 242-3]**

**What if that hegemony is waning? America no longer has the only large market in the world. The dollar is unlikely to retain its totemic position forever as the reserve currency, yielding to a basket that is largely composed of euros and dollars but includes other currencies too. In certain areas—the South China Sea, for example—U.S. military force is likely to be less relevant than that of China. In international negotiations, America will have to bargain and compromise with others. Does all this add up to instability and disorder?**

**Not necessarily. Two hundred years of Anglo-American hegemony has in fact created a system that is not as fragile as it might have been in the 1920s and 1930s. (When British power waned, America was unwilling to step in, and Europe fell through the cracks.) The basic conception of the current system—an open world economy, multilateral negotiations— has wide acceptance. And new forms of cooperation are growing. Anne-Marie Slaughter has written about how legal systems are constructing a set of transnational standards without anyone's forcing them to do so—creating a bottom-up, networked order.13 Not every issue will lend itself to such stabilization, but many will. In other words, the search for a superpower solution to every problem may be futile and unnecessary. Smaller work-arounds might be just as effective.**

**Decrease in US hegemony will not cause war**

**Zakaria**, Editor of Newsweek International, 200**8** [Fareed, The Post-American World, p. 242-3]

What if that hegemony is waning? America no longer has the only large market in the world. The dollar is unlikely to retain its totemic position forever as the reserve currency, yielding to a basket that is largely composed of euros and dollars but includes other currencies too. In certain areas—the South China Sea, for example—U.S. military force is likely to be less relevant than that of China. In international negotiations, America will have to bargain and compromise with others. Does all this add up to instability and disorder?

**Not necessarily.** Two hundred years of Anglo-American hegemony has in fact created a system that is not as fragile as it might have been in the 1920s and 1930s. (When British power waned, America was unwilling to step in, and Europe fell through the cracks.) The basic conception of the current system—an open world economy, multilateral negotiations— has wide acceptance. And new forms of cooperation are growing. Anne-Marie Slaughter has written about how legal systems are constructing a set of transnational standards without anyone's forcing them to do so—creating a bottom-up, networked order.13 Not every issue will lend itself to such stabilization, but many will. In other words, the search for a superpower solution to every problem may be futile and unnecessary. Smaller work-arounds might be just as effective.

# Ext heg doesn’t solve conflicts

**Regional balancing means US withdrawal won’t cause war**

**Sapolsky 97** – Prof PolSci, MIT Security Studies Program (Harvey and Daryl Press – Prof Government, Dartmouth – and Eugene Gholz – Research Associate, MIT Security Studies Program, “Come Home, America”, International Security 21.4, jstor, AG)

In today's world, disengagement will not cause great power war, and continued engagement will not reliably prevent it. In some circumstances, engagement may actually increase the likelihood of conflict. Second, selective engagers overstate the costs of distant wars and seriously understate the costs and risks of their strategies. Overseas deployments require a large force structure. Even worse, selective engagement will ensure that when a future great power war erupts, the United States will be in the thick of things. Although distant great power wars are bad for America, the only sure path to ruin is to step in the middle of a faraway fight. Selective engagers overstate America's effect on the likelihood of future great power wars. There is little reason to believe that withdrawal from Europe or Asia would lead to deterrence failures. With or without a forward U.S. presence, America's major allies have sufficient military strength to deter any potential aggressors. Conflict is far more likely to erupt from a sequence described in the spiral model. The danger of spirals leading to war in East Asia is remote. Spirals happen when states, seeking security, frighten their neighbors. The risk of spirals is great when offense is easier than defense, because any country's attempt to achieve security will give it an offensive capability against its neighbors. The neighbors' attempts to eliminate the vulnerability give them fleeting offensive capabilities and tempt them to launch preventive war. 71 But Asia, as discussed earlier, is blessed with inherent defensive advantages. Japan and Taiwan are islands, which makes them very difficult to invade. China has a long land border with Russia, but enjoys the protection of the East China Sea, which stands between it and Japan. The expanse of Siberia gives Russia, its ever-trusted ally, strategic depth. South Korea benefits from mountainous terrain which would channel an attacking force from the north. Offense is difficult in East Asia, so spirals should not be acute. In fact, no other region in which great powers interact offers more defensive advantage than East Asia. The prospect for spirals is greater in Europe, but continued U.S. engagement does not reduce that danger; rather, it exacerbates the risk. A West European military union, controlling more than 21 percent of the world's GDP, may worry Russia. But NATO, with 44 percent of the world's GDP, is far more threatening, especially if it expands eastward. The more NATO frightens Russia, the more likely it is that Russia will turn dangerously nationalist, redirect its economy toward the military, and try to re-absorb its old buffer states.72 But if the U.S. military were to withdraw from Europe, even Germany, Europe's strongest advocate for NATO expansion, might become less enthusiastic, because it would be German rather than American troops standing guard on the new borders. Some advocates of selective engagement point to the past fifty years as evidence that America's forward military presence reduces the chance of war. The Cold War's great power peace, however, was overdetermined. Nuclear weapons brought a powerful restraining influence.73 Furthermore, throughout the Cold War, European and Asian powers had a common foe which encouraged them to cooperate. After an American withdrawal, the Japanese, Koreans, and Russians would still have to worry about China; the Europeans would still need to keep an eye on Russia. These threats can be managed without U.S. assistance, and the challenge will encourage European and Asian regional cooperation.

# Ext inland waterways not key

**US inland waterways aren’t key to heg**

**Goure 11** [Daniel, PhD, vice president of the Lexington institute, Vice President with the Lexington Institute, a nonprofit public-policy research organization, “THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE JONES ACT TO U.S. SECURITY”, October]

 American economic and security interests are by no means limited to close-in waters or to its rivers and inland waterways. As the world’s largest economy and foremost military power, the United States has a singular interest in the maritime domain -- that combination of oceans, seas, bays, estuaries, islands, coastal areas, littorals, and the airspace above them that carries more than 90 percent of the world’s trade and near which some 60 percent of the world’s population lives. 2 Half of all the oil and natural gas produced annually is transported by sea or through pipelines that travel under water. Much of this vital flow must transit narrow chokepoints such as the Straits of Hormuz, Straits of Malacca and the Suez Canal. The United States maintains an extensive network of allies, partner nations and military installations around the world that can only be accessed by air or water.

# 1nc economy

**1. The economy’s resilient --- innovations solve**

**Leonhardt**, New York Times, National Bureau of Economic Research, 200**5** [David, October 8, Business Cycle Data]

MEMPHIS - The nearly empty Airbus 310 was coasting through the Alabama night sky when a message flashed in the cockpit. "DIVERT," it said, before using code to order the plane to land in Atlanta. The pilot banked the jet to the east and a half-hour later it was on the ground. There, its cargo door opened up to a group of waiting FedEx employees who began filling it with 17,000 pounds of cargo. It had been a busy day for Georgia businesses, and FedEx's regular nightly flights from Atlanta to the company's Memphis hub were overbooked with packages. So the local crew made a call to a sprawling, low-slung room here at headquarters, where people hunch over computer screens showing weather maps and flight plans, and asked for help from the five empty FedEx jets that roam over the United States every night. The recent birth of that small fleet, at a multimillion-dollar price tag, explains a lot about how the nation's economy has become so much more resilient. Think of it as the FedEx economy, a system that constantly recalibrates itself to cope with surprises. The United States has endured an almost biblical series of calamities in recent years - wars, hurricanes, financial scandals, soaring oil prices and rising interest rates - but the economy keeps chugging along at an annual growth rate of roughly 3 percent. It has been able to do so with the help of technology that allows businesses to react ever more quickly to changes. But with little notice, those reactions have also created a new feature of the business cycle: the micro-recession. When one of them strikes, activity slows for a few weeks, sometimes in just certain sectors or regions, as companies adjust to a dip in demand. It has happened much more often in the last few years than in earlier expansions, but growth has picked up each time, thanks in part to the adjustments that businesses have made. No company embodies this change, for better and worse, quite like FedEx. When Alan Greenspan, the Federal Reserve chairman, sees Frederick W. Smith, FedEx's chief executive, during halftime of Washington Redskins games, Mr. Greenspan uses the company's vast reach to check in on the economy. "He always asks, 'We still O.K.?' " said Mr. Smith, a part-owner of the team whose stadium suite abuts the one Mr. Greenspan uses. More formally, Federal Reserve staff members rely on FedEx and the nearly six million packages it delivers every day for real-time data that helps set interest rate policy. The company's around-the-world flights - fuller coming from Asia than going to it - are the shipping lanes of the global economy, bringing goods from Chinese factories to American shelves in just days. FedEx technology helps Procter & Gamble managers send more Crest to Wal-Mart whenever somebody buys a tube, and the managers can then watch the replacement move through the supply chain from their computer screens. All this - combined with financial innovations that allow companies to hedge their bets and, some say, the deregulation of pivotal transportation industries - has helped mute the economy's swings. The business cycle has certainly not been eliminated, as some dreamers suggested during the 1990's boom, but recessions really do seem to happen less often. There have been only two recessions in the last two decades. From the late 1960's through the early 80's, the economy endured four of them, including two of the deepest in decades, which left millions of people out of work. "The more flexible an economy, the greater its ability to self-correct after inevitable, often unanticipated disturbances," Mr. Greenspan argued in a recent speech. "The impressive performance of the U.S. economy over the past couple of decades, despite shocks that in the past would have surely produced marked economic contraction, offers the clearest evidence of the benefits of increased market flexibility." Of course, new technologies and global shipping lanes are also big reasons that job growth has been so disappointing during this expansion and that the gains from recent economic growth have gone mainly to highly skilled white-collar workers. In Woodbridge, N.J., for example, a large FedEx shipping center can sometimes seem void of human beings. And revenue at the express-shipping division has grown almost 30 percent since 2002, while the full-time work force has declined slightly. The number of part-time workers has grown. Across the economy, quick reactions, like asking workers to put in more hours one week and fewer the next, have helped lead to the business cycle's new hiccups. Mr. Smith calls them "mini-recessions."

**2. Economic collapse doesn’t cause war --- lack of resources prevent military conflict**

**Bennett and Nordstrom**, Department of Political Science Professors at Pennsylvania State, **2000** [Scott and Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, February, Ebsco]

In this analysis, we focus on using economic conditions to understand when rivalries are likely to escalate or end. Rivalries are an appropriate set of cases to use when examining substitutability both because leaders in rival states have clearly substitutable choices and because rivalries are a set of cases in which externalization is a particularly plausible policy option.7 In particular, when confronted with domestic problems, leaders in a rivalry have the clear alternatives of escalating the conflict with the rival to divert attention or to work to settle the rivalry as a means of freeing up a substantial amount of resources that can be directed toward solving internal problems. In the case of the diversion option, rivals provide logical, believable actors for leaders to target; the presence of a clear rival may offer unstable elites a particularly inviting target for hostile statements or actual conflict as necessary. The public and relevant elites already consider the rival a threat or else the rivalry would not have continued for an extended period; the presence of disputed issues also provides a casus belli with the rival that is always present. Rivals also may provide a target where the possible costs and risks of externalization are relatively controlled. If the goal is diversion, leaders willwant to divert attention without provoking an actual (and expensive)war. Over the course of many confrontations, rival states may learn to anticipate response patterns, leading to safer disputes or at least to leaders believing that they can control the risks of conflict when they initiate a new confrontation. In sum, rivals provide good targets for domestically challenged political leaders. This leads to our first hypothesis, which is as follows: *Hypothesis 1*: Poor economic conditions lead to diversionary actions against the rival. Conflict settlement is also a distinct route to dealing with internal problems that leaders in rivalries may pursue when faced with internal problems. Military competition between states requires large amounts of resources, and rivals require even more attention. Leaders may choose to negotiate a settlement that ends a rivalry to free up important resources that may be reallocated to the domestic economy. In a “guns versus butter” world of economic trade-offs, when a **state can no longer afford to pay the expenses associated with competition in a rivalry, it is quite rational for leaders to reduce costs by ending a rivalry**. This gain (a peace dividend) could be achieved at any time by ending a rivalry. However, such a gain is likely to be most important and attractive to leaders when internal conditions are bad and the leader is seeking ways to alleviate active problems. Support for policy change away from continued rivalry is more likely to develop **when the economic situation sours** and elites and masses are looking for ways to improve a worsening situation. It is at these times that the pressure to cut military investment will be greatest and that state leaders will be forced to recognize the difficulty of continuing to pay for a rivalry. Among other things, this argument also encompasses the view that the cold war ended because the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics could no longer compete economically with the United States. *Hypothesis 2*: Poor economic conditions increase the probability of rivalry termination. Hypotheses 1 and 2 posit opposite behaviors in response to a single cause (internal economic problems). As such, they demand a research design that can account for substitutability between them.

# 1nc economy

**3. US isn’t key to the global economy --- decoupling solves**

**Hong**, writer for Xinhua, 200**8** [Liu, Rise of emerging markets shapes global economic map, Xinhua, 8/24, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-08/25/content\_9706441.htm]

WASHINGTON, Aug. 24 (Xinhua) -- In the past, a sharp slowdown in the United States would trigger a severe decline in world growth. But now the dynamic of the world has changed with a fundamental shift being under way. TRADE WITH EMERGING ECONOMIES HAS SAVED AMERICA FROM RECESSION "We are experiencing the first episode in history of reverse coupling, in which the rest of the world pulls the U.S. forward rather than the opposite," said Fred Bergsten, director of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, a leading think tank in the United States. Bergsten told Xinhua that he believed that "trade has saved America from recession" because "the improvement in trade balance has accounted for the totality of U.S. economic growth over the three quarters." Bergstan's opinion was echoed by many U.S. economists and officials. U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson has repeatedly stressed that he believes the U.S. economy will not fall into a recession, given that the world economy, especially the economy in the emerging countries, is fundamentally strong. In spite of the pronouncements of many observers that recession had already set in, the U.S. economy grew at an annual rate of 1.9percent in the second quarter of this year, up from a 0.6-percent increase in the first quarter and a 0.2-percent decline in the fourth quarter last year. The U.S. Federal Reserve has concluded that the showing was mainly due to the strong growth of U.S. exports, especially the exports to emerging markets. China, the biggest emerging market, is now contributing more to global demand than the United States, said Jim O'Neill, chief economist at Goldman Sachs, noting that add on the BRICs, namely Brazil, Russia, India and China, the impact grows. The strong dynamism of domestic demand in emerging and developing economies has provided a "**trade shock absorber**," enabling a robust expansion of U.S. exports over the past year even as U.S. domestic demand has slowed, also said a recent report by the International Monetary Fund (IMF). EMERGING MARKETS TRANSFORMED INTO LOCOMOTIVES OF WORLD ECONOMY Analysts believe there have been two important shifts in the growth dynamic of the global economy. The first is that emerging economies have been transformed into locomotives of the world economy, as China has accounted for about one-quarter of global growth over the past five years, according to data provided by the IMF. The BRICs have accounted for almost half of global growth and all the emerging and developing economies together for about two-thirds, compared with about half in the 1970s. Secondly, the pattern of trade has changed. Almost half of exports from emerging and developing economies are now directed towards other such economies, with rising intra-regional trade within emerging Asia most notable. "While some U.S. companies may have cut jobs by outsourcing to China, think of how many more jobs they might be cutting if they were losing money or barely profitable," said Zachary Karabell, president of River Twice Research. Africa has also benefited from the emerging economies. Investment commitments in Africa by emerging financiers jumped from less than 1 billion dollars per year before 2004 to 8 billion dollars in 2006 and 5 billion in 2007 dollars, said a recent report by the World Bank. Growing infrastructure commitments by emerging countries in Africa are helping address the huge infrastructure deficit of the continent, Obiageli Katryn Ezekwesili, the World Bank's vice president for the Africa region told Xinhua. As a result, the global economy has clearly decoupled itself from the United States and world growth is likely to approach 4 percent in both 2008 and 2009 in spite of the sharp slowdown in the United States, said Bergstan. "The traditional relationship where the world catches cold when the U.S. sneezes' no longer holds," he noted. "China now plays a decisive role in the world economy as indicated by its dominant role in global economic growth," he told Xinhua.

**4. No impact to recession**

W. Michael **Cox**, senior vp and chief economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, IBD, 1-9-200**2**

Since 1960, the average recession lasted 11 months, with declines of 2.1 percentage points in total output and 1.7% in employment. The previous downturn, an eight-month pause from August 1990 to March 1991, saw just a 1.5% slump in economic activity and a 1.1% drop in the number of jobs. Before 1940, only one in seven recessions was over by 11 months. A third of them hung on for at least 23 months. Between 1887 and 1950, recessions meant an average decline of 13% in industrial production. Since 1960, the toll has been reduced to 7%. Shorter, milder recessions arise from a shift away from the dominance of boom-to-bust industries, such as farming and manufacturing. The economy has diversified, with volatile sectors not only being smaller slices of the pie, but also offset by more stable pieces, such as trade and services. Recessions are part of the system. Periods of economic slowdown serve a purpose in a capitalist economy. The pauses allow for time to correct excesses - rising inflation, bloated inventories, excess capacity, supply bottlenecks and misallocation of resources. Boom times hide the excesses, and they're wrung out during the down months. In recession an economy reorganizes itself, reallocating resources to emerge more efficient and productive. Layoffs are traumatic, but labor and other resources are freed for eventual use in the next wave of enterprises. Thousands of dot-com companies may have gone belly up, but we didn't lose their know-how. The technology and human resources are still here. Recession doesn't equal regression. We can reuse what we learned. Recessions are to some extent self-correcting. Now that a slump is here, the economy won't continue to spiral downward. Once down, it won't stay down. In an economy where markets provide continual feedback, behavior and expectations can change quickly. As demand falters, companies cut costs and reduce inventories. Prices adjust downward. Consumers react by buying more, reviving demand. Policy responses are part of the cure. The Federal Reserve moved aggressively in 2001 to lower interest rates. Credit is now cheaper than any time in the past 40 years. Looking ahead, the economy maintains considerable strength. Inflation remains tame at less than 2%. Real personal income continued to grow in 2001, so consumers have more money to spend. America still sits on a mother lode of new technologies - from electronics to medicine. The spirit of enterprise never lies dormant, not even in recession. Thus, the U.S. economy already has the makings of the next boom.

# Ext economy resilient

**Global economy is resilient – historically proven**

**Wolf**, associate editor and chief economics commentator at the Financial Times, 200**6** [Martin, America could slow down the world, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/c8b24a50-4dc4-11db-8704-0000779e2340.html]

To doubt the resilience of the world economy must now look perverse. Since 2000, it has overcome so many obstacles: post-bubble traumas in Japan; the bursting of a global stock market bubble in 2000; the terrorist attacks of September 11 2001; a US recession; years of stagnation in the eurozone; wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; real oil prices at levels close to those of the late 1970s; and the failure to complete the Doha round of multilateral trade negotiations. Yet, in spite of all this, world economic growth was 4.1 per cent in 2003, 5.3 per cent in 2004 and 4.9 per cent in 2005, measured at purchasing power parity exchange rates. In the International Monetary Fund's latest World Economic Outlook (WEO), it is forecast to reach 5.1 per cent this year.\* Growth is also broadly shared: in 2006, suggests the IMF staff, it will be 3.4 per cent in the US, 2.4 per cent in the eurozone and 2.7 per cent in Japan. In emerging markets it is far higher: 8.7 per cent in developing Asia, 6.8 per cent in the Commonwealth of Independent States, 5.8 per cent in the Middle East, 5.4 per cent in Africa, 5.3 per cent in central and eastern Europe and 4.8 per cent in the western hemisphere. How has it been possible for the world economy to leap over so many hurdles? We can offer three answers: first, the power of the underlying drivers of economic expansion - US productivity growth, globalisation and the rise of Asia; second, the ability of central banks and fiscal authorities to exploit the credibility they won in the 1980s and 1990s responding to the shocks of the 2000s; and, not least, the role of the US as borrower of last resort.

**US economy resilient—prefer objective data over their hype**

**Hamilton 9** – CEO of Sageworks Inc, a private financial analysis company (Brian, 1/5, The Sky May Be Lower But It Isn't Falling, Investor's Business Daily, http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=316049209319113, AG)

There is probably something in humans and in every generation that makes us think that the problems we face are uniquely difficult. Much has been written about the economy and, if you accept certain assumptions from what you read, you might think that we are in the midst of a global depression. Yet, it is important to put the current economy in perspective. We might even try reviewing and analyzing some objective data. Last quarter, GDP fell at a rate of 0.5%, which means that the total value of goods and services produced in the US fell by a half of one percentage point last quarter over the previous quarter(1). For the first two quarters of this year, GDP grew by 0.9% and 2.8%, indicating that economic growth is relatively flat this year, but that it is not falling off a cliff. This isn't the first time GDP has fallen and it won't be the last. A decrease in GDP after almost 6 years of increases is not positive, but almost predictable. No economy grows indefinitely and consistently; there are always temporary lapses. In fact, if you consider the media coverage of the economy over the past year and the consequent way people have been scared, it is remarkable that anyone is buying anything. Some would say that we cannot only look at GDP, so let's look at other factors. Interest rates remain at historically low levels(2). This means that if you want to borrow money, you can borrow money inexpensively as a business or as a person. Loan volume in the country, according to the FDIC and contrary to what you read about the credit crisis, actually increased last quarter compared to the same quarter last year(3). Someone is getting loans and they are not paying excessive interest rates for them. How about employment? According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, unemployment sits at 6.7%. At this time last year, unemployment was 4.7%. The decrease in employment is not favorable, but historically an unemployment rate of 6.7% is not close to devastating. The 50-year historical rate of unemployment is 5.97%(4). Most economists agree that the natural rate of unemployment, which is the lowest rate due to the fact that people change jobs or are between jobs, is around 4%. So, today we sit at 2.7% above that rate. Once again, the very recent trend is not good but it is certainly not horrifying. I have noticed many recent media references to the Great Depression (the period of time between late 1929 and around 1938 or so, depending upon the definitions used and personal inclinations). It might be illuminating to note that by 1933, during the height of the Depression, the unemployment rate was 24.9%. During that same time period, GDP was falling dramatically, which created a devastating impact on the country. Americans have good hearts and empathize (as they should) with those who are unemployed, yet it would be easy to go too far in our assumptions on how the working population is currently affected in aggregate. If 6% of the people are unemployed, approximately 94% of the people are working. We should always shoot for full employment, but why would we view our efforts as poor when we don't quite make that mark? A good student might try to get straight A's, but getting an occasional "B" or "C" won't end the world. Look at personal income today. Personal income is income received by individuals from all sources, including employers and the government. Personal income rose last quarter compared to a year ago according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis. Compared to five years ago, personal income has risen by 32.1%(5). Even considering that inflation was 18.13% over this period, people are generally making more money than they used to. This is another one of those statistics that can easily get bent to fit a story. You often hear things like "personal income fell last month by 23%", but writers tend to leave larger and more important statistics out. In this case, wouldn't you be more interested in trends over a quarter or a year? Using isolated statistics to fit your view is something that has become accepted and rarely challenged. Next, there is inflation. The inflation rate measures the strength of the dollar you hold today as compared to a year ago. The inflation rate is currently 3.66%. Over the past 50 years, the inflation rate has averaged about 4.2%(6). Inflation remains well within control. Yet, would you be surprised to read a story next month citing an X% jump in inflation over the last day, month? I wouldn't be. (Ironically, the one thing about the economy that is alarming from a historical standpoint is our national debt, which gets some but not enough media coverage. We now owe $10.6 trillion and have become a debtor nation over the past several decades. We now depend on the goodwill and investments of outside countries, while we continue to spend more than we make). Now, the skeptics reading this will undoudebtly point to other (I believe, far lesser) statistics that validate their gloomy view of the economy and the direction of the country. I ask the reader: if people are employed, are making good wages, can borrow inexpensively, hold a dollar that is worth largely what it was worth a year or five years ago, and live in a country where the value of goods and services is rising, tell me exactly where the crisis is? There is no doubt that the economy has slowed, but slowness does not equal death. It is true that the financial markets are a mess (and the depreciation of the value of equities is both scary and bad), but analysts typically go too far in ascribing the fall of the financial markets with the fall of a whole economy. The markets are an important component of the economy, but the markets are not the totality of the economy. No one can say whether conditions will worsen in the future. However, we have learned that the United States economy has been tremendously resilient over the past 200 years and will probably remain so, as long as the structural philosophies that it has been built upon are left intact. Americans are hard-working and innovative people and the country will be just fine.

# Ext no econ war

**Even if diversionary conflicts occur, they won’t escalate**

**Bennett and Nordstrom**, Department of Political Science Professors at Pennsylvania State, **2000** [Scott and Timothy, “Foreign Policy Substitutability and Internal Economic Problems in Enduring Rivalries,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, February, Ebsco]

When engaging in diversionary actions in response to economic problems, leaders will be most interested in a cheap, quick victory that gives them the benefit of a rally effect without suffering the long-term costs (in both economic and popularity terms) of an extended confrontation or war. This makes weak states particularly inviting targets for diversionary action since they may be less likely to respond than strong states and because any response they make will be less costly to the initiator. Following Blainey (1973),a state facing poor economic conditions may in fact be the target of an attack rather than the initiator. This may be even more likely in the context of a rivalry because rival states are likely to be looking for any advantage over their rivais. Leaders may hope to catch an economically challenged rival looking inward in response to a slowing economy. Following the strategic application of diversionary conflict theory and states' desire to engage in only cheap conflicts for diversionary purposes, states should avoid conflict initiation against target states experiencing economic problems.

# At trade solves war

**Economic growth doesn’t cause peace**

Christopher **Layne**, visiting associate professor of international politics and military strategy at the Naval Postgraduate School, consultant to the RAND Corporation, Summer 19**98**, World Policy Journal, “Rethinking American grand strategy: hegemony or balance of power in the twenty-first century?” v15 n2 p8(21), infotrac

These arguments notwithstanding, international economic interdependence does not cause peace. In fact, it has very serious adverse security consequences that its proponents either do not understand or will not acknowledge. Economic relations (whether domestic or international) never take place in a vacuum; on the contrary, they occur within a politically defined framework. International economic interdependence requires certain conditions in order to flourish, including a maximum degree of political order and stability. Just as the market cannot function within a state unless the state creates a stable "security" environment in which economic exchange can occur (by protecting property rights and enforcing contracts), the same is true in international relations. Because there is no world government, it falls to the dominant state to create the conditions under which economic interdependence can take hold (by providing security, rules of the game, and a reserve currency, and by acting as the global economy's banker and lender of last resort). Without a dominant power to perform these tasks, economic interdependence does not happen. Indeed, free trade and interdependence have occurred in the modern international system only during the hegemonies of Victorian Britain and postwar America.

**Empirics prove interdependence doesn’t solve conflict**

John J. **Mearsheimer**, Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Political Science and the College at the University of Chicago, co-director of the Program on International Security Policy, May **2K**, The Future Of The American Military Presence In Europe, edited by Lloyd Matthews, http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi/pubs/2000/milpres/milpres.pdf

Implicit in your question and in Professor Kaysen’s answer is the belief that increasing economic interdependence promotes peace. In other words, as states get richer and become more interconnected, there is a substantial decrease in the likelihood of war between them. There is a large international relations literature on this subject and it finds little support for that claim. Before World War I, for example, there was a significant amount of economic interdependence and prosperity in Europe, but war still happened. More recently, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in August 1990 in good part because Kuwait was over-producing its OPEC oil quotas and driving down world oil prices, thus harming the Iraqi economy, which was already in serious trouble from its war against Iran between 1980 and 1988. In short, because of the interdependency of Iraq and Kuwait through their membership in OPEC, Iraq chose to attack its neighbor. Thus, we should at least have reservations about the claim that economic interdependence produces peace.

**Economic interdependence doesn’t stop conflict**

Christopher **Gelpi**, Associate Professor of Political Science at Duke University **and** Joseph M. **Grieco**, Professor of Political Science Duke University, June 27, 20**01**, Economic Interdependence, the Democratic State, and the Liberal Peace, http://psweb.sbs.ohio-state.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Gelpi&Grieco.pdf

At the same time, Katherine Barbieri (1996, 1998) suggested that Oneal and Russett had erred in following a rule in constructing their data set whereby they attributed zero bilateral trade to pairs of countries if neither had reported trade to the International Monetary Fund. Barbieri constructed a revised data set that supplemented IMF figures for bilateral trade with information from alternative sources. If no data could be found, she recorded the trade data as missing – effectively eliminating the case from her analysis – rather than attributing a level of zero trade for that dyad. With her revised data set, Barbieri found that growing economic interdependence did not appear to dampen the likelihood of militarized conflict and might even exacerbate it. Thus, at the end of the decade, the question of the direct effect of economic interdependence on world peace remained unresolved and highly contested.

**Trade conflicts don’t escalate**

Joseph **Nye**, assistant secretary of defense for international security affairs, Washington Quarterly, Winter, **1996**

The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, increased trade and economic interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point, however, is that such disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.

# At oil dependence add on

**Long time frame for oil independence and global markets make the impacts inevitable**

**Roberts 8** (Paul, 5/1, The Seven Myths of Energy Independence, http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/2008/05/the-seven-myths-of-energy-independence.html)

 And yet, no country can really hope to improve its energy security by acting alone. True, cutting our own oil use would bring great things here at home, everything from cleaner air and water to lower noise pollution. But we'd be surprised by how little our domestic reductions changed the rest of the world—or improved our overall energy security. The first problem, once again, is the small-planet nature of energy. America may be the biggest user of oil, but the price we pay is determined by global demand, and demand is being driven largely by booming Asia, which is only too happy to burn any barrel we manage to conserve or replace. Second, any shift to alternatives or better efficiency will take years and perhaps decades to implement. The U.S. car fleet, for example, turns over at a rate of just eight percent a year. That's as fast as consumers can afford to buy new cars and manufacturers can afford to make them, which means that—even in a fantasy scenario where the cars were already designed, the factories retooled, and the workers retrained—it would still take 12 years to deploy a greener fleet. Most forecasts fail to acknowledge how slowly such changes could actually occur. Sure, if the United States could cut its oil consumption overnight by 9 million barrels, or 6.5 million barrels, or even 3.6 million barrels, it would have a staggering impact on oil prices. But barring a global depression, demand won't ever drop so rapidly; instead, our demand reductions will be incremental and thus effectively canceled out by the expected demand growth in other, less efficiency-minded countries like China. Berkeley's Borenstein, for example, estimates that the 3.6 million barrels the United States would save by 2030 under the 2007 energy bill will be more than offset by growth in demand elsewhere. Put another way, we could all squeeze into smaller cars and still be paying $4 for a gallon of gasoline.

# \*\*\*POLITICS\*\*\*

# 1nc

**Jackson-Vanik repeal will pass now – needs to be removed before Russian WTO acceptance in August**

**The Hill 6/10** [“Human rights concerns complicate efforts to ramp up Russia trade”, 2012]

Congress, the Obama administration and business groups are ramping up efforts to pave the way this summer for improved trade relations with Russia, but that work is being complicated by parallel efforts to address human rights concerns in that country. While the push is being made to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment and grant permanent normal trade relations, some lawmakers are also eager to pass a measure designed to signal to Moscow that human rights and national security violations won't be tolerated as that nation prepares to join the World Trade Organization (WTO). In the ever complicated realm of U.S.-Russia relations, supporters of repealing Jackson-Vanik — a 37-year-old provision designed to put pressure on Communist nations for human-rights abuses and emigration policies — are emphasizing that Russia's entry into the WTO does not require the U.S. to pass any additional measures . "The United States gives up nothing and won't be required to change its laws," said Edward Gerwin, senior fellow for trade and global economic policy at Third Way, told The Hill. Not only are normal trade relations denied to nations that restrict emigration, but without a repeal, U.S. businesses would lose the benefits derived from a more open Russian market, putting companies at a competitive disadvantage. "We're not rewarding the Russians," Gerwin said. "From a policy standpoint keeping Jackson-Vanik doesn't get us anywhere," he said. Granting permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) is in "no way an expression of support for their really bad foreign policy decisions in places like Syria," he added. Russia's decision to vote July 4, ahead of the July 23 deadline, on its WTO accession means lawmakers will have to pass a repeal before the August recess to gain the full benefits. Once the Russian Duma passes the bill, the nation joins the WTO 30 days later. For the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, normalizing trade relations with Russia is the top legislative priority this year, Christopher Wenk, the Chamber's senior director for international policy, told The Hill. Wenk said the Chamber is focusing on educating lawmakers as the issue bubbles to the surface this summer and that the "wheels are turning and we all can do more" to get PNTR done by August. "We have no leverage over Russia if don't recognize them," he said. "The whole point of this exercise is that they are agreeing to a set of rules and we'll all be under the WTO tent." The process appears to be moving forward with the House Ways and Means Committee expected to hold a hearing on June 20, a few days after the lower chamber returns from a weeklong recess, according to several sources. A Senate Finance Committee hearing also is in the offing soon, a source told The Hill. From there, lawmakers need to introduce legislation to repeal the decades-old Jackson-Vanik provision and move toward mark ups. If Jackson-Vanik is still on the books come August, U.S. companies won't be able to enjoy all the benefits and it would further complicate when Congress could take it up during the busy election season, Wenk said. Earlier this week, the President's Export Council (PEC) urged close collaboration with the Congress. "We urge you to work closely with the Congress to provide PNTR prior to Russia’s WTO ratification so that American companies and workers do not lose out on significant economic opportunities in the Russian market," they wrote in a letter signed by PEC Chairman James McNerney, president and chief executive of Boeing. Besides the benefits to U.S. businesses, proponents argue that Russia’s accession will allow the United States to use WTO mechanisms, including dispute settlement, to challenge actions that are inconsistent with international trade rules. "Once Russia becomes a member of the World Trade Organization, we need to make sure that American businesses have the full advantages of that, and therefore it's necessary for us to lift Jackson-Vanik," U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia on Thursday. Russia, which has been trying to join the trade organization since 1993, is one of the world's largest economies that isn't part of the 153-member WTO. Last year, the U.S. exported $11 billion worth of goods and services and at least one report says that could double by 2017 by just following through with the repeal. Meanwhile, blocs of bipartisan lawmakers on each side of the Capitol are pushing for passage of a human rights bill that would freeze assets and deny U.S. visas to Russian officials linked to human rights abuses, a move the Obama administration has warned could create more tension between Washington and Moscow. Russia has vowed to retaliate if the bill becomes law. Some lawmakers have suggested they would support repealing Jackson-Vanik as a trade-off in exchange for passage of the so-called Magnitsky bill. "There is growing recognition in the business community and on the Hill to do something meaningful and send a message on human rights," Gerwin said. "The Russians are hacked off about it but they can't deny us any trade rights because then they would be in violation of WTO rules," he said. "We've got a good track record at the WTO so it's unlikely Russia would do something blatant." Kirk said repealing Jackson-Vanik is a top priority for his office this year but he is opposed to linking it to a Magnitsky bill. “Our priority is for the Congress to lift Jackson-Vanik in a clean bill which deals only with the issue relevant to our ability to maintain our competitiveness,” Kirk said. The administration will "continue our work" with lawmakers concerned about human rights, Kirk said.

# 1nc

Spending on transportation infrastructure costs Obama political capital, especially before the election

**Capital 12** [online news publication, “When is Obama going to have his Eisenhower Moment?”, March 27]

At the moment, it can safely be said that building support for increased transportation spending is not the president's top priority, as he heads into a general election with the economy just showing signs of recovery. Infrastructure funding—and what were once packaged as stimulus projects, generally—have taken a back seat to, say, the price of gas and, by extension, the conspicuously expanded drive for domestic energy resources. The lesson that Obama and the administration seem to have taken from the times they have pushed hard for spending on big transportation-infrastructure projects is that they're a tougher sell than expected, or at least that voters don't necessarily see them as the economic generators they eventually become. So, for example, the president insisted that the federal stimulus act include $8 billion for high-speed rail, but then absorbed a great deal of grief over ensuing allocations, which were criticized as politically motivated. And while spending on less costly projects has been easier for the administration, politically, it has also been less rewarding. For instance, the stimulus included $1.5 billion in funding for so-called TIGER grants, a small pot of money (it was later expanded to $2.6 billion) that’s been sprinkled around the country. They hardly got noticed nationally, other than by transportation advocates, who felt they were too small to make any meaningful change to the physical transportation system itself. (There was a total of $48 billion in stimulus spending on projects around the country, but aside from the high-speed rail component and the TIGER grants, those funds are generally considered to have been inserted at the initiative of Congressional leaders and were not part of a coordinated national transportation strategy.) The reforms that transportation boosters have in mind are, generally speaking, more profound: an ongoing commitment to paying for large capital projects and maintenance of existing infrastructure; sustainable sources of revenue to offset that cost; alterations to the system of incentives that drive commercial and residential growth, and to the metrics that measure the efficiency and cost of moving people around their regions and across the country. “The federal tax code subsidizes some really bad development,” says Andrew Goldberg, managing director of government relations at the American Institute of Architects, which has advocated tax-code reforms. “A lot of the funding goes toward sprawl, toward building where land is cheapest." “I know this isn’t sexy," said Schank, "but he could direct D.O.T. to start doing the research necessary to implement real performance measures and accountability for transportation.” In other words, the administration could lay out a precise vision for how it would like to see the money it controls spent, and support that vision accordingly. The American Society of Engineers says there’s a $3 trillion backlog in surface transportation spending. The United States spends a mere 2.4 percent of its G.D.P. on transportation and water infrastructure, compared to Europe’s 5 percent and China’s 9. Many transportation experts also argue for a significantly higher tax on gas. This is politically difficult, if not impossible, as illustrated by the way Republicans have latched onto currently high gas prices as an argument against Obama, and the president's high-profile response, cheerleading the expansion of domestic oil and gas exploration as a solution. But the fact is gas here is cheap, relatively speaking: Americans are likely at any given time to be paying about half as much for fuel as Europeans. Yet gas-related revenue is where much of the nation’s infrastructure funding comes from. “We’ve got one of the lowest federal gasoline taxes in the world,” said Robert Yaro, president of the Regional Plan Association. “The other countries that have gasoline taxes as low as ours include Saudi Arabia, Iran, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait.” And that’s not the only issue with the gas tax, which is about 18 cents per gallon and which provides much of the funding for the nation's highways and mass transit (New York’s M.T.A. derives some $1 billion from it per year). It's not pegged to inflation, so it provides ever less revenue in real terms. Also, it's a victim of its own success: Today, thanks in part to the fact that the gas tax makes it more expensive to burn fuel, cars are much more fuel-efficient. Less consumption equals less revenue. But while transit-dedicated revenue from gas is going down, the need to spend money on the nation's aging transportation infrastructure is going up. “The interstate system, most of it is already approaching half a century old,” says Yaro. “It’s at the end of its useful life. Big stretches need to be rebuilt and there’s no money to rebuild them, much less create any new capacity in the system." The president, at least rhetorically, recognizes that. He's proposed a half-trillion-dollar, six-year transportation plan. And he’s suggested a $50 billion infrastructure bank that would leverage private funding. As of now, they're still just proposals. “So far he hasn’t really put his political capital behind it because he has other priorities,” said Schank. In this year’s State of the Union, the president made a strong argument for infrastructure spending. “During the Great Depression, America built the Hoover Dam and the Golden Gate Bridge,” he said. “After World War II, we connected our States with a system of highways. Democratic and Republican administrations invested in great projects that benefited everybody, from the workers who built them to the businesses that still use them today.” “In the next few weeks, I will sign an executive order clearing away the red tape that slows down too many construction projects. "But you need to fund these projects. Take the money we're no longer spending at war, use half of it to pay down our debt, and use the rest to do some nation-building right here at home.” The “you” in that sentence was Congress. But the Republican-controlled House is looking to cut transportation spending, not increase it. It will be all the president can do to get them to agree to pass the Senate's version of this year's transportation-spending bill, which more or less extends the status quo. “The White House hasn’t recommended funding sources, and the Congress has been reluctant to propose new revenues,” says Yaro, of the Regional Plan Association. House Republicans in particular have staked out a radical position on infrastructure funding, going so far as to propose eliminating mass-transit financing entirely from the gas tax. In fact, even if Obama wins a second term, his ability to do anything much more than hold the line on current spending levels would probably be contingent on his party winning both houses of Congress. "I think then he could really use the hammer of the bully pulpit of a sitting president who does’t have to run again," said Chris Ward, who served as the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's executive director before moving to construction firm Dragados. "I think he’ll be a very different president once he gets reelected." “I’ll tell you this, if he wins a second term, he’s going to come into a second term with some domestic priorities,” said Schank. “Investing in transportation is not a bad way to invest his political capital.”

# 1nc

Political Capital is key to get republicans on board

**Rogin 10-12** (Josh,- staff writer for Foreign Policy “McFaul: We must give Russia privileged trade status”)

Mike McFaul, the National Security Council senior director for Russia, will testify before senators this afternoon and say that that the Obama administration's "reset" policy with Russia is working and that Congress must terminate an antiquated law that prevents full and normalized trade relations with Moscow. McFaul is nominated to be the next U.S. ambassador to Moscow. Although several GOP senators have serious concerns about the reset policy and are critical of what they see as Obama's concessions to Russia, McFaul is expected to be confirmed. In his testimony this afternoon before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he will argue for the repeal of what's known as the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, a 1974 legal provision that punished the Soviet Union for restricting Jewish emigration, and which continues to prevent the United States from granting Russia permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status. "In order for U.S. businesses, farmers and workers to receive the maximum benefit from Russia's WTO accession ... we will need to give the same unconditional permanent normal trading relations treatment to Russia's goods that we provide to those of all other WTO members," McFaul will say in his opening statement, obtained in advance by The Cable. "That commitment requires us to terminate the application of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and extend permanent normal trading relations to Russia." WTO membership for Russia is a key goal of Obama's reset policy and the administration has been working hard behind the scenes to help Moscow finalize its bid. But several senior Republican lawmakers want to keep Jackson-Vanik in place to keep the pressure on Russia and prevent further backsliding on democratization, human rights, and respect for the rule of law. McFaul will testify that the administration wants to terminate Jackson-Vanik before Russia joins WTO. Russia could win membership as early as December, if they are able to strike a deal with Georgia. The WTO typically only accepts new members by consensus. The agreement between the two nations would likely have to do with international customs monitoring along the Russia-Georgia border, which is currently run by the Russian military. The Obama administration said it's not involved in the Russia-Georgia negotiations, but at other times officials have admitted that it is. Either way, it's unclear how the administration plans to convince intransigent GOP leaders, such as House Foreign Affairs Committee chairwoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), to abandon their opposition to granting Russia PNTR status, much less before December. But the Obama administration has decided to make the termination of Jackson-Vanik a jobs issue, thus placing the GOP in the position of being against American workers.

# 1nc

Jackson-vanik repeal is key to sustainability of US-Russia relations---accesses every impact

**BPC, 12** (Task Force Report of the Bipartisan Policy Center, January, “A Bull in Bear’s Clothing: Russia, WTO and Jackson-Vanik,” http://www.bipartisanpolicy.org/sites/default/files/Russia%20Staff%20Paper.pdf)

Relations with Russia remain central to U.S. strategic interests. Russia plays a pivotal role – positively and negatively – in our policy toward Iran, Afghanistan, North Korea, China, terrorism, energy security and other pressing national security issues. The improvement in bilateral ties in recent years is welcome but, in and of itself, has not fundamentally changed the structure of the relationship or sufficiently advanced U.S. interests. Indeed, Russian leaders recently continued their habit of manipulating elections to hold onto power and blaming America for any internal dissent. With Vladimir Putin expected to return to the presidency in March 2012 and the possibility of his continuing dominance of Russian politics to 2018 or beyond despite his party’s electoral rebuke in December and growing political opposition, U.S.-Russia relations could only become more challenging in the years ahead despite the mutual benefits that could come from deeper collaboration. Cooperation could also be slowed in the near-term during the U.S. presidential election in 2012. The goal of U.S. policy towards Russia should be to find ways that our two nations can work together as closely as possible on common objectives, while also working to resolve the issues that divide us. Our purpose is to advance U.S. economic and security interests, and to promote our values – in the case of Russia, these go hand-in-hand. One of the common goals should be Russian entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO). Russia membership was approved in December 2011, and formal entry awaits a vote by the Russian parliament, which is widely expected to occur by the spring of 2012. The WTO is a multilateral institution designed to promote and manage international trade. Russia is by far the largest economy outside this 153-member organization, which represents the vast majority of the global population and 97 percent of total global trade. Some in Moscow view WTO membership – and U.S. support for it – as a prerogative of its Great Power status, a prerequisite for further cooperation with the United States and a vehicle for economic growth. Other Russian leaders fear WTO membership will hurt some domestic industries and shine an unwelcome light on, if not undercut, the country’s rampant corruption and those who greatly benefit from it. Outgoing president and the apparent next prime minister, Dmitri Medvedev, is seen as part of the pro-WTO camp, while Putin is considered among those more skeptical of the WTO. We would welcome a more constructive approach from Putin, assuming he returns to the presidency. We strongly believe WTO membership would benefit the Russian people by requiring the government to adopt rules and policies that might begin to modernize their economy and society. Such changes are desperately needed as far-reaching graft has hollowed out Russia’s economic core, devastated its civil society and undermined respect for human rights. Russia’s citizens are increasingly demanding a political system with greater respect for the rule of law and greater transparency. These demands should not be ignored and Russian membership in the WTO would provide an opportunity to address them, both by spurring economic liberalization—which could lead to political reforms—and by giving Congress an opportunity to replace the anachronistic Jackson Vanik trade restriction with more modern human rights measures. WTO membership would not only be good for Russians but also for Americans. It could potentially double bilateral trade over five years and create more U.S. jobs. Moreover, the positive economic and political reform that WTO accession might spur in Russia will, in addition to improving the lives of Russians, create better conditions for U.S.-Russia cooperation. It is in the American interest for Russia to be a strong, vibrant and increasingly open country, and that ultimately rests on Russia developing a more modern and vibrant economy and civil society. However, once Russia joins the WTO the United States would need to take action to reap the benefits and avoid damage to trade: Congress has to graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974. We urge Congress to take action on Jackson-Vanik in a timely manner and enact new legislation that would address modern-day Russian human rights abuses and corruption. WTO & Jackson-Vanik Jackson-Vanik was designed to penalize countries, such as the Soviet Union, that restricted emigration by denying them permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) status, which permanently grants low tariff rates and high import quotas. Most U.S. trading partners enjoy PNTR status. Two decades after the Cold War, Congress continues to apply Jackson-Vanik to Russia even though it has graduated 15 other countries from its provisions entirely, including former Soviet republics Ukraine and Kazakhstan, as well as China and Vietnam. However, since 1994 successive U.S. presidents have certified that Russia is compliant with Jackson-Vanik requirements. This has made Russia eligible only for normal trade relations (NTR), which offers the same trade benefits as PNTR but must be renewed annually. Once Russia formally accedes to the WTO, this annual NTR certification process will no longer suffice without detriment to American interests. WTO rules require that member states grant each other unconditional free trade, and an annual certification process does not meet that requirement. Thus, even if the United States continues to certify Russian compliance with Jackson-Vanik, WTO rules will permit Russia to deny the United States the benefits of PNTR. In other words, Moscow would have legitimate grounds to discriminate against U.S. businesses. Failing to grant PNTR would also alienate Russia and undercut our bilateral relations. To avoid these significant diplomatic and economic drawbacks, Congress needs to act in a timely fashion to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik. Political issues are involved. Jackson-Vanik has been used by various Members of Congress as leverage on a myriad of Russian issues: human rights record; policy toward Iran, Georgia and other countries; willingness to embrace market reforms and the rule of law as part of its WTO accession process; and a desire by the Jewish Hasidic group Chabad to repatriate books to the United States. Successive administrations have also found Jackson-Vanik as a useful lever in their dealings with Russia. These impediments notwithstanding, we believe it is time to move beyond Jackson-Vanik and modernize U.S.-Russia relations for the benefit of both countries. Benefits of WTO & Jackson-Vanik Graduation WTO membership is crucial to ushering Russia’s economy into the 21st century. Russia is among the world’s largest economies. Its wealth, however, is highly dependent on natural resources, while its manufactured goods are largely uncompetitive in global markets. This is not only economically risky but has incentivized Russia’s leadership to meddle abroad to ensure high energy prices, and a continued stream of revenue into its coffers. Meanwhile, corruption, state capitalism and the legacy of Soviet-era planning have inhibited productivity, foreign investment, entrepreneurship and the diversification of exports. Indeed, Transparency International ranked Russia 143rd out of 178 countries in its annual Corruption Perceptions Index and the World Bank put Russia 120th out of 183 countries for ease of doing business. Large-scale graft drives these negative rankings, yet it not only has a hugely distortive economic impact (inefficiency, capital flight, etc.) but also promotes a culture of lawlessness in which human rights abuses are ignored if not tolerated. We believe this rampant corruption, perhaps as much as or more than any other factor, is seriously eroding the Russian economy and state. The regulations imposed by WTO membership would open Russian markets to foreign imports and investment while promoting greater transparency and accountability in its financial sector. Enmeshing Russia within these international rules could spur greater external trade and foreign investment that might, in turn, promote economic liberalization and much-needed modernization. A robust monitoring and enforcement regime on the part of the United States and international community might be necessary to keep Russia compliant with its WTO obligations initially. As Russian firms and products begin to increasingly compete with foreign imports and seek a greater share of foreign markets, however, market mechanisms will likely drive them to adopt more efficient and transparent practices, curbing costly corruption. Such modernization will greatly benefit the Russian people’s living standards, which, although much improved over the past decade, are threatened by economic stagnation and demographic decline. This should be welcomed and embraced by the wider Russian leadership out of responsibility to their citizenry and because it will enhance the strength and stability of the Russian state. Russian accession to WTO would also benefit the United States. Despite the size of Russia’s economy, it was only the 23rd-largest U.S. trade partner in 2010, behind Belgium and only slightly ahead of Colombia. As a WTO member, however, Russia would be required to lower tariffs on imported goods, leading to a freer flow of trade. According to some analysts, Russian WTO accession could double U.S. exports to Russia over the next five years, from $9 to $19 billion, which would spur American job creation and growth. U.S. sectors that could benefit include: agriculture, specifically meat and poultry producers; manufacturers, especially those that produce high-technology products such as pharmaceuticals or aeronautics; information technology; and a range of services from finance to education. More important, however, is that a Russia from which citizens and capital alike do not flee, a Russia more open to foreign trade and investment, a Russia with greater transparency and respect for human rights would be a better partner for U.S. leaders. Improving the economic, social and, perhaps ultimately, political conditions in Russia will enhance U.S. strategic interests by creating a stronger partner, more confident in its standing in the world, with a solid economic base.

# 1nc

Extinction

Allison, 11 (10/30, Director- Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6)

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin’s decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation’s interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia’s cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran’s drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions.

# Ext uniqueness

**Will pass – top priority and lobbying**

**WSJ 6/12** [Wall Street Journal, “Senators Seek to Ease Russian Trade”, 2012]

Some others express confidence Congress will pass the trade bill, their top trade priority, before its August recess. "We think the stars are starting to align for a late July vote," said William Lane, Caterpillar Inc.'s CAT +2.18% Washington director, who is helping to launch a lobbying blitz this week. The House and Senate appear to be taking different paths, with House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R., Mich.) supporting a trade bill without the Magnitsky bill. A separate House committee has already passed the Magnitsky bill. Mr. Camp remains open to moving the two bills in parallel, his spokeswoman Sarah Swinehart said. Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.), who unveiled the legislation along with Mr. Baucus, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D., Mass.) and Sen. John Thune (R., S.D.), said the trade bill must be accompanied by the human-rights legislation.

**Will pass – public and business support**

**Defense World 6/14** [one of the most prominent defence and aerospace news portals, “U.S To Lift Jackson-Vanik Amendment, Establish New Trade Relations With Russia”, 2012]

As Russia joins the World Trade Organisation later this year, a bipartisan group of U.S Senators are introducing a new bill that will allow permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) between the two countries. Should the new bill pass through the U.S Congress, Russian commercial aircraft and weapons manufactures could benefit and choose from a wide range of technology that was otherwise absent. The U.S will also stand to gain from the partnership with its former Cold War adversary. At present, US exports to Russia rake in approximately $9 billion each year. This number could double significantly within five years if Russia is given the PNTR status. Russia’s reliance of European and Israeli export is a $300 billion import market, more than half of which the U.S could gain. A recent public opinion survey found that a majority of Americans approved a greater trade relationship with Russia. About 57 per cent registered voters supported the potential economic benefits of a greater relationship. Another 70 per cent were in favor of the Congressional action to allow U.S. businesses to sell more to Russia, only 21 per cent oppose. Perhaps as a sign of things to come, Irkut Corporation, a commercial aircraft maker in Russia, and US’ Pratt and Whitney signed a definitive agreement to offer the latter’s PurePower PW1400G engine for Irkut’s MC-21 family of aircraft that is currently under development. The trade partnership could revolutionize the Russian commercial aircraft industry; commercial airliners such as the Sukhoi Civil Aircraft Company can now induct American equipment into the development of the SSJ100. While the U.S Congress mulls over the decision to include Russia, Boeing came out in support of the legislation, saying, “Russia is making significant concessions that will open up the world's ninth largest economy to U.S. goods and services”. “To take full advantage of those concessions, including substantial tariff reductions on commercial aircraft, and keep America competitive with exporters in other nations, the Congress must establish permanent normal trade relations with Russia”. Before passing the bill -- the White House’s top trade priority this year-- the Congress is reviewing Russia’s involvement in Syria and the alleged arms export that funds Al-Assad government crackdown on civilians.

**Will pass – top trade priority**

**Business Week 6/8** [“US official urges repeal of Russia trade law”, 2012]

U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said Thursday that the repeal of a U.S. law that can be used to put trade restrictions on Russia is a top priority for his office this year. The Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment denies normal trading arrangements to non-market countries that restrict emigration. It was originally a reaction to hurdles the Soviet Union put up for Jews who wanted to leave the country in the 1970s. Although Russia has not restricted emigration in any way since 1991 and the U.S. has granted Russia annual waivers since 1994, the law remains in force and is an irritant to investors and Russian politicians. Russia has wrapped up negotiations on membership in the World Trade Organization, and its parliament is expected to ratify Russia's membership on July 4. "Once Russia becomes a member of the World Trade Organization, we need to make sure that American businesses have the full advantages of that, and therefore it's necessary for us to lift Jackson-Vanik," Kirk told the American Chamber of Commerce in Russia. Some U.S. lawmakers have indicated they would support repeal of Jackson-Vanik in exchange for passage of the so-called Magnitsky bill that would bar Russian officials accused of human rights abuses from the United States. That bill calls for publicly identifying Russians tied to human rights abuses, but the Obama administration worries that could affect relations with Moscow. The bill was introduced by two Democrats and also is backed by prominent Republicans, including Sen. John McCain. The bill was named for lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who had accused Interior Ministry officials of corruption. He died in jail in 2009 from untreated pancreatitis. Proponents of the bill say the death, and allegations of torture in jail, highlight corruption in Russia's judicial system. Prospects for passing the measure as a stand-alone bill are uncertain, and senators saw an opportunity to boost its chances by tying it to the repeal of Jackson-Vanik. Kirk said the two measures should not be linked. "Our priority is for the Congress to lift Jackson-Vanik in a clean bill which deals only with the issue relevant to our ability to maintain our competitiveness," he said, adding the administration will "continue our work" with lawmakers concerned about Russian human rights.

**Will pass – bipartisan support**

**GazetteExtra 5/19** [“Pro: U.S. businesses and workers need full access to Russia’s surging economy”, 2012]

Russia’s accession to the WTO has been a bipartisan American foreign policy goal for many years — spanning Democratic and Republican administrations over 18 years of negotiation. The goal of bringing Russia into the global rules-based trading system is finally within reach. The only question now is whether U.S. companies, workers and farmers will reap the benefits. The answer rests with Congress, which must act this summer to approve PNTR and graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

# Ext uniqueness

**Will pass – business lobbying**

**The Hill 6/5** [“US companies alarmed by Russia sanctions bill”, 2012]

The business groups are lobbying against any effort to put PNTR and the Magnitsky measure on hold until after the election, since U.S. exports could suffer after August. “The companies feel an urgency to get PNTR before or soon after Russia accedes,” NFTC representative Dan O’Flaherty said. “This offends the Russians. They are afraid they will buy Komatsu instead of Caterpillar, Airbus instead of Boeing. Delay is not going to solve the problem.” As of Tuesday, chief Senate sponsor Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.) was still trying to link the sanctions bill to PNTR, USA Engage Director Richard Sawaya said.

**Will pass – wont be used to punish Russia and McCain support**

**The Hill 6/13** [“McCain: Keep Russian trade, Syria issues separate”, 2012]

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a leading critic of President Obama’s policies on Russia and Syria, said Wednesday that Russia’s role in suppressing Syrian dissent should be kept separate from an upcoming vote on trade. McCain reiterated that he supports permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with Russia as long as the bill establishing it is paired with a human-rights bill designed to punish those responsible for the death of Russian whistle-blower Sergei Magnitsky. The United States accused Russia this week of supplying Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad with attack helicopters to kill his own people. But when asked if the Russia PNTR bill should have Syria language in it, McCain said it should not. “I would not think that would be the case, but look — the Russians are behaving in a way that our least optimistic assessment of [Vladimir] Putin’s behavior ... has been realized,” he told The Hill. He added that, while the PNTR bill should only be used to advance Magnitsky legislation, the Syrian episode underscored that a tougher line needs to be taken with Russia. “I don’t know how exactly you punish Russia. It calls for us to start looking at Russia from a more realistic viewpoint, and stop pushing the reset button,” he said. McCain also repeated his calls for the United States to immediately begin arming the Syrian rebels and establish a safe haven for them in the country. “It is disgraceful ... they do nothing,” he said of the White House. Russia will join the World Trade Organization (WTO) this summer whether or not the United States acts on PNTR. Only once the United States votes to grant Russia PNTR, U.S. exports will enjoy the lower tariffs that Russia has promised other WTO members. For this reason, the business community is arguing that PNTR is not a good vehicle with which to pressure Russia, as not passing PNTR really only hurts U.S. economic interests. This week, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) said that he will move the Magnitsky bill, sponsored by Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.), in conjunction with PNTR through his committee. The move was seen as a major boost to McCain and other Magnitsky bill supporters. Asked Wednesday about the Russian support for Syria, Baucus told reporters that “I feel confident we’ll get PNTR passed.

**Will pass – congress needs to act now**

**The Hill 5/25** [“Russia trade, farm bill not on House summer calendar”, 2012]

Congress needs to act before Russia's legislature votes to join the World Trade Organization, which should happen by August. The Senate is set to take up its version of a 2013 farm bill in early June and the House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over trade have said they would hold hearings on the issue this summer. House Agriculture Committee Chairman Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) plans to mark up a farm bill in the coming weeks but it remains unclear if the House and Senate will be able to agree, especially on the levels of commodity payments, by the September deadline. While the Senate farm bill cuts nearly $24 billion from the budget deficit over ten years, that may not be enough for deficit hawks in the House. Meanwhile, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.) has said he plans to hold a June hearing on granting permanent normal trade relations to Russia. Camp and Trade Subcommittee Chairman Kevin Brady (R-Texas) have urged the White House to focus its efforts on convincing skeptical lawmakers that the long-standing and outdated Jackson-Vanik should be repealed and normal trade relations granted to Russia as that nation votes to join the World Trade Organization this summer. U.S. trade officials have said that ending Jackson-Vanik is a top priority of the White House because Russia joining the WTO gives the United States a new tool to enforce and handle any disputes over trade laws. Granting Russia permanent normal trade relations does not require the United States to make any changes to its tariffs and, if not completed, would leave U.S. exporters at a disadvantage with other international trading partners that would enjoy reduced duties. President Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin are scheduled to meet at the Group of 20 meeting next month in Mexico where the topic is likely to be discussed. The Russian Duma has until July 23 to vote on WTO membership and is currently scheduled to adjourn on July 15. Once the Duma votes, and Russia quickly notifies the WTO, its membership goes into effect in 30 days. Camp and Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) have said they would not hold up PNTR with Russia over questions of human-rights issues that they say would only hurt U.S. trade interests by indefinitely delaying lower tariffs for U.S. exporters with Russia. "Our ongoing relationship with Russia is a complex one, but to obtain the benefits of the concessions Russia made to join the WTO, we must grant Russia permanent normal trade relations," Camp said in April. House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairwoman Illeana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.) has floated the idea of tying human rights requirements to PNTR. In the Senate, there is bipartisan support for linking a bill punishing those accused of murdering whistleblower Sergei Magnitsky to PNTR, that would place public sanctions and visa bans on anyone who was involved in his death.
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**Will pass – McCain support proves**

**Foreign Policy 6/12** [“Magnitsky Act will be linked with Russian trade bill in Senate”, 2012]

The bill to grant Russia Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) was introduced in the Senate Tuesday and the head of the Senate Finance Committee promised he will combine it with a bill to sanction Russian human rights violators. Sen. Max Baucus (D-MT), who is the main sponsor of the PNTR bill and who will shepherd the legislation through his Finance Committee and then on the floor, has agreed to link it to the Magnitsky bill and pledged to pass them both this year. In doing so, Baucus secured the support of Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) for the PNTR bill, which includes a repeal of the 1974 Jackson-Vanik law that was set in place to punish the Soviet Union for refuses to let Jews emigrate. "It is clear the Magnitsky Act has overwhelming support in the Senate and growing support in the House," Baucus wrote in a letter today to McCain, Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD), Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-CT), and Sen. Roger Wicker (R-MS). "It is equally clear that many of our colleagues are rallying around the position you have advanced -- that the repeal of Jackson-Vanik for Russia must be accompanied by passage of the Magnitsky Act. I am fully committed to ensuring that the Senate can act on both items this year." After receiving that letter, McCain joined with Baucus, International Trade Subcommittee Ranking Member John Thune (R-SD), and Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D-MA) in unveiling the PNTR legislation, which they said allows U.S. business to take full advantage of the Russian market when Russia officially joins the WTO later this summer. "This is an opportunity to double our exports to Russia and create thousands of jobs across every sector of the U.S. economy, all at no cost to the U.S. whatsoever. We give up nothing as part of this process -- not one single tariff reduction -- so it's truly a one-sided benefit for the U.S.," Baucus said in a press release. "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs... The clock is ticking for us to move, so we need to act now." "As I and others have made clear, the extension of Permanent Normal Trade Relations status and the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment for Russia must be accompanied by passage of the Magnitsky Act," McCain said in the release. "I appreciate Senator Baucus's written commitment that he will work for Senate passage of both of these pieces of legislation as soon as possible this year. As we take steps to liberalize U.S. trade with Russia, as we should, we must also maintain our long-standing support for human rights and the fight against corruption in Russia." The Obama administration has opposed the Magnitsky Act in public while working quietly with Cardin to make changes to the bill just in case its passage can't be avoided. The latest draft version of the bill, circulated by Cardin and obtained by The Cable, seeks to make it more difficult to add names to the list of human rights violators that the bill creates and adds ways for the administration to waive penalties against those violators. By gaining McCain's support, Baucus has removed a major obstacle to the passage of PNTR for Russia. But now, with McCain on board, Baucus's PNTR bill is linked to the Magnitsky Act in such a way that if the administration opposes or seeks to water down the Magnitsky bill without McCain's agreement, both pieces of legislation could be in jeopardy.

# Ext uniqueness – business magnifier

**Business pushing for it**

**AP 6/13** [Associated Press, “U.S. Republicans Fire Back Over Jackson-Vanik Repeal”, 2012]

Major U.S. business groups, which say normalizing trade with Russia is a top priority for this year, have also expressed concerns about connecting the trade bill to the human rights issue. The White House, which prefers a clean trade bill, would like to drop a provision in the Magnitsky bill that calls for the naming of rights abusers.

**Businesses are actively lobbying**

**PR Newswire 6/16** [“USRBC Applauds Introduction of Russia PNTR Legislation in the U.S. Senate”, The U.S.-Russia Business Council (USRBC) represents the interests of its 250 U.S. and Russian member companies, 2012]

WASHINGTON, June 12, 2012 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- The U.S.-Russia Business Council (USRBC), the U.S.-based trade association leading the organized U.S. business community campaign for Russia's removal from the Jackson-Vanik amendment and enactment of Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Russia, applauded today's introduction of legislation by Senators Max Baucus (D-MT), John Thune (R-SD), John Kerry (D-MA) and John McCain (R-AZ) on Russia's graduation from the 1970s-era Jackson-Vanik law and approval of Russia PNTR. "We are pleased to see this action by a bipartisan group of Senators. This will help ensure that U.S. businesses benefit fully from Russia's pending WTO accession," said Klaus Kleinfeld, USRBC Chairman and Chairman and CEO of Alcoa, Inc. "The timely introduction of this legislation is an important first step towards ensuring that U.S. businesses can stay competitive in the Russian market." "The USRBC and the Coalition for U.S.-Russia Trade, for which USRBC serves as the Secretariat, urges the Obama Administration and Congressional leadership to enable passage of Russia PNTR by the August recess," said USRBC President and CEO Edward Verona. "We are committed to working constructively with all stakeholders towards successful passage of this legislation."

Business lobbying key to passage

**Mahoney 9** [Christopher, assistant professor of political science at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University, “The US's failure to control the influence of big business on policy is not an argument against the EU tightening its own lobbying rules”, European Voice]

In the US, we see more winner-take-all outcomes, with some advocates getting everything they want, while others get nothing. If we break down lobbying success by the type of lobbyist, a more troubling picture emerges: we see that, more often than not, it is industry and business interests that win. In the US, 89% of corporations and 53% of trade associations succeed, while the majority of those fighting for the broader good – 60% of citizen groups and 63% of foundations – fail in their lobbying goals. This is because legislators in the US are beholden to the wealthy interests that will underwrite their next re-election bid. In the EU, we see that industry often wins as well (the success rates are 57% for trade associations and 61% for lobbying firms) but citizen groups and foundations fighting for the public good win at equal rates (56% and 67%). Policymakers in the EU do not need industry's euros, so we do not see the same level of pandering to their interests. The American electoral process makes these findings understandable. Re-election-driven legislators in the US are driven not only to get votes, but also to raise the huge amounts of money needed to mobilise those votes. It is wealthy individuals and interest groups that are in the position to provide the much-needed resources for the launch of a successful re-election bid. Thus we often see public-policy outputs that benefit corporate interests over the common interest.

# Ext link – inland waterways

**Funding for inland waterways is unpopular – causes executive-legislative fights**

**Grier 2** [David, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, “Measuring the Service Levels of Inland Waterways”, TR News, July-August]

The aging of the inland navigation infrastructure and the budget constraints for ongoing maintenance and repairs have increased the scheduled and unscheduled downtime at locks. Lock unavailability has more than doubled since the early 1990s, from about 60,000 hours to more than 120,000 hours annually (Figure 5). Shippers can prepare for scheduled lock downtime by stockpiling or increasing shipments. Unscheduled downtime, however, disrupts shipments and contractual commitments, forcing shippers to scramble for alternatives that typically cost much more. Funding Challenges Another concern is the uncertainty of O&M funding, caused by a lack of consensus between the executive and legislative branches. The Administration’s FY 2002 budget request included about $406 million in O&M funding for 23 specific inland waterways projects, but in the final appropriation for FY 2002, Congress increased the requested amount by nearly 9 percent to $442 million. Yet the Administration’s FY 2003 budget request would reduce O&M by more than 6 percent, and individual projects would face more drastic reductions. The Administration’s request, for example, would reduce funding for 12 tributary waterways—in particular, the Apalachicola–Chattahoochee–Flint (ACF) system, the Alabama River, the Allegheny River, the Red River Waterway, the Ouachita–Black system, and the AIWW—by amounts ranging from 5 to nearly 90 percent (7, 8). Congress had increased O&M funding for most of these projects in the final FY 2002 appropriation—in the extreme case of the ACF, Congress authorized a more than tenfold increase.

Inland waterways funding is politically unpopular

**Jackson 7** [Colonel Donald, “Leveraging the Strategic Value of the U.S. Inland Waterway System”, March 14, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583]

 Infrastructure must be functional to effectively provide a means of efficient and 10 cost effective freight movement. Maintaining transportation infrastructure is an expensive, but critical, investment for the future. Construction of new infrastructure is time consuming, politically charged, and often not the answer to meeting economic mobility and power projection needs. The number two objective of the Framework for a National Freight Policy is adding physical capacity to the freight transportation system in places where investment makes economic sense. 42 Focusing limited resources on high payoff targets is the only way to ensure the future effectiveness of our freight transportation system. There is insufficient time or funding to complete the endless list of desired upgrades or repairs across the full spectrum of the transportation industry. Integrated prioritization ensures key infrastructure with strategic implications are adequately funded and completed. Key Framework strategies supporting this second objective include: (1) facilitating regionally-based solutions for freight gateways and projects of national or regional significance, and (2) utilizing and promoting new financing tools that encourage private sector investment. 43 Effective integration of freight transportation infrastructure is especially tenuous due to the complications of intra-governmental interoperability. Political liabilities and constraints may involve considerations of union contracts, federal funds provided for work projects, state funded work projects, and the allocation of resources and work based on lobbying efforts to elected officials. 44 Strategically, each of these stakeholders must work together, keeping in mind the overall benefit of the system nationally, in lieu of local political and economic implications. Careful management of scarce federal resources requires strategic vision that cannot be clouded by partisan parochialism. Adequate maintenance of our current system is the answer, but this requires a reliable source of revenue to be effective.

**Inland waterway funding is unpopular – deficit reduction concerns**

**ASCE 12** [American Society of Civil Engineers, “ASCE Tells Congress More Must Be Invested in Inland Waterways”, May]

Testifying on April 18 before the U.S. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee’s Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, James A. Rossberg, P.E., M.ASCE, the Society’s managing director of engineering programs, said that efforts by the administration and Congress to address the growing investment deficit in waterways infrastructure have largely been ineffectual because of political considerations that give precedence to deficit reduction and tax cuts over the badly needed restoration of critical infrastructure.

**No risk of a link turn – there’s no consensus over what actions and how to fund inland waterways**

**Pointon and Grier 4** [Mark and David, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Institute for Water Resources, “THE CHALLENGE TO MODERNIZE THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAYS”, ftp://ftp.hamburg.baw.de/pub/Kfki/Bib/2002\_Dredging/PDFs/40680-021-005.PDF]

 The replacement value of these improvements is estimated at over $120 billion in current dollars and annual maintenance exceeds $450 million. Nearly half of these locks and dams now exceed their 50-year design lives. At the same time traffic has continued to grow and there is a need for larger replacement locks at many locations. A new lock is an expensive proposition, ranging from $150 million to over $1 billion, depending on the size, type and location. Further, as the system ages the need for maintenance increases. Federal budget constraints have postponed critical maintenance while at the same time the queue of new or replacement lock projects awaiting construction continues to grow. Due to budget constraints, the construction schedules of many projects now underway are being stretched, increasing congestion and reducing project benefits. Other authorized projects may not be started for the foreseeable future. Yet replacement or major rehabilitation at many locks will become necessary in the next few years if the integrity of the inland navigation system is to be preserved. As yet there is no political consensus within the federal government or between commercial users and other stakeholder interests (such as recreation users, environmental concerns, hydropower, and water supply) over what actions to take and how to fund them.

# Ext link - transportation

**Transportation funding is unpopular before the election – Obama’s avoiding it**

**Freemark 12** [Yonah, an independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, from which he graduated in May 2008 with a BA in architecture. He writes about transportation and land use issues for The Transport Politic and The Infrastructurist, “On Infrastructure, Hopes for Progress This Year Look Glum”, January 25]

The contributions of the Obama Administration to the investment in improved transportation alternatives have been significant, but it was clear from the President’s State of the Union address last night that 2012 will be a year of diminished expectations in the face of a general election and a tough Congressional opposition. Mr. Obama’s address, whatever its merits from a populist perspective, nonetheless failed to propose dramatic reforms to encourage new spending on transportation projects, in contrast to previous years. While the Administration has in some ways radically reformed the way Washington goes about selecting capital improvements, bringing a new emphasis on livability and underdeveloped modes like high-speed rail, there was little indication in the speech of an effort to expand such policy choices. All that we heard was a rather meek suggestion to transform a part of the money made available from the pullout from the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts — a sort of war dividend whose size is undefined — to “do some nation-building right here at home.” If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become practically impossible to pursue. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate. For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside. Even so, it remains to be seen how the Administration will approach the development of a transportation reauthorization program. Such legislation remains on the Congressional agenda after three years of delays (the law expires on March 31st). There is so far no long-term solution to the continued inability of fuel tax revenues to cover the growing national need for upgraded or expanded mobility infrastructure. But if it were to pass, a new multi-year transportation bill would be the most significant single piece of legislation passed by the Congress in 2012. The prospect of agreement between the two parties on this issue, however, seems far-fetched. That is, if we are to assume that the goal is to complete a new and improved spending bill, rather than simply further extensions of the existing legislation. The House could consider this month a bill that would fund new highways and transit for several more years by expanding domestic production of heavily carbon-emitting fossil fuels, a terrible plan that would produce few new revenues and encourage more ecological destruction. Members of the Senate, meanwhile, have for months been claiming they were “looking” for the missing $12 or 13 billion to complete its new transportation package but have so far come up with bupkis. The near-term thus likely consists of either continued extensions of the current law or a bipartisan bargain that fails to do much more than replicate the existing law, perhaps with a few bureaucratic reforms. In the context of the presidential race, Mr. Obama’s decision not to continue his previously strong advocacy of more and more transportation funding suggests that the campaign sees the issue as politically irrelevant. If the Administration made an effort last year to convince Americans of the importance of improving infrastructure, there seems to have been fewer positive results in terms of popular perceptions than hoped for. Perhaps the rebuffs from Republican governors on high-speed rail took their toll; perhaps the few recovery projects that entered construction were not visible enough (or at least their federal funding was not obvious enough); perhaps the truth of the matter is that people truly care more about issues like unemployment and health care than they do for public transit and roads.
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**Jackson-vanik is the lynchpin of relations**

**Gsodev 12** [Nikolas, former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media. He is currently on the faculty of the U.S. Naval War College, “The Realist Prism: Resetting the U.S.-Russia Reset”, World Politics Review]

After a period of healthier ties following the much-heralded reset, U.S.-Russia relations appear to be deteriorating. Whether it was the war of words between U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin last December over the flaws in the Russian Duma elections, or the harsh language used by U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice after Russia vetoed a draft Security Council resolution last week calling on Syrian President Bashar al-Assad to step down, the optimism engendered by the Obama administration's reset with Russia has dissipated. Nor does the immediate future bode well for "resetting the reset." Putin is expected to reclaim the Russian presidency after next month’s election, and he has not forgotten or forgiven the Obama team's public relations effort back in 2009 to categorize President Dmitry Medvedev as the wave of the future and America's preferred interlocutor. At the same time, Putin and members of his immediate circle, who consistently expressed concerns about the "reset," feel that their doubts have been justified. In their narrative, Russia made many compromises to American preferences over the past few years, including relegating concerns about missile defense to a nonbinding preamble in the New START agreement; agreeing to much stronger sanctions on Iran and suspending a lucrative contract to provide Tehran with an advanced air defense system; and acquiescing to the U.N. Security Council resolution authorizing a no-fly zone for Libya. But these produced no real quid pro quos for Russian interests. Given the skepticism with which Putin is viewed in the U.S., not only by President Barack Obama but also by all the Republican challengers, there is little chance that, after March, there will be particularly warm and strong personal relations between the U.S. and Russian presidents. But does this mean that the U.S.-Russia relationship is doomed to fall back to a more confrontational posture, as occurred in 2007 and 2008, when analysts were warning of a "new Cold War"? That depends on several factors. The first is what happens in Russia in the aftermath of the Russian presidential elections. If there is evidence of widespread fraud, and if the government takes a hard line against the resulting protest movements, it will be very difficult for any U.S. administration to continue to deepen and broaden cooperation with Russia. That could change if Putin pursues a reform agenda. In a campaign op-ed in Kommersant that was reprinted in the Washington Post, he promised to restore direct elections of governors, increase local-self government and implement stringent new measures to combat corruption. If he is serious, it might take the steam out of the "White Revolution" and enable a U.S. administration to bank on "progress" being made. But the reality is that the political establishment in Washington is not prepared to extend to Russia the type of relationship the U.S. has with states like China or Saudi Arabia, where economic considerations routinely trump human rights concerns. The second is how extensive Putin plans to shake up the Russian government. Many expect that after resuming the presidency, Putin is prepared to make significant personnel and policy changes. What is not clear is whether long-serving Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov will continue as the primary steward of Russia's foreign relations, and whether outgoing President Medvedev will be asked to become prime minister or assume another role to allow some form of the tandem to continue. If Medvedev retains a good degree of influence, then some of the Obama-Medvedev partnership might be salvaged, and a new foreign minister could initiate a fresh start with his counterparts in Washington, leaving behind some of the baggage that has accumulated in the interactions between Clinton and Lavrov. The third is whether some of the new foundations in the U.S.-Russia relationship have solidified to the point that they can help weather the current storms. In contrast to the situation in 2008, there are now some important institutional connections in place. The Northern Distribution Network could represent enough ballast -- both in terms of the income generated for Russia and the safe route it offers the U.S. and NATO for the war effort in Afghanistan and for egress once the drawdown begins in the coming year -- to help prevent the relationship from veering out of control. The partnership between Exxon and Rosneft to develop both the Russian Arctic and additional projects in North America creates another set of incentives to keep ties on a level basis, as does the immense potential of a fully realized partnership between Russian and American firms in the nuclear power industry. American car manufacturers have found Russia to be a booming export market, while the U.S. space program is now dependent on Russia to ferry astronauts and cargo to maintain America’s manned presence in space. In short, there are a growing number of interests that depend on the preservation of healthy U.S.-Russia relations for their own success. But it is not yet clear whether they have sufficient clout to outweigh the naysayers on both sides. An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.
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Key to Russian relations

**RIA Novosti,** November 16, **2010,** p. Lexis

For some reason, both Russia and the United States act as if the entire reset policy depends on ratification of New START. But in fact, the rest is something much larger and much more significant. The post-Bush normalization in U.S.-Russian relations goes far beyond nuclear arms reductions. It involves Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization and Obama's stated intention to extend a pact on nuclear energy cooperation, which was signed when George W. Bush was still in office. To secure Russia's WTO membership, Obama will need to persuade the Republicans to scrap the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was passed in 1974. The amendment imposed restrictions on trade with the Soviet Union to pressure that country to relax its harsh emigration policies.
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Repeal is critical to Russian economic recovery – Obama capital key

**Charap and Kuchins 9** [Samuel Charap (visiting fellow in the CSIS Russia and Eurasia Program) and Andrew C. Kuchins (senior fellow and director of the program) Feb 2009 “Economic Whiplash in Russia: An Opportunity to Bolster U.S.-Russia Commercial Ties?”, http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090218\_charap\_econwhiplashrussia\_web.pdf]

The global economic crisis has hit Russia extremely hard. Its main stock market index, the Russian Trading System (RTS), has lost over 70 percent of its value since its peak in May 2008, the worst performance among emerging markets.2 After a remarkable decade of robust growth, economic performance is expected to stagnate this year or even decline.3 Since early August 2008, Russia spent more than a third (more than $200 billion) of its reserves on implementing various stimulus measures and supporting the ruble.4 Industrial production in December 2008 plunged 10.3 percent year-on-year, while the number of unemployed in Russia increased by 20 percent from October 1 to mid-January.5 Recent estimates suggest that if the average price of oil is below $35 per barrel this year, the Russian budget, after a decade of surpluses, could run a deficit of more than 10 percent of gross domestic product (GDP).6 In 2008, capital flight was an astonishing $129.9 billion, which is over five times the previous high recorded in 2000.7 The political impact of the downturn has been amplified by the speed and degree of Russia’s economic descent—the crisis hit when Russia’s economy was at its post-Soviet peak. From the economic crisis of 1998 to the summer of 2008, Russia underwent a macroeconomic revolution. Whereas it had defaulted on its external debt in 1998, by 2005 it had become a net creditor in the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and by May 2008 it held around $600 billion in currency reserves, the third largest in the world.8 Its nominal dollar GDP had increased by more than eight times from 1999 to 2008. By 2008, Russia’s stock market capitalization was over $1 trillion, the highest among emerging markets. The government’s strategic plan saw Russia becoming the largest economy in Europe and the fifth largest in the world after the United States, China, Japan, and India by 2020.9 It was from this position of economic might and policymaker confidence that Russia fell into what may be a drawn-out economic downturn.10 It is important that U.S. policymakers understand the implications of this unprecedented economic whiplash. The crisis could have a major impact on Russia’s external behavior and therefore on U.S. interests. As of this writing, many analysts many have already concluded that the crisis will spur a new period of aggressiveness in Moscow’s external stance.11 Most agree with Dimitri Simes’s maxim that “In Russia, hard times normally produce hard lines.”12 Thus far the crisis has indeed correlated with assertiveness in Russian foreign policy. For example, Russia has engaged in a highly destructive “gas war” with Ukraine, at one point going so far as to completely cut off deliveries to Europe, which caused rationing in some countries, such as Bulgaria, that are completely dependent on Russian gas. The recent announcement that Kyrgyzstan would close the U.S. military base at Manas under apparent Russian pressure would also indicate a more assertive line. Moscow seems at least in part motivated by a revanchist instinct to keep its “near abroad” under tighter political control. Despite these assertive moves, it is too early to draw definitive conclusions about the future trajectory of Russian policy. History provides evidence that economic downturns in Russia have often corresponded with periods of greater cooperation. Economic stagnation in the late 1980s was associated with the end of the Cold War, and the contraction of the early 1990s correlated with an accommodating foreign policy under Boris Yeltsin. Although nothing is predetermined, this historical perspective suggests that the current economic downturn could push Russia toward a more cooperative stance vis-à-vis the West, especially in terms of economic cooperation. Just nine months ago when oil was over $140 per barrel, Moscow had fewer incentives to engage with the West on economic issues. Russia was such an attractive market that it did not need to make an effort to lure Western investors; money flowed into its markets regardless of its policies. Its economy grew at a rapid clip despite the stagnation of the economic reform agenda, and it no longer needed financing from international institutions to ensure fiscal health. In short, Russia’s boom provided little incentive to reach out to the West on economic matters. With its economy in deep trouble and oil now under $50 per barrel, this situation has changed significantly. Clearly economic troubles are not exclusive to Russia, but the whiplash factor has altered the incentive structure to perhaps a greater degree than in other countries. Recovery from the crisis could require a considerably greater degree of economic engagement with the West than the boom did. In sharp contrast to the pre-crisis period, Russia may now need resources that only international, and particularly Western, investors, institutions, and trading partners can provide. This is a potentially powerful incentive for pursuing greater cooperation. Four examples illustrate the point. First, since its budget appears likely to run a large deficit this year, Moscow may need to turn to international lenders to shore up its fiscal position, especially if its stabilization funds and foreign currency reserves continue to be depleted at such a rapid clip. After having paid off virtually all its debts to other states and international financial institutions ahead of schedule in the first few years of this decade—a move intended both to prevent incoming oil and gas revenues from spurring inflation and to increase geopolitical freedom of maneuver—Russia could now once again turn to international markets and lenders for credits. According to the World Bank, Russia will be forced to do so if oil prices average below $30 per barrel for the year.13 Second, Russia’s stock market can only recover if foreign, and particularly Western, investors return.14 The massive expansion of Russia’s market over the course of the period from 1998 to mid-2008 was to a significant extent driven by Western investors. Many Russian firms held initial public offerings (IPOs) in London and New York, some listing directly on Western exchanges. After the “ring fence” that prevented foreigners from trading in its shares on the Russian market was lifted in December 2005 and the government consolidated its 51 percent stake, leaving the remainder to be purchased by private investors, Gazprom rapidly became one of the most desirable stocks in emerging markets. In May 2008, its market value peaked at $315 billion, making it the third-largest company by market capitalization in the world. In this period, Russia was viewed as one of the most attractive emerging markets. Portfolio foreign investment stood at $4.2 billion in 2007, a 31.8 percent increase from the previous year.15 Russia’s stock market expansion came despite such incidents as the “YUKOS affair,” the term used to refer to the events that began with the arrests of its parent company’s top shareholders, Platon Lebedev and Mikhail Khodorkovsky, in June and October 2003 respectively. At the time, YUKOS was Russia’s largest company and top oil producer. Since the arrests, the company has been gradually dismantled by the authorities and sold off to state-controlled enterprises. In a lawsuit filed in a U.S. court, American holders of YUKOS shares alleged that they lost $6 billion due to the wiping out of YUKOS’s share value and the nationalization of its assets.16 Relations between Russia and the West suffered, and the affair became a regular subject of discussion in high-level government-to-government meetings. Such economic and political uncertainty would usually scare off investors, but Russia was such an attractive market that the attack on YUKOS made little difference. After an initial dip, the RTS recovered in a matter of months. The economic circumstances that allowed the Russian government to interfere in the market with impunity are long gone. In the context of the current economic crisis and the bottoming out of the RTS at around 500 points (compared to its high of approximately 2,500 points in May 2008), Russia needs to attract foreign, and particularly Western, investors back to the market. Without a return of foreign capital, the Russian market is unlikely to recover in the medium term. Even if oil prices increase significantly, investors have little money to spend, and if Russia remains a risky investment they will be loath to spend it there. Third, Russian corporations and financial institutions need to refinance loans obtained from Western lenders. Russian firms obtained nearly $500 billion in private credits in the years of plenty leading up to the crisis.17 UBS estimates that around 40 percent of that went to the energy sector, mostly to Gazprom and Rosneft.18 Western lenders competed fiercely with one another to finance Russian companies’ rapid expansion, tempted by the impressive cash flows on their balance sheets. When the value of collateralized assets sank as investors fled the Russian stock market over the summer of 2008, Russian companies scrambled to make their (dollar-denominated) repayment schedules. Credit dried up fast and margin calls on 10 of the 25 wealthiest owners of large private companies forced even more asset sell-offs. As one brokerage house put it, “Russia has a solvency problem. Simply put, in August Moscow was flooded with international bankers competing to provide funding to Russian entities. By October, the only financiers visiting were those trying to get their money back.”19 In addition to cash shortage problems, Russian corporations will face difficulties refinancing as a result of the global credit crunch. Russian firms have about $100 billion in debt coming due in 2009, double the total owed by the governments and companies of Brazil, India, and China combined.20 So far, they have survived the initial wave of debt payments, in part thanks to a $50-billion government aid package specifically targeted for refinancing of foreign loans.21 Some analysts argue that Russia has weathered the worst of the corporate debt-repayment storm.22 However, debt transactions in Russia, which often involve off-shore entities, tend to be nontransparent; the $100-billion figure could be a vast underestimate. There is a significant probability that Russian firms will face serious difficulties repaying their debts. As Clifford Gaddy and Barry Ickes put it, “With no Western financial intermediation to roll over old corporate debts, Russia is itself in an acute crisis without any way out on its own.”23 Russia may well have few alternatives to Western lending sources if it wants to resolve its “solvency problem.” Fourth, as Russia’s leaders themselves have argued, the path out of the crisis depends to some degree on economic reform and, in the long term, diversification of the economy. President Dmitry Medvedev has repeatedly and publicly argued that “the only way to stabilize the economy and sustain growth...is through transparency, competition, accountability, and protection of property rights.”24 In a recent interview, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin maintained that the crisis will force the government to return to the reform agenda: “The global financial crisis is even helpful to us, since it makes us act in a more rational way. It makes us apply new technologies, like in energy saving. It makes us think of optimizing production and providing additional personnel training and re-training. All this makes us think about leaving this time of crisis as a more mature country with better prospects for development.”25 In other words, there are indications that the Russian leadership has recognized that a return to the structural reform agenda—largely neglected for the past five years—can be a key component of a recovery plan.26 While greater integration and economic cooperation with the West may not be necessary for Russia to push ahead with such reforms, closer ties can create conditions consistent with their implementation.
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Measures such as WTO membership will bring increased competition to the Russian market, force firms to restructure and produce higher-quality goods, and reinforce norms of transparency and protection of property rights. Increased Western foreign direct investment (FDI) can provide the know-how and technology transfer necessary for modernization and the resources to upgrade Russia’s aging infrastructure.27 In other words, economic integration is likely to facilitate reform. Further, as the government acknowledged in its recent strategic economic policy plan, deeper economic integration will be crucial for Russia to achieve optimal growth rates and diversify the sources of growth in the long term.28 In short, the crisis has created significant incentives for Russia to work with Western partners on economic issues; Russia may need the economic resources that Western investors, financial institutions, and trading partners can provide in order to facilitate its recovery from the crisis. As a result, there could well be a greater emphasis on economic cooperation as opposed to confrontation and assertive geopolitics in Russian foreign policy. Incentives clearly do not translate directly into policies; the key issue is whether the Russian leadership will react to the incentives or to their often conservative, anti-Western instincts. If the Russians respond to the incentives, they are likely to seek cooperation with the West on economic issues. This presents a valuable opportunity for the administration of President Barack Obama to expand the role of commercial ties in its broader strategy of engagement with Russia. Currently such ties are extremely weak. Despite significant increases following 1998, Russia accounted for only 1.1 percent of U.S. imports and 0.4 percent of U.S. exports in 2006. In the same year, the United States accounted for 3.1 percent of Russian exports and 4.4 percent of Russian imports.29 In 2007, trade turnover between the two countries totaled $27 billion, versus almost $387 billion between the United States and China.30 In 2007, U.S. FDI in Russia accounted for 5 percent of the total.31 These numbers are proportionally quite low. In terms of FDI, the 5 percent number should be four times as high if it were to reflect the proportion of U.S. FDI in the total global FDI stock.32 Despite this considerable potential to increase trade and investment, the economic aspect of U.S.- Russia policy has long been underemphasized in favor of such issues as arms control, nonproliferation, and counterterrorism. The Obama administration should respond to possible overtures from Moscow on economic cooperation and seek to strengthen commercial ties in the bilateral relationship. Even though arms control and other security issues will rightly remain the main priorities, there should be much more focus on economic measures than in the past. Policy Recommendations The following are suggestions for concrete steps that the administration can take to solidify the economic relationship with Moscow. First, the United States should continue to promote Russia’s integration into international economic institutions. By bringing Russia into structures such as the OECD and the WTO, the United States can foster rules-based international norms of economic behavior that can shape Russian policy and increase bilateral trade. Participation in these institutions carries with it obligations such as observance of international standards relating to rule of law, transparency, and property rights that are key to improving the investment climate and thus boosting bilateral commercial ties over the medium term. In the U.S.-Russia Strategic Framework Declaration (the so-called Sochi Declaration) signed by Presidents George W. Bush and Vladimir Putin in April 2008, the United States pledged to push for WTO accession and OECD membership.33 However, these efforts were derailed by the August war in Georgia, when most bilateral initiatives were shelved. Subsequently Russia reversed itself on several obligations it had taken on in bilateral WTO negotiations, by, for example, increasing quotas on chicken imports. Recently its top WTO negotiator issued an ultimatum stating that Russia would no longer observe any such obligations if it does not become a member of the organization by 2010.34 Despite these setbacks, Prime Minister Putin still maintains that WTO membership is a priority and seeks to push forward with it “on standard and acceptable terms.”35 He singled out the United States as the key actor in furthering WTO accession: “Joining the WTO is still on our agenda. We will continue talks with our American partners, and we hope they will support Russia in joining the WTO.”36 Although the two countries took a major step forward in November 2006 when they signed a bilateral agreement for Russia’s accession to the WTO, the United States still must play a role as an advocate for Russian membership in the organization, both publicly and in the multilateral negotiating process. Despite the recent hiccups, relatively few technical issues remain in the multilateral negotiations. It appears that the main impediment to moving forward is Georgia, which in 2006 pulled out of a bilateral agreement on WTO accession it had previously signed with Russia. Given the current climate of relations between the two countries, there is little chance that such an agreement can be worked out without intervention from the United States and other Western nations. Although Russia’s actions in Georgia and its recognition of South Ossetia and Abkhazia should not be excused, the United States, together with European allies, should work with Georgia and Russia to help the two sides overcome the present stalemate. Second, the United States should graduate Russia from the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 and grant it permanent normal trade relations (PNTR). The amendment is an anachronistic Cold War relic that no longer serves any purpose other than to antagonize the Russians.37 It forces the executive to certify annually to Congress that there are no restrictions on freedom-of-emigration from Russia in order to grant Moscow most-favored-nation status.38 The original intention was to compel the Soviet Union to lift limits on the emigration of minority groups, in particular Jews.39 Today, Russia imposes no such limits. Several other post-Soviet countries—Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia—have already been graduated from the amendment’s provisions. Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush both promised to graduate Russia from the Jackson- Vanik Amendment but did not follow through on their pledges. Repealing Jackson-Vanik would send a clear message that the United States is serious about strengthening commercial ties between the two countries and would create general goodwill by removing an irritant in the relationship. For U.S. companies, PNTR would add stability to the investment environment. The Obama administration should encourage congressional leaders to reintroduce relevant legislation and should publicly push for its passage.
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Russian economic deterioration leads terrorism and nuclear conflict resulting in extinction.

Filger 9 [Sheldon, an American-Canadian writer, is the author of GLOBAL ECONOMIC FORECAST 2010-2015: RECESSION INTO DEPRESSION. Sheldon Filger's other books and articles involve subjects such as politics, economics, and nuclear terrorism, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” May 10, 2009, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html]

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

# Turns global warming

**Russian cooperation is key to solve global warming**

**The Atlantic** 200**8** (November, Medvedev Spoils the Party, http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/ 200811u/medvedev-obama)

Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation. Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust. Given its influence in Iran and North Korea, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government. The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.” Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about resource depletion, environmental degradation, and global warming – the greatest challenges facing humanity. No country can confront these problems alone. For the United States, Russia may just prove the “indispensable nation” with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.
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Only scenario for extinction

Nick **Bostrom**, 200**2**. Professor of Philosophy and Global Studies at Yale. "Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards," 38, www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html.

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization. Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.
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Capital key

Needham, 3/18

(Columnist-The Hill, “Tensions over Syria could slow efforts to normalize Russia, U.S. trade relations,” http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/216549-tensions-over-syria-could-slow-legislation-to-normalize-russia-us-trade-relations)

"In the context of considering extending PNTR, it is the time to have a plan for tackling these other issues and to make sure that we are aligned in between the Congress and the administration," Alan Larson, chairman of the board, Transparency International USA, said during the Senate Finance hearing. U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul conceded earlier this week that the Obama administration needs to ramp up its outreach to Congress to get the trade bill through by summer.

Political capital’s key to get it through congress

Stokes 11 [Bruce, international economics journalist, “An Agenda, If You Can Keep It” National Journal -- January 26 -- http://www2.nationaljournal.com/member/daily/balance-of-payments]

After years of relative quiescence, Congress actually has a trade agenda in 2011: possible votes on the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, and on Russia’s application to join the World Trade Organization. Whether, when, how, and which elements of this agenda will be completed will largely depend on political calculations in the White House and on Capitol Hill. “The first question,” observed William Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, “is, how many of these fights does the administration want to have?” At the top of the list will be the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, which President Obama made his own by arm-wrestling the South Koreans for fixes to benefit the American auto industry. Now, that it has the support of Ford and the United Auto Workers, most observers agree that the deal with South Korea has sufficient votes for passage. And Obama has said he wants Congress to act on it by June. But the business community also wants action on the Colombia and Panama agreements negotiated by the George W. Bush administration. “From our perspective,” said Calman Cohen, president of the Emergency Committee for American Trade, “they are like three children. We want them all to go forward.” Congressional GOP leaders agree. “I strongly believe that we should consider all three agreements in the next six months,” House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., said at a trade hearing this week. Objections to the Panama accord, based on tax and labor issues, seem to pose no major obstacles. Organized labor continues to highlight the murders of union organizers in Colombia and other labor-rights abuses there, but Ways and Means ranking member Sander Levin, D-Mich., a longtime critic of Colombia’s record on these issues, suggested in testimony this week that some accommodation might be possible. “I believe there is now an opportunity for the two governments to work together mutually to achieve real progress on the ground,” he said. Republican leaders in Congress have talked of voting on all three trade deals, possibly one right after the other, to facilitate the legislative calendar and, the administration suspects, to aggravate divisions among Democrats. Parliamentarians, meanwhile, will have to decide if fast-track negotiating authority still applies to the Colombia agreement. Because Congress failed to act on it when it was first submitted, the fast-track authority for the deal expired. This is not a problem in the House, where Republicans control the Rules Committee, but it is in the Senate, where fast-track is needed to facilitate a vote. Business lobbyists think that the Korea deal could move by itself before the August recess but that doing all three together will take considerably more time, contrary to Camp’s ambitions. Members of the business community are less sanguine about legislation blessing Russia’s application to join the WTO, where membership can be held up by any current member. Georgia has yet to give its assent to Russia’s application, which might make the need for U.S. action moot. To give Moscow the green light, Congress would have to accord Russia most-favored-nation trading status, thus granting it the lowest possible U.S. tariffs. That, in turn, requires waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 trade act, effectively acknowledging that emigration from Russia is no longer a U.S. concern. Although Washington has no complaints about Russian emigration policy, Jackson-Vanik has long been seen as useful leverage over Moscow that many in Congress may be loath to relinquish. Capitol Hill staffers warn that passage of Russian WTO membership will be an uphill fight. Moscow has few champions in Congress, where Senate debate late last year over the New START deal demonstrated deep-seated suspicion among conservatives. Russia’s piracy of intellectual property and its past use of health and safety standards to bar the importation of U.S. poultry have also soured business interests. Buyers’ remorse over China’s admission to the WTO fuels congressional reluctance to make the same mistake twice. And Moscow’s past history of quixotic actions—cutting off gas to Ukraine, for example—makes advocates of WTO membership wary of going out on a limb only to have Moscow cut it off. Moscow is anxious to join the WTO, however, and membership is a key element in the administration’s “reset” of U.S.-Russia relations. Moreover, a Russia that is subject to international rules and dispute settlement might be better than a Russia operating outside the law. Ever since the financial crisis began in 2008, Russia has been one of the most frequent instigators of protectionist trade practices. WTO membership could help discipline such behavior. Veterans of past trade battles on Capitol Hill advise that the administration might have to give Congress something to vote for—some new oversight or restraint—to ease the pain of voting to waive Jackson-Vanik. When China was granted admission to the WTO, for example, Congress created a commission to report on Beijing’s human-rights record. After two years of relegating divisive trade issues to the back burner, in 2011 the administration now has a legislative trade agenda. The question is how much political capital it is willing to invest to get it through Congress. The White House can anticipate hand-to-hand combat in budget negotiations with Republicans over discretionary spending. Such conflict will unavoidably preoccupy administration strategists, who may want to husband their resources for more electorally attractive issues. Congress could accomplish a fair amount on trade this year, but doing so could be an uphill slog.

Obama will have to convince congress

**NYT 11** [“Russia, in From the Cold” November 12 -- http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/13/opinion/sunday/russia-in-from-the-cold.html]

The agreement reached Thursday is widely expected to be approved at a meeting of the W.T.O.’s entire membership in Geneva next month. But for the United States to enjoy normal trade relations with Russia after it joins the trade organization, Congress must exempt Russia from the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, which limits trade with countries that restrict emigration. President Obama has said that he would work with Congress to end the application of that law to Russia. Some lawmakers remain skeptical. On Thursday, some members of Congress sent a letter to Ron Kirk, the United States trade representative, expressing “significant concerns” about whether Russia would respect American intellectual property rights. In supporting the Russian deal, Mr. Obama will have to convince lawmakers that American interests — including its intellectual property rights — will be better protected with Russia inside the W.T.O. than if it remains outside.

# At pc irrelevant

Empirical studies and expert consensus proves political capital is key to the agenda

Wang 10 ( Yuhua Wang Department of Political Science University of Michigan, he is also a member of the Wo Wang Clan, a group of poli sci profs who are also ill rappers. “Congressional Weakness, Political Capital, and the Politics of Presidential Agency Design” <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/wangyh/files/presidential_agency_design_yuhua_wang.pdf>)

Presidents’ popularity with the public is a resource that may influence members of Congress (Neustadt 1960). Some recent studies have noticed the “political capital” the president possesses (Light 1999; Johnson and Roberts 2005). Several scholars demonstrate that popular presidents are able to win more often in Congress (Brace and Hinckley 1992; Edwards and Wood 1999;Ostrom and Simon 1985; Rivers and Rose 1985). Krutz, Fleisher, and Bond (1998) argue that, “Washingtonians widely accept the view that Congress is more inclined to give presidents what they want when public support is high rather than low” (873). For Light, presidents’ strength includes their public approval ratings and their margin of victory in the most recent election (Light 1999: 32). When these factors increase, presidents gain political capital and are therefore more likely to garner Congressional support for their domestic agenda in Congress. Although some studies identify methodological and theoretical reasons to question the importance of presidential capital (Bond and Fleisher 1990; Collier and Sullivan 1995), it is worthwhile to test this in models of agency design. This paper predicts that when Congress is strong and united, “weak” presidents enjoy less discretion creating agencies by executive orders; in contrast, popular presidents are not constrained by Congress in agency design1.

# At winners win

Overreaching will spark backlash from GOP- guts winners win

Politico 12 [“RNC hopefuls predict Obama backlash”, 1/5]

The candidates vying to lead the Republican National Committee predicted at a Monday debate that the Obama administration would outspend its political capital and spark a ballot box backlash. “I think they’re going to give us the gift of an overreaching, overpowering government that will limit our freedom,” South Carolina Republican Party Chair Katon Dawson said, arguing that Obama’s agenda would amount to “overpromising and building up bigger government.” Saul Anuzis, who chairs the Michigan GOP, agreed that Obama’s agenda would open up political opportunities for Republicans.

Obama capital finite, spending it now without positive returns

WSJ 9 [The Wall Street Journal 3/3 “The Obama Economy”]

As 2009 opened, three weeks before Barack Obama took office, the Dow Jones Industrial Average closed at 9034 on January 2, its highest level since the autumn panic. Yesterday the Dow fell another 4.24% to 6763, for an overall decline of 25% in two months and to its lowest level since 1997. The dismaying message here is that President Obama's policies have become part of the economy's problem. Americans have welcomed the Obama era in the same spirit of hope the President campaigned on. But after five weeks in office, it's become clear that Mr. Obama's policies are slowing, if not stopping, what would otherwise be the normal process of economic recovery. From punishing business to squandering scarce national public resources, Team Obama is creating more uncertainty and less confidence -- and thus a longer period of recession or subpar growth. The Democrats who now run Washington don't want to hear this, because they benefit from blaming all bad economic news on President Bush. And Mr. Obama has inherited an unusual recession deepened by credit problems, both of which will take time to climb out of. But it's also true that the economy has fallen far enough, and long enough, that much of the excess that led to recession is being worked off. Already 15 months old, the current recession will soon match the average length -- and average job loss -- of the last three postwar downturns. What goes down will come up -- unless destructive policies interfere with the sources of potential recovery. And those sources have been forming for some time. The prices of oil and other commodities have fallen by two-thirds since their 2008 summer peak, which has the effect of a major tax cut. The world is awash in liquidity, thanks to monetary ease by the Federal Reserve and other central banks. Monetary policy operates with a lag, but last year's easing will eventually stir economic activity. Housing prices have fallen 27% from their Case-Shiller peak, or some two-thirds of the way back to their historical trend. While still high, credit spreads are far from their peaks during the panic, and corporate borrowers are again able to tap the credit markets. As equities were signaling with their late 2008 rally and January top, growth should under normal circumstances begin to appear in the second half of this year. So what has happened in the last two months? The economy has received no great new outside shock. Exchange rates and other prices have been stable, and there are no security crises of note. The reality of a sharp recession has been known and built into stock prices since last year's fourth quarter. What is new is the unveiling of Mr. Obama's agenda and his approach to governance. Every new President has a finite stock of capital -- financial and political -- to deploy, and amid recession Mr. Obama has more than most. But one negative revelation has been the way he has chosen to spend his scarce resources on income transfers rather than growth promotion. Most of his "stimulus" spending was devoted to social programs, rather than public works, and nearly all of the tax cuts were devoted to income maintenance rather than to improving incentives to work or invest.

Empirically winners win doesn’t apply to Obama

Galston 10 (William,11-4, Senior Fellow, Governance Studies, Brookings, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties” Brookings Institute)

Second, the administration believed that success would breed success—that the momentum from one legislative victory would spill over into the next.  The reverse was closer to the truth: with each difficult vote, it became harder to persuade Democrats from swing districts and states to cast the next one.  In the event, House members who feared that they would pay a heavy price if they supported cap-and-trade legislation turned out to have a better grasp of political fundamentals than did administration strategists.

Capital can only deflate for Obama-prefer our ev quotes Paul Light

**The Hill 09** (7-27, “Analysis: July has been disaster for Obama, Hill Dems”, <http://img.thehill.com/homenews/administration/52107-analysis-july-has-been-disaster-for-obama-hill-dems>.)

Paul Light, an expert on the presidency and a professor at New York University, said the president's problems with Capitol Hill reflect "a miscalculation by the Obama administration on how political capital gets spent in Washington." Light said that capital, even for a president who enjoys immense personal popular support like Obama, is spent a bit at a time on each initiative or piece of legislation. "I think the Obama administration has been spending political capital at roughly the same rate the federal government spends money," Light said. "Eventually, it runs out." Light quoted President Lyndon Johnson, who said that "if you don't get it done in six months, you're not going to get it done." One of the reasons Obama has spent so much capital, aside from his ambitious agenda, has been his willingness to cede so much control to Congress, Light said While lawmakers like Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) are allies of the president, his political capital is not necessarily a priority of theirs. To that end, Light says, Obama has made a mistake in making Pelosi his "broker," spending his political capital but not always to his benefit.

# At magnitsky

**No impact**

**The Voice of Russia 6/7** [Russian news source, “American business opposes “Magnitsky bill””, 2012, http://english.ruvr.ru/2012\_06\_07/77434136/]

Sergei Lavrov has recently said that attempts to replace the Jackson-Vanik amendment with a new anti-Russian law are completely unacceptable for Moscow. Commenting on the situation an expert in American studies Valery Garbuzov said: “This will spoil the general tone of the Russian-American relations. Nevertheless, the adoption of such a bill will hardly derail Russian-American relations or affect the economy. Moreover, as a measure of retaliation, the Russian Foreign Ministry might approve a similar list”.

**Obama’s not spending PC on it**

**Bloomberg News 6/7** [“U.S. Won’t Oppose Russia Sanctions That Risk Putin Reprisal”, 2012]

The U.S. administration will no longer seek to prevent Congress from passing a bill targeting human-rights offenders in Russia, a step that President Vladimir Putin has warned would spark retaliation and damage ties. The House Foreign Affairs Committee today approved by voice vote legislation that would impose U.S. travel and financial curbs on any official abusing human rights in Russia, including 60 people suspected of involvement in the death of anti- corruption lawyer Sergei Magnitsky in a Moscow jail in 2009. Congress will vote on the measure at a later date. “You’d be hard pressed to find anyone who would bet against Congress expressing their concerns on the Magnitsky matter in some way,” U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said today in Moscow. “It’s important to work with Congress on an appropriate mandatory response to that.”

Magnitsky is key to sustainable relations with the Russian people- just repealing Jackson-Vanik embraces the current regime instead of the next one

Kramer 3-21 (David, Freedom House president, former assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights and labor, former Clark University Russian Studies lecturer, former Carnegie Endowment Russia Program associate director, former CSIS Russian Studies assistant director, "Situation in Russia," CQ Congressional Testimony, 3-21-12, l/n, accessed 3-23-12,)

Finally, the Magnitsky legislation has been connected with the recent debate and discussion about graduating Russia from the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. I have supported graduating Russia from the 1974 Jackson-Vanik for years, both when I was in the U.S. government and today. It served its purpose very well in promoting the emigration of Soviet Jews at the time, but it is legislation that no longer addresses current-day problems in Russia. I understand and agree with the arguments made by those in the business community who argue that not lifting Jackson- Vanik would hurt our companies. But I am not prepared to support graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik in the absence of passing the Magnitsky legislation. It would send a terrible signal to lift Jackson-Vanik and have nothing to take its place. It would be perceived by the Kremlin as weakness on our part, a symbolic award to a Russian government undeserving of any such measures, and would undermine the very people in Russia whom we want to support. In an op-ed in the March 14 Wall Street Journal, liberal opposition leaders Gary Kasparov and Boris Nemtsov made this very point. "Jackson-Vanik is a relic and its time has passed," they wrote. "But allowing it to disappear with nothing in its place, and right on the heels of the fantastically corrupt "election" of March 4, turns it into little more than a gift to Mr. Putin." They went on to say, "Replacing Jackson-Vanik with [the Magnitsky legislation] would promote better relations between the people of the U.S. and Russia while refusing to provide aid and comfort to a tyrant and his regime at this critical moment in history. This, too, would be a policy of principle." Contrary to some views expressed before a hearing of the Senate Finance Committee March 15, neither graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik nor granting Russia permanent normal trade relations status would improve the human rights situation inside Russia. China, which was graduated from Jackson-Vanik a decade ago, illustrates the limits of graduating a country; since Congress acted on China, there has been no improvement in the area of human rights in that country. Thus, we should have no illusions about the impact lifting Jackson-Vanik would have in the case of Russia. It may be the right thing to do now but only if it is replaced by the Magnitsky bill.

# At low relations inevitable

**Bilateral cooperation is increasing now – Jackson-vanik will determine relations**

**Russia Today 5/29** [Russian News Source, “Putin, Obama plan powwow during G20 summit”, 2012]

President Vladimir Putin and United States President Barack Obama will hold a full-scale meeting on the sidelines of the G20 summit. "The Russian and US presidents are scheduled to meet in Los Cabos (Mexico) as part of the G20 summit,” Russian Presidential Aide Yury Ushakov told reporters on Tuesday. “It was agreed that it will be a full-scale meeting, with even some important documents to be adopted.” The G20 will be held in Los Cabos, Baja California Sur, from June 18-19. Ushakov hinted at the possibility of the two leaders issuing a “joint presidential statement on further cooperation between our countries." The meeting announcement should dispel rumors of a bilateral rift between the two nations that began when Putin canceled his attendance at NATO’s Chicago summit earlier this month, followed soon after by a similar announcement by the American leader. Obama will not be able to attend the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in Vladivostok in September as it will be held concurrently with the US Democratic Party Convention. Americans will head to the polls on November 4 to vote on whether or not to give Obama another four years in the White House. Concerning the nuts and bolts substance of the meeting, the Russian president has expressed his readiness to pay more attention to the US-Russian Bilateral Presidential Commission, which has 20 working groups, Ushakov said. The presidential aide revealed that the number of bilateral working groups is set to increase. "Currently, two more groups are about to be formed: on military technical cooperation, which in the old days was out of the question, and on cyber security," he said. "[Putin] is determined to actively pursue a stable, smooth, constructive relationship" with our US partners, he said. "It is important that the same determination is shared by the White House." Ushakov said Moscow does not want to lose the “positivity” achieved between former President Dmitry Medvedev and Obama in recent years. “We understand that the atmosphere has become more favorable, and we want to further build our cooperation in the same fashion," he said. Putin has said on several occasions that the priority in the US-Russian relationship is to broaden trade and investment relations, the aide added. "The more solid the bilateral economic foundation, the stronger 'the safety net' for the entire structure of bilateral relations,” Ushakov said. “It could protect them against shifts in the political situation particularly noticeable in pre-election periods." Meanwhile, Ushakov said there has also been a positive trend in joint efforts in Afghanistan. "We have good cooperation developing on Afghanistan: about 2,400 US flights have been carried out since September 2009, transporting over 250,000 troops and more than 52,000 tonnes of cargo. Thirty-eight thousand NATO containers went on our railways and so on," the aide said. Despite the high optimism, however, there are some ominous clouds on the horizon that could dampen the relationship. For example, if the United States adopts a new anti-Russian law, Moscow would be forced to take retaliatory measures, warned Ushakov. "If the new anti-Russian law (Magnitsky Act) is passed…this law should be met with a tit-for-tat response," the Kremlin official told reporters. US Congress has drafted a bill that would place sanctions against the persons allegedly responsible for the death of lawyer Sergey Magnitsky. The initiator of the bill, entitled "Sergey Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act," is Democratic Senator Benjamin Cardin. Ushakov also expressed the hope that the US “anti-Soviet [Jackson-Vanik] amendment does not turn into an anti-Russian law."

# \*\*AFF ANSWERS\*\*
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**Case solves the impact – even if US-Russian relations collapse, US military strength deters Russia from starting a war**

**1. Wont pass – Republicans will block**

**AP 6/12** [“US bill for normal trade with Russia opposed”, 2012]

A Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia drew immediate resistance from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, a Democrat, on Tuesday introduced bipartisan legislation to normalize trade relations with Russia by repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik act that tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's allowing Jews and other minorities to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy the lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets that will become available when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. Supporters of normalized trade said it could lead to a doubling of U.S. exports to Russia. "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs," Baucus said in a statement. Baucus was joined in sponsoring the bill by Senate Foriegn Relations Committee chairman John Kerry, a Democrat andRepublicans John McCain and John Thune. But eight Finance Committee Republicans, led by ranking Republican Orrin Hatch, wrote a letter to Baucus saying that Congress cannot ignore current issues with Russia in moving to normalize trade relations. "Many aspects of the U.S.-Russia relationship are troubling," they said, naming the "flawed election and illegitimate regime of Vladimir Putin," the suppression of public protests, Russia's support for the Syrian government and its threats to attack U.S.-led NATO missile defense sites in Eastern Europe. The letter also raised Russia's theft of U.S. intellectual property and its pervasive problems with bribery and corruption and questioned whether Russia would comply if the WTO handed down adverse rulings on its economic policies. House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Republican, responding Tuesday to reports that Russia was selling attack helicopters to Syria, said the administration's "string of concessions to Moscow must stop, including the latest effort to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment to give Russia preferential trade benefits."

2. US-Russia strategic tensions inevitable

Steven **Pifer 3-21**, Senior Fellow at Brookings, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship”, <http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321_arms_control_pifer.aspx>

U.S. and Russian interests differ in the post-Soviet space, the region that is most likely to generate a major crisis in bilateral relations. Moscow seeks to gain influence over its neighbors, using mechanisms such as the Customs Union with Kazakhstan and Belarus. The Russians seek deference from other states in the post-Soviet space on issues that they define as affecting critical Russian interests. One example is staunch Russian opposition to the enlargement of NATO or the European Union into the post-Soviet space. Russian policies often seem to have the effect of pushing neighboring states away from Moscow, but the Russians have not changed course. The United States takes a different approach, rejecting the notion of a sphere of influence and supporting the right of each post-Soviet state to choose its own course. Some tension between the two approaches is inevitable. Washington should expect the kinds of tit-for-tat exchanges that have occurred in the past, such as when a U.S. Navy ship visit to Georgia was followed by a Russian warship calling on Venezuela. Given the difference in approaches, it would be wise for Washington and Moscow to consult closely and be transparent with one another on their policies in the post-Soviet space, so as to avoid surprises and minimize the chances that a clash of interests could escalate. One other difficult issue is the democracy and human rights situation within Russia. While Russian citizens today enjoy considerably more individual freedoms than they did during the time of the Soviet Union, it is equally true that they enjoy fewer freedoms, are more subject to arbitrary and capricious state action, and have less political influence than during the 1990s, however chaotic that period was.

3. Winners Win

Singer 09 (Jonathan, senior writer for the popular progressive blog MyDD, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital”, March 3, p. <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.
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**4. Infrastructure projects INCREASE political capital**

**Garrett 11** [Sierra, Honors degree in Economics from FSU, “Florida High-Speed Rail: An Economic Policy Analysis”, April 1]

Infrastructure projects are also important to politicians as political capital. As John Bartle writes about transportation infrastructure, a completed project is “a classic political photo opportunity and a tangible symbol politicians can point to of their work on behalf of their constituents.” 51 If the project is presented by a local official, but paid for by the federal government instead of the state, the deal seems even sweeter. Plus, local industry, from engineers to bankers and construction workers are employed, lending even more support to the incumbent politician. The increase in these types of projects may even create the need for specialized attorneys and investment professionals to work specifically with the financial instruments and tax codes created for these projects. The resulting political capital from transportation projects can also be focused for specific areas or groups of constituents. The location of the project and its related economic stimulus can bring greater support to a politician even if the money used for the project may have been equally or more beneficial if spent somewhere else. Infrastructure projects are also used nominally to aid low-income areas or groups of people, under the premise that development and investment will spur economic growth. Economists such as Bartle, however, believe direct subsidy to these individuals (rather than in the form of capital investment) is more effective and efficient.

5. No US-Russia war

Graham 7 [Thomas Graham, senior advisor on Russia in the US National Security Council staff 2002-2007, September 2007, Russia in Global Affairs “The Dialectics of Strength and Weakness”]

 An astute historian of Russia, Martin Malia, wrote several years ago that “Russia has at different times been demonized or divinized by Western opinion less because of her real role in Europe than because of the fears and frustrations, or hopes and aspirations, generated within European society by its own domestic problems.” Such is the case today. To be sure, mounting Western concerns about Russia are a consequence of Russian policies that appear to undermine Western interests, but they are also a reflection of declining confidence in our own abilities and the efficacy of our own policies. Ironically, this growing fear and distrust of Russia come at a time when Russia is arguably less threatening to the West, and the United States in particular, than it has been at any time since the end of the Second World War. Russia does not champion a totalitarian ideology intent on our destruction, its military poses no threat to sweep across Europe, its economic growth depends on constructive commercial relations with Europe, and its strategic arsenal – while still capable of annihilating the United States – is under more reliable control than it has been in the past fifteen years and the threat of a strategic strike approaches zero probability. Political gridlock in key Western countries, however, precludes the creativity, risk-taking, and subtlety needed to advance our interests on issues over which we are at odds with Russia while laying the basis for more constructive long-term relations with Russia. 7. To rebuild relations, we need to focus on common interests, but we can’t ignore values. To a great extent, this is already happening in U.S.-Russian relations. Because of an overlap in interests, the two countries are working together effectively on a number of nuclear security, counterterrorism, and non-proliferation issues, including Iran and North Korea. But we cannot avoid the issue of values, because they shape the way we think about our interests and are critical to the trust needed to deal with sensitive issues, even when outside observers would posit a common interest.

**6. A] The Magnitsky bill will pass now and Obama’s spending PC on it**

**WSJ 6/7** [“Magnitsky Moves”, 2012]

Two years after its introduction, a Russian human-rights bill is now moving toward adoption. The Kremlin detests and the Obama administration opposes the so-called Magnitsky Act, but political winds are against them. The House Foreign Affairs Committee on Thursday marked it up, becoming the first congressional panel to move on the bill. The full House is expected to pass it easily. A bigger test looms in the Senate. Sen. Ben Cardin, a Maryland Democrat, has pushed this legislation to sanction Russian officials implicated in human-rights abuses. His bill freezes the assets and bans from travel to the U.S. Russian judicial officials involved in the 2009 death of Sergei Magnitsky, a lawyer for the investment house Hermitage Capital. Magnitsky uncovered evidence of police corruption and embezzlement; he was jailed and died in prison at the age of 37. From the start, the Obama administration tried to scuttle or water down the measure. At White House behest, Sen. John Kerry has kept it off the Senate Foreign Relations Committee calendar—most recently so as not to spoil the mood ahead of Russian President Vladimir Putin's May visit to the U.S. (In the end, Mr. Putin cancelled the trip, in what came off like a calculated snub to the administration.) Sen. Cardin was pressed to weaken the legislation by narrowing the list of people who would be impacted by the sanctions. He has told aides this spring that he plans to stick firm to keep bipartisan support. The latest Senate draft that he circulated last night continues to give Congress authority to add any Russian rights abusers to the black list in the future.

B] That kills relations

**WP 6/5** [Washington Post, “U.S. business groups warn against Russia sanctions bill”, 2012]

A bill to punish Russian officials for alleged human rights abuses would badly damage U.S.-Russian ties and hurt U.S. exports, business groups said Tuesday, two days before a key congressional panel is expected to vote on the measure. The bill would require the United States to deny visas to and freeze the assets of Russians linked to the detention and death of Sergei Magnitsky, an anti-graft lawyer who died in a Russian jail in 2009 under suspicious circumstances. The legislation is expected to win approval Thursday in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, clearing the way for the full House to take up the measure. Bill Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, whose members include major U.S. exporters such as Boeing, Microsoft and Caterpillar, told reporters Tuesday that the Magnitsky legislation was “seriously flawed.” He said the bill would make it even more difficult to get Russia’s cooperation on a range of issues, including Iran’s nuclear ambitions and Syria’s crackdown on dissent. U.S. companies also fear that they will lose sales because Moscow will retaliate by turning to other suppliers, Reinsch said. The issue is coming to a head because the White House wants Congress to establish “permanent normal trade relations” with Russia by lifting a Cold War-era human rights provision known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment.
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7. No spillover between issues- other factors outweigh political capital.

Edwards 03(George C., Distinguished Professor ofPolitical Science at Texas A&M, former Director of the Center for Presidential Studies, Riding High in the Polls: George W. Bush and Public Opinion, <http://www-polisci.tamu.edu/MyDocuments/web/Edwards/Papers%20PDF/work_papers/SP01LegislativeImpact.pdf>)

 One of the perennial questions about presidential-congressional relations is the impact of the president’s public approval on the support he received in Congress. Did George W. Bush’s extraordinarily high approval ratings following the terrorist attacks provide him a significant political resources in his attempts to obtain congressional support for his policies? Did the patriotic response to the attacks help him to mobilize the public on behalf of his programs? Bush certainly seemed aware of the potential advantages of public support – as well as its ephemeral nature. As the president put it, “It is important to move as quickly as you can in order to spend whatever capital you have as quickly as possible.”43 Where the public supported his policies – on fighting the war on terrorism abroad, on investigating and prosecuting terrorism at home, and in reorganizing the government to enhance domestic security – the president ultimately won most of what he sought. Even on security issues, however, the going was not always easy. He lost on the issue of privatizing airport security workers, although Congress considered the bill in the immediate aftermath of the September 11 attacks. The president also faced a protracted battle over the new Department of Homeland Security when his proposal for additional flexibility in personnel policy in the department infuriated labor unions, a core Democratic constituency. Passing legislation was even more difficult on the divisive domestic issues that remained on Congress’s agenda, including health care, environmental protection, energy, the economy, the faith-based initiative, corporate malfeasance, judicial nominees, and taxes. The politics of the war on terrorism did not fundamentally alter the consideration of these issues, which continued to divide the public and their representatives in Congress as they had before. The inevitable differences between the parties emerged predictably, exacerbated by the narrow majorities in each chamber and the jockeying for advantage in the midterm elections. Bipartisanship in one arena (the war on terrorism) does not necessarily carry over in another. As the parties in Congress have become more homogeneous over time and as the number of competitive seats has shrunk, especially in the House, the differences between the parties have increased. The opposition party is not very fertile ground for presidents on most issues – even during wartime. Thus, the president failed to obtain many of his priority items in 2002, including making the 2001 tax cuts permanent and passing his fiscal stimulus program, a robust faith-based initiative, and drilling rights in the Artic National Wildlife Reserve. No progress was made on partially privatizing Social Security, banning cloning and certain kinds of abortion, and passing private-school tax credits, and the president experienced plenty of frustration on obtaining confirmation of his judicial appointees. He also had to sign a farm bill that was much more costly than he wanted. In December 2001, the president concluded quiet negotiations with the Democrats led by Senator Edward Kennedy and signed a bill on education reform. The president was able to claim a victory on one of his priority issues, even though he had to give up many of the most controversial elements of his original proposal. It is significant that to accomplish even this much, the president chose to stay private rather than go public. The modest impact of Bush’s approval is not surprising. The president’s public support must compete for influence with other, more stable factors that affect voting in Congress, including ideology, party, personal views and commitments on specific policies, and constituency interests. Although constituency interests may seem to overlap with presidential approval, they should be viewed as distinct. It is quite possible for constituents to approve of the president but oppose him on particular policies, and it is opinions on these policies that will ring most loudly in congressional ears. Members of Congress are unlikely to vote against the clear interests of their constituents or the firm tenets of their ideology solely in deference to a widely supported chief executive.44

# ext nonunique

**Wont pass – human rights concerns**

**Kansas City Star 6/8** [“Trade puts U.S.-Russian relations at turning point”, 2012]

The problem for some U.S. lawmakers is that granting Russia normalized trade relations rewards its authoritarian leader, Vladimir Putin. The Obama administration has tried to reset relations with Russia, but Putin’s return to power, anti-American rhetoric and treatment of dissidents has upset human rights advocates. “Putin clearly has complicated things, and … human rights are not fully respected. That is quite evident, and of course Russia is not a democracy. It’s a relatively mild authoritarian state,” said Anders Aslund, a senior researcher and Russia expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington. Russia is one of the four pillars in what economists call the BRIC nations – large developing economies that increasingly account for a greater share of the global economy. The other BRIC nations are Brazil, India and China. While two-way trade with China and Brazil continues to grow, U.S. trade with Russia – which ranks between 10th and 12th globally in economic size – is surprisingly minuscule. Russia is not in the top 30 markets for U.S. exports, and last year it was the United States’ 14th biggest source of imports, behind India and ahead of Brazil. This suggests there’s more at stake for U.S. businesses in the fight. “Our assessment is U.S. exports to Russia could double within five years of WTO accession,” said Aslund. “It is ridiculously small now.” U.S. exports of goods and services to Russia was about $11 billion in 2011, he said, but could double to $22 billion by 2017 if Russia joins the WTO and the United States normalizes trade relations. Failure to grant normalized relations would allow Russia to restrict U.S. exports. Here, Russia is still subject to U.S. trade restrictions dating back to 1974, the Jackson-Vanick Amendment. Although it’s waived annually in order to allow two-way trade, it remains on the books and a big irritant. It would disappear if Congress passed legislation granting Russia normalized trade status. However, in a sign that Congress may not be ready to decouple trade and human rights, the House Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday unanimously passed a bill to punish human rights abusers in Russia.

**WSJ 6/12** [Wall Street Journal, “Senators Seek to Ease Russian Trade”, 2012]

WASHINGTON—A bipartisan group of senators launched an effort to lift long-standing restrictions on trade with Russia, beginning a political fight that could inflame tensions with Moscow over its human-rights record and support for the Syrian government. The senators on Tuesday introduced a bill aimed at approving permanent, normal trade relations before the August recess, in a bid to ease the path for U.S. corporations to operate in Russia after the country enters the World Trade Organization in the coming weeks. But criticism of Russia by some lawmakers could impede passage. Sen. Richard Durbin (D., Ill.), the assistant majority leader, said it would be tough to fit the bill into the agenda. He added that any debate on legislation affecting U.S.-Russia relations would likely touch on Moscow's support of Syria's Assad regime, which the Obama administration says must step down. Efforts to get the bill enacted also won't be easy in an election year. Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney recently called Russia "our No. 1 geopolitical foe."

# ext Tensions inevitable

**Low Russian relations are inevitable**

**Kagan 6/6** [Robert, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and he writes all that heg stuff, “A bill that cracks down on Russian corruption”, 2012]

Russian authorities have warned Washington that their government’s participation in President Obama’s “reset” of relations will end if Congress passes the Magnitsky legislation. Right now, it is not clear how committed Moscow is to the reset, with or without Magnitsky. President Vladimir Putin’s decision to skip last month’s Group of 8 summit at Camp David; the recent threat by Gen. Nikolai Makarov, Putin’s armed forces chief of staff, to launch a preemptive strike against NATO over an ongoing missile defense dispute; and the continuing harassment of U.S. Ambassador Mike McFaul, the author of the reset, all raise some doubts.

BUT—Any disputes will be minor and squo relations solve the impact

Steven **Pifer 3-21**, Senior Fellow at Brookings, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship”, <http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321_arms_control_pifer.aspx>

By any objective measure, the U.S.-Russian relationship is stronger today than it was in 2008. Then, sharp differences over the future of strategic arms limitations, missile defense in Europe, NATO enlargement and Georgia dominated the agenda. Relations between Washington and Moscow plunged to their lowest point since the end of the Soviet Union. The bilateral relationship had become so thin that there are no indications that concern about damaging it affected in any way the Kremlin’s decisions regarding military operations against Georgia. The Russian government saw little of value to lose in its relationship with Washington. That was not a good situation from the point of view of U.S. interests. It is different today. There are things in the U.S.-Russian relationship that Moscow cares about, and that translates to leverage and even a restraining influence on Russian actions. This does not mean that all is going well on the U.S.-Russia agenda. Although the rhetoric is less inflammatory than it was four years ago, missile defense poses a difficult problem on both the bilateral and NATO-Russia agendas. The countries clearly differ over Syria. Moscow’s misguided support for Mr. Assad—which stems from the fact that he is one of Russia’s few allies and from the Russian desire to pay NATO back for what they consider the misuse of March 2011 UN Security Council Resolution 1973 on Libya—have led the Kremlin to an unwise policy. It is alienating the Arab world and will position Moscow poorly with the Syrian people once Mr. Assad leaves the scene.

# ext Magnitsky

**Kills relations**

**ITAR-TASS 6/13** [A Russian Publication, “Linking Jackson-Vanik to Magnitsky "political kindergarten", MPs say”, 2012]

Attempts to link the abolition of the Jackson-Vanik law to Magnitsky legislation is "cheap and tragicomic", First Deputy Chairman of the State Duma Foreign Affairs Relations Committee, Andrei Klimov, said on Wednesday, June 13. "It's a political kindergarten, American style," he said. Klimov noted that the Jackson-Vanik amendment is an outdated anachronism and its abolition would only benefit America. "After Russia has joined the WTO, further operation of this amendment will affect only American companies by giving them worse conditions than to other parties to the agreement. This is why there is nothing pro-Russian in the abolition of this amendment," he said. Attempts to link Magnitsky legislation to the abolition of this amendment are perplexing, he added. "This is an uncivilised form of communication that does no good and will certainly not help improve Russian-American relations," Klimov said. Russia is strongly against U.S. Congress' attempts to replace the Jackson-Vanik amendment with new "anti- Russian legislation" in the form of the so-called Magnitsky Act that claims to protect human rights and democracy in Russia, Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said earlier. He warned that the approval by the U.S. Congress of unilateral punitive measures against the persons purportedly responsible for Sergei Magnitsky's death "will cause serious damage to bilateral relations".

# ext No war

**No risk of nuclear war in the status quo --- only the plan provokes Russian aggression**

Desmond **Ball**, professor at the Strategic Defence Studies Centre of The Australian National University, May 200**5**. “The probabilities of 'On the Beach'Assessing 'Armageddon Scenarios' in the 21 st Century,” Manning Clark House Symposium Science and Ethics: Can Homo sapiens Survive? <http://www.manningclark.org.au/papers/se05_ball.html>.

**The prospects of a nuclear war between the US and Russia must now be deemed fairly remote**. There are now no geostrategic issues that warrant nuclear competition and no inclination in either Washington or Moscow to provoke such issues. US and Russian strategic forces have been taken off day-to-day alert and their ICBMs 'de-targeted', greatly reducing the possibilities of war by accident, inadvertence or miscalculation. On the other hand, while the US-Russia strategic competition is in abeyance, there are several aspects of current US nuclear weapons policy which are profoundly disturbing. In December 2001 President George W. Bush officially announced that the US was withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972, one of the mainstays of strategic nuclear arms control during the Cold War, with effect from June 2002, and was proceeding to develop and deploy an extensive range of both theatre missile defence (TMD) and national missile defence (NMD) systems. The first anti-missile missile in the NMD system, designed initially to defend against limited missile attacks from China and North Korea, was installed at Fort Greely in Alaska in July 2004. The initial system, consisting of 16 interceptor missiles at Fort Greely and four at Vandenberg Air Force in California, is expected to be operational by the end of 2005. The Bush Administration is also considering withdrawal from the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and resuming nuclear testing. (The last US nuclear test was on 23 September 1992). In particular, some key Administration officials believe that testing is necessary to develop a 'new generation' of nuclear weapons, including low-yield, 'bunker-busting', earth-penetrating weapons specifically designed to destroy very hard and deeply buried targets (such as underground command and control centres and leadership bunkers).

**Russia won't lash out**

Eugene B. **Rumer**, senior fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University, and Celeste A. Wallander, director of the Russia and Eurasia Program and the Trustee Fellow at CSIS, Winter 200**3**, The Washington Quarterly

Given Russia's geopolitical predicament, it is difficult to imagine how a rational, even selfish, assessment of Russian interests would lead Russia to conclude that it would be best served by undermining the United States. The fallout from a weaker and diminished U.S. role in global security affairs would carry with it a number of serious challenges to Russian security interests, ranging from a strong Russian stake in partnership with the United States on geopolitically balancing China to the immediate threat to Russian security in the event of U.S. abandonment of its security assistance to Central Asia to the prospect of Iran armed with nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles with Moscow well within range. Thus, although Russia apparently has a strong interest in making clear to the United States that it is not to be taken for granted and that its interests and sensitivities are not to be brushed aside, Russia has no compelling rational interest in undermining or geopolitically balancing the United States' international position.

# ext PC irrelevant

Obama’s not key

**Jacobs and King 10**, University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802)

 But personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency. Modern presidents have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas, and often accommodated stakeholders. Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact.8 Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds no overall relationship.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority. The widespread presumption, then, that Obama's personal traits or leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency. Indeed, the presumption is not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may, paradoxically, induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. Presidential sales pitches go only so far.

# ext Winners win

Winners win – plan is a win for Obama because he overcomes opposition

Ornstein 93 (Norman J., American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, Roll Call, “Clinton Can Still Emerge a Winner; Here's What to Do”, May 27, p. Online)

2. Winning comes to those who look like winners. This only sounds redundant or cliche-ish. If power is the ability to make people do something they otherwise would not do, real power is having people do things they otherwise wouldn't do without anybody making them - when they act in anticipation of what they think somebody would want them to do. If a president develops a reputation as a winner, somebody who will pull out victories in Congress even when he is behind, somebody who can say, "Do this!" and have it done, then Members of Congress will behave accordingly. They will want to cut their deals with the president early, getting on the winning team when it looks the best and means the most. They will avoid cutting deals with the opposition. Stories that show weakness, indecisiveness, or incompetence in the White House - and there are always lots of them - will go unreported or will be played down because they will be seen as the exception that proves the rule of strength and compete

Winners win

**Marshall and Prins 11**, Bryan W., poli sci at Miami University, Ohio, Brandon C., poli sci at the University of Tennessee & Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy, “Power or Posturing? Policy Availability and Congressional Influence on U.S. Presidential Decisions to Use Force”, Presidential Studies Quarterly 41, no. 3 (September) 2011

Presidents rely heavily on Congress in converting their political capital into real policy success. Policy success not only shapes the reelection prospects of presidents, but it also builds the president's reputation for political effectiveness and fuels the prospect for subsequent gains in political capital (Light 1982). Moreover, the president's legislative success in foreign policy is correlated with success on the domestic front. On this point, some have largely disavowed the two-presidencies distinction while others have even argued that foreign policy has become a mere extension of domestic policy (Fleisher et al. 2000; Oldfield and Wildavsky 1989) Presidents implicitly understand that there exists a linkage between their actions in one policy area and their ability to affect another. The use of force is no exception; in promoting and protecting U.S. interests abroad, presidential decisions are made with an eye toward managing political capital at home (Fordham 2002).