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# Inland Waterways Neg

## Soybeans

### 1NC

##### No shortages – food is abundant

Poole 6 (Holly Kavana, Institute for Food and Development Policy, “12 Myths About Hunger”, Backgrounder, 12(2), Summer, 4-9, http://www.foodfirst.org/12myths)

Myth 1: Not Enough Food to Go Around Reality: Abundance, not scarcity, best describes the world's food supply. Enough wheat, rice and other grains are produced to provide every human being with 3,200 calories a day. That doesn't even count many other commonly eaten foods - ­vegetables, beans, nuts, root crops, fruits, grass-fed meats, and fish. Enough food is available to provide at least 4.3 pounds of food per person a day worldwide: two and half pounds of grain, beans and nuts, about a pound of fruits and vegetables, and nearly another pound of meat, milk and eggs - ­enough to make most people fat! The problem is that many people are too poor to buy readily available food. Even most "hungry countries" have enough food for all their people right now. Many are net exporters of food and other agricultural products.

##### Food wars are a myth – there’s zero empirical evidence

Salehyan 7 (Idean, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, Summer, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=3922)

First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters.

##### China won’t go to war – no political will

Moore 6 (Scott, Research assistant, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_80.html, dw: 10-18-2006, da: 7-9-2011, lido)

The new generation of Chinese leaders, which has risen to power in the aftermath of the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident (liu si), has tended to consist of moderate technocrats,[10] who are unlikely to support radical policy reversals, such as the use of nuclear weapons. Chinese politics in general have also evolved into a "more pragmatic, risk-adverse" form.[11] This process was initiated by the rise of "interest group politics" during the tenure of President Jiang Zemin.[12] This new structure of decision-making involves the specialization of bureaucratic institutions, which have become more assertive, and occasionally resisted high-level decisions they believed to be ill conceived.[13] It is probable that certain institutions, such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, would strongly resist the actual or threatened use of nuclear weapons against the United States in almost any situation. In a risk-adverse policy environment that seeks consensus, this kind of strong opposition may well prevail. It thus appears unlikely that any impetus for the use of nuclear weapons in a conflict with the United States would come from within the established Chinese policymaking apparatus. There are suggestions, however, that pressure for the actual or threatened use of nuclear weapons against the United States may come from outside China's policymaking elite, via a phenomenon that may be termed "hyper-nationalism."[14] The gradual expansion of freedom of speech in China has revealed some truly radical nationalistic perspectives, ranging from a kind of Chinese lebensraum (sheng cun kong jian)[15] to allegations of a kind of racist plot in Western policy towards China.[16] In a crisis situation, there are suggestions that such hyper-nationalism may exert significant pressure on policymakers to respond with an aggressive response, which could include nuclear weapons.

##### Redundancy takes out the impact – no unique species

Maser 99 (Chris, governmental consultant, Ecological diversity in sustainable development: the vital and forgotten dimension, May 4, p. 55, JM)

Redundancy, as stated earlier, means that more than one species can perform similar functions. It is a type of ecological insurance policy, which strengthens the ability of the system to retain the integrity of its basic relationships. The insurance of redundancy means that the loss of a species or two is not likely to result in such severe functional disruptions of the ecosystem so as to cause its collapse because other species can make up for the functional loss. But there comes a point, a threshold, when the loss of one or two more species may in fact lip the balance and cause the system to begin an irreversible change. That change may signal a decline in quality or productivity of the very things for which we humans valued the system in the first place. An example might be the loss of indigenous perennial grasses in the Great Basin of the American West due to overgrazing by domestic livestock coupled with the suppression of fire. This combination allowed the takeover of such exotic annuals as cheatgrass brome, which effectively excluded indigenous perennial grasses and thereby created a virtual monoculture of little value as habitat for wildlife or for grazing livestock compared with the habitat diversity and quality of the forage inherent in the indigenous grassland.

##### The environment is resilient

Easterbrook 96 (Gregg, sr editor, The New Republic, former fellow at the Brookings Institute, A Movement on the Earth, p. 25, JM)

 "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

#### Hurts Ecosystem

##### The use of locks and dams has a negative effect on the river ecosystem

The National Academies Press 01

(The National Academies Press (NAP) was created by the National Academies to publish the reports issued by the[National Academy of Sciences](http://www.nas.edu/), the [National Academy of Engineering](http://www.nas.edu/nae), the [Institute of Medicine](http://www.iom.edu/), and the [National Research Council](http://www.nas.edu/nrc))"INLAND NAVIGATION SYSTEM PLANNING: The Upper Mississippi Riverâ”Illinois Waterway." *Inland Navigation System Planning: The Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway*. The National Academies Press, 2001. Web. 26 June 2012. <http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=10072>.

INLAND NAVIGATION SYSTEM PLANNING: The Upper Mississippi River—Illinois Waterway problem. Shippers have been reluctant to seek innovative, nonstructural ways to reduce congestion; reductions in congestion would reduce river traffic (at least at peak times), thereby reducing the benefits of lock extensions. Unfortunately, the “first-come, first-served” rule is an inefficient way to manage river traffic, as it results in higher systems costs (costs to all shippers) than if there were a system explicitly designed to reduce congestion. Better management of waterway traffic should result in improved service and lower total shipping costs—with benefits to most waterway shippers. In particular, farmers would benefit from lower shipping costs. Large amounts of waterway traffic, and the hydrodynamic changes caused by the series of navigation pools, have effects on aquatic habitat and species. The many federal, state, and local environmental conservation laws, such as the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, reflect public concern for protecting the river and its ecosystems. In addition, environmental protection provides tangible benefits from tourism, recreation, and the production of food and fiber. Estimates of the annual revenue generated by tourism and recreation in the Upper Mississippi range from $1.2 billion (Carlson et al., 1995) to $6.6 billion (cited in UMRCC, 2000). The vast river–floodplain ecosystem of the Upper Mississippi River basin also provides a range of ecosystem services, including drinking water, food (fishes and waterfowl), groundwater recharge, purification of polluted waters, and flood retention. The Upper Mississippi River ecosystem is a storehouse of biodiversity, which produces social benefits today (e.g., food and fiber), and may produce additional benefits in the future (e.g., medicines). On the other hand, intensive use of the waterway has negative effects on river ecology and, in turn, on these various social values and goods. The construction and subsequent operation of the dams and navigation pools on the UMR–IWW has also resulted in a range of environmental effects. Given these external costs, the multiple uses of a river and waterway system must be considered explicitly when deciding how much traffic should be permitted on the waterway and whether locks should be extended in order to accommodate more traffic. The public interest would be best served by river traffic management practices that are environmentally sustainable; that is, strategies that promote both a better flow of river traffic and the maintenance of ecosystem habitat and processes. The Corps has viewed its responsibility as providing adequate capacity to serve all waterway users; for example, deciding on the proper investments and determining the best time to make those investments. These decisions are guided by federal laws and congressional guidance (a fuller discussion of which is provided in Chapter 3 ). The Corps has given little or no attention to allocating the waterway among all those who wish to use the locks when there is congestion. The best solution to the problem of waterway congestion would be to simultaneously optimize access to the locks and to determine when public investment to extend the locks might be warranted. Instead, access to the locks is determined on the basis of delays caused by having to wait for others to clear the lock. Long waits to transit the locks indicate either that the locks should be extended or that current demand for the locks is being managed poorly. The public interest requires that the relevant government agency have responsibility for both managing the traffic and investing in lock extensions. Approaches for traffic management include nonstructural options such as tradable permits, congestion tolls, scheduling traffic, and charging for the time taken to transit a lock. This management problem interacts with a larger, more contentious one. Midwest grain could be moved on several routes for export. In addition to going by barge.

#### Inland waterway construction devastates scarce ecosystems

IWR 6/20

Institute for Water Resources, “US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization: Preparing for Post-Panamax Vessels”, June 20, 2012 <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/rpt/June_20_REPORT_SUMMARY_U.S._Port_and_Inland_Waterways_Modernization.pdf> Accessed 6-27-2012

Potential infrastructural development along coasts and waterways is a concern because coastal ports and inland waterway infrastructure is closely associated with two of the scarcest types of ecosystems—free flowing rivers and estuarine wetlands. Lock and dam impoundments have contributed substantially to the imperilment of numerous freshwater species by reducing free-flowing river habitat. In general, dredging of nontoxic bottoms impacts coastal and riverine benthic organisms temporarily and bottoms typically recolonize quickly following disturbance. In the past, about 10 percent of bottom sediments were contaminated with toxic materials and resistant to colonization by some bottom species. Sediment toxicity directly affects bottom species and indirectly affects the fish and other species that feed on them and humans at the end of the food chain.

#### Inland waterway construction destroys the environment in minority and low income areas

IWR 6/20

Institute for Water Resources, “US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization: Preparing for Post-Panamax Vessels”, June 20, 2012 <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/rpt/June_20_REPORT_SUMMARY_U.S._Port_and_Inland_Waterways_Modernization.pdf> Accessed 6-27-2012

Contaminated sediments are now disposed of in isolated containment areas. In 1992, USACE was authorized to beneficially use dredge material for environmental improvement. Today about 20 to 30 percent of port and waterway dredged material is used for habitat creation and other beneficial use. But dredging also has had some persistent effects, including some unavoidable take of imperiled species (e.g., sea turtle take is about 35 per year) and damage to shallow-water estuarine ecosystems. Deepening coastal navigation channels can also favor destructive saltwater intrusion into freshwater ecosystems and domestic water supplies. With respect to operations, future emissions of potentially harmful materials into air and water, including green house gasses, also are a significant environmental concern. Because harbors concentrate transportation system operations in densely populated areas, they remain a significant source of air quality degradation and inequitable impact on low income and minority groups (which is inconsistent with Federal policies pertaining to environmental justice).

#### Expanding inland waterway infrastructure damages ecosystems and environmental resources

US Army Corps of Engineers 12

[“US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization: Preparing for Post-Panamax Vessels,” Report Summary, US Army Corps of Engineers, June 20 2012 http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/rpt/June\_20\_REPORT\_SUMMARY\_U.S.\_Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Modernization.pdf](file://C:\Users\Talli\Documents\jdi%202012\Cards\)

The national footprint of adverse environmental impacts has accumulated over many decades and is not indicative of the present rate of adverse impact, which is much improved. Measured in geographical terms, the environmental footprint directly impacted by development of transportation system infrastructure is a small fraction of the conterminous United States. But the degree of adverse impact on natural systems and wild species of public interest has been particularly intense and the offsite impacts on air, water and habitat quality from systems operations have been far reaching. The sources of past environmental effects indicate the type of future modernization impacts that are likely to occur from expansion of harbor, port and intermodal infrastructure and from transportation systems operations. Modernization will need to be accompanied by justified mitigation to avoid further 1) degraded air and water quality that threatens human health and safety, especially of low income and minority groups; 2) loss of important natural and cultural heritage found in parks, refuges, wetlands and scarce species; or 3) loss of recreational, commercial and other economically important resources.

## Terrorism

### 1NC

#### No risk of an attack on US soil – threats are grossly exaggerated

**Carle** 7/16/**08** - a member of the CIA's Clandestine Service for 23 years

[Carle, L. Glenn, “ A member of the CIA's Clandestine Service for 23 years , ” The Salt Lake Tribune, July 16, 2008, http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/ci\_9901142

Sen. John McCain has repeatedly characterized the threat of "radical Islamic extremism" as "the absolute gravest threat ... that we're in against." Before we simply accept this, we need to examine the nature of the terrorist threat facing our country. If we do so, we will see how we have allowed the specter of that threat to distort our lives and take our treasure. The "Global War on Terror" has conjured the image of terrorists behind every bush, the bushes themselves burning, and an angry god inciting its faithful to religious war. We have been called to arms, built fences, and compromised our laws and the practices that define us as a nation. The administration has focused on pursuing terrorists and countering an imminent and terrifying threat. Thousands of Americans have died as a result, as have tens of thousands of foreigners. The inclination to trust our leaders when they warn of danger is compelling, particularly when the specters of mushroom clouds and jihadists haunt every debate. McCain, accepting this view of the threats, pledges to continue the Bush administration's policy of few distinctions but ruthless actions. I spent 23 years in the CIA. I drafted or was involved in many of the government's most senior assessments of the threats facing our country. I have devoted years to understanding and combating the jihadist threat. We rightly honor as heroes those who serve our nation and offer their lives to protect ours. We all "support the troops." Yet the first step for any commander is to understand the enemy. The next commander in chief should base his counterterrorism policies on the following realities: We do not face a global jihadist "movement" but a series of disparate ethnic and religious conflicts involving Muslim populations, each of which remains fundamentally regional in nature and almost all of which long predate the existence of al-Qaida. Osama bin Laden and his disciples are small men and secondary threats whose shadows are made large by our fears. Al-Qaida is the only global jihadist organization and is the only Islamic terrorist organization that targets the U.S. homeland. Al-Qaida remains capable of striking here and is plotting from its redoubt in Waziristan, Pakistan. The organization, however, has only a handful of individuals capable of planning, organizing and leading a terrorist operation. Al-Qaida threatens to use chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons, but its capabilities are far inferior to its desires. Even the "loose nuke" threat, whose consequences would be horrific, has a very low probability. For the medium term, any attack is overwhelmingly likely to consist of creative uses of conventional explosives. No other Islamic-based terrorist organization, from Mindanao to the Bekaa Valley to the Sahel, targets the U.S. homeland; is part of a "global jihadist movement"; or has more than passing contact with al-Qaida. These groups do and will, however, identify themselves with global jihadist rhetoric and may bandy the bogey-phrase of "al-Qaida." They are motivated by hostility toward the West and fear of the irresistible changes that education, trade, and economic and social development are causing in their cultures. These regional terrorist organizations may target U.S. interests or persons in the groups' historic areas of interest and operations. None of these groups is likely to succeed in seizing power or in destabilizing the societies they attack, though they may succeed in killing numerous people through sporadic attacks such as the Madrid train bombings. There are and will continue to be small numbers of Muslims in certain Western countries - in the dozens, perhaps - who seek to commit terrorist acts, along the lines of the British citizens behind the 2005 London bus bombings. Some may have irregular contact with al-Qaida central in Waziristan; more will act as free agents for their imagined cause. They represent an Islamic-tinged version of the anarchists of the late 19th century: dupes of "true belief," the flotsam of revolutionary cultural change and destruction in Islam, and of personal anomie. We need to catch and neutralize these people. But they do not represent a global movement or a global threat. The threat from Islamic terrorism is no larger now than it was before Sept. 11, 2001. Islamic societies the world over are in turmoil and will continue for years to produce small numbers of dedicated killers, whom we must stop. U.S. and allied intelligence do a good job at that; these efforts, however, will never succeed in neutralizing every terrorist, everywhere. Why are these views so starkly at odds with what the Bush administration has said since the beginning of the "Global War on Terror"? This administration has heard what it has wished to hear, pressured the intelligence community to verify preconceptions, undermined or sidetracked opposing voices, and both instituted and been victim of procedures that guaranteed that the slightest terrorist threat reporting would receive disproportionate weight - thereby comforting the administration's preconceptions and policy inclinations. We must not delude ourselves about the nature of the terrorist threat to our country. We must not take fright at the specter our leaders have exaggerated. In fact, we must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed and miserable opponents that they are.

#### Terrorist attacks are overrated – more people die from drowning in bathtubs

Mueller 1/1/2008 [John Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center Professor of Political Science Department of Political Science, Ohio State University. THE ATOMIC TERRORIST: ASSESSING THE LIKELIHOOD Prepared for presentation at the Program on International Security Policy, University of Chicago, January 15, 2008

It may be useful in this connection to consider al-Qaeda's capacity more broadly. Two publications from Washington think tanks, one authored by Anthony Cordesman of CSIS (2005, 29-31), the other by Brian Jenkins of RAND (2006, 179-84), have independently provided lists of violence committed by Muslim extremists outside of such war zones as Iraq, Israel, Chechnya, Sudan, Kashmir, and Afghanistan, whether that violence be perpetrated by domestic terrorists or by ones with substantial international connections. Included in the count are such terrorist attacks as those that occurred in Bali in 2002, in Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and Turkey in 2003, in the Philippines, Madrid, and Egypt in 2004, and in London and Jordan in 2005. The lists include not only attacks by al-Qaeda, but also those by its imitators, enthusiasts, and wannabes as well as ones by groups with no apparent connection to it whatever. Although these tallies make for grim reading,the total number of people killed in the five years after 9/11 in such incidents comes to some 200-300 per year. That, of course, is 200-300 too many, but it hardly suggests that al-Qaeda's destructive capacities are monumental. By comparison, over the same period far more people have perished in the United States alone in bathtubs drownings(Stossel 2004, 77) or in automobile accidents by people who have abandoned short-haul air flights because of the increased costs and waiting time imposed after 9/11 by the Transportation Security Administration (Ellig et al. 2006, 35).

#### Even if terrorists want to strike they cannot – chances of success are about 1 in 3 billion

Mueller 1/1/2008 [John Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center Professor of Political Science Department of Political Science, Ohio State University. THE ATOMIC TERRORIST: ASSESSING THE LIKELIHOOD Prepared for presentation at the Program on International Security Policy, University of Chicago, January 15, 2008

Evaluating the likelihood Even if there is some desire for the bomb by terrorists (something assessed more fully below), fulfillment of that desire is obviously another matter. Even alarmists Bunn and Wier contend that the atomic terrorists' task "would clearly be among the most difficult types of attack to carry out" or "one of the most difficult missions a terrorist group could hope to try" (2006, 133-34, 147). But, stresses George Tenet, a terrorist atomic bomb is "possible" or "not beyond the realm of possibility" (Tenet and Harlow 2007, 266, 279). It might be useful to take a stab at estimating just how "difficult" or "not impossible" their task is, or how distant the "realm of possibility" might be. After all, lots of things are "not impossible." As I recall, there is a James Bond movie out there someplace in which Our Hero leaps from a low-flying plane or helicopter and lands unruffled in the back seat of a speeding convertible next to a bemused blonde. Although this impressive feat is "not impossible," it may not have ever been accomplished--or perhaps more importantly, ever attempted--in real life. Or it is entirely "not impossible" that a colliding meteor or comet could destroy the earth, that Vladimir Putin or the British could decide one morning to launch a few nuclear weapons at Massachusetts, George Bush could decide to bomb Hollywood, that an underwater volcano could erupt to cause a civilization-ending tidal wave, or that Osama bin Laden could convert to Judaism, declare himself to be the Messiah, and fly in a gaggle of mafioso hit men from Rome to have himself publicly crucified.20 In all this, Brodie's cautionary comment in the 1970s about the imaginative alarmists in the defense community holds as well for those in today's terrorism community, both of which are inhabited by people of a wide range of skills and sometimes of considerable imagination. All sorts of notions and propositions are churned out, and often presented for consideration with the prefatory works: "It is conceivable that..." Such words establish their own truth, for the fact that someone has conceived of whatever proposition follows is enough to establish that it is conceivable. Whether it is worth a second thought, however, is another matter (1978, 83). At any rate, experience thus far cannot be too encouraging to the would-be atomic terrorist. One group that tried, in the early 1990s, to pull off the deed was the Japanese apocalyptic group, Aum Shinrikyo. Unlike al-Qaeda, it was not under siege, and it had money, expertise, a remote and secluded haven in which to set up shop, even a private uranium mine. But it made dozens of mistakes in judgment, planning, and execution (Linzer 2004). Chagrined, it turned to biological weapons which, as it happened, didn't work either, and finally to chemical ones, resulting eventually in a somewhat botched release of sarin gas in a Tokyo subway that managed to kill a total of 12 people. Appraising the barriers. As noted earlier, most discussions of atomic terrorism deal rather piecemeal with the subject--focusing separately on individual tasks such as procuring HEU or assembling a device or transporting it. But, as the Gilmore Commission, a special advisory panel to the President and Congress, stresses, building a nuclear device capable of producing mass destruction presents "Herculean challenges" and requires that a whole series of steps be accomplished. The process requires obtaining enough fissile material, designing a weapon "that will bring that mass together in a tiny fraction of a second, before the heat from early fission blows the material apart," and figuring out some way to deliver the thing. And it emphasizes that these merely constitute "the minimum requirements." If each is not fully met, the result is not simply a less powerful weapon, but one that can't produce any significant nuclear yield at all or can't be delivered (Gilmore 1999, 31, emphasis in the original). Following this perspective, an approach that seems appropriate is to catalogue the barriers that must be overcome by a terrorist group in order to carry out the task of producing, transporting, and then successfully detonating Allison's "large, cumbersome, unsafe, unreliable, unpredictable, and inefficient" improvised nuclear device. Table 1 attempts to do this, and it arrays some 20 of these--all of which must be surmounted by the atomic aspirant. Actually, it would be quite possible to come up with a longer list: in the interests of keeping the catalogue of hurdles down to a reasonable number, some of the entries are actually collections of tasks and could be divided into two or three or more. For example, number 5 on the list requires that heisted highly-enriched uranium be neither a scam nor part of a sting nor of inadequate quality due to insider incompetence; but this hurdle could as readily be rendered as three separate ones. In assembling the list, I sought to make the various barriers independent, or effectively independent, from each other, although they are, of course, related in the sense that they are sequential. However, while the terrorists must locate an inadequately-secured supply of HEU to even begin the project, this discovery will have little bearing on whether they will be successful at securing an adequate quantity of the material, even though, obviously, they can't do the second task before accomplishing the first. Similarly, assembling and supplying an adequately equipped machine shop is effectively an independent task from the job of recruiting a team of scientists and technicians to work within it. Moreover, members of this group must display two qualities that, although combined in hurdle 9, are essentially independent of each other: they must be both technically skilled and absolutely loyal to the project. Assessing the probabilities. In seeking to carry out their task, would-be atomic terrorists effectively must go though an exercise that looks much like this. If and when they do so, they are likely to find their prospects daunting and accordingly uninspiring or even dispiriting. To bias the case in their favor, one might begin by assuming that they have a fighting chance of 50 percent of overcoming each of these obstacles even though for many barriers, probably almost all, the odds against them are much worse than that. Even with that generous bias, the chances they could successfully pull off the mission come out to be worse than one in a million, specifically they are one in 1,048,567. Indeed, the odds of surmounting even seven of the twenty hurdles at that unrealistically, even absurdly, high presumptive success rate is considerably less than one in a hundred. If one assumes, somewhat more realistically, that their chances at each barrier are one in three, the cumulative odds they will be able to pull off the deed drop to **one in well over three billion**--specifically 3,486,784,401. What they would be at the (entirely realistic) level one in ten boggles the mind. One could also make specific estimates for each of the hurdles, but the cumulative probability statistics are likely to come out pretty much the same--or even smaller. For example there may be a few barriers, such as number 13, where one might plausibly conclude the terrorists' chances are better than 50/50. However, there are many in which the likelihood of success is almost certainly going to be exceedingly small--for example, numbers 4, 5, 9, and 12, and, increasingly, the (obviously) crucial number 1. Those would be the odds for a single attempt by a single group, and there could be multiple attempts by multiple groups, of course. Although Allison considers al-Qaeda to be "the most probable perpetrator" on the nuclear front (2004, 29), he is also concerned about the potential atomic exploits of other organizations such as Indonesia's Jemaah Islamiyah, Chechen gangsters, Lebanon's Hezbollah, and various doomsday cults (2004, 29-42).21 Putting aside the observation that few, if any, of these appear to have interest in hitting the United States except for al-Qaeda (to be discussed more fully below), the odds would remain long even with multiple attempts. If there were a hundred determined efforts over a period of time, the chance at least one of these would be successful comes in at less than one one-hundredth of one percent at the one chance in two level. At the far more realistic level of one chance in three it would be about one in 50 million. If there were 1000 dedicated attempts, presumably over several decades, the chance of success would be less than one percent at the 50/50 level and about one in 50,000 at the one in three level.22

#### U.S. won’t over-react to terrorism – popular support is against it

Jenkins-Smith 4 (Hank C., Ph.D., Professor of Government – Texas A&M University, and Kerry G. Herron, Ph.D., Research Scientist – Texas A&M University, Fall)

Our final contrasting set of expectations relate to the degree to which the public will support or demand retribution against terrorists and supporting states. Here our **data show that** **support for using** conventional **U.S. military force to retaliate against terrorists** initially averaged above midscale, but **did not reach a high level of emotional demand** for military action. **Initial support declined significantly across all demographic and belief categories by the time of our survey in 2002**. Furthermore, **panelists** both in 2001 and 2002 **preferred** that **high levels of certainty about culpability** (above 8.5 on a scale from zero to ten) be established **before taking military action.** Again, we find the weight of evidence supporting revisionist expectations of public opinion. Overall, these **results are inconsistent with the contention that highly charged events will result in volatile and unstructured responses among mass publics** that prove problematic for policy processes. The initial response to the terrorist strikes, in the immediate aftermath of the event, demonstrated a broad and consistent shift in public assessments toward a greater perceived threat from terrorism, and greater willingness to support policies to reduce that threat. But **even in the highly charged context of such a serious attack on the American homeland, the overall public response was quite measured** . On average, the public showed very little propensity to undermine speech protections, and initial willing-ness to engage in military retaliation moderated significantly over the following year.

## Hegemony

### 1NC

#### Competitiveness is declining because of decreasing traffic not poor technology – no need to update systems

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit” <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

As the environmental functions of the rivers have shifted, so have the economic opportunities in agriculture in the Upper Midwest. From 1950 through the late 1970s, the Mississippi River experienced steady growth in agricultural commodities traffic moving down the river via barge. However, since 1980, Mississippi River barge traffic has fluctuated significantly and the overall trend has been less traffic. At one key lock at Alton, Illinois, for example, barge traffic has declined from its peak of 80.5 million tons in 1990 down to 56.3 million tons in 2008.The causes of this transition include significant growth in agricultural production in other parts of the world and less demand than expected from emerging markets like China.

#### Heg is unsustainable – counterbalancing and multiple factors enough collapse is imminent

**Omestad 08  Former Associate Editor of Foreign Policy, Winner of the Edwin M. Hood Award for Diplomatic Journalism**

(Thomas, Is America Really on the Decline? US News and World Report, 10/29)

This time, however, might not turn out as well for America, some analysts worry, because the trends eroding America's pre-eminence run deeper. "It's not simply that we've run into a rough patch, shaking our self-confidence," warns Andrew Bacevich, an international affairs specialist at Boston University and author of this year's The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism. "It's different this time." That there is some sort of big change is widely accepted, even mainstream. Defense Secretary Robert Gates now speaks of a "multipolar world." In its 2007 annual survey, the International Institute for Strategic Studies referred to "the profound loss of authority suffered by the United States since its invasion of Iraq." Diminished dominance. Yet more troubling was the vista painted by Thomas Fingar, the U.S. intelligence community's top analyst. Foreshadowing a conclusion of a coming report called "Global Trends 2025," he said in September that "American dominance will be much diminished over this period of time" and "will erode at an accelerating pace with the partial exception of the military." In future competition, he added, the military will be "the least significant" factor. Fingar labeled U.S. pre-eminence since World War II a "truly anomalous situation." Indeed, shifts in economic and military power--played out slowly, over decades and centuries--are the norm, as Yale historian Paul Kennedy pointed out in his 1988 work, The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. Some analysts conclude that if the reality of America's power position has changed, so must American attitudes. "We should disenthrall ourselves from the idea that the well-being and security of the United States can only be attained by seeking to maintain primacy," says Bacevich. In any case, the new financial shock is rattling a load-bearing pillar of American strength--its role as global financial superpower, including its privileged position as issuer of the world's favored reserve currency, the U.S. dollar. The dollar's special role has been critically important. It allows the federal government to affordably cover budget and current account deficits. The Feds are selling about half the new national debt to foreign investors, including governments like China's and sovereign wealth funds like those in Abu Dhabi and Kuwait. That has bridged the yawning U.S. fiscal gap, financing, in effect, global military activities and domestic spending without sparking inflation or driving up the interest cost of such monumental borrowing. It has also allowed Americans to maintain a notoriously low net savings rate. Critics point to the hazards inherent in racking up some $10 trillion in public debt--exacerbated now by fresh doubts over American solvency. Says historian Kennedy, "The crisis will confirm in the minds of Asians not to be so fiscally dependent on Uncle Sam." Those foreign investors, suggests Chas. W. Freeman Jr., a former U.S. diplomat in China and Saudi Arabia and president of the Middle East Policy Council, will conclude, "We're not going to finance your improvidence indefinitely." One other vulnerability also looms larger than in the past: energy imports. When Jimmy Carter was urging energy conservation in 1980, the United States imported 37 percent of oil consumed; last year, it was 58 percent. Something else is different about the current debate over U.S. decline. Without any contraction of its daunting military firepower or the size of its economy, other nations are bound to assume more influential positions. The world geopolitical map is being redrawn: Several powers are rising, some rapidly. China takes top billing on the list. Back when economic reforms began in 1978, China contributed but 1 percent of the world's GDP and its trade. Last year, it reached 5 percent of world GDP and 8 percent of trade. China's growth has hummed along at nearly 10 percent annually--for three decades. That is three times the global average. China's "peaceful rise," as officials call the strategy, aims to restore China to the status it had enjoyed for many centuries: the world's largest economy. A recent Goldman Sachs report has bumped up the time by which China's economy is expected to surpass America's in size to 2027. China's growth is fueling a rapid expansion of military capabilities and, in effect, promoting a model competing with that of the United States--authoritarian capitalism. At the same time, India, the world's most populous democratic state, has also found a surer path to prosperity that is broadening its influence and enabling a military buildup. Along with the economic recovery of Japan and the growth of what used to be called the "tigers" of South Korea and Southeast Asia, predictions of a "Pacific century" or an Asian one look more plausible. Asia is returning to its historical norms, Kishore Mahbubani, dean of the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore, argues in his book The New Asian Hemisphere. "The era of Western domination has run its course," he writes. There are shifts elsewhere, too. The once slumbering giant of South America, Brazil, is overcoming its past weaknesses. Russia is undergoing a resurgence of uncertain duration, courtesy of massive sales of oil and natural gas. Its invasion of neighboring Georgia and support for separatist regions there may mark a new period of strategic challenges to the West. Meanwhile, the European Union, in fits and starts, continues to evolve into a more coherent force in global affairs that, as a 27-nation collective, already presents the world's largest economy

Biggest loser. The world's energy suppliers--especially those along the Persian Gulf--are also gaining strength. Flynt Leverett, director of the New America Foundation's Geopolitics of Energy Initiative, calls the flood of money from oil consumers to producers "arguably the greatest transfer of wealth from one group of countries to another." The "big loser," he says, is the United States. The Gulf Arab states, as a group, may emerge as the world's most important investor. As well, Iran and its regional ambitions will get plenty of sustenance. But the rise of other powers doesn't tell the whole geopolitical story. They are forging connections without U.S. involvement and, in some cases, with the likely aim of blunting U.S. influence. The maneuvering reflects the sort of games nations have virtually always played. When one country's overweening power ignites concern, some of the others search for ways to counterbalance it. That can happen frontally, through political-military alliances or, more gingerly, in a nonconfrontational mode dubbed "soft balancing." For instance, Russia, China, and the four Central Asian states have formed the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, a group with a decidedly non-U.S. approach to world affairs--no hectoring about human rights and democracy there. And though the United States, with its tight alliances, is East Asia's leading protecting power, it is not part of a new regional grouping that is becoming more influential. China is reaching deeply into Africa, the Middle East, and even Latin America with trade deals, energy investments, and aid with few strings attached. Russia, too, is using arms sales and energy commerce to revive old connections in the developing world. Its outreach, especially in Latin America, appeals to left-leaning governments aloof from Washington. For the first time since the Cold War, a Russian naval fleet is heading into Latin American waters for exercises with Venezuela. Parag Khanna, an analyst with the New America Foundation, sees the unipolar moment giving way to a different global game. In The Second World: Empires and Influence in the New Global Order, he predicts a "geopolitical marketplace" in which developing countries are courted by and align flexibly with one of the new "Big Three": the United States, the European Union, and China. Others anticipate an even more complex diffusion of global power. Richard Haass, president of the Council on Foreign Relations and a former Bush administration official, argues that the new era will devolve into "nonpolarity," in which nation-states lose influence and a fractious assortment of nonstate players wield more clout. These include a variety of regional and global organizations, nongovernmental groups, foundations, multinational corporations, and even unsavory militias, drug cartels, and terrorist networks. The erosion of U.S. global standing--at least in the eyes of the world--has been hastened by a foreign policy routinely portrayed overseas as one of arrogance and hubris. The charge of U.S. unilateralism--stoked above all by a costly and unresolved war of choice in Iraq--has fortified a troubling caricature of America as a militaristic and hypocritical behemoth that frittered away the outpouring of global goodwill after 9/11. The damage to America's reputation has weakened its "soft power"--the attractiveness abroad of its society and politics. Reports of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib and Guantánamo and what many see as encroachments on America's civil liberties in the name of fighting terrorism have taken a toll. It was, seemingly, with some glee that the German magazine Der Spiegel ran a cover story this fall titled "The Price of Arrogance" and depicting the Statue of Liberty with its flame extinguished. The world supply of deference to the lone superpower is flagging--a likely drag on the next presidency**.** The go-it-alone instincts of the Bush administration--though tempered in its second term--came into play on issues from climate change to international justice to arms control. Old allies felt a cool wind from Washington. Grand ambitions for a democratic Middle East went unfulfilled. The Americans championed the war on terrorism with a "with us or against us" zeal. Fairly or not, friends and foes alike saw a lecturing, moralistic American style of leadership. It sat badly. "We exited the Cold War with amazing prestige and an automatic followership," says Freeman. "Nobody will charge a hill with us anymore." There have been other body blows to American prestige. The inability to bring closure to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq (especially the lengthy bungling of the Iraq occupation), the initial feeble response to Hurricane Katrina, and the regulatory laxity and greed that underlie this year's financial crisis all served to cloud the picture of American pre-eminence. Chinese students are questioning whether they should study American-style business. Mahbubani, the Singaporean analyst and former diplomat, marvels at "a new level of incompetence in America that is puzzling the world."

#### Heg unsustainable – multiple constraints ensure collapse and rise of alternatives

Christopher Layne, Chair in National Security at the School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, 09 [“The Waning of U.S. Hegemony—Myth or Reality?: A Review Essay,” International Security, Vol. 34, No. 1, Summer 2009]

For an overview of trends that could affect international politics over the next two decades, a good starting point is the National Intelligence Council’s (NIC’s) Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World.[15](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html#f15) Global Trends 2025 is not light reading, but it is significantly more insightful and intellectually courageous than typical government reports. Its key geopolitical conclusion is that the U.S.-dominated unipolar world will give way to multipolarity during the next two decades spurred by two causal mechanisms: the emergence of new great powers (and potentially important regional powers); and economic, financial, and domestic political constraints that may erode U.S. capabilities. China, India, and possibly Russia are emerging great powers.[16](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html#f16) As Global Trends 2025 points out, the rise of China and India to great power status will restore each to “the positions they held two centuries ago when China produced approximately 30 percent and India 15 percent of the world’s wealth” (p. 7). Their ascent is being propelled by “the global shift in relative wealth and economic power” from North America and the Euro-Atlantic world to Asia—a shift “without precedent in modern history” (ibid.). By 2025, China figures to have the world’s second-largest economy (measured by gross domestic product [GDP]) and will be a first-rank military power (p. 30). India, buoyed by its strong economic growth rate, will “strive for a multipolar system with New Delhi as one of the poles” (ibid.). Although both states could encounter speed bumps that might slow—or even derail—their ascents to great power status, the NIC believes that the “chances are good that China and India will continue to rise” (p. 29).[17](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html#f17)**]** Because of uncertainties about economics, energy prices, domestic governance issues, and especially demography, Russia’s great power trajectory is more problematic than China’s or India’s (pp. 31–32).[18](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html#f18) Between 2009 and 2025, Russia’s population is forecast to drop from 141 million to below 130 million, affecting the availability of manpower for both the military and the labor pools (pp. 23–24, 30). If Russia overcomes its demographic challenge and continues its revival as a great power, however, the NIC believes it “will be a leading force in opposition to U.S. global dominance” (p. 32). Because its great power status is closely tied to its ability to control both the energy resources and pipelines of Central Asia and the Caucasus, Russia will also seek to reestablish its sphere of influence in the “near abroad” (pp. 32, 82). According to the NIC, in addition to relative decline, the United States will confront other constraints on its international role. U.S. military supremacy will no longer be as dominant as it has been since the Cold War’s end (p. 93). The United States’ soft power may diminish as its liberal model of political and economic development is challenged by authoritarian/statist alternatives (pp. 3, 8–9, 13–14). At home, economic and political constraints may undermine U.S. hegemony. Global Trends 2025 was published just before the full scope of the global financial and economic crisis became apparent. Nevertheless, the NIC did have an inkling of the meltdown’s potential long-term implications for U.S. power. In particular, Global Trends predicts that over the next two decades, the dollar’s role as the international economy’s preeminent reserve currency will erode. Although at the time this issue went to press, the dollar remained strong and will continue to be the reserve currency for some time to come, China’s spring 2009 call to replace the dollar with a new reserve currency signals that the NIC’s long-term worries may be justified.[**19**](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html#f19) **[End Page 153]** As the NIC observes, the financial privileges conferred on the United States by the dollar’s unchallenged reserve currency status have underpinned the preeminent role of the United States in international politics since the end of World War II. Thus, “the dollar’s decline may force the United States into difficult tradeoffs between achieving ambitious foreign policy goals and the high domestic costs of supporting those objectives” (pp. 12, 94, 97). Moreover, the growing dependence of the United States on foreign capital inflows “may curtail U.S. freedom of action in unanticipated ways” (p. 97). The NIC concludes that America’s “interest and willingness to play a leadership role may be more constrained as the economic, military, and opportunity costs of being the world’s leader are reassessed by American voters” (p. 93). Ultimately, although the United States will probably be primus inter pares in a multipolar international system twenty years from now, it will have less power—and foreign policy options—than it has been accustomed to having since 1945 (ibid.).

#### Hegemony fails at resolving conflicts

Maher 10—PhD candidate in Political Science @ Brown (Richard, Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University, The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States Will Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, 11/12/2010 Orbis, ScienceDirect)

And yet, despite this material preeminence, the United States sees its political and strategic influence diminishing around the world. It is involved in two costly and destructive wars, in Iraq and Afghanistan, where success has been elusive and the end remains out of sight. China has adopted a new assertiveness recently, on everything from U.S. arms sales to Taiwan, currency convertibility, and America's growing debt (which China largely finances). Pakistan, one of America's closest strategic allies, is facing the threat of social and political collapse. Russia is using its vast energy resources to reassert its dominance in what it views as its historical sphere of influence. Negotiations with North Korea and Iran have gone nowhere in dismantling their nuclear programs. Brazil's growing economic and political influence offer another option for partnership and investment for countries in the Western Hemisphere. And relations with Japan, following the election that brought the opposition Democratic Party into power, are at their frostiest in decades. To many observers, it seems that America's vast power is not translating into America's preferred outcomes. As the United States has come to learn, raw power does not automatically translate into the realization of one's preferences, nor is it necessarily easy to maintain one's predominant position in world politics. There are many costs that come with predominance – material, political, and reputational. Vast imbalances of power create apprehension and anxiety in others, in one's friends just as much as in one's rivals. In this view, it is not necessarily *American* predominance that produces unease but rather American *predominance*. Predominance also makes one a tempting target, and a scapegoat for other countries’ own problems and unrealized ambitions. Many a Third World autocrat has blamed his country's economic and social woes on an ostensible U.S. conspiracy to keep the country fractured, underdeveloped, and subservient to America's own interests. Predominant power likewise breeds envy, resentment, and alienation. How is it possible for one country to be so rich and powerful when so many others are weak, divided, and poor? Legitimacy—the perception that one's role and purpose is acceptable and one's power is used justly—is indispensable for maintaining power and influence in world politics. As we witness the emergence (or re-emergence) of great powers in other parts of the world, we realize that American predominance cannot last forever. It is inevitable that the distribution of power and influence will become more balanced in the future, and that the United States will necessarily see its relative power decline. While the United States naturally should avoid hastening the end of this current period of American predominance, it should not look upon the next period of global politics and international history with dread or foreboding. It certainly should not seek to maintain its predominance at any cost, devoting unlimited ambition, resources, and prestige to the cause. In fact, contrary to what many have argued about the importance of maintaining its predominance, America's position in the world—both at home and internationally—could very well be strengthened once its era of preeminence is over. It is, therefore, necessary for the United States to start thinking about how best to position itself in the “post-unipolar” world.

### Heg Low

#### **Heg low—China rise and fractured alliances**

Barber 11

Lionel Barber, Financial Times, “The end of US hegemony: Legacy of 9/11”, September 5, 2011, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f6acf1a6-d54d-11e0-bd7e-00144feab49a.html#axzz1zKbNHjmC

On the morning of September 11, 2001, America’s prospects appeared as bright as the clear blue sky over Lower Manhattan. The price of Brent crude oil was $28 a barrel, the Federal government was running a budget surplus, the US economy was turning (albeit imperceptibly) after the dotcom crash. The most powerful nation on earth was at peace. Ten years on, the oil price hovers around $115 a barrel, the US is projected to run a budget deficit for 2011 of $1,580bn, the largest in its history; the economy remains deeply troubled after the financial crash of 2008; and America’s military and intelligence services remain at war, battling insurgency and radical Islamic terrorism, from Afghanistan and Pakistan to Niger and Yemen. Admiral Mike Mullen, outgoing chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has described the national debt as the greatest threat to US national security. Standard & Poor’s recent downgrade of America’s credit rating appears to confirm the superpower’s steady slippage. And while there is no linear narrative from the September 2001 attacks to America’s present economic plight, the inflation-adjusted cost of the ensuing “global war on terror” at more than $2,000bn amounts to twice the cost of the Vietnam war. President George W. Bush’s response to the assault on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon was to launch two wars of choice against Afghanistan and Iraq, a pugnacious unilateralism at the expense of alliances and international law, and a near evangelical promotion of liberal democracy in the Middle East. His administration’s hard-edged policies fractured alliances in Europe and triggered a sharp fall in America’s standing abroad. On the positive side of the ledger, America has so far escaped another terrorist attack on its own soil. Others have not been so fortunate. The bombings in Bali (2002), Madrid (2004), and London (2005) did not match the scale of September 11, but they claimed several hundred victims. Al-Qaeda is down but not entirely out. Dozens of computer disks recovered from Osama bin Laden’s hideout in Abbottabad, Pakistan, suggest the al-Qaeda leader, killed last May during a daring raid by US Navy Seals, was planning another spectacular outrage, perhaps to coincide with the September 11 anniversary this weekend. Moreover, this year’s Arab awakening has dispelled the notion that the Middle East – with the exception of Israel – is congenitally incapable of embracing democracy, One by one, the region’s autocrats, from Zine el-Abidine Ben Ali in Tunisia to Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, have been toppled by protesters demanding dignity, freedom and jobs. True, the fall of Muammer Gaddafi in Libya was precipitated by armed rebellions assisted by Nato warplanes; but President Bashar al-Assad of Syria may be the next leader to feel the hot breath of the Arab street. The question is whether the much-maligned Mr Bush was correct in arguing that the autocratic status quo in the Middle East created an incubator for radical Islamic terrorism and consequently a clear and present danger to the US. If the answer is yes, then his administration’s failings were due less to a flawed diagnosis and more to a matter of execution. A second related question is whether the administration’s military response to September 11 amounted to a costly and disproportionate diversion of attention and resources at a time when the world was being reshaped by the rise of powerful new actors, notably China? . . . In the aftermath of the attack on the Twin Towers, a geopolitical re-alignment comparable to those of 1815, 1945 or 1989 appeared to take shape. The US mustered a coalition against terrorism that included rivals such as Russia and China, as well as one-time pariahs such as Cuba, Iran and Sudan. The military response was equally effective. Having identified the perpetrators, the US staged a brilliant improvised campaign to topple the Taliban in Afghanistan. US special forces combined with warlords and overwhelming air-power to break the Kabul regime within weeks. Although the leaders, notably Mullah Omar and his proxy Bin-Laden, slipped away, the al-Qaeda network was relentlessly targeted and disrupted. Within a year, the US had lost the moral high ground. Mr Bush’s error was to make clear that regime change in Iraq was only one step for dealing with what he described as an “axis of evil” including Iran, North Korea and potentially other adversaries suspected of harbouring or sponsoring terrorists. Overnight, the US was cast as a rogue nation. Concerns rose with the publication of a revised national security doctrine in 2002, which ditched cold war concepts of containment and deterrence. In their place came a “forward-leaning” strategy of pre-emptive military action, regime change, and a new kind of warfare that justified torture and denied the rights of the Geneva Convention to suspected terrorists. Thus the Iraq war was fought without the support of traditional allies such as Canada, France and Germany; without the backing of the UN Security Council; and without conclusive evidence that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction posing an immediate threat to the US. As for allies, Britain’s prime minister Tony Blair provided loyal political cover, though Donald Rumsfeld, US defence secretary, declared witheringly that UK forces were redundant in military terms. Nato, having for the first time invoked article five to commit all members to collective defence, was similarly sidelined. Washington’s motto was “the mission determines the coalition”. But selective alliances work both ways. By the end of the decade, European allies were using caveats to opt out of military operations in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya. Hence outgoing US defence secretary Robert Gates’ warning this year that Nato was fast becoming irrelevant. Europe, too, emerged much diminished – and not just during the Libyan conflict where Germany opted out and Britain and France ran short of munitions within weeks. At the beginning of the new century, flush with the success of launching a new monetary union, Europe’s leaders agreed plans to make the European Union the most competitive economic zone in the world. In retrospect, the much-vaunted Lisbon agenda marked the summit of ambitions coinciding with the bursting of the dotcom bubble. Ten years on, the original design of European monetary union has shown itself to be fundamentally flawed. The enforcement mechanisms for budgetary discipline were ignored by big and smaller members alike, including Germany; peripheral economies in Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain, which soared on the back of low interest rates, have been exposed as uncompetitive. Contagion in the bond markets now threatens to spread to Italy, a “core” eurozone member. By Mr Bush’s second term, abrasive rhetoric gave way to a more tempered approach. As an occupation force in Afghanistan and Iraq, the US became sucked into the nation-building that Mr Rumsfeld had long derided. In a similar confusion, President Barack Obama and David Cameron, UK prime minister, declared either one or both of these missions to be militarily vital and then acted as if they were discretionary by setting a (political) timetable for withdrawal. The accountants will tot up the collective bill for the Afghan and Iraq ventures at close to $2,000bn in inflation-adjusted terms; but Robert Zoellick, president of the World Bank and a former deputy US secretary of state, argues that a country as rich as the US can well afford the cost. In 1948, says Mr Zoellick, the average gross national product per head in the US was one quarter of where it stands today. Yet Americans readily supported President Truman’s doctrine to prop up democracies in Europe and counter communism around the world to the tune of billions of dollars. Whether the seeds of democratic transformation will take root in Iraq is more debatable. The much-vaunted US military “surge” rescued the country from chaos and possible break-up, but relations between Iraq’s ethnic groups – Kurds, Sunnis and the majority Shia – remain precarious. Arguably, the toppling of Saddam Hussein has allowed Iran to become the dominant regional power, exerting influence through the Shia government in Baghdad. Meanwhile, Tehran’s nuclear ambitions remain unchecked. Nor did 9/11 boost efforts to tackle the other serious and unresolved threat to regional stability: the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Both Mr Bush and Mr Obama have failed to break the deadlock over the occupied territories of Gaza and the West Bank, and the status of Jerusalem. Successive Israeli prime ministers from Ariel Sharon to Benjamin Netanyahu have turned the war on terror to their own advantage, arguing that concessions jeopardise Israel’s security and entities such as Hamas – which easily won elections in Gaza in 2005 – are terrorists masquerading as legitimate representatives of the Palestinians. Despite the focus on fighting terrorism, the US was still alert to broader geopolitical trends. The most important breakthrough took place between the US and India with the signing in 2008 of the“123” deal on civil nuclear co-operation. The new strategic partnership between Washington and New Delhi not only offers a counterweight to the rise of China, but also to nuclear-armed Pakistan, America’s long-time but increasingly unmanageable ally in South Asia. By contrast, Sino-US relations amount to not much more than an uneasy accommodation. Beijing sees Washington (at best) as “neither friend nor enemy”, while the US has belatedly woken up to China’s challenge to its dominance in the Pacific. Beijing has grudgingly applied pressure to its brooding nuclear neighbour in North Korea, but nationalist fervour means the leadership remains neuralgic over Taiwan and acutely sensitive to territorial disputes with Japan, South Korea and Vietnam. . . . In the final resort, the most significant geopolitical development of the past 10 years took place not on the battlefield but in the financial system. The global banking crisis stemmed from flawed regulation and perverse incentives for banks to sell mortgages to poor Americans with no ability to repay, as well as gigantic leverage in the financial system. These distortions were created, in part, by global imbalances driven by Americans living on cheap credit and Chinese exporters and savers contributing to a vast current account surplus. Until the Great Crash of 2008, this financial merry-go-round spun regardless. Thanks to cheap labour costs, China exported deflation to the rest of the world. China financed the US current account deficit by recycling its own surplus into US Treasury bonds. Now, three years into the financial crisis, the world economy has been turned upside down. The US is diminished, Europe sidelined, and Asia, for now, in the ascendant. Consider the broader historical trend. Developing Asia’s share of the global economy in purchasing power parity terms has risen steadily from 8 per cent in 1980 to 24 per cent last year. Taken as a whole, Asian stock markets now account for 31 per cent of global market capitalisation, ahead of Europe at 25 per cent and within a whisker of the US at 32 per cent. Last year, China overtook Germany to become the world’s largest exporter. Chinese banks now rank among the biggest in the world by market capitalisation. Import numbers are equally revealing: the developing world is becoming a driver of the global economy. From the consumption of cement to eggs, China leads the world; it has also just overtaken US to become the world’s largest market for cars. China’s voracious appetite for commodities is creating new trade routes, especially with emerging powerhouses such as Brazil. Last year, China surpassed the US as Brazil’s biggest trading partner. Latin America, a region once best known for instability, has emerged through the crisis virtually unscathed. Poverty is falling, the middle classes are expanding and asset markets are bubbling. Condoleezza Rice, Mr Bush’s national security adviser and secretary of state, once described multi-polarity as a theory of rivalry, a necessary evil. In economic terms, multi-polarity spells a new order in which interdependence is the norm and the US, while still overwhelmingly powerful, no longer occupies the role of hegemon. As for the legacy of 9/11, Gerard Lyons, chief economist of Standard Chartered Bank, says the three most important words in the past decade were not “war on terror” but “made in China”. On present trends, he adds, the three most important words of this decade will be “owned by China”.

#### Heg low—econ and alliances

Rashman 11

Anisur Rahman, The Daily Star, “Beginning of the end of American hegemony”, September 13, 2011, http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=202171

Ever since the end of World War II (WWII), the United States of America had enjoyed the status of a superpower of the world. No country overtly dared to challenge American hegemony. The other major victorious power of the WWII -- the erstwhile USSR -- did lodge a muted challenge and the so called "Cold War" ensued. But American militarily surrounded the whole of the Soviet bloc and contained the spread of socialism. American industrial base and its economy were by far the strongest in the world and the USSR was no match at all. This state of affairs continued until an apocalyptic event of historic proportions took place in 2001. On the morning of September 11, 2001, an earth-shattering (excuse the pun) event took place in America. The twin towers of the World Trade Centre in Lower Manhattan, New York, the potent symbol of American capitalism, were ignominiously destroyed by the al-Qaeda by crashing American civilian aircrafts onto them. It shook the whole of America to the core; the invincibility of the world's only superpower had been shattered brutally. The country was at the receiving end of an attack on its own soil. Even President George W. Bush, the most powerful man in the world, had to be protected in American itself from the threat of a terrorist attack on that day. The ignominy of the superpower was beyond belief and America is still reeling from that event. The hunt for the terrorists who perpetrated such a heinous crime was immediate. The al-Qaeda was on American radar for quite sometime and when it was found that this organisation was indeed behind this audacious attack, the fury was boundless. America vowed to destroy al-Qaeda completely. Bush asked the world to join him in his crusade and said: "Either you are with us or against us." America launched an attack on Afghanistan -- the bastion of the Taliban supporting al-Qaeda. Almost simultaneously, America targeted Iraq on the pretext that it supported and harboured Islamic terrorism. Bush stated in his State of the Union Address in January 2002 that Iraq, Iran and North Korea were an "axis of evil." America claimed that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) which must be destroyed, and that necessitated removal of Saddam Hussein. This hard-headed policy without any international consensus not only alienated America in the eyes of the world but also fractured Nato badly. France and Germany were strongly opposed to the Iraq adventure. Disregarding the division in the Western power bloc and ignoring international efforts for rational approach in tackling terrorism, America almost unilaterally led the attack on Iraq and Afghanistan. Lack of evidence that these two countries were behind the 9/11 attack did not deter America in her pursuit for revenge. It was a sheer gung-ho response. The country adopted the doctrine of "pre-emptive" strike on suspected countries. If necessary, America would carry out military action unilaterally without international consent or even UN approval. This was a brutal proclamation of military might and it did not endear America at all to the rest of the world. War is never a low cost undertaking. It is estimated that the total cost of American "War on Terror" from 2001 to 2011, with inflation adjusted figure, amounts to over $2,000 billion, almost twice the amount for the whole of the Vietnam War. But could America financially afford to wage two wars simultaneously? Even before these two wars of choice, American economy was not in great shape. Productivity was dropping, and American share of the world economy was in decline. Russia was putting its house together after the collapse of its empire in 1989. Slowly and imperceptibly China, India and Brazil were emerging as the world's economic powerhouses. The Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) was amassing a huge credit balance. All of these things were happening while America was blinded with rage and revenge and pursuing aggressive military adventures against her presumed enemies. Ten years on, following 2001, America finds itself in dire economic straits. Booming Chinese exports, were voraciously absorbed by the Americans. China offered credits, from her export earnings, to Americans to buy Chinese goods. To Americans It was like pay-day throughout the month. China, India and the OPEC countries also bought limitless amount of American sovereign bonds, which allowed America to pursue military adventures abroad without too much financial worry. But obviously things cannot go on like this forever and the consequence of such profligate behaviour will have to surface sometime. The annual budget deficit in America in 2011 is now nearly $1,600 billion ($1.6 trillion), the sovereign debt has ballooned to $14.3 trillion. In other words, every American man, woman and child bears a national debt of $55,000, which is one of the highest in the world, if not the highest. No wonder American credit rating agency, Standard and Poor's (S&P), recently downgraded American credit rating from AAA to AA+. This is the first time in American history that the country has lost its triple A rating. Moreover, S&P has put America on the negative watch, which means that if the country fails to come to grips with its national debt, the AA+ rating may be further downgraded. How did it all come about? How could the world's only superpower with the largest economy and huge industrial base run up such a massive, almost mind boggling national deficit? The answer to this can be found in profligate national expenditure and unilateral American military undertakings abroad, arising from excessive ego of national power. During the Cold War, America pursued a policy of collective defence -- Nato, Seato, Cento and so on to counter the might of the erstwhile USSR. The advantage of collective defence was that all participating countries shared the cost and pain of defence and war. But after the demise of socialism and disbanding of the USSR and consequent disappearance of Russian threat, America saw no further need for collective defence. When France and Germany opposed the attack on Iraq, America proclaimed that in the absence of collective agreement within Nato, the "mission will determine the participating countries." At heart, it was the stance of the superpower to pursue a military undertaking on its own if necessary, particularly when the issue was nothing short of punishing the country or countries for the audacious attack on America and challenging its global might. Historically, socialism hegemony did not collapse from foreign aggression. It happened from within when the state could no longer prop it up financially, when it failed to support client states internationally and maintain the military might of the superpower. It is the economic collapse which led to political collapse. Is a similar thing happening to America -- economic collapse leading to the demise of capitalism? Although it is highly unlikely that capitalism will disappear overnight the American brand of capitalism, i.e. raw capitalism with no compassion for the poor, the unfortunate and down trodden members of the society, is going to be damaged. If 1989 is regarded as the historic time when socialism collapsed, then in the same vein one can say that 2001 may come to be seen as the beginning of the end of American hegemony.

#### Heg low—credit downgrade

Coghlan 11—Professor @ New South Wales

Dr. Jo Coghlan (BA. Hons. PhD),lecturer in Australian Politics and International Relations at the School of Social Sciences and International Studies at the University of New South Wales, Foreign Policy Digest, “U.S. Credit Rating: American Hegemony in Decline?", August 9 , 2011 http://www.internationalpolicydigest.org/author/dr-jo-coghlan/

Standard and Poor’s (S&P) have reduced America’s sovereign credit rating from AAA to AA+. The rating puts the U.S. on par with Kuwait and Taiwan. America’s $14.3 trillion debt makes “the world’s richest nation” a worse credit risk than Australia, Germany, Britain and the Isle of Man. The downgrade followed the biggest weekly selloff in U.S. stocks in 32 months. S&P’s decision rested on two factors: America’s decision to raise the debt ceiling and concerns about America’s political processes. S&P were reportedly concerned about the “political brinksmanship of recent months” which had highlighted what they saw as “America’s governance and policymaking becoming less stable, less effective, and less predictable” than what they had previously believed. S&P were “pessimistic” about the ability of Congress and the White House to reach a broader plan to rein in the deficit “any time soon.” It has been widely reported that the legislation signed by Barack Obama on 2 August to reduce the fiscal deficit by $2.1 trillion over 10 years was well short of S&P expectations of US$4 trillion. The rating agency is also reportedly considering the possibility of lowering the rating to AA within two years if the U.S. government does not cut spending as much as recently pledged, or if higher interest rates and new fiscal pressures worsen the state’s financial picture. The Wall Street Journal has reported that the S&P decision will likely send “shock waves through global financial markets and potentially undermine world economic growth.” In July, S&P had placed the United States’ rating on “credit watch with negative implications” as the debt ceiling debate devolved into partisan bickering. In the same month, Moody’s Investors Services announced it had initiated a review of America’s sterling bond rating because of the likelihood of a U.S. default on its debts. Unlike S&P, who wanted to see no increase in the debt ceiling, Moody’s concern was based on the fact that the rise in the debt ceiling would not be high enough. In both cases, however, it seemed America’s rating was in trouble last month. The downgrade of America’s credit rating is the first time the U.S. was downgraded since it received an AAA rating from Moody’s in 1917 and S&P in 1941. It is the first time that S&P has issued a “negative” outlook on the U.S. government since it began rating the credit-worthiness of railroad bonds in 1860. “A downgrade is uncharted territory for the U.S., but one outcome seems likely: Americans could face higher interest rates on mortgages, car loans, credit cardsand other consumer loans. Business probably will also have to pay more to borrow money,” according to MSN Money, none of which will boost the already flagging economy. The likely domestic cost of the downgrading will be increased borrowing costs, which will have a drag effect on economic growth. It is predicted that the U.S. downgrade is likely to cost the U.S. economy $100 billion a year. Variable borrowing rates and mortgage rates will rise; conversely mortgage-backed bonds will face a downgrade. Money market mutual funds will come under significant pressure. The downgrade will negatively impact on the borrowing capabilities of American state and municipalities and companies, particularly those with debts linked to federal payments. A larger concern will be whether the appetite for U.S. debt might change among foreign investors, in particular China, the world’s largest foreign holder of U.S. Treasuries. In 1945, foreigners owned just 1 percent of US Treasuries. Today, they own a record high 46 percent. U.S. Treasury bonds, once undisputedly seen as the safest security in the world, are now rated lower than bonds issued by countries such as Britain, Germany, France, or Canada. Prior to the S&P decision, Dagong, China’s Global Credit Rating agency, had already pushed the U.S. rating from A+ to A, and placed the rating on negative watch (indicating the potential for a further cut). Other than the U.S. Federal Reserve, China is the biggest holder of American debt, with $1.16 trillion. It maintains the value of its currency through buying U.S dollars: a monetary policy that is likely to continue if only to protect its own currency. The downgrade, accompanied by a continuing weak U.S dollar, could affect Chinese exports and this will directly affect the Australian economy. Less demand for consumer goods in both the regional and global economy would directly lead to weaker demand for China’s exported goods; this then weakens demands for imports, particularly in the energy sector. If the Chinese currency appreciates as a response to the weakening U.S dollar, it will make Chinese goods more expensive. This will result in China shifting its focus away from export production to production for domestic consumption. With China continuing to buy U.S debt and shifting its focus to domestic economic production, the results will mean less Chinese currency floating in the regional and global economy. This coupled with contractions in Eurozone spending, bodes badly for any economy that is being driven by exports: as Australia currently is. Prime Minister Julia Gillard has immediately responded to the downgrade saying: “Australia’s economy is strong and should not be badly affected.” She maintained the Labor mantra that the Australian economy was, and would remain strong, because of China’s demand for Australian resources. However,world stock markets had already plunged prior to the S&P decision, stripping more than $100 billion from the value of listed Australian companies. Following the downgrade decision, the Australian share market is expected to face more losses. No amount of Gillard or Swan rhetoric is likely to stop further significant domestic losses. Similarly, the Canadian government is putting on a brave face in its acknowledgement of its interconnectedness with the U.S. The country’s finance minister Jim Flaherty has said that Canada is “well-positioned to face global headwinds.” Apart from the economic impact of the downgrade on American and international economies, the downgrade has a political context. The world’s economic superpower has been sharply criticised for its political handling of the debt ceiling issue. S&P issued a “sharply worded critique of the American political system”. There is a view that the U.S. does not deserve a triple-A rating, and the reason has nothing whatsoever to do with its debt ratios. America’s ability to pay is not the issue: the problem is its willingness to pay. It is not entirely clear that this is the position of Barack Obama and the Democrats, rather is likely being driven by those in Washington who are willing to “drive the U.S. into default.” It is possible that the S&P factored in the machinations of the Republican Party, and in particular the Tea Party, that took the U.S. to the brink of default. A smaller deficit-reduction deal was on offer, but was refused by the Republicans possibly hyped up by the Tea Party, who are desperate to remain relevant is a rapidly changing political landscape. This being the case, the S&P have punished America because of the action of recalcitrant Republicans for refusing to accept any legislation that would increase taxes. The political machinations of Washington confirmed to S&P the debilitating state of American politics. America emerged as the dominant, hegemonic power at the end of the Cold War. It played a preeminent role in shaping the post-war international economic system and was a key actor in many of the international organisations that now shape global economic and monetary policy. The decision to downgrade its credit rating is economic, political but also powerfully symbolic. In New Zealand, the downgrade was reported as “a dramatic reversal of fortune for the world’s largest economy.” The Australian media is reporting it as “a symbolic embarrassment for President Barack Obama, his administration and the Americans” and as a “symbolic blow.” As one American commentator has said: “The symbolism is undeniable.” The downgrade is a “blow to U.S. prestige.” The downgrade to America’s credit rating is a historic assault on the superpower’s prestige and a symbol of the changing world order: that is, the demise of the U.S. and the rise of China.

#### Heg low—challengers and economy

Regilme 11

Santino Regilme, CfP: The Decline of US Hegemony: Emerging Power(s) and the Future of World Politics (ECPR Grad Conference 2012, Proposed Panel), “The Decline of US Hegemony: Emerging Power(s) and the Future of World Politics”, November 30, 2011, http://politicalcogito.wordpress.com/2011/11/30/cfp-the-decline-of-us-hegemony-emerging-powers-and-the-future-of-world-politics-ecpr-grad-conference-2012-proposed-panel/

Panel Proposal: The Decline of US Hegemony: Emerging Power(s) and the Future of World Politics Since the emergence of the US as the world’s superpower almost 50 years ago, the discourse on its imminent hegemonic decline has been ongoing for quite some time. The advent of non-traditional security threats especially after 9/11 vis-à-vis the deep-seated problems in the American homeland have casted doubts over the tenacity and persistence of US hegemony. This is further complicated, moreover, by the long-standing economic instability in the US-led global political economy. More importantly, the rapid economic growth of China and other emerging powers, traditionally considered as countries from the Global South, has also been quite suggestive of the receding power of American hegemony. Some have even argued that the days of American global dominance could be nearly over, and the most promising candidate to replace it is China (Jacques, 2009).

#### Heg low—budget cuts

Mandelbaum 11

Michael Mandelbaum, Foreign Affairs, “America's Coming Retrenchment How Budget Cuts Will Limit the United States’ Global Role”, August 9, 2011, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68024/michael-mandelbaum/americas-coming-retrenchment

The acrimonious negotiation that produced legislation to raise the American debt ceiling while cutting the federal budget deficit, which President Barack Obama signed on August 2, was an early skirmish in the battle to bring deficits under control. That battle is bound to be protracted, difficult, and contentious, and one of its casualties will be spending on foreign and security policy, which will decline in the years ahead. That will impose new limits on the projection of American power around the world. What a difference a year makes. Only last year, in the May/June issue of Foreign Affairs, I published a review (“Overpowered?”) of three books whose common theme was that the United States was doing far too much beyond its borders. For its own sake and the sake of other countries, the three authors recommended, the country should pursue a more modest foreign policy. Now, as I forecast at the end of that essay, the fiscal condition of the United States will compel the fulfillment of that recommendation -- for better (the general sentiment of the books’ authors) or for worse (my own view). The August 2 legislation calls for $1 trillion in spending cuts over a ten-year period, about $350 billion of which is likely to come from the defense budget. The legislation also mandates a further $1.5 trillion reduction in expenditures in the next decade. If a special Congressional panel cannot agree on the targets of those reductions, an automatic trigger will impose across-the-board budget savings that will lower the Defense Department’s budget by an estimated $600 billion. Even if the triggering mechanism is avoided, spending on defense and on other aspects of U.S. foreign policy will decline over the next decade. The scale of deficit reduction required to put the country on solid fiscal footing is so large that it must involve both limits on Social Security and Medicare, despite the Democrats’ determination to preserve these programs intact, and increases in taxes in some form, despite the Republicans’ determination to prevent this. When Americans are paying more to their government and getting less from it, they will not be as generous in supporting the United States’ global role as they have been in recent decades...

## Trade

### 1NC

#### Locks sit empty over 50% of the time-no damage to trade

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

In fact, 2008 traffic levels on the UMR-IWW, taken from the Corps’ Internet barge traffic reporting system, continued a two decades long flat-to-declining trend with recent dramatic declines. Historic barge traffic for the Melvin Price Locks (see Figure 4) shows a steady decline from a peak of 80.5 million tons in 1990 down to 56.3 million tons in 2008. Preliminary data indicate that barge traffic for 2009 at the Melvin Price Locks will be close to the 2008 tonnage. A 2009 report by Dr. Donald Sweeney 13 (former lead economist on the Corps’ UMR-IWW proposed 1,200foot locks feasibility study) evaluates the Corps’ 2008 Economic Reevaluation Report. Dr. Sweeney compares the lock service status in four usage categories for the seven 600-foot locks at which new 1,200-foot locks are proposed. (See Figure 5) The graph vividly shows the steady decrease in lock traffic and associated growth in available lock capacity. In 1999, these seven locks were processing river traffic approximately 60 percent of the time and sat idle without traffic more than 35 percent of the time. By 2008, the same seven locks were processing traffic less than 35 percent of the time and sat idle without traffic more than 60 percent of the time. The existing seven 600-foot locks have had excess capacity of well more than 50 percent of their annual carrying capacity over the last five years and could accommodate significant increases in barge traffic. With lockage “supply” already outstripping “demand,” there is no justification for spending more than $2 billion to construct new 1,200-foot locks.

#### The need for waterways is vastly exaggerated – no demand for trade

Stern 12

Charles V. Stern, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy, “Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress,” The Congressional Research Service, April 12, 2012, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf>

A central issue for Congress is the level and urgency of infrastructure investments on federal waterways. Commercial users, including shippers and some agricultural interests, have argued that additional investment is justified because of aging infrastructure, the need for expanded capacity, and positive environmental externalities associated with inland waterway shipping compared to other forms of shipping. These users argue that the benefits of inland waterways are widespread. Their claims are countered by a number of other groups, including taxpayer and environmental advocacy groups, who argue against increased federal funding for inland waterways. These groups contend that the shipping industry often misrepresents or overstates the benefits of these investments and that major funding increases for inland waterway projects are not warranted.48 Despite these disagreements, most entities agree that the current system of financing inland waterways is inadequate to address future needs (regardless of the precise level of those needs). As a result of the recent funding drawdown, the Corps is expected to have appropriations for just one ongoing lock replacement project (Olmstead Lock on the Ohio River) through FY2016 under its current baseline for IWTF revenues.49 Barring a new source of revenue or supplemental federal appropriations by Congress, new or ongoing IWTF construction projects may be put on hold by the Corps, regardless of their urgency.Aging Infrastructure and Urgency of New Investments The condition of Corps inland waterway facilities has been a primary driver behind the call for increased investment on inland waterways. The Institute for Water Resources (part of the Corps of Engineers) notes that the majority of locks in the United States are now past their intended design age of 50 years.50 The Corps has connected this aging infrastructure to an overall decline in the efficiency of its assets on inland waterways, noting that overall lock unavailability (both scheduled and unscheduled) has increased in recent years.51 In some cases, the user industry favors new lock construction and expanded capacity over ongoing maintenance for a number of reasons.52 Other groups argue against significant new investments for inland waterway projects. In arguing against new locks on the Upper Mississippi River, a coalition of environmental groups noted that while the design life of new investments is usually only 50 years, regular maintenance can extend the life of existing locks for an additional 50 years at a considerably lesser cost than that for new construction.53 These groups generally argue that the costs of new lock construction greatly exceed the benefits of reduced waiting time and lock unavailability, and point out that issues associated with most aging inland waterways infrastructure can be overcome by improved smallscale and nonstructural improvements.54Waterway Traffic Projections The Corps has in the past noted that the justification for most new navigation alternatives depends greatly on traffic forecasts from future trade scenarios, which can themselves be difficult to predict. These forecasts often depend on a number of interrelated variables, such as commodity prices, the overall price sensitivity of shippers, and outside factors such as increases or decreases in the efficiency of other modes of freight transit. The Corps has noted that total domestic freight traffic is expected to increase by approximately 70% by 2020, but recently has avoided projections specific to inland waterway freight traffic.55 The Department of Transportation projects that the majority of this increase in freight traffic will be on freight rail and highway traffic, with annual waterway traffic projected to increase 2% per year between 2010 and 2035.56 Shipping interests point out that an overall increase in the efficiency of inland waterways could lessen anticipated pressure on highway and rail shipments, or at least maintain viability of inland waterways compared to these other forms of freight shipping. Future lock upgrades or new construction would likely increase demand for inland waterways. However, the extent to which these upgrades would have an effect on demand would likely also depend on a number of other external factors. Some groups have countered industry requests for new lock construction based on traffic projections by noting that traffic has been flat or decreasing at some individual locks on hightraffic portions of the inland waterway system.57 Observers, including former Corps employees, have also criticized previous projections of traffic increases by the Corps and as overly optimistic.58 To date, the Corps has avoided use of projected future traffic increases as a basis for changes to the overall level of investments on inland waterways.

#### Free trade is inevitable – technology

IFG 8, no author, internal forum on globization, September 10, 2008, http://www.ifg.org/inevitable.html
At the ifg's recent teach-ins in New York and Washington, D.C., as well as in press interviews, a recurring theme has been that opposition to economic globalization may be quixotic. Common wisdom holds that we are already in a global economy, as witnessed by the reach of CNN, the scale of Shell, IBM, Mitsubishi, and many other corporate operations, the increasingly uniform buying and behavior patterns of citizens in Asia, Africa, Europe, and the United States, not to mention the ramifications of the Internet. It is argued that to stand in opposition to such trends is to deny reality. Europeans are so often told by their leaders that "there is no alternative" that they have begun using the acronym TINA to describe the mindset. Truly, there is no denying that economic globalization is advancing rapidly, but most IFGers consider that to accept this advance without resistance is what will finally confirm its inevitability. Presumably, great changes in democratic societies are only augmented after public debate over their consequences. But in the case of economic globalization, secrecy was emphasized, not debate. By such means as "fast track" voting procedures in the United States, and the suppression of the actual trade agreement texts from media, the public and even the legislators who voted on them, democratic debate was surely denied. In some other countries, the situation was even more extreme—no parliamentary votes, merely approval by fiat. But critical questions must still be discussed and settled, such as these: Who gains and who loses? Who works and who does not, and at what level of survivability? Is the process environmentally sustainable? (It is not.) Where will the resources come from to feed the exponential growth of development that is basic to the process? Do we really want to sacrifice community, regional, and national sovereignties for global corporate governance from Geneva? (The headquarters of the World Trade Organization.) How can people's livelihoods be protected—whether workers or farmers or even middle managers? Can a system governed from the global center ever satisfy the needs of real people where they live? In fact, was a global economy ever intended for such purposes, or only for the needs of global corporations? Is this whole line of development a good idea? We have been permitted no public debate on these matters, least of all among presidential candidates. After debate, if the answers to these questions and the hundreds of others that emerge still lead us to a negative evaluation of economic globalization, then is the process still inevitable? If so, can we say that democracy is operative? At the Washington, D.C., Teach-In, during the Saturday evening debate, pro-globalization panelist Joe Cobb, a trade policy analyst at the right-wing think tank, the Heritage Foundation, noted that perhaps globalization would not have to be inevitable, but the new technologies make it so. In other words, maybe globalization could have been reversed by democratic process, but only if we could control technology, which, he seems to feel, we cannot. Many of us found this statement especially alarming because it implied that not only was democracy to be held hostage to globalization's inevitability, but it would also have to be sacrificed to technologies' inevitabilities. That doesn't give much wiggle room for citizens in so-called democracies to influence the conditions of their lives and governance.

#### No relation between trade and conflict

Nye 96 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.

#### Globalization short-circuits trade conflicts before they can escalate. It is self-correcting

De Jonquieres 03 Guy de Jonquieres, Senior Fellow at ECIPE and London-based writer and speaker on international economic affairs who previously worked for The Financial Times in positions that included world trade editor and Asia columnist and commentator Financial Times, May 26, 2003, <http://www.itssd.org/References/Johns%20Hopkins%20SAIS%20Ctr%20for%20Transatlantic%20Relations%20-%20highlighted.pdf>

Nonetheless, multinationals are not invulnerable. Increasingly, they rely on global supply chains; as a consequence, more than a third of world trade today is within companies. As the impact of stricter US border security after September 11 showed, those networks are highly sensitive to trade disruptions. The good news is that global integration is a potent check on governments' temptation to reach for the trade weapon. It is much easier to convince politicians that lashing out at foreigners is a bad idea if it directly imperils jobs and prosperity at home. That argument has made free-traders of governors of many US states that are home to foreign-owned companies. It also explains why protectionist US measures, such as steel tariffs, are increasingly confined to industries that produce only in their home market.

## Economy

### No Impact

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause instability

Fareed Zakaria was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.

### U.S. Economy Low

U.S. Economy low now- jobs, consumer confidences, and foreign exports

The New Zealand Herald 12 (The New Zealand Herald business section, US economy grows too slowly to end job slump, Saturday june 30, 2012, <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/economy/news/article.cfm?c_id=34&objectid=10816404>)

The United States economy is growing too slowly to pull the job market out of a slump, according to data that suggest June has been another weak month for hiring. Slow improvement in the economy threatens President Barack Obama's re-election hopes. He is likely to face voters with the highest unemployment rate of any President since the Great Depression. Applications for unemployment benefits stayed above a level last week that is generally considered too high to lower the unemployment rate. And the annual growth rate for the economy in the January-March quarter was unchanged at a tepid 1.9 per cent. Two government reports released yesterday added to the picture of an economy that is faltering for the third straight year. Job growth has tumbled, consumers are less confident and Europe's financial crisis has dampened demand for US exports. Most economists don't see growth accelerating much from the first-quarter pace, although some are hopeful that lower petrol prices could help lift consumer spending over the summer. Growth of around 1.9 per cent typically generates roughly 90,000 jobs a month. That's considered too weak to lower the unemployment rate, which was 8.2 per cent last month. The Federal Reserve last week downgraded its outlook for 2012 growth. The Fed now predicts the economy will grow between 1.9 per cent and 2.4 per cent this year - a half a percentage point lower than its forecast in April.

U.S. Economy Low now- Unemployment rate

The New Zealand Herald 12 (The New Zealand Herald business section, US economy grows too slowly to end job slump, Saturday june 30, 2012, <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/economy/news/article.cfm?c_id=34&objectid=10816404>)

And it doesn't see the unemployment rate falling much lower this year. Hiring hasn't likely improved in June, based on the level of people applying for unemployment benefits. Weekly applications fell only slightly last week to a seasonally adjusted 386,000, the Labour Department said. Applications have climbed nearly 5 per cent in the past two months. When applications are above 375,000, it generally means that hiring isn't strong enough to rapidly lower the unemployment rate. Economists are predicting that 100,000 jobs were added in June and the unemployment rate did not change, according to a survey by FactSet. The Government will issue the June employment report on July 6. "Jobless claims are still too high and show that employment growth is slowing and no progress is being made," said Jennifer Lee, an economist at BMO Capital Markets. Employers added an average of only 73,000 jobs a month in April and May after averaging 226,000 a month in the first three months of the year. The report on the first quarter's economic growth showed that corporate profits fell, the first quarterly decline since the final three months of 2008.

U.S. Economy L:ow- lowest employment rate this month

Rugaber 12( Christopher S. Rugaber, writer for the associated press and fay observer. Com, job market in United States weighs on economy, june 21, 2012, <http://fayobserver.com/articles/2012/06/22/1186062.aspx?sac=fo.business>)

The sluggish job market is weighing on the U.S. economy three years after the Great Recession ended. And the signs suggest hiring may not strengthen any time soon. A measure of the number of people applying for unemployment benefits over the past month has reached a six-month high, the government said Thursday. The increase suggests that layoffs are rising and June will be another tepid month for hiring. Sales of previously occupied homes fell in May. And manufacturing activity in the Philadelphia region contracted for the second straight month in June. The gloomy economic data echoed a more pessimistic outlook from the Federal Reserve issued Wednesday. Thursday's raft of economic reports showed: Applications for unemployment benefits dipped last week to 387,000, from an upwardly revised 389,000 the previous week, the Labor Department said. The four-week average, a less volatile measure, rose to 386,250. That is the highest level since December. When applications for unemployment benefits top 375,000, hiring generally remains too weak to rapidly lower the unemployment rate.

U.S. Economy Low now- Home Sales, economic activity

Rugaber 12( Christopher S. Rugaber, writer for the associated press and fay observer. Com, job market in United States weighs on economy, june 21, 2012, <http://fayobserver.com/articles/2012/06/22/1186062.aspx?sac=fo.business>)

Home sales fell 1.5 percent in May from April to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 4.55 million, the National Association of Realtors said. Sales are up 9.6 percent from a year ago. That suggests that the housing market is slowly improving. But the annual sales rate is well below the 6 million that economists consider healthy. The Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank said its index of regional manufacturing activity fell sharply to -16.6 from -5.8. That's the lowest level in nearly a year. A reading below zero indicates contraction. Measures of new orders and shipments also plummeted. A gauge of future U.S. economic activity rose in May to its highest level in four years, one of the few positive signs Thursday. The Conference Board's index of leading economic indicators increased to 95.8. That's the highest level since June 2008, which was six months into the recession. Still, before the recession, the index routinely topped 100. The generally bleak news came a day after the Fed downgraded its outlook for growth and took another step to try and jolt the economy. The Fed now expects growth of just 1.9 percent to 2.4 percent for the year. That's half a percentage point lower than its previous estimate in April. And it thinks the unemployment rate, now 8.2 percent, won't fall much further in 2012. To try to boost growth and hiring, the Fed said it would extend a program intended to drive down long-term U.S. interest rates. Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke hopes that will encourage more borrowing and spending. Hiring slowed sharply in April and May, raising concerns about the strength of the recovery.

U.S. Economy low- Weak job markets, home sales

Rugaber 12( Christopher S. Rugaber, writer for the associated press and fay observer. Com, job market in United States weighs on economy, june 21, 2012, <http://fayobserver.com/articles/2012/06/22/1186062.aspx?sac=fo.business>)

Employers have added an average of only 73,000 jobs a month in April and May. That's much lower than the average of 226,000 added in the first three months of this year. Some economists warned that the weaker job market may have started to affect home sales, which until recently had been showing modest improvement. Purchases made by first-time buyers, who are critical to a housing recovery, slipped in May. And sales fell in every region except the Midwest. "Not a surprise that existing home sales took a step back in May," said Jennifer Lee, an economist at BMO Capital Markets. "Softening job growth could slow the housing recovery." One positive sign in the report: The supply of homes for sale remains low. The inventory of unsold homes in May was just 2.49 million, roughly the same as in April. It would take only about six months to exhaust the supply at the current sales pace. Not since 2006, when the housing market was booming, has the supply been so low relative to the pace of home sales.

Economy Low Now- low consumer spending and low job creation

Straight Times 12( Straight Times, breaking news/ world, Jun 28, 2012, US economy grew at modest 1.9% rate in 1st 3 months of 2012, <http://www.straitstimes.com/BreakingNews/World/Story/STIStory_816095.html>)

WASHINGTON (AP) - The United States (US) economy expanded at a 1.9 per cent annual rate in the first three months of the year, a weak pace that few economists see changing much this year. The Commerce Department on Thursday made no change in its third and final estimate for growth in the January-March quarter. Slower growth in consumer spending was offset by faster growth in businesses investment, leaving the overall pace the same. A sluggish job market and diminished consumer and business confidence have kept the economy from accelerating in the April-June quarter. Most economists say growth has likely stayed roughly the same. Growth of around 1.9 per cent typically generates roughly 90,000 jobs a month. That's too weak to lower the unemployment rate, which was 8.2 per cent last month.

### Global Economy Low

Global Economy Low- slowing growth in economic leaders such as Europe, U.S., China, and India

The New Zealand Herald 12 (The New Zealand Herald business section, US economy grows too slowly to end job slump, Saturday june 30, 2012, <http://www.nzherald.co.nz/economy/news/article.cfm?c_id=34&objectid=10816404>)

Corporations earned less profit overseas, the report said. That's likely a result of Europe's economic woes and slowing growth in countries such as China and India. Lower overseas profits could discourage employers from adding some jobs in the second half of the year. "With global weakness continuing ... corporate profits are likely to remain under pressure, a development that is unlikely to help the employment outlook," said Jeremy Lawson, an economist at BNP Paribas. Other recent indicators have painted a mixed picture of the economy. A closely watched private survey this week showed consumer confidence fell in June for the fourth straight month. The Conference Board said worries about the job market outweighed lower petrol prices and steady improvement in the housing market. Americans have received little in the way of pay raises this year, with wage growth trailing inflation. That has started to slow their growth in spending. Retails sales have barely grown in the past two months. Less growth in consumer spending has also hurt manufacturing activity, a leading economic driver since the recession ended. Factories produced less in May than April, the Federal Reserve said this month.

Global Economy Low- Euro Zone’s private sector tanking creating a loss of economic stability in the world

Cable 12 ( Jonathan Cable, Reuters London, June 21, 2012, Global Economy- Outlook darkens Europe sinks, China struggles, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/21/economy-global-idINL5E8HL42620120621>)

LONDON, June 21 (Reuters) - The downturn in the euro zone's private sector is becoming entrenched and Chinese factories are finding the going increasingly tough, business surveys showed on Thursday, painting a darker outlook for the world economy. June was the fifth consecutive month that activity across the euro zone has declined, dragging down heavyweights Germany and France and putting pressure on the European Central Bank to take further action to support the economy. "We are at the point where the economy is increasingly losing traction and it's hard at this stage to see what will give us a lift. The ECB will do more, that will probably involve a rate cut - which is symbolic - but is action," said Peter Dixon at Commerzbank. With economic recovery showing increased fragility in the United States, the Federal Reserve delivered another round of monetary stimulus on Wednesday and said it was ready to do even more to help if the situation in Europe deteriorated. Data due later from the United States is expected to show manufacturing growth in the world's largest economy slowed this month but that there was a slight fall in new claims for unemployment benefits. The euro zone's private sector contracted at its fastest pace since June 2009, when the bloc was mired in a deep recession, according to Markit's Flash Composite Purchasing Managers' Index for June.

Global Economy Low Now- Manufacturing creates dips in growth

Cable 12 ( Jonathan Cable, Reuters London, June 21, 2012, Global Economy- Outlook darkens Europe sinks, China struggles, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/21/economy-global-idINL5E8HL42620120621>)

A combination of the services and manufacturing sectors which is seen as a guide to growth, the PMI fell to 46.0, slightly better than the fall to 45.5 predicted by economists in a Reuters Poll. But the index has been below the 50 mark that divides growth from contraction in all but one of the last 10 months. The euro fell after the data and European stocks traded lower. Analysts struggled to find much hope in the numbers. "The only remotely positive spin that can be put on the dismal euro zone (PMI) is that there was no further deepening in the overall rate of contraction. Hardly a cause for celebration," said Howard Archer at IHS Global Insight. The data pointed towards a second quarter contraction of around 0.6 percent, Markit said. Having held steady at the start of the year, the bloc's economy will contract 0.2 percent in the current quarter and narrowly escape recession by stagnating again in the next, according to economists polled by Reuters last week.

Global Economy Low Now- Eurozone manufacturing sector tank the economy

Cable 12 ( Jonathan Cable, Reuters London, June 21, 2012, Global Economy- Outlook darkens Europe sinks, China struggles, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/21/economy-global-idINL5E8HL42620120621>)

Earlier data from Germany, Europe's largest economy, showed its manufacturing sector contracted at its fastest pace since June 2009, while its service sector barely expanded, posting its lowest reading in seven months. In neighbouring France activity declined in both sectors, albeit it at a more moderate pace than last month. "For the time being, and if we cannot sort out the financial crisis, the euro zone is likely to remain in recession," said Dominique Barbet at BNP Paribas. While the euro zone has not actually met the technical definition of recession by putting in two consecutive quarters of contraction, many consider growth is so poor that it might as well have. The danger of Greece crashing out of the euro zone eased after pro-bailout parties won weekend elections, but risks are mounting that Spain, the euro zone's fourth-largest economy, will need a full-blown international rescue. The two-and-a-half year old crisis has hobbled the global economy, and world leaders meeting in Mexico piled pressure on the euro zone to move towards a fiscal and banking union to fix the crisis that now threatens to engulf Spain.

Economic growth will be low for the 6th straight quarter

Cable 12 ( Jonathan Cable, Reuters London, June 21, 2012, Global Economy- Outlook darkens Europe sinks, China struggles, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/21/economy-global-idINL5E8HL42620120621>)

CHINA CRACKS China's factory sector shrank for an eighth straight month in June as export orders sentiment hit its weakest level since early 2009, indicating the country's economic trough may extend well into the third quarter. The HSBC Flash Purchasing Managers Index, the earliest monthly indicator of China's industrial activity, fell to a seven-month low of 48.1 in June from 48.4 in May. It marked the eighth consecutive month that the HSBC PMI has been below 50, matching a similar streak during the much deeper slowdown during the global financial crisis of 2008/2009. Economic growth in the world's most populous nation is widely expected to have slid for the sixth straight quarter in April through June as the country feels the impact of the euro area debt crisis and property controls weigh on domestic demand. Connie Tse, an economist at Forecast Ltd in Singapore, said she sees an "increasing chance" that second-quarter annual growth will edge close to 7 percent, which would be the weakest pace of expansion since early 2009 but way ahead of its European counterparts. As recently as May, a Reuters poll had a median forecast of 7.9 percent for the second quarter. "Conditions of China's manufacturing sector, especially the small and medium sized factories, continued to slip. We see little probability of this series moving back into the expansion zone in the next two months," said Yao Wei at Societe Generale.

Global economy low now- world bank

Khuzwayo 12 ( Wiseman Zhuzwayo, writer for Business Report, June 15, 12, No end of gloom seen for fragile global economic – reports, <http://www.iol.co.za/business/business-news/no-end-of-gloom-seen-for-fragile-global-economy-reports-1.1319561>)

Economic reports released this week by a UN agency and the World Bank do not inspire optimism that the global economy is to make a recovery soon. The Global Economic Prospects report by the World Bank says developing countries should prepare for a long period of volatility in the global economy by re-emphasising medium-term development strategies for tougher times. The report says a resurgence of tensions in high-income Europe has eroded the gains made during the first four months of this year, which led to a rebound in economic activity in both developing and advanced countries and an easing of risk aversion among investors. It says since May 1, increased market jitters have spread. Developing and high-income country stock markets have lost about 7 percent, giving up two-thirds of the gains generated over the preceding four months. Most commodity prices are down, with crude and copper prices falling by 19 percent and 14 percent, respectively, while developing countries’ currencies have lost value against the dollar, as international capital fled to safe-haven assets, such as German and US bonds. The World Bank report says: “So far, conditions in most developing countries have not deteriorated as much as in the fourth quarter of 2011. “Outside of Europe, central Asia, the Middle East and north Africa, developing country credit default swap rates, a key indicator of market sentiment, remain well below their maximums from the (autumn) of 2001.” It says increased uncertainty will add to pre-existing headwinds from budget cutting, banking sector deleveraging and development constraints. As a result, the bank projects growth in developing countries will slow to a relatively weak 5.3 percent average in 2012, before strengthening somewhat to 5.9 percent in 2013 and 6 percent in 2014.

# Solvency

## 1NC

#### Barge traffic decreasing now

IWLA 10

"B I G P R I C E — L I T TL E B E N E F I T: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers Are Not Economically Viable." *Iwla.org*. Izaak Walton League of America (The Izaak Walton League was formed in 1922 to save outdoor America for future generations.), 2010. Web. 26 June 2012.

In 1982, the Corps 10 projected total combined upstream and downstream traffic volume traversing the locks at Dam 26 (replaced by Melvin Price Locks and Dam) would reach 123 million tons by 1998. This estimated volume was used to justify the construction of the 1,200-foot lock at the site of the new Melvin Price Dam, built to replace the failing original Dam 26. 11 However, barge traffic has never increased to the Corps’ projected level, even with record corn production in 2007. 12

#### System is not fuel efficient- studies fail

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

The barge industry asserts that inland waterways barge traffic is more fuel efficient than other modes of transportation. Industry representatives cite a 2007 Texas Transportation Institute report 28 to support this claim. The report includes the data in Table 3 portraying the superior fuel efficiency of barges in shipping cargo compared with trains and trucks. However, these comparisons do not take into account the variation in miles traveled to get from one point to another by water, rail, or road. The comparison between the distance of two modes of transportation both leaving one destination and going to the same final destination is called circuity. The Texas report acknowledges that nationally, barges have a 1.3 to 1 circuity factor when compared with trains, 29 which means that a barge must travel 30 percent farther than a rail car to reach the same destination. Any comparison of barge and rail efficiencies on the UMR-IWW must include the geographic realities of rivers. Rivers do not flow directly in straight lines; there are many turns that increase the distance a barge must travel. The rail system is not constrained by the flow of the river and follows a much straighter path to the Gulf of Mexico at New Orleans. But instead of comparing rail miles to barge miles on the Mississippi River using the acknowledged national 1.3 to 1 circuity factor, the Texas report uses a barge to truck comparison to establish a 1 to 1 circuity factor. (For comparison, a researcher at the University of Illinois 30 estimated a 1.38 to 1 circuity factor for barges specifically on the Upper Mississippi River.) Also ignored in this report was the use by rail companies of “unit trains” for shipping grain long distances. Unit trains are made up of cars going to the same final destination carrying one type of commodity. A 2008 study by researchers at Iowa State University 31 shows that unit grain trains moving from Iowa to New Orleans have a much better fuel efficiency – 640 versus 413 ton-miles per gallon – than an average train. Incorporating both the rail circuity factor and unit grain trains into a revision of the Texas Transportation Institute’s table (see Table 4) shows that barges have virtually no fuel efficiency advantage over an average train and are far less fuel efficient than unit grain trains. The primary grain commodity used in the NESP studies to support the construction of new locks is corn, which is also shipped by unit grain trains. The barge industry, as stated above, asserts that shipping commodities on barges is more efficient than rail, saving fuel and therefore emitting fewer pollutants. However, normal rail shipping is nearly equivalent to the fuel efficiency of barge shipping, and unit grain trains are significantly more efficient than barges.

#### The need for waterways is vastly exaggerated – doesn’t outweigh costs

Stern 12

Charles V. Stern, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy, “Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress,” The Congressional Research Service, April 12, 2012, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf>

A central issue for Congress is the level and urgency of infrastructure investments on federal waterways. Commercial users, including shippers and some agricultural interests, have argued that additional investment is justified because of aging infrastructure, the need for expanded capacity, and positive environmental externalities associated with inland waterway shipping compared to other forms of shipping. These users argue that the benefits of inland waterways are widespread. Their claims are countered by a number of other groups, including taxpayer and environmental advocacy groups, who argue against increased federal funding for inland waterways. These groups contend that the shipping industry often misrepresents or overstates the benefits of these investments and that major funding increases for inland waterway projects are not warranted.48 Despite these disagreements, most entities agree that the current system of financing inland waterways is inadequate to address future needs (regardless of the precise level of those needs). As a result of the recent funding drawdown, the Corps is expected to have appropriations for just one ongoing lock replacement project (Olmstead Lock on the Ohio River) through FY2016 under its current baseline for IWTF revenues.49 Barring a new source of revenue or supplemental federal appropriations by Congress, new or ongoing IWTF construction projects may be put on hold by the Corps, regardless of their urgency.Aging Infrastructure and Urgency of New Investments The condition of Corps inland waterway facilities has been a primary driver behind the call for increased investment on inland waterways. The Institute for Water Resources (part of the Corps of Engineers) notes that the majority of locks in the United States are now past their intended design age of 50 years.50 The Corps has connected this aging infrastructure to an overall decline in the efficiency of its assets on inland waterways, noting that overall lock unavailability (both scheduled and unscheduled) has increased in recent years.51 In some cases, the user industry favors new lock construction and expanded capacity over ongoing maintenance for a number of reasons.52 Other groups argue against significant new investments for inland waterway projects. In arguing against new locks on the Upper Mississippi River, a coalition of environmental groups noted that while the design life of new investments is usually only 50 years, regular maintenance can extend the life of existing locks for an additional 50 years at a considerably lesser cost than that for new construction.53 These groups generally argue that the costs of new lock construction greatly exceed the benefits of reduced waiting time and lock unavailability, and point out that issues associated with most aging inland waterways infrastructure can be overcome by improved smallscale and nonstructural improvements.54Waterway Traffic Projections The Corps has in the past noted that the justification for most new navigation alternatives depends greatly on traffic forecasts from future trade scenarios, which can themselves be difficult to predict. These forecasts often depend on a number of interrelated variables, such as commodity prices, the overall price sensitivity of shippers, and outside factors such as increases or decreases in the efficiency of other modes of freight transit. The Corps has noted that total domestic freight traffic is expected to increase by approximately 70% by 2020, but recently has avoided projections specific to inland waterway freight traffic.55 The Department of Transportation projects that the majority of this increase in freight traffic will be on freight rail and highway traffic, with annual waterway traffic projected to increase 2% per year between 2010 and 2035.56 Shipping interests point out that an overall increase in the efficiency of inland waterways could lessen anticipated pressure on highway and rail shipments, or at least maintain viability of inland waterways compared to these other forms of freight shipping. Future lock upgrades or new construction would likely increase demand for inland waterways. However, the extent to which these upgrades would have an effect on demand would likely also depend on a number of other external factors. Some groups have countered industry requests for new lock construction based on traffic projections by noting that traffic has been flat or decreasing at some individual locks on hightraffic portions of the inland waterway system.57 Observers, including former Corps employees, have also criticized previous projections of traffic increases by the Corps and as overly optimistic.58 To date, the Corps has avoided use of projected future traffic increases as a basis for changes to the overall level of investments on inland waterways.

### Deficit Spending Turn

#### The plan increases the federal deficit by shifting expenses onto taxpayers

IWLA no date

Izaak Walton League of America, conservation organization, “WAVE4 Act- Bad Deal for Taxpayers and the Environment” <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=d/sp/i/25063/pid/25063>

The WAVE4 Act (H.R. 4342) will shift the burden for funding costly inland waterway infrastructure expenses onto taxpayers, possibly leaving taxpayers on the hook for over $10 billion over the next 20 years! The WAVE4 Act will not fund necessary work to maintain the locks and dams and increase the backlog of infrastructure projects. The following summarizes some of the fundamental flaws with this legislation. Oppose H.R. 4342 because it: Eliminates cost share for dam construction and rehabilitation. Currently, dam rehabilitation and construction are funded through a 50-50 cost share between taxpayers and the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Navigation argues that they should not pay to maintain and construct dams because other user groups benefit from the dams. But, the dams were built and continue to be maintained primarily for navigation. In this tough economic time, the federal government cannot afford for industry to reduce their contribution. Eliminates cost share for lock rehabilitation. H.R. 4342 states that navigation will contribute 50% of the cost of lock rehabilitation over $100 million, but it’s a trap! There have been 16 lock rehabilitation projects since the Inland Waterway Trust Fund was established and the average cost of a lock rehabilitation project is $30 million. No lock rehabilitation project has ever approached $100 million and no future lock project is expected to cost $100 million. So, this is just another attempt to push even more costs onto taxpayers, which will also increase the federal deficit. Eliminates cost share for cost overruns. Cost overruns are a certainty for every Corps construction project. Projects on the Ohio River have seen overruns of 100 to over 200 percent. Most of these overruns are due to poor planning and inadequate funding. So, instead of punishing taxpayers and forcing the federal government to pick up the tab, the Corps needs to improve its planning process and produce more reliable cost estimates. Recommends the Army adopt the IMTS Team 20-year investment strategy. The 20-year investment strategy lists almost 150 lock and dam construction and rehabilitation projects that will cost $15 billion over the next 20 years. But, if H.R. 4342 passes, navigation will contribute only $5 billion for these projects, while taxpayers will be on the hook for $10 billion plus any cost overruns! If the cost overrun trend continues, this means that taxpayers could be on the hook for $20-30 billion over the next 20 years. Several of the projects on the list have not been funded by Congress because they are not economically justified. Instead of increasing costs for unnecessary projects that are environmentally damaging, let’s re-evaluate project priorities, planning and funding to alleviate the backlog of projects.

#### Government spending cannot cause a short, or long-term economic gain – history and studies are on our side

Riedl (Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies atHeritage Foundation) 2010

Brian, Wall Street Journal, January 8

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703481004574646551469288292.html?mod=WSJ_latestheadlines>

Government Spending Can Have a Long-Term Impact. Although it cannot immediately increase economic growth, government spending can have a long-term impact. Economic growth results from producing more goods and services (not from redistributing existing income), and that requires productivity growth and growth in the labor supply. Productivity growth requires some combination of: (1) a more educated and efficient workforce; (2) more private physical capital, such as factories and tools; (3) increased use of new technology; (4) more public infrastructure like roads and other utilities; and (5) markets to set prices and rule of law to enforce contracts. Government's effect on economic growth is determined by its effect on productivity and labor supply.

Only in the rare instances where the private sector fails to provide those inputs in adequate amounts is government spending necessary. Government spending on education, physical infrastructure, and research and development, for instance, could increase long-term productivity rates--but only ifgovernment invests more competently than businesses, nonprofit organizations, and private citizens would have if those investment dollars had stayed in the private sector. Historically, governments have rarely outperformed the private sector in generating productivity growth. Thus, mountains of academic studies show that government spending typically reduces long-term economic growth.

### Privatization Turn

#### Inland waterways is the most expensive form of transportation

Nicollet Island Coalition 10

Brad Walker, UMR Coordinator at Izaak Walton League Wetlands & Floodplain Director at Missouri Coalition for the Environment, “Big Price – Little Benefit,” February 2010, http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079

Barge Industry contributions are inadequate to properly fund the Inland Waterways Trust Fund’s projects backlog, yet the industry wants to restore IWTF solvency and increase inland waterways navigation investment primarily by increasing the burden on all other taxpayers. • The barge industry touts itself as the cheapest form of commodity transportation. Unfortunately, the equation used to derive that designation excludes over 90 percent of the costs to support the inland waterways system. According to the National Academy of Sciences,1 U.S. taxpayers pay 92 percent of the inland waterway system (IWS) costs of constructing, operating and maintaining barge navigation infrastructure. This is compared to virtually no taxpayer support for rail system users and only 20 percent for highway system users. The general public does receive some benefits from the current dams on the rivers, though it can be argued that the costs, both financial and to the environment, have far exceeded these benefits. The barge industry paid nothing for the original lock and dam system and do not contribute to repairing and restoring degraded riverine ecosystems, which the inland waterways navigation system is largely responsible for causing. The taxpayers have been totally responsible for these costs, and as mentioned above all of the O&M costs and 50 percent of the construction and rehabilitation costs. • When all costs are accounted for, the inland waterways system is by far the most expensive shipping system in the country. What the 1986 Inland Waterways Trust Fund Legislation Requires: • Funding of the IWTF comes from a diesel fuel tax per gallon paid by commercial transportation on inland waterways. The tax increased incrementally from 1986 at $0.10 to 1995 at $0.20. The tax from this legislation has not increased since 1995.2 • The legislation requires 50 percent of the cost of construction3 of new inland waterways navigation facilities to be funded from the IWTF.

#### Turn – stimulus dollars trade off with more productive private dollars – overall hurt the economy

Riedl (Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies atHeritage Foundation) 2010

Brian, Wall Street Journal, January 8

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703481004574646551469288292.html?mod=WSJ_latestheadlines>

Government spending can affect long-term economic growth, both up and down. Economic growth is based on the growth of labor productivity and labor supply, which can be affected by how governments directly and indirectly influence the use of an economy's resources. However, increasing the economy's productivity rate--which often requires the application of new technology and resources-- can take many years or even decades to materialize. It is not short-term stimulus.[13] In fact, large stimulusbillsoften reduce long-term productivity by transferring resources from the more productive private sector to the less productive government. The government rarely receives good value for the dollars it spends. However, stimulus bills provide politicians with the political justification to grant tax dollars to favored constituencies. By increasing the budget deficit, large stimulus bills eventually contribute to higher interest rates while dropping even more debt on future generations.

### BioDiversity Turn

#### Construction trades off with funding available for restoring river ecosystems

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

As previously cited, the 200 wildlife resource professionals that make up the Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee estimated in 2002 that an annual investment as high as $900 million for 50 years may be necessary to restore the river ecosystems and address the impacts from ongoing barge navigation. However, the necessity of achieving adequate ecosystem restoration on the Upper Mississippi River System is currently obstructed by the misguided and unjustified large-scale navigation construction projects proposed in NESP. This report details the verified shortcomings and faulty rationale for building seven new 1,200-foot locks on the UMR-IWW.

#### Loss of biodiversity Leads to Extinction.

Diner in ‘94

David Dinner, Ph. D in Planetary Science and Geology. “The Army and the Endangered Speciies Act: Who’s Endangering Who?. Military Law Review 143. 1994

To accept that the snail darter, harelip sucker, or Dismal Swamp southeastern shrew 74 could save [hu]mankind may be difficult for some. Many, if not most, species are useless to[hu]man[s] in a direct utilitarian sense. Nonetheless, they may be critical in an indirect role, because their extirpations could affect a directly useful species negatively. In a closely interconnected ecosystem, the loss of a species affects other species dependent on it. 75 Moreover, as the number of species decline, the effect of each new extinction on the remaining species increases dramatically. 4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is that diversity is better than simplicity. 77 As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. 78 [\*173] Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." 79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction**,** with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction**.** Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

# Solvency XT

### Spending links

#### New locks are not worth the initial investments

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

The UMR-IWW navigation expansion planning process has, since its inception, been replete with problems associated with the proposed new and extended locks. In early 2000, the Inspector General for the Department of the Army confirmed that the Corps had manipulated the economic justification for the proposed locks, and the resultant controversy delayed the navigation expansion process for more than a year. After selecting a plan from the developed alternatives in NESP in late 2004, the Corps was then required to undertake a lengthy economic re-evaluation of the proposed navigation plan. In January 2006, the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works) responded to the Corps’ Recommended Plan for NESP, stating that he did not believe the seven new locks were demonstrated to be economically justified. In response, the Corps provided an Economic Reevaluation Report in March 2008. After all of this effort, in July 2008 the Assistant Secretary of the Army declared, “My office has completed its review and I have determined that the recommended project cannot yet be supported by the reevaluation report….” The Assistant Secretary of the Army further determined that, “There are too many uncertainties documented by the [External Review Panel] to warrant conclusions that the project is economically justified.

#### Lock and dam projects are prone to severe cost overruns

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

One major reason IWTF is depleted is cost overruns on several large lock and dam projects the Corps has been constructing on the Ohio River. 39 The cost estimates and annual escalation factors for the Ohio River projects, as indicated in Table 5, have fallen far short. Actual cost overruns range from 82 percent to more than 205 percent. Similar to the Ohio River projects, Table 6 shows a dramatic increase in estimated costs for the seven new UMR-IWW locks proposed in the Corps’ 2004 NESP Final Report. In just five years, estimates have increased from 34 to 57 percent, an overall average of more than 43 percent. On an annual basis, the average cost estimate increase has been 8.7 percent. Due to inadequate IWTF funding levels and escalating navigation project costs, IWTF is not expected to be able to provide significant funding for NESP projects for at least the next 5 years. During this period, the cost of constructing the seven new 1,200-foot locks on the UMR-IWW will only continue to escalate, further undermining the economic justification of NESP because higher costs will decrease the projects’ Benefit-Cost ratios (assuming the value of benefits remain the same). Alternatively, should Congress act to reduce or eliminate the IWTF contribution to NESP construction, the projects’ costs for taxpayers could as much as double.

#### Related industries often misrepresent facts in order to secure unnecessary funding

Congressional Research Service 11

"Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues For Congress." *Unt.edu*. Congressional Research Service, 20 Jan. 2011. Web. 27 June 2012.

A central issue for Congress is the level and urgency of infrastructure investments on federal waterways. Commercial users, including shippers and some agricultural interests, have argued that additional investment is justified because of aging infrastructure, the need for expanded capacity, and positive environmental externalities associated with inland waterway shipping compared to other forms of shipping. These users argue that the benefits of inland waterways are widespread. Their claims are countered by a number of other groups, including taxpayer and environmental advocacy groups, who argue against increased federal funding for inland waterways. These groups note that the shipping industry often misrepresents or overstates the benefits of these investments and that major funding increases for inland waterway projects are not warranted.

#### Lock repairs only yield 80 cents for every taxpayer dollar spent on the project

IWLA 10

"B I G P R I C E — L I T TL E B E N E F I T: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers Are Not Economically Viable." *Iwla.org*. Izaak Walton League of America (The Izaak Walton League was formed in 1922 to save outdoor America for future generations.), 2010. Web. 26 June 2012.

The past two decades of recorded UMR-IWW barge traffic shows flat-or-declining traffic levels, significantly different from the projected increasing traffic “Reasonable Range” asserted by the Corps. The established trend of flat or falling barge traffic equates to a Benefit-Cost ratio of 0.2 for the NESP projects and constitutes a negative return of $0.80 for every $1.00 of taxpayer investment in the seven proposed new 1,200-foot locks. Even the analysis assembled by the Corps using the current traffic levels determines NESP construction would incur a major financial loss on investment.

#### Each 1200 foot lock costs hundreds of millions of dollars

Bertels 98

Bertels, Paul. (Dir. Agriculture Economic Analysis Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago) "Cost Recovery on the U.S. Inland Waterway System." *Ntl.bts.gov*. US Department of Agriculture, July 1998. Web. 26 June 2012.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is currently involved in a multiyear, $49 million study to analyze the infrastructure needs of the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. This study will predict which locks, if any, should be replaced and the pace of those projects. The engineering portion of this study was completed in 1997. Estimates from this study show that a new 1,200- foot lock chamber could cost $115 to $520 million.

#### Lock repairs can cost in excess of 1 billion dollars

Munro 10

MUNRO, EDITH. (Staff writer for Corn and Soybean Digest) "CAN OUR RIVERS DELIVER?." *Corn and Soybean Digest*. 01 Jan. 2010: 8. *eLibrary*. Web. 27 Jun. 2012.

Maintenance grows more expensive while funds are limited, he explains. "On the upper river, improving locks is a key issue, but one job can cost over $1 billion. Limited funding limits what you can do."

#### Operation and Maintenance of inland waterways will cost in excess of 400 million dollars annually

Bertels 98

Bertels, Paul. (Dir. Agriculture Economic Analysis Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago) "Cost Recovery on the U.S. Inland Waterway System." *Ntl.bts.gov*. US Department of Agriculture, July 1998. Web. 26 June 2012.

In addition to the costs associated with establishing the system, inland waterway operation and maintenance (O&M) costs are also paid by the U.S. Government. These costs include lock and dam maintenance, dredging and channelization projects, channel signaling, and like expenses. The Corps of Engineers has projected O&M costs of $433 million for the fuel-taxed waterways for 1998. Analysis of these costs by river ranges shows that the Upper Mississippi, Middle Mississippi, Lower Mississippi, and Illinois Rivers incur O&M costs which vary significantly by river segment; e.g., $88.4 million, $14.7 million, $36.5 million, and $23.9 million, respectively. These rivers, with the addition of the Ohio River ($58.7 million for O&M costs), are the leading arteries for waterborne agricultural traffic in the United States.

#### Costs don’t outweigh benefits- multiple factors

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

Since the early 1990s, despite flat or declining barge traffic, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps) has been developing a plan to increase barge capacity on the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway (UMR-IWW) by adding seven new 1,200-foot locks and extending five existing 600-foot locks. According to the Corps’ Upper Mississippi River System Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP) Web site, the Corps has prepared at least 253 detailed engineering, economic, and environmental reports to justify this UMR-IWW navigation expansion plan. 1 And taxpayers have paid the more than $50 million bill for the Corps to prepare reports pertaining to the new navigation projects and their environmental impacts. The Corps developed NESP’s navigation expansion plan – with an associated implementation cost of more than $2 billion – in response to industry claims of significant delays in passing barge tows through 600-foot locks on the UMR-IWW. Provisions to tie ecosystem restoration to the construction plans were later added through NESP to address the documented environmental degradation to river ecosystems resulting from barge navigation. Although delays do occur on the lock and dam system, and the need for environmental restoration actions are clearly known, the primary question is whether the heavily subsidized construction of new 1,200-foot locks to expand barge capacity on the UMRIWW system is a justified investment of taxpayer money. Multiple factors demonstrate that the proposed construction of the new locks is not justified: •Barge traffic on the Upper Mississippi River-Illinois Waterway has been flat since 1980, and in recent years continued a trend of significant drops in volume. Locks currently in operation have excess capacity of more than 50 percent, which would accommodate any reasonable future increase in lock demand. •Due to the lack of consistent funding, the Corps has been unable to keep current on necessary maintenance on the UMR-IWW lock and dam system. This large and growing backlog creates a perpetual problem that new construction does not solve. Because basic maintenance is necessary for any lock in use, new construction only adds another expense to existing unmet maintenance funding needs. •Several non-structural and small-scale measures, including barge traffic appointment scheduling, have been identified by the Corps as measures that can reduce barge lockage delays. These measures need to be instituted and evaluated before the Corps proceeds with any new lock construction. An important step in that evaluation process is completing another Benefit-Cost Analysis for the new locks using conditions subsequent to full implementation of non-structural and smallscale measures. •The barge industry asserts that shipping by barge is significantly more fuel efficient than rail transportation and therefore less polluting. More complete analysis of transportation fuel efficiency demonstrates that this claim is incorrect because it ignores the use of highly efficient rail systems and does not take into consideration that barges travel more miles following the course of the river than trains do to get to the same destination. •The Corps’ own economic analysis shows new construction of seven 1,200-foot locks will result in a negative return on investment. Based on two decades of flat or decreasing barge traffic, the proposed new locks will likely result in a loss of 80 cents for every dollar provided by taxpayers. Of additional concern is the fact that other Corps lock projects currently underway are exceeding their initial cost-estimates by double and even triple the estimated amounts.2

#### Plan would cost $380 million

Bolesovic 12

Bolesovic, Len. (staff writer) "Legislation Proposed to Fund Deteriorating Locks and Dams." *Legislation Proposed to Fund Deteriorating Locks and Dams*. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 25 Mar. 2012. Web. 26 June 2012. <http://old.post-gazette.com/pg/12085/1219043-28.stm>.

To speed the replacement of at-risk facilities, the legislation would provide $380 million in funding for 20 years. Most of the new money would be provided by taxpayers. The measure also would increase the diesel fuel tax that barge operators pay to support those projects to 26 cents. It has been 20 cents per gallon since 1995.

### **Biodiversity XT**

#### **Inland water ecosystems key to solve climate change**

Finlayson et al 05

C. Max Finlayson, Institute for Land, Water & Society, Charles Sturt University, Albury, NSW, Australia & 34 others, Inland Water Systems, Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Current State and Trends: Findings of the Condition and Trends Working Group of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 12/14/2005 <http://www.maweb.org/documents/document.289.aspx.pdf>

Inland water systems play two critical but contrasting roles in mitigating the effects of climate change: the regulation of greenhouse gases (especially carbon dioxide) and the physical buffering of climate change impacts. Inland water systems have been identified as significant storehouses (sinks) of carbon as well as sources of carbon dioxide (such as boreal peatlands), as net sequesters of organic carbon in sediments, and as transporters of carbon to the sea. Although covering an estimated 3–4% of the world’s land area, peatlands are estimated to hold 540 gigatons of carbon (Immirizy and Maltby 1992), representing about 1.5% of the total estimated global carbon storage and about 25–30% of that contained in terrestrial vegetation and soils (Joosten and Clarke 2002; Le´veˆque 2003). Many wetlands also sequester carbon from the atmosphere through photosynthesis and act as traps for carbon-rich sediments from watershed sources. It is likely that one of the most important roles of wetlands may be in the regulation of global climate change through sequestering and releasing a major proportion of fixed carbon in the biosphere (Mitsch and Wu 1995). Inland waters also contribute to the regulation of local climates. Possibly the most widely publicized example is that of the Aral Sea, where a combination of desiccation and pollution have altered the local climate, with dire effects on human health (as described later in the chapter). Similarly, the burning and degradation of peatland in Southeast Asia have degraded the atmosphere and affected the health of a large but possibly indeterminate number of people if the long-term effects on livelihoods as a consequence of the land degradation are considered. Getting accurate measurements of such effects and the number of people actually affected by changes in local climates is likely to prove difficult in some instances due to an absence of data and the dispersed nature of some effects or the population affected.

#### The plan increases taxpayer spending and eliminates industry responsibility to enviorment

IWLA no date

Izaak Walton League of America, conservation organization, “Another Corporate Bailout: Inland Waterways Trust Fund” <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=d/sp/i/5034/pid/5034> Accessed 6-26-12

The inland waterways navigation system – the locks and dams constructed on several of the country’s major rivers – is the most publically subsidized commercial transportation system in the United States, receiving about 90 percent of its funding from taxpayers. Despite this immense level of corporate welfare, the barge industry, through the Inland Waterways User’s Board, has proposed an increase in the public’s contribution, which would likely raise the subsidy to near 95 percent. On April 13, 2010, the Inland Marine Transportation Systems (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report—Final Recommendations was released. We estimate the IMTS recommendations will further increase the public subsidy for inland waterway construction and rehabilitation by about $200 million annually. The barge industry contributes about $80 million per year into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund (IWTF) through a $0.20 per gallon fuel tax that has not been increased since 1995. The IWTF currently pays the costs for half of all new and rehabilitation construction on the inland waterways system. The taxpayers fund the remaining half of construction projects as well as the cost of all of the system’s operation, maintenance, and environmental restoration – a total cost approaching $800 million per year. The proposed changes would eliminate all industry funding for costs related to dams on the system and also require the industry to fund only lock rehabilitation projects that cost more than $100 million. The taxpayers will pay the full cost of all lock rehabilitations that cost less than $100 million. The locks cannot function without the dams, so eliminating the barge industry’s responsibility for their rehabilitation is illogical and unreasonable. We strongly urge that the IMTS report recommendations for increasing the public’s cost-share obligations on the inland waterways system be rejected.

#### Plan increases taxpayer burden and trades off with other environmental projects

Udvardy et al 2012

Shana Udvardy, Director, Flood Management Policy American Rivers; Denny Caneff, Executive Director River Alliance of Wisconsin; Jim Harkness, President Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy ;Brad Redlin Agricultural Program Director Izaak Walton League of America; Kathleen Logan Smith Executive Director Missouri Coalition for the Environment; David Conrad Senior Water Resources Specialist National Wildlife Federation; Glynnis Collins Executive Director Prairie Rivers Network; Ed Hopkins Director, Environmental Quality Program; Sierra Club Steve; Ellis Vice President Taxpayers for Common Sense, Letter to US House of Representatives- “Inland Waterways Trust Fund Taxpayer Bailout” June 17, 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/5033> Accessed 6-26-12

We understand that the inland waterway users are proposing to shift large amounts of the costs of constructing and maintaining the inland waterway system off of the industry and onto federal taxpayers. This proposal represents a major retreat from prior long and strenuous negotiations for costsharing reforms and would effectively gut the inland waterway cost-sharing requirements agreed to in the landmark 1986 Water Resources Development Act. On behalf of the millions of members and supporters our organizations represent, we urge you to reject this approach and find a more equitable way to address the funding shortfalls in the Inland Waterway Trust Fund. Simply put, the trust fund is depleted due to several problems, including major increases in spending and massive cost overruns at projects and flat and declining traffic levels yielding less revenue. Tapping the U.S. Treasury to mask these structural problems would be irresponsible. Furthermore, recognizing the competitive nature of the Corps of Engineers budget, increasing taxpayer funding for the Inland Waterway System would directly reduce funding available for flood and storm damage reduction and environmental restoration projects. We have reviewed the recommendations contained in the Inland Marine Transportation Systems (IMTS) Capital Projects Business Model, Final Report, Revision 1 dated April 13, 2010 - Final Recommendations. This report prepared for the Inland Waterways Users Board, which consists primarily of representatives of the nation’s barge companies, recommends shifting the Congressionally-mandated cost-share requirements for construction and rehabilitation of locks and dams on the inland waterways system from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund to taxpayers. We strongly oppose all changes that will shift responsibility for the marine transportation system’s problems onto taxpayers. The IMTS recommendations resolve the industry’s shortfall by simply moving cost-share obligations from the users of the inland waterways to taxpayers and in so doing remove any incentive to contain project costs. Currently, the inland waterways system is publicly subsidized at approximately 90 percent, including 50 percent of the costs for new construction projects and rehabilitation projects, and 100 percent of all operation and maintenance expenses. This is by far the most subsidized freight shipping mode in the country. The industry provides only about $80 million per year to the IWTF through a $0.20 per gallon fuel tax that has not increased since 1995. The remaining more than $720 million required to keep the system functioning is already being provided by the taxpayers. We estimate the IMTS recommendations will further increase the public subsidy for inland waterway construction and rehabilitation by about $200 million annually, while adding major additional taxpayer obligations for operating and maintaining the inland waterway system. The table below details the changes proposed by the inland waterways users to long-standing costshare obligations in order to blatantly transfer the industry’s costs onto the U.S. Treasury and all federal taxpayers. We strongly urge that the IMTS report recommendations for increasing the public’s cost-share obligations on the inland waterways system be rejected. At a time when the federal government’s financial resources are stretched to the limit, seeking an increase in an already excessive subsidy is clearly unwarranted and irresponsible.

#### Lock system construction destroys the river’s ecosystem

Walker et al 2010

Brad Walker, Glynnis Collins, David Conrad, Christine Favilla, Bill Grant, David Hoskins, Scott Kovarovics, Dawn Merritt, Mark Muller, Julia Olmsted, Brad Redlin, Gwen Steel, and Dr. Don Sweeney, Nicollet Island Coalition, “Big Price- Little Benefit:Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and illinois rivers Are not economically Viable” February 2010 <http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079>, Accessed 6-26-12

Since the completion of the UMR-IWW navigation system, the river ecosystems have declined significantly. As the Corps candidly stated in its study of expanding navigation construction on the river, the Upper Mississippi River ecosystem is “significantly altered, is currently degraded, and is expected to get worse.” 4 Rather than a natural, continuous river, the dams turned the Upper Mississippi into a series of pools, which age like reservoirs from sediment accumulation and are degrading further each year. Channelization of the lower open portion of the river, due to the construction of levees and river training structures built to improve navigation, has separated the river from its floodplain. Barge traffic throughout the UMR-IWW system causes additional environmental damage to islands and river banks from wave action as well as from the long periods of storage, or “fleeting,” of empty barges along the river banks. These combined conditions and the resultant erosion and disturbance creates a host of environmental consequences such as high turbidity, which undermines river ecosystems by choking off aquatic plants and destroying the river food chain at its foundation. In sum, there is no denying that the natural functions of the river have been adversely affected by the presence of 29 dams and their associated locks and barge traffic. A river sub-divided into a string of lakes is simply not capable of functioning as a dynamic river ecosystem.

#### Repairing inland waterways would place a massive burden on taxpayers and disrupt the economic recovery

Quinlan 11

Quinlan, Paul. *The New York Times*. The New York Times, 3 Oct. 2011. Web. 27 June 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2011/10/03/03greenwire-industry-obama-admin-wrestle-over-funding-for-26677.html?pagewanted=all>.

Michael Toohey, president and CEO of the Waterways Council, an industry group, decried the plan as a massive tax increase. "The proposed legislation would more than double the amount of taxes and fees on one beneficiary of our nation's waterways: commercial shippers," Toohey said in a statement. "These new economic burdens will disrupt the fragile economic recovery by unfairly disadvantaging consumers who will surely pay more for their goods and electricity."

#### Despite costly mitigation techniques, expanding infrastructure leads to habitat destruction and species extinction in inland waterways

US Army Corps of Engineers 12

US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization: Preparing for Post-Panamax Vessels,” Institute for Water Resources, US Army Corps of Engineers, 6/20/2012, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/rpt/June\_20\_U.S.\_Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Preparing\_for\_Post\_Panamax\_Vessels.pdf

Potential environmental impacts and mitigation needs are important aspects of planning for port and waterway modernization in response to increasing international freight transport, intermodal container-based shipment in larger oceanic vessels, and Panama Canal enlargement. Although much investigation of modernization needs has transpired, as attested to in previous chapters, the environmental impacts have received much less attention. Mitigation costs can be substantial. At the Port of Savannah, for example, mitigation costs are about 45 percent of the total estimated harbor expansion cost.28 Environmental rules and permit requirements have become more stringent as their benefits became clearer. Emphasis on effective environmental impact mitigation is expected to continue, if not increase, and to be an essential consideration in determining modernization costs and net benefits. Possible adverse environmental impacts are based on indicators of potential impact sources and vulnerabilities of human populations and natural and cultural resources. Consistent with environmental goals established in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the vulnerability metrics were selected to indicate potential impacts on public health and safety (including the social inequity of many impacts), the sustainability of important resource heritage, and environmental services that support commercial, recreational, and other uses of natural marine, estuarine, freshwater and shore resources. The impact-source metrics indicate regional rates of freight transport growth based on regional population growth over the next three decades, the unused capacity of ports compared to percent growth in regional population, harbor expansion needs for acceptance of the largest post-Panamax vessels, and possible effects of Panama Canal enlargement. While specific port and waterway environmental assessments and impact statements were consulted, they were not uniformly available or comparable across regions. The Indicators were selected based on their national comparability across regional ports, reliability (mostly Federal databases), and representativeness. More detailed information can be found in a supporting IWR report. The Environmental Footprint Despite much improvement of impact mitigation since more stringent and comprehensive environmental laws were passed, the cumulative effects of adverse impacts from transportation system development and operations have left a significant environmental footprint. These impacts also interact with other sources of impact to degrade environmental quality. In the following subsections, the environmental footprint is first placed in perspective by geographic comparison to other sources of impact. Then the nature of past sources of the environmental footprint is summarized. The Environmental Footprint Much of the conterminous United States has been altered by land and water development and use. The change has been beneficial for the most part, but a large fraction of the Nation’s natural environment has been replaced with substantially different qualities that have compromised important natural services in support of human welfare. About 13 percent of the conterminous United States is now reserved for light use in parks, wildlife refuges, and wilderness areas where most natural qualities prevail.30 Another 56 percent is more intensively used for forest management, grazing and other use that sustains many natural qualities except where management is lax. Many natural qualities have been lost from the 27 percent used for intensive crop culture and rural residential development. The remaining 4 percent is densely urban or used for rural transportation. It includes the geographical area of landside port, highway and railroad impact, which is about 1.6 percent in total. Relatively few natural qualities remain in the footprint of these densely impacted areas. Despite many benefits, human use and transformation of the landscape has come at significant environmental cost. It has cumulatively degraded some commercial and recreational use of resources.31 It has contributed to health and safety concerns32 and to probable or possible extinction of at least 240 American species, and the decline of many more.33 While the freight transportation system has directly impacted a small percent of the total impacted area of the conterminous United States, the effects often are intense, extend well beyond directly impacted areas, and sometimes interact synergistically with other sources of adverse environmental impact. The geographical impact of land and water use described above provides a high-altitude perspective that misses the growing scarcity of wetland and open-water environments, which are disproportionately impacted by ports and waterways. Wetlands have been reduced from about 11.1 percent to about 5.3 percent.34 During the past decade, tidal wetlands have been further reduced by the cumulative effects of rising sea level, channelization, sediment deprivation, other human impact, and hurricanes.35 Now they are especially scarce, making up only 0.3 percent of the conterminous United States. Open waters comprise 5.3 percent of the conterminous United States, including the American portion of the Great Lakes and coastal oceanic waters to the 12-mile territorial limit.36 Without the Great Lakes and artificial reservoirs, the non-tidal inland waters of the conterminous U. S. amount to less than 1 percent of the total, much of that in lakes. The remaining free-flowing streams and rivers have become increasingly scarce and are now about 0.5 percent of the total area.37 Despite improvements in recent decades, freshwaters have been hit hard by physical, chemical and biological changes. Reservoir construction has increased the Nation’s total open-water area in total while reducing the area of free-flowing water. Numerous non-native aquatic species are well established and some have costly effects.38 Nearly 50 percent of streams and lakes remain unnaturally contaminated with nutrients, sediment, heavy metals and synthetic organic compounds.39 As a consequence of these changes, about five times as many freshwater species as terrestrial species went extinct.40 41 Species extinction and imperilment is concentrated in areas with active ports and waterways, especially along the Pacific Coast, Southeastern Coast, and in states bordering the Ohio, Tennessee and Mississippi waterways

### 2NC-Not solve in short term

#### Infrastructure spending does not increase jobs in the short term – only shifts jobs from one area to another

Foster '11 (Norman B. Ture Senior Fellow in the Economics of Fiscal Policy at The Heritage Foundation) J.D., Testimony on Labor – Heritage Foundation, Sept. 21

<http://www.heritage.org/research/testimony/2011/09/promoting-job-creation-in-the-us>

Increased infrastructure spending, as the President and others have advocated, is an example of a double folly. To be clear, the issue here is not whether the nation needs more or less infrastructure spending. I am not expressing an opinion on that one way or another. The issue is whether it acts as a short-term stimulus. It does not. First, assuming the additional spending was financed by additional borrowing, the policy runs afoul of the Keynesian fallacy. To be sure, once a project is underway one can point to the people working, but just as surely the borrowing that made that project possible reduced employment elsewhere. The second folly is just as plain. Infrastructure spending on projects is capital intensive and stretches over years. It cannot, even if enacted, swiftly affect employment in the next year plus.

#### Cost outweighs benefits—new locks would yield a negative return of 3 times the cost of the locks over the next 50 years

IWLA 10

"B I G P R I C E — L I T TL E B E N E F I T: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers Are Not Economically Viable." *Iwla.org*. Izaak Walton League of America (The Izaak Walton League was formed in 1922 to save outdoor America for future generations.), 2010. Web. 26 June 2012.

The high end B-C ratio of 1.3 for the HTS is still below the minimum 1.5 Benefit-Cost Ratio for public projects recommended by the Bush administration and relies on a growth in barge traffic that is unsubstantiated. Using the Corps 34 average annual costs and the LTS annual benefits for the proposed NESP navigation projects, the 0.4 B-C ratio for the LTS would result in a cumulative net loss of almost $5 billion to the U.S. economy over the 50 year design life of the NESP project if the lock expansions are constructed, or roughly twice the estimated cost of NESP lock construction. Similarly, though the Corps did not include an annual benefit number for the now decades-long flat or falling traffic condition (0.2), calculations indicate that it would result in a negative return of $7 billion over 50 years, or about three times the cost of the locks.

### Maintenance Solves Better

#### Normal maintenance programs extend the life of locks significantly

IWLA 10

"B I G P R I C E — L I T TL E B E N E F I T: Proposed Locks on the Upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers Are Not Economically Viable." *Iwla.org*. Izaak Walton League of America (The Izaak Walton League was formed in 1922 to save outdoor America for future generations.), 2010. Web. 27 June 2012.

“The study concluded that the life of existing locks and dams and their components can be extended with normal periodic rehabilitation for another 50 years and match the design life of any new construction being considered as part of the ‘with project’ condition.” 14 Over the past two decades, all of the locks on the UMRIWW have received major rehabilitation investments. Table 2 shows the rehabilitation investments made to the existing seven locks where new 1,200-foot locks are proposed.

#### Maintenance solves more effectively than complete repair

Congressional Research Service 11

"Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues For Congress." *Unt.edu*. Congressional Research Service, 20 Jan. 2011. Web. 27 June 2012.

Other groups argue against significant new investments for inland waterway projects. In arguing against new locks on the Upper Mississippi River, a coalition of environmental groups recently noted that while the design life of new investments is usually only 50 years, regular maintenance can extend the life of existing locks for an additional 50 years at a considerably lesser cost than that for new construction. These groups generally argue that the costs of new lock construction greatly exceed the benefits of reduced waiting time and lock unavailability, and point out that issues associated with most aging inland waterways infrastructure can be overcome by improved small-scale and non-structural improvements.

# Politics Link:

## Unpopular

#### **Waterway popularity down in favor of better forms of transport**

Marine Link 12

“US Inland Waterway Transportation Outlook,” 6/14/2012, Marine Link.com: *Maritime Reporter* and *MarineNews* magazines online, <http://www.marinelink.com/news/transportation-waterway345487.aspx>

With consumers increasing their spending as the economy recovers, and manufacturers likewise boosting their production, demand for inland water transportation will get a boost. Additionally, rising fuel costs will lead to operators earning more money from fuel surcharges. However, the industry will experience some turbulence from rail transport providers, which are often seen as cheaper, faster and more environmentally friendly. For these reasons, industry research firm IBISWorld has added a report on the Inland Water Transportation industry to its growing industry report collection. The Inland Water Transportation industry dipped as the economy sank into recession. Over the past couple of years, consumers have decreased spending, and manufacturing industries have decreased production. Consequently, fewer goods have been transported along domestic inland waterways, decreasing revenue. In 2008, the industry dodged a bullet when rising fuel prices caused industry operators to impose fuel surcharges, which increased revenue. “However, rising revenue from fuel surcharges has not hit the industry's bottom line because fuel purchase costs for operators have increased as a result of the rising prices,” said IBISWorld industry analyst Lauren Setar. This industry operates in rivers, ports and other bodies of water in the United States. While operators provide passenger ferry services, transporting freight commodities generates the majority of revenue. In 2006 and 2007, demand for coal, petrochemicals and grain was particularly strong, and worldwide demand for commodities, especially from China, further fueled revenue growth.

#### Congress does not want to pass waterway funding

Farm Futures 11

“Funding for Modernization of Inland Waterways Faces an Uphill Battle,” Farm Futures Staff, August 8 2011, http://farmfutures.com/story.aspx/funding-for-modernization-of-inland-waterways-faces-an-uphill-battle-0-51995

Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Locks modernization faces new funding hurdles amid enactment of major debt reduction. Congress authorized Upper Mississippi and Illinois River Locks modernization over former President Bush's veto in 2007, but never appropriated any dollars for the effort. Now, in 2011, Waterways Council Spokeswoman Debra Colbert says the fight to secure funding faces the new obstacle of debt reduction. "It is a fiscally difficult environment and a politically difficult environment as well," Colbert said. "The government is going to be looking for cuts in as many places as they can find. From our point of view however an investment in inland waterways infrastructure is just about the best return on investment you have going." That investment in infrastructure would help jobs, the environment, safety, and farm exports, which just got a boost with Hill leaders agreeing on a way to move free trade deals ahead in September. "When we hear President Obama say he wants to double exports, I think it's within the next four years, it's very frustrating when 60% of the nation's grains are moved on our inland waterways," Colbert said. "You cannot double exports and trade in the way that he prescribes if you don't have the right infrastructure and the efficient infrastructure to make that happen." Colbert says much of the problem lies on Capitol Hill where a 20-year Inland Waterway Capital Development Plan by private industry and the Army Corps is moving at a crawl. "Unfortunately we haven't made as much headway as we'd like to just given the political and fiscal environment that we're dealing with, but we continue to press on," Colbert said. "We would hope to have something included in a potential House Transportation and Infrastructure bill that has a maritime title. We continue to talk to those folks about the importance of having a proposal like the Capital Development Plan." That is another option rather than including it in another water resources and development act that has now slowed way down in the Senate Environment Committee. The Capital Plan also calls for raising the tax paid by commercial users of the waterway system, but with objections from politically-strengthened anti-tax Republicans, Colbert says that too may be a tough sell.

#### Plan not popular - Congress has consistently rejected lock funding

Glass 11

 “Obama proposes inland waterways financing program,” Pamela Glass, staff writer for Work Boat, published 9/26/2011, <http://www.workboat.com/newsdetail.aspx?id=11266>

Darcy said the administration has begun to discuss the plan with the inland industry and other stakeholders. Both the Bush and Obama administrations have previously submitted legislative proposals to replace the fuel tax with a lock user fee that would have increased revenues and tied user fees to trust fund balances. Congress rejected them all. Last year, the Inland Waterways Users Board, a federal advisory committee, endorsed an alternative capital development plan that would increase the fuel surcharge by six cents, but also require an increase in the federal share of inland waterway costs. Congress is now considering the plan.

#### Plan sparks political backlash—funding and the barge industry

Glass 11

P. Glass, The Maritime Domain Awareness Information Exchange, MDA.com, “Inland infrastructure funding remains elusive”, December 20, 2011 http://www.mda.gov/2011/12/20/top-ten-news-stories-of-2011/

Inland infrastructure funding remains elusive A long-term funding solution for the nation’s aging inland infrastructure remains elusive, as Congress, skittish about increasing taxes and federal spending, considers two funding proposals that would do just that. The difficulty is that neither of the plans — one offered by the Obama administration, the other by a joint industry-federal advisory board — makes lawmakers feel politically comfortable in an environment dominated by partisan politics and intense pressure to cut spending and the federal deficit. The first, floated more than a year ago by the Inland Waterways Users Board (IWUB), envisions more federal spending on lock-and-dam construction while proposing an increase in the diesel fuel tax now paid by the barge industry into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. The Capital Development Plan (CDP) also calls for significant reforms in how water projects are evaluated and prioritized for funding. The industry plan “is a place to start the discussion,” Rep. Bob Gibbs, R-Ohio, chairman of the House Water Resources and Environment subcommittee, said after a September hearing. “I don’t think it will go forward with a tax increase.” Added Rep. Timothy Bishop, D-N.Y., the panel’s ranking minority member: “I don’t see how this plan can fly unless there is an increase in the Corps budget, and I don’t see that happening.” The second plan, proposed recently by the Obama administration, would collect more funds for inland waterways infrastructure by imposing new fees on commercial vessels that use the nation’s rivers. The plan is expected to raise $1 billion over the next 10 years by using a two-tier fee system — one for all inland waterways operators and a second for those transiting locks — and would supplement the current 20-cent-per-gallon fuel tax. The plan would also expand the definition of inland waterways from 27 to 67 segments that would be subject to the new fees. These differing proposals have set up a perfect storm for a stalemate. The barge industry opposes the Obama plan, saying it is unworkable and unfairly doubles the taxes and fees on commercial shippers. The Obama administration opposes the industry plan, preferring instead its solution that would make commercial users pay more for using inland rivers. Meanwhile, Congress hasn’t shown much enthusiasm for either. No lawmaker has yet come forward to offer legislation on the industry’s plan, only one hearing on Capitol Hill has been held, and several lawmakers have said that any plan that shifts more costs to U.S. taxpayers or increases taxes will not pass Congress. User fees are equally unpopular, with previous proposals being ignored by Congress. But industry representatives, acknowledging tight budgets and challenges of educating lawmakers about the importance of waterways, remain optimistic that a solution can be found. The Waterways Council Inc., an industry-funded group, has taken a different track on convincing Congress that the industry plan merits approval. Newly appointed WCI president and CEO Michael J. Toohey pointed to some positive signs of late, including the willingness of Rep. Ed Whitfield, R-Ky., to offer the CDP legislation, and the inclusion of waterways infrastructure improvements in the president’s jobs plan. “We have a moment in time where the stars are aligned, and we must take advantage of it,” he said. “We will continue to have an opportunity if the economy remains stagnant, and we have high unemployment before the elections.”

#### **Inland waterways are partisan—spending**

Glass 11

Pamela Glass, Washington Watch, “Inland waterways funding: Tax increases or user fees?”, September 22, 2011 http://www.workboat.com/blogpost.aspx?id=11232

Just before Christmas, the inland waterways industry found coal in its stocking when the Obama administration bluntly rejected a new funding plan that had taken 18 months to develop. Shocked, as it thought it had a strong proposal to modernize and maintain the nation’s system of aging locks and dams, the joint industry-federal board that developed the plan pleaded with federal officials to reconsider. After months of silence, the response finally came last Monday when the president announced his plan for economic growth and deficit reduction. But its not quite what the industry had hoped for. Obama’s proposal includes a plan to finance waterways infrastructure with “a new user financing structure.” This user fee would supplement the diesel fuel tax that barges now pay to finance 50 percent of infrastructure construction. (So there would possibly be two taxes — the existing diesel tax and a likely lockage fee under the president’s plan.) By contrast, the joint industry-federal plan would, among other reforms, increase the diesel fuel tax by six cents a gallon, while shifting more of the financial burden for building most infrastructure from a 50-50 federal-industry split entirely to Uncle Sam. This shift is one of the principal reasons why the Obama administration and taxpayer groups oppose the plan. Testifying before a congressional committee on Wednesday, Jo-Ellen Darcy, assistant secretary of the Army for Civil Works, said that the new fee would raise $1.1 billion additional revenue for the Inland Waterways Trust Fund. The idea is that beneficiaries should shoulder a significant share of the costs of the infrastructure they use. It’s not yet clear what form the fee would take. Lockage fees, perhaps in the form of a flat fee or sliding scale to help combat congestion delays, are possibilities, although such proposals have been rejected by Congress when included in previous budgets. Darcy said the administration would offer details soon. But both the administration’s fee (or, really, tax) and the development plan’s tax increase on diesel fuel and the funding shift put Congress in a political dilemma. Republicans in the House have taken a strong public stand against no new taxes while advocating spending cuts. Democrats must also show that they can take steps to reduce the deficit. Neither of these proposals offers lawmakers much political cover in this partisan, budget-cutting environment. Many congressmen at Wednesday’s hearing, although emphasizing the need for a resolution, expressed reservations about components of the joint industry-federal plan. Meanwhile, taxpayer groups called it “greedy” and suggested that some “deadbeat waterways” should be shut down, investments prioritized, and lockage fees considered. At least two congressmen — one Democrat and one Republican — told me after the hearing that any plan with a tax increase will not likely move forward. This leaves us with a murky future for the reform of inland infrastructure funding. There is still a lot of work to be done.

# CPs

## Private investment CP

#### Public investment in waterways doesn’t solve for the environment – use of disincentives.

J. Brian Phillips & Alan Germani, Spring 2010, owns a contracting company based in Houston, Texas, he helped defeat zon-ing ordinances in Houston in 1993' and in Hohhs, New Mexico in 2007, and has actively fought other violations of property rights, Alan Germani is the associate editor of The Objective Stand, p. 52-3, Ebsco Host

Although some claim that still more government regulations are required to combat the ongoing problems of pollution and depleted fish populations, any such coercive measures are in principle doomed to failure because they attempt to treat problems in the waterways while ignoring their actual cause: "public ownership." Government force may provide a disincentive for certain behaviors, but this disin-centive does not motivate the users of waterways to maintain or enhance the life-serving value of these resources. As a result, America's waterways remain largely and significantly polluted, and fish populations, even where they are stabilizing, remain at levels insufficient to meet the growing demand for seafood. If "public" waterways offer little incentive for users to mitigate pollution and increase fish populations, then how do waterways fare when privately owned? Although "public" waterways are overwhelmingly the norm, the few instances of private waterways that do exist demonstrate that, to the extent that their right to property is recognized and protected, the owners of these resources have a strong incentive to maintain and enhance their life-serving value. Although nearly every state in the United States prohibits private owner-ship of streams, streams in a small section of Montana's Yellowstone Valley re –mark ably have not been subjected to the "public trust " doctrine. In this section of Yellowstone, streams are owned by individuals who profit from their property by leasing fishing rights to sports fishermen.^^ Stream owners have an incentive to keep their streams clean and well-stocked for their customers, which they ac-complish by voluntarily limiting both access to their property and the grazing of livestock nearby. The owners set these limits according to their own best judgment and toward the goal of long-term profits. Their streams, which are clean and teem –ing with fish, are in sharp contrast to "public" streams in the United States, many of which are too polluted for swimming or fishing ''and in which populations of such freshwater species as trout and bullheads are declining.^"

#### Private investment in waterways is the best option – incentive to maintain and improve.

J. Brian Phillips & Alan Germani, Spring 2010, owns a contracting company based in Houston, Texas, he helped defeat zon-ing ordinances in Houston in 1993' and in Hohhs, New Mexico in 2007, and has actively fought other violations of property rights, Alan Germani is the associate editor of The Objective Stand, p. 64, Ebsco Host

"Public" waterways are inherently impractical: By denying men the ability to es-tablish property in waterways, the "public trust” doctrine reduces their incentive to maintain and improve waterways. By contrast, private waterways are entirely practical: By recognizing the creation of and right to use values in the waterways, private property and the principle of property rights enable men to profit by creat-ing, maintaining, and enhancing values in the waterways. Those concerned with the cleanliness of water, the health and viability of fish populations, and, more importantly, each man's right to use his creations, must ad-vocate the privatization of waterways and the protection of property rights there -in. If the government—through a legislature that passed laws protecting value creation in the waterways and a judiciary that applied the principle of property rights when adjudicating disputes—recognized and protected private ownership in the waterways, then men could pursue value-creation there in, confident that they would have legal recourse should another violate their right to do so. The only alternative to such a system is the kind of system we already have: a legal and political frame work that violates individual rights and quashes the incentive for men to maintain and improve the value of waterways. If we care about the health and viability of waterways, we must advocate their privatization.