# Mayport HomeoHhPort Affirmative

## Notes

#### CVN = Aircraft Carrier

United States Navy Fact File, 01/06/2012 (<http://www.navy.mil/navydata/fact_display.asp?cid=4200&tid=200&ct=4>)

Aircraft carriers are the centerpiece of America�s Naval forces. On any given day, aircraft carriers exercise the Navy core capabilities of power projection, forward presence, humanitarian assistance, deterrence, sea control and maritime security.

Features

The aircraft carrier continues to be the centerpiece of the forces necessary for forward presence. In times of crisis, the first question leaders ask in a crisis is: �Where are the carriers?� Often the presence of an aircraft carrier has deterred potential adversaries from striking against U.S. interests. Aircraft Carriers support and operate aircraft that engage in attacks on airborne, afloat and ashore targets that threaten free use of the sea; and engage in sustained power projection operations in support U.S. and coalition ground forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. The aircraft carrier and its strike group also engage in maritime security operations to interdict threats to merchant shipping and prevent the use of the seas as a highway for terrorist traffic. Aircraft also provide unique capabilities for disaster response and humanitarian assistance. The embarked carrier air wing provides helicopters for direct support and C4I assets to support them and ensure aid is routed quickly and safely. The 10 Nimitz class aircraft carriers are the largest warships in the world, each designed for an approximately 50 year service life with one mid-life refueling. USS Nimitz (CVN 68), USS Dwight D. Eisenhower (CVN 69), and USS Carl Vinson (CVN 70) have all completed their Refueling Complex Overhauls (RCOH) at Newport News, Va., with USS Theodore Roosevelt (CVN 71) commenced RCOH in 2009. The next generation of aircraft carrier, the Gerald R. Ford class (CVN 78) was ordered in 2008 and is slated to be delivered in 2015 to replace USS Enterprise (CVN 65).

#### Solvency Advocate

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on Mayport homeporting alternatives was

released in November 2008. The FEIS examined 12 alternatives for homeporting additional

surface ships at Mayport. Four of the 12 alternatives involved homeporting a CVN; another four

involved making Mayport capable of homeporting a CVN, but not immediately homeporting a

CVN there; and the remaining four did not involve making Mayport capable of homeporting a

CVN. Ten of the 12 alternatives also involved transferring additional ships other than a CVN—

various combinations of cruisers, destroyers, frigates, large-deck amphibious assault ships

(LHDs), and other amphibious ships (LPDs and LSDs)—to Mayport. The FEIS also assessed

the alternative of homeporting no additional ships at Mayport. **Homeporting a single additional**

**ship—a CVN**—was Alternative 4.

The FEIS identified Alternative 4 as the Navy’s preferred alternative. The FEIS, like the January

2009 ROD, stated that a key reason for the Navy’s desire to transfer a CVN to Mayport is to

hedge against the risk of a catastrophic event that could damage the Navy’s CVN homeporting

facilities in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia. The FEIS stated:

Based on a thorough review of the alternatives, the Department of the Navy has determined

Alternative 4 to be its Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4 involves homeporting one CVN,

dredging, infrastructure and wharf improvements, and construction of CVN nuclear

propulsion plant maintenance facilities. Factors that influenced selection of Alternative 4 as

the Preferred Alternative included impact analysis in the EIS, estimated costs of

implementation, including military construction and other operation and sustainment costs,

and strategic dispersal considerations. Homeporting a CVN at NAVSTA Mayport would

enhance distribution of CVN homeport locations to reduce risks to fleet resources in the

event of natural disaster, manmade calamity, or attack by foreign nations or terrorists. This

includes risks to aircraft carriers, industrial support facilities, and the people that operate and

maintain those crucial assets.

#### The total costs are roughly 600 million dollars

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)



#### Ronald O’Rouke is NOT biased

Library of Congress, 6/15/2012 (<http://www.loc.gov/crsinfo/>)

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) works exclusively for the United States Congress, providing policy and legal analysis to committees and Members of both the House and Senate, regardless of party affiliation. As a legislative branch agency within the Library of Congress, CRS has been a valued and respected resource on Capitol Hill for nearly a century.

CRS is well-known for analysis that is authoritative, confidential, objective and nonpartisan. Its highest priority is to ensure that Congress has 24/7 access to the nation’s best thinking.

#### Other possible advantages

* + Heg
	+ Navy
		- General stability
		- Middle east stablility
		- South Americas
	+ Russia
		- Red spread = plan solves get shit there fast
	+ Trade adv
		- Navy and the perception of a navy
		- Also accesses a lot of da / elections impacts
		- Something about the panama canal – cant go through but stationing in florida is probably a reason terrorists wouldn’t attack that
	+ Piracy
		- Is the plan key
		- LNG
	+ LOST
		- Ill look into that – there are a lot of impacts
	+ Terrorism
		- Carribean narcoterroism? – see gbns wiki
	+ Florida specific
		- Jobs
		- People mobility
		- Why florida is key to econ/ election – possible da to elections

## 1AC

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should invest in a CVN homeport in Mayport, Florida.

### Strategic Dispersal

Homeporting at Mayport is not funded in the status quo

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

The Navy’s proposed FY2013 budget and the FY2013-FY2017 Future Years Defense Plan

(FYDP) contain no funding for Military Construction (MilCon) projects required to homeport a

CVN at Mayport.

The Navy states: “Although the FY 2013 budget does not contain a construction project supporting the homeporting of a CVN in Mayport, FL, the Department [of the Navy] is committed to the requirement and policy to strategically disperse CVNs on each coast. This is a deferral at this time due to fiscal constraints.

#### **Naval readiness is enduring massive problems—unresolved surface fleet problems make the status quo operational tempo unsustainable**

Philip Ewing, former Pentagon correspondent and editor of DoDBuzz, 07/12/2011(He holds a bachelor’s degree in journalism from the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University and a master’s degree in journalism from the University of Illinois at Springfield, previously employed at Politico, “Surface Navy: ‘We’re not good to go’”, DoDBuzz, Available online at <http://www.dodbuzz.com/2011/07/12/surface-navy-were-not-good-to-go/>, ZR)

A pair of top Navy officials admitted Tuesday that its endemic readiness problems are basically unresolved — and may keep getting worse — before the service’s plans to fix its surface fleet finally take effect. Vice Adm. Bill Burke, the Navy’s top maintenance officer; and Vice Adm. Kevin McCoy, head of Naval Sea Systems Command, told a House Armed Services Committee panel that it took so many years, and so many interconnected decisions, to put the surface Navy in its current state that it would take a lot of time and effort to get it right again.

“We have a good plan,” McCoy told committee chairman Rep. Randy Forbes, a Virginia Republican, “We’re not good to go right now.” In fact, he said some negative indicators “may turn a little harsher.”

Over the past five years and beyond, Navy inspections have found that a growing number of the Navy’s surface warships aren’t ready to fight: The ships are in bad physical shape, carry broken equipment, insufficient spare parts, and can’t even rely upon their advanced weapons and sensors. But despite years of embarrassing reports in the press and harangues from Congress and top DoD officials, the fleet has been slow to recover, given the wide range of causes for its woes. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, when the “running government like a business” craze swept the Pentagon, top leaders rewarded commanders who could get the job done for less money, which then sparked a flurry of inter-related decisions that had the net effect of reducing the readiness of the surface Navy:

The Navy fielded smaller crews, making fewer hands available for regular maintenance; it cut human-led, hands-on instruction, preferring to teach sailors their jobs using “computer-based instruction,” which meant they weren’t qualified to do their jobs at sea. And simple budget cuts meant ships didn’t get the regular maintenance or spare parts they needed. On top of all this, Navy commanders blame an increase in operational tempo, which meant more demands on their smaller, poorly maintained fleet, which meant less time and money to do the full-scale repairs ships need to keep them in service for their design lives. Crews realized all these problems at the operational level, but it has taken years to get the top brass to acknowledge the failures of initiatives such as “top 6 roll-down,” “lean manning,” and the “fleet response plan.”

According to Tuesday’s hearing, all those problems are more or less still in effect, although Burke and McCoy told Forbes they acknowledge what’s wrong and they know what they have to do to fix it. The surface Navy is doing the inconvenient, expensive maintenance it has long put off, McCoy said, because it now accepts the need to keep ships around for their full lives — something the Navy traditionally has not done. McCoy gave the example of the cruiser USS Chosin, now in dry-dock in Hawaii: Initially the repair bill for that ship was estimated at $35 million, McCoy said, but when engineers did their deep inspections and discovered the state of its tanks, pipes and other equipment, they realized they would have to spend $70 million to get the ship into the best shape they could. This is why McCoy and Burke warned the Navy could continue to have bad results on its inspections, as long-hidden problems finally come into view.

McCoy and Burke said that about 70 percent of the Navy’s hoped-for fleet of 313 ships is in service today, but the service can only get to that goal if all its destroyers and cruisers, for example, actually serve for their full 40 or 35 years.

But Congress has heard Navy leaders give this explanation many times before, Forbes said. He pointed to statistics that showed an ever-growing number of Navy warships were being found unready each year — from 12 percent in 2009 to 24 percent last year, and 22 percent already this year. What is the Navy’s target for that number? Forbes asked. McCoy and Burke said the service is in the process of formulating one, but it’s a complicated situation. Forbes complained that defense witnesses always come before Congress with a plan for how they’ll get better, but they seldom appear to be able to act on it; as when DoD was unable to even conduct the basic audits of itself that officials promised they would.

McCoy and Burke repeated that the Navy is “stretched” by the number of forces it must provide to combatant commanders, who Burke said want more carriers, aircraft and submarines than the Navy can deploy in answer. Burke, a submariner, said that combatant commanders want between 16 and 18 nuclear attack submarines at any one time, but the Navy only has enough to deploy 10. He and McCoy said the Navy wasn’t forcing commanders to miss missions, but that the rate of operations today was affecting the surface fleet’s ability to do maintenance and could hurt the service lives of its ships. Overall, the admirals warned, today’s operational tempo is “unsustainable.”

#### East Coast homeport and aircraft carriers are vulnerable now—only homeporting Mayport solves and it’s the most cost effective option

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

Then-Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Admiral Gary Roughead summarized the Navy’s rationale for its desire to homeport a CVN at Mayport in early 2010 testimony to Congress on the Navy’s proposed FY2011 budget: Hampton Roads [Virginia] is the only nuclear carrier capable port on the East Coast. A catastrophic event in the Hampton Roads Area affecting port facilities, shipping channels, supporting maintenance or training infrastructure, or the surrounding community has the potential to severely limit East Coast Carrier operations, even if the ships themselves are not affected. Consistent with today’s dispersal of West Coast aircraft carriers between California and Washington State, the QDR direction to make Naval Station Mayport a nuclear carriercapable homeport addresses the Navy’s requirement for a capable facility to maintain aircraft carriers in the event that a natural or manmade disaster makes the Hampton Roads area inaccessible. While there is an upfront cost to upgrade Naval Station Mayport to support our nuclear aircraft carriers, Mayport has been a carrier homeport since 1952 and is the most cost-effective means to achieve strategic dispersal on the East Coast. The national security benefits of this additional homeport far outweigh those costs.

The January 2009 ROD document states: The DON decision to utilize the capacity at NAVSTA Mayport to homeport a CVN is the culmination of a two and a half year process involving environmental analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), identification of the recurring and nonrecurring costs associated with homeporting surface ships at NAVSTA Mayport, and an assessment of strategic concerns.... The decision reached by the DON, as further explained later in this Record of Decision, is based upon the DON’s environmental, operational, and strategic expertise and represents the best military judgment of the DON’s leadership. The need to develop a hedge against the potentially crippling results of a catastrophic event was ultimately the determining factor in this decision-making process. The consolidation of CVN capabilities in the Hampton Roads area on the East Coast presents a unique set of risks. CVNs assigned to the West Coast are spread among three homeports. Maintenance and repair infrastructure exists at three locations as well. As a result, there are strategic options available to Pacific Fleet CVNs should a catastrophic event occur. By contrast, NAVSTA Norfolk is homeport to all five of the CVNs assigned to the Atlantic Fleet and the Hampton Roads area is the only East Coast location where CVN maintenance and repair infrastructure exists. It is the only location in the U.S. capable of CVN construction and refueling. The Hampton Roads area also houses all Atlantic Fleet CVN trained crews and associated community support infrastructure. There are no strategic options available outside the Hampton Roads area for Atlantic Fleet CVNs should a catastrophic event occur. 20

#### Aircraft carriers reductions are coming now—maintaining air power is key to US air power

Loren B. Thompson, 03/10/2009 – (Chief Operating Officer of the Lexington Institute and Chief Executive Officer of Source Associates. Prior to holding his present positions, he was Deputy Director of the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University and taught graduate-level courses in strategy, technology and media affairs at Georgetown. He has also taught at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. “Navy Will Offer Up Carrier & Air Wing In Quadrennial Review”, Lexington Institute, Available online at <http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/navy-will-offer-up-carrier--air-wing-in-quadrennial-review?a=1&c=1129>, Accessed 7/18/2012, ZR)

The word within the Pentagon is that the White House wants to collect 6-8 "scalps" -- major program kills -- in this year's Quadrennial Defense Review. Some of the cuts are already being considered as defense secretary Robert Gates rewrites the 2010 budget. You can expect to hear a lot of rumors about which programs are being targeted between now and when the Pentagon releases details of its budget request in April. But while most of the military services are scrambling to protect programs, at least one is getting ready to offer up a signature weapons system. The Navy will propose removal of one aircraft carrier and air wing from its posture, dropping the number of carriers to the lowest number since 1942. Of course, today's carriers make World War Two carriers look like toys. With nuclear propulsion, supersonic fighters, and over four acres of deck space, they are the biggest warships in history. But at any given time some are being repaired, some are being replenished, some are in training and some are in transit; if the fleet is cut to ten then maybe half a dozen will be available for quick action on any given day. Congress didn't think that was enough, so it mandated in law that at least eleven carriers must be maintained in the force. But with big bills coming from the Obama Administration and other items like healthcare costs pressuring Navy budgets, the service has repeatedly sought relief from that requirement. This year's quadrennial review is the likely venue for another such bid. The issue is coming to a head now because the pace of new carrier commissionings is not keeping up with the rate of retirements. Kitty Hawk, the last carrier in the fleet powered by fossil fuels, was removed from the force last summer after nearly 50 years of service. The Navy plans to decommission the nuclear-powered Enterprise in November of 2012, leaving the fleet with only the ten flattops of the Nimitz class for three years, until the next-generation Ford class of carriers debuts in September of 2015. Going to ten isn't supposed to happen under present law, but since the service hasn't made budgetary provisions for maintaining the Enterprise and its crew until the Ford class arrives, it looks like ten carriers will be the total number in the fleet. In the current budget environment, once the Navy gets used to having ten carriers, that's probably where it will stay. Navy insiders think the service will decide to forego the refueling of the Lincoln, which is scheduled for 2012. And when the decision to stay at ten is formalized, the service can also move to eliminate one of its carrier wings. That step would cut the Navy's projected shortfall in strike aircraft by half. So billions of dollars are saved by skipping the refueling, cutting the purchase of aircraft, and eliminating the need to sustain 6,000 personnel associated with ship operations and air-wing support. There's only one problem with all this. It reduces the nation's capacity to project power from the sea at the same time access to foreign bases is becoming doubtful. And why is such a move necessary? Because the Obama Administration has decided to stick with Bush-era plans to grow the size of ground forces by 92,000 personnel, and the Navy must pay part of the bill for that. Yet the administration is getting ready to depart Iraq, which was the main reason for increasing the size of ground forces in the first place. There are precious few other places where the warfighting scenarios for the next QDR suggest a big ground force will be needed. Most of the scenarios envision reliance on air power for the big fights of the future -- the kind of air power delivered by carriers. So cutting carriers to build a bigger ground force doesn't make much sense.

#### Norfolk is extremely vulnerable to terrorist threats

Virginia Fusion Center, 03/2009 ( “2009 VIRGINIA TERRORISM THREAT ASSESSMENT”, Available online at <http://rawstory.com/images/other/vafusioncenterterrorassessment.pdf>, Accessed 07-28-2012, ZR)

State government facilities include those owned or leased by all levels of government and can be located domestically and overseas. Many of these facilities such as courthouses, education facilities, libraries, and archives are open to the public and provide important government services. Other facilities contain highly sensitive information, materials, processes, and equipment such as military installations, embassies, and research facilities and are not open to the public. These facilities, varied in function, size, and location, are differentiated from other CIKR sectors because they are uniquely governmental. The abundance of government facilities and military related infrastructure in Virginia coupled with their symbolic nature and past attacks on such infrastructure in the U.S. suggests this sector remains especially vulnerable to exploitation by terrorist and extremist groups.

Potential Trend(s) Impacting Sector

Due to the desire of most international and many domestic groups to target the U.S. government, trends of significance include terrorism tradecraft techniques of surveillance, elicitation, and security probes. The trend of illicit entry into the U.S. also affects this sector, as many individuals will enter government facilities to obtain necessary documentation. Local, state, and federal government facilities are highly interconnected, both physically and through cyber networks. Efforts to identify, understand, and analyze interdependencies and dependencies are challenging because of the diversity and complexity of these facilities or components. Interdependencies vary widely and each has its own characteristics, whether physical, cyber, or geographic in nature.

Virginia facilities may be impacted by the closure of Guantanamo Bay; a recent report by the House Armed Services Committee has recommended government sites in Quantico and Norfolk as possible transfer locations for current Guantanamo detainees. According to early February 2009 reporting, a task force has 30 days to recommend where to put the 245 remaining detainees.451

#### Specifically, the HAMAS terrorist group is a threat to Norfolk

Virginia Fusion Center, 03/2009 ( “2009 VIRGINIA TERRORISM THREAT ASSESSMENT”, Available online at <http://rawstory.com/images/other/vafusioncenterterrorassessment.pdf>, Accessed 07-28-2012, ZR)

HAMAS was created in 1987 by leaders of the Palestinian wing of the Muslim Brotherhood. Widely recognized as a terrorist organization, HAMAS has governed the Gaza portion of the Palestinian Territories since July 2007 and utilizes political power and social programs as well as violent terrorist tactics to pursue the goal of establishing an Islamic Palestinian state in place of Israel.25 HAMAS, also known as the Islamic Resistance Movement, has also been involved in increasingly sophisticated methods of targeting children with their propaganda efforts.26

Domestic Activities

HAMAS has the largest U.S. presence of any Palestinian group, and maintains a complex fundraising, propaganda, and recruitment infrastructure.27 According to 2008 Terrorism Screening Center ground encounter data, HAMAS was one of the three most frequently encountered groups in Virginia.28 In 2007, the TSC reported 189 total Virginia encounters with subjects tied to HAMAS in Virginia.29 Current estimates suggest that numerous members, supporters, and sympathizers may reside in and near Virginia; these estimates appear to gain credibility from reports that several thousand protestors from the National Capitol area demonstrated in Washington, D.C. as a result of the most recent Gaza conflict.30

While no potential threats have been identified from HAMAS against targets in the U.S., members residing in Virginia have participated in fundraising and political activities to support the group. Subjects identified as defendants in the Holy Land Foundation trial have been tied to Arlington and Fairfax Counties.31 Additional subjects with ties to HAMAS have been identified in Norfolk, Newport News, Chesterfield County, and Falls Church.

#### Mayport is the place.

Ayres 11

CVN HOMEPORT AT MAYPORT¶ By: Kevin J. Ayres Senior Communication Specialist at Emory University¶ Nuclear Powered Aircraft Carriers of the United States Navy¶ http://borgseconomicspaces.wikispaces.com/CVN+Homeport+at+Mayport

The PROS¶ The Strategic Benefits The most significant logical argument for the DOD and Navy’s proposal for such a “high dollar” project is based on its “strategic laydown analysis” and response to the large possibility of breach within our National Security. The strategic laydown analysis is based upon a projected larger size Navy in the future years to come; as well as on the basis of apportioning the Navy among the Pacific and Atlantic Fleet. The primary reason for establishing a CVN homeport at Mayport is “to mitigate the risk of a terrorist attack, accident or natural disaster, the U.S. Navy will homeport an East Coast Carrier in Mayport, Florida” (O'Rourke, 2011). According to Admiral Gary Rough, Chief of Naval Operation, testimony to Congress stated “a catastrophic event in the Hampton Roads Area affecting port facilities, shipping channels, supporting maintenance or training infrastructure or the surrounding community has the potential to severely limit East Coast Carrier operations even if the ships themselves are not affect….the national security benefits of this additional homeport far overweighs those costs” (O'Rourke, 2011). The idea of being at least partially congruent with the West Pacific Fleet’s strategic layout of dispersion is very important in regards to how the Atlantic Fleet should be assigned as well. The inconsistence along the Atlantic region is portrayed as a higher possible target for manmade calamity or terrorism by foreign nations; however the risk toward facilities and military personnel can be reduced by the dispersion of the security force along the coast. As NS Norfolk is the homeport to all five carriers of the Atlantic Fleet, it is the only location U.S. capable of CVN construction, maintenance and repair and refueling, in addition to where all CVN trained crews and association community support are stationed. With this singular and limit expansion way of operation by the Atlantic Fleet CVNs, there is no strategic options for CVN naval operations outside of the Norfolk area. After reviewing all the possible alternatives, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) supports the proposal of the DOD and the Navy in the final statement: “Utilizing the capacity at NS Mayport to homeport a CVN disperses critical Atlantic Fleet assets to reduce risks, thereby enhancing operational readiness. Operational readiness is fundamental to the Navy’s mission and obligation to the Commander in Chief (O'Rourke, 2011).”

### Power Projection

#### The first impact is Power Projection

#### East Coast carriers are key to national security strategy

Crenshaw 9(Ander, Representative in Florida, Press Release, October 23, Appendix of Rourke’s report, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf> EG)

Prior to 2007, the Navy had operational flexibility on the East Coast with carriers stationed both at Naval Station Norfolk and Naval Station Mayport. However, the Navy lost the flexibility with the decommissioning of the last East Coast conventional carrier in 2007. In order to reduce risk to the Atlantic Fleet carrier force and restore the proper balance to the Navy, Naval Station carriers and maintenance facilities are spread among three homeports. In fact, in a December 2008 letter to Senator Jim Webb, Secretary Gates reinforced the concept of strategic dispersal stating, “Having a single CVN homeport has not been considered acceptable on the west coast should not be considered acceptable on the east coast.” The Norfolk area is the only east coast port in which nuclear aircraft carriers are repaired, built and housed. If tragedy, man-made or nature-related, intentional or accidental, rendered Norfolk out of reach the Navy would be forced to journey around the tip of South America to reach another nuclear aircraft carrier maintenance facility in San Diego, CA. While some would like to believe this is an acceptable back-up plan, common sense demands otherwise. Time and time again, aircraft carriers have proven to be key to the execution of our national security strategy. We believe as access to overseas land bases continues to decrease, the Navy’s aircraft carriers will be more and more important. The Navy has alternate homeporting and maintenance options for all ships on the East Coast except aircraft carriers, its most valuable assets. The total cost for permanently homeporting a nuclear aircraft carrier at Mayport is less that 1% of the cost of the nuclear carrier fleet. While the cost is not inconsequential, when weighed against the possible risks to our carrier fleet, upgrading Mayport to homeport a nuclear carrier is a sound national security expense. The Department MUST make this investment in Naval Station Mayport to provide flexibility to the Combatant Commanders and protection to some of the nation’s most valuable assets.

#### Nuclear-powered carrier force is key to power projection

Roughead 10(ADMIRAL GARY ROUGHEAD CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, “STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL GARY ROUGHEAD CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS BEFORE THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE”, February 25, <http://www.armed-services.senate.gov/statemnt/2010/02%20February/Roughead%2002-25-10.pdf> EG)

The Navy remains firmly committed to maintaining a force of 11 carriers for the next three decades. With the commissioning of USS GEORGE H. W. BUSH (CVN 77) and inactivation of the 48-year-old USS KITTY HAWK (CV 63), our last conventionally powered aircraft carrier, we now have an all nuclear-powered carrier force. Our carriers enable our nation to respond rapidly, decisively, and globally to project power, as we have done in Iraq and Afghanistan, or to deliver humanitarian assistance, as we have done in Haiti, while operating from a small, yet persistent, footprint that does not impose unnecessary political or logistic burdens on other nations. Our carriers remain a great investment for our nation. Our eleven-carrier force structure is based on worldwide presence and surge requirements, while also taking into account training and maintenance needs. I thank Congress for granting us a waiver to temporarily reduce our force to ten carriers for the period between the inactivation of USS ENTERPRISE (CVN 65) and the delivery of GERALD R. FORD (CVN 78). We will continue to meet operational commitments during this 33-month period by managing carefully carrier deployment and maintenance cycles. After the delivery of CVN 78, we will maintain an eleven-carrier force through the continued refueling program for NIMITZ Class ships and the delivery of our FORD Class carriers at five-year intervals starting in 2020.

#### There are 4 internal links to hegemony--forward presence, perception/deterrence, maritime security, humanitarian assistance

US Navy 12(“Aircraft Carriers – CVN”, Fact File, January 6, <http://www.navy.mil/navydata/fact_display.asp?cid=4200&tid=200&ct=4> EG)

Description Aircraft carriers are the centerpiece of America�s Naval forces. On any given day, aircraft carriers exercise the Navy core capabilities of power projection, forward presence, humanitarian assistance, deterrence, sea control and maritime security. Features The aircraft carrier continues to be the centerpiece of the forces necessary for forward presence. In times of crisis, the first question leaders ask in a crisis is: �Where are the carriers?� Often the presence of an aircraft carrier has deterred potential adversaries from striking against U.S. interests. Aircraft Carriers support and operate aircraft that engage in attacks on airborne, afloat and ashore targets that threaten free use of the sea; and engage in sustained power projection operations in support U.S. and coalition ground forces in Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. The aircraft carrier and its strike group also engage in maritime security operations to interdict threats to merchant shipping and prevent the use of the seas as a highway for terrorist traffic. Aircraft also provide unique capabilities for disaster response and humanitarian assistance. The embarked carrier air wing provides helicopters for direct support and C4I assets to support them and ensure aid is routed quickly and safely. The 10 Nimitz class aircraft carriers are the largest warships in the world, each designed for an approximately 50 year service life with one mid-life refueling. USS Nimitz (CVN 68), USS Dwight D. Eisenhower (CVN 69), and USS Carl Vinson (CVN 70) have all completed their Refueling Complex Overhauls (RCOH) at Newport News, Va., with USS Theodore Roosevelt (CVN 71) commenced RCOH in 2009. The next generation of aircraft carrier, the Gerald R. Ford class (CVN 78) was ordered in 2008 and is slated to be delivered in 2015 to replace USS Enterprise (CVN 65).

#### Aircraft carriers key to power projection

Rubel 11(Professor Robert Rubel is Dean of Naval Warfare Studies at the Naval War College. “The Future of Aircraft Carriers”, Naval War College Review, Autumn 2011, <http://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/87bcd2ff-c7b6-4715-b2ed-05df6e416b3b/The-Future-of-Aircraft-Carriers> EG)

zGeopolitical Chess Piece. It has been the habit of American presidents and their advisers in the gamut of crises since World War II to move aircraft carriers around to demonstrate American concern, resolve, or outright anger. The particular benefits of using carriers in this way are that they operate on the high seas, where permission to move is not needed from other countries, and that because they carry their own fuel, weapons, and maintenance, they are ready on arrival at the scene of a crisis to deliver power. Moreover, since modern U.S. carriers are large and imposing, and have been unchallenged on the seas, they “show the flag” to great effect—they provide excellent “visuals. ”Here too, however, precisely because they need to be visible in this role, and because they normally must be ready to function also as an airfield at sea, carriers cannot tolerate any significant risk. This was the difficulty in the Yom Kippur War crisis mentioned previously. The Navy and the nation are so used to operating carriers with impunity as airfields at sea that as new sea-denial threats emerge (as did the Soviet navy) the potential for a role/risk disconnect is magnified.

#### Aircraft carriers solve hegemony and humanitarian assistance

RAND 6(“LEVERAGING AMERICA'S AIRCRAFT CARRIER CAPABILITIES”, John Gordon IV, Peter A. Wilson, John Birkler, Steven Boraz, Gordon T. Lee, Prepared for the US Navy, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG448.pdf> EG)

For more than seven decades — stretching from before World War II through the Global War on Terrorism, to the 2004 Southeast Asia tsunami — the United States has used aircraft carriers and their air wings to show force, deter adversaries, engage friends and allies, provide humanitarian assistance, and bring airpower to bear against opponents. In coming years, it is likely that aircraft carriers will be called upon to shoulder even more duties. Some duties may involve new variations of combat and noncombat operations that carriers traditionally have pursued. Others might entail an expansion of nontraditional assignments. Equipped with aircraft, helicopters, and unmanned aerial vehicles and possessing large, open and covered spaces, significant human resources, and massive electrical-power-generation capabilities, aircraft carriers represent substantial resources that the U.S. Navy may be able to more fully exploit.

#### Hegemonic decline causes conflict—history proves.

Friedberg 11 — Aaron L. Friedberg, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, holds a Ph.D. from Harvard University, 2011 (“Hegemony with Chinese Characteristics,” *The National Interest*, June 21st, Available Online at http://nationalinterest.org/print/article/hegemony-chinese-characteristics-5439, Accessed 09-15-2011)

Throughout history, relations between dominant and rising states have been uneasy—and often violent. Established powers tend to regard themselves as the defenders of an international order that they helped to create and from which they continue to benefit; rising powers feel constrained, even cheated, by the status quo and struggle against it to take what they think is rightfully theirs. Indeed, this story line, with its Shakespearean overtones of youth and age, vigor and decline, is among the oldest in recorded history. As far back as the fifth century BC the great Greek historian Thucydides began his study of the Peloponnesian War with the deceptively simple observation that the war’s deepest, truest cause was “the growth of Athenian power and the fear which this caused in Sparta.”

The fact that the U.S.-China relationship is competitive, then, is simply no surprise. But these countries are not just any two great powers: Since the end of the Cold War the United States has been the richest and most powerful nation in the world; China is, by contrast, the state whose capabilities have been growing most rapidly. America is still “number one,” but China is fast gaining ground. The stakes are about as high as they can get, and the potential for conflict particularly fraught.

At least insofar as the dominant powers are concerned, rising states tend to be troublemakers. As a nation’s capabilities grow, its leaders generally define their interests more expansively and seek a greater degree of influence over what is going on around them. This means that those in ascendance typically attempt not only to secure their borders but also to reach out beyond them, taking steps to ensure access to markets, materials and transportation routes; to protect their citizens far from home; to defend their foreign friends and allies; to promulgate their religious or ideological beliefs; and, in general, to have what they consider to be their rightful say in the affairs of their region and of the wider world.

As they begin to assert themselves, ascendant states typically feel impelled to challenge territorial boundaries, international institutions and hierarchies of prestige that were put in place when they were still relatively weak. Like Japan in the late nineteenth century, or Germany at the turn of the twentieth, rising powers want their place in the sun. This, of course, is what brings them into conflict with the established great powers—the so-called status quo states—who are the architects, principal beneficiaries and main defenders of any existing international system.

The resulting clash of interests between the two sides has seldom been resolved peacefully. Recognizing the growing threat to their position, dominant powers (or a coalition of status quo states) have occasionally tried to attack and destroy a competitor before it can grow strong enough to become a threat. Others—hoping to avoid war—have taken the opposite approach: attempting to appease potential challengers, they look for ways to satisfy their demands and ambitions and seek to incorporate them peacefully into the existing international order.

But however sincere, these efforts have almost always ended in failure. Sometimes the reason clearly lies in the demands of the rising state. As was true of Adolf Hitler’s Germany, an aggressor may have ambitions that are so extensive as to be impossible for the status quo powers to satisfy without effectively consigning themselves to servitude or committing national suicide. Even when the demands being made of them are less onerous, the dominant states are often either reluctant to make concessions, thereby fueling the frustrations and resentments of the rising power, or too eager to do so, feeding its ambitions and triggering a spiral of escalating demands. Successful policies of appeasement are conceivable in theory but in practice have proven devilishly difficult to implement. This is why periods of transition, when a new, ascending power begins to overtake the previously dominant state, have so often been marked by war.

#### The pursuit of hegemony is inevitable—the only question is effectiveness.

Tellis 9 — Ashley J. Tellis, Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace specializing in international security, defense and Asian strategic issues, Research Director of the Strategic Asia program at NBR—the National Bureau of Asian Research, holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, 2009 (“Preserving Hegemony: The Strategic Tasks Facing the United States,” *Global Asia*, Volume 4, Number 1, Available Online at http://globalasia.org/pdf/issue9/Ashley\_J.\_Tellis.pdf, Accessed 09-13-2011, p. 54-55)

This hegemony is by no means fated to end any time soon, however, given that the United States remains predominant by most conventional indicators of national power. The character of the United States’ hegemonic behavior in the future will thus remain an issue of concern both within the domestic polity and internationally. Yet the juvenescence of the United State’s “unipolar moment,” combined with the disorientation produced by the September 11 attacks, ought to restrain any premature generalization that the imperial activism begun by the Clinton administration, and which the Bush administration took to its most spirited apotheosis, would in some way come to define the permanent norm of US behavior in the global system. In all probability, it is much more likely that the limitations on US [end page 54] power witnessed in Afghanistan and Iraq will produce a more phlegmatic and accommodating United States over the longer term, despite the fact that the traditional US pursuit of dominance — understood as the quest to maintain a preponderance of power, neutralize threatening challengers, and protect freedom of action, goals that go back to the foundations of the republic — is unlikely to be extinguished any time soon.

Precisely because the desire for dominance is likely to remain a permanent feature of US geopolitical ambitions — even though how it is exercised will certainly change in comparison to the Bush years — the central task facing the next administration will still pertain fundamentally to the issue of US power. This concern manifests itself through the triune challenges of: redefining the United States’ role in the world, renewing the foundations of US strength, and recovering the legitimacy of US actions. In other words, the next administration faces the central task of clarifying the character of US hegemony, reinvigorating the material foundations of its power, and securing international support for its policies.

### Naval Power

#### The second impact is Naval Readiness

#### Utilizing Mayport to homeport a CVN is key to operational readiness

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

The aircraft carriers of the United States Navy are vital strategic assets that serve our national

interests in both peace and war. The President calls upon them for their unique ability to

provide both deterrence and combat support in times of crisis. Of the 11 aircraft carriers

currently in service, five are assigned to the Atlantic Fleet. Utilizing the capacity at

NAVSTA Mayport to homeport a CVN disperses critical Atlantic Fleet assets to reduce

risks, thereby enhancing operational readiness. Operational readiness is fundamental to the

Navy’s mission and obligation to the Commander in Chief.
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#### US naval power is at a tipping point now—it’s key to all aspects of US leadership, preventing great power war, regional instability, human trafficking, drugs, weapons, and responding to natural disasters

George Galdorsi, et al, 10/2010 (Antonio Siorda, Scott Truver, “‘Tipping’ the Future Fleet,” Proceedings Magazine, Available online at <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2010-10/tipping-future-fleet>, Accessed 07/28/2012, ZR)

A global Navy is a key component of U.S. national––kinetic and, increasingly, non-kinetic––power. 2 This begs the question: 15 and more years from now, what should (or will) the Navy look like? We know today’s Fleet and can readily project, assuming straight-line trends during the next several years (a questionable assumption at best), what tomorrow’s Fleet is likely to comprise. After all, most of the ships expected to be in the water in 2025 are already in the active force or under construction in 2010. The sharper focus should be on the strategic construct of the future Navy: what should the Fleet look like and why? As the late political scientist Samuel Huntington once explained, if a “military service does not possess such a [strategic] concept, it becomes purpose-less, it wallows about amid a variety of conflicting and confusing goals, and ultimately it suffers both physical and moral degeneration.” 3

Navies in the 21st century have two fundamental roles. 4 The first entails handling regional disorder and “messiness.” And dealing with it is of paramount importance—from piracy off the Horn of Africa, to drug, arms, and human trafficking around the globe. This would show the clear implications of the “two-way linkages between good order at sea and good order on land and the simple fact that, without it, the human ability to fully exploit the potential value of the sea will be severely constrained.” 5 The second focuses on more traditional maritime power projection.

Even as navies respond to or anticipate expanding maritime security and constabulary tasks, the requirements to project regionally concentrated combat-credible maritime power to (1) limit regional conflict with deployed, decisive maritime power; (2) deter major-power war; and (3) win our nation’s wars also continue to increase. 6 Every once in a while, in addition to humanitarian assistance and disaster response, the Navy will be directed to kill people and destroy things. The cost to accommodate both of these trends comes at a time when the Navy and the nation are cash-strapped, with skyrocketing deficits and defense budgets driving political and economic pressures to contain and cut spending. 7 The irony is palpable: as the importance of the Navy (and Marine Corps and Coast Guard) continues to rise, the capability and capacity for it to continue to be everything to everyone, everywhere, are being called into question.

#### US naval power is critical to deter adversaries and make alliance commitments credible

Daniel Whiteneck, et al, 03/2010 (Michael Price, Neil Jenkins, Peter Swartz, CNA Analysis & Solutions, “The Navy at a Tipping Point: Maritime Dominance at Stake?”, Available online athttp://www.public.navy.mil/usff/documents/navy\_at\_tipping\_point.pdf, Accessed 07/28/2012, ZR)

A global navy is influential. It exerts coalition leadership in peacetime and in war. It provides a framework for allied operations. It is a visible force for reassuring allies and partners that the government at home is committed to them and that it has resolved to place its military forces in harm’s way in support of those allies. It is a force flexible enough to provide that influence at any point in the range of operations, from a show of force to deter a regional threat to the imposition of a blockade, or the use of naval power to project force and dominate an adversary. It is influential because it can deter and reassure [3]. Maritime forces are uniquely qualified as hybrid forces. They are trained, equipped, and deployed as multi-mission platforms, capable of high-end war fighting performance. They know that when they deploy they are not likely to engage in major combat operations, but they are trained and equipped to that level. This means they can flex to that level, control escalation to that level, and be a ready force to deter potential aggression to that level. In reality, they will likely perform a range of lower-end operations and shows of force or maritime security operations and engagement activities that can be performed by the same assets. In addition, they are manned and led by personnel who have a wealth of experience and “training by doing” for these lower-end missions. . Maritime forces have advantages over land and air forces in these areas because of their inherent flexibility, their visibility without heavy footprints on land, their self-sustainability, and their routine interactions with other maritime forces. (Being at sea and interacting with other nations in port visits, merchant interactions, and diplomacy is what navies have been doing for centuries.) This capacity is important because of the global commitments of the government. A global navy is a tool of a global power interested in political stability and economic activity across the globe. Its political and economic commitments are expressed in treaties and partnerships with other governments on several continents, and the navy is a visible sign of the government’s willingness to maintain a global presence.

#### Naval readiness independently solves multiple scenarios of war

**Cropsey 10 –** is a Senior Fellow at Hudson Institute. Previously, he served as Deputy Undersecretary of the Navy during both the Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations. (Seth, September 1, “Ebb Tide” <http://www.hudson.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=publication_details&id=7235>)

Only one statement can be made with certainty about the future of the U.S. Navy: Its strength is a necessary precondition of U.S. continuance as a great power. A robust, globally distributed and technologically superior naval force does not ensure the future of American international preeminence, but a waning fleet composed of fewer and less fearsome vessels guarantees the decline of U.S. influence in the world. Venice, Spain, Holland, France and England learned the identical lesson over the past 500 years: The loss of seapower paralleled and was in large measure responsible for their decline as great powers.
Seapower is an uncommonly flexible instrument of national power. It can and has been used to supply humanitarian assistance, as it did for the survivors of the Indian Ocean tsunami in December 2004 and more recently following the Haitian earthquake in January 2010. It can be used to pummel an enemy, as carrier-based strike craft are doing today to our enemies in Afghanistan. The Navy critically supports the amphibious operations of the U.S. Marines. It also supports important national purposes that fall between disaster relief and combat. For example, it supports our trade in and access to strategic resources, keeps sea lanes secure in peace and war, and assures allies of our presence and commitment. By maintaining sufficient combat power to provide allies with security by deterring and protecting against ballistic missile attack, it reduces the incentives to proliferate weapons of mass destruction and lowers the prospect of destabilizing regional security competitions. And the Navy, last but not least, also reinforces U.S. diplomacy, collects intelligence and supports homeland security by monitoring the movement of potentially dangerous cargo destined for U.S. or allied ports.
A shorter, more conceptual way of putting all this is to say that U.S. seapower protects our vital interest in a benign international order, thus providing a global common good that simultaneously enables America to do well for itself and to do good for others.
Despite the critical role of the Navy, the prevalence of land conflicts in recent years—the 1989 invasion of Panama, the 1990–91 Gulf War, the Balkan wars of the 1990s, the post-September 11 invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq (and the ongoing counterinsurgency campaigns there)—have propelled American seapower into virtual obscurity. This is not to say that the Navy has not participated in all these conflicts, but that the historically unprecedented concentration on land warfare has led a generation of American lawmakers, their staffs, policy experts and the media to take U.S. maritime interests for granted. This has engendered an unprecedented ignorance of the political and broadly strategic role of seapower in providing American and global security. American Presidents from George Washington to George H.W. Bush knew from history and their own experience alike that America was preeminently a seapower, and that American security has been inseparable from the development of seapower and the ideas that govern it. It still is. Indeed, the demand for U.S. seapower will only grow in the years ahead.
It will grow, for example, if Iran becomes a nuclear power and the oil-rich Gulf states require shelter under an American deterrent umbrella. The Obama Administration has already increased the demand for naval force by promising to place a U.S. seaborne ballistic missile shield in the Mediterranean to protect Europe against intermediate-range Iranian ballistic missiles. But if Iran is a jihadist state with nuclear ambitions, Pakistan is an existing nuclear state with a potential to turn jihadist or to collapse. Pakistan’s shaky future and Turkey’s increasingly problematic descent into the hands of Islamist rule will almost certainly enlarge demand for U.S. deterrent naval force in the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean.
Then there is China, whose growing wealth, nationalism, ambition and need for energy and raw materials have prompted it to cultivate an expanding, increasingly powerful navy, one of whose explicit goals is to deny U.S. naval vessels access to the western Pacific. This is an objective that China’s growing inventory of sophisticated anti-ship ballistic missiles brings into the realm of possibility. The United States is, or at any rate ought to be, as resistant to an Asian hegemon as it was to a European or Eurasian one in the World Wars and the Cold War that followed.
To note that China is neither a liberal state nor likely to become one soon is not tantamount to searching abroad for monsters to destroy. Nor is it spiting hope to point out that regional balances against potential hegemons do not burst spontaneously into being. China’s brand of politicized mercantilism precludes meaningful partnerships with the United States on issues of strategic gravity. In that light, Chinese hegemony in East Asia would undermine or neutralize U.S. military, diplomatic and economic relations with nations ranging from Japan to India, exacting a cost to America’s international position that cannot be readily imagined. No single instrument of U.S. policy is more effective than a strong U.S. Navy at moderating Chinese behavior—behavior such as its challenges to U.S. intelligence ships in international waters, its belligerent and recently expanded territorial claims to the South China Sea, or its de facto support for Iran’s nuclear program. American power is a necessary ingredient in a peaceful balance of power and perception in Asia. A U.S. Navy that can defend itself, protect American allies and continue the stabilizing presence of American forces in the western Pacific is the best way to prevent major conflicts. Its absence or abject weakness would be an invitation to calamity.

#### Specifically, Navy solves china war

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

China, while continuing to upgrade its naval capabilities, grows increasingly assertive. In pursuit of its own Monroe Doctrine for East Asia, Beijing has proclaimed its sovereignty over the entire South China Sea, menaced neighbors from India to Vietnam, used its economic muscle to intimidate Japan, and increased its threats against Taiwan. China’s leaders have been studying the writings of the 19th-century American naval theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan, who demonstrated the connection between sea power and economic strength. At the turn of the last century, Theodore Roosevelt found in Mahan the blueprint for achieving unprecedented American influence in world affairs. His efforts to build both a strong navy and a sound economy ushered in the “American century,” the period in which the United States became a force for good throughout the world and a beacon of hope for those yearning to breathe free.

In pursuing a “blue-water” ocean-going navy capable of supporting their expanding global economic ambitions, the Chinese are acting from a desire to defend their nation’s trade and access to world markets, with a focus on energy supplies. It is critical that the Chinese — who are closely studying both Mahan’s writings and the history of the Monroe Doctrine — and Americans who see Chinese hegemony over Asia as either inevitable or a price they are willing to pay in exchange for slashing defense spending not draw the wrong lessons from history. Both sides should understand that it was not American might that gave the Monroe Doctrine force, but the then all-powerful British navy. For much of the 19th century, Great Britain had reasons of its own for keeping other nations out of the Western Hemisphere and for wanting to see the United States develop internally.

If appropriately funded, the United States Navy has the capacity to play a similar role in China’s rise — perhaps, in the process, influencing how China develops. Should China conclude that the United States intends to remain a visible and active presence in the region, it will respond accordingly. Acting together, the two nations might embark on a series of cooperative ventures designed to help assure a steady flow of trade and an unimpeded exchange of people, goods, and ideas. They can also work together to combat a rise in piracy and terrorism in Asia and elsewhere and to respond to humanitarian crises, like the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. For its part, China, should it continue to hold North Korea in check, will achieve some of the status it seeks as a rising world power, with commensurate influence on the world stage.

Should China conclude, on the other hand, that the United States intends to turn inward, it may grow even more ambitious and assertive in its region and beyond, potentially menacing world peace. Its smaller neighbors nervously wait to see how the United States will respond to China’s growing assertiveness. Should they come to believe that the U.S. is in retreat, they will make their own accommodations with Beijing. That result would wreak irreparable damage both to America’s economy and to its security.

Messrs. Frank and Paul and their supporters have taken it into their minds that a reduced American presence in world affairs, particularly where the military is involved, would be a good thing. They had better think again: World politics, like nature, is hardly prone to respect vacuums. Iran and Venezuela remain as bellicose and destabilizing as ever, in spite of two years of Obama “engagement.” Iran squats beside the Strait of Hormuz, through which much of the world’s energy supply travels. Iran has also, the original Monroe Doctrine be damned, extended its military cooperation with Hugo Chávez’s authoritarian regime. Evidence is strong that Venezuela is providing sanctuary for Hezbollah terrorists in South America. The alliance of these two anti-American and increasingly menacing states could pose a threat to the United States of a kind that would make us nostalgic for the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Faced with such challenges, the United States can ill afford military retrenchment as advocated by the new isolationists. While waste in the Pentagon’s budget can and should be cut, the new isolationists want to do it with a chainsaw when a scalpel is needed. In the last decade, the U.S. Navy’s fleet has shrunk to its smallest size since the 19th century, just as potential rivals such as China have not only expanded theirs but have begun to target perceived American maritime vulnerabilities. The U.S. Air Force is fielding an aging and shrinking force, while China is developing an advanced fighter for sale to adversaries of America, including Iran.

A world in which the United States willingly ceded power and influence would both be more dangerous and prove less receptive to values that most Americans share, such as respect for human rights, the need to restrain governments through the rule of law, and the sanctity of contracts. By reducing its military strength to alarmingly low levels, the United States would create dangerous power vacuums around the world that other nations, with entirely different values, would be only too happy to fill. That, as history shows, would make war more, rather than less, likely. Congress and the president would do well to reflect on those lessons and remember their duty to provide a dominant American military presence on land, at sea, and in the air.

#### US-China war causes extinction

Cheong, Senior Writer @ the Strait Times, 2000 (Ching, Senior Writer at the Strait Times, “No one gains in a war over Taiwan,” June 25th, Lexis)

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunisticpowers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China, 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilization.

### **Colombia**

#### **The final impact is Colombia**

#### **CVN key to South American maritime power projection**

Martinez 9

Senator Mel Martinez at the U.S. Senate¶ 5) MARTINEZ SPEECH TO THE U.S. SURFACE NAVY ASSOCIATION SYMPOSIUM

http://listserv.alachua.fl.us/cgi-bin/wa.exe?A3=ind0902B&L=LEE-PINKOSON&E=quoted-printable&P=31444909&B=--\_000\_91A523B7EF768648822E589DF602FAE224B24DDBSENATEEX03senat\_&T=text%2Fplain;%20charset=us-ascii

Thank you Admiral LaFleur for that kind introduction. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you today.¶ First, let me say thanks to those that sacrificed to serve our nation and the cause of freedom. By answering our country's call to serve, you have helped to keep America's beacon of freedom shining brightly for so many around the world.¶ As someone who fled Communist Cuba seeking to live in freedom, I appreciate all that you have given - and continue to give - in service to our nation.¶ Next week, we will once again witness the peaceful transition of power in Washington - a true symbol of our democracy.¶ I'm looking forward to hearing about the President-elect's plans for our nation over the next four years, and specifically his plans to continue modernizing our Naval fleet.¶ From my perspective, I believe success in our navy's future hinges on three simple words: build more ships. With our nation at war and the threat of terrorism as real as it's ever been, building a robust and modern fleet is more than a national imperative. It is an essential piece in keeping our country as the world's preeminent seapower. That is why I share the Navy's goal of getting beyond a floor of 313 ships, and I intend to do all that I can to ensure the Navy achieves this goal.¶ At the end of the Cold War nearly two decades ago, the Navy's fleet was 529 ships strong. Today, that number has dwindled to a mere 283 - the lowest number in more than a century! Even though America is home to the most highly-skilled, most-advanced navy in the world, I believe we must do better. We're going to need more hulls in the water to keep our country safe and confront some of the many threats we face around the globe.¶ One of those threats is emerging near our shores, right before our eyes. Over the past few months, Russia has aggressively rekindled ties with certain Latin American and Caribbean countries on a scale we haven't seen since the height of the Cold War.¶ In November, several Russian warships engaged in joint naval exercises with Venezuela in Caribbean waters. Last month, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev went to Havana, and a flotilla of Russian ships visited Cuba for the first time since the Soviet era. After meeting with Hugo Chavez, Medvedev met with the leaders of Brazil and Peru. On their tour, the Russians sailed through the Panama Canal for the first time since 1944. And just last week, Russia's Navy approved a plan to station warships permanently in friendly ports across the globe. These actions - coupled with the provocative acts of military aggression against the Republic of Georgia last year - shows that Russia has rekindled a desire to project power near and far. Like Russia, China has also emerged as a potential adversary by virtue of their navy's staggering growth.¶ They are building an average of twenty-five ships per year. It is apparent that with the U.S. averaging between five and eight ships per year, shipbuilding should be a priority. Part of China's fleet includes their Yuan Class / hard-to-detect / ultra-quiet diesel submarines / highlighting a need for new technology and a renewed commitment to increasing our Anti-Submarine Warfare capabilities.¶ Both Russia and China have an increasing presence in the Americas, and our ability to monitor threats within this part of the world has become increasingly important. One of the tools the Navy now has at its disposal is the 4th Fleet - which was re-established at Naval Station Mayport in July of last year. The fleet's location in Jacksonville will provide tremendous support to the U.S. Southern Command.¶ **Not only will** it help keep our country more secure, it will also improve our cooperation with partner nations in the Western Hemisphere. The fleet's first commander, Rear Admiral Joseph D. Kernan, has already settled into his leadership role, and has begun serving our interests in the Caribbean and Central and South America. In addition to re-establishing the 4th Fleet, I am also pleased that the Navy has re-committed to improving the acquisition process.¶ Unfortunately, following the end of the Cold War and throughout the 1990s, the federal government took a procurement holiday and we are paying the price today. The Navy has tried to catch up, but as you know, one of the largest barriers to building more ships has been cost overruns, or "mission creep." Historically, the Navy has had difficulties keeping shipbuilding on-time and on-budget, highlighting a need for a more cost-effective and efficient process. Congress expects it, taxpayers expect it, and the Navy as a whole stands to gain by improving the process.¶ A prime example of this occurred in building the USS Freedom - our navy's first Littoral Combat Ship. Despite early difficulties, the Freedom has begun service, and by all accounts, this ship is a gamechanger. After it receives an Anti-Submarine Warfare mission module next summer, the ship immediately increases our Anti-Submarine Warfare capabilities and help with monitoring new and growing threats.¶ Unlike traditional deepwater ships, the Freedom can maneuver at great speed in shallow water. The Freedom, along with the other Littoral Combat Ships, add vital capabilities to our fleet's arsenal and help to narrow the vulnerability gap we have faced in recent years. So in the future, building more ships like the Freedom should continue to be a priority - but without a process that works, this can't happen.¶ I appreciate the good work of Navy Secretary Donald Winter and Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Gary Roughead for making tremendous progress in this area. While building more ships is critical to protecting our interests, it's also necessary if we want to continue our role as a leader in global maritime security.¶ U.S. Navy ships are positioned throughout the world to assist in safeguarding sea lanes and protecting commerce near the shorelines of many of our trading partners. As American products continue to find open markets abroad, the need to safeguard trade routes will become greater, and our Navy's role in maritime security will only grow larger.¶ In the past year, an increase in piracy off the coast of Somalia has highlighted the need for well-equipped and well-positioned ships that can effectively protect the flow of commerce. I believe the United States Navy can play a key role in this area of the world, but only if we build more ships in the future.¶ My home state of Florida couldn't be more proud to be taking part in that future. We expect that as part of the Navy's continuing efforts to strategically disperse our fleet, Naval Station Mayport's facilities will be upgraded to homeport a nuclear carrier. Mayport has been home to our capital ships since 1952 and has at times hosted multiple carriers.¶ The decision to maintain strategic dispersal by upgrading Mayport is in the best interest of our national security. Nuclear-powered carriers have proven their flexibility in response and maneuverability and the continued dispersal of these vital, national assets is the correct move for an all-nuclear carrier fleet. No matter what lens you use to view potential national security threats on the horizon, the upgrading of Mayport to a nuclear facility continues to demonstrate the Navy's commitment to strategic dispersal.¶ Our nation confronts many threats daily, and works to position our assets accordingly. The ability to meet threats whenever and wherever they emerge and dispatch naval assets without hesitation is paramount. U.S. Naval leadership is expected to advance that objective as soon as today by designating Naval Station Mayport as a homeport and maintenance facility for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.¶ The decision is necessary to prudently protect our Navy's ability to project force from the East Coast and service the carrier fleet in the event of a catastrophe at another nuclear-capable homeport or aboard a ship closest to Mayport. Once it's finished, Mayport will be the second nuclear-ready port on the East Coast; helping to relieve Norfolk's burden of nuclear aircraft carrier maintenance.¶ Currently, the Pacific fleet has three nuclear carrier homeports and maintenance facilities; while the Atlantic Fleet has only one at Norfolk. As you might imagine, this has not only placed a burden on Norfolk, but it has also created a liability. Last year, all five of the East Coast's nuclear aircraft carriers were in port simultaneously for 35 days.¶ Two or more carriers were in port or undergoing routine maintenance in the sole East Coast facility 81 percent of the time. If, Heaven forbid, tragedy should strike or Norfolk were to become inoperative, the impact on the Atlantic Fleet's ability to meet our national security needs would decrease immensely.¶ I'm looking forward to working with the Navy's leadership and my colleagues on the Senate Armed Services Seapower Subcommittee as we work to make Mayport nuclear-ready as quickly as possible. As you meet and discuss the future of our Navy during this symposium, I want you to consider the words of our first President, who knew the value of a having a strong, reliable fleet.¶ During that time, then-General George Washington said, "Without a decisive naval force we can do nothing definitive."¶ I don't think Washington's words have ever been as true as they are today. With so much at stake - our safety, our security, and our future prosperity - I believe it's time to act. I look forward to working with you as we begin rebuilding our Navy and preparing it for the future. Thank you for your hard work and all that you do to keep our nation safe and secure. May God continue to bless the men and women of the United States Navy, and may He continue to bless America.¶

#### Possible scenarios for conflict – aircraft carriers key

RAND 6(“LEVERAGING AMERICA'S AIRCRAFT CARRIER CAPABILITIES”, John Gordon IV, Peter A. Wilson, John Birkler, Steven Boraz, Gordon T. Lee, Prepared for the US Navy, <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG448.pdf> EG)

Table 1
Future Scenarios in Which U.S. Aircraft Carriers Might Be Used

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Scenario | Circumstance |
| Combat | China-Taiwan | Taiwan is threatened by the People’s Republic of China |
| Pakistan coup attempt | Radical group within Pakistani military attempts to overthrow the government in Islamabad |
| Korean crisis | North Korea, equipped with a dozen or more nuclear weapons, confronts South Korea |
| Strait of Hormuz crisis | A nuclear-armed Iran sponsors nonstate terrorist groups |
| Nigeria civil war noncombatant evacuation | Civil war in Nigeria requires a large-scale noncombatant evacuation operation |
| Colombia insurgency | Colombia’s police and military require help to counter an insurgency by two major guerrilla groups |
| Myanmar civil war | Myanmar government is pressed by a foreign-backed civil war |
| Noncombat | Nuclear detonation in Long Beach, California | Radical nonstate terrorist detonates nuclear device in Port of Long Beach |
| Tsunami along U.S. Atlantic coast | Underwater earthquake in mid-Atlantic causes major tidal wave on U.S. East Coast |
| Volcanic eruption in Hawaii | Kilauea volcano erupts, significantly damaging major portions of the Big Island |
| Earthquake in San Francisco, California | Large earthquake strikes San Francisco area, simultaneous with security crisis in Korea |
| Cuban refugee crisis | Post-Castro civil unrest in Cuba leads to a massive flood of Florida-bound refugees |

#### Colombia is experiencing civil unrest now—the guerrilla group FARC will continue offensive attacks and the Colombian military is not enough to solve

Wall Street Journal, 2011 (“Colombian Insurgents Vow a Battle,” Darcy Crowe, Available online at <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203733504577022332960404076.html>, Accessed 07/13/2012)

The most powerful guerrilla insurgency in Latin America vowed to continue its rebellion on Sunday, after the Colombian military killed its top commander and plunged the teetering rebel force into its deepest-ever crisis. Alfonso Cano, the top leader of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia was gunned down Friday in a military operation that the government of this Andean nation labeled as its greatest victory against the Marxist-inspired guerrilla insurgency, which has been fighting to overthrow the government for nearly 50 years. The blow, coming after a string of setbacks for the guerrillas in recent years, raised hopes that the rebels might be forced into peace talks. President Juan Manuel Santos, while pledging to continue fighting the guerrillas, also said over the weekend that he was willing to negotiate with them. But the guerrillas issued a defiant statement Sunday dismissing any potential negotiations with the government. "The only reality symbolized by the fall in combat of comrade Alfonso Cano is the immortal resistance of the Colombian people who would rather die than live on their knees as beggars," said the group, known by its Spanish acronym, FARC. "This is not the first time that the oppressed and exploited in Colombia cry for one of its greatest leaders." That language is certain to irritate most Colombians, who overwhelmingly reject the FARC. Founded in 1964 in one of the most violent periods in Colombian history, the FARC started as a peasant movement focused on demanding land redistribution. Like other guerrilla movements in Latin America, it turned to Marxist ideology and the Cuban revolution for inspiration. As time went by the FARC increasingly devoted itself to cocaine trafficking to build a flush war-chest. The guerrillas also kidnapped thousands of Colombians for ransom. They also abducted prominent politicians and in some cases are believed to have executed some of them during military rescue operations. By 2001, the FARC threatened the approaches to Bogotá and were able to overrun isolated military outposts. But a U.S-backed military offensive under former President Álvaro Uribe pushed them back to remote mountains and jungles. Once numbering about 18,000 fighters, the FARC now counts only about 7,000 men under arms. It was during this decline that Mr. Cano emerged as the guerrilla's top commander. A former anthropology student from a middle-class family in Bogotá, Mr. Cano abandoned university life more than three decades ago to join the FARC. Many analysts saw Mr. Cano, who sported a trademark thick, grey-streaked beard, large reading glasses and had a background in the Colombian Communist Party, as a radical Marxist ideologue unwilling to comprise in any potential peace agreement. The death of Mr. Cano, whose real name is Guillermo Leon Saenz, is likely to plunge the FARC deeper into crisis. While he was the clear heir to the FARC's legendary founder, Manuel Marulanda, known as Tirofijo, or "Sureshot," who died of natural causes in 2008, the top leaders that are left in the group don't have the same legitimacy with the FARC's rank and file. "This will be the FARC's most traumatic succession ever," said Alfredo Rangel, a security analyst. Iván Márquez, whose real name is Luciano Marin Arango, is the favorite to rise to the post of top FARC commander. Mr. Márquez, 56 years old, has been a member of the FARC for almost 30 years, and has some military successes under his belt. He is believed to be hiding in Venezuela. Another possible successor is a commander that goes by Timochenko, whose real name is Rodrigo Londono-Echeverry. He is seen as a strong military strategist and is also responsible for overseeing the FARC's cocaine operations. He reportedly studied medicine in the former Soviet Union and could also be hiding in Venezuela. Its reliance on cocaine cash to fund its operations, along with the kidnappings, has also eroded the ideological purity of the insurgency. In some regions, the FARC is believed to be allied with drug-traffickers who once belonged to right-wing death squads and were the FARC's sworn enemies. But even as the FARC weakens, it may still ride out the storm. In recent months, the FARC, switching tactics, had pulled off a number of stinging hit and run attacks. "They are going to intensify these types of actions," Mr. Rangel said. The operation itself underscored how Colombia's army has been shaped into a world-class fighting force. Mr. Cano was wounded in a bombing attack in a remote southwest area of Colombia. Colombian commandos followed up on the bombing raid, rappelling down from helicopters and engaging in a shoot-out with Mr. Cano and members of his security detail. A top Colombian intelligence official said operatives were alerted that Mr. Cano was in the area after spotting two dogs, a Labrador and a mutt, named Pirulo and Conan, who were Mr. Cano's constant companions.

#### Colombia Is the Linchpin of Global Cocaine Exports – Status Quo Counternarcotics Efforts Backfire and Make Cartels Stronger

Peter Chalk,senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation, 2011 (“The Latin American Drug Trade: Scope, Dimensions, Impact, and Response” RAND, 2011, Available Online at <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND_MG1076.pdf>, Accessed 7/14/2012, ZR)

That said, Washington’s overall counternarcotics assistance program has yet to significantly reduce or undermine the Latin American drug trade. Colombia still constitutes the principal source of cocaine for both the U.S. and global markets, accounting for 90 and 80 percent of respective consumption. There is no sign that overall volumes shipped from the country will drop any time soon, with the projected yield for 2009 standing at 54 MT; as noted, if achieved, this would represent the highest output since 2003. Such an outcome might appear counterintuitive given the vast areas of coca leaf that have been destroyed through aerial and manual eradication efforts. However, it is merely indicative of the ease with which crops can be regrown, many of which are capable of surviving in a wide range of climatic conditions. Just as importantly, it is now evident that farmers are planting higher yield bushes, which means that output can be maintained with smaller acreages. 16 Indeed, the very use of crop eradication is questionable. As noted above, the projected cost of manual and aerial fumigation programs is expected to surge to $1.5 billion by 2013. The fact that this might not result in any meaningful decline in production obviously calls into question the wisdom of this investment. Crop spraying has also been linked to various adverse health effects. Roundup, for instance, has resulted in fever, eye irritation, gastrointestinal complaints, skin rashes, and dizziness. 17 Moreover, fumigation is essentially an indiscriminate counternarcotics measure in the sense that it can destroy both licit and illicit crops. Taken together, these outcomes can have a highly detrimental impact on popular support for the government, driving local producers into the hands of insurgents and legitimating their rhetoric that the government is engaged in a rapacious drive to destroy peasant livelihoods. 18 Such an outcome could hand FARC a boon of popular support precisely at a time when it is otherwise reeling from critical leadership losses. There has also been no diminution in drug players operating in Colombia. Although weaker as an insurgent force, FARC remains a prominent and threatening drug-producing and -trafficking entity 19 and could yet benefit from government eradication efforts that inadvertently alienate local farmers; former paramilitaries have reemerged as straight crime syndicates; there are signs that the ELN is increasingly moving into the cocaine business; and at least 350 “baby cartels”. As one U.S. official candidly remarked, “If soybeans could be developed with the same yield as current coca plants, we could solve the world’s food crisis.” 17 Mejia and Posada, 2008, p. 33. 18 See, for instance, Rabasa and Chalk, 2001, p. 66. 19 Indeed, FARC’s involvement in the drug trade is currently greater than ever before. Whereas, in the past, the group primarily focused only on taxing and protecting coca cultivation, today it actively participates in all aspects of the cocaine chain, from the growth of coca leaf to the manufacture of coca base to the production and subsequent trafficking of refined cocaine. U.S. Responses continue to play a significant role in internal distribution and refining activities. In Mexico, the situation is even worse, with the northern border provinces now in the throes of what amounts to a fully fledged narcowar. This arguably reflects the post-Cali, post-Medellín “Colombianization” of the country’s drug trade, with increasingly fragmented cartels engaging each other and the authorities in a highly vicious battle over territory and sales “turf.” Moreover, as Schaefer, Bahney, and Riley observe, the Mérida initiative, at least as currently formulated, neither addresses the gap between federal and local police forces nor provides assistance at the municipal level to deal with everyday security issues. 20 Compounding problems is the fact that, of the $1.6 billion appropriated by Congress between 2008 and 2010, only 46 percent has been obligated and 9 percent actually disbursed. As a result, many of the programs listed under the aid package are not being fully or effectively implemented. 21 Finally, trafficking routes from Colombia and the wider Andean region have, by no means, been curtailed, merely shifting in response to extant interdiction approaches. Indeed, the mosaic of smuggling conduits extending from Latin America is now arguably more complex than ever before, embracing at least five principal “corridors”: a Colombia– Caribbean–Mexico route, a Colombia–eastern Pacific–Mexico route, a Peru–Bolivia–Paraguay–Uruguay–Brazil route, a Brazil–Atlantic– Europe route, a Colombia–Venezuela–Atlantic–Europe route, and a Colombia–Venezuela–Atlantic–West Africa–Europe route.

**Scenario 1 is Biodiversity**

**Cocaine Cultivation Puts the Colombian Rainforests on the Brink of Collapse**
ScienceDaily, 01/29/2011 (Science and Environmental News Source, Article Cites Research from Stony Brook University “Cocaine Production Increases Destruction of Colombia’s Rainforests”, Available online at <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/01/110128144723.htm>, Accessed 07/13/2012, ZR)

Scientists from Stony Brook University are reporting new evidence that cultivating coca bushes, the source of cocaine, is speeding up destruction of rainforests in Colombia and threatening the region's "hotspots" of plant and animal diversity. The findings, which they say underscore the need for establishing larger protected areas to help preserve biodiversity, appear in ACS' journal Environmental Science & Technology.

Dr. Liliana M. Dávalos, professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at Stony Brook, and her colleagues note that the pace of deforestation in Colombia has accelerated over the past 20 years, even as population growth has slowed and the economy has shifted from agriculture to other revenue sources. This increase in deforestation overlaps with an increase in the cultivation of coca for cocaine production, and the country accounted for 75 per cent of the world's coca in 2000.

Earlier reports found that direct deforestation from coca was surprisingly small, with as little as 150 km2 of forests replaced by coca each year by 2005. Since rainforests contain about 10 percent of the world's plant and animal species -- some of which become the basis of new medicines -- deforestation represents a serious threat to global biodiversity. With studies suggesting that coca cultivation contributes indirectly to deforestation, the scientists set out to further document this impact.

Their analysis of data from 2002-2007 on the effects of coca cultivation on deforestation of rainforests in Colombia identified several factors that boosted the likelihood that rainforests would be destroyed. In southern Colombia, a forest close to newly developed coca farms, for instance, was likely to be cut, as was land in areas where much of the farmland was devoted to coca.

Colombian Rainforests Are Critical Global Biodiversity Hotspots – Cocaine Production Is the Biggest Threat
Janie Doward**,** Staff Writer for the Observer**,** 10/25/2009 (Guardian UK, “Colombia's endangered species at the mercy of jungle drug cartels” 10/25/09, Available Online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/oct/25/colombia-endangered-species-cocaine>, Accessed 07/13/2012)

Colombia, one of the largest environmental hubs in the planet, with a territory of more than 1 million square kilometres, has been warning about the dangers of "ecocide" caused by the country's drug cartels for several years. As one of the most biodiverse countries in the world, it is home to 50,000 plant species and 18% of the world's bird species. But now it is attempting to make children aware that the threats facing its rainforests are a global issue that will have an impact on climatic stability.

The move represents a tacit admission that the past strategy of highlighting the cocaine trade's links to violence and kidnappings has struggled to leave much of an impression on the drug's users. "The environment is an issue that is important to everyone," said the Colombian minister for the environment, Carlos Costa Posada. "We are tired of using images of violence. It is all people think about when they think about Colombia – people don't want to come here for tourism. We are not saying this issue [cocaine's role in the destruction of the rainforests] is the most important issue, but it is something people can identify with."

Cultivation of illicit crops has led to destruction of 2.2 million hectares of tropical forest in Colombia, an area slightly larger than Wales. For every hectare of coca grown, three of forest are cut down. This means that for each gram of cocaine used, four square metres of rainforest are cleared.

The gorgeted puffleg, only 90 millimetres long, is particularly vulnerable. Its habitat consists of only 1,200 hectares of rainforest, 100 of which are disappearing every year because of coca cultivation. "We have around 400 species that are facing extinction," Costa Posada said. "Violence is a local issue, but biodiversity is a world issue – deforestation is a major contributor to climate change."

Cocaine Production and Status Quo Counternarcotics Efforts Decimate the Amazon Rainforest
**Mongabay, 05/26/2008** (Environmental News Source, “Cocaine use is destroying the Amazon”, Available Online at <http://news.mongabay.com/2008/0526-cocaine.html>, Accessed 07/13/2012, ZR)

A new campaign has linked cocaine consumption in Europe and the United States to destruction of the Amazon rainforest in Colombia. The "Shared Responsibility" drive, a joint initiative by the British and Colombian governments, features a collection of photographs showing the destruction of rainforest for coca plantations, the raw ingredient used for cocaine production. Cocaine production destroys rainforest In a speech in London marketing the launch of the initiative, Francisco Santos, Colombia's Vice President, said that every gram of cocaine consumed "destroys four square meters of rainforest." Deforestation in the Colombian Amazon - photo by Rhett A. Butler. The campaign estimates that 2.2 million hectares of forest have been cleared for cocaine production in Colombia. Pollution from production — kerosene, sulfuric acid, acetone, and carbide are used to process the leaves — has fouled waterways while armed groups operating in forests areas have decimated wildlife. "The real price of cocaine is not just among communities and on the streets here, but in communities and on the streets of Colombia," British Home Office Minister Vernon Coaker was quoted as saying by Reuters. Coca eradication also takes a toll Anti-drugs efforts have also harmed ecologically sensitive areas in Colombia. Colombia has long battled a cocaine-fueled insurgency in its remote regions. In an effort to destroy the rebels' chief source of income, the Colombian government has targeted coca fields with aerial spraying of herbicides. Coca provides the key ingredient in cocaine and its eradication is a fundamental part of the US-backed war on drugs. Much of Colombia's coca is grown by poor farmers because it generates more income than any other crop. Typically farmers convert the plant into coca paste and sell it to groups -- including paramilitaries and Colombian rebels -- who refine it into cocaine and export the narcotic to markets like the United States, Europe, and increasingly, Brazil. Drug eradification efforts have focused on aerial fumigation programs where herbicides (a mixture that includes Monsanto Corporation's Roundup and Cosmo-Flux 411F) are dropped by crop-duster planes on suspect vegetation. Since the concoction is a non-selective herbicide, surrounding vegetation -- including subsistence crops and native plants -- are killed as well. Environmentalists, indigenous rights' groups, and even the government of Ecuador have complained that widespread spraying of herbicides could pose health threats to locals as well as damage to the environment. Local reports suggest that farmers often replant coca seedlings soon after spraying, making the whole exercise somewhat futile. In 2005 a report from the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy showed that a massive aerial spraying offensive in 2004 failed to reduce the area of coca under cultivation in Colombia. Drug eradification efforts in the country have lately resulted in the shifting of large-scale coca production into the extensive rainforests of Chocó state, a biodiversity hotspot in northwest Colombia.

#### Destruction of the Amazon results in climatic change, famine, disease, nuclear war and ultimately extinction

Takacs, Instructor in Department of Earth Systems Science and Policy at California State-Monterey Bay 1996 (David, Philosophies of Paradise, Available online at [www.dhushara.com/book/diversit/restor/takacs.htm](http://www.dhushara.com/book/diversit/restor/takacs.htm), Accesssed 07/13/2012, ZR)

More often, however, humans are said to benefit from such ecosystem services. Half a century ago, Aldo Leopold warned: "Recent discoveries in mineral and vitamin nutrition reveal unsuspected dependencies in the up-circuit: incredibly minute quantities of certain substances determine the value of soils to plants, of plants to animals. What of the down-circuit? What of the vanishing species, the preservation of which we now regard as an esthetic luxury. They helped build the soil; in what unsuspected ways may they be essential to its maintenance?" More recently, Jane Lubchenco feels very strongly that people are in fact much more dependent on ecosystem services that are provided by both managed and unmanaged ecosystems than is generally perceived to be the case. So I think it's sheer folly for us to act in ways that are undermining the ability of both managed and unmanaged ecosystems to provide these services that we're depen dent on. And that we're doing that more and more as we pollute and destroy habitats, or alter habitats in one fashion or another. And I guess the bottom line is that we're changing the environment faster than our ability to understand the consequences of how we're changing it." Most predictions of eco-doom are predicated on this argument, and many are stated in much more dramatic terms than those Lubchenco employs. As the argument runs, a myriad of organisms, especially "little things," comprise ecosystems that provide countless services that keep the Earth's biotic and abiotic processes up and running.' According to Souls, "Many, if not all, ecological processes have thresholds below and above which they become discontinuous, chaotic, or suspended." Biodiversity may regulate these processes; among its many talents, biodiversity is said to create soil and maintain its fertility, control global climate, inhibit agricultural pests, maintain atmospheric gas balances, process organic wastes, pollinate crops and flowers, and recycle nutrients.' Confusion in this line of argumentation ties back into why the concept of biodiversity has risen to prominence. Remember that biologists have scant understanding of the roles that species or populations play in maintaining ecosystems. In interviews, Lovejoy, Falk, and Ray confessed that you can strip away many species from an ecosystem without loss of ecosystem function. Ehrlich points out that by the time a species is endangered, it has probably stopped playing an important role in keeping the system functioning anyway." Furthermore, it is not clear whether we should focus on species as functional cogs in the ecosystem wheel, or whether ecological services are emergent properties of ecosystems themselves. With the biodiversity concept, these dilemmas become nearly moot. Biodiversity embraces lists of species, lists of ecosystems, the interactions of species within ecosystems, and the processes that species may maintain or control. When arguing on behalf of bio-diversity, one need not focus on the specifics-specifically, the specifics of what we don't know. It is enough to explicate some of the functions that keep ecosystems running, or that ecosystems provide for us, and then extrapolate to the dangers associated with declining biodiversity. Peter Raven bases his thinking on Leopold's observation "To keep every cog and wheel is the first precaution of intelligent tinkering": "In every sense, in the sense of communities that will preserve soil, promote local climate, keep the atmosphere, preserve water, and every thing else, the first rule of being able to put together communities well or have the world go on functioning well, or to keep climates as they are, or to retard disease, to produce products we want sustainably, be cause, after all, plants, algae, and photosynthetic bacteria are the only device we have to capture energy from the sun effectively-in all those senses, and in the sense that we're losing the parts so rapidly, I con sider the loss of biological diversity to be the most serious problem that we have-far more serious than global climate change or stratospheric ozone depletion, or anything else." "Habitat destruction and conversion are eliminating species at such a frightening pace that extinction of many contemporary species and the systems they live in and support ... may lead to ecological disaster and severe alteration of the evolutionary process," Terry Erwin writes." And E. 0. Wilson notes: "The question I am asked most frequently about the diversity of life: if enough species are extinguished, will the ecosystem collapse, and will the extinction of most other species follow soon afterward? The only answer anyone can give is: possibly. By the time we find out, however, it might be too late. One planet, one experiment."" So biodiversity keeps the world running. It has value in and for itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: "It is likely that destruction of the rich complex of species in the Amazon basin could trigger rapid changes in global climate patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have entrained famines in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the famines could lead to a thermonuclear war, which could extinguish civilization."" Elsewhere, Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama: What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain in the face of climatic change, soil erosion, loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. Air pollution will increase, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's well stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, mortality from respiratory and epidemic disease, natural disasters, and especially famine will lower life expectancies to the point where can cer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. Humanity will bring upon itself consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter. Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civili zation will disappear some time before the end of the next century not with a bang but a whimper.

#### Scenario 2 is Terrorism

#### Columbian rebels are the backbone of the black market nuclear trade- spreads to nuclear terror and leads to an attack on the US

**MacDonald 8** (Brad MacDonald, staff writer for the Trumpet, “Is Chávez Helping Terrorists Go Nuclear?” 5/2008, http://www.thetrumpet.com/?q=5036.0.104.0)

That seizure marked the first time radioactive material has been linked to FARC. It raises some critical questions: Why is FARC in the major league of black-market uranium trade? Where did it get the uranium? And what was it planning on doing with it? So far, the most plausible explanation is that FARC planned to sell the uranium to raise money, since joint American-Colombian eradication efforts against FARC’s cocaine crops and operations are eating into its cash flow. That’s reasonable, though in reality the material was nearly worthless. But who would be interested in purchasing uranium, and how deep do FARC’s connections with that entity run? Matthew Bunn, senior research associate with Harvard’s Project on Managing the Atom, said he found it interesting that “a very professional terrorist organization like farc, with a good deal of experience in smuggling, apparently was interested in getting involved in buying and selling nuclear material for money. That suggests that someone who had serious nuclear material (unlike this material) and needed to move it from one country to another might have been able to make use of the FARC’s capabilities” (Foreign Policy, March 28; emphasis mine throughout). Black-market activities are inherently dangerous, but few are more so than the illegal trade of nuclear materials and technology. The nature of the underground trade in uranium, particularly when it involves covert enrichment and construction of a nuclear weapon (the ultimate weapon of mass destruction), requires above all a rare willingness to risk everything for the cause, as well as expansive expertise and vast resources. The point is, 66 pounds of uranium didn’t accidentally fall into farc’s lap. FARC is clearly—although we don’t know to what extent—involved in the international black-market trade of nuclear material. That’s alarming when you consider the known members of the black-market nuclear trade! Clearly, this seizure raises more questions than it answers. While many find assurance in the lack of answers, this is a naive approach. The truth is, these questions are extremely disconcerting—especially when considered against the growth of the South American terrorist network. Mountains of evidence have arisen in recent years showing that South America is a hideout and breeding ground for the world’s most dangerous terrorist organizations, including al Qaeda, Hezbollah and Hamas. Pockets of South America—including areas in Venezuela, Bolivia and Ecuador, all of which have governments hostile to the U.S.—have become launching pads from which the world’s most venomous anti-American entities, particularly radical Islam, could strike the United States. Now we learn that uranium is being illegally traded in the region. Even the weakest imagination ought to be able to conjure images of what the consequences for America could be!

#### Nuclear terrorism is an existential threat—it escalates to nuclear war with Russia and China

**Ayson 10** (Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weaponsbetween two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that **any** preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier)Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.

### Solvency

#### Solvency Advocate

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) on Mayport homeporting alternatives was

released in November 2008. The FEIS examined 12 alternatives for homeporting additional

surface ships at Mayport. Four of the 12 alternatives involved homeporting a CVN; another four

involved making Mayport capable of homeporting a CVN, but not immediately homeporting a

CVN there; and the remaining four did not involve making Mayport capable of homeporting a

CVN. Ten of the 12 alternatives also involved transferring additional ships other than a CVN—

various combinations of cruisers, destroyers, frigates, large-deck amphibious assault ships

(LHDs), and other amphibious ships (LPDs and LSDs)—to Mayport. The FEIS also assessed

the alternative of homeporting no additional ships at Mayport. Homeporting a single additional

ship—a CVN—was Alternative 4.

The FEIS identified Alternative 4 as the Navy’s preferred alternative. The FEIS, like the January

2009 ROD, stated that a key reason for the Navy’s desire to transfer a CVN to Mayport is to

hedge against the risk of a catastrophic event that could damage the Navy’s CVN homeporting

facilities in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia. The FEIS stated:

Based on a thorough review of the alternatives, the Department of the Navy has determined

Alternative 4 to be its Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4 involves homeporting one CVN,

dredging, infrastructure and wharf improvements, and construction of CVN nuclear

propulsion plant maintenance facilities. Factors that influenced selection of Alternative 4 as

the Preferred Alternative included impact analysis in the EIS, estimated costs of

implementation, including military construction and other operation and sustainment costs,

and strategic dispersal considerations. Homeporting a CVN at NAVSTA Mayport would

enhance distribution of CVN homeport locations to reduce risks to fleet resources in the

event of natural disaster, manmade calamity, or attack by foreign nations or terrorists. This

includes risks to aircraft carriers, industrial support facilities, and the people that operate and

maintain those crucial assets.

## Add-Ons

### Economy

#### First, Homeporting a CVN at Mayport generates $671 million in economic activity

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

Serving as the home port for a CVN can generate substantial economic activity in the home port

area. This activity includes, among other things, the ship’s crew of more than 3,000 sailors

spending its pay at local businesses, the Navy purchasing supplies for the ship from local

businesses, and Navy expenditures for performing maintenance on the ship while it is in the home

port. Various estimates have been reported of the value of homeporting a CVN to the economy of the

home port area. The FEIS estimates that transferring a CVN at Mayport would result in 2,900

more jobs, $220 million more in direct payroll, $208 million more in disposable income, and $10

million more in local tax contributions for the Mayport area.

An August 2007 press report stated that “some reports put the [earlier] loss of the [aircraft carrier] George Washington at $450 million in payroll and 8,200 military and civilian jobs in Norfolk.” A November 2008 press report from a Norfolk newspaper stated that “The regional chamber of commerce estimates a carrier creates 11,000 jobs and $650 million in annual economic activity.” Another November 2008 press report states that “Jacksonville mayor John Peyton said the new carrier would bring about 3,190 military jobs and pump about $500 million a year into the north Florida economy in salaries and spending.” 30 Another November 2008 press report states that “Virginians calculate that the economic activity related to one carrier can reach $1 billion a year.” 31 The Navy estimated that the initial $426 million in military construction work at Mayport would generate a total of $671 million in initial economic activity

#### Second, Military spending can provide immediate relief to the economy

Martin Feldstein, professor at Harvard and the president emeritus of the National Bureau of Economic Research, 12/24/08 (Martin Feldstein was the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Reagan , “Defense Spending Would Be Great Stimulus,” December 24, 2008, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123008280526532053.html>, ZR)

The Department of Defense is preparing budget cuts in response to the decline in national income. The DOD budgeteers and their counterparts in the White House Office of Management and Budget apparently reason that a smaller GDP requires belt-tightening by everyone.That logic is exactly backwards. As President-elect Barack Obama and his economic advisers recognize, countering a deep economic recession requires an increase in government spending to offset the sharp decline in consumer outlays and business investment that is now under way. Without that rise in government spending, the economic downturn would be deeper and longer. Although tax cuts for individuals and businesses can help, government spending will have to do the heavy lifting. That's why the Obama team will propose a package of about $300 billion a year in additional federal government outlays and grants to states and local governments.

A temporary rise in DOD spending on supplies, equipment and manpower should be a significant part of that increase in overall government outlays. The same applies to the Department of Homeland Security, to the FBI, and to other parts of the national intelligence community.

The increase in government spending needs to be a short-term surge with greater outlays in 2009 and 2010 but then tailing off sharply in 2011 when the economy should be almost back to its prerecession level of activity. Buying military supplies and equipment, including a variety of off-the-shelf dual use items, can easily fit this surge pattern.

For the military, the increased spending will require an expanded supplemental budget for 2009 and an increased budget for 2010. A 10% increase in defense outlays for procurement and for research would contribute about $20 billion a year to the overall stimulus budget. A 5% rise in spending on operations and maintenance would add an additional $10 billion. That spending could create about 300,000 additional jobs. And raising the military's annual recruitment goal by 15% would provide jobs for an additional 30,000 young men and women in the first year.

An important challenge for those who are designing the overall stimulus package is to avoid wasteful spending. One way to achieve that is to do things during the period of the spending surge that must eventually be done anyway. It is better to do them now when there is excess capacity in the economy than to wait and do them later.

Replacing the supplies that have been depleted by the military activity in Iraq and Afghanistan is a good example of something that might be postponed but that should instead be done quickly. The same is true for replacing the military equipment that has been subject to excessive wear and tear. More generally, replacement schedules for vehicles and other equipment should be accelerated to do more during the next two years than would otherwise be economically efficient.

Industry experts and DOD officials confirm that military suppliers have substantial unused capacity with which to produce additional supplies and equipment. Even those production lines that are currently at full capacity can be greatly expanded by going from a single shift to a two-shift production schedule. With industrial production in the economy as a whole down sharply, there is no shortage of potential employees who can produce supplies and equipment.

Military procurement has the further advantage that almost all of the equipment and supplies that the military buys is made in the United States, creating demand and jobs here at home.

Increased military spending should involve more than just accelerated replacement schedules. Each of the military services can identify new equipment and additional quantities of existing equipment that can improve our fighting ability in Afghanistan and our ability to protect our military forces while they are in combat.

Military planners must also look ahead to the missions that each of the services may be called upon to do in the future. Additional funding would allow the Air Force to increase the production of fighter planes and transport aircraft without any delays. The Army could accelerate its combat modernization program. The Navy could build additional ships to deal with its increased responsibilities in protecting coastal shipping and in countering terrorism. And all three services have significant infrastructure needs.

…The Obama team's goal of sending a stimulus package to Congress before the end of January may not leave enough time to work out the details of expanded military and intelligence budgets. If so, the stimulus plan should ask the Congress to provide a total of at least $30 billion a year of increased outlays in these budget categories. A substantial short-term rise in spending on defense and intelligence would both stimulate our economy and strengthen our nation's security.

#### Military has empirically created jobs during depressions—its more politically viable than other spending projects

Paul Krugman, columnist for the *New York Times,* 10/31/11 (Paul Krugman is a Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University, and the recipient of the 2008 Nobel Prize in Economics, “Bombs, Bridges and Jobs,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/10/31/opinion/bombs-bridges-and-jobs.html>)

First things first: Military spending does create jobs when the economy is depressed. Indeed, much of the evidence that Keynesian economics works comes from tracking the effects of past military buildups. Some liberals dislike this conclusion, but economics isn’t a morality play: spending on things you don’t like is still spending, and more spending would create more jobs.

But why would anyone prefer spending on destruction to spending on construction, prefer building weapons to building bridges?

John Maynard Keynes himself offered a partial answer 75 years ago, when he noted a curious “preference for wholly ‘wasteful’ forms of loan expenditure rather than for partly wasteful forms, which, because they are not wholly wasteful, tend to be judged on strict ‘business’ principles.” Indeed. Spend money on some useful goal, like the promotion of new energy sources, and people start screaming, “Solyndra! Waste!” Spend money on a weapons system we don’t need, and those voices are silent, because nobody expects F-22s to be a good business proposition.

To deal with this preference, Keynes whimsically suggested burying bottles full of cash in disused mines and letting the private sector dig them back up. In the same vein, I recently suggested that a fake threat of alien invasion, requiring vast anti-alien spending, might be just the thing to get the economy moving again.

#### Third, Navy spending is key to the economy

Till 10 **-**  FKC is a British naval historian and Professor of Maritime Studies in the Defence Studies Department of King's College London. He is the Director of the Corbett Centre for Maritime Policy Studies ( Geoffrey July 29 2010 “Asia Rising and the maritime decline of the west” [http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP205.pdf)bs](http://www.rsis.edu.sg/publications/WorkingPapers/WP205.pdf%29bs)

Historically, growth in GDP has a high correlation with naval expenditure and, given the maritime basis of much of that growth, it is not surprising that there is remarkable growth in the size, composition and operational aspiration of the local fleets. Naval modernization plans in the region were stalled by the Asian currency crisis of 1997— 1998. and their recovery further interrupted by the global credit crisis a decade later; even so, fleet re-construction is surging ahead. The U.S.-based naval consultancy firm, AMI International, anticipates a naval spending in the Asia-Pacific of USS 173 billion by 2030; the Asia-Pacific naval market as a whole is “expected to move past NATO countries to become the second largest source of future naval spending after the United States”. Asia already spends more on defence in general than Europe. According to the French naval armaments firm DCNS, the Asia-Pacific region was considered “as a future centre for defence business ... the defence market in the AsiaPacific should be, in about 2016, a major market—even above the U.S.”.2° The most marked feature of this surge in Asian naval capability is in China, where defence expenditure has nearly quadrupled from about 64 billion yuan in 1995 to 248 billion in 2005. China’s real level of military expenditure, however, is estimated to be somewhere between US$35 and US$90 billion—in other words up to three times as much as is officially admitted.

#### All trade is directed through the sea and the navy is key

**Eaglen and McGrath 11 —**Mackenzie Eaglen is Research Fellow for National Security in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, a division of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, at The Heritage Foundation. Bryan McGrath is a retired naval officer and the Director of Delex Consulting, Studies and Analysis in Vienna, Virginia. On active duty, he commanded the destroyer USS Bulkeley (DDG 84) and served as the primary author of the current maritime strategy.( May 16, 2011 Mackenzie Eaglen and Bryan McGrath Thinking About a Day Without Sea Power: Implications for U.S. Defense Policy [http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/thinking-about-a-day-without-sea-power-implications-for-us-defense-policy)bs](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/05/thinking-about-a-day-without-sea-power-implications-for-us-defense-policy%29bs)

The overwhelming majority of world commerce moves virtually unmolested across the great expanse of the maritime commons. This is as near a “given” on the international scene as can be conjured. So engrained is this sense of security in the free flow of goods across the world’s oceans that the activities of a relatively insignificant group of brigands off the East African coast have caught the world’s attention, forcing many to consider for the first time the impact of sea power on their lives. American sea power is taken for granted. Policymakers in the United States, friendly and allied governments, executive officers of international conglomerates, and would-be competitors are all affected by the daily operations of the world’s most pervasive and successful naval power, but few ever consider what the world would be like without it. Exploring this question is the central aim of this paper.

#### Fifth, Infrastructure stimulus is key to economic growth—multiple reasons.

New America Foundation 10 — New America Foundation—“a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy institute that invests in new thinkers and new ideas to address the next generation of challenges facing the United States,” 2010 (“The Case for an Infrastructure-Led Jobs and Growth Strategy,” February 23rd, Available Online at http://www.newamerica.net/publications/policy/the\_case\_for\_an\_infrastructure\_led\_jobs\_and\_growth\_strategy, Accessed 06-09-2012)

As the Senate takes up a greatly scaled down $15 billion jobs bill stripped of all infrastructure spending, the nation should consider the compelling case for public infrastructure investment offered by Governors Arnold Schwarzenegger (R-CA) and Ed Rendell (D-PA). Appearing on ABC’s "This Week" on Sunday, the bipartisan Co-Chairs of Building America's Future explained why rebuilding America’s infrastructure is the key to both job creation in the short and medium term and our prosperity in the longer term.

Rather than go from one negligible jobs bill to the next, the administration and Congress should, as the governors suggest, map out a multi-year plan of infrastructure investment and make it the centerpiece of an ongoing economic recovery program.

Here is why:

With American consumers constrained by high household debt levels and with businesses needing to work off overcapacity in many sectors, we need a new, big source of economic growth that can replace personal consumption as the main driver of private investment and job creation. The most promising new source of growth in the near to medium term is America’s pent-up demand for public infrastructure improvements in everything from roads and bridges to broadband and air traffic control systems to a new energy grid. We need not only to repair large parts of our existing basic infrastructure but also to put in place the 21st-century infrastructure for a more energy-efficient and technologically advanced society. This project, entailing billions of dollars of new government spending over the next five to ten years, would generate comparable levels of private investment and provide millions of new jobs for American workers.

More specifically, public infrastructure investment would have the following favorable benefits for the economy:

Job Creation. Public infrastructure investment would directly create jobs, particularly high-quality jobs, and thus would help counter the 8.4 million jobs lost since the Great Recession began. One study estimates that each billion dollars of spending on infrastructure can generate up to 17,000 jobs directly and up to 23,000 jobs by means of induced indirect investment. If all public infrastructure investment created jobs at this rate, then $300 billion in new infrastructure spending would create more than five million jobs directly and millions more indirectly, helping to return the economy to something approaching full employment.

A Healthy Multiplier Effect. Public infrastructure investment not only creates jobs but generates a healthy multiplier effect throughout the economy by creating demand for materials and services. The U.S. Department of Transportation estimates that, for every $1 billion invested in federal highways, more than $6.2 billion in economic activity is generated. Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody’s Economy.com, offers a more conservative but still impressive estimate of the multiplier effect of infrastructure spending, calculating that every dollar of increased infrastructure spending would generate a $1.59 increase in GDP. Thus, by Zandi’s conservative estimates, $300 billion in infrastructure spending would raise GDP by nearly $480 billion (close to 4 percent).

A More Productive Economy. Public infrastructure investment would not only help stimulate the economy in the short term but help make it more productive over the long term, allowing us to grow our way out of the increased debt burdens resulting from the bursting of the credit bubble. As numerous studies show, public infrastructure increases productivity growth, makes private investment more efficient and competitive, and lays the foundation for future growth industries. In fact, many of the new growth sectors of the economy in agriculture, energy, and clean technology require major infrastructure improvements or new public infrastructure.

Needed Investments that Will Pay for Themselves. New infrastructure investment can easily be financed at historically low interest rates through a number of mechanisms, including the expansion of Build America Bonds and Recovery Zone bonds (tax-credit bonds that are subsidized by favorable federal tax treatment) and the establishment of a National Infrastructure Bank. Public infrastructure investment will pay for itself over time as a result of increased productivity and stronger economic growth. Several decades of underinvestment in public infrastructure has created a backlog of public infrastructure needs that is undermining our economy’s efficiency and costing us billions in lost income and economic growth. By making these investments now, we would eliminate costly bottlenecks and make the economy more efficient, thereby allowing us to recoup the cost of the investment through stronger growth and higher tax revenues.

#### Infrastructure investment stimulates the economy—empirical evidence of both short-term and long-term growth.

Boushey 11 — Heather Boushey, Senior Economist at the Center for American Progress, previously held economist positions with the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress, the Center for Economic and Policy Research, and the Economic Policy Institute, holds a Ph.D. in economics from the New School for Social Research, 2011 (“Now Is the Time to Fix Our Broken Infrastructure,” Center for American Progress, September 22nd, Available Online at http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/09/aja\_infrastructure.html, Accessed 06-09-2012)

Investing in infrastructure creates jobs and yields lasting benefits for the economy, including increasing growth in the long run. Upgrading roads, bridges, and other basic infrastructure creates jobs now by putting people to work earning good, middle-class incomes, which expands the consumer base for businesses. These kinds of investments also pave the way for long-term economic growth by lowering the cost of doing business and making U.S. companies more competitive.

There is ample empirical evidence that investment in infrastructure creates jobs. In particular, investments made over the past couple of years have saved or created millions of U.S. jobs. Increased investments in infrastructure by the Department of Transportation and other agencies due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act saved or created 1.1 million jobs in the construction industry and 400,000 jobs in manufacturing by March 2011, according to San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank economist Daniel Wilson.[1] Although infrastructure spending began with government dollars, these investments created jobs throughout the economy, mostly in the private sector.[2]

Infrastructure projects have created jobs in communities nationwide. Recovery funds improved drinking and wastewater systems, fixed bridges and roads, and rehabilitated airports and shipyards across the nation. Some examples of high-impact infrastructure projects that have proceeded as a result of Recovery Act funding include:

\* An expansion of a kilometer-long tunnel in Oakland, California, that connects two busy communities through a mountain.[3]

\* An expansion and rehabilitation of the I-76/Vare Avenue Bridge in Philadelphia and 141 other bridge upgrades that supported nearly 4,000 jobs in Pennsylvania in July 2011.[4]

\* The construction of new railway lines to serve the city of Pharr, Texas, as well as other infrastructure projects in that state that have saved or created more than 149,000 jobs through the end of 2010.[5]

Infrastructure investments are an especially cost-effective way to boost job creation with scare government funds. Economists James Feyrer and Bruce Sacerdote found for example that at the peak of the Recovery Act’s effect, 12.3 jobs were created for every $100,000 spent by the Department of Transportation and the Department of Energy—much of which was for infrastructure.[6] These two agencies spent $24.7 billion in Recovery dollars through September 2010, 82 percent of which was transportation spending. This implies a total of more than 3 million jobs created or saved.

#### Now is the key time for infrastructure investment—it is vital to long-term growth.

Boushey 11 — Heather Boushey, Senior Economist at the Center for American Progress, previously held economist positions with the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress, the Center for Economic and Policy Research, and the Economic Policy Institute, holds a Ph.D. in economics from the New School for Social Research, 2011 (“Now Is the Time to Fix Our Broken Infrastructure,” Center for American Progress, September 22nd, Available Online at http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/09/aja\_infrastructure.html, Accessed 06-09-2012)

Infrastructure is a good investment now because it will get people to work, and at this point, given the lingering high unemployment, we shouldn’t be too concerned if projects take a bit of time to get up and running. As Mark Zandi said in August 2011:

Infrastructure development has a large bang for the buck, particularly now when there are so many unemployed construction workers. It also has the potential for helping more remote hard-pressed regional economies and has long-lasting economic benefits. It is difficult to get such projects up and running quickly—“shovel ready” is in most cases a misnomer—but given that unemployment is sure to be a problem for years to come, this does not seem in the current context as significant a drawback.[16]

We can create jobs. With nearly 14 million Americans unemployed, now is the time to make long-lasting investments in infrastructure that will not only get people to work today but pave the way for long-term economic growth.

Repairing potholes, upgrading an elementary school’s aging furnace, and replacing old water mains are all infrastructure investments. These are repairs that must be done and are often cheaper to do as maintenance than waiting to repair a totally failed system. Now is the right time for America to invest in maintaining and upgrading our infrastructure. We have millions of American workers who want to get off the unemployment queue and into a job and borrowing costs at decade lows, making it extraordinarily cost effective to make big investments today.

#### Independently, this threatens to make *every global problem* worse—economic growth is vital to generate the resources needed to meet emerging challenges.

Silk 93 — Leonard Silk, Distinguished Professor of Economics at Pace University, Senior Research Fellow at the Ralph Bunche Institute on the United Nations at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, and former Economics Columnist with the *New York Times*, 1993 (“Dangers of Slow Growth,” *Foreign Affairs*, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the firs of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues.

Growth will not solve all those problems by itself. But economic growth – and growth alone – creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

#### And, economic decline increases the risk of war—*strong statistical support*.

Royal 10 — Jedidiah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, M.Phil. Candidate at the University of New South Wales, 2010 (“Economic Integration, Economic Signalling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” *Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives*, Edited by Ben Goldsmith and Jurgen Brauer, Published by Emerald Group Publishing, ISBN 0857240048, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow.

First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown.

Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult [end page 213] to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4

Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write,

The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89)

Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions.

Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force.

In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. [end page 214] Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

### Florida Economy

#### Mayport nuclear carriers key to Northeast Floridian economy

Brown 10 (Corrine, Congresswoman 3rd District of Florida, Congresswoman Corrine Brown Strongly Disagrees with 2019 Mayport Assessment, <http://corrinebrown.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=83:congresswoman-corrine-brown-strongly-disagrees-with-2019-mayport-assessment-&catid=11:2010-press-releases&Itemid=54>)

Having a nuclear carrier at Mayport Naval Station is absolutely critical to the economic well being of Northeast Florida. Indeed, it is absolutely essential to the security of our entire nation. "I have been given assurances by the upper levels of leadership at the Department of Defense that plans to make Mayport nuclear capable are moving forward as scheduled. Moreover, Defense Secretary Gates has stated that 'having a single CVN homeport has not been considered acceptable on the west coast and should not be considered acceptable on the east coast (either).' And on July 22, 2009, the Secretary further committed to the dredging work being done at Mayport. Along with the North East Florida Congressional Delegation, U.S. Senators, Mayor, and local elected officials, I have worked hard over several years for the CVN to be homeported at Mayport as soon as possible.

#### Delaying homeporting at Mayport hurts the Florida economy

Christian Conte and Michael Clinton, 02/24/2012 – (Jacksonville Business Journal staff, “Nuclear carrier delay costs Mayport near half-billion-dollar economic impact” Jacksonville Business Journal, Available online at <http://www.bizjournals.com/jacksonville/news/2012/02/13/nuclear-carrier-delay-costs-mayport.html>, Accessed on 07/28/2012, ZR)

The delay to bringing a nuclear aircraft carrier to Mayport could prove to have a deep economic impact to the Mayport area. The carrier will add about 3,250 Navy personnel with a direct impact of $260 million. While the cost of basing a nuclear carrier at Mayport is estimated at about $500 million, the total annual economic impact is estimated to be $400 million with the creation of about 4,600 jobs, according to the Navy’s 2008 environmental impact statement. But businesses dependent on Naval Station Mayport still face a grueling time in the years before a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier arrives to deliver a much anticipated economic boost. It’s feared that the base will lose more than half of its ships, which will mean the loss of roughly $40 million worth of annual repair contracts and about 2,400 sailors by late 2016, said Ed Froehlich, executive director of the Jacksonville Area Ship Repair Association. This delay could intensify that impact on a region that has yet to recover from the loss of more than 3,000 Navy personnel through the decommissioning of the USS John F. Kennedy in 2007. More than 23,000 sailors called the base home when supercarriers USS Forrestal and USS Saratoga and 27 ships were stationed in Mayport, said Froehlich, the base’s commanding officer from 1984 to 1987. When the Forrestal left for Pensacola and the Saratoga was decommissioned in the early 1990s, the base kept busy with about 40 ships and the Kennedy, also a supercarrier, saidJohn Haley, vice president of business recruitment for JaxUSA Partnership.

#### Northeast Floridian seaport economy key to Florida’s economy

Anderson 11 (Paul, JAXPORT CEO, ECONOMIC IMPACT · JAXPORT, <http://www.jaxport.com/sites/default/files/docs/econimpactjaxport.pdf>, January 2011)

Cargo activity in Jacksonville generates nearly $19 billion in total economic activity. The beneﬁts are clear to those working in the maritime and related industries: $1.8 billion dollars in wages and salaries to those in jobs dependent on activity at the port and another $1.6 billion in personal income for those in positions related to the activity in the Port of Jacksonville throughout the region and state. According to a study commissioned by the Florida Department of Transportation, every $1.00 invested in seaports yields $6.90 to the state’s economy. In addition, a $50 million appropriation/investment made by the 2007 Florida Legislature in priority economic development projects at Florida’s seaports was found to have yielded approximately $25.00 for every $1.00 invested in those projects. Study after study continues to afﬁrm that ports are economic engines, driving business revenue, U.S. Customs revenue, local purchases, and state and local revenues.

#### Florida’s economy is key to the global economy- 10 internal links

Ware 8 (Janet, contributor to the Florida Trend an expert publication that is one of America's most award-winning business publications, Top 10 Reasons To Do Business in Florida, <http://atlanticpropertygroup.com/newsdocs/Top%2010%20Reasons%20to%20do%20Business%20in%20FL%20-%20FL%20Trend.pdf>, September 2008)

The right talent, right facilities and right attitude keep Florida’s innovation economy surging ahead. Why come to Florida? Just ask the 18.3 million people who already call Florida home. Or the hundreds more who move in every day. Many are drawn here by sun, sand and sparkling blue water. But they soon realize the added benefits of the state’s innovative spirit, ready workforce, business-friendly policies, global connectivity and exceptional quality of life. Florida is simply a great place to live, work and do business. And while we’ve summed it up in 10 top reasons, we encourage you to read on and learn why you should consider creating, investing or expanding your business here. 1 Technology Leadership For two years in a row, the publication Fierce Biotech has ranked Florida among the top five regions in the world for attracting biotech businesses. Since 2006, research institutes with names like Scripps, Burnham, Torrey Pines, SRI and Max Planck have found new homes in Florida, and they’re attracting the attention of other innovative companies looking to relocate or expand. With 22,052 high-tech companies employing 282,091 highly skilled workers, Florida leads the Southeast in technology-driven business. According to AeA Cyberstates 2008 report, Florida is 4th among all U.S. states for high-tech employment and 3rd for hightech companies. In 2007, Florida exported more than $13.3 billion in high-tech goods and services, putting this state in the No. 3 position nationwide for high-tech exports. Hightech job growth here is highly concentrated in two sectors: engineering services and computer systems design and related services — no surprise given that Florida ranks among the top U.S. states for number of Science and Engineering Doctorates awarded. Florida has a significant and growing presence in many cutting-edge economy sectors, including: Clean Energy, Life Sciences, Information Technology, Aviation and Aerospace and Homeland Security and Defense. 2 Global Gateway Florida is the strategic and economic center of the Americas. A prime geographic location, plus economic and political stability, have put Florida at the center of trade and finance throughout the Western Hemisphere. In 2007, Florida’s total international trade grew to $115 billion, fueled, in part, by a multicultural, multilingual workforce that is highly adept at facilitating international commerce. In 2006 (most recent data), the total value of holdings by foreign-affiliated companies in Florida reached $39.3 billion, employing 273,100 Floridians. Among the U.S. states, Florida ranks 9th in total value of inward foreign direct investment and 5th in total employment by foreign-affiliated firms. Miami is second only to New York as a U.S center for international banking. More than 70 foreign and domestic banks active in international trade and finance have offices in Florida, including six of the 10 largest banks in the world. Florida’s combined exports of goods and services amounted to more than $72 billion in 2007, helping to sustain more than 1.1 million jobs. In addition, Florida ranks 6th in the nation in state-origin exports (those actually produced or with significant value added in the state), which reached nearly $45 billion in 2007. Florida is a diversified global exporter of knowledge-intensive services too, such as accounting, consulting, engineering, legal, medical, telecommunications and transportation services. Florida’s services exports reached $27 billion in 2007. 3 Entrepreneurial Environment Small Business Survival Index 2008 ranks Florida as one of the nation’s friendliest states for entrepreneurs, and the U.S. Small Business Administration puts Florida among the most highly efficient states in fostering the birth of new businesses. In addition to 34 Small Business Development Centers throughout the state and the Disney Entrepreneur Center in Orlando, all of which provide one-on-one counseling, training and other assistance to entrepreneurs at every level, Florida is home to dozens of high-tech incubators, accelerators and university-based research hubs. At the new Florida Institute for Commercialization of Public Research, a collaborative effort of university tech transfer offices statewide, venture capitalists and entrepreneurs looking for potentially lucrative investment opportunities can find information about Florida’s newest innovations, as well as business plans for start-up companies seeking venture capital support. 4 Global Connectivity With one of the world’s most extensive multimodal transportation systems, including 19 major commercial airports, 14 deepwater shipping ports, a vast network of highways and railway connections and Kennedy Space Center’s one-of-a-kind Spaceport, Florida’s global connections are difficult to surpass. The Network Access Point (NAP) in Miami serves as a major switching station for Internet traffic coming to and from Latin America, while other high-speed networks, such as the Florida LambdaRail and LAGrid, facilitate research and development efforts. In addition, Florida has some of the fastest and most widely available networks for highspeed and wireless connectivity. Florida is the second most active participant in Sister City/State programs in the United States, underscoring its worldwide connections and open business and cultural environment. And with a vast network of 14 international offices, seven trade offices located around the state and 15 country-specific websites, Enterprise Florida offers many vital services for businesses looking to locate in Florida from overseas and for Floridabased businesses looking to expand internationally. 5 Business Climate Florida consistently ranks among the top pro-business states in the nation because of its business-friendly tax codes and commitment to providing incentives for job creation, capital investment, new and incumbent worker training and location in designated rural and urban Enterprise Zones and Brownfield sites. Recognizing that businesses need certainty, predictability and efficiency, Florida’s regulatory agencies and local governments are committed to providing quicker, less costly and more predictable permitting processes for significant economic development projects without reducing environmental standards. Assistance in accessing enterprise bonds, micro-loans and venture capital further contributes to Florida’s reputation as a great place to do business. 6 Workforce Talent Florida was named the No. 1 state for workforce in CNBC’s 2008 “America’s Top States for Business” study, which rated the workforce in all 50 states on such criteria as education level, number of available workers and relative success of worker training programs in placing participants in jobs. Florida is one of only 10 states with a right-towork provision in its state constitution, and, at 5.9%, Florida has one of the lowest unionization rates in the country and the 2nd lowest unionization rate in manufacturing (2.8%). No Floridian lives more than 50 miles from an institution of postsecondary learning, and it shows. The number of Floridians with associate, bachelor and advanced degrees has increased at almost double the national rate since 2000, and Florida is 11th among all states for workers with advanced degrees. Florida’s workforce is also one of the most culturally and linguistically diverse in the nation. More than 3.2 million Florida residents were born outside the U.S., and 4.4 million are speakers of languages other than English. Best represented are speakers of Spanish (3.2 million), Indo-European languages (875,000) and Asia and Pacific Islander languages (218,000). The demand for skilled labor in Florida is answered by many training programs designed to address industry needs. Customized programs and incentives, such as Quick Response Training, Incumbent Worker Training and the industry-specific Banner Centers provide skilled labor to employers in less time and at lower costs. Florida’s workforce training and incentive programs have been ranked 3rd best in the country by Expansion Management magazine. 7 Business-Friendly Government Florida has a pro-business, pro-technology agenda for policy-making and business climate improvement. Thanks to the interactive website MyFlorida.com, many business oriented functions of state and local government are easily accessible online. Tort reform has been a priority for Florida’s business-friendly leaders. Recent actions include the elimination of joint and several liability, rate reductions in workers’ compensation insurance and class-action suit reform. Many business sector associations, including Florida Aviation Aerospace Alliance, BioFlorida, Florida Defense Alliance, IT Florida, Space Florida, Florida High Tech Corridor Council and Florida Economic Development Council, work tirelessly to ensure that Florida’s legislators remain up-to-date on issues impacting global competitiveness. 8 World-Renowned Quality of Life The combination of sunshine, outstanding amenities and economic opportunity has helped put Florida at the top of Harris Poll’s “most desirable places to live” since the survey’s inception. And this year, Florida can boast the largest number of cities on Relocate-America’s 2008 “100 Top Places to Live,” the only list determined by statistics and feedback from people who live, work and play in these communities. Already one of the world’s top travel destinations, Florida is a natural choice for permanent residence by visitors who subscribe to a “play here, stay here” philosophy. Climate is a huge draw with average annual temperatures hovering between 81 and 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Florida has 1,370-plus golf courses — more than any other state — and, with 1,350 miles of sandy coastal shoreline, plus 11,761 square miles of inland waterways, there are plenty of opportunities for boating, fishing, snorkeling and other water-based activities. 9 Economic Development Partnerships More than any other state, Florida’s economic development goals and initiatives have been created and embraced as a statewide vision. Economic development organizations throughout the state work together to help existing and prospective businesses find the right location(s) to match their needs. Florida is one of the emerging forces in the innovation economy in large part because officials have made a concerted effort to create the right conditions for creative, knowledge-based businesses to thrive. The state is strategic about its economic development activities, which include funding research and development, attracting venture capital, building state-of-the-art infrastructure, fostering innovative high-tech firms and growing a qualified workforce. 10 Growth Economy While many regions struggle to maintain the status quo, Florida’s economic engine keeps surging forward. To put things in perspective, consider this: if Florida were a country, it would have the 19th largest economy in the world. Florida has the 4th largest Gross State Product and is the 8th largest economy in the Western Hemisphere. And with 12 cities named to Economy.com’s “Business Vitality Index,” Florida has more than double the number of any other state. In terms of personal income, Florida tops the Southeast, and its 2007 per capita income of $38,444 places it at No. 2 in the Southeast and No. 20 nationwide.

## Extensions

### AT: Nuclear CVs not key

#### Nuclear-powered aircraft carriers are key to long term sustainability of current operational tempo

Autospace, 04/23/2012 (“Nimitz Class Aircraft Carriers – The Terror Of The Seas”, Aditya Sharma, Available online at <http://autospace.co/nimitz-class-aircraft-carriers-the-terror-of-the-seas/>, Accessed 7/11/2012)

Imagine a floating air-force base holding 2 squadrons of aircraft, 23 stories high, as wide as the Empire Estate building, weighing a 100,000 tonnes and travelling at more than 30 knots with an unlimited range due to its nuclear reactors which can keep the ship powered for 25 years. The Nimitz-class supercarriers are a class of ten nuclear-powered aircraft carriers in service with the United States Navy. The lead ship of the class is named for World War II Pacific fleet commander Chester W. Nimitz, who was the Navy’s last fleet admiral. With an overall length of 1,092 ft (333 m) and full-load displacements of over 100,000 long tons, they are the largest capital ships in the world.

Instead of the gas turbines or diesel-electric systems used for propulsion on many modern warships, the carriers use two A4W pressurized water reactors which drive four propeller shafts and can produce a maximum speed of over 30 knots (56 km/h) and maximum power of around 260,000 shp (190 MW). As a result of the use of nuclear power, the ships are capable of operating for over 20 years without refueling and are predicted to have a service life of over 50 years.

### AT: Mayport not Key

#### Mayport super key.

Faram 5/7/12

Mayport makes its case for expensive expansion¶ By Mark D. Faram - Staff writer Posted : Monday May 7, 2012 8:38:32 EDT¶ Navy Times.Com¶ <http://www.navytimes.com/news/2012/05/navy-mayport-carrier-competition-050712/>

MAYPORT, Fla. — Something is missing at Naval Station Mayport — specifically, ships and sailors.¶ The numbers of both have been dwindling since budget constraints put on hold the dreams of local leaders to get an aircraft carrier transferred to the base near Jacksonville, which hasn’t had one since the John F. Kennedy was decommissioned in 2007. Their focus on the larger ship caused the Navy to hold off on moving other vessels there.¶ As of March 28, just 19 ships call the base home with a total of 5,017 sailors. In the 1980s, the base boasted two aircraft carriers, 28 combatants and nearly 30,000 sailors.¶ Since 2000, the Navy has sent only one ship to the base, the destroyer Farragut in 2006. With the promise of an aircraft carrier gone for now, both the base’s future and the local economy hinge on attracting new ships.¶ “On the East Coast, this is a prime place to put a carrier,” Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Jon Greenert told a lunch gathering of the Jacksonville Area Ship Repair Association on April 3. “We are still committed to strategic dispersal for all of our classes of ships.”¶ Building the nuclear maintenance facility required for a carrier home port would cost $500 million to $1 billion. But there’s no funding slated for that construction for the next five years, and Greenert didn’t say how long that funding would be delayed.¶ That expenditure caused Virginia lawmakers to fight the carrier move to Mayport, saying spending the money to build that facility when other existing Navy facilities were in need of repair wasn’t responsible in the current budget environment.¶ The Navy listened, opting to put off the carrier move. Instead, officials announced that an amphibious ready group would shift to Mayport by 2015, though the actual ships and timelines have yet to be confirmed.¶ Virginia lawmakers won’t fight the movement of amphibious or surface combatants to the base, according to Wes Battle, spokesman for Rep. Randy Forbes, R-Va., a Norfolk-area congressman.¶ “It wasn’t simply the movement of the ships that created the opposition to a carrier move to Mayport,” he said. “It was the fact the money was being spent to build a redundant facility while Navy-wide there is a shortfall of funds to make badly needed repairs to the Navy’s current infrastructure.”¶ Meanwhile, concerns have been raised about whether the base can remain vital as the Navy downsizes and Virginia lawmakers lobby hard to keep all five East Coast-based carriers in Norfolk.¶ Based on current plans, there are many who feel the current underutilization leaves the base vulnerable in the two base closure and realignment rounds Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has asked Congress to approve starting in fiscal 2013.¶ Navy officials say they have no intentions of offering Mayport or any other bases up to the closure process.¶ “I fear that the current state of utilization at Mayport and the fact it’s declined for so long leaves it hugely exposed and at risk for BRAC,” said Rick Hoffman, a retired Navy captain who commanded two ships operating out of Mayport and still lives in the area.¶ Ship shuffle¶ All 11 frigates at Mayport will be decommissioned by 2015, along with three of the base’s four cruisers. The remaining cruiser, Philippine Sea, is slated to move to Norfolk.¶ With one of Mayport’s four guided-missile destroyers, Carney, slated to move to Rota, Spain, that leaves just three destroyers at the base at the end of that fiscal year from among its existing complement of ships.¶ Republican Rep. Ander Crenshaw, whose district includes the base, said Navy officials have told him they’ll homeport the ARG and six other vessels at the base, moves Greenert confirmed in his remarks to ship repairers. The CNO said the Navy also is looking at accelerating the amphib moves.¶ “The focus all along wasn’t just on bringing an aircraft carrier to Mayport — though that seemed to get all the attention,” Crenshaw told Navy Times. “Discussions always included bringing other ships to Mayport as well — it’s an ongoing process that has been in the works for some time.”¶ Crenshaw said Navy Secretary Ray Mabus and Greenert have repeatedly stated their commitment to bring new ships to the base. But Greenert seemed to say the Navy’s plan to move the gators came only after budgetary shortfalls killed the carrier move.¶ “We went to the next thing we can afford to do so we get, for that class of ship, strategic dispersal,” he said.¶ Greenert said he now also plans to send three more destroyers, three coastal patrol boats and eventually eight littoral combat ships to the base, but he gave no timeline for those moves.¶ The Navy operates eight coastal patrol boats out of Little Creek, Va., and another five are in Bahrain. Five more are going to Bahrain in the near future.¶ “As the littoral combat ships go to the Middle East,” Greenert said, “the patrol craft will migrate back to the United States and I’d like to operate them out of Mayport for counterdrug operations in [U.S.] Southern Command.”¶ Economic impact¶ As the list of ships and numbers of sailors at Mayport has shrunk, the area’s economy has followed — evidenced by the number of boarded-up businesses on Mayport Boulevard.¶ Perhaps more critical to the Navy and its ships is that the private ship repair industry in the area was beginning to starve for work. If new ships aren’t put at the base soon, many of those companies might go under.¶ Mike McGrath, a former Navy captain who heads the Jacksonville Area Ship Repair Association, said the influx of new ships and the repair work they bring is critical to keeping the ship repair capability viable.¶ As the work declines, ship repair workers migrate to other ports to get work or leave the business altogether. Bringing in new non-nuclear surface ships will help the industry more than a carrier would, he said, as much of the work on those ships must be done by the Navy — sometimes in Norfolk.¶ Of the ships potentially slated for Mayport, McGrath said only the large-deck gator can’t be dry-docked in the area and will have to go to Norfolk for such repair work.¶ “Obviously, we’re hoping the ships get here sooner than later,” McGrath said. “We’re hoping the CNO can make good on his desire to move the ARG or at least one of those ships here next year.”

## Affirmative Answers

### AT: Military ≠ T

#### Military is transportation infrastructure

GAO 8 (Government Accountability Office, Defense Critical Infrastructure, <http://www.gao.gov/htext/d08851.html>, August 08)

The Department of Defense (DOD) established the Defense Critical Infrastructure Program (DCIP) to assure the availability of mission- critical infrastructure, including surface, sea, and air transportation assets to carry out its missions. GAO was asked to evaluate (1) the extent to which the U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) has identified, prioritized, and assessed critical transportation assets; (2) the extent to which DOD installation personnel have taken actions to help assure the availability of critical transportation assets, both within and independent of DCIP; and (3) how DOD is funding critical transportation asset assurance. GAO examined a nonprojectable sample of 22 critical transportation assets, reviewed relevant DOD guidance and documents, and interviewed cognizant officials.

#### Military ports are transportation infrastructure

GAO 8 (Government Accountability Office, Defense Critical Infrastructure, http://www.gao.gov/htext/d08851.html, August 08)

The Department of Defense (DOD) relies on a global network of critical surface, sea, and air transportation infrastructure--such as roads, railways, seaports, military air bases, and commercial airports--to carry out its missions. The incapacitation or destruction of one or more of the assets constituting this network of critical infrastructure could have a debilitating effect on DOD's ability to project, support, and sustain its forces and operations worldwide. DOD's critical transportation infrastructure is owned by both DOD and non-DOD entities, including private companies, state and local governments, and foreign governments. Because of its importance to DOD operations, this critical infrastructure represents an attractive target to adversaries, and may also be vulnerable to a host of natural disasters and accidents. DOD has recognized and emphasized the importance of assuring the availability of mission-critical infrastructure in the most recent versions of the National Military Strategy[Footnote 1] and the Quadrennial Defense Review.[Footnote 2] Critical assets in the Transportation Defense Sector depend on public works infrastructure that provides the utilities needed for many transportation critical assets to remain operational.[Footnote 3] To identify and help assure the availability of mission-critical infrastructure, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs (ASD[HD&ASA]) was assigned responsibility for the risk-based Defense Critical Infrastructure Program (DCIP) in September 2003. ASD(HD&ASA) subsequently issued guidance in August 2005 articulating the roles and responsibilities for DOD organizations involved in the program.[Footnote 4]

#### The GAO has the best methodology

GAO 8 (Government Accountability Office, Defense Critical Infrastructure, http://www.gao.gov/htext/d08851.html, August 08)

Further, we assessed relevant planning documents, including continuity of operations and emergency management plans for assets we selected for review and for the associated public works assets that support them. We reviewed Transportation Infrastructure Vulnerability Assessments that focus on critical infrastructure, when available, for those DOD and foreign installations we visited. Also, we analyzed relevant Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), military service, and combatant command guidance and funding data. Within DOD, we interviewed officials from OSD, the Joint Staff, defense agencies, the military services, combatant commands, subcomponent commands, sector lead agents, and installation-level organizations in the United States and abroad. In addition, we interviewed officials at the Department of Homeland Security, at three U.S. embassies and three commercial airports; host nation officials; and officials in both the private sector and academia. (Throughout this unclassified report, we do not identify specific assets, their locations or installations, or combatant command or others' missions that the assets support because that information is classified.) We conducted this performance audit from May 2007 through July 2008 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. To assess the reliability of data, we interviewed appropriate officials and reviewed relevant documentation. We found the data provided by DOD to be sufficiently reliable for representing the nature and extent of the DCIP funding. A more thorough description of our scope and methodology is provided in appendix I.

#### Military infrastructure definitions key to protect US assets

GAO 8 (Government Accountability Office, Defense Critical Infrastructure, http://www.gao.gov/htext/d08851.html, August 08)

Although OSD issued department-wide guidance on critical infrastructure in 2005, knowledge of the program at the installation level--where critical transportation assets are located--is minimal because the military services have not yet developed their own implementation guidance. This lack of awareness has led installation officials to rely on other, more established programs to protect critical assets. While programs, such as DCIP and the Antiterrorism Program, do share some precepts, there are significant differences in the types of threats and hazards each program focuses on and in their emphasis on protection, resilience, and restoration of operations and assets. Until the military services issue guidance that installation personnel can use to implement local critical infrastructure programs, mission-critical assets may incur unintended risk.

#### Homeporting at Mayport is transportation infrastructure

Matt Dixon, journalist at PolitiJax, 06/14/2011 (<http://jacksonville.com/opinion/blog/403455/matt-dixon/2011-06-14/mayport-one-step-closer-getting-money-continued-carrier>)

"Next stop is the United States Senate where I fully expect the Armed Services Committee and Appropriations Committee to agree with top defense and military personnel and approve the funds," said the Jacksonville Republican in a statement. Here's a full breakdown of House approved funding for Mayport, per Crenshaw's statement: $14.98 million for transportation infrastructure improvements for homeporting a nuclear aircraft carrier at Naval Station Mayport. Funding, as necessary, for the planning and design of future homeporting projects such as the maintenance wharf and controlled industrial facility.

#### Transportation infrastructure includes ports

CBO, Congression Budget Office, 09/2005

To assess the effects of options to expand strategic transportation forces, CBO first calculated the rate at which current forces can deliver cargo to a distant theater (the base case in this analysis). That delivery rate depends mainly on the distance that the combat units being deployed must travel, the size and characteristics of the mobility force executing the deployment, and the capacity of transportation infrastructure (such as ports and airfields) necessary to support the deployment.

### AT: Private CP

#### Perm solves—normal means employs private ship repair firms and shipyards for maintenance on CVNs

Ronald O’Rourke, a specialist in naval affairs at CRS, 2012 (He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the Johns Hopkins University and was valedictorian of his class at the Hopkins Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), where he obtained a master’s degree. “Navy Nuclear Aircraft Carrier (CVN) Homeporting at Mayport: Background and Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R40248.pdf>, Accessed June 25, 2012, ZR)

Mayport private-sector shipyards have a wide range of capabilities to perform maintenance

and modernization on the majority of non-nuclear hull, mechanical, and electrical systems of

various ship classes….

Private-sector ship-repair activities in Mayport will perform the same type of work on a

nuclear-powered aircraft carrier that they currently perform on non-nuclear surface ships.

Therefore, no additional specialized capabilities are required from the private-sector in

northeast Florida to support nuclear-powered aircraft carrier maintenance. Because the Navy

does not require additional capabilities from the private-sector in Mayport, no additional

costs to the Navy are expected for the private-sector to develop additional capabilities to

support a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier….

The Mayport private-sector has experience supporting large aircraft carrier availabilities of

the magnitude of a PIA [i.e., an aircraft carrier Planned Incremental (Maintenance)

Availability].52 March 29, 2011, GAO Report on Private Ship-Repair Firms

A March 29, 2011, GAO report that assessed the Navy’s December 2010 report stated that

Private ship repair firms in northeast Florida will likely be able to support the maintenance

requirements of a nuclear aircraft carrier if one is homeported at Naval Station Mayport in

2019 as the Navy plans….

The northeast Florida area is home to three master ship repair firms certified by the Navy to

have the capabilities and capacities to support the maintenance requirements of U.S. Navy

surface ships, including aircraft carriers. Each of these firms has significant production and

administrative facilities either on or near Naval Station Mayport, and officials from these

firms told us they will maintain their presence in northeast Florida….

The tasks required of the private ship repair firms to support a nuclear carrier are the same as

those performed on conventional carriers in the past and the other types of ships currently

homeported at Mayport.

Private ship repair firms in northeast Florida have previously demonstrated the ability to

support carrier maintenance. In fact, the largest aircraft carrier availability ever performed

outside of a public shipyard was completed on the USS John F. Kennedy in Mayport in

2003.

53