# Port Dredging Aff

### 1AC Trade Advantage

#### Contention 1 is Trade

#### Panama canal expansion will overload US infrastructure now-modernization is key to sustain trade and the economy.

**Army Corps of Engineers 2012**

(“U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy Options for the Future”, 4-2, <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port_and_Inland_Waterways_Options_for_the_Future_Working_Draft_v1_2012_Apr_01.pdf>, DOA: 7-12-12)

The health of the U.S. economy depends upon the vitality and expansion of international trade. International trade depends upon the nation’s navigation infrastructure, which serves as a conduit for transportation, trade and tourism and connects us to the global community. **Marine transportation is one of the most efficient, effective, safe and environmentally sound ways to transport people and goods.** It is a keystone of the U.S. economy. \_\_\_ percent [data to be inserted in next draft] of our international trade moves through the nation’s ports. The navigation industry is building ever larger ships to serve this global trade more effectively, reducing transportation costs across the world. These larger vessels, known as post-Panamax vessels, are expected to call at U.S. ports in increasing numbers, especially after the expansion of the Panama Canal in 2014. A modern, robust navigation infrastructure can exist without significant harm to the environment, reduce the transportation system’s carbon footprint and enhance economic opportunities for future generations. Sustaining a modern U.S. navigation system will require a coordinated effort between government, industry and other stakeholders. Critical Need for Capacity Maintenance and Expansion Congress has directed the USACE Institute for Water Resources to submit to the Senate and House committees on appropriations this report on how the Congress should address the critical need for additional port and inland waterways modernization to accommodate post-Panamax vessels. This report identifies the critical need for capacity maintenance and expansion on both the nation’s inland waterways and blue water ports. This identification has been accomplished through an evaluation of the future demand for capacity in terms of freight forecasts and vessel size expectations and an evaluation of the current capacity of the nation’s inland waterways and blue water ports. Despite the recent worldwide recession, international trade is expected to grow as the world’s population and standard of living grow. Export of U.S. agricultural goods could increase as larger bulk vessels reduce the cost of delivery to foreign markets. Trade at the nation’s blue water ports is expected to expand as the population grows, especially in regions where most of that growth occurs. As international trade expands, the number of post-Panamax vessels is expected to increase. **The nation’s ability to attract these vessels and allow full use of their capacity is the key to realizing the trade opportunities these vessels represent**. There is a high degree of uncertainty in the details of when such vessels will arrive in large numbers, which ports they will call, how deep calling vessels will draft and, consequently, how deep and wide navigation channels and other related navigation infrastructure must be. One pivotal uncertainly is the role that transshipment hubs in the Caribbean or on U.S. shores could play in transferring freight from large vessels to smaller feeder vessels. Over time these uncertainties will be reduced as experience replaces expectation. We can be more certain that in the absence of transshipment centers, post-Panamax vessels will call at ports in large numbers, they will call at most major ports and their sailing drafts and other dimensions will become known. Our challenge is to invest in capacity expansion in the right places at the right time consistent with industry needs. Port capacity depends upon channel depths, channel widths, turning basin size, sufficient bridge heights and port support structures such as dock and crane capacity to offload and onload goods. Vessels can be filled to their weight capacity or their volume capacity. Vessels loaded to their weight capacity sail at their maximum design draft; they sit deeper in the water. The deepest channel requirements are likely to be driven by these “weight trade” services. The Asian export trade, however, is considered a “cube trade” (i.e. volume trade). For volume trade routes, channel width and turning basin size may be of greater importance than additional channel depth at some ports, as vessels loaded to their volume capacity often sail at significantly less than their design draft. Careful consideration is needed when determining channel depth requirements at U.S. ports for this trade route. The deployment of post-Panamax vessels to deliver U.S. agricultural products to Asian markets through the expanded Panama Canal could significantly reduce the delivery costs. One estimate suggests cost reductions as high as $ 0.35 per bushel, **which could result in a surge in exports and traffic on the inland waterway system.** The inland waterway system can accommodate the forecasted increase in exported agricultural products as long as other non-grain traffic remains at current levels and the system is maintained at current capacity. Existing inland waterway system capacity is maintained through maintenance dredging and major rehabilitation projects. A Vision for Sustaining a Globally Competitive Navigation System **As a maritime nation our economic prosperity is directly linked to our investments in navigation infrastructure**. Just as current generations benefit from investments made in the past, the ability of future generations to prosper and grow will depend on infrastructure investment decisions made today. A globally competitive U.S. navigation transportation system for the 21st Century will have these characteristics: • Environmentally compatible development, infrastructure and operations. • Multi-modal connectivity. • High-performance and reliable navigation channels, turning basins and other related navigation infrastructure that are maintained to constructed depths and widths. • **Channels and ports that are not the limiting component to competitive global freight movement** • Navigation locks that are reliable and available to pass traffic on demand with lock chambers consistently sized for efficient movement of freight. • Navigation jetties that are planned, constructed and maintained for safe, reliable and efficient freight movement. • Dredged material placement facilities that are planned, constructed and maintained to be available when needed for navigation channel maintenance, never impeding dredging efforts. • Capital investments in navigation locks for replacement, major rehabilitation, or expanded capacity that are established through a capital investment plan that identifies and prioritizes on a system basis. • Capital investment plans that are shovel-ready as investment funds are identified. • An identified mechanism for the financing of operations, maintenance and capacity improvements. New, large vessels are typically deployed on the longest and largest trade service – Asia to Northern Europe. The “smaller” vessels on that service are forced to re-deploy to the next most efficient service for that vessel size. This cascading continues until the most marginal vessels in the fleet are forced to be scrapped. Cascading typically increases average vessel size for each trade service, placing demands on the port infrastructure to support larger capacity vessels. For U.S. ports to be ready to take advantage of post-Panamax vessel opportunities, major ports not only need to be “post-Panamax ready,” but second tier ports need to be “cascade ready” to take advantage of larger vessels that begin to service their trade.

#### Mega-container ships require deeper drafts

Juda and Burroughs **04** -- professors in the Department of Marine Affairs, University of Rhode Island (Lawrence, Richard, "Dredging Navigational Channels in a Changing Scientific and Regulatory Environment," Journal of maritime Law & Commerce, Vol. 34, No. 2, April, 2004 http://www.uritc.org/media/finalreportspdf/536151.pdf) CS

Simply put. larger ships benefit from economies of scale. so that a larger container vessel has lower costs per container and a larger tanker lower costs per unit of crude oil or other cargo." DOT has noted the trend toward the use of mega-container ships. that is ships designed to carry over 4.500 boxes measured in terms of twenty foot equivalent units (TEUs)." The Regina Maersk. the first 6.000+ TEU containership. was delivered in early 1996. and in the period of 1997-1999 some thirty five new vessels were ordered with a TEU capacity ranging from 4.500 to 9.000 TEUs." Ships on order now include what will be the two largest containerships in the world. with a capacity of 9.800 TEUs (for the Chi11a Shipping Group to be operated between Hong Kong and Los Angeles)." Industry sources suggest that in the near future ships with up to 12.000 TEU capacity will enter into service." and DOT expects that. by 2010. almost one third of all general cargo tonnage will be transported on ships with more than 4.000 TEUs." But if larger vessels offer cost efficiencies for ship operators. they present new problems for port managers. As ships have become larger. they have acquired deeper drafts. demanding deeper water to accommodate their hulls. At the start of the twentieth century. navigational channels of thirty 30 feet in depth were sufficient to allow safe movement of almost all ships." but this is no longer the case. Since the introduction of container carrying ships in the 1950s. six generations of such ships have evolved. with successively deeper drafts (Figure 1)." It is believed that the drafts of the mega-containerships that will be coming online will not be greater than 14.5 meters. a figure that does not exceed the draft of the largest containerships now in service." Mega-container operations require a water depth of at least fifty feet in ship channels. turning basins. and ship berths." According to the Maritime Administration. in 1997 only four of the ten major U.S. container ports that collectively loaded and unloaded almost eighty per cent of container traffic had channel and berthing areas deep enough in draft for fully laden mega-container ships." (Table 2). It is not ship draft alone that must be considered i11 navigational dredging. Other factors. such as increased beam and windage. create maneuverability problems in narrow channels." A particular port`s lack of the clearances needed by these larger. deeper draft vessels undercuts its potential for commercial success. To maximize their attraction for very large containerships. ports must be able to offer easy entrance and departure. the capacity to entertain such vessels even with full loads (high load factors). efficient loading and lll1l0Rdl11g. and ready access to other forms of transportation as part of the desired seamless network of intermodal carriage. For ship operators. fast turnaround time is essential. as any time lost at ports lessens the time that ships can move cargoes and generate revenues. frustrates the expectations of shippers regarding delivery. and generally raises questions about the reliability of service. In this market. ports with channels or berthing facilities that do not provide needed clearance for these newer and larger vessels may be avoided altogether. Otherwise. they may be left to served only by smaller ships or those that are not fully loaded. In the port of Oakland. for example. deep draft vessels have had to key their arrival times to tidal schedules. and delays in unloading might then cost an additional 10.5-14 horns of waiting for the next high tide." Such scenarios have serious implications for the port. for businesses dependent on maritime transportation. and. ultimately. for the consumer. The needs of ports to accommodate larger vessels with deeper drafts. taken together with the natural process of sedimentation. create demands for the dredging of shipping lanes. As noted by a former DOT official. for ports "the competition to capture markets by having the deep channels required for mega-ships translates simply and inescapably into millions of tons of dredged materials."24

#### Light loaded ships kills the seaport industry

Weakley 08 --President of the Lake Carriers' Association (James H. I., Testimony Before the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, April 30, 2008, http://www.ramphmtf.org/speeches\_043008.html) CS

The Importance of Dredging Our ports and harbors are gateways to domestic and international trade, connecting the United States to the world. Because of the Nation´s port system, food grown by Iowa farmers reaches tables in Japan and Russia. Manufacturers in Texas can sell goods and services profitably to foreign countries and supply food for peace. Appalachian and Midwest coal moves through coastal ports to power plants domestically and around the world, providing the fuel to heat and light homes, businesses, and cities. Whether products are arriving at our shores or departing for foreign sale, trade relies on an efficiently operating U.S. port system. Without exception, ports are critical to every State in the Nation. On average, each of our 50 States relies on 13 to 15 ports to handle its imports and exports, which add up to more than $5.5 billion worth of goods moving in and out of U.S. ports every day. Responsible for moving more than 99 percent of the country´s overseas cargo, U.S. ports and waterways handle more than 2.5 billion tons of domestic and international trade annually, and that volume is projected to double within the next 15 years - particularly after the expansion of the Panama Canal. International trade is responsible for 25 percent of the U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Along with meeting the demands of international trade, ports are busy with a sustained surge in cruise travel. Cruises depart from 43 ports in North America with a positive economic impact in all 50 States, since over 79 percent of cruise industry expenditures are made with U.S. businesses, including airlines, travel agents, food and beverage, and ship maintenance and refurbishing. On the Great Lakes, enormous quantities of raw materials that move by vessel are used to power major cities, make steel, and build roads. Equally, or more important is the National Defense support that our Nation´s ports provide. The U.S. military depends on numerous ports that have agreements with the Federal Government to serve as bases of operation and to deploy troops and equipment during national emergencies. Today this role is more evident than ever and more important than ever, given the current climate of persistent threats around the globe coupled with the closure in recent years of U.S. military ports. Port-related jobs are critical to augment our economy. Direct and indirect jobs generated by ports result in the employment of more than 8 million Americans who earned and spent $314.5 billion in 2006. Every $1 billion in exports alone creates an estimated 15, 000 new jobs. In Texas alone one in every four jobs is linked to trade. America´s deep-draft navigation system is at a crossroads, with a future that can be bright or bleak. Our waterways´ ability to support the Nation's continuing growth in trade and in the defense of our Nation, hinges on much-needed Federal attention to unresolved funding needs that are derailing critical channel maintenance and deep-draft construction projects of the water highways to our ports. Because most ports do not have naturally deep harbors, they must be regularly dredged to allow ships to move safely through Federal navigation channels. Also, as modern vessels increase in size, navigation channel depths must increase accordingly, if we are to continue to be a player on the international marketplace. A recent U.S. Army Corps of Engineers study reports that almost 30 percent of the 95, 550 vessel calls at U.S. ports are constrained due to inadequate channel depths. Ladies and gentlemen, these are the things that cause port directors nightmares. Without a channel dredged to its authorized depth, nothing else comes into play. Attracting new customers, dealing with labor issues, environmental concerns, and the public - all go away - because without a properly-dredged channel, business goes away. Public ports are at a critical state in keeping their channels open for business. We are losing existing business and potential new business to ports outside of the United States and once lost, it is rarely regained. Dredging can literally make or break our industry, and a lack of dredging is an issue throughout the United States. In fact, it is not an overstatement to say that in many parts of the United States, we face a dredging crisis. On the Great Lakes, as Chairman James L. Oberstar of this Committee and Chairman David R. Obey of the Appropriations Committee well know, decades of inadequate funding for dredging have left a backlog of 18 million cubic yards of sediment. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates removing the backlog will cost more than $230 million on the Great Lakes alone. In some cases, ports on the Great Lakes have actually shutdown due to inadequate dredging. There are similar examples of dredging problems in ports and harbors on all coasts of our Nation. In many cases, vessels must load light because of dredging shortfalls. The economic implications of light loading are enormous. On the Great Lakes, for example, vessels lose between 50 to 270 tons of cargo for each inch they must reduce their draft and, in some areas, the lost draft is measured in feet, not inches. Light loading because of inadequate dredging impacts everyone. A ship that is light-loaded reduces its efficiencies in the same way that a commercial airplane that is required to set aside seats with no passengers would quickly lose its efficiencies.

#### Port modernization solves the economy-99% of trade and 15000 jobs for ever billion in exports

**Nagle, GMU economics masters, 2012**

(Kurt, “Seaports and the US Economy THE Essentials for a Maritime Nation”, 5-7, http://www.transportationsummit.com/documents/s11-BillHanson.pdf, DOA: 7-12-12)

For centuries seaports have been an economic lifeline connecting us to the rest of the world. Seaports help build and grow international trade; strengthening local and international economies. Seaports provide high paying jobs and increase standard of living Cities were built around seaports because the water provided an efficient method of moving goods. Over time these ports and their cities and surrounding communities became important economic drivers by facilitating trade and generating economic vitality. Today more than ever, seaports continue to be a critical link for access to the global marketplace. Seaports are at the center of trade and transportation. Nearly everything we buy or consume – everything from the clothes we wear, to the foods we eat, to the coffee we start our day with – comes to us on a ship, through one of our seaports. In turn, **nearly everything sold in the global marketplace makes its way there via seaports**. This includes valuable domestic commodities like machinery, steel and building materials. Today, as we confront a host of international challenges – a tenuous economy, more trading opportunities, the panama canal expansion, population growth, trade growth – there is a clear and critical role for our ports. Ports are dynamic, vibrant centers of trade and commerce, but what’s most important to understand is that **seaports are partnerships**. Ports in the Western Hemisphere are investing billions of dollars every year to modernize and expand their infrastructure. Public sector/**government investment is critical to maintaining/updating connecting infrastructure** but these investments lag. Modern, navigable seaports are vital to international commerce, economic prosperity and must be a priority, even in these times of fiscal restraint and other challenges. Ports in Western Hemisphere pushing ahead with capital expansion programs Expansion creates jobs and new business opportunities • New demand for goods in China and other countries. New trade agreements with Colombia Panama, and South Korea Panama making significant investments in the Canal Expansion Canada investing in infrastructure through the Gateways Initiatives “We will double our exports over the next five years, an increase that will support two million jobs in America.” — President Barack Obama • **Every $1 billion in exports creates 15,000 jobs** AAPA and the Department of Commerce signed a Memorandum of Intent titled “Partnership with America’s Seaports to Further the National Export Initiative”. Cargo moving through ports generates 13 million jobs. Over one quarter of U.S. Gross Domestic Product accounted for by international trade **99% of overseas trade goes through America’s seaports** Port activity generates over $200 billion in federal, state and local tax revenues Existing transportation programs do not adequately address goods movement! AAPA policy focuses heavily on improving port infrastructure and connections through greater investment in: Federal navigation channels and marine highways Port, road and rail infrastructure. **Without these investments we cannot accommodate trade growth, population growth, increasing vessel size, etc.**

#### Reliable ports is key to sustainable exports-that solves economic recovery

Calhoun, Waterways Council Inc. chairman, 2011

(Rick, “Dredging for Prosperity”, Marine Log, August, proquest)

Just like the nation itself, our maritime industry is facing a multitude of challenges like flooding in the Midwest, silting of our major shipping arteries, and the need for recapitalization for our lock and dam infrastructure, to name a few. ¶ But these challenges and the solutions to them must be viewed as investments in the future of our nation itself because without a strong, reliable marine transportation industry, we simply cannot competitively sell our export products in the world marketplace. Those countries that buy from America do so because we are a dependable supplier of products at a competitive price, thanks in no small part to the existence of our enviable transportation system. If that system becomes compromised, those foreign buyers will simply shop elsewhere and that will further impact the United States' precarious economic recovery. ¶ Witness the dredging situation on the Lower Mississippi River. This year, we have seen unprecedented levels of high water on the Mississippi River carrying millions of tons of silt and debris to the mouth of the River. This silting has resulted in restrictions being imposed for ships and vessels that rely on this passageway to export products to the world market, as well as import goods competitively, via ports in south Louisiana. In the past the Corps of Engineers has been able to manage silting issues with funding for dredging that sometimes required the reprogramming of funds to be sure shortfalls did not occur. This year the Corps has said it can no longer reprogram funds and that a funding shortfall indeed exists on this vital part of the system. ¶ Throughout this country's great history, the federal government's role is in part to ensure that the inland navigation system, including the Mississippi River, remains open to transport products such as grain, coal, steel, petroleum and aggregate materials. The federal government now needs to take necessary steps to provide funding for our national transportation asset and to allow the Lower Mississippi River to remain fully open for commerce. We urge the White House to immediately submit an emergency request for supplemental funds to Congress, and we ask that Congress expeditiously process that request for Emergency Supplemental Appropriations funding. All of us who are responsible for managing money have faced times when cutting costs have become necessary, yet those who are successful rarely focus on reducing costs if it results in an even greater loss in the revenue stream. Again, dredging this critical artery should be viewed as an investment, not a cost, in the future of our inland waterways transportation system.

#### Trade deficit wrecks the economy

Weller et al., Center for American Progress senior fellow, 2011

(Christian, “The Case for Strategic Export Promotion”, 2-9, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/02/high_tech_trade.html/print.html>, DOA: 7-13-12)

The United States faces enormous economic obstacles in the immediate future as it recovers from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The private-sector recovery is under way, with industrial production growing by 9.2 percent from June 2009 to July 2010, and with business investment up by an inflation-adjusted 5.2 percent from June 2009 to June 2010. Private-sector employment is also on the rise with more than 1.1 million jobs created in 2010.¶ This is good news, but large challenges still loom that could derail the fledgling private-sector momentum contributing to our economic recovery. An important challenge is the trade deficit. The U.S. trade deficit is widening again, reaching 3.7 percent of gross domestic product (the total amount of goods and services produced in our economy) in the third quarter of 2010, up from 2.4 percent of GDP in the second quarter of 2009. This widening gap poses a drag on economic growth since the country has to borrow money overseas to pay for the extra imports—a debt that ultimately will have to be repaid.¶ A country can only import more than it exports if overseas investors lend it money. For the United States this means a persistent trade deficit requires taking on ever more foreign debt to pay for the excess of imports over exports. That’s why maintaining U.S. international economic competitiveness and strengthening our exports must be a key component of any serious strategy to produce sustained and long-term economic growth.

#### Decline causes global war.

Mead CFR senior fellow, 2009

(Walter, “Only Makes You Stronger”, 2-4, <http://www.tnr.com/article/only-makes-you-stronger-0>)

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

#### Studies prove.

Royal, director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010

(Jedediah, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal, and Political Perspectives, pg 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 defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts 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 remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace item 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. 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 favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess and 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 the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically 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. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in 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. 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.

#### And trade deficits cause unsustainable debt – causes global conflict

Elliot, Guardian economics editor, 2006

(Larry, “America is living beyond its means”, 10-2, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2006/oct/02/usnews.economicdispatch>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Consumers have been using their homes like ATMs - borrowing against rising prices - but this cannot go on forever. The US economy needs quite a prolonged period in which consumer spending grows more slowly than the economy: that is the only way that the trade deficit is going to be reduced. There are those who say that the trade deficit is not a problem for the US. They argue that it is perfectly sustainable to run sizeable deficits in perpetuity because the dollar's status as a reserve currency means that there will always be demand for US assets. But there are two points here. First, running a permanent trade deficit affects the structure of your economy. It means fewer manufacturing jobs where productivity tends to be higher and more jobs in the service sector, where productivity tends to be lower.¶ The US has struck a Faustian bargain with its trading partners, particularly China, responsible for about one third of the $700bn-plus trade total last year. As the American economist Tom Palley puts it: "US consumers get lots of cheap goods in return for which they give over paper IOUs that cost less to print. Meanwhile, China creates millions of jobs and builds modern factories that are transforming it into an industrial superpower, and it also accumulates billions of dollars in financial claims against the US. From this perspective, trade deficits don't matter because there are no limits to either government or private borrowing, and because manufacturing doesn't matter either." The logic of this, Palley notes drily, is that the US would benefit even further if China devalued its exchange rate and ran a larger trade surplus. The second point is potentially much more explosive: it is the one sketched out in the crystal ball gazing at the top of this piece. What would happen if, as a result of global developments over the coming decades, the dollar ceased to be the reserve currency of choice. This was a point raised by Avinash Persaud, one of the financial sector's more original thinkers, in a recent lecture in New York. Persaud's argument is as follows.¶ Throughout history, there has always tended to be one dominant reserve currency along with a host of lesser rivals. In the 19th century Britain was the pre-eminent economy and sterling was the main reserve currency. Yet currencies don't retain their dominance forever; part of Britain's problem at the time of Suez was that it was struggling to adjust to a world in which it was no longer the top-dog currency but the creditors came knocking at the door asking for their cheques to be cashed. The US is living beyond its means, hoping that nobody cashes the cheques it has been merrily writing as the current account has gone deeper into the red. That's the advantage of being a reserve currency, even though, as Persaud notes, there is no rule which says that you have to run current account deficits simply because you are a reserve currency.¶ Britain didn't a century ago. In the decade or so up to the first world war it had a trade surplus of 5% of GDP. "That is a mirror image of the US today. The UK was in surplus by as much as the US is in deficit." That deficit has enabled the Chinese to build up their industrial strength at a rapid rate, so much so that it is probable that China - and perhaps India - will have overtaken the US as the world's largest economy (on a purchasing power parity basis, at least) by 2050. Persaud thinks that the upshot of this will be that in the next few decades the dollar will start to lose its reserve status just as sterling did in the last century. "In the case of sterling's loss of reserve status, world war one and two accelerated a process that had begun more slowly before and ended abruptly with debt and inflation."¶ Today the process is also being accelerated - by wars where the end is as elusive as the enemy and by a consumerism built on a property bubble. Perhaps we will not have to wait until 2050. In my lifetime, the dollar will start to lose its reserve currency status, not to the euro but to the renminbi or the rupee. This would clearly have massive economic and geopolitical consequences. As Persaud rightly says: "If it was economically and politically painful for the UK, even though its international financial position did not begin from a position of heavy deficit, what will it be like for the US which has become the world's largest debtor. There will be an avalanche of cheques coming home to be paid when the dollar begins to lose its status."¶ And this "avalanche of cheques" is likely to make for the most horrendous geo-political tension. The idea that the US will give up global financial hegemony without a fight seems fanciful in the extreme.

#### The trade deficit will cause protectionist escalation – causes tit for tat trade war – boosting exports solve

Hufbauer et al., Peterson Institute senior fellow, 2010

(Gary, “US Protectionist Impulses in the Wake of the Great Recession”, March, <http://www.iie.com/publications/papers/hufbauer201003.pdf>, DOA: 7-12-13)

The U.S. unemployment rate more than doubled between the onset of the Great Recession in¶ December 2007 and December 2009, and is now hovering just below 10 percent (figure 1).¶ 1¶ Considering that this discouraging figure likely understates broader deterioration in the U.S.¶ labor market,¶ 2¶ the absence of sustained Congressional pressure for large‐scale protectionist¶ measures, beyond “Buy American” provisions and several smaller companions (all examined in¶ this report), is in some ways surprising.¶ 3¶ At least part of the explanation for the restrained political response is the simultaneous large¶ improvement in the U.S. trade balance during 2008 and early 2009. Figure 1 illustrates how the¶ total U.S. deficit in goods and services trade was nearly cut in half during this period, creating a¶ political obstacle to kneejerk protectionism. As we will elaborate in section IV, during recessions¶ an improving external balance (from imports falling faster than exports) often acts an¶ “automatic international economic stabilizer,” which temporarily fulfills an equivalent¶ economic function to a Keynesian government stimulus package. The “external sector” of the¶ U.S. economy during the early quarters of the Great Recession provided an “automatic offset”¶ to sliding U.S. economic activity. This probably caused policymakers to think twice about¶ succumbing to short‐term protectionist instincts.¶ However, figure 1 also shows how the improvement in the U.S. trade balance has been only¶ temporary and indeed began to reverse as the U.S. economy exited the Great Recession during¶ the second half of 2009. Crucial for the political threat of protectionism, economic forecasts indicate that the U.S. unemployment rate will probably remain at very high levels over the medium term, despite President Obama’s emphasis on “jobs, jobs, jobs” in his State of the Union Address delivered on January 27th 2010. ¶ A time lag of at least 12 to 18 months probably separates the point at which the U.S. trade¶ balance showed maximum improvement (spring 2009) and the expected drop in measured¶ unemployment well below 10 percent (fall 2010). Absent the “feel good” factor of an improving¶ trade balance, but facing continuing high unemployment levels, protectionist sentiment in the¶ U.S. Congress may increase in the coming months, especially as the November 2010 midterm¶ election draws near.¶ This is particularly so, as current economic forecasts suggest a more robust U.S. economic¶ recovery in the coming years, relative to other industrial trading partners (table 1). A large and¶ growing deficit in the U.S. external balances will likely persist for some time, while the external¶ balances of other major trading partners could hold steady or even improve. If the United¶ States thus returns to its “pre‐crisis role as the world’s importer/consumer of last resort,”¶ protectionist impulses in the U.S. Congress are destined to escalate.¶ 5¶ ¶ Fresh U.S. protectionist initiatives, at a time when the U.S. economy is growing at a decent pace,¶ will likely invite in‐kind retaliation by America’s trading partners, despite the relatively muted¶ reaction to the original “Buy American” provisions in early 2009 and other protectionist measures implemented since then. No longer facing a newly‐elected U.S. president, who¶ entered office with considerable global appeal in the midst of an unprecedented economic¶ crisis, foreign leaders are unlikely to give the U.S. an easy pass on future new instances of U.S.¶ protectionism.

#### Interdependence solves war

Griswold, director of the Cato Institute Center for Trade Policy Studies, 2005

(Daniel, “Peace on Earth? Try Free Trade among Men”, 12-28, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5344>)

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home.

#### Maritime infrastructure key to the economy

Juda and Burroughs -- professors in the Department of Marine Affairs, University of Rhode Island (Lawrence, Richard, "Dredging Navigational Channels in a Changing Scientific and Regulatory Environment," Journal of maritime Law & Commerce, Vol. 34, No. 2, April, 2004 http://www.uritc.org/media/finalreportspdf/536151.pdf) CS

Historically. transportation by vessels operating on livers and oceans has been essential to the expansion of both the national and international trade of the United States. Rivers. canals. and oceans provide the "road" over which ever increasing amounts of cargo are transported, and they tie together the disparate elements of the world`s economy. Before the advent of railroads and modem highways. ships provided the only practical way to move large amounts of cargo from location to location; now, in the modem world, carriage by ship or barge remains the most economical way to move goods. particularly those dealt in high volume and at low unit value. such as mineral ores and food grains. World-wide. it is estimated that by weight. some ninety percent\* of all international made of goods moves by ship. an astounding figure. especially given the tremendous expansion in world trade in past decades. As seen in Table 1. and reflected in the value of its imports and exports. the United States has experienced an explosion in the growth of its involvement in international trade as made barriers have been reduced. Also noted in Table 1 is the growing significance of the international made in goods for the economy of the United States: by the year 2000. the total value of imports and exports was equivalent to twenty per cent of the total Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Of course. American involvement in international trade is predicated on the ability of the maritime transportation system to move goods into and out of the country. Statistics provided by the Department of Transportation (DOT) to Congress in September 1999 summarize and indicate the extent and importance of the maritime transportation network of the United States." According to DOT. some ninety-five per cent of all U.S. imports and exports pass through U.S. ports. The U.S. maritime transportation system is characterized by more than 1.000 harbor channels. 25.000 miles of inland. intracoastal. and coastal Waterways serving over 300 U.S. ports. with more than 3.700 terminals. And. in an age of intermodal transportation networks. it is significant to note that these ports. in turn. connect to 152.000 miles of rail. 460.000 miles of pipelines. and 45.000 miles of interstate highways. According to DOT. U.S. port facilities annually service the movement of more than 2 billion tons of domestic and international cargo. 3.3 billion barrels of oil. 134 million ferry passengers. and over 5 million cruise ship passengers. T`l1e DOT estimates that waterborne cargo contributes more than $742 billion to the U.S. gross domestic product and provides employment for more than 13 million people. It has been estimated that by 2020 American overseas trade will more than double. further increasing dependence on the maritime transportation system.5

#### Maritime investment has a high multiplier effect and facilitate international trade-- the funds already exist

Nagle 11 --President and CEO of the American Association of Port Authorities (Kurt J., July 8, 2011, http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/PDFs/HMT%20Testimony%20on%20HR104%20to%20T%26I-WRE%208%20July%202011.pdf) CS

Seaports serve as a critical gateway to domestic and international trade, connecting large and small U.S. businesses to the global marketplace. Handling two billion tons of domestic, import and export cargo annually, seaports are a critical component of our nation's transportation infrastructure system. As we prepare for increasing cargo volumes and the future generation of bigger cargo and passenger vessels, our maritime highways must be improved and maintained to allow ships to transit safely and efficiently to deliver the goods that consumers and businesses depend on, both in the U.S. and abroad. With ships getting increasingly larger, dredging deep-draft navigation channels is more crucial than ever, both to maintain the existing channel depths and widths, and to expand them. This is important to inland waterways users, too, since more than half of the country's grain and oilseed exports move on the inland waterways for transport to ports for loading onto deep-sea vessels. Yet, the U.S. government doesn't fully utilize the federal harbor maintenance tax for its intended purpose - to pay for navigation maintenance dredging. Since its inception in 1986, this tax has too often been used to offset other programs while serious maintenance dredging needs have been neglected. Modern navigable seaports are vital to international trade and our nation's economic prosperity, however, the full authorized depths and widths of America's navigation channels are available only 35 percent of the time. This means channels may be restricted to one lane of travel, and the ships that are moving may not be able to carry full loads of cargo because of depth restrictions. Users of our nation's harbors are currently paying between $1.3 billion and $1.6 billion annually in harbor maintenance tax (HMT) but, in a typical year, less than $800 million is appropriated for channel maintenance, leaving a growing surplus of $5.6 billion in the HMT Trust Fund (as of November 2010). This results in increased costs for waterborne transportation, higher prices to consumers and reduced competitiveness of U.S. exports in the global marketplace. Jobs, tax bases and income produced are adversely impacted as well. Fiscal Year 2009 saw only a temporary increase from stimulus bill funds, which expired in September 2010. Fiscal Year 201 1 has been a challenge as a result of Continuing Resolutions limiting Corps spending on dredging. Since our founding fathers drafted the Constitution back in 1787 establishing the United States government, our legislative branch has been charged with the task of regulating commerce. It was important to those drafting the Constitution to create a system where trade and commerce could move freely between states and beyond our national borders and to defend the United States against invasion. Therefore, certain powers were granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution including "the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the several states..." and "to establish Post Offices and Post Roads." Maintaining our national infrastructure that supports foreign and interstate commerce is not only a federal responsibility but is strongly in the national interest as established by our forefathers. In fact, improving waterways and coastal ports for navigation and national security is the most federal of infrastructure responsibilities, dating to the early missions assigned the Continental Army by then General George Washington. In these times of a tightening Federal Budget, as Congress and the Administration take on the task of prioritizing expenditures, and identifying core federal missions that are in the national interest and help to revitalize our economy, a key focus should be on maintaining and strengthening our nation's infrastructure, including federal navigation channels, that support foreign and interstate commerce - the underpinnings of our economic security. These are wise investments that pay dividends immediately and over time, and form the backbone of our economy and society at large. Investments in port-related infrastructure are multipliers, as they create infrastructure that allows long-term job creation, positioning the United States as a leader in international trade and commerce. From the earliest days of our nation, there has been a clear and consistent federal role and national interest in developing and maintaining landside and waterside connections to A1nerica's seaports. This vital transportation infrastructure literally connects American farmers, manufacturers and consumers to the World marketplace. More than a quarter of U.S. GDP and over 13 million jobs are accounted for by international trade. It is critical tl1at basic, core federal missions such as these, that directly impact A1nerica's economic vitality, jobs, and global competitiveness, be recognized and prioritized. The Congress 1m1st honor its pledge to maintain tl1e nation's ports and harbors with the revenue provided by users.

#### Seaports affect every other sector of the economy

Martin Associates 11 -- team of economic analysts and transportation consultants evaluating the impacts of additional cargo through seaports (February, "An Economic Analysis: Priority Seaport Projects to Expand Capacity, Enhance Competitiveness, Accelerate Economic Growth, and Create Well-Paying Jobs Statewide," http://www.flaports.org/Assets/312011100301AM\_Martin\_Associates\_Analysis\_of\_Seaport\_Priority\_Projects\_February\_2011.pdf) CS

With respect to jobs, four types of job impacts are measured. These are direct, induced, indirect, and related jobs. The job impacts are defined as follows: Direct jobs are those jobs with local firms providing support services to the respective seaports. These jobs are dependent upon this activity and would suffer immediate dislocation if the seaport activity were to cease. Seaport direct jobs include jobs with railroads and trucking companies moving cargo to and from the ports' maritime terminals, members of the International Longshoremen's Association (ILA) or other dock workers (both union and nonunion), steamship agents, freight forwarders, ship chandlers, warehouse operators, bankers, lawyers, terminal operators, stevedores, etc. Induced jobs are jobs created locally and throughout the regional economy due to purchases of goods and services by those directly employed. These jobs are with grocery stores, the local construction industry, retail stores, health care providers, local transportation services, etc., and would also be discontinued if seaport activity were to cease. Indirect jobs are those jobs generated in the local economy as the result of local purchases by the firms directly dependent upon seaport activity. These jobs include jobs in local office supply firms, equipment and parts suppliers, maintenance and repair services, etc.

#### 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.

#### Strong US growth is key to promoting free trade–mercantilism risks protectionism and conflict

Posen 9 – Deputy director and senior fellow of the Peterson Institute for International Economics (Adam, “Economic leadership beyond the crisis,” http://clients.squareeye.com/uploads/foresight/documents/PN%20USA\_FINAL\_LR\_1.pdf)

In the postwar period, US power and prestige, beyond the nation's military might, have been based largely on American relative economic size and success. These facts enabled the US to promote economic openness and buy-in to a set of economic institutions, formal and informal, that resulted in increasing international economic integration. With the exception of the immediate post-Bretton Woods oil-shock period (1974-85), this combination produced generally growing prosperity at home and abroad, and underpinned the idea that there were benefits to other countries of following the American model and playing by American rules. Initially this system was most influential and successful in those countries in tight military alliance with the US, such as Canada, West Germany, Japan, South Korea, and the United Kingdom. With the collapse of Soviet communism in 1989, and the concomitant switch of important emerging economies, notably Brazil, China, India, and Mexico, to increasingly free-market capitalism, global integration on American terms through American leadership has been increasingly dominant for the last two decades. The global financial crisis of 2008-09, however, represents a challenge to that world order. While overt financial panic has been averted, and most economic forecasts are for recovery to begin in the US and the major emerging markets well before end of 2009 (a belief I share), there remain significant risks for the US and its leadership. The global financial system, including but not limited to US-based entities, has not yet been sustainably reformed. In fact, financial stability will come under strain again when the current government financial guarantees and public ownership of financial firms and assets are unwound over the next couple of years. The growth rate of the US economy and the ability of the US government to finance responses to future crises, both military and economic, will be meaningfully curtailed for several years to come. Furthermore, the crisis will accelerate at least temporarily two related long-term trends eroding the viability of the current international economic arrangements. First, perhaps inevitably, the economic size and importance of China, India, Brazil, and other emerging markets (including oil-exporters like Russia) has been catching up with the US, and even more so with demographically and productivity challenged Europe and northeast Asia. Second, pressure has been building over the past fifteen years or so of these developing countries' economic rise to give their governments more voice and weight in international economic decision-making. Again, this implies a transfer of relative voting share from the US, but an even greater one from over-represented Western Europe. The near certainty that Brazil, China, and India, are to be less harmed in real economic terms by the current crisis than either the US or most other advanced economies will only emphasise their growing strength, and their ability to claim a role in leadership. The need for capital transfers from China and oil-exporters to fund deficits and bank recapitalisation throughout the West, not just in the US, increases these rising countries' leverage and legitimacy in international economic discussions. One aspect of this particular crisis is that American economic policymakers, both Democratic and Republican, became increasingly infatuated with financial services and innovation beginning in the mid-1990s. This reflected a number of factors, some ideological, some institutional, and some interest group driven. The key point here is that export of financial services and promotion of financial liberalisation on the US securitised model abroad came to dominate the US international economic policy agenda, and thus that of the IMF, the OECD, and the G8 as well. This came to be embodied by American multinational commercial and investment banks, in perception and in practice. That particular version of the American economic model has been widely discredited, because of the crisis' apparent origins in US lax regulation and over-consumption, as well as in excessive faith in American-style financial markets. Thus, American global economic leadership has been eroded over the long-term by the rise of major emerging market economies, disrupted in the short-term by the nature and scope of the financial crisis, and partially discredited by the excessive reliance upon and overselling of US-led financial capitalism. This crisis therefore presents the possibility of the US model for economic development being displaced, not only deservedly tarnished, and the US having limited resources in the near-term to try to respond to that challenge. Additionally, the US' traditional allies and co-capitalists in Western Europe and Northeast Asia have been at least as damaged economically by the crisis (though less damaged reputationally). Is there an alternative economic model? The preceding description would seem to confirm the rise of the Rest over the West. That would be premature. The empirical record is that economic recovery from financial crises, while painful, is doable even by the poorest countries, and in advanced countries rarely leads to significant political dislocation. Even large fiscal debt burdens can be reined in over a few years where political will and institutions allow, and the US has historically fit in that category. A few years of slower growth will be costly, but also may put the US back on a sustainable growth path in terms of savings versus consumption. Though the relative rise of the major emerging markets will be accelerated by the crisis, that acceleration will be insufficient to rapidly close the gap with the US in size, let alone in technology and well-being. None of those countries, except perhaps for China, can think in terms of rivaling the US in all the aspects of national power. These would include: a large, dynamic and open economy; favorable demographic dynamics; monetary stability and a currency with a global role; an ability to project hard power abroad; and an attractive economic model to export for wide emulation. This last point is key. In the area of alternative economic models, one cannot beat something with nothing - communism fell not just because of its internal contradictions, or the costly military build-up, but because capitalism presented a clearly superior alternative. The Chinese model is in part the American capitalist (albeit not high church financial liberalisation) model, and is in part mercantilism. There has been concern that some developing or small countries could take the lesson from China that building up lots of hard currency reserves through undervaluation and export orientation is smart. That would erode globalisation, and lead to greater conflict with and criticism of the US-led system. While in the abstract that is a concern, most emerging markets - and notably Brazil, India, Mexico, South Africa, and South Korea - are not pursuing that extreme line. The recent victory of the incumbent Congress Party in India is one indication, and the statements about openness of Brazilian President Lula is another. Mexico's continued orientation towards NAFTA while seeking other investment flows (outside petroleum sector, admittedly) to and from abroad is a particularly brave example. Germany's and Japan's obvious crisis-prompted difficulties emerging from their very high export dependence, despite their being wealthy, serve as cautionary examples on the other side. So unlike in the1970s, the last time that the US economic performance and leadership were seriously compromised, we will not see leading developing economies like Brazil and India going down the import substitution or other self-destructive and uncooperative paths. If this assessment is correct, the policy challenge is to deal with relative US economic decline, but not outright hostility to the US model or displacement of the current international economic system. That is reassuring, for it leaves us in the realm of normal economic diplomacy, perhaps to be pursued more multilaterally and less high-handedly than the US has done over the past 20 years. It also suggests that adjustment of current international economic institutions is all that is required, rather than desperately defending economic globalisation itself. For all of that reassurance, however, the need to get buy-in from the rising new players to the current system is more pressing on the economic front than it ever has been before. Due to the crisis, the ability of the US and the other advanced industrial democracies to put up money and markets for rewards and side-payments to those new players is also more limited than it has been in the past, and will remain so for at least the next few years. The need for the US to avoid excessive domestic self-absorption is a real concern as well, given the combination of foreign policy fatigue from the Bush foreign policy agenda and economic insecurity from the financial crisis. Managing the post-crisis global economy Thus, the US faces a challenging but not truly threatening global economic situation as a result of the crisis and longer-term financial trends. Failure to act affirmatively to manage the situation, however, bears two significant and related risks: first, that China and perhaps some other rising economic powers will opportunistically divert countries in US-oriented integrated relationships to their economic sphere(s); second, that a leadership vacuum will arise in international financial affairs and in multilateral trade efforts, which will over time erode support for a globally integrated economy. Both of these risks if realised would diminish US foreign policy influence, make the economic system less resilient in response to future shocks (to every country's detriment), reduce economic growth and thus the rate of reduction in global poverty, and conflict with other foreign policy goals like controlling climate change or managing migration and demographic shifts. If the US is to rise to the challenge, it should concentrate on the following priority measures.

#### Protectionism will cause terrorism and global wars – risks extinction

**Panzner 8** – faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase (Michael, “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” p. 136-138)

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### **1AC Heg Advantage**

#### Allocating HMT funds upgrades ports-resolves competitiveness crisis

Hackbarth, Free Enterprise, 2012

(Sean, “Let’s Not Forget to Modernize Seaports”, 4-6, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/infrastructure/let%E2%80%99s-not-forget-modernize-seaports>, DOA: 7-13-12)

When I say “infrastructure” roads, bridges, and maybe airports probably pop into your head, but don't forget seaports. They move most goods in and out of the United States and support millions of jobs. This week, Jerry Bridges, chairman of the board of the American Association of Port Authorities, wrote about the funding issues ports are facing:¶ Although our nation's ports are dynamic, vibrant centers of trade and commerce, they rely on partnerships. U.S. seaports and their marine terminal partners anticipate investing about $8 billion annually over the next five years to maintain and improve their infrastructure.¶ Unfortunately, the federal government isn't adequately matching this commitment with investments in connecting land- and waterside infrastructure to effectively handle increased cargo volumes. This lack of federal foresight could create inefficiencies in moving cargo to and from ports, causing time delays, cost increases, reduced international competitiveness for U.S. exports and product shortages for consumers.¶ Despite there being a federal Harbor Maintenance Tax on seaport cargo that raises 100 percent of the cost for periodically dredging America's harbors and channels to their authorized dimensions, only about half of that money is being appropriated for its intended purpose, resulting in serious dredging needs being neglected.¶ Bridges makes an important point. With the Panama Canal undergoing expansion and increasing U.S. exports, the need for modern ports to move goods is critical to the economy. In another op-ed, Bob Stallman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, noted that as of this moment the U.S. only has "six ports deep enough to handle the new larger ships that will pass" through the canal.

#### Competitiveness prevents great power war

Baru, Singapore Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy visiting professor, 2009

(Sanjaya, “Geopolitical Implications of the Current Global Financial Crisis”, Strategic Analysis, Volume 33, Issue 2 March 2009, <http://www.india-seminar.com/2009/593/593_sanjaya_baru.htm>)

The management of the economy, and of the treasury, has been a vital aspect of statecraft from time immemorial. Kautilya’s Arthashastra says, ‘From the strength of the treasury the army is born. …men without wealth do not attain their objectives even after hundreds of trials… Only through wealth can material gains be acquired, as elephants (wild) can be captured only by elephants (tamed)… A state with depleted resources, even if acquired, becomes only a liability.’4 Hence, economic policies and performance do have strategic consequences.5 In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the foundation of power was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. ‘Victory (in war),’ Kennedy claimed, ‘has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base.’6 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. ‘The fact remains,’ Kennedy argued, ‘that all of the major shifts in the world’s military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources.’7 In Kennedy’s view the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis or even decline would be transmitted through a nation’s inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and military power – the classic ‘guns vs butter’ dilemma. Apart from such fiscal disempowerment of the state, economic under-performance would also reduce a nation’s attraction as a market, a source of capital and technology, and as a ‘knowledge power’. As power shifted from Europe to America, so did the knowledge base of the global economy. As China’s power rises, so does its profile as a ‘knowledge economy’. Impressed by such arguments the China Academy of Social Sciences developed the concept of Comprehensive National Power (CNP) to get China’s political and military leadership to focus more clearly on economic and technological performance than on military power alone in its quest for Great Power status.8 While China’s impressive economic performance and the consequent rise in China’s global profile has forced strategic analysts to acknowledge this link, the recovery of the US economy in the 1990s had reduced the appeal of the Kennedy thesis in Washington DC. We must expect a revival of interest in Kennedy’s arguments in the current context. A historian of power who took Kennedy seriously, Niall Ferguson, has helped keep the focus on the geopolitical implications of economic performance. In his masterly survey of the role of finance in the projection of state power, Ferguson defines the ‘square of power’ as the tax bureaucracy, the parliament, the national debt and the central bank. These four institutions of ‘fiscal empowerment’ of the state enable nations to project power by mobilizing and deploying financial resources to that end.9 Ferguson shows how vital sound economic management is to strategic policy and national power. More recently, Ferguson has been drawing a parallel between the role of debt and financial crises in the decline of the Ottoman and Soviet empires and that of the United States of America. In an early comment on the present financial crisis, Ferguson wrote: ‘We are indeed living through a global shift in the balance of power very similar to that which occurred in the 1870s. This is the story of how an over-extended empire sought to cope with an external debt crisis by selling off revenue streams to foreign investors. The empire that suffered these setbacks in the 1870s was the Ottoman empire. Today it is the US… It remains to be seen how quickly today’s financial shift will be followed by a comparable geopolitical shift in favour of the new export and energy empires of the east. Suffice to say that the historical analogy does not bode well for America’s quasi-imperial network of bases and allies across the Middle East and Asia. Debtor empires sooner or later have to do more than just sell shares to satisfy their creditors. …as in the 1870s the balance of financial power is shifting. Then, the move was from the ancient Oriental empires (not only the Ottoman but also the Persian and Chinese) to Western Europe. Today the shift is from the US – and other western financial centres – to the autocracies of the Middle East and East Asia.’10 An economic or financial crisis may not trigger the decline of an empire. It can certainly speed up a process already underway. In the case of the Soviet Union the financial crunch caused by the Afghan war came on top of years of economic under-performance and the loss of political legitimacy of the Soviet state. In a democratic society like the United States the political legitimacy of the state is constantly renewed through periodic elections. Thus, the election of Barack Obama may serve to renew the legitimacy of the state and by doing so enable the state to undertake measures that restore health to the economy. This the Soviet state was unable to do under Gorbachev even though he repudiated the Brezhnev legacy and distanced himself from it.

#### Competitiveness key to hegemony

Gelb, CFR president emeritus, 2010

(Leslie, “Fashioning a Realistic Strategy for the Twenty-First Century”, Summer, <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/forum/archives/pdfs/34-2pdfs/Gelb.pdf>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Power is what it always has been. It is the ability to get someone to do something they do not want to do by means of your resources and your position. It was always that. There is no such thing in my mind as “soft” power or “hard” power or “smart” power or “dumb” power. It is people who are hard or soft or smart or dumb. Power is power. And people use it wisely or poorly. Now, what has changed is the composition of power in international affairs. For almost all of history, international power was achieved in the form of military power and military force. Now, particularly in the last fifty years or so, it has become more and more economic. So power consists of economic power, military power, and diplomatic power, but the emphasis has shifted from military power (for almost all of history) to now, more economic power. And, as President Obama said in his West Point speech several months ago, our economy is the basis of our international power in general and our military power in particular. That is where it all comes from. **Whether other states listen to us and act on what we say depends a good deal on their perception of the strength of the American economy**. A big problem for us in the last few years has been the perception that our economy is in decline.3232

#### Robust maritime industry key to military readiness

AMP 2012

(American Maritime Partnership, “U.S. TRANSCOM General Says Domestic Maritime Industry is "Fourth Arm of Defense”, 5-22, <http://www.americanmaritimepartnership.com/news/2012/052212%20NMD.html>, DOA: 7-13-13)

U.S. TRANSCOM Commanding General William Fraser III today said maintaining a strong domestic maritime industry is critical to the defending the homeland, describing the sector as the "fourth arm of defense." The Air Force General's remarks came at a National Maritime Day celebration at the Washington Navy Yard.¶ "Maintaining a national maritime industrial base and strong partnerships with the commercial maritime industry is critically important to the Department of Defense," Gen. Fraser said. "A strong commercial American industry is particularly important during times of budget cuts."¶ General Fraser's remarks came on the 79th anniversary of National Maritime Day, which annually recognizes the men and women of the U.S. merchant marine for their contributions to American commerce and the U.S. military. In 1933, Congress designated May 22nd as American Maritime Day to commemorate the U.S.-flag steamship SAVANNAH embarking on what was the first-ever transoceanic voyage under steam power in 1819.¶ This historic voyage was the first of many maritime milestones attributed to the U.S. merchant marine. In the decades that have followed, American companies and mariners have pioneered innovations such as the containership, self-unloading vessel, articulated tug-barge units, railroad-on-barge carfloats and many other breakthroughs.¶ The Jones Act, the federal law that promotes the U.S. merchant marine of skilled seafarers and U.S.-flagged vessels, has made these innovations possible. By maintaining a viable domestic maritime industry, this law enables the flow of domestic waterborne commerce and supports a naval and military auxiliary in times of war or national emergency.¶ Today, the maritime industry is the most economical form of domestic transportation, moving more than 1 billion tons of cargo annually at a fraction of the cost of other modes. This efficient transportation mode helps the economy run smoothly and sustains nearly 500,000 jobs. It is also good for the environment as ships and tug/barge units use less fuel and produce fewer emissions than land-based modes of transportation.¶ The maritime sector plays an indispensible national defense role, fulfilling key support functions for the U.S. military. During Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom (2002-2010), U.S.-flag commercial vessels, including ships and seafarers drawn from the domestic trades, transported 90 percent of all military cargoes moved to Afghanistan and Iraq.

**Readiness is key to deterring global wars**

**Spencer**, Policy Analyst at Heritage, 9/15/ **2000**,

[Jack, Heritage Backgrounder #1394] (PDCL1741)

Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

#### Hegemony solves nuclear war

Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 2011

(Robert, “The Price of Power The benefits of U.S. defense spending far outweigh the costs”, 1-24, <http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/price-power_533696.html>)

Today the international situation is also one of high risk. • The terrorists who would like to kill Americans on U.S. soil constantly search for safe havens from which to plan and carry out their attacks. American military actions in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Yemen, and elsewhere make it harder for them to strike **and are** a large part of the reason **why for** almost **a decade there has been no repetition of September 11.** To the degree that we limit our ability to deny them safe haven, we increase the chances they will succeed. • American forces deployed in East Asia and the Western Pacific **have for decades prevented the outbreak of major war, provided stability, and kept open international trading routes, making possible an unprecedented era of growth and prosperity** for Asians and Americans alike. Now the United States faces a new challenge and potential threat from a rising China which seeks eventually to push the U.S. military’s area of operations back to Hawaii and exercise hegemony over the world’s most rapidly growing economies. Meanwhile, **a nuclear-armed North Korea threatens war** with South Korea and fires ballistic missiles over Japan that will someday be capable of reaching the west coast of the United States. Democratic nations in the region, worried that the United States may be losing influence, turn to Washington for reassurance that the U.S. security guarantee remains firm. If the United States cannot provide that assurance because it is cutting back its military capabilities, they will have to choose between accepting Chinese dominance and striking out on their own, possibly by building nuclear weapons. **• In the Middle East, Iran seeks to build its own nuclear arsenal**, supports armed radical Islamic groups in Lebanon and Palestine, and has linked up with anti-American dictatorships in the Western Hemisphere. The **prospects of new instability in the region grow every day** as a decrepit regime in Egypt clings to power, crushes all moderate opposition, and drives the Muslim Brotherhood into the streets. **A nuclear-armed Pakistan seems to be ever on the brink of collapse** into anarchy and radicalism. Turkey, once an ally, now seems bent on an increasingly anti-American Islamist course. The prospect of war between Hezbollah and Israel grows, **and with it the possibility of war between Israel and Syria and possibly Iran**. There, too, nations in the region increasingly look to Washington for reassurance, and if they decide the United States cannot be relied upon they will have to decide whether **to succumb to Iranian influence or build their own nuclear weapons** to resist it. In the 1990s, after the Soviet Union had collapsed and the biggest problem in the world seemed to be ethnic conflict in the Balkans, it was at least plausible to talk about cutting back on American military capabilities. In the present, increasingly dangerous international environment, in which terrorism and great power rivalry vie as the greatest threat to American security and interests, cutting military capacities is simply reckless. Would we increase the risk of strategic failure in an already risky world, despite the near irrelevance of the defense budget to American fiscal health, just so we could tell American voters that their military had suffered its “fair share” of the pain? The nature of the risk becomes plain when one considers the nature of the cuts that would have to be made to have even a marginal effect on the U.S. fiscal crisis. Many are under the illusion, for instance, that if the United States simply withdrew from Iraq and Afghanistan and didn’t intervene anywhere else for a while, this would have a significant impact on future deficits. But, in fact, projections of future massive deficits already assume the winding down of these interventions.Withdrawal from the two wars would scarcely make a dent in the fiscal crisis. Nor can meaningful reductions be achieved by cutting back on waste at the Pentagon—which Secretary of Defense Gates has already begun to do and which has also been factored into deficit projections. If the United States withdrew from Iran and Afghanistan tomorrow, cut all the waste Gates can find, and even eliminated a few weapons programs—all this together would still not produce a 10 percent decrease in overall defense spending. In fact, the only way to get significant savings from the defense budget—and by “significant,” we are still talking about a tiny fraction of the cuts needed to bring down future deficits—is to cut force structure: fewer troops on the ground; fewer airplanes in the skies; fewer ships in the water; fewer soldiers, pilots, and sailors to feed and clothe and provide benefits for. To cut the size of the force, however, requires reducing or eliminating the missions those forces have been performing. Of course, there are any number of think tank experts who insist U.S. forces can be cut by a quarter or third or even by half and still perform those missions. But this is snake oil. Over the past two decades, the force has already been cut by a third. Yet no administration has reduced the missions that the larger force structures of the past were designed to meet. To fulfill existing security commitments, to remain the “world’s power balancer of choice,” as Leslie Gelb puts it, to act as “the only regional balancer against China in Asia, Russia in eastern Europe, and Iran in the Middle East” requires at least the current force structure, and almost certainly more than current force levels. Those who recommend doing the same with less are only proposing a policy of insufficiency, where the United States makes commitments it cannot meet except at high risk of failure. The only way to find substantial savings in the defense budget, therefore, is to change American strategy fundamentally. The Simpson-Bowles commission suggests as much, by calling for a reexamination of America’s “21st century role,” although it doesn’t begin to define what that new role might be. Others have. For decades “realist” analysts have called for a strategy of “offshore balancing.” Instead of the United States providing security in East Asia and the Persian Gulf, it would withdraw its forces from Japan, South Korea, and the Middle East and let the nations in those regions balance one another. If the balance broke down and war erupted, the United States would then intervene militarily until balance was restored. In the Middle East and Persian Gulf, for instance, Christopher Layne has long proposed “passing the mantle of regional stabilizer” to a consortium of “Russia, China, Iran, and India.” In East Asia offshore balancing would mean letting China, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and others manage their own problems, without U.S. involvement—again, until the balance broke down and war erupted, at which point the United States would provide assistance to restore the balance and then, if necessary, intervene with its own forces to restore peace and stability. Before examining whether this would be a wise strategy, it is important to understand that this really is the only genuine alternative to the one the United States has pursued for the past 65 years. To their credit, Layne and others who support the concept of offshore balancing have eschewed halfway measures and airy assurances that we can do more with less, which are likely recipes for disaster. They recognize that either the United States is actively involved in providing security and stability in regions beyond the Western Hemisphere, which means maintaining a robust presence in those regions, or it is not. Layne and others are frank in calling for an end to the global security strategy developed in the aftermath of World War II, perpetuated through the Cold War, and continued by four successive post-Cold War administrations. At the same time, it is not surprising that none of those administrations embraced offshore balancing as a strategy. The idea of relying on Russia, China, and Iran to jointly “stabilize” the Middle East and Persian Gulf will not strike many as an attractive proposition. Nor is U.S. withdrawal from East Asia and the Pacific likely to have a stabilizing effect on that region. **The prospects of a war on the Korean Peninsula would increase.** Japan and other nations in the region would face the choice of succumbing to Chinese hegemony or taking unilateral steps for self-defense, which in Japan’s case **would mean the rapid creation of a formidable nuclear arsenal**. Layne and other offshore balancing enthusiasts, like John Mearsheimer, point to two notable occasions when the United States allegedly practiced this strategy. One was the Iran-Iraq war, where the United States supported Iraq for years against Iran in the hope that the two would balance and weaken each other. The other was American policy in the 1920s and 1930s, when the United States allowed the great European powers to balance one another, occasionally providing economic aid, or military aid, as in the Lend-Lease program of assistance to Great Britain once war broke out. Whether this was really American strategy in that era is open for debate—most would argue the United States in this era was trying to stay out of war not as part of a considered strategic judgment but as an end in itself. Even if the United States had been pursuing offshore balancing in the first decades of the 20th century, however, would we really call that strategy a success? The United States wound up intervening with millions of troops, first in Europe, and then in Asia and Europe simultaneously, in the two most dreadful wars in human history. It was with the memory of those two wars in mind, and in the belief that American strategy in those interwar years had been mistaken, that American statesmen during and after World War II determined on the new global strategy that the United States has pursued ever since. Under Franklin Roosevelt, and then under the leadership of Harry Truman and Dean Acheson, American leaders determined that the safest course was to build “situations of strength” (Acheson’s phrase) in strategic locations around the world, to build a “preponderance of power,” and to create an international system with American power at its center. They left substantial numbers of troops in East Asia and in Europe and built a globe-girdling system of naval and air bases to enable the rapid projection of force to strategically important parts of the world. They did not do this on a lark or out of a yearning for global dominion. They simply rejected the offshore balancing strategy, and they did so because they **believed it had led to great, destructive wars in the past and would likely do so again**. They believed their new global strategy **was more likely to deter major war and therefore be less destructive** and less expensive in the long run. Subsequent administrations, from both parties and with often differing perspectives on the proper course in many areas of foreign policy, have all agreed on this core strategic approach. From the beginning this strategy was assailed as too ambitious and too expensive. At the dawn of the Cold War, Walter Lippmann railed against Truman’s containment strategy as suffering from an unsustainable gap between ends and means that would bankrupt the United States and exhaust its power. Decades later, in the waning years of the Cold War, Paul Kennedy warned of “imperial overstretch,” arguing that American decline was inevitable “if the trends in national indebtedness, low productivity increases, [etc.]” were allowed to continue at the same time as “massive American commitments of men, money and materials are made in different parts of the globe.” Today, we are once again being told that this global strategy needs to give way to a more restrained and modest approach, even though the indebtedness crisis that we face in coming years is not caused by the present, largely successful global strategy. Of course it is precisely the success of that strategy that is taken for granted. The enormous benefits that this strategy has provided, including the financial benefits, somehow never appear on the ledger. They should. We might begin by asking about the global security order that the United States has sustained since Word War II—**the prevention of major war, the support of an open trading system, and promotion of the liberal principles of free markets and free government**. How much is that order worth? What would be the cost of its collapse or transformation into another type of order? Whatever the nature of the current economic difficulties, the past six decades **have seen a greater increase in global prosperity than any time in human history. Hundreds of millions have been lifted out of poverty**. Once-backward nations have become economic dynamos. And the American economy, though suffering ups and downs throughout this period, has on the whole benefited immensely from this international order. One price of this success has been maintaining a sufficient military capacity to provide the essential security underpinnings of this order. But has the price not been worth it? In the first half of the 20th century, the United States found itself engaged in two world wars. In the second half, **this global American strategy helped produce a peaceful end to the great-power struggle of the Cold War and then 20 more years of great-power peace**. Looked at coldly, simply in terms of dollars and cents, the benefits of that strategy far outweigh the costs. The danger, as always, is that we don’t even realize the benefits our strategic choices have provided. Many assume that the world has simply become more peaceful, that great-power conflict has become impossible, that nations have learned that military force has little utility, that economic power is what counts. This belief in progress and the perfectibility of humankind and the institutions of international order is always alluring to Americans and Europeans and other children of the Enlightenment**. It was the prevalent belief in the decade before World War** I, in the first years after World War II, and in those heady days after the Cold War when people spoke of the “end of history.” It is always tempting to **believe that the international order the United States built and sustained with its power can exist in the absence of that power,** or at least with much less of it. This is the hidden assumption of those who call for a change in American strategy: that the United States can stop playing its role and yet all the benefits that came from that role will keep pouring in. **This is a great if recurring illusion, the idea that you can pull a leg out from under a table and the table will not fall over.**

### **1AC Ag Advantage**

#### Dredging is key to sustain agricultural competitiveness-transaction costs are too high without it.

Stallman, AFBF president, 2012

(Bob, “US export industry in dire need of port updates”, 3-30, <http://westernfarmpress.com/government/us-export-industry-dire-need-port-updates?page=2>, DOA: 7-13-12)

It may surprise many that if the planned expansion of the Panama Canal was completed tomorrow, the United States, one of the world’s largest trading powers, would only have six ports deep enough to handle the new larger ships that will pass.¶ Yet, we are competing with all other parts of the world that are updating their ports. Since agriculture goods play a significant role in U.S. trade, modernizing our ports is extremely important for farmers and ranchers to be able to continue to thrive in the world market.¶ Even more surprising than the U.S. only having six large ports is the fact that all these ports are isolated on the East and West Coasts. That’s right, Gulf Coast ports, including New Orleans, do not currently have the capacity to handle larger ships.¶ If upgrades to U.S. ports are not completed in time, for major trade leaving the U.S. Gulf, smaller boats will need to be utilized to trans-ship our goods to ports like those in the Bahamas and Dominican Republic, where they would offload to larger vessels traveling to Latin America, Asia and other parts of the world.¶ Similarly, goods coming from other countries would potentially have to go through the same routine in the Caribbean, offloading to smaller vessels to enter ports in the U.S. Gulf.¶ If you are scratching your head, you aren’t the only one. This process of loading and offloading ships costs a lot of money. Inadequate port size also leads to higher transportation costs, because vessels may be loaded to less than capacity and more vessels may be required to ship the same amount of commodities.¶ In the meantime, our competitors around the world fare much better. Because their ports are deep enough, it is easier and less expensive to move products in and out. Further, Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean are all undergoing major new port projects or expansion of existing facilities.¶ Latin America, for example, is rapidly continuing with some of the world’s most sizable port development projects. The region is catching up with other regions through larger port investments, which stand at almost $12 billion. This means China will have access to sell its farm products to Latin America, where Asia never had access before.¶ The expansion of the Panama Canal will allow significantly larger ships to move through the waterway. The project, expected to be completed in 2014, should increase cargo volume by an average of 3 percent per year, doubling the 2005 tonnage by 2025.¶ Currently, the largest ship able to pass through the canal can hold up to 3,500 TEUs (twenty-foot equivalent unit, a measure used for capacity in container transportation). To maximize the canal’s new dimensions, shipbuilders are making larger vessels that are able to hold up to 12,000 TEUs and require 50-51 feet of draft.¶ These larger ships require deeper and wider shipping channels, greater overhead clearance, and larger cranes and shore infrastructure — all of which make the U.S. Gulf a non-trading player. Some U.S ports can accommodate the larger vessels. However, most cannot, including many ports that are very important to U.S. agricultural exports.¶ The U.S. exports approximately one-quarter of the grain it produces. In 2011, more than 58 percent of our grain exports departed from the U.S. Gulf. This may significantly change as larger ships carrying grain from our competitors are able to access our trading partners.¶ The Panama Canal could potentially shift world trade as U.S. exporters will be unable to pass on higher transportation costs when customers can purchase similar products from other countries.¶ As the saying goes, “For Right of Way, Gross Tonnage Rules.” This law, known as the rule of common sense on the water, is also common sense for international trade. In other words, those with the biggest ships and ports to accommodate them will win every time.¶ To maintain our competiveness in the world market, it is essential that the U.S. update and modernize its ports to accommodate larger ships. Without this investment in infrastructure, we will literally miss the boat.

#### Plan solves-port investment boosts value of ag products.

Casavant et al., Washington State economic sciences professor, 2011

(Ken, “The Relationship Between U.S. Transport Infrastructure Improvements And International Trade”, <http://wstc.wa.gov/Meetings/AgendasMinutes/agendas/2011/July19-20/documents/11_0719_BP5_FPTIInfrastTrdPolicyRept.pdf>, DOA: 7-13-12)

The efficient and affordable freight transportation system that facilitates the linkage to ¶ international markets has always been important drivers for U.S. export-oriented. In turn, the ¶ importance of participating in international trade is reflected in increasing exports over the past ¶ decades (Figure 2). Despite the sharp decline of the 1980’s and late 1990’s, the value of ¶ agricultural exports has exceeded the imports since early 1970’s. The sharpest decline in ¶ agricultural commodities exports happened during the economic downturn of 2008 – 2009, ¶ followed by a quick recovery in 2010. The positive trade balance since the 1970’s lead to higher ¶ farm prices and increased producer revenues. Reasons for exports fluctuations include but are ¶ not limited to U.S. dollar’s value against foreign currencies, changes in the economies of ¶ importing countries, and foreign countries’ favorable agricultural policies leading to increased ¶ competition in the world export markets.¶ The extent to which international markets are important to largely export-oriented¶ agricultural economy can also be reflected in export market shares of major agricultural ¶ commodities shown in Table 2. The export share of total agricultural production has gradually ¶ increased from 15.9% in 1988 to 21.4% in 1996. Primary crops and meat and livestock ¶ categories’ export share increased from 25.8% to 31.1% and 7.4% to 11.1% respectively. The ¶ average percentage of export market share is higher in the 1990s’indicating that U.S. farm ¶ income becomes more reliant on the foreign trade. In turn, foreign trade relies on cost-effective ¶ and timely transportation efficiency. Table 3 shows the export shares for several important agricultural commodities. Excluding grapes, soybeans and sunflower seed categories, the export share of production for other major agricultural commodities was found to be increased from 1988 to 1996. Most notably, the export share for almonds increased from 51.6 to 71.8%, apples shares were 12%, up from 6.2%. Export shares of wheat and soybeans are significant, averaging about 51% and 34% respectively. With increasing world food demand and growing foreign per capita expenditures on U.S. farm products, the positive relationship between agricultural export shares and foreign market dependence has important implications for trade policies. In particular, the pattern in export share of production for agricultural commodities suggests adequate response in investing and increasing transport capacity is needed in order to support uninterrupted trade flow. Recent wheat trade data published by the Foreign Agricultural Service Production, Supply and Distribution (FAS PSD) shows that the U.S. wheat exports have dominated in the top 5 wheat exporting countries (Figure 3). Despite the significant reductions during the last three 18 years, due to the economic downturn, the U.S. is leading exporter with more than 35 million metric tons exported in 2010, the highest. The rest of the major wheat exporting competitor countries listed in the FAS PSD online database are European Union, Canada, Australia, and Argentina. Soybean world exports are largely dominated by U.S. and Brazil, followed by Argentina, Paraguay, and Canada. The U.S. soybean exports increased almost 70% since 2005, reaching more than 43 million metric tons in 2010. Brazil, the second largest producer of soybeans has significantly increased the export levels during the last decade, reaching 32.3 metric million tons in 2010. 1 The trend in key agricultural commodity exports and imports, as well as export share of production for major commodities, speak about certain need for increasing transportation capacity and improving existing infrastructure. 3.2 Freight Services and Modal Share World’s leading economies—U.S., Japan, China, Germany and France cumulatively account for 50% of global gross domestic product (GDP) of $60.9 trillion (TN) and 35% of global goods exports of $16 TN. With its most expensive freight transportation network measured by the length of paved roads, waterways, railroad, pipelines, and number of airports, the U.S. has the highest level of freight activity. Due to relatively larger geographic area and lower population density, goods are shipped comparatively longer destinations from producers to local end-user locations and export ports. Although as a result of emerging economies, the U.S. share of world GDP has declined between 2001 and 2008 (after the “dot-com boom” years), the demand for its freight and port services has significantly increased (Figure 5). After relatively short steady state from 2000 to 2002, the U.S. freight services increased by 69%, reaching $68 B/year in 2008. Compatibly, since 2003, the port services doubled in value, reaching more than $63 B/year in 2008. From 2007 to 2008, the total international merchandise trade and imports passed through U.S. freight system increased about 12% and 7%, respectively. This trend is consistent with the U.S. trade growth of about 7% per year since 1990. The combination of observed and projected increasing trade volumes encourage further development and/or maintenance of transportation facilities that link local producers to foreign markets. The modal share utilization trend is another important consideration for prioritizing transportation infrastructure investments. Almost all of the freight transportation uses some combination of two or more modes of transportation: trucks, trains, barges, and ocean vessels. Depending on distance, a cargo of export goods may be transported from local production area to 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 1990 1993 1996 1999 2002 2005 2008 Billion Dollars Freight services Port services22 transshipment locations using trucks, then continue its way by rail or barge to exporting ports. Among other considerations, mode utilization depends on the industry (commodity type) and geographic location (accessibility). For example, rail (generally utilized for long-destination shipments) is the most cost-effective mode for many agricultural products transportation from elevator to transshipment location or exporting port shipments. Truck mode is utilized for shorter-distance, time-dependent shipments. According to freight transportation statistics by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, 77.7% (by weight) of U.S. merchandise trade uses waterborne transportation, and 21.7% relies on either truck or rail modes (Figure 6). Only less than 1% of the trade volume is attributed to air transportation. 3.3 Ports and Inland Waterways Ocean ports are one of the most vital hubs for U.S. international trade flows. Congestion and low efficiency result in delays and disruptions, which impact the entire supply chain (Blonigen and Wilson, 2006). Clark et al., (2004) show that an increase in port efficiency from 25th to 75th percentile reduces port shipping costs by 12%. In addition to port efficiency, an increase in the inland transport infrastructure efficiency from 25 th to 75 th percentile improves the bilateral trade by 25%. This estimate is comparable to the estimate of 28% reported in Limao 24.1 44.9 25.1 5.9 21.7 77.7 0.4 0.1 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 U.S. total land trade U.S. total water trade U.S. total air trade Other and unknown Percent Valu e Weight24 and Venables, (2001). Port efficiency can be measured by linking its impact on transportation costs. In their investigation of the transportation cost determinants, Sánchez et al. (2003) found statistically significant positive correlation between transport costs and distance and value per weight variables. The frequency of services and the level of containerization were both negatively correlated, but only the frequency of services was found to be statistically significant.

#### Decline in US ag allows Brazil to fill in

AP 2008

(Associated Press, “U.S. grain exports snagged by infrastructure delays”, 8-25, <http://www2.jcfloridan.com/news/2008/aug/25/us_grain_exports_snagged_by_infrastructure_delays-ar-60163/>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Some agribusiness groups worry the bottlenecks could hurt the United States' standing as a global food provider as other nations, such as Brazil and Argentina, compete for a lucrative share of the market. In years past, bountiful harvests meant millions of bushels were stored outside overstuffed grain silos, waiting for shipment. Commodities loaded on barges faced long waits at outdated locks and dams on the Mississippi River, adding days and dollars to their transportation. The barge delays alone added an average $72.6 million annually to cost of shipping goods down the Mississippi and Illinois rivers, according to a new Army Corps of Engineers analysis provided to The Associated Press. Rail delays are costly as well. In 2006, an estimated 1 billion bushels of grain was stored outside or in improvised shelters in Iowa, Illinois and Indiana, adding an estimated $107 million to $160 million that year to the cost of transporting it, according to USDA figures. That's about 1 percent of the combined $13.8 billion value of corn and soybean exports in 2006. "We're way, way behind in our infrastructure investment, both in the private sector and publicly," said Peter Friedmann, executive director of the Agriculture Transportation Coalition, a trade group representing grain exporters. "And we need to move a lot on that or we will see other countries supplant us as they get greater investment in their infrastructure." The problem is likely to persist, if not worsen, in years to come. Fixing the bottlenecks will take billions of dollars in investment over several years. In the meantime, exports are forecast to increase, with corn shipments expected to grow every year over the next decade from 54 million metric tons to 77 million metric tons, according to the Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute. Added costs from bigger bottlenecks could only hurt U.S. farmers in a competitive global industry. "Price is still king in this business," said Larry Jansky, senior trader in agricultural commodities for North Pacific Inc. in Portland, Oregon. "Two or three dollars a ton is the difference between getting a contract or not." Agricultural exports last year were worth just less than $90 billion. If the U.S. loses just 1 or 2 percent of that market to fast-growing exporters like Argentina, it could drain between $9 billion and $18 billion from the economy.

#### Specifically, Brazil pushes the US out of the soy export market- causes deforestation

Martin, Chicago Tribune, 2004

(Andrew, “Brazil threatens U.S. soybean dominance”, 6-13, <http://portland.indymedia.org/en/2004/06/290689.shtml>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Spurred by new global markets, soaring prices and vast tracts of undeveloped land, Brazil is poised to surpass the United States as the largest soybean producer in the world, largely due to the explosive growth of farming in Mato Grosso. Mato Grosso's success has stirred waves of panic in the American Midwest. Some U.S. soybean farmers worry that they can't compete with Brazil's cheap labor and land, divided into soybean plantations that are routinely 10,000 acres, far larger than a typical U.S. farm. Environmentalists, meanwhile, fret that Brazil's soybean success is accelerating deforestation of the Amazon for new farmland. Mato Grosso's governor, Blairo Maggi, gruffly brushes off such criticism and prefers to talk about his state's tremendous potential for agricultural expansion. Only 7 percent of the land in Mato Grosso is used for farming, and with twice as much land as California, Mato Grosso could see 10 percent annual growth in new farms over the next decade, the governor says. Already, Mato Grosso--"thick forest" in Portuguese--has more acres devoted to soybeans, 12.9 million, than Illinois or Iowa, America's biggest soybean states. Illinois has 10.5 million acres and Iowa 10.4 million acres, according to a recent U.S. Department of Agriculture report for 2002. "People have a lot of fear of the unknown," said Maggi, known locally as the Soybean King because his family owns the world's biggest soybean farming operation. "There is a lot of room to enlarge." The emergence of Brazil and Argentina as players in the world soybean market is unwelcome news to U.S. soybean farmers, who faced little competition for decades. In the 1960s, the United States controlled 80 percent of the global market for soybeans, which are used mostly as a protein source in livestock feed. By the turn of the century, that market share shrunk to 34 percent, and Brazil and Argentina together now supply 50 percent of the world's soybeans. Farmers still thrive The pain has yet to be felt by many Midwestern farmers because of government price supports and increasing world demand, primarily from China's emerging middle class. Indeed, Midwestern soybean farmers are seeing some of the best prices ever. A drought in the United States, along with Asian soybean rust fungus in South America, helped drive up prices this year, past $10 per bushel. Soybean prices usually hover around $5 or $6 a bushel, according to the USDA. But experts suggest that U.S. soybean farmers should enjoy the good times while they last. The future, they say, is clear: Brazil will grow more soybeans and the United States less. "At this point, it has been more talk than actual impact," said Darrell Good, an agricultural economist at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. "Everyone who goes down to South America comes back with a scare story for the American producer. "It's much more profitable to grow soybeans in Brazil than it is here. Over the next decade, we are going to lose beans to South America and switch to corn." Recognizing the threat, U.S. soybean associations are busily working on strategies to remain competitive, such as promoting U.S. advantages in quality, tracing shipments and transportation. Transport improvements Because many soybeans are transported by barge, U.S. soybean growers are pushing the government to improve locks and dams along the Mississippi River. They are also promoting an energy bill, now stalled in Congress, that encourages the use of soybeans to produce diesel fuel. In Illinois, a new program called SoySelect will allow farmers to quickly deliver soybean products that can be traced from the store to the field in which they were grown. Such "traceability," officials hope, will make U.S. soybeans more attractive. "We know that they [Brazilians] are producing lots of beans, more and more all the time," said Sharon Covert, a Tiskilwa, Ill., soybean farmer who heads the Illinois Soybean Checkoff Board, which uses farmers' money for promotions. "You just have to be ready for that type of competition." The potential of that competition--as well as its weaknesses--is evident on the road north from Cuiaba. BR 163 stretches 1,100 miles to the Amazonian port city of Santarem, through an immense stretch of largely undeveloped land that Maggi's government touts as the world's last great agricultural frontier. Roberto Smeraldi, director of the environmental group Friends of the Earth Brazil, said soybean expansion is a "powerful driver" of deforestation. Because land planted with soybeans typically soars in value, Smeraldi said speculators are clearing more and more territory in the hopes that it becomes the next cluster of huge soybean plantations. "It stimulates people to open up the frontier," Smeraldi said. "Out of four areas they open up, maybe only one actually works for soybeans . . . but then the damage is done."

#### Amazon key to prevent extinction- biodiversity, oxygen and disease

Sohn, staff writer, 99

(Pam, "Eight Days in Brazil," Chatanooga Times Free Press (Tennessee), 4-11, lexis)

Inside Brazil's rainforest, the Amazon is a waterworld of life. It nurtures more than half of the Earth's plant and animal species and spreads its life-giving oxygen to all of the planet. In late March, a 20-person group sponsored by the Tennessee Aquarium made a eight-day trip there to find, study and harvest seeds from the Amazon's Victoria lily. The lily is legend. With its giant green pad, the lily is an indicator of the health of the world's largest contiquous rain forest, which provides breathable air and serves as a global source of climate control. The Chattanooga Times and Free Press went along on the Amazon trip, which was arranged so that Tennessee Aquarium horticulturalist Charlene Nash and the Victoria Conservancy could find and study the lily in the wild. Inside today's newspaper, beginning on Page G1, an eight-page special section chronicles the trip with a special team of travelers, people with an eye for plants, fish and bugs. Many of the lessons learned in a Amazon also apply, on a smaller scale, to the Tennessee River Valley. Both regions are known for abundance. The Amazon, sometimes called the cradle of diversity, claims some 50 percent of the earth's known plant and animal species. The Southeast, with its Tennessee and Cumberland rivers, is said to be the global epicenter of freshwater mollusks. But the Amazon Basin's rain forest, which provides the habitat for all that biodiversity, is disappearing fast. And in the Tennessee and Cumberland river basins habitats are so changed that 30 species of freshwater mussels are already extinct and 70 percent of those remaining are considered endangered. Biodiversity is a scientific word for variety of life, and it may be key to human survival if a life-form that provides a life-saving medicine is lost. The threads of biodiversity are river basins with their wealth of plants and creatures. The rivers give life. The rivers are life. And the Amazon is life on a grand scale.

### 1AC Biodiversity Advantage

Contention 2 is biodiversity-

#### 1. Bio D is on the brink now

**Nature Publishing Group 11 –** (“Biodiversity on the brink” 8/26/11 <http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v1/n6/full/nclimate1223.html>)

Although such research suggests that biodiversity loss may be underestimated, **the incredibly complex nature of biodiversity** — let alone its interaction with the climate — clearly **leaves much room for expanding and advancing the research agenda on ecology** and climate change. On this front, ecology is continually revealing new complexities, as highlighted by two articles in this issue. A News and Views on [page 300](http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v1/n6/full/nclimate1202.html) discusses new research by Dedmer Van de Waal and colleagues,' published in *The ISME Journal*, that highlights a positive impact of climate change on ecosystems: as concentrations of carbon dioxide in surface waters increase, the toxic forms of the cyanobacteria *Microcytis* that routinely pose health problems to **freshwater ecosystems may decrease in numbers as they are outcompeted by their non-toxic counterparts**. Furthermore, in a Letter on [page 308](http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v1/n6/full/nclimate1200.html), Riccardo Rodolfo-Metalpa and co-authors provide a compelling case that calcifiers subjected to ocean acidification are more resilient when protected by external organic tissue, and that this previously underappreciated morphological attribute can play a role in how marine biodiversity is impacted by climate change. **“Halting the threat of a sixth extinction must begin in earnest, and cannot wait for greater certainty in our estimates of extant biodiversity and predictions of its fate.”** Undoubtedly, further discoveries of this kind will abound in the future. Meanwhile, **halting the threat of a sixth extinction** must begin in earnest, and **cannot wait for greater certainty in our estimates of extant biodiversity and predictions of its fate**. In this regard, the recently launched United Nations panel on biodiversity, which is due to meet formally for the first time next month in Nairobi, Kenya, is to be welcomed. At its October meeting, the panel — known as the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, or IPBES — will discuss its remit and how it will carry out its proposed work agenda in practice

#### 2. Dredged materials provide a generation of environmental benefits- but only 20% of the materials are being used beneficially

**EPA 7** (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC “The Role of the Federal Standard in the Beneficial Use of Dredged Material from U.S. Army Corps of Engineers New and Maintenance Navigation Projects” October 2007 <https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:jQJNxjMVM_EJ:el.erdc.usace.army.mil/dots/budm/pdf/RoleFederal.pdf+&hl=en&gl=us&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEEShT-8yeLMnfNFE2RMdtcjh-K2YFu4018mShNaGUOCcjzQPXznmoO0Ff8pwrNlxRfoj9qLxx4m3CyPSRMcONfW1bj0h8yjgOVwJU0L3OEAl4Fydg-jnpAZkAjJa_3Ux68_3RVeBB&sig=AHIEtbSfzbBTt4i7sauQlYhRWB0b2tQw5Q>)

The nation’s marine transportation system consists of about 25,000 miles of navigable channels, of which about 12,000 miles are commercially important. The system is supported by about 900 federal channel projects, including both deep (greater than 12 feet) and shallow (12 feet or less) draft harbors (US DOT 1999). Approximately 200 to 300 million cubic yards of material are dredged annually by USACE, as well as other federal and private interests, to improve and maintain the harbors and channels in this system. The majority of this dredging is by USACE and other federal interests. Placement of this dredged material provides an opportunity to generate both environmental and economic benefits (see Box 1). USACE estimates that 20 to 30 percent of the total volume dredged is currently used beneficially. Since the passage of the landmark Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986, there has been a major evolution of law and policy concerning the beneficial use of dredged material. Environmental restoration is now a priority mission of USACE, along with the traditional mission areas of flood damage reduction and inland and coastal navigation. New laws have established the authority of USACE to use dredged material for environmentally beneficial purposes, and programs have been initiated to implement these laws. The remaining challenges to increasing the number of beneficial use projects include educating those with an interest in these new opportunities and creating partnerships to develop and implement them.

#### 3. Non- removed dredged materials cause water pollution

**Delia et al. 10-** Faculty of Agriculture and Environment, Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania. Laboratory of Fishing and Aquaculture, Durres, Albania (Etleva Delia, Enkelejda Sallaku, Jerina Kolitan “The Environmental Impact of the Dredging in Port and Durres City” 5/25/10 <http://www.balwois.com/balwois/administration/full_paper/ffp-1648.pdf>)

The potential for environmental impact resulting from upland depends on the nature of the material and characteristics of the disposal site. As dredged material placed in an upland environment dries, the material oxidizes and becomes lighter in color, accumulations of salt develop on the surface and precipitations tends to dissolve the salts that may then runoff. The oxidation process may promote the release of contaminants in surface water and groundwater and volatilizations of some contaminations may also occur. Fugitive dust may also disperse contaminates. The upland placement of dredging material can potentially affect water quality, groundwater quality, wildlife, plants and human health.

#### 4. Water pollution collapses biodiversity- removing dredged materials solves

**City of Science and Industry, no date –** (“Pollution and biodiversity” <http://www.cite-sciences.fr/english/ala_cite/expositions/eau_pour_tous/pollution_biodiversite.php?rub=maitrise_eau&ss_rub=11>)

[Water pollution](http://www.cite-sciences.fr/english/ala_cite/expositions/eau_pour_tous/pop_definition.php?iddef=845&id_habillage=64&id_expo=39&lang=an) has, among other consequences, that of causing deep long-term modifications of biodiversity. [Eutrophication](http://www.cite-sciences.fr/english/ala_cite/expositions/eau_pour_tous/pop_definition.php?iddef=839&id_habillage=64&id_expo=39&lang=an) is one of the most alarming long-term alterations. This phenomenon occurs within aquatic environments that are fed only little new water: lakes, ponds, slow rivers, river mouths. The constant supply of nutrients (essentially phosphorus and nitrogen) contributes to the proliferation of certain algae. The decay of these algae results in an excessive consumption of oxygen. Such an asphyxia of the aquatic environment reduces drastically the number of species that it can support. Some techniques, such as [phytoremediation](http://www.cite-sciences.fr/english/ala_cite/expositions/eau_pour_tous/pop_definition.php?iddef=844&id_habillage=64&id_expo=39&lang=an), have been implemented in order to limit eutrophication. Now, the most efficient way to combat pollution remains prevention: a shift to renewable energies, the use of biodegradable products, waterproofing of dumping sites, etc.

#### 5. Removing dredged materials leads to improved water quality

**PIANC 5** - PIANC is the forum where professionals around the world join forces to provide expert advice on cost-effective, reliable and sustainable infrastructures to facilitate the growth of waterborne transport. (“dredging: the facts” <http://www.dredging.org/documents/ceda/downloads/publications-dredging_the_facts.pdf>)

Another environmental use of dredging has been in initiatives designed to remove contaminated sediments, thus improving water quality and restoring the health of aquatic ecosystems. This so-called “remediation” or “clean-up” dredging is used in waterways, lakes, ports and harbours in highly industrialised or urbanised areas. The removed material may be treated and used afterwards, or disposed of under strict environmental controls. Under proper conditions a viable alternative to removal is in-situ isolation, i.e. the placement of a covering or a cap of clean material over the contaminated deposit.

#### 6. Biodiversity collapse will cause extinction.

**Coyne 07** -Jerry Coyne, Professor of Ecology at UChicago and Hopi Hoekstra, Professor of Biology at Harvard (9/24/2007 <http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatest-dying>)

Aside from the Great Dying, there have been four other mass extinctions, all of which severely pruned life's diversity. Scientists agree that we're now in the midst of a sixth such episode. This new one, however, is different - and, in many ways, much worse. For, unlike earlier extinctions, this one results from the work of a single species, Homo sapiens. We are relentlessly taking over the planet, laying it to waste and eliminating most of our fellow species. Moreover, we're doing it much faster than the mass extinctions that came before. Every year, up to 30,000 species disappear due to human activity alone. At this rate, we could lose half of Earth's species in this century. And, unlike with previous extinctions, there's no hope that biodiversity will ever recover, since the cause of the decimation - us - is here to stay. To scientists, this is an unparalleled calamity, far more severe than global warming, which is, after all, only one of many threats to biodiversity. Yet global warming gets far more press. Why? One reason is that, while the increase in temperature is easy to document, the decrease of species is not. Biologists don't know, for example, exactly how many species exist on Earth. Estimates range widely, from three million to more than 50 million, and that doesn't count microbes, critical (albeit invisible) components of ecosystems. We're not certain about the rate of extinction, either; how could we be, since the vast majority of species have yet to be described? We're even less sure how the loss of some species will affect the ecosystems in which they're embedded, since the intricate connection between organisms means that the loss of a single species can ramify unpredictably. But we do know some things. Tropical rainforests are disappearing at a rate of 2 percent per year. Populations of most large fish are down to only 10 percent of what they were in 1950. Many primates and all the great apes - our closest relatives - are nearly gone from the wild. And we know that extinction and global warming act synergistically. Extinction exacerbates global warming: By burning rainforests, we're not only polluting the atmosphere with carbon dioxide (a major greenhouse gas) but destroying the very plants that can remove this gas from the air. Conversely, global warming increases extinction, both directly (killing corals) and indirectly (destroying the habitats of Arctic and Antarctic animals). As extinction increases, then, so does global warming, which in turn causes more extinction - and so on, into a downward spiral of destruction. Why, exactly, should we care? Let's start with the most celebrated case: the rainforests. Their loss will worsen global warming - raising temperatures, melting icecaps, and flooding coastal cities. And, as the forest habitat shrinks, so begins the inevitable contact between organisms that have not evolved together, a scenario played out many times, and one that is never good. Dreadful diseases have successfully jumped species boundaries, with humans as prime recipients. We have gotten aids from apes, sars from civets, and Ebola from fruit bats. Additional worldwide plagues from unknown microbes are a very real possibility. But it isn't just the destruction of the rainforests that should trouble us. Healthy ecosystems the world over provide hidden services like waste disposal, nutrient cycling, soil formation, water purification, and oxygen production. Such services are best rendered by ecosystems that are diverse. Yet, through both intention and accident, humans have introduced exotic species that turn biodiversity into monoculture. Fast-growing zebra mussels, for example, have outcompeted more than 15 species of native mussels in North America's Great Lakes and have damaged harbors and water-treatment plants. Native prairies are becoming dominated by single species (often genetically homogenous) of corn or wheat. Thanks to these developments, soils will erode and become unproductive - which, along with temperature change, will diminish agricultural yields. Meanwhile, with increased pollution and runoff, as well as reduced forest cover, ecosystems will no longer be able to purify water; and a shortage of clean water spells disaster. In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all. As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricate aquatic food web could collapse from both sides. Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory. As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion. In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as $50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed. Yet that is where we're heading if species extinction continues at its current pace. Extinction also has a huge impact on medicine. Who really cares if, say, a worm in the remote swamps of French Guiana goes extinct? Well, those who suffer from cardiovascular disease. The recent discovery of a rare South American leech has led to the isolation of a powerful enzyme that, unlike other anticoagulants, not only prevents blood from clotting but also dissolves existing clots. And it's not just this one species of worm: Its wriggly relatives have evolved other biomedically valuable proteins, including antistatin (a potential anticancer agent), decorsin and ornatin (platelet aggregation inhibitors), and hirudin (another anticoagulant). Plants, too, are pharmaceutical gold mines. The bark of trees, for example, has given us quinine (the first cure for malaria), taxol (a drug highly effective against ovarian and breast cancer), and aspirin. More than a quarter of the medicines on our pharmacy shelves were originally derived from plants. The sap of the Madagascar periwinkle contains more than 70 useful alkaloids, including vincristine, a powerful anticancer drug that saved the life of one of our friends. Of the roughly 250,000 plant species on Earth, fewer than 5 percent have been screened for pharmaceutical properties. Who knows what life-saving drugs remain to be discovered? Given current extinction rates, it's estimated that we're losing one valuable drug every two years. Our arguments so far have tacitly assumed that species are worth saving only in proportion to their economic value and their effects on our quality of life, an attitude that is strongly ingrained, especially in Americans. That is why conservationists always base their case on an economic calculus. But we biologists know in our hearts that there are deeper and equally compelling reasons to worry about the loss of biodiversity: namely, simple morality and intellectual values that transcend pecuniary interests. What, for example, gives us the right to destroy other creatures? And what could be more thrilling than looking around us, seeing that we are surrounded by our evolutionary cousins, and realizing that we all got here by the same simple process of natural selection? To biologists, and potentially everyone else, apprehending the genetic kinship and common origin of all species is a spiritual experience - not necessarily religious, but spiritual nonetheless, for it stirs the soul. But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction. We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water. In the end, we must accept the possibility that we ourselves are not immune to extinction. Or, if we survive, perhaps only a few of us will remain, scratching out a grubby existence on a devastated planet. Global warming will seem like a secondary problem when humanity finally faces the consequences of what we have done to nature: not just another Great Dying, but perhaps the greatest dying of them all.

### 1AC LNG Advantage

#### Panama Canal expansion increases LNG transportation

Eaton 12 (Collin, "Economists differ on Panama Canal Expansion's impact," Houston Business Journal, http://www.bizjournals.com/houston/blog/money-makers/2012/05/economists-differ-on-panama-canal.html) CS

Michael Economides, a professor of chemical and biomolecular engineering at the University of Houston , told an audience of about 100 that the Panama Canal expansion would be a defining moment for the U.S.’s energy sector, especially in its competition with Russia and China. “The reason for that is LNG, liquid natural gas,” Economides said. “The Panama Canal expansion will allow for super tankers to be able to traverse (the canal). We would be exporting energy from the U.S. Some of it's going to go east to Europe, primarily.”

#### **Middle East exports to Asia leaves Europe with an energy shortage**

Tuttle 12 (Robert, 6/1/12, "Mideast to cut LNG exports to Europe for first time in 20 years," The Daily Star, http://www.dailystar.com.lb/Business/Middle-East/2012/Jun-01/175325-mideast-to-cut-lng-exports-to-europe-for-first-time-in-20-years.ashx#axzz209uaDhs1) CS

Middle East liquefied natural gas producers, the biggest suppliers of the fuel to Europe, are set to cut exports for the first time in 20 years amid rising local demand for power generation. Qatar, Oman, Yemen and Abu Dhabi, which supply 40 percent of the world’s LNG, exported at 96 percent of capacity last year, according to the International Group of Liquefied Natural Gas Importers, or GIIGNL, a Paris-based lobby group. That will fall to about 94 percent in 2012, according to data compiled by Bloomberg. Combined shipments from the region’s four producers of the chilled gas have risen every year since 1992, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. The combination of reduced supply and rising demand in the Middle East, as countries build import terminals to meet their power needs, may accelerate the diversion of supplies from Europe to more lucrative markets. Japan, the biggest LNG buyer, is paying a record price to attract LNG after shutting all 54 of its nuclear plants following the earthquake and tsunami in March last year that caused the Fukushima Dai-Ichi disaster. “LNG now is going into Asia and tomorrow it could go into the Middle East,” Thierry Bros, a senior analyst at Societe Generale SA in Paris, said in a telephone interview. “Those terminals coming on line will come at the expense of somebody else and that somebody else will be Europe.” The four Middle East LNG producers exported 95.6 million metric tons last year, the GIIGNL said in its annual report published May 17. They have a combined liquefaction capacity of 100 million tons, it said. Yemen LNG’s plant halted for over seven weeks from March 31 after the pipeline feeding it was sabotaged, cutting 1 million tons of supply, according to Bloomberg estimates of stoppages based on data provided by operators, partners, third parties involved in the work and people familiar with maintenance. One million tons of LNG is about 1.2 billion cubic meters of gas, equivalent to Sweden’s annual consumption. Qatar and Oman will reduce output by a combined 5 million tons in 2012, the estimates show. Qatar has increased exports every year since 1996 and started its 14th liquefaction plant last year. It plans no more. Oman’s exports fell 13 percent from 2007 to 2010 as gas was diverted for domestic use. Middle East electricity demand grew 20 percent from 2006 to 2009, almost four times faster than the world average, according to U.S. Energy Department data. The region’s gas use may rise to 428 billion cubic meters by 2015 and 470 billion cubic meters by 2020, from 335 billion cubic meters in 2008, International Energy Agency data show. The Mideast’s rate of growth in imports is second only to China, Leslie Palti-Guzman, a New York-based analyst at the Eurasia Group, said in a May 16 email. Demand from the Middle East and Asia will ensure LNG spot cargoes, for near-term supply, sell at a price equal to oil-indexed contracts, which is about $16 to $18 per million British thermal units currently, Bros said in the May 9 interview. Spot LNG for delivery to northeast Asia in four to eight weeks rose 15 cents over the past week to a three-year high of $18.40 a million Btu, New York-based World Gas Intelligence reported Wednesday. Front-month U.K. gas closed at 53.98 pence a therm on the ICE Futures Europe exchange Thursday. That’s about $8.32 a million Btu. Falling Mideast shipments raise the prospect of price increases in Europe at a time when the region is struggling with a deepening sovereign debt crisis. Greece failed to form a government after parties opposed to EU austerity plans gained ground in May 6 elections. Spain is struggling to clean up its banks amid recession and unemployment of more than 20 percent.

#### Europe is running out of energy now-- US will export LNG

Hulbert 12 --Lead Analyst at European Energy Review, Senior Research Fellow, Netherlands Institute for International Relations (Matthew, "Why American Natural Gas Will Change The World," Forbes, 5/26/12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/matthewhulbert/2012/05/26/why-american-natural-gas-will-change-the-world/) CS

A couple of years ago you’d have said not much, but the fact the EIA has just downgraded recoverable shale reserves from 827tcf in 2011 to 482tcf in 2012 tells you all need to know. If the US wants to maintain its shale revolution, it badly needs prices to firm to make fields economically viable. LNG exports are a good way of doing that, at least to around $4-7Mmbtu. With some careful positioning, Washington could claim a political victory in the process; maintain the health of US shale (and American jobs) by making a virtue out of LNG export necessity. As far as US Energy Inc. is concerned, LNG isn’t a case of ‘if’, but when, how much and what pricing methods to use. 40 to 50 million tons a year by 2020 should be more than doable. That would make America the third largest LNG player in the world behind Qatar and Australia. Europe will watch the debate with considerable interest – not just because the likes of BG Group have a 34% stake in total US LNG export capacity being developed, but because European hub prices currently sit mid-way between the US and Asia. European spot market liquidity has held up reasonably well thanks to Qatari supplies, but Doha is increasingly looking East, a dynamic that could leave Europe with its more traditional Russian, North Sea and North African pipeline mix. If American LNG doesn’t come good, North West European liquidity will dry up quicker than most think – with potentially serious price and dependency implications. Europe will inevitably fail to develop its shale reserves, not unless the states in question happen to be perched on the Russian border. Little wonder serious forecasts already think Europe will end up importing more US LNG by 2020 than it manages to frack in its own backyard.

#### **European reliance on Russian energy undermines security and democracy**

Baran 07 --senior fellow and director of the Center for Eurasian Policy at the Hudson Institute in Washington, D.C.(Zenyo, “ EU Energy Security: Time to End Russian Leverage,” THE WASHINGTON QUARTERLY AUTUMN 2007, <http://ao.hudson.org/files/publications/07autumn_baran.pdf>) CS

The lack of reliable and sustainable European access to energy represents a clear threat to the continent's security. Under the leadership of Putin, the Kremlin has pursued a strategy whereby Europe's substantial dependence on Russian energy is leveraged to obtain economic and political gains. If this situation continues, the EU will find itself in further danger, as its dependence leaves it beholden to Russian interests. There simply is no readily available alternative to the supplies the EU receives from Russia, particularly natural gas. Unlike oil, gas is extremely difficult and costly to ship via tankers; pipelines are the preferred method of transportation. Thus, if a supplier refuses to provide gas or charges an unreasonable price, the consumer cannot quickly or easily turn to another source. The consumer state would have no choice but to accept the supplier's conditions or go without natural gas, an option that is all but unacceptable for most. The unjust manipulation or interruption of energy supplies is as much a security threat as military action is, especially since the EU relies on Russia for more than 30 percent of its oil imports and 50 percent of its natural gas imports.1 This dependence is not distributed evenly. As one heads eastward, Russia's share of the energy supply grows ever larger. No fewer than seven eastern European countries receive at least 90 percent of their crude oil imports from Russia, and six EU nations are entirely dependent on Russia for their natural gas imports. The Ukrainian gas crisis in January 2006 catapulted energy security to the forefront of the EU agenda. On the very day it took over the presidency of the Group of Eight (G-8)-a presidency that had announced energy security as its key theme-Russia halted natural gas deliveries to Ukraine. Because the gas pipelines crossing Ukraine carry supplies destined for EU markets, this shutdown resulted in significant supply disruptions for several member states, raising awareness that dependence on Russia has increased Europe's geopolitical vulnerability. Several EU states have experienced the misfortune of Russian supply cuts directly. Disputes between Russia and the Baltic states have led to the halt of pipeline deliveries of oil multiple times. In January 2003, Russia ceased supplying oil via pipeline to Latvia's Ventspils Nafta export facility. This embargo, which followed Riga's unwillingness to sell the facility to a Russian energy company, continues to this day. In July 2006, Moscow shut down a pipeline supplying Lithuania's Mazeikiu Nafta refinery, which is the largest company in Lithuania and one of the biggest oil refineries in central and eastern Europe. As with Ventspils Nafta, this shutdown came after a Russian company failed to obtain the energy infrastructure it coveted. Moscow has further sought to increase Europe's dependence on Russian energy supplies by acquiring significant stakes in the energy distribution companies and infrastructure of EU member parties and infrastructure of EU member states, typically through its proxy, Gazprom. This massive energy company-the world's largest-has control over the Russian gas pipeline network and consequently handles all Russian and Central Asian exports, either directly or through wholly owned subsidiaries. Such a preponderance of power would be troubling enough if the company were transparent, privately owned, and played by the rules of the free market, but Gazprom is none of those things. It is majority state owned and has deep ties to the Russian government. Many of the company's executive management and board members also occupy or previously occupied key positions within the Kremlin. For many years, Gazprom has owned significant portions of energy companies throughout the former Soviet Union. It is the largest or second largest shareholder in the gas utilities of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Recently, Gazprom has been expanding its influence even further into the domestic gas distribution networks of western Europe. In the past two years, Gazprom has signed deals with Eni (Italy), Gasunie (the Netherlands), BASF (Germany), E.ON Ruhrgas (Germany), and Gaz de France. Desperate for access to energy and the profits it brings, European companies are played against each other by the Kremlin in order to secure more advantageous conditions for Russia. If one company does not want to agree to Moscow's terms, a competitor will gladly accept them, leaving the first company with nothing. In addition to the economic disadvantages of such dependence, the broader foreign policy goals of EU states also suffer. Specifically, EU members limit their criticisms of Moscow, lest they be given a raw deal at the negotiating table. Russia's increasingly tainted record on transparency, responsible governance, and human rights is thus allowed to stand unchallenged and unquestioned. Dependency also erodes EU support for key allies in Europe and Asia. Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Ukraine-all crucial energy producers or transit countries-have each been subject to intimidation by Moscow. Instead of standing up to this harassment, Europe's dependence compels its leaders to look the other way. Due to the extremely close relationship between the energy industry and the Kremlin, Russia's oil and gas companies can pursue strategies that make little economic sense but that serve the long-term interests of the Russian state, namely, ensuring European dependence on Russian energy supplies. For example, Russia's undersea Nord Stream pipeline will cost at least three times more than a proposed overland route through Lithuania and Poland would have. Given the environmental sensitivity of the Baltic Sea, some industry insiders are predicting costs as high as $10 billion or even $15 billion.4 By divorcing western Europe's gas supply from eastern Europe's, however, the undersea route grants Moscow the ability to manipulate the European energy market more effectively. Needless to say, the unnecessarily high cost of the pipeline's construction will be passed on to European consumers. Many industry experts have expressed concern that corruption and inefficiency, coupled with Moscow's refusal to allow significant foreign investment in the energy sector, will soon lead the Russian oil and gas industry to bum out.5 Instead of developing new oil and gas fields or investing in its energy infrastructure, Russia has utilized windfall profits to pursue the aggressive policy of expansion and acquisition described above. Unless Moscow is able to secure additional gas supplies from fields in Central Asia, it may struggle to meet its commitments to Europe, which is why maintaining full control over Central Asia's export routes is so critical for the Kremlin. Engaging the Caspian Enshrined as the second of the three pillars of the EU, the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) states that the EU should seek to promote democracy, rule of law, and respect for human rights within its borders and abroad. Yet, dependence on Russian energy supplies undermines Europe's efforts to foster the ideals of good governance, market transparency, and democracy both in Russia and in Russia's neighbors. Although the establishment of these principles in energy suppliers is a worthy goal in its own right, doing so will also create a more stable environment for energy sector development, thereby improving European security. Diversifying oil and gas supplies by constructing pipelines directly from the Caucasus and Central Asia to Europe would not only decrease Russia's influence on EU countries but would also loosen Moscow's grip on Europe's neighbors. If the EU wishes to foster true reform within former Soviet states, it must offer them a non-Russian perspective, which can best be done through cooperation on joint energy projects. In the Caspian region, this strategy has been pursued with success by the United States. In the late 1990s, the United States pushed hard for the construction of several oil and gas pipelines that would carry Caspian energy westward without transiting Russia. It did so to break Russia's monopoly on the region's energy transportation system, thereby giving the Caspian countries greater economic and political independence from Moscow. Naturally, this proposal prompted strong objections and high pressure tactics by the Russian government. Determined support from the United States and from NATO ally Turkey was eventually successful in countering this Russian pressure. Two pipelines for oil and natural gas were eventually completed from the Azerbaijani capital of Baku across Georgia to Turkey. The Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) oil pipeline stretches from Baku all the way to the Turkish Mediterranean port of Ceyhan. The South Caucasus Pipeline (SCP) follows the same route as BTC but terminates in the central Turkish city of Erzurum. The United States devoted a great deal of time and energy to make these routes a reality. The time has now come for the EU to take the lead in bringing neighboring states closer to the West through a concerted engagement effort. The BTC and SCP pipelines are positive precedents. The construction of these pipelines has substantially decreased Moscow's leverage over Azerbaijan and Georgia, allowing them to resist political and economic pressure from Russia. When Gazprom demanded a higher price for the gas it provided to Azerbaijan, Baku decided not to import any Russian gas. Later, when Transneft (Russia's state-owned oil pipeline monopoly) refused to offer a market price for Azerbaijani oil, Baku decided not to export oil via Russian pipelines. Azerbaijan did not have these options prior to the construction of the two East-West pipelines. The construction of these projects has also led to significant reforms in both countries. The international consortium behind these pipelines did not agree to the construction of either project until contracts assured the needed legal protection. Ongoing involvement with Western companies and gentle prodding from Western governments have prompted further political and market reforms. Azerbaijan's most recent parliamentary elections in November 2005, while far from perfect, were the country's freest and fairest since independence. Georgia has been free to continue down the reform path it started during the Rose Revolution in 2003 and is expected to join NATO by the end of the decade. Years of positive interaction with the West have allowed Azerbaijan and Georgia to reorient themselves toward a future in European and Euro-Atlantic institutions. Yet, this westward orientation is not guaranteed. In Azerbaijan, as in many states on the cusp of reform, there are a number of hard-liners within the government who are fiercely resisting these changes and would rather reach energy deals with Russia in order to obtain Moscow's support to maintain the status quo. Moreover, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan are still almost completely dependent on Russian-controlled export pipelines, leaving them vulnerable not only to political manipulation but also to economic extortion. Until late 2006, Russia purchased natural gas from the Central Asian republics at a rate of about $45 to $65 per thousand cubic meters (tcm). It then sold that gas (and/or Russian-produced gas) to western European countries for around $230 per tcm. Even the tremendous distances that must be traveled cannot account for the increase. Per kilometer, this markup is far higher than that which occurs between Canadian supply hubs and distant American consumers. To be fair, pan of this disparity arises because of the horrific inefficiency of Gazprom. The rest is simply a rent that Moscow is able to extract because of its near-monopoly power. This becomes blatantly obvious when one considers that Russia currently sells gas to Georgia for $230 per tcm, despite paying only $100 per tcm for gas purchased from nearby Turkmenistan. It is Tbilisi's commitment to the West, not the market, that is determining the price of gas in Georgia. Despite the danger of inaction, many in the EU are hesitant to engage in energy deals with countries such as Kazakhstan or Turkmenistan because of their rather poor record on human rights or rule of law. Although the EU's intention is good, the strategy is not. Without incorporating the energy sector into its engagement strategy; the EU simply lacks the proper leverage to encourage these states to change. The EU is often perceived as admonishing its neighbors, calling for too much political and social reform too fast, and offering too little in return. If political reform were undertaken without the necessary improvements in economic, political, and physical infrastructure, governments would lose control of their states; and the dangers of terrorism, extremism, and drug trafficking in Central Asia and the Caucasus would increase.

#### **Failure to move away from Russia causes war**

Asmus 08 -- U.S. diplomat and political analyst, U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs (Ronald D., "Europe's Eastern Promise; Rethinking NATO and EU Enlargement," Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb 2008, http://search.proquest.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/214288895/137E720CC7276EBD60C/1?accountid=12598) CS

This accomplishment was the result of a common U.S.-European grand strategy that was controversial and fiercely debated at the time. The goal was to build a post-Cold War Europe "whole, free, and at peace"; to renew the transatlantic alliance; and to reposition the United States and Europe to address new global challenges. But as successful as the strategy of enlargement has been, the world has changed dramatically since it was forged. The United States and Europe face new risks and opportunities on Europe's periphery and need to recast their strategic thinking accordingly for a new era. Current policy toward Europe's periphery is increasingly out of date, for three reasons. First, the West has changed. The 9/11 attacks pulled U.S. attention and resources away from Europe and toward the Middle East. The reservoir of transatlantic goodwill and political capital accumulated during the 1990s has evaporated in the sands of Iraq. In Europe, enlargement fatigue has set in thanks to stumbling institutional reforms and the mounting expense of integrating new EU members. It was widely assumed that the western Balkan states (Albania and the former Yugoslav republics) would all eventually join the EU and NATO, but even that can no longer be taken for granted. Turkey's chances of gaining EU membership are fading. Indeed, the window of opportunity to expand the democratic world that opened with the end of the Cold War is now at risk of closing. Second, the East has changed. The challenge of the 1990s was to consolidate democracy in central and eastern Europe along a north-south axis from the Baltics to the Black Sea. Today's even more difficult challenge is to stabilize the countries of Eurasia, the region where Europe and Asia meet, along a new axis extending eastward from the Balkans across the Black Sea region to the southern Caucasus and including Turkey, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. Sandwiched between an unstable Middle East to the south and a hostile Russia to the north, these countries are the new flank of the Euro-Atlantic community. Old policies may still work in the Balkans, but countries such as Georgia and Ukraine -- let alone Moldova and Belarus, if and when the latter opens up to the outside world -- are weaker, poorer, and more politically problematic than the central and eastern European countries NATO and the EU sought to integrate earlier. Their claim to be part of Europe is more tenuous, and the perceived Western imperative to help is less obvious. The policy tools developed for central and eastern Europe a decade ago are, accordingly, no longer as effective. Finally, Russia has changed. In the 1990s, it was a weak, quasi-democratic state that wanted to become part of the West. Now, a more powerful, nationalist, and less democratic Russia is challenging the West. Moscow sees itself as an independent Eurasian power, offering its own authoritarian capitalist model of development as an alternative to democratic liberalism. It practices a form of mercantilist geopolitical hardball that many in Europe thought was gone for good. Nowhere is this more clear than in its policies toward Europe's periphery, where it is seeking to halt or roll back democratic breakthroughs in places such as Georgia and Ukraine. Moscow's willingness to use its energy resources as a political weapon has made European countries reluctant to confront Russia over its antidemocratic behavior. Until the EU can liberalize its energy markets and diversify its supplies, Moscow will have the upper hand. In this new strategic environment, Western policy toward the nations on Europe's periphery cannot remain on cruise control as if nothing has changed. NATO and the EU need to articulate a new strategic rationale for expanding the democratic West and devise a new approach to dealing with Russia. There is another opportunity today to advance Western values and security and redraw the map of Europe and Eurasia once more. But new ideas will be necessary to seize it -- and to reinvent the transatlantic alliance in the process. OUT WITH THE OLD The grand strategy of democratic enlargement that lay behind the opening up of NATO and the EU early in the 1990s grew out of the twin imperatives of reuniting Europe following communism's collapse and reinventing the transatlantic alliance for the post-Cold War era. The goal was to consolidate democracy across the eastern half of the continent by anchoring central and eastern European countries to the West. It reflected the vision of a peaceful Europe expanding its foreign policy horizons and sharing global leadership and responsibility with the United States. At the time, Washington concluded that the EU alone was too weak to lead the enlargement process. Thus NATO took the lead in bringing central and eastern Europe into the fold. NATO's membership could more easily be expanded, and extending NATO's security umbrella to countries in those regions was critical to the consolidation of democracy. NATO also contributed to reform by raising its requirements for new members, a "tough love" policy designed to reinforce positive transformation. As NATO played a key role in taking the security issue off the table and opening its doors to the East, the EU assumed most of the burden of transforming postcommunist societies into liberal democratic ones. EU enlargement policy was an asymmetric negotiation. Candidate countries simply had to accede to the EU's existing acquis communautaire -- the full range of its laws, regulations, and institutions. The newcomers had little say in anything but the timeline under which the EU's requirements would be implemented. Nevertheless, it was this transformation that fundamentally tied these countries to the West and thus created enduring security on the continent. Great care was taken to ensure that countries not included in the initial round of enlargement would not be destabilized. The West did not want to repeat the mistake that U.S. Secretary of State Dean Acheson made in 1950, when he appeared to sketch a new Western security perimeter and thereby invited the conclusion that countries on the other side of the line were of no interest to the West. Therefore, NATO and EU policy sought to blur the lines between members, potential future members, and partners. In practice, this meant finding new ways to embrace and deepen cooperation with countries that did not seek membership or were not yet realistic candidates for it. NATO explicitly left open the possibility of further expansion down the road. The EU was more circumspect, but it, too, expanded its outreach to countries on Europe's periphery whose future stability and orientation it wanted to shape. The West's desire to mitigate any negative fallout was perhaps most visible in its handling of Russia. In different yet reinforcing ways, the Americans and the Europeans signaled their strategic desire to pull Russia toward the West in the hope that Moscow would eventually evolve into a partner and perhaps even a de facto ally. NATO and EU enlargement were accompanied by an unparalleled effort to engage Moscow and work for Russia's own democratic transformation, while still taking what were seen as its legitimate interests into account. This strategy was not a new effort to contain Russia but an attempt to integrate it -- albeit in a looser form and on a different timeline than that of its smaller western neighbors. And it was not merely rhetoric. NATO rethought its military strategy and force posture in order to underscore that it had no offensive intentions. Moreover, it offered to expand political and military cooperation and plan for future joint military operations with Russia. The EU set out its own far-reaching plans to deepen cooperation. The West took such steps despite uncertainty over where Russia was headed and despite the fear that Moscow would take advantage of these openings to paralyze Western institutions rather than cooperate with them. Looking back, Western policy achieved two of its goals -- anchoring much of central and eastern Europe and preventing instability in those countries remaining outside NATO and the EU -- and was partially successful in dealing with Russia. These successes were not inevitable, and their importance should not be underestimated. Had NATO and the EU not acted, Europe today would be a messier, less stable, and more inward-looking place. And Washington would have even fewer allies in dealing with crises beyond Europe, such as Afghanistan and Iraq. Today, it is only too easy to forget that a decade ago there were concerns that enlargement would create new and sharper divisions between those countries joining NATO and the EU and those remaining on the outside. It has done the opposite. The success of NATO and EU enlargement, and the inclusion of countries such as the Baltic states, set a positive precedent for other former Soviet republics. Following the Rose and Orange Revolutions, democratic leaders in Georgia and Ukraine became more serious about seeking to tie their countries to the West. After all, if the Baltic states could do it, why should they not dare to do the same? The results in Russia were mixed, however. On the one hand, the train wreck that was so frequently predicted by enlargement critics never happened. New arrangements for cooperation with NATO and the EU were set up, and a breakdown of relations with Moscow was avoided. But the West's broader hopes of establishing deeper relations with a more democratic Russia never materialized. Instead of becoming more democratic and cooperative, Moscow has become more authoritarian and adversarial. Hopes that the West and Russia could find common strategic ground after 9/11 have largely gone unfulfilled, and the two are even further apart now on issues such as Afghanistan, Iran, and Kosovo. The Orange and Rose Revolutions were interpreted in Moscow not as democratic breakthroughs but as threatening developments that needed to be challenged and reversed. Who or what is responsible for these trends is, of course, an issue of considerable dispute. Was it a lack of U.S. and European imagination and will that allowed Russia to drift in this anti-Western direction? Or was it the result of internal Russian dynamics over which the West had little, if any, influence? Did NATO and EU enlargement push Russia in the wrong direction, or was the West fortunate to act when it did given what has followed? Enlargement has created more democratic stability on Russia's western border than at any time since Napoleon. Yet today, the Kremlin's spin doctors are creating a new stab-in-the-back legend of how the West betrayed Moscow during the 1990s. The gap in historical narratives mirrors the increasingly tense relationship between the West and Russia. ALL QUIET ON THE EASTERN FRONT? In light of these new circumstances in Russia, enlargement needs to be rethought from the ground up, starting with its strategic rationale. After the accession of a band of countries from the Baltic states in the north to Bulgaria and Romania in the south, many in the West assumed that the enlargement project was almost complete, with the western Balkans constituting the last piece of unfinished business. They were surprised to suddenly find new countries from Eurasia, and specifically the wider Black Sea region, starting to knock on the doors of NATO and the EU -- and unsure how to respond. In dealing with these new candidate countries, the West must stick to the values and diplomatic principles it laid down in the 1990s, including the notion that countries are free to choose their alliances. But that alone is unlikely to be enough, because although these countries clearly consider themselves European, many Europeans do not feel the same historical or moral commitment to them or see a compelling strategic need to integrate them. Thus, in addition to moral and political arguments, the United States and Europe need to articulate a strong strategic rationale for anchoring them to the West. That argument is straightforward. The challenge of securing Europe's eastern border from the Baltics to the Black Sea has been replaced by the need to extend peace and stability along the southern rim of the Euro-Atlantic community -- from the Balkans across the Black Sea and further into Eurasia, a region that connects Europe, Russia, and the Middle East and involves core security interests, including a critical energy corridor. Working to consolidate democratic change and build stability in this area is as important for Western security today as consolidating democracy in central and eastern Europe was in the 1990s. It is not only critical to expanding the democratic peace in Europe but also vital to repositioning the West vis-a-vis both Central Asia and the Middle East. This strategy presents an opportunity to redraw the strategic map of Europe and Eurasia in a way that enhances the security of countries on Europe's periphery as well as that of the United States and Europe. The United States and Europe also need to rethink what anchoring means in practice. In the 1990s, it meant pursuing membership in NATO and the EU roughly in parallel. Now the West needs to be more flexible and take a long-term view. The goal is to tie these countries as closely to the West as politics and interests on both sides allow. For some countries, this may mean eventual membership in both NATO and the EU; for others, it may mean membership only in NATO; and for the rest, it may mean membership in neither but simply much closer relations. Policy will have to be much more a la carte than prix fixe. The link between NATO membership and EU membership should be relaxed, if not dropped. The EU has enough on its plate sustaining its commitments to the western Balkans and Turkey; anything beyond that is probably a nonstarter for the time being. NATO will once again have to take the lead in anchoring countries such as Georgia and others in the wider Black Sea region. The West must also rethink how it should engage and reach out to these countries. If membership is less plausible as a short-term option, then the quality of ties short of membership must be improved to compensate. Outreach must grow in importance and may increasingly become the centerpiece of U.S. and European strategy. At the moment, the fear of future enlargement is one factor actually holding allies back, with institutions afraid of taking even small steps down what some fear could be a slippery slope. Yet precisely because the countries in question are weaker and more endangered, NATO and the EU should actually be reaching out and engaging them earlier. They need the security umbrella and engagement of the West as much, if not more, than the countries of central and eastern Europe did. The way out of this dilemma is to consider membership a long-term goal and focus in the mean time on strengthening Western outreach and engagement. This means recasting policy tools to address the different needs of the countries that are less developed politically and economically. Tools such as NATO's "membership action plan" should be extended earlier and tied less closely to actual membership commitments, thus allowing these countries to benefit from guidance and engagement while downplaying the question of the end goal. At the same time, the EU needs to enhance its own tools, such as the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Neighborhood Policy, as well as reach out to these countries more directly by offering them political and economic support. When communism collapsed, NATO and the EU had little idea how to reach out to postcommunist countries and anchor them to the West. Bureaucrats in both institutions said it could not be done. But political will and strategic imagination prevailed, and fresh approaches were developed. Political will can do the same today. As for Russia, neither Washington nor Brussels wants a confrontation with Moscow at a time when they face daunting challenges beyond Europe. But this does not mean the West should abandon its belief that the spread of democracy along Russia's borders contributes to peace and stability just because the current authoritarian rulers in Moscow disagree. Nor should the West abandon its principles and succumb to the sphere-of-influence thinking currently emanating from Moscow. If the United States and Europe still hope that democracy will eventually take root in Russia, they must recognize that consolidating a pro-Western, democratic Ukraine would indirectly encourage democratization in Russia. Of course, antidemocratic forces in Russia will oppose such a move. After all, Moscow only acquiesced in previous rounds of NATO and EU enlargement because it concluded that the United States and Europe were determined to carry them out and that its efforts to oppose the West would be futile. Western unity on issues such as the future of Ukraine is therefore of the utmost importance. Still, holding true to NATO's and the EU's core principles and expanding these organizations' reach does not mean starting a new Cold War. The West and Moscow should look for other areas in which their interests are more aligned, such as expanding trade and investment or controlling nuclear proliferation and building a new arms control regime. The key question is whether Russia -- when faced with a unified West -- will start to look for common ground. As strong as Russia may appear at the moment, it remains a country with real long-term structural weaknesses and problems. It, too, needs friends and allies, and the United States and Europe should be among them. UNCERTAIN FUTURES Three very different scenarios for the future of Western policy toward Europe's periphery reveal just how high the stakes are in this region. In the best-case scenario, the United States and Europe would regroup under the next U.S. president and launch a new era of transatlantic cooperation by overcoming differences on Iraq, avoiding disagreements over Iran, and stabilizing Afghanistan. This renaissance would include a new and ambitious democratic-enlargement strategy, and the results would be significant. Securing independence for Kosovo without turning Serbia against the West would facilitate the successful integration of the western Balkans into NATO and the EU. In Turkey, the AKP-led government would continue democratic reforms, bringing the country closer to EU accession. Georgia and Ukraine would continue to move closer to the West as well. That prospect would help create positive pressure for democratic change in Azerbaijan and encourage Armenia's reorientation toward the West. By 2012, a reunified West would have begun to build an arc of democratic stability eastward into Eurasia and especially the wider Black Sea region. Realizing that its real adversaries lie elsewhere, Russia would eventually have no choice but to reassess its policy and seek a new rapprochement with the West. A less optimistic scenario is stagnation. In this case, the United States and Europe would regain some political momentum after 2008 but fail to achieve any significant democratic breakthroughs. A new U.S. administration would manage to stabilize and then extricate itself from Iraq, but transatlantic tensions over Iran and other Middle Eastern issues would persist. Kosovo would achieve independence, but in a manner that leaves Serbia alienated and unable to find its way back onto the path toward EU accession. In the western Balkans, only Croatia would remain on track for both EU and NATO membership. Turkey's prospects for joining the EU would fade, and reforms in Georgia and Ukraine would stall. Azerbaijan would remain an autocratic pro-Western ally increasingly vulnerable to growing radicalization from within. By 2012, the West would have patched up relations across the Atlantic but without breakthroughs in the Balkans or Turkey -- let alone in Ukraine or the wider Black Sea region. All of this would lead to a more competitive relationship with Russia, resulting in stalemate and a new chill in relations with Moscow. In the worst-case scenario, rather than the West consolidating new democratic breakthroughs, Russia would succeed in a strategy of rollback. The United States and Europe would not achieve a meaningful rapprochement, and they would fail to consolidate democracy in the western Balkans. Kosovo would become independent, but without agreement from all sides. This would launch Serbia on a new nationalist trajectory, bringing further instability to the region. U.S. failure in Iraq would lead to partition, estranging Turkey and prompting Ankara to invade northern Iraq and further loosen its ties to the West. This, in turn, would badly damage Turkey's already strained relations with both Washington and Brussels. Ukraine would drift back to autocracy, and Georgia, the one liberal democratic experiment in the Black Sea region, would lose reform momentum and teeter toward failure. Last November's declaration of a state of emergency in Tbilisi was a reminder of how fragile and vulnerable this experiment is. Using its energy supplies and influence, Russia would emerge as an authoritarian capitalist alternative to the West, attracting autocratic leaders throughout Europe and Eurasia. Rather than a renaissance of the transatlantic alliance, the result would be a retreat of democracy and a further splintering of the democratic West. As these scenarios make clear, the western Balkans, Georgia, Ukraine, and the wider Black Sea region are less stable and more at risk today than central and eastern Europe were a decade ago. And the stakes are high. A world in which Ukraine has successfully anchored itself to the West would be very different from one in which it has failed to do so. A world in which Georgia's success has sparked democratic progress in the region and helped stabilize the southern flank of the Euro-Atlantic community would be a much safer one than a world in which Georgia has become an authoritarian state in Russia's sphere of influence. And a world in which the democratic West is ascendant would be very different from one in which an autocratic, nationalist Russia is on the rise. PERIPHERAL VISION The West needs to find the vision and the will to build on the successes of the 1990s by reproducing them under more challenging conditions. The Atlantic alliance was reinvented in the 1990s after the collapse of communism, but it sorely needs a second renaissance today. A new strategy of democratic enlargement can and must be part of this revival. The decision to open the doors of NATO and the EU to central and eastern Europe in the 1990s was a triumph of statesmanship and an example of successful crisis prevention. During a time of peace, and in spite of considerable opposition at home and from Moscow, the United States and its European allies acted to lock in democracy and put an end to the geopolitical competition that had historically bedeviled central and eastern Europe. One can only imagine how much worse off the United States and Europe would be today if NATO and the EU had not been enlarged and they now had to worry about instability in the heart of Europe. If U.S. and European leaders again succeed in linking new democracies to NATO and the EU, ten years from now they will look back at a redrawn map of Europe and Eurasia and be thankful that they acted when they did. If they fail, future generations may well pay a high price for their passivity.

### 1AC Plan

#### The United States federal government should require that the annual Harbor Maintenance Tax revenue be made fully available for port modernization Economy Advantage

## Inherency

### Obama Push Now

#### Obama is pushing port dredging in the status quo -- federal involvement speeds up the project by five years

Mayle 12 (Mary Carr, "Obama: Fast track harbor deepening," http://savannahnow.com/news/2012-07-19/obama-fast-track-harbor-deepening#.UAg7LbSdZ2A) CS

The planned Expansion of the Savannah Harbor got a major shot in the arm late Wednesday when the Obama Administration announced it would expedite the project, with all federal reviews completed and a Record of Decision coming no later than November. As part of his “We Can’t Wait” initiative, the president listed seven “nationally and regionally significant infrastructure projects” at five major ports, promising to put each on a fast track designed to save time and drive better outcomes for local communities. The initiative is part of a Presidential Executive Order issued in March charging the Office of Management and Budget with overseeing a government-wide effort to make the permitting and review process for infrastructure projects more efficient and effective. “President Obama is committed to improving federal permitting and reviews to ensure that smart infrastructure projects like the Port of Savannah can move as quickly as possible through the decision making process, boosting job growth and strengthening the economy,” Jeffrey Zients, acting director of the Office of Management and Budget, said Wednesday. “By working more efficiently in a coordinated fashion across the federal government and putting in place aggressive schedules and accountability systems, we are committing to accelerate the final steps of this review for the Port of Savannah project.” Georgia Ports Authority Executive Director Curtis Foltz said he was delighted with the announcement. “To have the President of the United States acknowledge the importance of the Port of Savannah — its infrastructure improvement needs and the role it plays in the economic recovery of the Southeast — is significant, ” Foltz said. The Savannah Harbor Expansion Project, which will deepen the Savannah River channel in anticipation of larger container ships calling on the port after the completion of the Panama Canal expansion in 2014, has been in the works for more than a dozen years. “The (U.S. Army) Corps of Engineers has completed a feasibility report that examined the benefits and costs of deepening the existing channel at Savannah Harbor from its current depth of 42 feet to a depth of 47 feet,” the White House said in its release. “The proposed project would enable the Port of Savannah to accommodate larger cargo vessels and other ships, ultimately facilitating more efficient movement of goods. The study involved a multi-year collaborative effort with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Interior and the Department of Commerce, all of whom must also approve the final report. “As a result of this collaboration, the project includes an extensive mitigation plan, which is an integral part of the recommended improvements and are intended to restore, preserve, and adaptively manage the surrounding ecosystem, which includes the Savannah National Wildlife Refuge.” The Obama Administration also announced the establishment of a White House-led Navigation Task Force that will consist of senior officials from various White House offices, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Departments of Transportation, Commerce, Homeland Security, and the Treasury. The Task Force will develop a Federal strategy and coordinated decision-making principles that focus on the economic return of investments into coastal ports and related infrastructure to support the movement of commerce throughout the nation. Improvements at the ports of Miami, New York/New Jersey, Jacksonville, Fla., and Charleston, S.C. also will be expedited, the White House said. According to the Post and Courier in Charleston, the administration pledged that all federal reviews of the Charleston Harbor deepening plan will be completed by September 2015, nine months earlier than the shortened time line announced just a week ago by the Corps of Engineers. The new study deadline, combined with project-shortening measures announced last week by the Corps, means the harbor could potentially be deepened by 2019, five years earlier than once estimated. Charleston is pursuing a plan to dredge its harbor from 45 to 50 feet or more. At the Port of Jacksonville, the administration announced the fast-tracking of two projects — the first to finalize the federal feasibility study examining the costs and benefits of deepening the harbor and the second to expedite the permitting of the port’s proposed intermodal container facility. Both projects will be completed by July of 2013, the White House said.

### Status Quo Fails

#### Status quo can’t solve-regulations make projects take 13 years

Davidson, USA Today writer, 3-20-12

(Paul, “USA's creaking infrastructure holds back economy”, http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/story/2012-05-20/creaking-infrastructure/55096396/1, DOA: 7-12-12)

**Far more revenue is jeopardized by outdated seaports on the East and Gulf coasts**. A half-dozen ports can't handle new larger ships with greater container capacity because the harbors are too shallow, says [Paul Anderson](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Paul%2BAnderson), CEO of the Jacksonville Port Authority. That raises shipping costs and delays exports of steel, factory machines and computers that may sit at docks for days. Delivery times and costs are also higher for imports of electronics, apparel and other goods , boosting retail prices. While some larger ships can dock at the port of Savannah during high tide, they can't load to full capacity and must typically wait up to six hours for the tide to come in, says Curtis Foltz, head of the [Georgia Ports Authority](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Georgia%2BPorts%2BAuthority). The need to accommodate bigger ships will become even more dire after the [Panama Canal](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Panama%2BCanal) is widened in 2014, allowing big ships from Asia to cross from the [West Coast](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Places%2C%2BGeography/Regions/West%2BCoast) to the Eastern U.S. There are plans to deepen several ports, **but project studies by multiple federal agencies take about 13 years. By contrast, Brazil, India, China and** [**Southeast Asia**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Places%2C%2BGeography/Regions/Southeast%2BAsia) **are dredging ports in as little as three years,** including planning and construction, Anderson says. Meanwhile, U.S. and foreign companies often turn to countries with modernized ports. Caterpillar, the world's top maker of construction and mining equipment, has moved 30% of its exports and 40% of imports to Canadian ports in recent years, costing U.S. ports tens of millions of dollars a year in revenue. "We can get our exports and imports to market faster and at lower costs," Caterpillar Chief Financial Officer Ed Rapp says of the move.

#### Status quo can’t solve-consistent federal funding is key to sustain projects

Hassan, Oakland North reporter, 2012

(Amna, “Port still waiting on federal funds for dredging”, 4-20, <http://oaklandnorth.net/2012/04/20/port-still-waiting-on-federal-funds-for-dredging/>, DOA: 7-13-13)

In September 2009, after a hard battle to secure federal funds, Port of Oakland officials and local politicians celebrated completion of a 10-year, $432 million project to deepen the port channels to 50 feet. The dredging project was meant to allow the port to host massive cargo ships and usher in an era of booming business.¶ Less than three years later, those business dreams have run aground over funding delays that hamper maintenance dredging. As of a few months ago, up to four feet of silt and sediment still clogged the channel floor, forcing the port to limit the weight of entering vessels and cramping its business.¶ The Port of Oakland is the heart of Oakland’s economy, generating $6.8 billion in revenue and $462.7 million in taxes in a year, and generating around 73,600 jobs in the area. But ports are subject to the constant effects of time and tide, with bay waters constantly threatening to remodel channel floors with sand and silt deposits.¶ The Port of Oakland was allocated $18 million in FY 2011 and $17.2 million in FY 2012 by the federal government for a dredging project that would clear the channels by the end of April. Currently, the US Army Corps of Engineers is evaluating the work the contractors have done to gauge whether it has been successful. But if the port is to run at full capacity throughout the year, the regular build-up along the channels’ floors needs to be addressed as soon as it occurs.¶ The federal government has been collecting the Harbor Maintenance Tax from port customers for years with the specific purpose of port maintenance and dredging. When the government increased the tax in 1990, it did so with the explicit promise that all dredging needs would be met with funds collected from the tax, according to Port of Oakland’s spokesperson Marilyn Sandifur. Today, in the long, drawn-out battle over port funds, Port of Oakland officials claim the government has not released sufficient funds for maintenance over the years, and the proof is in the channels’ depths.¶ ¶ The funds for dredging all federal channels or waterways come directly from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), and releasing these funds requires convincing government officials that a port needs them. The Army Corps of Engineers makes the initial budget request through its headquarters, based on its in-house labor expenses and project costs. The Federal Office of Management and Budget then develops the president’s budget. “Their proposal is often not the full amount that we are capable of executing in a given year,” says Jessica Burton Evans, the Navigation Program Manager for the US Army Corps of Engineers in San Francisco. “But they have to consider other federal expenses.”¶ The final allocation is made based on the president’s request to Congress. Once Congress approves the request, the money is released by the Federal Office of Management and Budget to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Corps in turn prioritizes project-level funding, such as the need for dredging in Oakland.¶ “Just because the president has made the request doesn’t mean that is what Congress is going to fund,” says Jim Haussener, Executive Director of the California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference.¶ “We had a continuing resolution for FY 2011 which allowed the Corps of Engineers to move the money around,” Haussener says. The continuing resolution allows the Corps to fund projects at a previous level, if a bill dictating the distribution has not been enacted that year. “The President’s budget request for 2011 was $7.5 million. Because there was a continuing resolution, the allocation that finally came out for the Corps was $18 million,”says Haussener.¶ Because the amount of money a port receives to clear the mud and silt from its channels can change, that leaves port authorities dependent on each year’s allocation process and on yearly surveys by the Corps to gauge the depth of all federal navigation channels.

#### Panama Canal expansion makes current ports unsustainable-ports are the foundation for economic activity

Bridges, AAPA Board Chairman, 2011

(Jerry, “The Economic Importance of Seaports: Is the United States Prepared for 21st Century Trade Realities?”, 10-26, <http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Bridges.pdf>, DOA: 7-12-12)

Since the birth of our nation, U.S. seaports and waterways that connect them have served as a vital economic lifeline by bringing goods and services to people around the world and by delivering prosperity to our nation. U.S. seaports are responsible for moving more than 99 percent of our country’s overseas cargo. Today, international trade accounts for more than a quarter of Americas Gross Domestic Product. Americas seaports support the employment of 13.3 million U.S. workers, and seaport- related jobs account for $649 billion in annual personal income. For every $1 billion in exports shipped through seaports, 15,000 U.S. jobs are created. Seaports facilitate trade and commerce, create jobs, help secure our borders, support our military and serve as stewards of valuable coastal environmental resources. Ports are dynamic, vibrant centers of trade and commerce, but what is most important to understand is that seaports rely on partnerships. Seaports invest more than $2.5 billion every year to maintain and improve their infrastructure. In recent years, however, this commitment has not been adequately matched by the federal government. Federal funding for dredging federal navigation channels has slowed and decreased, especially for new construction. Further, maintenance dredging is sorely underfunded, despite a more than $6 billion and growing surplus in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. Landside improvements have also been too low a priority, with little of the highway funds going to freight transportation projects. The only bright light has been the newly created TIGER grants, although not enough of this funding benefited ports. Virginia Port Authority received a TIGER grant for its heartland project. As we look to the future, we do know that there are challenges and opportunities. As we recover from this economic downturn, we must make investments today to address the trade realities of the future. Here are some the challenges and we have to ask: are we ready?¶ The Panama Canal expansion is due to be completed in 2014 and is expected to influence trade patterns. VPA and other ports have been making investments, but federal funding has been slow to match these investments. Ship sizes continue to get larger, requiring on-'going modernization of ports and federal navigation channels, even for ports that will not require 50 feet of depth. ¶ Canada and Mexico are making investments which could result in losses of maritime jobs in the U.S. as cargo enters the U.S. through these countries. We have already seen this job loss on the West Coast. ¶ The U.S. seeks to double exports; however countries like Brazil and Chile, who we compete against the U.S. in terms of agricultural exports, are making investments that could make their exports more competitive. ¶ New trade agreements with Korea, Panama and Colombia have been approved, with other trade agreements under negotiations which should result in increased exports and imports through ports. ¶ In addition to these near-term challenges, we know that the U.S. population is forecast to grow by 100 million - a 30 percent increase - before the middle of the 2lst century. And many of the goods used by this population will flow through seaports.¶ So are we ready? While ports are planning for the future, the federal government has not kept pace with the industry or our international competitors. The federal government has a unique Constitutional responsibility to maintain and improve the infrastructure that enables the flow of commerce, and much of that infrastructure in and around seaports have been neglected for too long. Many of our land and water connections are insufficient and outdated, affecting the ports' ability to move cargo efficiently into and out of the U.S. This hurts U.S. business, hurts U.S. workers and hurts our national economy. Port projects take decades to plan and build and we cannot wait. Federal investments in seaports are an essential and effective utilization of limited resources, paying dividends through increased trade and commerce, long-term job creation, secure borders, military support, environmental stewardship, and more than $200 billion in federal, state and local tax revenue. Earlier this month, the President’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness made an urgent plea for improvements in the nation's transportation infrastructure, including landside and waterside access to seaports. We cannot wait.

#### US ports are outdated – now is the time to modernize.

Major General Michael J. Walsh – Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works and Emergency Operations – 6/20/12, “U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Preparing for Post-Panamax Vessels,” U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Forward, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/rpt/June\_20\_U.S.\_Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Preparing\_for\_Post\_Panamax\_Vessels.pdf

The United States is a maritime nation. From its origin as 13 former colonies to its place as the ¶ preeminent world power today, our Nation’s success has been dependent on our coastal ports and ¶ inland waterways to conduct trade. Recognizing the importance of transportation to trade, the Nation ¶ had made a strong intergenerational commitment to develop its transportation networks. From the ¶ building of roads and canals in the early days of our Nation, to later construction of the transcontinental ¶ railroad and to the creation and development, just within my lifetime, of the Interstate Highway System, ¶ the Nation has committed the time and resources to enable and facilitate the large scale movement of ¶ raw materials and finished goods from their origin to manufacturer or market, both within our borders ¶ and internationally. ¶ These networks of highways, railways and inland waterways connect the interior of our country to our ¶ ports, which connect us to the rest of the world. These transportation networks have contributed to our ¶ success by providing a cost-efficient and environmentally sustainable means to transport large ¶ quantities of cargo over long distances and across oceans, keeping this Nation competitive in world ¶ trade. ¶ Population and income drive demand for trade, and trade drives the demand for transportation ¶ services. The U.S. population is expected to increase 32 percent, or almost 100 million people, in the ¶ next 30 years. The greatest population growth will occur in the South and West. Per capita income is ¶ expected to increase 170 percent in the same time period. These increases will drive increased trade, ¶ with imports expected to grow more than fourfold and exports expected to grow more than sevenfold ¶ over 30 years. The recent U.S. Navy Commercial (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EEtZ5r0CIYI), ¶ which states that 70% of the world is covered by water, 80% of all people live near water, 90% of all ¶ trade travels by water, highlights the importance of waterborne commerce to the Nation and the world. ¶ Our interconnected transportation networks, built in the last century or earlier, resulted in a ¶ competitive trade position for this Nation. In order to pass on to future generations the benefits of our ¶ competitive trade position, the Nation needs to ensure effective, reliable, national transportation ¶ networks and interconnections for the 21st Century. However, as Admiral John C. Harvey, Jr., ¶ Commander of the U.S. Fleet Forces Command, put it, “…many of our citizens have taken our maritime ¶ services for granted – we are no longer a ’sea conscious‘ Nation – even though we live in a global ¶ economy where 90% of all commerce is still transported by ship…” Despite this, I believe we have an ¶ opportunity as a Nation to strategically position public and private investments to become again a world ¶ maritime leader. ¶ The Nation is taking steps to seize that opportunity. The Conference Report for the Consolidated ¶ Appropriations Act of 2012 (Public Law 112- 74) requested a report from the Institute for Water ¶ Resources on how Congress should address the critical need for additional port and inland waterway ¶ modernization to accommodate post-Panamax vessels. Post-Panamax vessels are a reality today. They ¶ make up 16% of the world’s container fleet, but account for 45% of the fleet’s capacity. The efficiencies of scale they provide drive the deployment of more and more of these vessels. By 2030, they are ¶ expected to make up 27% of the world’s container fleet, accounting for 62% of its capacity. This report ¶ provides an analysis of the broad challenges and opportunities presented by the increasing deployment ¶ of post-Panamax vessels and outlines options on how the Congress could address the port and inland ¶ waterway infrastructure needs to accommodate those vessels. ¶ This Nation must address the need and the challenges of a modern transportation system and evaluate ¶ potential investment opportunities. This report advances that objective. It contributes to an ongoing ¶ public discussion, which is already underway, and will help inform current and future decisions on the ¶ maintenance and future development of our ports and waterways and their related infrastructure.

#### Many US ports are not ready for Panama Canal expansion.

Jay Landers, contributing editor at Civil Engineering Magazine, 7/3/12, “U.S. Ports Should Ready for Panama Canal Expansion,” Civil Engineering Magazine, http://www.asce.org/CEMagazine/ArticleNs.aspx?id=25769809931

A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers report says East Coast and Gulf Coast ports should begin to prepare now for the larger ships that will travel through the Panama Canal when its renovation is completed in 2014. ¶ July 3, 2012—Following the completion of the expansion of the Panama Canal in 2014, many vessels that currently are too large to pass through the canal will be able to do so, giving them readier access to certain U.S. ports, particularly those in the Southeast and along the Gulf Coast. Although the full ramifications of this change are not yet entirely known, the anticipated influx of larger ships carrying greater volumes of goods may justify expansion projects at certain Southeast and Gulf Coast ports, according to a recent report by the Institute for Water Resources within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. ¶ Released on June 21, the report—titled U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization: Preparing for Post-Panamax Vessels—was prepared at the request of the U.S. Congress. Last December, lawmakers included a provision in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-74) directing the Corps to make recommendations within six months as to how Congress should approach the issue of modernizing U.S. ports and inland waterways to accommodate the so-called post-Panamax vessels—that is, ships too large to traverse the existing Panama Canal. Although such ships are in the minority today, they handle significant volumes of goods, a situation that is only expected to increase. For example, post-Panamax ships currently comprise 16 percent of the world’s container fleet, but provide 45 percent of its capacity. However, by 2030, post-Panamax vessels are expected to account for 27 percent of the world’s container fleet and 62 percent of its capacity, according to the Corps’s report. ¶ Whereas the Panama Canal’s existing locks can handle ships up to 965 ft long and 106 ft wide, the new locks under construction will be able to accommodate vessels as long as 1,200 ft and as wide as 160 ft. For the purposes of the Corps, a port is deemed capable of accommodating post-Panamax ships “if it has a channel depth of about 50 feet with allowances for tide, as well as sufficient channel width, turning basin size, [and] dock and crane capacity,” according to the report. On the West Coast, the ports of Seattle, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Long Beach already have 50 ft deep channels, and three eastern ports—New York, Baltimore, and Hampton Roads, Virginia—are expected to have such channels ready by 2014. By contrast, “there is currently a lack of post-Panamax capacity at U.S. Gulf and South Atlantic ports—the very regions geographically positioned to potentially be most impacted by the expected changes in the world fleet,” the report states. (Some East and Gulf Coast ports have already made such plans, but have encountered difficulties in implementing them; read “Ports Plan for New Vessels.”

#### Current U.S. ports unable to meet economic demand

MAFC 11 – Mid-America Freight Coalition, a regional organization that cooperates in the planning, operation, preservation, and improvement of transportation infrastructure in the Midwest, 2011 (“The Far Reaching Effects of Canal Expansion,” MAFC, <http://midamericafreight.org/2011/03/panama-canal-expansion/>)

All-water options inherently have lower costs since they can reduce land bridge requirements and take advantage of the lower operating costs of East Coast ports. The impacts however will likely vary based on commodity, final destination markets, and ultimate timeliness of delivery. This all becomes a moot point however if the infrastructure cannot meet the demands of the markets. “Unless the US does a better job of maintaining its navigation channels, our channel dimensions will not keep pace with larger ships,” says Kurt Nagle, chief executive of the American Association of Port Authorities. The problem is intensified up and down the inland waterway system for bulk commodities and agricultural products “Everything is connected – the rivers, the railroads, Panama. We’re concerned about the logistics up and down the [Mississippi] river and our ability to feed the canal,” says Kendell Keith, president of the National Grain and Feed Association. The impact of the Panama Canal on imports and exports depends on other pieces of our interconnected network. If barges cannot feed into Cape-sized vessels to transit the canal because of the outdated locks on the Mississippi River, it won’t matter if the canal is expanded. If channel depths are not properly maintained, larger vessels won’t be able to access ports directly.

#### Economic benefits available but U.S. port capacity not yet ready

IWR 12 – Institute for Water Resources for the US Army Corps of Engineers, responsible for investigating, developing and maintaining the nation's water and related environmental resources, 2012 (“U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization: Preparing for Post-Panamax Waterways,” IWR, June 20th 2012, <http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/rpt/June_20_U.S._Port_and_Inland_Waterways_Preparing_for_Post_Panamax_Vessels.pdf>)

By undertaking the current expansion, Panama will double the Canal’s capacity. The resulting economy ¶ of scale advantage for larger ships will likely change the logistics chains for both U.S. imports and ¶ exports. Despite the uncertainties in timing and port-specific implications that still need to play out, the ¶ certain injection of successive new generations of post-Panamax vessels into the world fleet could be a ¶ “game-changer” for the U.S. over the long term, as it has the potential to not only provide a costeffective complement to the intermodal transport of imports via the U.S. land bridge, while also reshaping the service from Asia to the Mediterranean and on to the U.S. East Coast, but may also affect ¶ the highly competitive transport price structure along the Midwest to Columbia-Snake route for grain ¶ and other bulk exports bound for trans-Pacific shipping. Inland waterways play a key role in the cost ¶ efficient transport of grains, oilseeds, fertilizers, petroleum products and coal. Gulf ports play key roles ¶ in the transport of these commodities, such as New Orleans being the dominant port for the export of ¶ grains from the U.S. Therefore the expanded canal could provide a significant competitive opportunity ¶ for U.S. Gulf and South Atlantic ports and for U.S. inland waterways – if we are prepared. ¶ Through effective planning and strategic investment the U.S. can be positioned to take advantage of this ¶ opportunity. The railroad industry has been investing $6-8 billion a year over the last decade to ¶ modernize railways and equipment, and U.S. ports plan public and private-sourced landside investments ¶ of the same magnitude over each of the next five years. Annual spending on waterside infrastructure ¶ has been averaging about $1.5 billion. ¶ While the U.S. has ports on the West Coast (Los Angeles, Long Beach, Oakyland and Seattle/Tacoma) and ¶ East Coast (New York, Baltimore and Hampton Roads) expected to be ready with post-Panamax¶ channels in 2014, there is currently a lack of post-Panamax capacity at U.S. Gulf and South Atlantic ports ¶ – the very regions geographically positioned to potentially be most impacted by the expected changes in ¶ the world fleet. The Corps currently has 17 studies investigating the opportunity to economically invest ¶ in deep draft ports. At the Port of Savannah, USACE has identified an economically viable expansion to ¶ accommodate post-Panamax vessels. This project is estimated to cost $652 million dollars. It is possible ¶ June 20, 2012U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS VII INSTITUTE FOR WATER RESOURCES¶ that several of the remaining studies will also show economic viability and, if so, the challenge will be to ¶ fund these investments. In addition, justified investments in inland waterway locks and dams will be ¶ needed to allow the waterway transport capability to take advantage of an expanded canal for U.S. ¶ exports. This emphasizes the strategic need to address the revenue challenge within the Inland ¶ Waterway Trust Fund. ¶ Given this opportunity presented by the deployment of post-Panamax vessels, it is critical that the U.S. ¶ develop and move forward with a strategic vision for a globally competitive navigation system that sets ¶ the context for ensuring adequate investment in maintaining current waterside infrastructure and also ¶ facilitates the strategic targeting of investments to ensure the U.S. is ready for post-Panamax vessels ¶ and “cascade” fleet deployments consistent with the growth in global trade that is anticipated over the ¶ next twenty years.

### AT: State Investments Solve

#### State investments in ports insufficient – lack of federal action threatens port development

Holeywell 12 – Ryan Holeywell is a writer for Governing, a magazine that provides leading intelligence articles on management, policy and politics, 2012 (“Panama Canal Expansion Has U.S. Ports Rushing,” Governing, July 2012, <http://www.governing.com/panama-canal-expansion-has-ports-rushing.html>)

And U.S. ports are scrambling. State governments and their port authorities all along the Gulf and East coasts are seeking to spend billions of dollars building bigger ports as quickly as possible, in a rush to accommodate the larger ships that will start traveling through the canal. (Ports on the West Coast, which are naturally deeper, can already handle the bigger vessels.) It’s a high-stakes investment, and in a sense, they’re all competing with one another. The ports that become the first go-to destinations for larger vessels will have a huge competitive advantage over their peers. “They’ll be established as the destination to be,” says South Carolina state Sen. Larry Grooms, an advocate for expanding the port in Charleston. “It will be hard for the other ports to take business away.”¶ But port officials almost universally say they face an even bigger threat to their development than one another: the federal government. Byzantine regulatory hurdles and the overall lack of a clear federal ports strategy, they say, can leave expansion projects stuck in limbo for years. That threatens to keep the country from capitalizing on the work being done in Central America. “[If] Washington, D.C., and this administration don’t step up,” says South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley, “we won’t even have the luxury to compete.”

## Trade Advantage

### Dredging Key

#### America's ship channels cannot accommodate large ships now, damaging maritime commerce

ASCE 10 --American Society of Civil Engineers ("Statement of The American Society of Civil Engineers Before The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works On The Water Resources Development Act of 2010: Jobs and Economic Opportunities," May 6, 2010, http://www.asce.org/Government-Relations/Testimony-and-Correspondence/2010/May-6,-2010---ASCE-Statement---WRDA-2010--Jobs-and-Opportunities/) CS

C. A National Commitment to the Improvement and Maintenance of Ports, Harbors and Waterways Is Essential to the Economic and Environmental Well-Being of This Nation. The lack of adequate investment in America's infrastructure over many decades has left us with a vast backlog of deteriorated facilities that no longer meet our nation's increasing demands.9 As a threshold matter, we believe that a federal multi-year capital budget for public works infrastructure construction and major rehabilitation, similar to those used by state and local governments. The capital budget must be separated from non-capital federal expenditures. Such a budget would provide a knowable and reliable source of funding for the maintenance and improvement of America’s ports, harbors and waterways and other infrastructure to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare. The current budgeting process at the federal government level has a short-term, one to two year, focus. Infrastructure, however, by its very nature, is a long term investment. In order to provide for a minimum acceptable and consistent level of infrastructure funding, a long-term approach is needed. Without long-term financial assurance, the ability of the federal, state, and local governments to do effective infrastructure investment planning is constrained severely. ASCE strongly supports the concept of federal, state, and local investments in waterborne transportation infrastructure. Furthermore, we believe that these investments ought to come in the form of designated trust funds that are apart from the unified federal budget or have revenues that are segregated from other federal program revenues. With regard to WRDA, we support the deepening and widening of ship channels, as necessary, to accommodate the new, larger ships in the world fleet and the continued maintenance dredging of ship channels for the efficient handling of maritime commerce. ASCE also supports programs that limit erosion and sedimentation in ports, harbors and waterways globally. The enactment of federal and state legislation and regulations to protect the health and welfare of citizens from the catastrophic effects of levee failures is essential. Congress must enact legislation to establish a national levee safety program that is modeled on the successful National Dam Safety Program. The act should require the federal and state governments to conduct mandatory safety inspections for all levees and establish a national inventory of levees. D. The Committee Must Conduct Vigorous Oversight of the Budgets for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works Program In the face of the Corps’ aging infrastructure needs, the president's budget for the Civil Works Program in FY 2011 reduces—not increases—federal investments in essential national civil works systems. The budget proposal totals only $4.9 billion, a reduction of 9.3 percent from the FY 2010 enacted level of $5.4 billion. The administration request represents a 51 percent decrease from the FY 2009 enacted total of $10 billion through regular appropriations and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Moreover, the trend is not likely to improve in future years. The Corps estimates that its budget proposals will continue to decline through FY 2015, with a low estimate of $4.5 billion for FY 2013. The Corps expects that inflation will reduce actual spending on key infrastructure programs by a further $3 billion over the next five years. 10 ASCE believes that these levels of spending are inadequate to meet the nation’s security, economic and environmental demands in the 21st century. In an appearance before Congress earlier this year, the assistant secretary testified to the president’s intentions in cutting the civil works budget. “In keeping with President Obama's commitment to limit the overall level of non-security discretionary spending, the level of funding in the 2011 Civil Works budget is a reduction from both the 2010 budget and the 2010 appropriations.”

#### Action to match the expansion of the Panama Canal is necessary to maintain trade

Anderson 11 --Chief Executive Officer of the Jacksonville Port Authority (A. Paul, Testimony for the United States House of Representatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Oct. 26,2011, http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Anderson.pdf) CS

Changing patterns Before the advent of the 21" Century, ocean carriers often selected port routings. However, the rise of distribution centers, first on the West Coast, and then shifting over the past 10 years to port communities along the East Coast and Gulf Coast, has transferred the balance of power in port selection to shippers. These large retailers and manufacturers, adversely affected by the West Coast labor strike in 2002 and subsequent port congestion, want to move their cargo from port to distribution as efficiently and as reliably as possible. Thus, instead of routing cargo through West Coast ports and on rail across country to population centers in the Midwest and East, shippers have increasingly used so-called all-water services, with particular emphasis on container services flowing from Asia to East Coast ports. There are two paths available for all-water services: the Panama Canal, and the Suez Canal. Each presents advantages and disadvantages. The Panama Canal's width and depth currently limit the size of vessels, and transit time through the canal to the East Coast is slightly longer than a call to a West Coast port coupled with a rail move. Nevertheless, the Panama Canal offers less expensive transit to the East Coast. The expansion of the Panama Canal, to be completed in 2014, will offer transit to larger vessels with a lower per unit operating cost, making an all-water route to the East Coast even more attractive to both shippers and carriers. The Suez Canal does not present vessel size limitations, but the region's political instability and piracy incidents are causes for concern. Even so, with the rise of manufacturing centers in India and Vietnam, transit times from Asia through the Suez Canal to the East Coast are comparable to transit times from Asia to the West Coast with a rail move. The Jacksonville Port Authority and the City of Jacksonville, Fla., have benefited from these trends. JAXPORT's 158-acre TraPac Container Terminal, opened in 2009 for Tokyo-based shipping line MOL and its terminal operating subsidiary, TraPac, loads and unloads container ships sailing to and from ports in Asia. Two Panama Canal services plus one Suez Canal service already call the terminal each week. This terminal has doubled JAXPORT's capacity to handle containers. Further capacity additions will result when Hanjin Shipping Company of Seoul, Korea opens the Hanjin Container Terminal at JAXPORT later this decade. This 90~acre facility will serve as a key hub for Hanjin's East Coast port activity and will have the capacity to move an additional 800,000 TEUs annually. These two terminals -the TraPac Container Terminal and the Hanjin Container Terminal - will add 90,000 jobs to the region when operating at full capacity.[5] Realizing U.$. ports' potential Unfortunately, the TraPac Container Terminal does not currently offer the federal channel depth required by the larger ships transiting the all-water routes through the Suez Canal today and through the Panama Canal in just a few short years. Ships that do call are lightly loaded, which results in less cargo moves and less jobs; higher transportation costs along transportation routes through West Coast ports or transshipments from off-shore locations such as The Bahamas; and ultimately higher costs for American consumers. Hanjin Shipping Company is ready to invest $300 million to develop their container terminal in Jacksonville - as long as their terminal has access to deep water. Without a deep harbor, it's impossible for TraPac to begin to maximize their $200 million facility investment, and Hanjin continues to wait, wondering if America will commit to investing in its own waterways. With increasingly larger ships calling the East Coast, it is now more crucial than ever for the United States to invest in its gateway infrastructure. This call for federal investment should come as no surprise. Improving our nation's waterways for navigation and security harkens back to the birth of our country, when General George Washington assigned such missions to the Continental Army. In the U.S. Constitution, Congress is charged with the task of regulating commerce in Article I, Section 8. Yet, the full authorized depths and widths of U.S. waterway navigation channels are available only 35 percent of the time.[Â°] Harbor projects take an average of 12 years to complete. The Corps' cumbersome review procedures are not consistent with the President' s initiative to reduce red tape and streamline preconstruction federal review procedures for major infrastructure "jobs creating" projects. The President' s Aug. 31 directive to five federal agencies - Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Interior and Transportation - called for identification of high priority infrastructure projects for expedited review. This expedited review initiative should be extended to the Army Corps. Additionally, Independent Peer Review - a procedure required by Sec. 2034 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 - should not be applied to Corps studies begun prior to the two year period preceding enactment of the law, as expressly stated in Sec. 2034 (h). Because of procedural delay, most East Coast ports are not authorized to dredge to deep-draft requirements. Harbor project sponsors attempt to wade through the muddied and shifting approval, authorization and appropriation process, and changing requirements are making it increasingly difficult to move forward with these critical projects. In Jacksonville, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recently added an additional level of review by requiring "Harbor Sym modeling" for our city's deep draft navigation project. This new requirement has not been applied to previous deep draft projects, will increase costs to the federal government and the Jacksonville Port Authority, and will extend the timeline for completion of the project by one year. Any business leader assessing the current situation would quickly determine our country/s process for prioritizing, approving and funding critical infrastructure projects is fundamentally broken.

### Investment Key

#### Current funding is only a short term fix for a long-term problem-- uncertain funding prevents concrete action

Szakonyi 12— associate editor of the Journal of Commerce (Mark, “The Hill Ramping Up Dredging Efforts”, Journal of Commerce, 5/7/12, ProQuest) CS

The HMTF is expected to have a surplus of nearly $7 billion by the end of fiscal 2013, according to the Association of American Port Authorities. The ports' argument that more money needs to be spent on dredging to create jobs and boost trade also is gaining traction on the front line of congressional funding allocations. Under the latest House energy and water appropriations bill, ports in fiscal 2013 would get $1 billion for maintenance dredging. That's the largest single annual federal award for dredging and about $170 million more than the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers received last time around. "This is a significant development. It wasn't so long ago that (the corps) only received $750 million," said Paul Bea, principal of PHB Public Affairs, a maritime consulting firm. Ports will actually get less dredging help in the next fiscal year than in fiscal 2012, however, said Barry Holliday, executive director of Dredging Contractors of America. Funding tied to military project dredging and disaster relief pushed total maintenance dollars to about $1.1 billion in fiscal 2012. The latest appropriation shows a congressional willingness to spend more, even if the full allocation of HMTF dollars would fall short in tackling port needs, Holliday said. The Realize America's Maritime Promise Act, or RAMP Act, has been the major driver in convincing Congress the HMTF needs reform and more spending is needed. The legislation was included in the House's 90-day extension, which paved the way for the chamber to begin conferencing with the Senate on the surface transportation bill. The Senate has similar but less forceful language in its two-year, $109 billion plan. This boosts the chances that HMTF reform language will make it in the final version of the transportation bill, but it's just the first step in blocking appropriators from shifting money out of the fund for non-dredging purposes. Even if the RAMP Act language is adopted, it's not a mandate. Supporters would have to call a point of order in appropriation committees to slap the hands of would-be siphoners, Bea said. Despite the positive signs for ports, they are still stifled in getting authorization and funding for new major navigation projects. Historically, the Water Resources Development Act has been the vehicle for ports to get authorization for such projects, and funding is granted separately through the annual appropriations process. The last WRDA was in 2007, and there is no new version on the horizon. Even if there were, it's unclear how it would proceed under the House's ban on earmarks and the Senate's similar stance. Not only do the earmarks allow legislators to include language relating to their home ports, but they also provide impetus for representatives and senators to back the bill. The federal uncertainty hits the East Coast particularly hard, because only a few ports have the funding and approval necessary to deepen their channels. Ports such as Savannah, Ga., and Charleston, S.C, need deeper harbors to handle larger ships able to pass through the expanded Panama Canal in 2015. That supporters of Charleston and Savannah are preparing to take on the deepening expenses themselves reflects just how little optimism there is for federal help. Bea said maritime advocates and legislators are attempting to figure out how they can get projects funded and authorized in new ways. One such approach is by Sen. Lindsay Graham, R-S.C., to create a national assessment of which ports should be deepened. Plans to create a program for prioritization in authorization and funding come with their own set of problems, however, Holliday said. "When you start prioritizing ports, you begin picking winners and losers," he said. Aside from skepticism of the government's ability to discern champions from laggards, prioritization sidesteps the issue that most, if not all, ports need funding to maintain their infrastructure and grow. Such a prioritization process could dampen efforts to boost overall port spending. That could, unfortunately, fit too well with Congress's history of favoring easy short-term fixes over harder, more meaningful long-term decisions.

#### Failure to act devastates profits and causes accidents

ASCE 10 --American Society of Civil Engineers (Testimony of The Before The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works On The Water Resources Development Act of 2010: Legislative and Policy Proposals to Benefit the Economy, Create Jobs, Protect Public Safety and Maintain America’s Water Resources Infrastructure November 17, 2010, http://www.asce.org/Government-Relations/Testimony-and-Correspondence/2010/November-17,-2010---ASCE-testifies-on-WRDA-2010/) CS

The Corps of Engineers estimates that full channel dimensions at the nation's busiest 59 ports are available less than 35 percent of the time, the CRS reported. This can increase the cost of shipping as vessels carry less cargo in order to reduce their draft or wait for high tide before transiting a harbor. It could also increase the risk of a ship grounding or collision, possibly resulting in an oil spill.8 We support the deepening and widening of ship channels, as necessary, to accommodate the new, larger ships in the world fleet and the continued maintenance dredging of ship channels for the efficient handling of maritime commerce. ASCE also supports programs that limit erosion and sedimentation in ports, harbors and waterways. On land, U.S. port facilities are primarily a collection of state, local, or privately owned facilities and private companies.9 More than 13 billion tons of freight, valued at $11.8 trillion, were transported nearly 3.5 trillion tonmiles in the United States during 2007, according to the Commodity Flow Survey conducted by the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics.10 These ports and their related facilities are an essential element of the national economy and must be preserved and strengthened.

### Maritime Industry Key to Econ

#### Maritime industry sustains massive amounts of jobs-allocating HMT makes it sustainable

TTD 2012

(“The Vital Role of Maritime Transportation In Our Economy”, 3-11, <http://www.ttd.org/index.asp?Type=B_PR&SEC=%7B628A0512-CBEA-4830-9070-A5DFCBE65B80%7D&DE=%7B3DD1CF94-0332-45A9-8E69-F2B4BFFD6AF8%7D>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Unfortunately, neither the House nor the Senate surface transportation reauthorization bill included a substantial maritime title. This is a missed opportunity to acknowledge the importance of maritime to the nation and address the needs of America’s waterborne transportation system and its employees. More delay of important port and maritime policy actions is not an option as our world competitors invest billions to boost their maritime transportation capabilities in the global economy. For instance, China plans to invest over $40 billion dollars in their ports over the next five years, more than the U.S. has invested over the past 50 years. Failing to invest in ports and harbors will jeopardize an industry that supports over 500,000 jobs and will put us further behind our international competitors. ¶ In 1986 the Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) were established to provide a dedicated revenue stream funded through user fees to provide for the operation and maintenance of channels in ports and harbors. The HMT is charged on the value of cargo arriving in U.S. ports, and the money collected is then deposited into the HMTF. However, in recent years Congress has often diverted money from the HMTF to purposes other than harbor maintenance. In FY 2011, for instance, barely half of the funds collected by the HMT were used for its intended purpose, creating a backlog of critical maintenance projects in our nation’s harbors and coastal waterways. This neglect of maintenance projects has a direct and damaging economic impact. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that almost 30 percent of vessels traveling through U.S. ports are constrained due to the inadequate conditions of our navigation channels, resulting in billions of dollars in lost economic activity and job growth opportunities foregone.¶ Common sense legislative solutions exist to address these problems. Last year Representatives Charles Boustany (R-LA) and Joe Courtney (D-CT) introduced the RAMP Act (H.R. 104) – bi-partisan legislation that would ensure the funds collected under the HMT are in fact used for their intended purpose. A companion bill, the Harbor Maintenance Act (S. 412), has been introduced by Senators Carl Levin (D-MI) and Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX). We support these bills and urge Congress to include them in the pending surface transportation reauthorization or to find another path forward toward enacting these reforms into law. Without adequate harbor maintenance and channel depths, vessels containing American exports are unable to carry full capacity loads lest they run aground. This prevents the efficient shipment of goods, slows our economic growth and undermines the execution of President Obama’s ambitious agenda to grow American exports.

#### Solves the economy-trillions of dollars of output.

Nagle, GMU economics masters, 2011

(Kurt, “US port-related infrastructure investments reap dividends”, 10-17, <http://www.porttechnology.org/images/uploads/technical_papers/PTI-4.pdf>, DOA: 7-13-13)

For centuries, US seaports and the waterways that connect ¶ them have served as a vital economic lifeline by bringing goods ¶ and services to people around the world, facilitating trade and commerce, creating jobs, helping to secure US borders, ¶ supporting the military and serving as stewards of valuable coastal ¶ environmental resources.¶ As the primary gateway for overseas trade, seaports are essential ¶ for economic prosperity, and federal funding for infrastructure ¶ in and around ports pays dividends for the country. Deepdraft coastal and Great Lakes ports are the nexus of critical ¶ transportation infrastructure that connects America’s exporters ¶ with markets overseas. They also provide access for imports of raw ¶ materials, components, and consumer goods that are a key part of ¶ US manufacturing and standards of living.¶ Investments in port infrastructure and the intermodal ¶ connections that serve seaports – both land and waterside – help ¶ the nation prosper and provide an opportunity to bolster the ¶ employment and economic recovery. ¶ Economic impacts¶ Today, international trade accounts for more than a quarter of ¶ America’s gross domestic product, while ocean-going vessels ¶ that load and unload cargo at US seaports move 99.4 percent of ¶ the nation’s overseas trade by volume and 65.5 percent by value. ¶ Furthermore, customs collections from seaport cargo provide ¶ tens of billions of dollars a year to the US federal government, ¶ including $23.2 billion in financial year 2007, $24.1 billion in ¶ financial year 2008, $20.3 billion in financial year 2009 and $22.5 ¶ billion in financial year 2010.In the latest economic impacts analysis conducted in 2007, US ¶ seaport activities generated $3.15 trillion in annual economic output, with $3.8 billion worth of goods moving in and out of ¶ seaports every day. The impacts go far beyond the communities ¶ in which seaports are located. On average, any given US state uses ¶ the services of 15 different ports around the country to handle its ¶ imports and exports. ¶ From a jobs standpoint, America’s seaports support the ¶ employment of 13.3 million US workers, and seaport-related ¶ jobs account for $649 billion in annual personal income. For ¶ every $1 billion in exports shipped though US seaports, 15,000 ¶ domestic jobs are created. With ambitious greening initiatives ¶ nationwide, seaports have begun generating jobs outside of their ¶ traditional sectors, such as opportunities in the environmental ¶ sciences.¶ In addition to handling international trade, US seaports, and ¶ the waterways that serve them are also important transportation ¶ modes for the movement of domestic freight. Greater utilization ¶ of America’s coastal and inland water routes for freight ¶ transportation complements other surface transportation modes, ¶ helping to provide a safe and secure alternative for cargo while ¶ offering significant energy savings and traffic congestion relief.

#### More evidence.

Joiner et al., AJC International vice-chairman, 2011

(Eric, “Why the U.S. Needs Larger Seaports”, 2-18, <http://www.businessweek.com/managing/content/feb2011/ca20110216_880758.htm>, DOA: 7-13-13)

In his most recent State of the Union address, President Obama said, "To attract new businesses to our shores, we need the fastest, most reliable ways to move people, goods, and information—from high-speed rail to high-speed Internet." The first draft of the budget revealed by the White House leaves us wondering about a commitment to the infrastructure required to live up to the President's tallest fiscal order: doubling exports in the next five years.¶ U.S. seaports handle more than 2 billion tons of import and export cargo annually and account for 25 percent of U.S. gross domestic product. To meet President Obama's goal of doubling exports by 2016, our nation's deepwater ports must expand to accommodate the passage of vessels that require up to 50 feet in depth, which will be headed our way with the completion of the Panama Canal expansion in 2014.¶ Global trade hinges on the competitive advantage of even small differences in shipping costs. And shipping costs decrease the most when we can utilize the new, fuel-efficient deeper-draft vessels. Those vessels must be able to call at a network of efficient East and West Coast American ports in order for U.S. exporters and importers to lower costs, improve access to global markets, and reduce impact on the environment.¶ Simply stated: We need efficient ports in order to create jobs.¶ Benefit Analysis¶ The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' recent analysis of the pending deepening of the Savannah Harbor channel, from the current 42 feet to as much as 48 feet, attests to the benefits of modernization. The Georgia port's trade is evenly balanced between exports and imports, including 12 percent of all U.S. containerized exports. The current lack of space forces nearly 80 percent of the ships to take on lighter-than-capacity loads. Thirty percent of the ships sit idle waiting for high tide. And the most modern fuel- and cost-efficient ships cannot call at the port at all because they need the 48-foot channel that will be the result of this Savannah Harbor Expansion Project.¶ Navigation-channel modernization projects meet every test for federal investment. They are congressionally authorized after extensive merit-based analyses, matched with local-user funds, federally maintained, and subject to public review and a myriad of environmental and benefit-cost requirements established by Congress and the executive branch. The Corps' 10-year, $35 million analysis conservatively estimates that every dollar spent to deepen the Savannah channel will generate almost $5 for the U.S. (in addition to the current $61.7 billion in sales, $15.5 billion in employment income, and $6.1 billion in federal and state taxes already generated by Georgia ports annually).¶ Even in strong economic times, we neglected modernization of our federal navigation channels while other countries invested vast sums in ports and in deepening their channels to 48 feet or more to accommodate the new generation of larger cargo vessels that will soon dominate international trade. Now both American consumers and the job-creating capacity of our nation's businesses are paying the price.¶ Ports like Savannah and others waiting in line for federal funding can use their deeper channels to open the door to a surge in new commerce, sources of profits and tax revenue, and jobs for generations of Americans for decades to come. Our ports may lie out of sight to most Americans, but they need to stay fixed on the agenda of the President and the new Congress.

#### US Maritime Industry Continues to Create Jobs and Boost Economy

AAPA 2011 AAPA (American Association of Port Authorities), trade association involved in over 150 port authority organizations, June 15 2011, “US Port Industry”, American Association of Port Authorities, <http://www.aapaports.org/industry/content.cfm?itemnumber=1022&navitemnumber=901>

 **U.S. ports and waterways handle more than 2 billion tons of** domestic and import/export **cargo annually.** **By 2020, the** total **volume of cargo shipped by water is expected to be double that of 2001 volumes.** Much of total domestic production of basic commodities and finished products is shipped by water, including apples, wastepaper, corn, lumber, iron ore, steel, scrap steel, potatoes, phosphate, plastics, film, machinery, and modular homes. About two-thirds of all U.S. wheat and wheat flour, one-third of soybean and rice production and almost two-fifths of U.S. cotton production is exported via U.S. ports. U.S.- produced coal, grain and forest products also compete well in international markets because of our efficient transportation system. **A report released on June 15, 2011, from the U.S. Maritime Administration shows more ships are stopping at U.S. ports.** The stops, or vessel calls, rebounded by 13 percent in 2010, after an 8 percent decline in 2009. Oceangoing vessel calls reflect waterborne trade between the United States and countries around the world, and are a measure of import, export and domestic ocean shipments. “Although challenges remain, **this encouraging rebound in oceangoing vessels is a sign that President Obama's economic policies are working**," said U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood. "We're committed to **supporting policies that will build on this momentum** so that the maritime industry **will continue to grow and create American jobs**." The 2010 Vessel Calls Snapshot report contains data on calls by oceangoing vessels at U.S. ports. In 2010, 7,579 oceangoing vessels made 62,747 calls at U.S. ports. Of the 2010 calls, • 35 percent were by tankers carrying oil and gas used to power our cars and heat our homes, • 31 percent were by containerships carrying general export and import cargo for markets around the U.S. and the world, • 17 percent were by dry bulk vessels carrying iron, coal and grain for export, • 9 percent were by roll-on roll-off vessels carrying vehicles for import and export, and • 6 percent were by general cargo ships. In addition, the report shows that **tanker operators are replacing single-hull vessels with new, greener double-hull ships.** **In 2010, 97 percent of the tanker calls were by double-hull vessels, up from 78 percent five years earlier.** "As our economy recovers, **maritime can play even more of a key role in the affordable, efficient and environmentally sustainable transportation of goods**, both within our borders and across oceans," said U.S. Maritime Administrator David Matsuda. View the Vessel Call Snapshot 2010 Report. And, for the cruise industry, the **Cruise Lines International Association** (CLIA) **reports the North American cruise industry’s impact on the US economy grew to $37.85 billion in 2010**, a 7.8% increase over 2009, according to an independent study commissioned by CLIA. In 2009, a year of global recession, the impact was $35.1 billion. The record year was 2008, when the industry had a $40.2 billion impact. In 2010, CLIA member lines carried 14.8 million passengers, an increase of 10.3 percent, the largest year-over-year jump since 2003. Also **in 2010, cruising generated 329,943 jobs that had a $15.2 billion wage impact on the U.S. economy, a 5.1% increase in employment and a 7% rise in wages over 2009.** CLIA said the economic contribution spread across every state economy via $18 billion in direct cruise industry spending, with 10 states accounting for 78% of total employment and income impacts. "These job numbers are good news given the challenging economy. We are pleased with the strong gains in the cruise industry's economic contributions, and that **CLIA member lines were directly or indirectly responsible for putting nearly 330,000 Americans to work**," said CLIA chairman Howard Frank In short, the nation's seaports serve as gateways to domestic and international trade, connecting large and small U.S. businesses to the expanding global marketplace. U.S. seaports are responsible for moving nearly all of the country’s overseas cargo volume…99.4% by weight and 64.1 percent by value. **Each of our 50 states relies on at least 15 seaports to handle its imports and exports, which total some $3.8 billion** worth of goods moving in and out of U.S. seaports **each day**. **Seaports** also support the **employ**ment of **more than 13 million people in the U.S.**, which account for $650 billion in personal income. Additionally**, for every $1 billion in exports shipped though seaports, 6,000 U.S. jobs are created.**

#### Marine transportation industry will continue to boost US economy

DoT 07 United States Department of Transportation Maritime Administration, November 2007, “The Maritime Administration and the U.S. Marine Transportation System: A Vision for the 21stCentury”, Department of Transportation Maritime Administration, p.5, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/Vision_of_the_21st_Century_10-29.pdf>

**The marine** **transportation industry is not just about the shipment of consumer goods**: bulk commodities, such as grain; manufactured products; raw materials, such as logs and lumber; and energy products. It begins with shipyards that build and repair the vessels that operate in the Marine Transportation System. The infrastructure and many industries that help sustain it constitute an enormous engine of economic growth on their own. **These industries create high paying, skilled jobs throughout the economy that depend on the Marine Transportation System to deliver the goods of America.** For example, the trade activity of **the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach created 3.3 million jobs across the nation in 2005, a 200 percent increase from 1994.** Nationally, state and local taxes generated from trade activity grew from an estimated $6 billion in 1994 to more than $28 billion in 2005. The **U.S. commercial shipbuilding and repair industry adds billions of dollars to U.S. Economic output annually.** The marine transportation industry even contributes to U.S. commercial aviation. The cruise ship industry is among the largest purchasers of airline tickets; all those passengers have to get to their ships. **Overall, the Marine Transportation System supports 13 million jobs.** The success story does not end there. Since 2000, the total value of international trade has risen by over 40 percent and it is becoming a larger part of our national economy. **The combined value of foreign trade** (imports and exports) **represented 13 percent of GDP in 1990, rising to nearly 22 percent in 2006.** If this trend continues, **it is projected that the value of U.S. foreign trade will be equivalent to 35 percent of the Nation’s GDP in 2020 and 60 percent in 2030.** Marine transportation will become even more important to our economy as 95 percent of America’s foreign trade is moved by ship.

### Exports Key to Econ

#### Exports balance the economy and reduce the risk of shocks

Rockwell et al., Brookings senior research associate, 2010

(Jonathan, “Export Nation: How U.S. Metros Lead National Export Growth and Boost Competitiveness”, July, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2010/7/26%20mountain%20exports%20muro/0726_exports_istrate_rothwell_katz.pdf>, DOA: 7-12-12)

Exports Could Contribute to the Rebalancing of the U.S. Economy and a Lower Trade Deficit¶ For the most of the last 20 years, the United States has witnessed strong economic growth and low unemployment in comparison with other developed countries.18 Yet, the U.S. economy was affected by the wide fluctuations at the end of two business cycles, the so called IT bubble of the late 1990s and the housing bubble that ended between sometime during 2006 and 2007. Meanwhile, in 2006 household income inequality reached its post-World War II peak.19 Real median income in 2008 fell below 1999 levels.20 These three conditions—a tepid rise in living standards, increasing inequality, and bubble economies—are embedded in the consumption driven American economy.¶ In 1982, U.S. residents spent 86 cents of every dollar of after-tax income, but the intensity of consumption grew steadily such that by 2005, that share had reached 95 cents of every dollar.21 All this spending depleted savings, which dropped precipitously over the time period from over 10 percent in the early 1980s to just 1.7 percent in 2005.22 At the same time, an increasing share of consumption involved the purchase of imports. While the value of U.S. total imports was eight percent higher than the value of U.S. total exports in 1982, by 2005, the difference was 36 percent, the highest gap since 1960.23¶ With minimal household savings, domestic investment declined over the last two decades relative to the size of the economy. The United States invested about 7.3 percent of GDP in the 2000s, much less than the 9.4 percent rate of the 1970s.24 Moreover, from 2000 to 2007, private manufacturing investment as a share of GDP was just 0.26 percent per year compared to 0.37 percent during the 1990s. At the same time, foreign investment compensated to some extent, though more in the real estate sector. For example, Chinese holdings represented 6 percent of all federal agency debt and 29 percent of foreign-held agency debt in 2007, making China the largest foreign holder of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac debt.25¶ The externalization of risk is another major problem with trade deficits. A large portion of the dollars spent on imports end up being re-invested back into the United States and that process increases the risk of bubbles. No sector can sustain limitless growth, and as the safest and most valuable investments become saturated with funding, the excess liquidity begins to seep into riskier and riskier propositions like no-income-no-asset subprime mortgage derivatives. The economists Joshua Aizenman and Yothin Jinjarak have shown that current account deficits have coincided with and contributed to rapid housing price appreciation across OECD countries between 1990 and 2005.26¶ While the United States based its growth on private consumption over the last three decades, the other developed countries exploited foreign demand. Over the last 30 years, private consumption, as a share of GDP, increased by seven percentage points in the United States, while total exports grew by only two percentage points. The other large developed countries, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom, maintained an almost constant share of private spending, but increased their share of total exports in GDP by seven percentage points.28 In 2008, the U.S. total exports were only 12.7 of domestic production, in comparison with 29.7 percent in the other large developed countries. Moreover, as a recent Brookings report shows, this underperformance is not entirely explained by the size of the U.S. economy and its distance from trading partners.¶ There are a number of potential explanations for why the United States under-exports. First, the dollar is over-valued relative to the currencies of a number of important U.S. trading partners.29 In addition, U.S. companies have been focused on catering to the large and growing U.S market. About one percent of U.S. companies exported in 2008.30 It seems that many small and medium companies lack information regarding exports and perceive exporting as a risky endeavor.31 Finally, many countries still put up significant trade barriers against U.S. companies. In the absence of free trade agreements with emerging countries, U.S. companies had additional incentives to locate production abroad in order to take advantage of these foreign markets. For example, while nominal total exports grew by 10 percent annually between 1994 and 2007, nominal sales of U.S. affiliates located in foreign countries increased by almost 18 percent a year during the same period.32¶ Whatever the reasons why the United States is less export-oriented than other countries, increasing¶ exports relative to imports can be part of the solution to many long-standing difficulties.

### Multiplier Effect

#### Maritime investment has a high multiplier effect and facilitate international trade-- the funds already exist

Nagle 11 --President and CEO of the American Association of Port Authorities (Kurt J., July 8, 2011, http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/PDFs/HMT%20Testimony%20on%20HR104%20to%20T%26I-WRE%208%20July%202011.pdf) CS

Seaports serve as a critical gateway to domestic and international trade, connecting large and small U.S. businesses to the global marketplace. Handling two billion tons of domestic, import and export cargo annually, seaports are a critical component of our nation's transportation infrastructure system. As we prepare for increasing cargo volumes and the future generation of bigger cargo and passenger vessels, our maritime highways must be improved and maintained to allow ships to transit safely and efficiently to deliver the goods that consumers and businesses depend on, both in the U.S. and abroad. With ships getting increasingly larger, dredging deep-draft navigation channels is more crucial than ever, both to maintain the existing channel depths and widths, and to expand them. This is important to inland waterways users, too, since more than half of the country's grain and oilseed exports move on the inland waterways for transport to ports for loading onto deep-sea vessels. Yet, the U.S. government doesn't fully utilize the federal harbor maintenance tax for its intended purpose - to pay for navigation maintenance dredging. Since its inception in 1986, this tax has too often been used to offset other programs while serious maintenance dredging needs have been neglected. Modern navigable seaports are vital to international trade and our nation's economic prosperity, however, the full authorized depths and widths of America's navigation channels are available only 35 percent of the time. This means channels may be restricted to one lane of travel, and the ships that are moving may not be able to carry full loads of cargo because of depth restrictions. Users of our nation's harbors are currently paying between $1.3 billion and $1.6 billion annually in harbor maintenance tax (HMT) but, in a typical year, less than $800 million is appropriated for channel maintenance, leaving a growing surplus of $5.6 billion in the HMT Trust Fund (as of November 2010). This results in increased costs for waterborne transportation, higher prices to consumers and reduced competitiveness of U.S. exports in the global marketplace. Jobs, tax bases and income produced are adversely impacted as well. Fiscal Year 2009 saw only a temporary increase from stimulus bill funds, which expired in September 2010. Fiscal Year 201 1 has been a challenge as a result of Continuing Resolutions limiting Corps spending on dredging. Since our founding fathers drafted the Constitution back in 1787 establishing the United States government, our legislative branch has been charged with the task of regulating commerce. It was important to those drafting the Constitution to create a system where trade and commerce could move freely between states and beyond our national borders and to defend the United States against invasion. Therefore, certain powers were granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution including "the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the several states..." and "to establish Post Offices and Post Roads." Maintaining our national infrastructure that supports foreign and interstate commerce is not only a federal responsibility but is strongly in the national interest as established by our forefathers. In fact, improving waterways and coastal ports for navigation and national security is the most federal of infrastructure responsibilities, dating to the early missions assigned the Continental Army by then General George Washington. In these times of a tightening Federal Budget, as Congress and the Administration take on the task of prioritizing expenditures, and identifying core federal missions that are in the national interest and help to revitalize our economy, a key focus should be on maintaining and strengthening our nation's infrastructure, including federal navigation channels, that support foreign and interstate commerce - the underpinnings of our economic security. These are wise investments that pay dividends immediately and over time, and form the backbone of our economy and society at large. Investments in port-related infrastructure are multipliers, as they create infrastructure that allows long-term job creation, positioning the United States as a leader in international trade and commerce. From the earliest days of our nation, there has been a clear and consistent federal role and national interest in developing and maintaining landside and waterside connections to A1nerica's seaports. This vital transportation infrastructure literally connects American farmers, manufacturers and consumers to the World marketplace. More than a quarter of U.S. GDP and over 13 million jobs are accounted for by international trade. It is critical tl1at basic, core federal missions such as these, that directly impact A1nerica's economic vitality, jobs, and global competitiveness, be recognized and prioritized. The Congress 1m1st honor its pledge to maintain tl1e nation's ports and harbors with the revenue provided by users.

## Heg Advantage

### Dredging Key

#### Key to competitiveness

Lamb-Hale, Commerce Department assistant secretary, 2010

(Nicole, “Doubling U.S. Exports: Are U.S. Sea Ports Ready for the Challenge?”, 4-29, <http://www.finance.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/042910nltest.pdf>, DOA: 7-13-13)

As sourcing and product delivery operations span larger and longer distances, firms are ¶ transforming the way they look at and manage supply chains. No longer are individual ¶ companies competing with each other, entire supply chains are. Effective supply chains ¶ and just-in-time delivery systems drive modern global business. ¶ Supply chain infrastructure is the glue that binds successful trade routes. It affects the ¶ cost of every single product in the United States. Inefficient connections and capacity ¶ limitations lead to delays that raise the price of a company’s product, and make it harder ¶ to compete globally. Supply chain infrastructure is an important factor in a company’s ¶ decision on where to invest, build, and employ people. These decisions require ¶ substantial lead times, and the quality of the infrastructure determines the attractiveness ¶ of a particular location. ¶ As world commerce becomes more integrated, and as sourcing and product delivery ¶ operations span larger and longer distances, America’s firms and supply chains are being ¶ transformed. It has long been the case that it is no longer the individual companies that ¶ compete with each other. Rather, entire supply chains – fully integrated processes that ¶ connect manufacturer to transporter to distribution center to point of sale – are now the ¶ primary competitors in domestic and global commerce. Efficiencies in supply chains ¶ lead to competitive advantages, and they make possible global sourcing, just in time ¶ delivery systems, and modern global business itself. ¶ The velocity and efficiency of each supply chain depends on the infrastructure through ¶ which these goods and products flow. The increasingly time-sensitive and integrated ¶ nature of modern supply chains make smooth, just-in-time goods movement a critical ¶ element in that supply chain’s ability to compete in the global economy. ¶ Industry today sees infrastructure as an interconnected network of physical transport ¶ facilities, combined with modern information technology systems. The efficiency of this ¶ infrastructure -- and the industries that depend on it—is affected by environmental and ¶ sustainability considerations, new financing options, education, and regulatory and trade ¶ security measures. This speaks to the growing sophistication and complexity of modern ¶ supply chains, and their critical reliance on the quality of America’s supply chain ¶ infrastructure to support modern, high-tech manufacturing. ¶ Industry members have told us that supply chain infrastructure makes a difference ¶ because it affects the cost of every single product made or used in the United States. ¶ Missing connections and capacity limitations between port and manufacturer lead to ¶ delays that raise the price of every American export product and make it harder to compete with international producers. To illustrate this point, a recent Wall Street ¶ Journal article reported that a key harbor grain terminal in the Port of Los Angeles lacks ¶ enough space to handle the volume of exports arriving from inland producers due to the ¶ limited rail service to that terminal. ¶ Leading executives have also told us that a nation’s supply chain infrastructure also ¶ makes a difference when deciding where their firms will invest, build facilities and ¶ employ people. These decisions require substantial lead times, and the quality of the ¶ infrastructure at the point of decision – the efficiency of the ports, the level of inter-modal ¶ connections, the quality of the IT systems, and more – determines in part the ¶ attractiveness of a location.

#### Plan is a cost effective solution to economic competitiveness

Doble, Public Agenda senior research fellow, 2012

(John, “For U.S. to Get Out of Economic Slump, Simply Build Better Roads and Ports”, 3-1, http://www.policymic.com/articles/7680/for-u-s-to-get-out-of-economic-slump-simply-build-better-roads-and-ports, DOA: 7-12-12)

**America is losing the global economic race**. While the media focuses on issues like education and immigration, crucial systems like our nation’s transportation infrastructure get the short shrift. We often see the semi-truck on the road and the cargo ship in the harbor, and occasionally we think about how both vehicles transport products worth billions from warehouses, stores, and eventually to our homes. We do not see how this system is teetering on the brink of obsolescence. Only three years ago the [American Society of Civil Engineers](http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) gave the country’s infrastructure an overall grade of “D,” requesting that the nation invest $255 billion a year to fix the problem. We currently invest only [40%](http://www.economist.com/node/18620944%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) of that amount, and it seldom invested well. Even though the challenge is complex, a national freight policy with a number of components – including the passage of the Realizing America’s Maritime Promise (RAMP) Act; an increase taxes or redirection of funds to transportation infrastructure; or the creation of a national infrastructure bank – would resolve many of our difficulties. Given the need to boost exports due to the economic crisis, and the fact that 90% of all goods measured by weight or volume are transported by cargo ship, Congress has amazingly only just realized that [most of our ports are too shallow](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0412/74751.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22ixzz1soUaVDCX%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). **Only 35% of our nation’s ports**, the majority on the West coast, **will be able to handle international shipping** once the Panama Canal expansion is completed in 2014 because we’ve failed to dredge their harbors deep enough for [post-panamax ships](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Container_ship%22%20%5Cl%20%22Size_categories%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). The country instituted a Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) in 1986 to deal with this issue, which taxes $1.25 on every $1,000 of goods that moves through ports and equals about $1.4 billion annually, but only half of this money has been spent in recent years. The problem would be quickly and cheaply resolved if Congress were to pass the RAMP Act, which requires that the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to spend all of the money it receives on dredging.

#### Infrastructure investments in ports vital to competitiveness

Leone, MPA port director, 2012

(Michael, “Harbor Maintenance Funding and Maritime Tax Issues," CQ Congressional Testimony, 2-1, lexis)

As a result, only about 35% of America's navigation channels are currently at their authorized depth and width, which means that vessels calling our ports cannot be fully loaded or may be restricted to a one way transit. The entire maritime industry, therefore, is grateful for the oversight provided by your committees to ensure this tax on port users is used for its intended purpose -- ensuring that the navigation channels leading to our ports are regularly dredged to their authorized dimensions so that vessels calling our ports can deliver essential commodities and can take American made products to its global customers. Only with regular investments in dredging can these critical parts of our national transportation system continue to serve as gateways for the more than two billion tons of domestic, import and export cargo they are expected to handle each year, which in turn helps keep American businesses - both large and small - competitive in world markets. This concern is even greater today as East and Gulf Coast ports prepare for the larger vessels that will be transiting though an expanded Panama Canal. What is frustrating for many port directors who have dredging needs that go unmet is that the money for these projects is available. The users of our ports and harbors still pay their full share for maintenance dredging - over one dollar for every thousand dollars worth of imported and domestic cargo they move - while only getting back half as much benefit in return. Current estimates are that users of our nation's waterways are paying approximately $1.4 billion per year in harbor maintenance taxes which is about the amount the Army Corps of Engineers has determined is the annual need for maintenance dredging. Yet, this past fiscal year only about $820 million was appropriated for channel maintenance. That still leaves, according to the most recent estimates I've seen, a surplus in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund of about $6.4 billion and growing. This shortfall in funding is of particular concern to regional or niche ports, which are usually not included in the President's budget, because they generally handle less tonnage than the major container and bulk cargo ports. There are many ports in Massachusetts in need of maintenance dredging , for example, which could be completed if all of the HMT was appropriated each year. Not every port will need to have channels that are 50-feet deep in order to handle the largest ships that will traverse the expanded Panama Canal when that modernization project is set to be complete in 2014. But many will, and others will need to be dredged to handle the larger vessels that will be used in moving cargo from the larger hub ports to regional ports. In the meantime, individual ports have been dredging our own berths at our own cost, buying cranes that can handle these larger vessels, and investing in terminal infrastructure. Indeed, it's estimated that seaports invest more than $2.5 billion every year to maintain and improve their infrastructure, which is why ports are often discouraged that federal investments in maintenance dredging have not kept pace with their own. The larger issue is that spending on maintenance dredging is particularly critical at this time, and not only because of the larger ships that ports will soon be expected to handle, but to ensure that the Administration's National Export Initiative of doubling U.S. exports can be fulfilled. U. S. ports are the gateways for international trade and having a modern, reliable and cost-effective marine transportation system will expedite the delivery of U.S. exports to the global marketplace. Delays in the movement of exported cargo will only hurt the competiveness of U.S exports.

### Shipping Key to Power Projection

#### Shipping is key to power projection

Kiefer et al 2k (Jack, principle investigator for the Planning and Management Consultants, LTD (PMCL), Stuart Norvell, economist, Edward Cohn, independent subcontractor, Robert A. Pietrowsky, Chief of the IWR Navigation Analysis Division, Phillip J. Thorpe, Institute for Water Resources, Navigation Analysis Division for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers manager, "The National Dredging Needs Study of Ports and Harbors Implications to Cost-Sharing of Federal Deep Draft Navigation Projects Due to Changes in the Maritime Industry," http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/iwrreports/00-R-8.pdf) CS

2.2.2 Other Tangible Benefits' Indirect benefits of Corps projects include gains associated with international trade. Historical expenditures for harbor improvements facilitate international trade by providing ships more efficient access to the Nation's ports. International trade in turn creates and sustains jobs and generates Federal tax revenues. The exact method of computing income and employment associated with international trade is debatable. but one of the best techniques is to calculate the value added by U.S. businesses and households to imports and exports. Computations reveal that nearly 20 percent of all U.S. jobs are directly associated with international trade. A slightly higher percentage of personal income would be associated with international trade because such jobs pay somewhat more than the U.S. average. In addition. about $553 million were collected for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in 1999. 2.2.3 Intangible Benefits Some benefits of harbor improvements are difficult or impossible to quantify. For individual projects these are given little attention. Policy decisions concerning project authorizations and appropriations should consider intangible benefits as well as tangible direct and secondary benefits. This idea is particularly applicable to international trade and specifically container trade. For example, America is such a big market, international trade gives the U.S. considerable leverage when dealing with foreign governments. Thus. international trade can enhance the United States' role as a world leader. National harbors are also a vital part of our military`s power projection platform. Economists believe in the law of comparative advantage. which states that nations benefit when they specialize in producing certain goods and services and then trade with each other rather than producing everything themselves. For example. most people perceive that the majority of foreign trade consists of consumer goods such as clothing and televisions. However. as shown in Table 2-2. a significant portion of U.S. foreign trade consists of semi-manufactured commodities and raw materials such as iron and steel or crude petroleum. These products are used to produce other goods. or are further processed in the importing country. For example. in the United States imported car parts are often used to produce exports of finished automobiles. Machinery and electrical equipment are often used the same way. Thus, efficient flow of international commodities is important for all nations including the United States. Global trade is very competitive and profit margins are thin. This is particularly true for maritime transportation including the container shipping industry. Growth in U.S. foreign trade, even though it is substantial, is not as high as growth in total international trade. particularly with respect to containership. It is quite possible for some U.S. trade to be diverted or to be serviced by less efficient ships. This may occur if American ports and the Federal government are not able to meet current challenges posed by developments in international trade. 2.2.4 Lost Benefits There are lost benefits associated with delays in the construction of harbor improvement projects. Costs increase with delays, not only because of inflation but because the construction process becomes distorted by available funds. Costs associated with delays can and have been estimated. Typically, a year’s delay in schedule leads to a penalty of more than 10 percent of project cost. This is sizable and should be considered when making cost-sharing policies. Cost-sharing policies should seek to insure that both public ports and the Federal government fund projects in a timely manner. There are also benefits foregone due to lost transportation cost savings with project delays. Project delays affect the Nation in another way. Although these benefits are difficult to quantify, such effects are perhaps more important than those that can be measured. Delays create an uncertain atmosphere that can impact decisions to develop infrastructure elsewhere. Container ports are very capital intensive and require long term planning. Massive containerships are rapidly being put into service at ports throughout the world. Without a clear signal of intent to accommodate these vessels in the United States, necessary ports and facilities may be built elsewhere. Once major investments are made elsewhere, the full efficiencies of large containerships in the form of lower transportation costs for general cargo may be lost to the Nation for a long time to come. 2.3 Geographical Incidence of International Trade Public ports generally have a regional or local economic development mandate along with authorizations to improve harbor facilities. This does not mean, however, that local economies near ports capture all or most of the benefits associated with international trade. For example, when a port unloads crude petroleum from a ship, it charges a fee that generates revenues for the port and the local community. But imported oil also fuels cars and homes throughout the Nation. Likewise, when a port loads grain or coal onto a ship for export, farmers in the U.S. heartland benefit as do coal miners in the hills of West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Kentucky. Container trade benefits all regions of the country as well. As shown in Table 2-3, fifteen U.S. ports account for about 80 percent of international maritime trade in terms of value. These ports represent only ten states, however much of the cargo they handle flows to other regions. Table 2-4 shows the origin and destination of international cargo for each U.S. state measured in terms of value. On average, any given state uses the services of 15 different ports around the country. For example, the California ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland collectively handle about $187 billion worth of cargo, but the state of California is the origin or destination of only $106 billion. While most container trade flows in and out of ports on the East and West Coasts, it is distributed throughout the Nation as shown in Tables 2-5 and 2-6. For instance, the Port of Charleston, S.C. handled about 800 thousand TEUs in 1996, but the state of South Carolina was the origin or destination of only 160 thousand of these TEUs. Similarly, the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach and Oakland handled five million TEUs but only 2.5 million originated or were destined to sites within California. [table omitted] 2.4 Conclusion The benefits of harbor improvements are numerous. Expenditures for harbor improvements have facilitated international trade by providing ships more efficient access to the Nation's ports. International trade in turn creates and sustains jobs and generates Federal tax revenues. Foreign commerce has become crucial to the economic well-being of the United States. In 1946, U.S. international trade represented a relatively small portion of the U.S. economy, but today foreign trade accounts for 27 percent of U.S. gross domestic product. Harbor improvements also affect prices of U.S. imports and exports. With deeper channels vessel operators can load more cargo onto a ship and sail deeper, or they can use larger more efficient vessels. Unit transportation costs decline and lower transportation costs are reflected in commodity prices. Intangible benefits are also important. Free trade promotes international relations and stability and bolsters the United States’ position as a world leader. Lastly, it is important to stress that the economic benefits of international trade are widespread and are not limited to a handful of coastal states.

### Competitiveness Key to Econ

#### Protracted decline in US competitiveness will wreck the global economy

Mandelbaum, John Hopkins Foreign Policy Program director, 2005

(Michael, The Case for Goliath: How America Acts as the World’s Government in the Twenty-First Century, pg 192-195\_

Although the spread of nuclear weapons, with the corresponding increase in the likelihood that a nuclear shot would be fired in anger somewhere in the world, counted as the most serious potential consequence of the abandonment by the United States of its role as the world's government, it was not the only one. In the previous period of American international reticence, the 1920s and 1930s, the global economy suffered serious damage that a more active American role might have mitigated. A twenty-first-century American retreat could have similarly adverse international economic consequences. The economic collapse of the 1930s caused extensive hardship throughout the world and led indirectly to World War II by paving the way for the people who started it to gain power in Germany and Japan. In retrospect, the Great Depression is widely believed to have been caused by a series of errors in public policy that made an economic downturn far worse than it would have been had governments responded to it in appropriate fashion. Since the 1930s, acting on the lessons drawn from that experience by professional economists, governments have taken steps that have helped to prevent a recurrence of the disasters of that decade.' In the face of reduced demand, for example, governments have increased rather than cut spending. Fiscal and monetary crises have evoked rescue efforts rather than a studied indifference based on the assumption that market forces will readily reestablish a desirable economic equilibrium. In contrast to the widespread practice of the 1930s, political authorities now understand that putting up barriers to imports in an attempt to revive domestic production will in fact worsen economic conditions everywhere. Still, a serious, prolonged failure of the international economy, inflicting the kind of hardship the world experienced in the 1930s (which some Asian countries also suffered as a result of their fiscal crises in the 1990s) does not lie beyond the realm of possibility. Market economies remain subject to cyclical downturns, which public policy can limit but has not found a way to eliminate entirely. Markets also have an inherent tendency to form bubbles, excessive values for particular assets, whether seventeenth century Dutch tulips or twentieth century Japanese real estate and Thai currency, that cause economic harm when the bubble bursts and prices plunge. In responding to these events, governments can make errors. They can act too slowly, or fail to implement the proper policies, or implement improper ones. Moreover, the global economy and the national economies that comprise it, like a living organism, change constantly and sometimes rapidly: Capital flows across sovereign borders, for instance, far more rapidly and in much greater volume in the early twenty-first century than ever before. This means that measures that successfully address economic malfunctions at one time may have less effect at another, just as medical science must cope with the appearance of new strains of influenza against which existing vaccines are not effective. Most importantly, since the Great Depression, an active American international economic role has been crucial both in fortifying the conditions for global economic well-being and in coping with the problems that have occurred, especially periodic recessions and currency crises, by applying the lessons of the past. The absence of such a role could weaken those conditions and aggravate those problems. The overall American role in the world since World War II therefore has something in common with the theme of the Frank Capra film It's a Wonderful Life, in which the angel Clarence, played by Henry Travers, shows James Stewart, playing the bank clerk George Bailey, who believes his existence to have been worthless, how life in his small town of Bedford Falls would have unfolded had he never been born. George Bailey learns that people he knows and loves turn out to be far worse off without him. So it is with the United States and its role as the world's government. Without that role, the world very likely would have been in the past, and would become in the future, a less secure and less prosperous place. The abdication by the United States of some or all of the responsibilities for international security that it had come to bear in the first decade of the twenty-first century would deprive the international system of one of its principal safety features, which keeps countries from smashing into each other, as they are historically prone to do. In this sense, a world without America would be the equivalent of a freeway full of cars without brakes. Similarly, should the American government abandon some or all of the ways in which it had, at the dawn of the new century, come to support global economic activity, the world economy would function less effectively and might even suffer a severe and costly breakdown. A world without the United States would in this way resemble a fleet of cars without gasoline.

## Solvency

### HMT Solves

#### Annual HMT surplus sufficient to solve

Leone, MPA port director, 2012

(Michael, “Harbor Maintenance Funding and Maritime Tax Issues," CQ Congressional Testimony, 2-1, lexis)

As a result, only about 35% of America's navigation channels are currently at their authorized depth and width, which means that vessels calling our ports cannot be fully loaded or may be restricted to a one way transit. The entire maritime industry, therefore, is grateful for the oversight provided by your committees to ensure this tax on port users is used for its intended purpose -- ensuring that the navigation channels leading to our ports are regularly dredged to their authorized dimensions so that vessels calling our ports can deliver essential commodities and can take American made products to its global customers. Only with regular investments in dredging can these critical parts of our national transportation system continue to serve as gateways for the more than two billion tons of domestic, import and export cargo they are expected to handle each year, which in turn helps keep American businesses - both large and small - competitive in world markets. This concern is even greater today as East and Gulf Coast ports prepare for the larger vessels that will be transiting though an expanded Panama Canal. What is frustrating for many port directors who have dredging needs that go unmet is that **the money** for these projects **is available**. The users of our ports and harbors still pay their full share for maintenance dredging - over one dollar for every thousand dollars worth of imported and domestic cargo they move - while only getting back half as much benefit in return. Current estimates are that users of our nation's waterways are paying approximately $1.4 billion per year in harbor maintenance taxes which is about the amount the Army Corps of Engineers has determined is the annual need for maintenance dredging. Yet, this past fiscal year only about $820 million was appropriated for channel maintenance. That still leaves, according to the most recent estimates I've seen, a surplus in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund of about **$6.4 billion** and growing. This shortfall in funding is of particular concern to regional or niche ports, which are usually not included in the President's budget, because they generally handle less tonnage than the major container and bulk cargo ports. There are many ports in Massachusetts in need of maintenance dredging , for example, which could be completed if all of the HMT was appropriated each year. Not every port will need to have channels that are 50-feet deep in order to handle the largest ships that will traverse the expanded Panama Canal when that modernization project is set to be complete in 2014. But many will, and others will need to be dredged to handle the larger vessels that will be used in moving cargo from the larger hub ports to regional ports. In the meantime, individual ports have been dredging our own berths at our own cost, buying cranes that can handle these larger vessels, and investing in terminal infrastructure. Indeed, it's estimated that seaports invest more than $2.5 billion every year to maintain and improve their infrastructure, which is why ports are often discouraged that federal investments in maintenance dredging have not kept pace with their own. The larger issue is that spending on maintenance dredging is particularly critical at this time, and not only because of the larger ships that ports will soon be expected to handle, but to ensure that the Administration's National Export Initiative of doubling U.S. exports can be fulfilled. U. S. ports are the gateways for international trade and having a modern, reliable and cost-effective marine transportation system will expedite the delivery of U.S. exports to the global marketplace. Delays in the movement of exported cargo will only hurt the competiveness of U.S exports. As is true throughout the country, the Port of Boston is a vital economic engine for the New England region -- carrying cargo, opening markets for domestic goods, creating jobs and generating economic prosperity for our citizens. American seaports carry all but about 1% of the country's overseas cargo. They help generate almost 30% of Gross Domestic Product and support more than 13 million jobs. America's economic future depends on modern ports with facilities adequate enough, and channels deep enough, to keep pace with the demands of the global economy. It is now critical that Congress honor its pledge to maintain the nation's ports and harbors with the revenue provided by users. This can be accomplished through a shift in funding priorities in both the Congress and within the Administration, given that **annual revenue is available and adequate to meet current needs**. I would also urge the passage of H.R. 104 that would require that the annual Harbor Maintenance Tax revenue be made fully available to the Army Corps of Engineers for maintenance dredging in its annual appropriation. I, along with many other Port Directors, strongly support passage of H.R. 104 so that our marine transportation system can remain efficient and continue to serve as a national and regional economic engine.

### Dredging Key

#### Dredging key-otherwise martime industry and US economy will collapse

Weakley, Lake Carriers’ Association president, 2008

(James, “Realize America’s Maritime Promise”, 4-30, <http://www.ramphmtf.org/speeches_043008.html>, DOA: 7-12-12)

Port-related jobs are critical to augment our economy. Direct and indirect jobs generated by ports result in the employment of more than 8 million Americans who earned and spent $314.5 billion in 2006. Every $1 billion in exports alone creates an estimated 15, 000 new jobs. In Texas alone one in every four jobs is linked to trade. ¶ America´s deep-draft navigation system is at a crossroads, with a future that can be bright or bleak. Our waterways´ ability to support the Nation?s continuing growth in trade and in the defense of our Nation, hinges on much-needed Federal attention to unresolved funding needs that are derailing critical channel maintenance and deep-draft construction projects of the water highways to our ports. Because most ports do not have naturally deep harbors, they must be regularly dredged to allow ships to move safely through Federal navigation channels. Also, as modern vessels increase in size, navigation channel depths must increase accordingly, if we are to continue to be a player on the international marketplace. A recent U.S. Army Corps of Engineers study reports that almost 30 percent of the 95, 550 vessel calls at U.S. ports are constrained due to inadequate channel depths. Ladies and gentlemen, these are the things that cause port directors nightmares.¶ Without a channel dredged to its authorized depth, nothing else comes into play. Attracting new customers, dealing with labor issues, environmental concerns, and the public - all go away - because without a properly-dredged channel, business goes away. Public ports are at a critical state in keeping their channels open for business. We are losing existing business and potential new business to ports outside of the United States and once lost, it is rarely regained. ¶ Dredging can literally make or break our industry, and a lack of dredging is an issue throughout the United States. In fact, it is not an overstatement to say that in many parts of the United States, we face a dredging crisis. On the Great Lakes, as Chairman James L. Oberstar of this Committee and Chairman David R. Obey of the Appropriations Committee well know, decades of inadequate funding for dredging have left a backlog of 18 million cubic yards of sediment. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates removing the backlog will cost more than $230 million on the Great Lakes alone. In some cases, ports on the Great Lakes have actually shutdown due to inadequate dredging. There are similar examples of dredging problems in ports and harbors on all coasts of our Nation. ¶ In many cases, vessels must ?load light? because of dredging shortfalls. The economic implications of light loading are enormous. On the Great Lakes, for example, vessels lose between 50 to 270 tons of cargo for each inch they must reduce their draft and, in some areas, the lost draft is measured in feet, not inches. Light loading because of inadequate dredging impacts everyone. A ship that is light-loaded reduces its efficiencies in the same way that a commercial airplane that is required to set aside seats with no passengers would quickly lose its efficiencies. ¶ The Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund¶ The Harbor Maintenance Tax and the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund were established in the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1986. The Trust Fund (HMTF) applies a 0.125 percent ad valorem tax on the value of commercial cargo loaded or unloaded on vessels using Federally-maintained channels. The tax is only assessed on imports and domestic cargo, as it was ruled as an unconstitutional assessment on exports in a 1998 Supreme Court ruling. This Fund - that you, members of Congress - established, was authorized to be utilized to recover 100 percent of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers eligible Operations and Maintenance (O&M) expenditures for commercial navigation, along with 100 percent of the O&M cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway, certain costs of NOAA, and the costs to Customs to collect the tax. ¶ Fixing the Problem¶ Ladies and gentleman - would it surprise you to know that this utilization has not been honored? HMTF revenues exceed transfers for authorized activities by an increasing margin. Yet, our Federal channels are not being maintained at authorized depths. The Fund is being held hostage to paper balance the budget - interestingly, not one of its legal uses. In 2007, the HMTF began with a $3.3 billion surplus and collected an additional $1.4 billion - resulting in a $4.7 billion surplus, while only $751 million was utilized for maintenance dredging. That is incredible. I would ask that you consider this analogy offered by my colleague in a Gulf Coast port: "What would you say to a toll booth operator who took your money to use the toll road only to then tell you that the road was unusable?"? ¶ That is what is happening to shippers who pay this tax every day. We must solve this problem. We must draft legislation that mandates that the Fund be utilized for its intended purpose - the maintenance dredging of Federal ports and harbors. There are a number of ways to address this problem. As you know, other modes of transportation - surface transportation and aviation ? have faced similar problems in the past decade. Although we are in the early stages of addressing this problem, our Coalition believes Congress should consider an approach similar to that taken with the Highway Trust Fund in 1998 and with the Airport and Airway Trust Fund in 2000. In those cases, Congress legislatively enacted "firewalls" around the Trust Funds ? essentially guaranteeing minimum levels of spending that could only be used to support eligible projects. Although there are some variations between the Highway, Aviation, and Harbor Maintenance Trust, the point of a firewall in each case is the same - ensuring that monies from a tax would be used for their intended purpose and not merely for deficit reduction.

## AT: Counterplans

### AT: PPPs CP

#### Case is a prerequisite

Miller et al., Urban Land Institute infrastructure expert, 2011

(Jonathan, “Infrastructure 2011: A Strategic Priority”, [www.uli.org/~/media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Infrastructure/Infrastructure2011.ashx](http://www.uli.org/~/media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Infrastructure/Infrastructure2011.ashx), DOA: 7-13-12)

PROVIDE GREATER FEDERAL **CERTAINTY**. Congress could help lubricate the public/ private partnership process for infrastructure development by **allocating funding in a way that ensures support over extended project time horizons**. “It’s difficult to attract private money into U.S. transportation infrastructure without **long-term certainty** of funding”; the annual appropriations mentality of Congress and shortfalls in the Highway Trust Fund do not inspire confidence. “Many prospective bidders don’t want to take the chance dollars will run out in later years. They don’t want to be left high and dry.” In Europe and Asia, infrastructure projects are typically viewed as 30- to 40-year investments.

### AT: States CP

#### Ports don't have the funds-- state action takes decades

Feigenbaum 12 - transportation policy analyst with Reason Foundation (Baruch, “Government Bureaucracy Is Sinking Port Deepening Projects,” 2/13/12, http://reason.org/news/show/1012613.html)

CURRENT FUNDING PROCESS Most ports do not have the local funds to deepen their harbors. The cost of deepening ranges from $600 million for the port of Savannah to $1.3 billion for the port of New York. Ports must go through a cumbersome, lengthy, and unpredictable process to obtain federal funding that is governed by the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA 2007). The first task in the current federal process is a reconnaissance study, which examines the cost-benefit ratio. Conducting the study requires a Congressional authorization and an appropriation and must show a cost-benefit ratio of 1.0 or higher, where the benefits of deepening the port are greater than the costs, for the process to continue. The feasibility study, the next step, includes an Environmental Impact Study, Design Overview, and Economic Analysis. This Economic Analysis often compares one port to another port to determine if a project has a net national benefit. In the analysis the Army Corps of Engineers studies incremental increases such as deepening a harbor from 42 to 43 feet and then from 43 to 44 feet. The Corps studies each incremental increase until it finds the deepening with the greatest benefit. After the Corps has completed the study it transmits the findings, labeled a Chief's Report, to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works. The findings recommend proceeding - if it is appropriate - with the process. If the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works agrees with the recommendation, the plan will be forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget, which must also approve the project, and Congress. At this stage the project is approved, but it is not yet funded. Currently OMB has a freeze on funding all new port deepening projects because it is prioritizing public safety projects. The Port of New Jersey/New York is the only port to have received sufficient funds -over $600 million- to deepen its harbor. And it took the port almost 10 years from the start of the process until the port began the dredging process in 2008. Many other East Coast and Gulf Coast ports are on a waiting list for federal funds to permanently deepen their harbors. The following ports have expressed an interest: Boston, MA; Morehead City, NC; Charleston, SC: Savannah, GA; Jacksonville, FL; Canaveral, FL; Fort Lauderdale, FL; Miami, FL; Mobile, AL; Port Arthur, TX; Galveston, TX; Texas City, TX; Freeport, TX; Corpus Christi, TX; and Brownsville, TX. The current situation is problematic for two reasons. First, with the Panama Canal opening in 2015, other ports cannot afford to wait for a 10-year-long process. Second, with limited federal money available and the prioritization of safety projects, some ports may not receive any federal funding at all.

#### Federal regulations and funding key to private investment

Gibbs 11 – Subcommittee Chairman (Bob, “Memorandum on the Hearing on “The Economic Importance of Seaports: Is the United States Prepared for 21st Century Trade Realities?”, October 21, 2011, http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/112th/Water/Water%20Briefing%20Memo%20%20%2010-26-11.pdf)

Infrastructure Investment Investing in ports not only creates jobs during the construction period, but supports wider and long lasting opportunities. Knowing the value of maritime trade, localities and port authorities have invested in the infrastructure of their ports. The AAPA finds that American ports are investing $2 billion annually in marine terminal capital improvements. The Port of New Orleans has spent $400 million in recent years on landside improvements that make it more efficient and attractive to shippers. Acknowledging that 12% of the country's international containers pass under the Bayonne Bridge, The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey have pledged $1 billion toward the bridge retrofit that will allow for Post Panamax ships to sail under it and into the Atlantic Coast's busiest port. The cost benefit analysis of the project estimates that this single project will provide a $3.3 billion dollar annual national benefit. Local investments optimize existing infrastructure and increases port efficiency; however, many projects are required to utilize Federal funds and processes. The operation and maintenance of shipping channels is paid for by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), which is funded from a .125% ad valorum tax levied on cargo imports at American ports. The HMTF is a user fee that grows based on the value of cargo coming to ports. These monies pay for the necessary dredging that keeps navigation channels open for business. In fiscal year 2010, the HMTF grew by $1.3 billion; however, only $828,550,000 was spent in total operations of the fund as the balance was diverted to deficit spending. Because the HMTF is not \_off-'book' on paper there is a balance, however the reality is that all of the balance has been used to offset other government spending. Because of this inequitable allocation, many of the country's most valuable navigation channels are under maintained, reducing the cost effectiveness and efficiency of maritime trade. While some FY 2012 presidential budget requests reflect goals of the NEI, in the areas of navigation there appears to be a disconnect between the production of exports and the transportation of exports overseas. The International Trade Administration request was $526 million towards the administration costs of implementation. Thirty million dollars of Small Business Administration grants are to be disbursed to states to support export activities. Transportation is addressed in the President's budget request with a sweeping surface transportation authorization request and $70.5 billion to fund the Federal Highway Administration. However, maritime trade, the most prevalent form of exportation, does not receive as much funding necessary to support a significant development much less doubling exports. The President's Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program appropriation request in the Administration's FY 2012 budget submittal is $4.631 billion, which is approximately 6.1% below the annualized Continuing Resolution for FY 2011 of $4.929 billion. These funds are distributed to the many missions of the Corps civil works program including investigations, construction, operations and maintenance, levee safety, flood control and environmental restoration. The Corps budget has a profound effect on waterborne commerce as it shoulders the bulk of coastal infrastructure development and operation and maintenance activities. Unlike surface transportation funding, there is no Federal credit assistance programs for the construction, operation and maintenance of ports' navigation channels. Even local ports with willing investors are often required to wait on Federal appropriations to pursue needed projects. Two accounts within the budget of the Corps have significant impact on maritime trade: Construction - The President's budget requests $1.48 billion for the Construction account. This is $210 million less than the FY 2011 annualized Continuing Resolution of $1.69 billion. These funds are used for the construction of river and harbor, flood damage reduction, shore protection, environmental restoration, and related projects specifically authorized or made available for selection by law. Almost half of this budget request is for flood damage reduction projects. However, more alarming is that approximately $470 million are for ecosystem restoration projects that provide Rule or no economic benefits, while navigation projects would only receive $280 million. Operation and Maintenance - The President's budget also requests $2.314 billion for expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control and related projects. This is $47 million less than the FY 2011 annualized Continuing Resolution of $2.361 billion. The budget would use only $691 million from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund resulting in an increase in the estimated balance from $6.12 billion to $6.93 billion at the end of FY 2012. In addition, while proposing paltry amounts be appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, the President's budget proposes to expand the authorized purposes of the fund for activities not typically associated with the Corps of Engineers maintenance of navigation channels. Among the persistent barriers to trade, only one-third of the nation's federal navigation projects are currently at their authorized depths and widths, and 8 out of the nation's 10 largest ports are not at their authorized depths and widths. Exporters are required to wait for high tide to get out of port or are forced to ship in lighter loads. This reality is especially burdensome for the many raw material exporters whose products are heavy and whose ships require deeper drafts. Overall, the President's proposal does not address some of the nation's most profound infrastructure needs. It does not direct Congress to pursue multiyear reauthorizations that provide stability and predictable funding to projects. Developing world-class infrastructure cannot be hurried to completion in two years to comply with a truncated funding schedule. Even beyond funding, a transportation infrastructure bill could include no cost policy changes that would support maritime trade. The proposed legislation does not streamline the permitting processes, an action that would expedite valuable projects. Permit backlog delays the timeline for construction and increases costs associated with navigation projects that could promote maritime trade. Also, legislation that would support maritime trade would allow non-federal project sponsors to supply more capital to navigation projects without having to wait on the appropriations process. Re-authorizations, permanent policy changes, and regulatory reduction would unlock private capital and hasten project completion, benefitting maritime trade and the economy as a whole existing river and harbor, flood control and related projects. This is $47 million less than the FY 2011 annualized Continuing Resolution of $2.361 billion.

#### Federal action key-only way to bypass cumbersome regulations

Anderson, JAXPORT CEO, 2011

(Paul, “The Economic Importance of Seaports: Is the United States Prepared for 21st Century Trade Realities?”, 10-26, <http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Anderson.pdf>, DOA: 7-12-12)

With increasingly larger ships calling the East Coast, it is now more crucial than ever for the United States to invest in its gateway infrastructure. This call for federal investment should come as no surprise. Improving our nation’s waterways for navigation and security harkens back to the birth of our country, when General George Washington assigned such missions to the Continental Army. [7] In the U.S. Constitution, Congress is charged with the task of regulating commerce in Article I, Section 8. Yet, the full authorized depths and widths of U.S. waterway navigation channels are available only 35 percent of the time. [8] Harbor projects take an average of 12 years to complete. The Corps’ cumbersome review procedures are not consistent with the President’s initiative to reduce red tape and streamline preconstruction federal review procedures for major infrastructure “jobs creating” projects. The President’s Aug. 31 directive to five federal agencies ‐ Agriculture, Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, Interior and Transportation ‐ called for identification of high priority infrastructure projects for expedited review. This expedited review initiative should be extended to the Army Corps. Additionally, Independent Peer Review – a procedure required by Sec. 2034 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 2007 – should not be applied to Corps studies begun prior to the two year period preceding enactment of the law, as expressly stated in Sec. 2034 (h). ¶ Because of procedural delay, most East Coast ports are not authorized to dredge to deep‐draft requirements. Harbor project sponsors attempt to wade through the muddied and shifting approval, authorization and appropriation process, and changing requirements are making it increasingly difficult to move forward with these critical projects. In Jacksonville, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recently added an additional level of review by requiring “Harbor Sym modeling” for our city’s deep draft navigation project. This new requirement has not been applied to previous deep draft projects, will increase costs to the federal government and the Jacksonville Port Authority, and will extend the timeline for completion of the project by one year. Any business leader assessing the current situation would quickly determine our country’s process for prioritizing, approving and funding critical infrastructure projects is fundamentally broken.

#### Fed key-review process

Nagle, GMU economics masters, 2012

(Kurt, “Budget Hearing - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers –Assistant Secretary, Chief of Engineers”, 3-7, <http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/PDFs/EWTestimony%20Mar2012%20Final.pdf>, DOA: 7-12-12)

The second troubling trend that impacts our ability to be ready for the challenges of the future is the time it takes to complete new projects. Ports are growing increasingly wary of the time it takes to complete a project. The new norm is decades, with costs rising with each delay. There are a multitude of reasons for these delays, including a long, slow approval process, lack of funding which results in small amounts of funding for each project, and lack of resources to maintain expertise at the Corps. We must make port modernization a higher priority in our future funding. Maritime movement of cargo is the most cost-effective way to move cargo, and we should be encouraging this through effective federal project development processes, investments and funding.5 ¶ As our nation recovers from its economic troubles, we know that cargo growth will expand as well. As our nation invests in infrastructure, we must ensure that ports and their needs are high on the list. We are in a critical time for our nation. We face enormous challenges, and ports are making the necessary investments to build and maintain a world-class maritime transportation system which support U.S. jobs, our global competitiveness, and our economy. We need our federal partner to make that commitment, too. We urge your subcommittee to serve as advocates for waterside port infrastructure so that we can meet the challenges of today and tomorrow

#### Fed key

AAPA 2011

(“Getting Back to Basics”, March, <http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/PDFs/Transportation%20and%20the%20Constitution1.pdf>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the United ¶ States Constitution, Congress, by statute, has ¶ reserved jurisdiction over navigable waters for the ¶ federal government, which can determine how ¶ the waters are used, by whom, and under what ¶ conditions. As a result, the federal government ¶ takes the lead in building, maintaining, and ¶ operating the nation’s navigation channels.¶ Authority to construct and maintain navigation ¶ projects on behalf of the United States was ¶ granted to the Corps of Engineers in the General ¶ Survey Act of 1824. In 1826, Congress passed ¶ the first Rivers and Harbors Act and provided ¶ funds to the Corps to make specific navigation ¶ improvements to the Ohio, Mississippi, and ¶ Missouri Rivers. Congress has continued to ¶ appropriate funds for specific navigation projects ¶ and the Corps has played a dual role by ¶ assessing, as well as implementing, needed ¶ projects in federal navigation channels. In 1899, ¶ Congress enacted the Rivers and Harbors Act, ¶ which makes it unlawful to undertake any ¶ modifications of navigable water channels unless ¶ authorized by the Secretary of the Army on the ¶ recommendation of the Corps of Engineers.¶ It is well established that the Commerce ¶ Clause is the basis for exclusive federal jurisdiction over navigable waterways. The landmark ¶ United States Supreme Court case of Gibbons v. ¶ Ogden, 22 U.S. 1 (1824) found that navigation of ¶ vessels in and out of the ports of the nation is a ¶ form of interstate commerce and that federal law ¶ takes precedence. Federal authority over ¶ navigable waterways has been repeatedly ¶ affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court. ¶ With interstate commerce and connectivity as the impetus, the federal role in ensuring a contiguous system of roads spanning the states has been implicit in our federal government since the writing of the Constitution. These powers were granted to Congress in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution by the clauses describing ¶ the regulation of commerce with foreign nations and among the several states …” and the responsibility “to establish Post Offices and Post Roads.” As the timeline illustrates, since the founding of this great nation, our most visionary leaders have engaged in national infrastructure initiatives. The highway system as we know it today was largely borne out of the 1939 Bureau of Public Roads report commissioned by Franklin Delano Roosevelt titled Toll Roads and Free Roads, which proposed a map of a transcontinental national superhighway system. This led to President Eisenhower’s Federal-Aid Highway of 1956 and subsequent development of the Interstate System. Without the federal role in planning, coordinating and providing funding, our current system of inter-regional highways would not have been possible. ¶ Today, this federal responsibility continues through the surface transportation programs funded largely by federal gas taxes. Highways, arterials and secondary roads that are identified as being important to the nation's economy, defense, and mobility are classified as part of the National Highway System (NHS) and are eligible for federal funds through the federal-aid program. ¶ Road infrastructure that accesses major intermodal terminals, including seaports, are designated NHS connectors by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). While accounting for less than one percent of total NHS mileage, this important infrastructure represents a critical link in the goods movement value chain, carrying truck traffic between transportation modes and to the broader network of the interstate system. According to the Federal Highway Administration, of the 616 total defined NHS intermodal connectors, 253 are connected to ocean and river ports. Of the 1,222 total miles defined as part of the NHS intermodal connectors, 532 miles are port-related infrastructure. Unfortunately, these roads are often inadequate and in poor condition, plagued by inadequate turning radii and shoulder deficiencies and have been found to have twice the percentage of mileage with pavement deficiencies when compared to non-interstate NHS routes according to a study conducted by USDOT. States and MPOs have traditionally assigned freight-focused projects a low priority when compared with passenger-related improvements. Due to their freight-focused nature, NHS connectors generally do not fare well in project selection within the State and MPO planning processes. ¶ This critical infrastructure is more important than ever as our nation rebuilds the economy and creates jobs by expanding commerce through free trade agreements and increasing America’s exports and international competitiveness. These roads are key pieces of our connection to the world marketplace. ¶ In addition to their national economic importance, NHS Intermodal connectors are vital to defense mobilization and national security. With the military's increasing reliance on strategic ports and commercial trucking for mobility, intermodal connectors are critical to national defense planning. ¶ Given the reliance of our national economy and defense on intermodal connectors, it is important that the federal government remain engaged in identifying, prioritizing and funding improvements to this critical infrastructure which has languished when dependent upon State and local planning processes.

#### Federal requirements and jurisdiction-make them the only sustainable actor.

Dyke, Greenville News business writer, 2010

(David, “Two options for port funding, Graham says”, 11-19, lexis)

The Ports Authority says it needs to deepen the Charleston harbor to remain competitive following the widening of the Panama Canal in 2014. The widening is expected to quicken a trend toward megaships that will change global logistics and open new business opportunities for South Atlantic shipping facilities. The Charleston port can accommodate the big ships now, but only during high tide. Port officials have said a $400,000 federal earmark to study the deepening of the Charleston harbor is a critical initial step in a $300 million expansion. Federal law requires the Corps of Engineers to conduct the study before improvements to a harbor can be made. Without it, no deepening is permitted and it must be funded through the appropriations process, the officials said. They said there is no other way. Business leaders, including executives from Boeing South Carolina, Sonoco, BMW Manufacturing, Milliken & Co. and Michelin North America, have stressed that the port is South Carolina's single most important natural asset and will help shape the state's economy for generations. Officials with the Georgia Ports Authority said they reached a major milestone Wednesday with their plan to expand the Savannah Harbor. It was reached, the officials said, when the Corps of Engineers released its draft environmental impact statement to the public and agencies for review and comment. "The study's release is a significant step forward for the Savannah harbor expansion project and addresses a critical need of our country's transportation infrastructure," said Curtis J. Foltz, the Georgia authority's executive director. The $40 million scientific study details plans to avoid impacts to natural resources and proposes mitigation for any unavoidable impacts of the project. GPA officials say larger vessels offer more capacity and lower the cost per container compared to current Panamax vessels. That's an important economic consideration for such companies as BMW and Michelin, which both have large Upstate operations and are major users of the Port of Charleston. The Georgia harbor expansion will deepen the Savannah River from its current 42-foot depth to as much as 48 feet. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution reported the project would cost an estimated $551 million with 70 percent borne by the federal government. Georgia's legislators have approved $102.3 million of the remaining costs, the newspaper reported. Long term, DeMint said he wants to restructure the way the Corps of Engineers identifies priorities and funds projects. He also wants to reform the Harbor Maintenance Trust fund to allow South Carolina to get back the money it contributes. Currently, the fund can't be used for new construction to make a port deeper, as Charleston proposes. He said he wants to meet with officials from the port, the Corps of Engineers and legal advisers to determine if the port can proceed with its own feasibility study and have that study recognized by the federal agency. Graham has said states have the right to fund such studies on their own. However, federal officials have rejected port studies conducted that way and states didn't get reimbursed for the money they spent, he said. Port officials worry that if they pay the initial feasibility-study cost, it will jeopardize federal funding for the project. Normally, a cost-sharing system is in place where the federal government will pay 40 percent of the construction bill to deepen the harbor, with the state paying the remaining 60 percent, a port spokesman said. DeMint told The News recently that he understands the port's importance to the state and its economy, but it was time to draw the line on earmarks. Graham this week joined DeMint and Sen. Mitch McConnell, the Senate Republican leader, in calling for a two-year ban on the practice. Raju Chebium of Gannett's Washington Bureau contributed to this report.

#### **Congressional funding necessary for depth expansion**

Fritelli 11 --Specialist in transportation policy (John, Congressional Research Service, "Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Expenditures," January 10, 2011, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41042.pdf) CS

The HMTF is used to fund maintenance dredging, not new construction. Maintenance dredging is work performed to maintain a channel`s depth and width to the dimensions authorized by Congress. To increase a channel's authorized depth or width requires an act of Congress, which is referred to as construction or "new work" by the Corps and is funded from the General Treasury not the HMTF. There are also different federal/local cost sharing requirements between construction and maintenance dredging as indicated in the following table. 7 The cost of bigger ships is illustrated at the Port of New York/New Jersey. To deepen the port to 50 feet. dredgers have had to go beyond just removing soft clay and silt-they have had to blast away up to ten feet of bedrock. But the "design" draft of a ship is not the only concern: sufficient draft can also be a problem To reach most of the port's terminals. ships must pass under the Bayonne Bridge. which has an under-deck clearance of 156 feet at low tide. too low for the size of ships expected to call at the port once the Panama Canal has finished its deepening project. The port authority is studying options to either raise the deck of t11e existing bridge. build a new bridge. or dig a tunnel under t11e ship channel.

Note: HMTF= Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund

#### Too many conflicts and USACE study required

Allen 12 - Judson Falknor Professor of Law, University of Washington, Visiting Professor, Yale Law School and Distinguished Visiting Professor of Maritime Studies, U.S. Coast Guard Academy (Craig, “ Future Ports Scenarios for 21ST Century Port Strategic Planning”, JOURNAL OF TRANSPORTATION LAW, LOGISTICS & POLICY, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2066661_code334079.pdf?abstractid=1967856&mirid=2>)

To keep pace with growing capacity demands, marine terminals that once averaged 50 acres, with alongside depths of less than 40 feet, now find themselves expanding to 100 and even 200 or more acres and needing alongside depths sufficient to accommodate ships with 50 foot drafts. On-dock rail access, nearby container freight stations and the need for an efficient transit corridor connecting the port to its intermodal arteries create additional port development challenges. Ports attempting to address those development challenges complain, and the federal MTS studies largely agree, that domestic management of marine areas in the U.S. is badly fragmented and is plagued with a confusing array of laws, regula­tions and practices at the federal, state and local levels. In some places, more than a dozen federal, state and local agencies regulate the same cubic foot of water. Additionally, devel­opment and operations planning in marine areas suffers from frequent conflicts between federal, state, local, tribal and interagency mandates, policies and procedures, and too often lacks an effective mechanism for resolving those conflicts.91 Exasperated port officials in Charleston, SC, would likely be among the first to declare the current regime ponderously slow. Port planning efforts there to dredge the channel to 50 feet, to accommodate the larger Panamax ships that will be trading to east coast ports after the Panama Canal expansion project is completed in the summer of 2014, were “slow steamed” by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, who told the port that a 5-8 year long feasibility study costing up to $20 million will be required before the dredging could even begin. As a result, the project could not be completed until 2024—more than a decade after the canal expansion.92

#### Feds key

**National Academies Press, no date** (*Dredging Coastal Ports: An Assessment of the Issues* pages 78-79)

The important role and responsibilities of the US Army Corps of Engineers in all port dredging projects—whether federally or locally funded—makes **the federal government the focus of concern of those who advocate fast tracking**. The federal role in ports results from three basic developments. First, **the Constitution of the United States prohibits discrimination among the nation’s ports by the federal government**. Second, since the passage in 1824 of the General Survey Act, **the Corps has had primary responsibility to oversee or carry out dredging for the nation’s ports**. The Corps’ initial responsibility was to ensure navigability. Some of this responsibility is now taken by the US Coast Guard (placement of aids to navigation, for example). Ensuring navigability by dredging is still a responsibility of the Corps. Third, during the late 1960s and the decade of the 1970s, **a broad set of environmental legislation gave the Corps and a variety of other federal agencies responsibility for assessing the environmental consequences of dredging and other activities and ensuing that those activities met standards adopted to protect the environment. They key institutional consequences of this body of legislation was to require that the Corps take responsibilities far beyond navigation and to assure that it coordinate and cooperate with a variety of other federal agencies as well as state and local governments.** **The Corps, then, is the key and lead federal agency for dredging activities irrespective of origin or funding**. Federal projects differ from local projects in a number of ways. Historically**, the federal government has assumed responsibility both for construction and maintenance of maybe access channels, maneuvering areas and anchorages in the ports of the United States**. This has meant that **the federal government both funds and manages federal dredging activities**. **Funding for federal projects has traditionally been provided in omnibus authorization and appropriations bills enacted by the Congress every two years** or so. The projects pass through several phases ranging from initial investigations to physical construction**. Movement from one key phase to the next requires specific authorization and funding by Congress,** and intermediate steps—consultation with other federal and state agencies, the public and preparation of reports for successive approvals by higher levels of the Corps—might depend on annual appropriations. The evolution from initiation to completion of federal dredging projects is outlined in Table 14 (Appendix G) and mapped against time in Table 15 (Appendix G). The average time initiation to completion is 21.6 years. Over

### ----Ext. No Jurisdiction

#### Channels are federal property

Gerena 05— Online Editor at Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Business Writer at Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond (Charles, “Sink or swim”, Winter, Region Focus, ProQuest, http://proxy.lib.umich.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/docview/201535291?accountid=14667)

First, there is the task of deepening and widening waterways even further. Since channels are federal property, the Army Corps of Engineers performs routine dredging that clears channels of silt and other debris, while federal funding covers part of the cost of enlarging channels. Ports pay the remainder of that tab, plus they are responsible for deepening the access channels that lead to individual terminals and the berths where ships dock.

#### Federal laws prevent ports from increasing revenues

Cook 11 - J.D. Candidate, Fordham University School of Law (Christopher T., “FUNDING PORT-RELATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT: THE CURRENT DEBATE AND PROPOSED REFORM” 38 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1523, lexis)

Containerized cargo is here to stay, but what is less certain is how the United States will fund new infrastructure and development to accommodate its proliferation within the shipping industry. n27 In recent years, members of Congress have proposed legislation to fund infrastructure and development at U.S. seaports. n28 Three of these proposals create a fund based on a tax or fee assessed on the value of goods entering or leaving the United States. n29 A separate proposal concerns the creation of an infrastructure bank that, with an initial government contribution of $ 10 billion, would "leverage private-public partnerships and maximize private funding" to fund infrastructure and development projects. n30 Two of these proposals died in committee during the 111th Congress, n31 and the other two have been reintroduced in the 112th Congress after failing to be enacted in previous legislative sessions. n32 [\*1529] The hands of local port authorities, however, are tied by constitutional and statutory constraints, rather than a lack of consensus. n33 Port authorities generate revenues through the management of port facilities. n34 The ability of port authorities to assess taxes on shippers "for the privilege of entering, or trading, or lying in a port or harbor" n35 is precluded by the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution's Tonnage Clause. n36 The Court has, however, recognized a State's ability to assess a charge on shippers for actual use of port facilities that is fairly apportioned to "opportunities, benefits, or protection conferred or afforded by the taxing [authority]." n37 Congress placed additional constraints on state regulatory authority with the passage of the Shipping Act. n38 The Shipping Act provides that port authorities cannot "fail to establish, observe, and enforce just and reasonable regulations and practices relating to or connected with receiving, handling, storing, or delivering property [at ports]"n39 or impose "any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage with respect to any person." n40 Courts and the Federal Maritime Commission ("FMC") have interpreted this as requiring any fee imposed on a shipper, trucker, marine terminal operator, n41 or beneficial [\*1530] cargo owner n42(collectively "Port Users") to generate actual benefits to the user on a reasonably equivalent basis. n43 The problem with this fee structure is that it limits the ability of port authorities to assess a fee for the construction and development of large-scale, port-related infrastructure and development projects n44 - the benefits of which would accrue to both those paying and not paying the fee, or the costs of which would be incurred by those not enjoying the benefit.

#### The federal government has exclusive jurisdiction

Sherman 02 – Director of Research and Information Services American Association of Port Authorities (Rexford, “Seaport Governance in the United States and Canada”, American Association of Port Authorities, http://www.aapa-ports.org/files/PDFs/governance\_uscan.pdf)

The U.S. Constitution does grant the federal government exclusive jurisdiction over the navigable waters of the United States, including its deepdraft channels and harbors--authority delegated primarily to the Coast Guard and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. But federal jurisdiction over harbors stops at the water's edge. Port authorities in the United States are instrumentalities of state or local government established by enactment or grants of authority by the state legislature. Neither Congress nor any federal agency has the power, or even the right, to appoint or dismiss port commissioners or staff members, or to amend, alter or repeal a port authority charter. Certain port activities are, of course, subject to federal law and jurisdiction, particularly those pertaining to foreign and interstate commerce

### ----Ext. No Uniformity

#### Federal supremacy key to uniform laws

Hager et al 10 (Jared D. Hager--adjunct professor of law, teaching Advanced International Commercial Arbitration at Seattle University School of Law, associate at Perkins Coie, Mary P. Gaston-- partner at Perkins Coie, Thomas J. McLaughlin-- partner at Perkins Coie, cum laude from Harvard Law School, "Navigating the Nation's Waterways and Airways: Maritime Lessons for Federal Preemption of Airworthiness Standards," The Air and Space Lawyer, Volume 23, Number 2, http://www.perkinscoie.com/files/upload/10\_27\_ABAArticle.pdf)

Federal supremacy is at the heart of the U.S. system of governance. Where Congress has explicitly preempted state law in an area, federal law supplants all state regulation in that area. Even in the absence of express congressional intent to preempt state law, federal preemption is implied where (1) state law "actually conflicts with federal law" or (2) federal law so thoroughly occupies a legislative field "as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it." The answer of whether federal safety regulation preempts state law, however, varies. For example, the Supreme Court has held that federal law provides the exclusive safety standards for nuclear power plants and oil tankers.5 On the other hand, the Court has allowed states to supplement federal law for recreational boat safety\* and warnings on pharmaceutical labels.5 The Supreme Court has not yet decided the preemptive effect of federal laws regulating safety standards for aircraft, and lower federal and state courts have taken different approaches and reached starkly different results. We argue here that air safety standards are exclusively within the province of the U.S. federal government, precluding states from imposing different, heightened safety standards, including through their tort law. We lay out our position in three sections; first we briefly survey the law of preemption generally; next, we examine three different approaches to preemption and aviation taken by federal appellate courts; and, finally, we conclude by advancing a case for federal preemption in the area of airworthiness. Our position rests on the text of the Federal Aviation Act of 19586 and the comprehensiveness of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations. Additionally, the Supreme Court"˜s decisions in a trilogy of cases addressing preemption in the context of maritime safety support our conclusion. The Court"˜s seaworthiness cases are particularly relevant to airworthiness because (1) Congress has required that federal law prescribes rules ensuring the safe navigation of both the nation's waterways and airways; (2) federal law has created a comprehensive regulatory scheme to certify both sea- and airworthiness; and (5) the movement of marine vessels and aircraft across political boundaries is vital to the commercial viability of their respective industries, and a uniform system regulating that movement is necessary to balance competing federal interests and preserve international comity.

## AT: Disads

### AT: Environment DA

#### Dredging is the safest method for excavation – your authors are misinformed

Jones, GPAA Editor/Content Director, 2012

(Brad, ,The science — and politics — of dredging”, 7-28 http://www.goldprospectors.org/Communication/ArticlesandInformation/tabid/153/EntryId/537/Dredging-doesn-t-harm-fish-experts-say.aspx, DOA: 7-13-12)

Greene was environmentally conscious back then and still is today. He remembers being especially concerned about high levels of phosphorous in laundry detergent that were causing large algae blooms and turning some affected rivers “pea soup green.” He even belonged to the Sierra Club. “I was a good environmentalist,” he said. When he first heard claims that suction dredging was harmful to fish, he was disappointed, realizing that to stay in good conscience he may be faced with giving up his gold prospecting hobby. To be sure, **he began to study the facts about suction dredging’s effects on the environment and eventually found the activist’s claims to be unsubstantiated**. Even though he had bought into the environmentalist school of thought, he began to question the science. The more he learned about activists and their agenda, the more he began backing away from them. “There are a lot of people who actually believe that mankind does not belong out in nature; that it’s only for the wildlife. There is some blend of all this weirdness. And, the worst part is we have millions of good-hearted, honest, concerned citizens who — I don’t want to call them lazy — but who are misinformed ... They are trusting these environmental organizations and they are being bamboozled by a bunch of thieves,” Greene said. If the conclusion of his study had found that suction dredging was harmful, which it didn’t, he said he would not have continued dredging. “In my own case, I wouldn’t be a miner,” he said. Since then, he has tried to convince others in the scientific community that much of the so-called science behind some of the activists’ claims is flawed or simply doesn’t exist. But, Greene said most scientists are apathetic to his concerns. “I have all sorts of friends who are scientists and they don’t care; If you hired them as a consultant they would,” Greene said. “Suction **dredge mining in waters is the most environmentally safe, best method of mining**. The most common myth is that suction dredging harms the environment. Even some miners don’t believe that suction dredging benefits fish. They are just as brainwashed. I’ve heard miners say it. It’s frustrating to me. The old saying about a lie told often enough becomes the truth is exactly what’s been happening to us in small-scale mining,” he said.

#### Impact is short term and reversible

Environmental Solutions 2002

(“Environmental Impact Assessment PROPOSED DREDGING WORKS AT WEST HARBOUR, PORT ANTONIO, JAMAICA”, July, <http://www.nrca.org/eias/ptantonio/FinalReport_PtAntonio_Dredging.pdf>, DOA: 7-13-12)

Dredging of the deep rocky ledge along the north side of the approach channel at Site H1 will result in the short-term irreversible loss of the existing coral communities living on the affected area. It should be borne in mind that at least 50 % of the 2,600m² reef area is presently comprised of dead individuals. The potentially negative impacts on the associated fish species are thought to be less severe given that that there are adequate reef and sea grass bed ecosystems within less than a 1 km radius of the site to which they may retreat. Over time, recruits of the same coral species are likely to recolonise the fresh rock face of the now deepened plateau and a similar new reef ecosystem would become established. **Thus, the immediate negative impact of deepening the approach channel would be reversed over the long-term period** (say 10 to 30 years). The reef community and sea grasses living on the slope above 7m should not be directly affected. The predominantly fast 0.232 m/s southwestward current in the channel, which maintains excellent water clarity in this section of the channel, is expected to promote rapid sediment transport of turbid waters away from the immediate area and into the channel. This will tend to reduce the time period over which undisturbed coral and sea grass species would have to endure deteriorated water clarity.

#### Dredging improves fish habitats

Jones, GPAA Editor/Content Director, 12

(Brad, ,The science — and politics — of dredging”, 7-28 http://www.goldprospectors.org/Communication/ArticlesandInformation/tabid/153/EntryId/537/Dredging-doesn-t-harm-fish-experts-say.aspx, DOA: 7-13-12)

Suction dredge mining does not harm fish and can actually improve fish habitat, scientists say. Claudia Wise and Joseph Greene, worked for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for more than 30 years. Wise is a retired physical scientist and Greene is a retired research biologist. **Both scientists have done extensive research on the issue and cannot find any evidence to substantiate claims made by environmental activists that suction dredging harms fish or fish habitat**. They say suction dredging can benefit salmon and other species of fish by improving habitat in rivers and streams. The science of dredging “Any negative effects of suction dredging on fish or fish habitat are insignificant. The benefits definitely outweigh any of the negative effects in any of the studies I’ve ever seen,” Wise said in recent interview. In almost every study, the environmental impact of suction dredge mining on fish — including salmon — and fish habitat has been proven to be “less than significant,” Greene said. Dredging improves fish habitat by creating pockets in the bottoms of riverbeds and streambeds. These depressions are ideal places for fish, especially salmon, to spawn when there are limited natural areas of loose gravel, called refugia. “It’s a pool of water within the river you might say. If it is three feet deep, it’s considered refugia, which is a depression in the river bottom that is under the main currents where fish prefer to rest in cooler water, lots of times at the mouth of a tributary,” she said. “There are so many benefits to it,” said Wise, explaining that the gravels in many rivers and streams have become so compacted over the years that the fish cannot always find a natural place to spawn. Because suction dredgers break up or loosen the gravels and create small pockets in the bottoms of streams, it often creates manmade refugia, where none had previously existed. While opponents of suction dredging argue that fresh dredge tailings (gravels), are not as stable as natural gravel beds, they are better than nothing where natural gravels don’t exist, Wise said. “However, the salmon are smart enough to recognize the difference between natural and manmade refugia,” Greene said. If there is no suitable place to spawn, the fish will spawn anyway. “The eggs will just be floating down river and be eaten by any predator that would eat them. They have to get through the gravel to build that nest.” he said. After dredge tailings have settled for a year, they become more stable and more attractive to salmon. “By the next year, you’ve got great spawning gravel,” Wise said. So, adding more refugia means salmon have more places to spawn which helps to increase salmon populations. Even one redd (nest of salmon eggs) can contain thousands of salmon eggs, she said.

### ----Ext. No Keystone Species

#### Not irreversible – keystone species live outside of dredging areas and recovery happens immediately

Ravindran, UGC Visiting Professor, School of Industrial Fisheries, 2006

(Dr, K., “Report of the Committee of Experts on Ecological and Environmental Impact of Dredging at Vaduthala Kayal and Vaikam Kayal, Kerala” in “Dredging: Removal of benthic animals”, September, <http://www.ukmarinesac.org.uk/activities/ports/ph5_2_2.htm>, DOA: 7-13-12)

During all dredging operations, the removal of material from the seabed also removes the animals living on and in the sediments (benthic animals). With the exception of some deep burrowing animals or mobile surface animals that may survive a dredging event through avoidance, dredging may initially result in the complete removal of animals from the excavation site. Where the channel or berth has been subjected to continual maintenance dredging over many years, it is unlikely that well-developed benthic communities will occur in or around the area. It is therefore unlikely that their loss as a result of regular maintenance dredging will significantly effect the marine ecology of SACs. However, certain marine species and communities are more sensitive to disturbance from dredging than others. For example, dredging where maerl beds (calcified seaweed) or Sabellaria reefs (reef forming marine worms) are present may result in the irreversible damage of these sensitive, slow growing species. These are important habitats, generally associated with the Annex I habitat subtidal sandbanks, found in only a few UK marine SACs (Birkett et al 1998). It is, however, unlikely that such sensitive marine communities would develop in close proximity to the disturbed habitat of a regularly maintained navigation channel. The recovery of disturbed habitats following dredging ultimately depends upon the nature of the new sediment at the dredge site, sources and types of re-colonising animals, and the extent of the disturbance (ICES 1992). In soft sediment environments recovery of animal communities generally occurs relatively quickly and a more rapid recovery of communities has been observed in areas exposed to periodic disturbances, such as maintained channels i . Recovery of benthic communities following dredging activities A review of dredging works in coastal areas world-wide showed that the rates of recovery of benthic communities following dredging in various habitats varied greatly (Nedwell & Elliot 1998; Newell, Seiderer & Hitchcock 1998), which is indicated as follows: **Recovery rates were most rapid in highly disturbed sediments** in estuaries that are dominated by opportunistic species. In general, recovery times increase in stable gravel and sand habitats dominated by long-lived components with complex biological interactions controlling community structure. These findings are supported by studies of the Georgia Estuary system, USA, which suggest that maintenance dredging has only a short term effect on the animal communities of the silt and clay sediments. Although almost complete removal of organisms occurs during dredging, **recovery begins within 1 month and within 2 months the communities were reported to be similar to pre-dredge conditions** (Stickney & Perlmutter 1975). Other studies suggest that dredging impacts are relatively short term in areas of high sediment mobility (Hall, Basford & Robertson 1991). For example, the complete recovery of benthic animals in a channel in the estuarine Dutch Wadden Sea occurred within 1 year of the removal of sediments from this highly mobile sand environment (Van der Veer et al 1985).

### ----Ext. Hype

#### Dredging bad is environmentalist hype

Wise et al, former EPA physical scientist, 2012

(Claudia, “The science — and politics — of dredging”, 3-28, http://www.goldprospectors.org/Communication/ArticlesandInformation/tabid/153/EntryId/537/Dredging-doesn-t-harm-fish-experts-say.aspx, DOA: 7-13-12)

Politics of dredging Even though most environmental activists are aware that suction dredgers are not allowed in the water during spawning season, they still use it as propaganda. “That’s totally bogus. The opponents know that we DO NOT dredge during spawning season ... That’s what the environmentalists use as their hammer. You can see it over and over in their writings that we are killing all the salmon and sucking up the eggs. It’s just an absolute lie.” So, why are environmental extremists so down on dredging? Both Greene and Wise contend that the push by environmental activists such as the Sierra Fund, local Friends of the River groups, and some native American tribes has nothing to do with science and **everything to do with politics and profits**. Wise said many radical environmentalist groups get government grants to research environmental issues that eventually lead to more bans, restrictions, regulations and even lawsuits against the government. “Part of it is money. If they don’t have an issue that they can spread to their membership and government, then they don’t have wages,” Wise said. “Most of those clubs don’t do habitat restoration ­— they sue. That’s their whole mandate to sue the government.” And, how are they able to use taxpayer dollars to sue the government for more taxpayer dollars? While they may not directly sue the government, they use the funds to draft environmental reports which are then handed off to other groups to sue the government, she said. “Part of the Endangered Species Act says that they have to allow funds to hold these agencies’ feet to the fire ...These people sue and they don’t even have to have their own money on the line,” Wise said. Follow the money trail In fact, there is so much money involved, that new environmental groups seem to be springing up everywhere. One example is Friends of the River. On the surface, Friends of the River groups seem to be local, but they are far from it, Wise said. “There’s so many of them. I mean, it’s a good way to make money. There’s lots of money so they are popping up all over the place. We’ve got friends of every river. They can apply for grant money. They can sue agencies. They can be the stakeholder in places they don’t even live. **It’s like a franchise**. So, they’ve got a Friends of the River for every little tributary … It’s a business; they’re out there making money.” Groups like the Sierra Fund, Greenpeace and World Wildlife Fund are doing the same thing — making money — but on a larger scale, she said. Hedge fund billionaire George Soros, founder of Earthjustice contributes millions of dollars to various environmental groups. Infamous for betting against the value of U.S. dollar among other currencies, Soros has also predicted the collapse of the Western economy. He is known for lavish funding of big-government, globalist causes and left-wing organizations such as www.moveon.org. The payoffs In recent times, part of doing business, means appeasing environmental groups whether that means siding with them or paying them off, Wise said. “Big mining companies, energy companies and drilling companies are paying them off. They are giving millions to environmental activists to stop them from suing,” she said. Because environmental groups have amassed so much money, and the big companies have appeased them in one way or another, environmental activists have resorted to suing smaller companies that don’t have the money to pay them off, Wise said. “There’s a whole environmental economy and it just keeps getting bigger and bigger and bigger. It’s huge and they are feeding off of each other. It’s a feeding frenzy, A lot of these environmental groups’ CEOs make $250,000 to $1.5 million [a year]. Why wouldn’t you find another issue?” she said. “You have to question whether it is politically driven; they are looking at politics more than science.” Conservation groups Then, there are other so-called conservation groups such as Trout Unlimited, which have smaller groups affiliated with them, like Oregon Trout. They are taking a stance against suction dredge miners out of good-intentioned ignorance, Wise said. While Oregon Trout has a vested interest in fishing, **its members are throwing miners under the bus and siding with the environmentalists in an effort to appease them**, not realizing that they could be targeted next, she explained. Wise pointed out the irony of the fishermen going out to catch — and not always release — fish and then blaming suction dredgers for killing fish. Even more hypocritical is the fact that suction dredging is not permitted during spawning season, but fishing is allowed. “Salmon fishermen fish when the salmon are spawning so there are redds present. When the fishermen walk out into the water to cast, they are stepping on redds. They catch salmon on their way upstream to spawn. They are there at their most critical time. They do so much more damage — not just fishing and killing fish, which is their whole reason for being there.” “If they [fishermen] weren’t siding with the environmental activists, the environmental activists would be trying to shut down fishing, so they are saving their own butts. That’s what they’re doing,” she said. “Fishermen are off limits, because a lot of the environmentalists are also fishermen.” Wise is convinced that if the environmental activists succeed in banning small-scale mining, fishermen will be the next logical target. **Environmental groups have to justify their own existence and will invent targets so they can keep getting grants and collect membership fees**, she said. “Fishermen are next,” Wise said. adding that Sierra Fund’s Carrie Monohan has already targeted anglers. “There are a lot of fishermen who just listen to what the environmentalists say — how bad mining is — and spread the same misinformation. And, they believe mining is bad,” Wise said. More proof that miners are getting the shaft is that boats and personal watercraft cause far more damage than dredging, but are allowed and are not under attack by the green lobby. “Jet boats do way more damage than a dredge. A suction dredge is all in one area, whereas a jet boat runs up and down the river and the waves are rushing up against the banks eroding the riverbanks and they scare the fish. They do way more damage and there are studies that show that,” she said. The green extreme Because it seems as though the entire Western world has bowed down to a new religion of environmental extremism, even the scientific community has been reluctant to challenge the green faithful. **Not only does the scientific community have blinders on, but it has attracted activists with an agenda**, Wise said. “Joe and I get really frustrated at times, because we’ve researched this whole area. Between us, we know so much about suction dredging and its effect on the environment and will give them pages and pages of reference that supports what we say, but [they say] we’re cherry picking,” she said. “And they’re not? Spouting off stuff that they don’t even have a reference for? **They ignore the science**. We have references and peer review journal articles. We could not find a single paper that showed any harm — or significant harm — to the environment.” Change in EPA doctrine Wise, who is a gold prospector and member of the GPAA, was a scientist first. “When I was young, I went panning, but I didn’t have anyone to show me how. I just went up in the hills around the Blue River area in Oregon,” she said. Her father was a scientist for the U.S. Forest Service, which she says has taken on a left-wing agenda over the years. “Now, they don’t even want to see best management practices. They want to have this pristine area that is better than is was naturally, probably. In a lot of cases, I‘ve seen that,” she said. “I think it’s just been an infiltration of a lot of these activists that must benefit somehow from it. The scientists benefit from grant money. **They can spend their whole career on a subject as long as they give the right answer**.” Wise said she first began noticing a shift in EPA philosophy about the same time the media hype over what was known then as global warming. “The 1990s was when I really started noticing it ... If we didn’t get the right answer, we weren’t allowed to publish it,” said Wise, who conducted studies and research for the EPA **for 32 years**, before retiring in 2006.

#### No data to back up the assertions.

Wise, retired physical scientist for the EPA

(Claudia e-, Joseph Greene, research biologist, both Wise and Greene worked for the EPA for 30+ years, Brad Jones quoting Wise and Greene, March 28, 2012, “The science — and politics — of dredging”, http://www.goldprospectors.org/Communication/ArticlesandInformation/tabid/153/EntryId/537/Dredging-doesn-t-harm-fish-experts-say.aspx, 6/10/12, atl)

Media coverage Both Wise and Greene concur that most, if not all, **the media coverage of the suction dredging debate has been one-sided in favor of environmental extremist groups**. “**It’s pure laziness in journalism**. They are selling something and they are making money from this issue also. It’s part of the whole environmental economy. There are a lot of people who will read environmental hype and controversy. **Sensationalism** — that’s what they’re doing. They’re not even looking at the facts. They’re just taking what the environmentalists say and that’s their headline. It’s definitely unfair and unbalanced.” Wise said she often gets irritated with the way some news reporters cover the issues. “I don’t have the answer for everything, but they like to play the ‘gotcha’ game if you don’t have the right answer for them. They’re trying to sell papers.” Like Wise, Greene believes the mainstream media has been irresponsible in its coverage of environmental issues with the faulty assumption that everything green must be good without questioning motives. “In every single case, they do not do it. They just take the information and repeat it as if it’s gospel.” “That’s very typical. That’s what we’re up against. **We can’t find an honest or understanding journalist anywhere**. There are very, very few of them. They are extremely rare. Even the ones who seem to try still get it half wrong.” Greene is convinced it’s more than just shoddy journalism, but an indoctrination of young journalists that teaches them not to question environmental activism. It is the same kind of self-censorship that led to coining of the phrase political correctness, which also surfaced in the ’90s. “I happen to believe that they have an agenda — especially the young ones, because they are coming out of the schools that way,” he said. “We were actually seeing that at the EPA with the new hires and PhDs. They were just these avid environmentalists. Everything is wrong and they’re right!” “So, as a research scientist, the first thing you do is build a comprehensive library. There was not a lot of material out there and all of it **showed that the effects of suction dredge mining are minimal, quickly reversible and local**. **I’ve not found anything different from that,” Greene said**.

### AT: Elections DA—No Link

#### Low awareness of ports but people understand its importance

Fox 9 – Karen Fox is the North Carolina State Ports Authority conducting an awareness survey for the AAPA PR Seminar, 2009 (“North Carolina Has Ports?: Ports Awareness Survey – A Work in Progress,” North Carolina Ports, June 23rd 2009, <http://aapa.files.cms> plus.com/SeminarPresentations/2009Seminars/2009PublicRelations/Fox\_Karen.pdf)

What we learned¶ People understand very little about ports’ mission, but seem to have ¶ inherent sense ports are important part of State’s infrastructure¶ When public learns more about ports mission, they like what they¶ hear¶ Job benefits are number one driver for support of ports¶ Having port operation sensitive to environment is very important¶ Battling environment and jobs for most positive reaction was ¶ competitiveness

### AT: Politics—Thumper

#### **Obama committed to port deepening**

Smith 7/19 (Bruce, "Charleston studies expedited, money still needed," 7/19/12, http://hosted.ap.org/dynamic/stories/S/SC\_CHARLESTON\_HARBOR\_DEEPENING\_FLOL-?SITE=FLPAN&SECTION=HOME&TEMPLATE=DEFAULT) CS

CHARLESTON, S.C. (AP) -- Designating the Charleston Harbor deepening as a nationally significant project could trim a couple years off the work, but U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham said Thursday that still depends on getting the money. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers said last week that expedited studies could mean the project will be completed in 2020, instead of 2024 as originally projected. The Obama Administration announced Wednesday evening that Charleston and four other harbor projects have been designated national significant projects and needed federal reviews and studies will be expedited. That means the work could now be completed by 2019. Maritime interests want the harbor deepened to 50 feet to accommodate a new generation of larger container ships that will be calling when the Panama Canal is deepened in 2014. The president issued an executive order in March to have the Office of Management and Budget oversee efforts to smooth the permitting and review process for infrastructure projects. Jim Newsome, the president and CEO of the South Carolina State Ports Authority, said the announcement "demonstrates that the highest levels of our government understand the critical need to advance this project." In two years, he said, the Charleston project has gone from not being included in the president's budget to being a national priority. Two of the projects designated as nationally significant under the federal We Can't Wait program to improve infrastructure are harbor projects in Miami and Jacksonville, both in the key election state of Florida where President Barack Obama visited Thursday.

#### **Obama committed**

Dredging Today 7/19 ("President Names Charleston Deepening to Priority Project (USA)," 7/19/12, http://www.dredgingtoday.com/2012/07/19/president-names-charleston-deepening-to-priority-infrastructure-project-usa/) CS

The President of the United States has named Charleston’s Post 45 Harbor Deepening Project one of the nation’s seven priority infrastructure projects, committing that the project’s study and necessary reviews will be completed by September 2015. The initial list of projects, which is part of the Administration’s We Can’t Wait initiative, is targeted to expedite the most critical infrastructure projects in the country. Charleston’s harbor deepening is one of seven projects in five ports included in the initiative, which was announced by The White House Wednesday evening. The news builds upon last week’s update from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Charleston District announcing a reduced timeline and cost estimate for Charleston’s feasibility study. Under the new Administration program, the study and federal reviews now will be further expedited and will be completed up to one year earlier. “This announcement represents more good news for our deepening project, and demonstrates that the highest levels of our government understand the critical need to advance this project,” said Jim Newsome, president and CEO of the South Carolina Ports Authority (SCPA). “In just two years, we have gone from not being included in the President’s Budget to now being a top priority. We are grateful for the Administration’s commitment.” We Can’t Wait is a direct result of a Presidential Executive Order issued in March, which called for a government-wide effort to streamline the permitting and review process for vital infrastructure projects in communities across the nation. The SCPA, along with U.S. Sen. Lindsey Graham, Congressman Jim Clyburn and Charleston Mayor Joe Riley, in April sent letters to the Administration and members of the steering committee charged with this initiative, asking that they include Charleston’s Post 45 Project in their priority infrastructure list. The steering committee, comprised of leadership of the U.S. Army as well as the federal departments of Transportation, Commerce and Agriculture, participated in the selection process. “This priority infrastructure program is a natural extension of the Obama Administration’s export initiative,” Newsome said. “There is clearly a recognition that in order to double the nation’s exports – which are primarily sourced from the Southeast region – a port in this region must be deepened to at least 50 feet to accommodate the largest ships expected to call our coast without tidal restriction. We anticipate a favorable cost-to-benefit ratio in the Chief’s Report allowing for a true post-Panamax harbor allowing for two-way vessel traffic.” A report to Congress released last month by the Corps of Engineers’ Institute for Water Resources indicated that modernizing Southeast and Gulf ports was most critical to serving the nation’s export needs over the coming years. In February, the Obama Administration included $3.5 million toward the project’s feasibility study in the President’s Budget for fiscal year 2013. The deepening of Charleston Harbor to 50 feet is predicted to provide significant economic benefit to the Southeast region and the entire nation, with $106 million in net benefit to the nation estimated on an annual basis.

#### **Non-uniques spending**

Donnelly 7/20 (Frank, "White House says work to deepen NY Harbor shipping channels will be speeded up," 7/20/12, http://www.silive.com/news/index.ssf/2012/07/white\_house\_says\_work\_to\_deepe.html) CS

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y. -- The Obama Administration said the deepening of the Port of New York and New Jersey, along with projects at four other ports, is nationally significant and it is expediting the work. The White House released a statement saying the dredging will be speeded up under the federal "We Can't Wait" program. The other ports are Charleston, S.C.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Miami, and Savannah, Ga. The work coincides with massive improvements to the Panama Canal, whose capacity will be doubled. That will allow the passage to handle larger vessels carrying increased cargo in 2014. As a result, the Port of New York and New Jersey and ports around the nation are deepening their shipping channels to accommodate the super container ships. The administration says additional projects to be expedited will be announced in the coming months. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has deepened most of the 38 miles of underwater shipping channels around New York Harbor to the 50-foot depth necessary to accept the huge "Panamax" ships. The Arthur Kill channel approaching New York Container Terminal has yet to be finished, but that dredging is slated for completion by 2013, said officials. The project costs about $2 billion. That's in addition to a $1 billion plan to raise the Bayonne Bridge. Starting in summer 2013, crews will begin building a new elevated roadway 64 feet above the existing deck. Workers are currently stripping lead paint off the 80-year-old span. The lower roadway will be removed once the upper deck is completed. At that point, the roadway will be 215 feet above the Kill van Kull. The bottom deck is expected to be removed by the fall of 2015, which, Port Authority officials said earlier this week, would be in time for the mammoth containerships to pass beneath. Previously, deck removal wasn't expected to be finished until mid-2016.

### AT: Politics—Plan Popular

#### Port dredging has bipart support

Seaport Magazine 12 – (“Ports and Politics”, 2011/2012 Issue of AAPA Seaport Magazine, <http://digital.sea-portsinfo.com/issue/54053>)

 Bipartisan House caucus backs ports U.S. Rep. Janice Hahn, D-Calif., and U.S. Rep. Ted Poe, R-Texas, have announced formation of the bipartisan House Ports Opportunity, Renewal, Trade and Security **(PORTS)** Caucus. According to an Oct. 25 joint statement, the mission of the caucus will be “to promote the importance of our ports to the nation’s economy and the need to secure them.” The congressmen noted that U.S. ports support 13.3 million jobs and account for $3.15 trillion in business activity. Rep. Hahn, whose district includes the Port of Los Angeles, said, “As a long-time advocate for the Port of Los Angeles, I understand how vital the ports are for our nation’s economy**.** This bipartisan caucus will bring together members who represent diverse ports across the country, so we will find ways together to promote our ports and keep them safe.” Rep. Poe, whose district includes the Port of Port Arthur, commented, “Promoting and protecting our nation’s ports is critical to both national security and economic security. Ports are the gateway in and out of the United States. They are our country’s link to the rest of the world and the global economy. I look forward to working with Rep. Hahn to building an effective congressional caucus that advocates on the behalf of ports nationwide.” The announcement from Hahn and Poe came the day before Oct. 26 testimony before the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by several port industry leaders, including Jerry A. Bridges, executive director of the Virginia Port Authority and current AAPA chairman.

#### Plan has bipart support

Boustany 12 – Congressional Record of the 112th Congress, second session from the House of Representatives Volume 158 Number 56 (Charles, “Congressional Record; Proceedings and debates of the 112th Congress, Second Session”, Congressional Record, 4/18/12, [http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2012-04-18/pdf/CREC-2012-04-18-house.pdf)](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2012-04-18/pdf/CREC-2012-04-18-house.pdf%29//MM)

Our country depends on its maritime commerce**.** Without the use of our maritime transportation routes, we’re not really talking about transportation**.** We cannot expand exports and we cannot move our agricultural commodities or our manufactured goods to other destinations around the world if we do not have waterways that have been maintained. The Army Corps of Engineers has said to me on multiple occasions, if you take the top 60 ports and harbors in this country, fewer than 35 percent of those waterways are dredged adequately to the authorized depth and width authorized by Congress. My bill, which is now an amendment to this transportation bill, H.R. 104, is the RAMP Act. It is the Realize America’s Maritime Promise Act. **It** has bipartisan support with 190 Members in the House and with over 30 Senators over on the Senate side.

#### Ports will lobby for the plan

**Marcario, 11** – Assistant Editor at Seapower Magazine, Navy League of the United States (John, “Where Does the Money Go?” June 2011, [http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/AAPAArticles/Where%20does%20the%20money%20go%20-%20Seapower%20-%20June%202011.pdf)](http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/AAPAArticles/Where%20does%20the%20money%20go%20-%20Seapower%20-%20June%202011.pdf%29)

USACE officials said they have heard several complaints from ports and maritime officials regarding how little trust fund money is spent each year. "The ports would like to see us fully maintain these navigation channels so that they can economically move their commerce. Once they understand the current legislation is what drives our process, they channel that energy into seeking legislative change through Congress," said Jim Walker, head of the navigation branch at the Washington headquarters of the USACE.

#### **Plan popular and bipartisan**

Mulé 12— Communications Director for Senator Jeff Landry (Millard, “Congressman Landry Leads Bipartisan Alliance for Port Dredging”, March 14th, 2012. http://landry.house.gov/press-release/congressman-landry-leads-bipartisan-alliance-port-dredging)

WASHINGTON, DC – Fighting to protect American jobs and ports, Congressmen Jeff Landry (R, LA-03) and Tim Bishop (D, NY-01) led a huge bipartisan coalition of 72 House Members calling for proper port dredging. The Landry coalition sent a letter today to the U.S. House Budget Committee requesting the Committee apportion all Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) proceeds for its stated legal purpose: harbor dredging. “At a time when the national unemployment rate continues to exceed eight percent, we believe it is imperative that all the revenue generated by the HMT be fully committed towards dredging our nation’s ports, an activity that will put Americans back to work and return economic prosperity to our manufacturing, agriculture and energy sectors,” wrote Landry and his colleagues. Landry, whose district has the most domestic maritime industry jobs in the nation, is hopeful the widespread support will create jobs nationwide and protect the vitality of America’s commercial waterways. “I thank Ranking Member Bishop for his steadfast leadership on this issue and recognizing the way to solve problems in Washington is by building coalitions. I also thank the 70 members who joined us in signing this important letter and the members that followed our lead by sending their own letter to the Budget Committee on this important issue. Together, we can properly solve the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund boondoggle.” Congressman Tim Bishop, who co-led the letter and serves as the Ranking Member on the U.S. House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee’s Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, said: “Maintaining our nation's ports, harbors and beaches is an economic imperative, and funds collected from the users of waterways specifically for dredging should be used only for dredging, not to offset other spending. We must change the budgeting process to guarantee the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is devoted solely to the purpose of maintaining our infrastructure, and I thank Congressman Landry for working with me on this critical issue for our economy.” In 1986, Congress established the HMTF – financed through a 0.125% tax on cargo imported through a port or moved between two domestic ports – to fund up to 100% of dredging costs at domestic ports and waterways. However, recent Administrations have ignored the law – utilizing only 1/2 to 2/3’s of the revenue for harbor maintenance and holding the rest for increased federal spending in other areas of the budget. A copy of Congressman Landry’s letter may be found at http://landry.house.gov/sites/landry.house.gov/files/documents/Landry%20Bishop%20HMTF%20Letter%20031312.pdf. The full list of letter signers are Congressmen Jeff Landry (R, LA-03), Tim Bishop (D, NY-03), Leonard Boswell (D, IA-03), Corrine Brown (D, FL-03), Larry Bucshon (R, IN-08), Shelley Moore Capito (R, WV-02), Lois Capps (D, CA-23), Michael Capuano (D, MA-08), Russ Carnahan (D, MO-03), John Carney (D, DE-AL), Bill Cassidy (R, LA-06), John Conyers Jr. (D, MI-14), Jerry Costello (D, IL-12), Peter DeFazio (D, OR-04), Robert Dold (R, IL-10), Sean Duffy (R, WI-07), Blake Farenthold (R, TX-27), Bob Filner (D, CA-51), Trey Gowdy (R, SC-04), Sam Graves (R, MO-06), Michael Grimm (R, NY-13), Gregg Harper (R, MS-03), Andy Harris (R, MD-01), Alcee Hastings (D, FL-23), Brain Higgins (D, NY-27), Ruben Hinojosa (D, TX-15), Mazie Hirono (D, HI-02), Bill Huizenga (R, MI-02), Bill Johnson (R, OH-06), Walter Jones (R, NC-03), Marcy Kaptur (D, OH-09), Mike Kelly (R, PA-03), Dennis Kucinich (D, OH-10), Steve LaTourette (R, OH-14), Barbara Lee (D, CA-09), Blaine Luetkemeyer (R, MO-09), Doris Matsui (D, CA-05), Mike McIntyre (D, NC-07), Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R, WA-05), Patrick Meehan (R, PA-07), Michael Michaud (D, ME-02), Candice Miller (R, MI-10), Jerrold Nadler (D, NY-08), Grace Napolitano (D, CA-38), Bill Owens (D, NY-23), Ron Paul (R, TX-14), Gary Peters (D, MI-09), Thomas Petri (R, WI-06), Pedro Pierluisi (D, PR), Bill Posey (R, FL-15), Nick Rahall II (D, WV-03), Jim Renacci (R, OH-16), Laura Richardson (D, CA-37), Cedric Richmond (D, LA-02), Steve Scalise (R, LA-01), Robert Schilling (R, IL-17), Aaron Schock (R, IL-18), Kurt Schrader (D, OR-05), David Scott (D, GA-13), Bill Shuster (R, PA-09), Albio Sires (D, NJ-13), Louise Slaughter (D, NY-28), Steve Southerland (R, FL-02), Jackie Speier (D, CA-12), Pete Stark (D, CA-13), Betty Sutton (D, OH-13), Mike Thompson (D, CA-01), Tim Walberg (R, MI-07), Daniel Webster (R, FL-08), Joe Wilson (R, SC-02), and Don Young (R, AK-01).

#### Popular: Congress and organizations support

RAMP 09 (Realize America's Maritime Promise Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Fairness Coalition, July 24, 2009, http://www.ramphmtf.org/letter072409.pdf) CS

As you probably know, there is broad support for this correction even beyond the more than 160 groups who have signed this letter. For example, the 53 House Members of Congress have signed a letter to you supporting this change (Enclosure I) Also, attached is a resolution from the AFL-CIO in support of the change (Enclosure 2). Thank you for your support in this matter. Agriculture Transportation Coalition AGP Grain, Ltd AK Steel American Great Lakes Ports Association. American Maritime Officers Service American Maritime Officers, AFL-CIO American Shipbuilding Association American Steamship Company ArcelorMittal Steel City of Superior Planning Department, WI Cleveland-Cliffs Inc Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority, OH CMS Energy Collins Engineers, Inc Connecticut Maritime Coalition Coquille (Bandon), OR Corus Cottrell Contracting Corporation Associated Branch Pilots of the Port of New Orleans (Bar Pilots) Associated Federal Pilots and Docking Masters of Louisiana Association of Ship Brokers and Agents B+B Dredging Company Baird & Associates Bay Planning Coalition Bay Shipbuilding Company Brown County Port & Solid Waste Dept. Calcasieu River Waterway Harbor Safety Committee California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference Canadian National Railway Co. Carmeuse Lime, Inc. C EMEX Central Dock Company Central Marine Logistics, Inc, Chetco (Brookings Harbor), OR Chicago Port Council, IL Citgo Petroleum Corporation City of Depoe Bay, OR City of Petersburg, AK Crescent River Port Pilots Association CSX Transportation, Toledo, OH Docks Detroit Edison Detroit/Wayne County Port Authority, MI District No. l-PCD, MEBA, AFL-CIO Dock 63 Inc. Dredge America Dredging Contractors of America Dredging Supply Company, Inc Duluth Seaway Port Authority, MN Durocher Marine Edw. C. Levy Co. Ellicott Dredges Erie Shipbuilding, LLC Faulkner, Muskovitz & Phillips, LLP Flats Oxbow Association Fox River Dock Co., Inc. Fraser Shipyards Gateway Trade Center, Inc Grand River Navigation Company, Inc. Great Lakes District Council, ILA, AFL-CIO Great Lakes Dredge and Dock, LLC Great Lakes Fleet, Inc. / Key Lakes, Inc. Great Lakes Maritime Task Force Gulf Intracoastal Canal Association Gulf Ports Association of the Americas Gulf States Maritime Association Hallett Dock Company Hannah Marine Corporation ILA - Lake Erie Coal & Ore Dock Council ILA - Local 1317 ILA - Local 1768 Illinois international Port District Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific International Brotherhood of Boilermakers International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots International Ship Masters' Association International Union of Operating Engineers Jason Yellin Jaxport, FL Jay Cashman, Inc. K&L Gates Latarge North America Lake Carriers' Association Lake Charles Harbor and Terminal District Lake Charles Pilots Mobile Bar Pilots Association National Association of Maritime Organizations New Orleans-Baton Rouge Steamship Pilots Association New Orleans Board of Trade Norfolk Dredging Norfolk Southern Corp., Sandusky & Ashtabula, OH coal docks NSA Agencies, Inc. Odom Hydrographic Systems Orange County Navigation and Port District, TX Orion Dredging Services, LLC Orion Marine Group Osbome Concrete & Stone Co. Pacific Coast Council of Customs Brokers & Freight Forwarders Assns Pacific Northwest Waterways Association Pere Marquette Shipping Company Pickands Mather Lake Services Company Pine Bluff Sand and Gravel Port of Astoria, OR Port of Coos Bay, OR Port of the Dalles, OR Port of Freeport, TX Lake Michigan Carferry Service, Inc. Lakes Pilots Association Lower Mississippi River Waterways Safety Advisory Committee Lorain Port Authority, OH Luedtke Engineering Company L.W. Matteson, Inc. Maersk Lines Limited Manson Construction Company Marsha Cohen Marine Tech, LLC Maritime Exchange for the Delaware River and Bay Maritime Navigation Safety Association Masterpiece International MCM Marine, Inc Michigan Maritime Trades Port Council, MTD, AF L-CIO Midwest Energy Resources Company Midwest Terminals of Toledo, International, Inc. Mike Hooks Inc Port of Galveston, TX Port of Garibaldi, OR Port of Gold Beach, OR Port of Houston, TX Port of Humboldt Bay, CA Port of Longview, WA Port of Milwaukee, WI Port of Morgan City, LA Port of New Orleans, LA Port Orford. OR Port of Oswego Authority, NY Pon of Portland, OR Port of Siuslaw. OR Port of South Louisiana Port of Toledo, OR Ports of Indiana Propeller Club of New Orleans Rita Foti Rogue (Gold Beach), OR Ryba Marine Construction Co Sargent Companies Seafarers International Union.

#### Plan popular-- AFL-CIO

International Union of Operating Engineers 09 ("Port Dredging," 2009 MTD Executive Board Meeting, February 26-27, 2009 http://www.ramphmtf.org/letter072409.pdf) CS

America is in the midst of an infrastructure crisis. From serious deterioration of local roads to bridge collapses, from schools with leaking ceilings to the need for Internet access for all, many infrastructure project needs are fairly visible to the average person. However, we in the maritime industry know of one major concern that has been ignored for way too long: port dredging. Almost all goods that enter or exit the United States do so through a harbor. waterborne commerce is the umbilical cord to the nation's international trade. Yet, many of the channels needed by commercial vessels to transit America's ports are covered with sediment and other debris. In fact, the Army Corps of Engineers recently analyzed 59 of the busiest commercial channels within the U.S. and discovered half of them were available at their authorized depth or width for less than one-third of the year. What this means is vessels laden with American-made goods cannot carry all they are capable of holding because they would be too heavy to keep from running aground, nor can ships with imports for the U.S.-market enter due to the same concerns. The unfortunate reality is America has had an effective way to deal with this national problem. However, Congress has not shown the political will to pass the necessary legislation to resolve this matter. Since 2003, the U.S. has appropriated fewer dollars on dredging projects than the annual amounts collected by the Harbor Maintenance Tax. As of Fiscal Year 2007, the Harbor Maintenance Tax Fund had a surplus of $4.7 billion - money that is waiting to be used to dredge ports on a regular basis thus allowing commerce to flow more smoothly. The international Union of Operating Engineers calls upon its fellow affiliates within the Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO to urge Congress to pass legislation that would compel Harbor Maintenance Tax appropriations to more closely mirror the tax's annual revenues. Similar language has been passed in previous Congresses.

#### Labor unions key to Obama win

**Boyer, 12** (Dave, Columnist, Washington Times, 2/17)

Mr. Obama "is certainly indebted to organized labor," Mr. Semmens said. At the same time, some union leaders have been diverting resources away from national Democratic campaign committees and toward states such as Wisconsin and Ohio where Republicans have waged campaigns to eliminate or roll back collective-bargaining rights. AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka has spoken of a new strategy of labor forging an independent voice separate from the Democratic Party. Mr. Trumka also voiced anger last summer with Mr. Obama for his negotiations with congressional Republicans on debt reduction. Since then, Mr. Obama has promoted a plan to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to create construction jobs and to hire more teachers and police officers. In what is viewed as a tight presidential election, Mr. Obama's campaign team will need enthusiastic union support for a strong get-out-the-vote effort. Several trade unions have threatened to boycott the Democratic National Convention in Charlotte, N.C., because of its location in a right-to-work state and their disappointment with the weak economy.

### AT: Politics—Plan Unpopular

#### Unpopular-- perceived as earmark

Abbott 11 – Editor, AAPA Seaports Magazine (Paul, "Special Feature on Port-Related Infrastructure," Summer, www.aapa-ports.org/Publications/SeaportsDetail.cfm?itemnumber=18152#seaportsarticle4)

Infrastructure: A priority for future competitiveness For a nation to be economically competitive, it is imperative that its transportation infrastructure provides for the safe, swift and efficient movement of goods and people. Just look at the convergence of expert views to that effect expressed throughout this issue of AAPA Seaports Magazine. But, in a time of budget deficits and lingering fears that falsely equate infrastructure spending with “pork barrel” earmarks, lawmakers seem all the more hesitant to invest in the future by funding projects to improve and expand ports, deepen their channels and bring highway and rail systems to 21st century standards.

Unpopular with public-- liabilities

Tirschwell 08 — Senior Adviser of the Journal of Commerce (Peter, “Ports face uphill climb in gaining acceptance,” Seaports Magazine, Winter, http://www.aapaseaports.com/pdf\_issues/AAPASeaports\_Winter2008.pdf)

The simple fact is one that’s hardly inspiring or even encouraging: As much as those of us connected with seaports might prefer things to be otherwise, for the general public, to the extent they think about them, ports are more liability than asset, if anything a problem waiting to happen or which has already happened. Ports today often find themselves on the wrong side of the conversation. They are seen as ugly when people want their surroundings to be pretty. They are seen as dirty when people are insisting their environment be clean. They facilitate imports that people see as taking away jobs. And they are seen as affording exposure to a dangerous outside world at a time when people want their communities to be safe. Thankfully, politicians often appreciate ports for the economic value they provide to cities, regions and the nation, but, as elected officials, they must balance community interests in ways that can restrict port activity or expansion. The result of this is that ports constantly find themselves on the defensive in dealing with local journalists, community groups or elected officials. It can be frustrating for port staff members who understand the value they provide to be constantly forced to defend their actions against openly hostile interests. Ports have a steep uphill climb to gain credibility and acceptance among their communities, and, if a crisis isn’t properly managed, years of effort can be lost in an instant. I think the first step is to acknowledge this is the way it is, and it probably won’t change. The frustration ports encounter day to day in dealing with an indifferent or unfriendly press and public cannot divert them from pursuing the long-term goal of greater understanding and acceptance from the community.

#### Unpopular-- environmental litigation proves

Kinnard 12 (Meg, "Savannah Riverr panel votes to set dredging limits," The Post and Courier, 5/8/12, http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20120508/PC16/120509234&source=RSS) CS

COLUMBIA – A panel created to represent South Carolina’s interests in the Savannah River moved today to set limits on a dredging project, moves that officials said would both save money and protect wildlife. Among the recommendations approved by the Savannah River Maritime Commission is a proposal to limit dredging of the river to 45 feet. Going to that depth, instead of the 47 feet currently planned, would not only allow the project to proceed without additional federal funding but would also be safer for fish in the area, according to an attorney who advises the commission. The $600 million deepening project will help Georgia handle the larger ships that will come calling once the Panama Canal is widened in three years. “From the very beginning, we’ve been concerned about the environmental impacts to the Savannah River,” state Sen. Larry Grooms, R-Bonneau, a commission member, said today. “The Savannah River is a shared resource, and to needlessly destroy the environment is really unacceptable.” During a 30-minute closed-door session, Attorney General Alan Wilson also briefed commission members on the litigation surrounding the contentious dredging proposal. Wilson represents the Commission in its appeal of the Department of Health and Environmental Control’s decision to grant Georgia the water quality permits needed for the project. DHEC staff initially rejected the application, citing unacceptable harm to the waterway’s endangered sturgeon and fragile marshes. But less than two months later, the agency’s board approved a compromise with Georgia officials and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The approval came after Georgia Gov. Nathan Deal made a last-minute visit to discuss the issue with South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley, who appoints the members of the commission. The Commission has said DHEC improperly approved the permit. Statehouse Democrats and Republicans united to unanimously approve a bill that would suspend DHEC’s ability to consider dredging issues since 2007 – the year the Commission was created. Haley vetoed the measure but was quickly overridden by both chambers. There are two other legal challenges to the project. South Carolina’s Supreme Court is considering environmental groups’ lawsuit over whether the state’s environmental officials had the ability to issue water permits. A federal judge is slated to decide whether the deepening requires a pollution permit from the state before work can begin. At issue are billions of dollars in economic activity for Savannah and Charleston, which is also seeking to deepen its harbor and has received $2.5 million in federal money to study the project. The states have proposed a joint port along the Savannah River in rural Jasper County, miles closer to the Atlantic Ocean than Savannah’s. South Carolina legislators have argued that Savannah’s project will harm the environment and kill plans for a port in Jasper County.

#### Unpopular: economy tanks support

Sabonge 08 --Vice President of Market Research and Analysis at the Panama Canal Authority(Rodolfo R., "Panama Canal expansion:

Changing dynamics of world trade," AAPA Seaports Magazine, Summer 2008 Vol. 13, http://www.aapaseaports.com/pdf\_issues/AAPASeaports\_Summer2008.pdf) CS

Containerships are the heavyweights of the new fleet, and U.S. containerized trade is expected to grow from 157 million metric tons in 2000 to 350 million metric tons by 2020 and 525 million metric tons by 2040. Navigation customers and stakeholders need to help the American public understand the importance of a resilient marine transportation system. We have our work cut out for us. The public will not support additional investments if they think the economy is in the tank, but that's all they're hearing from most news media. lf people believe the economy is robust and growing, on the other hand, they will understand we need infrastructure to keep it going. Without the infrastructure, economic growth cannot continue.

### ‘

### AT: Qatar Econ DA

#### Econ low now

Emirates Business 2011 (“Qatari economy to lose steam in 2012”, http://www.emirates247.com/business/qatari-economy-to-lose-steam-in-2012-2011-12-27-1.434641)

Qatar appears to be heading for an end of its economic euphoria as growth in its GDP is projected to dip to only around six per cent in 2012 from an expected 19 per cent in 2011 and similar high rates in previous years. IMF figures showed the Gulf country’s real GDP, which has recorded one of the world’s highest growth rates over the past decade, leaped by nearly 17 per cent in 2010 and is forecast to pick up by about 19 per cent in 2011. The report expected GDP growth in the world’s third largest gas power to dive to nearly six per cent in 2012 but gave no reason the sharp fall apart from saying Qatar is still enforcing a moratorium on gas development projects. Analysts attributed it to relative stability in the country’s LNG supply growth following the completion of mammoth projects to boost output to 77 million tonnes per year. The country’s LNG exports had grown by at least 15 per cent annually over the past 10 years before stabilizing at the peak 77 million tonne level at the end of 2010, when the projects were completed.

#### Middle East wars don’t escalate- history disproves.

Rober Satloff is the Washington Institute’s executive director, December 21, 2006, “the Iraq study group: Assessing its regional conclusions,” <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/templateC05.php?CID=2549>

The report’s greatest analytical leap of faith is the ntion that all the key issues in the Middle East are “inextricably linked.” In the past, it was believed that the export of the Iranian revolution would undermine pro-West regimes throughout the Middle East, or that failure to resolve the Israli Palestine conflict would spark a regional war. Today, the idea of linkage implies that Sunni-Shiite violence will spread throughout the region. The problem with all these theories is that there is no evidence to back them up. To the contrary, military success in the Gulf does not translate into diplomatic success in the Arab-Israeli arena. The Madrid process had a promising opening session, but when it came down to bargaining it ran up against the reality of the Isreli-Palestine differences. Furthermore, there is no evidence that local disasters translate into regional disasters. Ayatolah Ruholla Khomeini’s Iran failed to export the revolution despite national efforts. There is no evidence to suppor the proposition that Israeli-Palestinian violence has substantial regional repercussions, let alone that it can lead to regional war. The years 2000 to 2003 saw the worst period of Israeli Palestinian relations, but the regional implication was zero. Not one state threatened to fight Israel, the arab street did not rise to protest, and no Arab regime’s stability was threatened. The United states should not view the Middle East as an organic unit. Iraq’s problems are primarily Iraqi in origin and Iraqi in solution. Iran alone poses a serious challenge, and the Israeli Palestinainan problem is important to solve because it’s the right thing to do.

#### No chance of a Middle East war – stability, cross-border peace, dampening civil conflicts

Christopher J. Fettweis, Assistant Professor of National Security Affairs in the National Security Decision Making Department of the US Naval War College, “On the Consequences of Failure in Iraq” Survival, Volume 49, Issue 4 December 2007, pages 83 - 98

No matter what the outcome in Iraq, the region is not likely to devolve into chaos. Although it might seem counter-intuitive, by most traditional measures the Middle East is very stable. Continuous, uninterrupted governance is the norm, not the exception; most Middle East regimes have been in power for decades. Its monarchies, from Morocco to Jordan to every Gulf state, have generally been in power since these countries gained independence. In Egypt Hosni Mubarak has ruled for almost three decades, and Muammar Gadhafi in Libya for almost four. The region's autocrats have been more likely to die quiet, natural deaths than meet the hangman or post-coup firing squads. Saddam's rather unpredictable regime, which attacked its neighbours twice, was one of the few exceptions to this pattern of stability, and he met an end unusual for the modern Middle East. Its regimes have survived potentially destabilising shocks before, and they would be likely to do so again. The region actually experiences very little cross-border warfare, and even less since the end of the Cold War. Saddam again provided an exception, as did the Israelis, with their adventures in Lebanon. Israel fought four wars with neighbouring states in the first 25 years of its existence, but none in the 34 years since. Vicious civil wars that once engulfed Lebanon and Algeria have gone quiet, and its ethnic conflicts do not make the region particularly unique.

#### Deterrence prevents Middle East escalation

Sprow 2002 (Maria, Daily Staff Reporter, Professor of Political Science, <http://media.ww.michigandaily.com/media/storage/page851/news/2002/04/09/News/u.Profs.Say.Threat.Of.Wwiii.is.Small-1403618.shtml>)

Regardless of whether the similarites hold any weight, Morrow said there are many more differences, including the size of the army involved, the number and strength of the nations involved and the number of deaths expected. “Normally, the reason why people talk about world war I and world war II is because tens of millions of people died,” Morrow said. “this doesn’t look like a war in which tens of millions of people are going to die, even if it has a world-wide scope.” Additional reasons include the balance of power between allied and axis armies, political science Prof. Douglas Lemke said. “There would have to be some foe on the other side that was relatively equal to the United States,” he said. “if something happened that tightly unified all those factors so that they acted as if they were one, then you might get the west ves the rest kind of war… But this is not an area that has shown great coherence in the past.

#### No impact to Qatar econ

Barfi 2012 (Barak, Research Fellow, New America Foundation, “Why Qatar's new influence won't last”, http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/05/15/why-qatars-new-influence-wont-last/)

With Middle East heavyweights such as Egypt rocked by instability, Qatar has helped fill the leadership vacuum in the region. The tiny Persian Gulf emirate has been hyperactive on the diplomatic front, leading the campaign to topple the regime in Libya and now working to do the same in Syria. Its moment in the sun, however, is likely to be a transient one. The convergence of factors that have fueled its rise are sure to unravel as fallen Arab powers regain their stature. And Qatar lacks the intrinsic qualities that have made perennial regional titans such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Qatar has been able to carve out its sphere of influence through petrodollars and shrewd diplomacy. The emirate serves as a bridge between the Western world and adversaries such as Iran and the Taliban. Its government-funded satellite news network, Al Jazeera, is the voice of the Arab street. Closer to home, Qatar has mediated between warring regional factions in Lebanon, Sudan and Yemen, and Doha’s doors have always been open to Israelis shunned by their Arab neighbors. Qatar has also rolled out the red carpet to international organizations and conglomerates. Prestigious American institutions, such as Georgetown University, and prominent research centers, such as the British Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies, have established satellite offices in the emirate. Yet for all the praise Qatar has received in the international media, its policies have fomented a regional backlash, according to American diplomatic cables released by WikiLeaks. The Bahraini king told an American official that Qatar’s behavior “is an annoyance.” Former Yemeni President Ali Abdullah Saleh told U.S. Gen. David Petraeus the emirate was working “against Yemen” and ruled out its participation in a regional conference to rebuild his country. And Somali President Sheikh Sharif Sheikh Ahmed accused Qatar of supporting the terrorist organization al-Shabaab. Regional powers such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia can afford alienating neighbors who need their political backing. But smaller nations like Qatar, who have nothing beyond bottomless coffers to entice aggrieved parties, cannot. It is unable to provide the Palestinians the political cover Egypt can to make territorial concessions to Israel. Unlike Saudi Arabia, which is the spiritual epicenter of the Muslim world by virtue of its control of Islam’s two holiest sites, Qatar cannot offer the Palestinians the religious bona fides they will need to concede parts of Jerusalem’s Old City. Factions that benefited from Qatari patronage have turned on the emirate when they found its demands overly cumbersome or decided it was politically expedient to do so. In 2009, Israel refused Qatar’s offer to re-establish ties in exchange for cement earmarked for use in Gaza housing projects. Jerusalem’s fears that Hamas would appropriate the cement to build underground bunkers outweighed the benefits of reducing its regional isolation. Also, Libyans who praised Qatar for its financial aid and political support during last year’s revolution now scorn it for backing political parties that have weakened the rebel government that emerged victorious. Qatar’s domestic ambitions have encountered similar challenges, rendering it little more than a house of cards. The sprawling Education City, where six American universities have established regional campuses, is a cutting-edge scholastic park. But its facilities are not churning out future generations of Qatari leaders. They are instead exploited by expatriates looking for a subsidized American education. Of Georgetown’s 182 students, only 60 are Qatari. More culturally sensitive institutions are equally imported. The country’s Islamic museum contains geographically and temporally diverse pieces ranging from Mamluk Egypt to Moghul India. But none of its treasures originates from Qatar, a nation with no significant Islamic history. Al Jazeera, the crown jewel of its empire, is managed by foreigners. Even Qatar’s royal family is imported from Saudi Arabia. Qatar’s recent ascent mimics those of smaller nations that proliferated in the Ancient Near East. From 1200-900 B.C., regional powers such as Egypt and Assyria were on the decline, leading to what scholars sometimes refer to as the “Era of Small Nations.” As the great dynasties waned, minor Biblical peoples such as the Arameans, Israelites and Phoenicians flourished. King David unified the Israelites, and his son Solomon extended his empire east across the Jordan River. But after a 300-year slumber, the Assyrians emerged from hibernation to gobble up their neighbors. The kingdom of Israel was destroyed, as were the other minor nations that sprouted up during the interregnum. Once Egypt and other regional powers recover, expect Qatar to be brushed aside. With little more than wads of cash to entice afflicted factions, the emirate will discover that its influence is as fleeting as the waves that crash under the shadows of Doha’s skyscrapers.

#### Qatar diplomacy fails

Kamrava 2011 (Mehran, Mehran Kamrava is Director of the Center for International and Regional Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service in Qatar, “Mediation and Qatari Foreign Policy”, http://georgetown.academia.edu/MehranKamrava/Papers/1139165/Mediation\_and\_Qatari\_Foreign\_Policy)

Uniquely for a country its size, Qatar has emerged as one of the world’s most proactive mediators in recent years. Motivated by a combination of international prestige and survival strategies, the country has sought to position itself as a proactively neutral peacemaker in many of the international and intra-national conﬂicts brewing across the Middle East region. In three of the most notable cases in which it has involved itself — in conﬂicts in Lebanon, Sudan, and Ye-men — Qatar has proven itself to be a capable mediator in reducing tensions but not, crucially, in resolving conﬂicts. Qatar’s successes have been facilitated by a combination of its perceived neutrality by the disputants, the vast ﬁnancial resources at its disposal to host mediation talks and offer ﬁnancial incentives for peace, and the personal commitment and involvement of the state’s top leaders. But these successes are often checked by limited capabilities to affect long-term changes to the preferences of the disputants through power projection abilities, in-depth administrative and on-the-ground resources, and apparent under estimations of the complexities of the deep-rooted conﬂicts at hand. Qatari mediation efforts are likely to continue in the years to come, but their outcomes are also likely to remain mixed in the foreseeable future.