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## **Adv Answers**

### A/T Terror: Not targeting

#### Terrorists are unlikely to target U.S. ports- 6 reasons

Paul W. Parfomak and John Frittelli, May 14, 2007, Maritime Security: Potential Terrorist Attacks and Protection Priorities, Congressional Research Service, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homesec/RL33787.pdf

Other analysts **believe future maritime attacks against the United States are relatively unlikely, especially in U.S. waters.** Notwithstanding specific acts of terrorism in the past, such as the *Cole* bombing, they note that **fewer than 1% of all global terrorist attacks since 1997 have involved maritime targets.**119 Furthermore, **international terrorists have attacked no maritime targets in U.S. territory since the anti-Castro attacks in 1976** despite their demonstrated ability to do so overseas.120 Analysts also argue that **U.S. ports and waterways are increasingly well-protected against terrorists due to the ongoing security activities of the U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), provisions of the Maritime Transportation Security Act** (P.L. 107-295), **protections added using DHS port security grants, and other U.S. maritime security measures**.121 Classification issues may also influence differing perceptions of maritime terrorism risk since piracy unrelated to terrorism is common in Southeast Asia and may be conflated with terrorism in maritime security statistics.122

**A key consideration in assessing the general likelihood of a maritime attack against the United States is the inherent operational difficulty in mounting such objectives**. **One U.S. naval analyst has identified a number of specific challenges for terrorists in the maritime environment:**

* **Maritime targets are relatively more scarce than land targets;**
* **Surveillance at sea offers less cover and concealment than surveillance on land**;
* **Tides, currents, wind, sea state, visibility, and proximity to land must all be factored into a maritime terror operation**;
* **Maritime terror operations may require skills that are not quickly or easily acquired such as special training in navigation, coastal piloting, and ship handling**;
* **Testing weapons and practicing attack techniques, hallmarks of Al Qaeda’s typically meticulous preparation, are harder and more difficult to conceal at sea than on land**;
* **The generally singular nature of maritime targets, the low probability of damage and casualties secondary to the intended target, and the problems associated with filming attacks at sea for terrorist publicity may also reduce the desirability of maritime targets.123 attacks, especially compared to land attacks which may alternatively satisfy terrorist publicity may also reduce the desirability of maritime targets.123**

#### ---Already spending too much on port security- low risk of attack

Kate Farrish, Sep 9, 2011, Port Security A Concern As Funds Shrink, http://c-hit.newhavenindependent.org/health/entry/port\_security\_a\_concern\_as\_funds\_shrink/

John Mueller, a professor of national security studies at Ohio State University, concluded in a recent study that since 9/11, **the U.S. has spent one trillion dollars on homeland security with little assurance that it was needed. He said spending on port security “seems to be excessive.’’**

“**You want the ports to be secure of course, but the risk of an attack is unlikely**,” he said. “There has not been a very careful analysis of all the money spent on ports.’’

#### Alt Cause: Nuclear attacks on ports can’t be prevented because of prolif

**Rugy**, November **2007** [Veronique de, senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University, specifically researching homeland security, “Is Port Security Funding Making us Safer?” http://web.mit.edu/cis/pdf/Audit\_11\_07\_derugy.pdf, PWS]

Because it rests mainly on domestic detection of WMD in ports—a task that is not clear could be achieved—the port security model offers almost no value to the nation.6 Even if we could seal our ports, America wouldn’t be safe. The only effective way to prevent nuclear attacks is to deny terrorists access to weapons and material. Without nuclear materials there can be no nuclear bombs.

#### Radiological weapons can be detected and stopped at sea

Stephen E. Flynn, January/February 2006, *Far Eastern Economic Review*, Port Security Is Still a House of Cards, http://www.cfr.org/border-and-ports/port-security-still-house-cards/p9629

**In addition to these Coast Guard and Customs initiatives, the U.S. Department of Energy and Department of Defense have developed their own programs aimed at the potential threat of weapons of mass destruction. They have been focused primarily on developing the means to detect a “dirty bomb” or a nuclear weapon**.

**The Energy Department has been funding and deploying radiation sensors in many of the world’s largest ports as a part of a program called the Megaport Initiative. These sensors are designed to detect radioactive material within containers. The Pentagon has undertaken a counterproliferation initiative that involves obtaining permission from seafaring countries to allow specially trained U.S Navy boarding teams to conduct inspections of a flag vessel on the seas when there is intelligence that points to the possibility that nuclear material or a weapon may be part of the ship’s cargo.**

#### Can’t predict terrorist targets- just because ports may seem appealing does not mean they are at greater risk

**Mueller** November 2, **2011** [John, John Mueller is a professor of Political Science at Ohio State University and a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. “TERRORISM IS NOT AN APOCALYPTIC THREAT,” < http://breakthroughjournal.org/content/debates/terrorism-is-not-an-apocalypti.shtml> PWS]

This was inspired by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in particular and also by the country's support for Israel in the Palestinian conflict. Religion was a key part of the consideration for most. However, it was not that they had a burning urge to spread Sharia law or to establish caliphates -- indeed, few of the potential terrorists would likely even be able to spell either word. Rather, it was the desire to protect their religion against what was commonly seen to be a concentrated war upon it in the Middle East by the United States government and military. And while I agree that terrorists do not choose targets randomly, "Planes, Trains, and Car Bombs," verges on the hyperbolic when it suggests there is a "seamless compatibility between their tactics and strategy." The terrorists may not flip coins or soberly consult a table of random numbers when contemplating which targets to hit, but they often effectively act randomly in the sense that the targets are chosen out of momentary whim and caprice and for their convenience. Therefore, given that there is a near-infinite number of potential targets, there is no good way to predict potential targets unless you can get, and stay, inside the mind of the specific would-be terrorist. A would be bomber targeted a mall in Rockford, Illinois because it was nearby, and terrorist plotters in Los Angeles in 2005 drew up a list of targets that were all within a 20-mile radius of their shared apartment, some of which didn't exist. Breakthrough's conclusion that "airplanes are the most highly valued targets of terrorist attacks" is less than fully convincing.

#### Recent Technology improves Port Security

**Lee**, 9/28/**2011** [Elizabeth, Staff Writer for Voice of America, “US Port Security Technology Evolving” http://www.voanews.com/content/us-port-security-technology-evolving-130793378/173729.html PWS]

Millions of containers from around the world enter ports throughout the United States every year. The threat to U.S. national security at these ports have grown in the last decade and so has security. At a recent technology conference near Los Angeles, companies were able to show off their latest inventions in high tech security. At two of the busiest ports in the United States, thousands of containers come and go every day. John Holmes with the Port of Los Angeles says 10 years ago security around here was not a priority. "Not even fences or lights or signs," said Holmes. "It was just [a] very open atmosphere where the big focus was moving cargo through." But everything changed after the September 11th, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States. U.S. ports have become a potential target because most of the goods that come into the U.S. come by the ocean. "Every single container does get screened. Everything that comes off the ship goes through radiation detection equipment," added Holmes. The ports of Los Angeles have different high-tech devices that look for bombs, chemical and biological weapons. Michael McMullen with the Port of Long Beach says technology is a big component of security. "Most of the security that we do today is really done almost in a virtual state," he said. McMullen says there are underwater sonar sensors, high-tech radars that detect every ship within 11 kilometers of the port and hundreds of cameras above ground. In a room filled with computers and video monitors of all sizes, security analysts can track everything that goes on in and around the port complex. The port has shared the technology with personnel from Latin America and Asia so they can learn how these high tech systems are integrated and apply them to their own port security. "Ports may all be a little bit different, but what we're trying to do is very similar," Holmes explained. To share information, John Holmes says the Port of Los Angeles held a port security summit last year with countries that included China, Korea and Israel. Holmes says ports around the world are vulnerable, using the 2008 terrorist attacks in Mumbai, India as an example. "In Mumbai, the attacks actually came from the water," he said. Security experts say exchanging information will help them stay current with all the new high-tech devices on the market. At a technology conference near Los Angeles, Fred Aldrich is trying to sell a container scanning system. It would go on a ship and scan stacks of containers before they reach land. "Our system would be installed at the foreign ports and scanning and detection happens 24/7 autonomously," Aldrich said. Craig Crawford with 3-D Image Tek, is trying to find buyers for his machine that converts video from 2-D to 3-D. He says 3-D images provide depth and detail. He says it can be used for night surveillance or even to diffuse a bomb. "It actually puts human eyes right on the threat then they can manipulate it just like a surgeon would be during a surgery looking at the wires identifying the threat," said Crawford. Port of Long Beach's Michael McMullen says in the next two years, he expects 3-D technology to be one component of security at his port that will help improve communication by providing even more detailed information.

#### **US Ready to handle a Terrorist Attack on a Port—no threat to US or World Economy**

Sahagun, July 21, 2007 [Louis, Times Staff Writer interviewing Homeland Security chief Chertoff, “Port plan covers terrorism,” < http://articles.latimes.com/2007/jul/21/local/me-security21> PWS]

Flanked by lawmakers and law enforcement authorities at a fire station at the Port of Los Angeles, Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff on Friday unveiled a new strategy for the rapid resumption of trade after a terrorist attack at a major U.S. port. As the U.S. Coast Guard gunboat Halibut idled a few yards offshore, Chertoff said the plan was "about making sure we spend as little time as possible paralyzed by an attack." The 130-page Department of Homeland Security's new Strategy to Enhance International Supply Chain Security provides protocols for damage assessments of international supply lines. It also describes what kind of cargo and vessels should receive top priority based on public health, national security and economic needs. The plan aims to streamline the maze of jurisdictions through which commerce moves, devise a chain of command and return into service key terminals, bridges, roads, rail lines and pipelines. The aim is to quickly restore the flow of commodities and goods, such as crude oil, clothing, car parts and medical supplies if a terrorist attack were to occur at a major port. Even a brief closure of the Los Angeles-Long Beach port complex, the nation's busiest, would result in economic losses running into billions of dollars, federal officials said. For example, the 11-day West Coast port lockout in 2002 cost the U.S. economy an estimated $1 billion a day and required roughly six months for full recovery. Because the United States represents nearly 20% of global maritime trade, a chemical, biological or nuclear attack would affect economic activity around the world. Under the new recovery strategy, the U.S. response to a terrorist incident would not trigger an automatic shutdown of all of the nation's ports. The plan instead calls for a prudent and measured response, keeping some ports open based on available intelligence and specifics of an incident.

#### **US Navy deters terrorist threat at ports with Port Security Barriers**

**Maritime Professional, 2011** [News Network specializing in Maritime Security, “Port Security Barriers” Meeting the Terrorist Threat,” < http://www.trustonbarriers.com/downloads/TrustonBarriers\_MaritimeProfessional\_aug2011.pdf> PWS]

Port Security concerns have now evolved to the point that the U.S. Navy has required commercial shipyards to maintain a U.S. Navy approved barrier to protect “personnel, U.S. Naval vessels, work in process, the material and equipment to be installed therein, and GFM dry docks (as applicable) at the Contractor’s facility…”, (NAVSEA Standard Items FY-12 (CH-2) 009-72, May 2011). Tested by the U.S. Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center (NFESC) to deter and prevent terrorist attacks, Port Security Barriers (PSB) are the only barrier system the U.S. Navy has selected to protect its warships and ports. Designed to meet the Navy’s new requirements. Port Security Barriers (PSBs) are floating physical blockades used to deter, and if necessary, stop terrorist suicide boat attacks. They provide primary and secondary protection to naval and commercial facilities, ports, harbors, vessels, and other facilities. PSBs provide clear delineation of restricted areas as well as shore-to-shore physical division of secured perimeters. U.S. Navy approved PSBs are designed to stop 99.9% of the boats in the U.S. (NFESC TR-6050-OCN, August 2003). Indeed, U.S. Navy modeling of the standard PSB with nylon net shows 5.1 million foot\*pounds of boat stopping capacity (NFESC TR-6058-OCN, 23 Nov. 20050; far exceeding the minimum requirement for Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) Priority B assests.

### A/T Terrorism- Terrorists not a threat

#### **Threat of Terrorism Over Exaggerated, number of attacks significantly falling**

Glaser, June 07, 2012 [John, Asistant Editor at Antiwar.com, news site for global war and terrorism, “Clinton Inflates Terror Threat, Contradicting Data,” < http://news.antiwar.com/2012/06/07/clinton-inflates-terror-threat-contradicting-data/> PWS]

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on Thursday said the threat of al-Qaeda and terrorism is spreading and remains imminent, even as the data says otherwise, suggesting she inflated the threat. “The core of Al-Qaeda that carried out the 9/11 attacks may be on the path to defeat, but the threat has spread, becoming more geographically diverse,” Clinton said at a speech at the Global Counterterrorism Forum meeting in Istanbul, adding that ”the danger from terrorism remains urgent and undeniable.” The National Counterterrorism Center’s annual report for 2011 was released on this week and it documents a declining threat from al-Qaeda and non-state terrorism. “Total ‘terrorist’ attacks fell 12 percent from the previous year and are down 29 percent from 2007,” writes Dan Murphy at the Christian Science Monitor, “which the center says is a five year low.” The study said about 10,000 acts of violence occurred in 2011 that the government classifies as terrorism, killing about 13,000. Zero terrorist attacks occurred in the U.S. and, as Murphy points out ”three-quarters of the fatalities were in just four countries: Afghanistan (3,353), Iraq (3,063), Pakistan (2,033), and Somalia (1,101).” Incidentally, those all happen to be countries in which U.S. foreign policy has been excessively interventionist and brutal and which only became hot-spots of “terrorism” following U.S. wars or proxy wars. The report says, out of about 13,000 people, only 17 private American citizens were killed in terrorist incidents last year: 15 in Afghanistan, one in Jerusalem, and one in Iraq. Those in Afghanistan and Iraq were likely aid workers or private contractors, although the report doesn’t specify. Even counting all 17 U.S. deaths by terrorism last year, though almost all went knowingly into a war zone, that amounts to .001% of Americans died from government-designated terrorism last year. Clearly, Clinton was engaging in some major threat inflation, as all people in positions of high authority do to maintain their power. That said, the U.S. has been laying the groundwork for some very serious blowback via its own state terrorism (not counted in the report, of course) in places like Yemen, Pakistan, and beyond.

#### Impact of Terrorism has low Magnitude—No threat of Extinction

**Mueller** November 2, **2011** [John, John Mueller is a professor of Political Science at Ohio State University and a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. “TERRORISM IS NOT AN APOCALYPTIC THREAT,” < http://breakthroughjournal.org/content/debates/terrorism-is-not-an-apocalypti.shtml> PWS]

There is a great deal I agree with in Breakthrough Institute's report, "Planes, Trains, and Car Bombs." In particular I salute Breakthrough's efforts to supply an updated threat assessment. The sober and thoughtful dismemberment of the exceedingly popular notion that terrorists are likely to become capable of producing nuclear and other scary "weapons of mass destruction" is most welcome. And so is the observation that what remains of the Islamist extremist movement is very much in decline. However, I would have appreciated some effort to assess the threat in quantitative terms. Breakthrough might have noted, for example, that, at present rates, an American's chance of being killed by a terrorist is about one in 3.5 million per year. Or one might note that the number of people killed worldwide outside of war zones since 2001 by Islamist extremists of all shapes and varieties is a few hundred per year. This number is regrettable, of course. But it scarcely presents an existential or apocalyptic threat. The conclusion that terrorists seek by their actions to "grow support for their cause so they can one day gain political power and govern territory," leaves out, or actually seems to ignore, a key consideration in their motivation. In almost all domestic terrorism cases, the overwhelming driving force -- besides perhaps "displaying self-relevance" as Breakthrough suggests at one point -- was simmering, and more commonly boiling, outrage at American foreign policy.

#### No Threat of Terrorism Anywhere, their Bombs don’t work

**Mueller** November 2, **2011** [John, John Mueller is a professor of Political Science at Ohio State University and a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. “TERRORISM IS NOT AN APOCALYPTIC THREAT,” < http://breakthroughjournal.org/content/debates/terrorism-is-not-an-apocalypti.shtml> PWS]

But it would be much too extravagant to suggest that the military is under siege. Although would-be terrorists have been drawn to bombs, in ten years no terrorist in the United States has been able to detonate even a primitive bomb and, except for the four explosions on the London transportation system in 2005, neither has any in the United Kingdom. In many instances, the only explosive on the scene was a fake one supplied by the FBI (in recently uncovered plots, accommodating FBI agents and informants have greatly outnumbered actual would-be terrorists). It is clear in these cases that the gullible terrorists utterly lacked the capacity to create or acquire a bomb on their own. When terrorists did try to create one after extensive training abroad, or were actually given one by a terrorist group abroad, the plot was disrupted or the bomb failed. In result, the only method by which Islamist terrorists have managed to kill anyone at all in the United States since 9/11 has been through the firing of guns. In this context, I find wild understatement in "Planes, Trains, and Car Bombs" conclusion that the terrorists out there "do not appear to have recruited the sorts of sophisticated computer engineers who can threat the viability of key cyber-infrastructure or internet nodes." However, I find no understatement whatever in its observation that the chief danger arises from the possibility that terrorists will be able to goad the United States into "polarizing responses" that play into their hands. With that important caveat, the report concludes by suggesting that "cautious optimism" is justified in assessing the threat presented by Islamist extremist terrorism. Maybe it is time to consider throwing such caution to the wind.

#### Threat of Terrorism Greatly exaggerated, New Security Measures won’t lower the number any further

**The Economist,** 11/24/**2010**[“The low risk of terrorism: We're safer than we think” < http://www.economist.com/blogs/democracyinamerica/2010/11/low\_risk\_terrorism> PWS]

IT'S the busiest travel day of the year, so I hope you will indulge one more post on the TSA's new security policies. Whereas my colleague criticises the mindset that led to those policies, Kevin Drum bravely stood up for the policies themselves the other day. However, it wasn't clear to me from Mr Drum's post whether he believed airport security policy actually made anyone safer, so I asked him over Twitter: "So do you think all this jazz actually has/does keep people from dying in/from planes?" Mr Drum replied in a follow-up post, writing: Well, yeah. Obviously this isn't something that I can prove geometrically, but that's baked into the cake of security issues like this where your goal is to prevent people from even trying to blow things up in the first place. Still, we've made it very, very hard to bring explosives onto airplanes, and I think it makes sense to think that if we hadn't made it so hard more people would have tried it. For example, my guess is that the reason no one has tried a shoe bomb since Richard Reid's failed attempt is that everyone knows it won't work. Shoes are now x-rayed, so there's no point in trying. American life after 9/11 has been marked by flailing, unfocused violence abroad combined with a timorous, paranoid crouch at home. Our desperate flag-waving and chest-beating only makes more vivid that this has been an age of fearful truculence and squandered liberty upon which we will some day look back with shame. No offence intended to Mr Drum, but his response here neatly encapsulates the mentality I find so frustrating. Like most Americans, Mr Drum seems to be convinced that the 9/11 attacks were not an isolated incident which offered little evidence of a larger threat, but were instead a first strike in an ongoing terrorist campaign against the United States. An ongoing "war on terror" seems sensible and justified only if we assume the existence of some cabal of terror engaged in an ongoing war with us. That is to say, the "war on terror" mental frame comes bundled with the premise that the homeland really is under siege, that a legion of terrorists really is, as we speak, scaling the ramparts or plotting to blow them up. I am convinced America's post-9/11 wars have raised the likelihood of terrorist attacks from very, very, very unlikely to very, very unlikely. But I am not convinced that there is otherwise any particular reason to worry about terrorism. A majority of Americans endorse and endure the rights-suspending idiocy of America's airports because they think it helps keep us safe. Which is just to say, they have been led to believe—wrongly in my opinion—that there is a significant airplane-focused threat to worry about, and—wrongly in my opinion—that the unconscionably intrusive current security measures would thwart a truly sophisticated, well-planned attack. The feckless shoe- and undie-bombers do show that the 9/11 attacks inspired some semi-copycat wannabes, and that, therefore, there is some reason to imagine that future terrorist attempts are more likely to target airplanes than shopping malls or sports arenas. However, absent evidence of specific airplane-related terrorist plots, our current, completely insane level of airline passenger scrutiny is hardly better justified than would be "enhanced pat-downs" of theatre-goers. My guess is that no one has tried a shoe bomb since Richard Reid's failed attempt for the same reason no one tried a shoe bomb before Richard Reid's failed attempt: approximately nobody ever attempts to blow up their shoes, period, much less on airplanes. And as Matt Yglesias observes: If you assume the existence of a person willing to die for Osama bin Laden’s war on America, located within the United States of America, and in possession of a working explosive or firearm, there’s basically nothing stopping him from blowing up the 4/5/6 platform at Union Square or the 54 bus in DC or the Mall of America or even the security line at DFW airport. And yet it doesn’t happen. Maybe we should take this as evidence that "the surge" somehow succeeded in keeping America's crowded places unexploded. But it's far more sensible to take this happy fact as evidence of the further happy fact that the supply of people ready, willing, and able to blow up America's crowded places is very small.

#### **Threat of Terrorism Proved Exaggerated by Recent Study**

Lobe, 2/9/ 2012, [James R. Lobe is an American journalist and the Washington Bureau Chief of the international news agency Inter Press Service, “Muslim 'terror threat' belied by numbers,” < http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/02/20122912326479430.html> PWS]

The threat of terrorism carried out by Muslim Americans appears to have been exaggerated by US officials in recent years, according to a new study on domestic terrorism released Wednesday. The [study](http://sanford.duke.edu/centers/tcths/documents/Kurzman_Muslim-American_Terrorism_in_the_Decade_Since_9_11.pdf), the third in an annual series by the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security in North Carolina, found that both the number of plots by and indictments against radicalised Muslim Americans fell sharply last year from a high in 2009, defying predictions by law enforcement and other officials. Only one of the 20 Muslim Americans who were indicted in 2011 for plotting terrorist activities succeeded in carrying out an actual attack; in that case, the assailant fired shots at military buildings outside Washington without injuring anyone. "Threats remain: violent plots have not dwindled to zero, and revolutionary Islamist organisations overseas continue to call for Muslim-Americans to engage in violence," according to the report's principal author, Charles Kurzman, a sociologist at the University of North Carolina. "However, the number of Muslim-Americans who have responded to these calls continues to be tiny, when compared with the population of more than 2 million Muslims in the United States and when compared with the total level of violence in the United States, which was on track to register 14,000 murders in 2011," wrote Kurzman, who last year published a book titled The Missing Martyrs: Why There Are So Few Muslim Terrorists.

#### Al Queda is weaker than thought

Lobe, 2/9/ 2012, [James R. Lobe is an American journalist and the Washington Bureau Chief of the international news agency Inter Press Service, “Muslim 'terror threat' belied by numbers,” < http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2012/02/20122912326479430.html> PWS]

Coincidentally, the new report was released as a senior Pentagon official suggested that Washington may also have exaggerated the threat posed by al-Qaeda in the aftermath of 9/11. "Al-Qaeda wasn't as good as we thought they were on 9/11," Michael Sheehan, the assistant secretary of defence for special operations and low-intensity conflict, told a conference here Tuesday. FBI halts anti-Muslim training "Quite frankly, we … were asleep at the switch, the US government, prior to 9/11. So an organisation that wasn't that good looked really great on 9/11. Everyone looked to the skies every day after 9/11 and said, 'When is the next attack?' And it didn't come, partly because al-Qaeda wasn't that capable," he was reported as saying by the Army Times. "They didn't have other units here in the US …Really, they didn't have the capability to conduct a second attack," he added.

#### **Animal Rights Activists are a larger risk than Terrorists**

Hassaballa, May 8, 2010 [ Hesham, Chicago Doctor and Writer of many books regarding Islam and Terrorist Threats, ““Islamic Terror” Threat Heavily Exaggerated,” < http://godfaithpen.com/2010/05/08/islamic-terror-threat-heavily-exaggerated/> PWS]

The RAND report includes a time line of all acts of terrorism on U.S. soil committed by jihadists.  Not a single U.S. civilian has been killed by jihadists since 9/11.  However, fourteen soldiers have been killed, thirteen of those during the [Fort Hood Shooting](http://www.loonwatch.com/2009/11/major-nidal-hasan/). Not only were no civilians killed by jihadists in this period, but only three jihadist acts of terrorism were committed. Jihadism thus accounted for only 3.6% of terrorist attacks.  The RAND report states: [Of the] 83 terrorist attacks in the United States between 9/11 and the end of 2009, only three…were clearly connected with the jihadist cause.  (The RAND database includes Abdulmutallab’s failed Christmas Day attempt to detonate a bomb on an airplane.) The other jihadist plots were interrupted by authorities. Fifty of the 83 terrorist attacks were committed by environmental extremists and animal rights fanatics, “which account for most of the violence.”  Five civilians were killed by the anthrax letters. The RAND report includes a number of other interesting findings: (1) The number of jihadist recruits is “tiny”, and the overwhelming majority of Muslim Americans oppose jihadist ideologies.  Therefore, a mistrust of Muslim Americans is unfounded.  The Muslim American community is not a fifth column, and does not seek to do harm to their fellow Americans.  Rather, jihadists remain “lone gunmen” and commit “one-off attacks”, with no community support.  The report reads:

### A/T Terrorism- No solvency

#### Alt Cause: International ports- an attack in any country would force other countries to raise alert and shut down shipping

**As one of the world’s busiest ports, it is fitting that Hong Kong** played host to the World Trade Organization’s December 2005 meeting. After all, **seaports serve as the on- and off-ramps for the vast majority of traded goods**. Still, the leaders of the 145 delegations that convened in Hong Kong undoubtedly did not have much more than a sightseer’s interest in the host city’s magnificent and frenetic harbor. For the most part, finance and trade ministers see trade liberalization as involving efforts to negotiate rules that open markets and level the playing field. They take as a given the availability of transportation infrastructures that physically link markets separated by vast distances.

But **the days when policy makers could take safe transportation for granted are long past**. The Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on New York and subsequent **attacks on Madrid and London show that transport systems have become favored targets for terrorist organizations**. **It is only a matter of time before terrorists breach the superficial security measures in place to protect the ports, ships and the millions of intermodal containers that link global producers to consumers**.

Should that breach involve a weapon of mass destruction, **the United States and other countries will likely raise the port security alert system to its highest level, while investigators sort out what happened and establish whether or not a follow-on attack is likely. In the interim, the flow of all inbound traffic will be slowed so that the entire intermodal container system will grind to a halt**. In economic terms, the costs associated with managing the attack’s aftermath will substantially dwarf the actual destruction from the terrorist event itself.

### A/T Econ

#### ---A terrorist attack on a port would have minimal effects on the economy

Peter Chalk, 2008, The maritime dimensions of international security: Terrorism, piracy and the challenges for the United States, (Peter Chalk is a senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation) <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG697.pdf>

Although it is true that very little redundancy (in the form of surplus supply) is built into the contemporary international trading system, **it would be extremely difficult to decisively disrupt its operation through a campaign of terrorism. Major ports such as Rotterdam, Vancouver, Singapore, New York, and Los Angeles are both expansive and highly secure, making them extremely difficult to fully close down. Even if an attack did result in the wholesale suspension of all loading/offloading functions, ships could be fairly easily diverted (albeit at a cost) to alternative terminals, thus ensuring the continued integrity of the inter-modal transportation network**. Successfully blocking a SLOC to all through traffic would be similarly difficult, not least because it would require a group to scuttle several large vessels at the same time—a formidable and technically demanding undertaking.12 Moreover, very few maritime choke points are truly nonsubstitutable for ocean-bound freight. Bypassing the Malacca Straits in Southeast Asia (one of the world’s busiest maritime corridors), for instance, would require only an extra three days of steaming, and other than oil and certain perishable goods, most commodities would not be unduly affected by short delays in delivery.13

#### Alt Cause: Port inefficiency is caused by overregulation and organized crime.

Ximena Clark, David Dollar, Alejandro Micco, 2004. PORT EFFICIENCY, MARITIME TRANSPORT COSTS AND BILATERAL TRADE, National Bureau of Economic Research, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w10353.pdf?new_window=1>

Seaport efficiency, though, is not just a matter of physical infrastructure.

Organized crime has an important negative effect on port services, increasing transport

costs. In terms of our sample, an increase in *organized crime* from the 25th to 75th

percentiles implies a reduction in port efficiency from 50th to 25th percentiles. In addition

our results suggest that some level of regulation increases port efficiency, but excessive

regulation can be damaging.

### A/T Trade

#### Ports are adapting to accommodate post-Panamax ships

Catherine Ngai, December 5, 2011, E. Coast US ports gearing for growth via Panama Canal, Metal Bulletin Daily Alerts, Lexis

**More East Coast ports are taking measures to handle increased business in anticipation of the** $5.2-billion **Panama Canal expansion** to be completed in August 2014.

**Some analysts say that East Coast ports could benefit from as much as a 10- to 12-percent jump in container volume traffic from the expansion, and major metals ports are racing to dredge deeper in order to accommodate post-Panamax vessels**-the largest ships that can sail on the canal-that can transport almost 12,600 20-foot equivalent units (AMM, Aug. 19).

### A/T Wind: Causes Warming

#### Wind turbines cause global warming

Tim **Worstall , 4/30/2012** Contributor “Wind Farms Cause Global Warming!”http://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2012/04/30/wind-farms-cause-global-warming/

**The basic effect is that given that the ground at night is generally cooler than the atmosphere, thus the air near the ground is cooler than the air higher up. Turning blades of the turbines mix up this air,** cool with warmer**, and thus lower the temperature of the higher up air.The effect is quite large too, that 0.72 of a degree is not far off the 0.8 of a degree which is said to be the total amount of anthropogenic global warming so far.**

#### Wind turbines cause global warming

Brad **Plumer , 04/30/2012** associate editor at The New Republic “No, wind farms are not causing global warming” “http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/no-wind-farms-are-not-causing-global-warming/2012/04/30/gIQAMl2GsT\_blog.html

The frenzy started after Liming Zhou, **a scientist at the University of Albany, published a short study in Nature Climate Change. Zhou’s team analyzed satellite data for a handful of large wind farms in west-central Texas. And he found that, between 2003 and 2011, the surface temperature in the immediate vicinity of Texas’ wind farms had heated up a fair bit, especially during the night hours, as the wind turbines pulled warmer air from the atmosphere down closer to the ground.**

#### Windmills have drastic negative effects on climate change.

Louise **Gray 12**, Environment Correspondent, “Wind farms can cause climate change, finds new study” <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/9234715/Wind-farms-can-cause-climate-change-finds-new-study.html>

**Wind farms can cause climate change**, according to new research, **that shows for the first time the new technology is already pushing up temperatures.** Usually at night the air closer to the ground becomes colder when the sun goes down and the earth cools. But on **huge wind farms the motion of the turbines mixes the air higher in the atmosphere that is warmer, pushing up the overall temperature.** **Satellite data over a large area in Texas that is** **now covered by four of the world's largest wind farms,** **found that over a decade the local temperature went up by almost 1C as more turbines are built. This could have long term effects on wildlife living in the immediate areas of larger wind farms** .It could also affect regional weather patterns as warmer areas affect the formation of cloud and even wind speeds. "Wind energy is among the world’s fastest growing sources of energy. The US wind industry has experienced a remarkably rapid expansion of capacity in recent years,” he said. “**While converting wind’s kinetic energy into electricity, wind turbines modify surface-atmosphere exchanges and transfer of energy, momentum, mass and moisture within the atmosphere.** **These changes, if spatially large enough, might have noticeable impacts on local to regional weather and climate.”**

#### Wind turbines have warming effects on the climate.

Nina **Chestney 4/29/12 , Rueters Staff Writer, “Wind farms may have warming effect – research”** <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/29/wind-farms-climate-idUSL6E8FR3H520120429>

Researchers at the State University of New York at Albany analysed the satellite data of areas around large wind farms in Texas, where four of the world's largest farms are located, over the period 2003 to 2011.The results, published in the journal Nature Climate Change, showed a warming trend of up to 0.72 degrees Celsius per decade in areas over the farms, compared with nearby regions without the farms."We attribute this warming primarily to wind farms," the study said. The temperature change could be due to the effects of the energy expelled by farms and the movement and turbulence generated by turbine rotors, it said."These changes, if spatially large enough, may have noticeable impacts on local to regional weather and climate," the authors said.But the researchers said more studies were needed, at different locations and for longer periods, before any firm conclusions could be drawn.Scientists say the world's average temperature has warmed by about 0.8 degrees Celsius since 1900, and nearly 0.2 degrees per decade since 1979. Efforts to cut carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions are not seen as sufficient to stop the planet heating up beyond 2 degrees C this century, a threshold scientists say risks an unstable climate in which weather extremes are common.

### A/T Wind- Doesn’t solve

#### Long Time Frame- Wind plants take 7-9 years to get off the ground

Brandi Colander, November 23, 2010, Natural Resources Defense Council Staff, Obama Administration Paves Way for Offshore Wind Power to Take Flight Off Atlantic Coast, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/bcolander/obama\_administration\_paves\_way.html

Currently, **the process for getting offshore wind power off the ground in this country is far too long, with a projected timeline of** [7-9 years](http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/ngreene/good_cape_wind_getting_ok_bett.html) **for domestic wind leasing, which is far longer than the typical siting process for a coal-fired power plant**.  The focus of yesterday’s announcement – Cape Wind in Nantucket Sound, heavily anticipated as the country’s first utility-scale offshore wind farm – is a perfect example. Already a decade in the making, just yesterday Massachusetts approved its agreement to sell half of its power to the National Grid, once its turbines are built and spinning. While this is a tremendous feat for offshore wind in America, we must expedite the timeline for similar projects in the future if we want to get serious about advancing this promising source of renewable technology in America.

#### Wind can’t generate enough energy to be reliable. Can’t replace fossil fuels

**Mathias 12**, Energy Informative, “Wind Energy Pros and Cons” <http://energyinformative.org/wind-energy-pros-and-cons/>

**Wind is unpredictable and the availability of wind energy is fluctuating. Wind energy is therefore not suitable as a base load of energy source (breakthroughs in energy storage technologies might change this in the future). This is why wind turbines have to be used together with other renewables or even non-renewables to meet the power demand.**

#### The environment at sea is too harsh for offshore wind turbines.

**Wind Energy Planning 2012 , “Offshore Wind Turbines”** <http://www.windenergyplanning.com/category/offshore-wind-turbines/>

Offshore wind turbine technology has developed at a fast pace over the last few years with some of the world’s biggest utility companies heavily involved in offshore wind energy projects. **Some significant barriers however are present with the technology – the most problematic being the harsh environment out at sea. Construction and maintenance of offshore wind turbines is more expensive than for their onshore cousins with in many cases specialist vessels required.**

#### **Wind Energy is unreliable and emits C02, Study Proves**

**Daily Mail Reporter**, **1/8**/2012 [EU news Network, “Wind power 'does not give value for money' as it is unreliable and requires back-up gas stations,” < http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2084046/Wind-power-does-value-money-unreliable-requires-gas-stations.html>

But wind power is unreliable and requires back-up gas power stations to maintain a consistent electricity supply, the Civitas think-tank study found. Unreliable: A study into wind power has found that it is not a cost-effective way to reduce carbon dioxide emissions It means energy users pay twice – once for the ‘window-dressing’ of renewables and again for fossil fuels the energy sector continues to rely on. The study, written by economist Ruth Lea, uses Government-commissioned estimates of the cost of electricity generation to calculate the most cost-effective technologies. Study: The report into wind power was led by Ruth Lea Gas-fired power is the most cost-effective in the short term, while nuclear power stations become the most cost-efficient in the medium term, more than twice as cost-effective as wind. The report concludes: ‘Wind power is expensive and yet is not effective in cutting CO2 emissions. ‘If it were not for the renewables targets, wind power would not even be entertained as a cost-effective way of generating electricity or cutting emissions. The renewables target should be renegotiated with the EU.’ The study attacks Government claims that wind power is one of the more cost-effective means of generating power. In fact, it says, it is ‘unreliable and requires conventional back-up capacity’. The report also says wind power, backed by conventional gas-fired generation, can emit more CO2 than the most effective gas turbines running alone. Read more:

### A/T Wind- No projects coming

#### Lack of financing and low demand block offshore wind.

Jeffrey Ryser, Keith Chu, Mary Powers, May 21, 2012, Atlantic 'backbone' project moves up federal ladder amid uncertainty about offshore wind, Electric Utility Week, Lexis

**At just under $6 million per megawatt,** **offshore wind farms are estimated to be more expensive to build than nuclear plants, which explains why banks, up to now, have been reluctant to finance** **offshore wind farms off the US Atlantic coast**.

**Moreover, it is not an ideal time for high-priced renewable power. Flat demand for power mixed with low natural gas prices that have pushed wholesale power prices to their lowest levels in memory are making it difficult for project developers to compete for long-term power contracts with utilities**

#### Lack of federal support will block offshore wind.

Jeffrey Ryser, Keith Chu, Mary Powers, May 21, 2012, Atlantic 'backbone' project moves up federal ladder amid uncertainty about offshore wind, Electric Utility Week, Lexis

**There are doubters that the government will bring anywhere near that $17 billion amount to bear on** **offshore wind**.

During a conference call about clean energy on Thursday, David Crane, chairman and CEO of NRG Energy, said he believes that **getting** **offshore wind off the ground "will need significant and coordinated backing from the federal government." And "frankly," he said, "I don't see that happening."**

#### States are backtracking on offshore wind- unlikely projects will get built

Jeffrey Ryser, Keith Chu, Mary Powers, May 21, 2012, Atlantic 'backbone' project moves up federal ladder amid uncertainty about offshore wind, Electric Utility Week, Lexis

**But conditions for developing** **offshore wind projects in the respective states have been somewhat topsy-turvy in recent months.**

**In 2010 Bluewater** **Wind, a subsidiary of NRG, signed a power purchase agreement with Delmarva Power & Light to supply 200 MW** **from a** **wind facility off Delaware. NRG, however, was unable to find partners for the project, ultimately lost patience with the slow progress, shut Bluewater and let the PPA expire.**

On Thursday CEO **Crane seemed to justify the decision to step away from** **offshore wind when he said, "for my money, we can put solar panels on rooftops in Delaware a lot cheaper than building** **offshore wind**."

**New Jersey has a program to use** **offshore renewable energy certificates**, or ORECs, **as a way to obligate utilities to subsidize** **offshore wind production, but the General Assembly's biggest champion of** **offshore wind development**, Assembly Telecommunications and Utilities Chairman Upendra Chivukula, **said recently he was not sure offfshore** **wind would ever get built considering the obstacles it now faces**.

**The Maryland Legislature, which had been following New Jersey's lead using ORECs, saw pro-****offshore wind power legislation defeated.**

**In Virginia, utility holding company Dominion has said it wants to build 2,000 MW of** **offshore wind power itself and put it all in rate base, but there has been no activity yet**. Gamesa, the Spanish wind developer and turbine manufacturer, last week suspended its own plan to put a prototype turbine offshore Virginia. A "viable commercial market" for turbines is at least three to four years away, the company said.

#### Lack of tax credits and transmission lines prevent development of offshore wind.

Brian Hansen, May 14, 2012, Spanish firm slams US market for offshore wind power, Inside Energy with Federal Lands, Lexis

In addition to complaining about the length of the federal permitting process, Gamesa said two other issues also contributed to its decision to abandon its Virginia project. **The first is Congress' inability to date to extend the production tax credit for** **wind energy, which is slated to expire at the end of this year.**

Three months ago, some lawmakers tried to extend the PTC as part of a broader tax bill, but that effort failed (IE, 20 February, 1). Wind-energy supporters may try again in a post-election "lame duck" session of Congress, but there is no guarantee they will succeed, given some lawmakers' concerns about the costs of extending the credit, among other things. Pro-wind experts say **that if Congress does not extend the PTC soon, the construction of new** **wind-power projects could plummet by as much as 70%.**

David Rosenberg, Gamesa's US-based vice president of marketing and communications, told Platts that **because the offshore wind-energy industry is still in its infancy, the PTC is needed to make** **offshore projects "viable."**

**The second specific roadblock** that Gamesa cited in its **statement was the "lack of an** **offshore grid" that would link up** **wind farms in the Atlantic Ocean and transmit their electricity to the mainland.** A host of firms, led by Maryland-based Trans-Elect Development Company, have proposed to build a $5 billion, 350-mile-long underwater transmission line that would link up offshore wind farms along the Eastern Seaboard.

But **the project is stalled, in part because of a "chicken-or-egg" situation: because no** **wind farms have been built yet in the Atlantic Ocean, there is a perception in some quarters that there is no need for such a transmission line.**

#### Companies won’t invest in offshore wind due to lack of market and comprehensive US energy policy

Brian Hansen, May 14, 2012, Spanish firm slams US market for offshore wind power, Inside Energy with Federal Lands, Lexis

"The fact is, Virginia and Gamesa did their parts," McDonnell said in a statement. "But **this project will not move forward due to the ongoing lack of a true national energy policy and a global market that has become more difficult for** **offshore wind the past few years. That is disappointing."**

Gamesa, for its part, said **the lack of a "mature" US market for offshore wind made it "extremely difficult to justify the enormous expenditure of capital" and other resources that would be required for its project.** Still, the Spanish company said it will "act quickly on future opportunities ? should the US market develop."

### A/T Wind: Offshore cost

#### Offshore wind costs twice as much as other power sources and requires redundant capacity. Other alternatives should be preferred.

Jenny Fyall, June 26, 2012, Stop pouring taxpayers' cash into costly wind power, says Shell boss, The Scotsman, Lexis

He argued that **offshore wind was far more expensive than other forms of generation - about double the cost of setting up and running a new gas plant**.

"We need a trajectory that achieves decarbonisation but we are also dealing with some other challenges in society," he said.

"**People are unemployed. People have got high energy bills. The only way that very expensive investments are going to get paid for is by an increase in those energy bills**."

**He questioned whether today's economic climate meant this was the right time for a potential "doubling" in energy bills.**

He said he would be concerned **if the focus on** **offshore wind got "too big", not just because of the expense but also because the more** **wind we used, the more "redundant power capacity" would be needed in addition, "in case the** **wind doesn't blow**".

"**So there's an awful lot of redundant capital that needs to be spent**," he added. "We do see a clear role for renewables but there is a question of pace."

**Building windmills in the ocean cost twice as much than on the land.**

Larisa **Epatko** 11/26/**05** , Staff writer for Online Newshour , “Land- vs. Sea-based Wind Farms”<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/indepth_coverage/science/wind_power/landseawindfarms.html>

But **one of the main challenges to building offshore is cost. The price tag of installing offshore sites can reach 50 percent to twice that of land-based wind technology**, Calvert said. **This cost is reflected in the fact that currently sea-based wind farms generate only about 600 megawatts, compared to 50,000 megawatts of land-based wind power**, he added.

### A/T Wind: Hurricanes

#### Offshore wind turbines in the US will be destroyed by hurricanes

Doyle Rice, February 14, 2012, USA TODAY, Hurricanes pose risk to wind farms;   
High winds could damage turbines, Lexis

**When an oncoming hurricane curves offshore -- as most do -- we usually breathe a sigh of relief. But soon, those** **offshore storms might give us something more to worry about.**

**Offshore hurricanes could demolish half the turbines in proposed** **wind farms just off the USA's coastlines,** according to a study out Monday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

"**We find that hurricanes pose a significant risk to** **wind turbines off the U.S. Gulf and East coasts, even if they are designed to the most stringent current standard**," the authors from Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh write.

Engineer Stephen Rose and colleagues estimated that **over a 20-year span many turbine towers would buckle in** **wind farms enduring hurricane-force winds off the coasts of four states** -- Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina and Texas -- **where offshore wind-farm projects are now under consideration.**

**Wind turbines are vulnerable to hurricanes because the maximum** **wind speeds in those storms can exceed the current design limits of wind turbines, according to the study.**

**Failures can include loss of blades and buckling of the supporting tower.**

### A/T Wind- Kills Birds

#### Wind farms kill migratory birds

Paul **Mulshine** 4/30/**12**,Staff Writer, “Wind farms may be warming the planet”nj.com/njv\_paul\_mulshine/2012/04/wind\_farms\_warming\_the\_planet.html

**The radical environmentalists who push Al Gore-Style alarmism over climate change keep claiming that so-called "alternative energy" is wonderful for the world**. **They leave out all the negative environmental and aesthetic effects of giant wind and solar farms.** It's turning out wind isn't so wonderful after all. **The first wind farms turned out to be vast killing fields for migratory birds.** And the noise and vibration they create makes them unsuitable as neighbors to humans. Looks like **it's time to look for a new magical source of carbon-free power.** Or maybe now the enviros will finally turn to the type of power advocated by those who started the scam.

### A/T Wind- Solar S

#### Solar power is decreasing global warming now

Michelle **Radcliff ,No date** “Using Solar Power to Decrease Global Warming”http://greenliving.lovetoknow.com/Using\_Solar\_Power\_to\_Decrease\_Global\_Warming

**One of the proposed alternative energy sources for decreasing the effects of global warming** (climate change) **is solar power. This clean energy source shows promise in combating the harmful emissions of fossil fuels.**

#### Solar power is key to decrease worldwide global warming

Michelle **Radcliff ,No date** “Using Solar Power to Decrease global lWarming”http://greenliving.lovetoknow.com/Using\_Solar\_Power\_to\_Decrease\_Global\_Warming

**Since the world became industrialized, emissions from burning fossil fuels for energy plants and vehicles have filled the atmosphere and are blamed for the steady and dramatic rise of greenhouse gases**. In fact, this theory is clearly depicted by the atmospheric chart shown on the United States Department of Energy Information Administration website**. Many scientists and environmentalists feel that there must be a significant decrease in greenhouse gas emissions in order to decrease global warming. Clean energy, such as solar power does not produce greenhouse gases and promises to be a solution.**

### Warming Alt Cause

#### It’s impossible to solve warming without reducing meat consumption

[Scott Sterling](http://www.scpr.org/about/people/staff/scott-sterling), Jun 28, 2012, Studies say less red meat production key to rebalancing global warming trends, KPCC Public Radio, http://www.scpr.org/blogs/environment/2012/06/28/6846/studies-say-less-red-meat-production-key-rebalanci/

There have been numerous [studies linking the consumption of meat to health risks](http://guardianlv.com/2012/06/red-meat-not-a-healthy-choice-study-says/), but **a new report by the Union of Concerned Scientists claims that meat production is just as dangerous to the environment**. [The study, entitled “Grade A Choice? Solutions for Deforestation-Free Meat,”](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/solutions/forest_solutions/solutions-for-deforestation-free-meat.html?utm_source=SP&utm_medium=head&utm_campaign=SP-head-meat-report-6-28-12) states that **the vast amounts of land required for meat production is one of the leading causes of deforestation and global warming emissions**. Findings also reveal that a shift towards less red meat consumption would protect the planet by drastically reducing those emissions.

“We have a big beef with beef,” said Doug Boucher, a Union of Concerned Scientists’ director and co-author of the report in a statement. “**Because of the way it is produced, the more beef we eat, the worse global warming gets.”**

Calling red meat “ecologically inefficient,” the report finds that beef production consumes a staggering 60 percent of the world’s agricultural land, but returns less than 5 percent of the protein and 2 percent of the calories that feeds the world.

“**Beef production causes global warming through its effects on deforestation, both directly through pasture and indirectly through its use of feed and forage, and also because of the methane, a powerful heat-trapping gas, that comes from the stomachs and manure of cattle**,” says a passage taken from the report.

**The study comes on the heels of** [**similar findings by scientists at England’s University of Exeter**](http://www.exeter.ac.uk/news/research/title_215120_en.html)and published in the “Energy and Environmental Science” journal earlier this month. According to their research, **society needs to eat less meat and recycle more waste for any chance of rebalancing the world’s carbon cycle**, not to mention feed a global population of 9.3 billion people by the year 2050.

### Warming Take outs

#### **There’s no uniqueness to warming - Global cooling is the overall trend**

Taylor ‘9 Senior Fellow of The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News /James M, March, Environment and Climate News, “Global Cooling Continues”, The Heartland Institute, Google/

Continuing a decade-long trend of declining global temperatures, the year 2008 was significantly colder than 2007, and global temperatures for the year were below the average over the past 30 years. The global temperature data, reported by NASA satellite-based temperature measurements, refuted predictions 2008 would be one of the warmest on record. Data show 2008 ranked 14th coldest of the 30 years measured by NASA satellite instruments since they were first launched in 1979. It was the coldest year since 2000. (See accompanying figure.) Satellite Precision NASA satellites uniformly monitor the Earth’s lower atmosphere, which greenhouse gas theory predicts will show the first and most significant effects of human-caused global warming. The satellite-based measurements are uncorrupted by urban heat islands and localized land-use changes that often taint records from surface temperature stations, giving false indications of warming. The uncorrupted satellite-based temperature measurements refute surface temperature station data finding 2008 to be one of the top 10 warmest years on record. “How can an ‘average year’ in one database appear to be a [top 10] warmest year in another?” asked meteorologist Joe D’Aleo on his International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project Web site. “Well, the global databases of [surface station reports] are all contaminated by urbanization, major station dropout, missing data, bad siting, instruments with known warm biases being introduced without adjustment, and black-box and man-made adjustments designed to maximize [reported] warming,” explained D’Aleo. Warming Trend Overstated “The substantial and continuing La Niña cooled the Earth quite a bit in 2008, to the point that it was slightly below the 30-year average [1979-2008] but slightly above the 20-year average [1979-1998],” said John Christy, distinguished professor of atmospheric science and director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH). “From research we have published, and more to come soon, we find that land surface air temperatures misrepresent the actual temperature changes in the deep atmosphere—where the greenhouse effect is anticipated to have its easiest impact to measure. Surface thermometers are affected by many influences, especially surface development, so the bulk atmospheric measurements from satellites offer a straightforward indicator of how much heat is or is not accumulating in the air, for whatever reason,” Christy explained. “Recent published evidence also supports the long-term trends of UAH as being fairly precise, so the observed rate of warming is noticeably less than that projected by the IPCC ‘Best Estimate’ model simulations which, we hypothesize, are too sensitive to CO2 increases,” Christy added.

#### No warming – their models are incorrect and satellite data disproves.

Steven F. **Hayward**, F.K. Weyerhaeuser fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, 3-15-**2010**, The Weekly Standard, “In Denial,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/print/articles/denial

This central pillar of the climate campaign is unlikely to survive much longer, and each repetition of the “science-is-settled” mantra inflicts more damage on the credibility of the climate science community. The scientist at the center of the Climategate scandal at East Anglia University, Phil (“hide the decline”) Jones dealt the science-is-settled narrative a huge blow with his candid admission in a BBC interview that his surface temperature data are in such disarray they probably cannot be verified or replicated, that the medieval warm period may have been as warm as today, and that he agrees that there has been no statistically significant global warming for the last 15 years—all three points that climate campaigners have been bitterly contesting. And Jones specifically disavowed the “science-is-settled” slogan: BBC: When scientists say “the debate on climate change is over,” what exactly do they mean, and what don’t they mean? Jones: It would be supposition on my behalf to know whether all scientists who say the debate is over are saying that for the same reason. I don’t believe the vast majority of climate scientists think this. This is not my view. There is still much that needs to be undertaken to reduce uncertainties, not just for the future, but for the instrumental (and especially the palaeoclimatic) past as well [emphasis added]. Judith Curry, head of the School of Earth and Atmos-pheric Sciences at Georgia Tech and one of the few scientists convinced of the potential for catastrophic global warming who is willing to engage skeptics seriously, wrote February 24: “No one really believes that the ‘science is settled’ or that ‘the debate is over.’ Scientists and others that say this seem to want to advance a particular agenda. There is nothing more detrimental to public trust than such statements.” The next wave of climate revisionism is likely to reopen most of the central questions of “settled science” in the IPCC’s Working Group I, starting with the data purporting to prove how much the Earth has warmed over the last century. A London Times headline last month summarizes the shocking revision currently underway: “World May Not Be Warming, Scientists Say.” The Climategate emails and documents revealed the disarray in the surface temperature records the IPCC relies upon to validate its claim of 0.8 degrees Celsius of human-caused warming, prompting a flood of renewed focus on the veracity and handling of surface temperature data. Skeptics such as Anthony Watts, Joseph D’Aleo, and Stephen McIntyre have been pointing out the defects in the surface temperature record for years, but the media and the IPCC ignored them. Watts and D’Aleo have painstakingly documented (and in many cases photographed) the huge number of temperature stations that have been relocated, corrupted by the “urban heat island effect,” or placed too close to heat sources such as air conditioning compressors, airports, buildings, or paved surfaces, as well as surface temperature series that are conveniently left out of the IPCC reconstructions and undercut the IPCC’s simplistic story of rising temperatures. The compilation and statistical treatment of global temperature records is hugely complex, but the skeptics such as Watts and D’Aleo offer compelling critiques showing that most of the reported warming disappears if different sets of temperature records are included, or if compromised station records are excluded. The puzzle deepens when more accurate satellite temperature records, available starting in 1979, are considered. There is a glaring anomaly: The satellite records, which measure temperatures in the middle and upper atmosphere, show very little warming since 1979 and do not match up with the ground-based measurements. Furthermore, the satellite readings of the middle- and upper-air temperatures fail to record any of the increases the climate models say should be happening in response to rising greenhouse gas concentrations. John Christy of the University of Alabama, a contributing author to the IPCC’s Working Group I chapter on surface and atmospheric climate change, tried to get the IPCC to acknowledge this anomaly in its 2007 report but was ignored. (Christy is responsible for helping to develop the satellite monitoring system that has tracked global temperatures since 1979. He received NASA’s Medal for Exceptional Scientific Achievement for this work.) Bottom line: Expect some surprises to come out of the revisions of the surface temperature records that will take place over the next couple of years. Eventually the climate modeling community is going to have to reconsider the central question: Have the models the IPCC uses for its predictions of catastrophic warming overestimated the climate’s sensitivity to greenhouse gases? Two recently published studies funded by the U.S. Department of Energy, one by Brookhaven Lab scientist Stephen Schwartz in the Journal of Geophysical Research, and one by MIT’s Richard Lindzen and Yong-Sang Choi in Geophysical Research Letters, both argue for vastly lower climate sensitivity to greenhouse gases. The models the IPCC uses for projecting a 3 to 4 degree Celsius increase in temperature all assume large positive (that is, temperature-magnifying) feedbacks from a doubling of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere; Schwartz, Lindzen, and Choi discern strong negative (or temperature-reducing) feedbacks in the climate system, suggesting an upper-bound of future temperature rise of no more than 2 degrees Celsius. If the climate system is less sensitive to greenhouse gases than the climate campaign believes, then what is causing plainly observable changes in the climate, such as earlier arriving springs, receding glaciers, and shrinking Arctic Ocean ice caps? There have been alternative explanations in the scientific literature for several years, ignored by the media and the IPCC alike. The IPCC downplays theories of variations in solar activity, such as sunspot activity and gamma ray bursts, and although there is robust scientific literature on the issue, even the skeptic community is divided about whether solar activity is a primary cause of recent climate variation. Several studies of Arctic warming conclude that changes in ocean currents, cloud formation, and wind patterns in the upper atmosphere may explain the retreat of glaciers and sea ice better than greenhouse gases. Another factor in the Arctic is “black carbon”—essentially fine soot particles from coal-fired power plants and forest fires, imperceptible to the naked eye but reducing the albedo (solar reflectivity) of Arctic ice masses enough to cause increased summertime ice melt. Above all, if the medieval warm period was indeed as warm or warmer than today, we cannot rule out the possibility that the changes of recent decades are part of a natural rebound from the “Little Ice Age” that followed the medieval warm period and ended in the 19th century. Skeptics have known and tried to publicize all of these contrarian or confounding scientific findings, but the compliant news media routinely ignored all of them, enabling the IPCC to get away with its serial exaggeration and blatant advocacy for more than a decade.

#### CO2 isn’t key, warming isn’t caused by humans, and historical data prove there is no impact.

John **Deaver**, The Times Herald, “Deaver: Cap and Trade bill not the answer to global warming,” 8/10/**2010,** http://www.thetimesherald.com/article/20100810/OPINION02/8100310/Deaver-Cap-and-Trade-bill-not-the-answer-to-global-warming

Wait a minute! While it is true that there is general agreement that there is a greenhouse gas effect, there is no agreement about the importance of CO2, which is a tiny fraction of such gases. Here are some facts that should tell us to be cautious about introducing costly economic measures that might not do anything to alleviate the situation.

First, there is no scientific proof that global warming is caused by CO2. There is only knowledge that over the past 150 years CO2 emissions generally and very roughly correspond to rising global temperatures.

Second, during the Middle Ages--from about the years 1000 to 1300--an abundance of evidence reveals a period of warming that probably exceeded that of the present period. Greenland was green then. Yet there was no industrial revolution to cause it, and no evidence of any corresponding increase in CO2 from other sources.

Third, there is a growing body of evidence, mainly from Arctic and Antarctic ice cores, that reveal long-term temperature cycles associated with variations in the sun's radiation that could explain the recent warming.

The main point is scientists do not have positive evidence either about future climate trends or the fundamental causes of climate change. This suggests government programs such as Cap-and-Trade to deal with CO2 emissions, while imposing huge costs in terms of jobs and slower economic growth, could fail to have any impact on global warming.

### A/T Dredging

#### Dredging is conducted for other types of projects- plan doesn’t stop most of it

The World Association for Waterborne Transport Infrastructure, March 2009, DREDGING MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: A STRUCTURED SELECTION APPROACH, http://www.terra-et-aqua.com/dmdocuments/terra114\_1.pdf

In addition to navigation-related projects, dredging is conducted for other purposes such as land reclamation, maintenance of river flow, beach nourishment and environmental remediation of contaminated sediments. Dredging therefore is a valuable tool for the benefit of mankind, for social and economic development, and for environmental restoration.

#### Dredging can be done in environmentally sustainable ways

IADC, accessed 6/29/12, Dredging Envirofacts. (International Association of Dredging Companies) http://www.iadc-dredging.com/images/stories/pdf/Dredging\_envirofacts.pdf

**Dredging, a vital process**

Technically speaking, **dredging is the relocation of underwater sediments and soils for the construction and maintenance of waterways, dikes and transportation infrastructures, and for reclamation and soil improvement**. But **dredging is more. It is a valuable tool for the benefit of** mankind, for **social and economic development, and for environmental restoration**.

**Dredging for sustainable development**

Dredging for infrastructure projects has been characterised by some as man-made modification of nature, lacking awareness or underestimating the effects on the entire ecological system. Today, however, **increasingly, a holistic approach is being applied to ensure overall and long-lasting sustainable development.**

## DA Links + CPs

### Private Enterprise CP

#### Offshore ports can be privately funded- no need for federal investment

Robert Pfriender, 03/11/2006, The day a nuke hit our port, (President, Allied International Development, Ltd. ) http://www.wnd.com/2006/03/35206/

**The design, development and construction of the Super-Security Inspection Ports will cost an average of $5.5 billion each**. In comparison, the congressional General Accountability Office estimates that missile defense programs will cost the United States $53 billion between 2004 and 2009. **The Offshore Super-Security Inspection Ports project will be *privately financed and does not require any public funding***.

### Increase Funding CP

#### Port Security measures are effective- they just need more funding

Jonathan Medalia, January 24, 2005, (Specialist in National Defense)Terrorist Nuclear Attacks on Seaports:Threat and Response, Congressional Research Service Report to Congress.http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/crs/rs21293.pdf

What Priority Should Port Security Have?The 9/11 Commission wrote,

“Opportunities to do harm are as great, or greater, in maritime or surface transportation

[compared to commercial aviation]. Initiatives to secure shipping containers have just

begun.” **Terrorists “may be deterred by a significant chance of failure.”20 Improving the**

**ability to detect terrorist nuclear weapons in the maritime transportation system may make**

**a terrorist attack on a port less likely to succeed, and thus less probable**. **The American**

**Association of Port Authorities**, a trade association, **welcomed federal grants for port**

**security upgrades** to comply with the MTSA, **but called for “substantially greater**

**resources.”21 Others agree that more resources are needed to secure U.S. ports, such as**

**to reduce overcrowding of cargo-handling facilities and to hire more workers**.22 A similar

case could be made for gas pipelines, electric power plants, rail yards, or bridges. At issue

for Congress is how to allocate security funds among ports and other potential targets.

#### Increased and better targeted funding can solve problems with port security

Veronique de Rugy, April 1, 2005, American Enterprise Institute, What Does Homeland Security Spending Buy? <http://www.aei.org/files/2005/04/01/20050408_wp107.pdf>

**A close look at homeland security funding for port security reveals that probably too little money is appropriated, much of the appropriated money is allocated to the wrong things, and much of the allocated money is not spent.**

**First, appropriators should direct funding to programs that provide the greatest contribution to the most critical missions**; ideally, getting the biggest return on our tax dollars should be the only criterion guiding spending decisions. Thus, considering the importance of the U.S. maritime system to our economy and our security, **the federal government**—to the extent that it should be involved in port security at all—**should make protecting our ports a priority. But Congress has not done so: in FY2005, it allocated only $150 million for port security grants** out of TSA’s $5.4 billion budget ($4.7 billion will be going to aviation security in FY2006).84 To put that number in perspective, consider that **the Coast Guard estimates that the first-year costs for enhancing security at America’s 360 maritime facilities would be $963 million and then $535 million annually for the succeeding decade**.85 So if the goal is really to protect our ports, $150 million seems rather pointless.

Second, **allocating money efficiently means that the money appropriated should be spent based on risk analysis. Because most U.S. ports face a very low probability of attack, providing resources for every port in the country makes little sense**. In addition, 18 the U.S. port infrastructure is so vast that spreading $150 million across the nation will not achieve meaningful security either.

To be most effective, the **money should go to critical national ports and terminals, the areas of highest consequence with the greatest vulnerability to terrorist attack**. As explained above, 95 percent of all foreign commerce enters the United States through the nation’s 360 public and private ports and **about 42 percent of that trade moves through just 10 ports, with the biggest loads passing though Houston, New York and South Louisiana.86 Severely damaging one of these critical ports could not only cause injuries, death, and property damage, but could also disrupt the flow of basic goods into and out of the country. For this reason, the nation’s biggest ports are regarded as high-risk areas. However, they are often getting relatively less than smaller and lower risk ports.**

### States CP

#### States should be responsible for infrastructure security

Veronique de Rugy, April 1, 2005, American Enterprise Institute, What Does Homeland Security Spending Buy? http://www.aei.org/files/2005/04/01/20050408\_wp107.pdf

**A similar logic applies to which aspects of homeland security are public goods at the national versus state level**. (See Table 2.) Espionage, intelligence, and immigration control benefit all the states, so the *federal* government should make these investments. But **the benefits of protection of public infrastructure like bridges and water treatment plants are enjoyed by the residents of a particular state, rather than many states, so these investments should be made at the *state* level. This is not to say that the entire economy might not suffer were a specific bridge to be destroyed, but rather, that the principle economic impact of such an unfortunate event would be felt locally.28**

#### States can fund port infrastructure

**Helms** [Dave, <http://blog.al.com/live/2010/10/port_authority_oks_infrastruct.html>, “Alabama State Port Authority approves $360 million to upgrade infrastructure” All Alabama]

The Alabama State Port Authority board of directors agreed Tuesday to spend up to $360 million over the next five years improving port infrastructure. The capital program identifies key public investment needs at the Port of Mobile to attract new industry, create jobs and increase shipper competitiveness, Director Jimmy Lyons said in a statement. “This is a long-range road map for us to identify projects that will enhance the port; it’s the same thing we did in early 2000 with a program of about the same size,” Lyons said.

### **Politics Links**

#### Republicans are not in favor of securing ports.

Jonathan **Weisman 5/5/06** Washington Post Staff Writer, “House Passes $7.4 Billion Port Security Bill” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/05/04/AR2006050401672.html>

**Republicans had voted several times in the past two years against Democratic proposals to increase funding for port security, saying that enough was already being spent.** Indeed, **White House officials** repeated that assertion yesterday in a policy statement that **depicted the House bill as overly generous and technologically unrealistic.** **House Republicans blocked consideration of a Democratic amendment that would have required that all cargo be screened before it leaves foreign ports for the United States.** The Senate Homeland Security Committee, in drafting its companion bill earlier this week, added a pilot program at three foreign ports to test the feasibility of 100 percent screening.

#### Obama would have to invest capital to get offshore wind

Jeffrey Ryser, Keith Chu, Mary Powers, May 21, 2012, Atlantic 'backbone' project moves up federal ladder amid uncertainty about offshore wind, Electric Utility Week, Lexis

With the BOEM announcement, **offshore wind generation in the Atlantic may be about to get something like the type of attention the Obama administration gave to utility-scale solar generation** that is now under construction in the deserts of California, Nevada and Arizona.

**A key question, though, is whether the administration will have the time and be able to get the congressionally approved funding to push** **offshore wind the way it pushed utility-scale solar.**

#### Obama is pushing offshore wind

Nick Juliano, February 13, 2012, DOE grants for offshore wind turbines could aid pending Mid-Atlantic projects, Inside Energy with Federal Lands, Lexis

**The advanced technology grants are part of a broader effort from the Obama administration to help create an offshore wind industry in the US.** DOE has distributed about $128 million through earlier funding opportunities aimed at offshore wind technology and removal of market barriers, among other efforts, Hart said.

### Politics A/T Port Sec Bill

1) There is no evidence that the bill will even be taken up in the house

2) Obama didn’t have to invest capital in the bill- it had overwhelming support because it is just a study. Our specific links prove this wouldn’t be the case for the plan.

3) The plan builds ports, which is different than port security

### Military Industrial Complex

#### Port security efforts fuel security regimes and the military industrial complex

Joshua A. Lindenbaum, Summer, 2006, ASSURING THE FLOW: MARITIME SECURITY CHALLENGES AND TRADE BETWEEN THE U.S. AND CHINA, Richmond Journal of Global Law and Business, Lexis

While the intelligence and manpower necessary for the implementation of the CSI are supplied by the U.S. and cooperative foreign governments, **it is technology that actually detects threats within shipping containers. In evaluating terrorist threats, a primary area of concern is a bomb attack on a port, especially one carried out with a nuclear device or radiological bomb**. [n32](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n32) As such, non-intrusive inspection equipment with the capability to detect radiation is required to effectively screen the standard shipping container. The acquisition of such equipment is one of the requirements for a port to be eligible for participation in the CSI. [n33](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n33) Technology is also crucial to the administrative and communication components of port security operations. [n34](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n34) Prior to 9/11, ports were the frontline of the War on Drugs, not the War on Terrorism. As a result, much of the security technology used by ports and the Coast Guard focused on the detection of illegal drugs. [n35](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n35) **Technology companies and the military industrial complex rapidly expanded and tailored their research and development efforts, advancing existing research with computers and satellites to develop applications for** **port security.** **[n36](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n36) The military-industrial complex's history of rapid response to the security needs of the U.S. indicates that effective technologies to secure the world's ships and ports will be developed. The question is: who will bear the substantial costs of developing, purchasing and deploying this equipment and the security regimes it will support?** [n37](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n37) This query is among the most pressing for port executives and security officials, politicians, and business leaders. [n38](http://www.lexisnexis.com.mutex.gmu.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1340995931060&returnToKey=20_T15030959485&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.953139.9224869789" \l "n38)