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# STRATEGY PAGE

There are two advantages in this file, but if you want to read the hegemony advantage along with the competitiveness advantage, you will either have to extremely trim it down (cut out some internal links) or only choose one of the impact scenarios in the competitiveness advantage.

The 1AC Solvency cards are my favorites from the solvency cards, but I recommend reading through the extensions and switching things out if there are certain warrants you like better in the other cards. You obviously don’t need to read every single solvency card in the 1AC block, I was simply highlighting what I thought were the most 1AC worthy cards.

Any other questions about the file, feel free to ask ☺

Good luck!

Jackie
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## First, US port infrastructure is declining now – Dredging investment is key to access future market competition due to Panama Canal expansion

Port Tech News 1/12/12

[US port infrastructure ranked behind Iceland and Estonia, 12 Jan 2012 - Port Planning, Ports, <http://www.porttechnology.org/news/us_port_infrastructure_ranked_behind_iceland_and_estonia/>]jap

Elected officials call for increased funding to help modernize US facilities. World Economic Forum now ranks US port infrastructure as 22nd in the world. The condition of port infrastructure in the United States was further realized this week with claims that its port development is falling behind countries including Iceland and Estonia. The subject was at the forefront of a recent policy forum attended by a coalition of elected officials from the Building America’s Future Educational Fund (BAF) and Jacksonville’s Chamber of Commerce, the JAX Chamber, to highlight the need for continued investment in the country’s port infrastructure. “Other countries understand that port innovation and capacity is key to competitiveness in an export-driven economy,” former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, and BAF co-chair, told the IFW. “The World Economic Forum now ranks US port infrastructure 22nd in the world, behind such countries as Iceland and Estonia.” During his keynote speech, Rendell noted how the 59 busiest ports in America were only operable 35 percent of the time. As a result US ports have experienced notable delays and backlogs, which have increased the cost of goods going in and out of the country considerably. “Policy-makers in Washington need to make smart infrastructure investments a priority, because if we don’t, we will only fall further behind the rest of the world.”A key area of investment highlighted by Rendell was the dredging of US harbors in preparation for the completion of Panama Canal expansion in 2014. Rendell stressed that unless necessary funding was provided then the country could face the prospect of losing millions of dollars of trade, as shipping companies seek alternative ports in neighboring countries capable of handling the larger ships that will navigate the Panama Canal from 2014.

## Shipping business is rising – expansion in port infrastructure funding is key to meet demands

Shippers Digest 2012

[Port infrastructure must keep pace with rebound in United States, economist says, February 1, 2012, http://www.shippersdigest.com/2012/02/port-infrastructure-must-keep-pace-with-rebound-in-united-states-says-economist/]jap

Ocean cargo shippers can expect a slight surge in business this year, with the economic tide lifting all boats. This will be particularly evident when it comes to measuring port throughput across the Continent. Meanwhile, U.S. port authorities should continue to lobby for funds to expand infrastructure, said said Dr. Walter Kemmsies, Moffof&NichollsChief Economist. The observation resonated with the Port of Oakland shippers who comprise the nation’s top exporters of agricultural cargo.

“Bulk commodities and specialized capital goods (project cargo) fit the profile of U.S. comparative advantages,” he said. “Relative to faster growing emerging markets, the U.S. has a lower cost of capital. It also has a relative abundance of scarce resources – like water – and more advanced biotechnology. Finally, we have more reliable quality control and surveillance of compliance.”
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## 2 Impacts to Competitiveness:

## First is the economy, ports are key – over a quarter of US GDP, large employment source, and critical to trade and commerce BUT poor investment kills ports. Now is key to invest in port dredging and maintenance – 6 Reasons

Bridges 10/26/2011

[Jerry A. Bridges, Chairman of the Board of the American Association of Port Authorities and Executive Director of the Virginia Port Authority, Testimony before the United States House of Respresentatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Hearing: “The Economic Importance of Seaports: Is the United States prepared for 21st trade realities?” [http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Bridges.pdf]jap](http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Bridges.pdf%5Djap)

Since the birth of our nation, US 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. US seaports are responsible for moving more than 99 percent of ours country’s overseas cargo. Today, international trade accounts for more than a quarter of America’s Gross Domestic Product. 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 through seaports, 15000 US 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, funding for dredging federal navigation channels has slowed and decreased, especially for new construction. Further, maintenance dredging is dorel underfunded, despite a more then $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 opportunitie. As we recover from the econoic downturn, we must make investments today to address the trade realities of the future, Here are some of 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, requring on-going modernization of ports and federal navigation chanels, 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 US as cargo enteres the US through these countries. We have already seen this job loss on the West Coast.\* The US seeks to doble exports; however countries like Brazil and Chile, who we compete against the US in terms of agricultural exports, are making investments that could make their exports more competitive.\* New trade agreements with Korea, Paname and Colombia have been approves, with other trade agreement under negotiations which should result in increased exports and imports through ports.\* In addition to these near-term challenges, we know that the US population is forecast to grow by 100 million – a 30 percent increase – before the middle of the 21st century. And many fo 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 of 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 the infrastructure in and around seaports have been neglected for too long. Many of our land and water connections are insuggicient and outdated, affecting the ports’ ability to move cargo efficiently into and out of the US. This hurts US bueiness, hurts US 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 stweardship, and more then $200 billion in federal, state and local tax revenue.Earlier this month, the President’s Council on Job and Competitiveness made an urgent plea for improvements in the nationas transportation infrastructure, including landside and waterside access to seaports. We cannot wait.
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## Ports are a critical source of income for the US economy – diversion of port funds will kill their effectiveness

Picayune Times 2012

[A win for waterways across the country: An editorial, April 20, 2012,

http://www.nola.com/opinions/index.ssf/2012/04/a\_win\_for\_waterways\_across\_the.html]jap

Keeping ports and waterways navigable is vital for our nation's economy, and that's why Congress needs to ensure that money collected for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is actually used to dredge and maintain the country's arteries of commerce.Legislation aimed at doing just that advanced this week. The House adopted a transportation bill that included what's known as the RAMP Act, an acronym for Realize America's Maritime Promise. Louisiana Rep. Charles Boustany, who has been pushing the measure for more than a year, succeeded in getting it added as an amendment to the House transportation bill.That's encouraging for Louisiana. This state has had to beseech Congress -- as recently as last year -- for enough money to keep the lower Mississippi River adequately dredged when a tighter Army Corps of Engineer dredging budget and high river levels were threatening to disrupt shipping.The measure is also important to the nation as a whole. While the Mississippi River is a major artery for national commerce, it's not the only waterway that's experienced a shortage of money for dredging. The nation's 59 busiest ports are at federally designated depths and widths less than 35 percent of the time, according to a 2010 report issued by the Congressional Research Service.Given how crucial navigation is, it's hard to fathom why this money -- $1.3 billion to $1.6 billion annually -- isn't being used for its intended purpose. Instead, only about half of it is spent on such work. Congress has traditionally used the rest to offset general spending."It is a blatant misuse of taxpayer funds to divert money from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to projects other than dredging and maintenance,'' Rep. Boustany said. "Our waterways are critical economic pathways for our nation's commerce and ability to move American goods to the marketplace.''Indeed, a report on the Mississippi that came out early this year, commissioned by a group of maritime businesses, makes it clear that the U.S. economy would take a huge hit if decreased dredging forced reductions in shipping. According to the study, silting-in of the lower Mississippi River could cause the national economy to lose more than $9.2 billion worth of cargo.Inadequate spending on ports and waterways also would hamper the nation's ability to take advantage of the widening of the Panama Canal, slated for completion in 2014.

## Ports are the backbone of the economy – every industry depends on them

Farm Bureau 2012

[Port Infrastructure AFBF Policy Development, http://azfb.org/upload/Port%20Infrastructure.pdf]jap

As the American economy has grown, the United States has become more and more dependent on its waterborne trade. Today, international trade through U.S. ports, directly and indirectly, supports 25-30 percent of U.S. GDP and 13 million jobs. For U.S. agriculture the impact is even larger, 30-35 percent of agricultural income is derived from exports, the vast majority of which is transported via water. Overall, deep draft ports accommodate ocean-going vessels which carry more than 99 percent of U.S. overseas trade by weight and 64 percent by value.Our country’s inland navigation system plays a critical role in our nation’s economy, moving hundreds of millions of tons of domestic commerce. Incredibly important to the agriculture industry, approximately 60 percent of the nation’s grain exports move by barge on the inland waterway, primarily on the Mississippi River.Across all trade, the transportation cost savings alone are estimated to exceed $7 billion annually compared to the cost of shipping this type of tonnage by alternative means.
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## The US is key to the Global Recovery

Caploe 2009

[David, PhD in International political economy from Princeton, “Focus still on America to lead global recovery,” The Straits Times]

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown:'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity.At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades.If the USdoesnotdrive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies. Team Obama seems reluctant to acknowledge the extent to which its policies at home are failing not just there but around the world as well. Which raises the question:If the US can't or won't or doesn't want to be the global economic engine, which country will? The obvious answer is China. But that is unrealistic for three reasons. First, China's economic health is more tied to America's than practically any other country in the world. Indeed, the reason China has so many dollars to invest everywhere - whether in US Treasury bonds or in Africa - is precisely that it has structured its own economy to complement America's. The only way China can serve as the engine of the global economy is if the US starts pulling it first. Second, the US-centred system began at a time when its domestic demand far outstripped that of the rest of the world. The fundamental source of its economic power is its ability to act as the global consumer of last resort. China, however, is a poor country, with low per capita income, even though it will soon pass Japan as the world's second largest economy. There are real possibilities for growth in China's domestic demand. But given its structure as an export-oriented economy, it is doubtful if even a successful Chinese stimulus plan can pull the rest of the world along unless and until China can start selling again to the US on a massive scale. Finally, the key 'system' issue for China - or for the European Union - in thinking about becoming the engine of the world economy - is monetary: What are the implications of having your domestic currency become the global reserve currency? This is an extremely complex issue that the US has struggled with, not always successfully, from 1959 to the present. Without going into detail, it can safely be said that though having the US dollar as the world's medium of exchange has given the US some tremendous advantages, it has also created huge problems, both for America and the global economic system. The Chinese leadership is certainly familiar with this history. It will try to avoid the yuan becoming an international medium of exchange until it feels much more confident in its ability to handle the manifold currency problems that the US has grappled with for decades.Given all this, the US will remain the engine of global economic recovery for the foreseeable future, even though other countries must certainly help. This crisis began in the US - and it is going to have to be solved there too.

# RAMP AFF – Competitiveness Advantage – 1AC (5/11)

## Global economic crisis causes war – statistics prove

Royal 2010

[Jedediah, director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal, and Political Perspectives]

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.
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## Second impact is global economic leadership:

## Two internal links, first is market access

## Port investment is key to economic competitiveness – connections to the global export market

Wilhelm 2012

[Joe Wilhelm Jr., Staff Writer, 2/27/2012, U.S. Mayors discuss national port infrastructure plans, Daily record, <http://www.jaxdailyrecord.com/showstory.php?Story_id=535764>]

U.S. mayors determined over the weekend that there is an immediate need to invest in “crumbling” infrastructure necessary to move domestic goods to the global marketplace.The U.S. Conference of Mayors met at the Hyatt Downtown to raise awareness about exports. Mayor Alvin Brown, chairman of the organization’s task force on Metro Exports and Ports, led the meeting.**“Investing in our infrastructure is so critical for our country. Ports play a major role in putting America back to work all around the globe**,” Brown said.“We want to remain competitive in the marketplace and the only way to do that is to invest in our ports,” he said.The U.S. Conference of Mayors released a report during the weekend outlining the economic impact of exports on metro cities’ economies. It also projects that exports will outpace imports by 2020.“The U.S. Conference of Mayors has one message — cities are where the action is,” said Scott Smith, mayor of Mesa, Ariz.“Cities are where economic activity happens. Cities are where economic growth will happen. The great opportunity we have right now is in exports. We believe 40 percent of real growth in our GDP will come through exports,” he said.Smith said cities operate in a world economy that needs to be connected.“The challenges we face in America is that we have fallen behind in our ability to connect with the world. Our problem is that we have lagged in infrastructure investment. We have redirected resources and we all know how challenged we are with resources in Washington,” he said.Smith explained that policy changes are needed to correct operations.“We are looking for smart investment. We are looking for smart cuts, not dumb cuts, in Washington. We think it’s dumb to cut the investment in our ports, in our highways and in those things that connect the world and create real economic opportunity,” said Smith.The report was produced for the conference by IHS Global Insight, which claims to offer economic and financial analysis, forecasting, and market intelligence for 204 countries from Afghanistan to Zimbabwe. The report “U.S. Metro Economies: Exports in the Next Decade” provided an outline of how exports could help with the creation of jobs and bolster GDP.“The world’s fastest growing economies are, generally, the U.S.’s fastest growing export destinations, led by Qatar, Vietnam, India, China and Panama,” it said.Canada, Mexico and China are the largest U.S. export destinations. International markets are expanding at a much greater rate than in the U.S, it said.“We are here developing and refining this message, so when we get together with all the mayors in a few short months we will be able to define a policy that we will put forth to Washington and those leaders,” said Smith.
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## Second internal link is signal

## Passing RAMP outside of transportation bills is key to send a signal of global economic leadership – shows we are willing to invest in the global market

TTD 2012

[News Flash: the RAMP Act is Bipartisan. Pass it!, Transportation Trades Department, http://blog.ttd.org/2012/04/05/news-flash-the-ramp-act-is-bipartisan-pass-it/]jap

With so much attention directed at other things in Washington, such as partisan fighting, brinksmanship and the chronically delayed surface transportation bill, our ports and maritime industry sort of need a foghorn on steroids to get someone’s attention.Well, now more than 180 House lawmakers – yes on both sides of the aisle – are paying attention. And Senators are starting to stir as well. They need to step up their game and become vocal. Our 32-member Executive Committee stepped up its game in March when it vowed to push for action on critical maritime infrastructure investments through passage of the RAMP Act (H.R.104/S.412).Unfortunately, the House and Senate surface transportation bills fall short on a meaningful maritime title. This is disappointing, given that inaction jeopardizes a sector that supports 500,000 jobs, and disturbing when you consider the role maritime plays in balancing international trade and moving our top exports. More to the point, when President Obama took office he vowed to double exports as part of our nation’s economic revival. We support him but his plan will be derailed if we don’t invest more in the port and maritime sector. It is that simple.Beyond the economic arguments that favor significantly more investment in this sector, are the humanitarian ones; U.S. maritime also ships billions in humanitarian aid to nations throughout the world, a very American ideal.Why then do we continue to fall behind many other nations in funding our critical port infrastructure components? China, for example, plans to invest $40 billion in its ports over the next five years – more than the U.S. has invested since before Apollo 11 landed on the moon. This is pitiful. I’m sorry, but how is it we seem perpetually puzzled about why the U.S. continues to fall behind on the global competitiveness scale? I think the answers are fairly obvious.That is why the RAMP Act is so important. This bill, introduced last year by Reps. Charles Boustany (R-LA) and Joe Courtney (D-CT), would ensure that funds collected under the Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) are actually spent on harbor maintenance such as dredging. What a strange concept! Currently, we spend barely half of what is needed on dredging leaving our ports vulnerable in a delicate but fiercely competitive global economy. In a year filled with head-scratching proposals for our transportation system, this is a no-brainer.A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Sens. Carl Levin (D-MI) and Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX). We hope these important pieces of legislation aren’t left floating in congressional purgatory for another few years. Their enactment is far too critical to our economy, our job growth and America’s competitiveness in a world where nations are more and more defined by the quality of their transportation infrastructure.We also need expansion of the intermodal principles that were established in the Ferry Boat Discretionary Program. To provide for the future growth of ferry systems throughout the country, the nation needs to increase funding for the construction of ferries and ferry terminal facilities. This type of investment increases transportation options for local communities, creates a more efficient intermodal transportation network, and creates quality construction and operating jobs. From an economic perspective, it’s the gift that keeps on giving.Transportation unions will loudly advocate policies that boost investment in harbor maintenance and intermodal freight infrastructure grants. The RAMP Act is a good start – it simply says let’s start spending funds dedicated for port and maritime investments on the projects they were intended to support. Sort of the un-Washington.
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## Diminished US economic leadership will create an economic vacuum filled by mercantilism

Posen 2009

[Adam, deputy director and senior fellow of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, “Economic leadership beyond the crisis,” http://www.astrid-online.it/Dossier--d1/Studi--ric/POSEN\_Foresight\_global-power\_06\_2009.pdf]

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.

## Mercantilism fuels economic nationalism, kills economic cooperation and risks diversionary wars

Garten 2009

[Jeffrey, professor at the Yale School of Management “The Dangers of Turning Inward”, 3/5, Wall Street Journal, [http://www.business.illinois.edu/aguilera/Teaching/WSJ09\_Dangers\_of\_Turning\_Inward.pdf]jap](http://www.business.illinois.edu/aguilera/Teaching/WSJ09_Dangers_of_Turning_Inward.pdf%5Djap)

Yet if historians look back on today's severe downturn, with its crumbling markets, rising unemployment and massive government interventions, they could well be busy analyzing how globalization -- the spread of trade, finance, technology and the movement of people around the world -- went into reverse. They would likely point to the growth of economic nationalism as the root cause.Ordinary protectionism such as tariffs and quotas would be one aspect of this problem, but it won't be the worst of it because a web of treaties and the enforcement capabilities of the World Trade Organization will constrain the most egregious behavior. Economic nationalism is more insidious because it is broader, more subtle and subject to fewer legal constraints. It is a frame of mind that casts doubt on the very assumption that we live in a single international market, and that relatively open borders are a virtue. It is based on a calculation that despite all the talk about economic interdependence, nations can go it alone, and could be better off in doing so. True economic nationalists want above all to protect capital and jobs in their own countries. They see global commerce not as a win-win proposition but as a contest in which there is a victor and a loser. They are thus not focused on international agreements to open the world economy; to the contrary, they are usually figuring out how to avoid international commercial obligations.The last time we saw sustained economic nationalism was in the 1930s, when capital flows and trade among countries collapsed, and every country went its own way. World growth went into a ditch, political ties among nations deteriorated, nationalism and populism combined to create fascist governments in Europe and Asia, and a world war took place. It took at least a generation for globalization to get back on track. There have been some bouts of inward- looking governmental action since then, such as the early 1970s when the U.S. cut the dollar from its gold base and imposed export embargoes on soybeans and steel scrap. However, the economic conditions were not sufficiently bad for the trend to sustain itself.The kind of economic nationalism we are seeing today is not yet extreme. It is also understandable. The political pressures could hardly be worse. Over the last decade, the global economy grew on average about 4% to 5%, and this year it will come to a grinding halt: 0.5% according to the International Monetary Fund, where projections usually err on the optimistic side. World trade, which has grown much faster than global gross domestic product for many years, is projected to decline this year for the first time since 1982. Foreign direct investment last year slumped by 10% from 2007. Most dramatically, capital flows into emerging market nations are projected to drop this year by nearly 80% compared to 2007.The aggregate figures don't tell the story of what is unraveling in individual countries. In the last quarter of 2008, U.S. GDP dropped by 6.2% at an annual rate, the U.K. by 5.9%, Germany by 8.2%, Japan by 12.7% and South Korea by 20.8%. Mexico, Thailand and Singapore and most of Eastern Europe are also in
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deep trouble. In every case, employment has been plummeting. So far popular demonstrations against government policies have taken place in the U.K., France, Greece, Russia and throughout Eastern Europe. And the governments of Iceland and Latvia have fallen over the crisis.Governments could therefore be forgiven if they are preoccupied above all with the workers and companies within their own borders. Most officials don't know what to do because they haven't seen this level of distress before. They are living from day to day, desperately improvising and trying to hold off political pressure to take severe measures they know could be satisfying right now but cause bigger damage later. Thinking about how their policies might affect other countries is not their main focus, let alone taking the time to try to coordinate them internationally.Besides, whether it's in Washington, Brussels, Paris, Beijing, Brazilia or Tokyo, it is hard to find many top officials who wouldn't say that whatever measures they are taking that may undermine global commerce are strictly temporary. They all profess that when the crisis is over, they will resume their support for globalization. They underestimate, however, how hard it could be to reverse course.Political figures take comfort, too, from the global institutions that were not present in the 1930s -- the IMF, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, all of which are assumed to be keeping globalization alive. This is a false sense of security, since these institutions are guided by sovereign countries. Government officials often feel that because they are going to endless crisis summit meetings -- the next big one is in London on April 2, when the world's top 20 nations will be assembling -- that some international coordination is actually taking place. This is mostly an illusion. With a few exceptions, such as the so-called Plaza Agreements of 1984 when currencies were realigned, it is difficult to point to a meeting where anything major has been said and subsequently implemented.But as the pressure on politicians mounts, decisions are being made on an incremental and ad hoc basis that amounts to a disturbing trend.Classic trade protectionism is on the rise. In the first half of 2008, the number of investigations in the World Trade Organization relating to antidumping cases -- selling below cost -- was up 30% from the year before. Washington has recently expanded sanctions against European food products in retaliation for Europe's boycott against hormone- treated American beef -- an old dispute, to be sure, but one that is escalating.In the last several months, the E.U. reintroduced export subsidies on butter and cheese. India raised tariffs on steel products, as did Russia on imported cars. Indonesia ingenuously designated that just a few of its ports could be used to import toys, creating a trade-blocking bottleneck. Brazil and Argentina have been pressing for a higher external tariff on imports into a South American bloc of countries called Mercosur. Just this week, the E.U. agreed to levy tariffs on American exports of biodiesel fuel, possibly a first shot in what may become a gigantic trade war fought over different environmental policies -- some based on taxes, some on regulation, some on cap and trade -- being embraced by individual countries.Much bigger problems have arisen in more non-traditional areas and derive from recent direct intervention of governments. The much-publicized "Buy America" provision of the U.S. stimulus package restricts purchases of construction-related goods to many U.S. manufacturers, and although it is riddled with exceptions, it does reveal Washington's state of mind. The bailout of GM and Chrysler is a purely national deal. Such exclusion against foreign firms is a violation of so-called "national treatment" clauses in trade agreements, and the E.U. has already put Washington on notice that it will pursue legal trade remedies if the final bailout package is discriminatory.Uncle Sam is not the only economic nationalist. The Japanese government is offering to help a broad array of its corporations -- but certainly not subsidiaries of foreign companies in Japan -- by purchasing the stock of these firms directly, thereby not just saving them but providing an advantage over competition from non-Japanese sources. The French government has created a sovereign wealth fund to make sure that certain "national champions," such as car- parts manufacturer Valeo and aeronautics component maker Daher, aren't bought by foreign investors.Government involvement in financial institutions has taken on an anti-globalization tone. British regulators are pushing their global banks to redirect foreign lending to the U.K. when credit is sorely needed and where it can be monitored. Just this past week, the Royal Bank of Scotland announced it was closing shop in 60 foreign countries. Western European banks that were heavily invested in countries such as Hungary, the Czech Republic and the Baltics have pulled back their credits, causing a devastating deflation throughout Eastern Europe. The Swiss are reportedly considering more lenient accounting policies for loans their banks make domestically as opposed to abroad.This de-globalizing trend could well be amplified by Washington's effort to exercise tight oversight of several big financial institutions. Already AIG's prime Asian asset, American International Assurance Company, is on the block. As the feds take an ever bigger stake in Citigroup, they may well force it to divest itself of many of its prized global holdings, such as Banamex in Mexico and Citi Handlowy in Poland. It appears that new legislation under the Troubled Asset Relief Program will also restrict the employment of foreign nationals in hundreds of American banks in which the government has a stake.Whether or not it goes into bankruptcy, General Motors will be pressed to sell many of its foreign subsidiaries, too. Even Chinese multinationals such as Haier and Lenovo are beating a retreat to their own shores where the risks seem lower than operating in an uncertain global economy. The government in Beijing is never far away from such fundamental strategic decisions.Then there is the currency issue. Economic nationalists are mercantilists. They are willing to keep their currency cheap in order to make their exports more competitive. China is doing just that. A big question is whether other Asian exporters that have been badly hurt from the crisis -- Taiwan, South Korea and Thailand, for example -- will follow suit. Competitive devaluations were a major feature of the 1930s.It's no accident that the European Union has called an emergency summit for this Sunday to consider what to do with rising protectionism of all kinds.There are a number of reasons why economic nationalism could escalate. The recession could
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last well beyond this year. It is also worrisome that the forces of economic nationalism were gathering even before the crisis hit, and have deeper roots than most people know. Congress denied President Bush authority to negotiate trade agreements two years ago, fearing that America was not benefiting enough from open trade, and an effort to reform immigration was paralyzed for years. Globally, international trade negotiations called the Doha Round collapsed well before Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers did. Concerns that trade was worsening income distribution were growing in every major industrial nation since the late 1990s.Whenever countries turned inward over the past half-century, Washington was a powerful countervailing force, preaching the gospel of globalization and open markets for goods, services and capital. As the Obama administration works feverishly to fire up America's growth engines, patch up its financial system and keep its housing market from collapsing further, and as its major long-term objectives center on health, education and reducing energy dependence on foreign sources, the country's preoccupations are more purely domestic than at any time since the 1930s.In the past, American business leaders from companies such as IBM, GE, Goldman Sachs and, yes, Citigroup and Merrill Lynch beat the drum for open global markets. As their share prices collapse, some voices are muted, some silenced. It is not easy to find anyone in America who has the stature and courage to press for a more open global economy in the midst of the current economic and political crosswinds.And given that the global rot started in the U.S. with egregiously irresponsible lending, borrowing and regulation, America's brand of capitalism is in serious disrepute around the world. Even if President Obama had the mental bandwidth to become a cheerleader for globalization, America's do-as-I-say-and-not-as-I-do leadership has been badly compromised.If economic nationalism puts a monkey wrench in the wheels of global commerce, the damage could be severe. The U.S. is a good example. It is inconceivable that Uncle Sam could mount a serious recovery without a massive expansion of exports -- the very activity that was responsible for so much of America's economic growth during the middle of this decade. But that won't be possible if other nations block imports.For generations, the deficits that we have run this past decade and the trillions of dollars we are spending now mean we will be highly dependent on foreign loans from China, Japan and other parts of the world. But these will not be forthcoming at prices we can afford without a global financial system built on deep collaboration between debtors and creditors -- including keeping our market open to foreign goods and services.The Obama administration talks about a super-competitive economy, based on high-quality jobs -- which means knowledge-intensive jobs. This won't happen if we are not able to continue to bring in the brightest people from all over the world to work and live here. Silicon Valley, to take one example, would be a pale shadow of itself without Indian, Chinese and Israeli brain power in its midst.More generally, without an open global economy, worldwide industries such as autos, steel, banking and telecommunications cannot be rationalized and restructured efficiently, and we'll be doomed to have excessive capacity and booms and busts forever. The big emerging markets such as China, India, Brazil, Turkey and South Africa will never be fully integrated into the world economy, depriving them and us of future economic growth. The productivity of billions of men and women entering the global workforce will be stunted to everyone's detriment.Of course, no one would say that globalization is without its problems. Trade surges and products made by low-priced labor can lead to job displacement and increasing income inequality. Proud national cultures can be undermined. But these challenges can be met by reasonable regulation and by domestic policies that provide a strong social safety net and the kind of education that helps people acquire new skills for a competitive world. With the right responses of governments, the benefits should far outweigh the disadvantages. For thousands of years, globalization has increased global wealth, individual choice and human freedom.The point is, economic nationalism, with its implicit autarchic and save-yourself character, embodies exactly the wrong spirit and runs in precisely the wrong direction from the global system that will be necessary to create the future we all want.As happened in the 1930s, economic nationalism is also sure to poison geopolitics. Governments under economic pressure have far fewer resources to take care of their citizens and to deal with rising anger and social tensions. Whether or not they are democracies, their tenure can be threatened by popular resentment. The temptation for governments to whip up enthusiasm for something that distracts citizens from their economic woes -- a war or a jihad against unpopular minorities, for example -- is great. That's not all. As an economically enfeebled South Korea withdraws foreign aid from North Korea, could we see an even more irrational activity from Pyongyang? As the Pakistani economy goes into the tank, will the government be more likely to compromise with terrorists to alleviate at least one source of pressure? As Ukraine strains under the weight of an IMF bailout, is a civil war with Cold War overtones between Europe and Russia be in the cards?And beyond all that, how will economically embattled and inward-looking governments be able to deal with the critical issues that need global resolution such as control of nuclear weapons, or a treaty to manage climate change, or help to the hundreds of millions of people who are now falling back into poverty?
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## Protectionism causes nuclear war and turns case

Panzner 2008

(Michael, 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 Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138, googlebooks)

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 (heap 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 healed 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.
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## Economic downturn causes great power wars and extinction

Auslin, scholar at American Enterprise Institute, 2009

[Michael, “The global Economy Unravels” American Enterprise Institute, http://www.aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.29502/pub\_detail.asp]

Global policymakers need to get real about the gravity of the present world economic and political situation. Only with a coordinated and forceful economic policy response is there any hope of extricating ourselves from what is turning out to be the most serious global economic slump since the Great Depression. The world's policymakers are finally waking up to how synchronized and how severe the global economic crisis is turning out to be. Just this week, newspapers reported that the British army is being put on standby to deal with possible civil disorder.World leaders are beginning to grasp the all too likely political fallout from a sustained period of falling output, rapidly rising unemployment and declining equity and home prices. However, their uncoordinated global policy response to this crisis underscores the political failure to embrace policies most likely to restore growth and not simply bust national budgets. Conversely, global policymakers do not seem to have grasped the downside risks to the global economy posed by a deteriorating domestic and international political environment. If the past is any guide, the souring of the political environment must be expected to fan the corrosive protectionist tendencies and nationalistic economic policy responses that are already all too much in evidence. After spending much of 2008 cheerleading the global economy, the International Monetary Fund now concedes that output in the world's advanced economies is expected to contract by as much as 2% in 2009. This would be the first time in the post-war period that output contracted in all of the world's major economies.The IMF is also now expecting only a very gradual global economic recovery in 2010, which will keep global unemployment at a high level. Sadly, the erstwhile rapidly growing emerging-market economies will not be spared by the ravages of the global recession. Output is already declining precipitously across Eastern and Central Europe as well as in a number of key Asian economies, like South Korea and Thailand. A number of important emerging-market countries like Ukraine seem to be headed for debt default, while a highly oil-dependent Russia seems to be on the cusp of a full-blown currency crisis.Perhaps of even greater concern is the virtual grinding to a halt of economic growth in China. The IMF now expects that China's growth rate will approximately halve to 6% in 2009. Such a growth rate would fall far short of what is needed to absorb the 20 million Chinese workers who migrate each year from the countrysideto the towns in search of a better life. As a barometer of the political and social tensions that this grim world economic outlook portends, one needs look no further than the recent employment forecast of the International Labor Organization. The ILO believes that the global financial crisis will wipe out 30 million jobs worldwide in 2009, while in a worst case scenario as many as 50 million jobs could be lost. What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely.Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States,unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.
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## Modernized ports are key to international trade and the economy

[U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy Options for the Future, Institute for Water Resources U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Working Draft, 2 April 2012, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf]

Global Security 2012

[National Port Readiness Network, [http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dot/nprn.htm]jap](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dot/nprn.htm%5Djap)

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.

## Port expansion is key to US trade competition – new vessels require modernized marine transportation

[U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy Options for the Future, Institute for Water Resources U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Working Draft, 2 April 2012, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf]

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.
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## Investment now is key to a stable economy now and in the future

[U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy Options for the Future, Institute for Water Resources U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Working Draft, 2 April 2012, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf]

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 capacityimprovements.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.For a port to be considered “post-Panamax ready,” in addition to dock and crane capacity a channel depth of about 50 feet is needed with allowances for tide. U.S. West Coast ports at Seattle, Oakland, Los Angeles and Long Beach all have 50-foot channels. Northeastern U.S. ports at Norfolk, Baltimore and New York have or will soon have 50-foot channels. Only along the Southeast U.S. and Gulf Coasts is there a dearth of ports with 50-foot channel depths. This is also the area of the country with the fastest forecasted population and trade growth.The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) currently has 17 [validate number for next draft] active studies investigating possible port improvements,most associated with the desire to be post-Panamax ready. One such study at the Port of Savannah is nearing completion and indicates a well justified project that will cost about $600 million. It is likely that other studies will also show well justified projects, either to become “post-Panamax ready” or “cascade ready.” It is easy to see that the national investment to sustain a globally competitive navigation system could easily become billions of dollars.
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## Port investment key to the economy – bolsters jobs and trade

Nagle 2011

[Kurt, 30 years experience in Washington, DC, related to seaports and international trade. President of the American Association of Port Authorities, US port-related infrastructure investments reap dividends<http://www.porttechnology.org/images/uploads/technical_papers/PTI-4.pdf>]

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. Deep- draft 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.

## Ports are key to the economy – jobs, commerce and trade

Levin 12/11/2012

[Sandy, Michigan Congressman, Letter Urging Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to report the RAMP Act, out of Committee, http://levin.house.gov/letter-urging-transportationa-and-infrastructure-committee-report-ramp-act-out-committee]jap

The social, economic and recreational value of our nation’s ports and harbors are enormous. According to a 2003 report by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. ports and harbors handle more than 2.3 billion short tons of domestic and foreign commerce. Seventy percent of our imported oil and more than 48 percent of consumer goods bought by Americans pass through harbors maintained by the Corps, while the U.S. marine transportation industry supports nearly $1 trillion in commerce and creates employment for more than 13 million people in our nation.
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## Investing in ports now is key to economic leadership – Panama expansion puts us on the brink for development

Rendell 2011

[EDWARD G. RENDELL. The writer, the former governor of Pennsylvania, is co-chairman of Building America’s Future. Investing in Ports, With an Eye to America’s Prosperity August 26, 2011

[http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/27/opinion/investing-in-ports-with-an-eye-to-americas-prosperity.html?\_r=1]jap](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/27/opinion/investing-in-ports-with-an-eye-to-americas-prosperity.html?_r=1%5djap)

American ports are scrambling to secure resources needed to deepen facilities to accommodate the gigantic new ships that will become the norm once the newly expanded Panama Canal opens in 2014. Our international competitors are ahead of the United States when it comes to such critical infrastructure investments. China has poured $3.3 trillion into its infrastructure and can now boast of having six of the world’s top 10 ports while the United States has none. In Brazil, a new $2.7 billion intermodal superport — the size of the island of Manhattan — is being built in Açu to accommodate increased trade with China.Earlier this month, Building America’s Future released a report, “Falling Apart and Falling Behind.” If the United States continues to defer making smart investments in our future, we will continue to fall further behind our competitors.We are not proposing another quick round of federal spending; we are advocating a long-term infrastructure policy based on sound economics, not politics.Nearly 100 years ago, the United States had the foresight to invest in building the Panama Canal, which allowed America to become an economic superpower. Now is the time to show that foresight again by investing in our own future and prosperity by deepening our ports to take advantage of the 21st-century Panama Canal.
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## Any delay in funding will kill port effectiveness – destroys economic competitiveness

Southeast Shipping News 2012

[http://seshippingnews.typepad.com/south\_east\_shipping\_news/2012/04/ramp-act-remnant-to-stop-the-theft-of-harbor-maintenance-tax-now-in-conference.html]jap

The proposal came in the form of an amendment to H.R. 4348, legislation regarding federal highway, transit and other transportation programs, and would protect funding for regular maintenance and dredging of the nation’s harbors by making sure that funds available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) match revenue expended from it each fiscal year. The amendment is based the Realize America’s Maritime Promise Act (RAMP) Act (H.R. 104) which Capps and a bipartisan group of other Representatives introduced. The RAMP Act is also supported by a large coalition of organizations, including maritime businesses and agricultural operators, as well as the California Marine Affairs and Navigation Conference, which represents Central Coast ports and harbors.The amendment will now be a focus of debate in the upcoming conference committee of House and Senate members to negotiate a long-term transportation bill. Capps has been pushing for finalization of the transportation bill for months.“Our ports and harbors are a vital part of our local economy, but the growing backlog of dredging needs at these waterways continues to stand in the way of their full utilization,” said Capps. “I’ve heard repeatedly from Central Coast port directors and harbor masters that their navigation channels aren’t being maintained at their authorized depths. And while I’ve been able to work with both Republican and Democratic administrations to secure federal funds to conduct critical maintenance dredging on the Central Coast, I know that more can and must be done. That’s why I supported this common sense amendment to ensure HMTF funds will be used for their intended purpose – the dredging and maintenance of our coastal ports and harbors.”Across the country, silt accumulation and a growing backlog of maintenance dredging needs continues to stand in the way of the full utilization of our nation’s ports and harbors. Today, an alarming two-thirds of our nation’s navigation channels are not maintained at their authorized depths. And, according to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the backlog of needed maintenance dredging projects grew from $2.36 billion to $3.25 billion last year.For too long, user fees deposited into the HMTF have not been fully utilized to maintain and support ports and harbors. For example, at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2012, the HMTF had a surplus of approximately $6.2 billion; yet, the funding was not being used to address the backlog of necessary maintenance dredging needed to sustain maritime infrastructure, but instead other federal programs. Similarly, the 2013 budget assumes a level of revenue $1.66 billion into the HMTF while utilizing $839 million, or 51 percent, of the fund’s revenue. At the end of 2013, the budget projects a balance in the fund of about $7 billion.Coast al ports and harbors, including require annual or semi-annual dredging. Delays or decreases in federal funds to maintain these ports and harbors could negatively impact regional and national commerce, reduce economic competitiveness, and increase the risk of vessel groundings, collisions, and pollution incidents.“Going forward, I’ll be working to ensure that the language passed by the House today to protect port and harbor funding is included in the final transportation bill signed by the President,” added Capps.
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## Advantage Two is Hegemony

## We’ll isolate 2 Internal Links

## First is Alaska:

## Dredging is key to Alaskan Ports

Northern Economics 2011

[Northern Economics, Inc. Planning for Alaska’s Regional Ports and Harbors. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Alaska District and Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities. January 2011.[http://www.westcoastcorridors.org/library/Planning\_for\_Alaska's\_Ports\_and\_Harbors\_Final%20Report.pdf]jap](http://www.westcoastcorridors.org/library/Planning_for_Alaska%27s_Ports_and_Harbors_Final%20Report.pdf%5Djap)

Port and Harbor Infrastructure and Increasing Vessel Size: Containerization, transshipment, and larger vessels have placed new demands on port facilities and services. New demand for improvements in Alaskan port facilities may involve a variety of infrastructure investments, such as increasing the depth of water in entrance channels and alongside berths, extending and supporting existing harbors, providing breakwaters, and better cargo handling equipment and storage facilities, among others.

One issue with funding port infrastructure improvements will be ensuring that benefits from investing public dollars are not captured solely by private industry but are shared with residents of the region.

Facility Expansion and Dredging: Dredging is critical to a number of ports in Alaska, needed on a regular basis to maintain access to existing facilities that would otherwise be impeded by shallow water or build-up of sediment.Dredging needs will increase as shipping companies employ larger ships that require deeper water or a larger space for maneuvering or docking. Proper port and harbor design can help minimize the amount of dredging. Increases in the number of recreational vessels as well as changes in the size of commercial fishing fleets may require new or expanded harbors. Modular design concepts that could be used in multiple locations around the state might be developed to reduce engineering and construction costs. Expansion plans should be tempered with a realistic assessment of infrastructure needs in each region to avoid under-utilization of maritime infrastructure.

## Port of Anchorage is key to the US military – funding is critical

McCoy 2011

[Katherine, Report for Alaska Public, What’s Next for the Troubled “New” Port of Anchorage?

[http://www.alaskapublic.org/2011/12/09/what’s-next-for-the-troubled-“new”-port-of-anchorage/]jap](http://www.alaskapublic.org/2011/12/09/what%27s-next-for-the-troubled-)

It’s not just Anchorage’s port. It’s Alaska’s port.Our food, fuel, books, tires and toys flow through here. In 2005, the federal government named it one of 19 national strategic seaports for the U.S. Fuel for Alaska’s military bases and the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport comes through here. Construction cement – enough last year to build a sidewalk from Kenai to Barrow and back — arrives this way.Without this commodity pipeline, we’re in a world of hurt.Here’s the bad news. The port is 50 years old. Some of it predates the ’64 quake and a major tumbler could seriously damage or even destroy it.And here’s the really bad news. The fix – a rebuilt port — went wildly awry.The first plan was a giant upgrade, in the works for a decade and priced at $360 million in 2005. It would add 135 acres, expand the number of berths from four to seven, and include buildings and a military staging area. Instead of a traditional dock on pilings, this design relies on creating new landmass behind a bulkhead of steel that stretches out into the inlet, held in place by interlocking steel sheets.Now, with $279 million spent and only about a third of the work done (some of it so flawed it needed re-doing), the price tag has climbed to $1.2 billion. Instead, the city of Anchorage is opting for a much smaller fix, heading to Juneau in January asking for $350 million to get at least a piece of the job done.The finger pointing is fierce. Lawsuits are flying, audits are underway and some new oversight is in place.

# RAMP AFF – Hegemony Advantage – 1AC (2/6)

## Second internal link is deployments,

## Ports provide the military with critical equipment and movement – key to power projection

US Maritime Administration 2012

[National Port Gateway And Freight Corridor Strategy, [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=military%20depends%20on%20seaports%20united%20states&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CF0QFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nrf.com%2Fmodules.php%3Fname%3DDocuments%26op%3Dviewlive%26sp\_id%3D1487&ei=MxHiT5\_tCaL00gHA5aneAw&usg=AFQjCNEexX8NjDq\_e0sCr19rOeX0X3c3Og&sig2=6JlpObxFV0UCzA5p9ds7Rg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=military%20depends%20on%20seaports%20united%20states&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CF0QFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nrf.com%2Fmodules.php%3Fname%3DDocuments%26op%3Dviewlive%26sp_id%3D1487&ei=MxHiT5_tCaL00gHA5aneAw&usg=AFQjCNE)]

The transportation network that serves our economy also serves our national defense. Themovement of military and related traffic essential to our national security relies heavily on ourcommercial transportation system. This is particularly true for the sustainment of large or longtermoperations. Ports that move commercial and consumer goods also move military equipmentand supplies that enable the United States to project its power anywhere in the world. Both inshort-term surge operations and long-term deployments, the ports must be able to handle themilitary’s needs while continuing to serve the commercial sector in the increasingly globaleconomy. Robust intermodal connectivity is necessary to support the flow of global commerceand the deployment of military forces. Only focused, sustained attention to the needs of bothbusiness and our military will allow for the creation of a truly seamless, integrated intermodalfreight transportation system.
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## Accessible ports are key to military deployments and readiness – the military depends on the use of ships to transport equipment, containers, aircraft and vehicles

US Maritime Administration 2012

[National Port Gateway And Freight Corridor Strategy]

The Department of Defense, in partnership with the Maritime Administration, has designated 15commercial ports as Strategic Seaports. The 15 commercial Strategic Ports are geographicallydispersed along the Nation’s coasts. (See appendix \_\_ for a list of the ports) Each of thesestrategic ports has individual capabilities that provide the Department of Defense with the portfacilities and services that are critical in maintaining the military’s operational flexibility whileensuring sufficient redundancy exists to meet a wide range of possible national security missionsand timelines. Recent history also proves that these same capabilities and commitment topreparedness can also be applied to domestic emergency relief activities after a natural disaster.Military operational deployments require the large-scale use of Roll-on/Roll-off (RO/RO) ships,which are capable of carrying a combination of aircraft, wheeled and tracked vehicles, oversizeequipment, and containers. As demonstrated during Operating Iraqi Freedom (OIF), loading ofcombat units requires substantial staging areas for vehicles and aircraft, adequate port railinfrastructure, and port labor that is skilled in handling non-containerized military equipment.Therefore, the effectiveness of military cargo operations at the ports is directly tied to themobility planning process and the availability of staging areas and rail infrastructure forsequencing such equipment arriving from the military installations. U.S. ports will continue toexpand their operations to meet the forecasted growth in commercial containerized freight. Ifports reduce the area available for non-containerized cargo, facilities needed to support theunique military cargo handling requirements will become scarcer and this may reduce the abilityof U.S. ports to facilitate future military unit deployments. The logistical backbone for deployment of American forces and materiel, from the “fort tofoxhole,” relies on the commercial intermodal freight transportation system. This vital militarycargo is overlaid on the transportation system, which is already stressed by carrying commercialfreight with demanding delivery schedules.Virtually all CONUS based military contingency cargoes are deployed through U.S. commercialseaports, with the exception of ammunition and other specialized or dangerous cargoes.Whereas commercial cargo and peacetime military cargo are primarily containerized, OIFmilitary cargo is based on moving an entire military unit’s needs (force package) and containswheeled vehicles, tanks, and other materiel. Military surge and sustainment freight also differsin volume and needed configuration. This surge deployment of OIF cargo puts unique pressureon staging areas and requires the use of other labor skills to load the cargo.
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## Decline in US power projection triggers multiple nuclear wars

Kagan 2007

(Robert, senior associate at Carnegie, “End of Dreams, Return of History” Policy Review, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html#n10, ldg)

This is a good thing, and it should continue to be a primary goal of American foreign policy to perpetuate this relatively benign international configuration of power. The unipolar order with the United States as the predominant power is unavoidably riddled with flaws and contradictions. It inspires fears and jealousies. The United States is not immune to error, like all other nations, and because of its size and importance in the international system those errors are magnified and take on greater significance than the errors of less powerful nations.Compared to the ideal Kantian international order, in which all the world's powers would be peace-loving equals, conducting themselves wisely, prudently, and in strict obeisance to international law, the unipolar system is both dangerous and unjust. Compared to any plausible alternative in the real world, however, it is relatively stable and less likely to produce a major war between great powers. It is also comparatively benevolent, from a liberal perspective, for it is more conducive to the principles of economic and political liberalism that Americans and many others value. American predominance does not stand in the way of progress toward a better world, therefore. It stands in the way of regression toward a more dangerous world. The choice is not between an American-dominated order and a world that looks like the European Union. The future international order will be shaped by those who have the power to shape it.The leaders of a post-American world will not meet in Brussels but in Beijing, Moscow, and Washington. The return of great powers and great games If the world is marked by the persistence of unipolarity, it is nevertheless also being shaped by the reemergence of competitive national ambitions of the kind that have shaped human affairs from time immemorial. During the Cold War, this historical tendency of great powers to jostle with one another for status and influence as well as for wealth and power was largely suppressed by the two superpowers and their rigid bipolar order. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not been powerful enough, and probably could never be powerful enough, to suppress by itself the normal ambitions of nations. This does not mean the world has returned to multipolarity, since none of the large powers is in range of competing with the superpower for global influence. Nevertheless, several large powers are now competing for regional predominance, both with the United States and with each other. National ambition drives China's foreign policy today, and although it is tempered by prudence and the desire to appear as unthreatening as possible to the rest of the world,the Chinese are powerfully motivated to return their nation to what they regard as its traditional position as the preeminent power in East Asia. They do not share a European, postmodern view that power is passé; hence their now two-decades-long military buildup and modernization. Like the Americans, they believe power, including military power, is a good thing to have and that it is better to have more of it than less. Perhaps more significant is the Chinese perception, also shared by Americans, that status and honor, and not just wealth and security, are important for a nation. Japan, meanwhile, which in the past could have been counted as an aspiring postmodern power -- with its pacifist constitution and low defense spending -- now appears embarked on a more traditional national course. Partly this is in reaction to the rising power of China and concerns about North Korea's nuclear weapons. But it is also driven by Japan's own national ambition to be a leader in East Asia or at least not to play second fiddle or "little brother" to China. China and Japan are now in a competitive quest with each trying to augment its own status and power and to prevent the other 's rise to predominance, and this competition has a military and strategic as well as an economic and political component. Their competition is such that a nation like South Korea, with a long unhappy history as a pawn between the two powers, is once again worrying both about a "greater China" and about the return of Japanese nationalism. As Aaron Friedberg commented, the East Asian future looks more like Europe's past than its present. But it also looks like Asia's past.Russian foreign policy, too, looks more like something from the nineteenth century. It is being driven by a typical, and typically Russian, blend of national resentment and ambition. A postmodern Russia simply seeking integration into the new European order, the Russia of Andrei Kozyrev, would not be troubled by the eastward enlargement of the EU and NATO, would not insist on predominant influence over its "near abroad," and would not use its natural resources as means of gaining geopolitical leverage and enhancing Russia 's international status in an attempt to regain the lost glories of the Soviet empire and Peter the Great. But Russia, like China and Japan, is moved by more traditional great-power considerations, including the pursuit of those valuable if intangible national interests: honor and respect. Although Russian leaders complain about threats to their security from NATO and the United States, the Russian sense of insecurity has more to do with resentment and national identity than with plausible external military threats. 16 Russia's complaint today is not with this or that weapons system. It is the entire post-Cold War settlement of the 1990s that Russia resents and wants to revise. But that does not make insecurity less a factor in Russia 's relations with the world; indeed, it makes finding compromise with the Russians all the more difficult. One could add others to this list of great powers with traditional rather than postmodern aspirations. India's regional ambitions are more muted, or are focused most intently on Pakistan, but it is clearly engaged in competition with China for dominance in the Indian Oceanand sees itself, correctly, as an emerging great power on the world scene. In the Middle East there is Iran, which mingles religious fervor with a historical sense of superiority and leadership in its region. 17 Its nuclear program is as much about the desire for regional hegemony as about defending Iranian territory from attack by the United States. Even the European Union, in its way, expresses a pan-European
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national ambition to play a significant role in the world, and it has become the vehicle for channeling German, French, and British ambitions in what Europeans regard as a safe supranational direction. Europeans seek honor and respect, too, but of a postmodern variety. The honor they seek is to occupy the moral high ground in the world, to exercise moral authority, to wield political and economic influence as an antidote to militarism, to be the keeper of the global conscience, and to be recognized and admired by others for playing this role. Islam is not a nation, but many Muslims express a kind of religious nationalism, and the leaders of radical Islam, including al Qaeda, do seek to establish a theocratic nation or confederation of nations that would encompass a wide swath of the Middle East and beyond. Like national movements elsewhere, Islamists have a yearning for respect, including self-respect, and a desire for honor. Their national identity has been molded in defiance against stronger and often oppressive outside powers, and also by memories of ancient superiority over those same powers. China had its "century of humiliation." Islamists have more than a century of humiliation to look back on, a humiliation of which Israel has become the living symbol, which is partly why even Muslims who are neither radical nor fundamentalist proffer their sympathy and even their support to violent extremists who can turn the tables on the dominant liberal West, and particularly on a dominant America which implanted and still feeds the Israeli cancer in their midst. Finally, there is the United States itself. As a matter of national policy stretching back across numerous administrations, Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, Americans have insisted on preserving regional predominance in East Asia; the Middle East; the Western Hemisphere; until recently, Europe; and now, increasingly, Central Asia. This was its goal after the Second World War, and since the end of the Cold War, beginning with the first Bush administration and continuing through the Clinton years, the United States did not retract but expanded its influence eastward across Europe and into the Middle East, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.Even as it maintains its position as the predominant global power, it isalso engaged in hegemonic competitions in these regions with China in East and Central Asia, with Iran in the Middle East and Central Asia, and with Russia in Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and the Caucasus.The United States, too, is more of a traditional than a postmodern power, and though Americans are loath to acknowledge it, they generally prefer their global place as "No. 1" and are equally loath to relinquish it. Once having entered a region, whether for practical or idealistic reasons, they are remarkably slow to withdraw from it until they believe they have substantially transformed it in their own image. They profess indifference to the world and claim they just want to be left alone even as they seek daily to shape the behavior of billions of people around the globe. The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying -- its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between themless likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic. It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond.Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War I and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible. Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War ii would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even todayEurope's stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United Statescould step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger ofworld war. People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that 's not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe. The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world's great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States. Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United Statesweakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China 's neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan. In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene -- even if it remained the world's most powerful nation -- could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist
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theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe -- if it adopted what some call a strategy of "offshore balancing" -- this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances. It is also optimistic to imagine that a retrenchment of the American position in the Middle East and the assumption of a more passive, "offshore" role would lead to greater stability there. The vital interest the United States has in access to oil and the role it plays in keeping access open to other nations in Europe and Asia make it unlikely that American leaders could or would stand back and hope for the best while the powers in the region battle it out. Nor would a more "even-handed" policy toward Israel, which some see as the magic key to unlocking peace, stability, and comity in the Middle East, obviate the need to come to Israel 's aid if its security became threatened. That commitment, paired with the American commitment to protect strategic oil supplies for most of the world, practically ensures a heavy American military presence in the region, both on the seas and on the ground. The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation.In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn't change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. 18 And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn 't changed that much. An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to "normal" or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again. The alternative to American regional predominance in the Middle East and elsewhere is not a new regional stability. In an era of burgeoning nationalism, the future is likely to be one of intensified competition among nations and nationalist movements. Difficult as it may be to extend American predominance into the future, no one should imagine that a reduction of American power or a retraction of American influence and global involvement will provide an easier path.
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## Port of Anchorage is key to national defense – deployments, fuel supplies, essential goods and connections to bases

Port of Anchorage 2012

[Military Support, [http://www.portofalaska.com/business/military-support.html]jap](http://www.portofalaska.com/business/military-support.html%5Djap)

The Port of Anchorage is essential to Alaska's Armed Forces providing deployment and staging areas, essential fuel supplies, and consumer and business goods. The Port has a long and successful history of supporting military deployments from its docks. Between 2005 and 2010, the port supported over 20 military deployments including Stryker Brigade deployments to Iraq and Afghanistan. During that same time period over 18,000 pieces of military equipment passed through the Port's facilities.In 2006, the Port of Anchorage was designated by as a Department of Defense Nationally Strategic Seaport. Only 19 ports in the United States have this designation. What makes the Port of Anchorage strategically important to the Armed Forces? First, the Port is connected to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) by a secure roadway created as part of the Port's ongoing Intermodal Expansion Project. This allows the military to deploy directly from JBER to the Port without having to tie up public roadways. Secondly, the Port has existing and efficient intermodal capabilities. The Port is directly connected to four of Alaska's five major military installations by rail. These intermodal connections can support deployments from both JBER and Fort Wainwright via rail lines that transport all military cargo directly onto the secure Port property. A third factor is the year-round accessibility at Port allowing the military to stage deployments from January through December without difficulty.Another critical aspect of the Port's relationship to the military is through its fuel supplies. One-hundred percent of the jet fuel used on JBER enters the Port of Anchorage and is transported to the base by pipeline. Additionally, two thirds of all fuel used by the military for transportation and other purposes passes through port facilities first. If there was a large seismic or other catastrophic event today, it is unlikely the port facilities would remain fully function. This could diminish the Port's ability to support fuel shipments to and from its facilities potentially affecting its support service to the military in a time of great need. With completion of the Intermodal Expansion Project, several areas of the dock, including modernized fuel berths, are designated as "essential facilities." These areas are designed to withstand a catastrophic event with minimum damage to ensure that Alaskans and the Armed Forces can always receive access to essential supplies and services.In a 2009 letter to U.S. Secretary of Transportation Raymond LaHood, U.S. Senator Daniel Inouye wrote "The Port of Anchorage is vital to our national defense." He goes on to identify all five military bases in Alaska saying "Without the Port of Anchorage, these key military bases would be out of business." This recognizes an additional relationship between the Port of Anchorage and military operations. The port supplies the essential merchandise goods that the military relies on every day to conduct business. From goods in the commissary to notebooks and pencils, these items all come through the port before being delivered to military bases around Alaska.In a December 2010 letter to U.S. Senator Lisa Murkowski, Lieutenant General Dana Atkins, Commander, Alaskan Command writes, "The Port of Anchorage is not only the strategic hub for military deployments and operations, it is also the point of throughput for the commodities we stock in our base exchanges, commissaries and troop stores in support of 55,000 military and family members in Alaska."
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## Port efficiency is key to military deployments – they are the delivery mechanism during national contingency plans

Global Security 2012

[National Port Readiness Network, [http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dot/nprn.htm]jap](http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/agency/dot/nprn.htm%5Djap)

Strategic ports are U.S. ports designated to support major force deployments during the initial surge period under one or more national defense contingency plans. They are selected based on their proximity to deploying units, transportation links to those units, and port characteristics. Strategic ports also include primary military ammunition ports (Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point NC, Concord Naval Weapons Station CA, and Port Hadlock WA) whose operations would impact unit deployments due to their proximity to other strategic ports and the nature of their activities during deployment.

The National Port Readiness Network promotes the readiness of three continental U.S. military and 13 commercial strategic seaports to support deployment of military surge and sustainment cargo. These **ports and waterways must continue to provide the critical infrastructure and services needed to ensure rapid, secure, and effective military mobilization. These strategic resources include deep-draft harbor channels, modern port facilities, and an extensive network of intermodal links**.

## Ports are critical to military readiness – provides over 90 percent of US fighting capabilities

DHS 2012

[Department of Homeland Security, US Coast Guard, MARITIME SAFETY AND SECURITY TEAM (MSST) 91114, [http://uscg.mil/lantarea/msst91114/]jap](http://uscg.mil/lantarea/msst91114/%5Djap)

In the United States there are 95,000 miles of coastline, 3.5 million square miles of excusive economic zone and 361 ports of varying characteristics that are integral to our Nation’s commerce. United States seaports conduct over 95 per cent of U.S. overseas trade. Over the next 20 years, the total volume of imported and exported goods at U.S. seaports is expected to more than double. The top 50 ports in the United States account for about 90 per cent of all the cargo tonnage, and twenty-five ports account for 98 per cent of all container shipments. Cruise ships visiting foreign destinations embark from 16 U.S. ports, and U.S. ferries move 113 million passengers and 32 million vehicles each year**. Over 90 per cent of all the war fighting capabilities required to project U.S. military power overseas flows from U.S. seaports of embarkation**. Maritime industry contributes over $1 trillion annually to the gross domestic product. More than 7,500 ships and 200,000 sailors make 51,000 port calls every year in the United States, and those ships carry 6.5 million passengers, 1 billions tons of petroleum, and 6 million containers a year-16,000 each day.
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## Seaports are key to deployments – the backbone of US power projection

Redfield 2003

[Carol Ann Redfield Major, US Army, The Seaport of Debarkation: A Critical Vulnerability for the Operational Commander?,[http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a415436.pdf]jap](http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a415436.pdf%5Djap)

**With fewer forces stationed overseas, the US military must be able to project forces worldwide. As a result US military strategy is dependent upon the ability to deploy successfully**. The end of the Cold War was followed by the dissolution of the former Soviet Union and the threat of a superpower conflict ceased to exist. As stated by President George Bush, “The world remains a dangerous place and our ability to project power will underpin US strategy in the Post-Cold War era more than ever before. We must be able to deploy and sustain substantial forces in parts of the world where prepositioning of equipment is not feasible”. 1 This means that the operational commander must be able to assemble an overwhelming force, at a distant location expeditiously. One could argue that to respond quickly to a crisis OCONUS, forces must be deployed using strategic airlift. However, in the case of the deployment of a huge combat force and its equipment, sealift can move more, faster and cheaper than a fleet of aircraft.

## Ports are key to military equipment deployment – that’s critical to power projection

US Maritime Administration 2012

[National Port Gateway And Freight Corridor Strategy, [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=military%20depends%20on%20seaports%20united%20states&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CF0QFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nrf.com%2Fmodules.php%3Fname%3DDocuments%26op%3Dviewlive%26sp\_id%3D1487&ei=MxHiT5\_tCaL00gHA5aneAw&usg=AFQjCNEexX8NjDq\_e0sCr19rOeX0X3c3Og&sig2=6JlpObxFV0UCzA5p9ds7Rg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=military%20depends%20on%20seaports%20united%20states&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CF0QFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nrf.com%2Fmodules.php%3Fname%3DDocuments%26op%3Dviewlive%26sp_id%3D1487&ei=MxHiT5_tCaL00gHA5aneAw&usg=AFQjCNE)]

The network that serves our economy also serves our national defense. Our Armed Forces canproject the nation’s power anywhere in the world through the same commercial transportationsystem that provides us with commodities. Every day the United States military is moving assetsacross our nation and to the fighting front, using the seaports for the deployment of equipment.During a time of forward deployment of our men and women in uniform, the ports must workwith both the military and the commercial sector to efficiently move the goods for the nation aswell as the military.
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## Military power key to hegemony

Thayer 2007

[Bradley,strategic studies professor at Missouri State, American Empire: A Debate, pg 16-17]

Another critical question is not simply how much the United States spends on defense but what benefits it receives from its spending: "Is the money spent worth it?" The benefits of American military power are considerable, and I will elaborate on five of them. First, and most importantly, the American people are protected from invasion and attack. The horrific attacks of 9/11 are—mercifully—an aberration. The men and women of the U.S. military and intelligence community do an outstanding job deterring aggression against the United States. Second, American interests abroad are protected. U.S. military power allows Washington to defeat its enemies overseas. For example, the United States has made the decision to attack terrorists far from America's shores, and not to wait while they use bases in other countries to plan and train for attacks against the United States itself. Its military power also gives Washington the power to protect its interests abroad by deterring attacks against America's interests or coercing potential or actual opponents. In international politics, coercion means dissuading an opponent from actions America does not want it to do or to do something that it wants done. For example, the United States wanted Libya to give up the weapons of mass destruction capabilities it possessed or was developing. As Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said, "I think the reason Mu'ammarQadhafi agreed to give up his weapons of mass destruction was because he saw what happened to Saddam Hussein."21 Third, our allies like Australia, Great Britain, Japan, Kuwait, Israel, and Thailand are protected by American military might and so we are able to deter attacks against them. They are aligned with the United States, and thus under its "security umbrella"—any attack on those states would be met by the military power of the United States. Other states know this and, usually, that is sufficient to deter aggression against the allies of the United States. Fourth, as political scientist Barry Posen has argued, military power gives the United States control over the global "commons," the command of the sea, air, and space, that allows it effectively to project its power far from its borders while denying those areas to other countries if it so chooses.22 That is significant because the sea lanes, airspace, and space act as a major force multiplier for the United States, allowing Washington to exploit better its own economic and military resources and those of its allies while at the same time hindering its enemies. For example, control of the world's oceans provides the United States with the ability to move heavy forces to trouble spots such as the Persian Gulf or Korea and ensure that key resources, like oil, may travel to world markets. Command of space gives the United States control of the ultimate "high ground." The United States owns about half of the approximately three hundred active satellites in the Earth's orbit. Its intelligence satellites allow it to spy on the rest of the world; its navigation satellites guide its forces; and its communications satellites give Washington the ability to command forces worldwide. Fifth, the military power of the United States gives it great influence in international politics. This influence comes in several forms, one of which is the U.S.' ability to create favorable conditions in international politics, such as by securing access to key regions of the world like the Persian Gulf. Often the United States does this by creating global partnerships for action. As a general rule, these partnerships are easy to create because most states want to cooperate with the United States, leading to broad partnerships with like-minded states to advance common interests.
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## Power projection is vital to preventing numerous scenarios for nuclear conflict

Thayer 2006

(Bradley, "In Defense of Primacy," The National Interest, November/December 2006, p. lexis)

Throughout history, peace and stability have been great benefits of an era where there was a dominant power-- Rome,Britain or the United States today. Scholars and statesmen have long recognized the irenic effect of power on the anarchic world of international politics. Everything we think of when we consider the current international order--free trade, a robust monetary regime, increasing respect for human rights, growing democratization--is directly linked to U.S. power. Retrenchment proponents seem to think that the current system can be maintained without the current amount of U.S. power behind it. In that they are dead wrong and need to be reminded of one of history's most significant lessons: Appalling things happen when international orders collapse. The Dark Ages followed Rome's collapse. Hitler succeeded the order established at Versailles. Without U.S. power, the liberal order created by the United States will end just as assuredly. As country and western great Ral Donner sang: "You don't know what you've got (until you lose it)." Consequently, it is important to note what those good things are. In addition to ensuring the security of the United States and its allies, American primacy within the international system causesmany positive outcomes for Washington and the world. The first has beena more peaceful world. During the Cold War, U.S. leadership reduced friction among many states that were historical antagonists, most notably France and West Germany. Today, American primacy helps keep a number of complicated relationships aligned--between Greece and Turkey, Israel and Egypt, South Korea and Japan, India and Pakistan, Indonesia and Australia. This is not to say it fulfills Woodrow Wilson's vision of ending all war. Wars still occur where Washington's interests are not seriously threatened, such as in Darfur, but a Pax Americana does reduce war's likelihood, particularlywar's worst form: great power wars.Second, American power gives the United States the ability to spread democracy and other elements of its ideology of liberalism. Doing so is a source of much good for the countries concerned as well as the United States because, as John Owen noted on these pages in the Spring 2006 issue, liberal democracies are more likely to align with the United States and be sympathetic to the American worldview.3 So, spreading democracy helps maintain U.S. primacy. In addition, once states are governed democratically, the likelihood of any type of conflict is significantly reduced. This is not because democracies do not have clashing interests. Indeed they do. Rather, it is because they are more open, more transparent and more likely to want to resolve things amicably in concurrence with U.S. leadership. And so, in general, democratic states are good for their citizens as well as for advancing the interests of the United States. Critics have faulted the Bush Administration for attempting to spread democracy in the Middle East, labeling such an effort a modern form of tilting at windmills. It is the obligation of Bush's critics to explain why democracy is good enough for Western states but not for the rest, and, one gathers from the argument, should not even be attempted. Of course, whether democracy in the Middle East will have a peaceful or stabilizing influence on America's interests in the short run is open to question. Perhaps democratic Arab states would be more opposed to Israel, but nonetheless, their people would be better off. The United States has brought democracy to Afghanistan , where 8.5 million Afghans, 40 percent of them women, voted in a critical October 2004 election, even though remnant Taliban forces threatened them. The first free elections were held in Iraq in January 2005. It was the military power of the United States that put Iraq on the path to democracy. Washington fostered democratic governments in Europe, Latin America, Asia and the Caucasus. Now even the Middle East is increasingly democratic. They may not yet look like Western-style democracies, but democratic progress has been made in Algeria, Morocco, Lebanon, Iraq, Kuwait, the Palestinian Authority and Egypt. By all accounts, the march of democracy has been impressive. Third, along with the growth in the number of democratic states around the world has been the growth of the global economy. With its allies, the United States has labored to create an economically liberal worldwide network characterized by free trade and commerce, respect for international property rights, and mobility of capital and labor markets. The economic stability and prosperity that stems from this economic order is a global public good from which all states benefit, particularly the poorest states in the Third World. The United States created this network not out of altruism but for the benefit and the economic
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well-being of America. This economic order forces American industries to be competitive, maximizes efficiencies and growth, and benefits defense as well because the size of the economy makes the defense burden manageable. Economic spin-offs foster the development of military technology, helping to ensure military prowess. Perhaps the greatest testament to the benefits of the economic network comes from Deepak Lal, a former Indian foreign service diplomat and researcher at the World Bank, who started his career confident in the socialist ideology of post-independence India. Abandoning the positions of his youth, Lal now recognizes that the only way to bring relief to desperately poor countries of the Third World is through the adoption of free market economic policies and globalization, which are facilitated through American primacy.4 As a witness to the failed alternative economic systems, Lal is one of the strongest academic proponents of American primacy due to the economic prosperity it provides. Fourth and finally, the United States, in seeking primacy, has been willing to use its power not only to advance its interests but to promote the welfare of people all over the globe. The United States is the earth's leading source of positive externalities for the world. The U.S. military has participated in over fifty operations since the end of the Cold War--and most of those missions have been humanitarian in nature. Indeed, the U.S. military is the earth's "911 force"--it serves, de facto, as the world's police, the global paramedic and the planet's fire department. Whenever there is a natural disaster, earthquake, flood, drought, volcanic eruption, typhoon or tsunami, the United States assists the countries in need. On the day after Christmas in 2004, a tremendous earthquake and tsunami occurred in the Indian Ocean near Sumatra, killing some 300,000 people. The United States was the first to respond with aid. Washington followed up with a large contribution of aid and deployed the U.S. military to South and Southeast Asia for many months to help with the aftermath of the disaster. About 20,000 U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines responded by providing water, food, medical aid, disease treatment and prevention as well as forensic assistance to help identify the bodies of those killed. Only the U.S. military could have accomplished this Herculean effort. No other force possesses the communications capabilities or global logistical reach of the U.S. military. In fact, UN peacekeeping operations depend on the United States to supply UN forces. American generosity has done more to help the United States fight the War on Terror than almost any other measure. Before the tsunami, 80 percent of Indonesian public opinion was opposed to the United States ; after it, 80 percent had a favorable opinion of America. Two years after the disaster, and in poll after poll, Indonesians still have overwhelmingly positive views of the United States. In October 2005, an enormous earthquake struck Kashmir, killing about 74,000 people and leaving three million homeless. The U.S. military responded immediately, diverting helicopters fighting the War on Terror in nearby Afghanistan to bring relief as soon as possible. To help those in need, the United States also provided financial aid to Pakistan; and, as one might expect from those witnessing the munificence of the United States, it left a lasting impression about America. For the first time since 9/11, polls of Pakistani opinion have found that more people are favorable toward the United States than unfavorable, while support for Al-Qaeda dropped to its lowest level. Whether in Indonesia or Kashmir, the money was well-spent because it helped people in the wake of disasters, but it also had a real impact on the War on Terror. When people in the Muslim world witness the U.S. military conducting a humanitarian mission, there is a clearly positive impact on Muslim opinion of the United States. As the War on Terror is a war of ideas and opinion as much as military action, for the United States humanitarian missions are the equivalent of a blitzkrieg. THERE IS no other state, group of states or international organization that can provide these global benefits. None even comes close. The United Nations cannot because it is riven with conflicts and major cleavages that divide the international body time and again on matters great and trivial. Thus it lacks the ability to speak with one voice on salient issues and to act as a unified force once a decision is reached. The EU has similar problems. Does anyone expect Russia or China to take up these responsibilities? They may have the desire, but they do not have the capabilities. Let's face it: for the time being, American primacy remains humanity's only practical hope of solving the world's ills.
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## The HMT has enough funds to cover port expansion for upcoming business, but regulations keep funding from being used

AFBF 2012

[Farm Bureau, Port Infrastructure AFBF Policy Development May 2012, http://azfb.org/upload/Port%20Infrastructure.pdf]jap

Funding (in constant dollars) for operations and maintenance (O&M) on America’s inland navigation system has remained flat for more than two decades. During this period, operations costs have continued to increase, yielding fewer funds that can be devoted to proper system maintenance. As a result, an increasing amount of routine maintenance on waterways infrastructure has been deferred. In fact, 50 percent of the locks and dams are over 60 years of age. As funding has stagnated and infrastructure has deteriorated an increasing percentage of available maintenance dollars has gone into emergency repairs.**The HMT was developed to recover O&M costs at U.S. coastal and Great Lakes harbors from maritime shippers. O&M is mostly the dredging of harbor channels** to their authorized depths and widths. The tax is levied on importers and domestic shippers using coastal or Great Lakes ports. The tax is assessed at a rate of 0.125 percent of cargo value. The tax revenues are deposited into the HMT from which Congress appropriates funds for harbor dredging. Most, if not all, of the busiest ports in the country generate more than sufficient HMT revenue to cover USACE O&M expenditures at their port, even at exceptionally dredging intensive ports like those on the Mississippi River in Louisiana. While the top ten ports account for nearly 70 percent of the total value of foreign goods shipped through U.S. ports, these ports have received about 16 percent of total HMT expenditures over the last decade. Given the amount of HMT collections unspent on harbor maintenance and the amount spent on shallow draft or little used deep draft harbors, a rough estimate is that only 30 to 45 cents of every HMT tax dollar paid is being spent on harbors that shippers readily use.Unlike the IWTF, the **HMT balance has grown considerably over the last decade. In 2001, the balance of the fund was $1.8 billion. By 2011, the balance had grown to $6.4 billion**. However, **despite this growth, disbursements to USACE have remained fairly stagnant**, averaging $723 million. Despite a large surplus, the **busiest U.S. harbors are presently under-maintained**. USACE estimates that full channel dimensions at the nation’s busiest 59 ports are available less than 35 percent of the time. Further, significant amounts of HMT funds are spent at harbors and channels that see little or no ship traffic, says USACE.**Lack of maintenance and** expansion of the nation’s marine assets including the navigable channels, waterways and **infrastructure** maintained by USACE **will be further exacerbated when the expanded Panama Canal opens in 2014**. Once completed, the new locks will allow post-Panamax ships, ones that can carry volumes of cargo up to three times the current limit, to pass through the expanded canal. In order to handle these larger ships infrastructure improvements will be required, including: deeper channel depth, increased berth capacity, crane outreach capacity, and intermodal capacity. These improvements are especially necessary at the Atlantic and Gulf coast ports. Currently, **there are no ports in the Gulf and only Baltimore and Norfolk on the Atlantic coast able to accommodate these larger ships. It is unlikely that a few ports will be able to handle the tremendous influx of cargo.**

**Without adequately maintained shipping channels and port infrastructure, U.S. participation and benefits will not be maximized**. Despite this, the IWTF is woefully low of funding and **the HMT may only be used to fund maintenance, not new construction. To increase a channel’s authorized depth or width requires an act of Congress, which is referred to as construction or “new work” by USACE and is funded from the General Treasury, not the HMT.** Multiple other proposals for collecting additional revenues have surfaced. Some have proposed raising the current waterways fuel tax, taxing recreational users, initiating additional user fees, privatization and combinations thereof.
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## The RAMP Act shifts funding from the HMT – solves port infrastructure issues

Politico 2012

[Burgess Everett and Adam Snider, Lawmakers find updating ports a heavy lift, April 2, 2012

<http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=D6E71414-06D2-4B81-AA7E-7D7F6E91CD5C>]jap

Members of Congress are eyeing the Realizing America’s Maritime Promise Act as a first step in revitalizing the nation’s 150 deep-draft cargo ports. They want to spend the much-needed funds ahead of the world-changing expansion of the Panama Canal in 2014.The RAMP Act is a simple bill. It ensures the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund spends as much on port improvements as it takes in through the Harbor Maintenance Tax — an ad valorem fee of $1.25on each $1,000 worth of cargo that brings in about $1.4 billion annually.Kurt Nagle, CEO of the American Association of Port Authorities, has estimated the country’s dredging needs at $1.3 billion to $1.6 billion each year — but annual expenditures have averaged less than $800 million the past five years.Only a handful of U.S. ports have done the needed dredging in anticipation of a new caliber of shipsthat will soon wind their way through the Central American corridor. At their largest, those vessels will measure nearly 1,000 feet long, more than 100 feet wide and 40 feet deep.Only Baltimore and Norfolk, Va., are ready on the East Coast. New York Harbor is ready for the larger ships, but many won’t be able to access it thanks to the Bayonne Bridge, 50 feet lower than the tallest ships, which will stretch more than 200 feet above the water.The needs are drastic and staggering: Less than 35 percent of ports are at the authorized width and depth. Every foot of depth lost on the Mississippi River thanks to silt buildup costs $1 million per ship per day. Port needs have more significance in light of President Barack Obama’s goal of doubling U.S. exports in five years.“This should be a no-brainer when you think about it,” said Rep. Charles Boustany (R-La.). “You’ve got the cheapest, cleanest way to transport and you have a ready-made solution to solve some of the problems plaguing our maritime infrastructure that doesn’t add to the deficit, doesn’t require earmarking.”

## Ports will be useless without RAMP – damage and ill-maintenance is piling up

Levin 12/11/2012

[Sandy, Michigan Congressman, Letter Urging Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to report the RAMP Act, out of Committee, http://levin.house.gov/letter-urging-transportationa-and-infrastructure-committee-report-ramp-act-out-committee]jap

We respectfully urge the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to report H.R. 104, the RAMP Act, out of Committee so that it may come to the House floor for a vote on final passage. America’s harbors and ports are suffering from a severe lack of maintenance and this legislation is critical to solving this troublesome problem, which impacts communities and economies across the country.As you know, Congress established the Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) and Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF) in 1986 to fund dredging and maintenance of federal ports and harbors. Maintenance dredging is work performed to maintain a channel's depth and width to the dimensions authorized by Congress. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the HMT will raise over $1.3 billion in revenues in 2011, yet only $790 million will be spent on dredging and maintenance functions while the remaining funds will be deposited in the HMTF. The HMTF, which began 2011 with a cash balance over $6.3 billion, is expected to grow to over $20 billion by 2012 based on current projections.**Despite the sizable surplus in the HMTF, our nation’s ports are currently suffering from chronic under maintenance,** threatening the livelihood of families and communities around the country. A 2011 report by the Congressional Research Service (CRS) estimates that the **full channel capacity of our nation’s busiest 59 ports is available less than 35 percent of the time. Meanwhile, only 11 of the 60 federal commercial harbors on the Great Lakes will be dredged next year under the Obama administration’s current budget proposals**.
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## US marine transportation must be invested in now – critical to the economy and military readiness. Passing RAMP solves

TTD 2012

[Transportation Trades Department, AFL-CIO, THE VITAL ROLE OF MARITIME TRANSPORTATION IN OUR ECONOMY, [http://www.ttd.org/vertical/sites/%7B6F59B120-2C3D-4AB1-B7AE-6DB7D7864685%7D/uploads/MaritimePS.pdf]jap](http://www.ttd.org/vertical/sites/%7B6F59B120-2C3D-4AB1-B7AE-6DB7D7864685%7D/uploads/MaritimePS.pdf%5Djap)

A strong and viable maritime industry and U.S.-flag fleet is critical to America’s economic and national security interests. America’s longshoremen and mariners serve a unique role acting as an economic driver in transporting domestic and international cargo, while providing safe and secure transport of humanitarian food aid and military supplies and personnel during times of war or national emergencies. It is critical that federal policies embrace maritime transportation as a vital component of our nation’s transportation system, and make significant investments in the U.S. maritime industry and port infrastructure.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 Hutchinson (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.
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## RAMP is key to US port stability – ensures funding to revitalize port infrastructure

MTD 2012

[Maritime Trades Department AFL-CIO, IAM Urges Ramp Inclusion within Surface Transportation Bill, 5/24/2012]jap

In a story in its May 2012 IAM Journal, the Machinists stated the RAMP Act will create badly-needed U.S. jobs and enhance America’s economic competitiveness.Among other things, RAMP would require that funds designated for commercial harbor dredging and maintenance be used for that purpose. Right now, many dollars being deposited in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are being used to offset our nation’s budget deficit among other things.This is having an adverse effect on many important U.S. interests, noted IAM Eastern Territory General Vice President Lynn D. Tucker, Jr. A member of the MTD Executive Board and a founding member of the Seaway Task Force, Tucker added, “**Our ports are being underutilized.“Years of inadequate funding have wreaked havoc on our maritime infrastructure. Without needed maintenance and upgrades, many ports won’t be able to keep up with the changes in the marine transportation system.”**Moreover, the problem is only going to get worse. Pointing to the “massive expansion of the Panama Canal” that is scheduled to occur around 2014/2015, the IAM Journal pointed out that **a new generation of super carriers will be built.“These ships can carry 20,000 containers**,” said the IAM Journal. “**They need ports that are at least 51 feet deep, and that requires dredging. We cannot meet the goal of doubling U.S. exports in five years without significant investment in our ports and commercial waterways. “The RAMP Act is long overdue.”**
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## Solutions are approved – FUNDING is key. The government should approve all of the HMT for navigation maintenance – key to global economic leadership

Nagle 2011

[Kurt Nagle, President of the American Association of Port Authorities, US port-related infrastructure investments reap dividends<http://www.porttechnology.org/images/uploads/technical_papers/PTI-4.pdf>]

While US investment in its waterways infrastructure is trending downward, countries like India, Brazil and even the UK are committing the equivalent of billions of dollars to modernize their ports and channels. The first major expansion of the Panama Canal in more than a century is slated for completion in 2014, and it is driving ports around the world to deepen their navigation channels and improve harbor facilities.India plans to invest $60 billion, including both public and private funds, in creating seven new major ports by 2020 to handle a rapid expansion in exports of merchandise, which is forecast to triple by 2017. Brazil expects tonnage at its coastal ports to more than double, to 1.7 billion tons by 2022 and has committed $17 billion, including $14 billion from the private sector, for port improvements. In the UK, the world’s fourth largest marine terminals operator, DP World, plans to spend $2.5 billion on London’s Deep-Water Gateway, the country’s first such development in the last 20 years.**Back in the US, public funding for new navigation channel improvements has all but dried up as lawmakers focus on reducing the deficit and eliminating appropriation ‘earmarks’ that have traditionally funded federal navigation deepening projects. At the same time, funding for projects already approved and underway is slow, incremental and insufficient.**Insufficient appropriations also make it impossible to maintain most federal navigation channels at their authorized and required dimensions. The US Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for improving and maintaining the nation’s water access to ports. Nevertheless,the federal government annually spends only about half of the tax that it collects specifically for deep-draft channel maintenance.The rest – more than $6 billion since 1986 – has essentially ‘disappeared’ into the US Treasury, while serious dredging needs have been neglected.Projects to maintain these critical waterways would create jobs immediately and would provide transportation savings to benefit US businesses. With decreases in the cost of freight transportation, these sectors can enhance their global competitiveness and can create more jobs. AAPA continues to strongly urge Congress to take action to ensure 100 percent of the annual amount collected from the Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) is utilized to maintain federal navigation channels.

## Failure to pass RAMP will cost hundreds of billion dollars in trade and taxes

Bay Planning Coalition 2012

[CALL TO SUPPORT RAMP ACT by the Dredging Contractors of America, [http://bayplanningcoalition.org/2012/call-to-support-ramp-act-by-the-dredging-contractors-of-america/]jap](http://bayplanningcoalition.org/2012/call-to-support-ramp-act-by-the-dredging-contractors-of-america/%5Djap)

H.R.104, the RAMP Act, includes a point of order to end decades of Congressional budgeting that diverted much of the annual Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) payments by maritime commerce away from being spent on the harbor maintenance activities for which these taxes were paid. In FY11 alone, approximately $700M (almost half of the collected HMT revenues) was diverted. A recent study of the economic impact of reduced maintenance dredging of the Mississippi River shows that trying to be “penny wise” by not spending tens of millions of dollars annually required to fully maintain that river’s navigation channels (and which maritime commerce has already paid) is “pound foolish” because it is estimated that it will cost the U.S. economy several billions of dollars annually and reduce federal tax revenues by hundreds of millions of dollars.

Extrapolating this study nationwide, the **annual diversion of hundreds of millions in HMT revenues and the resulting degradation of the nation’s harbor navigation channels may be costing the nation tens or hundreds of billions of dollars in economic activity** (such as exports) **and reducing federal taxes by far more than would be spent on such harbor maintenance activities.**

# RAMP AFF – Solvency – 2AC/1AR EXTN (2/3)

## Time is key for ports – RAMP passage must happen now AND it’s cost neutral and bipartisan

Levin 12/11/2012

[Sandy, Michigan Congressman, Letter Urging Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to report the RAMP Act, out of Committee, http://levin.house.gov/letter-urging-transportationa-and-infrastructure-committee-report-ramp-act-out-committee]jap

H.R. 104 would ensure funds collected annually by the HMT that enter the HMTF are spent as intended by Congress for the purpose of dredging and maintenance. This bi-partisan, cost neutral legislation would save jobs and help ensure the United States’ dominant role in international trade and commerce.We understand that H.R. 104 was included in Chairman Mica’s multi-year surface transportation proposal earlier this year and we applaud your efforts to act on H.R. 104. However, time is running out for many of our nation’s commercial harbors and the businesses and jobs that rely on them. We respectfully urge you to report H.R. 104 out of Committee so that it may come to the House floor for a vote on final passage.

## Panama Canal expansion makes port funding critical – new vessels are too big for US ports

Pincus 2/13/2012

[Walter Pincus reports on intelligence, defense and foreign policy for The Washingon Post. He first came to the paper in 1966 and has covered numerous subjects, including nuclear weapons and arms control, politics and congressional investigations. He was among Post reporters awarded the 2002 Pulitzer Prize for national reporting. Panama project should boost U.S. shipping’s fortunes, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/panama-project-should-boost-us-shippings-fortunes/2012/02/11/gIQAOoWyBR_story.html>]

While congressional Republicans seek to cut holes in the safety net for the poor and the unemployed, a little-known Pentagon-financed safety net for corporations is being kept in place to help American business meet a new foreign challenge.It’s the 2014 completion of the $5.2 billion widening and deepening of the Panama Canal. When completed, ships double the size of those that currently go through the Panama locks will be able to make the trip. Larger container ships will be able to carry 12,000 or more normal containers, better than double the 5,000 they carry today.Ships wide enough to fit through the Canal today are called Panamax. Those that will go through the wider Canal are called Post-Panamax. These larger ships were first used in the Far East, transporting goods through the Suez Canal to Western Europe. Later they added a route between Asia and the West Coast as commerce increased, particularly to and from China.U.S. ports on the West Coast — at Long Beach, Los Angeles and Oakland, Calif. — could take the larger ships. They already handle almost twice as many containers as all the ports on the East Coast do.Though more container ships have begun headingfor the East Coast, most ports in that region don’t have harbors and channels deep enough to handle the Post-Panamax container ships, which need harbor water depths of 50 feet. The East Coast ports that today have the main container terminals — New York, Savannah, Ga., Charleston, S.C., and Miami — are at 42 feet or less. Norfolk and Baltimore have the depth but not the container volumes.Enter the federal government, which, not surprisingly, has programs to help the multibillion-dollar import-export business. The Port of New York and New Jersey alone “provides more than 269,900 full-time jobs and $11.2 billion in personal income in port related activities,” according to a December 2011 report by the Army Corps of Engineers. Cargo valued at $175 billion passed through the port in 2010, according to the report.The Corps’ role as a key player became apparent Thursday during a routine Senate Armed Services Committee confirmation hearing on the nomination of Army Lt. Gen. Thomas Bostick to become commanding general of the Corps. There were no GOP complaints about too much federal interference in business or even any hand-wringing over earmarks — a liberal and Tea Party press favorite.Sen. Lindsey O.Graham (R-S.C.) asked Bostick whether there were administration or congressional plans to deal with the issue because “it would affect infrastructure in the nation to make sure we can export our products to market.”When Bostick said he didn’t know of any, Graham responded, “Well, I can tell you there’s not, and that reflects badly on all of us.”

# RAMP AFF – Solvency – 2AC/1AR EXTN (3/3)

## Dredging is key to the ports industry – provides access for ships

US Maritime Administration 2012

[National Port Gateway And Freight Corridor Strategy, [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=military%20depends%20on%20seaports%20united%20states&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CF0QFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nrf.com%2Fmodules.php%3Fname%3DDocuments%26op%3Dviewlive%26sp\_id%3D1487&ei=MxHiT5\_tCaL00gHA5aneAw&usg=AFQjCNEexX8NjDq\_e0sCr19rOeX0X3c3Og&sig2=6JlpObxFV0UCzA5p9ds7Rg](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=military%20depends%20on%20seaports%20united%20states&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CF0QFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.nrf.com%2Fmodules.php%3Fname%3DDocuments%26op%3Dviewlive%26sp_id%3D1487&ei=MxHiT5_tCaL00gHA5aneAw&usg=AFQjCNE)]

Dredging is a major component of infrastructure development in the transportation system, dueto the requirements for deeper channels to accommodate larger ships. Almost every one of thenation's top 50 ports that handle foreign commerce requires regular maintenance dredging.Together these ports move nearly 99 percent of U.S. overseas trade by weight and 61 percent byvalue.5 Without routine dredging, sections of the navigation channels can quickly shoal,reducing the draft and size of vessels that can access ports. In addition, as the size of shipscontinues to grow, approach and alongside depths in several key ports need to be increased to asmuch as 45 to 50 feet. This requires significant investment, both on the part of the Federalgovernment and private industry. Without adequate water access, U.S. ports simply cannotcompete with ports capable of increased efficiencies brought by larger vessels.

## Current steps ensure any budgeted plan will be fast and feasible

[U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy Options for the Future, Institute for Water Resources U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Working Draft, 2 April 2012, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf]

The study process to identify individual navigation projects for Federal investment is well established. Recently USACE has taken steps to ensure the timely execution of this process, including the Planning Modernization Initiative that requires feasibility studies to be completed more expediently. This initiative will streamline and expedite the project delivery process and will identify the project-specific critical needs for sustaining the nation’s globally competitive navigation system. However, completing studies on a shorter timeframe will only add to the nation’s backlog of unfunded projects unless methods are developed to finance navigation infrastructure improvements.

# RAMP AFF – Inherency – Funding Down

## Current funds are not being put to correct use and aren’t enough to meet port expansion demands

Maritime Professional 2011

[Creaking port infrastructure threatens US economy, [http://www.maritimeprofessional.com/Blogs/Far-East-Maritime/September-2011/Creaking-port-infrastructure-threatens-US-economy.aspx]jap](http://www.maritimeprofessional.com/Blogs/Far-East-Maritime/September-2011/Creaking-port-infrastructure-threatens-US-economy.aspx%5Djap)

And now, just when federal funding for the ports is so urgently needed, the government is in desperate cost cutting mode,slashing and burning every budget in sight. At the Association of American Port Authorities annual congress in Seattle, port infrastructure was the hot topic on every executive director's mind. Some port authorities, such as the Georgia Ports Authority and the Port of Los Angeles, are in good shape, but many are not. The timing of the debt crisis could not have been worse. The US Army Corps of Engineers says**the top 59 ports in the US will only have 50 percent of their channel depth requirements in the coming year because of funding constraints.**Of the US$832 million set aside for coastal navigation, only $706 million is going towards maintaining the channel depths of more than 929 coastal ports. Of the 446 ports that requested maintenance funding, only 154 will get it.Talk about being behind the curve. John Horsley, executive director of the American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials in Washington, has little good to say about Congress. “The president has stated that he wants the US to stage an export-led economic recovery. What will it take to make that possible and to sustain that? Can this be done when we have a mindless drive to cut government spending at every level, regardless of the effect?”After letting the problem develop through either ignoring calls from the industry or battling through decade-long studies and environmental impact assessments, the US is in … well, we could say in deep water, but that is the problem. The US is in water that is too shallow.Container lines had better start adding wheels to the bottom of their bigger vessels because they will soon have to drive them into US ports. And then that college kid who has been behind the port development programme for so long may as well take the wheel.

## It’s going to cost a lot of money that the port budget doesn’t have

US Army Corps of Engineers 2012

[U.S. Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy Options for the Future, Institute for Water Resources, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf]

To fully meet the challenges of and realize the opportunities presented by increased use of post- Panamax vessels in global trade, the existing capacity of the nation’s ports and waterways must be maintained and additional capacity must be built. Both paths require a significant financial commitment. The current level of USACE navigation funding is not adequate to meet the critical modernization needs of the nation and take advantage of these opportunities. Available financial options for meeting these needs vary from an increased Federal commitment to the divestiture of the Federal financial role. **There is a growing consensus that the existing budgeting process and budget levels are not adequate to meet the critical needs of future modernization.** The current process collects revenues for funding the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), allocating those dollars to USACE navigation programs according to Federal budget priorities and assigned budget ceilings and providing additional funding for channel deepening with revenues from the general treasury. With the continuing revenue stream dedicated to the HMTF and the fund’s reserves, financial support for maintenance of existing channels could be secured for the near term. However, into the next decade the current processes (and budget ceilings) are not expected to provide significant funds for additional necessary channel deepening projects.The Congress and its partners in the navigation industry must find ways to increase revenues for harbor deepening and inland navigation channel, lock and dam maintenance.

# RAMP AFF – Inherency – Ports Down

## Current ports are not built to sustain market productivity – kills US economic competitiveness

Building America’s Future 2011

[Transportation Infrastructure Report 2011, Building America’s Future: Falling Apart and Falling Behind, [http://www.bafuture.com/sites/default/files/Report\_0.pdf]jap](http://www.bafuture.com/sites/default/files/Report_0.pdf%5Djap)

Freight moving by water is slowed by similar constraints on capacity and limitations of aging infrastructure. Our ports were built for the last century’s economy, without suffi- cient intermodal access for increased container traffic. Our inland waterways are similarly overburdened: dozens of locks along major inland shipping routes are past their 50-year life span, and some are more than a century old and showing their age.

Congestion and capacity constraints threaten to increase the cost of trade and impede our global competitiveness. Delays in freight movement impose real costs on businesses that reduce productivity, impede our competitiveness, and increase pricesfor consumers.

# RAMP AFF – Topicality – “Transportation Infrastructure”

## Ports are transportation infrastructure – Presidential definition proves

Bridges 10/26/2011

[Jerry A. Bridges, Chairman of the Board of the American Association of Port Authorities and Executive Director of the Virginia Port Authority, Testimony before the United States House of Respresentatives Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Hearing: “The Economic Importance of Seaports: Is the United States prepared for 21st trade realities?” [http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Bridges.pdf]jap](http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyWater/2011-10-26%20Bridges.pdf%5Djap)

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 stweardship, and more then $200 billion in federal, state and local tax revenue. Earlier this month, **the President’s Council on Job and Competitiveness made an urgent plea for improvements in the nation’s transportation infrastructure, including landside and waterside access to seaports.** We cannot wait.