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## 1. Funding now

Bloomberg 4/21/2012

[NYC Launches $250 Million Infrastructure Project in NY Harbor, [http://www.mikebloomberg.com/index.cfm?objectid=C65883AE-C29C-7CA2-F48E7CC68CDB4C68]jap](http://www.mikebloomberg.com/index.cfm?objectid=C65883AE-C29C-7CA2-F48E7CC68CDB4C68%5djap)

Mayor Bloomberg and Port Authority Executive Director Pat Foye today launched a $250 million construction project to boost economic development in New York Harbor. The project involves digging a new water transmission main – called a siphon – between Staten Island and Brooklyn that will allow for the removal of two existing tunnels that are currently at a much shallower depth. This in turn will enable the dredging and deepening of the Anchorage Channel, a process that is critical for accommodating increased cargo volumes and larger vessels in future years.The announcement was made on Staten Island at the site where the 110-ton, 300-foot-long tunnel boring machine, will soon begin drilling 100 feet underground. Over the next ten months, the tunnel boring machine will drill a distance of nearly two miles. The Mayor and Executive Director Foye were joined by Department of Environmental Protection Commissioner Carter Strickland, New York City Economic Development Corporation President Seth W. Pinsky and Staten Island Borough President James Molinaro. “New York Harbor has been a critical part of our economy since the founding of our great city some 400 years ago,” said Mayor Bloomberg. “And if we want New York City’s economy to stay competitive, we must accommodate new mega-ships and their cargo. Thisinvestment in our infrastructure will spur economic activity all along our working waterfront.”“The Port Authority has committed $1 billion to the ongoing, decade-long dredging of New York and New Jersey’s channels to help ensure we can accommodate larger cargo vessels and maintain our port’s place as the largest on the East Coast,’’ said Port Authority Executive Director Pat Foye. “We understand the impact this project has on the water resources of Staten Island and we are making sure that this dredging project also brings direct benefits to borough residents.”The Port of New York and New Jersey is the largest on the East Coast, handling nearly 40 percent of the East Coast shipping trade, and is the third-largest port in the country,providing more than 279,000 jobs to the local economy and $12 billion in annual wages. Last year saw record cargo volumes at these facilities, with 5.5 million TEUs (20-foot equivalent units) processed, eclipsing the 2007 record set before the economic downturn. With future cargo volumes expected to double over the next decade, the Anchorage Channel must be deepened in order to accommodate the new generation of larger cargo vessels and better position the region to benefit from growth in global trade. These new, larger next-generation ‘Post-Panamax’ vessels also bring environmental benefits by carrying more cargo in fewer ships and cleaner fuel technology. The New York and New Jersey Harbor Deepening Project is being managed by the Port Authority and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and is expected to be completed in 2014.

## 2. Funding dredging isn’t enough for port stability – every port has a different infrastructure need

Politico 4/12/2012

[Lawmakers find updating ports a heavy lift, [http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0412/74751\_Page2.html]jap](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0412/74751_Page2.html%5djap)

But the problem goes deeper than dredging — many West Coast ports are already prepared for the post-Panamax ships. It’s a confusing situation that caused Rep. Janice Hahn (D-Calif.) to form the bipartisan PORTS Caucus with Co-chairman Rep. Ted Poe (R-Texas) to educate their colleagues about the effects of port commerce. Caucus membership has grown — including a number of lawmakers who don’t even have a port in their district.

“Ports are a mystery to most people,” Hahn said. “I know about them because I’ve got one in my backyard, I can literally see it from my house. We don’t have a national freight policy in this country. If we had a national freight policy that understood the global supply chain, all of our ports should’ve been ready for dredging.”

That’s just the first step that water-savvy lawmakers are considering. Los Angeles and Long Beach are dredged — and they need work now on bridges, roads and on-dock rail to avoid congestion on land, Hahn said. But she envisions that sort of reform as a second step — the first is the basic national restructuring envisioned by the RAMP Act.

# RAMP NEG – Solvency – Frontline (2/3)

## 3. Plan costs billions of dollars that isn’t available

Associated Press 6/21/2012

[Price tag to dredge Eastern ports for big ships: $5 billion, [http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/story/2012-06-21/southern-ports-expansion/55746890/1]jap](http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/story/2012-06-21/southern-ports-expansion/55746890/1%5djap)

U.S. seaports in the Southeast likely need up to $5 billion to deepen their shipping channels so they can trade with super-size cargo ships expected to arrive soon through an expanded Panama Canal, a federal agency said Thursday in a report to Congress. The report, from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is in response to Congress' request to examine improvement needs among the nation's ports as local governments scramble for federal funds to deepen their harbors to make room for a growing fleet of giant commercial ships.The East Coast has only three ports —New York, Baltimore and Norfolk, Va. — with waterways deep enough to accept the fully loaded ships regardless of tides.The Southeast, forecast to undergo the nation's biggest growth in population and trade, remains too shallow from Virginia to South Florida and across the Gulf to Texas.The need for expanding port capacity "is likely to be most critical along the U.S. Southeast and Gulf coasts," the report said.That's because no shipping channels are at least 50 feet deep, which will be required for the ships — many from China and other Asian countries — that will begin using the Panama Canal after a major expansion is completed by the end of 2014.Savannah, Ga., Charleston, S.C., and Miami on the Southeast coast, as well as several ports in the Gulf, are already undertaking harbor-deepening projects. None have advanced beyond studies to actual dredging, however.In April, the Corps completed a 12-year study on the Port of Savannah — the nation's fourth busiest container port — which wants $652 million in taxpayer funds to deepen more than 30 miles of river.The Corps said 17 such projects are being studied overall, and the cost of harbor expansions across the Southeast would likely be $3 billion to $5 billion."Strategically, we need to find a bucket of money to fund the projects that need to happen to keep our nation competitive," said Curtis Foltz, executive director of the Georgia Ports Authority, which is seeking final permits and funding to start deepening the Savannah harbor next year.The budget crisis has made federal funding for port projects extremely tight, especially since Congress and President Obama for the past two years have sworn off so-called "earmark" spending that was used to fund such projects in the past.The Army Corps report said current funding levels for port improvements won't cover all the projects that should be done.If Congress won't increase the agency's funding for harbor projects, the report said, then perhaps state governments and private companies such as shipping lines should be required to pay a greater share.

## 4. Port investment not key for Post-Panama – we’ll just use the ports that are already deep enough

Trigaux 2011

[Robert Trigaux, Business Columnist, St. Petersburg Times, Rising doubts emerge that dredging Port of Miami will boost Panama Canal shipping or promised jobs, [http://www.tampabay.com/blogs/venturebiz/content/rising-doubts-emerge-dredging-port-miami-will-boost-panama-canal-shipping-or-promised-jobs]jap](http://www.tampabay.com/blogs/venturebiz/content/rising-doubts-emerge-dredging-port-miami-will-boost-panama-canal-shipping-or-promised-jobs%5djap)

The bad news is there are rising doubts that this strategy -- designed to play off the widened Panama Canal and the superfreighters presumably coming in a few years -- will deliver the economic boost Florida so desperately needs.The latest criticism comes in this week's Miami New Times, which claims **scores of ports around the state and country are competing for the same ships. Only a couple will benefit**and, the story says, citing shipping experts, "Miami probably won't be among them." Here's the story. States the story, citing Jean-Paul Rodrigue (photo, right), a transportation professor at Hofstra University and expert on the Panama Canal expansion: "In effect, Miami is spending itself into a hole to compete for table scraps. New York City, the nation's largest port, is the clear frontrunner for these large 'Panamax' freighters, Rodrigue says. Norfolk, Virginia, already has a Panamax-ready port, and Savannah, Georgia, has better infrastructure than South Florida. Even Fort Lauderdale's Port Everglades is deep-dredging and has signed an agreement with Florida East Coast for its own 48-acre rail yard."
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## 5. Port destruction inevitable – disasters

Madhusudan and Ganapathy 2011

[Madhusudan.C, Research Scholar, Centre for Disaster Mitigation and Management, VIT University, Ganapathy.G.P , Associate Professor, Centre for Disaster Mitigation and Management, VIT University, Disaster resilience of transportation infrastructure and ports - An overview. International Journal of Geomatics& Geosciences. 2011, Vol. 2 Issue 2, p443-455. 13p.]

**We are living in the age of disasters. The more we advance, the greater is the impact of each disaster on our society and the more it becomes necessary for us to build resilience into our communities and infrastructure. We cannot avert most disasters**. We can, however, beprepared for them to minimize their impact and return to normalcy within the shortestpossible time after a disaster with the help of as little external resources as possible. This iswhat a resilient society strives for.Transportation beit road, rail, air or water – is the lifeline of our society. Serious disruption to transportation infrastructure can have catastrophic impact on the ability of the community, business and economy to recover from a disaster. Hence it is of utmost importance for researchers to address the issue of building resilient transportation infrastructures. Today,more than three quarters of world trade by volume is carried on ships. Hence ports play a very critical role in the overall transportation infrastructure. If port activity is disrupted due to any reason, it will have a direct adverse impact on not only the other transportation functions but also the nation’s economy as a whole. This was amply demonstrated by the impact of the1995 earthquake on Kobe port in Japan.

## 6. Multiple obstacles to port dredging – would take decades

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

Many U.S. ports are cramped, with narrow navigation channels, shallow harbors, and congested truck and rail access routes. For example, the harbor at Newark, New Jersey, is so shallow outside the dredged channel and so prone to siltation that very large ships must unload part of their cargo in Nova Scotia or elsewhere before entering, thereby raising shipping costs and putting the port at a competitive disadvantage. **Maintenance and expansion of navigation channels are often impeded by delays in the granting of permits, a complex web of environmental regulations, and disagreements about how to dispose of dredged material**. As a case in point, **it took the Port of Oakland 20 years to begin the first phase of a channel-deepening project**.
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## Ports find funding through private entities – governmental intervention unnecessary

World Cargo News 2011

[Tampa Dredging Deal, http://www.worldcargonews.com/htm/w20110817.578901.htm]jap

A "beneficial joint project" agreement has been reached between the port and The Mosaic Company The agreement will result in the transfer of dredge materials from Mosaic’s port berth along the Alafia River to one of the port authority’s spoil islands. The cooperative arrangement will assist Mosaic and the US Army Corps of Engineers to proceed with essential, ongoing maintenance dredging—an amount estimated at 350,000 yds3 - that will be transported to the port authority's Spoil Island 2D, in order to keep Mosaic’s berth channel to an adequate operational depth.

## No impact – private investors step in during funding crises

Rochester Business Journal 2012

[THOMAS ADAMS, Rochester Business Journal, March 15, 2012, Partnership to spend $1 million to dredge port, [http://www.rbj.net/article.asp?aID=190631]jap](http://www.rbj.net/article.asp?aID=190631%5djap)

A public-private partnership will spend $1 million to dredge the Port of Rochester for the first time in three years, after funding was not included in federal budgets, officials announced Thursday.The harbor is categorized as low-use, with less than 1 million tons of transit annually, said Stephen Bales, the Buffalo District commander for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.The Corps of Engineers is working with the EssrocItalcementi Group and other users of the harbor to explore dredging the federal channel at non-federal expense, Bales said.The Corps of Engineers has a pilot program to provide support activities such as surveying and determining the quantity of the dredging, permitting and engineering assistance, he said.Rept. Louise Slaughter, D-Perinton, brought together officials from port businesses as well as federal, state and local government entities, she said,The work is scheduled for this spring.“**The situation has reached a crisis point,” Slaughter said in a statement. “If the channel isn’t dredged this spring, companies like Essroc who rely on the port may not be able to get a small barge up to the basin, and that costs them business.”**Some $2 million worth of goods come to Rochester through the port each year, and 97,000 tons of material has been shipped or received through the port since 2008, Slaughter said.More than 244,000 cubic yards of sediment has accumulated at the harbor since it was last dredged in 2009, she said.
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## Re-routing RAMP funds doesn’t solve – ports won’t receive the correct funding

Politico 4/12/2012

[Lawmakers find updating ports a heavy lift, [http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0412/74751\_Page2.html]jap](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0412/74751_Page2.html%5djap)

“I’ve got something I’m working on independent of this act — my vision for the Harbor Maintenance Fund. It’s becoming clearer,” he said. “The **trust funds are not meeting their intended purpose. They need to be reformed from top to bottom, not just change the revenue flow**.”While Graham still pushes for money for Charleston, he sees a network of ports with different needs. He echoed Hahn’s thoughts on the unique situation for West Coast ports.“We don’t have a vision in terms of the Panama Canal expansion — should the Harbor Maintenance Fund be changed? The West Coast, they’re getting a raw deal here. They pay about 30 percent of all the fees, but they can’t use the money for interior road/rail development. They don’t need deeper ports; they need to be able to create infrastructure to get the products off the dock to the interior,” he said.Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-Fla.) said the Sunshine State isn’t faring much better — and he said all of his state’s ports are in need of improvement.“For us as Floridians, we don’t get recompensed for the amount that we put in. We get less than we should,” Hastings said.The House legislation has a companion bill in the Senate, called the Harbor Maintenance Act, sponsored by Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.). Levin’s bill has 35 sponsors. Graham is not one of them.“The money that’s collected is not used for what it’s supposed to be used for. And what it’s supposed to be used for is dredging harbors around the country,” said Levin, who called the Great Lakes port situation desperate. “Ships have to light-load in order to get into the harbors; they can’t carry in the load that they’re supposed to; and at the same time we’ve got this surplus in the harbor fund.”That surplus exceeds $6 billion, but Boustany says those funds are only on paper: “That money has probably already been spent in previous years, because it’s probably been lent out to fund other operations of government, other aspects of the Army Corps of Engineers budget.” So his bill would apply only to future years and wouldn’t even require input from the Congressional Budget Office. “If we were to try to go after that, it would trigger a score. Whereas by taking incoming revenue, the way the original bill was written, it does not trigger a score with the Congressional Budget Office,” he said.CBO scores can raise eyebrows on the Hill and might cause reluctant lawmakers to oppose a bill they see as a spending increase — a fate Boustany and others hope to avoid.
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## No Solvency – HMT funding wouldn’t aid key strategic ports – they don’t need to be dredged

McDermott 2012

[McDermott Fights for Improving the Port of Seattle's Infrastructure, [http://mcdermott.house.gov/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=563:mcdermott-fights-for-improving-seattle-port-infrastructure&catid=25:press-releases&Itemid=20]jap](http://mcdermott.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=563:mcdermott-fights-for-improving-seattle-port-infrastructure&catid=25:press-releases&Itemid=20%5djap)

Today, Congressman Jim McDermott (D-WA) arguedthat current law needs to be changed to increase the uses of a federal maritime trust fund to benefit deep-water ports like the Port of Seattle. As things stand, the “Harbor Maintenance Tax” (HMT) is imposed on cargo owners when they arrive at U.S. ports and that money is held in a trust and is primarily used for port dredging – something that the Port of Seattle doesn’t need because of its natural depth. “The Port of Seattle gets one cent back for every dollar that we put into the trust fund – that’s not fair and the definition of what the HMT money can be used for should be expanded,” McDermott said at a congressional hearing that focused on a shipping bill and the HMT. **“Seattle has a Seawall that has been there for 100 years, and its wooden platforms have significantly deteriorated. We also live in an earthquake zone and we know what the seismic impacts could be on one of the big ports in this country**. This is not a partisan issue, it’s an economic issue and we can’t get anyone to agree that the **HMT money should be used to study the Seawall and repair it.”** Surprisingly, the Commissioner of the Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry, Dr. Mike Strain, who was called by the Republicans to testify at the hearing, agreed with McDermott. Over the last 10 years, Louisiana’s ports alone received 20% of the HMT funds. Strain responded to McDermott’s statement by saying, “There is $6.1 billion in this trust fund and we need to do everything we can to protect and expand our ports, including allowing the funds to be used for the Seawall, dredging, rebuilding the inland waterways and those lock systems… And, we have a way to generate the dollars…when we talk about growth in shipping, there is going to be more money coming [into HMT funds].”Due to the limited nature for which the HMT funds can be used, there is an uncommitted balance that continues to grow and reached an estimated $6.1 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 2012. McDermott is currently working on legislation that would change the definition of how HMT funds can spent so that the Port of Seattle, and other deep-water ports, can improve their infrastructure and access the HMT funds they currently pay, but see little benefit from.

# RAMP NEG – Solvency – 2NC Frontline EXTN #4

## Decline in weaker ports inevitable – forces competition in the national market

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

In summary, efficient intermodal transfer capabilities are vital to the continuing success--perhaps even the existence--of U.S. ports. And competition for this business is intense, with shippers often choosing their routes on the basis of a port's intermodal transfer capabilities. As some ports modernize, they attract more business. One result has been the concentration of cargo at the most competitive facilities, known as "load center" ports, and an uncertain future for lesser rivals. Of course, the **decline of weaker ports is inevitable and not necessarily bad for the nation as a whole** (even though there may be severe repercussions for regional economies), because **a reduced number of highly competitive ports is preferable to retaining many inefficient ones.** However, strategic planning is needed to ensure that the right capabilities are developed and maintained at appropriate locations. This can enable some ports to thrive in spite of inherent limitations.
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## Alt cause to port failures – intermodal transportation

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

Intermodal transportation. Freight often is transferred among sea, land, and air carriers. The expansion of this "intermodalism" in the 1980s can be traced to the emergence of railcars double-stacked with containers, which carry the greatest number of revenue loads for a given train length and therefore save fuel and labor costs. These containers are often moved between rail yards and the waterfront by truck. The challenge for marine terminals is to handle these heavy loads quickly, allowing both the seagoing and land-based modes of transportation to maintain their tight schedules. This means that if a ship, train, or truck is running even a few hours late, the connection at the marine terminal may be missed.

**Achieving high throughput of freight is no simple matter. Unbelievable as it may seem, the queuing and unloading of container ships carrying goods from Asia through Puget Sound is influenced by rush-hour train schedules in Chicago-...-**double-stacked trains cannot pass through that city at rush hour, when commuter trains have priority. Road and rail access to ports is a major problem nationwide. A 1991 survey found that half of public ports and nearly two-thirds of container ports faced growing traffic congestion on local truck routes. For about one-third of container ports, bridges and tunnels lacked sufficient clearance for double-stacked trains. And the problems can cut both ways: Almost half of ports reported that feeder rail lines crossed local streets, meaning that the long trains prized for efficiency can frequently tie up traffic.

## Alt cause to port failures – information infrastructure

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

Yet another factor that influences port productivity is its information infrastructure. The private sector is implementing many of its own cargo-tracking and other information technologies, and companies are working together to develop communal systems to automate customs, process commercial transactions, and improve document collection. The federal government, however, is finding it more difficult to carry out its traditional responsibility for managing traffic on waterways. Shipping efficiency can be enhanced through the use of technologies that track vessels and manage traffic flow and by improving systems for collecting and disseminating realtime data on tides, currents, and other environmental conditions. Indeed, ample technology is available that can help avert accidents and optimize traffic flow, but capital and operating funds have proved scarce. European ports have invested heavily in these shorebased surveillance and communications systems, but U.S. investments have lagged. For example, there is a pressing need to resurvey an estimated 43,000 square nautical miles of harbor areas outside navigation channels in order to provide accurate hydrographic data for updated charts. However, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) lacks the funds to tackle this job, and funds are limited for port-specific installation and operation of a NOAA system to provide environmental data in a timely manner.
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## Environmental regulations take out dredging solvency – can backlog the process for years

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

Environmental regulation. The recent increase in environmental regulations, from all levels of government, stems from the recognized and growing need for coastal protection. At least 10 major federal environmental laws as well as myriad amendments and other requirements affect the port industry. To comply, ports must expend considerable staff time and resources.

One major issue is dredging. Most U.S. ports require periodic and sometimes constant dredging to maintain shipping channels at the authorized depths. All the materials dredged, about 280 million cubic yards annually, must be disposed of or reused in some way. Clean material may be deposited in the ocean or put to beneficial uses, such as the creation of offshore islands. But roughly 5 to 10 percent of **dredged material is considered contaminated and requires special handling, such as permanent containment or costly treatment. It can take years to resolve all dredging and disposal issues and obtain the requisite permits, with the result that channel maintenance and deepening are seldom timely or cost-effective**. Dredging permits for the Port of Newark, for example, were delayed for three years amid controversy over disposal of sediments that contained traces of dioxin, a chemical that has been linked to cancer and other health problems. Improving processes for making decisions, undertaking consensus building among stakeholders, and implementing technological advances will help resolve some of these issues. But in the meantime, steps must be taken to upgrade ports to a level that will sustain U.S. economic growth in the coming years.

Faced with these and numerous other environmental concerns, **many ports are finding it increasingly expensive and difficult to dredge channels, manage wastes, respond to spills of oil and hazardous substances, control air emissions, and comply with wetlands and endangered-species legislation.** Unfortunately, these growing demands come at a time when port resources are dwindling because of cutbacks in subsidies from state and local governments. Many smaller ports lack the resources and technical expertise to address environmental issues adequately, which is further evidence of the need for port-specific strategic planning as well as expanded attention to these problems on a national scale.
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## 1. Heg is sustainable – new changes on one facet of leadership aren’t enough the US is still ahead on the greatest combination of strengths.

Brooks and Wohlforth 2009

[Stephen and William, Dartmouth Government Professors, “Reshaping the World Order”, Foreign Affairs, Mar/Apr2009, 88.2]

So why has opinion shifted so quickly from visions of empire to gloomy declinism? One reason is that the United States' successes at the turn of the century led to irrational exuberance, thereby setting unreasonably high standards for measuring the superpower's performance. From 1999 to 2003, seemingly easy U. S. victories in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq led some to conclude that the United States could do what no great power in history had managed before: effortlessly defeat its adversaries. It was only a matter of time before such pie-in-the-sky benchmarks proved unattainable. Subsequent difficulties in Afghanistan and Iraq dashed illusions of omnipotence, but these upsets hardly displaced the United States as the world's leading state, and there is no reason to believe that the militaries of its putative rivals would have performed any better. The United States did not cease to be a superpower when its policies in Cuba and Vietnam failed in the 1960s; bipolarity lived on for three decades. Likewise, **the United States remains the sole superpower today.** Another key reason for the multipolar mania is "the rise of the rest." Impressed by the rapid economic growth of China and India, many write as if multipolarity has already returned.But such pronouncements mistake current trajectories for final outcomes--a common strategic error with deep psychological roots. The greatest concern in the Cold War, for example, came not from the Soviet Union's actually attaining parity with the United States but from the expectation that it would do so in the future. Veterans of that era recall how the launch of Sputnik in 1957 fed the perception that Soviet power was growing rapidly, leading some policymakers and analysts to start acting as if the Soviet Union were already as powerful as the United States.A state that is rising should not be confused with one that has risen, just as a state that is declining should not be written off as having already declined. China is generally seen as the country best positioned to emerge as a superpower challenger to the United States. Yet depending on how one measures GDP,China's economy is between 20 percent and 43 percent the size of the United States'. More dramatic is the difference in GDP per capita, for which all measures show China's as being less than 10 percent of the United States'. Absent a 1930s-style depression that spares potential U.S. rivals, the United States will not be replaced as the sole superpower for a very long time. Real multipolarity--an international system of three or more evenly matched powers--is nowhere on the horizon. Relative power between states shifts slowly. This tendency to conflate trends with outcomes is often driven by the examination in isolation of certain components of state power. If the habit during the Cold War was to focus on military power, the recent trend has been to single out economic output. No declinist tract is complete without a passage noting that although the United States may remain a military superpower, economic multipolarity is, or soon will be, the order of the day.Much as highlighting the Soviet Union's military power meant overlooking the country's economic and technological feet of clay, examining only economic output means putting on blinders. In 1991, Japan's economy was two-thirds the size of the United States', which, according to the current popular metric, would mean that with the Soviet Union's demise, the world shifted from bipolarity to, well, bipolarity. Such a partial assessment of power will produce no more accurate an analysis today. Nor will giving in to apprehension about the growing importance of nonstate actors. The National Intelligence Council's report Global Trends 2025 grabbed headlines by forecasting the coming multipolarity, anticipating a power shift as much to nonstate actors as to fast-growing countries. But nonstate actors are nothing new--compare the scale and scope of today's pirates off the Somali coast with those of their eighteenth-century predecessors or the political power of today's multinational corporations with that of such behemoths as the British East India Company--and projections of their rise may well be as much hype as reflections of reality. And even if the power of nonstate actors is rising, this should only increase the incentives for interstate cooperation; nonstate threats do not affect just the United States. Most nonstate actors' behavior, moreover, still revolves around influencing the decisions of states. Nongovernmental organizations typically focus on trying to get states to change their policies, and the same is true of most terrorists. When it comes to making, managing, and remaking international institutions, states remain the most important actors--and the United States is the most important of them. No other country will match the United States' combination of wealth, size, technological capacity, and productivity in the foreseeable future. The world is and will long remain a 1 + x world, with one superpower and x number of major powers. A shift from 1 + 3 to 1 + 4 or 5 or 6 would have many important consequences, but it would not change the fact that the United States will long be in a far stronger position to lead the world than any other state.
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## 2. Heg doesn’t solve war

Mastanduno 2009

(Michael, Professor of Government at Dartmouth, World Politics 61, No. 1, Ebsco)

During the cold war the United States dictated the terms of adjustment. It derived the necessary leverage because it provided for the security of its economic partners and because there were no viable alter natives to an economic order centered on the United States. After the cold war the outcome of adjustment struggles is less certain because the United States is no longer in a position to dictate the terms. The United States, notwithstanding its preponderant power, no longer enjoys the same type of security leverage it once possessed, and the very success of the U.S.-centered world economy has afforded America’s supporters a greater range of international and domestic economic options. The claim that the United States is unipolar is a statement about its cumulative economic, military, and other capabilities.1 But preponderantcapabilities across the board do not guarantee effective influence in any given arena. U.S. dominance in the international security arena no longer translates into effective leverage in the international economic arena. And although the United States remains a dominant international economic player in absolute terms, after the cold war it has found itself more vulnerable and constrained than it was during the golden economic era after World War II.
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## 3. Even if heg is good, US wouldn’t deploy – offshore balancing and nuclear weapons solve

Adams 2011

(Gordon Adams, Professor U.S. Foreign Policy @American U, “A Leaner and Meaner Defense,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 90 Iss. 1)

Some people point to China as a successor to the Soviet Union and cite it as a reason why preventing and preparing for nuclear or large-scale conventional war should remain priority missions. They highlight the risk of a U.S.-Chinese conflict over Taiwan or the possibility that China will deny the U.S. military access to the western Pacific. Of course, China is a rising power that is making increasingly substantial investments in defense. But it is important not to overreactto this fact. Focusing on China's military capabilities ought not replace a broader strategy. As the United States determines how to engage China and how to protect its interests in Asia generally, it must balance the diplomatic, economic, and financial, as well as the military, elements of its policy. Most defense analysts estimate that China's military investments and capabilities are decades behind those of the United States, and there is very little evidence that China seeks a conventional conflictwith the United States. There is substantial evidence that China's economic and financial policy is a more urgent problem for the United States, but one of the best ways for the United States to respond to that is to get its fiscal house in order. The prospect of a major war with other states is even less plausible. Defense planning scenarios in the 1990s were built around the possibility of two conflicts. The one involving Iraq is now off the table. A conflict with North Korea was the second, but although that country's military is numerically impressive, South Korea's state-of-the-art armed forces can manage that challenge without needing the assistance of U.S. troops.**The United States can now limit its contribution to strategic nuclear deterrence, air support, and offshore naval balancing in the region**. The prospect of a conventional war with Iran is not credible. Iran's vast size, to say nothing of the probability that the population would be hostile to any U.S. presence there, means that anything more than U.S. air strikes and Special Forces operations targeting Iranian nuclear capabilities is unlikely. Given the stakes, some hedging for these exceedingly low-probability risks is reasonable. But even a smaller U.S. force and budget than today's would be ample because many of these risks are less likely than ever and the United States' allies now enjoy unprecedented military and strategic advantages. The most vexing missions are those at the heart of the Quadrennial Defense Review: counterinsurgency, nation building, and the building of other countries' security sectors, among others. And these, alongside competition with China, are motivating Gates and other planners at the Pentagon, despite Gates' acknowledgment in this magazine last spring that "the United States is unlikely to repeat a mission on the scale of those in Afghanistan or Iraq anytime soon -- that is, forced regime change followed by nation building under fire." Such planned missions are based on a misguided premise: that the U.S. campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq foreshadow the need for a large U.S. military force to increasingly intervene in failing states teeming with insurgents and terrorists. But Gates' effort to nonetheless tailor U.S. military capabilities to such tasks suggests that there is still significant support for them in the Pentagon. According to General George Casey, the army chief of staff, for example, **the United States is in an "era of persistent conflict." Yet the United States is very unlikely to embark on another regime-change and nation-building mission in the next decade -- nor should it. Indeed, in the wake of its operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, the demand for the United States to act as global policeman will decline.**Pakistan is often cited as a state that might require such an intervention. Clearly, it is the case that Gates had in mind when he worried about "a nuclear-armed state [that] could collapse into chaos and criminality." But even if Pakistan collapsed, the U.S. government would probably not send in massive forces for fear of facing widespread popular opposition and an armed resistance in the more remote parts of the country. More likely, the U.S. government would resort to air power and Special Forces in order to secure Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. After the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, it is clear that U.S. forces are not suited to lengthy occupations, especially when they involve a stabilization mission, governance reform, and economic development. who
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## No challengers

Kaplan and Kaplan 2011

(Robert D and Stephen S, Kaplan, senior fellow – Center for a New American Security, and Kaplan, frmr. vice chairman – National Intelligence Council, ’11 “America Primed,” The National Interest, March/April)

To be sure, America may be in decline in relative terms compared to some other powers, as well as to many countries of the former third world, but in absolute terms, particularly military ones, the United States can easily be the first among equals for decades hence. **China, India and Russia are the only major Eurasian states prepared to wield military power of consequence on their peripheries. And each, in turn, faces its own obstacles on the road to some degree of dominance**.The Chinese will have a great navy (assuming their economy does not implode) and that will enforce a certain level of bipolarity in the world system. But Beijing will lack the alliance network Washington has, even as **China and Russia will always be—because of geography—inherently distrustful of one another. China has much influence, but no credible military allies** beyond possibly North Korea, and its authoritarian regime lives in fear of internal disruption if its economic growth rate falters. Furthermore, Chinese naval planners look out from their coastline and see South Korea and a string of islands—Japan, Taiwan and Australia—that are American allies, as are, to a lesser degree, the Philippines, Vietnam and Thailand. **To balance a rising China, Washington must only preserve its naval and air assets at their current levels.** India, which has its own internal insurgency, is bedeviled by semifailed states on its borders that critically sap energy and attention from its security establishment, and especially from its land forces; in any case, India has become a de facto ally of the United States whose very rise, in and of itself, helps to balance China. Russia will be occupied for years regaining influence in its post-Soviet near abroad, particularly in Ukraine, whose feisty independence constitutes a fundamental challenge to the very idea of the Russian state. China checks Russia in Central Asia, as do Turkey, Iran and the West in the Caucasus. This is to say nothing of Russia’s diminishing population and overwhelming reliance on energy exports. Given the problems of these other states, America remains fortunate indeed.The United States is poised to tread the path of postmutiny Britain. America might not be an empire in the formal sense, but its obligations and constellation of military bases worldwide put it in an imperial-like situation, particularly because its air and naval deployments will continue in a post-Iraq and post-Afghanistan world. No country is in such an enviable position to keep the relative peace in Eurasia as is the United States—especially if it can recover the level of enduring competence in national-security policy last seen during the administration of George H. W. Bush. This is no small point. America has strategic advantages and can enhance its power while extricating itself from war. But this requires leadership—not great and inspiring leadership which comes along rarely even in the healthiest of societies—but plodding competence, occasionally steely nerved and always free
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## Other factors determine conflict - hegemony doesn’t solve

Ikenberry 2009

(G. John et al, Prof. Int’l Affairs @ Princeton World Politics, Vol. 61, No. 1, p. Muse)

Power transition and hegemonic theories predict that major war involving the leading state and a challenger becomes more likely as their relative capabilities approach parity.39 Under unipolarity, parity is beyond the reach of a would-be challenger, so this mechanism does not operate. In any event, many scholars question whether these traditional theories of war remain relevant in a world in which the declining benefits of conquest, nuclear deterrence among most major powers, the spread of democracy, and changing collective norms and ideas reduce the probability of major war among great powers to a historically low level.40�**The absence of major conflicts among the great powers may thus be overdetermined or have little to do with unipolarity.**

## Heg doesn’t solve conflict - data proves

Geller 99

(Daniel S and Joel David, Geller and Singer, 99 – \*Chair of the Department of Political Science @ Wayne State University, Nations at war: a scientific study of international conflict, p. 116-117)

Hopf (1991) and Levy (1984) examine the frequency, magnitude, and severity of wars using polarity (Hopf) and “system size” (levy) as predictors. Hopf’s database includes warefare in the European subsystem for the restricted temporal period of 1495-1559. The system is classified as multipolar for the years 1495-1520 and as bipolar for the years 1521-1559. Hopf reports that the amount of wardare during these two periods was essentially equivalent. He concludes that polarity has little relationship to patterns of war for the historical period under examination. Levy (1984) explores the possibile linear association between the number of great powers (system size) and war for the extended temporal span of 1495-1975. **His findings coincide with those of Hopf; he reports that the frequency, magnitude, and severity of war in the international system is unrelated to the number of major powers in the system.**
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## 1. Economy is resilient.

Zakaria, 2009

[Fareed, Phd in PoliSci and Editor of Newsweek, “The secrets of stability,” Newsweek, December 12, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html]

One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. Andthat rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?" This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature. The first is the spread of great-power peace. Since the end of the Cold War, the world's major powers have not competed with each other in geomilitary terms.There have been some political tensions, but measured by historical standards the globe today is stunningly free of friction between the mightiest nations. This lack of conflict is extremely rare in history. You would have to go back at least 175 years, if not 400, to find any prolonged period like the one we are living in. The number of people who have died as a result of wars, civil conflicts, and terrorism over the last 30 years has declined sharply (despite what you might think on the basis of overhyped fears about terrorism). And no wonder—three decades ago, the Soviet Union was still funding militias, governments, and guerrillas in dozens of countries around the world. And the United States was backing the other side in every one of those places. That clash of superpower proxies caused enormous bloodshed and instability: recall that 3 million people died in Indochina alone during the 1970s. Nothing like that is happening today. Peace is like oxygen, Harvard's Joseph Nye has written. When you don't have it, it's all you can think about, but when you do, you don't appreciate your good fortune.Peace allows for the possibility of a stable economic life and trade. The peace that flowed from the end of the Cold War had a much larger effect because it was accompanied by the discrediting of socialism. The world was left with a sole superpower but also a single workable economic model—capitalism—albeit with many variants from Sweden to Hong Kong. This consensus enabled the expansion of the global economy; in fact, it created for the first time a single world economy in which almost all countries across the globe were participants. That meanseveryone is invested in the same system. Today, while the nations of Eastern Europe might face an economic crisis, no one is suggesting that they abandon free-market capitalism and return to communism. In fact, around the world you see the opposite: even in the midst of this downturn, there have been few successful electoral appeals for a turn to socialism or a rejection of the current framework of political economy. Center-right parties have instead prospered in recent elections throughout the West. The second force for stability is the victory—after a decades-long struggle—over the cancer of inflation. Thirty-five years ago, much of the world was plagued by high inflation, with deep social and political consequences. Severe inflation can be far more disruptive than a recession, because while recessions rob you of better jobs and wages that you might have had in the future, inflation robs you of what you have now by destroying your savings. In many countries in the 1970s, hyperinflation led to the destruction of the middle class, which was the background condition for many of the political dramas of the era—coups in Latin America, the suspension of democracy in India, the overthrow of the shah in Iran. But then in 1979, the tide began to turn when Paul Volcker took over the U.S. Federal Reserve and waged war against inflation. Over two decades, central banks managed to decisively beat down the beast. At this point, only one country in the world suffers from -hyperinflation: Zimbabwe. <<CONTINUED>>
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<<CONTINUED>>Low inflation allows people, businesses, and governments to plan for the future, a key precondition for stability. Political and economic stability have each reinforced the other. And the third force that has underpinned the resilience of the global system is technological connectivity. Globalization has always existed in a sense in the modern world, but until recently its contours were mostly limited to trade: countries made goods and sold them abroad. Today the information revolution has created a much more deeply connected global system. Managers in Arkansas can work with suppliers in Beijing on a real-time basis. The production of almost every complex manufactured product now involves input from a dozen countries in a tight global supply chain. And the consequences of connectivity go well beyond economics. Women in rural India have learned through satellite television about the independence of women in more modern countries. Citizens in Iran have used cell phones and the Internet to connect to their well-wishers beyond their borders. Globalization today is fundamentally about knowledge being dispersed across our world. This diffusion of knowledge may actually be the most important reason for the stability of the current system. The majority of the world's nations have learned some basic lessons about political well-being and wealth creation. They have taken advantage of the opportunities provided by peace, low inflation, and technology to plug in to the global system. And they have seen the indisputable results. Despite all the turmoil of the past year, it's important to remember that more people have been lifted out of poverty over the last two decades than in the preceding 10. Clear-thinking citizens around the world are determined not to lose these gains by falling for some ideological chimera, or searching for a worker's utopia. They are even cautious about the appeals of hypernationalism and war.Most have been there, done that. And they know the price. In fact, the most remarkable development in the last few years has been the way China, India, Brazil, and other emerging markets have managed their affairs prudently, taming growth by keeping interest rates up and restricting credit in the middle of the bubble—just as an economics textbook (and common sense) would advise. Instead it was the advanced industrial world, which had always lectured everyone else about good political and economic management, that handled its affairs poorly, fueling bubble after bubble, being undisciplined in the boom, and now suffering most during the bust. The data reflect this new reality. By 2014 the debt of the rich countries in the G20 will be 120 percent of GDP, three times the level of debt in the big emerging-market countries. The students of the global system are now doing better than their teachers. Among the many realities that have become apparent in the last year, this is perhaps the most consequential

## 2. Economic decline does not cause war.

Miller 2000

(Morris, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” 273)

The question may be reformulated. **Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes?** Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis.** After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19**Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – a**s measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - **bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and emidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another). Global economic collapse is impossible.**
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## Economic collapse doesn’t cause war.

Deudney 1991

[Daniel, PhD and Prof PoliSci @ Johns Hopkins, “Environment and Security: Muddled Thinking”, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, April, Google Books]

Although initially compelling, this scenario has major flaws. One is that it is arguably based on unsound economic theory. Wealth is formed not so much by the availability of cheap natural resources as by capital formation through savings and more efficient production. Many resource-poor countries, like Japan, are very wealthy, while many countries with more extensive resources are poor. Environmental constraints require an end to economic growth based on growing use of raw materials, but not necessarily an end to growth in the production of goods and services. In addition, economic decline does not necessarily produce conflict. How societies respond to economic decline may largely depend upon the rate at which such declines occur. And as people get poorer, they may become less willing to spend scarce resources for military forces. As Bernard Brodie observed about the modern era, “The predisposing factors to military aggression are full bellies, not empty ones.”’” The experience of economic depressions over the last two centuries may be irrelevant, because such depressions were characterized by under-utilized production capacity and falling resource prices. In the 1930’s, increased military spending stimulated economies, but if economic growth is retarded by environmental constraints, military spending will exacerbate the problem. POWER WARS A third scenario is that environmental degradation might cause war by altering the relative power of states; that is, newly stronger states may be tempted to prey upon the newly weaker ones, or weakened states may attack and lock in their positions before their power ebbs further. But such alterations might not lead to war as readily as the lessons of history suggest, because economic power and military power are not as tightly coupled as in the past. The economic power positions of Germany and Japan have changed greatly since World War II, but these changes have not been accompanied by war or threat of war. In the contemporary world, whole industries rise, fall, and relocate, causing substantial fluctuations in the economic well-being of regions and peoples without producing wars. There is no reason to believe that changes in relative wealth and power caused by the uneven impact of environmental degradation would inevitably lead to war. Even if environmental degradation were to destroy the basic social and economic fabric of a country or region, the impact on international order may not be very great. Among the first casualties in such a country would be the capacity to wage war. The poor and wretched of the earth may be able to deny an outside aggressor an easy conquest, but they are themselves a minimal threat to other states. Contemporary offensive military operations require complex organizational skills, specialized industrial products, and surplus wealth. In today's world everything is connected, but not everything is tightly coupled. Severe regional disasters may produce scarcely a ripple in the rest of the world. For example, Idi Amin drew Uganda back into savage darkness, the Khmer Rouge murdered an estimated two million Cambodians, and the Sahara has advanced across the Sahel without much perturbing the economies and political systems of the rest of the world.
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## Economic collapse impacts are empirically disproven

Naim ‘10

[MoisesNaim, Editor in Chief of Foreign Policy Magazine. Foreign Policy. “It Didn't Happen”]

Just a few months ago, the consensus among influential thinkers was that the economic crisis would unleash a wave ofgeopolitical plagues. Xenophobic outbursts, civil wars, collapsing currencies, protectionism, international conflicts, and street riots were only some of the dire consequences expected by the experts. It didn't happen. Although the crash did cause severe economic damage and widespread human suffering, and though the world did change in important ways for the worse-- the International Monetary Fund, for example, estimates that the global economy's new and permanent trajectory is a 10 percent lower rate of GDP growth than before the crisis --the scary predictions for the most part failed to materialize. Sadly, the same experts who failed to foresee the economic crisis were also blindsided by the speed of the recovery. More than a year into the crisis, we now know just how off they were. From telling us about the imminent collapse of the international financial system to prophecies of a 10-year recession, here are six of the most common predictions about the crisis that have been proven wrong:The international financial system will collapse. It didn't.As Lehman Brothers, Bear Stearns, and Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac crashed, as Citigroup and many other pillars of the financial system teetered on the brink, and as stock markets everywhere entered into free fall, the wise men predicted a total system meltdown. The economy has "fallen off a cliff," warned investment guru Warren Buffett. Fellow financial wizard George Soros agreed, noting the world economy was on "life support," calling the turbulence more severe than during the Great Depression, and comparing the situation to the demise of the Soviet Union. The natural corollary of such doomsday scenarios was the possibility that depositors would lose access to the funds in their bank accounts. From there to visions of martial law imposed to control street protests and the looting of bank offices was just an easy step for thousands of Internet-fueled conspiracy theorists. Even today, the financial system is still frail, banks are still failing, credit is scarce, and risks abound. Butthe financial system is working, and the perception that it is too unsafe to use or that it can suddenly crash out of existence has largely dissipated.The economic crisis will last for at least two years and maybe even a decade. It didn't. By fall of 2009, the economies of the United States, Europe, and Japan had begun to grow again, and many of the largest developing economies, such as China, India, and Brazil, were growing at an even faster pace.This was surely a far cry from the doom-laden -- and widely echoed -- prophecies of economist NourielRoubini. In late 2008 he warned that radical governmental actions at best would prevent "what will now be an ugly and nasty two-year recession and financial crisis from turning into a systemic meltdown and a decade-long economic depression." Roubini was far from the only pessimist. "The danger," warned Harvard University's Kenneth Rogoff, another distinguished economist, in the fall of 2008, "is that instead of having a few bad years, we'll have another lost decade." It turned out that radical policy reactions were far more effective than anyone had expected in shortening the life of the recession. The U.S. dollar will crash. It didn't. Instead, the American currency's value increased 20 percent between July 2008 and March 2009, at the height of the crisis. At first, investors from around the world sought refuge in the U.S. dollar. Then, as the U.S. government bailed out troubled companies and stimulated the economy with aggressive public spending, the U.S. fiscal deficit skyrocketed and anxieties about a dollar devaluation mounted. By the second half of 2009, the U.S. currency had lost value. But devaluation has not turned out to be the catastrophic crash predicted by the pessimists. Rather, as Financial Times columnist Martin Wolf noted, "The dollar's correction is not just natural; it is helpful. It will lower the risk of deflation in the U.S. and facilitate the correction of the global 'imbalances' that helped cause the crisis."Protectionism will surge. It didn't. Trade flowsdid drop dramatically in late 2008 and early 2009, but theystarted to grow again in the second half of 2009 as economies recovered. Pascal Lamy, director-general of the World Trade Organization, had warned that the global financial crisis was bound to lead to surges in protectionism as governments sought to blame foreigners for their problems. "That is exactly what happened in the 1930s when [protectionism] was the virus that spread the crisis all over the place," he said in October 2008, echoing a widely held sentiment among trade experts. And it is true that many governments dabbled in protectionism, including not only the U.S. Congress's much-derided "Buy American" provision, but also measures such as increased tariffs or import restrictions imposed in 17 of the G-20 countries. Yet one year later, a report from the European Union concluded that "a widespread and systemic escalation of protectionism has been prevented." The protectionist temptation is always there, and a meaningful increase in trade barriers cannot be ruled out. But it has not happened yet.The crisis in rich countries will drag down developing ones. It didn't. As the economies of America and Europe screeched to a halt during the nightmarish first quarter of 2009, China's economy accelerated, part of a broader trend in which emerging markets fared better through the crisis than the world's most advanced economies. As the rich countries entered a deep recession and the woes of the U.S. financial market affected banking systems everywhere, the idea that emerging economies could "decouple" from the advanced ones was widely mocked. But decouple they did. Some emerging economies relied on their domestic markets, others on exports to other growing countries (China, for example, displaced the United States last year as Brazil's top export market). Still others had ample foreign reserves, low exposure to toxic financial assets, or, like Chile, had taken measures in anticipation of an eventual global slowdown. Not all developing countries managed to escape the worst of the crisis -- and many, such as Mexico and Iran, were deeply hurt -- but many others managed to avoid the fate of the advanced economies. Violent political turmoil will become more common. It didn't.Electorates did punish governments for the economic hard times. But this was mostly in Europe and mostly peaceful and democratic. "There will be blood," prophesied Harvard historian Niall Fergusonlast spring. "A crisis of this magnitude is bound to increase political [conflict] ...It is bound to destabilize some countries. It will cause civil wars to break out that have been dormant. It will topple governments that were moderate and bring in governments that are extreme. These things are pretty predictable." No, it turns out: They aren't.
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## Protectionism has no impact – empirically disproven

Sally 2010

[Razeen, Director of the European Centre for International Political Economy, “International trade and emerging protectionism since the crisis”,<http://www.ecipe.org/blog/international-trade-and-emerging-protectionism-since-the-crisis>]

Perhaps the biggest surprise is that the world has not hurtled into tit-for-tat protectionism. According to the WTO, new trade measures since the crisis started affect a maximum of 1 per cent of world trade in goods. New protectionism is concentrated in sectors that have long been protected: textiles, clothing, footwear, iron, steel, consumer electronics and agriculture. New anti-dumping, safeguards and countervailing-duty investigations have increased, but they still affect a tiny share of world trade. And up to one-third of new trade measures have been liberalising. Global Trade Alert (GTA) paints a more alarming picture. It counts at least 297 trade-discriminatory measures since November 2008. And protectionism in the pipeline is trending upwards. It estimates that one-third of new protectionist measures are bailouts to financial services, automobiles and other sectors. Thus the good news on remarkably mild “traditional” protectionism (mainly border barriers) is balanced by worrying signs of non-traditional, behind-the-border protectionism.

## No trade wars

Long 2009

[Guoqiang, senior fellow Development Research Center, “Is Protectionism a Threat to the World Economy?” <http://www.eeo.com.cn/ens/finance_investment/2009/03/06/131493.shtml>]

I don't think we'll end up with a trade war. Countries mostly adopt protectionist measures within the WTO framework. There are two reasons--the first is that all the countries have something in common in prosting protectionism, second, countries have emphasized corporation at recent top-level meetings. If some country dared to really put up protectionist barriers, it would open up a hornets' nest of criticism against them. Second, trade retaliation forces parties to weigh the pros and cons before taking protectionist measures. So while protectionism is sure to rise, it would not have a big impact. **Periodic trade disputes will be unavoidable in the near future, but there would be little possibility of trade conflicts.** I treat frictional trade rhetoric as a part of the bilateral negotiation process. It just becomes more intense during times of crisis**.**
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## Normal means is state funding for ports – but they are slacking in duties now

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

The U.S. waterways transportation system includes about 145 ports that each handle more than l million metric tons of cargo annually. The top 10 ports handle a total of more than 900 million metric tons annually. The burden on ports is expected to mount in the near future as foreign trade soars. Beyond supporting commerce, major ports and their smaller counterparts provide many tangible benefits to their communities. The port industry and port users generate more than 15 million jobs and add some $780 billion to the GDP annually. Port-generated economic activities include shipping and related enterprises, trade services, inland transportation, and cargo and vessel services.

These benefits, although large, may be overlooked by those who usually pay for port improvements. Much of the economic value generated is national in scope, whereas **ports traditionally have depended on state and local governments for financial and planning support. This mismatch has become a growing problem amid budget shortfalls confronting state and local officials, some of whom are cutting port subsidies and, at the extreme, even asking for a share of port revenues**.

## Lack of regional planning kills port efficiency

Bookman 2006

[Charles Bookman is director of the Marine Institute at the National Research Council. U.S. seaports: At the crossroads of the global economy. By: Bookman, Charles, Issues in Science & Technology, 07485492, Fall, Vol. 13, Issue 1, ebsco]jap

Regional planning for port needs. Although building new ports would improve shipping access to the United States, different tactics are needed to improve road and rail access to ports in order to enhance the efficiency of vessel movements. Making the necessary **improvements will require regional planning that takes port needs into account**. One barrier that has typically stood in the way of such regional planning, however, is that state and local government officials have tended to be more interested in highway and mass transit improvements than in port access.

In addition to addressing road and rail access problems, regional planners will need to look for ways to improve waterways management capabilities. There is a barrier here, too. Although waterways management has traditionally been a federal responsibility, federal funds for this task are tight and becoming tighter. This budget shortfall is likely to frustrate the Coast Guard and NOAA in their efforts to undertake the necessary improvement projects. Furthermore, political pressure to transfer federal responsibilities to state and local levels suggests that new approaches to technology selection, purchasing, and operation are needed. Because **few ports can afford to install and operate waterways management systems on their own, regional planning groups might be better positioned to undertake the large-scale solutions required for modernization**. Of course, these groups should work in cooperation with the appropriate federal agencies, particularly the Coast Guard, which is responsible for port safety and maritime law enforcement among its other missions.

# RAMP NEG – Politics – Link – Plan Unpopular

## Transportationand tax bills are always met with political division – the public distrusts the federal governments ability to solve regional issues

Seely 2008

[BRUCE SEELY is a historian of technology and chair of the Department of Social Sciences at Michigan Technological University, The Secret Is the System. By: Seely, Bruce, Wilson Quarterly, 03633276, Spring2008, Vol. 32, Issue 2, ebsco]jap

Even as transportation became more politicized, the tide of public opinion shifted against taxes and government spending, and against government itself as an authoritative institution capable of accomplishing public ends. The change affected spending much more in the states than at the federal level. By the 1990s few politicians anywhere could effectively advocate higher taxes of any kind. Congress has not increased the federal levy (18.4 cents per gallon) since 1993, and most states, with taxes now ranging from 7.5 cents per gallon in Georgia to 32.1 cents in Wisconsin, have been equally reluctant to act. Yet the purchasing power of those pennies has steadily declined. As a result, Highway Trust Fund expenditures may exceed current balances sometime between 2010 and 2012, raising the specter of a return to the annual political battles over highways that were common before 1956.

## Infrastructure spending is unpopular – populace doesn’t respect expert opinion

Seely 2008

[BRUCE SEELY is a historian of technology and chair of the Department of Social Sciences at Michigan Technological University, The Secret Is the System. By: Seely, Bruce, Wilson Quarterly, 03633276, Spring2008, Vol. 32, Issue 2, ebsco]jap

There is nothing new about our reluctance to spend money on infrastructure. It is impossible to imagine San Francisco without its Golden Gate Bridge, but that iconic span was debated for decades before workers broke ground. It often takes special circumstances to end the financial and political inertia. That's what the Great Depression did, adding demand for job creation and economic stimulus to the existing arguments and sparking construction of many of the nation's most impressive public works, from the Golden Gate to Hoover Dam and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Many less glamorous jobs got done too: thousands of railroad grade crossings, parkways, trails in the national parks. Public-works relief funding from the federal government finally broke fiscal logjams.

**Still, there is something significantly different about the way we build now. The political and financial environments have become much more difficult to navigate.** Numerous reviews, rapidly rising costs, and blizzards of litigation are among the well-known symptoms. And there has been a subtler but very far-reaching change: the decline of respect for expertise. Americans once accepted with little question the views of experts such as highway engineers and dam builders at the Army Corps of Engineers. The experts tended to speak with one voice, and they enjoyed a reputation as neutral specialists and servants of the general welfare. Their authority made it easier for the public and Congress to accept the arguments, costs, and even the dislocations associated with such projects as the inevitable price of progress.