# Keystone XL – Affirmative Starter Pack – SDI 2012

## \*\*\* 1AC

### 1AC—Inherency

Contention 1 is Inherency

#### First, Obama rejected the Keystone decision causing a standstill

Eilperin and Mufson ‘12, Juliet and Steven, House of Representatives reporter and staff writer covering energy and other financial news, respectively, “Obama Administration Rejects Keystone XL Pipeline,” Jan. 18th, 2012.

(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-administration-to-reject-keystone-pipeline/2012/01/18/gIQAPuPF8P_story.html>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

President Obama, denouncing a “rushed and arbitrary deadline” set by congressional Republicans, announced Wednesday that he was rejecting a Canadian firm’s application for a permit to build and operate the [Keystone XL pipeline](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-allies-interests-collide-over-keystone-pipeline/2011/10/11/gIQAr09cpL_story.html), a massive project that would have stretched from Canada’s oil sands to refineries in Texas.¶ Obama said that the Feb. 21 deadline, set by Congress as part of [the two-month payroll tax cut extension](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/boehner-2-month-tax-cut-would-hurt-small-businesses/2011/12/22/gIQA5ClZBP_story.html), made it impossible to adequately review the project proposed by TransCanada. But he left the door open to the possibility that a new proposal might pass regulatory muster.¶ [4983](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-administration-to-reject-keystone-pipeline/2012/01/18/gIQAPuPF8P_allComments.html#comments)¶ [Comments](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-administration-to-reject-keystone-pipeline/2012/01/18/gIQAPuPF8P_allComments.html#comments)¶ [Weigh In](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-administration-to-reject-keystone-pipeline/2012/01/18/gIQAPuPF8P_story.html#weighIn)¶ [Corrections?](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/interactivity/corrections/) Raising the stakes in a bitter election-year fight with Republicans, President Obama on Wednesday rejected a Canadian company's plan to build a 1,700-mile pipeline to carry oil across six U.S. states to Texas refineries. (Jan. 18)¶ More On This Story¶ [Read more at PostPolitics](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics)¶ [Protesters arrested at 'Occupy Congress'](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/handful-of-protesters-arrested-during-occupy-congress/2012/01/17/gIQAjGgO6P_story.html)¶ [Treasury moves to keep U.S. under debt limit](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/treasurys-thrift-savings-plan-maneuver-aims-to-keep-government-under-debt-cap/2012/01/17/gIQActhf6P_story.html)¶ [Court orders new hearing for death-row inmate](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/supreme-court-alabama-death-row-inmate-cory-maples-should-get-new-hearing/2012/01/18/gIQAdXzI8P_story.html)¶ [View all Items in this Story](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/obama-administration-to-reject-keystone-pipeline/2012/01/18/gIQAPuPF8P_story.html)¶ “This announcement is not a judgment on the merits of the pipeline, but the arbitrary nature of a deadline that prevented the State Department from gathering the information necessary to approve the project and protect the American people,” the president said in a statement.¶ This is the second time the Obama administration has tried to deflect political pressure over the proposed $7 billion, 1,700-mile Keystone XL pipeline, which last year sparked debate over U.S. energy and environmental policy. At one point, about 12,000 people [demonstrated outside the White House](http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/dc-politics/oil-pipeline-protesters-encircle-white-house/2011/11/06/gIQAmjnRtM_story.html) against the project, while the oil industry, construction unions and the Canadian government lobbied in favor of it

### 1AC—Plan

#### Thus the plan: The United States federal government should substantially invest in infrastructure development of the Keystone XL pipeline.

#### We reserve the right to clarify our intent

### 1AC—Canada Relations

#### Contention 2 is US-Canada Relations

#### First, Failure to invest in Keystone pipeline pushed relations to the lowest point – it signaled a movement away from cooperation and diplomacy – the plan is key to effective relations

Burney and Hampson 12 (Derek H., and Fen Olser, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs , “How Obama Lost Canada,” Foreign Affairs, 6-21, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>)

Permitting the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline should have been an easy diplomatic and economic decisionfor U.S. President Barack Obama. The completed project would have shipped more than 700,000 barrels a day of Albertan oil to refineries in the Gulf Coast, generated tens of thousands of jobs for U.S. workers, and met the needs of refineries in Texas that are desperately seeking oil from Canada, a more reliable supplier than Venezuela or countries in the Middle East. The project posed little risk to the landscape it traversed. But instead of acting on economic logic, the Obama administration caved to environmental activists in November 2011, postponing until 2013 the decision on whether to allow the pipeline.¶ Obama’s choice marked a triumph of campaign posturing over pragmatism and diplomacy, and it brought U.S.-Canadian relations to their lowest point in decades. It was hardly the first time that the administration has fumbled issues with Ottawa. Although relations have been civil, they have rarely been productive. Whether on trade, the environment, or Canada’s shared contribution in places such as Afghanistan, time and again the United States has jilted its northern neighbor. If the pattern of neglect continues, Ottawa will get less interested in cooperating with Washington. Already, Canada has reacted by turning elsewhere -- namely, toward Asia -- for more reliable economic partners.¶ The United States' mistreatment of Canada extends beyond economic issues.¶ Economically, Canada and the United States are joined at the hip. Each country is the other’s number-one trading partner -- in 2011, the two-way trade in goods and services totaled $681 billion, more than U.S. trade with Mexico or China -- and trade with Canada supports more than eight million U.S. jobs. Yet the Obama administration has recently jeopardized this important relationship. It failed to combat the Buy American provision in Congress’ stimulus bill, which inefficiently excluded Canadian participation in infrastructure spending.

#### Second, Relations have fundamentally changed and are not resilient– they require constant care over high priority issues – investment in Keystone signals a renewed commitment to relations

Burney and Hampson 12 (Derek H., and Fen Olser, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs , “How Obama Lost Canada,” Foreign Affairs, 6-21, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>)

Of course, the U.S.-Canadian relationship has had its rocky moments before. In the 1970s and 1980s, in response to public concern over the United States’ economic domination of Canada, Ottawa enacted a wide variety of protectionist measures that irritated Washington. Eventually, the two countries recognized their mutual interests and resolved what differences they had, ratifying the Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement in 1987 and its successor, NAFTA, seven years later.¶ Back then, Canada had little choice but to find a way to fix its relationship with the United States, the only game in town. Ottawa is in a different position now. Today, it enjoys a respectable platform of self-confidence, having weathered the financial crisis and ensuing recession far better than the United States. And unlike in the past, Canada can now look beyond its own neighborhood for economic opportunities -- especially to the rising economies of Asia.¶ Indeed, Canada has made a full-court press in the Asia-Pacific region. It is wooing countries such as China, India, Japan, and South Korea, which are eager to invest and trade in Canadian minerals, energy, and agricultural products. Harper has announced Canada’s intention to explore free-trade negotiations with China, and talks with Japan, Thailand, India, and South Korea are under way. As Harper put it during a visit to China in February, “We want to sell our energy to people who want to buy our energy.”¶ To be sure, Canadian companies will never abandon the U.S. market. Nevertheless, the U.S. recession and the rise of Asia have allowed Canada to diversify its economic relations. In 2010, only 68 percent of Canadian exports were destined for the United States, down from 85 percent in 2000. Canadians are accustomed to benign neglect from a neighbor preoccupied with more urgent global flashpoints, but since that neglect has grown so much as to be malign, they have begun to reappraise their relationship with the United States. As Canada develops closer ties with China and finds more receptive outlets for its exports, the United States may find itself with a less obliging partner to the north.¶ The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually -- the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great -- but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### Third, Keystone pipeline investment jumpstarts relations- it’s the most critical issues

Mufson 7-6 (Steven, Energy Correspondent – Washington Post, “Keystone XL Pipeline Would Add Link in U.S.-Canada Trade Relations,” Washington Post, 2012, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/keystone-xl-pipeline-creates-sticking-point-in-us-canada-trade-relations/2012/07/06/gJQAxcrtRW_story.html>)

If the U.S. government gives TransCanada the go ahead, the Keystone XL pipeline will give another boost to U.S.-Canada trade relations. Canada — not China — is the largest U.S. trading partner. And oil and gas accounted for more than a third of the $316.5 billion of U.S. imports from Canada in 2011.¶ The oil in TransCanada’s existing Keystone and proposed Keystone XL lines alone could outstrip the value of all U.S. imports from Brazil and, depending on the price, roughly equal those from France or Taiwan.¶ The United States is a natural destination for that oil. “The best market is the one right next to us demanding 10 million barrels of oil every day,” TransCanada chief executive Russ Girling said. “It makes no sense having tankers moving to the U.S. from Europe and the Middle East and tankers going to Asia from America.”¶ The large volume of oil moving to the United States from Canada is a good thing in the eyes of many U.S. experts on national security and oil industry lobbyists, who have been promoting the idea of increased U.S. reliance on North American sources of oil rather than on imports from places like Venezuela or Saudi Arabia. Canada is already the United States’ largest source of foreign petroleum, accounting for about a quarter of U.S. crude oil imports.¶ But reduced reliance on imports from outside North America would not insulate the United States from geopolitical crises in other oil-producing regions. When it comes to oil prices, the increased reliance on Canada will make little or no difference. The price of crude oil is a function of world supply and demand. And if a geopolitical crisis choked off some of the world’s oil sources, other consuming countries would scramble for supplies, and prices would soar globally, including the price of Canadian oil. The U.S. tab for importing oil would increase as a result.¶ Even so, many trade experts say, boosting U.S. imports from Canada is good for the U.S. economy because for every dollar of exports to the United States, Canada buys 85 cents’ worth of U.S.-made products. That includes goods such as U.S. iron and steel, automobiles, refined petroleum products, fruits and juices, plastics and the supersized Caterpillar dump trucks that haul away oil extracted from the tar sands of Alberta.¶ By contrast, Saudi Arabia buys 29 cents of U.S. goods for every dollar of U.S. imports from the kingdom.¶ Irritated Canadians ¶ Despite the strong ties between the United States and Canada, the long battle over the Keystone XL pipeline has irritated many Canadian leaders and sparked talk about sending output from Canadian oil sands to China. TransCanada has been working on U.S. permit approvals for nearly four years, and has faced vociferous opposition from environmentalists and scientists worried about the unusually high level of greenhouse gas emissions associated with oil extraction from the tar sands.¶ During a February visit to Beijing, Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper courted Chinese participation in such an arrangement. China’s rapidly expanding economy is thirsty for crude oil, although its ability to refine such oil may be limited.¶ Chinese firms already own minority stakes in oil sands ventures. Sinopec is one of half a dozen partners in the pit operations of a venture called Syncrude and China National Offshore Oil Corp. owns 17 percent of MEG Energy, which is producing 25,000 barrels a day from a steam-injection project.¶ Contributing to Harper’s reoriention was President Obama’s decision to reject TransCanada’s initial permit application — which would have routed the pipeline through ecologically sensitive areas of Nebraska — because, Obama said, he could not evaluate the permit properly in the face of a congressional deadline.¶ “I think we need to be clear. As much as I want to see that Keystone project proceed, this incident underscores the fact it is in this country’s national interest to be able to sell its products beyond the United States,” Harper said in an interview with Reuters at the time of his China visit.

Scenario 1 is Hegemony,

#### First, Keystone XL is inevitable, but approving now key to relations

Burney and Hampson ‘12, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### Second, US-Canada relations are key to F-35s.

Berthiaume ‘12, Lee, Writer for Embassy Magazine, Canada.com and the National Post, “F-35s Delivery Won’t be Complete Before Current Fighter are Retired: Documents,” June 22nd, 2012.

(<http://www.canada.com/technology/delivery+complete+before+current+fighters+retired+Documents/6827273/story.html>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

OTTAWA — Defence Department officials knew last year Canada would not have enough F-35 stealth fighters by the time the last of the country’s CF-18s were due to be retired in 2020, newly released documents show.¶ As a result, officials were preparing to ask the Conservative government for more money to again extend the lives of some of the CF-18s — which have already undergone a $1.8-billion overhaul — until the last of the F-35s could come online.¶ “The planned CF-18 estimated life expectancy is currently 2020,” reads one email dated Sept. 21, 2011, and obtained by Postmedia News through access to information laws.¶ “However, the current Next Generation Fighter Capability project scheduled is based on the last of Canada’s F-35s being delivered in 2022 or 2023. CF-18 estimated life expectancy requirements are currently being assessed and a request for an extension will be made once the required date is confirmed.”¶ The revelation flies in the face of constant assertions that a stopgap would not be required between the retirement of the CF-18s and final delivery of the F-35s.¶ “Right now, our transition plan allows for that transition between the operational (CF-18) fleet as it ages out and the new (F-35) fleet as it comes online,” Royal Canadian Air Force commander Lt.-Gen. Andre Deschamps told a parliamentary committee on Dec. 11.¶ “The intention is to overlap between the two.”¶ It also comes after the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the equivalent of Canada’s auditor general, warned on June 14 that allies are increasingly delaying their plans to purchase F-35s, and testing of the stealth fighter is behind schedule.¶ Both issues have consequences for Canada as the government’s plan to purchase 65 F-35s requires doing so when full production is already underway.¶ Defence Department officials did not respond to questions by press time Friday.¶ Canada’s fleet of CF-18s were initially set to be retired in 2002, but a decade-long, $1.8-billion upgrade extended the life of 80 of the aircraft to between 2017 and 2020. (Three of the aircraft have since been lost.)¶ Further life extensions have been regarded as prohibitively expensive.¶ “Canada is now spending considerably more money on the CF-18 when it is deployed than when it was new,” Major Ed Roberds, an air weapons control at 1 Canadian Air Division Headquarters, wrote in the Canadian Military Journal in 2008.¶ “As the airframe gets older, more repairs are required, and our operational tempo requires a substantial increase in spare parts that must be transported to theatre when the aircraft are deployed.”¶ NDP military procurement critic Matthew Kellway said structural concerns also pose a potential threat to any pilot who must operate the CF-18s past even the outer edge of their lifespans.¶ “I wonder whether these guys are ready to play a very dangerous game to try to somehow extend the lives of the CF-18s,” he said of Defence Department officials.¶ Previous internal documents have shown the Conservative government was concerned last year about the rising costs of the F-35 program even as it was reassuring Canadians the program was on track and on schedule.¶ Kellway said the new email about the CF-18s again shows the government and Defence Department have not been playing straight with the public about the stealth fighter.¶ “The suggestion in the email that they may have to extend the life of the CF-18s clearly does suggest there are concerns the government has harboured about putting a fleet of F-35s in the air in time,” he said.¶ “Like so many of these issues, the government has put itself in a corner by not acknowledging the concerns publicly.”¶ Meanwhile, concerns are mounting about the government’s plan to pay an outside accounting firm up to $5 million to “assess the appropriateness” of the way in which the Defence Department has calculated how much the F-35s will cost.¶ Whatever firm wins the contract will not be allowed to question the figures presented, but rather will be called upon to judge whether the Defence Department followed correct procedures in determining how the cost estimates were arrived at.¶ The government says the external assessment will ensure proper procedures were followed, but Liberal defence critic John McKay alleged the government and National Defence are simply trying to set up a whitewash.¶ “These guys have suffered a huge blow to their credibility on the specific aspect on the F-35,” he said.¶ “They’re setting up a scenario where they can legitimately stand up in question period and say, ‘Well look, KPMG says we can do this all the time, so we didn’t mislead you in the first place.’”

#### Third, US-Canadian relations key to arms sales – required in the F-35 deal

Wyss and Wilner ‘12, Marco and Alex, Wyss is a Senior Researcher at the Center for Security Studies(CSS) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) in Zurich, Wilner is a Senior Researcher at the CSS, “The Next Generation Fighter Club: How Shifting Markets Will Shape Canada’s F-35 Debate,” Spring 2012.

(<http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

In either case, politics often informs both a producer’s motivation to transfer arms to another state and a recipient’s motivation to acquire arms from another state. This was particularly evident during the Cold War, when opposing Western and Eastern blocs duelled over global political support by using the arms trade as an instrument of foreign policy. The acquisition of arms from one of the two superpowers was widely acknowledged as evidence of a state’s allegiance. Clients became allies. But the politicking behind the Cold War’s arms trade was nothing new. “Arms transfers have been used at least since the Peloponnesian Wars,” writes Krause, “to achieve the political, military and economic goals of states and rulers.”[62](http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp#_edn62) The same principle exists today. What distinguishes the arms market from, say, the automobile market, is the pervasive influence of political considerations in driving policy, shaping decisions, and influencing state behaviour.[63](http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp#_edn63) This is especially evident when it comes to fighter jets. When one government decides to purchase sophisticated military hardware – like combat jets – produced by another state, it is not only thinking about improving the quality of its armed forces, but also about the political and strategic signals it is sending to other countries (and its own citizens) with its purchase.

#### Fourth, F-35s key to hegemony—cutting them would kill the aerospace industry and alliances

Donnelly ‘11, Thomas, Director of the Center for Defense Studies, The Weekly Standard, “An Extremely Immodest Proposal,” 2011

(<http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/extremely-immodest-proposal_576967.html>? HK] accessed 7/24/11

No doubt the legal and monetary obligations would be great, but the strategic, operational, and defense industrial consequences of terminating the F-35 program would be catastrophic. To begin with, the F-35 is a multinational program. To kill it would not only yank the rug out from under America’s closest friends and allies – long-time partners like Great Britain, Australia, and Canada, for example – but destroy the prospects for closer partnerships in the Middle East and, particularly, the Asia-Pacific, where Japan, Korea and Singapore are likely F-35 customers. And it would forestall the opportunity to share a common fifth-generation aircraft with others like India, which could only turn to Russia or try to develop such an aircraft on its own. Terminating the F-35 would be the clearest signal one can imagine, even beyond retreat from Iraq or Afghanistan, that the United States no longer will assume the burdens of international security. Terminating the F-35, or simply terminating the F-35B short take off vertical landing (or STOVL), would be fatal for the Marine Corps as a serious war fighting service. The modernization of the Marines is already at risk; the V-22 Osprey tilt-rotor transport turned out to be more difficult and more expensive than anticipated, and last year the Obama administration cancelled the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle, which would have given the Marines both enhanced amphibious assault capability but, even more important, more firepower and mobility ashore. The Marines’ AV-8B Harriers – a development of the original British jump jet – are at the end of their service life, and the Marines’ F-18s cannot operate from Marine amphibious assault ships. And there’s hardly reason to have the big-deck amphibs without the F-35B. Conversely, operating a fifth-generation aircraft would give the Marine Corps a new viability in small-scale contingencies – think Libya – and allow them to contribute to more challenging “anti-access, area-denial” contingencies in East Asia or in an Iran-type operation. Similar challenges face the Navy; without a fifth-generation aircraft, its own aircraft carriers are increasingly irrelevant to high-end strike campaigns. Ending the F-35 program would also eviscerate what remains of the American military aviation industry. Only two companies in the world have prime contractor experience in building manned “stealth” aircraft, Northrop Grumman and Lockheed Martin. Northrop’s B-2 bomber, designed in the late 1970s, was last bought in 1997; only 21 of a planned 132 bombers. Northrop is no longer in that business. Lockheed built the F-117 Nighthawk, the first stealth fighter, another 1970s design and also long out of production. Lockheed also builds the F-22 Raptor, but that program was ended (with just 187 of a planned 750 aircraft produced) two years ago and the last F-22 will soon roll off the line. The F-35 line itself was sized (and the workforce planned) to build up to several hundred planes a year; under current plans, it’s not going to reach maximum efficiency. Indeed, the company may have to lay off workers. There’s no other place for the designers, engineers, or management to go; the investment, knowledge, and production experience to make stealthy, manned combat aircraft will rapidly disappear.

#### Fifth, Declining hegemony causes global war – it risks unstably multipolarity, Chinese aggression, miscalculation and war in every region of the world – The probability is high

Khalilzad ‘11, Zalmay, Former director of planning at the Defense Department, The National Review Online, “The Economy and National Security” , February 8, 2011

( <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=1>) Accessed 7/29/11.

If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

#### Scenario 2 is Arctic Conflict

#### First, Loss of US-Canadian relations causes Arctic Conflict (you need a reverse casual piece of ev that an increase in relations over keystone resolves arctic conflict

Burney and Hampson ‘12, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The United States’ mistreatment of Canada extends beyond economic issues. Washington has also failed to trust and respect its loyal ally. To name one small but telling example, when Canada ran for a nonpermanent seat on the UN Security Council in 2010, the United States offered little support. For whatever reason, Portugal was a more compelling choice.¶ One would also think the United States and Canada could find common ground on security, economic, and environmental issues in the Arctic, an area of shared sovereignty and responsibility. Yet there has been little more than senseless bickering and public spats between Ottawa and Washington on who should attend what meeting of Arctic states. U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, for example, went out of her way to rake Canada over the coals for hosting a meeting of Arctic coastal nations in March 2010 and failing to invite other countries with “legitimate interests” in the region. But she was also taking a jab at Canada’s long-standing claims to the waters of the Arctic archipelago, including the Northwest Passage, which the United States rejects. While Canada and the United States squabble, Russia and China are aggressively asserting their own interests in the region.

#### Second, Construction of Keystone spurs US-Canadian co-op over Arctic

The Diplomat ‘12, Canada’s Leading Foreign Affairs Analysts, “China’s Stake in Canada’s Oil Sands A National Security Threat,” June, 28, 2012.

(http://diplomatonline.com/mag/2012/06/the-big-six-goals-canadas-priorities-in-the-u-s/. JMC.) Accessed 7/13/12.

Canada and the United States have the closest energy relationship in the world, with Canada the leading supplier of all forms of energy to the United States.¶The electricity grid in Canada and the U.S. is completely integrated. Canada supplies a significant portion of the electricity to the U.S. Northeast, Upper Midwest and Pacific Coast. With renewable hydroelectricity counting for more than 60 percent of Canadian production, clean Canadian electricity is a key element in ensuring energy security and addressing climate change.¶There have also been significant increases in Canadian oil sands production over the last 20 years, which has found its way to U.S. markets beyond the traditional upper Midwest, helping to displace offshore imports. With continued expansion of Canadian production, as well as U.S. production in Montana and North Dakota, new pipelines, such as Keystone XL, are needed to reach refineries on the U.S. Gulf Coast. While disappointed in the decision to delay construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, we are confident the new route proposed in Nebraska will allow for its approval in due course.¶Americans readily understand the economic and energy security benefits that result from expanded oil sands production and transportation — not least because more than 1,000 U.S. companies directly supply oil-sands producers. This is why every poll indicates that a substantial majority of Americans favor building the Keystone XL pipeline. A recent Pew Research Centre report put support at 66 percent.¶There are environmental concerns about oil-sands production that remain and need to be addressed. However, many claims about the oil sands are “frozen facts,” which are at least 10 years old and fail to take into account recent improvements in environmental performance. In fact, when evaluated on a full life-cycle basis, emissions from Canadian oil sands products compare favorably to other forms of heavy crudes consumed in the United States, and are even less GHG-emitting than some, such as California Heavy Crude.¶That said, there is more that must be done, which is why Canada and the U.S. are working together to reach our common target of reducing GHG emissions to 17 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. We are coordinating through the Clean Energy Dialogue, and Canada and the U.S. have both made substantial improvements through aligning our light- and heavy-duty vehicle emissions standards. This is particularly important for Canada, where transportation is the leading cause of emissions. Canada and the U.S. share “common cause” on a wide spectrum of critical foreign policy issues, including in the Middle East, Afghanistan, the Arctic and the Americas, at multilateral institutions such as the UN, NATO, the G8 and the G20 and on important themes such as non-proliferation and disarmament, human rights and democratic development. Approaches and nuances between our two countries differ from time to time. It is in our mutual interest, however, to work together in advancing our common agenda, whether bilaterally, in small groups of like-minded countries, or through organizations such as NATO and the UN.¶ This need to work closely together has been evident over the past tumultuous year in the Middle East and North Africa. Canada has worked closely with our partners, providing both military assets and the leadership of Lieutenant-General Joseph Jacques Charles Bouchard to an unprecedented coalition charged with protecting civilians in Libya. The situation in Syria has proven more challenging. Despite the best efforts of many, the international community has failed to respond with the same unanimity of purpose. Despite these challenges, Canada has worked actively with the U.S. and others to implement sanctions and isolate the Syrian regime, demanding with one voice that the Assad regime must end. Canada and the U.S. also share a common concern with Iran’s nuclear program and its persistent violations of human rights, and have worked closely with our partners to put in place a tough sanctions regime.¶Closer to home, the Arctic is an important part of Canada’s foreign policy, and strategically engaging partners such as the U.S. is an important part of our approach. Our work with the U.S. includes issues related to the Beaufort Sea, the continental shelf, a mandatory code for polar navigation, arctic science and Aboriginal issues. Canada will chair the Arctic Council starting in 2013, followed by the U.S. in 2015, which may be a further opportunity to pursue issues of a common agenda.¶ While Canada and the U.S. play different roles on the world stage, the shared values that guide our approach to international affairs, most notably those of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law, ensure that we will continue to work together in the pursuit of our common goals on a wide range of issues.

#### Second, Arctic conflict amounts to a nuclear war between the US and Russia

Buckley ‘08, Adele, Vice President Technology and Research at the Ontario Centre for Environmental Technology Advancement, 2008.

([http://www.gsinstitute.org/ pnnd/events/Pugwash2008/pres\_ Buckley.pdf](http://www.gsinstitute.org/pnnd/events/Pugwash2008/pres_Buckley.pdf). JFS.) Accessed 7/11/12.

The polar ice that envelops the high Arctic is melting at a rate even faster than anticipated by climate change scientists. Providing an equitable regime to govern the results of these unprecedented challenges will require a high degree of global cooperation. With the opening of Arctic waters, and then opening of shipping lanes, comes the potential for economic gains in international trade and the search for seabed oil and gas and other resources. There is guaranteed territorial jurisdiction within the 200-nautical-mile limit, but elsewhere nations are taking measures to assure national access, rights and, in some cases, sovereignty over portions of the seabed. Security strategy will dictate the deployment of an increased military capability. Territorial claims and counter claims will be a source of tension that could degenerate into open conflict. Naval operations of both Russia and the United States will increase when there are open waters, creating a potential for military confrontation, especially because both have nuclear-armed submarines. The Arctic regions are host to the two major nuclear powers, and nowhere else are they in such close proximity to each other. There exists a potential for additional nuclearization, for both sea and land. Prudence suggests that nuclearization must diminish and sooner, rather than later; there must be no role for nuclear weapons in the Arctic (as it is now in the Antarctic). Nuclear weapons overtly stationed in the region present a multi-faceted danger to the Arctic lands and peoples, and, before it is too late, preventive measures must be taken. So while this issue may, at first, seem peripheral to adaptation to the new Arctic climate, it is actually central to the Arctic security environment.

#### Third, Only scenario for extinction

Bostrom ‘02, Nick, Oxford Philosophy Faculty, Published in the Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, “Existential Risks,” 2002.

([http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html. JFS](http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html.%20JFS).) Accessed 7/11/12.

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that *might* have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4]  Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.

#### Scenario 3 is China,

#### First, Canada isn’t waiting for the US --- will shift to China.

Madhani ’12, Aamer, National correspondent at Chicago Tribune, “Canada seeks alternative route for Keystone XL pipeline”, Jan. 9th, 2012.

(<http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/01/obama-canada-alternative-route-keystone-xl/1#.T-MBgbWcATZ>.)

While President Obama wants to delay a decision on the controversial Keystone XL pipeline until after the 2012 election, Canada's Prime Minister Stephen Harper is stepping up efforts to explore an alternative pipeline that would allow Canada to ship their tar sands oil to China. On Tuesday, an independent federal panel in Canada will begin its review of a proposed western pipeline that would carry the oil from Alberta to the coast of British Columbia. From British Columbia, the oil would be shipped on tankers to oil-hungry China. "I think it's essential, based on what's occurred with Keystone XL, that this country does diversify its energy-export markets," Harper said in a radio interview on Thursday, the Wall Street Journal reports.

#### Second, China-Canada oil connection causes spills and leaks – Kills biological diversity

Thinkprogress.org ‘12, Edited by Joe Romm, we cover climate science, solutions and politics. Columnist Tom Friedman calls us "the indispensable blog" and Time magazine named us one of the 25 "Best Blogs of 2010.", “Pipeline or Pipe Dream? A China-Bound Alterntaive to Keystone XL is No Easy Feat,” Mar 23, 2012.

(<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/23/450615/pipeline-or-pipe-dream-a-china-bound-alternative-to-keystone-xl-is-no-easy-feat/?mobile=nc>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

But on inspection the China-bound [alternative](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/theoval/post/2012/01/obama-canada-alternative-route-keystone-xl/1%22%20%5Cl%20%22.T2jKPUobdO9) to the Keystone XL—the Enbridge “Northern Gateway” pipeline—faces hurdles as big if not bigger than Keystone XL. Some groups in Canada call the fight over its approval the “[defining environmental battle](http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/politics/article/1112329--titanic-clash-looms-over-proposed-northern-gateway-pipeline)” of modern times, potentially determining which limits will be placed on the Canadian federal government’s energy and environment policies. The pipeline is now in the midst of a Canadian federal environmental assessment that will go at least to late 2013. This is later than the original approval process the U.S. State Department would have taken before Congress forced the Obama administration’s hand to reject the Keystone XL last January.¶ Here’s a look at the rough road ahead for the project.¶ Crossing the Rockies¶ First, there are some pretty big physical hurdles. As big as mountains, you could say. The pipeline would need to cross the Rockies west from Alberta to British Columbia going 1,172 kilometers up and down steep rock faces to ports where it will hook up to ocean-going oil tankers on the coast. This rugged terrain makes a rupture even more likely than in Keystone XL’s pipeline, which would have traversed a relatively flat terrain. A spill would put British Columbia’s Great Bear Rainforest, an ecological gem, as well as healthy wild salmon rivers and a diverse ocean ecosystem at risk.¶ From there the tar sands oil would be loaded onto supertankers, each one carrying eight times the volume of the entire Exxon Valdez oil spill. The tankers would need to navigate through treacherous waters like the Hecate Straight and Queen Charlotte Sound, part of which is considered the fourth-most dangerous body of water in the world, a region prone to hurricane-force winds and waves several stories high.¶ Putting coastal jobs at risk with little in return¶ But nature isn’t the only thing a spill would jeopardize, and this brings us to the second big hurdle facing the project: money. According to the [British Columbia government](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/03/keystone_china_alternative.html/%22http:/www.env.gov.bc.ca/omfd/reports/BCs-Ocean) the seafood industry and ocean-based tourism together create 45,000 jobs. Those 45,000 jobs depend on a clean and healthy ocean ecosystem. An oil spill could ruin this coastal economy as the Gulf states affected by BP’s Deepwater Horizon disaster know only too well.¶ And what is Enbridge offering in return? Apparently [217 long-term jobs](http://www.northerngateway.ca/economic-opportunity/benefits-for-canadians/) for northern British Columbia—104 operating the pipeline and 113 in associated marine services. That means 200 jobs would be at risk in the region for every one job created by the project according to Enbridge’s own numbers.¶ Further, Enbridge estimates only [1,150 long-term jobs](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/03/keystone_china_alternative.html/%22http:/www.norther) “throughout the Canadian economy” as a result of the project. Given those figures we can imagine the fight for approval through British Columbia to be an even [heavier lift](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/03/keystone_china_alternative.html/%22ht) than we saw in the United States where fewer jobs were at risk against a larger number of jobs that could have been created by Keystone XL.

#### Third, Extinction --- precautionary principle is a side constraint

Craig ‘03, Robin, Associate Professor of Law at the Indiana University School of Law, 2003.

#### Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs’ value for food production. Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. More generally, “ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cyclingof all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements.” In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet’s ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem’s ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, “indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable.” Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be “the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit.” At the forefrontof such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea- and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but wenow know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, “starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen’s nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly.” More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique. The Black Sea is a microcosm of what is happening to the ocean systems at large. The stresses piled up: overfishing, oil spills, industrial discharges, nutrient pollution, wetlands destruction, the introduction of an alien species. The sea weakened, slowly at first, then collapsed with shocking suddenness. The lessons of this tragedy should not be lost to the rest of us, because much of what happened here is being repeated all over the world. The ecological stresses imposed on the Black Sea were not unique to communism. Nor, sadly, was the failure of governments to respond to the emerging crisis. Oxygen-starved “dead zones” appear with increasing frequency off the coasts of major cities and major rivers, forcing marine animals to flee and killing all that cannot. Ethics as well as enlightened self-interest thus suggest that the United States should protectfully-functioning marine ecosystems wherever possible- even if a few fishers go out of business as a result.

#### Scenario 4 is Soft Power

#### First, Chinese-Canadian oil investments increase China soft power through economic and political influence

Reichel,Justina, Syndicated Columnist for The Epoch, “China’s Stake in Canada’s Oil Sands A National Security Threat,” May,28, 2012.

(http://www.theepochtimes.com/n2/world/chinas-stake-in-canada-s-oil-sands-a-national-security-threat-says-may-241336.html. JMC.) Accessed 7/13/12.

As foreign ownership of the Alberta oil sands increases, the leader of the federal Green Party warns that China’s large—and rapidly growing—stake in Alberta oil is putting Canadian national security at risk.¶ In a period of 18 months between 2009 and 2011, Chinese state-owned companies invested $15 billion in the oil sands, according to a study sponsored by the Canadian Council of Chief Executives (CCCE).¶ Green leader Elizabeth May says this is cause for alarm because these companies are owned by the Chinese Communist Party, and the more Beijing controls Canada’s natural resources, the more influence it can exert on federal policies.¶ “There’s really no separation between the Chinese Communist government and their capitalist enterprises—they’re the same thing. In that light there are concerns with national security,” she said in an interview.¶ “This is the kind of concern that should be reviewed in advance of Chinese investments.”¶ In recent years Chinese companies have been aggressively investing in Canada’s natural resources, especially the oil patch.¶ Since 2010, notable investments include a $1.25 billion share of Penn West Petroleum by the China Investment Corporation, and the purchasing by Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation of Opti Canada for $2.34 billion.¶ Sinopec recently took over Daylight Energy Ltd. for $2.2-billion, and Petro-China became the owner and manager of the MacKay River oil sands project to the tune of $1.9 billion.¶ In the largest deal to date, state-owned Sinopec Corp. purchased a $4.65-billion piece of Syncrude in 2010, secur(ed)ing a 9 percent stake in the company.¶ Sinopec, which is also a partner in Enbridge’s Northern Gateway Project, has a long history of major scandals involving allegations of corruption, human rights violations, and environmental pollution. It is also known to enthusiastically engage in business with oppressive regimes around the world.¶ May said the 9 percent share is enough for Sinopecto get a seat on theSyncrudeboard, which gives them veto power and an ability to indirectly represent the interests of the Chinese regime.¶ “It gives the Chinese government quite a significant level of control over decisions that should be made by Canadians and the Canadian national interest,” she said.

#### Second, China using its soft power to isolate Taiwan, risking armed confrontation with the US

CRS ‘08, Objective Organization Providing Research to Government Officials, “China’s Foreign Policy and ‘Soft Power’ In South America, Asia, and Africa,” 2008.

(<http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2008_rpt/crs-china.pdf>.)

In addition to economic and resource-related imperatives, China’s outreach into Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and the Pacific incorporates the political dynamic of trying to separate Taiwan from its remaining diplomatic relationships. China claims that Taiwan is part of its sovereign territory, and for decades has tried to make acknowledgment of this ‘‘one China’’ policy a condition for receiving Chinese investment and assistance. All but one of Taiwan’s remaining 23 official relationships are in the three regions that are the focus of this memo. With China’s dynamic economic growth in recent decades, it effectively has been able to ‘‘outbid’’ Taiwan in courting a number of these governments. Taiwan lost four of its diplomatic relationships to this competition in the last three years, including the loss of official relations with Malawi on January 14, 2008. The Taiwan factor is not uniformly significant in China’s relationships with the regions under discussion. While the Taiwan issue is important in China’s African relationships, it is not important in China’s relations with Central Asian countries, where Taiwan has no official diplomatic relations. It is a negligible factor in China’s relationships with Southeast Asian countries, where Taiwan has significant economic interests but again no diplomatic ties. And Taiwan is a very important factor—even perhaps the only one—in China’s courtship of the 6 tiny Pacific Island nations that still have official relations with Taiwan. But Taiwan-PRC competition looms large in China’s relationships in Latin America and the Caribbean. Not only is this where Taiwan maintains most of its remaining official diplomatic ties, but the region’s proximity to the U.S. mainland allows Taiwan’s president and senior leaders to ask for controversial but symbolically meaningful transit stops in the United States when making official visits to these western hemisphere countries. A significant reduction, or even the disappearance, of Taiwan’s Latin America and Caribbean relationships greatly could impair this convenient Taiwan-U.S. connection. On an entirely different level, Taiwan also is a potentially important factor in China’s activities with U.S. allies in Asia—Japan and Australia, especially, but also Korea and the Philippines. While all of these countries recognize the PRC and not Taiwan, as U.S. allies they potentially could become a factor in any U.S.-China conflict over Taiwan. In 2005, for instance, the United States and Japan declared for the first time that Taiwan is a mutual security concern, implying a new Japanese willingness to confront China over Taiwan. It is in China’s interests, then, to use its diplomatic and economic activities to exert quiet pressure on these U.S. allies to stay out of any possible conflict over Taiwan. Maneuvering against Taiwan—and ultimately ‘‘recovering’’ it—provides one of the key contradictions in China’s foreign policy objectives as it is an issue that appears to be able to trump other key policy goals. Chinese officials have said, for instance, that they will ‘‘pay any price’’ to prevent Taiwan independence, although this would jeopardize the otherwise key imperative of assuring strong economic growth, not to mention risking armed confrontation with the United States.12

#### Third, Extinction

Strait Times ‘2K, “Regional Fallout: No One Gains in War Over Taiwan,” 2000.

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -- horror of horrors -- raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -- truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

### 1AC—Venezuela Terrorism

Contention 3 is Venezuela Terrorism

#### Venezuela and Iran are planning a cyber attack against the US

Waterman ‘11, Shaun, Award-winning reporter for the Washington Times, covering foreign affairs, defense and cybersecurity, “U.S. Authorities Probign Alleged Cyberattack Plot by Venezuela, Iran,” December 13, 2011.

(<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/dec/13/us-probing-alleged-cyberattack-plot-iran-venezuela/>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

U.S. officials are investigating reports that Iranian and Venezuelan diplomats in Mexico were involved in planned cyberattacks against U.S. targets, including nuclear power plants.¶ Allegations about the cyberplot were aired last week in a documentary on the Spanish-language TV network Univision, which included secretly recorded footage of Iranian and Venezuelan diplomats being briefed on the planned attacks and promising to pass information to their governments.¶ A former computer instructor at the National Autonomous University of Mexico told Univision that he was recruited by a professor there in 2006 to organize a group of student hackers to carry out cyberattacks against the United States, initially at the behest of the Cuban Embassy.¶ In an undercover sting, instructor Juan Carlos Munoz Ledo and several selected students infiltrated the hackers and secretly videotaped the Iranian and Venezuelan diplomats.¶ Reports about Iran's involvement in the suspected plot come amid the Islamic republic's refusal to return a sophisticated, unmanned U.S. spy plane that crashed inside its borders this month. Iranian officials have laid claim to the drone, vowing to research it for its technology.¶ Calling the reports "disturbing," State Department spokesman William Ostick said federal authorities are examining the cyberplot allegations but added that U.S. officials "don't have any information at this point to corroborate them."¶ Sen. Robert Menendez, New Jersey Democrat and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, called for hearings in the new year about Iranian activities in Latin America.¶ Some House lawmakers called for the expulsion of a Venezuelan diplomat in the U.S. who is implicated in the suspected plot.¶ The Univision documentary fanned fears among lawmakers that Iran's recent diplomatic outreach in the region, particularly to Venezuela's anti-American leftist President Hugo Chavez, might be a front for nefarious activities.¶ Earlier this year, U.S. prosecutors charged an Iranian official based in Tehran with trying to recruit a Mexican drug cartel to kill the Saudi ambassador to the United States by bombing a Washington restaurant.¶ "If Iran is using regional actors to facilitate and direct activities against the United States, this would represent a substantial increase in the level of the Iranian threat and would necessitate an immediate response," Mr. Menendez said.

#### Only recently is the attack possible – This means high probability

Rep. Meehan ‘12, R-PA, “Iranian Cyber Threat Cannot be Underestimated,” April 26th, 2012.

(<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/223901-iranian-cyber-threat-cannot-be-underestimated-meehan>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

As the world’s largest state sponsor of terrorism, Iran has successfully attacked U.S. interests for three decades, most notably in Beirut in 1983 and at Khobar Towers in 1996, when it killed a combined 260 of our servicemen. It seems willing to do anything to accomplish its goal of securing a nuclear weapon. Last fall, it was revealed that the Iranian government had sponsored a terrorist attack to assassinate the Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States in Washington, D.C. This brazen attack, and the growing, unconventional and enterprising Iranian threat, should surprise no one. Today, we face the latest threat from an emboldened Iran: a cyber attack. While most grasp the cyber threat posed by China and Russia, few are aware that Iran has increased its cyber capabilities, as evidenced by a recent $1 billion investment in new technology.¶ Our nation’s senior intelligence officials and technology executives have acknowledged the cyber threat posed by Iran. According to the director of National Intelligence, Gen. James Clapper, “Iran’s intelligence operations against the United States, including cyber capabilities, have dramatically increased in recent years in depth and complexity.” Speaking about the general cyber threat, FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III forewarned, “…the cyber threat…will be the number one threat to country.” There is every reason to suspect an Iranian cyber attack on the United States could expand from our security and intelligence infrastructure to the personal and financial security of American citizens. In fact, Google Executive Chairman Eric Schmidt recently cautioned, the “Iranians are unusually talented in cyber warfare for reasons we don’t fully understand.” If Iran is willing to blow up a Washington restaurant and kill innocent Americans, we would be naïve to think Iran would never conduct a cyber attack against the U.S. Homeland. As tensions continue to rise with the West over Iran’s illicit nuclear program, the risk of an Iranian miscalculation also increases. In the event of a U.S. or Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear facilities, former Director of the National Counterterrorism Center Michael Leiter assessed that a cyber attack conducted by Tehran against the U.S. would be “reasonably likely.” Knowing that it cannot compete with the United States military conventionally, Iran has spent the last three decades mastering the use of asymmetric warfare. As technology has advanced, Iran has also taken advantage and placed cyber capabilities into its asymmetric warfare arsenal. This isn’t an academic question. Recently, Iran has tested its cyber attack capabilities on Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and a major Israeli financial institution. It is expanding its cyber reach in a very public way. The Iranians feel they “owe us one” because of perceived U.S. involvement in the Stuxnet attack against nuclear facilities throughout Iran.

#### US imports from Canada trade off with Venezuela, crippling the Venezuelian economy. Defunding Chavez destabilizes terrorism and Iran’s ability to launch attacks from the region

O’grady ‘12, Mary, The Wall Street Journal, “Keystone XL and National Security,” February 17, 2012.

(<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204792404577229533441470866.html>. JMC.)

Numerous sources in Venezuela say Mr. Lugar has this problem backward. His logic, which has dominated thinking in Washington since Chávez first came to power, is that Chávez has an "oil weapon" that he can use against the U.S. by cutting off supplies. But the Venezuelan strongman needs the U.S. more than it needs him. He is heavily dependent on the greenbacks he receives for his oil, and the authoritarian populist is unlikely to walk away from them in an election year in Venezuela.¶ That doesn't mean Venezuela is not a threat. As Mr. Lugar rightly points out, Iran has shown that it is eager to practice terrorism in the West if given the chance, and Venezuela provides a trampoline to plan and launch attacks from nearby.¶ With this in mind, the U.S. should be seeking to defund the Chávez machine, and there is no better way to do that than with approval of the Keystone XL. The Alberta crude that will travel through the XL is of a similar quality to Venezuelan oil, and the U.S. could begin buying from Canada instead of from Venezuela if a pipeline were put in place.¶ There is one thing that Mr. Lugar and Venezuelans who don't believe that Chávez has an oil weapon agree on, and that is the Venezuelan dictator's vulnerability. "Divisions in Venezuela's Russian-armed military, an inflation rate over 30 percent, a dilapidated oil infrastructure, widespread food and energy shortages, and soaring crime rates are all putting heavy pressure on [him]," the senator writes. Losing a customer like the U.S. might just push him over and with him, Iran's strongest base of support in the hemisphere.

This solves cyber terror

Cárdenas ’12, José R., served in several foreign policy positions during the George W. Bush administration (2004-2009), including on the National Security Council staff, consultant with Vision Americas; “Game Changer in U.S.-Venezuela Relations”, What’s Next Venezuela?, 2/7/12, (<https://www.whatsnextvenezuela.com/tag/cyber-attacks/>, TDS.) Accessed 7/13/12.

Indeed, Chávez’s deep-seated economic, military, and intelligence relationship with Iran, running into the tens of billions of dollars, provides an enormous cover for covert operations and other destabilizing activities. That relationship runs from establishing Venezuela’s Margarita Island as a center for Iranian and Hezbollah operations in the Americas and facilitating Iran’s development of a nuclear capability by helping it obtain uranium, to bluntingsanctions by providing Iran’s access to Venezuela’s banking system and jointly trafficking in weapons (here and here) and narcotics. The DEA believes a weekly flight between Iran and Caracas is used for, among other nefarious purposes, smuggling South American cocaine to the Middle East.¶ Moreover, we know already that a member of the terrorist network plotting to detonate fuel tanks at JFK International Airport in New York in 2007 was arrested on the run to Venezuela, where he planned to board a Venezuelan flight to Tehran.¶ Lastly, the explosive documentary aired last month on Univisión, “The Iranian Threat,” included not only incriminating information on Venezuelan and Iranian diplomats discussing cyberattacks on sensitive U.S. computer systems (The State Department subsequently expelled the Venezuelan diplomat from the United States, where she had been re-posted), but also compelling evidence on how young Latinos are targeted for recruitment and paramilitary training in Iranian and Venezuelan camps visited by Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Colombian FARC.

#### Cyberwarfare causes global, nuclear war

Fritz ‘09, Jason, Researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, Former Army Officer and Consultant, Master of Internation Relations at Bond University, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control,” 2009.

(<http://icnnd.org/Documents/Jason_Fritz_Hacking_NC2.pdf>.) Accessed 7/11/12.

This paper will analyse the threat of cyber terrorism in regard to nuclear weapons. Specifically, this research will use open source knowledge to identify the structure of nuclear command and control centres, how those structures might be compromised through computer network operations, and how doing so would fit within established cyber terrorists’ capabilities, strategies, and tactics. If access to command and control centres is obtained, terrorists could fake or actually cause one nuclear-armed state to attack another, thus provoking a nuclear response from another nuclear power. This may be an easier alternative for terrorist groups than building or acquiring a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb themselves. This would also act as a force equaliser, and provide terrorists with the asymmetric benefits of high speed, removal of geographical distance, and a relatively low cost. Continuing difficulties in developing computer tracking technologies which could trace the identity of intruders, and difficulties in establishing an internationally agreed upon legal framework to guide responses to computer network operations, point towards an inherent weakness in using computer networks to manage nuclear weaponry. This is particularly relevant to reducing the hair trigger posture of existing nuclear arsenals. All computers which are connected to the internet are susceptible to infiltration and remote control. Computers which operate on a closed network may also be compromised by various hacker methods, such as privilege escalation, roaming notebooks, wireless access points, embedded exploits in software and hardware, and maintenance entry points. For example, e-mail spoofing targeted at individuals who have access to a closed network, could lead to the installation of a virus on an open network. This virus could then be carelessly transported on removable data storage between the open and closed network. Information found on the internet may also reveal how to access these closed networks directly. Efforts by militaries to place increasing reliance on computer networks, including experimental technology such as autonomous systems, and their desire to have multiple launch options, such as nuclear triad capability, enables multiple entry points for terrorists. For example, if a terrestrial command centre is impenetrable, perhaps isolating one nuclear armed submarine would prove an easier task. There is evidence to suggest multiple attempts have been made by hackers to compromise the extremely low radio frequency once used by the US Navy to send nuclear launch approval to submerged submarines. Additionally, the alleged Soviet system known as Perimetr was designed to automatically launch nuclear weapons if it was unable to establish communications with Soviet leadership. This was intended as a retaliatory response in the event that nuclear weapons had decapitated Soviet leadership; however it did not account for the possibility of cyber terrorists blocking communications through computer network operations in an attempt to engage the system. Should a warhead be launched, damage could be further enhanced through additional computer network operations. By using proxies, multi-layered attacks could be engineered. Terrorists could remotely commandeer computers in China and use them to launch a US nuclear attack against Russia.Thus Russia would believe it was under attack from the US and the US would believe China was responsible. Further, emergency response communications could be disrupted, transportation could be shut down, and disinformation, such as misdirection, could be planted, thereby hindering the disaster relief effort and maximizing destruction. Disruptions in communication and the use of disinformation could also be used to provoke uninformed responses. For example, a nuclear strike between India and Pakistan could be coordinated with Distributed Denial of Service attacks against key networks, so they would have further difficulty in identifying what happened and be forced to respond quickly. Terrorists could also knock out communications between these states so they cannot discuss the situation. Alternatively, amidst the confusion of a traditional large-scale terrorist attack, claims of responsibility and declarations of war could be falsified in an attempt to instigate a hasty military response. These false claims could be posted directly on Presidential, military, and government websites. E-mails could also be sent to the media and foreign governments using the IP addresses and e-mail accounts of government officials. A sophisticated and all encompassing combination of traditional terrorism and cyber terrorism could be enough to launch nuclear weapons on its own, without the need for compromising command and control centres directly.

#### Independently, instability causes extinction

Manwaring ’05, Marx G., Retired U.S. Army Colonel and an Adjunct Professor of International Politics at Dickinson College, Venezuela’s Huge Chávez, Bolivarian Socialism, and Asymmetric Warfare, 2005.

The Issue of State Failure. - President Chávez also understands that the process leading to state failure is the most dangerous long-term security challenge facing the global community today. The argument in general is that failing and failed state status is the breeding ground for instability, criminality, insurgency, regional conflict, and terrorism. These conditions breed massive humanitarian disasters and major refugee flows. They can host “evil” networks of all kinds, whether they involve criminal business enterprise, narco-trafficking, or some form of ideological crusade such as Bolivarianismo. More specifically, these conditions spawn all kinds of things people in general do not like such as murder, kidnapping, corruption, intimidation, and destruction of infrastructure. These means of coercion and persuasion can spawn further human rights violations, torture, poverty, starvation, disease, the recruitment and use of child soldiers, trafficking in women and body parts, trafficking and proliferation of conventional weapons systems and WMD, genocide, ethnic cleansing, warlordism, and criminal anarchy. At the same time, these actions are usually unconfined and spill over into regional syndromes of poverty, destabilization, and conflict.62 Peru’s SenderoLuminoso calls violent and destructive activities that facilitate the processes of state failure “armed propaganda.” Drug cartels operating throughout the Andean Ridge of South America and elsewhere call these activities “business incentives.” Chávez considers these actions to be steps that must be taken to bring about the political conditions necessary to establish Latin American socialism for the 21st century.63 Thus, in addition to helping to provide wider latitude to further their tactical and operational objectives, state and nonstate actors’ strategic efforts are aimed at progressively lessening a targeted regime’s credibility and capability in terms of its ability and willingness to govern and develop its national territory and society. Chávez’s intent is to focus his primary attack politically and psychologically on selected Latin American governments’ ability and right to govern. In that context, he understands that popular perceptions of corruption, disenfranchisement, poverty, and lack of upward mobility limit the right and the ability of a given regime to conduct the business of the state. Until a given populace generally perceives that its government is dealing with these and other basic issues of political, economic, and social injustice fairly and effectively, instability and the threat of subverting or destroying such a government are real.64 But failing and failed states simply do not go away. Virtually anyone can take advantage of such an unstable situation. The tendency is that the best motivated and best armed organization on the scene will control that instability. As a consequence, failing and failed states become dysfunctional states, rogue states, criminal states, narco-states, or new people’s democracies. In connection with the creation of new people’s democracies, one can rest assured that Chávez and his Bolivarian populist allies will be available to provide money, arms, and leadership at any given opportunity. And, of course, the longer dysfunctional, rogue, criminal, and narco-states and people’s democracies persist, the more they and their associated problems endanger global security, peace, and prosperity.65

#### Terrorism guarantees Nuclear war

**Ayson 10** (Robert, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand – Victoria University of Wellington, “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects”, Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, 33(7), July)

*A Catalytic Response: Dragging in the Major Nuclear Powers*

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today's and tomorrow's terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks,[40](http://www.informaworld.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/smpp/section?content=a923238837&fulltext=713240928#EN0040) and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”[41](http://www.informaworld.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/smpp/section?content=a923238837&fulltext=713240928#EN0041) Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington's relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington's early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country's armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents' … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”[42](http://www.informaworld.com.proxy-remote.galib.uga.edu/smpp/section?content=a923238837&fulltext=713240928#EN0042) American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia's use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia's traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.

## \*\*\*2AC—Inherency

## \*\*\*2AC—Canada Relations

## Inherency

#### 1. Obama’s Keystone decision kills US-Canada Relations

Radia, Andy, Political Columnist for Yahoo News Canada, “Keystone Decision Bad News Canada-US Relations,” Jan. 19th, 2012.

(<http://ca.news.yahoo.com/blogs/canada-politics/keystone-decision-bad-news-canada-u-relations-140707856.html>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12

Call it sour grapes if you will, but many American supporters of the Keystone XL pipeline are proclaiming that the rejection of the controversial project is bad news for Canada-U.S. relations.¶ On Wednesday, U.S. President Barack Obama [issued a statement](http://ca.news.yahoo.com/obama-set-reject-keystone-oil-pipeline-sources-165859308.html) which said that TransCanada's application for the 2,740-km pipeline was denied because the State Department did not have enough time to complete the review process.¶ At a [press conference](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=re2RJHCi098&feature=player_embedded#%21) following the announcement, Republican leadership hopeful Newt Gingrich said Obama was pushing Canada into the "hands of China."¶ "If I would have said to you three or four years ago that it was inconceivable that an American president would drive Canada into a partnership with China. But that's what's going to happen," Gingrich said.¶ "Prime Minister Harper is a Conservative. He's pro-American. It's much less expensive and makes much more sense to bring the pipeline straight down so you don't cross any mountains. But he's faced with a president who is not going to allow Canada to get its oil out to the United States, he's going to cut a deal with the Chinese for them to finance a pipeline across the Canadian Rockies to Vancouver and they're going to ship it straight to China.¶ "What Obama will have done is killed jobs, weakened American energy security, and driven Canada into the hands of China out of just sheer utter stupidity."¶ David Pumphrey of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington told [Businessweek.com](http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-01-18/canada-pledges-to-sell-oil-to-asia-after-obama-keystone-denial.html) that the administration's decision may hurt relations between the two countries.¶ "It certainly introduces new uncertainties into the economic relationship," he said.¶ " This is a cornerstone of economic development for the country."¶ And, Jack Gerard, the CEO of the American Petroleum Institute, said the move is proof that the United States is not interested in furthering its commercial relationship with Canada.¶ "The prime minister of Canada is losing confidence in the decision-making process on the part of the president of the United States," he said in a press conference according to [iPolitics](http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/01/18/keystone-decision-proof-obama-cool-on-canadian-relations-u-s-oil-ceo/).¶ "As of yesterday, the prime minister in a public statement, said that he's discouraged by the United States holding Canada hostage."

#### 2. Keystone XL decision brought relations to there lowest point in 25 years

Mintz, Jack, Palmer Chair of Public Policy, School of Public Policy, University of Calgary, “Jack Mintz: Canada Downgraded, Relations with the U.S. at Lowest Point in 25 Years,” Jan 25, 2012.

(<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2012/01/25/jack-mintz-canada-downgraded-relations-with-the-u-s-at-lowest-point-in-25-years/>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

Canada’s relationship with the United States is facing recent strains unseen since the signing of the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement 25 years ago. Unlike early episodes of Canadian angst over nationalism, this stress is due to the U.S. taking Canada, its most important and reliable ally, far too much for granted.¶ Even President Obama’s State of Union address mentioned a host of countries throughout the world with no reference to Canada, which he recently kicked in the teeth with his decision over the Keystone XL pipeline.¶ If anything, Canada needs to think hard about how to reboot its ties with the United States.¶ Historically, Canadians have understood that our most critical political and economic ties are with the world’s largest economy, with which we share a 8,891-kilometre border, the longest in the world. Trade is exceptional, with over $600-billion of bilateral trade. Family ties are strong, with many Canadians living in the United States and many Americans migrating here over the years. Security issues are shared since military and terrorist threats know no boundaries. ¶ We have signed many important agreements with the U.S., such as the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Canada-U.S. tax treaty and recently, a promising start to removing unnecessary regulatory impediments to Canadian-U.S. trade. These and other treaties have helped minimize policy confrontations but stronger treaties could have been negotiated in some cases.¶ For example, the 2010 government procurement treaty lessens the effect of obnoxious Buy American rules under 2009 U.S. Recovery Act that would have hurt Canadian businesses bidding for construction infrastructure contracts. While NAFTA provides an exemption from such actions with respect to certain federal programs, it does not apply to sub-national governments. The procurement agreement exempts us from some discriminatory trade policies of state and local governments, although only temporary relief has been given for agriculture, energy, environment and housing projects, a logic that defies explanation. Why would a “friend” not jump to a permanent exemption?¶ In the case of the Canada-U.S. softwood lumber agreement, just renewed this week for two years, Canada has had to accept an export charge on its $8.5-billion of lumber exports to avoid a tariff imposed by the United States. While U.S. complaints about provincial logging regulations are fair enough (as if there are no subsidies and tax preferences that support the U.S. forest industry), this historic dispute remains intractably unresolved after so many years.¶ But it is the Keystone XL pipeline decision that illustrates best the Obama government’s downgrading of Canadian-U.S. relations. Even though the case for the pipeline is clear-cut in terms of energy security and jobs, President Obama’s decision to reject the project was officially based on the need to reroute the pipeline through Nebraska to avoid an aquifer, an issue that could be quickly resolved. But as everyone knows, the real reason for the rejection was to placate an environmental lobby that wants to trap Canadian oil sands production in Alberta. If the shoe were on the other foot, the U.S. would have applied considerable pressure on Canada to approve a Keystone XL pipeline. The whole mismanaged process was an insult to Canada, which is supposed to be a close ally. This is further illustrated by Tuesday’s Wall Street Journal article co-written by John Podesta, former chief of staff for Bill Clinton and chairman of the Democrat-leaning think-tank Center for American Progress. He criticizes Republicans for supporting a “pipeline that imports more foreign oil,” thereby grouping Canada with Iraq, Saudi Arabia and Venezuela. Has Canada fallen that far down the totem pole?¶ So what should Canada seek now that U.S. is treating us so shabbily? As with squabbling members of a family, it does little for the small brother to retaliate with actions that only hurt him. In the past, some experts have raised the idea of a “grand bargain” with the Americans to deepen the relationship. But the current protectionist climate doesn’t lend itself to big ideas.

## Hegemony Scenario

### F-35s Hege. Extensions

#### ( ) F-35s solve hegemony—aid allies and keep U.S. aerospace abilities and economy ahead

Buffenbarger, Thomas, President of the International Association of Machinists, “Fund the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter for America’s War Fighters and Workers,” 2011.

( http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-buffenbarger/fund-the-f35-joint-strike\_b\_899847.html, HK) Accessed 7/24/11.

Fortunately, there's one strong step that Congress can take to show our nation's leaders are serious about protecting our national security and our economic security. By fully funding the military's newest and most advanced fighter jet, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, Congress can give our war fighters the air support they need, while generating the good-paying jobs that can jumpstart our economy. Yes, our fighter jets are still the best in the world. But the fleet is aging, and its technologies are being superseded by recent discoveries and developments. By utilizing these next-generation technologies and incorporating economies of scale and commonality, the F-35 program will allow three variants of one advanced plane to serve multiple roles and replace several aging aircraft. With its versatility and cost-effectiveness as well as its impressive roster of prospective customers among our Armed Services and our closest allies, the F-35 makes sense in an era when federal spending is closely scrutinized. The Joint Strike Fighter will serve the US Air Force, Navy and Marines, and eight allied partner countries - the United Kingdom, Canada, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands, Denmark, Australia and Turkey - have already committed substantial investments in the program. Developing any advanced technology isn't easy or error-free. But, at every step along the way, the F-35 program has overcome the obstacles, addressed the challenges, and perfected the product. In fact, the program executive officer for the Jet Strike Fighter, US Navy Admiral David Venter, a former test pilot himself, recently reported that "flight tests are revealing that the F-35 Lightning II will likely hit several performance goals that were once in doubt."

#### ( ) Investment F-35 key to stay ahead of Russian and Chinese stealth technology

Majumdar, Dave, Writer for Defense News, “Air Forces to Start Operational Testing of F-35,” 2011.

(http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2011/07/defense-air-force-to-start-opeval-test-f35-071511/, HK.) Accessed 7/24/11.

In the meantime, the Air Force has started to seriously look at the capabilities it will need in the jet that replaces the F-22 and F-35. “We’re definitely thinking about a sixth-generation fighter,” he said. “But it’s 2030-plus.” He said that the U.S. must continue to invest in new technologies. He said the Chinese and Russians are making slow progress in stealth, a tough technology to master. Neither has yet developed a good pilot vehicle interface, which is an important aspect of building fighters, but is particularly important for stealth aircraft because of the need to manage radar signatures in-flight, Carlisle said. “They’re getting better than they used to be, but they’re still a long ways behind us in pilot vehicle interfaces,” he said. Carlisle is a veteran fighter pilot who in his earlier years was part of an elite group of Air Force aggressor pilots selected to fly Russian and Chinese aircraft acquired via various means. The problem for the United States will be that though the country will continue to lead the world in military technology, other nations will able to match those capabilities far more quickly than in years past due to cyber threats and globalization. Instead of decades at a time, the U.S. edge will last for years at a time — but he reiterated that that does not mean the U.S. is falling behind. “Given the world we live in today,” Carlisle said, “My belief is that we’ll continue to continually push the technological envelope… I just think that our ability to have that technological advantage will be for a shorter period of time.”

#### ( ) Slow F-35 procurement decreases readiness - it leads to inventory gap as pilots outnumber planes

Trimble, Stephen, Flight International, “USAF Rules Out New F-15s and F-16s to Narrow ‘Fighter Gap’,” 2010.

(http://www.flightglobal.com/articles/2010/04/06/340121/usaf-rules-out-new-f-15s-and-f-16s-to-narrow-fighter.html, HK.) Accessed 7/24/11.

Delays and cost overruns for the Lockheed Martin F-35 have not changed the US Air Force's plans to deactivate about 250 fighters later this year, says its chief of staff, Gen Norton Schwartz. The USAF, however, has begun destructive tests on Boeing F-15s and Lockheed F-16s to prove the viability for a potential service life extension programme, says Schwartz. "At 10-15% of the cost [of a new fighter] you could perform a service life extension programme," Schwartz says, "which would get us close to where we need to be in, we think, a more affordable way." Schwartz rejected buying the latest "fourth-generation-plus" versions of the F-15 and F-16 despite a new two-year slip and nearly 90% projected cost overrun for the F-35. "To be sure, we do not think it prudent to utilise precious procurement dollars for anything but fifth-generation aircraft." But Schwartz added an important caveat, that the USAF still has not determined whether the service life extension programme would be technically or financially viable. The USAF has terminated Lockheed F-22 production with 186 aircraft in inventory after 2011, leaving only plans to acquire 1,763 F-35s over the next 30 years to modernise its fighter fleet. Meanwhile, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review set the tactical aircraft requirement at about 2,000 fighters. During the F-35's projected lifetime in production, however, the USAF faces a growing fighter inventory gap made even more complicated by Lockheed's cost and schedule problems. In 2009 the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported alarming trends. Twelve Air National Guard units today patrol US airspace with F-16s scheduled for retirement by 2020. As of late 2008, only one of the 12 units was scheduled to receive F-35s by 2020 to continue flying the mission. The increasing gap in the fighter inventory prompted a US lawmaker to predict the air force's dependence on the F-35 will be a "monumental mistake". "When these F-16s and F-15s are no longer able to fly and the F-35s still has problems because somebody hasn't figured it out, you're going to have air guard units that are not going to have planes," says Representative Frank LoBiondo, who represents a district that includes an F-16 base, during a 24 March hearing.

### F-35s Aerospace Add-On

#### 1. Keystone XL is inevitable, but approving now key to relations

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually — the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great — but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### 2. US Canada Relations key to F-35 Development

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

In February 2002, Canada agreed to participate in the further development of the U.S.-led multinational Joint Strike Fighter (JSF, or F-35) program, contributing $150 million over a 10year period. In December 2006, it was announced that the Canadian government had committed an additional C$500 million for the development of the aircraft. Canada has reportedly agreed to consider purchasing the new fighters to replace its own fleet of CF-18 planes when they are retired in 2017, and has earmarked nearly C$4 billion for the new planes. In June 2007, the Department of National Defense announced plans to form a new office to evaluate Canada’s future air defense requirements. Canada appeared reap rewards from its participation; as of June 2007, Canadian firms had won 150 JSF contracts worth about $160 million. In addition, Canadian defense companies stand to benefit from the Pentagon’s plans to purchase additional F-35s. In July 2010, Defense Minister MacKay confirmed that the government planned to spend C$9 billion on the acquisition of 65 F-35 aircraft. The opposition Liberals criticized the decision, arguing that it should have been reviewed by parliament first, while the New Democrats maintained that the radar-evading F-35 may be more airplane than Canada needs. In recent months, the media have also faulted the purchase, pointing to large cost overruns. During a January 2011 visit to Canada, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates urged Canada to proceed with its planned procurement of the aircraft.2

#### 3. F-35 is key to the Aerospace industry – declining orders can spiral to crush the industry

The Economist, “The Last Manned Flighter,” July, 14th, 2011.

(http://www.economist.com/node/18958487?story\_id=18958487&fsrc=rss, HK] Accessed 7/24/11.

How worried should Lockheed Martin be? The F-35 is the biggest biscuit in its barrel, by far. And it is not only Mr McCain who is seeking to knock a few chocolate chips out of it. The bipartisan fiscal responsibility and reform commission appointed by Mr Obama last year said that not all military aircraft need to be stealthy. It suggested cancelling the STOVL version of the F-35 and cutting the rest of its order by half, while buying cheaper F-16s and F-18s to keep numbers up. If America decided it could live with such a “high-low” mix, foreign customers might follow suit. The danger for Lockheed Martin is that if orders start to tumble, the F-35 could go into a death spiral. The fewer planes governments order, the more each one will cost and the less attractive the F-35 will be. This happened to the even more sophisticated and expensive F-22. By cutting its order from 750 to 183, the Pentagon helped to drive the programme cost per aircraft of the F-22 up from $149m to $342m. Lockheed Martin’s investors doubt this will happen to the F-35: the share price has been remarkably stable over the past two years. Tom Burbage, the executive who helped run the F-22 programme and who has also been in charge of the F-35’s development from the start, is still in charge—evidence that the company thinks he is doing a decent job. Mr Burbage says that a programme as big as the F-35 is bound to attract barbs. The main cause of the delays and cost over-runs, he says, is a problem with the weight of the STOVL version that came to light in 2004. It was impossible to continue work on the other two variants while this was being dealt with, he says. The plane was slimmed by 2,700lb (1,225kg), but this severely disrupted the supply chain that Lockheed Martin had put together with its main partners (BAE Systems and Northrop Grumman). That set the project back by nearly two years. On the bright side, Mr Burbage says that applying a similar diet to the other two variants yielded better planes.

#### 4. Add impact

### F-35s Key to Aerospace Industry Extensions

#### ( ) F-35s are key to the Aerospace industry – they provide huge profits – cancellations can crush the industry

Thompson, Loren, Forbes Online, Chief Operating Office of the Lexington Institute, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” 2011.

(<http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory>. HK] Accessed 7/24/11.

The F-35 has proven to be a mixed blessing for the companies that build it. If it comes to fruition as planned, it will generate hundreds of billions of dollars in revenue over six decades. But because the program is so huge, it attracts much more scrutiny than other weapons from Pentagon officials, members of Congress, investors and journalists. Every setback is a negative for Lockheed’s stock, in much the same way that delays in the 787 Dreamliner have hammered Boeing shares. And there have been setbacks — testing delays, design issues, software glitches, and all the other problems that typically arise when developing cutting-edge weapons. The problems are manageable, but each one gets magnified because so much money is on the table and so many users are counting on the plane. Pentagon officials say there’s no alternative to the F-35 if the U.S. wants to maintain its longstanding edge in air power. That edge is the main reason why no U.S. soldier has been killed by hostile aircraft since the Korean War, and no U.S. pilot has been downed by an enemy plane since the Vietnam War. However, the urgent need to replace aging air fleets before overseas adversaries catch up with U.S. capabilities has not prevented the Pentagon from slowing down and restructuring the program as development problems were detected. Whatever the merits of those adjustments may have been, they had the effect of increasing expenses in a program where cost is a crucial metric of success.

#### ( ) Cancelling F-35s will kill the industry – death spiral

Thompson, Loren, Forbes Online, Chief Operating Office of the Lexington Institute, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” 2011.

(<http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory>. HK] Accessed 7/24/11.

Cost is crucial for two reasons. First, if the price of each plane rises too far, potential users will start dropping out of the program. Fewer users means lower production rates, so economies of scale are lost — leading to further price increases. This dynamic is referred to in the aerospace industry as the budgetary “death spiral,” a process that did in the Air Force’s last new bomber and fighter before production numbers got anywhere near what the service needed. The second reason cost matters so much is that while relatively few people in Congress and the media understand cutting-edge aerospace technology, they all think they understand what a price-tag means. So when former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld started complaining in public that each of the Air Force’s F-22 fighters would cost a quarter-billion dollars, that proved to be the death knell for the program. Rumsfeld was wrong, but the astronomical price-tag became conventional wisdom and his successor killed the program.

#### ( ) F-35s key to the aerospace industry—huge profits for defense companies

Davidson, Michael, Boulder County Business Report, “F-35 Program Economics Boost for State,” July 12th, 2011.

( <http://www.bcbr.com/article.asp?id=58615>, HK) Accessed 7/24/11.

The plane, named the Lighting II, is the result of the Department of Defense’s Joint Strike Fighter program. The stealthy jet is intended to become the next-generation attack jet and general-purpose fighter for the Air Force, Navy and Marines. Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corp. will build antennas for the planes, and the company held a ribbon cutting ceremony June 29 at the facility in Westminster where the components will be assembled. Boulder-based Ball Aerospace is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Ball Corp. (NYSE: BLL), which is based in Broomfield. The contract is a big deal for Ball. If the military buys the expected number of planes, the company could earn $677.2 million over the next 25 years. The order would call for an estimated 48,000 antennas, with each plane requiring 15. To fill the order, Ball expects to hire 400 employees who would work three shifts at the recently expanded Aerospace Manufacturing Center in Westminster. Ball spent $14.6 million to expand the manufacturing center to accommodate the order.¶

#### ( ) F-35s key to aerospace success—jobs, profits, and stealth technology

Davidson, Michael, Boulder County Business Report, “F-35 Program Economics Boost for State,” July 12th, 2011.

( <http://www.bcbr.com/article.asp?id=58615>, HK) Accessed 7/24/11.

Congressman Mike Coffman talked about the importance of protecting military programs from budget cuts. The threat of cuts is something Lockheed Martin (NYSE: LMT) officials discussed openly during the event. The Bethesda, Maryland-based company expects to produce about 2,400 F-35s for the U.S. and 600 to 700 for U.S. allies, Lockheed Martin executive Danny Conroy said. The F-35s will replace Air Force F-16s and Navy F-18s that were designed in the 1970s, before the invention of stealth technology. “If you look at aircraft they’re flying today, they’re getting up there in age. Some of them are on life support,” Conroy said. While Conroy spoke about the F-35’s military value, as much of the presentation was focused on the economic impact Lockheed Martin and contractors like Ball have across the country. The F-35 program currently supports 460 direct and indirect jobs in Colorado, uses 15 suppliers and generates $33 million each year, according to data from Lockheed Martin. Those numbers will jump up as the plane enters a faster production cycle, Conroy said. Currently only test planes have been delivered to the service branches. If the full order is delivered, the F-35 will cost about $65 million per jet, Conroy said.

**( ) Fully funding the F-35 saves aerospace competitiveness – jobs and global leadership**

Buffenbarger, Thomas, President of the International Association of Machinists, “Fund the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter for America’s War Fighters and Workers,” 2011.

( http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-buffenbarger/fund-the-f35-joint-strike\_b\_899847.html, HK) Accessed 7/24/11.

When the F-35 takes wing, working Americans will benefit from tens of thousands of high-skill, high-wage, high-tech, family-supporting jobs. Even now, before full production ramps up, the F-35 program supports a broad industrial base of more than 1,300 suppliers in 47 states and Puerto Rico. Directly and indirectly, the F-35 program contributes at least 127,000 American jobs and creates over $12 billion in economic activity. These are the kinds of jobs that are absolutely essential to rebuilding the economy and renewing our global competitiveness. These jobs are at the juncture of the aerospace industry, which is America's export powerhouse; the high-tech sector, which represents our economic future; and the manufacturing base, which sustains our middle class but suffered the loss of some 5,000 jobs in May. Make no mistake: Congress must continue to support the F-35 program which maintains our global leadership, militarily and economically, while keeping our commitments to our closest allies. America's allies depend on continuing the F-35. America's war fighters deserve a state-of-the-art fighter jet. America's workers demand more high-wage family-supporting jobs. Now, it's up to Congress to make sure that America remains the world's "arsenal of democracy" and powerhouse of prosperity.

### F-35s Economy Add-On

#### 1. Keystone XL is inevitable, but approving now key to relations

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually — the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great — but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### 2. US Canada Relations key to F-35 Development

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

In February 2002, Canada agreed to participate in the further development of the U.S.-led multinational Joint Strike Fighter (JSF, or F-35) program, contributing $150 million over a 10year period. In December 2006, it was announced that the Canadian government had committed an additional C$500 million for the development of the aircraft. Canada has reportedly agreed to consider purchasing the new fighters to replace its own fleet of CF-18 planes when they are retired in 2017, and has earmarked nearly C$4 billion for the new planes. In June 2007, the Department of National Defense announced plans to form a new office to evaluate Canada’s future air defense requirements. Canada appeared reap rewards from its participation; as of June 2007, Canadian firms had won 150 JSF contracts worth about $160 million. In addition, Canadian defense companies stand to benefit from the Pentagon’s plans to purchase additional F-35s. In July 2010, Defense Minister MacKay confirmed that the government planned to spend C$9 billion on the acquisition of 65 F-35 aircraft. The opposition Liberals criticized the decision, arguing that it should have been reviewed by parliament first, while the New Democrats maintained that the radar-evading F-35 may be more airplane than Canada needs. In recent months, the media have also faulted the purchase, pointing to large cost overruns. During a January 2011 visit to Canada, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates urged Canada to proceed with its planned procurement of the aircraft.2

#### 3. F-35s key to offset job losses caused by F-22 cuts

Drew, Christopher, The New York Times, “Obama Wins Crucial Senate Vote on F-22,” 2009.

(<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/22/business/22defense.html>, HK.) Accessed 7/26/12.

Lockheed Martin, the prime contractor for the F-22, has estimated that work on the plane provides 25,000 jobs and indirectly supports about 70,000 others. But Robert M. Gates, the defense secretary, has said that the Pentagon needs to accelerate a new plane, the F-35, and that doing so would offset the job losses. About 1,000 suppliers in 44 states provide the jobs, which will gradually be phased out as some of the 187 F-22s that have been ordered are completed.

#### 4. F-35s key to the economy—jobs for bases revitalize local markets

Sanders, Rebekah L., The Arizona Republic, “Glendale Luke AFB Transitions, New Mission Could Ripple,” 2011.

(<http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2011/07/17/20110717luke-air-force-base-transitions.html>, JMC.) Accessed 7/26/12.

Luke Air Force Base is scheduled to shrink in the next three years, potentially drying up millions of dollars in economic impact for Arizona as one of the state's largest employers. But base advocates are optimistic the Air Force will replace two F-16 training squadrons scheduled for relocation with a new training mission at Luke: the F-35 Lightning II, known as the Joint Strike Fighter. In a good scenario, the mission would land at Luke, ensure the base's future and make up for the expected financial loss. In a less-optimistic scenario, delays could continue to hamper Lockheed Martin's production of the F-35, Luke could face a gap of activity between missions, and the state could temporarily lose out on jobs and revenue. Worse case, the F-16s could leave and the F-35 training mission could be placed elsewhere.

### F-35s Air Power Add-On

#### 1. Keystone XL is inevitable, but approving now key to relations

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually — the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great — but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### 2. US Canada Relations key to F-35 Development

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

In February 2002, Canada agreed to participate in the further development of the U.S.-led multinational Joint Strike Fighter (JSF, or F-35) program, contributing $150 million over a 10year period. In December 2006, it was announced that the Canadian government had committed an additional C$500 million for the development of the aircraft. Canada has reportedly agreed to consider purchasing the new fighters to replace its own fleet of CF-18 planes when they are retired in 2017, and has earmarked nearly C$4 billion for the new planes. In June 2007, the Department of National Defense announced plans to form a new office to evaluate Canada’s future air defense requirements. Canada appeared reap rewards from its participation; as of June 2007, Canadian firms had won 150 JSF contracts worth about $160 million. In addition, Canadian defense companies stand to benefit from the Pentagon’s plans to purchase additional F-35s. In July 2010, Defense Minister MacKay confirmed that the government planned to spend C$9 billion on the acquisition of 65 F-35 aircraft. The opposition Liberals criticized the decision, arguing that it should have been reviewed by parliament first, while the New Democrats maintained that the radar-evading F-35 may be more airplane than Canada needs. In recent months, the media have also faulted the purchase, pointing to large cost overruns. During a January 2011 visit to Canada, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates urged Canada to proceed with its planned procurement of the aircraft.2

#### 3. F-35s are key to the Aerospace industry – they provide huge profits – cancellations can crush the industry

Thompson, Loren, Forbes Online, Chief Operating Office of the Lexington Institute, “Massive Cost Estimates for Fighter Program is Misleading,” 2011.

(<http://blogs.forbes.com/beltway/2011/06/27/massive-cost-estimate-for-fighter-program-is-misleading/?partner=contextstory>. HK] Accessed 7/24/11.

The F-35 has proven to be a mixed blessing for the companies that build it. If it comes to fruition as planned, it will generate hundreds of billions of dollars in revenue over six decades. But because the program is so huge, it attracts much more scrutiny than other weapons from Pentagon officials, members of Congress, investors and journalists. Every setback is a negative for Lockheed’s stock, in much the same way that delays in the 787 Dreamliner have hammered Boeing shares. And there have been setbacks — testing delays, design issues, software glitches, and all the other problems that typically arise when developing cutting-edge weapons. The problems are manageable, but each one gets magnified because so much money is on the table and so many users are counting on the plane. Pentagon officials say there’s no alternative to the F-35 if the U.S. wants to maintain its longstanding edge in air power. That edge is the main reason why no U.S. soldier has been killed by hostile aircraft since the Korean War, and no U.S. pilot has been downed by an enemy plane since the Vietnam War. However, the urgent need to replace aging air fleets before overseas adversaries catch up with U.S. capabilities has not prevented the Pentagon from slowing down and restructuring the program as development problems were detected. Whatever the merits of those adjustments may have been, they had the effect of increasing expenses in a program where cost is a crucial metric of success.

### F-35s Naval Power Add-On

#### 1. Keystone XL is inevitable, but approving now key to relations

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually — the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great — but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### 2. US Canada Relations key to F-35 Development

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

In February 2002, Canada agreed to participate in the further development of the U.S.-led multinational Joint Strike Fighter (JSF, or F-35) program, contributing $150 million over a 10year period. In December 2006, it was announced that the Canadian government had committed an additional C$500 million for the development of the aircraft. Canada has reportedly agreed to consider purchasing the new fighters to replace its own fleet of CF-18 planes when they are retired in 2017, and has earmarked nearly C$4 billion for the new planes. In June 2007, the Department of National Defense announced plans to form a new office to evaluate Canada’s future air defense requirements. Canada appeared reap rewards from its participation; as of June 2007, Canadian firms had won 150 JSF contracts worth about $160 million. In addition, Canadian defense companies stand to benefit from the Pentagon’s plans to purchase additional F-35s. In July 2010, Defense Minister MacKay confirmed that the government planned to spend C$9 billion on the acquisition of 65 F-35 aircraft. The opposition Liberals criticized the decision, arguing that it should have been reviewed by parliament first, while the New Democrats maintained that the radar-evading F-35 may be more airplane than Canada needs. In recent months, the media have also faulted the purchase, pointing to large cost overruns. During a January 2011 visit to Canada, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates urged Canada to proceed with its planned procurement of the aircraft.2

#### 3. F-35s are key to US naval power projection – they are key to respond to Chinese naval modernization

Cheng, Dean, Research Fellow at the Asian Studies Center, “Sea Power and the Chinese State: China’s Maritime Ambition,” 2011.

(http://www.militaryaerospace.com/index/display/avi-wire-news-display/1454399439.html, HK.) Accessed 7/24/11.

In this regard, even as it recognizes China's maritime interests, the United States must also protect its own maritime interests. Such protection will require action in several different areas of U.S. defense policy. First, America must sustain a strong set of maritime forces. The United States Navy and Marine Corps are the ultimate guarantors of U.S. maritime interests around the world. Unlike the PLAN, U.S. naval forces must operate far from their own shores, which increases wear and tear on ships while extending transit time from home ports to patrol areas. Consequently, the U.S. must maintain robust and substantial naval forces in the Asia-Pacific region, as well as the Indian Ocean, if it is to be able to dissuade and deter potential opponents and support national interests. This, in turn, means that reductions in the size of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps and their operational tempo will have a disproportionate effect not only on actual abilities to operate in the region, but also on perceptions of American commitment and credibility. Far from reducing Navy and Marine resources, it may be that additional resources are necessary. The U.S. cannot afford to see its navy shrink further. At the same time, training must be strengthened and, in some cases, revived. When the Cold War ended, certain missions-including anti-shipping strikes and open-ocean anti-submarine warfare-were seen as no longer important; certain capabilities, such as the ability to launch anti-ship cruise missiles from submarines, were also abandoned.[26] Those missions and capabilities are likely to become important once again as the Chinese navy presents the first blue-water challenge since the late 1980s. Regaining proficiency will require not just shifts in priorities, but also increases in funds for training and for operations and maintenance. The rise of the Chinese navy also means that the U.S. Navy must reinvigorate its research and development efforts. Currently, there are no new surface or subsurface combatants in the design phase-an unprecedented situation that could result in the Navy's having to respond to a Chinese challenge with outdated combatants or, even worse, face a PLAN that has more advanced capabilities. To avoid such a scenario, Congress should require the development of a comprehensive naval research and development plan that exploits advances in such technologies as unmanned aerial vehicles, unmanned submersibles, and space systems.[27] The U.S. military operates jointly, so careful attention must also be paid to Air Force and Army operations throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Given that both Chinese naval air capabilities and PLA Air Force systems are being modernized-including the proliferation of advanced SAM systems such as the S-400 and HQ-9-the U.S. Pacific Air Force cannot afford to fall behind in its own modernization program. Low observable aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) are especially important, as are electronic warfare capabilities. It is essential that the U.S. Air Force sustain funding for the F-35, especially in light of the shortsighted decision to end the F-22 program. Meanwhile, Congress should consider acquiring additional E/A-18 Growler electronic warfare aircraft and advanced UAV systems to facilitate air operations within the Chinese air defense envelope. Similarly, special operations forces and space forces can play a role in effecting deterrence and presence. The United States should also seek to expand its already robust interactions in these areas with allied and selected other Asian militaries.

### F-35s Inherency

#### 1. F-35s will be cut due to budget constraints

Siegfried, Joel, Airlines Examiner, “F-22 Jet Faces Oxygen Issues and Budget Cuts,” 2011.

(<http://www.examiner.com/airlines-airport-in-national/f-22-jet-faces-oxygen-issues-and-budget-cuts>, HK.) Accessed 7/24/11.

In the current deficit budget crisis, financial analysts may end up with more impact on the outcome of this issue than aerospace engineers, although it would be nearly impossible to nix an aircraft program for a plane that was first introduced on December 15, 2005, after so many of them have already been built. Doing so would be creating a very large white elephant graveyard, and also an uncomfortable embarrassment for politicians. Even more at risk, as the Economist points out, is the Lockheed Martin F-35 Lightning II single-seat, single-engine, fifth generation multi function fighters that are currently under development to perform ground attack, reconnaissance, and air defense missions with stealth capability. The plane was planned for operational introduction around 2016 to 2018. Each of the 13 test aircraft cost about $150 million, plus an additional $183.5 million for its weapon systems, and an undetermined cost for program development. Dubbed the last manned fighter, it would be the most expensive military project ever attempted. Working on a plan to reduce military spending by $400 billion by 2023 designed by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, the current head of the Department of Defense (DoD), Leon Panetta, knows a lot about number crunching from his previous experience as the director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Some are already predicting that the F-35 will be red-lined in favor of must less costly unmanned drone aircraft, along with the remainder of the yet to be built F-22s.

### AT – US-Canadian Relations Not Key

#### 1. Extend **Fergusson and Ek, only good US-Canada relations pushes Canada to buy.**

#### 2. Current budget constraints make Canada not buy, US-Canadian relations key to push make Canada fund

Berthiaume, Lee, Writer for Embassy Magazine, Canada.com and the National Post, “F-35s Delivery Won’t be Complete Before Current Fighter are Retired: Documents,” June 22nd, 2012.

(<http://www.canada.com/technology/delivery+complete+before+current+fighters+retired+Documents/6827273/story.html>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

OTTAWA — Defence Department officials knew last year Canada would not have enough F-35 stealth fighters by the time the last of the country’s CF-18s were due to be retired in 2020, newly released documents show.¶ As a result, officials were preparing to ask the Conservative government for more money to again extend the lives of some of the CF-18s — which have already undergone a $1.8-billion overhaul — until the last of the F-35s could come online.¶ “The planned CF-18 estimated life expectancy is currently 2020,” reads one email dated Sept. 21, 2011, and obtained by Postmedia News through access to information laws.¶ “However, the current Next Generation Fighter Capability project scheduled is based on the last of Canada’s F-35s being delivered in 2022 or 2023. CF-18 estimated life expectancy requirements are currently being assessed and a request for an extension will be made once the required date is confirmed.”¶ The revelation flies in the face of constant assertions that a stopgap would not be required between the retirement of the CF-18s and final delivery of the F-35s.¶ “Right now, our transition plan allows for that transition between the operational (CF-18) fleet as it ages out and the new (F-35) fleet as it comes online,” Royal Canadian Air Force commander Lt.-Gen. Andre Deschamps told a parliamentary committee on Dec. 11.¶ “The intention is to overlap between the two.”¶ It also comes after the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the equivalent of Canada’s auditor general, warned on June 14 that allies are increasingly delaying their plans to purchase F-35s, and testing of the stealth fighter is behind schedule.¶ Both issues have consequences for Canada as the government’s plan to purchase 65 F-35s requires doing so when full production is already underway.¶ Defence Department officials did not respond to questions by press time Friday.¶ Canada’s fleet of CF-18s were initially set to be retired in 2002, but a decade-long, $1.8-billion upgrade extended the life of 80 of the aircraft to between 2017 and 2020. (Three of the aircraft have since been lost.)¶ Further life extensions have been regarded as prohibitively expensive.¶ “Canada is now spending considerably more money on the CF-18 when it is deployed than when it was new,” Major Ed Roberds, an air weapons control at 1 Canadian Air Division Headquarters, wrote in the Canadian Military Journal in 2008.¶ “As the airframe gets older, more repairs are required, and our operational tempo requires a substantial increase in spare parts that must be transported to theatre when the aircraft are deployed.”¶ NDP military procurement critic Matthew Kellway said structural concerns also pose a potential threat to any pilot who must operate the CF-18s past even the outer edge of their lifespans.¶ “I wonder whether these guys are ready to play a very dangerous game to try to somehow extend the lives of the CF-18s,” he said of Defence Department officials.¶ Previous internal documents have shown the Conservative government was concerned last year about the rising costs of the F-35 program even as it was reassuring Canadians the program was on track and on schedule.¶ Kellway said the new email about the CF-18s again shows the government and Defence Department have not been playing straight with the public about the stealth fighter.¶ “The suggestion in the email that they may have to extend the life of the CF-18s clearly does suggest there are concerns the government has harboured about putting a fleet of F-35s in the air in time,” he said.¶ “Like so many of these issues, the government has put itself in a corner by not acknowledging the concerns publicly.”¶ Meanwhile, concerns are mounting about the government’s plan to pay an outside accounting firm up to $5 million to “assess the appropriateness” of the way in which the Defence Department has calculated how much the F-35s will cost.¶ Whatever firm wins the contract will not be allowed to question the figures presented, but rather will be called upon to judge whether the Defence Department followed correct procedures in determining how the cost estimates were arrived at.¶ The government says the external assessment will ensure proper procedures were followed, but Liberal defence critic John McKay alleged the government and National Defence are simply trying to set up a whitewash.¶ “These guys have suffered a huge blow to their credibility on the specific aspect on the F-35,” he said.¶ “They’re setting up a scenario where they can legitimately stand up in question period and say, ‘Well look, KPMG says we can do this all the time, so we didn’t mislead you in the first place.’”

#### 3. The deal will only go through given good political relations

Wyss and Wilner, Marco and Alex, Wyss is a Senior Researcher at the Center for Security Studies

(CSS) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) in Zurich, Wilner is a Senior Researcher at the CSS, “The Next Generation Fighter Club: How Shifting Markets Will Shape Canada’s F-35 Debate,” Spring 2012.

(<http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

The JSF remains a contentious albeit promising program. The aircraft is being produced by a U.S.-led consortium of eight (unequal) partners, of which Canada is a junior member.[1](http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp#_edn1) When it goes operational, the F-35 will be the most sophisticated multi-role fighter in the sky. While falling short of introducing a full-blown technological revolution, the F-35 and its emerging fifth-generation contemporaries represent the future. Already, Canada’s main allies have signaled their intent to fly F-35s. For Canada, doing the same guarantees interoperability. And given that uncertainty is the only certainty in international relations, ensuring Canadian pilots are flying the best machines into future combat will go a long way in making sure they can do their jobs safely and expeditiously. Naturally, the JSF has its faults. The program has suffered from a number of production and testing delays, and it appears to be exorbitantly expensive. But the bottom line remains: if Canadians are set on equipping their military with the most advanced arms available, political considerations and market demands all but guarantee that their only choice of aircraft is the F-35.

#### 4. US-Canadian relations key to arms sales – required in the F-35 deal

Wyss and Wilner, Marco and Alex, Wyss is a Senior Researcher at the Center for Security Studies

(CSS) at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH) in Zurich, Wilner is a Senior Researcher at the CSS, “The Next Generation Fighter Club: How Shifting Markets Will Shape Canada’s F-35 Debate,” Spring 2012.

(<http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

In either case, politics often informs both a producer’s motivation to transfer arms to another state and a recipient’s motivation to acquire arms from another state. This was particularly evident during the Cold War, when opposing Western and Eastern blocs duelled over global political support by using the arms trade as an instrument of foreign policy. The acquisition of arms from one of the two superpowers was widely acknowledged as evidence of a state’s allegiance. Clients became allies. But the politicking behind the Cold War’s arms trade was nothing new. “Arms transfers have been used at least since the Peloponnesian Wars,” writes Krause, “to achieve the political, military and economic goals of states and rulers.”[62](http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp#_edn62) The same principle exists today. What distinguishes the arms market from, say, the automobile market, is the pervasive influence of political considerations in driving policy, shaping decisions, and influencing state behaviour.[63](http://www.journal.dnd.ca/vol12/no2/18-wilner-eng.asp#_edn63) This is especially evident when it comes to fighter jets. When one government decides to purchase sophisticated military hardware – like combat jets – produced by another state, it is not only thinking about improving the quality of its armed forces, but also about the political and strategic signals it is sending to other countries (and its own citizens) with its purchase.

## China Spill Scenario

### More evi.

#### Species loss leads to global extiction

Whitty 12, Julia, MotherJones, Scientists: Extinctions Just as Damaging as Climate Change:| Wed May. 2, 2012 11:18 AM PDT article cites Journal Article from Nature (David U. Hooper, E. Carol Adair, Bradley J. Cardinale, Jarrett E. K. Byrnes, Bruce A. Hungate, Kristin L. Matulich, Andrew Gonzalez, J. Emmett Duffy, Lars Gamfeldt & Mary I. O’Connor. A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change. Nature (2012) doi:10.1038/nature11118 )“ (<http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2012/05/extinctions-gnarly-global-warming> ME)

A new paper in the prestigious science journal Nature assesses one of the big questions in ecology today: How do species extinctions rack upcompared to other global change issues like global warming, ozone holes, acid rain, and nutrient pollution (overfertilization)? "Evidence is mounting that extinctions are altering key processes important to the productivity and sustainability of Earth's ecosystems." The answer: Just as nasty. In fact species loss is likely to rank among the top five drivers of global change. "Some people have assumed that biodiversity effects are relatively minor compared to other environmental stressors,” says lead author David Hooper of Western Washington University. "Our new results show that future loss of species has the potential to reduce plant production just as much as global warming and pollution." Studies in the past 20 years have demonstrated that more biologically diverse ecosystems are more productive. So there's growing concern that the very high rates of modern extinctions from habitat loss, overharvesting, pollution, biological invasions, human overpopulation, and other human-caused environmental changes will diminish nature's ability to provide goods and services important to all life (ours too)... like food, clean water, and a stable climate. A schematic image illustrating the relationship between biodiversity, ecosystem services, human well-being, and poverty: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment via Wikimedia Commons Schematic illustrating the relationship between biodiversity, ecosystem services, human well-being, and poverty, and where we can improve our strategies: Millennium Ecosystem Assessment via Wikimedia Commons "The biggest challenge looking forward is to predict the combined impacts of these environmental challenges to natural ecosystems and to society," said co-author J. Emmett Duffy at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. The team performed a meta-analysis of published data from 192 earlier studies to assess the effects of extinctions on productivity and decomposition: Productivity (the rate of production of biomass in an ecosystem, starting with plants producing life from sunlight) Decomposition (the work done by bacteria and fungi that releases nutrients back for recycling by the producers) The stats: At intermediate levels of species loss (21–40%), plant production is reduced by 5–10%, comparable to previously documented effects of ultraviolet radiation (ozone hole) and global warming. At higher levels of species extinction (41–60%), dwindling productivity rivals the effects from ozone holes, acid rain, global warming, and nutrient pollution (overfertilization). At intermediate levels, species loss had equal or greater effects on decomposition compared to global warming and nutrient pollution. From the paper: [O]ur analyses clearly show that the ecosystem consequences of local species loss are as quantitatively significant as the direct effects of several global change stressors that have mobilized major international concern and remediation efforts.The paper: David U. Hooper, E. Carol Adair, Bradley J. Cardinale, Jarrett E. K. Byrnes, Bruce A. Hungate, Kristin L. Matulich, Andrew Gonzalez, J. Emmett Duffy, Lars Gamfeldt & Mary I. O’Connor. A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem change. Nature (2012) doi:10.1038/nature11118

## Arctic Conflict Extensions

#### US-Canada Relations key to preventing Artic Conflict

Brian Flemming; CM, QC, DCLFellow of the Canadian Defence& Foreign Affairs InstituteandHonorary Fellow, Marine and Environmental Law ProgramDalhousie Law School;December, 2008 “Canada-U.S. Relations in the Arctic: A Neighbourly Proposal” <http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/Canada-U.S.%20Relations%20in%20the%20Arctic%20%20A%20Neighbourly%20Proposal.pdf>

The creation by bilateral treaty of a new international institution – the North West Passage

Authority (NWPA) – would require Canada to set aside, but not give up legally, its claim thatmost of the Passage lies within Canada’s internal waters. On the American side, there wouldhave to be a suspension, but not a legal surrender, of the U.S. claim that the Passage is an“international strait” under international law. The setting aside of these current claims couldherald a renewed, 21 st century period of cooperation between Canada and the United States. Diplomatic success in negotiating such an agreement could pave the way for successful negotiations on other issues that have been “on ice” [HAHAHA DO YOU GET IT? BECAUSE THE ARTIC IS MADE OF ICE]between Canada and the U.S. during the presidency of George W. Bush. The importance of reviving the old, historic relationship between Canada and the United States was urged by Professor Robert A.Pastor this summer when he outlined his idea for a new “North American Community” thatwould “lay the foundation for a new North America.”Success in negotiating a new Arcticarrangement will start Canada and the U.S. down the trail towards this goal and will perhaps put paid to dark suggestions such as the one made by a former U.S. Coast GuardLieutenant Commander, Scott G. Borgerson, when he said:Without U.S. leadership to help develop diplomatic solutions to competing [Arctic] claims and potential conflicts, the [Arctic] region could erupt in an armed mad dash for its resources.

#### More ev.

Oran R. Young; Canada Artic Resources Committee Senior Fellow of the Center for Northern Studies; No date“Canada and the United States in the Arctic: Testing the "Special Relationship" <http://www.carc.org/pubs/v15no2/2.htm>

The Arctic today is recognized as a strategic arena of vital significance, a fact that poses a mounting challenge to the "special relationship" that has characterized interaction between Canada and the United States during this century. The United States is expanding its military presence throughout the arctic region and exerting growing pressure on Canada to co-operate with its plans for the defence of North America against ballistic missiles fired from submarines sheltered in arctic waters and cruise missiles launched from manned bombers operating in arctic airspace. In contrast, Canada is poised between the superpowers in a region of rising strategic importance to both the Soviet Union and the United States. Canada must also contend with the pervasive, though implicit, threat to its effective occupancy of the Far North arising from the burgeoning U.S. presence in the Arctic.¶ Confrontations between the two countries over arctic issues could well become severe enough to cause a considerable erosion of the "special relationship". In fact, developments along these lines are almost certain to occur unless the United States abandons its traditional attitude of benign neglect toward arctic politics and the sensibilities of its northern allies, and unless Canada transcends its propensity to respond in a highly emotional fashion to specific arctic incidents, like the passage of the U.S. ice-breaker Polar Sea through the Northwest Passage in August 1985. At the same time, the emerging arctic agenda also offers significant opportunities for constructive dialogue between Canada and the United States if the leaders of the two countries recognize the importance of arctic issues and move briskly to agree on imaginative procedures to handle their arctic concerns.

## Economy Add-On (Incomplete)

### US-Canadian Relations Key to Relations

#### 1. US-Canada Relations key to the economy

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

Economically, Canada and the United States are joined at the hip. Each country is the other’s number-one trading partner — in 2011, the two-way trade in goods and services totaled $681 billion, more than U.S. trade with Mexico or China — and trade with Canada supports more than eight million U.S. jobs. Yet the Obama administration has recently jeopardized this important relationship. It failed to combat the Buy American provision in Congress’ stimulus bill, which inefficiently excluded Canadian participation in infrastructure spending.

#### 2. Relations are key to 8 million US jobs

Blanchfield, Mike, Writer of the Canadian Press quoting Ian F. Fergusson and Carl Ek, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Critics say Obama has ‘Lost Canada’,” June 26, 2012.

(<http://thechronicleherald.ca/canada/110957-critics-say-obama-has-lost-canada>. JMC.) Access 7/10/12.

OTTAWA — Is Barack Obama squandering Canada’s love?¶ The answer is a resounding yes, according to an essay in a leading U.S. foreign policy journal.¶ “How Obama Lost Canada,” is the headline in the online edition of Foreign Affairs, published by the influential Washington think tank, The Council On Foreign Relations.¶ The article cites a litany of wrongs that its authors pin on the current U.S. president, including the delay in the Keystone XL pipeline, protectionist Buy American provisions, even disrespect for Canadian military contributions in Libya and Afghanistan.¶ As a result, the U.S. has jilted Canada, leaving relations at “their lowest point in decades.”¶ The article is by Derek Burney, a former Canadian diplomatic heavyweight and one-time ambassador to the U.S., and Fen Hampson, a Carleton University foreign policy expert.¶ Theirs is not the first analysis to note this pattern. But its publication in a respected U.S. policy journal months before the presidential election offers a ready-made slogan for further Republican attacks on Obama’s leadership during an economic downturn. Canada and the U.S. are each other’s top trading partners.¶ Obama’s decision to delay the Keystone decision until 2013 — after the election and following intense lobbying by environmentalists — was a point of attack for Republicans during their protracted primaries.¶ But Burney and Hampson cite that as only the latest in long series of blunders, not all of them economic.¶ The article offers a sobering counterpoint to the polls that consistently show Obama to be more popular in Canada than his own country, not to mention his outburst of “I love this country” when he first visited Ottawa a month after his 2009 inauguration.¶ “Whether on trade, the environment, or Canada’s shared contribution in places such as Afghanistan, time and again the United States has jilted its northern neighbour,” the essay says.¶ “If the pattern of neglect continues, Ottawa will get less interested in co-operating with Washington.”¶ The article notes how Prime Minister Stephen Harper has declared it an economic imperative to bolster trade with China, India, South Korea and other Asian countries. It highlights Harper’s pledge — while in China — to “sell our energy to people who want to buy our energy.”¶ Harper spoke after the delay of the Keystone pipeline project, which would have carried crude from the Alberta oilsands to U.S. refineries on the Gulf of Mexico.¶ Two-way trade between Canada and the U.S. totalled $681 billion last year, and supports eight million U.S. jobs.¶ “Yet the Obama administration has recently jeopardized this relationship,” the essay says, through the Buy American provision in its stimulus bill that prevented Canadian companies from bidding on infrastructure projects in the U.S.¶ The U.S. recession and the rise of Asia have led to a decline of Canadian exports south in the last decade. About 85 per cent of Canadian exports went to the U.S. in 2000, compared with 68 per cent in 2010, the essay says.¶ The slights don’t stop there.¶ The essay criticizes the U.S. for demanding concessions from Canada on agricultural subsidies as the price of entry into negotiations over the Trans-Pacific Partnership, “while preserving massive agricultural subsidies of its own.”¶ It accuses the U.S. of sticking Canadian taxpayers with the bill for a new bridge between Detroit and Windsor, the choked crossing point for one-quarter of the trade between the two countries.

#### 3. Increase in US imports from Canada directly increase US exports to Canada

Mufson, Steven, Washington Post, “Keystone XL Pipeline Creates Sticking Point In Us-Canada Trade Relations,” July 6th, 2012.

(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/keystone-xl-pipeline-creates-sticking-point-in-us-canada-trade-relations/2012/07/06/gJQAxcrtRW_story.html>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12

Even so, many trade experts say, boosting U.S. imports from Canada is good for the U.S. economy because [for every dollar](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/gblec02a-eng.htm) of exports to the United States, Canada buys 85 cents’ worth of U.S.-made products. That includes [goods](http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/statistics/product/enduse/exports/c1220.html) such as U.S. iron and steel, automobiles, refined petroleum products, fruits and juices, plastics and the supersized Caterpillar dump trucks that haul away oil extracted from the tar sands of Alberta.

## Terrorism Add-On

#### 1. US-Canada Relations solve terrorism

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

Relations between the United States and Canada, though generally close, have undergone changes in tenor over the past three decades. During the 1980s, the two countries generally enjoyed very good relations. The early 1990s brought new governments to Ottawa and Washington, and although Canada’s Liberal Party emphasized its determination to act independently of the United States when necessary, relations continued to be cordial. In early 2006, a minority Conservative government assumed power in Ottawa. It was regarded as being more philosophically in tune with the George W. Bush Administration than the Liberals were; some observers believe that this compatibility helped facilitate bilateral cooperation. The election of President Obama in November 2008 signaled a new chapter in U.S.-Canada relations; unlike President Bush, Obama is quite popular in Canada. The two North American countries continue to cooperate widely in international security and political issues, both bilaterally and through numerous international organizations. Canada’s foreign and defense policies are usually in harmony with those of the United States. Areas of contention have been relatively few, but sometimes sharp, as was the case in policy toward Iraq. Since September 11, the United States and Canada have cooperated extensively on efforts to strengthen border security and to combat terrorism, particularly in Afghanistan. Both countries have also been active participants in the U.N.-sanctioned NATO mission in Libya. In addition, the United States and Canada work together closely on environmental matters, including monitoring air quality and solid waste transfers, and protecting and maintaining the quality of border waterways.

#### 2. Future terrorism will be nuclear in nature—multiple sources allow terrorists to acquire nuclear weapons

Cetron, Marvin, President of Forecasting International, “Defeating Terrorism: Is it possible? Is it probable?,” May 1, 2007.

(<http://www.nsaww.com/media_publications_2007-05.html>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

2. Terrorists will gain weapons of mass destruction. The elite among tomorrow's terrorists will have more than plastic explosives with which to make their point. They will have nuclear weapons. Pakistani engineer Abdul Qadeer Khan ensured that when he gave Pakistan what most extremists regard as an "Islamic bomb" and then spread the plans far and wide. If terrorists cannot lay hands on a stolen weapon from the former Soviet Union, they soon may be able to obtain them from either Islamabad or Tehran.

#### 3. Terrorists will use nuclear weapons triggering a global nuclear war and threatening all life on the planet.

Sid-Ahmed, Mohamed, Mohamed Sid-Ahmed (1928–2006), a long-serving contributing editor of Middle East Research and Information Project, “Extinction!,” 2004.

(<http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive**.** But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

## Laundry List Impact

#### 1. US-Canada Relations key to security, trade, environmental concerns, and a laundry list of impacts.

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12.

Relations between the United States and Canada, though generally close, have undergone changes¶ in tenor over the past three decades. During the 1980s, the two countries generally enjoyed very¶ good relations. The early 1990s brought new governments to Ottawa and Washington, and¶ although Canada’s Liberal Party emphasized its determination to act independently of the United¶ States when necessary, relations continued to be cordial. In early 2006, a minority Conservative¶ government assumed power in Ottawa. It was regarded as being more philosophically in tune¶ with the George W. Bush Administration than the Liberals had been; some observers believe that¶ this compatibility helped facilitate bilateral cooperation. This cooperation has continued with the¶ election of President Obama in November 2008, despite the differences in the two leaders’¶ governing philosophies.¶ The two North American countries continue to cooperate widely in international security and¶ political issues, both bilaterally and through numerous international organizations. Canada’s¶ foreign and defense policies are usually in harmony with those of the United States. Areas of¶ contention have been relatively few, but sometimes sharp, as was the case in policy toward Iraq.¶ Since September 11, the United States and Canada have cooperated extensively on efforts to¶ strengthen border security and to combat terrorism, particularly in Afghanistan. Both countries¶ were also active participants in the U.N.-sanctioned NATO mission in Libya.¶ The United States and Canada maintain the world’s largest bilateral trading relationship, one that¶ has been strengthened over the past two decades by the approval of two major free trade¶ agreements. Although commercial disputes may not be quite as prominent now as they have been¶ in the past, the two countries in recent years have engaged in difficult negotiations over items in¶ several trade sectors, including natural resources, agricultural commodities, and intellectual¶ property rights. The most recent clash centered around the Buy America provision of the 2009¶ economic stimulus law. However, these disputes affect but a small percentage of the total goods¶ and services exchanged. In recent years, energy has increasingly emerged as a key component of¶ the trade relationship. In addition, the United States and Canada work together closely on¶ environmental matters, including monitoring air quality and solid waste transfers, and protecting¶ and maintaining the quality of border waterways.¶ Many Members of Congress follow U.S.-Canada environmental, trade, and trans-border issues¶ that affect their states and districts. In addition, because the countries are similar in many ways,¶ lawmakers in both countries study solutions proposed across the border to such issues as federal¶ fiscal policy and federal-provincial power sharing.

## Now Key

#### 1. Every day makes relations worse

Lugar, Dick, Senator R-IN, “Press Release of Senator Lugar, Lugar Blasts Keystone XL Obstruction, Expresses Confidence in Growing Support for Pipeline,” April 25, 2012.

(<http://lugar.senate.gov/news/record.cfm?id=336620>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The American people clearly understand that affordable and reliable oil from Canada via the Keystone XL pipeline is good for private job creation, gas prices, and energy security,” Lugar said. “Every day that President Obama and Senate Democrat leaders continue their blockade of Keystone XL is another day of unemployment for thousands of construction and manufacturing workers and another day of delay in bolstering U.S. energy security with oil from a friendly neighbor.”¶ Yesterday, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) said about Keystone XL, “Personally, I think Keystone is a program that we’re not going, that I am not going to help in any way I can. The President feels that way. So do I.”¶ Lugar is a chief author of legislation to enable construction of the privately funded Keystone XL pipeline. Lugar, along with Senators John Hoeven, David Vitter, and other colleagues, introduced legislation to approve the pipeline, notwithstanding President Obama’s opposition. ¶ “We already received a majority vote in the Senate for our legislation despite President Obama’s veto threats and personal lobbying against it,” Lugar said. “Now more Democrats are indicating flexibility on moving forward with the project. The trend of growing support for Keystone XL will continue. The question is, how long will the President and other Democrat leaders block the will of the majority.

## Keystone XL is Key

#### 1. Keystone XL is inevitable, but approving now key to relations

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually — the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great — but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

#### 2. The Keystone XL Pipeline would boost US Canadian relations by increase US trade with Canada.

Mufson, Steven, Washington Post, “Keystone XL Pipeline Creates Sticking Point In Us-Canada Trade Relations,” July 6th, 2012.

(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/keystone-xl-pipeline-creates-sticking-point-in-us-canada-trade-relations/2012/07/06/gJQAxcrtRW_story.html>. JMC.)

If the U.S. government gives TransCanada the go ahead, the Keystone XL pipeline will give another boost to U.S.-Canada trade relations. Canada — not China — is the largest U.S. trading partner. And oil and gas accounted for more than a third of the $316.5 billion of U.S. imports from Canada in 2011.¶ The oil in TransCanada’s existing Keystone and proposed Keystone XL lines alone could outstrip the value of [all U.S. imports](http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/statistics/highlights/top/top1112yr.html) from Brazil and, depending on the price, roughly equal those from France or Taiwan.

#### 3. The failure of Keystone XL opens Canada to opening up to other nations, removing relations with the US. Only recently is this possible

Coyne, Andrew, Andrew Coyne was part of the team that launched the National Post 13 years ago. His distinguished journalism career has also included positions with Maclean's, the Globe and Mail and the Southam newspaper chain, as well as contributing to a wide range of other publications including The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, National Review, Time and Saturday Night. Coyne is also a long-time member of the CBC’s popular At Issue panel on The National, “Andrew Coyne: How Canada Broke Up With the U.S.,” ul 6, 2012.

(<http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2012/07/06/andrew-coyne-lets-just-say-it-sometimes-gets-awkward-between-the-u-s-and-canada/>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

In response, Canada has moved to more aggressively assert its interests, for example warning it might cultivate China and other export markets for its crude oil, scaling back its commitment to Afghanistan and changing its Facebook status to “it’s complicated.” Notwithstanding the two countries’ partnership in the North American Free Trade Agreement, it has pursued its own trade agreements with a number of other powers. In bilateral meetings the tone has noticeably cooled. People familiar with the situation say you could see it in their body language — nothing overt, but let’s just say, awkward.¶ Still, other experts suggest this takes a too one-sided a view of the relationship. They point to such signs of continuing cooperation as the recent Detroit-Windsor bridge agreement, the Beyond the Borders initiative on perimeter security, and that bus ride back from the Coldplay concert. Besides, they ask, if American policy was so relentlessly hostile to Canadian interests, how is it that Obama remains so popular on this side of the border? They note polls showing he retains an approval rating in excess of 60% among Canadians. (In foreign policy circles, this is known as “always flinging that in my face.”)¶ Still another strain of thought seeks to place any cooling of relations in a larger strategic context, post-Cold War, post-financial crisis, post-modernism. In this emerging, multipolar world, scholars of this school, known as the New Neo-Realism, advise, Canadian foreign policy must steer between two shoals, avoiding either a blinkered emphasis on classical bilateralism or a simplistic faith in enhanced multilateralism. Also, they say, Canada should get out more, maybe take up tennis, meet people.¶ To be sure, tensions between the two countries are nothing new, nor have their interests always aligned in the past. Where were the critics of the Obama administration, observers with long memories ask, when the Bush administration was pressing Canada to participate in its ballistic missile defence system, or to send troops to Iraq? What about when Bush failed to mention Canada in that speech to Congress — which Canada actually missed because Buffy the Vampire Slayer was on. But still.¶ It is inevitable, when two countries are as intimately intertwined as Canada and the U.S. have become, with the world’s largest two-way trading relationship, a high degree of military interoperability and a sexual chemistry you could cut with a knife, that disputes will flare up from time to time.¶ Ordinarily these are manageable with close consultation, and, if necessary, binding binational disputes panels. Only occasionally do they threaten to escalate to a level that might, say, spoil the whole weekend. At such times, it is important to remember the values we share as liberal democracies, and maybe give that Mexico a call.

## AT – US-Canadian Relations are Resilient

#### 1. Relations were resilient in the past because Canada had to rely on the US. Now is completely different

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

Of course, the U.S.-Canadian relationship has had its rocky moments before. In the 1970s and 1980s, in response to public concern over the United States’ economic domination of Canada, Ottawa enacted a wide variety of protectionist measures that irritated Washington. Eventually, the two countries recognized their mutual interests and resolved what differences they had, ratifying the Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement in 1987 and its successor, NAFTA, seven years later.¶ Back then, Canada had little choice but to find a way to fix its relationship with the United States, the only game in town. Ottawa is in a different position now. Today, it enjoys a respectable platform of self-confidence, having weathered the financial crisis and ensuing recession far better than the United States. And unlike in the past, Canada can now look beyond its own neighborhood for economic opportunities — especially to the rising economies of Asia. Unlike in the past, Canada can now look beyond its own neighborhood for economic opportunities — especially to the rising economies of Asia.¶ Indeed, Canada has made a full-court press in the Asia-Pacific region. It is wooing countries such as China, India, Japan, and South Korea, which are eager to invest and trade in Canadian minerals, energy, and agricultural products. Harper has announced Canada’s intention to explore free-trade negotiations with China, and talks with Japan, Thailand, India, and South Korea are under way. As Harper put it during a visit to China in February, “We want to sell our energy to people who want to buy our energy.”¶ To be sure, Canadian companies will never abandon the U.S. market. Nevertheless, the U.S. recession and the rise of Asia have allowed Canada to diversify its economic relations. In 2010, only 68 percent of Canadian exports were destined for the United States, down from 85 percent in 2000. Canadians are accustomed to benign neglect from a neighbor preoccupied with more urgent global flashpoints, but since that neglect has grown so much as to be malign, they have begun to reappraise their relationship with the United States. As Canada develops closer ties with China and finds more receptive outlets for its exports, the United States may find itself with a less obliging partner to the north.

## AT – Detroit Deal

#### 1. Turn, the Detroit Deal hurt relations

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “Misplaced Outrage,” Jul 9, 2012.

(<http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/07/09/hampson-burney-misplaced-outrage/>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

We have been spinning bureaucratic wheels for four years, if not longer, and have precious little to show for it. Canadian companies who do business at the border still complain about delays at key transit points and mountains of red tape. Canada is also getting the short end of the auto bailout, despite having contributed its full share. If a new bridge at Detroit-Windsor eventually gets built it will be on the backs on Canadian — not U.S. — taxpayers.

## \*\*\*2AC—Venezuela

## Venezuela-Colombia Conflict Add-On

#### First, Venezuela is funding attacks against Colombia

El Universal ‘12, Quoting US Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, “Chavez Fingered for “Attempts at Exmporting Terrorism,” June 18, 2012.

(<http://www.eluniversal.com/nacional-y-politica/120618/chavez-fingered-for-attempts-at-exporting-terrorism>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

On occasion of the recent presentation of Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez during an obligatory simultaneous broadcast of weaponry made in Venezuela with the aid and technology of foreign countries, US Representative for the State of Florida Mario Díaz-Balart put the blame on the Venezuelan government. According to the US Congressman, the Venezuelan government and rogue states try to take to the hands of terrorists, destruction items against free countries. For this reason, he strongly recommended taking action as soon as possible. "I am worried about Chávez's attempt at exporting terrorism and blackmail. He has an ammunition manufacturing plant and another one of AK-47 rifles as well. Chávez has a very close relationship with Iran, other foes of freedom, and terrorists such as the Castro brothers," Díaz-Balart uttered. "We can see now that he has all that military capacity. It is not that they will use it against Colombia, but there is fear that they can export them. We must keep a watchful eye over the alignment with China and Russia," he added.

#### Second, Keystone XL would remove US funds from Venezuelan Oil. This defunds Chavez and stop Venezuela-Colombian conflict

Levant ‘12, Ezra, columnist for Sun Media newspapers and the anchor of a daily news commentary show on the Sun News Network. Ezra was the publisher of the Western Standard magazine and has written for Sun newspapers going back to his days as a student. A lawyer by profession, Ezra is also the author of several best-selling books including 2009's "Shakedown" about Canada's human rights commissions and 2010's "Ethical Oil: The case for Canada's oilsands", “Keystone Cop-Out: Obama Chose Conflict Venezuelan Oil Over Ethical Canuck Oil, and Movie Stars Over Working Men, Women,” Jan. 21, 2012.

(<http://www.torontosun.com/2012/01/20/keystone-cop-out>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

U.S. President Barack Obama made a choice last week: He chose Venezuela over Canada.¶ That’s what he did when he rejected the proposed Keystone XL pipeline that would have taken oilsands oil from Alberta to the Gulf Coast of Texas.¶ That pipeline would have delivered 700,000 barrels of oil every day from Canada (and from a new oilfield called Bakken that straddles the North Dakota-Saskatchewan border).¶ Which is almost precisely the amount of oil Venezuela now ships to the United States, to those same refineries in Texas.¶ With one fell swoop, Obama could have replaced conflict oil, from a belligerent, authoritarian OPEC regime, with ethical oil from Canada.¶ But he didn’t.¶ Hugo Chavez, the bully ruler of Venezuela, is a serial human rights violator.¶ He’s a Marxist, too, but that’s a different matter. According to impeccably liberal human rights groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, Chavez has shredded civil liberties in Venezuela — crushing independent labour unions, shutting down newspapers and radio stations that disagree with him, corrupting the political system and abusing Aboriginal people.¶ It won’t surprise you to learn that a ruler who treats his own people that way threatens other countries, too.¶ Chavez routinely menaces Colombia, a true democracy, even massing troops on the border and giving cover support to narco-terrorists seeking to undermine Colombia’s government.¶ And Chavez’s new ally is none other than Mahmoud Ahmadinejad — the two men share a hatred for Americans. And they have something else in common: If it weren’t for oil revenues, they’d both have been toppled by now.¶ Venezuela sells an enormous amount of oil to the U.S. About 800,000 barrels a day. At a hundred bucks a barrel, that’s $80 million a day.¶ That’s about $30 billion a year America pays to its greatest enemy in the western hemisphere.

#### Third, Venezuela-Colombia conflict would pull in the US

Richani ‘12, Nazih, ssociate Professor of political science and Director of Latin American studies at Kean University in Union, New Jersey, “The Increasing ‘Americanization’ of the Colombian Conflict,” April 3, 2012.

(<https://nacla.org/blog/2012/4/3/increasing-%E2%80%98americanization%E2%80%99-colombian-conflict>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

First, U.S. generals David Petraeus and Stanley A. McChrystal played a pivotal role in designing Colombia’s new counterinsurgency strategy to target the mid-level command structures of the Revolutionary Armed Forced of Colombia (FARC). Now, U.S. Army general [Martin Dempsey](http://www.ambito.com/noticia.asp?id=630809), Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, is further increasing military ties between Colombia and the United States.¶ Colombian president Juan Manuel Santos and U.S. general Martin Dempsey (patriagrande.com.ve)Last week Dempsey visited Colombia, which may be on the road to becoming the third theater of U.S. military operations after Afghanistan and Iraq. Dempsey revealed that Army and perhaps Marine Corps colonels that have commanded combat brigades in Iraq and Afghanistan [will be arriving to Colombia in a few weeks](http://www.eltiempo.com/justicia/ARTICULO-WEB-NEW_NOTA_INTERIOR-11461264.html) to share their experiences with the Colombian military. The move is an effort to improve the counterinsurgency performance of the Colombian armed forces.¶ “We learned how to defeat al-Qaida by attacking the network along its entire length,” Dempsey [told reporters](http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2012/03/30/us-ties-to-latin-america-key-to-war-on-terror/) during the trip. “Now in that case we did most, if not all, of the heavy lifting. The question here [in South America] would be, can we take the same paradigm in how to attack a network—but not do it ourselves?"¶ The U.S. personnel will be housed in the strategic Larandia military base in the department of Caqueta, which has been core to the offensive against the FARC. It is reported that Larandia also housed Israeli military personnel and private security contractors such as [Dyncorp](http://forum.prisonplanet.com/index.php?topic=122633.0).¶ The increasing U.S. intervention sheds light on the growing importance of Colombia for the U.S. military strategy in the Pacific-Atlantic-Amazon triangle. The region is a key node for U.S. hemisphere security, and an important reason that the United States is not keen about the growing assertiveness of regional players such as Brazil and Venezuela. Colombia has become the most reliable satellite for the U.S. hemispheric security strategy. As Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez once said, Colombia has become the “Israel of Latin America,” with the largest military in the region, on par with Brazil.¶ For the United States, defeating the Marxist insurgency in Colombia has become an imperative in order to set up the U.S. hemispheric security regime. Given the training, aid, and experiences that the Colombian armed forces have gained over the country’s nearly 50-year civil, they could even be put at the service of the U.S. global conflicts, ranging from fighting drugs in Central America to insurgencies in Africa, Asia, or in the Middle East.

#### Fourth, Iran would join and use nuclear weapons – Keystone XL solves

Senator Lugar ‘12, Richard G., R-Indiana, is the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “Growing Risk Posed by Iran-Venezuela Axis,” Feb. 15th, 2012.

(<http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/02/15/2643399/growing-risk-posed-by-iran-venezuela.html#storylink=cpy>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

The growing and deepening alliance between the mullahs of Iran and the America-bashing leader of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, poses a serious threat to U.S. national interests, but the Obama administration has been behind the curve in appraising these risks and forging effective policies to counter them.¶ The administration’s neglect of the dangers in the Iran-Venezuela bonds assumes greater importance against the backdrop of the rising tensions in the Middle East. Iran continues to be a direct threat to U.S. national security, the security of our close ally, Israel, and other U.S. interests. As Iran accelerates its drive toward building a nuclear weapon in the face of growing U.S.-led sanctions, the probabilities grow of a major conflict in the region.¶ Countries that support Teheran, such as Venezuela, could be tempted to serve as proxies for Iran around the world and in coordination with Iran openly challenge the United States. Iranian government officials have already made statements to the effect that any response to aggression would include the closing of the Strait of Hormuz, the choke point through which a fourth of the world’s oil moves.¶ Venezuela, in sympathy with its friend Iran, could at the same time cut off its oil exports to the United States or take other steps to disrupt oil supplies.¶ Yet the administration has paid little attention to Venezuela’s tightening links with Iran and the consequences for U.S. security. The most glaring recent example is President Obama’s cavalier decision last year to delay construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, which would bring Canadian oil down to Gulf Coast refineries that now rely heavily on Venezuelan crude. Ending our energy dependence on Venezuela would take the oil weapon out of Chávez’s hands, in effect disarming him without firing a shot.¶ Hostile Iranian actions in the Western Hemisphere are not far-fetched, they are a reality. Iran is seeking to establish terrorist networks around the world, and it sponsored a terrorist attack in Buenos Aires in 1992. The bizarre plot by Iran against Saudi Arabia’s ambassador to Washington, disrupted last year, further illustrates the mullahs’ brazen intentions.¶ The chances of Venezuela serving as Iran’s surrogate in the hemisphere through terrorism or other coordinated action are increased by its chaotic state of affairs. Venezuela is in the midst of a make-or-break election that will determine the survival of its democracy amid continuing doubts about President Chávez’s health and a welcomed show of will by its diverse opposition groups. Divisions in Venezuela’s Russian-armed military, an inflation rate over 30 percent, a dilapidated oil infrastructure, widespread food and energy shortages, and soaring crime rates are all putting heavy pressure on President Chávez.

## Venezuela Terror Extensions

#### **Venezuela continues to support FARC terrorists**

Washington Post, ’10, - Colombia proves again Venezuela is harboring FARC terrorists, July 11, 2012, (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/29/AR2010072905211.html)

COLOMBIA'S PRESENTATION to the Organization of American States about Venezuela's hosting of the FARC terrorist movementprompted a flurry of speculation about the motives of Álvaro Uribe, Colombia's outgoing president. Why, it was asked, did he want to end his eight years in office in another confrontation with Venezuelan strongman Hugo Chávez? Could he be trying to sabotage his successor, Juan Manuel Santos, who is due to take office on Aug. 7?Allow us to offer a simple explanation: Mr. Uribe, who has devoted his presidency to rescuing Colombia from armed gangs of both the left and the right, is deeply frustrated by Venezuela's continuing support for the FARC-- and by the failure of the international community to hold Mr. Chávez accountable for it. Before leaving office, Mr. Uribe felt compelled to make one more effort to call attention to a problem that, were it occurring in the Middle East, would surely be before the U.N. Security Council.ThatVenezuela is backing a terrorist movement against a neighboring democratic governmenthas been beyond dispute since at least 2008, when Colombia recovered laptops from a FARC camp in Ecuador containing extensive documentation of Mr. Chávez's political and material support. [Colombia's presentation to the OAS last week](http://edition.cnn.com/2010/WORLD/americas/07/22/colombia.venezuela.oas/#fbid=aH5V0Air-ia) contained fresher and more detailed intelligence. AmbassadorLuis AlfonsoHoyos supplied precise map coordinates for several ofthe 75 FARC campsthathe said had been established on Venezuelan territory and that harborsome1,500 militants. He showed photos and videos, including one of a top commander from another Colombian terrorist organization, ELN, sipping Venezuelan beer on a popular Venezuelan beach.

#### U. S now views Venezuela as a state that supports terrorism

Walser, ’10-Ray Walser, Ph.D. Veteran Foreign Service officer, January 20, 2010, “State sponsors of terrorism: time to add Venezuela to the list”, July 11, 2012,

http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/01/state-sponsors-of-terrorism-time-to-add-venezuela-to-the-list

The U.S. officially designatesfourcountries as state sponsors of terrorism--Iran, Syria, Cuba, and Sudan.It ishightime to add Venezuela to the list. Far from being merely a populist showman and bully, Hugo Chávez is a reckless leader who collaborates with Colombian narcoterrorists andIslamist terrorists, pals around with brutal Iranian dictator Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, is a virulent anti-Semite, and is guided by a relentless anti-Americanism in everything he does.President Obama does not see Venezuela as a threat to U.S. national security. This view is not optimistic--it is dangerous. Heritage Foundation Latin America expert Ray Walser lays out the overwhelming-- and disturbing--evidence of the increasing threat that the Chávez regime poses to U.S. security

#### Proof that Venezuela houses terrorists comes out

Voice of America, ’10-7-28-2010,“Venezuela must help fight terrorism”, july 11, 2012, http://www.voanews.com/policy/editorials/Venezuela-Must-Help-Fight-Terrorism-99464549.html

At a meeting of the Permanent Council of the Organization of American StatesJuly 21,Colombia's ambassadorto the OASpresented captured photographs, maps,videos and other materials to back up longstanding claims thatthe Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC, and National Liberation Army, or ELN, have bases inborder areas ofVenezuela.The ambassador, Luis Alfonso Hoyos,asked the Venezuelangovernment to dismantle the campsand go after the guerrillas. He also asked the OAS to form an international commission to verify Colombia's information.

#### Venezuela aids in the overthrow of the region

Rainone, No date-Anthony Rainone, “Venezuela: a new terrorist haven” writer for reflections.com, July 11, 2012, http://www.ebireflections.com/1/17/3

According to several Colombian law enforcement documents and El Tiempo, a leading Colombian newspaper, Mr. Chavez allows the use of Venezuelan territory as a staging area for terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (known as the FARC) to attack Colombia's armed forces. This attack is aimed at overthrowing the democratic government of Colombia. This threatens the peace and stability of the region.

## AT – No Attack

#### 1. Chavez has a history of violence and is now aligned with anti-American Iran. Keystone is the only way to defund his regime

Levant, Ezra, columnist for Sun Media newspapers and the anchor of a daily news commentary show on the Sun News Network. Ezra was the publisher of the Western Standard magazine and has written for Sun newspapers going back to his days as a student. A lawyer by profession, Ezra is also the author of several best-selling books including 2009's "Shakedown" about Canada's human rights commissions and 2010's "Ethical Oil: The case for Canada's oilsands", “Keystone Cop-Out: Obama Chose Conflict Venezuelan Oil Over Ethical Canuck Oil, and Movie Stars Over Working Men, Women,” Jan. 21, 2012.

(<http://www.torontosun.com/2012/01/20/keystone-cop-out>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

U.S. President Barack Obama made a choice last week: He chose Venezuela over Canada.¶ That’s what he did when he rejected the proposed Keystone XL pipeline that would have taken oilsands oil from Alberta to the Gulf Coast of Texas.¶ That pipeline would have delivered 700,000 barrels of oil every day from Canada (and from a new oilfield called Bakken that straddles the North Dakota-Saskatchewan border).¶ Which is almost precisely the amount of oil Venezuela now ships to the United States, to those same refineries in Texas.¶ With one fell swoop, Obama could have replaced conflict oil, from a belligerent, authoritarian OPEC regime, with ethical oil from Canada.¶ But he didn’t.¶ Hugo Chavez, the bully ruler of Venezuela, is a serial human rights violator.¶ He’s a Marxist, too, but that’s a different matter. According to impeccably liberal human rights groups like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, Chavez has shredded civil liberties in Venezuela — crushing independent labour unions, shutting down newspapers and radio stations that disagree with him, corrupting the political system and abusing Aboriginal people.¶ It won’t surprise you to learn that a ruler who treats his own people that way threatens other countries, too.¶ Chavez routinely menaces Colombia, a true democracy, even massing troops on the border and giving cover support to narco-terrorists seeking to undermine Colombia’s government.¶ And Chavez’s new ally is none other than Mahmoud Ahmadinejad — the two men share a hatred for Americans. And they have something else in common: If it weren’t for oil revenues, they’d both have been toppled by now.¶ Venezuela sells an enormous amount of oil to the U.S. About 800,000 barrels a day. At a hundred bucks a barrel, that’s $80 million a day.¶ That’s about $30 billion a year America pays to its greatest enemy in the western hemisphere.

#### 2. Venezuela and Iran have and will continue terrorism against the US – Multiple Warrants – AND – Keystone XL solves

Senator Lugar, Richard G., R-Indiana, is the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, “Growing Risk Posed by Iran-Venezuela Axis,” Feb. 15th, 2012.

(<http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/02/15/2643399/growing-risk-posed-by-iran-venezuela.html#storylink=cpy>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

The growing and deepening alliance between the mullahs of Iran and the America-bashing leader of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, poses a serious threat to U.S. national interests, but the Obama administration has been behind the curve in appraising these risks and forging effective policies to counter them.¶ The administration’s neglect of the dangers in the Iran-Venezuela bonds assumes greater importance against the backdrop of the rising tensions in the Middle East. Iran continues to be a direct threat to U.S. national security, the security of our close ally, Israel, and other U.S. interests. As Iran accelerates its drive toward building a nuclear weapon in the face of growing U.S.-led sanctions, the probabilities grow of a major conflict in the region.¶ Countries that support Teheran, such as Venezuela, could be tempted to serve as proxies for Iran around the world and in coordination with Iran openly challenge the United States. Iranian government officials have already made statements to the effect that any response to aggression would include the closing of the Strait of Hormuz, the choke point through which a fourth of the world’s oil moves.¶ Venezuela, in sympathy with its friend Iran, could at the same time cut off its oil exports to the United States or take other steps to disrupt oil supplies.¶ Yet the administration has paid little attention to Venezuela’s tightening links with Iran and the consequences for U.S. security. The most glaring recent example is President Obama’s cavalier decision last year to delay construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, which would bring Canadian oil down to Gulf Coast refineries that now rely heavily on Venezuelan crude. Ending our energy dependence on Venezuela would take the oil weapon out of Chávez’s hands, in effect disarming him without firing a shot.¶ Hostile Iranian actions in the Western Hemisphere are not far-fetched, they are a reality. Iran is seeking to establish terrorist networks around the world, and it sponsored a terrorist attack in Buenos Aires in 1992. The bizarre plot by Iran against Saudi Arabia’s ambassador to Washington, disrupted last year, further illustrates the mullahs’ brazen intentions.¶ The chances of Venezuela serving as Iran’s surrogate in the hemisphere through terrorism or other coordinated action are increased by its chaotic state of affairs. Venezuela is in the midst of a make-or-break election that will determine the survival of its democracy amid continuing doubts about President Chávez’s health and a welcomed show of will by its diverse opposition groups. Divisions in Venezuela’s Russian-armed military, an inflation rate over 30 percent, a dilapidated oil infrastructure, widespread food and energy shortages, and soaring crime rates are all putting heavy pressure on President Chávez.

## AT – No Anti-Americanism

#### 1. Chaves and Ahmadinejad openly spoke against America

Mahjar-Barducci, Anna, Fellow at the Gatestone Institute, “Iran, Venezuela Plotting Attacks “Worse than 9/11,” January 13, 2012.

(<http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/2748/iran-venezuela-plotting-attacks>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

The U.S. action against the Venezuelan Consul comes exactly at the time Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad visited Venezuela. It therefore seems a clear signal of disapproval that Washington wanted to send to Venezuela, given that the Venezuelan consul is accused of having backed an alleged Iranian plot to attack the U.S.¶ Ahmadinejad's visit indicates the further strengthening of relations between Venezuela and Iran. During the visit, Ahmadinejad and Chavez took the opportunity to laugh at the U.S.'s concern over Iran's nuclear program. "They accuse us of being warmongers," said Chavez. "They, the Americans, are the threat." Chavez also commented o being honored by Ahmadinejad's visit. "Now Washington's spokespersons are saying that it is not convenient for any country to get close to Iran. Well, the truth is that this makes us laugh," Chavez said.¶ In a Univision interview, U.S. President Barack Obama declared that the Venezuelan government's relations with Iran did not serve the interests of the Venezuelan people. "Ultimately, it is up to the Venezuelan people to determine what they gain from a relationship with a country that violates universal human rights and is isolated from much of the world. The Iranian government has consistently supported international terrorism that has killed innocent men, women and children around the world – including in the Americas. It has brutally suppressed the Iranian people simply for demanding their universal rights. And Tehran continues to pursue a nuclear program that threatens the security of the Middle East. Here in the Americas, we take Iranian activities, including in Venezuela, very seriously and we will continue to monitor them closely," Obama said.¶ Chavez, however, seems not at all worried, and is evidently willing to keep on cooperating with Iran, even if this will lead to more U.S. sanctions. During the meeting with Ahmadinejad, the two heads of state agreed to expand cooperation in the fields of industry, science and nano-technology, as well as economy. They also called on the "imperialist and extremist powers to stop interfering in the internal affairs of other countries."¶ It is clear, that despite the expulsion of the Venezuelan Consul, the U.S. should keep high alert, as other threats against the U.S. can come from Venezuela, in cooperation with Iran.

## AT – Chavez will die soon

#### 1. Iran is still interconnected into Venezuela, through terrorism, economically, politically and militarily

#### 2. Chavez no longer has cancer

Naranio and Cawthorne, Mario and Andrew, Reuters, “Venezuela’s Chavez says “Totally Free’ of Cancer Again,” July 09, 2012.

(<http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-07-09/news/sns-rt-us-venezuela-election-chavezbre8681cq-20120709_1_bolivarian-hurricane-venezuela-s-chavez-south-american-opec>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

CARACAS (Reuters) - Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez on Monday declared himself fully recovered from cancer and ready to return to the streets for his re-election campaign ahead of an October vote.¶ "Free, free, totally free," an ebullient Chavez told reporters when asked if he was free of the disease that struck a year ago.

## \*\*\*2AC Add-Ons

## Economy Advantages

## Canadian Economy Add-On

#### 1. The energy sector is key to the Canadian economy – ten percent of GDP

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “Misplaced Outrage,” Jul 9, 2012.

(<http://www.ipolitics.ca/2012/07/09/hampson-burney-misplaced-outrage/>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

When your #1 trading partner misbehaves the actions need to be challenged vigorously no matter what the year. They should certainly not be excused least of all by Canadians. The fact that Canada is still the United States’ #1 export market seems to have escaped the attention of the Obama Administration and its Canadian acolytes.¶ Should the presidential veto of Keystone be sustained this would violate a basic principle of NAFTA. Is that something we should take on the chin as being “understandably political?” We suspect that many, particularly many in western Canada would respectfully disagree as should anyone with a modicum of appreciation for tangible Canadian interests. The energy sector alone contributes more than one tenth of Canada’s GDP.

## Middle East Oil Dependency Add-On (incomplete)

#### U.S. Dependence on Middle East Oil is bad, need to look for another source

#### (Luft, Gal 10-27-04, executive director of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security in Washington, D.C. a specialist on strategic issues and energy policy with a PhD in strategic studies, A former lieutenant colonel in the Israel Defense Forces, writings have appeared in *Commentary, Foreign Affairs,* the *Los Angeles Times, Middle East Review of International Affairs,* the *Washington Post* and *Wall Street Journal* http://www.meforum.org/653/ending-americas-dependence-on-middle-east-oil)

Today, however, the U.S. finds itself in the position of financially supporting both itself and its enemies in the "War on Terror." This is a consequence of the U.S.'s growing dependence on oil, particularly as a transportation fuel. Currently, the United States consumes 25% of the world's oil while possessing only 3% of world oil reserves. The Muslim world, in contrast, depends on oil far less while possessing 75% of the world's oil reserves. As the U.S. continues to invest in the oil economies of the Middle East and the 5

, these economies continue to use their oil revenues to spread radical Islam, promote anti-Semitic and anti-American ideas, and in some cases, develop unconventional weapons. Every time an American goes to a gas station, he is sending money to America's enemies. To complicate the matter, America is not the only country with a growing demand for foreign oil. China and India, hosting two of the largest and fastest growing economies, are also experiencing a steep rise in their demand for transportation fuel. China, for example, will likely enter into Middle Eastern politics in order to meet this demand. It will need to enhance its diplomatic relations in the region and possibly increase its weapons sales to the Muslim world's oil moguls. Foreshadowing this potential development is the Pakistani nuclear bomb, which was built by the Chinese and financed by the Saudis. The steeply rising demand for oil today means that the disruption of petroleum production causes oil prices to rise. America's Islamist foes are aware of this reality and view it as America's Achilles' heel. According to an al-Qaeda spokesman, the October 2002 attack on a French oil tanker off the coast of Yemen was a victory against the "Crusader nations." After the terrorist attack against oil employees in Khobar, Saudi Arabia, al-Qaeda leaders bragged that the consequent rise in oil prices caused Americans to suffer. Some people believe that an American invasion of Saudi Arabia, home to the world's largest oil reserves, will resolve the oil problem. These people fail to look at the situation in Iraq, home to the world's second largest oil reserve. Due to the instability caused by the invasion, the U.S. is not receiving any Iraqi oil and will not obtain any Iraqi oil in the near future. Results from an invasion of Saudi Arabia would be similar. The U.S. needs to get serious about gradually reducing the demand for foreign oil and bringing about the turning point in the current war. To do so, it must promote scientific and technological advancement by tapping into homegrown fuel sources that can be used for transportation purposes. These include: electricity, coal, and biomass (agricultural waste). Currently, the U.S. has 25% of the world's coal and billions of tons of biomass. In fact, nearly 60% of the garbage Americans throw away can be used as transportation fuel. Electricity can power vehicles. On an electric battery, a vehicle may drive between 20 and 40 miles before the battery needs to recharge, which can be done easily overnight. New hybrid vehicles will carry both an electric battery and a normal engine. The engine will run on gasoline only after a driver exceeds the mile capacity of the electric battery. This will make possible trips longer than 40 miles. These hybrids will empower electricity companies and end the transportation fuel monopoly held by the oil companies. Alcohol fuels such as ethanol, made from corn or biomass and methanol, made from coal, can also power a vehicle. Flexible fuel vehicles can run on any combination of gasoline and alcohol, thus reducing the overall amount of oil used. There are three million cars on the road today that are built to use the alcohol-gasoline mixture. Ford Taurus, Dodge Caravan, and Mercedes C-320 are all flexible fuel cars. In addition to decreasing U.S. need for foreign oil, flexible fuel will also aid the economy because it will bring new jobs to the American farmers and the American coal miners. These alternate fuel vehicles can move the U.S. into an energy era free of dependence on OPEC and other oil exporters. Equally significant, the Europeans, Chinese, Japanese, and others will look to the U.S. as the world leader in this new energy era.Unfortunately, current U.S. energy policy is looking elsewhere, towards seeking oil reserves outside the Middle East. This is at best a short-term and ultimately shortsighted solution. If we deplete the oil reserves outside the Middle East before we deplete the reserves in the Middle East, we will become in time more dependent on Middle Eastern oil than ever before. To avoid these outcomes, there needs to be a "Set America Free Plan" that will utilize alternate energy sources. In order to effectively implement its principles, leaders of this initiative must use the conservative political movement in America as its avenue to the American public. Usually, environmental political groups endorse energy initiatives of this nature as part of environmental preservation or anti-global warming campaigns. These campaigns, however, fail to resonate with the American public because of a general apathy toward the environment and distrust of anti-capitalists causes. Contrarily, if the initiative is presented by the conservatives and linked to the national security agenda, it will gain the necessary public support for implementation. Consequently, liberal political groups will also look to endorse the new energy campaign, further bolstering its appeal. Essentially, America will not be able to win its "War on Terror" if energy security is not at the top of its agenda.

## Solves Bottleneck Scenario

#### **Pipeline construction solves oil bottleneck**

Broder 6-26 (John M., White House Correspondent – New York Times, “U.S. Grants a Keystone Pipeline Permit,” New York Times, 2012, <http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/26/u-s-grants-a-keystone-pipeline-permit/>)

“We continue to believe that we will be in a position to begin construction later this summer and are working with the Corps and others to secure the approvals and permits we require,” the company said in a statement. “Once the gulf coast project is completed, it will help move both Canadian and American oil to refineries on the gulf coast, where it is critically needed.”It will help push out oil from OPEC nations or conflict regions and replace it with safe, secure and reliable access to Canadian and American oil,” it added. “It will help remove the bottleneck that currently exists in Cushing, which is impacting American producers.”

## \*\*\*2AC Solvency

## Presidential Permit

#### 1. Affirming the new presidential permit for the Keystone XL pipeline allows a connection to be made from Nebraska to Canada. This connection will allow Canadian oil to be moved throughout many more projects

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12.

The permit for Keystone XL, which would add an additional 0.8 Mbpd of import capacity, was denied by the U.S. State Department in January 2012. However, TransCanada subsequently announced that it would proceed with development of the Keystone XL segment connecting Cushing, OK, to the Gulf Coast as a stand-alone project not requiring a Presidential Permit. The company also informed the State Department that it intended to file a new Presidential Permit application for the remaining cross-border segment of the Keystone XL project from the Canadian border through Nebraska. If ultimately approved and constructed, Keystone XL would bring Canada’s total U.S. petroleum export capacity to over 4.1Mbpd, enough capacity to carry over 35% of U.S. petroleum imports in 2011. Given that Canada actually supplied the United¶ States 2.7 Mbpd in 2011, large increases in Canadian supply will ultimately be possible, although¶ the industry anticipates significant excess pipeline capacity for the next decade. In addition,¶ several large pipeline projects are proposed within the United States to increase movements of Canadian petroleum to and from key U.S. market hubs, including refineries in the Midwest and on the Gulf Coast that employ complex technology in order to process “heavy” crude oils like those from Canada, Mexico and Venezuela.

## Other Mechanisms

### North American Energy Access Act

#### 1. By passing the North American Energy Access Act, the keystone decision will be passed over to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which wouldn’t require a presidential permit.

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12.

The Obama administration has lent its support for TransCanada’s plan to proceed with the southern segment of the Keystone XL pipeline, while reserving judgment on the reconfigured¶ northern segment until completion of a new Presidential Permit review. A final State Department¶ decision on a re-filed permit application appears unlikely before 2013, however. Congress may act to influence this decision in the meantime. The North American Energy Access Act (H.R.¶ 3548) would transfer the permitting authority over the pipeline to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, requiring the commission to issue a permit for the project within 30 days of enactment. The Keystone For a Secure Tomorrow Act (H.R. 3811) would immediately approve the original permit application. S. 2041. The Energizing America through Employment Act (H.R.¶ 4000) would also approve the original permit upon passage. All four bills include provisions for¶ later alteration of the pipeline route in Nebraska. S. 2100 would suspend sales of petroleum¶ products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until issuance of a Presidential Permit for the¶ Keystone XL project. H.R. 3900 would seek to ensure that crude oil transported by the Keystone¶ XL pipeline, or resulting refined petroleum products, would be sold only into U.S. markets.¶

### Keystone For a Secure Tomorrow Act

#### 1. By passing the Keystone For a Secure Tomorrow Act, the original permit will be approved

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12.

The Obama administration has lent its support for TransCanada’s plan to proceed with the southern segment of the Keystone XL pipeline, while reserving judgment on the reconfigured¶ northern segment until completion of a new Presidential Permit review. A final State Department¶ decision on a re-filed permit application appears unlikely before 2013, however. Congress may act to influence this decision in the meantime. The North American Energy Access Act (H.R.¶ 3548) would transfer the permitting authority over the pipeline to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, requiring the commission to issue a permit for the project within 30 days of enactment. The Keystone For a Secure Tomorrow Act (H.R. 3811) would immediately approve the original permit application. S. 2041. The Energizing America through Employment Act (H.R.¶ 4000) would also approve the original permit upon passage. All four bills include provisions for¶ later alteration of the pipeline route in Nebraska. S. 2100 would suspend sales of petroleum¶ products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until issuance of a Presidential Permit for the¶ Keystone XL project. H.R. 3900 would seek to ensure that crude oil transported by the Keystone¶ XL pipeline, or resulting refined petroleum products, would be sold only into U.S. markets.¶

### Energizing America Through Employment Act

#### 1. By passing the Energizing America Through Employment Act, the original permit will be approved

Fergusson and Ek, Ian F. and Carl, Specialist in International Trade and Finance and Specialist in International Relations, “Canada-U.S. Relations,” April 5, 2012.

(<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/96-397.pdf>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12.

The Obama administration has lent its support for TransCanada’s plan to proceed with the southern segment of the Keystone XL pipeline, while reserving judgment on the reconfigured¶ northern segment until completion of a new Presidential Permit review. A final State Department¶ decision on a re-filed permit application appears unlikely before 2013, however. Congress may act to influence this decision in the meantime. The North American Energy Access Act (H.R.¶ 3548) would transfer the permitting authority over the pipeline to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, requiring the commission to issue a permit for the project within 30 days of enactment. The Keystone For a Secure Tomorrow Act (H.R. 3811) would immediately approve the original permit application. S. 2041. The Energizing America through Employment Act (H.R.¶ 4000) would also approve the original permit upon passage. All four bills include provisions for¶ later alteration of the pipeline route in Nebraska. S. 2100 would suspend sales of petroleum¶ products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until issuance of a Presidential Permit for the¶ Keystone XL project. H.R. 3900 would seek to ensure that crude oil transported by the Keystone¶ XL pipeline, or resulting refined petroleum products, would be sold only into U.S. markets.¶

## \*\*\*Answers

## “Increase” = Spending card

#### We meet -- Accepting the permit would subsequently result in a $1 billion dollar tax subsidy

Stockman, Lorne, Coordinator of the Remember Saro-Wiwa campaign, Oil Exchange International, “Keystone XL Benefits from Taxpayer Subsidies,” Feb. 8th, 2012.

(<http://priceofoil.org/2012/02/08/keystone-xl-benefits-from-taxpayer-subsidies/>. JMC.) Accessed 7/12/12.

Sen. Mitch McConnell claimed recently that the Keystone XL Pipeline “doesn’t require a penny of our taxpayer money all the president has to do is approve it.” But our research reveals many places that the pipeline project benefits from taxpayer subsidies.¶ [The refineries that are linked](http://priceofoil.org/2011/08/31/report-exporting-energy-security-keystone-xl-exposed/) to the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline as [committed shippers](http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/Oil/3900710) will receive between $1 billion and $1.8 billion in tax breaks. They are paid specifically for investing in equipment to process the heavy sour oil the pipeline promises to deliver.¶ The largest of these refineries, [Motiva](http://www.motivaenterprises.com/home/content/motiva/about/), is half owned by Saudi Refining Inc., and will receive between $680 million and $1.1 billion in U.S. taxpayer support.¶ Keystone XL, like all oil industry projects, is enabled by substantial taxpayer subsidies. Three of the refineries that are planning to process the pipeline’s oil have invested in special equipment to handle the extra heavy tar sands oil. According to our conservative estimates, the U.S. taxpayer is subsidizing these investments to the tune of $1.0-1.8 billion. Here’s how it works.¶ Tar sands oil is not like most other crude oil. It is a semi-solid bituminous sludge that has to be diluted with much lighter oil in order to be transported by pipeline. Once it arrives at a refinery, the diluent is removed and the bitumen is refined into petroleum products using special equipment. The equipment required includes cokers and hydrocrackers.¶ In anticipation of the Keystone XL pipeline, three refineries in Port Arthur, Texas have added this equipment in order to be able to profitably process the bitumen. Their goal is to maximize their production of high value fuels such as gasoline and diesel rather than be left with less valuable fuels such as residual oil (for shipping and industrial burners) and Petroleum Coke, a coal like substance that is burned in aluminum smelters and the like. Heavy oil yields high proportions of these less valuable fuels if you do not have the specific equipment to increase the higher value yield.¶ Special tax rules apply to these investments that are unique to the refining industry. Title 179C of the tax code allows the refining companies to deduct the value of these investments from their tax returns at a highly accelerated rate. Rather than spread the expense over the life time of the equipment, say 20-30 years, the refiners are allowed to expense (i.e., deduct from their taxable income) 50% in the first year and expense the rest through the next 9 years. This is tantamount to a massive interest free loan from the taxpayer to big oil refiners, making it cheaper for them to process a particularly dirty form of foreign oil. In the case of the three Port Arthur refineries preparing to process Keystone XL crude, we calculate this to cost the taxpayer between $1.0 billion and $1.8 billion.

## AT – Eventual Passage

#### 1. It will be too late to solve our advantages. China will have already shifted business to Asia and relations will be destroyed

Burney and Hampson, Derek and Fen, Burney was Senior Strategic Advisor of Norton Rose, former Chief of Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister, and Canadian Ambassador to the US, Fen is the Chancellor’s Professor & Director of NPSIA, Professor of International Affairs, “How Obama Lost Canada: Botching Relations With the United States’ Biggest Trade Partner,” June 21st, 2012.

(<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137744/derek-h-burney-and-fen-osler-hampson/how-obama-lost-canada>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

The Keystone XL pipeline will probably be approved eventually — the economic consequences of not building it are simply too great — but it will take a long time to undo the damage its delay has done to U.S.-Canadian relations. Obama’s mishandling of an ordinarily routine pipeline permit awakened Canadians to the problems with depending exclusively on the United States as an export market. Already, Ottawa has shifted toward alternative options that include exporting oil from the west and east coasts of Canada later this decade. To that end, the Harper government introduced legislation that will speed regulatory approval of such projects.¶ In May 1961, U.S. President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the Canadian parliament in which he celebrated the deep ties between the United States and Canada. “Geography has made us neighbors, history has made us friends, economics has made us partners, and necessity has made us allies,” he said. What Kennedy stated then is still true today, and the two countries, linked by shared values and a network of individual contacts, will continue to cooperate for their mutual security and prosperity. Yet none of the truths he listed should excuse neglect. Even relations between close allies require constant care. And when the world’s most powerful country allows narrow political considerations to trample the high-priority interests of its immediate neighbor, it raises questions not only about its ability to maintain an entrenched alliance but also about its capacity for steady global leadership.

## AT – Environmental Concerns

#### 1. We straight turn this, The a subpoint is defense, three years of review proves no environmental impact AND the b subpoint is the turn, Canada turning to China is worse for the environment.

Senator Hoeven, John, Republican Senator from ND and former governor, “Why We Need the Keystone Oil Pipeline,” February 24, 2012.

(<http://www.cnn.com/2012/02/23/opinion/hoeven-keystone-pipeline-defense/index.html>. JMC.) Access 7/10/12.

From an environmental perspective, the project has been under review since September 2008, more than three years, and the State Department's environmental review, completed in August 2011, found "no significant impacts on most resources" providing environmental restrictions are met. Further, our new legislation includes all federal and state safeguards and sets no time limit on Nebraska's ability to further review the pipeline's route through the state, the only portion of the route in contention. Additionally, 80% of the new Canadian oil sands development is being developed "in situ," meaning, it has a similar carbon footprint and emissions as conventional oil wells.¶ If the Keystone XL pipeline isn't built, Canadian oil will still be produced -- 700,000 barrels a day of it -- but instead of coming down to our refineries in the United States, instead of creating jobs for American workers, instead of reducing our dependence on a turbulent part of the world, that oil will be shipped to China.¶ It will have to be carried there on large oil tankers, creating more carbon emissions, and it will be processed at facilities with weaker environmental safeguards.¶ Finally, it's important to point out that the Keystone XL pipeline is nothing new. Thousands of pipelines crisscross our nation, delivering refined products to fuel our cars, heat our homes and power our industries. In fact, the original Keystone pipeline, which became operational in 2010, runs from Alberta through my state of North Dakota. Contrary to claims by critics, the pipeline itself has never leaked. The leaks happened at fittings and seals at above-ground pumping stations, which were properly and promptly fixed.

#### 2. More evi.

Sivy, Michael, Chartered Financial Analyst and a former securities analyst for an independent stock research firm, “The Unlikely Green Alternative to the Keystone Pipeline? Railroads,” January 24, 2012.

(<http://business.time.com/2012/01/24/railroads-the-unlikely-green-alternative-to-the-keystone-pipeline/#ixzz20KcXHwFA>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

President Obama’s decision last week to kill the Keystone XL Pipeline that would carry oil from Canada to the U.S. was cheered by some environmental activists like Robert Redford. But many mainstream commentators reacted with dismay. A Washington Post editorial called the decision wrong on the substance of the question. And a columnist for the same newspaper described it more hyperbolically as “an act of national insanity.” The argument for the pipeline is not only that it would give the U.S. a secure source of oil with low transportation costs, create jobs and help our close ally Canada, but also that the alternative is actually worse from an environmental point of view. Canada is still going to produce its oil, and the U.S. is still going to need energy. Without the pipeline, Canada will have to try to sell some of its oil to China, which means building a pipeline to the Canadian West Coast. And we will buy more from the Middle East or somewhere else. The overall result: more oil shipped longer distances and greater chances of an oil spill

#### 3. Without Keystone XL the US will import oil from Venezuela, which is kills the enviroment

Levant, Ezra, columnist for Sun Media newspapers and the anchor of a daily news commentary show on the Sun News Network. Ezra was the publisher of the Western Standard magazine and has written for Sun newspapers going back to his days as a student. A lawyer by profession, Ezra is also the author of several best-selling books including 2009's "Shakedown" about Canada's human rights commissions and 2010's "Ethical Oil: The case for Canada's oilsands", “Keystone Cop-Out: Obama Chose Conflict Venezuelan Oil Over Ethical Canuck Oil, and Movie Stars Over Working Men, Women,” Jan. 21, 2012.

(<http://www.torontosun.com/2012/01/20/keystone-cop-out>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

It’s not just conflict oil, though. Venezuelan oil is some of the most carbon-intense oil in the world — even more so than Canada’s oilsands.¶ So by replacing Venezuelan imports with Keystone XL oilsands oil, not only would Obama have been doing the right thing geopolitically, it would have reduced America’s carbon footprint — which Obama claims to care about.

## AT – Pipelines Spill

#### 1. Straight turn, the a subpoint is defense, 1. pipelines are empirically the safest form of oil transportation and 2. Keystone XL is the best pipeline yet AND the b subpoint is the turn, without Keystone XL the US will get oil from more unsafe places

Girling, Russell, The Hill and Chief Executive Officer, President and Director, [TransCanada Corp.](http://investing.businessweek.com/research/stocks/snapshot/snapshot.asp?capId=309162), “The Proposed Keystone XL Pipeline Will Be Built Responsibly,” 2011.

(<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-a-environment/171321-the-proposed-keystone-xl-pipeline-will-be-built-responsibly?page=2>. JMC.) Accessed 7/10/12.

Keystone XL is a 1,700-mile (2,700 KM) proposed pipeline that would carry Canadian and U.S. crude oil to U.S. refineries including those at the U.S. Gulf Coast. Using the most advanced technology, the pipeline will be monitored 24 hours a day through a centralized control centre. 16,000 sensors embedded in the pipeline provide data via satellite every five seconds. If the slightest drop in pipeline pressure is detected, remote valves are automatically closed, shutting off the flow of oil within minutes.¶ Our pipeline would cross Montana’s Yellowstone River. As Governor Brian Schweitzer (D) pointed out, Keystone XL will use the most advanced construction techniques, including horizontal directional drilling that allows us to drill under the river a minimum of 25 feet. The pipe will be built with thicker steel, operate at a lower pressure and use advanced coatings to protect the surface from abrasion – all in an effort to further improve safety. To ensure the integrity of our pipelines longer term, they are cathodically protected, which means a low-voltage electric current runs through the pipeline, inhibiting external corrosion. ¶ Internal electronic devices called “pigs” are pushed along inside the pipeline to inspect the pipe’s integrity. These special monitoring tools are used to detect anomalies involving loss of wall thickness, including corrosion. In the unlikely event anomalies are detected, the pipeline segment in question is excavated and visually inspected. It is either repaired on the spot or replaced. In addition, pipeline rights of way are routinely patrolled from the air. Ground patrols with hand-held leak detectors are also employed. TransCanada has voluntarily agreed to 57 conditions put forward by the U.S. national pipeline regulator PHMSA (Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration) that will further improve the safety of Keystone. These conditions include an increased number of automatic shut-off valves, increased pipeline inspections and burying the pipeline deeper in the ground. Pipelines remain the safest method of transporting oil – safer than tankers, trucks or rail. Each day in the U.S., more than 200,000 miles of pipelines move oil and other energy products safely to where they are needed. That’s enough pipe to circle the earth eight times. National pipeline statistics indicate that pipeline accidents are uncommon and that leaks tend to be small; most pipeline leaks involve three barrels or less, 80 percent of spills involve less than 50 barrels and less than 0.5 percent of spills total more than 10,000 barrels. The United States consumes 15 million barrels of oil per day and imports 11 million. Keystone XL offers Americans the choice of receiving their oil from a friendly, secure supplier in Canada, instead of importing crude from unstable, volatile foreign nations such as Venezuela, Libya and other areas of the Middle East.

## AT – Indigenous People

#### 1. We link turn this, China-Canada oil connection goes directly though Indigenous peoples’ land

Thinkprogress.org, Edited by Joe Romm, we cover climate science, solutions and politics. Columnist Tom Friedman calls us "the indispensable blog" and Time magazine named us one of the 25 "Best Blogs of 2010.", “Pipeline or Pipe Dream? A China-Bound Alterntaive to Keystone XL is No Easy Feat,” Mar 23, 2012.

(<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/23/450615/pipeline-or-pipe-dream-a-china-bound-alternative-to-keystone-xl-is-no-easy-feat/?mobile=nc>. JMC.) Accessed 7/11/12.

Then there’s the Canadian constitution. In Canada, indigenous peoples’ rights are protected under the constitution. While Canada’s adherence to this is far from perfect, a growing body of legal decisions give a strong say to affected indigenous communities in decisions about large development projects like the proposed pipeline.¶ The pipeline would pass through the territory of indigenous communities including the Carrier-Sekani Tribal Council, the Haida Nation, and the Yinka Dene Alliance, many of which have not signed treaties with the Canadian government, meaning that they have powerful leverage to stop or significantly delay the pipeline because their land has not been ceded.¶ And these communities are vocally opposing the pipeline and tanker project, with [130](http://wcel.org/resources/publication/first-nations-have-declared-opposition-proposed-enbridge-tanker-pipeline-proje) of them signing the [Save the Fraser Declaration](http://savethefraser.ca/) and the [Coastal First Nation Declaration](http://wcel.org/sites/default/files/file-downloads/Coastal%20First%20Nations%20Tanker%20Ban%20Declaration.pdf). Indigenous communities whose territories make up more than 50 percent of the combined pipeline and tanker route do not support this project, and they’ve banned oil tankers and pipelines using their indigenous laws and authority, which are recognized under Canadian and international law. They have vowed to “[form an unbroken wall of opposition from the U.S. border to the Arctic Ocean](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/03/keystone_china_alternative.html/%22http:/www.theglobeandma).”¶ The controversy even [followed Prime Minister Harper all the way to China](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/03/keystone_china_alternative.html/%22http:/www.vancou) last month, with the Yinka Dene Alliance, five communities in central British Columbia, sending an open letter to Chinese President Hu Jintao raising human rights concerns related to the Canadian government’s treatment of indigenous peoples and opposition to tar sands oil.¶ These aren’t empty threats, either. The indigenous communities in central British Columbia took on big development projects in the past and won in the courts. And in the case of the Great Bear Rainforest, coastal First Nations communities partnered with environmental groups to create a plan for sustainable development, demonstrating these communities’ appetite for creatively finding income-generating options while protecting ecosystems.

## AT – Clean Energy DA

1. Tag me

Levi 12 (Michael A., Senior Fellow for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change, “Five Myths About the Keystone XL Pipeline,” Council on Foreign Relations, 1-18, http://www.cfr.org/energyenvironment/five-myths-keystone-xl-pipeline/p27099)

4. The pipeline would have set back the green economy.

The Natural Resources Defense Council, a key group opposing the Keystone XL project, claimed that the pipeline "is at odds with millions of clean energy jobs." Others have advanced more subtle variations: Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.), writing to Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton late last year, pitted pipeline construction against clean energy, asserting that "proponents of this pipeline would be wiser to invest instead in job-creating clean energy projects, like renewable power, energy efficiency or advanced vehicles and fuels."¶ Clean energy is important, but these claims are unjustified. Entrepreneurs weren't waiting on the sidelines to see what happened with Keystone XL before pouring money into new technologies for biofuels or solar power. Nor were motorists putting off the choice between a Prius and a Hummer until the State Department weighed in. The future of the green economy will depend on whether the U.S. government can consistently penalize dirty energy across the economy — rather than in isolated spots such as this pipeline — as well as promote greater energy efficiency through regulation and offer direct support to sustainable-energy innovation.

## \*\*\*CPs

## AT – Railroads CP

#### Pipeline transport is the safest means to move oil--- Railroad equivalents would be expensive, dangerous, and detrimental to the environment

**DOT 07,** U.S. Department of Transportation’sPipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), “Safe Pipelines FAQs”, August 27, 2007,<http://phmsa.dot.gov/portal/site/PHMSA/menuitem.ebdc7a8a7e39f2e55cf2031050248a0c/?vgnextoid=2c6924cc45ea4110VgnVCM1000009ed07898RCRD&vgnextchannel=f7280665b91ac010VgnVCM1000008049a8c0RCRD&vgnextfmt=print>

Pipelines are the safest and most cost-effective means to transport the extraordinary volumes of natural gas and hazardous liquid products that fuel our economy.To move the volume of even a modest pipeline, it would take a constant line of tanker trucks, about 750 per day, loading up and moving out every two minutes, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The railroad-equivalent of this single pipeline would be a train of seventy-five 2,000-barrel tank rail cars everyday. These alternatives would require many times the people, clog the air with engine pollutants, be prohibitively expensive and -- with many more vehicles on roads and rails carrying hazardous materials -- unacceptably dangerous. Relative to the volumes of products transported, pipelines are extremely safe when compared to other modes of energy transportation. Oil pipeline spills amount to about 1 gallon per million barrel-miles (Association of Oil Pipelines). One barrel, transported one mile, equals one barrel-mile, and there are 42 gallons in a barrel. In household terms, this is less than one teaspoon of oil spilled per thousand barrel-miles.Pipelines also generally have a better safety record (deaths, injuries, fires/explosions) than other modes of oil transportation. For example, compared to the pipeline record, there are 87 times more oil transport truck-related deaths, 35 times more oil transport truck related fires/explosions, and twice as many oil transport truck-related injuries.Pipeline statistics for calendar year 2002 report 139 liquid pipeline accidents resulted in the loss of about 97,000 barrels and about $31 million in property damage, but no deaths nor injuries. Natural gas transmission line accidents in 2002 resulted in one death and five injuries.

#### Rail transportation is more expensive--- Keystone is key to reduce oil prices

**Fox News 3/20** ,Perry Chiaramonte, “Trains roll from Canada to Gulf to fill void left by failed Keystone pipeline”, Published March 20, 2012  
<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/03/20/trains-roll-from-north-to-fill-void-left-by-failed-keystone-pipeline/#ixzz20R5f3l8n>

A Canadian railroad carrying millions of barrels of oil to Gulf refineries is hurtling full steam ahead through the Obama administration's block of the Keystone pipeline.The amount of oil Canadian Pacific Railways carries from the Bakken Formation down through the heartland has surged 2,500 percent since 2009, to 8.5 million barrels per year from just 325,000. The company expects to move 45 million barrels per year within the decade.

“We are responding to a growing demand,” Ed Greenberg, a spokesman for Canadian Pacific told FoxNews.com. “There has been unprecedented growth in the energy industry.”The Calgary-based railroad is one of two that carries oil down from Canada's tar sands, but Canadian Pacific also carries thousands of barrels per day to the Gulf from North Dakota's booming Bakken Formation oil fields.Experts estimate shipping by rail instead of pipeline adds anywhere from $5 to $10 to the price of a barrel, not to mention the high-capacity, 24-7 flow a pipeline affords. Rep. Fred Upton, (R-Mich.), chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, says theexplosive growth of oil delivery by rail underscores themissed opportunity of the Keystone XL Pipeline, a Canada-to-Texas oil pipeline that became bogged down by environmental concerns and was ultimately tabled by the Obama administration and the Democrat-controlled Senate."We need to be doing all we can to develop our resources, particularly now, with rising gasoline prices and the threat of supply disruptions overseas," Upton told FoxNews.com. "Most observers acknowledge that rail transport is the best option we currently have to get this oil down to the refineries -- but the Keystone XL pipeline presents us with a better alternative. “Supporters of the pipeline, which the Obama administration plans to consider again after the 2012 election, say it would not only lower the price of a barrel of oil, but that it would also provide jobs. TransCanada, the company seeking to build the pipeline, has estimated it would generate 130,000 jobs, a number endorsed by Republican supporters of the pipeline. But Democrats cite a study by Cornell University that places the number at just 5,000 jobs. With the pipeline in limbo, trains are the next-best way to move the oil south to the thirsty refineries on the Texas and Louisiana coasts,Michael Ervin, a petroleum industry analyst based in Calgary, Alberta, Canada,toldFoxNews.com.“The use of rail as a short-term solution to pipeline capacity limitations was a likely approach either with or without the additional production,” Ervin said. “It is more a matter of a lack of pipeline capacity, which in turn is depressing domestic crude oil prices of all types in the Midwest and Canada as well. “Oil companies are investing their own money in the older mode of transport, said Tony Hatch, a New York-based transportation and railroad industry analyst, noting that Hess Oil is among the latest companies to buy its own rail tankers. He said even if the pipeline ultimately gets built, rail transport will be a piece of the puzzle.“The markets are ready for the oil now," said Tony Hatch, a New York-based transportation and railroad industry analyst. "It’s clear that they are investing in rail even when and if a pipeline is built.

#### Pipelines account for a majority of oil transportation—with the increasing demand for oil they will become even more important because they are safer than road and rail transportation.

**Furchtgott-Roth 6/1**, Diana Senior Fellow, Manhattan Institute, Former Chief Economist at U.S. Department of Labor, “Pipelines are Safest for Transportation of Oil and Natural Gas”, Issues 2012 No. 17, <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ir_17.htm>

The Obama administration’s decision to delay approval for the construction of TransCanada Inc.’s proposed Keystone XL pipeline was based, in part, on concerns over the safety and reliability of oil and natural gas pipelines. The pipeline is intended to transport oil from Canada to U.S. refiners on the Gulf of Mexico. In announcing his decision, the president called for a full assessment of “the pipeline’s impact, especially on the health and safety of the American people. “Pipelines have been used to transport American natural gas or oil, including from Canada to the United States, for three quarters of a century. Almost 500,000 miles of interstate pipeline crisscross America, carrying crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas. This extensive and operational infrastructure network is heavily regulated by the Department of Transportation, which monitors the very issues central to the Keystone controversy: safety and reliability.Thus it is possible to answer, based on experience, the question of whether pipeline transport of oil and gas is safe. It is, moreover, possible to compare the record of oil and gas pipelines to that of transport via rail and road. As the major alternative means of fuel shipment, transport by rail and road has been increasing as limitations on pipeline capacity have become manifest (the underlying reason for the Keystone proposal).A review of safety and accident statistics provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation for the extensive network of existing U.S. pipelines—including many linked to Canada—clearly show that, in addition to enjoying a substantial cost advantage, pipelines result in fewer fatalities, injuries, and environmental damage than road and rail. Americans are more likely to get struck by lightning than to be killed in a pipeline accident.[[1](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ir_17.htm#notes)]The question of how to transport oil and gas safely and reliably is not a transitory one linked only to the Keystone controversy.Petroleum production in North America is now over 16 million barrels a day,[[2](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ir_17.htm#notes)] and could climb to 27 million barrels a day by 2020.Natural gas production in Canada and the United States could rise by a third over the same period, climbing to 22 billion cubic feet per day.This oil and gas will have to travel to where it is needed. Whether it is produced in Canada, Alaska, North Dakota, or the Gulf of Mexico, it will be used all over the country, especially since new environmental regulations are resulting in the rapid closures of coal-fired power plants, increasing the demand for natural gas as a substitute. Similarly, large fleets of buses and trucks are switching to natural gas, and General Motors and Chrysler are making dual-fuel pickup trucks.This paper compares the record of transport via pipeline to that of road and rail and finds that pipelines are the environmentally safer option. The first large-diameter long-distance pipelines were constructed during the Second World War, and they proliferated across the country over the ensuing two decades. Now America has 175,000 miles of onshore and offshore petroleum pipeline and 321,000 miles of natural gas transmission and gathering pipeline. In addition, over 2 million miles of natural gas distribution pipeline send natural gas to businesses and consumers.[[3](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/ir_17.htm#notes)] This is expected to increase as households and businesses shift to natural gas to take advantage of low prices that are expected to last into the foreseeable future.Pipelines are the primary mode of transportation for crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas. As shown in Table 1, approximately71 percent of crude oil and petroleum products are shipped by pipeline on a ton-mile basis. Tanker and barge traffic accounts for 22 percent of oil shipments. Trucking accounts for 4 percent of shipments, and rail for the remaining 3 percent.Essentially all dry natural gas is shipped by pipeline to end users.If safety and environmental damages in the transportation of oil and gas were proportionate to the volume of shipments, one would expect the vast majority of damages to occur on pipelines. This paper finds the exact opposite. The majority of incidents occur on road and rail.

#### Perm: Do both – not mutually exclusive – rail will exist post-aff.

Chiaramonte 12

Perry Chiaramonte “Trains roll from Canada to Gulf to fill void left by failed Keystone pipeline” Fox News

Published March 20, 2012 (http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/03/20/trains-roll-from-north-to-fill-void-left-by-failed-keystone-pipeline/

A Canadian Pacific train moving crude oil out of the Bakken formation in North Dakota. Transporting of crude oil has dramatically increased since 2009. (Canadian Pacific) A Canadian railroad carrying millions of barrels of oil to Gulf refineries is hurtling full steam ahead through the Obama administration's block of the Keystone pipeline. The amount of oil Canadian Pacific Railways carries from the Bakken Formation down through the heartland has surged 2,500 percent since 2009, to 8.5 million barrels per year from just 325,000. The company expects to move 45 million barrels per year within the decade. “We are responding to a growing demand,” Ed Greenberg, a spokesman for Canadian Pacific told FoxNews.com. “There has been unprecedented growth in the energy industry.” The Calgary-based railroad is one of two that carries oil down from Canada's tar sands, but Canadian Pacific also carries thousands of barrels per day to the Gulf from North Dakota's booming Bakken Formation oil fields. Experts estimate shipping by rail instead of pipeline adds anywhere from $5 to $10 to the price of a barrel, not to mention the high-capacity, 24-7 flow a pipeline affords. Rep. Fred Upton, (R-Mich.), chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, says the explosive growth of oil delivery by rail underscores the missed opportunity of the Keystone XL Pipeline, a Canada-to-Texas oil pipeline that became bogged down by environmental concerns and was ultimately tabled by the Obama administration and the Democrat-controlled Senate. "We need to be doing all we can to develop our resources, particularly now, with rising gasoline prices and the threat of supply disruptions overseas," Upton told FoxNews.com. "Most observers acknowledge that rail transport is the best option we currently have to get this oil down to the refineries -- but the Keystone XL pipeline presents us with a better alternative." Supporters of the pipeline, which the Obama administration plans to consider again after the 2012 election, say it would not only lower the price of a barrel of oil, but that it would also provide jobs. TransCanada, the company seeking to build the pipeline, has estimated it would generate 130,000 jobs, a number endorsed by Republican supporters of the pipeline. But Democrats cite a study by Cornell University that places the number at just 5,000 jobs. With the pipeline in limbo, trains are the next-best way to move the oil south to the thirsty refineries on the Texas and Louisiana coasts, Michael Ervin, a petroleum industry analyst based in Calgary, Alberta, Canada, told FoxNews.com. “The use of rail as a short-term solution to pipeline capacity limitations was a likely approach either with or without the additional production,” Ervin said. “It is more a matter of a lack of pipeline capacity, which in turn is depressing domestic crude oil prices of all types in the Midwest and Canada as well.” Oil companies are investing their own money in the older mode of transport, said Tony Hatch, a New York-based transportation and railroad industry analyst, noting that Hess Oil is among the latest companies to buy its own rail tankers. He said even if the pipeline ultimately gets built, rail transport will be a piece of the puzzle. “The markets are ready for the oil now," said Tony Hatch, a New York-based transportation and railroad industry analyst. "It’s clear that they are investing in rail even when and if a pipeline is built."

#### Many downsides

Vanderklippe 11

Nathan Vanderklippe “CN, CP eye shipping oil to West Coast” The Globe and Mail Jan. 24 2011 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-investor/cn-cp-eye-shipping-oil-to-west-coast/article563560/)

Downsides Rail is generally less efficient than pipe on large volumes. Canadian oil patch is built around pipe. Shipping by rail would require creation of new facilities to on-load and off-load crude, creating potential logistical problems. Pipelines generally have a better safety record than rail lines.Is as vulnerable to a proposed tanker ship ban as a pipeline, since both would load onto ships.

#### Rail not big enough – need pipelines for large amounts

Vanderklippe 12

Nathan Vanderklippe “Rail makes big inroads in oil transport” The Globe and Mail May 21, 2012 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/rail-makes-big-inroads-in-oil-transport/article4198192/)

That’s not to say rail is a shoo-in. The cost has made companies skeptical. Cenovus, which is boosting its daily train movements from 2,000 to 5,000 barrels this year, has supported two new pipeline proposals to move oil to the West Coast, for example. Chief executive officer Brian Ferguson calls rail “really interesting” and a “good short-term solution for relatively small volume.” But “anything of size in terms of shipments will require pipeline connections.” Still, rail service has some powerful backers. Tesoro Corp. is building up capacity to receive 30,000 barrels a day at its Anacortes refinery in Washington state. In mid-April, U.S. Development Group LLC said it had completed an expansion at its St. James, La., terminal, allowing it to offload 130,000 barrels a day from trains.

#### Rail expensive

Vanderklippe 12

Nathan Vanderklippe “Rail makes big inroads in oil transport” The Globe and Mail May 21, 2012 (http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/rail-makes-big-inroads-in-oil-transport/article4198192/)

Pipelines are still dominant – and a raft of new proposals, which would carry vast amounts of Alberta and Saskatchewan crude to the south, west and east, has raised questions over whether trains are merely a short-term solution. Rail does suffer from one important problem: It’s expensive. In rough terms, it costs twice as much to ship oil by train, some $5 to $10 more a barrel

## \*\*\*Politics

## Plan Popular

#### 1. Opponents concerns are being met and a majority of Americans support the pipeline.

Kish, Daniel, American expert in human echolocation and President of World Access for the Blind, US News, “Approving the Keystone XL Pipeline a Matter of National Security,” 2011.

(<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/on-energy/2011/12/15/approving-the-keystone-xl-pipeline-a-matter-of-national-security>. JMC.) Accessed 7/9/12

Opponents of the pipeline's construction are concerned about the environmental impacts, and such concerns should not be dismissed outright. Neither should the American public be led to believe that oil carried across thousands of miles of ocean in super tankers holding upwards of 1 million barrels of crude oil is more ecologically safe than a pipeline traveling hundreds of miles through America's heartland.¶ But as technology advances, our ability to detect and prevent leaks both on land and sea increases. With respect to Keystone XL, both TransCanada—the proposed pipeline's owner—and the state of Nebraska have already [prepared to redraw the pipeline route](http://news.yahoo.com/nebraska-gov-oks-alternative-keystone-xl-route-193218813.html) to accommodate environmental concerns about the Sandhills region and the Ogallala aquifer.¶ [[Read the U.S. News debate on whether it is time to drill in the Arctic Refuge.](http://www.usnews.com/debate-club/is-it-time-to-drill-in-the-arctic-refuge)]¶ And Secretary of State Hillary Clinton [appeared poised to authorize the pipeline](http://fuelfix.com/blog/2011/08/29/former-state-dept-official-clinton-will-approve-keystone-xl/) before President Obama nixed it last month, citing the need for an "open and transparent process that is informed by the best available science and the voices of the American people."¶ As for the voices of the American people, a [November 23 Rasmussen poll](http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/general_politics/november_2011/60_favor_building_keystone_xl_pipeline) reported that 60 percent of voters support building the Keystone XL pipeline. Last week, a [Wall Street Journal poll](http://online.wsj.com/community/groups/question-day-229/topics/should-proposed-keystone-xl-pipeline) showed more than 66 percent in support of the pipeline. And as for an open and transparent process, the Institute for Energy Research has [filed a Freedom of Information Act Request](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2011/11/18/ier-files-foia-request-to-uncover-truth-about-administrations-politicized-decision-to-delay-keystone-xl-pipeline/) with the State Department and is awaiting a response. Time will tell just how transparent the administration's decision on Keystone XL will be.

#### Public Wants Keystone – Poll Proves It

Doherty, Daniel 3/22/12 Web Editor at Townhall.com “Memo to President Obama: Majority of Americans Support the Keystone Pipeline Project” Townhall.com http://townhall.com/tipsheet/danieldoherty/2012/03/22/memo\_to\_the\_president\_americans\_overwhelmingly\_support\_the\_keystone\_xl\_pipeline\_project

A new Gallup pollout today confirmswhat most people already knew – namely, the vast majority of Americans support building the Keystone XL pipeline:A majority of Americans, including a plurality of Democrats, think the government should approve the building of the controversial Keystone XL pipeline, according to a new national survey.A Gallup poll released Thursday indicates 57% of the public says the Obama administration should give the go ahead for the pipeline's construction, with 29% disagreeing and 14% unsure.

#### That’s key to the agenda

**Roy Behr**, et al, Office of the Lieutenant Governor of California Behr, et al, Stephen Ansolabehere and ShantoIyengar, Political Science Professors at UCLA, **1993**, The Media Game: American Politics in the Television Age, p. 190

Public opinion, however, is more than a predictor of politicians’ reelection chances. Chief executives such as governors and presidents must build coalitions with legislators and cultivate support with leaders of interest groups in order to implement their policy proposals. Legislators, in turn, must consider how their support or opposition to the chief executive’s proposals will play with their constituents.If the governor is unpopular, a state legislator knows that he can vote against gubernatorial proposals without risking his own career prospects. On the other hand, if the governor is widely admired, a legislator will be more cautious about registering dissent. In short, personal popularity boosts the policy-making influence of governors (and presidents).

#### The plan has bipartisan support in Congress

**Cornilles**, 1/10/**2012** (Rob – president and founder of Game Face Inc., The proposed Keystone XL oil pipeline is a bipartisan proposal, PolitiFact at The Oregonian, p. http://www.politifact.com/oregon/statements/2012/jan/14/rob-cornilles/how-bipartisan-support-keystone-xl-oil-pipeline/)

Does the pipeline have bipartisan support?Much of the really vocal support for this project comes from Republicans. Democrats, not so much, although there are some who want the project. Environmentalists are opposed while labor’s AFL-CIO has decided not to take a formal position. Senate Democrats who like the project are Max Baucus D-Mont., Jon Tester D-Mont., Mary Landrieu D-La., Mark Pryor, D-Ark., and Mark Begich, D-Alaska, Claire McCaskill, D-Mo., and Kent Conrad, D-N.D. We queried our delegation. Sens. Ron Wyden and Jeff Merkley are opposed. Rep. Earl Blumenauer was among 32 House Democrats who sent a letter urging the State Department to reject the route. Schrader is opposed to the expedited process, but not necessarily against — or for — the project. We don’t think the support of one Democrat or one Republican makes a proposal bipartisan, but it’s clear some Democrats are on board with the project. If we had to picture a bipartisan meter, the needle probably would surpass the halfway mark but fall short of 75 percent.

## Plan Unpopular

#### Public strongly oppose Keystone

**C**enter for **B**iological **D**iversty**2/12/12**“More Than 793,000 People Call on Congress to Reject Climate-killing Keystone XL Pipeline” Environmental News Network http://www.enn.com/press\_releases/3932

Over the course of only 24 hours, more than 793,000 people from around the country sent a powerful message to Congress: Don’t build the Keystone XL pipeline. The Center for Biological Diversity joinedmore than 40other environmental groups, led by 350.org, on Monday and Tuesday to galvanize public opposition to the project. More than 24,700 messages opposing Keystone XL came from the Center’s supporters.“Americans want clean energy and a clean environment, not a pipeline that spills oil and pushes us closer to the brink of climate catastrophe,” said Noah Greenwald, endangered species program director with the Center. “More than a half-million people are calling on Congress to reject Keystone XL and reject the oil-industry money and influence that has plagued our system for too long.”President Barack Obama rejected the pipeline in January, but now Republicans in the Senate are pushing legislative language requiring the project to be permitted in 30 days. A vote on that language could happen this week.Time and again, Americans have opposedKeystoneXL. More than 1,000 peaceful protesters were arrested last summer; some 12,000 people encircled the White House last fall. The petitions collectedthis week in just 24 hours are the latest evidence of widespread and passionate public opposition to the project.The signatures were hand-delivered to Congress late Tuesday.“People across the country understand the dangers of Keystone XL, and simply want it stopped,” Greenwald said. “Never has there been a clearer example of the corrupting influence of money in politics than this push by congressional Republicans to force approval of the pipeline at the bidding of Big Oil — directly against the will of the American people.”

## \*\*\*Topicality

## T – Transportation Infrastructure – 2AC

#### -- We meet – contextual evidence proves Keystone is “transportation infrastructure investment”

EIS for Keystone Pipeline, United States Department of State Bureau of Oceans and International Enviomental and Scientific Affairs, “Final Environmental Impact Statement Keystone XL Project,” August 26th, 2011, Aspomer.

0917 001 Cottrell Carolyn Our country needs a chance to get back on its feet. We need to see jobs created and the economy improve. The Keystone XL Pipeline is the perfect project to help make that happen. The oil it brings in will help to meet our demand, lowering prices and stimulating other sectors of our economy. I hope that you go ahead and approve this pipeline so the construction phase can begin. Comment acknowledged. 1315 001 Cottrell Mark LIUNA Local 340 In a time of economic recession, the United States needs two things: jobs and affordable energy. The Keystone XL pipeline will provide both of these. Comment acknowledged. 3314 001 Couey Jeremiah C02 and the need to reduce emissions, especially in the transportation sector: My central concern that supports my objection towards the pipeline is that further exploitation of tar sands would make it effectively implausible to stabilize climate and avoid disastrous global climate impacts. These impacts will disproportionately affect those people who have the least capacity to adapt to them, and furthermore will unjustly subject future generations to an impoverished atmosphere that is far beyond the carbon recycling capacity of the planet. Consolidated Responses GHG-1 through GHG-5 address concerns related to greenhouse gas, climate change, alternative energy considerations, and approach to assessment of GHG emissions. 3314 002 Couey Jeremiah Accordingly, acceptance of this pipeline without a full review of the decades and century long environmental and social impacts would be a failure to govern the state of affairs, and Consolidated Response ENR-1 provides information on the Department of State’s environmental review process, the National Interest Determination process, and the need to SDEIS Comment Response Matrix 114 Keystone XL Project Ltr ID Cmt ID Last Name First Name Organization Comment Responsetherefore would not be in accordance to the mission of the State Department, that is to "build and sustain a more democratic, secure, and prosperous world composed of wellgoverned states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty, and act responsibly within the international system." complete those reviews before approving or denying the Presidential permit for the proposed Project. 3314 003 Couey Jeremiah Infrastructure decisions and the need to move may for hardpath systems: Another important dimension that must be considered is that *accepting* this project represents an investment in the transportation infrastructure for the U.S., and hence the arguments for the project should equally consider other available investments in infrastructure. For example, if the money available for this project was instead invested in upgrading and improving rail transportation services in the eastern corridor, this would also drastically reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Even if powered by coal, this infrastructure investment has much better potential to control futureC02 emissions due to the potential to capture and sequester the carbon and other pollutants in the process of electrifying the train corridor. The problem is that the capturing and sequestering of automobile emissions is profoundly more difficult compared to capturing the emissions for large power plants. Therefore, a public transportation investment offers a 'softer path' in present and future governance decisions, that accordingly is contrasted with the 'hard path' that would be locked into place by our continued reliance on oil as a fuel for transportation.

#### -- Contextual definitions are good – it proves the aff is predictable and heavily discussed in the literature by federal government policy.

#### -- Counter-interpretation – “transportation infrastructure” means “physical distribution system” – that includes pipelines

Moteff et al 3 (John, Specialist in Science and Technology Policy Resources, Science and Industry Division, Claudia Copeland, and John Fischer, “Critical Infrastructures:What Makes anInfrastructure Critical?,” Congressional Research Service, 1-29, http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31556.pdf)

The Commission’s report also defined the infrastructures of each of the sectors mentioned in this EO.

Banking and Finance: Entities such as retail and commercial organizations, investment institutions, exchange boards, trading houses,and reserve systems, and associated operational organizations, governmentoperations, and support activities that are involved in all manner ofmonetary transactions, including its storage for saving purposes, itsinvestment for income purposes, its exchange for payment purposes, andits disbursement in the form of loans and other financial instruments.Electric Power Systems: Generation stations, transmission and distributionnetworks that create and supply electricity to end-users so that end-usersachieve and maintain nominal functionality, including the transportationand storage of fuel essential to that system.

Emergency Services: Medical, police, fire, and rescue systems and personnel that are called upon when an individual or community isresponding to emergencies. These services are typically provided at thelocal level. In addition, state and federal response plans define emergencysupport functions to assist in the response and recovery.

Gas and Oil Production Storage and Transportation: The production and holding facilities for natural gas, crude and refined petroleum, and petroleum-derived fuels, the refining and processing facilities for these fuels and the pipelines, ships, trucks, and rail systems that transport these commodities from their source to systems that are dependent upon gas and oil in one of their useful forms.

Information and Communications: Computing and telecommunications equipment, software, processes, and people that support:

! the processing, storage, and transmission of data and information;

! the processes and people that convert data into information and information into knowledge; and,

! the data and information themselves.

Transportation: Physical distribution systems critical to supporting the national security and economic well-being of this nation, including the national airspace systems, airlines, and aircraft, and airports; roads and highways, trucking and personal vehicles; ports and waterways and the vessels operating thereon; mass transit, both rail and bus; pipelines, including natural gas, petroleum, and other hazardous materials; freight and long haul passenger rail; and delivery services.

#### -- Prefer our interpretation –here’s our offense

#### First is aff flexibility – forcing the aff to avoid any transportation of goods related to energy massively overlimits the topic and forces stale advantage area.

#### Aff flexibility outweighs neg ground – the neg already has plenty of ground for core disad links and States CPs check aff explosion.

#### Second is education – breadth is better than depth, covering broader topic areas exposes debaters to more issues. Issues like energy policy pose critical questions for the future – education outweighs fairness because it is the only portable skill students get from debate.

#### Third,their definition is bad and has no intent to define – distinct categories are created to exclude portions that have “a weak performance index”

#### Distinct categories don’t have a clear bright line – pipelines are in the “transportation” category

WTO 12 (Communication between Turkey and Egypt for consideration by the Negotiating Group on Trade Facilitation, “Discussion Paper on the Inclusion of the Goods Moved via FixedInfrastructure into the Definition of Traffic in Transit,” World Trade Organization, 6-4, http://www.wcoomd.org/files/1.%20Public%20files/PDFandDocuments/wto\_doc\_storage/tnTFW179E.pdf)

Another practical issue regarding fixed infrastructure is that projects to build and operate pipelines often involve private sector partnership. In some cases, a private sector dominated consortium established under private law owns the pipeline and is responsible for its operation. Naturally, WTO Agreements create obligations for Members but not for private entities. While there can be extreme cases where Members are obliged to take necessary measures vis-à-vis the private entities to ensure freedom of transit through its territory6, obviously, a privately owned border crossing pipeline through the territory of a Member would not fall under this category. Taking into account that such a pipeline would be built to transport a certain type of natural resource from one point to another for commercial reasons, this situation resembles more to a case where a private company builds a private railway line to transport coal from the mining site to a port. In such a case, a third party aspiring to transport coal on the same route would either have to build its own infrastructure or seek for access to the existing infrastructure on commercial terms.

One more important question regarding fixed infrastructure is on whether the fixed infrastructure should be regarded as "a means of transport" or not. Previously, some delegations submitted that fixed infrastructure is a type of transportation infrastructure just the like highways in the road transportation case and thus should be regarded as out of the scope of "traffic in transit" mentioned in GATT Article V. In this case, a natural resource flowing through the pipeline would resemble the goods moving on a road. While this argument has some merit and pipelines exhibit some properties of a transportation infrastructure, it also true that pipelines exhibit the properties of a means of transport. As a result, a pipeline is built exclusively to transport a certain type of natural resource and the physical characteristics of the pipeline highly depend on the physical characteristics of the natural resource to be transported. For example, the ratio of sulphur content, viscosity, etc… of the product simply affect the selection of the type of the steel and pumps and many other technical parameters of the pipeline design. That is to say, a product incompatible with the technical specifications of the pipeline cannot be transported as this would result in irrevocable damages to the whole system. In this sense, the difference between the transportation infrastructure and the means of transport blursand a pipeline can easily be regarded as a special means of transport built to carry a specific good from definite destination to another.

#### -- Now our defense --

#### First, there is no limits explosion – the only good pipeline affs are natural gas and oil – the negative already has structural checks on the topic like the States CP or incentive CP.

#### Second, no ground loss – there are plenty of disads that apply to “transportation infrastructure” generally – adding energy doesn’t spike any core links.

#### --Finally, competing interpretations are bad – it triggers a race to the bottom where the neg will always try to limit the topic further to exclude the aff. Default to reasonability – topicality debates trade-off with substantive debate.

## Ext – Pipelines = T

#### “Transportation infrastructure” includes oil and natural gas pipelines

Fletcher 2 (David R., Geographic Paradigm Computing, “The Role of Geospatial Technology in Critical Transportation¶ Infrastructure Protection: A Research Agenda,” *Critical Infrastructure Protection*, http://www.ncgia.ucsb.edu/ncrst/research/cip/CIPAgenda.pdf)

Examples of Critical Transportation Infrastructure (CTI)

1. Major arterial highways and bridges comprising¶ the National Highway System (NHS), including the¶ Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) and¶ National Intermodal Connectors.

2. International marine harbors, ports and airports.

3. Major railroads, including depots, terminals and¶ stations.

4. Oil and natural gas pipelines.

5. Transportation Control Systems (e.g., air traffic¶ control centers, national rail control centers)¶ [Everett].

#### Counter-Interpretation: Transportation infrastructure includes pipelines

**Abkowitz02**, Mark, Ph.D., Professor Civil Engineering Vanderbilt University, “Transportation Risk Management: A New Paradigm”, July 2002, <http://www.ltrc.lsu.edu/TRB_82/TRB2003-000196.pdf>

While perhaps simple in concept, successful implementation of this process within the transportation sector is an ambitious task. Our nation’s transportation infrastructure is large and diverse, representing a variety of potential terrorist targets. This infrastructure, supporting both passenger and freight transportation, contains: Highways; Pipelines; Railroads; Navigable waterways; Air transport networks; Fixed facilities (traffic management centers, terminals, transfer and storage sites, rest areas); Infrastructure hot spots (e.g., bridges, tunnels);“Vehicles” that use these facilitiesWhether conducted on a local, state or national scale, it will be important for the risk prioritization process to be inclusive by involving all relevant parties in the region of interest.This will help ensure that all potential transportation vulnerability points have been identified and evaluated at the front end of the process, allowing risk management priorities and control strategies to be determined with the confidence of knowing that a systematic process was used in making these decisions.

#### Long-distance transportation of energy is transportation infrastructure

**Andrews-Speed 03**- Philip, Chatham House Associate Fellow, Director and Professor of Energy Policy, University of Dundee, “Energy Security in East Asia: A European View”, Presented at the Symposium on Pacific Energy Cooperation 2003, <http://www.dundee.ac.uk/cepmlp/journal/assets/images/Philip_Andrews-_Energy_Security_East_Asia.pdf>

#### The long-distance transportation of energy by pipeline or by wireis a natural monopoly which gives disproportionate power to the commercial operator, to the supplier of the energy and to any transit state; thus suchtransportation infrastructure is commonly governed by an international treaty

## Ext – Pipelines = T – AT: Commerce

#### **Even the Chamber of Commerce agrees**

Commerce 10 (US Chamber of Commerce, “Infrastructure Index: Let’s Rebuild America,” 4-6, http://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/lra/docs/lraindexinitphasereport100406.pdf)

Transportation indicators serve as the building blocks for the Transportation Index. The objective is to identify a set of indicators that reflects the performance of the transportation infrastructure and its relationship to economic health and growth. The indicators are selected based on the following definitions of transportation infrastructure:

General Definition: Moving people and goods by air, water, road and rail

Technical Definition: The fixed facilities (roadway segments, railway tracks, transit terminals, harbors, and airports), flow entities (people, vehicles, container units, railroad cars) and control systems that permit people and goods to traverse geographical space efficiently and in a timely manner and for the intended purpose. Transportation modes include highway, rail, air, waterway, and pipeline.

## T – In the United States – 2AC

#### 1. We Meet- The oil dividends made by investment in the Keystone XL pipeline will benefit all states by lowering gas prices

**Hoeven 2/16**, John, U.S. Senator [R] North Dakota, News Release, Feb 2 2012, <http://hoeven.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/news-releases?ID=415dc2ab-dec2-4e95-8643-d0fe23471e15>

WASHINGTON –Senator John Hoeven today urged U.S. Department of Energy Secretary Steven Chu to pursue energy infrastructure projects such as the Keystone XL pipeline, citing an Energy Department reportthatstated theKeystone XL pipelinewould transport oil to be refined in the United States, and itwould lower U.S. gas prices.

“Here we have rising gas prices, putting a strain on our consumers, on business, on the economy, and yet the administration turns down a project that would help us reduce gasoline prices,” Hoeven said.

Currently, the average price of gas in the United States is more than $3.50 per gallon, higher than it has ever been at this time of year. Experts predict that it could rise to $5 per gallon in some areas this summer. Gas prices have risen 90 percent since President Obama took office in 2009.

An Energy Department report from its expert Dr. Carmine Difiglio stated that the Keystone XL pipeline would lower gas prices in the U.S. Gulf Coast, East Coast and Midwest. It also stated that oil from the Keystone XL pipeline would be refined in the United States, contrary to the claims of some of the project’s opponents. The United States retains 99 percent of the crude oil and uses 97 percent of gasoline refined in the country.

#### 2. Counter-Interpretation- “In” indicates involvement. As long as the US is involved in the project were topical.

**Yates 99,** Jean, Professor of Spanish at George Washington University, “The Ins and Outs of Prepositions”, pg 61, Barron’s Educational Serievs, ISBN: 0764107577

In indicates involvement in a career or project

Pattern: be/be involved/work + in + noun

#### Our definition is directly defined within the context of the grammar of the resolution.

#### Prefer our interpretation first for aff flexibility – forcing the aff to avoid projects that extend past our borders massively overlimits the topic and forces stale advantage area.

#### Aff flexibility outweighs neg ground – the neg already has plenty of ground for their Politics and Elections links and States CPs check aff explosion.

**Second is education – breath is better than depth, covering broader topic areas exposes debaters to more issues. In a global community international transportation projects pose serious questions– education outweighs fairness because it is the only portable skill students get from debate.**

**--Finally, competing interpretations are bad – it triggers a race to the bottom where the neg will always try to limit the topic further to exclude the aff. Default to reasonability – topicality debates trade-off with substantive debate.**