#### US oil demand is increasing now – expected to rebound in the next year
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 (Andrew, former Expert-Policy and Programming, Division A-Policy, DG XVII-Energy, with the European Commission, Brussels “ Crude Oil Demand Recovery Is Unlikely” The Market Oracle [http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article35184.html 7/9/12](http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article35184.html%207/9/12), MDRJ)

“World oil consumption will rebound next year as the global economy recovers, according to a report released by the Paris-based International Energy Agency which said it expects global oil demand to grow 1.7%, for an increase of 350,000 barrels per day from its previous estimate". The only problem with the serial oil demand growth-forecasting reports from the IEA is the above example dates from.... September 2009. At that time, crude for November delivery was trading around $71.75 a barrel for WTI grade. Why oil demand did not rebound is the real question, and the reasons for this are not only due to GDP change or oil prices but are wide ranging - and will go on growing. This especially affects the European Union countries, the US and Japan, which are the three main oil consumers in the IEA's 28 member states, using a combined 44.25 million barrels a day (Mbd) as of March 2012, almost exactly 50% of world total oil demand.

#### Building HSR is the only way to curb our oil usage – the time is now

Magee, politician and current write-in president for the election of 2012 also writes about public issues, 2012

(Erin, 3/15, Articlesbase.com, “High Speed Rail: The Time is Now” <http://www.articlesbase.com/politics-articles/high-speed-rail-the-time-is-now-5745202.html>, 7/5/12, MDRJ)

Since increasing oil supply is proving to be practically impossible, reducing demand is the only viable solution. Ramping up forms of transportation that consume little or no oil is the heart of the solution. Creating a national transportation network based on a system of electric trains throughout the country will take a huge bite out of our unsustainable appetite for oil, while increasing mobility, efficiency, global competitiveness and national security. In conjuction with butanol production, High-Speed Rail will reduce our dependence on foreign oil by more than 50% (2,3) High-Speed Rail is the large-scale, comprehensive solution to the oil supply problem, and is the most significant way to reduce our daily consumption of oil quickly and efficiently while maintaining our prosperity and economic growth. High-Speed Rail will mean: Less Money Spent on Gasoline, More Business & Real Jobs for Real People With so many advantages, when should we commit ourselves to a national High-Speed Rail system? The time is now.

#### HSR is the key internal link to solve Oil Dependency – not enough oil to continue current consumption
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[Katherine Dorsett, “Is the U.S. turning a corner on high-speed rail?”, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2010/TRAVEL/08/18/us.high.speed.rail/index.html>]

The United States Conference of Mayors, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and America 2050 -- a coalition of regional planners, scholars and policy-makers -- back high-speed rail plans. The U.S. High Speed Rail Association is also among the supporters. "Experts in the oil industry have been saying for a number of years now that there is not enough oil left in the ground to continue our current level of consumption, not to mention no way to meet growing demand, and we can expect half as much oil available to us in the next 20 years," said Andy Kunz, president and CEO of the rail association. "If we are to continue economic development and prosperity, we will need to greatly reduce our daily oil consumption, and high-speed rail is the only possible solution that can scale up to meet the growing demand of American mobility while greatly reducing our oil consumption," said Kunz.

#### Peak oil will draw the US into resource wars unless we embrace HSR – irreversible declines and increased prices

US High Speed Rail Association, The only organization in America focusing entirely on advancing a state-of-the-art national high speed rail network across the country. They are an independent, nonprofit 501(c)(6) trade association chartered to organize and mobilize the industry, No Date

(USHSR, “Energy Security” <http://www.ushsr.com/benefits/energysecurity.html> 7/5/12, MDRJ)

Building an electrically-powered national high speed rail network across America is the single most powerful thing we can do to get the nation off oil and into a secure, sustainable form of mobility. A national network of high speed trains can be powered by a combination of renewable energy sources including wind, solar, geothermal, and ocean/tidal energy. America's dependency on oil is the most severe in the world, and inevitably pulls us into costly resource wars. It also pushes us into exploring for oil in extreme locations such as 10,000 feet deep below the Gulf of Mexico. We use 25% of the entire world's oil supply, yet we only have 5% of the world's population. We use 8-10 times more oil per person per day than Europeans, and they have faster, easier and better mobility than we do. The extremely high daily oil consumption of Americans is not due to a higher standard of living, but because of the extremely inefficient nature of our national transportation system – based on individual vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, combined with our sprawling community designs that force people into cars for every trip. As the world oil supply begins to peak and then irreversibly declines, prices will rise faster, and the situation will get far worse for America if we don't quickly reduce our national oil dependency. This dependency cuts across our entire society and affects our daily survival. Oil provides 95% of the energy to grow, process and deliver food to the nation. Our entire national transportation system is powered mostly by oil. Numerous daily products we use are made from oil. We use 20 million barrels of oil every day - just in America - 70% of it for transportation. Of the 20 million barrels we consume, we import 2/3 of this oil (13 million barrels per day) from foreign sources, many in unstable places. No combination of drilling off our coasts, hydrogen fuel cells, natural gas, biofuels, and used french fry oil will solve this and carry 300 million Americans into the future. None of these fuels can be scaled up to anywhere near the amount of liquid fuel we use daily in any practical, economical, or sustainable way.

#### Oil peak leads to bloody resource wars – exporting regions will attack their neighbors

Howard 9 (Roger, author of three books on oil, including The Arctic Gold Rush: The New Race for Tomorrow’s Natural Resources, contributor to the *Wall Street Journal, International Herald Tribune, The National Interest, The American Conservative*, “Peak Oil and Strategic Resource Wars,” *The Futurist*, 43(9), p.21-25) KGH

The economic and social impacts of diminishing oil revenues on producer countries will likely be powerful. Many exporting states, particularly in the Middle East, South America, and Africa, have booming populations that in the years to come will impose an immense strain on their national infrastructures. If these countries fail to diversify their economies, then it is not easy to see how they will afford the housing, roads, schools, and job-creation schemes that future generations are likely to demand. Saudi Arabia is already struggling to reduce its rate of domestic unemployment, reckoned to stand at around 15%, and may well struggle even more after around 2020, when its oil output is expected to reach a plateau. The prospect of “resource wars” has also been much discussed. Conflict could break out, it is sometimes said, not only as consuming countries use their military weight to seize diminishing reserves of petroleum and other natural assets, but also between and within producing countries. Desperate to secure their future, these exporting nations, or factions within them, could perhaps try to stake their claim over disputed oil-rich regions or even blatantly disregard international law by attacking vulnerable neighbors. Current wars in western Africa illustrate how dangerous and bloody such conflicts might become. But the political consequences of peak oil on producer countries are in fact likely to be much more far-reaching and complex. Growing fears about future output may drive these states to react in ways that could have adverse repercussions for local democracy and political freedom or increase tension with neighboring states in unexpected ways.

#### Resource Wars cause extinction – US poised to lead prevention

Richard Heinberg, New College of California Core Faculty, Power Down: Options and Actions For A Post-Carbon World, 2004, p. 111

The US is also uniquely positioned to lead the global energy transition. While it is the world's foremost energy user, the US also possesses advanced renewable-energy research facilities. And China, if it were to follow the model of Kerala or Cuba, rather than attempting to shift its economy in the direction of greater energy-resource dependency, could be a beacon to the less-industrialized nations of the world. However, currently neither nation is on the path to lead a global Powerdown. Indeed, present trends suggest that the US and China are on a collision course, as the energy appetites of both nations continue to grow in the context of deepening energy- resource depletion. For the sake of American readers, I will put the matter as bluntly as possible: A peaceful global Powerdown is possible only if the US leads the way. If current American domestic and foreign polices continue, Powerdown efforts on the part of other nations may result in improved survival options for the people of those nations, but for the world as a whole by far the most likely outcome will be devastating resource wars continuing until the resources themselves are exhausted, the human species is extinct, or the fabric of modern societies has been shredded to the point that anarchy - in the worst sense of the word - prevails nearly everywhere.

#### Resource wars are the most probable situation for a World War – central to national security

Moran and Russel, respectively Prof of national security affairs at CCC, Senior Lecturer; Co-Director, Center for Contemporary Conflict; Managing Editor, Strategic Insights. ‘08

Daniel and James, Center for Contemporary Conflict “The Militarization of Energy Security” 4/4/08 http://www.analyst-network.com/article.php?art\_id=1671 Accessed: 7/3/08

This book does not seek to challenge the prevailing consensus that large-scale conflict among developed states has become unlikely. Its aim is rather to reflect upon conditions in the one area of international life where serious observers still regard it as possible: energy security. It is in the energy sector that strategic planners now find it easiest to imagine major states reconsidering their reluctance to use force against each other. “Energy security” is now deemed so central to “national security” that threats to the former are liable to be reflexively interpreted as threats to the latter. In a world in which territorial disputes, ideological competition, ethnic irredentism, and even nuclear proliferation all seem capable of being normalized in ways that constrain the actual use of military force, a crisis in global energy supply stands out as the last all-weather casus belli when the moment comes to hypothesize worst-case scenarios.