# \*\*\*Oil Dependence Disad\*\*\*

### Oil Disad: 1NC Shell

#### U.S. oil dependency is holding strong now – the trade deficit demonstrates the magnitude of oil import volume

Fitzsimmons, ’10 [Michael, “Foreign Oil Dependency: The Root Cause of America's Economic Pain,” November 28, http://seekingalpha.com/article/238920-foreign-oil-dependency-the-root-cause-of-america-s-economic-pain]

The point is this: out of a $44 billion dollar monthly trade deficit, $27 billion of that was for one commodity alone. Unfortunately for the U.S., it happens to be the most strategic commodity of all: OIL. Put another way, imported oil made up 62% of the U.S. monthly trade deficit. This is not an aberration - it goes on month after month, year after year. And as the price of oil goes up, so too does this problem. It is quite simply draining away the wealth of America. We are burning it up in our cars and trucks.

#### Improving transportation infrastructure would decrease foreign oil dependency

Brooks, ’12 [Kevin, “The American Transportation Grid; The Good, The Bad & The Ugly… The Uglier… and The Ugliest,” January 22, 2012, http://iicleantech.com/blog/2012/01/22/american-transportation-grid-good-bad-ugly-uglier-ugliest/]

“Modernizing American’s fleet vehicles with electric cars and trucks should be something Republicans and Democrats alike can agree on since it could reduce reliance on foreign oil.” – Detroit Free Press

The Uglier: In 2010, SAFE examined a long-neglected element of oil dependence: the fuel wasted due to inefficient, outdated transportation infrastructure, and the steps needed to reroute our transportation future. Transportation infrastructure and energy policy have historically been debated in two entirely separate spheres in American politics, and a coherent, unified strategy for the federal surface transportation system has largely been absent since the construction of the interstate highway system. Characterized by indirect fees, misaligned incentives, burdensome regulations, and inefficient capital investments, today the system faces major funding, decision-making, and performance challenges. Road congestion in particular severely threatens the potential gains associated with more efficient vehicles and alternative fuels.

#### Decreased dependence causes withdrawal from the Middle East

Mahmood **Monshipouri**, Professor, Political Science, Quinnipiac University, Middle East Policy v. 9 n. 3, 9—**02**, p. 69-70.

The history of the post-war period has shown that many nationalist leaders in the Middle East and North Africa have fallen into disfavor with the United States over the issue of oil. To better understand the region’s place in U.S. policy, it is critical to take a hard look at the economics of war. The lesson is obvious: U.S. petroleum poltiics has often resulted in continued intervention with tense and uncertain outcomes. Cutting oil dependency would arguably lead to the withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Gulf region, thus removing an important source of hatred of the United States. All-out embargoes have been show to be ineffective. Sanctions policies, such as the Iran-Libya Sanctions Act (ILSA, 1995) and “dual containment” have been [70] either softened or not fully implemented oweing to their uniatleral nature. Meanwhile, U.S. dependency on oil has continued to soar. According to one source, U.S. demand is expected to grow 20 percent by 2015.

#### U.S. military presence key to prevent Middle East power vacuum, hostile hegemons and Arab-Israeli war

Zalmay **Khalilzad**, WASHINGTON QUARTERLY, Spring 19**95**, LN.

In the Persian Gulf, U.S. withdrawal is likely to lead to an intensified struggle for regional domination. Iran and Iraq have, in the past, both sought regional hegemony. Without U.S. protection, the weak oil-rich states of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) would be unlikely to retain their independence. To preclude this development, the Saudis might seek to acquire, perhaps by purchase, their own nuclear weapons. If either Iraq or Iran controlled the region that dominates the world supply of oil, it could gain a significant capability to damage the U.S. and world economies. Any country that gained hegemony would have vast economic resources at its disposal that could be used to build military capability as well as gain leverage over the United States and other oilimporting nations. Hegemony over the Persian Gulf by either Iran or Iraq would bring the rest of the Arab Middle East under its influence and domination because of the shift in the balance of power. Israeli security problems would multiply and the peace process would be fundamentally undermined, increasing the risk of war between the Arabs and the Israelis. The extension of instability, conflict, and hostile hegemony in East Asia, Europe, and the Persian Gulf would harm the economy of the United States even in the unlikely event that it was able to avoid involvement in major wars and conflicts. Higher oil prices would reduce the U.S. standard of living. Turmoil in Asia and Europe would force major economic readjustment in the United States, perhaps reducing U.S. exports and imports and jeopardizing U.S. investments in these regions. Given that total imports and exports are equal to a quarter of U.S. gross domestic product, the cost of necessary adjustments might be high. The higher level of turmoil in the world would also increase the likelihood of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and means for their delivery. Already several rogue states such as North Korea and Iran are seeking nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. That danger would only increase if the United States withdrew from the world. The result would be a much more dangerous world in which many states possessed WMD capabilities; the likelihood of their actual use would increase accordingly. If this happened, the security of every nation in the world, including the United States, would be harmed.

#### Global nuclear war

John **Steinbach**, DC Iraq Coalition, Israeli Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Threat to Peace, March 20**02**, [http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2002/03/00\_steinbach\_israeli-wmd.htm](https://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2002/03/00_steinbach_israeli-wmd.htm)

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed

## \*\*Top Shelf\*\*

### Disad Turns the Case: Economy

#### High oil imports ensure continued valuation in dollars, which preserve the economy

Chas. W. **Freeman** Jr., with Frank A. Varrasto & Alan S. Hegberg, CSIS and James A. Placke, CERA, “Securing the U.S. Energy in a Changing World,” Middle East Policy Council Briefing, FEDERAL NEWS SERVICE, September 17, 20**04**, LN.

MR. FREEMAN: Thank you for the addition of the two other factors. I think they're important linkages between us and Saudi Arabia. On the two questions that you asked, first the dollar link, I would like to ask others to address it. I would simply note that it is a matter of convenience rather than law, a matter of custom rather than of well-considered principle that international commodity markets based in London use the dollar not only for oil but for all other commodities with one exception, which is still traded in sterling. There is no inherent reason that this should be the case. It has been the case because of the unique role of the dollar as an international reserve currency and the willingness of the American people to refrain from saving and to consume gluttonously, thus exporting dollars in large numbers, which we persuaded the Arab oil producers in the mid- 70s they should then recycle into investments in the United States. The danger is if the cycle be broken that if the dollar were not the medium of account for the oil trade, it would cease to be the medium of account for cotton and copper and aluminum and all the other commodities that are traded -- some 200 of them -- which we are dependent upon, and would then actually have to pay for, those things by doing something other than printing dollars. That is the problem, in essence. How real the danger is, I'm not sure. How acute the problem would be, I would like to hear an economist address. MR. PLACKE: I studied economics a long time ago, Chas., but I'll do the best I can. MR. FREEMAN: I slept through the course. MR. PLACKE: (Laughs.) You referred to the recycling of petrodollars, as they were called in the 1970s, back into U.S. Treasury bills. By the mid-80s -- well, by the early '80s, Saudi Arabia was the largest holder of U.S. Treasury bills because of various things that happened in the course of the '80s with oil prices, with the first Gulf War, which was largely financed by Saudi Arabia. In fact, there is even a suggestion that we made a profit on it, which we certainly haven't on this one. That's over. Saudi Arabia is a modest, indeed if at all, holder of Treasury bills, which is generally true for the other principal oil exporters as well. If we are, today, on the verge of another so-called oil boom analogous to the 1970s, with large amounts of capital then to be accumulated by the principal oil exporters, where will that capital go? Given the way the dollar looks today, it probably isn't going to go into Treasury bills. What does that mean for the United States economy? You are getting into an area of very broad macroeconomic and financial analysis that is pretty murky, and I think all you can say with any high degree of confidence is it's not good. The Burgsden theory about a potential dollar collapse, which you referred to earlier and I'm acquainted with as well, may then become a more eminent and real prospect. We haven't experienced that since the 19th century. I don't know what our 21st-century economy would do in response to it, and I hope we don't find out. MR. VERRASTRO: I think you covered the economic and currency issues. On the supply side, my gut instinct would be that as long as the United States maintains its position as a huge consumer of oil -- and maybe of liquid natural gas -- instead of energy independence we are looking at an interdependence, I think, so it's good for producers and good for consumers as well. To the extent that you buy into the PFC analysis, for example, that by the middle of the next decade a lot more of the production capacity shifts to OPEC out of non-OPEC, then it puts them in the stronger position, if we have done nothing else. I mean, I don't think there is any question about that. Now, whether that restricts our foreign policy objectives or our military options or our financial incentives, I would argue that this influx of the capital -- oil revenue -- probably reduces our leverage to promote democracy to the extent that that is a priority. If these countries now are given an awful lot of money -- I mean, $200 billion this year -- I think that slows the process up rather than speeds it up, so it's a likely outcome.

### Uniqueness: Ext.

#### U.S. oil dependency is increasing now – lack of reserves in Alaska and declining Gulf production

WSJ, ’10 [“Double Blow For U.S. Oil Dependency Hopes,” October 28, http://blogs.wsj.com/source/2010/10/28/double-blow-for-us-oil-dependency-hopes/tab/print/]

The last few days have seen a double blow to U.S. hopes for reducing its heavy dependence on imported oil. First, on Tuesday the U.S. Geological Survey cut by 90% its estimate of the undiscovered hydrocarbon reserves beneath the National Petroleum Reserve on Alaska’s North Slope–the richest region for onshore oil production in the country. Second, one of the largest oil and gas producers in the U.S., Royal Dutch Shell, revealed that the Deepwater Horizon accident and subsequent drilling moratorium will significantly reduce for several years its oil output from the Gulf of Mexico–the richest offshore area in the U.S. It also unveiled its third quarter results. Already unrealistic hopes that the U.S. could mitigate the profound economic and security implications of weaning itself off foreign oil by dramatically boosting domestic output are more remote than ever. The news from Alaska is actually even worse than its seems on first reading. The USGS cut its oil reserve estimate for the NPRA from 10.6 billion barrels of oil to 896 million barrels, because new wells show that much of what was assumed to be oil reservoirs in fact contain gas, which has a lower energy content. Of course, gas reserves have value, but their development can be very difficult to justify in such remote locations. Two major Alaska oil producers, ConocoPhillips and BP, have been debating for years how to monetize the huge gas reserves they hold in North Slope oil fields, but have so far failed to find an economic solution. Their plans to build a $35 billion pipeline to carry the gas to towns and cities in the lower 48 states are being reassessed and may never come to pass. The reappraisal of the NPRA also raises questions about how much oil really lies beneath the perennial bargaining chip in the contest between environmentalism and energy security, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. On Thursday, Shell revealed that the moratorium on drilling imposed on the Gulf of Mexico in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon disaster will have an impact on its ability to produce oil from the region for several years. The company’s output is already 10,000 barrels of oil equivalent (boe) a day lower than it would have been without the moratorium, because it has been prevented from doing development drilling to boost output at existing fields. That shortfall will be at least 40,000 boe a day in 2011, a fall of 15% from the expected level, and could rise further because of anticipated delays in the issuance of new permits now that the moratorium has been lifted, said Shell’s Chief Financial Officer Simon Henry. Other companies have yet to disclose whether they will also suffer a 15% cut in their potential production from the region, but everyone has suffered similar effects from the moratorium. The impact of this on the U.S. economy could be profound. The Gulf of Mexico produced 1.6 million barrels of oil a day in 2009, almost 30% of total U.S. crude oil production. Shell’s operations in Alaska have also taken a hit. Its plans to drill in the promising Beaufort Sea off Alaska’s north slope are on hold for at least 12 months after permits to drill this year were withdrawn after the Deepwater Horizon disaster. Applications have been resubmitted, but the process may take longer than expected, Henry said. Shell has not even resubmitted its even more contentious applications to drill in the neighboring Chukchi Sea. The prospects of a dramatic boost in domestic U.S. oil production look slimmer by the day. If the country is serious in its intention to wean itself off foreign oil, it’s time to switch the focus from billion-barrel reserves to miles per gallon.

Dependency on foreign oil stable now

Alic, 7/1 [Jen, a geopolitical analyst, co-founder of ISA Intel in Sarajevo and Tel Aviv, and the former editor-in-chief of ISN Security Watch in Zurich, “Weaning off Middle East Oil Means Less Than you Think,” July 1, 2012, http://oilprice.com/Energy/Crude-Oil/Weaning-off-Middle-East-Oil-Means-Less-Than-you-Think.html]

One expects the crazy talk to come out during an election season, but reports that the US is close to being weaned off Middle Eastern oil and set to become “independent” purposefully fail to consider the fact that as long as America is dependent on oil it will be dependent on Middle Eastern supplies because crude prices are determined globally.

## \*\*Link Extensions\*\*

### Links: HSR

#### A high speed rail system would end dependency on foreign oil

Kunz, ‘9 [Andy, “America's Transportation Future: Steel-Wheel, High-Speed Rail,” Engineering News-Record, Vol. 263, Issue 5, August 10]

Transportation delays currently cost America about $78 billion each year. The 21st Century transportation solution is high speed rail (HSR), steel wheels on steel track, which is fast, efficient, safe and has a very high capacity for moving large numbers of people and light freight quickly and without delay. Since HSR is powered by electricity, it can operate past the age of oil, and it is therefore not subject to the volatility of oil prices the way all our current modes of transportation are. HSR can be powered by clean, safe renewable sources of energy including a combination of wind, solar, geothermal and ocean or tidal power, depending on the region of the country. Freedom from oil enables this new transportation mode to end our serious oil dependency, which translates into energy security and national security. America currently spends about $700 billion each year purchasing foreign oil. This is a huge, unsustainable drain on our economy and transfers a large part of our wealth to other nations. As we build more miles of our national HSR system, this large trade deficit will be reduced each year by an ever-increasing amount to the point when the savings will be larger than the cost of constructing the national HSR system, which means the system will end up costing America nothing.

#### HSR reduces foreign oil dependence

Kunz, 7/5 [Andy, “Moving Forward on California’s High Speed Rail,” July 5, 2012,

Investment in HSR is both visionary and pragmatic. It's visionary for thinking big and working for a better future. It's pragmatic and fiscally conservative because it's a smart investment in the nation's future. HSR creates millions of jobs, revives manufacturing, stimulates real estate development, and sets up America to save energy, money, and time - year after year. HSR delivers fast and reliable mobility, it lowers our carbon footprint, protects the nation from energy price spikes, and increases national security by reducing dependency on foreign oil. High speed rail is the modern form of transportation that really delivers. It functions reliably and at full capacity even during the height of rush hour, peak holiday travel, and bad weather. Investing in HSR as part of a balanced transportation system is smart business for California. High speed rail delivers: Proven technology with a 45 year track record; Highly successful everywhere it's built; Safely transporting billions of passengers; Relieving congestion, saving time, money, and fuel; Creating jobs, economic development, city revitalization, efficiency, and new real estate development; Every high speed rail system in the world is highly successful and profitable. HSR is currently in operation in more than 20 countries (including the UK, France, Germany, Belgium, Spain, Italy, Japan, China, Korea, Taiwan). HSR is under construction in more than 10 countries (including Saudi Arabia, China, Spain, Italy); and in development in another 14 countries (including Morocco, Qatar, Turkey, Russia, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, India, Argentina, Brazil). HSR has operated for 45 years in Japan carrying 9 billion passengers without a single fatality. California desperately needs additional options for moving people and goods around the state. Our roads and airports were built when oil was $5 per barrel. Today, we struggle to keep these running with oil now above $85 per barrel, and rising. Experts predict oil will surpass $200 per barrel this decade, establishing a real urgency to constructing HSR in multiple corridors as quickly as possible. Currently, we consume 20 million barrels of oil per day in America, 70% of it for transportation - most of which is imported. HSR runs on electricity which can be generated by renewable energy, thereby drastically reducing oil dependency.

#### The US is very dependent on oil and HSR lowers that dependence

Center for American Progress 10 [“It's Easy Being Green: Rail Transport Picks Up Speed”, 3/24/10, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/03/ebg\_032310.html/]

The United States uses 25 percent of the entire world’s oil supply despite having only 5 percent of the world’s population, and sprawling communities force people to drive even short distances. We need alternate modes of transportation to kick this oil dependence, and one alternative is high-speed rail, which offers tantalizing environmental and economic benefits. President Barack Obama, Vice President Joseph Biden, and Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood announced a strategic plan for high-speed rail last year that includes $8 billion in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and $1 billion a year for five years in the federal budget. Their goal is to jumpstart a potential world-class rail system in the United States.

#### HSR decreases oil dependency – electrically powered

USHSR Association, NDG

[US High Speed Rail Association, “Rail - The Solution to Rising Gas Prices,” 21st Century Transportation for America, http://www.ushsr.com/benefits/energysecurity.html]

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.

### Links: Keystone

#### Keystone would put the US on the road to energy independence

Kelly 12 [William, “Allen West: Keystone XL pipeline would reduce foreign oil dependence”, Palm Beach Daily News, 1/5/12, http://www.palmbeachdailynews.com/news/news/allen-west-keystone-xl-pipeline-would-reduce-forei/nMFLK/]

The Keystone XL oil pipeline would create 20,000 jobs in the nation’s manufacturing and construction sectors, boosting the economy while helping put the United States on the road toward energy independence, U.S. Rep. Allen West told a Rotary Club of Palm Beach audience on Thursday.¶ West cited Iran’s threat to close the key global oil passageway, the Strait of Hormuz, as evidence of the need for the United States to end its dependence on foreign oil.¶ About one-sixth of the world’s oil passes on tankers through the Strait of Hormuz, and analysts have warned the price of Brent crude could temporarily jump to as high as $210 if the strait is closed; the current price is $112.66, according to Oil-Price.net. The U.S. has pledged to keep the shipping route open.¶ Nearly 50 percent of the oil consumed in the United States is imported from foreign countries. The 1,661-mile pipeline would bring tar sands oil from Alberta, Canada, to refineries in Texas.

#### Keystone would decrease US demand for foreign oil

Petty 12 [Kathleen, “Dewhurst says Keystone XL Pipeline needed to decrease America's foreign oil dependency”, Midland Reporter-Telegram, 2/22/12, http://www.mywesttexas.com/top\_stories/article\_fe7651e5-9398-5373-9532-7290e2f36587.html]

Passing legislation that will allow to develop the Keystone XL pipeline is instrumental in weaning America from its dependency on Middle Eastern oil, Lt. Gov. David Dewhurst said Wednesday.¶ "I have long wanted to end America's dependence on foreign oil," he said, speaking during an interview at the Reporter-Telegram. "The Keystone pipeline provides 20 percent of what we need to end our demand."¶ President Barack Obama rejected the proposed pipeline, but TransCanada Corp.'s Keystone XL could re-submit its application with tweaks to the pipeline route.¶ Both Dewhurst and fellow Senate candidate Ted Cruz blame Obama for not signing a deal they say would have created jobs, revenue and a decrease in purchasing of oil from foreign countries, particularly in the Middle East.

### Links: Magnifier (Generic)

#### Link magnifier: the aff deals with decreasing oil dependence directly rather than the question of the supplier which magnifies the strength of the link

Alic, 7/1 [Jen, a geopolitical analyst, co-founder of ISA Intel in Sarajevo and Tel Aviv, and the former editor-in-chief of ISN Security Watch in Zurich, “Weaning off Middle East Oil Means Less Than you Think,” July 1, 2012, http://oilprice.com/Energy/Crude-Oil/Weaning-off-Middle-East-Oil-Means-Less-Than-you-Think.html]

Overall, Americans are being misled about the nature of their dependency. Too much focus on removing the “foreign” element in the foreign oil dependence equation is skewing the larger picture: Independence can only be achieved by tackling dependency on oil itself, not on the origins of oil.

### Links: Transportation Infrastructure (Generic)

#### The transportation sector consumes a ton of oil, making us dependent on imports

NRDC 4 [“Reducing America’s Energy Dependence”, 7/2/04, http://www.nrdc.org/air/transportation/gasprices.asp]

The root cause of high gasoline prices is soaring demand, caused in large part by increasingly fuel-inefficient cars and trucks. Of the 20 million barrels of oil consumed each day, 40 percent is used by passenger vehicles, 24 percent by industry, 12 percent by commercial and freight trucks, 7 percent by aircraft, and 6 percent in residential and commercial buildings.1 The U.S. passenger vehicle fleet alone accounts for one-tenth of world petroleum consumption.2 To make matters worse, fuel economy of the combined car and light truck fleet peaked in 1987 and has essentially been declining since then (see Figure 1, below) due to outdated standards and increased sales of fuel-wasting SUVs and other light trucks.¶ While in real terms oil prices are not as high as in 1981, the current price tag of $40 per barrel of oil is the highest since the 1991 Persian Gulf War. High demand, driven largely by the transportation sector,3 has sparked this increase in three ways:¶ First, there is very little excess global oil production capacity.4 Even OPEC officials estimate that world crude oil production is running at 97 percent capacity, with a thin cushion of only 2 million barrels per day.5 Moreover, the only significant spare capacity is in Saudi Arabia, making this politically unstable country the critical "swing producer."¶ Second, high demand has reduced the ability of suppliers to respond quickly if a sudden supply disruption occurs, and thus traders and speculators have bid up oil prices on the spot market based on the fear that the global oil supply chain may be disrupted by terror attacks.6 As a result, the oil industry has profited generously over the last few months and passed the higher costs to consumers at the pump.¶ Finally, U.S. gasoline demand has outstripped our domestic refinery capacity, leading to a tight market for gasoline and other refined products.¶ World surplus capacity in 2004 fell to its second lowest level in three decades.7 Lower supply and high demand makes the United States dangerously dependent on Middle East oil, which holds two-thirds of world oil reserves. The United States, with just 2 percent of world oil reserves, relies on the Middle East for one-fifth of our oil imports (see Table 1).

#### 70% of oil consumption is from transportation –alternative methods decrease that

Goldberg and Davis 10 [David, communications director for Transportation for America Campaign (T4) and Smart Growth America, and Stephen, Online Coordinator for Transportation for America Campaign; “Do Americans really make the connection between transportation, oil use, and environmental impacts?”, Grist, 4/2/10, http://grist.org/article/2010-04-01-do-americans-really-make-the-connection-between-transportation/]

Somewhat surprisingly, then, reducing oil dependency only did slightly better than global warming as a rationale for more, and cleaner, transportation options. One obvious reason is that most people don’t realize that the lion’s share of our oil consumption is for transportation. Once they’re told that 70 percent of oil consumption goes to motoring around, support for reduced oil use as a rationale leaps to nearly two-thirds — and this crosses party and geographic lines. And when they’re subsequently asked which of many potential outcomes would be the best reason to support expanded options, reducing our dependence on foreign oil tops the list.¶ So what’s the lesson? We all need to start talking about the 70 percent solution to oil dependency: reducing the amount we burn for transportation. There are three ways to do it: More efficient vehicles, renewable and/or diversified fuel sources, and spending less time driving around. The technology for the first two is in development, while the technology for the last has existed in one form or another for many, many years. Walkable neighborhoods, streetcars, light rail, buses, and safe streets for walking can work in tandem with newer technologies such as broadband internet and wireless networks, to make it possible for people to avoid some trips, take others by transit, foot or bike — and still drive their hybrids when it makes sense to do so.

#### Alternative transportation reduces oil dependence

Metro Magazine 10 [“Study: Transportation options could reduce oil dependency”, 11/23/10, http://www.metro-magazine.com/news/story/2010/11/Study-Transportation-options-could-reduce-oil-dependency.aspx]

By increasing competition among transportation modes, making transportation pricing transparent, and tying transportation spending to energy and economic performance, America could cut oil demand by as much as 779 million barrels a year by 2030, according to a new analysis released by the Mobility Choice Coalition.¶ At a time when national transportation infrastructure policy is up for revision and improvement, the 19-member coalition also believes policy makers must take a fresh look at transportation.¶ The analysis "Taking the Wheel: Achieving a Competitive Transportation Sector Through Mobility Choice," details the benefits of 10 specific policy options that would level the playing field among transportation options. If all were adopted, U.S. oil demand would fall by as much as 462 million barrels of oil per year by 2020 and 779 million barrels a year by 2030.¶ Right now, the country uses about 6.8 billion barrels, or nearly 300 billion gallons, of oil annually.

#### Lack of transportation infrastructure perpetuates oil dependency

USHSR Association, NDG

[US High Speed Rail Association, “Rail - The Solution to Rising Gas Prices,” 21st Century Transportation for America, http://www.ushsr.com/benefits/energysecurity.html]

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.

### Links: Urban Mass Transit

#### Urban mass transit decreases oil demand and foreign dependency

Metro Magazine, ’10 [“Study: Transportation options could reduce oil dependency,” November 23, 2010, http://www.metro-magazine.com/news/story/2010/11/Study-Transportation-options-could-reduce-oil-dependency.aspx]

By increasing competition among transportation modes, making transportation pricing transparent, and tying transportation spending to energy and economic performance, America could cut oil demand by as much as 779 million barrels a year by 2030, according to a new analysis released by the Mobility Choice Coalition. At a time when national transportation infrastructure policy is up for revision and improvement, the 19-member coalition also believes policy makers must take a fresh look at transportation. The analysis "Taking the Wheel: Achieving a Competitive Transportation Sector Through Mobility Choice," details the benefits of 10 specific policy options that would level the playing field among transportation options. If all were adopted, U.S. oil demand would fall by as much as 462 million barrels of oil per year by 2020 and 779 million barrels a year by 2030. Right now, the country uses about 6.8 billion barrels, or nearly 300 billion gallons, of oil annually. The report's recommendations aim to reduce economic disruptions from oil spikes, cut wasteful government spending and provide Americans with economical and convenient transportation options. "Taxpayers have made their anger over wasteful government spending clear, and we know there are ways to re-introduce accountability for how the federal government spends tax dollars, specifically as it relates to transportation," said report co-author Anne Korin of the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security (IAGS ). "When it comes to transportation, Americans need to get what they pay for and pay for what they get." The Mobility Choice Coalition, which includes the IAGS, the Intelligent Transportation Society of America, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the American Bus Association (ABA), as well as and 15 other organizations, analyzed the specific effect on oil demand from telecommuting, bus rapid transit, transit competition, improved transportation technology, vouchers and other policies. The group also recommended implementation strategies to maximize oil savings. "As long as the playing field is level, modern buses can save energy and compete with any mode of transportation as a cost-effective and efficient alternative," ABA President & CEO Peter J. Pantuso said. "Motorcoaches are the greenest choice, achieving 206 passenger miles per gallon." As an example, the report said government agencies can set a good example by encouraging telecommuting and a compressed workweek for its workforce. Barriers to telecommuting in state and local tax codes should be eliminated, and tax incentives can be provided for telecommuting infrastructure setup, Internet connectivity and maintenance costs; similar to the tax-free benefits currently provided for other workplace transportation costs. "Our country cannot afford to continue barreling along its current transportation spending path, which strands too many consumers due to few travel choices," said report co-author Deron Lovaas, federal transportation policy director at the Natural Resources Defense Council. "This will only lead to an increase in oil dependence. Putting some of these long-overdue reforms in place would create more transportation options and cut our overall oil use." The report also calls for an increased federal investment in transportation technology to save drivers time and money and increased transportation system efficiency and services.

#### Urban mass transit decreases oil dependency

Addison, ’12 [John, “Record Public Transit Ridership Reduces U.S. Oil Dependency,” Clean Fleet Report, March 14, http://www.cleantechblog.com/2012/03/record-public-transit-ridership-reduces-u-s-oil-dependency.html]

The United States is reducing its dependency on oil as we now consuming 18.3 million barrels a day, down from our peak of 21 million barrels a few years ago. Record use of public transit is a major factor – less solo driving in gridlock and we use less oil. Other major factors, of course, include high gasoline prices and more fuel-efficient cars. Since 96 percent of our transportation is from oil refined into gasoline, diesel, and jet fuel, we will take all the help we can get.

## \*\*Impact Extensions\*\*

### Internal Link: Relations

#### Dependence key to relations with oil producers

Fisher 10 (Max, associate editor at The Atlantic, “The Upside of Depending on Foreign Oil”, APR 2 2010, http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2010/04/the-upside-of-depending-on-foreign-oil/38380/)

When President Obama opened the coastline to offshore oil drilling, nearly every aspect of the plan came under heated debate. The only thing everyone agrees on, it seems, is the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Statements from the Environmental Protection Agency to automakers to T. Boone Pickens to Obama himself, whether supporting or condemning offshore drilling, all cite the dangers of relying on foreign energy. It's not hard to see why. Shipping oil from halfway around the world is environmentally costly, economically inefficient, and lands us in bed with some of the world's least democratic regimes. But our ties to these states might not be categorically terrible things for us, as they're often assumed to be. Hidden unexamined among the many downsides of our dependence on foreign oil is an upside: It gives us leverage over the countries that sell us oil. ¶ The top ten oil exporters to the U.S., which account for half of all U.S. consumption, read like a State Department tourism warning list: Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Nigeria, Iraq, Angola, Russia, Colombia, and Brazil. (To be fair, Canada has long been our number one oil source, and Mexico alternates with Saudi Arabia for the number two spot.) But keep in mind that most of these countries need our money a lot more then we need their oil. If Saudi Arabia and the U.S. suddenly ended our trade tomorrow, for example, the U.S. and global economies would not suffer nearly as much as Saudi Arabia's. The Saudis understand this and so want to keep U.S. and Saudi interests aligned. ¶ As a result, buying Saudi oil gets us a lot more than just energy. It gets us a dedicated ally that wields unparalleled influence in a part of the world where we desperately need it: the Middle East. The Saudi royal family has put their wily intelligence service at our disposal and allowed sprawling U.S. military bases onto their soil. In 1992, the Saudis even exiled one of their own on America's behalf: A prominent, wealthy, and popular humanitarian and freedom fighter named Osama bin Laden. Saudi royalty risked a violent backlash by expelling bin Laden to Sudan, but U.S. officials had demanded his ouster. That's no small favor. It would be almost as if the United States deported Google CEO Eric Schmidt to Honduras at the request of angry Chinese officials. The Saudis came to our aid again in 1996 when they convinced the Sudanese regime to themselves deport bin Laden.

### Impact Module: Caspian Conflict

#### U.S. energy dependency in the Caspian key to stability: boosts hegemony, contains Russia and is key to checking terrorism and smuggling

Jam **Kalicki**, Public Policy Scholar, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, September/October, 20**01**, ASP.

The countries surrounding the Caspian Sea -- Russia to the north, Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan to the east, Iran to the south, and Azerbaijan to the west -- hold some of the largest oil and gas reserves in the world. And together with neighboring Armenia, Georgia, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan, they represent important economic, political, and strategic interests for the United States. To advance those interests, Washington should strengthen its policy toward the Caspian by giving the highest level of support to the cooperative development of regional energy reserves and pipelines. In particular, it should encourage the construction of multiple pipelines to ensure diverse and reliable transportation of Caspian energy to regional and international markets. Although the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries will continue to dominate the global energy market for decades to come, oil and gas development in the Caspian basin could help diversify, secure, and stabilize world energy supplies in the future, as resources from the North Sea have done in the past. The proven and possible energy reserves in or adjacent to the Caspian region -- including at least 115 billion barrels of oil -- are in fact many times greater than those of the North Sea and should increase significantly with continuing exploration. Such plentiful resources could generate huge returns for U.S. companies and their shareholders. American firms have already acquired 75 percent of Kazakhstan's mammoth Tengiz oil field, which is now valued at more than $10 billion. Over time, as the capital generated from Caspian energy development spreads to other sectors, U.S. firms in other industries -- from infrastructure to telecommunications to transportation and other services -- could also benefit. In addition to these energy-related and commercial interests, the United States has important political and strategic stakes in the Caspian region -- including a NATO ally in Turkey, a former adversary in Russia, a currently turbulent regime in Iran, and several fragile new states. Located at the crossroads of western Europe, eastern Asia, and the Middle East, the Caspian serves as a trafficking area for weapons of mass destruction, terrorists, and narcotics -- a role enhanced by the weakness of the region's governments. With few exceptions, the fledgling Caspian republics are plagued with pervasive corruption, political repression, and the virtual absence of the rule of law. Even if they can muster the political will to attempt reform themselves, the attempt will fail so long as they lack the resources to build strong economic and political institutions. And until they build close, substantive relations with the West, they will remain vulnerable to Russia's hegemonic impulses. The cooperative development of regional energy reserves and pipelines -- independent of their huge neighbors to the north and the south -- thus represents not only a boon for the United States and the world at large, but also the surest way to provide for the Caspian nations' own security and prosperity

#### Failure to contain russia would destabilize all of eurasia, spark nuclear wars and put a stranglehold on the west.

Ariel **Cohen**, PhD & Heritage Foundation, BACKGROUNDER n. 1065, January 25, 19**96**, http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/BG1065.cfm

Much is at stake in Eurasia for the U.S. and its allies. Attempts to restore its empire will doom Russia’s transition to a democracy and free-market economy. The ongoing war in Chechnya alone has cost Russia $6 billion to date (equal to Russia’s IMF and World Bank loans for 1995). Moreover, it has extracted a tremendous price from Russian society. The wars which would be required to restore the Russian empire would prove much more costly not just for Russia and the region, but for peace, world stability, and security. As the former Soviet arsenals are spread throughout the NIS, these conflicts may escalate to include the use of weapons of mass destruction. Scenarios including unauthorized missile launches are especially threatening. Moreover, if successful, a reconstituted Russian empire would become a major destabilizing influence both in Eurasia and throughout the world. It would endanger not only Russia’s neighbors, but also the U.S. and its allies in Europe and the Middle East. And, of course, a neo-imperialist Russia could imperil the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf.15 Domination of the Caucasus would bring Russia closer to the Balkans, the Mediterranean Sea, and the Middle East. Russian imperialists, such as radical nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovsky, have resurrected the old dream of obtaining a warm port on the Indian Ocean. If Russia succeeds in establishing its domination in the south, the threat to Ukraine, Turkey, Iran, and Afganistan will increase. The independence of pro-Western Georgia and Azerbaijan already has been undermined by pressures from the Russian armed forces and covert actions by the intelligence and security services, in addition to which Russian hegemony would make Western political and economic efforts to stave off Islamic militancy more difficult. Eurasian oil resources are pivotal to economic development in the early 21st century. The supply of Middle Eastern oil would become precarious if Saudi Arabia became unstable, or if Iran or Iraq provoked another military conflict in the area. Eurasian oil is also key to the economic development of the southern NIS. Only with oil revenues can these countries sever their dependence on Moscow and develop modern market economies and free societies. Moreover, if these vast oil reserves were tapped and developed, tens of thousands of U.S. and Western jobs would be created. The U.S. should ensure free access to these reserves for the benefit of both Western and local economies.

### Impact Module: Renewables

#### Smooth transition to renewable, decarbonized global energy system is underway—only thing that can derail it is government intervention

Henry **Linden**, Mx MacGraw Professor of Energy & Power Engineering and Management, Illinois Institute of Technology, Pathways to a Sustainable Global Energy System,” Engineering Colloquim, Goddard Space Flight Center, October 6, 19**97**, <http://ecolloq.gsfc.nasa.gov/archive/1997-Fall/announce.linden.html>

Political forces are again mobilizing to interfere with the rational development of the U.S. and global energy systems. This time the nominal justification is anthropogenic climate change, but the ideological drivers are the same as those which generated the fictitious "energy crisis" of the 1970s and early 1980s. Poverty is the most pernicious environmental and social pollutant. Yet, energy abundance and the resulting economic, social, and environmental benefits and physical mobility seem to offend certain intellectual and political elites. In this presentation, it will be shown that the global energy system is moving steadily towards sustainability through electrification, decarbonization, and efficiency improvements, thanks to cost-effective technological advances driven by market forces. The outcome of these developments is now quite well defined -- electrification of most stationary energy uses with high-tech renewable or essentially inexhaustible primary energy sources and the use of non-fossil hydrogen as the dominant transportation fuel. During what is likely to be the 100-year transition, abundant global natural gas supplies and ever more efficient power generation and end-use technologies will play an important role in reducing the environmental impact of fossil fuel consumption. As a result of these parallel developments, atmospheric carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas concentrations are unlikely to reach levels that even under the questionable climate sensitivity assumptions used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) will cause mean global surface temperature increases in excess of 1.5 degrees C. The major challenge will be to prevent interference by governments of the industrialized world or intergovernmental bodies with the technical and economic drivers that will ensure evolution to sustainability along least-cost pathways without impairment of human social and economic well-being so closely related to adequate and affordable energy services. Another challenge will be to assist the developing world, which is projected to be responsible for 66 percent of the increase in carbon dioxide emission between 1995 and 2015, in adopting the more advanced energy supply, conversion, and end-use technologies that often require larger hard-currency investments.

#### Perception of decreased oil dependence causes opec to flood the market with cheap oil

**SOUTHEAST FARM PRESS**, staff, December 19, 20**01**, LN.

But just when it appears something will in fact be done toward increasing domestic energy supplies, getting serious aboutalternative sources, and making a long-term commitment toward reducing our dependence on foreign oil - well, miraculously,prices go down. OPEC magnanimously increases supply, refineries begin humming, and once again thoughts of a national energy policyfade like the Cheshire cat. Only the cat's grin is left. And the cat is OPEC and the energyi ndustry. They've seen it all before. They know they have only to wait; that we in the United States have a short memory, and that aslong as they toss us a sop of energy "bargains" from time to time, we'll moan and groan and pay their price the rest ofthe time.

#### Dropping oil prices could delay transition for 25 years

Curtis **Rist**, Why We’ll Never Run Out of Oil, DISCOVER, June 19**99**, <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1511/is_6_20/ai_55926786>

Environmentalists once hoped that oil shortages would cut carbon dioxide emissions, but now only voluntary restrictions or, more likely, taxes on fossil-fuel consumption and incentives for developing alternative fuels are likely to reduce emissions. The 1997 Kyoto Conference--a world meeting on fossil-fuel use--produced an agreement by a handful of highly industrialized countries to cut carbon emissions to 1990 levels by 2010. What it did not produce was how this will be achieved. Of course, some see encouraging growth in renewable energy sources such as solar, wind, and even geothermal power. And if oil prices start of rise, these alternatives could eventually become competitive with conventional energy sources. But with the price of oil dropping--by an average of 2 percent a year since a peak in 1980--"that could push off the date for economic feasibility by as much as 25 years," says Lynch.

### Impact Module: Saudi Relations

#### U.S./Saudi ties high, dependence key to relations

**INTERNATIONAL OIL DAILY**, staff, November 5, 20**04**, LN.

**S**audi Arabian oil supply is expected to remain at the heart of US energy policy following the compelling election win by President George W. Bush, according to analysts polled by International Oil Daily. "Bush is more inclined to US dependence on Middle Eastern oil than Kerry would have been," said Muhammad-Ali Zainy, analyst at the Center for Global Energy Studies in London, adding that he sees the US-Saudi relationship remaining strong. "It isn't the Bush/Al-Saud relationship that promotes the oil relationship, the US dependence on Saudi oil is a historical fact which is inescapable," said Zainy. "The priorities in relation to Saudi Arabia will remain the same, that of oil and stability, and both are interlinked," said Mai Yamani, a Saudi expert at London's Royal Institute for International Affairs. "The most important issue for the US is to keep the oil tap open," she added. Even if Bush succeeds with proposals to promote domestic production, by opening Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) for example, this will not change its need for Saudi oil, commented Zainy. "Assuming Congress will approve this [ANWR exploration ], this has an inherently long lead time from initial exploration to bringing any oil on the markets," he said. "In any case any new production will only offset declines elsewhere." Despite declines earlier, prompting talk of a possible shift in Saudi policy, the kingdom has recently returned to the top of the US' crude oil import rankings. In August, Saudi Arabia was by far the largest crude oil supplier to the US at 1.821 million barrels per day, and also landed 110,000 b/d of products (IOD Oct.20,p4). Saudi Arabia has held the top spot every year since 1998.

#### Poor U.S./Saudi relations foster a China/Saudi alliance—outcome is a world war between the U.S. and China

Gal **Luft**, Executive Director, Institute for the Analysis of Global Security, “U.S., China Are on Collision Course Over Oil,” LOS ANGELES TIMES, February 2, 20**04**, <http://www.iags.org/la020204.htm>Sixty-seven years ago, oil-starved Japan embarked on an aggressive expansionary policy designed to secure its growing energy needs, which eventually led the nation into a world war. Today, another Asian power thirsts for oil: China. While the U.S. is absorbed in fighting the war on terror, the seeds of what could be the next world war are quietly germinating. With 1.3 billion people and an economy growing at a phenomenal 8% to 10% a year, China, already a net oil importer, is growing increasingly dependent on imported oil. Last year, its auto sales grew 70% and its oil imports were up 30% from the previous year, making it the world's No. 2 petroleum user after the U.S. By 2030, China is expected to have more cars than the U.S. and import as much oil as the U.S. does today. Dependence on oil means dependence on the Middle East, home to 70% of the world's proven reserves. With 60% of its oil imports coming from the Middle East, China can no longer afford to sit on the sidelines of the tumultuous region. Its way of forming a footprint in the Middle East has been through providing technology and components for weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems to unsavory regimes in places such as Iran, Iraq and Syria. A report by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, a group created by Congress to monitor U.S.-China relations, warned in 2002 that "this arms trafficking to these regimes presents an increasing threat to U.S. security interests in the Middle East." The report concludes: "A key driver in China's relations with terrorist-sponsoring governments is its dependence on foreign oil to fuel its economic development. This dependency is expected to increase over the coming decade." Optimists claim that the world oil market will be able to accommodate China and that, instead of conflict, China's thirst could create mutual desire for stability in the Middle East and thus actually bring Beijing closer to the U.S. History shows the opposite: Superpowers find it difficult to coexist while competing over scarce resources. The main bone of contention probably will revolve around China's relations with Saudi Arabia, home to a quarter of the world's oil. The Chinese have already supplied the Saudis with intermediate-range ballistic missiles, and they played a major role 20 years ago in a Saudi-financed Pakistani nuclear effort that may one day leave a nuclear weapon in the hands of a Taliban-type regime in Riyadh or Islamabad. Since 9/11, a deep tension in U.S.-Saudi relations has provided the Chinese with an opportunity to win the heart of the House of Saud. The Saudis hear the voices in the U.S. denouncing Saudi Arabia as a "kernel of evil" and proposing that the U.S. seize and occupy the kingdom's oil fields. The Saudis especially fear that if their citizens again perpetrate a terror attack in the U.S., there would be no alternative for the U.S. but to terminate its long-standing commitment to the monarchy — and perhaps even use military force against it. The Saudis realize that to forestall such a scenario they can no longer rely solely on the U.S. to defend the regime and must diversify their security portfolio. In their search for a new patron, they might find China the most fitting and willing candidate. The risk of Beijing's emerging as a competitor for influence in the Middle East and a Saudi shift of allegiance are things Washington should consider as it defines its objectives and priorities in the 21st century. Without a comprehensive strategy designed to prevent China from becoming an oil consumer on a par with the U.S., a superpower collision is in the cards. The good news is that we are still in a position to halt China's slide into total dependency.

#### Extinction

**STRAITS TIMES** (nqa) 6/25/**2K**[staff, “Regional Fallout: No One Gains in War Over Taiwan,” LN

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.

### A2: Declining Oil Dependence

#### All of their uniqueness evidence is misleading – oil dependency measurements are misleading because they reflect the poor economy

Brooks, ’12 [Kevin, “The American Transportation Grid; The Good, The Bad & The Ugly… The Uglier… and The Ugliest,” January 22, 2012, http://iicleantech.com/blog/2012/01/22/american-transportation-grid-good-bad-ugly-uglier-ugliest/]

The Ugly: Every recession over the past 35 years has been preceded by – or occurred concurrently with – an increase in oil prices. In general, recessions are caused by myriad factors and are damaging to nearly all sectors of the economy. And yet, oil price spikes tend to exact a particularly heavy toll on fuel-intensive industries like commercial airlines and shipping companies. Automobile manufacturers suffer proportionately as well, as consumers scale back large purchases. The most fundamental impact is on consumer spending. When oil prices spike, consumers must spend more on gasoline, leaving them less to spend on everything else. Because consumer spending accounts for approximately 70 percent of U.S. economic activity, sharp increases in the price of petroleum therefore represent a significant threat to the health of the U.S. economy.

### A2: Energy Independence

#### Self-sufficiency does not secure energy—markets, and thus prices, are global

Jerry **Taylor** and Peter Van Doren, Cato Institute, “The Energy Security Obsession,” LIMES: THE ITALIAN JOURNAL OF GEOPOLITICS, 11-23-**07**, [www.cato.org/pubs/articles/energy-security.pdf](http://www.cato.org/pubs/articles/energy-security.pdf)

Among the most fashionable preoccupations in foreign policy circles is “energy security.” Although it is unclear what exactly energy security means, foreign policy elites have long been concerned about reliance on foreign energy. Fear of embargoes and supply disruptions affects how Western nations deal with oil and gas producing states, what sort of policies are pursued in the Middle East, and even fundamental questions of war and peace. That’s unfortunate, because a nation that is self sufficient in energy is no more “secure” than one that relies on imports for all its energy needs. Given the global nature of oil markets and the increasing globalization of natural gas markets, willingness to pay market prices will secure all the energy a nation could possibly wish for during peacetime. Worries about producer blackmail are only a bit less far-fetched than worries about alien invasion.1 Simply put, reliance on oil and natural gas – imported or otherwise – is not the Achilles heel of the Western industrialized world.

#### U.S. oil dependence actually gives us ecocnomic leverage to quell dangerous regimes—trade spurs peace

Shikha **Dalmia**, senior analyst, Reason Foundation, “Defend America, Buy More iranian Oil,” REASON, 5-5-**06**, [www.reason.org/commentaries/dalmia\_20060505.shtml](http://www.reason.org/commentaries/dalmia_20060505.shtml), accessed 5-15-08.

Our dependence on Middle Eastern oil is only the flip side of their dependence on our purchases. But given the narrow base of Middle Eastern economies, the power in the relationship is firmly on the side of the oil buyers. If that relationship were to end because of "energy independence," we would give up crucial leverage to control the worst behavior of some of the world's worst regimes. Of course, this leverage is no magic wand that would protect us from a totally irrational regime willing to absorb the economic cost of using the oil weapon. But the more oil we get from such a regime, the higher the price it would have to pay. Thus whatever other arguments there might be for boosting domestic oil production, national security is not one of them. While this might seem counter-intuitive, it is really part of the overall logic of trade: The mutual dependence that trade breeds fosters peace because it gives hostile trading partners an incentive to refrain from acting on their hostility. Energy independence would weaken that incentive.

#### The U.S. has been an importer for almost a hundred years with no effect

Robert **Bryce**, energy analyst, “The Impossible Dream of Energy Independence,” interviewed by Brian Doherty, REASON ONLINE, 2-20-**08**, [www.reason.com/news/show/125027.html](http://www.reason.com/news/show/125027.html)

reason: While “energy independence” has soared to fresh public prominence in this era of soaring gas prices and Mideast wars, it’s not a new idea, is it? Robert Bryce: The first president to promote the idea was [Richard] Nixon in the wake of the oil embargo in 1973. In his State of the Union address in 1974, Nixon said that he was aiming for energy independence by the end of the decade. He hoped that by 1980 the U.S. would not be importing any oil. And every president since Nixon, in one way or another, has espoused a similar idea. But if you look back at the data, the U.S. was a net crude oil importer [as early as] 1913 and ever since we’ve been a net crude importer with a handful of years [as exceptions]. It’s remarkable how much the rhetoric about “energy independence” has had no connection with reality.

### A2: New Tech Solves

#### New technology has existed for years – the U.S. won’t transition without mandates

Shah, ‘12 [Igar, “We Have The Technology To Achieve Oil Independence, We Just Need The Will,” Fast Company, http://www.fastcoexist.com/1680061/we-have-the-technology-to-achieve-oil-independence-we-just-need-the-will]

The sad truth is that the technologies necessary to meet the fuel goal have been around for 20 years, but we seem incapable of deploying them at scale.

Many alternative fuels could also be scaled up profitably. The reason: we have invested 30 years of research, and gasoline and diesel are now hovering at around $4 per gallon. Fuel choices like methanol, hydrogen, electricity,Fischer–Tropsch synthesis, and other renewable fuels are competitively priced. So, just like solar and wind energy, getting the existing system to scale requires mandates like the U.S. Renewable Fuels Standard. Today, that standard needs to be updated to include non-renewable fuels, better known as the open fuels standard. Increasing these fuels faster is not only possible, but necessary to meet our goals by 2018.

### A2: Oil Dependency Inevitable

#### Oil independence is not possible – no way to meet oil demand even with increasing use of renewables

Shah, ‘12 [Igar, “We Have The Technology To Achieve Oil Independence, We Just Need The Will,” Fast Company, http://www.fastcoexist.com/1680061/we-have-the-technology-to-achieve-oil-independence-we-just-need-the-will]

Today, we import about 8 million barrels of oil per day. Meeting President Obama’s goal means a reduction of about four million barrels a day, or 50% of our total imports. The current increase in fuel economy standards will get us part way there, and the predicted increase in oil drilling in the U.S. and Canada will get us even closer to the goal. But no matter how we slice the data, we will still be short of the ultimate goal of energy independence.

## \*\*\*Aff Answers\*\*\*

### Non-Unique: Oil Dependence Declining

#### Non-unique: Foreign oil dependence declining because of increased U.S. oil production

Eland, ‘11 [Ivan, “No War for Oil: US Dependency and the Middle East,” Independent Institute, December 21, http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article\_ID=21463]

The one prominent issue that both American political parties can seemingly agree on is that the United States should be less dependent on foreign oil, especially from the Middle East. This goal has been made much more feasible by the fact that the United States is in the midst of a mini oil boom, which has temporarily reversed the country's increasing dependence on foreign sources of oil, says Ivan Eland, senior fellow and Director of the Center on Peace and Liberty at the Independent Institute.

#### Non-Unique: Oil dependency is declining now – increased production and declining consumption

Margot, 6/19 [Ben, “Canadian energy producers will need to step up their game if U.S. becomes self-sufficient,” Financial Post Magazine, June 19, 2012, http://business.financialpost.com/2012/06/19/canadian-energy-producers-will-need-to-step-up-their-game-if-u-s-becomes-self-sufficient/]

In the last three years, production of U.S. crude oil has risen by almost 15% to 5.7 million barrels a day, ending a virtually uninterrupted slide in supply that began in the mid-1980s and saw the U.S. oil industry’s production capacity cut almost in half. Consumption trends, meanwhile, have also turned around. Long perceived as insatiable in its need for crude oil, the U.S. is now reducing its oil dependency. “It’s all about efficiency and technology improvements,” says Michael Wittner, global head of oil research at Société Générale in New York. The mass commercialization of new technologies, combined with a higher mandated content for ethanol in petroleum products, has reduced demand for refined fuels. Higher legislated standards have also made U.S. vehicles more efficient. Other factors may be more transient: post-recession economic hardships as well as near-record high gasoline prices. Yet the structural changes will remain, pushing the U.S. toward more modest oil consumption, says Judith Dwarkin, chief economist at Ross Smith Energy Group in Calgary. “It’s safe to say that U.S. crude demand peaked several years ago,” she says. “It’s downhill from here.”

#### Non-unique: oil dependence fell to below 50% in 2010

Reuters, ’11 [Tom Doggett, “U.S. Oil Dependency Drops Below 50 Percent, Energy Department Reports,” May 25, 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/25/us-oil-dependency-drops-energy-department\_n\_867131.html?view=print&comm\_ref=false]

U.S. dependence on imported oil fell below 50 percent in 2010 for the first time in more than a decade, thanks in part to the weak economy and more fuel efficient vehicles, the Energy Department said on Wednesday. The department's Energy Information Administration said it expected the moderating trend in U.S. oil-import dependency to continue through the next decade due to improvements in energy efficiency and even higher fuel economy standards.

#### Non-unique: oil dependence has declined by over 10 percent since 2005

Eland, ‘11 [Ivan, “No War for Oil: US Dependency and the Middle East,” Independent Institute, December 21, http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article\_ID=21463]

Dependence on overseas oil has decreased from 60 percent of U.S. consumption in 2005 to a little less than half now.

### Oil Independence Inevitable

#### Oil independence inevitable – increased oil production, revised vehicle emission standards, and the development of shale gas

Hindustan Times, 7/6 [Pramit Pal Chaudhuri, “Independence Day,” July 6, 2012, http://www.hindustantimes.com/News-Feed/ColumnsOthers/Independence-day/Article1-883948.aspx]

There are intersecting reasons for this. One is the US’ return as an oil producer. This combines two developments: shale oil and mileage efficiency. The first has been most recently and comprehensively analysed in a Harvard University study by Leonardo Maugeri titled ‘Oil: The Next Revolution’. The study confirms earlier claims by analysts like Daniel Yergin all that talk of oil running out is nonsense. New technology and new investments mean that the world is experiencing the start of an enormous surge in oil and gas production. The real surprise is that the US is riding the crest. The report states, “The US could produce 11.6 million barrels per day (mpd) of crude oil and [other liquid fuel sources] by 2020, making the country the second largest oil producer in the world after Saudi Arabia.” A mix of technologies now allows the commercial harnessing of shale oil — crude trapped in sedimentary rock. The US has massive shale oil deposits. The Bakken-Three Forks shale formations in North Dakota, for example, have an estimated 900 billion barrels of oil. Saudi Arabia’s estimated proven reserves: 700 billion barrels. The second development is vehicle emission standards. American vehicle mileage rates traditionally rise and fall with oil prices. Presidents George W Bush and Obama began a policy of using the law to lock-in mileage rates so that they can only go up. US energy consultants Rhodium Group notes that when implemented, the latest US standards will slash US oil consumption by the equivalent of half of Nigeria’s entire crude production today. To put it another way, new mileage rates will mean that by 2025, the US will burn 16% less petroleum than it would have and by 2035 this figure would have risen to a staggering 35%. Gas-guzzlers will live on only in Mandarin. The third, and earlier, development has been the rise of shale gas — the same technological mix but used to extract natural gas. Four, as gas conquers America, coal is being sidelined. But the US has among the world’s largest coal deposits. So it has begun exporting it. Using a 2005 benchmark, these are the annual growth rates of US coal exports: 2007 (70% increase), 2008 (107%), 2010 (71%) and 2011 (49%). The subprime crisis killed growth in 2009, but only for a few quarters. The US is now the world’s fourth-largest exporter of coal and, say many analysts, has a decent shot at becoming number one. Already, coal shipping terminals are sprouting along the US’s eastern shoreline. The US is transforming its global energy profile in a manner probably unparalleled in the history of any major country. When it comes to oil, in two years the US will only need imports from Canada and Mexico, in six years it may be self-sufficient and after that it may be exporting. When it comes to gas, the US has already achieved self-sufficiency. Once new pipelines and terminals come on stream in 2014, the US will be able to export gas by the trillions of cubic metres. When it comes to coal, it could be the world’s largest exporter in a decade.

#### Decline in oil dependency is inevitable – increasing natural gas production

Fitzsimmons, ’10 [Michael, “Foreign Oil Dependency: The Root Cause of America's Economic Pain,” November 28, http://seekingalpha.com/article/238920-foreign-oil-dependency-the-root-cause-of-america-s-economic-pain]

The U.S. could very easily adopt natural gas transportation and reduce foreign oil imports by 5,000,000 barrels/day within 5 years. This would save the country not only $400,000,000 a day (assuming oil is at $80, but I assure you oil will be higher than that in 5 years), but it would also enable Americans to refuel their vehicles (at home) with natural gas at less than half the price of gasoline derived from foreign oil ($1.20 GGE natural gas today compared to $2.75/gallon gasoline). However, the economic gains would be much greater than these numbers due to the multiplier effect of keeping/saving this money in the U.S. and having it ripple through the consumer sector. In addition, hundreds of thousands of well paying jobs would be created in the energy, automotive, and industrial sectors as a result of reindustrializing the United States around its abundant natural gas resources. Such a reindustrialization effort would pay dividends to all Americans for decades into the future and usher in an age of economic prosperity few today can even imagine.

### Oil Independence Not Possible

#### Oil independence not possible – the U.S. would have to replace 8 million barrels of imported oil a day

Alic, 7/1 [Jen, a geopolitical analyst, co-founder of ISA Intel in Sarajevo and Tel Aviv, and the former editor-in-chief of ISN Security Watch in Zurich, “Weaning off Middle East Oil Means Less Than you Think,” July 1, 2012, http://oilprice.com/Energy/Crude-Oil/Weaning-off-Middle-East-Oil-Means-Less-Than-you-Think.html]

Let’s put America’s foreign oil dependency into perspective. In order to achieve independence from foreign oil imports, the US would have to find a replacement for the approximately 8 million barrels of oil it imports every day. There are plenty of factors that can contribute to reducing these imports, including increased domestic oil and gas production, improved fuel economy standards, and renewable energy. According to the Wall Street Journal, the US could become completely independent from Middle Eastern oil by 2035 primarily because of increased oil and gas production in the US and Canada (plus imports from Brazil) thanks to the technological advance found in hydraulic fracking. As a side note, renewable energy is mentioned as a potential contributor to energy independence.

#### Oil dependency theoretically flawed – oil responds to markets

Eland, ‘11 [Ivan, “No War for Oil: US Dependency and the Middle East,” Independent Institute, December 21, http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article\_ID=21463]

Additionally, despite claims that the world will soon deplete its dwindling oil supply, the United States need not convert itself into an aggressive hoarder of oil. These claims preclude the fact that the oil production market is dynamic and capable of responding to market forces. As demand has increased in recent years, production methods that were previously not economical became feasible, and the world oil market reacted. This suggests strongly that the United States is in no immediate danger.

### Impact Defense: Country Scenarios

#### Declining oil sales to the U.S. will not impact governments

Eland, ‘11 [Ivan, “No War for Oil: US Dependency and the Middle East,” Independent Institute, December 21, http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article\_ID=21463]

However, this should not be seen as a great victory against dictatorships and terrorism-sponsoring governments in the Middle East, and portraying it as such is misleading. The simple fact is that increased domestic production, coupled with depressed domestic consumption, will have little effect whatsoever on those governments that partially lose the United States as a buyer.

#### The volume of U.S. oil imported does not affect Persian Gulf countries

Eland, ‘11 [Ivan, “No War for Oil: US Dependency and the Middle East,” Independent Institute, December 21, http://www.ncpa.org/sub/dpd/index.php?Article\_ID=21463]

Only about 18 percent of total imports originate from the Persian Gulf, and therefore changes in our supply and demand can have only a marginal impact on their economies. Furthermore, the prices that these nations receive for their oil are not determined by individual buyers like the United States but by the world market, meaning that even if the United States were able to cut out Persian Gulf imports entirely, the resulting price change would be minimal.

### Impact Turn: Economy/National Security

#### Oil dependency hurts the U.S. economy and threatens national security

Brooks, ’12 [Kevin, “The American Transportation Grid; The Good, The Bad & The Ugly… The Uglier… and The Ugliest,” January 22, 2012, http://iicleantech.com/blog/2012/01/22/american-transportation-grid-good-bad-ugly-uglier-ugliest/

The must read report concludes; Reliance on petroleum has created unsustainable risks to American economic and national security. Much of the oil we consume is produced in hostile nations and unstable regions. Its price is increasingly volatile. As a result, the economy is left at the mercy of events and actors beyond U.S. control. The U.S. transportation system and U.S. energy use are, to a very significant extent, irrevocably linked. Efforts must therefore be refocused on developing transportation policies that transform the way projects are funded and chosen, using oil consumption as a principal metric.The current approach is unsustainable for the U.S. transportation system, national energy security, and the growth of the American economy. It is time for policymaking that emphasizes the crucial interaction between transportation policy and U.S. oil dependence.

### Impact Turn: Resource Wars/Survival

#### Oil dependency causes resource wars and threatens our survival

USHSR Association, NDG

[US High Speed Rail Association, “Rail - The Solution to Rising Gas Prices,” 21st Century Transportation for America, http://www.ushsr.com/benefits/energysecurity.html]

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.