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#### The United States Supreme Court should rule that compliance orders from federal enforcement agencies regarding reducing restrictions on oil drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf unconstitutional.

#### Courts have authority to rule over energy production

Brenda Bowers April 2011 “Future Of American Energy Production At Stake In US Supreme Court – Big Government” http://brendabowers.wordpress.com/2011/04/19/%C2%BB-future-of-american-energy-production-at-stake-in-us-supreme-court-big-government/

We all know how important energy is in our lives, just as commercial energy is critical to free market capitalism and the pursuit of prosperity in America. Now, thanks to environmental activists and several states, that may all be at risk in the US Supreme Court. In 2004, unhappy that the duly elected Bush administration wasn’t restricting carbon emissions in the alleged cause of global warming, environmental activism prompted several states to file a “public nuisance” lawsuit, which would empower the courts in this regard. They lost in the lower court but that was reversed in 2007. This case is novel, and far more aggressive and disruptive than the global warming case the Court previously permitted. In a 2007 decision, Massachusetts v. EPA, a closely divided Court agreed with 12 states and several cities that the Environmental Protection Agency has authority to regulate carbon dioxide as a pollutant under the Clean Air Act. Though that case dealt with a narrow claim to enforce a federal statute, the Court’s decision emboldened what had already become a cottage industry of lawsuits designed to slow global warming by asking federal courts to enact what interest groups have been unable to secure through the democratic process: carbon caps and other limits on the way energy is produced in this country. Under the guise of “public nuisance,” the plaintiffs in these suits seek to impose enormous damages and binding emissions caps on energy companies. The plaintiffs have acknowledged that their goal is a veritable sea change in the way energy is produced, sold, and used in this country. Incredibly, they assert that these companies can make major changes to lower emissions – such as the adoption of wind and solar alternatives – “without significantly increasing the cost of electricity.” But never before has the “public nuisance” doctrine been used to set national economic and energy policy. While litigation may be therapeutic for those frustrated by political inaction, this case is at odds with this country’s legal tradition. Meanwhile, a recently elected Republican House is taking steps to go in the other direction through budget cuts to the EPA. Environmental activism in the US is, in effect, looking to up-end the democratic process – an all too common theme across the Left – by empowering the courts to make policy in perhaps the single most critical policy area for American prosperity.

#### This solves and competes – it doesn’t ‘reduce’ a legal restriction – it just makes it unenforceable

William Treanor (associate professor of law at Fordham University) and Gene Sperling (Deputy assistant to the president for economic policy University of Minnesota) 1993 “Prospective overruling and the revival of Unconstitutional statutes” JSTOR

Unlike the Supreme Court, several state courts have explicitly addressed the revival issue. The relevant state court cases have concerned the specific issue of whether a statute that has been held unconstitutional is revived when the invalidating decision is over- turned.42 With one exception, they have concluded that such statutes are immediately enforceable. The most noted instance in which the revival issue was resolved by a court involved the District of Columbia minimum wage statute pro- nounced unconstitutional in Adkins. After the Court reversed Adkins in West Coast Hotel, President Roosevelt asked Attorney General HomerCummings for an opinion on the status of the District of Columbia's statute. The Attorney General responded, The decisions are practically in accord in holding that the courts have no power to repeal or abolish a statute, and that notwithstanding a decision holding it unconstitutional a statute continues to remain on the statute books; and that if a stat- ute be declared unconstitutional and the decision so declaring it be subsequently overruled the statute will then be held valid from the date it became effective.43 Enforcement of the statute followed without congressional action.44 When this enforcement was challenged, the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia inJawish v. Morlet 45 held that the decision in West Coast Hotel had had the effect of making the statute enforceable. The court observed that previous opinions addressing the revival issue proceed on the principle that a statute declared unconstitutional is void in the sense that it is inoperative or unenforceable, but not void in the sense that it is repealed or abolished; that so long as the decision stands the statute is dormant but not dead; and that if the decision is reversed the statute is valid from its first effective date.46 The court declared this precedent sound since the cases were "in ac- cord with the principle 'that a decision of a court of appellate jurisdic- tion overruling a former decision is retrospective in its operation, and the effect is not that the former decision is bad law but that it never was the law.' "47 Adkins was thus, and had always been, a nullity. The court acknowledged that, after Adkins, it had been thought that the District of Columbia's minimum wage statute was unconstitutional. As the court put it, "'[J]ust about everybody was fooled.' "48 Nonetheless, the court's view was that since the minimum wage law had always been valid, although for a period judicially unenforceable, there was no need to reenact it.49 Almost all other courts that have addressed the issue of whether a statute that has been found unconstitutional can be revived have reached the same result as theJawish court, using a similar formalisticanalysis.50 The sole decision in which a court adopted the nonrevival position is Jefferson v. Jeferson,51 a poorly reasoned decision of the Louisiana Supreme Court. The plaintiff in Jeferson sought child sup- port and maintenance from her husband. She prevailed at the trial level; he filed his notice of appeal one day after the end of the filing period established by the Louisiana Uniform Rules of the Court of Ap- peals. The Court of Appeals rejected his appeal as untimely, even though the Louisiana Supreme Court had previously found that the ap- plicable section of the Uniform Rules violated the state constitution. One of Ms. Jefferson's arguments before the state Supreme Court was that that court's previous ruling had been erroneous and that the rules should therefore be revived. In rejecting this claim and in finding for the husband, the Court stated: Since we have declared the uniform court rule partially unconstitutional, it appears to be somewhat dubious that we have the right to reconsider this ruling in the instant case as counsel for the respondent judges urges us to do. For a rule of court, like a statute, has the force and effect of law and, when a law is stricken as void, it no longer has existence as law; the law cannot be resurrected thereafter by a judicial de- cree changing the final judgment of unconstitutionality to con- stitutionality as this would constitute a reenactment of the law by the Court-an assumption of legislative power not dele- gated to it by the Constitution.52 The Louisiana Court thus took a mechanical approach to the revival question. According to its rationale, when a statute is found unconstitutional, it is judicially determined never to have existed. Revival there- fore entails judicial legislation and thereby violates constitutionally mandated separation of powers: because the initial legislative passage of the bill has no legitimacy, the bill's force is considered to be purely a creature of judicial decision-making. Jefferson has little analytic appeal. Its view of the separation of pow- ers doctrine is too simplistic. Contrary to the Jeferson rationale, a "re- vived" law is not the pure product of judicial decision-making. It is, instead, a law that once gained the support of a legislature and that has never been legislatively repealed. Its legitimacy rests on its initial legis- lative authorization. Moreover, the view that a statute that has been found unconstitutional should be treated as if it never existed may have had some support in the early case law, but it has been clearly rejected by the Supreme Court. Instead of treating all statutes that it has found unconstitutional as if they had never existed, the Court has recognized a range of circumstances in which people who rely on an overturned decision are protected. Indeed, as will be developed, the doctrine of prospective overruling evolved to shield from harm those who relied on subsequently overruled judicial decisions.53 In short, the one case in which there was a holding that a statute did not revive does not offer a convincing rationale for nonrevival.
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**Organizing a more just society should be the primary goal of modern politics – the meticulously economic focus of energy system hamstrings our ability to accomplish this goal and destroys the biosphere and causes global war**

**Dahm and Bannas 2011** (Daniel, Stephen, “The decline of the Fossil Age is the rise of distributive justice” <http://poldev.revues.org/835>)

The many cultures of the world today face a huge challenge: the organisation of a sustainable and just society, which enables people to have a share in the essentials of life, in knowledge and political and cultural development, as well as access to and the use of technological infrastructure. Sustainable development demands more than simply maintaining and protecting the climatic and ecological balance of the bio-geosphere; it requires a constructive effort to enable and promote the evolution of living things and the cooperative development of the diversity of the Earth’s cultural forms as a complement to bio-ecological evolution. In the co-evolution of humanity, economics has taken on an increasingly significant interface function with relation to nature. Economics mediates between the ideas, needs and demands of human culture and social reality on the one hand, and natural resources on the other. The role of energy availability has become ever more important as a result of industrialisation and the increasing tendency to use material and technological methods for economic production. Energy became the means and the motor of economic development. Its availability and access to it increased in significance for the development of industry, wealth and the creation of infrastructure. Many alternative cultural forms had already been marginalised and consigned to history, and many geographical areas had already been restructured to become suppliers of resources for transport to the booming western European-style societies. Together with an increasing shift in the orientation of models of prosperity from “being” to “having” (cp. Fromm, 1976) and the expansion of the consumer goods industry necessary for this, energy availability and energy use became entrenched as a prerequisite for prosperity. Energy transformed ideas and wishes into material goods and legitimised the conception that everything was endlessly feasible. At the start of the 21st century, energy is the source, the prerequisite and the legitimation of the model of power and consumption of the last century. However, there is neither the material basis nor the energy availability for us to pursue further, and around the globe, the resource-hungry and energy-hungry lifestyle of the past decades. This lifestyle never brought happiness (cp. Kasser, 2002). It could never be achieved throughout the world. Today, energy no longer embodies the genie from the bottle, who works wonders, but rather a model for limitless economic growth, material excess and the accumulation of economic, social and political power by one group at the expense of the others. Energy is frequently seen as being synonymous with the climatic and ecological crisis, with greenhouse gases, global injustice and military conflicts. At the same time, though, energy today once again represents hope. The age of renewable energy has dawned and, with its potential for decentralised production, its polycentric supply infrastructure and ecological balance, it represents a new technological age. Renewable energy gives new strength to ideas of good governance, of justice, participation and stewardship of our social goods.

#### The belief in an entirely controllable and regulatable natural world causes extinction

**Dahm and Bannas 2011** (Daniel, Stephen, “The decline of the Fossil Age is the rise of distributive justice” <http://poldev.revues.org/835>)

The biosphere and geosphere exist in close dynamic interdependency. Their relational structure is gaining degrees of complexity whose causal relatedness is far beyond analytical objectivity. In particular, linear determinisms – still common in most scientific analyses – are reaching their limits. The fundamental uncertainty of ecological interdependencies and processes is multiplying within the cultural dimensions of the anthroposphere. Human value concepts and interpretations of reality (lat. res = thing) are becoming bio-ecological and climate ecological parameters. Economic and political strategies are directly affecting the geo-bio-ecological budgets, material and energy flows, accumulation, distribution and the ecological balance – in space as well as in time. 2The wide range of life-threatening conflicts today range from the destructive climate impacts by greenhouse gases as CO2, Methane and others and the atmospheric enrichment with particulate matter, up to the extensive degradation and desertification of soils and landscapes worldwide, the far-reaching pollution and exhaustion of water resources as well as the wasteful use of fossil resources, to the systematic destruction of marine and land ecosystems, and the rapid extinction of the wide variety of life forms. Humans are rarely able to understand clearly the complex chains of cause and effect, but we know that humans play a decisive role in these processes. But much easier to link directly to human behaviour and the human world of ideas is the broad spectrum of severe, destructive and far-reaching conflicts that humanity is facing daily. 3The only field in which humans are able to interact and communicate with their ecological environment is that of “culture”. It is only through culture that human-nature-relations are interpreted and strategically translated and realised. By means of cultures of knowledge, of economics, politics, social and civil relations, etc., humans set limits and openings for their position in “the world”, and their patterns of actions and opportunities. [2. The human-nature-relation: an epistemological disconnect](http://poldev.revues.org/835#tocfrom1n2) 4Scientifically this relationship represents one of the most fundamental epistemological (of the theory of cognition) schisms in history: the contact between a materialistic view of reality and the immaterial “Wirklichkeit” of a living world in dynamic interdependency. “The insights of modern physics – of quantum physics – suggest a new interpretation of the world that carries us beyond the materialistic-mechanistic worldview. Instead of the world assumed until now – a mechanical, temporally determined “reality” of objectifiable things, the real Wirklichkeit (a world that effects) turns out to be basically “potentiality”: an indivisible, immaterial, temporally essentially indeterminate and genuinely creative bonding of relations that determines only “can”-probabilities, a differentiated potential for a material-energetic realization.” (Dürr, Dahm & Lippe, 2005) Such a “schism” cannot be resolved (as historically expected for a long time in the development of the sciences particularly in the philosophies) primarily by means of a change in our spiritual relationship to our world. Rather, and more drastically, humanity is confronted with this epistemological schism through its interaction with the living world, which both includes and borders humanity. The scenarios of bio-geo-ecological crises present human beings in a life-threatening way with the narrowness of their interpretations of the world and of their patterns of behaviour, and challenge them to adopt a new course of action. This goes hand in hand with a confrontation between the diverse cultural strategies and views of reality. 5Living complexes do not follow the mechanistic ideas of the old physics. The manifestations of life emerge and vanish in a highly dynamic flow of interactions. In this way, reality is created in a permanent transformative process. The description of ecology, biological and cultural plurality, and human impacts on nature, demands the describing and consequent inclusion of the in-betweens and go-betweens (Turnbull, D. 2004), of aspects of an inter-connected relatedness that are not measurable. Within such intelligence, the aspects of fuzziness and uncertainty are indivisibly integrated in the comprehension of nature, life and ecology. The consequences for actions and strategies from the local to the global level are presumably drastic, calling for a re-orientation in economic, political, socio-cultural and ecological matters. 6Since the 15th century, a narrow, centralistic world view, which strives to iron out all differences between diverse philosophical outlooks and create homogeneity, has come to dominate as never before. This can be seen especially clearly in the colonisation of virtually the entire known world by western European powers. This was followed by the one-sided monopolisation of the spiritual, living and material resources of our Earth by the European-style power centres. 7These strategies and ways of thinking, adapted all over the world, and the view of humanity that is closely connected with them, have a causal link with the materialistic-mechanistic world view that is still favoured around the globe, i.e. the object-related division of life resulting from the desire to control it (frequently referred to as the Cartesian-Newtonian world view). 8At the start of the modern era, in the 17th century, the changes wrought by the Cartesian revolution engendered diverse and far-reaching processes of social restructuring. This intellectual and philosophical change, having matured for some time, also began to affect the nature of economic activity and the organisation of the state. Put simply, a “God-given” world order was replaced by an impression of unlimited power to shape the world. This brought with it a materialistic view of reality and reduced the relationship between humans and nature to one concerned first and foremost with the production of energy and materials.

#### The Alternative is to take a reality check – energy production follows a stringent line of historical reasoning believing that the next energy revolution will save everything – however through the alternative we can think historically to understand the massive inequalities and violence necessary for the energy regime

**Byrne and Toly 2k6** (john, Noah, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse” Transforming Power: Energy, Environment, And Society in Conflict. Eds John Byrne, Noah Toly, and Leigh Glover. Pgs 1-32. Transaction Publishers. )

From climate change to acid rain, contaminated landscapes, mercury pollution, and biodiversity loss,2 the origins of many of our least tractable environmental problems can be traced to the operations of the modern energy system. A scan of nightfall across the planet reveals a social dilemma that also accompanies this system’s operations: invented over a century ago, electric light remains an experience only for the socially privileged. Two billion human beings—almost one-third of the planet’s population—experience evening light by candle, oil lamp, or open fire, reminding us that energy modernization has left intact—and sometimes exacerbated—social inequalities that its architects promised would be banished (Smil, 2003: 370 - 373). And there is the disturbing link between modern energy and war.3 Whether as a mineral whose control is fought over by the powerful (for a recent history of conflict over oil, see Klare, 2002b, 2004, 2006), or as the enablement of an atomic war of extinction, modern energy makes modern life possible and threatens its future. With environmental crisis, social inequality, and military conflict among the significant problems of contemporary energy-society relations, the importance of a social analysis of the modern energy system appears easy to establish. One might, therefore, expect a lively and fulsome debate of the sector’s performance, including critical inquiries into the politics, sociology, and political economy of modern energy. Yet, contemporary discourse on the subject is disappointing: instead of a social analysis of energy regimes, the field seems to be a captive of euphoric technological visions and associated studies of “energy futures” that imagine the pleasing consequences of new energy sources and devices.4 One stream of euphoria has sprung from advocates of conventional energy, perhaps best represented by the unflappable optimists of nuclear power who, early on, promised to invent a “magical fire” (Weinberg, 1972) capable of meeting any level of energy demand inexhaustibly in a manner “too cheap to meter” (Lewis Strauss, cited in the New York Times 1954, 1955). In reply to those who fear catastrophic accidents from the “magical fire” or the proliferation of nuclear weapons, a new promise is made to realize “inherently safe reactors” (Weinberg, 1985) that risk neither serious accident nor intentionally harmful use of high-energy physics. Less grandiose, but no less optimistic, forecasts can be heard from fossil fuel enthusiasts who, likewise, project more energy, at lower cost, and with little ecological harm (see, e.g., Yergin and Stoppard, 2003). Skeptics of conventional energy, eschewing involvement with dangerously scaled technologies and their ecological consequences, find solace in “sustainable energy alternatives” that constitute a second euphoric stream. Preferring to redirect attention to smaller, and supposedly more democratic, options, “green” energy advocates conceive devices and systems that prefigure a revival of human scale development, local self-determination, and a commitment to ecological balance. Among supporters are those who believe that greening the energy system embodies universal social ideals and, as a result, can overcome current conflicts between energy “haves” and “havenots.” 5 In a recent contribution to this perspective, Vaitheeswaran suggests (2003: 327, 291), “today’s nascent energy revolution will truly deliver power to the people” as “micropower meets village power.” Hermann Scheer echoes the idea of an alternative energy-led social transformation: the shift to a “solar global economy... can satisfy the material needs of all mankind and grant us the freedom to guarantee truly universal and equal human rights and to safeguard the world’s cultural diversity” (Scheer, 2002: 34).6 The euphoria of contemporary energy studies is noteworthy for its historical consistency with a nearly unbroken social narrative of wonderment extending from the advent of steam power through the spread of electricity (Nye, 1999). The modern energy regime that now powers nuclear weaponry and risks disruption of the planet’s climate is a product of promises pursued without sustained public examination of the political, social, economic, and ecological record of the regime’s operations. However, the discursive landscape has occasionally included thoughtful exploration of the broader contours of energy-environment-society relations. As early as 1934, Lewis Mumford (see also his two-volume Myth of the Machine, 1966; 1970) critiqued the industrial energy system for being a key source of social and ecological alienation (1934: 196): The changes that were manifested in every department of Technics rested for the most part on one central fact: the increase of energy. Size, speed, quantity, the multiplication of machines, were all reflections of the new means of utilizing fuel and the enlargement of the available stock of fuel itself. Power was dissociated from its natural human and geographic limitations: from the caprices of the weather, from the irregularities that definitely restrict the output of men and animals. By 1961, Mumford despaired that modernity had retrogressed into a lifeharming dead end (1961: 263, 248): ...an orgy of uncontrolled production and equally uncontrolled reproduction: machine fodder and cannon fodder: surplus values and surplus populations... The dirty crowded houses, the dank airless courts and alleys, the bleak pavements, the sulphurous atmosphere, the over-routinized and dehumanized factory, the drill schools, the second-hand experiences, the starvation of the senses, the remoteness from nature and animal activity—here are the enemies. The living organism demands a life-sustaining environment. Modernity’s formula for two centuries had been to increase energy in order to produce overwhelming economic growth. While diagnosing the inevitable failures of this logic, Mumford nevertheless warned that modernity’s supporters would seek to derail present-tense7 evaluations of the era’s social and ecological performance with forecasts of a bountiful future in which, finally, the perennial social conflicts over resources would end. Contrary to traditional notions of democratic governance, Mumford observed that the modern ideal actually issues from a pseudomorph that he named the “democraticauthoritarian bargain” (1964: 6) in which the modern energy regime and capitalist political economy join in a promise to produce “every material advantage, every intellectual and emotional stimulus [one] may desire, in quantities hardly available hitherto even for a restricted minority” on the condition that society demands only what the regime is capable and willing to offer. An authoritarian energy order thereby constructs an aspirational democracy while facilitating the abstraction of production and consumption from non-economic social values. The premises of the current energy paradigms are in need of critical study in the manner of Mumford’s work if a world measurably different from the present order is to be organized. Interrogating modern energy assumptions, this chapter examines the social projects of both conventional and sustainable energy as a beginning effort in this direction. The critique explores the neglected issue of the political economy of energy, underscores the pattern of democratic failure in the evolution of modern energy, and considers the discursive continuities between the premises of conventional and sustainable energy futures.
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#### Energy production doesn’t solve jobs

Levi 12 – Senior Fellow (at CFR) for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Michael, July/August, “Think Again: The American Energy Boom” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think_again_the_american_energy_boom?page=full>) Jacome

"The U.S. Energy Boom Will Create Millions of New Jobs."

**Overstated**. The U.S. oil and gas boom has come at an auspicious time. With record numbers of Americans out of work, hydrocarbon production is helping create much-needed jobs in communities from Pennsylvania to North Dakota. Shale gas production alone accounted for an estimated 600,000 U.S. jobs as of 2010, according to the consultancy IHS CERA.

It's much harder, though, to extrapolate into the future. In a deeply depressed economy, new development can put people to work without reducing employment elsewhere. That's why boom states have benefited massively in recent years. The same is not true, though, in a more normal economy. Unemployment rates are typically determined by fundamental factors such as the ease of hiring and firing and the match between skills that employers need and that workers have. The oil and gas boom won't change these much.

That's why we should be skeptical about rosy projections of millions of new jobs. Wood MacKenzie, for example, claims that the energy boom could deliver as many as 1.1 million jobs by 2020, while Citigroup forecasts a whopping 3.6 million. Unless the U.S. economy remains deep in the doldrums for another decade, these will mostly come **at the expense of jobs elsewhere.**

#### Oil jobs trade off with other parts of the energy industry – those would create more growth than the aff

Jen Alic 6-12-2012; Energy Independence Equals Jobs across the Environmental Divide <http://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/Energy-Independence-Equals-Jobs-across-the-Environmental-Divide.html>

With that in mind, let’s look at the prospects for energy jobs at a time when the national unemployment rate is about 8.2% and millions of Americans remain without jobs and with dwindling if not completely exhausted unemployment benefits. From a global perspective, the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) said the off-grid electricity industry alone is poised to create 4 million jobs alone in accordance with the United Nation’s goal of providing sustainable energy for all by 2030. Currently, renewable energy companies worldwide employ an estimated 5 million people. Germany alone forecasts it will employ over half a million people in the renewable energy sector by 2030, while currently over 380,000 people work in the sector. Worldwide, between 2007 and 2011, the number of jobs in the renewable energy sector doubled. According to the UN, renewables are poised to have a better job-creation rate than oil and gas sector in the longer term. In the US, the solar industry in particular has seen a massive job boom. According to the National Solar Jobs Census 2011, employment growth in the solar sector was nearly 10 times higher than the average national rate last year, translating into over 100,000 solar jobs for Americans and a forecasted increase of 24% for 2012. And these figures are said to reflect the bare minimum. In the State of California, for instance, despite two major recessions, job creation in the renewable energy sector has outpaced job growth in any other sector, according to the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF).

#### Squo solves – oil prices are lower and exports are increasing

Julian Pecquet 8-9-2012; The Hill, “US trade deficit hits 18-month low” http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/trade/242889-us-trade-deficit-hits-18-month-low

The U.S. trade deficit in June hit its lowest level since December 2010, the Commerce Department said Thursday, as the gap between the nation's exports and its imports from abroad narrowed to $42.9 billion. The numbers are good news for the Obama administration, which has come under attack from Mitt Romney for being “soft” on China, the main driver of the U.S. trade deficit. The Republican presidential candidate has vowed to designate China a currency manipulator on his first day in office. The trend was fueled by a record high in exports, which reached $185 billion thanks to spikes in sales of consumer goods, automobiles and and industrial supplies and material. U.S. sales of food and beverages abroad were down by $800 million, however. Imports of goods and services fell to $227.9 billion, down from $231.4 billion in May, driven in large part by falling oil prices.

#### No impact to the trade deficit – doesn’t affect or correlate negatively with growth

Fisher Investments 9-15-2011; Trade Gap Irrelevant for U.S. Economic Growth <http://www.thestreet.com/story/11250198/1/trade-gap-irrelevant-for-us-economic-growth.html>

NEW YORK (TheStreet) -- International trade is an important and volatile component of global economic growth, one that's commonly misunderstood. For example, last Thursday's U.S. Commerce Department report on trade led off with a discussion of a $6.8 billion reduction in our trade deficit, to a minus $44.8 billion. And, as is customary, the trade gap is what led off most coverage of the report. Some argue an expanding trade gap is bad. And counterintuitively, last week some argued the shrinking trade gap was also bad -- supposedly as a sign of a slowing economy. But in reality, the trade gap simply doesn't describe U.S. economic conditions. (Although the trade deficit does affect GDP, it's mostly a statistical anomaly. As discussed in our recent article, "What GDP Doesn't Say ," it's a reason why GDP isn't completely synonymous with economic health.) The more telling metric is total trade. Calculating total trade calls for adding exports and imports but it is rarely done. However, in our view, this is the most correct way to view trade. Imports can detract from a nation's GDP calculation, but rising imports can be sign of strong demand. Imports can also create massive economic value for consumers and businesses -- by helping firms stay competitive and even resulting in lower prices. Moreover, over half of U.S. imports aren't children's toys, cars or food, but equipment and components U.S. businesses use to produce or reassemble goods for final sale or re-export. For example, in the first seven months of this year (the latest data available), one category -- industrial supplies -- outweighed foodstuffs, vehicles and consumer goods combined, according to the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. Since imports have a positive economic value and can be indicative of healthy demand, it makes little sense to us to statistically account for them as a negative. And it reinforces the point that total trade can be more instructive regarding overall economic health than the trade deficit.

#### Domestic production doesn’t solve prices

Levi 12 – Senior Fellow (at CFR) for Energy and the Environment and Director of the Program on Energy Security and Climate Change (Michael, July/August, “Think Again: The American Energy Boom” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/06/18/think_again_the_american_energy_boom?page=full>) Jacome

"We Can Drill Our Way Out of High Prices." Don't bet on it. Some people claim that unleashing U.S. oil and gas resources would slash the price of crude. Who can forget the cries of "Drill, Baby, Drill!" that saturated airwaves during the 2008 presidential campaign? Others insist that, because **oil is priced on a global market, increased U.S. output wouldn't move the needle.** Even Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the top economist for John McCain's 2008 presidential campaign, has written, "Domestic action to increase production will not lower gas prices set on a global market." The precise truth lies somewhere in between. If U.S. producers were able to massively ramp up output, the ultimate impact would mostly boil down to one big question: How would other big oil producers (mainly the Saudis and the rest of OPEC) respond to a surge in U.S. supplies? To stop prices from falling, they could cut back their output in response to new U.S. production, much as they've tried to in the past. That's essentially what happens in the much-cited projections by the Energy Information Administration. In one recent exercise, for example, it looked at what would happen to gasoline prices if U.S. oil production grew by about a million barrels a day. The net impact was a mere 4 cents a gallon fall. Why? All but a sliver of the increase in U.S. output was matched by cutbacks in the Middle East, leaving oil prices barely changed.

#### Nonsense – the world market is controlled by state companies with price targets

Aaron Menenburg 9-6-2012; graduate student in international relations at The Maxwell School of Syracuse University. “Let’s Get Real: Energy Independence is an Unrealistic and Misleading Myth” http://www.economonitor.com/policiesofscale/2012/09/06/lets-get-real-energy-independence-is-a-unrealistic-and-misleading-myth/

The Oil Market is Not a Free One, and We Cannot Treat it As if it is Free One of the arguments for energy independence is that it would lower gasoline prices because we could apply free market principles to the energy market to eliminate its distortions. This last part implies a truth; the oil market is not a free market and does not operate on free market principles. A majority of the world oil supply is produced by members of the oil cartel, OPEC. As much as 90% of conventional (inexpensive) oil reserves are held by national oil companies whose investment and production decisions are far removed from the free market ideal.[9] 40% of the world’s oil reserves are in Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Iraq, a large portion of which are developed by national oil companies.[10] As a whole, the oil industries in OPEC countries do not function as profit-maximizing firms seeking to expand market share. Instead, investment levels are determined, at least partially, as part of a strategy to achieve specified price targets. Because of these distortions, the application of American market capitalism would be ineffective in achieving free market outcomes.

##### Manufacturing jobs losses are due to efficiency – reversing the trade deficit doesn’t solve

Charles Roxburgh et al May 2012; Director, McKinsey Global Institute London, with Richard Dobbs Director, McKinsey Global Institute Seoul James Manyika Director, McKinsey Global Institute San Francisco Charles Roxburgh Susan Lund Director of Research, McKinsey Global Institute Washington, DC; The McKinsey Global Institute (MGI), the business and economics research arm of McKinsey & Company, was established in 1990 to develop a deeper understanding of the evolving global economy. Our goal is to provide leaders in the commercial, public, and social sectors with the facts and insights on which to base management and policy decisions. “Trading myths: Addressing misconceptions about trade, jobs, and competitiveness”

MYTH 3: TRADE IS AT THE HEART OF THE LOSS OF MANUFACTURING JOBS Reality: The decline in manufacturing jobs in mature economies—and the shift in jobs among sectors overall—is dominated by changes in the composition of demand and ongoing increases in productivity. The share of manufacturing employment in mature economies is bound to decline further, from 12 percent today to below 10 percent in 2030, according to our analysis. In the case of the United States, the 5.8 million manufacturing job losses from 2000 to 2010 largely reflected ongoing productivity increases coupled with reduced output mostly explained by weak domestic demand after the recession, even when we adjust for widely discussed difficulties in measuring productivity. Historically, rising productivity is accompanied by strong increases in demand and ouput. However, this latest decade was one in which increased productivity coincided with stagnation in domestic demand in real terms as the recession reversed previous increases.4 According to our analysis, around 20 percent of the decline in jobs can be attributed to trade or offshoring. Closing the entire 2010 US current account deficit of 3.2 percent of GDP by improving the manufacturing trade balance would be equivalent to approximately 2.2 million more manufacturing jobs—well short of the job losses of the past decade alone.5

#### Manufacturing isn’t declining in ways that matter – increasing productivity preserves manufacturing leadership

Steve Chapman 3-8-2012; a member of the Chicago Tribune's editorial board “Manufacturing an economic myth Nostalgia is no guide to sound policy” <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-03-18/news/ct-oped-0318-chapman-20120318_1_manufacturing-sector-rick-santorum-products>

#### But if nostalgia were a sound guide to economic policy, we should be building Studebakers and rotary telephones. Neither Santorum nor Obama seems to grasp the realities of manufacturing in 21st-century America. The first is that it's not declining in the ways that matter. Compared with 1990, the total value of U.S. manufacturing output, adjusted for inflation, was up by 75 percent in 2010 — despite a drop caused by the Great Recession. It has declined as a share of gross domestic product only because other industries have expanded even more rapidly. Economist Mark J. Perry of the University of Michigan at Flint points out that in 2009, the total value of America's manufacturing output was nearly 46 percent greater than China's. Over the past two decades, our share of the world's manufacturing has been pretty stable. The decline in the number of manufacturing jobs is taken as evidence that the sector is sick or uncompetitive or the victim of unfair trade practices. In reality, the change indicates sound health. Our manufacturing workers have become so much more productive that they can churn out more goods with a far smaller workforce. The same pattern, by the way, is evident in American agriculture. In 1900, 39 percent of all Americans lived on farms. Today it's 1 percent. It's a good thing, not a bad thing, that we need fewer people to produce our food. Likewise with manufactured products. Manufacturing accounts for a shrinking slice of the total economy mainly because as we grow wealthier, we spend a smaller portion of our income on physical products, like cars and appliances, and a bigger one on services, from health care to cellphone contracts to restaurant meals. That phenomenon holds across the developed world. It's the result of the free market at work, endlessly shifting resources to accommodate changes in consumer demand. Politicians don't think they should tell Americans to eat at Burger King instead of Chipotle, or buy baseball bats instead of soccer balls. They didn't insist we keep our typewriters when personal computers came along. For the most part, our leaders take it as normal and sensible to defer to consumer demand, rather than try to dictate it. Given that, why do they think they ought to rig the tax code to push consumption dollars from services, which Americans want, to goods, which they don't want quite so much? Why should they divert investment from more popular businesses to less popular ones? That's what the measures offered by Santorum and Obama would do. The point is to ease the tax burden of manufacturers at the expense of other companies, on the superstition that the former are more valuable than the latter. It's hard to see the fairness or the economic logic. When the president unveiled his proposal, Jade West of the National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors complained to The New York Times, "My guys are totally freaked out b

#### Trade deficits are imaginary and irrelevant

Kent McManigal, 5-3-2010; former Libertarian presidential candidate, “Trade deficits- not just irrelevant, but completely imaginary” http://www.examiner.com/article/trade-deficits-not-just-irrelevant-but-completely-imaginary

Stossel was very good at defending free trade, and exposed Lou Dobbs as a source of a lot of hot air without a foundation. But, one thing Stossel didn't point out is that there can be no such thing as a "trade deficit". Maybe he has bought into the myth, just a little, himself. Maybe he hasn't thought this through, yet. The truth is there can be trade, or there can be theft. The component that makes the distinction, by its presence or absence, is coercion. The example that is much overused in regard to "trade deficits" is China. Chinese manufacturers make stuff, cheap, and sell it to customers in America. And we customers pay them for it. No one forces us to buy any one thing in particular. Even government has so far failed in this area. When we give a Chinese manufacturer dollars, we have made an even trade. Dollars for products. There is no deficit. Unless a government or mugger gets involved and takes your property (products or dollars) and gives nothing (or too little) in return, the trade is always an even one.

3. Domestic gas production doesn

y manufacturing getting a different tax rate than we do. They're not more important in the economy than retail or distribution or anything else." In fact, manufacturing is bound to be a diminishing share of any advanced economy. Obama and Santorum can fling money into the teeth of that trend. But any time politicians want to resist powerful and beneficial economic forces, bet on the economic forces.

### 1nc defense

**Studies and empirics prove no war impact**

**Miller, 2k** (Morris, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

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

**No conflict can be explained by the current crisis**

**Barnett, 9** (Thomas, Distinguished Scholar and Author at the Howard H. Baker, Jr. Center for Public Policy at the University of Tennessee, May, “The New Rules: The Good News on the Global Financial Downturn”, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/article.aspx?id=3805)

When the global financial contagion kicked in last fall, the blogosphere was quick to predict that a sharp uptick in global instability would soon follow. While we're not out of the woods yet, it's interesting to note just how little instability -- and not yet a single war -- has actually resulted from the worst global economic downturn since the Great Depression. Run a Google search for "global instability" and you'll get 23 million hits. But when it comes to actual conflicts, the world is humming along at a level that reflects the steady decline in wars -- by 60 percent -- that we've seen since the Cold War's end. As George Mason University's Center for Systemic Peace (CSP) notes, that trend applies within the Muslim world, too, so even America's "war on terror" has not quite lived up to the pessimists' expectations. Wikipedia's page for "ongoing conflicts" cites a whopping seven wars with annual death rates of 1,000-plus. And they're all familiar situations: Arabs-Israel, Somalia, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Sudan and Mexico. None have been helped by the financial crisis, but all predate it. Iraq's internal situation has actually improved, despite slumping oil revenue. And as for fears that Mexico might soon become a "failed state," that government's recent response to the swine flu indicates otherwise. The CSP's database lists only three new conflicts since 2008 -- Russia-Georgia, Kenya and southern Sudan. None can be blamed on the global economy. Meanwhile, Colombia's internal security has improved dramatically, and Sri Lanka's stubborn separatist movement just collapsed. Yes, we suffer from Somali piracy, and American and Chinese subs continue their cat-and-mouse games off China's otherwise quiet coast. Still, many expected more from a financial panic that, according to the IMF, erased roughly 6 percent of global GDP: Beijing and Washington locking horns, for instance, instead of letting Taiwan negotiate peace with the mainland. But disappointment abounds for the doom-and-gloomers: - Instead of coming apart at the seams, China implemented a stimulus package that seems to be working at home and abroad (see America's construction industry exports). Beijing's flagship companies have exploited the crisis for the extraordinary buying opportunities it has created, locking in long-term commodity and energy contracts in exchange for much-needed cash. Meanwhile its central bank has swapped $100 billion worth of currency with major trade partners. - Asia's big powers should be at each other's throats over sea-based energy deposits, or at least over North Korea. And yet recently we've witnessed the first China-Japan-South Korea summit, followed soon after by the creation of a $120-billion liquidity fund to help out their smaller neighbors. - India's Congress Party just won a decisive victory in national elections, allowing it to rule without relying on anti-globalizing elements like its native Communist party. Expect another young Gandhi to champion India's next round of reforms. - The EU definitely regrets its fast integration of all those now-shaky Eastern European economies. And yet, as Washington Post economic columnist Steve Pearlstein recently noted, ". . . the real story in Europe may be how firmly market liberalization seems to have taken hold. Not only have there been few, if any, calls for renationalizations, but some countries are still moving toward privatization and reregulation. Instances of protectionism are outweighed by the examples of cross-border mergers and acquisitions that have been accepted as a matter of course . . ." - In the Middle East, the Arab world's biggest state, Egypt, remains committed to opening up its state-heavy economy even more, while Arab sovereign wealth funds continue their aggressive investment in Africa, where China and India's portfolios also grow. - In Latin America, market-friendly forces (e.g., Brazil's Lula) are gaining steam, while market-hostile ones (e.g., Venezuela's Chávez) lose traction. - Even "axis of diesel" Russia has quieted down considerably over the past nine months, with Vladimir Putin's hand-picked successor, Dmitry Medvedev, slowly emerging as a force of level-headed moderation. Add it all up and it's clear that assessments such as "the world is in chaos" -- a David Rothkopf beauty -- just don't fly. Periodic riots do not an Armageddon make.

# 1NC Dependency

### (1) 1NC ME Leadership

#### Oil dependence guarantees US Middle East presence

Charles L. Glaser August 2011 Professor of Political Science and International Relations Elliot School of International Affairs The George Washington University “Reframing Energy Security: How Oil Dependence Influences U.S. National Security”

In framing our analysis, we should remember that U.S. oil dependence has substantially influenced U.S. security and foreign policy for decades. At the most sweeping level, U.S. grand strategy—which matches U.S. vital interests with the military and political means for protecting them—has long included protecting the flow of Persian Gulf oil as a key requirement. Although there has been an extensive debate over U.S. grand strategy, even neo-isolationists—who favor cutting U.S. security commitments to Europe and Asia—have argued that U.S. oil interests in the Persian Gulf require a continuing U.S. commitment. Military capabilities have played a prominent role in protecting U.S. interests in the Persian Gulf since the late 1970s. Planning to increase U.S. military capabilities in the region began following the Iranian revolution of 1979 and was well along by the end of that year when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, President Carter stated in January of 1980 that the flow of Persian Gulf oil was a vital U.S. interest and that Washington would use “any means necessary, including military force” to protect the flow of oil. This became known as the Carter Doctrine and in one form or another has been U.S. policy ever since then. The Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force was created in March 1980 to enable the United States to quickly project power into the region. In 1983 the United States created Central Command (CENTCOM) as a unified, multi-service command responsible for South Asia. To support its military requirements in the Persian Gulf, the United States significantly increased its sea- and air-lift capabilities, prepositioned materiel in the region, negotiated access to regional facilities, and improved its major military base at Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. U.S. capabilities deployed in the region increased further following the Gulf War of 1991. In addition to maintaining substantial military capabilities, the United States has used force in the Persian Gulf a number of times in recent decades. Some of these were directly related to protecting the flow of oil. During the later years of the Iran-Iraq war, the United States escorted Kuwaiti oil tankers through the Persian Gulf. The 1991 Gulf war was motivated primarily by the U.S. desire to prevent Iraq from dominating Persian Gulf oil. The role of oil is less clear-cut in the largest U.S. military involvement in the region—the Iraq War—which the United States launched in 2003. The key rationale offered by the Bush administration for launching the war was the danger posed by Iraq’s WMD programs. Nevertheless, at a minimum, oil played a background role in the U.S. decision. As John Duffield argues “Even if oil-related considerations played no role in the decision to invade, one can see the war as the logical culmination of a series of prior steps that were taken largely, if not exclusively, because of the region’s strategic importance to the United States.” This argument is reinforced by recognizing the cases in which the United States did not use force to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, including North Korea and Pakistan.

#### Middle East presence checks regional and great power war – and collapse would destroy trade and overall leadership

Walter Russell Mead 12-27-2007 senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations "Why We´re in the Gulf," http://docs.google.com/View?docid=ah6sxjndq9qq\_387kw2kfkm9

For the past few centuries, a global economic and political system has been slowly taking shape under first British and then American leadership. As a vital element of that system, the leading global power -- with help from allies and other parties -- maintains the security of world trade over the seas and air while also ensuring that international economic transactions take place in an orderly way. Thanks to the American umbrella, Germany, Japan, China, Korea and India do not need to maintain the military strength to project forces into the Middle East to defend their access to energy. Nor must each country's navy protect the supertankers carrying oil and liquefied national gas (LNG). For this system to work, the Americans must prevent any power from dominating the Persian Gulf while retaining the ability to protect the safe passage of ships through its waters. The Soviets had to be kept out during the Cold War, and the security and independence of the oil sheikdoms had to be protected from ambitious Arab leaders like Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser and Iraq's Saddam Hussein. During the Cold War Americans forged alliances with Turkey, Israel and (until 1979) Iran, three non-Arab states that had their own reasons for opposing both the Soviets and any pan-Arab state. When the fall of the shah of Iran turned a key regional ally into an implacable foe, the U.S. responded by tightening its relations with both Israel and Turkey -- while developing a deeper relationship with Egypt, which had given up on Nasser's goal of unifying all the Arabs under its flag. Today the U.S. is building a coalition against Iran's drive for power in the Gulf. Israel, a country which has its own reasons for opposing Iran, remains an important component in the American strategy, but the U.S. must also manage the political costs of this relationship as it works with the Sunni Arab states. American opposition to Iran's nuclear program not only reflects concerns about Israeli security and the possibility that Iran might supply terrorist groups with nuclear materials. It also reflects the U.S. interest in protecting its ability to project conventional forces into the Gulf. The end of America's ability to safeguard the Gulf and the trade routes around it would be enormously damaging -- and not just to us. Defense budgets would grow dramatically in every major power center, and Middle Eastern politics would be further destabilized, as every country sought political influence in Middle Eastern countries to ensure access to oil in the resulting free for all. The potential for conflict and chaos is real. A world of insecure and suspicious great powers engaged in military competition over vital interests would not be a safe or happy place. Every ship that China builds to protect the increasing numbers of supertankers needed to bring oil from the Middle East to China in years ahead would also be a threat to Japan's oil security -- as well as to the oil security of India and Taiwan. European cooperation would likely be undermined as well, as countries sought to make their best deals with Russia, the Gulf states and other oil rich neighbors like Algeria. America's Persian Gulf policy is one of the chief ways through which the U.S. is trying to build a peaceful world and where the exercise of American power, while driven ultimately by domestic concerns and by the American national interest, provides vital public goods to the global community. The next American president, regardless of party and regardless of his or her views about the wisdom of George W. Bush's invasion of Iraq, will necessarily make the security of the Persian Gulf states one of America's very highest international priorities.

### (2) 1NC Iran Prolif

#### Dependence prevents Iran prolif – leverage over future extraction is the biggest bargaining chip

Roger Howard, 11-29-2008; Roger Howard is a writer and broadcaster on international relations. His books include Iran in Crisis? (Zed, 2004), What’s Wrong with Liberal Interventionism (Social Affairs Unit, 2006) and Iran Oil: The New Middle East Challenge to America (IB Tauris, 2006). He has written widely for newspapers and journals ranging from the Daily Mail and Daily Express to the National Interest and the RUSI Journal. “An Ode to Oil” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122791647562165587.html

The United States has powerful political leverage over producers because it holds the key to future oil supply as well as market demand. The age of "easy oil" is over, and as fears grow that oil is becoming harder to get, so too will the dependency of producers on increasingly sophisticated Western technology and expertise. Such skills will be particularly important in two key areas of oil production. One is finding and extracting offshore deposits, like the massive reserves reckoned to be under the Caspian and Arctic seas, or in Brazil's recently discovered Tupi field. The other is prolonging the lifespan of declining wells through enhanced "tertiary" recovery. Because Western companies have a clear technological edge over their global competitors in these hugely demanding areas, Washington exerts some powerful political leverage over exporters, many of whom openly anticipate the moment when their production peaks before gradually starting to decline. Syria illustrates how this leverage can work. Although oil has been the primary source of national income for more than 40 years, production has recently waned dramatically: Output is now nearly half of the peak it reached in the mid-1990s, when a daily output of 600,000 barrels made up 60% of gross domestic product, and can barely sustain rapidly growing domestic demand fueled by a very high rate of population growth. With enough foreign investment Syrian oil could be much more productive and enduring, but Washington has sent foreign companies, as well as American firms, a tough message to steer well clear. It is not surprising, then, that the Damascus regime regards a rapprochement with the U.S. as a political lifeline and in recent months has shown signs of a new willingness to compromise. The same predicament confronted Libya's Col. Moammar Gadhafi, who first offered to surrender weapons of mass destruction during secret negotiations with U.S. officials in May 1999. Facing a deepening economic crisis that he could not resolve without increasing the production of his main export, oil, Col. Gadhafi was prepared to bow to Washington's demands and eventually struck a path-breaking accord in December 2003. Col. Gadhafi had been the "Mad Dog" of the Reagan years, but oil's influence had initiated what President Bush hailed as "the process of rejoining the community of nations." Oil could also help the outside world frustrate the nuclear ambitions of Iran, whose output is likely to steadily decline over the coming years unless it has access to the latest Western technology. Many wells are aging rapidly and the Iranians cannot improve recovery rates, or exploit their new discoveries, unless Washington lifts sanctions, which have been highly successful in deterring international investment**.**

Cross apply the 1ac impact

### (3) 1NC Dollar Heg

#### Oil dependence is key to dollar reserve status – that’s key to military supremacy

Daniel Drezner, November 2008; professor of political science at Tufts, “Oil dependence as virtue”; The National Interest. .98 (November-December 2008): p8.

As the strategic and economic value of oil skyrocketed during the first half of this year, many experts declared that the global distribution of power is rapidly shifting to oil exporters--specifically, Russia and the members of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). This belief has led to a lot of talk about the rise of "authoritarian capitalist" great powers and "the return of history."¶ But let's imagine--as The National Interest asked me to do--that the summer of 2008 turns out to be the all-time peak of oil prices, and that the end of the oil era is imminent. The first instinct is to assume that in this world--a world in which oil would be a minor commodity, irrelevant to both geopolitics and the global economy--America would be much better off. Oil-exporting autocracies would fade into obscurity, and the Middle East would revert to barren sand-strewn lands. This imagined future, after all, is what drives politicians from George W. Bush to Barack Obama to say that ending dependence on foreign oil will liberate America.¶ But would this really be the case? It may be that the assumptions we hold are grounded in a misunderstanding of the global order. Perhaps instead, without oil dominating their economies, the Middle East oil states would be far less dependent on the United States for trade, for security and for dollars. Perhaps the dollar would no longer be the world's reserve currency, which would severely hinder America's ability to fund its current-account deficit--and its military superiority. And then, perhaps, the security guarantee the United States provides to the Middle East--and by extension the entire oil-dependent world--would be null and void.¶ In short, a world that doesn't need oil may also be a world that doesn't need the United States. But when prices of oil are skyrocketing, people aren't thinking about the possible long-term implications of energy independence, only the short-term gains.

### (4) 1NC Russia

#### Oil revenue prevents Russian nuclear miscalc

Gregory D. Miller, April 2010; assistant professor of political science at the University of Oklahoma, “The Security Costs of Energy Independence”, the Washington Quarterly April 2010 http://csis.org/files/publication/twq10aprilmiller.pdf

Russia is another potential danger spot because it is the only nuclear state, at least for now, that has significant revenue from the sale of oil, roughly 8—20 percent of its GDP. Losing that income will have less dramatic effects on Russia than on many OPEC states more heavily reliant on oil sales, at least partly because of recent attempts to diversify the Russian economy. Its economy, however, is still too fragile to handle a major drop in demand for oil. Given the existing tension between Russia and states such as Georgia and Ukraine, neither the United States nor Russia’s neighbors can afford the risk of a nuclear Russia suffering economic instability.19

### (5) 1NC DeFo

#### Oil dependence is key to prevent deforestation from biomass use

Robert Bryce 4-23-2010; Cleaning Up Oil's Reputation Robert Bryce is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute; <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303491304575187934172406168.html>

Oil, and foreign oil in particular, has been a favorite ~~whipping boy~~ for American politicians since the 1970s. They say that we are "addicted" to oil, that oil fosters terrorism and that we can "win the oil endgame." While those claims are effective at rousing the masses, here's the reality: The world isn't using too much oil. It's not using enough.¶ The world now consumes about 85 million barrels of oil per day. That consumption has resulted in unprecedented levels of mobility and affluence. The correlation between oil use and wealth is so close as to be inarguable. Yes, the U.S. is among the world's biggest per capita consumers of oil, but that petroleum has made the American economy into a powerhouse. Increasing oil consumption among the rural poor would have major benefits: It would help preserve rain forests and endangered species habitat; more importantly, it would help save the lives of hundreds of thousands of impoverished people who die premature deaths every year due to indoor air pollution caused by burning biomass.¶ People living in rural poverty have no choice but to cook their food with locally available fuels. For tens of millions of these people, the only choice is wood, which often results in the destruction of forests needed to sustain endangered species. Consider the case of the mountain gorillas living in Virunga National Park in the Democratic Republic of the Congo who are under siege due to demand for wood from the people living around the park. What's the best way to preserve the forest? Local conservationists agree the fastest way is to provide the locals with butane, propane or other fuels derived from oil so that they quit burning wood and charcoal.¶ [energybook]¶ If oil didn't exist, we'd have to invent it. No other substance can compare to oil in terms of energy density, flexibility, cost and convenience. None of this is to deny the many problems caused by the global oil business. Oil drilling and oil spills—both onshore and offshore—have had significant environmental effects including wildlife kills, habitat destruction and serious land- and water-contamination problems. And the risks of oil drilling were made apparent again on Thursday when a giant oil platform in the Gulf of Mexico, the Deepwater Horizon, sank after it was hit by a deadly explosion and fire. Eleven rig workers are still missing. The costs associated with oil are many. But when compared with the fuels that might replace oil, particularly plant-based biofuels, petroleum outshines them all.

#### Extinction – oxygen shortages

Tatchell 8 **–** human rights campaigner (Peter, The Guardian, “the oxygen crisis,” 8/13, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/13/carbonemissions.climatechange)

Compared to prehistoric times, the level of oxygen in the earth's atmosphere has declined by over a third and in polluted cities the decline may be more than 50%. This change in the makeup of the air we breathe has potentially serious implications for our health. Indeed, it could ultimately threaten the survival of human life on earth, according to Roddy Newman, who is drafting a new book, The Oxygen Crisis.¶ I am not a scientist, but this seems a reasonable concern. It is a possibility that we should examine and assess. So, what's the evidence?¶ Around 10,000 years ago, the planet's forest cover was at least twice what it is today, which means that forests are now emitting only half the amount of oxygen.¶ Desertification and deforestation are rapidly accelerating this long-term loss of oxygen sources.¶ The story at sea is much the same. Nasa reports that in the north Pacific ocean oxygen-producing phytoplankton concentrations are 30% lower today, compared to the 1980s. This is a huge drop in just three decades.¶ Moreover, the UN environment programme confirmed in 2004 that there were nearly 150 "dead zones" in the world's oceans where discharged sewage and industrial waste, farm fertiliser run-off and other pollutants have reduced oxygen levels to such an extent that most or all sea creatures can no longer live there. This oxygen starvation is reducing regional fish stocks and diminishing the food supplies of populations that are dependent on fishing. It also causes genetic mutations and hormonal changes that can affect the reproductive capacity of sea life, which could further diminish global fish supplies.