# Ptx 2NC Overview

**2NC Uniqueness Run**

**The post-convention bounce is a measure of Democratic enthusiasm – it means the pool of likely Democratic voters will be higher**

**Silver, 9/13/**12 - statistician, author of FiveThirtyEight, one of Time’s 100 most influential people (Nate, “[Sept. 12: Polls Since Conventions Point to Decline in ‘Enthusiasm Gap’](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/09/13/sept-12-polls-since-conventions-point-to-decline-in-enthusiasm-gap/),”

<http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/>

Why did President Obama get a bounce in the polls following the Democratic convention?

Part of it may simply be one of the functions that conventions have long served: to motivate voters who are generally loyal to the party, but who had been paying only marginal attention to the race.

At FiveThirtyEight, we measure the “enthusiasm gap” between the parties in a particular way. Specifically, we watch for cases in which pollsters report results among both the broader universe of registered voters, and the narrower one of likely voters. If one candidate’s supporters are more likely to vote, that candidate will do better in the likely-voter polls than the registered-voter ones.

Typically, the candidate who benefits from the comparison is the Republican. Republican voters tend to be older, whiter and wealthier, all characteristics that correlate with a greater propensity to vote.

In midterm election years, when overall participation is lower, the enthusiasm gap can be correspondingly greater. In 2010, for instance, we calculated it to be about six percentage points in favor of Republicans. For the most part, that advantage proved to be predictive of the actual results on Election Day. Democrats outperformed their likely-voter polls by a point or two on average in Senate and governors races, and underperformed them by a point or so in races for the House of Representatives. But in both cases the likely-voter surveys did a much more accurate job of capturing the Republican wave than polls of registered voters.

There have also been midterm election years, like 2006, when there was almost no likely-voter gap, or when it even favored Democrats by a point or so. With lower turnout, there is the possibility of a wider range of outcomes based on the particulars of the political cycle.

In presidential election years, however, when the turnout is higher, the gap has been more consistent: always favoring Republicans, but always narrowly.

Specifically, based on our research, the likely-voter gap has favored Republicans by 1.5 percentage points on average in presidential elections years since 1988, with little variance from cycle to cycle.

This year, however, there was evidence that the gap was larger, averaging close to three percentage points in favor of Mitt Romney.

Our forecasts build in an adjustment for this factor, adding points to Mr. Romney’s column in polls of registered voters, and subtracting them from Mr. Obama’s, in order to make them comparable to likely-voter polls.

Polls conducted since the Democratic convention in Charlotte, N.C., however, suggest that the gap may have narrowed. Although the difference varies from polling firm to polling firm, on the average it has reverted back to the historical average of between one and two percentage points.

In the table below, I’ve presented a comparison of the results of the polling firms that have released both sets of numbers since Charlotte. (I count the telephone and online polls by Ipsos as separate surveys, since they use distinct methodologies.)

There have been outlying results on either side. An ABC News/Washington Post poll released this week showed Mr. Obama leading Mr. Romney by six points among registered voters, but by just one point among likely voters — a five-point enthusiasm gap favoring Mr. Romney.

Conversely, a Fox News poll, released on Wednesday, showed a reverse enthusiasm gap, with Mr. Obama actually doing one point better in their likely-voter poll than in their survey of registered voters.

On average among the five polling results, however, the gap has been 1.4 percentage points favoring Mr. Romney — almost exactly in line with the historical average.

Will Democrats maintain this narrower gap? Or is it a temporary effect from the conventions?

It’s hard to know for sure, of course. Until we see more evidence, the forecast model is still assuming that the gap will be slightly wider than average, perhaps around two percentage points in Mr. Romney’s favor.

But in general, there’s more reason to believe that a shift is permanent rather than temporary when it brings the numbers closer into line with historical norms, as it has in this case.

In addition, there is a question over whether likely-voter models applied before the party conventions are all that informative, since voter enthusiasm can wax and wane over the course of the cycle.

Our research suggests that likely-voter polls become more accurate than registered-voter polls beginning around Labor Day. But it is more debatable which set of polls do a better job of predicting the result before that date.

If there were no likely-voter gap at all, and all registered voters turned out to vote, Mr. Obama would have a very clear advantage in the race, perhaps being favored to win by five or six percentage points.

That case is probably wishful thinking for Democrats. Even in years like 1996 when Republicans had a middling candidate, their voters were nevertheless quite loyal on Election Day.

But if Democrats can keep the enthusiasm gap to its traditional value of about one and a half percentage points, rather than three, that could make quite a lot of difference. Before the conventions our forecast model had generally shown Mr. Obama as a favorite by about two and a half percentage points; now it projects him to win by about four. That’s consistent with what you’d get if the enthusiasm gap had been narrowed by a point or two.

We’ll need to wait for another week or so to see how much of Mr. Obama’s convention bounce carries forward, but we’re getting to the point where polls do provide for a pretty reliable gauge of the Election Day outcome. A four-point deficit in the polls can certainly be overcome, but it isn’t that easy, especially in a year like this one with few undecided voters.

They say that in order for Obama to win he needs enthusiasm – biggest fact.

**Overall expectations about the economy are positive – this is mobilizing Democrats and boosting fundraising**

**Easley, 9/11/12** (Jonathan, “Team Obama has post-convention glow,” The Hill, <http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/248879-team-obama-has-post-convention-glow>)

The Obama campaign has been flush with good news since the Democratic National Convention, leaving both it and its Republican counterpart scurrying to deal with the altered dynamics of the race.

President Obama and Mitt Romney entered the conventions statistically tied in the polls.

Romney didn’t receive much of a bump following the Republican National Convention in Tampa, Fla., late last month, and while Obama is enjoying a modest boost, that movement is magnified because the race has been almost completely static since Romney became the GOP’s likely nominee.

Monday’s daily tracking polls from Gallup and Rasmussen showed Obama with a 5-percentage-point lead after last week’s Democratic gathering in Charlotte, N.C., and a CNN-ORC poll released late Monday, the first major poll to come out after the completion of the convention, showed Obama with a 52-to-46 percent lead over Romney.

Perhaps the best news for the Obama campaign is that those polling numbers include reaction to last Friday’s weak job report, which showed employers added only 96,000 jobs. Economists had expected upward of 150,000 new jobs last month.

The polling bounce wasn’t the only positive development for the president this week.

On Monday, the Obama campaign announced it had raised $114 million in August, the largest monthly haul for either presidential campaign in the 2012 cycle. Romney, who raised $111.6 million in August, had beaten Obama in each of the prior three months.

And while Friday’s troubling job data will be a source of concern for the Obama campaign going forward, it came with some sunny economic news.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average on Tuesday closed at its highest mark since December 2007, and as the Democrats gathered in Charlotte, Gallup’s U.S. Economic Confidence Index surged 11 points to its highest level since January 2008.

It was the largest one-week gain for the index, surpassing the 10-point bump following the killing of Osama bin Laden. The largest swing the index ever recorded was a 15-point drop during the financial crisis in September 2008.

“The convention appears to have given Democrats and, to a lesser degree, independents, fresh optimism about the economy,” wrote Lydia Saad at Gallup. “There was no comparable shift in Americans’ views of the economy, either overall or by party, during the prior week spanning the Republican National Convention … This could reflect renewed confidence in the economy per se, or heightened enthusiasm for the Democratic Party generally.”

**Most election models predict a narrow Obama win but it’s reversible**

**Klein, 9/11/12 –** the editor of Wonkblog and a columnist at the Washington Post, as well as a contributor to MSNBC and Bloomberg(Ezra, Washington Post, “The economy (slightly) favors Obama, not Romney,”

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/09/11/the-economy-slightly-favors-obama-not-romney/>

I learned this the hard way. Some months ago, I worked with political scientists Seth Hill, John Sides and Lynn Vavreck to build a model that used data from every presidential election since 1948 to forecast the outcome of this presidential election. But when the model was done, I thought it was broken: It was forecasting an Obama win even under scenarios of very weak economic growth. (You can play with the model here.)

After a lot of frantic e-mails, my political scientist friends finally convinced me that that’s the point of a model: It forces you to check your expectations at the door. And my expectation that incumbents lose when the economy is weak was not backed up by the data, which suggest that incumbents win unless major economic indicators are headed in the wrong direction, as was true with unemployment in 1980 and 1992.

This year, the major economic indicators are headed in the right direction, albeit slowly. We’ve been adding jobs, though not enough. We’ve been growing, though not particularly fast. We’ve seen the unemployment rate drop, though partially because workers are leaving the labor force. All in all, it’s not an impressive record. But it’s weak growth, not a new recession. And the political valence of that weak growth is unusually hard to discern, as voters continue to place more blame for our current economic troubles on George W. Bush than on Barack Obama.

Recently, Dylan Matthews surveyed six other forecasting models. Five of those models include economic data. Most, though not all, are predicting an Obama win. And that, I think, is a pretty accurate summation of where the economic fundamentals of the election stand: A slight lean towards Obama, but nothing that guarantees him a victory.

**Obama is winning in all swing states**

**Miles, 9/12**/12 - Chris is the editor at PolicyMic. He has worked for media outlets including the Associated Press and the Stars and Stripes (“Obama vs Romney Polls: Obama is Winning in So Many Polls It Might As Well Not Be a Race Any More”, PolicyMic, <http://www.policymic.com/articles/14628/obama-vs-romney-polls-obama-is-winning-in-so-many-polls-it-might-as-well-not-be-a-race-any-more>)

Barack Obama is still holding a considerable polling edge over Republican rival Mitt Romney in the 2012 election.

He’s polling high … he’s winning the swing states … and now he’s even seen by the rest of the world as the candidate they trust the most.

First this: Obama is winning in the key swing states, necessary to give him the electoral college lead in terms of delegates. As U.S. News reports, with less than two months to go before the November election, President Obama has built a "structural advantage" in key swing states which makes him the favorite to defeat Romney, says a prominent Democratic strategist.

As the story reports, Obama's strength among African Americans, Latinos, unmarried women and young people is translating into a powerful asset in the nine swing states that will decide the election — Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Virginia, and Wisconsin. These states have 110 of the 270 electoral votes needed for victory.

Ohio is the deathblow in that list: many pundits believe Ohio is critical if Romney has any chance at winning.

**New statistical models predict an Obama win**

**Rainey, 9/12**/12 – spent many of his 30 years in journalism cogitating on politics (James, Los Angeles Times, “Two election models, like recent polls, tilt toward Obama” [http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-two-election-models-obama-20120912,0,2273167.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-two-election-models-obama-20120912%2C0%2C2273167.story)

There are two competing temptations when looking at the boost in support for President Obama after the Democratic National Convention: to take the surge too seriously or not seriously enough.

With eight weeks to go until the election, plenty of time remains for unforeseen events (a dramatic economic event, a candidate’s stumble, a terrorist attack or some other calamity) to change the dynamic. But a couple of statistical analyses suggest that the recent polling has some significant, if not conclusive, meaning. And the findings all accrue to Obama’s benefit.

Politics Now cited a University of Colorado election model that several weeks ago projected a Mitt Romney win in the presidential election. But that model subsequently came in for a beating from analysts such as New York Times statistical whiz Nate Silver, who found “glaring problems” with the methodology used by the Colorado political scientists. Among other problems, the Colorado model put a huge weight on unemployment rates — but only with a Democrat sitting in the White House.

Silver and others modeling the election, including the financial prognosticator NerdWallet.com, now find that Obama’s chances of reelection have surged to a high for the year. The Obama bounce has been solid, if not exactly breathtaking, and certainly nothing like what might be known as the “Lehman Bounce” in 2008.

Four years ago, many Americans interpreted the bankruptcy of financial giant Lehman Bros. as a strong sign that the Republican Party should no longer be managing the nation’s economic affairs. Silver recalled in his blog Monday how, after the Lehman collapse, it was clear Republican John McCain would lose, “with Barack Obama’s projected probability of winning the Electoral College increasing by about 25 percent in a period of just 48 hours.” McCain never fully recovered.

Silver’s model, factoring in the candidates’ chances of victory in key swing states, has put the likelihood of an Obama victory at 60% to 70% through much of the summer. But on Tuesday it set the chances of a second Obama term at a high of 79.8%.

NerdWallet, a company that started analyzing credit card rates, extended its data analysis to fields such as education and politics. Joanna Pratt, who heads election analysis for the company, acknowledges that the political sideline was intended to bring more attention to the company’s core business.

The company looks at polls, particularly in battleground states, and their historical performance in elections. In general, the company notes that polls become more predictive of final outcomes as election day approaches. (No huge surprise there.)

On Tuesday, NerdWallet put Obama’s chance of reelection at 78.4% — just shy of the probability predicted by Silver. Of 12 states that analysts expect to be most closely contested, NerdWallet projects only two — Missouri and North Carolina — as most likely to go to Romney. Obama has more than a 50% chance of victory in 10 other battleground states: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin.

Among the possibilities that could cause the analysis to misfire, according to NerdWallet: “Dramatic events or substantial new information between now and the election....”

**Even GOP internal polls prove Romney is losing key swing states – and it’s not a bounce**

**Karl, 9/11/11 –** ABC News' Senior Political Correspondent (Jonathan, “Republicans Nervously Eye Swing State Polls”, <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/09/republicans-nervously-eye-swing-state-polls/>)

For Mitt Romney’s campaign, the outlook in the battleground states is even worse than the national polls.

According to a GOP source with **access to private polling being done by independent Republican groups** (who are spending a lot of money tracking public opinion in the battleground states), Romney is in trouble in two must-win states:

Ohio:  Romney down 5 percent.

Virginia:  Romney down 4 percent.

Most troubling for Romney:  the Ohio trend has been consistent for several weeks and is not a “sugar high” resulting from the Democratic convention.

### Link Debate

#### No risk of a link turn – experts agree that fossil fuel production won’t help Obama

**Belogolova 12 –** reports on energy and environment policy for National Journal and manages the bi-monthly Energy and Environment Insiders Poll, holds bachelor’s degrees in Journalism and European Studies from Boston University. She studied abroad at Oxford University, was one of 10 American journalism students selected for a press trip to Jordan. (Olga, May 17th, “Insiders: Outreach to Oil Industry Won’t Help Obama” http://www.nationaljournal.com/energy/insiders-outreach-to-oil-industry-won-t-help-obama-20120517) Jacome

Better dialogue between the White House and the oil and gas industry has lobbyists and congressional Republicans screaming “politics,” arguing that both sides have something to gain from warmer relations in an election year. But National Journal’s Energy & Environment Insiders say that this ostensible “détente” won’t really do much for President Obama in November.

Nearly 70 percent of Insiders polled said that improved relations with Big Oil won’t help the president at the polls, many pointing out that no one has noticed these developments outside the Beltway and that campaign donations from the industry will still mostly flow to Republicans.

“Follow the money. When oil and gas trade associations shift PAC contributions away from Romney/GOP, then it will help the president,” said one Insider. “Until then, this is less détente than a cold peace.”

Earlier this month, American Petroleum Institute President Jack Gerard told National Journal Daily that communications between the industry and the White House have improved “dramatically” in recent months. Congressional Republicans were already well aware of that and were not happy. In an April 23 e-mail obtained by NJD, a senior aide on energy issues to Senate Environment and Public Works ranking member James Inhofe, R-Okla., criticized oil and gas lobbyists for working closely with the White House.

Despite the growing anxiety over the improved relations, Insiders argue that the whole food fight has likely gone unnoticed outside of Washington, where voters still see Republicans as aligned with the oil industry and the Obama administration aligned with the environmental movement.

“Energy-industry leaders understand this is all about politics and that this administration’s heart is with the Sierra Club in stopping ALL fossil fuels.… American people don’t care,” said one Insider, arguing that the story is “too inside Beltway.”

Still, 31 percent of Insiders said the Obama administration’s efforts to make nice with the oil and gas industry will actually pay off. “The White House obviously thinks it will,” one Insider said. “How else can you explain the warming relations at this point?”

Improved relations with the industry will “marginally” help Obama “with independent voters who want to see Washington working and not riven with partisan dysfunction,” said another Insider.

Obama wouldn’t have taken this gamble if he didn’t think it would pay off, some Insiders said, arguing that his drift toward more moderate policies is no accident.

“The president has been navigating towards the economic center since November 2010 and a pro-production veneer will certainly help make that case (even if it doesn’t last),” said one Insider.

That doesn’t mean Republicans will back off from attacking Obama on his energy policies. While improved relations between the White House and big oil have thrown a wrench into some of their plans, 93 percent of Insiders say Republicans have plenty of material left.

Whether it’s the administration refusing to “drill, baby, drill,” delayng the Keystone XL pipeline, imposing tough environmental regulations, or backing a big loan to struggling solar company Solyndra, Republicans are not short on ammunition to fire at Obama on energy issues.

“It may be harder now for Republicans to land punches related to oil and gas, because the administration has called off the dogs, but many voters still think the president would like to thwart production and consumption of fossil fuels,” said one Insider. “Every time the president singles out the oil and gas industry for unfavorable tax treatment, voters are reminded of the White House's true goals."

Insiders said that energy issues will continue to be a sticking point in this election — to the very end.

“Energy is one of the president's biggest vulnerabilities. From Solyndra to 'cap and tax,' the administration has pursued one energy flop after another. The president's campaign team must agree, since their first ad was a defensive spot on their energy record, and the follow-up was a campaign swing through the country's energy heartland,” said another Insider. “Republicans are going to continue to pound away on the president's energy record to make sure he doesn't get away with trying to mask it.”

Will the apparent warming relations between the oil and gas industry and the White House help President Obama in November?

(42 votes)

Yes  31%

No  69%

Yes

“The president has been navigating towards the economic center since November 2010 and a pro-production veneer will certainly help make that case (even if it doesn't last).”

“The best case for this proposition was made by Senate Republican staff who chastised the industry for working constructively on their issues with the administration.”

“It is clearly damage control, as the president realized that there was a good argument to be made that he was opposed to domestic fossil-fuel resources. The thaw, therefore, might provide the president some much needed cover, however it is unlikely that industry will soon forget the poor treatment for the past three years.”

“The White House obviously thinks it will. How else can you explain the warming relations at this point?”

“Perhaps marginally so with independent voters who want to see Washington working and not riven with partisan dysfunction. Not sure I accept the premise of the question, though, as I think actions by White House are a political short-term strategic retreat more than anything else.”

No

“Even during the worst periods of World War I, opposing troops sometimes left their bunkers to celebrate holidays. They then returned to the trenches to continue the fight.”

“I understand keeping your enemies close, but when this relationship erupts, it'll be the president that gets fracked.”

“I don't think anyone outside the Beltway thinks they have thawed that much.”

“We see this every election cycle — the Democrats get close to big business in the hopes they'll get strong support and backing in the election, but big business always hedges its bets, gives to both parties, and generally vocally supports GOP policies. It won't do much for Obama's numbers.”

“It’s an election year with high gas prices, so the Chicago campaign advisers are repeating their 2008 strategy of trying to reinvent the president as being pro-domestic energy production. The difference this time around is, he has a record to defend.”

“Unless Obama has an epiphany on [the] Keystone [XL pipeline], anyone who cares about an energy bill considers him a “some of the above” president when it comes to energy choices.”

“Big oil will continue to pour money into American Crossroads and other super PAC’s to defeat President Obama’s reelection bid. Like Republicans in Congress, Big oil will only be satisfied if the president is a one-termer.”

“What warming? Weren’t industry and the administration just trading accusations over unused leases?… Whatever thaw is happening it isn’t all that visible, and certainly not on the campaign trail. No help for Obama in November.”

“I don’t think improved relations with the industry really matter from an electoral perspective. The industry will continue to finance both the Romney campaign and pro-Romney super PACs in far greater amounts than the Obama campaign, and the industry will continue to bash the president because it is far better off under a Romney administration.”

### A2 Too Far Away

#### The next two weeks are key

**Lombardo, 9/12**/12 - Global CEO, StrategyOne (Steve, “Why This Election Comes Down to Two Days in October,” Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-why-this_b_1877815.html>)

Look for a higher level of advertising spend from the Romney campaign in key battleground states over the next two weeks. History has shown that the candidate who is clearly in the lead by mid to late September will likely be the winner in November. That doesn't mean things can't change in October -- they can. But sentiment will start to firm up in the next two weeks. The Romney campaign has a $60 million cash-on-hand advantage, and they should use it now. Team Obama defined Romney in the spring using their cash advantage; the Romney campaign should not wait until October. They need to change the dynamic before October 1.

# AT: Econ Solves

**US-Russian relations improving now – START, proliferation cooperation, and provision of troops prove**

**Gordon 11** – Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs (Philip H., "Overview of U.S. Relations with Europe and Eurasia" March 10, House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and Eurasia - Testimony, <http://www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/rm/2011/158214.htm>)

Finally, what has arguably been the most challenging part of our European agenda – our reset with Russia – has paid significant dividends. We can now say that our engagement with Russia can help with America’s security and our global priorities. The results speak for themselves: Most significantly, we have concluded a New START Treaty and following the recent approval by both Congress and the Russian State Duma, it has entered into force. The agreement is the most comprehensive arms control agreement in nearly two decades and significantly reduces the number of nuclear weapons and launchers deployed by the United States and Russia while also putting in place a strong verification regime. We signed an agreement for the transit of troops and materiel across Russia in support of efforts in Afghanistan. Under our bilateral agreements, more than 850 flights carrying over 130,000 U.S. military personnel have transited Russia en route to Afghanistan. Under a NATO-Russia agreement, more than 23,000 containers have transited Russia for use in Afghanistan. At this time, 50% of U.S. sustainment cargo for Afghanistan goes through the Northern Distribution Network and 60% of supplies transiting that network go through Russia. This is a significant benefit for the United States. We have secured cooperation with Russia on Iran and North Korea’s nuclear programs, both in terms of UN Security Council Resolutions 1929 and 1874 respectively, and Russia’s decision to cancel a contract for the delivery of the S-300 air defense system to Iran. · We have done all of this without compromising our principles – in particular our steadfast commitment to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all of the nations of Europe. · And thanks to the work of the Bilateral Presidential Commission and its 18 working groups, our engagement with Russian society is paying important dividends as well. Polling now indicates 60 percent of Russians have a positive view of the U.S., a figure not seen in nearly a decade.

**Despite security-related setbacks, relations are resilient**

**Lawrence & Lum 11** – Beijing Bureau Chief for the Far Eastern Economic Review & specialist in Asian Affairs at the Congressional Research Service (Susan V. & Thomas, "US-China Relations: Policy Issues" Congressional Research Service, January 12, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA535780&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)

China has been the more unwilling partner. Although President Obama and China’s President Hu pledged in their 2009 Joint Statement to “take concrete steps to advance sustained and reliable military-to-military relations in the future,” China continues to link the military relationship to the issue of U.S. arms sales to Taiwan. Having suspended military-to-military relations in October 2008 over the issue of Taiwan arms sales by the George W. Bush Administration, China again suspended the military-to-military relationship in January 2010, after the Obama Administration notified Congress of a new $6.4 billion package of arms sales to Taiwan. With President Hu’s state visit to the United States pending, the two countries agreed in September 2010 to a resumption of military-to-military exchanges. They held the 11th round of the U.S.-China Defense Consultative Talks in December 2010 and Secretary of Defense Robert Gates made a long-delayed trip to China in January 2011. He and his Chinese counterpart agreed to a program of exchanges including high level visits, institutionalized exchange programs, and military education, and to cooperation in such non-traditional security areas as counterterrorism, peacekeeping, counter-piracy, humanitarian assistance, and disaster relief. They also agreed to establish a working group to develop “a new framework” for the military-to-military relationship. In a joint press conference with Secretary Gates, however, China’s Minister of Defense Gen. Liang Guanglie suggested that any future Taiwan arms sales could again disrupt the relationship.75

**Alt cause to US-China relations – arms sales**

**Lawrence & Lum 11** – Beijing Bureau Chief for the Far Eastern Economic Review & specialist in Asian Affairs at the Congressional Research Service (Susan V. & Thomas, "US-China Relations: Policy Issues" Congressional Research Service, January 12, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA535780&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)

According to many experts, U.S. arms sales to Taiwan remain the single greatest contributor to Chinese mistrust of the United States. The PRC argues that U.S. arms sales embolden those in Taiwan who seek Taiwan’s formal independence—China calls them “separatist forces”—and that the arms sales are therefore destabilizing.85 China also charges that continued U.S. arms sales represent a betrayal of U.S. commitments under the August 17th Communiqué of 1982, in which the United States stated its intention “gradually to reduce its sale of arms to Taiwan, leading, over a period of time, to a final resolution.” Finally, Chinese scholars suggest that China increasingly feels that the United States owes China concessions on Taiwan arms sales in recognition of China’s economic might and China’s positive contributions on issues of importance to the United States, such as Iran.86 The U.S. government argues that U.S. arms sales contribute to stability by giving Taiwan’s leaders the confidence to engage with China. The United States also cites its obligation under the Taiwan Relations Act (P.L. 96-8) to provide Taiwan with defense articles and services “in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient selfdefense capability.”

# Econ

### 2NC Uniqueness

#### Growth is increasing and the economy resilient

Gautam Godhwani 8-15-2012; CEO, SimplyHired.com “Signs Of Resilience In Our Economy” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gautam-godhwani/us-economy-jobs\_b\_1778664.html

This month's Labor Department job report was also more positive than expected, showing that over the past month, the U.S. economy created jobs at the fastest pace since February of this year. Employers added a total of 163,000 jobs in July. And after disappointing reports in May and June, this change of direction demonstrates strength and resilience in our economy. We've seen this again and again in our history, and it has brought us out of past recessions and slow economic times. Consider what we've endured in the last five years: the collapse of the housing market, the financial crisis that followed, debt ceiling talks, the European debt crisis, and dramatic shifts in oil prices. All of this created the worst recession since the Great Depression, and brought consumer confidence to historic lows. With consumer spending making up 70 percent of the U.S. economy, we saw a spiral down across the economy. Businesses slowed hiring and unemployment rates rose dramatically, with millions of Americans out of work. The nation was in a panic. Four years later, we see growth in nearly every industry. Our August U.S. Employment Outlook revealed growth in job openings in 14 out of 18 industries over the last month, including the automotive, education, financial services, real estate, and technology sectors. It also showed that over the past year, we've even seen job openings increase in some of the nation's hardest hit industries, including construction and manufacturing. In addition, strong performing industries from recent past years, such as healthcare, continue to flourish with a consistent increase in job openings. Further, small businesses, which have historically been a key engine of our economy, have resumed hiring after a lull during the recessionary period. As employers continue to look at filling open positions and ramp their hiring efforts, our country's prospect of economic growth and recovery is bright -- albeit slow going. The U.S. economy is built upon businesses large and small, providing goods and services across a wide range of sectors. There are undeniable signs that we've seen the worst of the recent economic downturn, and that better times are ahead. If anything, our recovery from the Great Recession shows that our economy is as resilient as ever.

### 2NC Energy Jobs

#### Oil production increases don’t solve employment – and they only cause job shifting, not growth

Casey Junkins 6-13-2012; West Virginia Observer “Drilling Not Helping Jobless Numbers” http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id/570900/Drilling-Not-Helping-Jobless-Numbers.html?nav=515

WHEELING - As West Virginia's unemployment rate jumps to 6.9 percent, some Mountain State residents believe a hiring boom in the oil and natural gas drilling industry is just around the corner. However, information from WorkForce West Virginia shows the Marcellus and Utica shale drilling industry has not created much direct employment over the past two years. "We've not seen much change in employment in the oil and gas industry over the past year. Employment in oil and gas in 2010 was 2,244, dropping slightly to 2,179 in 2011," said WorkForce spokeswoman Courtney Sisk. The presence of the drilling industry does lead to increased employment in certain areas, as restaurant and hotel owners report being very busy these days because of drillers working in the area. There are also companies that supply materials to the drilling industry that may hire more employees to meet these needs, while retailers may also see an upswing in some business because of mineral owners receiving spending money from lease and royalty checks. However, the WorkForce statistics show that the number of West Virginia residents working directly for gas and oil drillers has not increased over the past two years, despite a continued upswing in drilling and fracking. Gas industry jobs paying nearly $30 per hour are on the way to Marshall County soon, as Dominion Resources will look to hire 40-45 full-time, permanent workers for the natural gas processing plant set to open in December. There will be positions for electricians, plant operators and loaders. In all employment sectors combined, the number of jobless West Virginians residents rose by 1,900 in May to 55,600. There are 1,400 fewer people working in the mining and logging industries, while there are 400 fewer people employed in the manufacturing sector. West Virginia's unemployment rate was 6.7 percent in April. On the positive side, there are 400 more people working in the financial industry with another 100 more working in government. West Virginia's unemployment rate is still more than one point better than the 8.2 percent national average. In addition to serving as a Republican member of West Virginia's House of Delegates from Ohio County, Erikka Storch is also the chief financial officer for Wheeling-based Ohio Valley Steel. She said her company is not seeing much business growth right now, which hinders her ability to hire workers. "The level of construction is down," she said. "I can only keep so many people at levels like this." Storch said the company now has 26 employees, noting the optimal number should be in the range of 35 with a few more out in the field as ironworkers. "There are some out-of-area companies opening up sub-offices around here," she said. "These offices are hiring some employees, but they are mostly just taking local workers from one job to another job. These are employment shifts, rather than unemployed people getting jobs." "I am not seeing the private sector spending money like it usually does," Storch added.

# 2nc defense

**Any instability is low-level --- great powers are too busy with domestic issues to get involved**

**Ferguson, 9** (Niall, Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, April 10th, “'There will be blood'”, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/article973785.ece)

Heather Scoffield**:** Is a violent resolution to this crisis inevitable? Niall Ferguson**:** “There will be blood, in the sense that a crisis of this magnitude is bound to increase political as well as economic [conflict]. It is bound to destabilize some countries. It will cause civil wars to break out, that have been dormant. It will topple governments that were moderate and bring in governments that are extreme. These things are pretty predictable. The question is whether the general destabilization, the return of, if you like, political risk, ultimately leads to something really big in the realm of geopolitics. That seems a less certain outcome. We've already talked about why China and the United States are in an embrace they don't dare end. If Russia is looking for trouble the way Mr. Putin seems to be, I still have some doubt as to whether it can really make this trouble, because of the weakness of the Russian economy. It's hard to imagine Russia invading Ukraine without weakening its economic plight. They're desperately trying to prevent the ruble from falling off a cliff. They're spending all their reserves to prop it up. It's hardly going to help if they do another Georgia.” “I was more struck Putin's bluster than his potential to bite, when he spoke at Davos. But he made a really good point, which I keep coming back to. In his speech, he said crises like this will encourage governments to engage in foreign policy aggression. I don't think he was talking about himself, but he might have been. It's true, one of the things historically that we see, and also when we go back to 30s, but also to the depressions 1870s and 19980s, weak regimes will often resort to a more aggressive foreign policy, to try to bolster their position. It's legitimacy that you can gain without economic disparity – playing the nationalist card. I wouldn't be surprised to see some of that in the year ahead. It's just that I don't see it producing anything comparable with 1914 or 1939. **It's kind of hard to envisage a world war**. Even when most pessimistic, I struggle to see how that would work, because the U.S., for all its difficulties in the financial world, is so overwhelmingly dominant in the military world.”

**Geopolitics is determined by numerous other factors --- not the economy**

**Blackwill, 9** (Robert D., former United States Ambassador to India and National Security Council Deputy for Iraq, served as the Harvard Kennedy School of Government’s Associate Dean and the Belfer Lecturer in International Security, RAND Corporation, The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Finally, if not, why not? If the world is in the most severe international economic crisis since the 1930s, why is it not producing structural changes in the global order? A brief answer is that the transcendent geopolitical elements have not altered in substantial ways with regard to individual nations in the two years since the economic crisis began. What are those enduring geopolitical elements? For any given country, they include the following: • Geographic location, topography, and climate. As Robert Kaplan puts it, “to embrace geography is not to accept it as an implacable force against which humankind is powerless. Rather, it serves to qualify human freedom and choice with a modest acceptance of fate.”29 In this connection, see in particular the works of Sir Halford John Mackinder and his Th e Geographical Pivot of History (1904)30, and Alfred Th ayer Mahan, Th e Infl uence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783 (1890).31 • Demography—the size, birth rate, growth, density, ethnicity, literacy, religions, migration/emigration/ assimilation/absorption, and industriousness of the population. • Th e histories, foreign and defense policy tendencies, cultural determinants, and domestic politics of individual countries. • Th e size and strength of the domestic economy. • Th e quality and pace of technology. • Th e presence of natural resources. • Th e character, capabilities, and policies of neighboring states. For the countries that matter most in the global order, perhaps unsurprisingly, none of these decisive variables have changed very much since the global downturn began, except for nations’ weaker economic performances. Th at single factor is not likely to trump all these other abiding geopolitical determinants and therefore produce international structural change. Moreover, the fundamental power relationships between and among the world’s foremost countries have also not altered, nor have those nations’ perceptions of their vital national interests and how best to promote and defend them. To sum up this pivotal concept, in the absence of war, revolution, or other extreme international or domestic disruptions, for nation-states, the powerful abiding conditions just listed do not evolve much except over the very long term, and thus neither do countries’ strategic intent and core external policies— even, as today, in the face of world economic trials. This point was made earlier about Russia’s enduring national security goals, which go back hundreds of years. Similarly, a Gulf monarch recently advised—with respect to Iran—not to fasten on the views of President Ahmadinejad or Supreme Leader Khamenei. Rather, he counseled that, to best understand contemporary Iranian policy, one should more usefully read the histories, objectives, and strategies of the Persian kings Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, who successively ruled a vast empire around 500 BC.32 Th e American fi lmmaker Orson Welles once opined that “To give an accurate description of what never happened is the proper occupation of the historian.” 33 Perhaps the same is occasionally true of pundits.

# Oil

### 2NC Oil Dependence

#### Can’t solve the impacts – globalized oil market makes the source of oil irrelevant

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/

Oil is a Global Commodity Oil is a global market and therefore a globally priced commodity, and so long as America consumes oil and abstains from protectionist policies, self-sufficiency of oil would still mean buying and selling oil at the world price. Because oil is available from dozens of countries and hundreds of companies, and because it is relatively easily shippable, there is only a single global market for oil no matter where the consumer is located. Oil prices are set in open commodity markets, and oil is traded globally, which means that prices are affected by events around the world and decisions made by countries and companies unassociated with the United States. The way the oil production supply chain functions means it would be impossible to separate domestic and foreign gasoline. William Nordhaus of Yale University illustrates the globally integrated oil market nicely as a “bathtub” that: “…contains the world inventory of oil that has been extracted and is available for purchase. There are spigots from Saudi Arabia, Russia, the United States, and other producers that introduce oil into the inventory; and there are drains from which the United States, Japan, Denmark, and other consumers draw oil from the inventory. Nevertheless, the price and quantity dynamics are determined by the sum of these demands and supplies and the level of total inventory, and are independent of whether the faucets and drains are labeled “U.S.,” “Russia,” or “Denmark.”[3] A useful example of how oil consumers are beholden to the global oil market is Europe’s experience in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. After Katrina, gas prices in Europe soared as a result of the damage to US refineries even though those facilities sent very little gas to Europe. Even if the USdoes not import one barrel of oil from the Middle Eastor any other region, the price US consumers pay at the pump would still be a function of worldwide supply and demand, just as it was for Europeans after Katrina.[4] The extent of our vulnerability is not a function of how much oil we produce domestically. Britain produces more oil than it needs, but its self-sufficiency does nothing to alter its gasoline prices or its vulnerability to global price volatility.[5] Likewise, the US, so long as it uses significant amounts of oil, will be susceptible to the global oil market no matter how much of our consumption comes from domestically produced oil.

# AT: Prolif

**Iranian prolif doesn’t spill over**

**Procida 9**—National Intelligence Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (Frank, Why an Iranian Nuclear Bomb Is Not the End of the World, 9 June 2009, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65127/frank-procida/overblown)

Since the advent of the nuclear age, scientists, activists, academics, and politicians have feared that the spread of atomic weapons would prove unstoppable. The rhetoric one hears today regarding the probable reaction of Middle Eastern countries to a nuclear Iran echoes concerns put forth by experts when the Soviet Union, China, and even France got the bomb. Yet the worst-case scenarios rarely came to pass -- Germany and Japan, for instance, remained nonnuclear despite expectations -- and there is no reason to suspect that the Middle East will buck this historical trend. Analysts are particularly concerned about the reactions of countries such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia to an Iranian nuclear program. What they seem to forget is that the Arab world already has been living with a nuclear neighbor, Israel -- a state against which many Arab countries have fought wars and still do not recognize. Still, the Arab world has been unable or unwilling to respond in kind. An Iranian nuclear capability would not threaten these states more, or even as much as, an Israeli weapon. And in terms of prestige and influence, a Persian bomb should not be any more significant to these states than a Jewish one. Furthermore, developing a nuclear weapon is not as simple as flipping a switch. Libya spent close to two decades trying to acquire a nuclear weapon before giving up its program in 2003. Technology has never been the region's strong suit, and even with A. Q. Khan-supplied centrifuge drawings readily available, it would be foolish to expect a rash of nuclear successes in the near future.

# Ext 1NC 1: Heg Fails, Need Cooperation

1. **Hegemony fails—recent political climate proves.**

**Hachigan 10**—Senior Fellow at American Progress, Senior political scientist at RAND Corporation, Director of the RAND Center for Asia Pacific Policy, International affairs fellowship from the Council on Foreign Relations, National Security Council at the White House

(Nina, “The False Promise of Primacy in US Foreign Policy”, World Focus, January 22, 2010, http://worldfocus.org/blog/2010/01/22/the-false-promise-of-primacy-in-us-foreign-policy/9372/)//AW

One unquestionable success of the Obama administration so far has been to turn the page on the failed Bush foreign policy framework. Not so, says Robert Kagan, who reveals a perverse nostalgia for the previous paradigm in his recent writings in which he argues that the Obama administration is formulating foreign policy from a perspective that accepts, rather than fights, the decline of American power. To understand this yearning for American policy of yore, you have to remember that American foreign policy leaders during the Bush administration clung to the false promise of primacy, the belief that the lynchpin of American security was for it to remain more powerful than all other countries by a huge, fixed margin. Mona Sutphen and I described why this was a misguided strategy in our 2008 book, The Next American Century: How the U.S. Can Thrive As Other Powers Rise. But the proof is in the pudding. In the end, the primacy strategy didn’t deliver. Primacy tempted our leaders into a reckless war in Iraq. It did not prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons. It did nothing to slow China’s influence, as was its implicit goal. And it wrecked, with Moscow’s help, our relationship with Russia. A fixation on primacy paradoxically managed to undermine the influence and authority America did have. Nevertheless, the fact that the Bush administration embraced the notion of primacy was a comfort to the remaining Cold Warriors. President Barack Obama’s approach is different, to say the least. His political allies and his detractors can agree that Obama sees foreign policy not in terms of asserting America’s unparalleled might, but of seeking common cause, including with other major powers. On the one-year mark of his presidency, the contours of the new paradigm are fairly clear: Lead the world in addressing shared challenges Treat other governments and peoples — friends and foes — with respect Forge strategic collaborations with big, pivotal powers and demand responsibility from them on global challenges Reinvigorate and repair existing alliances Reengage with international institutions and rules, pushing for increased accountability Make basic political and economic rights available to more people, knowing that democratic government is the best way to achieve this goal As for primacy, Obama dismissed that as a strategy goal in his inaugural address when he observed, “Our power alone cannot protect us.” Later, in Moscow, Obama elaborated on his view of great power relations, saying, “a great power does not show strength by dominating or demonizing other countries…[G]iven our interdependence, any world order that tries to elevate one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail. The pursuit of power is no longer a zero-sum game — progress must be shared.”

1. Hegemony fails—resistance.

Leverette and Leverette 10—\*Senior fellow at the [New America Foundation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_America_Foundation) in [Washington, D.C.](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington%2C_D.C.), Professor at the [Pennsylvania State University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pennsylvania_State_University) School of International Affairs \*\*CEO of Strategic Energy and Global Analysis (STRATEGA) and  Senior Lecturer and Senior Research Fellow at Yale University’s Jackson Institute for Global Affairs

(Flynt and Hillary, “US Quest for Global Hegemony”, What Others Think, Iran Review, December 22, 2010, http://www.iranreview.org/content/Documents/US\_Quest\_for\_Global\_Hegemony.htm)//AW

The results, however, have been disastrous. The United States has been at war for a startling two out of every three years since 1989, and there is no end in sight. As anyone with a rudimentary knowledge of world events knows, countries that continuously fight wars invariably build powerful national-security bureaucracies that undermine civil liberties and make it difficult to hold leaders accountable for their behavior, and they invariably end up adopting ruthless policies normally associated with brutal dictators. The Founding Fathers understood this problem, as it clear from James Madison’s observation that ‘no nation can preserve its freedom in the midst of continual warfare.’ Washington’s pursuit of policies like assassination, rendition and torture over the past decade, not to mention the weakening of the rule of law at home, shows that their fears were justified. To make matters worse, the United States is now engaged in protracted wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that have so far cost well over a trillion dollars and resulted in around forty-seven thousand American casualties. The pain and suffering inflicted on Iraq has been enormous. Since the war began in March 2003, more than one hundred thousand Iraqi civilians have been killed, roughly 2 million Iraqis have left the country and 1.7 million more have been internally displaced. Moreover, the American military is not going to win either one of these conflicts, despite all the phony talk about how the “surge” has worked in Iraq and how a similar strategy can produce another miracle in Afghanistan. We may well be stuck in both quagmires for years to come, in fruitless pursuit of victory. The United States has also been unable to solve three other major foreign-policy problems. Washington has worked overtime—with no success—to shut down Iran’s uranium-enrichment capability for fear that it might lead to Tehran acquiring nuclear weapons. And the United States, unable to prevent North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons in the first place, now seems incapable of compelling Pyongyang to give them up. Finally, every post–Cold War administration has tried and failed to settle the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; all indicators are that this problem will deteriorate further as the West Bank and Gaza are incorporated into a Greater Israel. The unpleasant truth is that the United States is in a world of trouble today on the foreign-policy front, and this state of affairs is only likely to get worse in the next few years, as Afghanistan and Iraq unravel and the blame game escalates to poisonous levels.” John is equally clear when it comes to diagnosing the source of America’s “world of trouble” on the foreign-policy front: “The root cause of America’s troubles is that it adopted a flawed grand strategy after the Cold War. **From the Clinton administration on, the United States rejected [various strategic alternatives], instead pursuing global dominance, or what might alternatively be called global hegemony, which was not just doomed to fail, but likely to backfire in dangerous ways if it relied too heavily on military force to achieve its ambitious agenda.** Global dominance has two broad objectives: maintaining American primacy, which means making sure that the United States remains the most powerful state in the international system; and spreading democracy across the globe, in effect, making the world over in America’s image. The underlying belief is that new liberal democracies will be peacefully inclined and pro-American, so the more the better. Of course, this means that Washington must care a lot about every country’s politics. With global dominance, no serious attempt is made to prioritize U.S. interests, because they are virtually limitless. This grand strategy is ‘imperial’ at its core; its proponents believe that the United States has the right as well as the responsibility to interfere in the politics of other countries. One would think that such arrogance might alienate other states, but most American policy makers of the early nineties and beyond were confident that would not happen, instead believing that other countries—save for so-called rogue states like Iran and North Korea—would see the United States as a benign hegemon serving their own interests.” John reminds those of us who voted for George W. Bush over Al Gore in 2000 that, on foreign policy issues, Bush largely ran against the kind of liberal imperialism that Gore advocated and that the administration he served as Vice-President had practiced. But, of course, after 9/11, Bush took the quest for global dominance to new heights, especially in the Middle East: “By pursuing this extraordinary scheme to transform an entire region at the point of a gun, President Bush adopted a radical grand strategy that has no parallel in American history. It was also a dismal failure. The Bush administration’s quest for global dominance was based on a profound misunderstanding of the threat environment facing the United States after 9/11. And the president and his advisers overestimated what military force could achieve in the modern world, in turn greatly underestimating how difficult it would be to spread democracy in the Middle East. This triumvirate of errors doomed Washington’s effort to dominate the globe, undermined American values and institutions on the home front, and threatened its position in the world.” In this vein, John points out that “the Bush administration’s fondness for threatening to attack adversaries (oftentimes with the additional agenda of forced democratization) encouraged nuclear proliferation. The best way for the United States to maximize the prospects of halting or at least slowing down the spread of nuclear weapons would be to stop threatening other countries because that gives them a compelling reason to acquire the ultimate deterrent. But as long as America’s leaders remain committed to global dominance, they are likely to resist this advice and keep threatening states that will not follow Washington’s orders.” John warns that the Obama Administration, for all its talk of “change”, has largely embraced the same delusions of global dominance that got the United States into such trouble on the foreign-policy front under the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations. The alternative, as John points out, is not “Fortress America” isolationism. It is a posture he describes as “offshore balancing”—which is actually the United States’ traditional approach to grand strategy, before it developed hegemonic hubris. America still has not faced up to its most fundamental strategic choices in a post-Cold War world. John Mearsheimer has given it an indispensable guide for thinking through those choices.

# Econ

### 2NC Uniqueness

#### Growth is increasing and the economy resilient

Gautam Godhwani 8-15-2012; CEO, SimplyHired.com “Signs Of Resilience In Our Economy” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gautam-godhwani/us-economy-jobs\_b\_1778664.html

This month's Labor Department job report was also more positive than expected, showing that over the past month, the U.S. economy created jobs at the fastest pace since February of this year. Employers added a total of 163,000 jobs in July. And after disappointing reports in May and June, this change of direction demonstrates strength and resilience in our economy. We've seen this again and again in our history, and it has brought us out of past recessions and slow economic times. Consider what we've endured in the last five years: the collapse of the housing market, the financial crisis that followed, debt ceiling talks, the European debt crisis, and dramatic shifts in oil prices. All of this created the worst recession since the Great Depression, and brought consumer confidence to historic lows. With consumer spending making up 70 percent of the U.S. economy, we saw a spiral down across the economy. Businesses slowed hiring and unemployment rates rose dramatically, with millions of Americans out of work. The nation was in a panic. Four years later, we see growth in nearly every industry. Our August U.S. Employment Outlook revealed growth in job openings in 14 out of 18 industries over the last month, including the automotive, education, financial services, real estate, and technology sectors. It also showed that over the past year, we've even seen job openings increase in some of the nation's hardest hit industries, including construction and manufacturing. In addition, strong performing industries from recent past years, such as healthcare, continue to flourish with a consistent increase in job openings. Further, small businesses, which have historically been a key engine of our economy, have resumed hiring after a lull during the recessionary period. As employers continue to look at filling open positions and ramp their hiring efforts, our country's prospect of economic growth and recovery is bright -- albeit slow going. The U.S. economy is built upon businesses large and small, providing goods and services across a wide range of sectors. There are undeniable signs that we've seen the worst of the recent economic downturn, and that better times are ahead. If anything, our recovery from the Great Recession shows that our economy is as resilient as ever.

### 2NC Energy Jobs

#### Oil production increases don’t solve employment – and they only cause job shifting, not growth

Casey Junkins 6-13-2012; West Virginia Observer “Drilling Not Helping Jobless Numbers” http://www.theintelligencer.net/page/content.detail/id/570900/Drilling-Not-Helping-Jobless-Numbers.html?nav=515

WHEELING - As West Virginia's unemployment rate jumps to 6.9 percent, some Mountain State residents believe a hiring boom in the oil and natural gas drilling industry is just around the corner. However, information from WorkForce West Virginia shows the Marcellus and Utica shale drilling industry has not created much direct employment over the past two years. "We've not seen much change in employment in the oil and gas industry over the past year. Employment in oil and gas in 2010 was 2,244, dropping slightly to 2,179 in 2011," said WorkForce spokeswoman Courtney Sisk. The presence of the drilling industry does lead to increased employment in certain areas, as restaurant and hotel owners report being very busy these days because of drillers working in the area. There are also companies that supply materials to the drilling industry that may hire more employees to meet these needs, while retailers may also see an upswing in some business because of mineral owners receiving spending money from lease and royalty checks. However, the WorkForce statistics show that the number of West Virginia residents working directly for gas and oil drillers has not increased over the past two years, despite a continued upswing in drilling and fracking. Gas industry jobs paying nearly $30 per hour are on the way to Marshall County soon, as Dominion Resources will look to hire 40-45 full-time, permanent workers for the natural gas processing plant set to open in December. There will be positions for electricians, plant operators and loaders. In all employment sectors combined, the number of jobless West Virginians residents rose by 1,900 in May to 55,600. There are 1,400 fewer people working in the mining and logging industries, while there are 400 fewer people employed in the manufacturing sector. West Virginia's unemployment rate was 6.7 percent in April. On the positive side, there are 400 more people working in the financial industry with another 100 more working in government. West Virginia's unemployment rate is still more than one point better than the 8.2 percent national average. In addition to serving as a Republican member of West Virginia's House of Delegates from Ohio County, Erikka Storch is also the chief financial officer for Wheeling-based Ohio Valley Steel. She said her company is not seeing much business growth right now, which hinders her ability to hire workers. "The level of construction is down," she said. "I can only keep so many people at levels like this." Storch said the company now has 26 employees, noting the optimal number should be in the range of 35 with a few more out in the field as ironworkers. "There are some out-of-area companies opening up sub-offices around here," she said. "These offices are hiring some employees, but they are mostly just taking local workers from one job to another job. These are employment shifts, rather than unemployed people getting jobs." "I am not seeing the private sector spending money like it usually does," Storch added.

# 2nc defense

**Any instability is low-level --- great powers are too busy with domestic issues to get involved**

**Ferguson, 9** (Niall, Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History at Harvard University, April 10th, “'There will be blood'”, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/article973785.ece)

Heather Scoffield**:** Is a violent resolution to this crisis inevitable? Niall Ferguson**:** “There will be blood, in the sense that a crisis of this magnitude is bound to increase political as well as economic [conflict]. It is bound to destabilize some countries. It will cause civil wars to break out, that have been dormant. It will topple governments that were moderate and bring in governments that are extreme. These things are pretty predictable. The question is whether the general destabilization, the return of, if you like, political risk, ultimately leads to something really big in the realm of geopolitics. That seems a less certain outcome. We've already talked about why China and the United States are in an embrace they don't dare end. If Russia is looking for trouble the way Mr. Putin seems to be, I still have some doubt as to whether it can really make this trouble, because of the weakness of the Russian economy. It's hard to imagine Russia invading Ukraine without weakening its economic plight. They're desperately trying to prevent the ruble from falling off a cliff. They're spending all their reserves to prop it up. It's hardly going to help if they do another Georgia.” “I was more struck Putin's bluster than his potential to bite, when he spoke at Davos. But he made a really good point, which I keep coming back to. In his speech, he said crises like this will encourage governments to engage in foreign policy aggression. I don't think he was talking about himself, but he might have been. It's true, one of the things historically that we see, and also when we go back to 30s, but also to the depressions 1870s and 19980s, weak regimes will often resort to a more aggressive foreign policy, to try to bolster their position. It's legitimacy that you can gain without economic disparity – playing the nationalist card. I wouldn't be surprised to see some of that in the year ahead. It's just that I don't see it producing anything comparable with 1914 or 1939. **It's kind of hard to envisage a world war**. Even when most pessimistic, I struggle to see how that would work, because the U.S., for all its difficulties in the financial world, is so overwhelmingly dominant in the military world.”

**Geopolitics is determined by numerous other factors --- not the economy**

**Blackwill, 9** (Robert D., former United States Ambassador to India and National Security Council Deputy for Iraq, served as the Harvard Kennedy School of Government’s Associate Dean and the Belfer Lecturer in International Security, RAND Corporation, The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Finally, if not, why not? If the world is in the most severe international economic crisis since the 1930s, why is it not producing structural changes in the global order? A brief answer is that the transcendent geopolitical elements have not altered in substantial ways with regard to individual nations in the two years since the economic crisis began. What are those enduring geopolitical elements? For any given country, they include the following: • Geographic location, topography, and climate. As Robert Kaplan puts it, “to embrace geography is not to accept it as an implacable force against which humankind is powerless. Rather, it serves to qualify human freedom and choice with a modest acceptance of fate.”29 In this connection, see in particular the works of Sir Halford John Mackinder and his Th e Geographical Pivot of History (1904)30, and Alfred Th ayer Mahan, Th e Infl uence of Sea Power upon History, 1660–1783 (1890).31 • Demography—the size, birth rate, growth, density, ethnicity, literacy, religions, migration/emigration/ assimilation/absorption, and industriousness of the population. • Th e histories, foreign and defense policy tendencies, cultural determinants, and domestic politics of individual countries. • Th e size and strength of the domestic economy. • Th e quality and pace of technology. • Th e presence of natural resources. • Th e character, capabilities, and policies of neighboring states. For the countries that matter most in the global order, perhaps unsurprisingly, none of these decisive variables have changed very much since the global downturn began, except for nations’ weaker economic performances. Th at single factor is not likely to trump all these other abiding geopolitical determinants and therefore produce international structural change. Moreover, the fundamental power relationships between and among the world’s foremost countries have also not altered, nor have those nations’ perceptions of their vital national interests and how best to promote and defend them. To sum up this pivotal concept, in the absence of war, revolution, or other extreme international or domestic disruptions, for nation-states, the powerful abiding conditions just listed do not evolve much except over the very long term, and thus neither do countries’ strategic intent and core external policies— even, as today, in the face of world economic trials. This point was made earlier about Russia’s enduring national security goals, which go back hundreds of years. Similarly, a Gulf monarch recently advised—with respect to Iran—not to fasten on the views of President Ahmadinejad or Supreme Leader Khamenei. Rather, he counseled that, to best understand contemporary Iranian policy, one should more usefully read the histories, objectives, and strategies of the Persian kings Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, who successively ruled a vast empire around 500 BC.32 Th e American fi lmmaker Orson Welles once opined that “To give an accurate description of what never happened is the proper occupation of the historian.” 33 Perhaps the same is occasionally true of pundits.