### 2NC—Conditionality Good

We get \_\_ advocacies

Conditionality is good—

1. **Neg Flex**—multiple worlds are crucial to test the aff from every angle—it prevents us from being locked in to a strategy
2. **Innovation**—conditionality incentivizes risk taking—vital internal to argument research—prevents stale and repetitive debates
3. **Mixedscanning**—Argument introduction determines what warrants in-depth review—best middle ground between breadth and depth—key to priority-setting and high-pressure decision-making.
4. **Info processing**—more arguments teach students to process information—most portable skill

Now defense—

No skew—condo leads to more critical thinking—without it, being aff would be too easy

2NR means we have a stable advocacy

Err neg—the aff speaks first and last and infinite prep—voting on theory leads to substance crowd-out—if we don’t make debate impossible don’t vote us down

Fusion inevitable completely takes out their add-on—their ev doesn’t make a distinction about fast v. slow fusion—tech will obviously exist before long-term incentives for colonization

### Russia Relations – 2NC Impact Calculus

#### DA outweighs and turns case – Romney immediately decimates Russia relations which destroys global non-proliferation efforts and leads to increasing hostilities – escalates to US-Russia nuclear war – that’s Felton (and Allison). It’s the fastest timeframe because relations will decline as soon as Romney takes office in early 2013. And turns or makes all their impacts inevitable – Allison card proves US leverage uniquely with Russia key to solve any geopolitical threat outlined by the 1AC

#### Russia war outweighs – largest arsenals and most probable because of hair-trigger alert

Helfand and Pastore 9 | Presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility (Ira and John, MD's and Past Presidents of the Physicians for Social Responsbility, "US-Russia nuclear war still a threat," 3/31)

Since the end of the Cold War, many have acted as though the danger of nuclear war has ended. It has not. There remain in the world more than 20,000 nuclear weapons. Alarmingly, more than 2,000 of these weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals remain on ready-alert status, commonly known as hair-trigger alert. They can be fired within five minutes and reach targets in the other country 30 minutes later. Just one of these weapons can destroy a city. A war involving a substantial number would cause devastation on a scale unprecedented in human history. A study conducted by Physicians for Social Responsibility in 2002 showed that if only 500 of the Russian weapons on high alert exploded over our cities, 100 million Americans would die in the first 30 minutes. An attack of this magnitude also would destroy the entire economic, communications and transportation infrastructure on which we all depend. Those who survived the initial attack would inhabit a nightmare landscape with huge swaths of the country blanketed with radioactive fallout and epidemic diseases rampant. They would have no food, no fuel, no electricity, no medicine, and certainly no organized health care. In the following months it is likely the vast majority of the U.S. population would die. Recent studies by the eminent climatologists Toon and Robock have shown that such a war would have a huge and immediate impact on climate world wide. If all of the warheads in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals were drawn into the conflict, the firestorms they caused would loft 180 million tons of soot and debris into the upper atmosphere — blotting out the sun. Temperatures across the globe would fall an average of 18 degrees Fahrenheit to levels not seen on earth since the depth of the last ice age, 18,000 years ago. Agriculture would stop, eco-systems would collapse, and many species, including perhaps our own, would become extinct. It is common to discuss nuclear war as a low-probabillity event. But is this true? We know of five occcasions during the last 30 years when either the U.S. or Russia believed it was under attack and prepared a counter-attack. The most recent of these near misses occurred after the end of the Cold War on Jan. 25, 1995, when the Russians mistook a U.S. weather rocket launched from Norway for a possible attack. Jan. 25, 1995, was an ordinary day with no major crisis involving the U.S. and Russia. But, unknown to almost every inhabitant on the planet, a misunderstanding led to the potential for a nuclear war. The ready alert status of nuclear weapons that existed in 1995 remains in place today. The nuclear danger will not pass until the U.S. and Russia lead the other nuclear states to a Nuclear Weapons Convention that seeks to abolish these weapons forever. As a critical first step the U.S. and Russia must take their weapons off ready-alert status. Presidents Obama and Medvedev can do this on their own by executive order.

### Relations

**Romney destroys Russia relations – he’s labeled them our #1 geopolitical foe and embraces a Cold War ideology that refuses to make any concessions – that’s Felton.**

#### Romney win causes a full-scale crisis in relations - largest internal link to collapse—this card answers all their alt cause arguments

Richter 7/2 Paul is a writer at the LA Times, citing Alexey Pushkov, chairman of the international affairs committee of the Russian Duma. "Russian official: Romney's hard line could bring 'full-scale crisis'," 2012, http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jul/02/news/la-pn-russian-official-romneys-hard-line-could-bring-fullscale-crisis-20120702

MOSCOW -- Mitt Romney’s comment that Russia is America’s **“**No. 1 geopolitical foe,” a red-meat line for Republicans, is also attracting some attention in Moscow. Alexey Pushkov, chairman of the international affairs committee of the State Duma, said in a recent interview that Russian leaders have noted Romney’s comments with concern, and are watching with interest as neoconservative and “realist” advisers maneuver for influence within the campaign. **“We don’t think that for us Romney will be an easy partner,”** said Pushkov, an ally of President Vladimir Putin. “We think that Romney will be, on the rhetorical side, a replay of the Bush administration.” He also noted Romney’s statements that the United States should assert its dominance in the 21st century. “If he is serious about this, I’m afraid he may choose the neocon-type people…In the first year of his presidency, we may have a full-scale crisis,” he said. Romney, in an interview with CNN in March, called Russia "without question our No. 1 geopolitical foe, they fight for every cause for the world's worst actors. The idea that [Obama] has more flexibility in mind for Russia is very, very troubling indeed." Pushkov said Russian leaders have noticed that Romney has among his foreign policy advisers several foreign policy figures often described as neoconservatives, such as Robert Kagan. “We don’t find it very positive,” he said. Pushkov said that the “reset” in U.S.-Russia relations that Obama has portrayed as a signature foreign policy accomplishment “is stuck, basically. It needs another reset.” Nevertheless, though the U.S. and Russia are at odds on issues such as Syria and missile defense, Obama would be “acceptable” as a partner for Russia in a second term, Pushkov said. Obama and Putin showed in their recent meeting in Mexico that “they don’t want a personal conflict,” he said.

#### Putin’s not the problem

Gutterman 9/5 Steve is a writer for Reuters. “Putin says he could work with Romney but relations a two-way street,” 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/05/us-russia-putin-idUSBRE8840Y320120905

(Reuters) - Russian President Vladimir Putin said he is ready to work with Mitt Romney if he is elected U.S. president but suggested **he would not go out of his way to court Washington and that the relationship would depend largely on the United States.**

### UQ

#### Obama will win—Romney gaffes, economy on the rise, and swing states

Jim Malone 9/21/12, reporter for Voice of America News, "Obama Rising," Voice of America News, blogs.voanews.com/2012-election/2012/09/21/obama-rising/

It’s been three weeks now since Mitt Romney pleaded his case to be president before the American people in his speech before the Republican Party National Convention in Tampa, Florida. Before the convention, the presidential race was essentially tied. Three weeks later there has been a noticeable shift in President Obama’s favor.¶ So what happened? The Republican convention did little to boost Mr. Romney’s chances of getting elected. The lasting memory from the convention is not Mr. Romney’s speech, but Hollywood actor Clint Eastwood’s bizarre, unscripted appearance with an empty chair that was supposed to contain an imaginary President Obama. The Romney campaign checked with Eastwood early on to find out what he was going to say, but Eastwood simply told them he didn’t know yet and that he would wing it. Amazing that on such little things campaigns sometimes turn.¶ Self-inflicted Wounds¶ Mitt Romney’s decision to weigh in early on the anti-U.S. protests in Egypt and Libya was not well-received, even by some Republicans. And his latest distraction is proving to be costly as well as he tries to defend his secretly-recorded comments at a private fund raising meeting in May that the 47 percent of voters who support President Obama are dependent on government handouts and see themselves as victims.¶ One of the big problems here is that many people, **including many undecided swing voters**, are going to be put off by comments that seem to divide and polarize people based on income and tax status.¶ The telling reactions here are from many Republicans who see the Romney comments as a major gaffe and not in keeping with a conservative philosophy that strives to empower and enfranchise all citizens, regardless of humble beginnings. Republicans like to point out that Ronald Reagan was always able to put a smiling face on conservatism, but the Romney comments struck many as divisive and unhelpful in his efforts to woo undecided voters and those who are disappointed with Mr. Obama’s performance.¶ A Less Sour Public¶ Some of the latest public opinion polls show slight improvements in how Americans see the direction of the country and their views on the national economy. This has always been the Obama “Achilles Heel,” the thought that voters will simply conclude he’s failed in line with a greater view that the economy is bad and little is being done to fix it or change course.¶ To be sure these are only slight indications and a number of surveys still show more people believe the country is headed in the wrong direction than on the right course. But if the trend continues for a while, it could give the Obama campaign a much needed undercurrent of optimism about the economy, which has always been something the Democrats have hoped for but couldn’t count on.¶ Speaking of polls, the latest numbers for Mr. Romney from so-called battleground states – states that could go either way in the November election — are daunting. He’s trailing by notable margins in Ohio, Virginia and Iowa, and though the margins are somewhat closer, he’s also behind in Florida, Colorado and Wisconsin, home state of his running mate, Paul Ryan.

#### Obama will win---he’s ahead in all swing states---unexpected events could change it

Silver 9/20 Nate is the chief pollster for the NYT’s 538 blog. “Sept. 20: Obama’s Convention Bounce May Not Be Receding,” 2012, <https://www.google.com/search?q=obama+will+win&num=100&hl=en&safe=off&prmd=imvnsu&source=univ&tbm=nws&tbo=u&sa=X&ei=k-FcUK2wGIOU2wX_tIGQDA&ved=0CCAQqAI&biw=1162&bih=683>

President Obama’s position **inched forward** in the FiveThirtyEight forecast on Thursday. His chances of winning the Electoral College are **76.1 percent**, according to the forecast, up from 75.2 percent on Wednesday. Mr. Obama’s projected margin of victory in the national popular vote also increased slightly, to 3.4 percentage points.¶ By and large, the story that Thursday’s polls told was the same one as on Wednesday. Mr. Obama continues to get very strong results in state polls that use industry-standard methodology, meaning that they use live interviews and place calls to mobile phones along with landlines.¶ **In the 10 states that have generally been ranked the highest on our tipping-point list — Ohio, Virginia, Florida, Wisconsin, Colorado, Nevada, Iowa, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire and Michigan** — there have been 21 such polls since the Democratic convention ended. **Mr. Obama has led in all 21 of these surveys — and usually by clear margins**. On average, he has held a six-point lead in these surveys, and he has had close to 50 percent of the vote in them.¶ Mr. Obama’s results have been more varied among polling firms that use different methodologies. A series of polls in eleven swing states, released on Thursday by the online firm YouGov, were fairly strong for Mr. Obama, putting him ahead among likely voters in all of the states except North Carolina.¶ But automated polls, like those from the Rasmussen Reports, have had lukewarm results for Mr. Obama. A Rasmussen Reports poll released on Thursday, for instance, put Mr. Obama three points behind in Iowa.¶ I don’t mean to keep repeating this point about polling methodologies, but it really does seem to be the easiest way to unpack the state-level data right now.¶ In contrast to the six-point lead Mr. Obama has held on average among the swing-state polls that included cellphones, and the five-point lead he had on average among the YouGov Internet surveys, Mr. Obama has been ahead by just two points on average in polls that called landlines only, most of which were “robopolls” conducted by automated script.¶ If Mr. Obama’s lead is five or six points in the typical swing state right now, then Mitt Romney will probably need some sort of external contingency to give him much of a chance at winning.¶ If Mr. Obama’s lead is more like two points instead, then routine factors like the debates or economic reports could more easily put Mr. Romney ahead, although obviously there would be no guarantees.¶ Although the forecast model weighs polls from the stronger polling firms more heavily, it continues to project something of an in-between result — in part because the national polls seem to have gravitated more toward the range of a three- or four-point lead for Mr. Obama, and in part because it continues to assume that Mr. Obama could still be experiencing a modest afterglow from his convention that will subsequently fade.¶ However, Mr. Romney will need to see Mr. Obama’s numbers decline fairly soon if he wants to bank on the convention bounce hypothesis. The penalty that the forecast is applying to Mr. Obama’s polls will phase out over the next week or so. The model would make Mr. Obama a 83.9 percent favorite right now were it not for the convention bounce adjustment.¶ But isn’t Mr. Obama’s convention bounce declining already? It sure seemed to be the case a couple of days ago — but now the evidence has become more ambiguous.¶ The most powerful argument that Mr. Obama’s convention bounce is fading — or perhaps has already faded — is the Gallup national tracking poll, which showed the race reverting to a tie on Thursday after once having given Mr. Obama a seven-point lead.¶ Gallup is one of four national tracking polls, however, and the others tell a variety of stories, none of which are exactly consistent.¶ In the Rasmussen Reports tracking poll, Mr. Obama’s numbers faded sharply late last week, but they have since rebounded. In Thursday’s version of that poll, he held a three-point lead over Mr. Romney when voters who leaned toward a candidate were included.¶ In the Ipsos online tracking poll, Mr. Obama’s numbers have fluctuated some, but he remains five points ahead among likely voters — only slightly off his peak. (The survey also put Mr. Obama 10 points ahead among the broader universe of registered voters.)¶ In the RAND Corporation’s tracking poll, Mr. Obama lead has expanded slowly but steadily. In fact, he reached his highest level of the year on Thursday, with the survey giving him a 5.4 percentage point advantage among likely voters.¶ A simple average of the four tracking polls put Mr. Obama 3.4 percentage points ahead on Thursday. That is essentially no different than a week ago, when the same technique gave him a 3.5-point lead.¶ It’s at least possible that Mr. Obama’s bounce was fading — but that the attention to Mr. Romney’s ”47 percent” comments has since given Mr. Obama renewed momentum. It will take a few more days before we can come to any sort of conclusion about this, however, especially since some of the tracking polls use long field periods and have only conducted a fraction of their interviews since Mr. Romney’s remarks were uncovered.

#### Obama will win---consensus of top political scientists---it’ll be close

Camia 9/20 Catalina is a writer for USA Today. “8 of 13 forecasts say Obama wins popular vote,” 2012, http://content.usatoday.com/communities/onpolitics/post/2012/09/20/obama-romney-forecasting-models-election/70000816/1#.UFuz9Y1lScw

What happens when 20 eminent political scientists crunch data to predict the outcome of the 2012 election?¶ Eight of their 13 forecasting models predict President Obama will win the popular vote over Mitt Romney, **but the race could be close.**¶ After crunching a **wide range of data** -- from public opinion polls to leading economic indicators to the impact of war -- these forecasts range from predicting a 53.8% popular vote for Obama to a 53.1% vote for Romney.

### AT: Spending now

#### Thumpers are irrelevant - public opinion of Obama's actions in the coming months is all that matters

Abramowitz 12 Alan is the Alben W. Barkley Professor of Political Science at Emory University. He holds a PhD from Stanford. "What Does President Obama’s May Approval Rating Tell Us About His Reelection Chances?," May 23rd, http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/articles/what-does-president-obama%E2%80%99s-may-approval-rating-tell-us-about-his-reelection-chances/

Whether we base our prediction on President Obama’s 47% approval rating in the Gallup Poll in early May or a more sophisticated forecasting model incorporating economic conditions and the “time for change” factor, it appears likely that we are headed for a very close election in November. Both models make Obama a slight favorite to win a second term. However, the final outcome will depend on the actual performance of the economy and the public’s evaluation of the president’s job performance in the months ahead. Those interested in assessing where the presidential race stands should focus on these two indicators rather than the day-to-day events of the campaign, which tend to dominate media coverage of the election.

### Link

#### More deficit spending would swing the election to Romney

Kraushaar 5/14 (Josh, National Journal writer, 2012, http://decoded.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/romneys-targeted-deficit-messa.php)

If unemployment was the only factor driving this presidential election, Mitt Romney would not be spending much time campaigning in Iowa, where the state's agricultural economy is relatively healthy, and the state boasts a 5.2 percent unemployment rate, the lowest for any battleground state. But spending and debt are big issues in the American heartland, too. And that's why Romney spent time on the trail in Des Moines Tuesday, with a speech decrying excessive government spending. Concern over federal spending is what drove the tea party movement into existence in 2009, and it's an issue that hasn't gone away in 2012. It's what's driving Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's momentum in next month's gubernatorial recall, with a deficit-conscious GOP base showing high levels of enthusiasm. (It's also an effective message with independents: Check out this new ad from Republican New Mexico Senate candidate Heather Wilson that's focused squarely on the debt, deficit and spending -- in a Democratic-leaning state.) When pollsters ask voters what their most important issue is, the catch-all "jobs and the economy" comes first. But the number of voters naming the deficit rose in 2010 and has remained largely constant, and it's an issue that's driving conservatives to the polls. It's also a way for Romney to criticize the president on the economy in states that haven't suffered the brunt of the downturn. New Hampshire is another state with a solid economy, but one receptive to Romney's small-government messaging. Indeed, the RNC held a conference call today, featuring former New Hampshire Gov. John Sununu and former New Hampshire Rep. Jeb Bradley, decrying Obama's record on debt and deficits. Obama may be leading in early Granite State polls, but the Romney campaign is optimistic about their chances there, hoping to take advantage of the state's "live free or die" sentiment. If Obama needs high levels of youth and minority turnout to win a second term, Romney needs a restive base anxious about the fiscal future of the country to show up in big numbers. That's the ticket to a Romney victory in states like Iowa, New Hampshire, and Virginia -- where the economy is pretty good but voter dissatisfaction still runs high.

### AT: October Surprise!

#### No October surprise—Obama playing it safe

Miller 7/2/12---distinguished scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Aaron David, “No Dog in This Fight,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/02/no\_dog\_in\_this\_fight?page=full)

Rarely has foreign policy -- outside of rising oil prices and terror attacks -- been less relevant to American voters. It figures almost not at all in a campaign focused on unemployment, disposable income, and mortgage woes. Republicans are having a hard time finding vulnerabilities in the Obama's foreign policies, I've argued elsewhere, and a consensus has emerged between the two candidates on some of the core foreign-policy issues.¶ What this means in practical terms is that success abroad -- even spectacular success -- won't mean much in election currency. As long as the administration doesn't allow the Republicans to outflank it on the one foreign issue Americans do care about -- fighting terror -- there's not much upside to risking military action or a big peace initiative that could be messy, costly, and worst of all seen as a failure. In political terms, Obama's Middle East policy has been pretty successful -- killing Osama bin Laden and whacking al Qaeda operatives from one end of the planet to the other, getting out of Iraq, and taking out Muammar al-Qaddafi without owning a mess in Libya. Other issues -- Israeli-Palestinian peace or the Arab spring turned winter -- really don't matter much in terms of the election, unless of course the president stumbles.¶ And that -- together with bad options on Iran and Syria -- is the source of the Obama's caution. I've never really understood the notion of the "October surprise" -- not in the world of foreign policy this president inhabits. The idea that any president would want to willfully plunge ahead into the broken, angry, dysfunctional Middle East looking for opportunities and glory to help him win re-election is an idea reserved for the conspiratorial and the interminably obtuse.¶ You can divide the Middle East Obama confronts in two: migraine headaches and root canals. There are no opportunities, only risks and dangers. And the president is resolved to avoid them for now, or at least minimize them.¶ On Iran, it's clear he and the mullahs share a common objective: avoid an Israeli attack anytime soon. A unilateral Israeli strike would inject tremendous uncertainty into the global economy, roil markets, raise oil and gas prices, and retard an already weak recovery. It could draw America into another Middle East quagmire. If things went badly, the Republicans would start hammering the president for not dealing with Israel's Iranian concerns earlier and charge weakness and incompetence.¶ The notion that Obama is more prepared to go to war with Iran because it's an election year and he must satisfy the pro-Israeli community or an Israeli prime minister is nonsense, given where the electorate is. § Marked 08:12 § At the same time, Obama isn't in much of a position to make concessions on the nuclear issue, either, because he knows he'll get hit with the appeasement charge faster than you can say the word "enrichment."¶ It's the fear of war, not the desire for one, that's driving the president, and this is very much related to his re-election. A war with the mullahs and the Revolutionary Guards is the last thing Obama wants or needs now. It's much safer to keep the nuclear talks limping along and get through November without a crisis.

### Agencies Link---2NC

#### Obama will be blamed for agency action

Wallison 3 Resident Fellow @ A.E.I. “A Power Shift No One Noticed”, AEI Online, 1-1, http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.15652/pub\_detail.asp

To be sure, the president had appointed the chairman and the other members of the SEC, but that in itself would not make him blameworthy unless one assumed that he was also directly responsible for how the SEC acted before, and after, the scandals erupted. That is the nub of the important but largely unnoticed change that has occurred: the unchallenged assumption on the part of all parties--in Congress, in the media, among the public, and even in the White House itself--that the president was fully accountable for an agency that has always been viewed as independent.

The significance of this change in the grand government scheme of things can hardly be overstated. Without legislation or judicial decision, the president has suddenly become electorally responsible for the decisions of bodies that were considered to be within the special purview of Congress, susceptible only to congressional policy direction. Of course, this functional revolution did not give the president any new powers with respect to the independent regulatory agencies. But the die is now cast. The way the American people look at the president's responsibilities apparently is changing, and that will affect the attitude of Congress. If the American people believe that the president should be responsible for the actions of the SEC, it will be difficult to convince them otherwise. Significantly, since Harvey Pitt's resignation as SEC chairman in November, the media have routinely referred to the president's choice to head the SEC, investment banker William H. Donaldson, as a member of the Bush "economic team."